Gustav A. Beckmann
Onomastics of the "Chanson de Roland"

Gustav A. Beckmann

Onomastics of the "Chanson de Roland"

Or: Why Gaston Paris and Joseph Bédier were both right

Translated by
Linda Archibald

Acknowledgements

In terms of content, the English version of my *Onomastics of the Chanson de Roland* presented here differs minimally from the German version, *Onomastik des Rolandsliedes*.

But one of the very first reviewers of the German version, Karin Ueltschi (CCM 59 (2016 [sic]), 459–460), who was impressed by the fact that the book could be studied in a coherent reading, but could also be used as a lexicon of the names in the French *Song of Roland*, wished it a quick translation into "French and English" – a dubble suggestion I would have found difficult to resist, if . . . . it had not exceeded the available funds. So it was almost through a biographical coincidence which of the two languages came into play.

I had known Dr Linda Archibald for a long time – especially through her translations from German and French into English; she is a native British speaker and has a doctorate in German studies on Otfrid von Weißenburg. She then accepted my proposal – for which I would like to thank her here too from the bottom of my heart – and brilliantly 'pulled through' the extensive translation in just over a year, chapter-by-chapter and, occasionally even sentence-by-sentence, in exchange of opinions with me.

My publisher deGruyter, Berlin/Boston, was open to the project from the start, for which I am especially indebted to Dr Ulrike Krauß and Dr Christine Henschel who both had already supervised the German edition and some other of my books before. No less thanks to Monika Pfleghar, who was responsible for the technical side of the production this time.

And finally, the book would not nearly be what it is without the two extensive English indexes, one to the works from before 1600 quoted in the book and the other to the names occurring in the *Chanson*, which I owe to Meiken Endruweit and to my wife respectively.

Trier, January 2023   Gustav A. Beckmann

Contents

A The non-Christian side

B Between Islam and Christianity

C The Christian side

D Appendix

Introduction

1 Aim of this book

The present study seeks to uncover everything that all the proper names in the Chanson de Roland (from now on Rol.) can tell us about three fundamental aspects of the text: its structure(s), its world-imaging content (i.e., its relationship with the world, even where it does not intend to be "representational reality" in Auerbach's sense) and the extent to which it is the outcome of a development process.

Setting such a goal today is certainly a challenge: it entails a considerable amount of work, and there are two reasons for that.

2 Inventory of names in the Song of Roland

First, the Rol. has an exceptionally rich selection of names: Segre's index of names has twelve and a half pages containing 407 lemmata[1] (of which 47 are only references to variants, e.g., from *Bramidonĭe* to *Bramimunde*, but even these require some explanation); the lemmata are spread, according to Duggan's *Index Verborum*, over 1823 occurrences.[2] This means that within the total of 4002 verses, on average, a name occurs in almost every second verse, and a new name in every 10th verse. The two smallest categories are the 10 named horses and 7 named weapons. The named individuals are somewhat different: if we subtract the biblical characters, the saints, the 'heathen' gods and also Homer, Vergil and Turold – 24 altogether – there are 116, that is to say 57 on the Christian side and 59 on the non-Christian side.[3] The explanation for this almost perfect quantitative

---

1 For the text of the *Rol.*, I usually follow Segre (1971), checking Segre (1989); I also retain his manuscript sigles. Like Segre, I count adjectival names like *espa[n]* 'Spanish' as names, but they do not merit a lemma of their own if they appear together with the subst. as in *la franceise gent* besides *li Franceis*.

2 To be precise: 1923 (sic) items in the index of names (from 27 ⅓ large-octave pages), to which 20 additional ones are added from Duggan's main section, if we (like Segre) count as names; even adj. (!) *alexandrin* (2x), *angevin*, *espa[n]*, *franceis* (7x adj.), *leutize / leutiz, persis* (2x), *sarazineis, sarraguzeis, sarrazin* (only 1x adj.), *valentineis* and *vianeis*. On the other hand, I have removed the 120 occurrences of *Deu(s), Damne(s)deu(s)* for the Christian God because they would significantly distort the picture; Segre too, unlike Duggan, does not count *Deu(s)* in this sense as one of the names.

3 Including the few figures (such as e.g., Ganelon's son Baldewin) who do not have an active role. Bramimunde/-donĭe alias Juliane is counted on both sides (through baptism human beings

parity on the two sides in the inventory of names (not in the numerical strength of the armies!) lies largely in the fact that the poet constructs the Battle of Ronce-vaux almost completely (and to a lesser extent the Baligant battle) as a succession of single combats. Furthermore, in his depiction of the two sides, even in the council scenes and other similar scenes, he deliberately provides an almost equal amount of detail, albeit with opposite moral signposting. This reveals not only the poet's basic narrative approach – he is the omniscient author – but also the work's most significant structural principle, which is parallelism. If we count as geographical names all the feudal and homeland information, e.g. *(Engeler de) Guascuigne, (Margariz de) Sibilĭe* as well as the corresponding personal forms such as *li Guascuinz (Engeler)* and the adjectives that go with them such as *(li Sarrazins) espans, (palĭe) alexandrin,* the total comes to 201. This is almost twice as many as the named individuals (as defined above), which gives us an early indication that the geographical names are not to be dismissed as being of secondary importance. Indeed, they should be investigated, not only in terms of their real geographical content and their potential symbolic meanings, but also in terms of the contribution that they make to the structure of the work.[4]

3 Outline of previous research

Secondly, this extensive of corpus of names (even if we start by excluding most of the variants) has been available to researchers since 1837, indeed since Francis-que Michel's *editio princeps* of the Rol. based on the Oxford Ms.; this makes the Rol. one of the oldest topics of all in French medieval studies. The year 1869 can be considered as the date when a methodical study of its names truly began: this was when, even before the launch of *Romania,* Gaston Paris published his first, almost four-page essay on the geography of the Rol., quickly followed by a second essay in 1873, on the 'heathen' people. Since then, a huge quantity of research material has emerged. For many years, it was mostly about the geographical

---

become a "new person"). Slight deviations from these numbers in Aebischer (1955–1956, 73) and Menéndez Pidal (1960, 318) can be explained as isolated problems.

4 If we switch from lexical items to occurrences, however, we find that the personal names, as one might expect, are clearly in the majority. This can be seen in the most frequent items in each group according to Duggan's concordance: there are 190 *C(h)arles / C(h)arlemagnes* (sometimes with *K-*) and 187 *Rollant* in comparison to the quasi-geographical 160 *Francs / Franceis* and 31 *Sar(r)azins* (to which one could add 114 *paiens,* although quite rightly, neither Segre nor Duggan count these as names). Among geographical names in the narrower sense, there are 83 *France* and 50 *Espaigne,* and in the subgroup of placenames 29 *Sar(r)aguce* and 19 *Ais / Eis.*

names; only a few scholars were interested in the personal names, including especially Rajna (1886 to 1897), Tavernier (1903 and passim until 1914–1917a and b) and Boissonnade (1923), although the last two were only partially successful in their efforts. There were a few heated discussions over the course of these many decades, and they unexpectedly came to a head when Lejeune (1950b) brought the names *Olivier* and *Rollant*, especially in their paired appearances, into the spotlight. Thanks to Menéndez Pidal (1960) the controversy between (neo-) traditionalists and individualists – to use the terminology of that time – expanded further into a debate about the basic principles of these two different approaches, which medievalists felt obliged to consider as antagonistic rather than as complementary.

Shortly after 1970, however, both the geographical and the personal names began to attract less attention, and this trend has continued until the present time; the only major exception being de Mandach's last book (1993), and even this is not primarily conceived of as an onomastic study. Unfortunately, we cannot say that the topic has been "exhausted" in a way that shows consensus on the key issues or on most of the points of detail. On the contrary, the situation is more like the kind of exhaustion that would be called *burn-out* in sociomedical circles.

How can we explain this decline in interest? First of all, the big controversy between traditionalists and individualists did not produce a winner. It simply faded away, and in the judgment of most observers it ended in a *non liquet*. Secondly, a new major problem emerged, through Noyer-Weidner's (1968, 1969, 1971 and again 1979) emphasis on the symbolic elements in the geographical names of the work, especially in the catalogue of 'heathen' peoples, and his sharp criticism of their literal geographical interpretation. And thirdly, an even bigger *non liquet* burden fell on the huge number of isolated problems that are to be found in epic onomastics as a whole, not just since the period immediately before 1970, but for many decades before that. There are often three or more mutually exclusive explanations for each name, and it is not possible to regard all but one as disproven. In extreme cases there can be many more: in the relevant sections of this study below, I have identified nine for *Durendal*, and 23 for *Tervagan*. In the 1970s, this must all have led to the impression that everything examinable about the prehistory and onomastics of the Rol. had been examined but had produced a plethora of possible answers, or at least did not add up to any bigger picture, and therefore in the end, had contributed little to our appreciation of the work: the knowable seemed not worth knowing, *multa, sed non multum*. Any new researcher who reaches a conclusion like this will surely find another field to specialise in.

And yet this conclusion is wrong, and we could almost say: grotesquely wrong. The whole of this book is a wager on the opposing position. What is

knowable and worth knowing about these names has not by a long chalk been ascertained. Almost every name in the Rol. offers novel and interesting aspects, a few names bring real discoveries, and all in all, a whole world opens up in these names. Even more significantly, if for every isolated problem, including the geographical ones, we compare all of the suggested answers, using the usual technical criteria of our discipline, then in a clear majority of cases one answer stands out as far more probable than the others, so that we can with a good conscience call it the right one. In a few cases there may be two competing answers, but almost never more than that. Incidentally, in this endeavour, Segre's stemma holds up magnificently. Moreover, these isolated findings in no way amount to a zero-sum game, but they show that the surviving text of the Rol. is great literature not least in its choice of names and in the way they are used: its names are an important element of the work's structure, they open up aspects of the poet's lived experience and at the same time, they are the key to the previous history of the work.

4 Structure of this study

Admittedly – and this is unfortunately the crux of the problem – we cannot nowadays acquire this kind of knowledge through awareness of methodology or literary sensibility, and certainly not through a new theory of the epic. What we need to do, is collect and then work through much larger bodies of material than most philologists are happy to consider: any conclusions will require a much broader and more thorough underpinning.

The study proceeds, in terms of the order of presentation, from the far to the near: from the Orient with its 'heathen' peoples and their overarching structure over North Africa and Spain, to the Frankish realm and the Franks. Because of the above-mentioned almost-parity in numbers between the two sides in the inventory of names, it is easy to identify two large complexes: the representation of the non-Christian (A) and that of the Christian (C) side. A slimmer mid-section (B) consists of the smaller categories of weapon names, the provenance of the textiles, and the names of horses: there is no reason to allocate these to the two main sides because this would only separate items that are comparable with each other. I anticipate that this A-B-C order will give the reader a more compact overview, than would be possible with the reverse ordering. This means, however, that the work begins with the tricky, and thus far fundamentally misunderstood, catalogue of heathen peoples. The quantity of material pertaining to this opening section requires much more patience than the material in each of the sections which follow on later.

In terms of the scope of the whole topic, I have placed the 'Results' section immediately after this 'Introduction' and expressly ask my readers to read through

it before proceeding to the other parts of the study. These days, time constraints dictate that *before* we read a scholarly book, we have a right to know what kind of results to expect – just as we nowadays expect a scholarly article to be preceded by an abstract.

5 Collecting and analysing the material

In almost the whole of section A, that is to say with the sole exception of the sections about the three main characters Baligant, Marsilĭe and Bramimunde / Bramidonĭe (A.3.3, A.8.3s.), in the whole of section B and in the first half of section C, again excluding only the main characters in this section (C.10–C.17), the objective is a synchronous one, in so far as it is directed only at the names which appear in the surviving text of the Rol. When researching the catalogue of peoples (A.1), I think I worked through the entire geographical/historical literature from classical times until 1100; but even here, the aim is only to show how and why a poet in the first half of the 12th century could know and select the names in question. In the sections on the catalogue of peoples, the other geographical names on the non-Christian side and a few other topics (such as the names of the 'heathen' gods, A.13) a similar structure is used: each section starts with an investigation of the reading (if necessary, possible readings) of the archetype; then the suggested explanations are listed, sometimes along with an additional, new reading; finally they are critically examined, where possible with a decision in favour of one of them, or else with a list in descending order of probability. In the case of the 'heathen' peoples, I also hope to show how each item fits with the previous and following items so that the catalogue is a tightly structured whole, a point which has been missed by previous scholars.

   In the other sections of the book, only the investigation of the archetype is the same, and after that the focus is necessarily variable. For example, in the case of the saints (C.1.3.–C.1.6.7) the focus is on the choice of these names, but also on the structure of the small list of relics (C.1.4) and in the case of Peter, it is about his connection with Charlemagne's flag (C.1.6.7); in the case of *Munjoie* (C.2.2) the different strands of questions which have been erroneously tangled up in the literature had to be separated and dealt with one by one; with Charlemagne's ten *eschieles* (C.6) the task was to describe how they are weighted and characterised as well as the reasons for the choice of their leaders; in the case of the twelve peers (C.7) their listing had to be set within the archetype of the Song of Roland, but there was also a need to outline their pre- and post-history; with the minor characters it was important to look at the regional appropriateness of their names and the spatial distribution of their fiefdoms (C.8 and 9).

In the case of the main characters especially – on the non-Christian side with Baligant, Marsilĭe and Bramimunde / Bramidonĭe (A.3.3, A.8.3s.), on the Christian side with Ganelon, Turpin, Naimes, Olivier, Roland and Charlemagne (C.10–C.17) – it was mainly about their previous history, which was investigated with the help of a wide array of statistical findings, the origins of which I must now explain in more detail.

The work presented here has an unusually long previous history. Lejeune based her 1950 essay about the name *Olivier* and the two brother names *Rollant* and *Olivier* on a total of 119 mostly large cartularies, a haul of material which I admire to this day. But in about 1963, when I was still a young assistant lecturer, I discovered more through chance that she had missed an even older instance of the name *Olivier*, from a place near the Rhône Bend. Inspired by this to carry out more spot checks, I found that she had only collected a random selection from the Cluny charters and that there were also some references missing here and there from the other large charter collections originating in the southeast of France. This added weight to Lejeune's account of the position of the southeast in relation to the Septimanian/Catalan area, but it did not affect her other results. However, it became clear to me around this same time, when I was studying the inventories put together by Stein (1907), Cottineau (1937–1939) and Chevalier (1894–1899), that these 119 cartularies captured indeed the majority of the bigger documents from the period in question, but that overall, this was still less than half of all the relevant documents available in print. It was likely, therefore, that there would be paired brother names still to be discovered. Furthermore, I calculated that if similar investigations were carried out, interesting results would turn up in relation not just to *Olivier* and *Rollant* but also other names in the Rol. such as *Guenelun*, *Naimes*, *Ogier*, *Gualter del Hum*, *Marsilĭe* or *Baligant* as well as single names from other epics such as perhaps *Vivĭen*, *Gormont* or *Galan(t)* (~ Wayland the Smith). This brings us ultimately to the question of how widely distributed all these "epic" names are. Italy had already been screened for this by Rajna (1886 to 1897, especially 1889 passim), Aebischer (1936, 1952, 1958), Rosellini (1958) and Capitani (1963) with notable success; and yet precisely for this reason, I surmised that the investment of energy into further research in that direction would not lead to a good return. On the other hand, the border with Spain had not been researched, and yet it seemed interesting because Catalonia had produced interesting results for Lejeune, and even more for Coll I Alentorn (1956). The neighbouring Germanic regions of Galloromania and – in the period after 1066 – England were similarly interesting, and completely unresearched.

I soon had to exclude England – apart from the Royal Charters – because the additional amount of work was just too much, but it had already become clear

that the answers to most questions were to be found in France in the period before 1066. So, having excluded England, I prepared a plan to work my way through *all charters that had thus far been published in print, from the years 778 to 1150 and from Galloromania plus the regions along its borders to the west of the Rhine and to the north of the Ebro, searching for these above-mentioned "epic" names.*[5]

I hope I have completed about 95% of this plan. Thanks to a grant from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, I was able to spend the whole academic year 1965–1966 in the National Library in Paris, spending the hours between 9.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. just looking through charters for these names. It was a *tour de force*, but less monotonous than one might think, because you could come across other onomastic discoveries at every turn (cf. the comparatively presented findings on names like *Agolant*, *Corbaran* etc. in the section on 'Saracen names for Christians', or passim the observations on the development of the OF name system, on the use of hypocoristic names and epithets in the charters etc.). Over the course of that year, I worked my way through almost 800 charter collections containing charters from the period before 1150, an endeavour that would not have been possible in any other library at that time, and it was only possible in Paris because many of these, especially the newer ones, contained complete *Indices nominum*.[6]

It was impossible to complete 100% of the plan, for several reasons. Even when I was working on the bibliography, I may have missed a few publications whose titles did not suggest that they included charters. Also, the *Bibliothèque nationale* could only let me have a maximum of ten items per day, so I had to manage my time carefully and did not include essays that only dealt with isolated (i.e., up to three) charters. Above all, however, I worked on the principle of starting with charters from the older monasteries and working gradually forwards in time to the newer ones, which meant that by the end of the year, my daily quota of ten publications would contain very few charters from before 1150, and my tally

---

5 Stein's bibliography of cartularies (1907) covers a total of 4522 items, but the vast majority of them consist of a) cartularies of church foundations after 1150 (e.g., many Cistercian and Premonstratensian monasteries, priories, hospices, etc.) or older foundations which have cartularies that only start after 1150; b) cartularies that have been lost over the last three centuries and whose former existence is only known from references to them; c) cartularies from non-church institutions (e.g., towns), a genre that did not generally arise until after 1150. (Furthermore, Stein generally uses the term *cartulaire*, sometimes narrowed down to *cartulaire factice*, also for collections of medieval charters which were first put together by modern scholars – which in fact were quite useful for my purposes.)

6 I used to select ten of the most trivial and ordinary occurrences of names from the main text of each publication and then check if they appeared in the index; in a few cases I had to ignore incomplete indices and work through the whole text instead.

tended increasingly towards zero. I stopped working when collections turned out to have charters only from about 1110/1115 onwards.

In 1966/1967, I started working on the corpus I had collected in Paris. However, apart from a few essays from the 1970s, which are loosely connected with this topic,[7] the work, for various reasons that I will not go into here, proceeded very slowly and with many interruptions until shortly after 2000. It was only then that I could devote all of my time and energy to it, and I started by adding charters which had been published in the interim – and later also those being published from then onwards – from Galloromania, and Northern Spain.

As my work on the corpus progressed towards its conclusions, many ad-hoc decisions had to be made, mainly so that the present study would not be overburdened with detail. I have presented all (real, probable or apparent) brother pairs *Rollant* and *Olivier* in full up to 1150 (plus up to 1200 those already mentioned in the scholarly literature), even though this entailed lengthy discussion on some points; I was able to add seven certain and six probable or debatable ones, bringing the total to over 30. My work also revealed, however, that apart from the brother pairs, for the name *Olivier* a complete reference list up to the year 1060 was sufficient, whereas quite unexpectedly a complete list for the name *Rollant* only needed to go as far as the turn of the millennium, and after that the further development of each name could be summarised. In the case of *Guenelun*, the reference counts are given within set time intervals at first; but then closer attention needed to be paid to a rather small area of Galloromania, now with a full list of references up to the year 1150 and a fair amount of commentary. There are only four real individuals by the name of *Naimes* and these, just as the few occurrences of the name *Marsilĭe,* are listed in full. I did not find any reference to *Baligant* before 1150. Since Lejeune had also published a statistics-based essay on the name *Vivïen* in 1986, I was able to compress my own results into a few notes (in the discussion of *Vivïen* from Rol. 3996). A reference list on the name *Gormont* is given in the section below on the 'Saracen names for Christians'. I have already published a few results from this corpus elsewhere: while working on the Anglo-Norman Royal Charters, my attention was drawn to the historical *Malduit* family of treasurers and the (thus far oldest) *Baligan(t)*- reference of 1155–1161, and having written about this in 2012, I now just summarise the detail. *Ogier* and *Gualter del Hum* likewise furnished some small, but important details that are evaluated in an essay (2004d) and a monograph (2010);

---

7 These are essays on *Rennewart* from the *Chanson de Guillaume* (1971a), *Hugue li Forz* from the *Pèlerinage* (1971b), the figure of *Maugis d'Aigremont* (1973a), the geography of the Basin story in the KMS I (1973b), the epic toponym *Nobles* (1973c) and the first branch of the *Couronnement de Louis* (1974).

similarly, references to the name or indeed the figure of the smith *Galan(t)* led to a monograph (2004a, with Erika Timm).[8] In the bibliography it was sufficient to include only those sources that were actually cited in the main text; they are listed there, wherever possible, as in the main text, under their respective place- (sometimes region-) and/or monastery (or church) name (e.g., Poitiers-S.Cyprien) as a short lemma (in the bibliography followed by =), and in the case of royal charters, under the Fr. form of the royal name.

In the present world of the internet and digitalisation, I would, of course, go about collecting this material in a different way than I did in 1965/1966. However, contrary to all expectations, this new world has not made me regret what might seem like a huge waste of working hours. It has given me greater confidence in my material because it has conveniently afforded me – and my readers too – countless opportunities to check for completeness. In particular, a great many of the extensive capitularies that I worked through are now available on the inter- net, at least in the form of a photograph of the printed editions (*mode image*), and quite a few have been scanned and are searchable (*mode texte, numérisé*).[9]

---

8 We could add here some publications which are only loosely connected with our subject: the essays on the 'epic' toponym *Luiserne* (2004b) and *Auridon/Oridon/Dordon(e)* (2008d) as well as the figure of *Renaut de Montauban* or *d'Aubépine* (2009b).

9 Cf. some regional initiatives such as the *Chartae Burgundiae Medii Aevi* for Bourgogne via www.artehis-cbma.eu, the *Cartulaires d'Île-de-France* for the Île-de-France via www.elec.enc. sorbonne.fr and the Bibliothèque nationale's large *Gallica* programme (www.bnf.fr; if you type *Cartulaire* or *Chartes* into the search form, a list of relevant texts appears); for a few older items, there is also www.books.google.fr – Stein's (1907) work is going to be superseded a by more complete and much more detailed bibliography (especially in terms of the secondary lit- erature), since 1991 at the latest (cf. Vérité 1993, 201 n. 76) prepared by the *Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes* (IRHT). Vol 1. for the South West of France appeared in print in 2003 (= Vérité 2003, passim) with 573 entries and 104 Appendix entries. An almost complete list for Bourgogne can also be found at www.cbma-project.eu/Manuscrits *Inventaire de cartulaires bourguignons conservés*, ordered according to the four relevant *Archives départementales*. On the current status of the French initiative as a whole cf. www.cn-telma.fr/cartulR on a partially parallel but much broader initiative cf. www.cn-telma.fr/chartae-galliae – Undoubtedly, only a tiny fraction of the total number of charters from the period before 1150 remains unpublished (perhaps excluding the Spanish inventory, over which I have no overview). It is true that there are copies of medieval and early modern charters contained in those hundreds of handwritten volumes, of which some were put together centrally by monastic orders in the 17th and 18th centuries, especially the Maurists (*collection Baluze, Duchesne, Grenier, Moreau* etc.), some by the state (e.g., *collection Bréquigny*) and stored today in Paris, some taken on by local initia- tives, and then especially in the *Archives départementales*. However, it transpires that when newer studies on individual monasteries or regions have included volumes relevant to their theme, the number of new charters from before 1150 that have come to light is minimal, in comparison with those already known. For my geographically extensive topic, it would have

The first of this latter category to come to my attention was (in around 2008) the electronic version of the hitherto completely indexless six-volume edition of the charters of Cluny prepared by the *Institut für Frühmittelalterforschung* at the University of Münster.[10] In 1965/1966 I had identified over 100 references to the name *Rotlandus* (including its graphical variants) just in the tenth century edition alone (containing over 2400 charters); now in three hours of work I was able to ascertain that I had only missed one reference (C.15.7.3). Since then, I have also conducted a great many checks of my material using other searchable sources: altogether this also produced a miss rate of about 1%. Thus, I present the results from the analysis of my material today, fully confident that they have lost none of their relevance in the digital world.

6 Questions of authenticity

Any study that relies quite considerably on medieval charters, should contain a few introductory words about authenticity.

As with almost all sources that convey information, practically every charter contains statements that cannot be confirmed by referring to another source. With charters, this is the rule rather than the exception. If family X donated a piece of land Y to monastery Z, we mostly know this only from the charter that was drawn up to document this very event; but even if later a Royal or Papal charter confirms this donation, it usually does not repeat the date of the first charter, or the names of the witnesses etc. Strictly speaking, it is not the authenticity of a charter which can be proven (at least not in its entirety), but only its inauthenticity, by pointing out something specific about it – anything from the detail of its external characteristics to the content itself – which does not fit with our wider knowledge of its geographical and chronological context. If we cannot find such inconsistencies, then the charter must be considered authentic. So, whenever a charter is cited in this study, with no mention of authenticity, this means that I am not aware of any arguments against its authenticity in the literature, nor in relation to the charter itself.

Even if I may have missed such arguments here and there, due to the quantity of material that I was dealing with, there are two reasons why this would

---

been impossible to include these collections from the 17th-18th century, not only in terms of quantity, but in terms of the human effort that would have been required, even if a team could undertake the work, in comparison with the minimal number of additional results one might expect to find.

10 *Chartae cluniacenses electronicae*, available at www.uni-muenster.de/Fruehmittelalter/Projekte/Cluny/CCE.

probably not affect my results. First, most of the results do not rely on just one occurrence, but rather on a series of occurrences that would survive the loss of any individual pieces. Secondly, for our purposes it is not important whether a person in the charter actually carried out the action in question (such as a donation, bearing witness, contestation or similar), but only whether the person existed around this time and place. Even in the Middle Ages, forgers of charters only rarely named people who did not exist. In most forgery cases, the events that were being misrepresented had occurred only about one to three generations before the time of writing, because contestations usually arose within this period of time, and it would have been extremely risky for forgers to invent people who were supposed to have belonged to the donating family, a religious institution or a royal household, groups that retained a certain collective memory.[11] If the misrepresented events lay further back in time, medieval forgers usually worked from genuine originals by falsifying as little as possible, which meant it was not necessary to invent any witnesses. If, however, they made forgeries without the help of genuine originals, they mostly give themselves away through features which are easy to spot.[12] All in all, therefore, I do not expect any questions of authenticity to detract from my conclusions.

---

11 In actual fact, there are two instances where a suspicious charter is the earliest item in a series of references, and in both cases the proximity in time between the date when the charter was written down and the date of the disputed legal event turned out to be decisive for the evaluation: these are the earliest reference to the name *Naimes* (C.12.3) and the earliest evidence of a pair of brothers called Roland and Olivier (C.13.1.3).

12 Examples of this can be found in the two forgeries in the name of Charlemagne (MGH DD. Kar.I, no. 264, 278), both of which also have Olivier (a non-existent person) among the witnesses. No. 263, the supposed original from the area around Arezzo, exhibits a "thoroughly artificial" writing style, in which "the curving lower strokes and long terminal strokes of the *m* and *n*" indicate that the earliest possible date is the second half of the 12th century; the place descriptions are surprisingly detailed; the monastery is protected against all imaginable people, from the Bishop and Lord, to the Sheriff, and against all imaginable claims even extending to the provision of horse fodder; *puplicam* appears instead of *publicam;* the poen formula *auri optimi libras mille* is excessive; Charlemagne's monogram is modelled on that of Emperor Henry II; the charter is supposed to have been dictated by *Turpinus archipresul*, and yet is dated 702 rather than 802; the first person to sign under a particularly large flourish is *Rolandus*, and then between him and *Oliverus* there is a *Decimus,* to make it all a little less obvious; after *Oliverus* there are names which as far as I know do not appear anywhere else: a count *Zephyr,* a duke *Techfyr* and a duke-and-margrave *Eulafh*, the last two of which are apparently supposed to represent the Germanic 'barbarian' element in Charlemagne's circle. No. 278, on the other hand, for Saint-Valery-sur-Somme, has (acc.) placenames *Tilloyan* and *Boussevillam* which are later forms and also uses *Scotia* anachronistically (in the sense that it is used today, and for which the earliest evidence comes in the 11th century), *Yrlandia* (instead of *Scotia* or *Hibernia*), *Allemania* and *Noroergia* [sic], and it even regards, from a perspective in Francia,

7 On the dating of the Song of Roland

I must warn my readers about one point which they might find disappointing: they must not expect any definitive dating of the surviving text of the Song of Roland. I am convinced and argue accordingly that this work – including the Baligant section – emerged after 1119, based on two considerations: first because of the sequence of events: massacre at the Upper Ebro (somewhere around Valtierra) – Baligant story – conquest of Saragossa; secondly, because of the *simultaneously* and clearly positive roles played by the Normans and the Angevins. There are a few elements cited in this study that could point to a later date for the work, but these are more or less isolated points, each of which should be taken as a suggestion which must be weighed up against other arguments. Indeed, this uncertainty around dating has not detracted from our admiration of the work over the last 175 years, and neither does it detract from our admiration and appreciation of its world of names.

(not only *Angliam* and *Scotiam*) but also *Acquitaniam* (evidently in the period when it belonged to England) and *Allemaniam* as foreign countries; *Rolandus et Oliverius* appear as witnesses, despite the date being 809; the notary was supposedly on this occasion *Paulus Diaconus* . . . .

Results

A summary is inevitably more apodictic than detailed argumentation. On the one hand I shall have to skip over those sections where the conclusions about a single name cannot be summarised any further. On the other, I am obliged to rehearse here some of the points made in the short 'reviews' at the end of many sections.

As mentioned above, the goal of the present study is to uncover everything that all the proper names in the Rol. can tell us about the structure, worldliness and previous history of the work. The conclusion is unequivocal: the surviving text, right down to the level of its smaller scenes, is more tightly and profoundly structured than is generally assumed, it is also much more connected to the real world, and it has a long pre-history, the outline of which can be traced back, albeit with decreasing certainty, (almost) to the Frankish defeat of 778.

A The non-Christian side

The Orient

Baligant's peoples – the catalogue (A.1). This is the most seriously misunderstood and underrated part of the whole poem. Possible models for this section – the catalogue of peoples in Latin epic poetry and (theoretically) the genealogies in the book of Genesis – all show a clear train of thought that leads us through *real* geography, and so also does this catalogue, in an astonishingly simple way, even though this finding goes against some 150 years of previous scholarship.

The first group of ten in Baligant's *eschieles*, the left wing of his army, consists of his *western* troops (that is to say excluding the Spain and North Africa complexes which had appeared in the Marsilĭe section, North Africa being understood in the medieval sense, i.e., West of Egypt). The train of thought leads in principle in a north to south direction, that is to say from eastern Europe (which in Charlemagne's time was heathen, but later was Christianised) to northeast Africa, but then a bridging passage linking to the second group of ten leads back to the Euphrates, to Bālis, the most easterly point that the crusaders ever reached.

This is where the second group of ten (A.1.2) picks up the train of thought, with the *central* part, the "hard core" of Baligant's troops, and carries it on in a broadly south to north direction; the initial emphasis is on the Turkish peoples, from the area that stretches today from the border region between eastern Syria and Iraq to the area around the Black Sea, followed by some eastern European peoples (then thought to be heretics or still heathens), and it ends with the age-

old cliché of a "Wild North East" stretching up to the northern ocean, with which in the Middle Ages the Caspian Sea was thought to be connected.

The third group of ten (A.1.3) consists of the right wing of Baligant's army; it continues the same train of thought when it describes the first five and the last *eschiele* of Baligant's *eastern* troops from the Baghdad-India-Central Asia triangle. It seems that we cannot avoid making a special assumption about the sixth to the ninth *eschiele* (A.1.3.5): presumably, the description of a geography that was no longer within the recent experience of Europeans would have made the catalogue increasingly hazy and difficult for ordinary audiences to imagine, and so towards the end, these *eschieles* seem to bring contemporary enemies from the years 1147–1150 into the song. However, the last *eschiele* clearly takes up the guiding principle of the catalogue again and leads it to the place that the poet considers the "end of the world", which almost certainly is in India (A.1.3.10).

The shadow of Alexander the Great already hangs over the first and second groups of ten but is even more obvious with the mention of *Val penuse* (A.1.3.4) and probably also *Valfonde* (A.1.3.10) in the third group of ten. The poet's train of thought, leading from Butrint/Butrinto-*Butentrot* (A.1.1.1) to remotest India, reminds us of Jerome (PL 25.528): Alexander conquered *ab Illyrico et Adriatico mari usque ad Indicum Oceanum et Gangem [. . .] partem Europae et omnem Asiam [. . .]*, a sentence that reads like a plan which the catalogue is now carrying out.

On the other hand, the poet distances himself from the facile focus on miracles which characterises the mentality of the Alexander literature. Fantastical elements are only briefly hinted at, once at the beginning of each of the three groups of ten (bristles on the backs of men, A.1.1.2; cynocephaly, A.1.2.1; giants, A.1.3.1) and their purpose is only to add a little spice to the story. As a whole, the catalogue is informed both by contemporary geographical learning and by knowledge gained from books; both point to a poet who is, in my opinion, a real Norman, and who has obviously been interested from an early age in everything that *this* wide world has to offer. (In this respect, the catalogue represents a marked contrast to the lists of peoples in the Occitan *Chanson de Sainte Foy*, A.1.4). Whereas in the Rol. the sound elements are only sporadic additions, the colour symbolism is clearly much more than that, because it represents an intermittently occurring but nevertheless valuable structural element (especially in the first group of ten), bringing to light the hellish underground of the whole world of Baligant. However – and this is important to see – it is presented precisely as an addition to the geographical meaning, and not alternating with it.

Ultimately, the catalogue is inspired by the poet's basic religious position: Christ is here, the Antichrist is there, *tertium non datur*. The Middle Ages, however, also had a much-admired, non-Christian predecessor who had already

nursed a similar ambition to provide maximum polarisation of the whole world as it was then known: Lucan, although he really knows better, has the Persians, the peoples from the Indus and the Ganges and even the mythical Arimaspi fighting at the Battle of Pharsalus. Here too, the Roland poet creates the impression that he knew the classical epic, even though there is no clear evidence that he borrowed any particular point from it.

A notable detail on the periphery of Baligant's army: the mention of *Sulian* 'Syrian' (A.1.3.11) shows that the poet had some insight into the inner workings of the Islamic world.

The over-arching structure of Baligant's realm (A.2). Baligant himself resides in Cairo (*Babylonia minor*) and maintains contact with the Mediterranean world via Alexandria – as did the Fatimid caliphs, who since 1099 had long been considered the worst enemies of the Crusader Kingdom; nevertheless, his Babylon assumes something of the godless aura of the ancient Mesopotamian *Babylonia major* (A.2.1). Baligant's brother has his fiefdom in today's Turkey – as did the Sultan of the Rum Seljuk Sultanate, who vehemently opposed the combatants of the First Crusade, and even more so those of the Second (A.2.3). Baligant's standard-bearer holds a fief in the area around Aleppo; thus, he represents the forces under the rank of Sultan, whose growing success in Northern Syria would eventually lead to the start of the Second Crusade (A.2.4). Taken together, these three are the "hard core" of the crusaders' enemies.

There was only one more place, apart from Spain, where the Christian and Islamic world came into military contact at that time: in North Africa, as a result of the temporary thirst for conquest exhibited by the Italo-Normans. Baligant promises his son a fiefdom there because it was in Charlemagne's – by which is meant: Norman – possession (A.2.2).

The overarching structure of Baligant's realm is therefore a meaningfully thought-out structure of the most important areas.

Methodological issues around the 'heathen' personal names in epic poetry and in the Christian everyday world (A.3.1). The OF epic in general, and the Rol. in particular, cannot manage without a wealth of personal names for Saracens since they depict battles mostly as the outcome of single combats. None of the poets of that time knew nearly enough real Saracen names – for their minor characters especially – and so we find mostly other names instead: they are often expressive (caricature-like, or intimating a sorry end), sometimes biblical or from pagan antiquity, and occasionally (apparently Old English or other antiquated) Germanic names. All told, personal names are clearly more frequent in the Marsilĭe section than in the Baligant section; in order to avoid an imbalance due to the

length of the Baligant section, this part must limit the number of single combats and evoke its huge dimensions through the number of peoples or *eschieles* instead, or through scenic variation (such as questions about the state of play in the battle, deployment of reserve troops, breaking through or failing to break through in the great final duel).

Quite a few 'heathen' personal names, group names and titles play a secondary role in the everyday world of the time, as names of Christians, and they turn surprisingly quickly from nicknames into normal names. To mention first some names from texts other than the Rol. *Affricanus, Agolant, Almorabit, Ar(r)abita, Agarenus, Corbaran, Gor- (*instead of *Guer-)mundus, Paganus, Sarracenus, Soltanus* (A.3.1.2). Those of most interest (not least chronologically) for the Rol. are especially the Christians called *Baligan* (for which a new earliest mention is found, in England before 1161, 1.3.3.4) and *Massilius / Marsilius* (A.8.3). At that time, any enrichment of the available stock of names was welcome because the traditional single-name system was in decline, mainly through increasing failure to keep alive the old Germ. naming structures, and the switch to a system of naming individuals after other people without using variations; other reasons include increasing populations and the emergence of towns, now also to the north of the Alps (A.3.1.1).

Individuals in the Baligant section; the name Baligant (A.3.2–A.3.3). The name *Jangleu* stands out among the personal names of the Baligant section (A.3.2) because this aptronym has interesting narrative implications at this point in the story (A.3.2.5).

The name *Baligant* itself (A.3.3) was the only case where a decision between two scenarios was not possible.

Either (A.3.3.1) the *Baligant* of the Rol. is a pure invention of the poet, and the name of this *vieil d'antiquitét* from *Babilonĭe* is a variation on the Babylonian royal names *Bel-us, Bal-eus* (2x), *Bal-adan, Bal-thasar*, which we find in the world chronicle *par excellence* of the Middle Ages, that of Eusebius/Jerome, and also partly in classical poetry and the Bible, all of them names in which a medieval Christian presumably also heard the ungodly name *Baal*; the alliteration in the name *Baligant de Babilonĭe* is then a welcome bonus. And just as in the Bible, Moses' hardest test was his single combat with King Og of Bashan, whose dynasty extended back as far as to what was known in Moses' time as the former age of the giants, so in the Rol., Charlemagne's hardest test is his single combat with this *Baligant* from *antiquitét*, whose kindred has survived (*survesquiét*) all the way back to the ancient heroic world of *Virgilĭe e Omer*.

Or alternatively, (A.3.3.2) the form *Belig(u)andus*, as it appears in the PT (for the junior in the shared kingship of Saragossa, who survives his brother *Marsirus*

there, just as in the Rol. *Baligant* survives *Marsilĭe*) is older than the *Baligant* of the Rol.; if this is the case, then the name leads back to the actual history of Islamic Saragossa, presumably via a Southern French regional saga (*Bahaluc* x Old Occitan *belugar*).

Fortunately, there is a way to harmonise these two possibilities to a large extent (A.3.3.3). For even if the second possibility is the right one, then in the Rol. the change from *Bel-* > *Bal-*, the characterisation as a Babylonian *vieil d'antiquitét* and the *survesquiét* motif all cast a sideways glance at these Babylonian kings, and the "upwards transformation" of the person who remained after Marsirus' death to the status of Lord of the Heathen in a new, grandiose act of revenge would be no less admirable than the free invention of the character.

On the narrative technique of the Baligant section (A.4). Five short scenes are being placed either in a literary or a real historical context: the figure of Baligant who is described according to the rules, apart from the unexpected ordering from bottom to top (A.4.1), the illuminated fleet (A.4.2), the question of who killed Amborre (A.4.3), Amborre's banner (A.4.4) and the angel's rhetorical question *Que fais-tu?* (A.4.5).

Oriental elements in the Marsilĭe section (A.5). The Marsilĭe section contains many references to the Orient and as such forms a prelude to the Baligant section. We can cite the following from our thematic investigation: the white mules sent by the *reis de S̨atilĭe* 'from Attalía ~ Satalia', today Antalya in Southern Turkey (A.5.3); the fundamentally realistic figure of the fleet commander Valdabrun, who connects the East with the West, with the absolutely historical motif of the murder of the Patriarch of Jerusalem (A.5.6); the figure of Marsilĭes' brother Falsaron from 'the land of Dathan and Abiram', which leads us to conclude that the poet almost correctly places the Islamic conquest of Spain in the generation before Charlemagne (A.5.7); the only apparently mysterious *amiralz de Primes*, or rather *de primes* (A.5.9); the guest fighter *Grandonĭe* of Cappadocia who panics, probably named after the Norman crusader **Grandone* (A.5.12) who also panicked; finally the African who wants to take Roland's sword to *Arabe* as a trophy, obviously to Baligant (A.5.13). If we add the non-onomastic narrative moments which serve as linkages between the Marsilĭe and Baligant sections (the fact that Roland is not allowed to kill Marsilĭe, that Roland's sword does not contain a relic of the Lord, that each of the three heathen gods is mentioned several times but the three only come together as an anti-Trinity at the transition to the Baligant section, and also the character development of Bramidonĭe), then the suspicion arises that if we want to attribute the Baligant section to a different author

than that of the Marsilĭe section, then we must assume that this author also made some quite significant alterations to the Marsilĭe section (A.5.14).

North Africa

North Africa (A.6–A.7). The Rol. reflects the most important aspects of Muslim North Africa as it was at that time. The emphasis is on the Algalife (< *al-Khalīfa*, with the typically Old Spanish substitution of /ɣ / for Arabic /x/) and his battle-winning black African troops, clearly modelled on the historical Almoravid Yūsuf (the *amīr al-muslimīn*, if not quite *amīr al-mu'minīn* 'caliph') and his battle-winning African troops (A.6). The three other kings (A.7.1, A.7.3s.) seem to reflect North Africa's then conspicuous wealth in gold, its piracy, and its mountainous interior (the 'Atlas'). Abisme, however, Marsilĭe's black standard bearer (A.7.5) represents the slaves who even before the time of the Almoravids had been transferred from Africa to Spain via the slave trade, and whose best or even only chance of upward mobility was to become military slaves.

The Pyrenean Peninsula (with its northern foothills)

The Pyrenean Peninsula with its capital Saragossa: King Marsilĭe and his family (A.8). Saragossa (A.8.2) never actually was the capital of Spain; in the Rol. its narrative role is due to Charlemagne's campaign of 778, its status as the residence of the ruler of the *whole* of Spain, and also the fact that it was the centre of what was between 1090 and 1110 (more or less) the most powerful and indeed only notable surviving Taifa principality. At that time there was no greater ruler residing anywhere in Islamic Spain (the Almoravids had their residence in Africa until 1106 or later).

The epic name *Marsilĭe* (A.8.3) goes back to the Christian name *Massilius*, which crops up as a main name and as an epithet in Marseilles/*Massilia* around 1000, and before 1050 acquired the parasitic *-r-* in parallel with the development of the town name. It assumed epic relevance when it became charged with the content of one or two similar-sounding Spanish-Muslim names, i.e., *(al-) Manṣūr* (with /ns/, which was still unusual for Gallo-Rom., and therefore liable to be substituted) and/or *(al-) Mundhir* (Spanish-Arabic /mondžír/). The former was widely known in the Christian world as the name of the Cordoban dictator (d. 1002), who carried out about 50 campaigns which laid waste Christian Spain from Catalonia to Compostela; the latter, was more specific, and chronologically closer,

because it was the name of the first and third kings of Saragossa (1017–1023 or 1029–1039), For dialectal reasons, it may be assumed that the change in the meaning of this name occurred in the area around Anjou-Touraine-Poitou shortly after the middle of the century, by about 1065 at the latest. The name *Marsilius* crops up as a Christian name around 1080–1085 in the Fr. (i.e., non-Occ.) language territory and must have crossed the language boundary with Italy shortly after that, the border with Flanders around 1095, and then must even have reached Cologne by 1120 at the latest. This geographically impressive proliferation would be difficult to comprehend, if the real name had continued to be understood as 'man from Marseilles'; for an epic name, however, this spread through time and space is fairly typical. On the other hand, it is not surprising that the name remains relatively rare, as measured by the number of individuals in question, since it was a 'heathen' name first of all.

The name *Bramidonĭe / Bramimunde* (A.8.4) is obviously a feminine form of the great family of OF epic names which are derived from the Arab. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān, the name of Charles Martel's opponent at Tours and Poitiers, and later of the three most powerful rulers of Islamic Spain. The previous form of *Bramidonĭe* (in consonantal terms) must have been *Braidimenda* (i.e., after the first metathesis: *bd-r-mn > br-d-mn,* but before the second: *br-d-m-n > br-m-d-n*), which is attested around 1118 in Southern France as an epic name for a Muslim woman who had converted to Christianity, presumably with reference to the figure in the Roland story. This form is also the one that precedes *Bramimunde*, in which the doubling of the *m* (as in *Gramimund*) preserved the metrically important syllable count. In her fate, though not her name, Bramidonie may be modelled on the figure of Zaida, the Islamic princess who fled to Alfonso VI and then converted. Saint *Juliana* bestowed her name at Bramidonĭe's baptism, because she shares with Bramidonĭe the facts that she could not save her bridegroom / husband from his hardened unbelief, she had the courage to overcome the devil / idols through a hard, physical struggle, and finally, because, due to the Santillana monastery (< *Sancta Iuliana*), she was more or less considered to be a Spanish woman.

The name *Jurfaret* /džǫrfarẹt/ and then through dissimilation and change of suffix *Jurfaleu* (A.8.5) is, if the hypocoristic *-et* is removed, identical to the Arab. name *Džaʿfa*r, which is also contained in the name *(al-) Džaʿfariyya* i.e., Aljafería, the architecturally magnificent private palace which the most powerful of all the rulers of Saragossa *Abū Džaʿfar* Aḥmad bin Sulaymān al-Muqtadir (1046/1047–1081/1082) had built for himself. It is even possible that this *Abū Džaʿfar* nexus, meaning literally 'father of a Džaʿfar', gave the poet the idea to name the ruler Marsilĭe's son 'the young Džaʿfar'; alternatively, the

Džaʿfariyya itself was famous enough to ensure that the name *Džaʿfar* would come down to the poet in association with Saragossa's last ruling dynasty.

The twelve anti-peers (A.9). I can deal here only with the structural elements; most of the names are explained below in the main text. The group of twelve anti-peers (A.9) is evidence of a well-planned ordering of material. At the top of the list is Marsilĭe's nephew who is the counterpart to Charlemagne's nephew; the second and third anti-peers also have royal blood, which is an indirect tribute to Olivier and Turpin: the Frankish trio of protagonists is set against a Muslim trio (A.9.1–A.9.3). The geographical ordering commences with the fourth anti-peer: each set of four anti-peers, geographically speaking from North to South, forms an eastern (A.9.4–A.9.7) and apparently also a western (A.9.8–A.9.11) semi-circle, so that through the fourth to seventh and the eighth to eleventh positions, the poet manages to cover the whole of Spain right down to the south coast, and not just the Ebro Basin. The eleventh anti-peer, the only one of the twelve with a clear historical archetype, is brave and brings a certain flair from his Andalusian homeland which makes him a favourite with the ladies (he rules the land from Seville to the port of Cádiz, i.e., to the southern end of Spain). He is not only the brightest figure of them all (for the poet, *Margariz* is not a 'renegade' but a 'pearl', Lat. *margarita* < Gk. μαργαρίτης), but through his special destiny he relieves any monotony that might otherwise attach to the whole section about the anti-peers. The twelfth and last position (A.9.12), on the other hand, leads us almost exactly back to the ideal centre, Saragossa. In deliberate contrast to the eleventh position, the poet gives this one a darker tone via the fiefdom of the Monegro, as befits the closing section, which has the greatest psychological effect through its power to "reverberate" through the rest of the poem.

This first part of the Battle of Roncevaux is packed full of structure, because the group of twelve had already (v. 860–990) been introduced and is now presented in the same order on the battlefield (v. 1178–1337). In both contexts, a whole laisse is devoted to each anti-peer, which means that the latter section appears to show an altogether fair contest between two fighters at a time, each of whom is equally distinguishable as an individual (A.9.13).

Valtierra and the date of the Chanson de Roland (A.9.8.2). The naming of *Valterne* 'Valtierra' and the conquering of Saragossa only after the defeat of Baligant, taken together, constitute evidence that the surviving text, that is to say including the Baligant section, came into being after 1118; these are elementary narrative connections without which the song would not be "the same".

Other enemies in the Battle of Roncevaux (A.10) Once the anti-peers have fallen, individuality gives way gradually to mass descriptions. In the middle part of the battle, up to the point where Marsiliĕ flees (v. 1338–1912), twenty Muslims are mentioned by name (17 of them being present in the battle) but only four of these are already known to the audience, these being Marsiliĕ himself and his son Jurfarét as well as Climborin and Valdabrun; only four more – Siglorel, Malquiant, Grandoniĕ, Abisme – are furnished with short, memorable character sketches, but most of them are just names. The first seven die without inflicting any damage (v. 1352–1395). Parallel to the ominous storms and earthquake in France (v. 1423–1437) there are quantitative indications to emphasise the superior strength of the opponents: the enemies are dying *a millers e a cent* (v. 1417, and similarly 1439), *de cent millers n'en poënt guarir dous* (v. 1440), but Marsiliĕ comes into view with his *grant ost* of no less than twenty *eschieles* (v. 1450s.). From now on, the laisses tell of alternate deaths, first of one, and then of several Christian peers, and the retaliatory death of the four victors (and of two further enemies; v. [1483–1609]=1526–1652). When Marsiliĕ himself steps in (v. [1628] =1467), the impression of enemies *en masse* eclipses almost all sense of their individuality: the standard-bearer Abisme and the barely mentioned Faldrun de Pui represent the masses, and Marsiliĕ's son is the last, but all the more trenchant victim of this episode – and these are all the names that appear.

Yet the full denial of individuality only comes in the very last stage of the battle (from v. 1913): of the fifty thousand *neire gent* of the Algalife, not a single one is worthy of a name, not even the young African who tries to steal the dying Roland's sword from him.

Borel and his twelve sons (A.10.2). This motif is interesting, because it is demonstrably earlier than the Roland story, since it occurs in both the William epics (from the Hague Fragment onwards) and the Rol., and moreover it has a double historical origin – partly in Catalonia and partly in Italy.

Marsiliĕ's messengers (A.11.2). The names of the ten messengers differ from the other names of Saracens in the Rol. in so far as the proportion of learned or (secular or religious) classical or at least serious-sounding names is larger; it is of course particularly important for messengers to have credibility. Some ambivalence arises around the name *Malbien*, however. In short: dignity, but a cobbledtogether dignity that cannot really be taken seriously.

Marsiliĕ's tribute to Charlemagne (A.11.4). This turns out to be extremely interesting from a cultural and social history perspective and the poet also makes it into a little showpiece of poetic, *ad hominem* variation.

The Pyrenees (A.12.1) The names of the passes (*de Sízer, d'Espaigne* and the one that makes sense in v. 870, but not in v. 1103: *d'Aspre*) and the toponym *Rencesvals* are examined in relation to their meaning in the song, and to real events.

Roland's Spanish conquests (A.12.2–A.12.3). The poet lists these (v. 196–200) in a way that shows how he imagines what had happened in the *set anz*. Roland conquers first *Dax* and then *Coimbra,* which means the western part of the peninsula, so that when Charlemagne is approaching Saragossa – initially as far as *Valtierra* – he will not have enemies behind him. (Less likely: the road leads from Dax straight via *Miranda* de Arga to Valtierra). But Saragossa, *ki est en une muntaigne*, does not capitulate. Charlemagne decides to cut the town off from its hinterland and practically surround it: Roland conquers *Pina* de Ebro with its neighbouring area as far as *Balaguer* for Charlemagne, and then goes on to narrow the circle on the other side with his conquest of *Tudela.*

The town still refuses to capitulate. Charlemagne chooses not to launch an assault, which would have brought great losses or might even have failed; instead, he conquers the whole of Spain, including the south (as in Alfonso VI's famous symbolic ride) right 'into' the sea. The conquest of Córdoba brings this phase to an end, and Roland also names a town that is representative of the ones he conquered: *Sevilla.* Only one town is given, because of course the poet knows much less about Southern Spain than the Ebro Basin; this also explains why he seems to underestimate the north-south dimension of Spain.

Marsilĭe of Saragossa offered his surrender around the time when Roland captured Seville, and possibly earlier than that, but almost immediately after doing so, he murdered Charlemagne's messengers who brought the emperor's answer, either out of uncontrollable hate or because he had fortified the town in the meantime and felt more secure. Nevertheless, Charlemagne went on to complete the conquest of southern Spain that he had already begun. This is where the song takes up the story: when the last bastion, Córdoba, is about to fall, Marsilĭe sends another message – and Roland takes issue with this now, in the first council scene, revealing just how appalling the unavenged crime is, especially, when set against the background of a war that has just been won.

Here too, as with the anti-peers, we see a well thought-out, neither random nor fantastical ordering of the geographical details, which are intended to cover the whole of Spain, and not just the Ebro Basin.

Other Spanish geographical details (A.12.6). This section draws attention specifically to the *Marbrise / Marbrose* pair, which has unexpected links with reality (A.12.6.5).

Non-Christian ideas

The 'heathen' gods (A.13). In the specific context of protecting a catabasis, the poet does not need a god of the underworld, but rather a god who can force the powers of the underworld into his control, and for this he finds a model in Virgil's *Jupiter* (A.13.1).

For all other situations, he uses an idea documented since Origen, but found mostly in the visual arts, the diabolical Anti-Trinity (A.13.2.1), which, however, he depicts as three different deities so that he needs three different names. *Mahomet* (A.13.2.1) is indispensable because of the (albeit evilly misinterpreted!) reality of the situation. The other two (A.13.2.2s.) embody what is arguably the most 'natural' and the most widespread principle of idolatry, namely, the worship of the sun and moon, here represented by *Apollin* (A.13.2.3) and his sister Diana. By this time, however, Diana had turned into the three-fold Diana-Luna-Hecate, and instead of opting for one of the three names at random, the poet accentuates the night-time wandering aspect by creating the aptronym *Tervagan* (~ *ter vagam*). Here too, all of the details are consciously chosen, e.g., the fact that the Anti-Trinity as such does not appear until the transition to the Baligant section – just as the diabolic unity of the 'heathen' world is not made manifest until this moment (A.13.2).

B Between Islam and Christianity

Weapon names (B.1). In all epic poetry, there are some basic narrative reasons why individuals, including enemies, should have names, in the Rol. especially because of the large number of single combats. The opposite is true when it comes to swords: large numbers of sword names would detract from the most important element, which is the people who fight. This is why the poet uses them sparingly: the only people carrying a named sword are Charlemagne, the Roland-Olivier-Turpin trio, Ganelon and Baligant. In other words, if a person owns a named sword, this is a sign that he is a main character in the plot. However, the sword name is also chosen to convey subtle meanings: the sword reflects something of its owner. On the Christian side, Charlemagne's sword *Joiuse* (B.1.1.2) reminds us of the source of his strength and the legitimacy of his rule, the Christian's *joy* at his salvation through Christ's sacrificial death, represented in the sword by the very point of the lance used at the Crucifixion. Roland's *Durendal* (B.1.3) reminds us of the *stubbornness* of its wearer; Olivier's sword *Halteclere* (B.1.6.2) of his *bright clar*ity, the major key of his thoughts, feelings and actions; Turpin's *Almice* (B.1.6.1) probably indicates the archbishop's grim and warlike understanding

of his clerical office. Ganelon's sword *Murglais* (B.1.6.3) prefigures a dark link between its wearer and the Saracen side. Baligant himself, the only enemy who is on the same level as Charlemagne, is the only Saracen who deserves to have his weapons named: his *Preciuse* (B.1.1) is a perversion of Charlemagne's *Joiuse* into a purely material object; his lance *Maltét* (B.1.1.3), by the mere fact of bearing a name – no other lance ever does – reveals the arrogant flamboyance of its wearer, and at the same time the meaning indicates the pure evil that gives power to his rule.

Why is Roland unable to destroy Durendal? (B.1.3) This section offers an alternative to the overly one-sided research which since Brault (1978) has suggested, in my opinion incorrectly, that Roland is faultless in every way.

Geographical indications of the origins of weapons (B.1.8) and textiles (B.2). The poet deals sparingly with these details, whereas in later epics they often appear as more or less facile filler material. Only once does he use a deliberately copious amount of them (v. 994–998), because after presenting the anti-peers, he also wants to characterise the larger contingent of the enemy as being very well armed.

Horse names (B.3). The horses, like the weapons, are rather rarely afforded names, and for the same reasons: more horse names would distract attention from the combatants. But the distribution of these names is different.

Among the main characters, Charlemagne and Roland on the Christian side have *Tencendor*, probavbly the 'fighter' (B.3.1.8), and *Veillantif*, either the 'time-tested' or the 'watchful' (B.3.1.9). Both are, as we might expect, faithful servants: they are introduced shortly before their rider charges into battle (v. 1153, 2993); Tencendor survives his rider's final victory (v. 3622); Veillantif dies just before his master, pierced 30 times in the last hail of lances and spears from the now cowardly enemies, just before they make their escape (v. 2167). Turpin's horse is given a *descriptio* instead of a name, depicting him as a model example of his species. But Olivier's horse does not have a name. Among the enemies, Marsilĭe rides on his *Gaignun* (B.3.1.2); but the horses of the twelve anti-peers and the Algalife, and Baligant's horse remain unnamed, even though the latter's rider performs a magnificent cavalcade in front of the assembled army with a leap that is fifty feet long (v. 3165–3167).

In comparison, it may appear strange that several episodic figures also ride a named horse: on the Christian side Gerin rides *Sorel,* Gerer rides *Passecerf* (v. 1379–1380), on the Saracen side, Climborin rides *Barbamusche* (v. 1534 [1491]), Valdabrun rides *Gramimund* (v. 1571 [1528]), Malquiant rides *Salt Perdut* (v. 1597 [1554]), and Grandonĭe rides *Marmorĭe* (v. 1615 [1572]). However, all six of these

occur in the middle part of the battle of Ronceveaux, which does not have *eo ipso* the tight structure of the preceding battle of the twelve against twelve, nor the relentlessly dark drama of the closing section which follows next. The poet must have thought he needed to add a few extra splashes of colour to this middle section.

C The Christian side

Christian ideas

God (C.1.1.2.1). The name of God which appears in the particularly intense invocation *Veire paterne* (v. 2384, 3100) uses the fem. (!) OF *paterne*, Old Occ. *paterna* which is older than the Chanson de Roland; it probably arose because *paterna maiestas*, which was frequently used to refer to the first Person of the Trinity, underwent an ellipsis when it crossed over into the vernacular.

The trio of angels around the dying Roland (C.1.3). After Michael, the generalissimo of the heavenly army of angels, and Gabriel, the messenger between God and his elect, we would expect to see Raphael as the third archangel; however, as the angel of *physical* healing, he would be out of place beside the dying Roland, and so he is replaced by the Cherub who guards the entrance to Paradise after the fall of man (*Gen* 3.24, interpreted as a singular). There is evidence from the time shortly before the Rol. of a belief that whenever a large number of Christians die as martyrs in a great battle, this angel is sent to them, in order to lead them into Paradise.

The relics in Durendal's hilt (C.1.4). Their enumeration is carefully structured in a double way: first in the objects *dent, chevels, vestiment* and (incorrectly remembered) *sanc,* attributed to the saints in a person-specific way; and then also in the saints themselves: each being representative of early eastern and early western Christianity, framed by the two great pillars of the Catholic faith: Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and the Mother of Jesus. It is obvious that something has been deliberately missed out: a relic of the Lord. This is reserved for Charlemagne's sword *Joiuse.*

The *orie flambe* and *Munjoie* (C.2). *Orie flambe* (C.2.1) is a (probably Norm.-Southern It.) loan translation of the common Byzantine χρυσᾶ φλάμουλα (or a literal translation of the singular χρυσοῦν φλάμουλον) and thus means here simply

the 'Emperor's banner', judging by the way it is used at this point in the song. It originally had the name *Romaine* and was Saint Peter's city of Rome banner (~ the banner of the Papal States); the fact that Charlemagne had received this from Saint Peter (a suggestion the poet would probably have found in a mosaic in Old St. Peter's and not in the mosaic in the Lateran Palace), makes Charlemagne the 'advocate' (= trustee, protector) of Rome and in effect also of Christendom as a whole. This banner was the material *signum* of his rule, and so when he received it, he immediately gave it the name that already was his non-material *signum*, his battle cry: *Munjoie*.

Munjoie for its part should (C.2.2) be understood in connection with *Joiuse*. The poet hints that the same Christian *joy* in salvation, which is embodied in the relic in Charlemagne's sword, also applies, in the form of an anticipatory *joy* on reaching the place of eternal blessedness, in the battle cry *Mun(t)joie*. The name is a sublimated form of the pilgrim toponym *Mons gaudii* 'mountain, from where the pilgrims first catch sight of their goal' (C.2.2.1); the poet infuses it with the ancient paradise connotations of *mons* and *gaudium* frequent in theological speech (C.2.2.3). The pilgrim toponym *Mons gaudii* 'mountain of joy' itself is self-explanatory and therefore not in need of any etymology 'behind' it (C.2.2.2).

There is no identifiable connection between *orie flambe* (C.2.1) or *Mun(t)joie* on the one hand and Saint-Denis on the other, (C.2.2.2, C.2.2.5) until after the appearance of the surviving text of the Rol. (and until after the death of Suger).

Turoldus, Vivïen, Bire and **(N)imphe (C.3.2).** Although considerable uncertainty remains in relation to this section, the following analysis can be deemed probable. *Turoldus* is not a copyist, but at the very least an editor of the Rol., and the abrupt ending is an admirably executed artistic device (C.3.2.1). For *Vivïen, Bire* and *(N)imphe*, the geographically closest solution, and also the most satisfactory literary one is: *Vivïen* is the Vivien of the William epics (C.3.2.2), *Bire* is close to Narbonne, *(N)imphe* is Nîmes (C.3.2.3). The poet's ending of the Rol. leads into the William epics, which more or less continue the narrative timeline of the Roland epic (and also began to rival the Roland epic in popularity during the poet's lifetime), thus creating a highly interesting intertextual reference. At the same time, drawing a felicitous parallel between nephews Roland and Vivïen, both of whom die young, expressly leads to the idea that, for Christians, the fight will go on until Judgement Day. Yet there seems to be no call to any contemporary crusade-like action, and for that reason, these lines cannot really help with the dating of the song.

Geographical details and minor characters

Ter(r)e major (**C.4.1–C.4.2**). In its meaning 'the empire of Charlemagne' it corresponds to a Lat. *Terra major*, not *majorum*, where *major,* as in similar OF expressions, is essentially meant as a term of distinction which is suffused with emotional content. There is evidence of this expression with this meaning going back to the 11th century, presumably in connection with a version of the Rol., and its first appearance is in the mouth of the Southern Italian Normans.

The *vals de Moriane* and Roland's conquests outside Spain (C.4.3–C.4.4). In the Rol., the *vals de Moriane*, where Roland receives the sword Durendal from Charlemagne, are the valleys of Maurienne, regardless of what this expression might mean in the *Mainet* epic.

The account that the dying Roland gives of the lands he has conquered with the help of Durendal has 18 sections and the poet has given it a deliberate structure throughout. However – because Roland's life is an eventful one – this structure is rather more complex: an "internal" western French group of five to start with, an "external" Norman-inspired northwest European group of three at the end; altogether a circular movement which is like an opening spiral and has – in the long middle section – some great jumps in space to make the action all the more impressive.

Those who will rebel against Charlemagne in the future (C.4.5s.). The list of rebels is – like the catalogue of peoples – conceived of as a train of thought leading through real geographical areas. Charlemagne does not need to fear any rebellions within his own heartlands, but he certainly does have to worry about the periphery, not so much in the southwest, where he himself has spent the last seven years squashing rebellions, but in the east. That is why the list goes from the northeast to the southeast: the Saxons make up the obligatory starting point, and the poet is aware of them as the subject of the Saxon epic; the Hungarians are familiar via general European experience and the Bulgarians probably more specifically through Norman experience. Romans, Apulians, and Sicilians reflect the major challenges of the Southern Italian Norman state, while Africa and the Balkans represent their two biggest external adventures: in short, it is a "normannogenic" list.

Blancandrin's perspective on Charlemagne's conquests (C.4.7). He, too, is impressed by Charlemagne's conquests . . . but only those in reality carried out by the Normans.

The four corners (C.4.8–C.4.9). The poet names two lines standing almost perpendicularly on each other: Mont-Saint-Michel – Xanten and Besançon – Wissant. This allows him to represent a *France* (with Aix-la-Chapelle/Aachen as its capital) extending to the river Rhine, a timeless idea in francophone minds, and the Rhine border is characterised in the most meaningful way possible by the mention of Xanten, the Frankish place which lies closest to tribal Saxony.

Two fundamental questions: [1] Apparent anachronisms in the OF epic (C.5.1). In a world where fiefdoms generally pass from fathers to sons (with a strong preference for the first-born son), and where the names of ancestors are no longer made by recombining their constituent parts, or by using alliterative names, but are simply handed down in whole (to the first-born son with a preference for the name of the grandfather on the father's side), the chances are good that where X rules as lord of Y today, there has "previously" been an X who has ruled as lord of Y. This makes it difficult for people living in this system even to imagine a territorial order different from the one that pertains in the present; it also tempts them to project contemporary territorial names like *Normandie* into the past (as happens today to a lesser extent: "the Romans in southern Germany" and similar expressions). **[2] Regionality and supra-regionality in the Chanson de Roland (C.5.2).** Although the Norman element clearly plays a disproportionally large role in the surviving text of the song, the poet wants his work *in principle* to be understood in the universally western/Christian sense as a Song of Charlemagne, praising him and his whole Empire (with its centre in Aachen, not Paris). He does not want it to be misinterpreted in a regional-patriotic way; that is why he leaves out the fiefdoms of the main characters (Roland, Olivier, Naimes, Ganelon), since he has plenty of other ways to represent their individuality. When it comes to the minor characters, he can only leave out the fiefdom names when two figures can be defined as a pair (e.g., *Ive e Ivořie*); the other minor characters, however, if they did not have their fiefdoms specified, would lack so much definition that it would be difficult to tell them apart.

The ten *eschieles* and their leaders (C.6). The poet also describes the *eschieles* and their leaders very systematically. The absolute numbers are admittedly fantastical – as they usually are even in medieval chronicles – but their relationship to each other is methodical (C.6.2): in Charlemagne's army the Franks must be in the majority, for basic narrative reasons; but the poet had a great and structurally fruitful idea: he presented the impetuous youths in the first two *eschieles* and the experienced older men in the last one, and in so doing he not only positioned the Franks as the A and O of the whole army, but he also intimated the course of the battle itself. The total number

of non-Christians has no upper limit, which suggests that their numbers are incalculable, and yet the total proportion of Christians against non-Christians is at least 1:5. Charlemagne's empire is a large empire, but it is pitched against the rest of the world.

There is artistic variation in the characterisation of the ten Christian *eschieles* (C.6.1). but above all there is also a careful equilibrium: only positive things are said about each one, no audience member can therefore feel slighted on behalf of his home region, and the hearts of everyone can beat faster with the thought of their ancestors all belonging to this *one* empire; this demonstrates the hugely unifying power of the song, especially against the contemporary background of the time, and how crucial it is to its literary success. You have to examine the text very closely indeed to find overtones of the author's pride at the literally unrivalled fighting prowess of the Normans or his scepticism of the Bretons, when they are under local rulers, or perhaps even a touch of disaffection for the Occitan people.

The personal names are even more surprising (C.6.3): none is a random selection; each one has to be specific to its troop. The leaders of the youths in the first two troops must *per definitionem* not yet be famous; here the poet evinces the hope that they will be worthy successors of Roland and Olivier, in their pairing, but also because both parts of the pair, just like Roland and Olivier, in purely onomastic terms (not through citation of their fiefdoms!) represent complementary parts of France, and thus *in nuce* the whole of France. At the same time, the poet shows that *one* pair cannot be a substitute for the two illustrious martyrs by doubling up the pairing, it seems, in onomastic as well as numeric terms. The leader of the other troops can mostly be a local person. If the poet cannot find a regionally renowned individual (real or epic) to lend his name, he nevertheless has sufficient life experience to know of a name that would be typical for that region.

The twelve peers (C.7). The concept of 'peers' in the OF epic (but not its onomastic packing) ultimately derives from the *aulici* who fell in the battle of a. 778 (C.7.1). To some extent, the figure 12 imitates the number of Christ's disciples (C.7.2.1), but it is also a common *topos*, i.e., modelled on the many positively regarded groups of twelve men that were already available at that time (C.7.2.3).

The names that are packed into the group of twelve vary considerably before and after the Rol., with the exception of the two constants: Roland and Olivier (C.7.3). Strictly speaking, the (partial) list of peers in the *Nota Emilianense* and the peer list that probably comes next chronologically, in the *Pèlerinage,* are in answer to the question, not of the '12 highest-ranking casualties of Roncevaux', but rather of 'Charlemagne's 12 greatest warriors', which means, among other things, that the

Aimerides find their way into these lists. The author of the Rol. (C.7.4), however, can eliminate them because most of the Aimerides epics take place later, under the reign of Louis the Pious. He makes Ogier and Naimes both courtiers in Charlemagne's inner circle, but he keeps them out of the group of twelve. Turpin too, because he is a cleric, is not a peer, but he dies with the peers in Roncevaux because the poet is evidently very keen to demonstrate the compatibility of his spiritual role with his battle role and martyrdom, weapon in hand, against the heathen.

The number twelve gives the poet a tighter structure, and allows him to order the peers in pairs, including two pairs who bear his mark in onomastic terms: Gerin and Gerer, Ive and Ivoriĕ. He places the two heavyweights Roland and Olivier at the beginning and another two heavyweights Engelier of Gascony and Girart de Roussillon at the end, with *homines novi* between them, so that the tragedy of Roncevaux as a whole is greatly enhanced because it affects the elite individuals among the future prospects of the empire, and not the tried and tested grandees in Charlemagne's inner circle.

Judging by the levels of popularity of the names in reality at that time, which differs according to region, he also aims to share them out over (almost) the whole of France, or to be precise, over (almost) all of the FR-Occ. language continuum: in the northwest Ive (Amiens to Le Mans; close to Ivoriĕ?) and Roland (probably Le Mans to Angers), in the mid-southwest Gerin and Gerer (north or east of Bordeaux?), in the far southwest Engeler (Bordeaux and Gascony), in the far south Atun (Albi-Béziers), and also somewhere in the south, close to the Mediterranean, Berenger, in the far southeast Girart (Vienne) and Olivier (~ upper Rhône valley, Geneva?), in the near southeast Sansun (~ Dijon?), in the east Ansëis (Metz). Some areas are not covered: the immediate domain of the Capetians (shortly after 1100 stretching from Bourges to Péronne and Montreuil) and the northeast – a phenomenon that is repeated when the fiefdoms of the other figures are explicitly cited.

Ultimately, this Peers concept sparked a stroke of genius in the poet, which gave the whole first act of the Battle of Roncevaux its structure: the invention of the 12 Anti-Peers.

The minor characters (C.8) cannot be summed up as a group, but their names ensure that they often merit closer examination; notable in this respect are Alde, Austorje, Baldewin / Guinemer, Guiun de Seint Antoniĕ, Pinabel de Sorence.

The explicit fiefdoms (C.9.1) and their negative counterpart, the Capetians barrier, a basic fact in the geography of epic names (C.9.2). The Capetian royal domain is excluded, stretching as it did just after 1100 from Bourges to Orléans and from Paris to Péronne, and including the small exclave of Montreuil-sur-Mer; the whole northern and north eastern French-speaking area is not represented either. It is a basic fact of epic name geography as a whole that in the second half of the 11th century, the key epic names *Olivier*, *Turpin* and *Naimes* simply ran up against a geographical barrier separating them from the Capetian-controlled area plus the north and the northeast. This is true also of *Rollant* (with minor exceptions) and the paired brother trend of Olivier / Roland or Roland /Olivier, the Proto-Chanson de Roland having already conquered first the south and then the west of Galloromania in the first half of the 11th century. Moreover, the distribution of the name *Vivien* suggests that it was not much different in the William or Aimerides epics.

The reason for this is the fact that the Capetian dynasty, which had taken over from the Carolingian dynasty in less than glorious circumstances, was not only regarded with disdain bordering on contempt from outside the periphery of its rule until after the middle of the 11th century but had also kept its focus on a very un-epic mission to expand Capetian regional dynastic influence rather than growing into the lofty ideology of the Carolingians. Pro-Carolingian endorsements, even if only in terms of onomastics, were not appropriate in the political climate of the time.

The main characters

Ganelon (C.10). Rather probably, the name *Ganelon* or *Guenes / Guenelun* was not given to the traitor in the Roland story until around 1045–1055 in Anjou, the reason being a widespread enmity towards the treasurer Ganelon of Saint-Martin -de-Tours, governor of the Thibautiens in the contested Touraine area, who was accused of making himself rich despite a notable absence of any spiritual or military achievements (C.10.2.3). I have found no reliable indications that the treachery theme in the Roland story is older than this. Specifically, in the half-century after the brief "betrayal" of Charles the Bald by Archbishop Ganelon of Sens in 858/859 no decline in the frequency of this name can be identified (C.10.1), and among the references with the name type X + *Ganelon,* only a few use *Ganelon* in a way that can be interpreted as an epithet, rather than a father's name, and these are after around 1080, all of which fits with the name coming from that of the treasurer (C.10.3).

Turpin – with reference back to Ganelon and Marsilĭe; the Angevin core Chanson de Roland of 1045–1055 (C.11). We have seen that in the area of Anjou/ Touraine around the middle of the 11th century, the southern Fr. name *Marsilius* appears to have been repurposed as a Saracen name, influenced by *(al-)Manṣūr* or/and *Mundhir* /mondzír/, and the name *Guanilo* probably changed from that of a personal enemy to that of the traitor in the Chanson de Roland. In the same area and time, as a statistical study of names (C.11.1s.) demonstrates, the singular name *Tilpinus* borne by the Archbishop of Rheims in the year 778 evolved into the epic *Turpinus*, probably, as Bédier has argued, under the influence of the name *Turpio*, borne by a count from almost adjacent Limousin who died while fighting heroically against the Normans and by a highly respected bishop of Limoges. And far from being a passive reporter of events, our new epic Turpinus already seems to have taken part in the fighting.

This overlap in time and space between three names which have no logical connection to each other cannot be ascribed to a collective, as perhaps might be the case at the start of a saga; they rather reveal an individual poet who works in a very deliberate way. If to these three figures we add the already paired Roland and Olivier (the rationale for this is provided below), then the song that appears in outline before us is already the core Chanson de Roland, as I would like to call it (C.11.3). It is the song that we have in outline – though not in the actual words – if we eliminate from the Oxford Roland the parts that in a careful synchronic analysis turn out not to be central. In place of the Blancandrin section, with its superbly intricate discussion between Blancandrin and Ganelon, there was a simpler sequence of events, something like the one in the PT. The Baligant section was still missing, as in the PT; either Baligant did not exist, or he was the insignificant brother of Marsilĭe. Ganelon's trial had not yet become a huge act of empire, with the accompanying psychology of disillusionment, but it was presumably a summary court martial, as in the PT. Bramimonde's conversion was not there yet, as it is missing in the PT. And since *Turold* is a purely Norman name, and the poet was an Angevin, he did not sign his name as *Turoldus* either. Indeed, he probably did not sign it at all.

A song like this, however, would have had a ready audience in Normandy. A jongleur could have performed a few laisses from it immediately before the battle of Hastings and perhaps – why not? – in so doing he moderated his otherwise steady cantillation with a slight dip or lengthening of his voice at the end of each laisse, so that the army could respond with AOI as a kind of military *sursum corda*.

Naimes (C.12). The figure of Charlemagne's adviser Naimes (< *N'Aimes*) emerged before or around 1050 in Southern France, in Gascony, if Naimes was originally a duke from the Basque country, or in Aquitaine, if he was originally a duke from

Bavaria. He was therefore probably included in the Angevin core Rol. of around 1045–1055 already.

The paired names Olivier-Roland and Roland-Olivier (C.13). The poet of the Angevin song of 1045–1055 did not invent Roland, and probably not Olivier either, as literary figures, but he seems to have been the first to depict them together *in Roncevaux* and thus dying together. His song probably caused the name trend for pairs of brothers which started in around 1065/1070 (C.13.1, especially name pair no.3). In the early phase until shortly before 1100, the Olivier-Roland ordering was more prevalent, and this can be explained by the assumption that this song depicted him as the more level-headed, and probably the older of the two; however, the atmosphere of the First Crusade brought with it a higher appreciation of Roland, and the preferred order switched to Roland-Olivier in the end (C.13.4). The present study adds seven certain and six probable or questionable brother pairs to the existing scholarship, although they do not appear until the early 12th century.

Olivier (C.14). The name *Olivier* originated around 980 near the Rhône Bend (C.14.1) as a symbolic name (C.14.4), expressing the same longing for peace in Christian society that nourished the Peace of God movement which was spreading through this same area at roughly the same time (C.14.6). We cannot even rule out the possibility that it was invented by the poet who wrote the first song about Roland and Olivier, that is to say (as Aebischer noted) an Ur-*Girart de Vienne* (which already was about the reconciliation of a feud between Christians in favour of a joint struggle against enemies of the faith); alternatively, this poet must have skilfully used the pre-existent name to refer to the figure of a nephew of Girart de Vienne, conceiving him as a (probably more mature) opponent, but finally sworn brother of a young Roland, who even before the time of this poet was already a nephew of Charlemagne. The story may have ended, like the surviving text of *Girart de Vienne,* with a foreshadowing of their death together in Roncevaux (C.14.2, C.14.7, C.14.9s.). The name *Olivier* quickly spread over the south of Galloromania including Catalonia, and a few decades later also the west, including especially Anjou (C.14.1.1s.). It did not reach the other parts until after 1060, and then only slowly and sparsely; it reached Normandy much later than Anjou, mostly from the Anjou direction and passing through eastern Brittany which lies between (C.14.1.3, C.14.2).

Morant de Riviers (C.14.8). À propos the toponym *Riviers* (to be read thus rather than *Runers* in the Oxford Ms.), the genesis of the *Mainet* material is explained, with reference to the female name *Galiena* first documented in 1135.

Roland (C.15). The defeat of 778 was the only one that Charlemagne ever experienced as a military commander, and the only one for which he was at least partly responsible; it was the only defeat of his life that remained unavenged, and it was never going to be forgotten, because it was almost repeated in 813, actually repeated in 825, and the shock of it reverberated forwards into the words of the Astronomus shortly after 840 (though this is often denied); it was the only Frankish defeat in Charlemagne's lifetime, in which every last man in a precisely definable part of his army died; the only one where *plerique aulicorum* 'most of his courtiers' died, by which is meant the people who were part of his domestic circle, and this explains why it is the only defeat that is recounted in the annals with unusually emotional language, such as the "heart" of the monarch and the "clouding" of his spirits. This collectively traumatic experience needed to be overcome in psychological terms, in this case through the memory of the Emperor's glorious reign as a whole. This is what gives the defeat its epic significance (C.15.1, C.15.8).

There are three pieces of evidence underpinning the existence of Roland and his death in the year 778 (charter, C.15.2.1; coins, C.15.2.2; *Vita Karoli*, C.15.2.3) and all three are valid. The idea that he did not die in 778, or even that he never existed, arises from a hypercritical (and not very deeply grounded) position (C.15.3). Roland was probably from the Wido family, which explains why his name is suppressed in the B group of *Vita Karoli* mss. (C.15.22.3). There is about a 50% probability that he was related to Charlemagne in some way, judging by the social structure of the leadership elite in the Carolingian empire; it is less likely that he was his nephew, but even this possibility cannot be excluded altogether (C.15.5).

Within the rear of the army, Eggihard and Anselm were highest in rank, because they were *aulici* ('holders of court offices'), and as such, they were essentially in charge of the baggage train; and precisely because Roland was not an *aulicus*, his role can only have been the leader of the army division that was asked to defend the retinue, which meant that at the time of the battle, he was effectively in command (C.15.4). This must have been self-evident to those who survived; it explains why his name survived in the epic while the names of the two *aulici* do not.

There are two pieces of evidence from the two centuries between 840 and 1040 which suggest that the memory of Roland lived on in the North (C.15.6). First, around or just after 900 in Saint-Denis, the forger of a supplementary charter to Fulrad's will deviates from his source to mention *Rotlanus* as a witness, and he uses a form of the name that does not appear in the *Vita Karoli* (C.15.6.1). Secondly, it seems that the Normans – probably around the middle of the 10th century, when they were beginning to merge with the local peoples – took the name *Roland* from an indigenous narrative tradition and grafted it into a story

with similar content relating to the time when the Normans had settled the land; the resulting hybrid form is retained by Dudo, who probably heard it from the main source of his information, Raoul d'Ivry (C.15.6.2).

There was more creativity in the South, however, in the Franco-Prov. area near the Rhône Bend. There, a trend for the name *Roland* proliferated like an explosion around 900 (C.15.7.3) and continued into the 11th century, contrasting so sharply during the whole 10th century with the rest of Galloromania (C.15.7.2s.) that this requires an explanation. It must have started around 870–880, too soon after the death of the Archbishop Roland of Arles in 869 in Muslim captivity to exclude a link with this event; at the same time, however, there is no evidence of any significant posthumous veneration of the Archbishop anywhere else. Only one possibility remains: an author was prompted by the rather unheroic death of the Archbishop to look back at the heroic death of the older Roland and devote a poem to him, making this the first hint of a Chanson de Roland that we have ever found (C.15.7.4). He could have been the person who made Roland the nephew of Charlemagne, and for him already, Roland's enemy will simply have been the Muslims. Judging by the strength and durability of his impact, he could have been the first of a very few writers who shaped the Roland material, preceding the poet from Vienne, the Angevin, and Turold. Of course this lies at the very edge of what can be inferred, and his existence is hypothetical; but because we can demonstrate a very precise impact, we must assume that there is a precise cause, and for this reason, I think that this hypothesis is preferable to the other two extreme and mutually contradictory options, which are either to regard the first two hundred years of Roland material cursorily as the amorphous work of many individuals, or to regard it as non-existent (C.15.8).

Gefreid d'Anjou (C.16.1). The surviving text of the Rol. portrays Gefreid d'Anjou and his brother Tierri in a very positive light. That this fits with the many pro-Norm. elements points almost certainly to the date of the song being after the cessation of the long enmity between the two territories, i.e., after 1119, and possibly even after 1128.

There is a legend which has Geoffroy I. Grisegonelle of Anjou (954–987) recklessly carrying the standard of the French king in a decisive battle, but the earliest evidence of this is from the 12th century. Nevertheless, it probably belonged to the legend corpus around Geoffroy, which his descendent Fulk IV *le Réchin* referred to in 1096/97. This legend seems to have prompted the Rol. poet to make Gefreid the permanent *gunfanuner* for Charlemagne, and to have him act in a similarly reckless manner.

Tierri d'Anjou: *Par anceisurs* (C.16.2–C.16.3). Tierri d'Anjou is not the same person as Tierri d'Argone (C.16.2). When he says he must avenge Roland 'due to our (common) ancestors', i.e., because he is related to Roland, he is probably referring to a historical family relationship between the first Count of Anjou and the Wido family, which means also with Roland (C.16.3).

Gaydon alias Tierri d'Anjou (C.16.4). In the *Gaydon* epic (the surviving form is from around 1230–1234), the episode with the jay appears to explain the origin of the second name *Gaidon* for the Tierri d'Anjou / Tedricus of the Rol. and the PT. In reality, however, this episode seems to be an etymologizing story to explain the fact that the person who avenged Roland's death on Ganelon and his clan, named Tierri d'Anjou in the Rol., was called /gędõN/ in an Angevin legend no longer extant. It probably referred to the historical *Wid(d)o* mentioned in the Imperial Annals of the year 799, the first successor of Roland as Margrave of the *Marche de Bretagne* whose name is known, and who thus was, in a regional legend, his designated avenger. This legend was older than the joining of the name Tierri and Anjou in the surviving text of the song; consequently, there is a good chance that it was already present in the 11th century Angevin song.

Charlemagne (C.17). The character of the emperor is portrayed in the Rol. through a constant counterpoint between the unsurpassable greatness of his reign on the one hand, and his longsuffering humanity and loneliness on the other. Similarly, the references to him waver between the sublimely universalising *emperere* and the time-hallowed *reis* and, in parallel, between *Charlemagnes* and *Charles*. Only once are *all* of these elements concentrated in a single verse: in the opening verse of the whole poem, a tmesis is used to include both *Charles* and *Charlemagne*, so to speak, at the same time, framing *reis* and *emperere,* while the *nostre* adds a note of warmth to the image of the ruler: *Carles li reis, nostre emperere magnes [. . .].*

A **The non-Christian side**

The Orient

A.1 Baligant's peoples – the catalogue

First of all, the catalogue urgently needs discussion as a methodological problem.

Military catalogues are the hallmark of great epics since they only make sense when a great battle is about to be described in some detail, usually at very end of the epic. The Germanic epic genre before the 12th century, with the exception of *Beowulf,* is on a much smaller scale, and so it does not have any such catalogues. To be sure, there is one catalogue poem in England, and then half a millennium later another one in Iceland, the *Wīdsīþ* and the *Hyndlulióð*, but they each have a different rationale: the English poet names the courts of the heroic kings that he claims to have visited, and the Norse poet names the family trees of the heroes.

The military catalogue genre is in fact inherited from classical antiquity, and if we find one in a later epic, then *a priori*, classical influence is almost certainly present. This also holds for the Chanson de Roland (henceforth: Rol.). After all, in his entire narrative technique its author reveals an undeniable knowledge of classical antiquity (cf. Tavernier's work, and now e.g., Gicquel 2003, passim), though he never writes a single verse that clearly imitates a definite classical text (cf. Bédier 1927, 316s.).

Now, almost all Greek and Latin military catalogues follow a meaningful train of thought through geographical space. There are some spatial leaps here and there, but they never compromise the clear geography in the arrangement of material. A few examples will suffice.

According to Niemeier (2008, 78 with sketch) the so-called catalogue of ships in the *Iliad* (2.484–785) lists the 29 homelands of the Greeks; it proceeds from the centre outwards in a spiral fashion: first, it goes northwards (1–4) through central Greece (from Boeotia to Locris), then eastwards (5) to the nearby island of Euboea, returning south to the mainland at Attica (6) and south to the nearby island of Salamis (7), southwest (8–13) to the Peloponnese (which is traversed in a north-westerly direction), further northwest to the nearby (14) western and (15) eastern Ionian islands, and from there to the nearby mainland in Aetolia (16). In other words, the first part of the catalogue has taken us around Greece in a continuous and expanding clockwise movement through about 360 degrees. Then, the first leap leads to the island regions in the south (17–20; taking a left turn there through Crete, Rhodes, Symi and the Sporades). The second leap takes us into the northern continental foreshore (21–29); as the poet is located in Asia Minor, he provides less detail about the

north, but he does name its southernmost part first, the area around the Spercheios, and then the north-eastern part, the area around Peneios-Pelion.

Whereas in this catalogue, the distance between the farthest points is some 700 km, it is only about 200 km in the huge Latin catalogue of the *Aeneid*, (7.641–817) so that here the leaps are less obvious. The Latin catalogue leads from the northwest, from Etruria (v. 647–654), to the centre (v. 655–669) and to the southeast (v. 670–690), jumps to the north (v. 691–705) and goes from there to the northeast (v. 706–722), jumps again to the southeast (v. 723–732) and the south (v.733–743), then properly to the east (v. 744–760), from where it reaches central Latium which is the climax of it all (v. 761–802). After this, there is a kind of coda: Camilla rushes in with mounted troops from the south, the homeland of the Volsci (v. 803–817).

Finally, there is an illustration of how a catalogue can invite us to go from historical facts to almost the ends of the Earth in Lucan's catalogue of Pompey's troops at Pharsalus (*Pharsalia* 3.169–297). A few keywords will suffice: Greece-Thrace (with Strymon)-Mysia-Ilion-Asia Minor-Syria (from the Orontes to Gaza-Idumea and back to Tyre-Sidon)-Taurus mountains-Cilicia-Far East (to the Ganges and Indus), jumping back to Cappadocia-Armenia; finally, as if to recap something that has been forgotten (indicating almost limitless extent), Arabia, Carmania, Ethiopia, Upper Mesopotamia and (East and West) Scythia – troops from all these areas rush towards their doom. There is a coda here, too: Ammon (Jupiter) himself insists on sending some Libyans.

These findings could be replicated several times. This unmistakable hankering for a geographical order is also evident in the only catalogue of peoples (although not of troops) from outside of classical antiquity that was of interest to the Middle Ages: the biblical genealogies (*Gen* 10, also slightly condensed in 1 *Paralip* 1.4–26), with their structure according to the three sons of Noah: Japheth's descendants in the north (Europe and the non-Semitic part of Asia Minor, as far as Cyprus and Media), Ham's descendants in the west (Africa) and in a few Semitic regions either situated on the borders of Africa (parts of Arabia) or viewed negatively from Israel's perspective (polytheistic Mesopotamia and pre-Israelite Canaan), and finally Shem's descendants in the bulk of the Semitic area (where Israel is represented by its ancestor (H)Eber).

We should assume, therefore, that when scholars of Romance languages and literature began to take a serious interest in the Rol. catalogue around 1870, they would look for a geographical ordering of material. This did not happen for the first 70 years, however, because the catalogue was so difficult to comprehend. Scholars were generally happy if they could put together a new hypothesis in relation to some aspect of one or other of the names, often picking out a piece of evidence from the text without any consideration of a stemma. Boissonnade

(1923) was an exception, in so far as he did try to identify a large number of items, but unfortunately with an above-average indifference to phonetic considerations. Grégoire (1939) on the other hand, was the first scholar to try and explain the whole of the catalogue as the expression of a central theme –Robert Guiscard's campaigns around 1085 in the Balkans – but his conjectures are only a slight improvement in terms of phonology, and even he does not consider any logical progression through geographical space; the reason why, for example, 'the people from the Peneios' should be named in fourth or 24th place seems at best to depend on assonance, while most of the ordering seems to lack any kind of rationale at all.

It was inevitable that a very different solution would be proposed: Noyer-Weidner (1968, 1969, 1979) emphasised the symbolic meaning, especially the colour symbolism of several names and in these cases went so far as to deny any geographical meaning at all; for him, then, the guiding principle of the catalogue was to symbolise evil, and the real, geographical names were only supplied to create an illusion of reality. In fact, Noyer-Weidner's essays point out a symbolic dimension that had hitherto been overlooked, and for that reason they are still useful; however, we must reject the idea that they have explained the guiding principle of the catalogue, not least because he was only able to provide a symbolic meaning for less than a third of the names. As there was no consensus at all on the majority of the names, even the great Cesare Segre (1971 and 1989 in his commentary, relating to v. 3225) could still refer to *tanti nomi fantastici*. The three consecutive laisses constituting the catalogue were thus dismissed as a more or less meaningless jumble of sounds, in stark contrast to the impressively tight composition of the rest of the song. Finally, de Mandach (1993) revisited the possibility of a geographical interpretation, and in so doing made the most important contribution thus far to our understanding of the catalogue. Unfortunately, his information is too often unreliable (which means it requires time-consuming checks for accuracy), or it is linguistically vague, and sometimes far-fetched; moreover, he blithely ignores the stemma of the Rol. and likes to gloss over other research opinions or trivialises the differences between them and his own. Nevertheless, these faults are partly compensated by three methodological achievements: de Mandach goes out of his way to set each geographical detail within a historically convincing context (which he sometimes chooses too arbitrarily); he tries to collect the poet's material into larger units, each according to its particular theme and supposed source (but unfortunately not in a way that reveals any logical progression through space, even across larger distances); and he is the first person to spell out the geographical ordering of the thirty *eschieles* at the moment of battle (although he makes an error at the last moment).

What then is new about the present analysis of the catalogue? It may not appear so at first, but this analysis aims to take a piece of poetic writing seriously and on its own terms, to show that the catalogue is just as tightly structured as the rest of the song, and to accept something that scholars had hardly dared hope for before: the catalogue follows a clear and simple plan. We can only see this plan, however, if we consistently analyse the catalogue as the author's own train of thought taking us on a journey through real geography, or through what was considered to be real geography at the time of writing. *We have to ask ourselves constantly, not just what each name means, but also why it would be known to a Francophone author at that time, and why it appears at this point in the catalogue.*

This is impossible without some rather extensive and "positivist" preparatory and complementary work.

First: to the best of my knowledge, I am the first to approach the catalogue in a way that takes the stemma seriously. A large part of the uncertainty that attaches to previous, often mutually exclusive identifications is due to the fact that scholars hypothesise about forms that they find in this or that manuscript, and about which they have some idea or other. Over many years of working with the text of the song, I have convinced myself that Segre's stemma is correct for the non-onomastic parts of the text;[13] for this reason, I do not see why it should not also be correct for the names. Therefore, I generally list the variants for each name, and then using the stemma, the palaeography, and historical phonetics, I work my way back to the archetype. Occasionally, this method still leaves elements that cannot be explained, but again and again I was surprised to find how drastically it reduces the supposed chaos of the textual tradition.

Secondly, when I then compare the reading of the archetype with real geographical names, I take the phonetic dimension very seriously. There is a widely accepted convention in medieval studies of implicitly assuming that names *in general* have been significantly corrupted over time, and consequently pleading that in a particular case, a similarity cannot be random. To the very best of my knowledge, I have avoided this. If a trace of this remains, it is openly admitted.

Thirdly, I believe that I have gone further in the factual underpinning of the individual identifications than my predecessors. When a name referred to peoples or places chronologically close to the author's lifetime – as in the case

---

13 We will refer here once and for all to the stemma in Segre's edition (1971, p. XIV; 1989, 1.169), which Segre defended successfully in 1960 (passim) against the assertion that the text had been passed down without any stemma, and then in 1974 (passim) specifically against the alternative stemma suggested by Halvorsen (1959).

of names associated with eastern Europe or the first Crusades – I have sketched out which recent historical events might have been responsible for ensuring that the name was familiar in the Francophone area. On the other hand, whenever a name seemed to originate in the scholarly tradition, I have tried to show how deeply embedded it was in the sources, especially in the classics of geographical scholarship: Pliny's *Naturalis historia* which survives in over 200 mss. (GdT 1.406); on Solinus and his extensive direct and indirect influence (cf. the article *Solinus im Mittelalter* in the LM); and finally, Isidore's *Etymologiae,* which within two hundred years became the basic reference book for the whole of the Middle Ages, gaining an importance which cannot be overestimated (E.R. Curtius, 1954, 487). I also checked the cartographical tradition of the Middle Ages, even though the only evidence from the time of writing of the Rol., the very rudimentary *mappae mundi,* proved helpful in only a few instances.

And fourthly, I have endeavoured to examine all identifications that have ever been suggested; in other words, I do not present my own identifications in the expectation that they will be accepted as the most probable without further discussion. For every identification, I have also tried to cite the author(s) who first suggest it, or who contributed important arguments in support of it, but not everyone who simply took it up. For the time before 1900, however, finding the first author was not always feasible, because a few basic identifications were quickly accepted as common knowledge. On the other hand, I have done my best to avoid rejecting an identification just because it has emerged from within a flawed theory; even Boissonnade, Grégoire and Tavernier sometimes found the right answer.

In the oldest ms. of Rol., the famous Oxford Bodl. Digby 23, part 2 (O), the catalogue appears in its entirety; to avoid misunderstandings, it may be helpful to recap here how far it is preserved in the non-Os. The Norse version (n) and the French ms. L do not have a Baligant section; the Welsh version (w), the Dutch (h) and the French fragments do not have any text from this section of the poem either. Together with the readings of the German Song of Roland (K) by Priest Konrad, I have mentioned those of the Stricker and the *Karlmeinet* (which are mostly omitted by Segre). V4 corresponds with O 3217 and 3262 in speaking of thirty *eschieles* but misses out the second group of ten. P and T also speak of thirty *eschieles*, but already from the fifth *eschiele* of the first group of ten onwards, they present two distinctly different and extremely truncated versions which offer very little assistance in establishing the critical text.[14]

---

14 We can deal with these here. P fills up its first group of ten as follows: 5) *la gent Lycanor*. Explanation: C, V7 and P have already turned the *Esturguz* in *Rol.* 1358 into *Liganors / li*

In the second group of ten (and sporadically elsewhere) O and the non-Os differ, in the count and ordering of the items but in such a way that the basic identity of each item with its counterpart in O remains unequivocal.

Finally, and most importantly, the principle that underpins the structure of the catalogue is not only astonishingly simple, but also quite easy to see. Western armies usually attacked in waves, and so their army divisions were placed one behind the other. By far the most common opinion on battle strategy was that the commander in chief should stand in the middle of the last section of the army. Indeed, this was the only place from where he could still overlook the battlefield when most parts of his army were in the melee. So that he could, if necessary, rush to the rescue of any unit in danger of collapse; otherwise, he would step into the fighting only when the battle reached its decisive concluding phase. Whereas Charlemagne's position is therefore in his tenth and last *eschiele* (cf. v. 3092), Baligant's position is not with his thirtieth *eschiele*, it is with his twentieth (cf. v. 3246 with 3286s.). This is because Muslim armies had enhanced wing sections, and the centre of the army was positioned between and behind them, in the hope that the enemy could be caught in a pincer movement. Therefore, if Baligant stands at the back with the twentieth *eschiele*, we must conclude that the poet is describing the left wing first, then the centre (with Baligant), and then the other wing, each consisting of ten *eschieles*. This realisation leads us quickly to the simplest possible hypothesis for the filling of the three groups of ten: Baligant's peoples are standing in relation to each

---

Ganois / Lucanor; Licanor and similar forms are a medieval distortion of *Nikanor*; e.g., Alexander the Great's historical military commander *Nikanor* is *Licanor* in the Old French *Roman d'Alexandre*; but in the Middle Ages, the Seleucid military commander *Nicanor* from the books of Maccabees (*1 Mach* 7–9, *2 Mach* 8 and 12–15) was much more familiar. Moreover, the name was popularised into the name of a people at least in the *Aspremont* 3791 *tot li Luicanor*, probably by incorporating 'Lycaonian' into it (familiar from *Act Ap* 14.5–18), which Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 294, maintain is the actual etymology. – 6) the troops of *Maligors*, their leader, a *mal*-formation, perhaps ~ Lat. *malignior*; in the Old French *Chanson d'Antioche* there had been a Saracen called *Malingre / Maligos*. – 7) The *Amoraive* 'Almoravids'; on its accentuation cf. Span. *los Almorávides*. – 8) Those of *Cartaige* 'Carthage'. – 9) *Val Tornee* 'tortuous valley', probably without any real geographical connection. – 10) *Val Fonde*, which appears in the thirtieth position in the other texts (cf. below A.1.3.10). Its second and third groups of ten are missing. – T does not have any names for positions no. 5–10. His second group of ten contains only four names, which he takes from the existing tradition in no particular order: *Occident* (instead of *Occiant*), *Mors, Quavelleux* (instead of *Canelius*), *Claivent* (instead of *Clavers*), these being *eschieles* no. 20, 6, 11 and 29 from the main tradition. His third group of ten contains only two names; they do not appear elsewhere in the tradition: *du Mainne, une terre gastee* [!]; *Val Doree*.

other more or less as they lived in real geographical terms. The present study confirms this hypothesis.

A.1.1 First group of ten: the western section (northwest group of five and southwest group of five)

A.1.1.1 First *eschiele*: *de cels de Butentrot*

It consists *de cels de Butentrot* O 3220, *Ualpŏtenrot* K (*Valpotenrôt* Stricker, *van Botzen roit* the *Karlmeinet*), *Butintros* V4, *Boteroz* CV7, *Butancor* P, *bonne terre* T. The points of consensus between O and K, and again between O and V4 tell us that *But-en-tro-t* is the archetype. K has *B- > P-* because of the German dialectal merger of voiced and voiceless stops (as we see in his consistent use of *Paligan* and other similar words); on *val-* cf. below [2]. P has misinterpreted an abbreviation (*-tor* instead of *-tro*) and has also misread the *-t-* as *-c-*. Finally, T offers a facile secondary meaning.

What is meant is [1] today's Butrint (Alban. also *Butrinti*, Ital. *Butrinto*), the southernmost coastal town in Albania, in what was formerly Epirus, directly opposite the island of Kerkyra/Korkyra/Corfu, which was already Greek at that time; it does not mean [2] modern Pozantı in southeast Turkey, in the area that used to be called Cappadocia, which is located 778 m above sea level, 13 km north of the Taurus Pass (i.e., the *Pylae Ciliciae* 'Cilician Gates') between Ereğli and Adana.

On [1]: Butrint in modern Albania has been referred to since Hecataeus of Miletus († around 480 B.C.) with the name Βουθρωτός/-τόν (Lat. *Buthrōtum* Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, Pliny, itineraries etc., *Butrotum* Martianus Capella) and as it passed into the Middle Ages, a parasitic *-n-* crept in: Βοθρον-τοῦ Parthey Not. XIII 475 (with the /θ/>/t/ substitution that is normal in VLat. and Rom.),[15] *Butruntio* Lupus Protospatharius for the year 1017, *Bŏtruntīna/Bŏtrontīna urbs* William of Apulia 4.203 and 329; the unstressed middle vowel appears from now on as *-e-* (later also *-i-*): Βοθρεντοῦ Parthey Not. X 624, Βοθρεντόν Anna Komnene 3.12.3, 6.5.2–3, 6.5.9, *Butrehntos* Guido of Pisa 112.22. We would therefore

---

15 Theta has been a fricative since Hellenistic times (Adrados 2001, 183, 187). This substitution is like ἀποθήκη > Rom. *botica/boteca* > Fr. *boutique* etc. (Kahane/Kahane 1968–1976, 432, Figge 1966, 192s.), exactly as with Germ. words: *Θeud(e)rīk* > OF *Tierri* and similar (Pope 1952, § 629, 634).

expect something like **B(o)utrentó* in OF.[16] Yet a familiar type of metathesis occurred here (outside the local Albanian tradition): postcons. *-r-* moved over into the corresponding position in the neighbouring syllable:[17] **Butentró*. But because there were no words ending in *-ó* in OF, Francophone authors usually finished the word off as Butentrǫt,[18] which then produced an amusing apparent meaning: *bo(u)te-en-trot* 'drive at a trot'.[19] This form is attested in the early 12th c., in the

---

16 In spoken Gk. at that time, apart from certain sandhi cases (Thumb 1910, § 15 and 34), the final /n/ was already silent, regardless of the intonation (Adrados 2001, 180, 230, 234, Chatzidakis 1892, 11).

17 The best-known example of this type: Lat. *crocodīlus* > Ital. *cocodrillo*, Span. *cocodrillo*, Fr. (as a variant until the beginning of the 17th c.) *cocodrile* (> ME. *cokedrille*, MHG. *Kokodrille*); also, from the history of Fr., Lat. *temperat* > OF (12th c.) *tempre* > (13th c.) *trempe*, VLat. **adbiberat* > OF (12th c.) *abevre* > (13th c.) *abreve* > *abreuve*, Lat. *fimbria* > **frimbia* > OF *frange*, late Lat. *tufera* > **tufra* > OF **truf(f)e*, Old Norse *stafn* > OF **estavre* > *estrave* (Pope 1952, § 124). Hjelmslev (1968, 62) even states that the metathesis exists in two forms: 1. Shift of *one* element. It always has one element in a group jumping from an unstressed syllable to the stressed one – never anything else. This is not quite true in quite this absolute sense.

18 The handling of *-ó* (colloquial Gk. for *-óv*, cf. n. 16) is the same as in an example that was important in the First Crusade: *Κιβωτόν* (acc. in Anna Komnene) > *Civitot/Civetot/Chevetot* (Fulcher, Ordericus Vitalis, *Chanson d'Antioche*, William of Tyre and others), although the many Norman place names ending in *-tot* such as *Yvetot* and similar (< Old Norse *toft*, but always *-tot* in 11th century Norman, Nègre 1990–1998, no. 18295–18349) exerted some attraction. A second, related possibility appeared when the precons. *-l-* became vocalised: *Ταρσό(v)* (acc.) 'Tarsos' > *Torsolt /torsout/* (var. *Tarsot* or *Tursot*) in the *Chanson d'Antioche* and *Tharsis*, *vulgari nomine Tursolt* in Albert of Aachen; also, in Orderic 11.26 and 29 (ed. Le Prévost 4.257 and 267) the Armenian prince *Thorós* becomes *Turoldus de Montanis* with attraction involving the Norman name.

19 We could compare the formulation *bo(u)te-en-trot* with modern Fr. (since the 18th c.) *boute-en-train* 'busybody, live wire, animator'. These types of formulation are one of the characteristic features that occur when exotic peoples', place and personal names are taken over into OF; it would be utterly impossible to analyse these names properly without understanding them. An educated modern readership must find them semantically random and therefore distasteful, which leads to a quite unjustified mistrust of their philological derivation. Yet we can very easily and reliably be persuaded of their reality through the place names and personal names that we find in the historians of the Crusades: there, *al-ʿArīsh* becomes *Lariz / Laris* 'bare hill', *ʿAzāz* becomes *Hasart* 'hazard', *Ḥārim* becomes *Harenc* 'herring', *Ḥayfa* becomes *Caipha*s (name of the high priest), *Iskandarūn(a)* becomes *Scandalion*, *Λαοδίκεια* (in inscriptions often *Λαδίκεια* /laðíkja/ [Robert 1962, 283]) becomes *Lalice* (as already in *Alexius* v. 81, 190) 'the barrier', *ar-Rūdž* becomes *(Chastel)-Rouge*, *Ṣahyūn* (castle) becomes *Saone* (river name), *Sarūdž* becomes *Seroge/Serorge* 'brother- in-law, sister-in-law', *Ṣaydāʾ* 'Sidon' becomes *Saëte* 'arrow', *Ṭarṭūs* becomes *Tortosa* (after the Spanish town), *Zardana* becomes *Sardoine* 'sardonyx', *Yaghi-Siyan* becomes *Cassianus* (clerical author), *Shams ad-Daula* becomes *Sensadolus* 'senza duolo, sine dolo', *Firūz* becomes *Pirrus* 'Pyrrhus'. Further examples e.g., in Deschamps (1955, passim). This is a common pattern even in modern times: when French troops

writings of historians of the Crusades, although by this time referring to the place in Cappadocia (cf. [2] below). There is evidence that this ending also crept into the name of the place in Epirus in a reference to the year 1191 in an early 13th c. ms. of the *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi et Regis Ricardi* by Pseudo-Benedict of Peterborough: in this year, the author accompanied King Philip II of France on his journey back from the crusade via Corfu, and the nearby Byzantine mainland was pointed out to him, (*parte Romaniae*) a *castellum desertum quod dicitur Butentrost* [already with a silent *-s-*] *secus littus maris, in quo Judas proditor natus fuit*.[20] In the late 14th c., when Venice assumed control of this area, we can still find at least eight references to *Butentro* in the Venetian charters, as well as many genitives (*castrum, insula*) *Butentroy*.[21] And even in 1900 the name of the place in colloquial Gk. is *Vutzindro*[22] (with modern Gk. regular *v-* < *b-* and *-nd-<-nt-*).

In the Latin-speaking world of the Middle Ages, the cultural domain of Greece – and also, from a western European perspective, the as yet un-converted part of Slavia – was regarded as the Orient, in its widest sense. This meant that the port in Epirus was seen as a key invasion point and as such an excellent introductory marker for the catalogue, indeed an almost obligatory marker, because the first group of ten lists several eastern European and especially Balkan peoples.

This interpretation of the town also reflects in essence the fact that the young Alexander the Great conquered Illyria before he turned to the east. An educated western person would know about this from e.g., Jerome's commentary on Daniel (PL 25.528): after that, Alexander conquered *ab Illyrico et Adriatico mari usque ad Indicum Oceanum et Gangem fluvium [. . .] partem Europae et omnem [. . .] Asiam*. The same information could be found in the universal histories, such as that of Orosius 3.16.2, the chronicle by (Eusebius-) Jerome or their copiers, starting with Bede's s *Chronica*, all of them in relation to the year 335 B.C.

Moreover, any reader of the *Aeneid* would know the *celsa Buthroti urbs* with its *portus* on the *litora Epiri* as the western border town of the Greek and Trojan world. This is where a big, emotionally-laden scene takes place (3.292–505), and where Aeneas is astonished to find the Trojan Helenus and Andromache, Hector's

---

occupied Madagascar in 1895, they quickly learned to cope with the local names by using puns, e.g., *reine blanche* for the local coin *raimbilandza* etc. (Ferrand 1913–1914, I, p. III).

20 Cf. Baum 1916a, 216 with n. 1; *Gesta* etc. 1867, II, p. 204s. Taken over as *Buteentrost* (where the second *-e-* is obviously a writing or printing error) by Roger of Howden in his *Chronica*, III, p. 165.

21 Valentini 1967, no. 203, 205, 290, 296, 321, 322. 330, 544.

22 PW, art. *Buthroton*.

widow, ruling over the area. From our perspective, the most important point to note is that this is Aeneas' last stop in the lands east of the Adriatic Sea before he crosses over to Sicily. Even though his short stay in that place is followed by a storm that blows him over to Carthage, thus leading into the huge, delaying plot line in the epic, his departure from Buthrotum is the geographical break that marks the moment when he ceases to be a man of the east. For readers of the *Aeneid*, therefore, Buthrotum marks the western border of the Orient; if we reverse the perspective, it becomes the very starting point of the Orient. Aeneas' parting wish is that Helenus' realm and the future Roman realm should remain allies through the ages to come. In fact, when Vergil was alive, the *Colonia Iulia* (or *Augusta*) *Buthroti* was a prosperous town which minted its own coins, and its extensive ruins, complete with a beautifully preserved theatre, can still be seen today.[23] In the middle of the 12th c., it was still a "small but flourishing town with markets and an urbane atmosphere" according to Idrīsī who was based in Norman Sicily, and therefore in a good position to know such things.[24]

It was probably just as important to the author of the Rol. that Robert Guiscard had passed through Thessalonica in his attempts to conquer the Byzantine empire, and that his first move in 1081 was to sail the majority of his fleet over to Butrint. He had sent out his son Bohemund in advance; the latter had taken over the town that is called Vlorë today (Old Gk. Αὐλῶν, acc. -να, Ital. *Valona*) without too much trouble, but then he was surprised by a Byzantine troop of two thousand Turkish mercenaries when he was on a foray near Butrint. He defeated them in a fierce struggle, captured their leader Basilios Mesopotamites, and then presented him as a prisoner to his father when the latter arrived. The battle is not mentioned by Anna 3.12.3; it was Henri Grégoire[25] who ensured that its description in William of Apulia 4.322–340 was brought to the attention of scholars of French language and literature and interpreted as a beacon showing us how all Norman wars against the Byzantines started out. This key insight underpinned Grégoire's *théorie du premier choc*, which is still valid, even though he surrounded it with a number of mostly untenable explanations of other proper names in the Rol.

Even if, as many scholars argue, the Rol. that we have now had originated in the time of the Second Crusade, this perspective remains valid. In the second half of the year 1147, and perhaps even in the first few months of 1148, as the

---

23 Cf. e.g., the many images at https://maps.google.de/ and a video on Butrint as a World Heritage Site at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gJ4RD8qDXdg (last access: 26. 01. 2021).
24 PW and (especially with more recent lit. on the material evidence) KPauly, art. *Buthroton*; Idrīsī 1999, 345.
25 Very clearly in 1939b, 689s., and 1942–1943, 535–537; cf. also Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 269–275, and Grégoire 1939a, 211–220.

crusaders were making their way from Constantinople, through present-day Turkey towards their final fiasco, and were growing ever more certain that they had been betrayed by the Basileus, the Norman King Roger II of Sicily, who did not take part in the crusade, set off with his Normans to launch a surprise attack on this same Basileus, now Manuel I, the grandson of Alexios I, just as his uncle, Robert Guiscard, and his cousin Bohemund, had done before. They landed in Corfu first of all, which is within sight of Butrint, and indeed held on to Corfu until the very end of this war.[26] In the course of these events, Roger's soldiers must have remembered and discussed in detail what their fathers and grandfathers had experienced before them.

The arguments advanced thus far show that Butrint was a real, geographical entry point to the Orient. Taken together, they are the most substantial set of arguments of all, because they show that a movement through real geography is the guiding principle behind the structure of the catalogue.

Right next to *cels de Butentrot*, V4, CV7 and P add one or two additional verses (fully cited in Segre's commentary) 3220*a* or *ab*, stating that this is where Judas came from. This legend about Judas' background[27] was already attached to the Epirotic town before the First Crusade, and so it was probably a further reason behind the Roland poet's choice of Epirotic *Butentrot* as the beginning of the evil Orient. The oldest version of the legend, A, preserved in a Latin ms. of the 12th c., takes place, as in the New Testament, entirely in the Holy Land, and so it is of no interest to us.[28] The next, one might say commonly accepted version, R. survives in a Latin ms. of the late 12th c. and in around 15 mss. of the 13.–15th c., although it must have originated in the 11th century at the latest, because the form *Butentrot* has been transferred from an Epirotic to a Cappadocian context, which was already the case during the First Crusade (cf. [2] below). According to this version, Judas' parents are living in the Holy Land and upon hearing an ominous prophecy, they push their infant son out to sea; the container is carried to an island called *Scarioth*; the queen of that land brings Judas up as her own son (a borrowing from the story of Moses' early life); Judas secretly kills the natural son that she bears later, flees to Jerusalem, unknowingly kills his father and marries his mother (a borrowing from the Oedipus saga), finds out about his family origins and repents for a while and turns to Jesus, but then he steals from him

---

26 Chalandon 1912, 318–320, or 1907, 2.135–137.
27 Baum 1916a, passim, and Lehmann, 1959, passim are seminal. The different versions are also succinctly and precisely presented in Worstbrock 1983, 883s.
28 Baum, 1916a, Lehmann 1959, 285, Worstbrock 1983,883. It agrees in all material respects with the Byzantine version, which were published by Istrin 1898, based on two texts (apparently of indeterminate date).

and betrays him.[29] Finally, version H which is preserved in two Latin mss. of the 13th and one of the 14th c. states that the container was carried from Jaffa to the coast of the 'Illyrian' Sea, to the town of *Bitradum* (var. *Bithor*, *Bithroci*), the *famosa* [therefore also well known by that time!] *alitrix Jude traditoris* – which of course researchers recognised as Butrint because of the above-mentioned reference relating to the year 1191 in the *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi et Regis Ricardi*.[30]

How did the legend come to mention an *island* of Scarioth, and then modify this to Butrint? The answer to this is found in principle in Bédier (1927, 44–47), but requires further elucidation. Homeric Phaeacia Σχερίη, in prose Σχερία (as in Aristotle, Strabo, Lat. *Scheria* e.g., in Pliny 4.52; very soon pronounced /sk/ in Latin, and since the 12th century at the latest in Gk., despite the older spelling[31]) has since the 5th c. B.C. (Hellanicus, Thucydides) been identified as the island which lies directly in front of Butrint, called Kérkyra, today's Corfu (as stated in Pliny 4.52). There was an area there (dating from a time that cannot be ascertained) called Σκαριά, a name which is evidently connected with the Homeric name, even if only because it was simply named after this identification; its inhabitants were called Σκαριῶται. On the other hand, Judas' epithet in *Mt* 10.4 and 26.14 is Ἰσκαριώτης (var. Σκαριώτης, 10.4 also Ἰσκαριώθ), *Mc* 3.19 Ἰσκαριώθ (var. Σκαριώθ, Ἰσκαριώτην, acc.), 14.43 (only var., Ἰσκαριώτης, Σκαριώτης), *Lc* 6.16 Ἰσκαριώθ (var. Ἰσκαριώτην, acc., Σκαριώθ), 22.3 Ἰσκαριώτην.[32] The hypercorrect forms with *Scar* defined the Latin tradition for centuries: in the Itala (ed. Jülicher) they are by far in the majority, and the critical edition of Jerome's Vulgate by Fischer/Gryson/Weber (4th edn. 2007) uses them (unlike the *Iscariotes* of the uncritical Vulgate editions, which are based on the Clementina of 1592) frequently in the text: *Mt* 10.4 *Scariotes*, *Mt* 26.14, *Mc* 3.19, 14.43, *Lc* 6.16 and 22.3 *Scarioth*. There are even a few which survive into the French tradition: *Judas Cariot* [< *Scariot*, haplographically] *Roman d'Alexandre déc.* V, v. 8000, cf. Flutre s. v. The name is not explained anywhere in the New Testament;[33] in the search

29 Baum 1916a, 485–489, 492–496, Lehmann 1959, especially 285 on the date of the oldest Ms., Worstbrock 1983, 883s.

30 Baum 1916a, 485–487, 501, 504ss., and 1916b, 216s., Lehmann 1983, 236s., Worstbrock 1983, 884.

31 Cf. Adrados 2001, 234, Thumb 1910, § 18.1.

32 According to Aland *ad locos*. The -της form is intended to be a Gk. ethnicon, but it tautologically retains the 'man' element. The forms without Ἰ- are hypercorrect: since around the time of the birth of Christ, there was a tendency in parts of Greece (as in VLat.) to have an i- (in VLat. soon > ẹ-) before the s- impurum (Adrados 2001, 179s.); another hypercorrect reaction to this is e.g., Σπανία < [H]ispania in Paul's Rom 15.28.

33 It probably means 'man (*iš*) from Cariot' (= Qəriyyōt-Ḥeẓrōn in Moab); cf. Koch 1978 s. v. *Iskariot*.

for a meaning, scholars thought of 'man from Scaria, Scariot' – and the legend was then relocated from the Holy Land to Corfu. It has remained there until modern times: in the 15th/16th c. and even in the 19th c. people talked about a particular house that was supposed to have belonged to Judas;[34] in 1864, another custom was described which is still practised today: at exactly 11 p.m. on Holy Saturday, people throw pots out of their windows to symbolise a shattering kind of divine judgement on Judas;[35] furthermore, Grégoire (1939a, 313) mentions an Italian saying that is familiar "aujourd'hui encore": *Giuda Iscariotto – Fu villan Corfiotto*. Also, as we shall see below in [2], shortly before 1191 is not the date when the legend was first transferred over from Corfu to the better-known port of Butrint which lies directly opposite.[36] This had already happened before the First Crusade.

On [2]: Today's Pozantı in Turkish Cappadocia was throughout its long Greek history called Ποδυανδός (as in Ptolemy, and then *Paduando* in the *Tab. Peut.*), later simplified to Ποδανδός /-όν e.g., Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos *De them.* 19.21ss. (var. Ποδεντόν[37]), Zonaras *Epit.* 17.4.10 (ed. Bonn 2.414.18), Anna 13.12.21, also Lat. *Podando* (abl.) *Itin. Ant.* – with only minor variants: *Opodando*[38] in the *Itin. Hier.*, τοῦ Ποδαντοῦ Michael Attaliates referring to the years 1068 and 1072 (RHC Grecs 1.14 and 1.45). Also: Arab. *al-B*dh*ndun*[39] (Masʿūdī, Ṭabarī, Ibn Khurdādhbih,

---

34 Baum 1916b, 216–218 with n. 19. However, Graziano Zorzi is not, as Baum seems to think, a modern academic author. He is the Venetian lord of Leukás/Lefkada who was expelled in 1357, and as such the subject, and not the author of a paper by Karl Hopf, whose modern Gk. translation of Joannes A. Romanos, Corfu 1870, Baum consulted. Hopf occasionally mentions the Judas legend in relation to 1191, and the footnote that Baum quotes (with ὡς ἠκούσαμεν) dates back not to Zorzi, but to Hopf in 1870.

35 Kirkwall 1864, II, 47s.; the custom practised today is described at e.g., www.corfu.de/korfufest.htm (last access 28. 01. 2021).

36 Judging by *Google Maps*, the strait is only about 2 km wide at one point; according to the above-mentioned *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi et Regis Ricardi,* it was so narrow that people could shout to each other across it.

37 Even in the Koiné of the Roman imperial era, Gk. /nd/ and /nt/ were already interchangeable, but in the only (i.e., western) part of the language territory that remains today they collapsed into /nd/ (cf. Schwyzer/Debrunner 1968–1994, I, 129s.); the /nt/ in Konstantinos could therefore be hypercorrect. However, in parts of Asiatic Gk., the blended form was apparently pronounced /nt/, cf. perhaps Pontic Gk. ἄντρες instead of ἄνδρες 'men' (Chatzidakis 1892, 22), which could be significant for the forms in question.

38 Agglutination of the Gk. nom. Art., then carried into the flexion.

39 Arab. has no /p/ and so regularly uses /b/ instead; it normally omits short, unstressed vowels in the written form; because it only differentiates between the three vowel qualities /a/, /i/, /u/ the stressed /o/ of the Gk. has to be rendered with <u. On the *-dh-* cf. the next n. below!

Idrīsī), West Armen. *Boudantē*, Turk. *Pozantı* (var. *Bozantı, Bozanta*).[40] There are no forms with invervoc. *-t-*, with *-th-* or with *-r-* in any of these traditions.[41]

The Latin historians of the First Crusade stand in stark contrast to the whole Greek, Armenian, Arabic and Turkish tradition; I shall quote all variants as having equal status, because I am not able to verify the stemma in several places: *vallem de Botentroth / Botrenthrot / Brotrenthrot* the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* 4.10 (RHC Occ. 3.130), *vallem de Botenhtrot / Botrenthot / Botrenthrot* Tudebod 4.2 (RHC Occ. 3.30), *vallem de Botentroth* Tudebodus Imitatus 31 (RHC Occ. 3.184), *vallem de Borentot* Tudebod-Duchesne 18 (RHC Occ. 3.30), *vallem [. . .] Botemtroth* Guibert of Nogent 3.13 (RHC Occ. 4.164), *vallem [. . .] Botentrot / Boteintrot / Botrentot / Botrentoh / Botrentrot* Baldric of Dol (RHC Occ. 4.37), *valles Butentrot / Buotentrot / Buotentot / Buotrenten / Buetrenten* Albert of Aachen (RHC Occ. 4.342), *Butroti [!] / Buteoti valles* Raoul de Caen 34 (RHC Occ. 3.630), *vallem de Botentrot* Ordericus Vitalis 9.8, *vallem de Botentrot* the *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis* (ed. Hoffmann 480 referring to the year 1097).[42] Here we can explain the *p- > b-* shift from the Gk., mainly from its sandhi forms,[43] but this does not explain the *-t-* nor indeed the *-tr-*. There is only one explanation: the form heard as /boðandó/, and in Asia probably also /boðantó/,[44] was completely transformed through the name of the Epirotic town into the form *Butentrot*, as Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 273) rightly concluded and emphasised.

We can explain this very easily with reference to real history. Xenophon, Alexander and Septimius Severus travelled through the *Pylae Ciliciae* 13 km south of Podandos, but there were no military encounters, and so the literature

---

40 PW s. v. *Podandos*, and Honigmann (1935, 44). The Western Armenian form from Setton (1969a), *Gazetteer*, s. v. On the *-nt-* forms cf. above n. 37! The intervoc. Gk. -δ- was already, as it is now, a fricative (as in Eng. *The*), and therefore also Arab. *-dh-* and (as substitution) Turk. *-z-*.
41 There is one only apparent exception in the isolated *Poderados* (var. *Poderades*) which according to the *Notitia Antiochiae ac Ierosolymae Patriarchatuum* was one of the seven suffragans of Tarsus (although as far as I am aware, there is no Greek source to support this); the *Notitia* originates in terms of its material perhaps in the 6th c., but the sole-surviving Latin version is not preserved in any Ms. dating from before the end of the 12th c., and it shows western, probably OF-inspired additions (e.g., *Irinopolis que est Baldac*). Cf. ed. Tobler 331, 332.
42 We can add here the *Chanson d'Antioche* 2257s.: *Le val de Botentrot en sont outre passé, / Desi que a Torsolt n'i a nul aresté* (according to ed. Duparc-Quioc C *Botentrot*, B *Boutecot*, D *val de Bonté*; A *Civetot* is factually impossible because a detailed account of the Battle of Dorylaeum has already been provided). The cursory mention in *Florence de Rome* 5445 (Judas' home) does not permit any decision between the two places. *Aliscans* 5993 (Renoart kills many *Turs de Botentrot)* can simply take the name from the Rol.
43 More generally on Rom. *b* < Gk. *p* Kahane/Kahane (1968–1976, 432), Figge (1966, 223–228), late and isolated occurrences also 255–261, 275–278).
44 Cf. above n.37!

does not record any place names from that area. Podandos was not a substantial community in late antiquity, and no classical or medieval ruins have ever been found there.[45] Basilīus of Caesarea (*epist.* 74) thought that Podandos was one of the most miserable places on Earth. This town lay on the border with or indeed frontline against Islam between 830 and 950 (Honigmann 1935, 48,82). After that, the great Byzantine military renaissance commenced: in 969 Emperor Nikephoros II Phokas reconquered Antioch in Syria, about 200 km south of Podandos as the crow flies, and for the next century or more until the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, the whole land route from Constantinople to Antioch via Podandos remained firmly in Byzantine hands. After Manzikert, the Turks occupied the majority of Asia Minor in the face of minimal resistance, and the Sultan of what was now the "Rum Seljuk Sultanate" was soon able to set up residence in Nicaea, almost at the gates of Constantinople. When the crusaders reached Pozantı in 1097, the inhabitants had no doubt forgotten that their home had been a frontier town more than 250 years before; the crusaders, having fought their way through the whole of Asia Minor and having achieved hard-won victories such as those at Nicaea and Dorylaeum, would likewise not have considered Pozantı to be the point where they would be passing from Byzantium into the world of Islam; unlike Butrint, therefore, Pozantı did not function as a frontier in any way, a fact which is very important in our context. Moreover, the main army passed through an area far to the north of Pozantı; only Tancred with his southern Italian Normans and Baldwin, with his 'Flemings' (mainly northern Francophones) dared to make a breakthrough over the Taurus mountains. But they split up precisely at Pozantı because Baldwin looped back towards the north east and only Tancred went on through the Pylae. This was, however, enough of an event to ensure that the place was mentioned in the descriptions of the Crusades; neither section of the army was involved in conflict at that place, however. Tancred's southern Italian Normans (but not Baldwin's 'Flemings') were probably the same ones who had been at Epirotic *Butentrot* 16 years earlier, and even those who had not been there would have heard this name from their fathers on more than one occasion – no-one ever allows the stories of past victories to be forgotten. In any case, the name was familiar enough to them to become the replacement for a similar name that they did not know. This name transfer can therefore *only* be attributed to the Normans, and proves in retrospect, how deeply imprinted the victory of 1081 was in the consciousness of the Normans. We find an additional piece of evidence that has not been noticed before, in Raoul de Caen, Tancred's historian who was there at the time: as the author of elegant Latin epics, he knew from the *Aeneid*

---

45 PW s. v. *Podandos*, col. 1135 and 1139.

that the correct Latin name of Epirotic *Butentrot* was *But(h)rotum*; and so he selected this form of the name for the supposed homonym in Cappadocia: *Butroti valles*. We should note, however, that in Cappadocia the name always appears coupled with *vallis / valles*; this should have been enough to prevent any confusion between the two. In contrast with the First Crusade, no crusaders seem to have passed through Pozantı in the Second Crusade, and certainly none did in all of the following crusades;[46] even if the song is from a later date, Butrint is to be preferred over Pozantı.

The Judas legend also clings to the name *Butentrot*, at least for a short time and in the Lat. versions – but never in the Gk. ones! – Butrint is transposed to Pozantı. Only one historian of the crusades, Albert of Aachen, writing between 1125 and 1150 (RHC. Occ. 4.342) on the year 1097, maintained that Tancred *per valles Butentrot* (var. *Buotentrot / Buotentot / Buotrenton / Buetrenton) superatis rupibus per portam quae vocatur Judas ad civitatem quae dicitur Tarsus, vulgari nomine Tursolt, descendit.* When he was writing this, the legend had already been passed down, and then a further conclusion had been drawn, that Judas, if he came from this place or lived there for a long time, must have used the nearby Pylae on his way to or from the Holy Land; since no other passes are mentioned anywhere else in connection with his life, the Pylae must be "his" pass, where Albert's *porta Judas* ~ OF *la porte* (or *les porz*?) *Judas* instead of the correct **porta Judae* suggests that the name was cited in the OF language. It is also clear that this transfer of meaning was *only* possible via the toponym, and that the legend cannot have come to the Cappadocian place independently of that. For version A of the legend takes place entirely in the Holy Land; in all later versions, however, the 'island' or 'port' motif does not fit with the location of Pozantı, situated as it is 778 m above sea level and separated from the sea by the Taurus mountains; above all, however, the meaning of the name *(I)skariotes* could not be re-interpreted in Cappadocia, because there was no suitable toponym.

The Cappadocian place seems to have left only *one* trace in the Rol. tradition: the *Valpotenrôt* in K; but this tells us nothing about the urtext, because in

---

46 In the Second Crusade, the French army along with the significantly reduced number of Germans reached today's Turkish south coast in Attalia/Anatolia, almost 400 km west of Pozantı or Tarsus. Louis VII and the wealthiest participants sailed from there to St. Symeon, the port of Antioch; those who were left behind had to start marching all the way along the coast to Antioch via Tarsus, a journey which less than half of them managed to complete – whereas Pozantı is located 98 km by road (65 km as the crow flies) north of Tarsus, at 778 m elevation in the Cappadocian highlands. In the Third Crusade too, the German army reached the coast more than 100 km west of Tarsus in Seleucia/Silifke, after Barbarossa had drowned a short distance north of the town; the English and the French reached the Holy Land only by sea.

all other respects K offers very poor evidence for the geography of the song. On the other hand, the north Italian, probably Venetian V4 in the (probably early) 14th c. can only have thought of his *Butintros* as the Epirotic *Butentro* that is mentioned in Venetian charters dating from almost the same time, and his compatriot, the editor of the sub-archetype of CV7 (probably soon after 1300), with his *Boteroz* even comes close to the *Bŭthrōt(um)* of the *Aeneid*; none of the later crusades passed through Pozantı, and so we are entitled to doubt whether in the second half of the 13th century the author of P, who was probably from Lorraine, would have known about the Cappadocian place. There is therefore every reason to suppose that the supplementary verses 3220a or ab in V4, CV7 and P also refer to Butrint. In any case they cannot go back to β or indeed to the archetype; the idea that they would be deleted independently in O and K would be atypical for O and utterly implausible for K, because the latter was a pious man who introduced a remark about Judas into his work three times (v. 1925, 1936, 6103) without any basis in the French tradition, and he would certainly not have deleted such a reference.[47]

Let us sum up the key points! The Epirotic place was the gate to the Orient for Latin-speaking Europe. This is exemplified in the conquests of the young Alexander, in a scene that is central to the *Aeneid* and in the glorious *premier choc* which the Normans delivered to the non-Christian soldiers of the Basileus. The Cappadocian place, on the other hand, did not have this function in the First Crusade, nor in the Second. Furthermore, the basic *Scaria* pun was only possible in Epirus, and the Epirotic place was already thought to be the home of Judas before the start of the First Crusade; the Cappadocian place then briefly took over its west European name and the Judas legend from the Epirotic place. Thus, in the song – even if it originated around 1150 – the place in Epirus is the more likely meaning.

---

47 Segre also makes this point in relation to v. 3220ab and adds an aesthetic argument: for the Roland poet, Judas is already incarnated in Ganelon, i.e., more would be less; in the index of names, Segre therefore opts correctly for the Epirotic place. – In order to keep the Cappadocian place in the song, de Mandach (1993, 283) amends the *cels de Butentrot* in O to *vals de Butentrot* (from K). This is incorrect, not just because within the catalogue of peoples, *de cels de* + toponym is authenticated as typical of the author's language by v. 3228 and 3256, but also because it contradicts the stemma, since *cels* also appears in CV7 (and in Italianising *quilli* in V4). In other respects too, de Mandach's treatment of *Butentrot* is very one-sided: Grégoire's thesis is labelled *surannée*, without any recognition of the Epirotic place's function as a gate to the Orient, or of the concept of the *premier choc*; the historic name *Podandos* is not even mentioned alongside the short-lived crusader name *Butentrot*, so that the whole name (and legend) tradition can remain without comment; but because the simple act of marching through the Cappadocian place would provide a conspicuously weak argument, *Butentrot* is discussed together with *Ermines,* even though there are seven other *eschieles* between them in the song.

A.1.1.2 Second *eschiele*: *de Micenes as chefs gros*

It is comprised *de Micenes as chefs gros* O 3221, *Meres* K (*Mers* Stricker, *mers* the *Karlmeinet* 476.29), *Nices* V4, *de Mont Nigre les Torz* (*Corz* V7) CV7, *Mucemens* (a person, leader of the *eschiele*) P, *Mitoines* (a person, leader of the *eschiele*) T: O can be retained, if *Micenes* is taken to be disyllabic (cf. Segre ad loc.): / mitsnəs/, as *angele* /ãndžlə/ O 836, *humeles* /ymləs/ O 1163, *Kartagene* /kar-tadžnə/ O 1915 or *ydeles* /iδləs/ O 2619.[48] The form in the archetype can be ascertained: *M-* via β except V4, *Mi-* via T, *-ice-* via V4 (and *-ce-* also via P, with *Mu-* instead of *Mi-* through a misreading of 4 vertical strokes as 5), *-nes* via T (and *-es* also via V4, *-s* via all others except CV7). K must have gone through an indecipherable previous stage (with a confusion of nasal tilde and *r* abbreviation, among other things). V4 is probably influenced by OF *nice* (< *nescius*) 'foolish'. CV7 has probably replaced an indecipherable name with an epithet. There is a factual misunderstanding behind P and T: the name is taken to mean the name of the leader of the *eschiele*; T has additionally (after re-accentuation) undergone a further development *ei > oi* and a misreading *c>t*.

The meaning is [1] the Milceni or Upper Sorbs, the Slavic tribe in Upper Lusatia with centres in Bautzen and Görlitz (but enriched with associations of a motif, the [2] Νέμιτζοι, who were thought to be a Byzantine troop of 'German' mercenaries, which also explains the geographical location just after Butrinto/Butrint), but it does not mean [3] the Μιληγγοί, a Slavic tribe in the Peloponnese, [4] 'people from Mycenae' or [5] the Turks from Nicaea.

On [1]: The Milceni are called *Milzane* in the oldest reference, the Bavarian Geographer (middle of the 9th c., ms. around 900), *Milzeni* in Thietmar of Merseburg († 1018), and later also *Milzsane, Milcini,* etc. (always with the stress on the first syllable).[49] Since in OF the /l/ between /i/ (also /y/) and /ts/ disappeared (*filicella > ficele*, *pulcella > pucele*), the form *Míc(e)nes* is normal.[50]

---

[48] Also *angle* O 1089 and another 9 *angle(s)* 'angel' are no doubt to be pronounced /ãndžlə (s)/. The name was recognised and linked with the meaning 'Milceni' by G. Paris (1873, 331).

[49] The initial accentuation follows from the variation *a ~ e ~ i* of the middle vowel in the spelling of the German scribes who first wrote down the name; but since modern Upper and Lower Sorbian and Czech all have automatic initial accentuation, and the consensus among experts is that this is also true of Polish until the 13/14th c., it was probably also true of the Slavic form. – On the Milceni, Horák/Trávníček (1956, 50s.), LM s. v. *Milsener, Lausitz* and *Bolesław Chrobry*, Dvorník (1956, 33 and 107), Niederle (1927, 121s.); see also Hermann (1985, 9 and 337–367), Mazur (1993, 75s. and Karten p. 26 and 29).

[50] The fact that O 821 still has *pulcele*, and not *pucele* can be due to the fact that the author is aware of the connection with *puella*, but there is no such connection for *Micenes*. A similar

According to the Bavarian Geographer, their land covered 30 *civitates* (~ castellanies/strongholds). In 932, it was forced by the Germans to pay tribute, and after the bishopric of Meissen was founded (in 986), it was gradually absorbed into the ecclesiastical and administrative structures of the empire. The rest of Europe knew about it in the 11th c.: in 1002 it was occupied by the Polish Duke Bolesław Chrobry in connection with a dowry dispute, and he remained in control of it during 15 years of mostly successful war against Emperor Henry II. In 1031, it fell to the Empire again, however, and it was allocated to the Margravate of Meissen;[51] this was the start of a very long Germanisation process that was never completed. The Milceni name appears in imperial documents until at least 1165.[52]

On [2]: Grégoire's identification of the *Mícenes* with the Νέμιτζοι, the 'German' mercenaries in Byzantium (Grégoire 1939a, 241s., Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 283–286, 314), seemed to him, and could still seem today, incompatible with the 'Milceni' meaning. Since we cannot entirely rule this interpretation out, nor accept it fully, we must discuss it in more detail.

Among the Merovingian people, members of the royal clan were the only individuals who wore their hair untrimmed for life, although it was always well-groomed with a middle parting – this is how it is described in the 6th c. by Byzantine author Agathias (*hist.* 1.3);[53] the Frankish sources speak of *reges criniti* 'with full/long hair' (Gregory of Tours, *h.F.* 2.9, *Liber historiae Francorum* 4 and 5). In the early 9th c., the Byzantine Theophanes even maintains (in connection with the year 6216 [723/724]) that they were called κριστάται, which can only be a rendering of *cristati,* meaning 'with a (cock's) comb'. Theophanes goes on to explain that κριστάται in Greek means τριχοραχάται 'with hair on their back', τρίχας γὰρ εἶχον κατὰ τῆς ῥάχης ἐκφυομένας ὡς χοῖροι 'because they had hair down their back like hogs', implying bristles. His words were

---

pattern exists after other vowels in the vocalisation of /u̯/: Bugre 'Bulgarians' O 2922, where the *l* is removed (except in the hypercorrect *nevuld* O 216, *nevold* 824 and similar).

51 The name of the stronghold, Margravate and bishop's seat Meissen, Slav. *Misni,* then in Adam of Bremen (1075) *Misna,* is only accidentally similar in sound to the name of the Milceni. De Mandach 1993, 255, however, thinks that the *Micenes* are *originaires de Meissen/Misna.* This makes very little difference to the factual basis of our interpretation, but it does not explain the written form *-cen-* that has been confirmed in the archetype.

52 E.g., in Henry IV's charters of 1071 and 1086 (ed. MGH, No. 246 and 390) and Frederick I's charter of 1165 (ed. MGH, No. 473).

53 There are even earlier – fleeting but relevant – references to this in Claudian, *IV. Consul. Honor.* 445–447, *Consul. Stilic.* I 202–203 (MGH AA 10, p. 167 or 196), and in Avitus' letter to Clovis on the occasion of his baptism (MGH AA 6, vol. 2, p. 75s.).

copied in Byzantium around 1100 by Kedrenos (ed. Niebuhr p. 794), whereas Anastasius Bibliothecarius had translated them into Latin by the middle of the 9th c. (with a slightly amended dating reference to 6234 ~ 735): *dicebantur enim ex genere illo descendentes cristatae, quod interpretatur trichorachati; pilos enim habebant natos in spina velut porci*. This notion must therefore have been very well known across the whole of Byzantine-Italian culture.

The Rol. immediately characterises the *Micenes* in the following two verses (3222s.) in a similar fashion: *Sur les eschines qu'il unt en mi le dos / Cil sunt seiét* ('bristled') *ensement come porc*.[54] Grégoire emphasises the fact that no other text, apart from these two, attributes this abnormality to any people,[55] and rightly concludes that the overlap is not a coincidence.

He goes on to mention one of the foreign forces in the Byzantine army, the Νέμιτζοι (and similar), whose name is clearly a superficially graecified form of Common Slavic *nemec* 'German' (as argued by Vasmer 1976–1979, s. v. нéмeц). This ethnicon appears in 950 in Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos (*De cer.* 2.398, οἱ λεγόμενοι Νεμέτζιοι as the people led by the king of the Saxons and Bavarians) and around 1100 in Theophylact of Ohřid (Νεμιτζοί Niederle 1927, 482 n. 3 ~ Νέμιτζοι Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 302, Germans around 900 as enemies of the Greek mission in Moravia), the regional name in the second half of the 11th c. in Michael Attaleiates (ἡ Νεμιτζία ed. Niebuhr p. 221,), the military force in Emperor Alexios' charter of 1088 (Νεμίτζοι).[56] There is more detail in Anna (2.9.4–5, 2.10.2): the Νεμίτζοι are barbarian troops, who have long been (ἀνέκαθεν) in the service of the Roman Empire; they had been tasked with guarding a tower on the walls of Constantinople for Emperor Nikephoros Botaneiates in 1081, but they let the pretender Alexios Komnenos in; this episode is also in Zonaras, with an almost identical date (18.20, PG 135, col. 293s., Νέμιτζοι). The Byzantines never managed to make a clear distinction between the people's names Φράγκοι/ Φράγγοι ~ Νέμιτζοι ~ Γερμανοί (references in Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 302), and

---

54 This idea is carried forward unchanged in K and V4 (Northern Ital. *le sede* ~ Standard Ital. *le sétole* 'the bristles'); later P and T, and even more, C and V7 water it down. À propos *in spina* and *en mi le dos*: the European wild boar (Scrofa scrofa *Linné*) has thick bristles on its neck and withers which form a comb, and which the animal will raise when enraged – this is precisely the image that medieval hunters would have known. – The other attribute of the *Mícenes*/Miceni, as *chefs gros* (v. 3221), is too general to allow any conclusions to be drawn.

55 There was at the time of the Rol. an existing tradition of cynocephalics who had a mane like a horse, which Grégoire does not mention (Letter of Pharasmanes, and later ones, Lecouteux 1982, 2.27). However, horse manes are very different from boar bristles, not least because they do not have this derogatory association.

56 Grégoire 1946, 452: gen. pl. in the main text: Νεμίτζων, in the footnote: Νεμίτσων.

so the boar-bristle superstition was obviously generalised from the "Francs chevelus" to all Νέμιτζοι. The many Normans who served in Byzantium would also have known about this.

Thus far, Grégoire's explanation of the highly specific bristle motif is persuasive but then (1939a, 241, Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 314) his final step amounts to an act of philological violence. Referring to the "*Nemitzes ou Allemands*" he states: "Avec une simple métathèse: *Micenes*, ils figurent en bonne place, c'est-à-dire, comme formant la seconde ‹échelle› de la première dizaine de Baligant, v. 3222". He continues quite simply: "nous corrigeons en *Nemices*". But the stemma shows that this impossible: the initial *M-* is common to OKPT, and therefore belongs in the archetype; moreover, the *Mic-* in O lives on in the *Muc-* of P and the *Mit-* of T. It is also very unlikely in terms of meaning: the German-speaking Franks are subsumed into the *Francs* of the song, as we see in *Antelme de Maience* and *Ais* 'Aachen' as Charlemagne's capital; similarly, the *Alemans*, *Ba(i)vier, Tiedeis* and presently even (see Ganelon's trial) the *Saisnes* are subject to Charlemagne, which means that there would be almost no tribe left in the Germanic area (which at that time extended only to the Elbe-Saale line!) to make up the *Némices*.

Grégoire's explanation needs just one small modification: the poet heard about the *Némices* legend from Normans or other Francophone people who had returned from service in Byzantium, but he could only imagine these *Némices* in geographically vague terms as 'Byzantine mercenaries from an area north of Byzantium', which means supposedly from Slavia, and so he identified them as the similar-sounding *Mícenes*.

On [3]: The Μιληγγοί[57] are a Slavic tribe which probably migrated into the Peloponnese in the late 7th c., launched an unsuccessful rebellion against Byzantium in the 9th and again in the 10th c., achieved a certain amount of autonomy, and then in the late 10th c. plundered monasteries, rebelled against the 13th century French emperors of Byzantium and demonstrably remained Slavophone until into the 15th c.[58] Earlier Slavic language scholars, from Šafařík to Niederle, traced the Greek form back to *Milenci*, which could then be interpreted as being etymologically related to *Mílceni*. Geographically, this would fit well with *Butentrot*; but there is no justification for the voiceless palatal in the supposed

---

57 Written thus in Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, *De adm. imp.* 50 (2x), with /i/ in the first syllable (only later with /e/, perhaps already under the influence of mod. Gk. folk-etymology), cf. Birnbaum (1986, 20), Vasmer (1941, 170).

58 Cf., also on the following point, especially Birnbaum (1986, passim); LM s. v. *Melingoi*; Vasmer (1941, 18 and 170).

Milenci, which means that we must relinquish this theory in favour of other explanations – and so we must also reject any possibility of a phonetic link with our *Micenes*.

On [4]: Do the Mícenes have anything to do with Mycenae? Instead of counting *Micenes* as disyllabic, Hilka/Pfister athetize the *-s*: *Et l'altre aprés de Micene(s) as chefs gros*. In their index, they correctly state that the *Micenes* [here with *-s*] should probably be identified as the Milceni. But because a nominative plural would be very unusual after *de,* one would have to interpret the form without *-s* as a fem. sg., so in fact as *Micéne* 'Mycenae', Lat. *Mycēne, Mycēnae*. The name of this town is mentioned in the *Aeneid* (1.284 etc., altogether 10x) and by Dares (2x) and Dictys (7x), and the Old French 10-syllable *Alexandre*, *Thèbes* and *Troie* take it from their Latin sources and generally turn it into French as *Miceine*, *Miceines*.

However, in the Rol., the *-s* is attested in every version, and so it belongs also in the archetype, which means that to athetize it would contradict the stemma; yet without the athetization, the accentuation *Micénes* would be metrically impossible.

Furthermore, the ancient town of Mycenae according to Strabo (8.372), writing in the 1st c. B.C., had not left any visible traces above the ground, and remained, until Schliemann, as good as forgotten (KPauly s. v.), which means that it is unlikely any text ever located post-classical events in that place. This is why I, too, think it is improbable that this town would have caught the attention of the Normans, when in the war of 1147 against Byzantium their fleet plundered Nafplio, and then Corinth, both of which were only about 15 km away from inland Mycenae (Chalandon 1912, 319s., or 1907, 2.136s.).

Mycenae would link very well geographically with Butrint, but then the bristles on the backs of the people from this place would remain unexplained.

On [5]: Mireaux (1943, 37) believed that the author means *Niceni*, "les Turcs de Nicée". But *Niceni* (more precisely: *Nicęni ~ Nicaeni*, a name that was familiar across the whole of the Christian world because of the ecumenical council that took place there, and the resulting creed) has the stress on the *-c(a)e-* and so is an even worse fit with *Mícenes*.

On the other hand, Miraux has a supplementary idea which proves almost correct. He thinks that "les Turcs des *Montes Nigri*", whom the sub-archetype of CV7 introduces, are "de la Montaigne Noire au sud-est de Nicée et que traversèrent les croisés après leur victoire de Dorylée", i.e., from those *Nigri Montes*, where according to Albert of Aachen (3.1) the crusaders camped for a night after

the Battle of Dorylaeum (100 km southeast of Nicaea), although nothing of significance happened there. However, whereas Albert of Aachen never went to the Orient, William of Tyre (4.10 and 15.14) was born there and knows the *Nigra Montana* only as those near Antioch, over 800 km by road from Dorylaeum. These mountains, and not the ones mentioned by Albert, are also to be found with reference to the First Crusade as the *Noire Montaigne* in the *Chanson d'Antioche* 2.260, and also as *the Nigre Montaigne desous Andioche*, in a poem cited by Godefroy s. v. *nigre*. This is why Susan Edgington, in her edition and commentary (2007, ad loc.), suspects that there is "some topographical confusion on Albert's part". But no matter whether the author of the CV7 sub-archetype located his 'Black Mountains' near Dorylaeum or (more probably) near Antioch or just vaguely 'somewhere down there' in present-day Turkey, he contributed nothing to our knowledge of the archetype.[59]

A.1.1.3 Third *eschiele*: *de Nubles e de Blos*

De Nubles e de Blos O 3224 and V4, *Nobiles* and *Rosse* K (*von Nobles und von Rosse* Stricker, but *van Nubles, van Bolois* the *Karlmeinet*), *Nubles* and *Bloz* CV7, *Blondernie* P, *Conibre* T: the consensus between O and V4(CV7) shows that both names belong in the archetype. K tells us (v. 9080–9083) he first translated his entire source into Lat. and then made his German poem based on his translation; because his source was Anglo-Norman, he would have been accustomed to replacing u> with <o>, and so he also interpreted *Nubles* as *⁺Nobles* (although OF *noble* as a 'semi-erudite' word has /o̧/, and so it is always written with <o> in Anglo-Norman); he then Latinised *⁺Nobles* as *Nobiles*. His *Rosse* 'Russians, Russia', however, is carried back from the following verse (where it corresponds to V4 *Ros*, P *Roussie*, T *Rossile*); in return, *Plais* (again with *B-* > *P-* because of the dialectal German consonant merger, while Stricker 9534 still has *Blais*), has been moved over there, although it belongs with the *Blos* of O and V4 (on his *-a-* cf. below [a1]); while the Stricker follows K, the *Karlmeinet* restores the original order with *Bolois*, and in so doing reveals that he had his own route of access to the French tradition. *Bloz* in CV7 already originates in a period when /ts/ had become /s/, and so <z> had become equivalent to <s>. In P the verse is: *De Blondernie font la tierce rangier* in a laisse with *-ier* rhymes (and thus eight rather facile infinitives). The rhymer could not insert the six-syllable *de Nubles*

---

et de Blos in the first (four-syllable) hemistich without shortening it; he suppressed the four-syllable *de Nubles et* and in return expanded *Blo-* with two additional syllables (+ /-ə/): he understood *blo(i)s* as 'blond ones',[60] replaced it with the unequivocal *blond*, added on the familiar "epic" morpheme *-ern-* (used mainly in names of towns)[61] and with the *-ie* turned the town name into the name of a region. Finally, a precursor of T misread the four-stroke *nubles* as **mibles* and thought he should repair this by changing it to *Commibles* 'Coimbra' (cf. O 198!); a later writer replaced *Commibles* with the more accurate form *Conībre* (Lat. Conimbria), and T overlooked the tilde.

The meaning of the [a] *Blos* is literally [a1] the Wallachians, as Grégoire rightly noted, albeit with inadequate explanation (Grégoire 1939a, 265–268 etc.); however, the poet simultaneously relies on the symbolic force that derives from the adjective *blo* meaning something like 'pale blue'. On the other hand, there is no evidence to support [a2] the Polovtsy. Similarly, in the case of [b] the *Nubles* the poet is also probably thinking on a literal level of the *Nubii* 'Nubians'. But he mentions them here – in the first and not the second part of this group of ten, where they would have been a better geographical fit – for the symbolic value that is gained from the homonymous adjective *nuble* 'dark as thunder clouds'. The poet is therefore attaching importance to the symbolic play of light that arises from the names: 'partly dark grey, partly pale blue'.

On [a1]: We shall consider first the *Blos* 'Wallachians', with the play on colour that the poet is setting out here. He must have been thinking of the partial spectrum of meaning in OF *blo*[62] stretching from a demonic 'pale blue' to 'corpse-coloured'. Noyer-Weidner (1969, 42–50), discusses its symbolic meaning in detail

---

60 OF *blo/bleu/blef*, fem. *bloe/bleue/bleve*, and OF *bloi*, fem. *bloie*, have an almost completely overlapping spectrum of meaning: from 'fair-skinned or fair-haired, sallow, pale, wan' to 'blue' (cf. Godefroy and Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v.); this means they are "as good as synonyms" (Noyer-Weidner 1969, 46). However, the 'blond' nuance (apart from one *blo(u)s* in the *Aubry le Bourguignon*) almost totally devolves on *bloi*, while the 'bloodshot, corpse-coloured' is much more common with *blo*. Though according to the FEW, *blo* is derived from Germ. *blāo*, while *bloi* is from Celt. *blavos*, many scholars including Emmanuel Walberg and Elise Richter argued a case for an undifferentiated adjective. From this broad spectrum of meanings – any normal speaker of OF could only have thought of it as such – P selected 'fair, blond', whereas the poet wanted to evoke precisely the complementary, negatively-tinged part of the spectrum; cf. above in the main text.
61 This is how *Salerne* came about, and then *Palerne*, followed by *Biterne*, *Belferne*, *Califerne*, *Oluferne*, *Valterne*, and eventually *Fine Posterne*, *Loquiferne*, *Luiserne* and *Vouterne*. I consider this type of formation in more detail below in relation to *Oluferne* (A.2.4).
62 Cf. n. 59!

but dismisses any reference to a real people. I would emphasise his mention of 'the dark grey/blue, boyish devil of the Exultet from Fondi dating from the beginning of the 12th century' (Noyer-Weidner, 1969, 44, following O. Erich 1931, 90). However, this tradition is already indicated in the book of Revelation (*Apoc* 9.14ss.): after the sixth trumpet has sounded, out of the Euphrates (and so even here out of a demonic Orient!) emerges the army of horsemen in their *igneae et hyacinthinae et sulphureae* breastplates, which translates as roughly 'fire-coloured, steely blue, sulphur-coloured'. There is more information on blue as the colour of devils in LCI s. v. *Teufel*.

It is tempting to let the symbolic meaning of the *Blos* suffice, but then it appears that the poet has capriciously added something else: as the battle proceeds, he introduces within Baligant's horde of peoples *cels [. . .] de Bascle* (in O v. 3474, *Blandie /blándĭə/* V4, with á-ə-assonance). Besides the almost forty peoples in this catalogue, can he have conjured up a further regional name without any obvious reason?[63] This would not fit with the otherwise carefully worked structure of the song. On the contrary, if we want to equate the people from *Bascle/Blandĭe* with one of the peoples in the catalogue, then the only possibility would be the *Blos*. The superficial meaning of *Bascle* is clearly 'Basques';[64] but Baligant's army consists only of the peoples he brought over with him to Spain, which means that there must be a misunderstanding in O. The *Blandĭe* of V4 can be of assistance here. First of all, its <di> could easily be a misreading of <ch>. Secondly, the name of the Wallachians, or of Wallachia, often appears elsewhere in OF with a parasitic *-n-*. This occurs at least three times in Ms. C of Ernoul's continuation of William of Tyre's work, as *li Blanc* (which differs from *li Blac* found in the other mss., Stabile 2011, 128s.), and in both occurrences in ms. B of the *Prophecies de Merlin* as the regional name *Blancie* (which differs from the *Blachie* if Ms. P, cf. Stabile 2011, 152; vaguely in Flutre s. v.). Similarly, V4 must have had a **Blanch(i?)e* in front of him, which in turn was derived from a *Blach(ĭ?)e* 'Wallachia' (probably pronounced with /k/). This last reading was

---

63 This is quite different from the treatment of the *Enfruns* and the *Ar(r)abit* or *cels d'Arabe*; cf. the section below on 'Enfruns and Arabiz' (A.1.2.10).

64 We find the clear meaning 'Basques' in M.Lat. *Basclus, Bascli* with *-l-* in the pilgrims' guide of *the Codex Calixtinus* (cap. 7 several times), vernacular *Bascle(s)* in the Occitan *Cansó d'Antiocha* (v. 28 where the crusaders are listed: *e Bascle e Navar, Tolzá e Caersi*), in the troubadours Bertran de Gordo and Savaric de Malleo (Wiacek 1968 s. v.) and in several *chansons de geste* (Moisan s. v.); we find *Bascleis* in the *Roman d'Alexandre* V 2196 and II 1243, both times next to the Provençals and the French, and in the *Anseïs de Cartage* 9599 *Basclois*. There was probably an underlying variant *Vascŏnes* as well as *Vascōnes* (> *G[u]ascons*), as *Saxŏnes* > OF *Saisnes* or *Saxōnes* > modern Fr. *Saxons*, then (with Gascon *v-* > *b-*) > **Bascne* > *Bascle*, because there was no /kn/ in OF.

probably the right one; but because the copyist of O or another scribe before him was more familiar with the Basques than the Wallachians, the metathesis crept into *Bascle*.[65]

Now *Blachĭe* is the name of a region, and so when the ending is removed, the people's name *Blac* is what remains, or in the sigmatic forms of the declension, *Blas*.[66] If therefore *Blachie* or *Blas* suggests Wallachia and its inhabitants to the poet, then it is difficult to hold onto any completely different interpretation, especially since we find that one of its variants is *Blais (> Plais) in K (Stricker *Blais*).

But is it likely that the name of the Wallachians (~ Romanians) reached France so early, and if so, was it *-a-* or with *-o-*? The path led through Byzantium. The only form of the name over there was Βλάχοι (pronounced /vláχi/, as in two Diplomas of Emperor Basilios II from 980 and 1020, cf. Stabile 2011, 33s.; also Kekaumenos, late 11th c., but here, too, looking back to the period shortly after 1000, *Strategikon*, cap. 173; Anna 5.5.3, 8.3.4, 10.2.6, 10.3.1; Chalkondyles, vol. 2, p. 77.7–78.16; also an interpolation in Scylitzes looking back to events around 976 and later. Most of these attestations relate to the subsections of this people that were located to the right of the Danube, in the hinterland of the east coast of the Adriatic, in the Balkan Mountains and concentrated in Thessaly, which was even called Μεγάλη Βλαχία (and so approximately the ancestors of the later Istro-Romanians and Aromanians); but Chalkondyles clearly states that the land of the Wallachians stretches from *Ardeal* (= modern Hungarian *Erdély* 'wooded land', i.e., 'Transylvania') to the Black Sea, which means the Daco-Romanians in today's Romania.[67]

The following facts reveal just how well people in France knew the Wallachians even before the First Crusade. Around 1066, at the very time when the Wallachians were launching a rebellion against Byzantium, there was a rumour in Byzantium that Robert Guiscard was planning an invasion; Chalandon suspects there is a connection. This was even more obvious in the constellation of events that followed around the year 1085: Bohemund marched towards Ioannina and wanted to make common cause with the Wallachians there.[68] According to Anna

---

65 Baist (1902, 219) already suspects this since he argues that *Bascle/Blándĭe* can lead to *Blakie*.

66 Cf. Pope (1952, § 326 and 808 (III)).

67 ODB, map *Greece* and Art. *Vlachia, Vlachs*; LM s. v. *Vlachen*; Vatteroni (2013, 468 with n. 5). – Middle Gk. Βλάχος goes back via southern Slav. Влахъ to Germ. *wal(a)h* 'Romanian' (must originally have been 'Gallic', because it is derived from the Gallic tribal name Volcae); cf. now in detail Stabile (2011, 19–35).

68 Chalandon (1900, 60s., 85s.).

Komnene (8.3.4 and 5, 8.5.5), in 1086 and 1091 Emperor Alexios deployed the following troops against the Pechenegs at the same time: the Βλάχοι, the 'Franks' (French) of Humbertopoulos plus five hundred armed men from the County of Flanders (who were part of the Kingdom of France and mostly Francophone, from around Arras, Douai and Lille). According to the Latin *Ann. Barenses* ('from Bari', MGH SS. 5.53, 11th c.; on this now Stabile 2011, 35s.), the multi-ethnic army of Emperor Basilios II in 1027 [more correctly in fact: 1025 at the latest] that was sent to reconquer Sicily included *Vlachi*; the early south Italian Normans had been witnesses to this endeavour, and they repeated it for themselves a generation later.

This brings us to the evidence from Galloromania; sources there replace the foreign /vl-/ consistently with /bl-/. The *Miraculum* 22 in Book II of the *Codex Calixtinus* was written down by 1139 at the latest (with Pope Calixt II as the presumed author), and survives in a manuscript dating from around 1150, but it has not been considered before in relation to our material: a merchant from Barcelona is captured by pirates on his way to Sicily, becomes a slave and then sets off on a veritable odyssey: he has many adventures, and from *Iazera* in *Esclavonia*, which means Zadar/Zara in Dalmatia, he is sold on via *Blasia* to *Turcoplia* and from there to Persia and India. Even though it remains unclear how a whole region could be attributed to the Turcopoles (children of one Turkish and one non-Turkish parent), this stopover between Dalmatia and a (half-)Turkish region obviously relates to our *Blachia*, the Wallachians. The form of the name has probably been influenced by the phonetically correct obl. pl. *Blas* (< *Blacs*); this is precisely what the early popularity of this form reveals. In around 1200, Raimbaut de Vaqueiras (ed. Linskill) has the correct rectus (~nom.) pl. *li Blac* (XX, v. 36) and the obliquus (~non-nom.) *Blacs* (with the -c- reintroduced from the rectus; XXII, v. 57; cf. now Vatteroni 2013, 467). For Fr. between 1200 and 1500, cf. the very detailed references in Stabile (2011, 102–196), beginning with the chroniclers of the Fourth Crusade and its aftermath: Villehardouin (ed. Faral) likewise has several instances of *Blac*, or in the sigmatic forms *Blas*, and more than 30 occurrences of the region *Blaquie/Blakie* with occasional written variations such as *Blachie/Blasquie*; Robert de Clari (ed. Lauer) also has several instances of *Blak*, although in the sigmatic forms it is *Blaks*,[69] Henri de Valenciennes has *Blac* four times, *Blas* eleven times, one instance of the expanded form *Blacois* (subst., var. *Blac*), one each of *Blaquie, Blakie* – etc. We should mention from among those writing in Latin in the French cultural domain: William of Rubruck who wrote a large account of his travels for his king, Louis IX, shortly

---

[69] Only the name of the prince of the Wallachians occurs as *Jehans li Blakis* four times and then it is, as we would expect, *Jehans li Blaks* six times.

after 1255 (ed. van den Wyngaert 1929, 167, 209, 219, 220) with *Blakia, Blac, Blaci* (nom. pl.), *Blacorum* and (as noted by Vatteroni 2013, 468 n.5) the French or French-educated anonymous author who wrote the *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* in 1308 with the nom. pl. *Blazi*.[70] The first reference in Italian is probably from the early 13th c., or at least before 1265: *blàchi* in Uguccione da Lodi (Schweickard in the DI s. v. *Valàcchia*).

The overall picture is clear: we have a united front in favour of *-a-*. There is therefore only one explanation for our *Blos*: the poet consciously modifies the vowel in this name, not just because of assonance, but because he wants to let another dimension emerge alongside the geographical one: a light grey, shimmering, demonic colour which contributes additional symbolic value. In v. 3474 the intention is different: he just wants us to share the experience of a hard battle in realistic terms – no more and no less; this is why there is a normal *-a-* in this scene.

On [a2]: The Polovtsy (Cumans, Qıpčaq-Tatars) attacked both Byzantium and Hungary without success around 1090, and from then until the Mongol invasion they appear in history in various roles including as enemies, mercenaries or allies of the Byzantines, Hungarians, Russians and Georgians. In MHG they are called the *Valwen/Falben* 'pale ones, yellowish ones';[71] their Armen. name *Xartešk'n* is thought to have the same meaning (LM s. v. *Kumanen*). This colour name, and the fact that the German *Karlmeinet* has *Bolois* instead of the *Plais* in K, led Jenkins (ad loc.) to the conclusion that the name *Blos* should be interpreted as the Cumans rather than the Wallachians.

And yet, there is no reason to assume this. In OF, the Cumans are never called 'pale ones' or anything like that. They are simply called *Coumains*; this is how they appear after 1200 in a few epics. And the *Bolois* of the *Karlmeinet* cannot be relevant here because a monosyllabic word is required.

---

70 In central Europe too, this name first appears around 1200, on the one hand as MHG *Wála-chen* (*Nibelungenlied* 1339.2, 1343.1), and on the other as M.Lat. *Blacus, Blachii, Blasii* in the *Gesta Hungarorum* (cap. 9, 24 and 25 ed. Silagi) by the anonymous notary working for Béla III. († 1196) – here, too with *-a-*.

71 The references are in Gillespie 1973 s.v. *Valwen* (the first one in the *Kaiserchronik* v. 14023); cf. also Tannhäuser's poem *Uns kumt ein wunneclîchiu zît* v. 41s. (Siebert 1934, 150, Lomnitzer/Müller 1973, col. 78ss.): *Kriechen, Valwen, heiden vil,/ Unger, Polan, Riuzen, Beheim*, and MGH SS. 28.208 the letter by two clerics from the year 1241: *Comani quos Teutonice Valwen appellamus.*

On [b]: If a real people exists behind the name *Nubles*, then it must be the Nubians. Does the poet know this people?

After the caliphs had conquered Egypt (around 642 AD), they were forced to turn their attention towards Byzantium and the recently subdued Persian Empire, who were their two main enemies. Africa remained in the background: they concluded a trade treaty in around 651 with the Monophysite Christian Kingdom of Nubia (Arab. mostly *Nūba*; on Idrīsī's map of the world *Nūbiya*) west of the Upper Nile (Brice 1981,1), which in effect was a non-aggression pact and lasted for centuries. Around 1000, however, a process of Islamisation began, which expanded to include ever greater parts of Nubia, until finally in the 14th c., it took over the ruling family, thus making Nubia an Islamic country (EI s. v. *Nūba*, ODB s. v. *Nubia*).

As far as contacts between Nubians and Europe are concerned, some authors know about the *Christian* Nubians, e.g., Richard of Poitiers in the last version of his Chronicle (dating from 1172, MGH SS. 26.84), Arnold, the chronicler of the Slavs (before 1210, in a message from Barbarossa to Saladin, MGH SS. 21.238), Robert de Clari (from a meeting in Constantinople, cap. 54) and Aubri de Troisfontaines (SS. 23. 886 and 935). There is an astonishingly large number of references in OF literature *to Nubie, Nuble, Nubiant* and *Nubleis* (cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.), but always as enemies. This is understandable because in 1099 at the defence of Jerusalem, and again in 1106 in the Battle of Ascalon, the Fatimid army deployed troops from the area to the south of Egypt (Setton 1969a, 333, Runciman 1951, 231, 1952, 71).

Since *Nubĭe* (as in *Ch. de Guill.* 1715 *li reis de Nubĭe* alongside Egyptians, Indians and Persians), soon became phonetically impossible in OF, it was approximated with *Nuble* in the Rol., and is found also the Crusade Cycle: in ms. C of the *Chanson d'Antioche* v. 5187 (ed. Duparc-Quioc) there is a King *Hangos de Nuble*, in the *Godefroi* v. 4490 an *almaçour de Nuble*. There are also extended forms *Nubian(t)* and *Nubleis*, the latter derived from *Nuble(s)*. In the *Roman d'Alexandre* V 7812s., for example, humanity is divided up after the failed attempt to build the Tower of Babel: *L'autre fu Etyops, li autre Nubians, / L'autre Egyptians et l'autre Arabians*. By placing the Nubians between the Egyptians and 'Ethiopians' (the latter referring at that time to much more than the modern meaning and used as a collective name for all sub-Saharan Africans) the poet shows that his idea of them is grounded in a properly geographical way. He then immediately (v. 7816s.) adds a variation on this same thought: *Li autre fu Grifons* (the mythological Gryphi and secondarily 'rapacious ones', a nickname for 'Greeks'), *li autre Africans, / Li autre fu Nubleis et li autre Troians*. Here, too, the *Nubleis* are positioned next to the (sub-Saharan) 'Africans', suggesting that the *Nubians* and *Nubleis* are for the poet, related peoples, if not the same single

people; OF and even MF permit considerable variation in the way word forms are created, as we can see simply by looking at countless pages in Godefroy, or in the Tobler/Lommatzsch or the FEW. Following the decasyllabic version, the vernacular (twelve-syllable) *Alexandre* places Nubia in the correct geographical place. In II 762s. we read: *Par mi un val parfont devers destre partie / Lor resort une eschiele du regne de Nubíe* (now with a different accentuation!) – this makes perfect sense, because we are in the *Fuerre de Gadres*, the 'foraging expedition near Gaza'. Similarly, at a later point in II 1159–1165: when the Greeks are fighting *as Gadrains et as Mors* 'against the people from Gaza and the Moors', *Calot de Nubie* is conquered. In the *Anseïs de Cartage* 4035 ss. the Saracens deem it necessary to mobilise the whole of Africa, and then immediately there is talk of the King *Corsubles, ki de Nubie est nés.* In the *Enfances Vivien* the heathen town of Luiserne-sor-mer on the Mediterranean coast in the south of Spain is attacked by another heathen, *Gormon de Nubie* accompanied by King *Pharaon* (Beckmann 2004b, 254). Finally, in the *Chevalerie Ogier* 3027s. (ed. Eusebi) Amiraus and his sons have their armour and horses brought to them by *quatorze Nubians*, evidently African servants;[72] for it is not the *Nubians* who go into battle, but the *Sarrasin et Persant*.

We have shown 1) that OF *Nubles* in geographical contexts means the Nubians, and 2) that it is highly likely that the Roland poet knew about the Nubians and where they lived. Consequently, it is also very likely that the poet, when using the term *Nubles* in a geographical context, would have thought of the Nubians, though Noyer-Weidner (1969, 40) denies this. We do concede however – in agreement with Noyer-Weidner on this point – that the homonymy with the adj. *nuble* (< *nūbilus*) 'dark as thunderclouds' was important here. The colour association attached to *blos* on its own would perhaps have escaped the audience, but the pair *nubles et blos* makes this almost impossible. The poet was so keen to create this effect that he distorted the geographical perspective slightly by taking the *Nubles* out of the second part of the first group of ten and putting them into the first part. Let us not forget that already Latin *nubilus* sometimes meant 'stormy dark' and even 'menacing, being up to no good' (cf. the dictionaries). Noyer-Weidner cites Isidore (10.194), where *niger* 'black' is etymologised as *nubiger* 'cloudbearing' and linked with *nubilus* and *taeter* 'ugly' (both referring to bad weather), as well as an alliterating *ne noir ne nuble* in Gautier de Coincy and a fictional heathen *Valnuble* in the *Fierabras*.

---

[72] This point can be compared with William of Tyre 19.18 which states that every gate of the caliph's palace in Cairo was guarded by *Aethiopum cohortes*; the OF translation reads: *A chascune de ces entrées avoit grant plenté des Mors* (RHC Occ. I/2, 277).

On [b2]: We cannot accept the suggestion in Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 287–290 and 314, that we should change *Nubles* to *Publes and then interpret this as the Paulicians, a Manichaean sect who were called *Publicani* in M.Lat and were wrongly assumed in popular belief to be a 'heathen' *people* – as happens during the First Crusade according to Robert the Monk (RHC Occ. 3.763), and then passim in OF literature.[73] Contrary to the clear evidence in the mss., we would have to assume a palaeographically unexplainable error was already in the archetype, and furthermore, the poet would have used a form which exists nowhere else; for in OF, too, this name always retains its full ending: sometimes *Publican, Puplican, Pulican* etc., more often *Popelican(t)* etc. (cf. Moisan, Flutre and the dictionaries s. v.).

A.1.1.4 Fourth *eschiele*: *de Bruns e d'Esclavoz*

De Bruns e d'Esclavoz O 3225, *Plais* and *Teclavosse* K (*Blais* and *Clavosse* Stricker, *Klans* and *Rois* in the *Karlmeinet*), *Ros* and *Sclafors* V4, *Escoz* and *Esclavoz* CV7, *Li Esclamor* and *ceuls de Roussie* P or *Rossile* T: In K (as compared with O) *Plais* and *Rosse* have changed places (cf. above A.1.1.3, s. v. *Blos*), so that now the focus is on *Rosse* 'Russians, Russia'; for *Teclavosse* K had a later form than O in front of him, namely **d'Eclavos,* and he agglutinated the *d',* just as he did in *Darmoloten* (~ *d'Ormaleus* O 3243), *Dorcanivessen* (~ **d'Orcanois* β 3238), *Dalvergie*

---

73 Gk. Παυλικιανοί was already pronounced /pavlikjaní/; in the west, /vl/ was impossible in Lat. and so it was "corrected" to /bl/; this drew the name's meaning closer to *publicani* 'tax collectors (in the New Testament, disdained by traditional Jews as being rapacious and even de-facto helpers of the Romans, *Mt* 9.11 and often; but also see *Mt* 18.17: Jesus morally equating *ethnicus* 'non-Jew' *et publicanus*). The transformation of the sect into a people is also less naïve than it first appears. In the 9th c. the Paulicians were still mostly Armenian and escaped the intolerance of the Byzantines by putting themselves under the protection of the Muslim Emir of Melitene (today Malatya), managing to set up their own state in what was then the Byzantine-Muslim border region of East-Anatolia, until emperor Basilios I. finally destroyed it after prolonged fighting. The Orthodox Petros Sikeliotes had already written anti-Paulician works around 870, and so the term "Paulicians" became familiar and was then used in connection with other sectarians, but it is difficult to judge what kind of connection these others might have had with the older Paulicians (cf. e.g., in the LM an obvious discrepancy between the articles on *Paulikianer* and *Bogumilen*). In the late 11th c. Alexios I. regarded the "Paulicians", especially those who were concentrated in regions close to the Bulgars, as a threat to his empire and committed acts of deception and double dealing against them (Anna 6.2.1, 14.8.3, 15.8.1); the "Paulicians" appear to have reacted by inviting the Pechenegs into the empire in 1085, (Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 288), and this caused Alexios a great deal of trouble. It is evident that when the Greeks reported this kind of thing to the crusaders, simpler minds must have considered the sect as a heathen people. According to Robert the Monk (RHC Occ. 3.763) *Publicani* were already in the Muslim army that was defeated at Dorylaeum.

(~ *d'Alver[g]ne* O 3062) and in *Targilisen* (~ *d'Argoilles* O 3259), where just as here in *Teclavosse d- > t-* occurs due to the dialectal German merger of stops. In V4 *de Sclafors < d'Esclav*oz shows the Italian suppression of the initial vowel with *s- impurum*; *-f-* must be hypercorrect against the Westrom. *-f-> -v-* (although this is attested in only a few words); in Gothic script, the <or> nexus was with the <r> leaning to the left (in order to make a smoother link to the round letter <o>, Bischoff 2009, 176), so that an *-oz* could be misread as *−or,* which in turn made the addition of a plural *-s* necessary. In CV7 *d'Escoz* can easily be interpreted (under the alliterating influence of the *d'Esclavoz* which follows) as a misreading and misinterpretation of **desros* (= *des Ros*), but not of **desbruns*. In the common predecessor of P and T the names have changed places and been moved into the middle part of two successive verses (ending in the *-ier* rhyme); with <au> /av/ > <am>, the scribe has misread by a single stroke; *-oz > -or* as in V4.

In summary, then, there is some competition in the first part [a] between *Bruns* O (=α) and **Ro(u)s* β, which obviously relates to the relative merits of the colours 'brown' vs. 'red', although the correct ordering is yet to be determined. In the second part [b] everything leads back to *Esclavoz*, and the consensus across OCV7 tells us that exactly this form belongs in the archetype.

In the first part, *Bruns* (O) does not refer [a1] to placenames with *Brun-* in Saxony (O), but *Rous* refers [a2] to the Kievan Russians (β). In the second part, the meaning is [b1] the western portion of the south Slavic people.

Here it is useful to start with a short analysis of the meanings of the colours. *Esclavoz* does not lend itself to any colour interpretations, but both *R(o)us* and, to a lesser degree, *Bruns* do; this means that they connect well with *Nubles* and *Blos*.

Christian symbolism is generally ambivalent: red is overall more positive than negative, because of the blood of Christ and all the martyrs; but red is also a demonic colour. Noyer-Weidner (1969, 44) cites, among other things, the *equus rufus* from the book of Revelation, which was interpreted in the Middle Ages as an image of the devil and his never-ending hate of mankind, since its rider was sent "to take peace from the earth" (*Apoc* 6.4). We can *a fortiori* add the seven-headed *draco magnus rufus*, who first pursues the woman carrying the Saviour (*Apoc* 12.3ss.) and then is cast into the bottomless pit (20.3), an action marking the victorious Second Coming of Christ. Similarly, the *bestia coccinea* (*Apoc* 17.3), on which the great Whore of Babylon sits, has been interpreted since Victorinus of Pettau (†304) as *imago diaboli* and *auctor homicidiorum* (Meier/Süntrup 1987, 457). It is also worth noting that hell as the devil's domain is dominated by the red of the consuming fire, and that the Antichrist, the devil and a few evil characters are described by Hildegard of Bingen as having eyes,

face and hands as red as fire (Meier/Süntrup 1987, 456s., 468). Even a red rash is a sign of sin, and of bloodlust (Meier/Süntrup 1987, 467s.).[74]

As to brown, Godefroi suggests that *brun* means 'sombre, obscur, funeste' and as an adverb 'd'une manière farouche', thus altogether something like 'dark-hostile', but nothing clearly diabolic; neither does Noyer-Weidner give clear-cut examples of pure brown, dwelling instead on similarities and transitions between brown and red, and also between brown and the (unequivocally demonical) colour black.[75] Let us remember instead that brown was certainly known quite realistically as a colour of the skin, e.g. of certain Africans.

How about the geographical interpretations?

On [a1]: The only suggestion that has been made for the *Bruns* is Jenkins' question (on v. 3225): "Are these the 'Browns' of Braunschweig (*Brunesvîk*), a part of heathen Saxony under Charlemagne? The Emperor destroyed Brunsberg, on the Weser, near Höxter." But the victory of Braunsberg (*Brunisberg*, in 775) was a *fait divers* within the Saxon wars; it is highly arbitrary to assume that a 12th speaker of French would extract the first syllable of a place-name to make it into the name of a people; and last but not least, the Saxons appear among the judges in Ganelon's trial (v. 3700, 3793), which means that even if they rebel later (as Charlemagne correctly predicts, v. 2921), they cannot be under Baligant's command.

If we were to insert the *Bruns* in O into the critical text, it would mean that we are squeezing a geographically meaningless colour descriptor between the Wallachians and the geographically neighbouring Slavs.

---

[74] Underneath the religious and thus official symbolism lies another layer of traditional superstition which neither Noyer-Weidner nor Meier/Süntrup have considered. Because OF *rous* and modern Fr. *roux* mean 'red-haired' we should at least remember that from the classical period until modern times, red hair was the sign of an evil character. The HdA, Art. *rot*, col. 802s., cites in this connection three ancient Gk. references, and then four from the Middle Ages: in the *Ruodlieb* (around 1000) we read: *Non tibi sit rufus specialis amicus*, and in the Chronicle of Thietmar of Merseburg [5.11, G.A.B.]: *Bolizlavus, Boemicorum provisor, cognomento Rufus et impietatis auctor immensae*; William of Tyre writes [end of the 12th century] about Fulco, the King of Jerusalem [14.1, G.A.B.]: *Erat autem idem Fulco vir rufus sed [. . .] fidelis, manifestus* [or rather: *mansuetus*, G.A.B.] *et contra leges illius coloris affabilis, benignus et misericors*; finally, there is a poem about Gerbert's pact with the devil: *Rufus est, tunc perfidus*.

[75] Among other things, Noyer-Weidner, 1969, 37, argues that the *Bruns* in their demonic association are relatives of the *Nigres* and the *Mors,* suggests further (1969, 44) that 'red-brown' is repeatedly the colour of the devil., although he does not supply exact references. He also cites Habicht (1959, 48, n.8), arguing that in French the 'evil' colour black (*neir*) is 'synonymous' with blue and brown. Finally (1969, 52s.) on the *Ros*, he argues that they can easily be understood as colour variants of the *Bruns*.

On [2]: Things look quite different if we opt for *R(o)us*: the Wallachians join with their neighbours to the east, the Russians, and these in turn, together with the Slavonians, Serbs and Sorbs, make up a Slav foursome. Could one wish for any more coherence than this?

Curiously, the name 'Russians' appears for the first time anywhere in the world, though not with its later meaning, in the Annals of St. Bertin in northern France, where it is reported for the year 839 that a group of *Rhos* who had travelled through eastern Europe as far as Constantinople, now requested permission to pass through the Frankish empire in order to return to their Swedish homeland. Louis the Pious suspected them of being western Norsemen on a reconnaissance trip, whereas in reality, they were eastern Norsemen, in other words, Scandinavian Varangians. But in 989/990, the Russians – by this time essentially in our sense of the word – were well known across the whole of Christendom. Firstly, through a series of marriages: Rurik's great-grandson Vladimir the Great of Kiev had won the hand of the Byzantine emperor's daughter Anna through a combination of military assistance and blackmail before he and his Varangians converted to Christianity. Vladimir's family was soon to become one of the biggest dynasties in Europe: his son Yaroslav I married a Swedish princess, and his daughter probably a Polish king. In the second generation, Yaroslav's son Vsevolod married another daughter of a Byzantine emperor, and his brother Iziaslav the daughter of a Polish king; one of the sisters became a queen of Norway, a second became queen of Hungary, and the third, Anna, as the wife of Henry I became queen of France; after Henry died (in 1060) she was co-regent for her underaged son Philip, and in this capacity she signed a charter in Cyrillic script, but in the French language, as *Ana rəïna* (Pope 1952, § 235). In the third generation, Vsevolod's son Vladimir Monomakh married a daughter of Harold II of England, the king who was later defeated at the Battle of Hastings (LM, vol. 9, family tree of the *Rjurikiden I–IV*, no page number), and Vsevolod's daughter Eupraxia/Praxedis (known later as Adelheid in Germany) married Emperor Henry IV. Secondly, in the treaties of 945 and 971, the Russians had already promised Byzantium military support whenever needed; from around 989 onwards, the Byzantine emperors maintained large companies of Russian troops, and these were deployed in 1019, 1041 and 1046–1048, increasingly in Italy against the southern Italian Normans (cf. Leib 1924, 78s.). indeed, 'Franks' (mainly Normans) and Russians would have come across each other frequently from around the middle of the 11th c. onwards while in service to Byzantium, e.g., when in 1057 Katakalon helped the insurgent Isaac Angelos with five units of troops from Asia Minor, two of them consisting of 'Franks' and one of Russians. Last, but not least, the whole of Europe knew that the Russian empire had Kiev as its capital

and belonged to the Eastern Church, so that it appeared to be oriented towards Constantinople.

The name has /o/ in the above-mentioned *Rhos*, and then in the Byzantine tradition: οἱ Ρῶς 'the Norsemen', 'Russia' (Vasmer in the RussEW s. v. Русь and Россия), Ρῶσοι e.g. very close to Βάραγγοι 'Varangians' in Alexios' Chrysobull of 1088 (Grégoire 1946, 452); according to Vasmer, the Byzantine Council word form Ρωσσία was strong enough to give rise to the form *Rossija* in Russian, initially in official and later in everyday use [and in so doing it pushed *Rus'*, but not its ethnicon *Russkij*, into the poetic and historical register]. Similarly, we must not underestimate the importance of its journey from Byzantium, via the Normans and other 'Franks' into the French-speaking region. For in contrast to the stable MHG. *Rûʒ(e)/Riuʒe* and (as a region name) *ze (den) Rûʒen/Riuʒen*, the OF name form is consistently *Ro(u)s* and *Ro(u)ssie* (and not *Russe*, *Russie*), as the large number of references in the *chansons de geste* and in the romances shows, from the *Couronnement de Louis* and the decasyllabic *Alexandre* onwards (cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.). Thanks to the undefined length of its stressed vowel, MLat. *Russu*s, *Russia* fits well with the OF forms, but is also the basis of the later French forms.

I therefore agree with Gaston Paris, Hofmann, Stengel, Tavernier, Lot, Grégoire, Roncaglia[76] and de Mandach (1990, 1–3) to put the *Ro(u)s* of β into the archetype.[77]

On [b1]: It has never been disputed that *Esclav-oz* means 'Slavs'.

The Germ. term *wendisch/windisch* already meant all Slavs, because of their easily recognisable linguistic similarity, no matter where people met them. This is also true of the way the Slavs described themselves, since they are called (in graecized as well as Latinised form) from the middle of the 6th c. onwards Σκλαβηνοί / *Sclaveni* / *Sclavini* in Pseudo-Kaisarios, Prokop and Jordanes, and around the same time also in the shorter form Σκλάβοι, sg. Σκλάβος, in Agathias and Malalas.[78] The shorter form predominated, first in the Greek-speaking and then in the Latin-speaking parts of Europe: the shorter form *Sclavi* can be found e.g.,

---

76 On these Roncaglia re v. 3225.

77 Why then did O change it to *Bruns*? I agree with de Mandach and think that a palaeographical factor has probably played a role in this (**rus>brũs*), but I do not believe that the term "Russians" was unknown in England (since one cannot deduce this, as de Mandach does, simply from the absence of this word in Robert de Torigni!). The scribe probably understood **rus* naturalistically as a colour name and knew of no "red-skinned people", though he would certainly have known about brown people.

78 Also Σκλαβῖνοι, Σκλαβινιοί, even Σθλάβοι with adj. Σθλαβικός (e.g., Zonaras); cf. LM s. v. *Slaven*, col. 2002, Reisinger/Sowa (1990, 9s.), in more detail Niederle (1927, 477s.). The -β- had been /v/ for a long time; the /k/ is a transitional sound of non-Slavic origin because Gk. has

in the *Vita Columbani* by Jonas of Bobbio (second quarter of the 7th c., MGH SS. schol. 37.216), in Fredegar 4.48 and 68 (MGH SS.mer. 2.144 and 154, here along with *Sclavini*), in Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* (4.7 etc., appearing in 14 chapters across books 4–6) and in the Royal Frankish Annals passim from the year 780 onwards. But there, for the year 789 we also find the new regional term *Sclavania*, and the same in the *Ann. Fuldenses* for 895, as well as 884 and 889 the personal form *Sclavani*. Around 1000, in the ambitious plans of Otto III for a universal empire, the *Sclavinia/Slavania* to the east of *Germania* was supposed to become a separate member with equivalent status (LM s. v. *Bolesław Chrobry*).

Throughout the 11th c., then, the Normans' experiences especially for and against Byzantium, but also in the whole of Italy, ensured that people in western Europe would have developed a much clearer idea of the whole of Slavia as an ethnic unit; only its distant eastern border remained vague, because until 1223 it was relentlessly pushed towards the northeast and the southeast. In the Romance languages, the above-mentioned variants *Sclav-/S(c)lavan-/Sclaven-/Sclavin-* were mostly replaced by *Sclavon-*. It may automatically have arisen when the term *Sclav-* took on imparisyllabic inflection:,*Sclávo-Sclavónem;* however, both intonation variants quickly established themselves as independent name forms, especially in OF. The OF epic has a large number of occurrences with no difference in meaning, both of (**Esclev*s >) *Esclés* (and more frequently *Esclers*[79]) and of *Esclavons* (cf. Moisan s. v.); this makes it easy to construct laisses with $\bar{e} < \acute{a}$[or with $\tilde{o}$. Thus, a heathen protagonist in the *Chanson de Guillaume*, Guibourc's first husband, is called both *Tebald l'Escler* (v. 2312) and *Tebald l'Eclavun* (< *l'Esclavun*, ms. *le clavun*, v. 2362).[80]

---

words beginning with σκλ-, but not with σλ-. Exhaustive references on the Greek: Weiß/Katsanakis (1988, passim), on the Latin: Reisinger/Sowa (1990, passim).

79 There is evidence of an OF phonological trend *-rs* > *-(s)s* from the early 12th c. onwards, especially in western France (Philip de Thaun, *Troie*, Beroul), and from around 1200 also in the centre; it produces hypercorrect formations, some which have survived into modern Fr., including *Nemours* and *velours* (cf. Pope 1952, § 396s.) – and so also OF *Esclers*.

80 However, there is apparently a huge semantic absurdity here: Tedbald is the son-in-law of Deramé of Córdoba and also appears to have once crossed over the sea to Orange, since he has the epithet *l'esturman* 'the steersman' in v. 668 and 676; but there is nothing obvious to link him with Slavia. And this is not the only time this happens: very often the 'Slavs' in the OF epic are not located in Slavia, but rather among the (mostly Spanish or North African) Saracens. Thus e.g., Langlois quite correctly reflects a consensus among scholars, when he defines both the *Esclers* and the *Esclavons* as '*Slaves, confondus avec les Sarrasins*'. But here, too, the *confusion* is grounded in history. It is well known that groups of state-owned slaves played an important role in the Muslim armies: the Mamluks (~ 'transferred to state ownership'), who

The Roland poet's *Esclav-oz* consists of the stem *Sclav-* (with the Rom. initial vowel before the *s- impurum)* and the Rom. suffix OF *-ot.* The latter is primarily a simple diminutive (OF *Charlot* 'Charles Jr.', *angelot*), sometimes also with a joking or familiar tone (Nyrop 1936, § 287–291, Meyer-Lübke 1921, § 160); as with quite a few pet names for heathens,[81] there is a kind of grim irony here. This means that *Esclavoz* is once again a distortion of a geographical term, this time without any colour implications, although it is meant *in malam partem*, obviously as a distortion of *Esclavons* rather than one of the other 'Slav' terms.

In 11th c. Europe the term 'Slav' had been significantly displaced by the more specific names of the newly Christian kingdoms of the Poles, Bohemians

---

were bought or stolen from non-Muslim lands. They were mostly taken before puberty and then after a few years of religious and military training, they became dependable warriors for Islam. Just how important they could be for a Muslim country became evident a few decades after Saladin's death in Egypt: they conquered his dynasty in 1250 and founded the Mamluk empire, which then reigned until 1517 and was the only Islamic state to withstand both waves of the Mongol invasion. In Spain, these state slaves with a foreign heritage were called Arab. *Ṣaqāliba* (sg. *Ṣiqlabī/Ṣaqlabī*) 'Slavs', because their ancestors really were heathen Slavs when they were sold to Islamic territories via Verdun or Venice in particular; the name stuck, even after the Christianisation of the Slavs in the late 10th c. which cut off the supply from that source and meant that the *Ṣaqāliba* were recruited from various other territories. These 'Slavs' soon appear in the most elevated positions: e.g., in the 9th c. Badr aṣ-Ṣaqlabī was one of the most influential viziers, in the 10th c. the 'Slav' Ghālib was one of the Caliphate's most competent generals, and towards the end of the Caliphate, other 'Slavs' were military commanders in the Central March and Governors of Valencia and Tortosa. The 'Slavs' usually lived together in the same place, and so after the fall of the Caliphate (1031) they finally became – alongside the original Arabs and the Berbers – a clearly visible political power whose name was on everyone's lips. 'Slav' generals managed, among other things, to seize power precisely in the Levant, in Almería and Denia, where they set up independent Taifa kingdoms. (On 'Slavs' at length Lévi-Provençal 1957, 328–332, and Clot 2002, 158, 164s., 192s.) In the 10th c. Almería had developed into the central navy port of al-Andalus and thus the home base of the strongest fleet in the Mediterranean; its name must have had sombre connotations for Christians residing in the Mediterranean coastal states. However, it was soon overtaken by Denia, where the 'Slav' rulers were based until 1076; towards the middle of the 11th c. Denia assumed the central role, and Corsair ships set off from there to carry out daring missions along the Fr. and Cat. coasts, although this did not prevent its ruler from maintaining friendly relations with Ramon Berengar I of Barcelona (LM s. v. *Denia*). These circumstances ensure that the term "Slav" would have been known to the Christians in the sense described here and would linger on e.g., in the William epic. However, it is clear that the Roland poet's use of the term *Esclavoz* does not carry this meaning.

81 In the Rol. *Blancandr-in, Clar-in, Climbor-in, Espan-el-iz, Esprevar-in, Eudrop-in, Jurfar-et, Just-in, Malpal-in, Siglor-el, Timoz-el.*

and Russians.[82] As a result, the MLat.(-Rom.) *S(c)lavonia* (and only very occa-
sionally the other terms for Slav that had managed to cling on) were able to
revert to a more condensed meaning by the end of the 11th c.: it was used, even
by Francophone people, to refer to the Slavophone communities who lived on
the shores of the Adriatic.[83]

Referring to the First Crusade, Raymond of Aguilers (Preface and cap. 1)
describes how Raymond of Saint-Gilles travelled to Constantinople through

---

82 And also the older term Bulgarians, which by this time referred to a fully Slavicised
people.

83 Since Galloromania is some distance from the Balkans, it may be of interest to summarise
the terminology used by the neighbours of this *Sclavonia*. The *Vita Sancti Venceslai*, written in
Monte Cassino at the end of the 10th c. describes *Sclavonia* as the area under the influence of
Cyril/Constantine and Methodius, which scholars agree includes the southern Slav area and
also Moravia (Dvorník 1956, 267). Later however, Italian usage overlaps with Francophone
usage. According to the *Origo civitatum Venetiarum* (= *Chronicon Altinate et Chronicon Gra-
dense*, ed. Cessi, p. 75.16) Veglia/Krk was one of the places *in capite Sclavonie* (var. *Sclavanie*).
Around the same time, the anonymous monk of San Nicolò del Lido in Venice (cap. 4, RHC
Occ. 5.256) recounts a voyage: *Egressi tandem de Dalmatia, velis vento commissis, Sclavoniae,
Bulgariae et Achaiae regna deserentes, claram Rhodon usque pervenerunt*; later (cap. 30, p. 271)
another journey, which arrived in *Sclavonia*, at a place called *Iadera* (Zara/Zadar). Moreover,
in the 11–12th c. the road leading from Poreč/Parenzo to the interior Istria was called the *Via
Sclavonica* (LM s. v. *Istrien*). The language of that region is in Lat. sometimes simply *sclavica*,
often more precisely *sclavonica* (first attested around 1042 in Schweickard, DI s. v. *Schiavònia*
p. 286 n. 1; five references, starting in 1284 from Ragusa/Dubrovnik, in Kostrenčić s. v., one
reference dated 1346 from Venice in Metzeltin 1988, 555) or *sclavonesca* (references from 1323
onwards in Kostrenčić s. v., on *Ragusa* cf. also Metzeltin 1988, 555). *Slavonicae litterae,* with
references from 1248 and 1252 (Smičiklas 1906, 343, 479), according to the editor means the
Glagolitic script. In Ital., too, from the beginning of the tradition (second half of the 13th c.)
until well into the 19th c. *schiavone* usually means 'Adriatic-Slav' (also, but becoming rarer,
'slave' [= *schiavo*]); alongside the main meaning of *schiavone* there is also *schiavonesco* (at-
tested as the name of a language from 1313 onwards); cf. Schweickard, DI s. v. *Schiavònia*
p. 282s., 285s. and s. v. *Slavi* p. 396b, Battaglia, the two Art. *schiavo* and *schiavone* and Art.
schiavonesco. In 1154 in Norman Sicily, a hub for Italian, French and Arab culture, Idrīsī's map
of the world was created for King Roger II: it shows *asklawōnia, bilad asklāba*, between Croatia
and Albania (Miller 1927, 121). Hungarian usage seems to have been somewhat narrower: after
the Hungarian kings had annexed today's Croatia (and part of today's Slovenia) as far as the
Adriatic in the last decade of the 11th c., the term *S(c)lavonia* in official Hungarian parlance
only meant the land between Drau and Save (today East-Slovenia and East-Croatia), whereas
the annexed area as a whole was officially called *regnum Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Sclavoniae*.
This *S(c)lavonia* retained its close relationship with Hungary and was part of the Habsburg
monarchy until 1918 (von Bogyay 1990, 29s., 35, 40, and especially LM s. v. *Kroatien* and *Slavo-
nien*). Smičiklas (1906–1907) in the Index to his *Codex Diplomaticus* lists *Slavonia* (*S(c)lavonia*)
more than 60 times between the years of 1236 and 1270 alone, and defines it laconically: *id est
Croatia, regnum*.

Sclavonia. i.e., along the Dalmatian coast; for him, *Sclavonia* reached almost as far as Dyrrhachium/Durazzo/Durrës, where the Byzantine empire began.[84] In the same context, William of Tyre (2.17) refers to this area as *Dalmatia*, but adds that apart from a few coastal towns, the people there speak *Sclavonico sermone*. In the decasyllabic *Miraculum* 22 of the *Codex Calixtinus,* the town of *Iazera* (today's Croat. *Zadar*, Ital. *Zara*) lies in *Esclavonia*. In the decasyllabic *Alexandre* A 5973 the dying Alexander decrees that Ptolemy should give *Esclavonie* to Alexander's still under-aged half-brother, who was also a son of Philip of Macedonia, but who had not taken part in Alexander's conquests,[85] and in the twelve-syllable version I 145, Philip actually owns *Esclavonie* already. In the *Roman de Thèbes* (v. 6327 ed. Raynaud de Lage = v. 7229 ed. Mora-Lebrun) the Lord of Corinth has a horse from *Esclavonie*. Flutre s. v. *Esclavon(n)ie* rightly defines this as simply *l'Illyrie*. In the context of the Fourth Crusade, Villehardouin (§ 63, 77 and 101 ed. Faral) and the *Estoire de Eracles l'Empereur* (RHC Occ. 1/2, Book 28, cap. 3) mention *Jadres* (Zadar/Zara) in *Esclavonie*. Finally, Bartholomeus Anglicus (who was probably an Anglo-Norman, or at least can be considered practically Francophone because of his studies with Grosseteste and apprenticeship in Paris, even if he was later active in Germany) sums the term up very well in his encyclopaedia *De proprietatibus rerum* (written probably in 1242–1247), lib. 15, cap. 140: *Sclavonia, quae Dalmaciam, Serviam, Carinthiam continet et alias multas regiones*.

In the light of this evidence, we should not hesitate to postulate that poet of the Rol. used *Esclavoz* in that sense of the word, i.e., referring to the peoples known today as Slovenians and Croatians, and perhaps even the Herzegovinians and Montenegrins as well. However, we should not push this finding too far: we are bound to find partial differences, such as the fact that Bartholomeus counts Serbia as part of *Sclavonia*, whereas the Roland poet counts the Serbs as a people in their own right: this sort of thing happens very often between the best of geographical authors in the classical and medieval periods and so we should not make too much of it.

---

84 However here the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* (1.3) still have *Sclavinia*, Peter Tudebode *Sclavania* and Baldric of Dol (cap. 12, RHC Occ. 4) a single *Sclavaria* (var. *Clavaria*).

85 In V 9739, however, this statement is reduced to a simple claim that Alexander bequeathed *Esclavanie* [sic] to Ptolemy himself (instead of Syria, or later in III 5992 Egypt, which is historically more accurate).

A.1.1.5 Fifth *eschiele: de Sorbres e de Sorz*

De Sorbres e de Sorz O 3226, *Sordis* and *Sorbes* K (*Solis* Stricker, *Sorbes* and *Zors* the *Karlmeinet*), *Sòrbanes* and *Sors* V4, *Saraçins* (*Sarraçins* V7) *de Goz* CV7: K (but not the *Karlmeinet*) has swapped the two parts and traces the *-z* back to a presumed *-dis* (~ *-des*?). In V4, *r-r > r-n* is a case of dissimilation; the epenthetic vowel *-a-* is an Italianism (cf. Ital. *giovane < iuvenem*, especially Venetian *càvara* 'capra', *làvaro* 'labbro' etc. Zamboni 1988, 528). The common source of CV7 did not recognise either of these peoples and came up with the generic 'Saracens' in the first part, and then made 'Goths' out of *Sorz*. There is doubtless a degree of misreading here: the capital letters *S-* and *G-* can look similar, and if the *-r-* was abbreviated or in superscript form (cf. Cappelli 1961, XXX), then it could be easily overlooked; however, it may also be relevant that especially in Italy, where CO7 originated, the Goths (who retained their Arian beliefs there until their demise) were remembered as the embodiment of heresy in general. We can be sure that the archetype has *Sorbres* and *Sorz* through OV4(+K).

Non-Slavs around 1100 may well have noticed, as we do today, that particular word stems crop up more than once in the names of Slav peoples. We know of the Slovaks and the Slovenians, and until the early 20th c. there were also Slovincians in the easternmost part of Pomerania – similarly the Roland poet will have known the *Esclavoz* and the *Esclavers. We know of the Serbs and the Sorbs –and similarly, there is no doubt that the Roland poet is referring to [a] the Serbs and [b] the Sorbs; only the order remains unclear at this point. Both names derive from the Common Slav. **sьrbъ*, which in modern Serb. becomes *Srb(in)* 'Serb', adj. *srpski*, in Sorb. *Serb* 'Sorb', adj. *ser(b)ski*; in Czech, *Srb* still means both 'Serb' and 'Sorb'. However, outside the Slav region, the stressed vowel in the name of the Sorbs was velarised from the very beginning through German transmission, whereas the name of the Serbs was passed down mainly by the Greeks and so it was not. And now for the details!

On [a]: Some of the Serbs became Christian around 870. After this, they had their own princes but mostly came under Byzantine jurisdiction, interrupted around 924 and again around 1000 by temporary allegiances with Old Great Bulgaria. In the 11th c. they pressed forward to the Adriatic coast in several places and caused problems for the Byzantine governors in Ragusa and Dyrrachium (LM s. v. *Serbien*); in 1073 the Serbian Crown Prince Bodin took part in the Bulgarian rebellion against Byzantium. This was connected to a temporary rapprochement with the West: in 1067 Gregory VII elevated the diocese of Antibari (today Bar in Montenegro) to an archdiocese and granted it a suffragan diocese of Serbia; in 1077 the Serbian King Michael requested a royal insignia from the Pope (Letter in reply from Gregory VII. dating from 2. 1. 1078; Dvorník 1956, 280s.). Just outside Durazzo/Dyrrachium a

few years later, however, the Serbs, now under Bodin, supported Emperor Alexios against Robert Guiscard and his Normans (Grégoire 1942, 63). They were at war with Byzantium again around 1095 (Anna 9.4.2s.), but then they finally submitted to Byzantine oversight while keeping their own local rulers. Thus, they were well known, both to Francophone people in service to the Basileus and more generally to the southern Italian Normans.

In the 10th c., one of the Theophanes continuators (in the *Vita Basilii I.*, ed. Bekker p. 288.19, 291.1–8) calls them Σέρβλοι, just as Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, calls their territory Σερβλία (*De administrando imperio* 32), and even at the end of the 11th c. the epithet (Λέων) ὁ Σέρβλιος is found in Skylitzes (ed. Thurn, p. 476.52). On the whole, however, Σέρβοι, Σερβία prevailed, and this is the form used by several authors around 1100 (Kedrenos, ed. Niebuhr, p. 515B; Skylitzes, ed. Thurn, p. 145.73, 353.65 and 9x more; Zonaras, ed. Pinder, *Epit.* 17.21.7 and 18.17.1; Anna 9.4.2s. and 14.4.3).

According to Vasmer (1941, 295s.), the *-l-* in the older Gk. form goes back to a preliterary Serbian form of the name of the country: because in southern and eastern Slav. an epenthetic *-l-* creeps into the *-b-j-* nexus,[86] *sьrbja* (*zemja*) 'Serbia', derived from the ethnicon *sьrbъ* 'Serb', must have become *sьrblja; for a time, forms with and without *-l-* influenced each other, but then in both languages those without *-l-* won out, even in the name of the country: *Srbija*,[87] Σερβία. I suspect that the second *-r-* in *Sorbres* derives from this *-l-*.

For the stressed vowel *-o-* the only explanation is that the poet modified it to create a jocular sound effect: he made it match the *Sorz* 'Sorbs' which come next.[88] His audience would understand that the two peoples in question could only be the Serbs and the Sorbs.

The sequence of thought is probably this: he was working on a laisse ending in ǫ, thought of the Sorbs first and put their name into the assonance; he then remembered the similar name of the Serbs, which he placed before them, altering the vowel in the process so that the sounds would match. The audience of the song would understand that the Serbs who are mentioned first are

---

86 Cf. Bräuer (1961, § 112).

87 According to Vasmer (referencing Vuk's dictionary), however, the *-l-* is retained in the derivations *Sŕbljâk* and *Sȑbljanin*.

88 This delight in finding consonance between the initial parts of names is found elsewhere in the song too: such as *Bas-an* and *Bas-ilĭe*, *Clarï-en* and *Clari-fan*, *Esturg-anz* and *Esturguz*, *Ger-er* and *Ger-in*, *Guene-lun* and *Guine-mer*, *Iv-e* and *Iv-orĭe*, *Ma-chiner* and *Ma-heu*, *Malcu-d* and *Malqu-iant*, *Marbr-ise* and *Marbr-ose*, *Ba-ligant de Ba-bilonĭe*, *Be-von de Bel-ne*, *Capuël de Cap-adoce*, *Tur-gis de Tur-teluse*, just like *Sor-bres* and *Sor-z*.

attached to the 'Slavonians' on the (south)eastern side, and then they pull the similarly named and ethnically related Sorbs along after them.

On [b1]: In Carolingian times, the Sorbs had a loose tribute arrangement with the empire, which sometimes led to military complications; in the 10th c. their territory was absorbed into the empire and parcelled out into marches and castellanies, and under Otto I it was also integrated into the diocesan structure. Nevertheless, the Sorbs remained clearly visible within the empire as a distinct ethnic group with their own language. The Upper Sorbs (around Bautzen, Görlitz) are the *Mícenes* and have already made up the second *eschiele*, and so strictly speaking, the *Sorz* can only be the Lower Sorbs (around Cottbus, formerly extending northwards up to a line from the confluence of Saale and Elbe to the Oder east of Berlin).

The name of the Sorbs first appears with a *-u-*: in Fredegar 4.68 (MGH SS. mer. 2, 155) for the year 632 *gens Surbiorum*, in the *Ann. Maximiniani* for the year 806 *Suurbi*, in the Bavarian Geographer (mid- 9th c.) *Surbi*, in Alfred the Great's description of Europe (871–901) *Surpe*[89] and in the third Klosterneuburg continuation of the Annals of Melk (MGH SS. 9, p. 631.6) for the year 1176 *Swrbones* as well as MHG in the *Rother Suurven* (with Mid-Franconian *-rb->-rv-*), in the *Biterolf Surben* (Gillespie 1973 s. v. *Surben*).

After the Carolingian reform, however, the norm soon became *Sŏrăbi* (for the two short vowels cf. MGH PLAeC 4.19.34 and 38): as in the Royal Annals, edition E ("annales Einhardi") for the year 782, the other editions more often after the year 806,[90] Einhart's *Vita Karoli* 15, the anonymous *Vita Hludowici* 26 and 40, and in the continuation of the Royal Annals, the *Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 839 (2x) and *Ann. Fuldenses* for the year 851 and passim; then in many texts of the 10th to 12th c. In Ger. *Zorben* for 1123 in the *Sächsische Weltchronik* (MGH Dt. Chr. II, p. 197.20*)* and later.

Since in OF *corpus > cors*, and not **corz*, we might expect **Sors* instead of O's *Sorz* in the archetype. But rhymes ending in *-s* and *-z* existed in Anglo-Norm. from the very beginning, on the continent occasionally in Chrétien de Troyes (Pope 1952, § 195 and 1183), and for foreign geographical terms, uncertainty may have arisen somewhat earlier.

---

89 I am quoting from Kaiser (1955, 36, cf. the map p. 37). In the Sweet edn. (1883, 16) the form *Surfe* appears as well. *Surpe* has gone through a strictly Old High German interim stage with (with *-b- > -p-*), *Surfe* (with the normal OE ~ /v/) through a Low German-Dutch one (with *-rb -> -rv-*).

90 Although in the year 822/823 it must mean the Serbs!

A.1.1.6 Interim summary

Eight peoples are named in the first five *eschieles,* which constitute the first half of the first group of ten, and seven of them are from the southeast, east and east-central European area. They were all Christianised between 870 and 1000, and so they were still unbelievers when Charlemagne was alive. This cannot be a coincidence; a random trail through the whole of the non-Christian world that was known in the time of Charlemagne – including the Orient which is where Baligant comes from – would look quite different. On the contrary, what we see here is the beginning of a great plan: these peoples make up the northwest flank of Baligant's army. The eighth people, the *Nubles*, would have been a better fit, geographically speaking, in the second half of the first group of ten, but they are brought forward here because they link up with the next people, the *Blos* in the colour symbolism of the same *eschiele*, which then broadens out to include the *Rous* of the next *eschiele,* making a triad of symbolic colours. One name contains a pun (*boute-en-trot*), Two phonetically similar names for two ethnically related peoples are even more closely coupled together by jocularly altering the tonic vowel of one of them (*Sorbres et Sorz*), thus deemphasizing the geographical leap between them (within the area outlined above) a second leap of this type could lie behind the phonetic association of *Νέμιτζοι-Mícenes*. Finally, through the ending *-oz* instead of *-ons*, one name acquires a tone of grim irony.

The primary structural principle is real geography; in this section, it is mostly contemporary geography, drawn more from lived experience than from bookish learning. The pun and the sound associations are welcome elements in this, but the colour symbolism is clearly a secondary structural principle, since it intermittently adds an important dimension of "moral judgement", and it does this by reflecting the whole hellish underground of Baligant's world, not by alternating with the geographical meanings, but in and through these very same geographical meanings.

Medieval knowledge of geography was limited, and so we cannot expect the same degree of cohesion and detail that was evident in relation to (south) eastern Europe when we turn to the next section: the south western flank of Baligant's sphere of control.

A.1.1.7 Sixth *eschiele*: *d'Ermines e de Mors*

D'Ermines e de Mors O 3227, *Ermines* and *Demples* K (*von Temples und von Ermîn* Stricker, *van Moryn ind van Ernyn* the *Karlmeinet*), *Cleribaneis* and *Mors* V4, *Ermines* (*Herminez* V7) *forz* CV7, *Mors* T:[91] *Ermines* is in OKC and

---

therefore certainly in the archetype. *Herminez* in V7 has a silent *H-* (which is quite common with the term "Armenian", cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v., and has even persisted in the etymologically identical Ger. *Hermelin* 'stoat'); *-z* and *-s* are interchangeable in V7, including after final syllable-*e*. In the *Cleribaneis* of V4, the *cl-* is a misreading of *d-* (i.e., d' ~ *de*); the three strokes of the *-m-* have been read as *-iu-* /-iv-/ and then quasi-Latinised to *-ib-*; *-aneis* (< *-anus* + *-ensis*) instead of *-ines* is essentially a change of suffix; and so here, too, *d'Ermines* is the underlying form. *Mors* is confirmed by OV4T. *Demples* in K contains another agglutinated *de* (cf. above A.1.1.4, s. v. *Esclavoz*) and a further aberration *mpl-es* instead of *m-or-es*, which probably implies that the source has been damaged or soiled. CV7 have replaced *Mors* with *forz*, perhaps in order to avoid any misinterpretation as 'dead people'. It should also be pointed out that two verses later, in the *eschiele* about the *Gros*, K introduces the *Mores* instead (and so he knows them too) and V4 even repeats the *Mors* that was used before. This fact is discussed in more detail later.

Thus [a] *Ermines* means the Armenians; it remains doubtful that with [b] *Mors* the poet would be able to differentiate between [b1] the Moors (albeit for him meaning only those on the Libyan-west-Egyptian coast) and [b2] the 'Blackamoors' (for him meaning sub-Saharan Africans southwest or southeast of Egypt).

On [a]: The name of the Ἀρμένιοι ~ *Arměnii* and the country name Ἀρμενία ~ *Arměnia* are sometimes (*nonnunquam*) written with *-min-* in the late manuscript tradition of classical literature, according to the TLL, although without supporting references; I noticed this myself in the case of Orosius (1.2.23 etc.) in an 8th c. ms., and in the *Demensuratio provinciarum* (§ 6, Schnabel 1935, 426) in a 9th c.ms. The standard way to write the initial sound is *Ermenii* or rather *Hermenii* and not *Ar-* even in the oldest crusader historian, the anonymous writer of the *Gesta* cap. 11s., 14, 18s. (and more in the indices of the RHC Occ.). In OF *(h) ermin* or *(h)ermine* is very much the normal form until well into the 14th c., and the same in Occ.: *hermini(n)* is in the *Sancta Fides* v. 488 (Moisan and Flutre s. v. and FEW, vol. 25, s. v. *arménien*).

Armenia had long been vaguely familiar in the geographical and historical literature of Christendom because of its role in the Roman-Parthian and Roman-Sasanian wars. During the 11th c. many Armenians migrated out of their historic homeland (the Caucasus and today's northeast Turkey roughly starting from the Euphrates) into today's southeast Turkey (Cilicia and the surrounding areas) and had built an empire there. After the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert (1071), when the Turks overran almost all of the Asiatic part of the empire, the Armenians survived in the shadow of the Byzantines, and were even able to absorb Edessa, but in fact their territory soon disintegrated into smaller feudal units; there was also

an Armenian minority living south of Antioch, and quite a few of them served as mercenaries for the Egyptian (Shiite, Fāṭimid) Caliphate. Armenian mercenaries gave the Fāṭimid state the strength to resist external pressures and brought about political renewal in its internal affairs.[92]

The history of the Armenian people is marked by a constant need to manoeuvre between powerful neighbours who were at war with each other – between Romans and then Byzantines on the one hand, Parthians, Sasanians, Arabs and then Turks on the other – and so the Armenians had to learn to take sides with the victor at short notice. This is why they were very soon mistrusted, and even hated, by the crusaders: according to the anonymous *Gesta,* and when Antioch was being besieged by the crusaders, they came out of the town to act as spies for the Turks, and they also *inviti aut spontanei* shot arrows from the town onto the crusaders and tried to provision the town from the surrounding area (cap. 12, 18, 19; cf. also Fulcher 1.16.9 and 1.24.14, and Guibert of Nogent, RHC Occ. 4.180); after the town had been captured, however, they brought Bohemund the head of Yaghi-Siyān, and after the defeat of Kürbuǧa[93] they killed escaping Turks (*Gesta* cap. 19, 29). When the crusaders were fighting with the Fāṭimids during and after the capture of Jerusalem, Anna 11.7.1 considers the Armenian mercenaries to be the most important part of the Fāṭimid army in the battles of 1102. The Armenians thus appear, in an understandably simplified form, in the OF epic as unbelievers – even though there had been in actual fact a certain symbiosis between Armenians and Francophones, at least for some of the time when the County of Edessa had belonged to the region of Cilicia (until it was taken over by the Turks in 1144) and again (from 1198), when it was more clearly under Armenian control (until the final Turkish victory of 1375).

In the literature, the older Armenian state in the Caucasus itself and in the foothills of the Caucasus is sometimes called Great Armenia, while the new state in Cilicia and on the Mediterranean coast is Little Armenia. Yet anyone who is even superficially familiar with the European sources of the late 11th to 14th c. will know that at that time, 'Armenian' generally meant *tout court* the state on the Mediterranean coast. The Rol. also means these Armenians. Everything that lay between the people of Butrint, the Slavonians and the Serbs on the one side, and these Armenians on the other was within the Christian empire of the Byzantines, which the poet, even if he felt some rancour towards the

---

92 One of these Armenians converted and rose to the position of Vizier and senior judge which meant in practice political leader of the country (von Grunebaum 1963, 136s.). Cf. on the Armenians in Syria Setton 1969a, 97, 297, 309, 318, and on those in the Egyptian army 93.

93 According to EI s. v. *Kurbuḳa* the Arabic written form *Kurbuqa* stands for Turk. *Kürbuǧa* 'large-headed bull'.

Greeks, would not have dared to suggest could be ruled by Baligant; the geographical leap from Baligant's northwest to his southwest flank is therefore no bigger than absolutely necessary and the new Armenia could well have been understood geographically as the *northern*most part of an Islamic *south*western flank.

On [b1] and [b2]: Modern translators of the Rol. have to decide upon either 'Moors' or 'Blackamoors'. Thus, Bédier, Moignet, Pellegrini and H.-W. Klein – along with Bancourt (1982a, 8–10), who in my opinion supplies insufficient supporting evidence – opt for the Moors, while Bertoni and Noyer-Weidner (1969, 29s.) opt for the Blackamoors. The latter does so because of the obvious colour symbolism: black means *evil* in general, and *the evil one* as well (Noyer-Weidner 1969, 23–29). If this were translated as Moors, then the *Mors* would be seriously 'bleached' of all their colour (Noyer-Weidner (1969, 30). However, the fact that the Roland poet has thus far deliberately used colour symbolism does not relieve us of the necessity of investigating the real geography.

On [b1]: We shall examine the Moors first. In the ancient world, the *Mauri* are the inhabitants of what was then Mauritania (corresponding roughly with to-day's Morocco and a large part of Algeria), which means they were Berbers and ethnically white; Latin literature stretches the term to include all the Berbers in North Africa, and especially Carthaginians, without leaving any evidence that anyone was thinking about a dark skin colour. When Islam appeared, an additional religious connotation was formed. In Italy in 846, Emperor Lothar, planning a campaign against the Muslims who had invaded southern Italy, called them *Sarraceni et Mauri*, which seems to imply that the *Mauri* are all the Berbers of the Mediterranean coast (MGH Capit.r.F. 2.67). The word 'Berber' is used with the same meaning in the Chronicle of 754: 'Berber (also from regions east of Mauritania), especially as a part of the Muslim invasion force'. The next available source in time, the Chronicle of Nájera (middle of the 12th c.), uses *Mauri* with the Old Spanish meaning which persists into modern Spanish (cf. Barbour 1971 passim): *moros* are 'Muslims (mostly, but not always as masters of a part of the Pyrenean Peninsula)', still with no detectable connotation of a darker skin colour[94] – and this is the origin of our 'Moors'. Occ. *Maurs* must surely be understood in the same way as 'Berbers/Arabs in the Maghreb and in

---

94 Before the Almoravid invasion (1086), Berbers, but very few black Africans, played a part in the history of 'Moorish' Spain; the Almoravids did use black Africans as troops, but these troops appear not to have settled anywhere in Spain – and the Almoravid period only lasted for sixty years.

al-Andalus' (as in Wiacek 1968 s. v. *Maurs*) in Peire Vidal and Raimbaut de Va-
queiras as well as *Sarrazi e Mor* in Folquet de Romans (Raynouard s. v. *Mor*).
Likewise, in older Italian, the meaning '(Spanish or North African) Muslim' is
one of two possibilities. Thus in 1438, in the Italian version of the contract be-
tween Venice and Tunis, the Muslim party calls their ruler *signor nostro de'
mori* (Mas-Latrie 1866, II 250). Finally, Ariosto's Medoro (18.165s.) is a *moro* and
comes from *Tolomitta* (Ptolemais, today almost completely in ruins, formerly a
port in Cyrenaica, about 100 km east of Benghazi), but he has *la guancia color-
ita / e bianca [. . .] e chioma crespa d'oro*, i.e. red and white cheeks and golden-
blond hair (quoted also in Barbour 1971, 256).

On [b2]: The term 'Blackamoors' seems to have a different origin. Classical Gk.
ἀμαυρός 'dark' appears in the 6th/7th c. as μαῦρος 'black', used e.g. to refer to a
demon, who is 'black as an Ethiopian' (where Αἰθίοψ, *Aethiops* is the classical
expression for 'sub-Saharan African'), or also to black monks' clothing (Lampe
and Sophocles s. v.). At the same time, the word also appears in Latin: *mauri
homines* [this is what a child calls the devils] *venerunt*, Gregory the Great, *Dia-
logi* 4.19 (Blaise I s. v.); in the OF *Dialoge Gregoire lo Pape* (probably around
1200, 219.3 ed. Foerster) this becomes *home mor sont venut*. The Occ. *Sancta
Fides* (v. 511) couples *Niell* (< *nigelli* 'black people' ~ sub-Saharan Africans) *e
Maur*, although the context provides no further indications. There is less ambi-
guity in Chrétien's *Yvain* (v. 286s. ed. Roques): *Uns vileins, qui resanbloit Mor, /
leiz et hideus a desmesure [. . .],* and no ambiguity at all in a fabliau: *Lors culs
erent plus noirs que mors* (: *gros*) (Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *mor*). Around and
after 1200 we even find definitions or equivalents thereof: Ugutio († 1210), *Liber
derivationum*, s. v. *maurus: quidam populus qui estivo calore combustus speciem
nigri coloris attraxit* (NGML s. v.); Matthew Paris (a. 1241) cites the following cli-
mate zones: 1) India, 2) *Clima ethiopum sive (!) maurorum*, 3) Egypt, 4) Jerusa-
lem, 5) Greece [. . .] (so that the *mauri* are living further south than in Egypt,
Edson et al. 2005, 64s., 116); the OF translation by William of Tyre has (RHC
Occ. I/2, 277) *grant plenté des Mors* for William's (19.18) *Aethiopum cohortes*;
Brunetto Latini 171: *Ethiope [. . .] ou sont les gens noirs comme meure* [= *mûre*],
et por ce sont il apelé mores (Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *more*). This meaning, al-
ready attested in Italy through Gregory, Ugutio and Brunetto, also appears in
Italian from the 16th c. onwards (Battaglia s. v. *moro*).

To sum up: outside of Spain, the two meanings have coalesced in one
word – which makes it doubtful if the poet distinguishes between the two. In
the light of this, I would like to leave the decision between 'Moors' and 'Black-
amoors' open in our context, but with one important reservation. In the Marsiliĕ
section, the poet has already – *sit venia verbo* – "worked his way" through most

of North Africa, that is to say Carthage (or even al-Mahdiyya) and all the land west of it, with the Caliph and the kings Malcud (with his son Malquiant), Corsalis and Almaris, as we shall see in more detail below in the section on 'North Africa' (A.6, A.7). Even more importantly: in the whole Rol. he is very careful to make a geographical distinction between Marsilĭe's territory and Baligant's territory. Therefore, if in his *Mors* he includes any 'Moors', it must essentially be those of Libya.[95] This reduces the problem considerably: his *Mors* are a people located either west or south of Egypt – or both.

No matter which of the three possibilities applies, we must remember that because the Armenian settlement area stretched as far as territories south of Antioch, and especially because of the presence of Armenians in the Egyptian Fatimid army, the terms *Ermines* and *Mors* would have been much closer together from a 12th c. European perspective than they are for us today.

A.1.1.8 Seventh *eschiele*: *de cels de Jericho*

De cels de Jericho O 3228, *uon Ioricop* K (*Jêricop* Stricker, *Roricoff* the *Karlmeinet*), *de qui' de Jericos* V4, *de cels de Ificoz* (*Ysicoz* V7) CV7: In the source of CV7 the -*e*- was overlooked, so that the *J-/I-* automatically became a vowel (which V7

---

95 In both ancient and medieval times, Egypt was thought to be part of Asia (see briefly, but correctly, KPauly s. v. *Africa*), ultimately for cultural reasons: from Herodotus onwards, Egyptian high culture was thought to be correlated with the high cultures of Asia Minor, whereas the Gulf of Suez could mean little to a Mediterranean-centred consciousness, since it opens toward the Red Sea. But where then was the western border of Egypt? We find a rudimentary answer, in the first instance, so to speak, in Mela 1.8, Pliny *n.h.* 3.3 and most later authors (see e.g., Richer *hist.* 1.1, all medieval T-maps, even after 1500 Joannes Leo Africanus 1.2): the Nile separates Africa from Asia, just as the Don separates Europe from Asia. But the wide Nile delta was highly significant for Egyptian culture; therefore, it was often necessary to be more precise: the border was the western branch of the mouth of the Nile, the *Canopicum ostium*, according to Pliny (*n.h.* 5.48); the same is stated in Isidore (*et.* 14.3.28). But in fact, Pliny 5.62 modifies this assertion: Alexandria, the pearl of Egypt since Alexander's time, lies 20 km west of the Canopicum estuary and yet is described as a part of Egypt – as all geographers agree. A few of them explicitly push Egypt's western, and therefore North Africa's eastern border to the west as far as Paraetonium (as in e.g., Orosius 1.2.8) or even to Catabathmus (both still in Egypt today), the latter e.g., Mela 1.36 and 1.41, the *Demensuratio Provinciarum* and therefore very probably Agrippa's world map (Schnabel 1935, 431.27). We can go even further west if we take Lat. Africa to mean 'the Roman province of Africa' (Pliny *n.h.* 5. 23: *proprie [. . .] Africa*, Isidore 14.5.8: *vera Africa*) or as its successors the Byzantine Exarchate Ἀφρική and finally the Islamic Ifrīqiya. In any case all of the terms for Africa include today's Tunisia, with Carthage and al-Mahdiyya; cf. EI, Art. *Ifrīqiya,* and especially Idrīsī (1999, 186). "Mahdia est la capitale de l'Ifrîqiya et le centre de son royaume". It is clear that the Roland poet has been inspired by scholarly tradition in the way he separates the Baligant section from the Marsilĭe section.

enhanced to a *Y-*); the *-r-* was misread as a long *-f-* (which C made into an *-f-*). In V 4 *qui'* is a contraction of Northern Ital. (e.g., Old Venet.) *quili* 'quelli, those'.[96] In K the *-e-* was misread as *-o-*. Since there are no nouns in the native OF vocabulary ending in <-o> and in particular none ending in /-ǫ/, K and γ independently surmised that a final consonant was missing in their source and then supplied one at random. If none of the non-O scribes recognised the biblical place name, the main reason is probably that they did not expect such a name, given the nature of the list. But the non-Os offer no common innovation (apart from the banal suppression of the *-h-*), and so we must put the *Jericho* from O into the text.

What is meant is [1] the Jericho of the Bible, and not [2] Orikum in Albania (in the Bay of Vlorë/Valona).

On [1]: When biblical names are not Latinised with *-us*, *-a* endings, they tend to retain their Hebraic stress on the final syllable, not only in the Septuagint and the Vulgate, but all through the Middle Ages. In OF this coincides with the vernacular's customary stress on the final syllable. Furthermore, *Jericho* follows the rule that in Latinisms (and foreign words) stressed <e> and <o> are pronounced as /ę/ and /ǫ/.[97]

Jerusalem and the Holy Land lie between the Mediterranean Armenians and the *Mors,* as crusaders knew from their own experience; so geographically they would fit into the second half of the first group of ten. In v. [1518]=1565 it had already been revealed that Valdabrun, the admiral of Marsilĩe's fleet, had captured Jerusalem using treacherous means; in the mind of the poet, therefore, the

---

96 Cf. Stussi (1995, 127).

97 This principle is still followed by the many Latinisms in modern Italian, such as *profęta, cǫdice* despite Lat. *prophēta*, *cōdex*. It also defines the 'Vatican' pronunciation of Lat. and is therefore often the way singers pronounce Lat. texts (especially for the Mass). It tends to be neglected in historical phonetics, and *salvo errore* its origin is not mentioned at all, even though it is fairly obvious. At the beginning of the Carolingian reforms of the 8th c., when the correct written forms of classical Latin had to be rediscovered lexeme by lexeme, this was done using old mss., of classical verse texts in particular, and with the help of foreign (e.g. Anglo-Saxon) grammarians; but those tasked with retaining and transmitting the correct forms, instead of having to spell them out every time individually, would have found a considerable benefit in a clear, albeit artificial pronunciation that would lend itself to dictation. Such a pronunciation resulted if they consistently avoided the middle phoneme in the vernacular phoneme series /i/-/ę/-/ę/ and /u/-/ǫ/-/ǫ/. The emerging MLat. language therefore did not use vernacular pronunciations such as /fęde/, /kręd(e)re/, /gǫla/, /flǫre/ but enunciated in line with the written form /fidem/, but /krędere/, /gula/, but /flǫrem/ – and so also (with stress on the last syllable) /džerikǫ/. (Any tendencies towards diphthongisation were ignored in this process; because it was supposed to be Latin, after all.)

Holy Land was possibly controlled by the Saracens at the time of Baligant's battle. Whether or not this was the case, it would not have been appropriate to go against the whole Christian tradition and refer to people under Baligant's leadership as 'people from the Holy Land' or even worse, 'people from Jerusalem'. But there was a way out of this dilemma: just as Jerusalem was the Holy City, so Jericho was the damned city. Joshua had not just sacrificed all living things in Jericho, excepting Rahab's family, and burned the town itself to the ground, in keeping with his oath, but he had also cursed whosoever would go on to rebuild the city: "At the cost of his firstborn shall he lay its foundation, and at the cost of his youngest son shall he set up its gates"– *Ios* 6.17–19, 24, 26. In the reign of the idolatrous King Ahab, a certain Hiel built Jericho up again, but Joshua's double curse was fulfilled in the fate of his two sons (*1 Reg* 16.34). Nebuchadnezzar's troops overtook the last King of Israel as he was making his escape near Jericho (*2 Reg* 25.5). According to the Jewish tradition (*Gen. rabba* p. 85 *in fine*) the King of Babylon ordered the Holy Land to be administered by his representative in Jericho; Jericho was therefore the capital of the temporarily desecrated Holy Land. This kind of substitution, implicit in the thinking of the Roland poet, had come to the Latin Middle Ages e.g. via Solinus (35.4): *Iudaeae caput fuit Hierosolyma, sed excisa est. Successit Hierichus, et haec desivit, Artaxerxis bello subacta.* Jericho's negative image lingered on elsewhere as well. According to Isidore (15.1.20) the town that Hiel built was destroyed by the Romans *propter civium perfidiam* when Jerusalem was being besieged, but then later replaced by a third town. Isidore's information was carried over e.g. into Adamnan's report on the pilgrimage of Bishop Arculf (*De locis sanctis* 2.13, CC 175 p. 212, cf. 267); but Adamnan adds that this third town now also lies in ruins. The *Jericho* in the song is therefore the geographical place,[98] but any reader of the Bible would be familiar with the negative symbolism that lurks "behind" the geography. Typologically, Jericho stands for the ruin of this temporal world of mortals (*defectus mortalis vitae*, Rabanus Maurus *De univ.* 14.1, *in librum Josue* 1.7); its demise prefigures the Last Judgement (Réau II, 1, 222s., LCI II s. v. *Josue*). Moreover, we can see how firmly Jericho was

---

[98] After Jerusalem had been captured by the crusaders, Raymond of Saint-Gilles and a little later Godfrey of Bouillon went there, but because of the Jordan, where Jesus was baptised, and not because of Jericho (Runciman 1951, 242, 254). Despite its position in a fertile oasis (palm trees, tropical fruits, sugar cane, indigo) this place had no political significance at that time, and remained totally unfortified until 1143 (Runciman 1952, 187). The ruins of the ancient town were certainly still visible nearby (*Tell es-Sulṭān*) and those of Hellenistic Jericho with Herod's Winter Palace (*Tulūl Abu el-ʿAlāyiq*) too (EJ, Art. *Jericho*). Contemporary events around 1100, if the Roland poet knew about them, would certainly not have contradicted the dark biblical history of this place.

lodged in religious and geographical thinking in the fact that it often appears in otherwise sparsely detailed medieval maps of the world: in the 21 *mappae mundi*, which von den Brincken (1968, 162–167) examined quantitatively and comparatively, Jerusalem appears 17 times, Jericho, along with Bethlehem and Babylon, 11 times, but Nazareth only six times, and Hebron only five.

The question remains, why Jericho is mentioned after and not before the *Mors*. Poetic constraints may well have caused this. Even if we were to delete *de cels* from the verse, there would not be sufficient space for a second name. Naming '(the ones) from Jericho' always takes up a whole verse. The case of *Mors* is different: its monosyllabic nature attracts a second ethnonym towards it. If the poet wanted to avoid padding out the verse *E la siste est d'Ermines et de Mors* with fillers to make it into two verses – and the Rol. is otherwise densely composed – he would have to place *Jericho* either before or after *Ermines*-and-*Mors*. The jump from eastern Europe to the Armenians is then smoother than a jump from eastern Europe to Jericho would have been.

On [2]: Today's Orikum in Albania, in ancient times Ὠρικός, or Ὠρικόν, *Oricus, -cum*, played a moderate, essentially passive role in the war between the Romans and Philip of Macedonia (Livy 24.40.2ss.) and in the civil war between Caesar and Pompey (*Bellum civile* 3.8.4, Lucan 3.187). It appears in Roman literature as the nearest port on the other side of the Adriatic (as in Propertius 1.8.20, Horace *carm.* 3.7.5), but not like Buthrotum, in a major scene of a great epic. Anna, who was an emperor's daughter and an Atticist, obviously knew nothing of its history, since she calls it Ἱεριχώ (like the biblical town).[99] Grégoire (in Grégoire/de Keiser 1939, 275–277) draws attention to the fact that as soon as Bohemund arrived (1.14.4) he conquered Kanina, Ἱεριχώ and the whole of Aulon (Valona/Vlorë) 'like a sudden bolt of lightning'.[100] But this in no way merits the use of the *premier choc* concept (relying this time on Anna rather than William of Apulia); and Grégoire does not try to apply it here. Unlike Buthrotum/*Butentrot*, Jericho is only the middle place in a group of three. And above all: why would the poet think of that place precisely at this point in the song? If we were to agree with Grégoire here, we would have to concede in terms of method that any of the places that Bohemund briefly occupied at any

---

99 Anna 1.14.4, 4.3.2, 13.5.1, 13.6.4. Around 1100 the Norman Malaterra (3.24ss., cap. 34, ed. Pontieri p. 71) spells it as *Herico*, and until well into the 19th c. it is called *Erico* or similar. Today's official spelling *Orikum* is deliberately archaic.

100 In 13.6.4 Anna once again describes how Bohemund sends troops out to pillage Avlon, Orikum and Kanina, and in 4.3.2, and how Robert Guiscard is marooned in Orikum for two months.

time could appear anywhere in the catalogue; this would reduce the catalogue to a kaleidoscopic picture with no inherent structure – and our whole account argues against this position.

A.1.1.9 Eighth *eschiele*: *de Nigres*

De Nigres O 3229, *Walgies* K (*ualges* Stricker, *ualgres* the *Karlmeinet*), *(de) Clames* (ed. Cook) / *(de) Claines* (edd. Stengel, Gasca Queirazza, Beretta) V4, *Anage* CV7: OKV4 confirm that *-es* belongs in the archetype. A comparison of the *an-age* in CV7 with the *u(u)-alg(i/r)es*) in the K family shows that the *-a(.?)g (.?)e(–)* which they have in common belongs in the sub-archetype β; the same is probably the case with *-a(.?)gres*, because *uual-gies* in K hardly inspires confidence, while *ual-gres* in the *Karlmeinet* fits with *Ni-gres* in O. This comparison also shows that the *an-* in CV7 correlates with the *u(u)-* in the K family; and in fact, *an-* does not belong in the sub-archetype β, while *u(u)-* does, because it differs from the *ni-* in O only by a single stroke. V4 appears to be isolated but *cl-* is a misreading of *d'* (and then a supposedly missing *de* is inserted in front of it), and the *ame-* or rather *aine-* must (via an **agne-* or similar) correlate with the *anage* in CV7. The *-l-* in *u(u?)algres* is found only in the K family, and K is known to rest on an Anglo-Norman source from the court of Henry II. The most widely read books at this court certainly included the Chronicles of the Normans by Dudo of Saint-Quentin and those by Robert de Torigni. Both mention the name *Walgri* in prominent places (Dudo 2.10 p. 149 ed. Lair, Robert 2.7s. ed. van Houts) meaning the Dutch island of Walcheren, where Rollo made his first landing before winning several victories over the local people; this name presumably popped up in the minds of the copyists of the Rol., although this might seem crass to us, given its actual meaning. The *-l-* in the K family then does not correspond to anything in β. This means that β has **u(u?)agres*. The editors therefore have to choose between this and *Nigres* in O; yet so far all of them (including Stengel) have opted for *Nigres*.

It probably means [1] more sub-Saharan Africans, less likely [2] the Wagrians, and not [3] the Varangians in service to the Basileus.

On [1]: For OF *nigre* 'black' (instead of *neir*), Godefroy s. v. *negre* lists just one reference from the 13th c. and one from the 14th c. Yet Latinisms like this form a relatively open category in early OF, even in the Chanson de Roland.[101] The

---

101 The following from the Rol. clearly belong in this category: *magne* (v. 1 and eleven times more separated from *Charle*-), (*enseigne/gent*) *paienur* (v. 1221, 2639), (*Geste*) *Francor* (v. 1443, 3262), *meie culpe* (v. 2369), *Veire Paterne* (v. 2384, 3100), *Oriente* (v. 3594) and *omnipotente* (v.

term *nigre* would have been easily understood, as is evident in another part of the song which Noyer-Weidner highlights (1969, 34). *Mun<e>igre* (v. 975) refers, as the context clearly shows, to the Spanish territory *Monegros*. The assonance here requires an *-ei-*, but all of the texts (and according to Segre ad loc. presumably the archetype as well) have *-i-: Munigre* O, *Valnigre* V4, *Mont Nigre* CV7, *Valniger n (a)*. Evidently *nigre* was chosen, in spite of the assonance discrepancy, precisely because its meaning was understood.

Noyer-Weidner joins the editors in opting for *Nigres* at this point because of the ever-present symbolic value of the devil's colour black – and indeed this symbolic value may have encouraged the choice of the Latinism, since the poet had learned about it mainly via Latin formulations.

This brings us to the reality test! The erudite geography of classical antiquity imagined 'black' Africa correctly as stretching far southward from Egypt, amongst other things, because Augustus' scouts had discovered huge cataracts 2400 km upstream from the mouth of the Nile, and then Nero's scouts had observed that the river was still very mighty at about 2600 km (Pliny *n.h.* 6. 181, 184).[102] Pliny (6.195) noted that there were *Nigroi* to the west of the uppermost part of the Nile and (5.43, possibly identical to them?) the 'Ethiopian' people of the *Nigritae* by a river *Nigris*, part of which divided [North] Africa from 'Ethiopia', and which Pliny tends to identify with the (in his opinion west-to-east) course of the uppermost part of the Nile (5.30, 44, 52s.); we find this people again in Martianus Capella 6.673: *Aethiopes, Nigritas et ceteros monstruosae novitatis*.

Consequently, in the Rol. there was still room for the *Nigres* after the *Mors*.[103] However, it still means Baligant's southern west flank, because the Algalife's land has to be deducted. The poet's train of thought is likely to have reached its southernmost point with the *Nigres* because it is hard to imagine what else he could have known that is further south.

3599); a few more are attested in the Rol. for the first time, such as *glorïus* (v. 124, 429), *enluminét* (v. 535) etc. which the poet may have brought into his native language as new terms.

102 That is to say as far as 870 or 975 Roman miles (~ 1392 or 1560 km) south of Syene/ Aswan, which in turn is about 1030 km by road from the mouth of the Nile.

103 This point is correctly made, although using entirely unacceptable arguments, by Place (1947, 879s.): he wants to read the *Nigres* as *Nigrés* (which is metrically impossible), see this as an inaccurate spelling of **Nigreiz* (which is idiosyncratic) and then interpret this as a phonetically regular representation of the *Nigritae* or *Nigrites* (which is also impossible, because the suffix has *-ī-* !).

On [2]: Baist (1902, 217) and de Mandach (1990, 3s.) have opted for the Wagrians, and some sympathy towards this hypothesis is also expressed by Boissonnade (1923, 175) and Prioult (1948, 291). The Wagrians lived in an area of eastern Holstein about 60 km in diameter between Kiel and Lübeck and were just a branch of the Slav Obodrites. First attested in the sources around 950, they took part in the great Slavic revolts of 983 and 1066, on both occasions destroying the Bishopric of Oldenburg-in-Holstein, which was responsible for them. The Obodrite kingdom broke up in 1127 but in 1137 the Wagrians, acting independently, invaded German Holstein. The retaliatory actions of Count Adolf II of (Schaumburg-) Holstein were "devastating": in less than a decade the land was subordinated once and for all, the Slav population was confined to a kind of reservation in eastern Wagria, and western Wagria was occupied by German settlers. (LM s. v. *Wagrien*, *Wagrier*). But it was Henry the Lion who mainly benefited from this victory. From 1142 as Duke of Saxony he was Adolf's liege lord: he rebuilt the Bishopric of Oldenburg-in-Holstein, seized the royal investiture rights in 1150 and a few years later moved the bishopric to Lübeck.

The attested forms of this name (in Widukind, Thietmar, Adam of Bremen, Annalista Saxo, Helmold) are *Wagri* (*Wageri*, *Wagiri*), *Waigri* (this early form in the Leiden fragment Voss lat. 4º 123 of Adam of Bremen, probably from the very end of the 11th c., the only surviving manuscript of Adam that appears to have reached France during the Middle Ages, de Mandach 1990, 3), *Vagri* and, probably corrupt, *Wairi* (*Wairenses*), *Wa(a)rii*, along with the region's name *Wagria*, *Wagirensis provincia* (cf. e.g., Niederle 1927, 128 n.2). Whereas older research suggested that the scholia on Adam had *Walgri*, the two standard editions of the scholia by Schmeidler and Trillmich (II 19 schol. 12; II 21 schol. 15; II 43 schol. 29) only have *Waigri* (var. *Wagri*, *Vagri*, and on one occasion *Ungri*). Only once do we find a form with an unambiguous -*l*-: *Vulgaria* [sic] in a bull granted by Innocent III on October 5, 1199 to St. Mary's Priory at Segeberg (Potthast Nr. 844), a document presumably written by a native speaker of a Romance language. But this form evidently derives from contamination or even confusion with *Bulgaria* and shows how little known the Wagrians were.

Even if we accept that the poet wanted to include them despite their relative obscurity, it would be astonishing for him to have them placed, without any apparent reason, not in the first (north-western) group of five *eschieles* but in the second (south-western) group. We can expect less subtlety from the copyists – β can hardly have imagined the *u(u?)a(i?)gres* as anything other than the Wagrians. He could have come across them in the following way. For the Anglo-Norman kingdom, Wagria was the nearest heathen land; people would have been following its Christianisation from 1137 onwards with great interest, especially around 1168, when Henry the Lion became the son-in-law of Henry II

of England-Normandy-Anjou-Aquitaine. If β misread e.g., the *nigres* of his source as *uigres*, he could have been reminded of the Wagrians, and have "corrected" his text to *uaigres* or *uuaigres*.

On [3]: Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 291s.) and Grégoire (1939a, 242 n. 2) want to follow Baist (1902, 217) and read *Nigres* as **Walgres*, but understand it to mean the 'Varangian' troop owned by the Basileus, the Βάραγγοι (Anna 2.9.4, 4.5.3, 7.3.6; < Old Norse *væringjar*, in which *-ar* is only a pl. ending) or in Latin script *Waringi* (Gaufredus Malaterra 3.27 and 29); from around 1080 onwards, the Scandinavians in the troop had mostly been replaced by emigrants from England or Russians.

Malaterra was Francophone; he had been a monk in Saint-Évroul before he joined his compatriots in southern Italy. So his *Waringi* reflects a spoken **Warencs* or **Varencs* with final stress.[104] A **/var(ə)ŋg(ə)s/* or similar would be impossible in the OF phonemic and phonotactic system. Consequently, the word no longer fits into the hemistich *L'oitme est de Nigres / *Wa(i)gres.*

A.1.1.10 Ninth *eschiele*: *de Gros*

De Gros O 3229, *uon Mores* K (as in Stricker and *Karlmeinet*), *de Mors* V4, *d'Enoz* C, *des Noz* V7: KV4 show that β had *Mors*, even though this had already appeared two verses before and was confirmed via OV4 for the archetype of all the mss. (cf. above A.1.1.7). This was not a problem for K, because he had read *Demples* instead of *Mors* in that earlier verse; V4, on the other hand, either overlooked or condoned the double mention of *Mors*; CV7 tried to keep alterations to a minimum and hit on the nonsensical *des noz*. In terms of the stemma, therefore, we have a choice between *Gros* and *Mors*; but since we cannot believe the poet would write a second *Mors,* all editors have opted for *Gros*.

Noyer-Weidner (1969, 386s.) once again identifies the name quite simply as an adjective: he maintains that the *Gros* are 'fat people' and therefore ugly, because according to him ugliness is typical of 'heathens' everywhere else: the poet labelled the *Micenes* as *chefs gros* (v. 3221), the *Canelius* as *les laiz* (v. 3238) and the people from *Malprose* (v. 3253) as *jaianz* or hulking, which makes them all appear ugly. But it makes a difference to the narrative whether an additional negative attribute is attached to a named people, or whether a negative adjective with no geographical connotations, and therefore no particular required order in the catalogue, could function as a people name; we would surely regard the latter possibility as facile. Thus far, it has been possible to reinterpret

---

104 Cf. the suffix OF *-eng* < *-ing* e.g., in the *Flamengs* and *Loherengs* of the Rol.

Noyer-Weidner's adjectival explanations for the names in such a way that a people name was always visible "through" the adjective. We should not forfeit this requirement in the case of the 'fat' unless there are compelling reasons.

The meaning of *Gros* is not [1] the Greeks or [2] the Kurds, but [3] the Georgians.

On [1]: Grégoire/ de Keyser 1939, 291, proposed that the *Gros* 'fat people' should be interpreted as the *Grieus* 'Greeks', whereby the vowel is "influenced" by assonance. There are some elementary semantic problems with this suggestion: even in the Latin Middle Ages the Greeks were regarded as one of the greatest of the ancient civilisations and above all, as *the* people of the early Christian Church; the schism had only just been completed in 1055. Furthermore, a shift from /ieu̯/ to /ǫ/ changes the physiognomy of a monosyllabic word so completely that the meaning would probably have been lost.[105]

On [2]: Boissonnade opted for 'Kurds' (1923, 215). He argued that "Curti, Grudi" or (215 in the note) "Curti, Crudi" are attested in the Latin historians of the First Crusade. Unfortunately, his information on variants cannot be relied upon. I checked his list of references and also all the Latin, Greek, Armenian and Arabic historians of the Crusades and could find neither *Crudi* nor *Grudi*;[106] but in the Latin historians I found only *Curti* (passim from the anonymous *Gesta* cap. 21 onwards), and very rarely *Curtae*.[107] In OF there is the *de Mont Nigre les Corz*

---

105 To be sure, since the *Chanson d'Antioche* there has been for the Greeks abundant evidence of the nickname *Grifons* (Moisan, Flutre s. v.), Old Occ. *Grifos* in Raimbaut de Vaqueiras (20.38); there is also the *Grifonnie* region in the *Jourdain de Blaye* and *Grifonaille* 'ramas de Grecs' in Ambroise (v. 549) and others; devolved to *Grif(f)oni* in the Venetian chronicle literature, cf. Carile (1969, Glossary s. v.). But it was easier to interpret: if you made a slightly affective *-on* derivation, you would arrive at *Grievons* or (because of the strangeness of the diphthong in unstressed syllables, cf. Thibaut < Thiébaut etc.) at *Grivons*; this would be very close to *Grifons* 'griffins'. The occasional reference to *Grison* in Flutre is a (probably early) misreading of *Grifon*.

106 Boissonnade's *Grudi* may have been prompted by Gaston Paris in a note, *Romania* 2 (1873), 480, which reports, but does not evaluate, Joseph Haupt *Die dakische Königs- und Tempelburg auf der Columna Trajana*, Mittheilungen der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Central-Commission zur Erhaltung und Erforschung der Baudenkmale [Vienna] 15 (1870), 111–144, as having interpreted the *Gros* of the Rol. as *Grudi*. I followed up Paris' note by reading Haupt's work; it is an incredibly uncritical heap of details, many of which bear no relation to each other, and the *Gros* = *Grudi* equation is offered with no explanation at all.

107 With *-t-* in the Byzantines too: Κοῦρτοι from the Taurus region and the Manichean towns, Theophani continuatores 5.49 (ed. Bekker p. 283.19) referring to events in the late 9th c.

in V7 5387 instead of the *Micenes* in O (cf. above A.1.1.2 with n. 59), *Cordes*, *Curdes* 'Kurds, Kurdistan' in the *Melusine* (Flutre s. v.) and the further forms *Cordis*, *Cordins* 'Kurds', *Cordie* 'female Kurd' in Ms. G of the *Eracle*, the OF translation and continuation by William of Tyre (RHC Occ. 1/2, 211, 312. 335, here referring to events in the years 1197–1219). A metathesis of the *-r-* is unlikely because Lat. *curti* 'the short ones' (~ OF *les cǫrz*) already offered an opportunity for interpretation as a nickname.[108] And the unattested *g-* instead of *c-* would alter the name quite considerably.[109]

On [3]: Jenkins (ad loc.) opted for the Georgians because their land is called *Grouzia* in the Russian sources. Byzantium had managed to extend its influence into (mainly western) Georgia in the 10th c. where the indigenous Bagratids ruled as the Basileus' *kuropalatoi*. Around 1000 Bagrat III unified almost the whole of Georgia and Abkhazia into one kingdom, which enjoyed a "Golden Age" (LM s. v. *Georgien*) from then until the Mongol Invasion of the 13th century. It had forged the closest possible dynastic connections with Byzantium: Bagrat IV married a Byzantine princess, and their daughter Maria became the wife, first of Emperor Michael VII Dukas (1071–1078), and then of Emperor Nikephoros III (1078–1081, ODB, Art. *Georgia*). Georgians continued to serve the Byzantines, and in so doing must have come into contact with Francophone people. Georgians were in the army of Emperor Romanos IV at Manzikert (1071) (and the Georgian Joseph Trachoniotes was even the commander of a large part of it), alongside the Normans under Roussel de Bailleul (Cahen 1939, 628–631). Georgian King David IV (1089–1125) was completely independent from Byzantium (neither he nor his kingdom are mentioned by Anna Komnene); but he fought successfully against the Turks and is supposed to have paid for the services of up to two hundred European crusader knights.

Thus, there was plenty of opportunity for relationships to form between Georgians and Francophones.

On the other hand, whereas a Francophone, based on his experience of pilgrimage and crusade, might harbour resentment against Armenian and Syrian Christians, there is less reason why he should distrust the Georgians. The Georgian church was autocephalous, but unlike the Armenian and Syrian Church

---

108 Cf. also Kurdish *Kurd* (sg. and pl., with adj. *kurdî*, region *Kurdistan*) and Turk. *Kürt*. We would not expect any influence from the Arabic plural *Akrād* (of the sg. *Kurd*). – Later, after / kǫrts/ > /kǫrs/ had occurred, perhaps with the help of a scribal confusion of δ and b, a *Corbi* type emerged (Schweickard 2012, 951s.).

109 Indeed, the ancient writers often have *Gordyaei* (Pliny *n.h.* 6. 118 and 129) or *Cordueni* (6.44) as the ancestors of the Kurds, but I cannot find any *G-* forms for the medieval Kurds.

(which had both refused to recognise the Council of Chalcedon), it did not have any doctrinal feuds with the Greek Orthodox Church. It is very possible, however, that our poet's Roman Catholic heritage would encourage him to automatically include the national churches of the east in his concept of 'heretics' and thus 'enemies'.

When referring to the Georgians, the Byzantines retained – at least in writing – the ancient term *Iberia*, *Iberi*. But as there was no trace of this left in any living language in the Middle Ages, it does not seem to have been part of the everyday language of the Byzantine army. According to Vasmer's RussEW (s. v. Грузин) the Old Georg. word for themselves was *gurz*, Tatar. *gurdži*, *gürdži*, Pers. *gurǰi*,[110] Osset. *gurǰi* and then in Old Russ. (pl.) *gurzi*; Vasmer finds the earliest example of the Russian metathesis to *gruz-* in a source from the early 17th c. (which would make *Gruzija* a Russian neologism[111]). But if the Normans adopted the term *gurz,* it would have undergone automatic terminal devoicing to become */gurs ~ gǫrs/; anyone who wanted to make a meaningful nickname out of that would probably have come up with *Grǫs*.

This brings us to a final note on the sixth to the ninth *eschiele.* The strange fact that due to a mistake, lines 3227 and 3229 must both have ended in *Mors* already in the sub-archetype ms. β encourages us to make a bold suggestion. In geographical terms, the urtext would be more polished if *Mors* (v. 3227) and *Gros* (v. 3229) were to change places: 'the sixth *eschiele* consisted of Armenians and Georgians, the seventh of people from Jericho, the eighth of *Nigres*, the ninth of *Mors*'. It is entirely conceivable that the urtext looked like this. Practised copyists in this period would read and remember several verses at a time, in order to minimise the time spent looking back and forth, and then write them down all in one go; so the copyist who wrote the archetype of all surviving mss. could have made

---

110 The term *gurz* passed into Arab. twice; on the first occasion it became *džurz*, and on the second it was approximated as *kurdž*. This explains why the EI directs us from the key word *Djurz(ān)* to *Gurdjistān*, and from there to the art. *(al-)Kurdj*, *Gurdj*, *Gurdjistān*, when the older sources are cited with *džurz(ān)*. Around 1255, William of Rubruck, who had lived in Acre for four years before he travelled to Mongolia, probably has his term *Curgi* from the Arab., *quos nos dicimus Georgianos,* he also uses *Gurgia, Gurgini, Georgini* (ed. van den Wyngaert 1929, 319, 320, 325). Forms which cannot be influenced by the name *Georgius* such as MLat. *Gorgii, Gorzi* (and expanded in Ital. *Gorziani*) occur occasionally until around 1500 (Schweickard 2012, 950–953).

111 And incidentally the same is true of *Gruzín*, the Russian singulative (Bräuer 1969, § 180s.), from which the archaic Ger. adj. *grusinisch* for 'Georgian' is derived.

the following mistake. In v. 3227 he wrote the later word *Mors* instead of *Gros,* then in v. 3229 he correctly wrote down *Mors*. Having completed his manuscript, he reread it, noticed the double *Mors* and checked his source. In order to avoid an erasure, he added the correction *Gros* in the margin; but, as he deemed the order of the *eschieles* unimportant, he inadvertently placed it at v. 3229 instead of v. 3227. O respected this (pseudo-) corrrection, β overlooked it (as often happened with marginal corrections).[112]

A.1.1.11 Tenth *eschiele*: *de Balide la fort*

De Balide la fort O 3230, *uon Paligea* K (but *Balie* Stricker and *Karlmeinet*), *de Baligera la fors* V4, *de Baile et de Gloz* C, *d'Albeigne et de Gloz* V7: K has Bavarian *p-* as usual (also in the name *Paligan*, cf. above A.1.1.1 s. v. *Butentrot*); K with *-igea*, V4 with *-igera* and therefore also β are influenced by the name *Baligant* or the well-known epic name of the Catalan town *Balaguer*.[113] More specifically, β probably had *Balige(r?)* (a longer form is impossible because of the syllable count), because the *-g-* is still reflected in the *Albeigne* of V7, where 'Albania' is a secondary meaning,[114] whereas it is dropped in C, and also in the Stricker and in the *Karlmeinet*, showing that these mss. here, as in other places, bypass K and have access to the French tradition by some means that is not entirely clear. Since *la fort* is confirmed in the archetype via OV4, we cannot insert *et de Gloz* from CV7; *Gloz* is simply (with an incorrect assonance vowel) OF *glọt* 'glutton', which is used in the Rol. 3456 as a random insult referring to Saracens, and that is precisely why it seemed more appropriate here than *la fort*.

  The meaning is [1] Bālis at the great bend of the Euphrates, suggested with a good explanation by Boissonnade (1923, 217), rightly accepted by de Mandach (1993, 281s.) and incorrectly denounced using three exclamation marks by Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 311). It is not [2] Cape *Pallës* (in Alban., Ital. *Pali*) north of Durrës/Durazzo, as Grégoire/de Keyser believe (1939, 279) and most definitely not [3] Pöhlde near Göttingen.

On [1] We begin with Bālis on the great bend of the Euphrates. The poet has used the first nine *eschieles* to take us on a tour of the western portion of the

---

112 But let it be clear that nothing can be deduced from this about the relative age of O and β to each other.

113 As noted by Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 278s.).

114 It does not matter whether the intended meaning of the name is its ancient one, a region in the Caucasus, or – as would be more likely from a North Italian writer – today's Albania, which first acquired this name in the middle of the 11th c. (cf. LM s. v. *Albanien*).

enemy which stretches from eastern Germany to the Sudan. Now the most obvious meaning in OF of *la fort* is not 'the strong (region)', but 'the strongly fortified (town)'.[115] *Balide* is then probably a town, just like *Butentrot*. The latter was the gate to the Orient, in the broadest sense of the word, and thus to Baligant's world. If the Rol. really was as tightly constructed as we assume, then we would expect to see a town here which was the gate to the Orient *par excellence,* in a narrower sense, meaning to the central lands of Islam, to its "hard core" in the military sense, which then will constitute the second group of ten.

This town was Bālis on the great bend of the Euphrates. Until the very end of the ancient era, it was called *Barbalissos* (also *Barbarissos* through the influence of *barbaros*),[116] then from its first mention by Arab Geographers (al-Iṣṭakhrī, Ibn Ḥawqal, 10th c.) it mostly appears as *Bālis*, probably taking on a heavily contracted local form. Finally, the poet, a Christian writer, added a slightly graecizing touch to the name by replacing the *-s* ending with *-de* – because he wanted an obvious feminine form to put in front of *la fort*.[117]

---

115 I could not find any references in OF for a 'strong' country, but I found plenty for 'strong' kings etc. and especially for 'strong (= strongly fortified)' towns and castles; there is also the nominalised form, first seen in the decasyllabic *Alexandre*, i.e., *le fort* 'fort, stronghold' (where the omission of the noun is very revealing in terms of the most likely meaning of the adjective!); cf. the dictionaries.

116 Lat.: *Tabula Peutingeriana*: *Barbalisso*; *Notitia dignitatum* [around 430] 33: *In Augusta Eufratensi: [. . .] Barbalisso*; Theodosius, *De situ terrae sanctae* [around 525] 32: *Barbarisso*; *Itin. Anton. Plac.* [around 570] 47: *Barbarisso* – all to be taken as locatives; *Geographus Ravennas* 2.15: *Barbalission*. Gk.: Ptolemy 5.15.17, Procopius *de aedific.* 2.9.10, Malalas *chron.* 18 (PG 97.676).

117 Even in the Middle Ages it was easy for literate people to see that in Lat. the fem. names ending in *-s*, gen. *-dis* (or even *-dos* after the Gk.) were from the Greek. From the time of the ancient grammarians onwards, it was customary to indicate the source of quotations from the *Aeneid*, Thebaid or *Ilias latina* etc. using expressions like *in octavo Aeneidos*. Non-nominatives with -d- were found, in the Aeneid: of *aegis, Aulis, Elis, Ilias* 'woman from Ilion', *Pallas*, from Ovid also *Aeneis, Argolis, Brisëis, Byblis, Chrysëis, Leucas, Persëis, Phegis, Phorcynis* 'Phorcys' daughter, Medusa', *Procris, Psophis, Thebais* 'woman from Thebes', *Thetis, Troas*, in Lucan of *Chalcis, Phocis, Tigris* etc. The Romance forms ending in *-de* arose easily out of the acc. ending in *-dem* and often even from graecized *-da*. The large proportion of geographical names is interesting; it could well have invited imitation. – De Mandach 1993, 281, attempts to explain *-ide* instead of *-is* using arguments that are wrong in more ways than one. He brings the variant *Bālad* into the discussion alongside *Bālis*, explained as either a town to the northeast of Mosul (although the crusaders never reached anywhere near there!), or alternatively a town which appears in (Vasiliev-) Honigmann's map III of 1935 exactly in the place where we would expect to see *Bālis*. But on Honigmann's map III (which content-wise is the only one of his four maps which could include Bālis) it clearly says, in the correct place: "*bālis* Βαρβαλισσός *qalʿat bālis*" or in other words (following Honigmann's interpretation of the letters, p. 227) the Arab or

The Euphrates flows in a north-south direction for 200 km before it reaches Bālis, turning slightly to the west as it passes through a mountainous landscape; from Bālis onwards, it flows through the plains in a south easterly direction to the ruins of Babylon some 600 km away (which is only 80 km from Baghdad on the Tigris) and then to the river mouth almost 1000 km away near Basra. According to the Arab geographers, Bālis, situated only just inside Syria, marks the corner between the three countries of Syria, Mesopotamia and Arabia (cf. e.g., Abū 'l-Fidā', ed.-trad. Reinaud II/1, 99s., II/2, 1s., 46, 49).

It was this position that made Bālis so important. One of the most famous highways in history, especially in commercial terms, taking traders from the Persian Gulf up the Euphrates through Mesopotamia, left the Euphrates precisely at Bālis to go on in its north westerly direction to Antioch and the Mediterranean coast. By the end of the 4th millennium B.C., this road went through the town of Habbuba Kabira not far from the site of the later Bālis. Around 2300 B.C., the road was the lifeline of the early Akkadian Empire which stretched from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean (AW 17, map 4), and it must have helped to build the prosperity of Mari, Emar (Habbuba Kabira's successor and Bālis' predecessor), Ebla and Ugarit (AW 16, map 1); Nebuchadnezzar would pass through here later, on his way from Babylon to Egypt and Israel (AW 20, map 4). This place continued to be a focal point connecting Babylon (then Ctesiphon, then Baghdad) via Aleppo with Antioch and from there with the Mediterranean Sea. In the Middle Ages, this connection reached twice as far back: there was a sea route from India to Basra, and also the southern Silk Road China-Ray(~Teheran)-Hamadan-Baghdad (cf. e.g., Haussig 1994, map I at the end of the book).[118]

There are specific reasons why Bālis' location was so important: since water routes were often more convenient than land routes in those days, Bālis was a major reloading point from ship to land transportation and vice versa. This is how the town is perceived by the Arab geographers: Iṣṭakhrī (ed. de Goeje, 62) notes that Bālis is the port on the Euphrates for people from Syria, as does Ibn Ḥawqal (ed. de Goeje, 119). But then the river changed its course, taking it four miles away from the town (first reported by Yāqūt, around 1225), the Mongol Invasion swept over the town, and according to Abū 'l-Fidā' (around 1300) Bālis was abandoned (ed.-trad. Reinaud 2:2, 46, Le Strange 1905, 107). When the river started to flow back towards the town in the last few centuries, it was too late: Ottoman

---

Syrian, the Greek and the modern name of the place. Jenkins (ad loc.) asks "*Balis* (gen. *Balidis*?)" but the genitive is not attested.

118 Central Europeans tend to be most interested in the northern Silk Road, but because the financial strength of the Orient was many times greater, the volume of trade on the southern route must also have been very significant.

rulers tended to obstruct world trade here as elsewhere, and Europe obtained its tropical goods increasingly from Africa and America. Today the Euphrates has been dammed up at Lake Assad and most of the town is submerged.

Last, but not least, Bālis' position was important strategically. For the Seleucids it was a military base against the advancing Parthians, and in late antiquity it was a launching point for invasions into the Eastern Roman Empire: in 253 the Sassanian ruler Shapur I inflicted a painful defeat on the Romans, and in 540 Khosrow I rampaged through these lands. This prompted Justinian I, according to Procopius (*de aedif.* 2.9.10) to have the town fortified with extremely strong walls, and these are still mentioned by Ibn Ḥawqal (10th c.) and Kamāl ad-Dīn Ibn al-ʿAdīm (13th c.). In Arabian times, Bālis was turned into a border fortress against the Byzantines. According to an 11th c. Christian source from Antioch, it fell into the hands of the Byzantines again in 966 (Honigmann 1935, 94), but immediately after the peace accord of 969 the border was drawn a considerable distance north and even far to the west of the city (Honigmann 1935, 94–97, and his map III); in any case, Bālis remained Muslim from this time onwards. It is admittedly difficult to establish just how long after that the fortifications were fully maintained, because in 1114 an earthquake caused heavy damage (Cahen 1940, 271, and RHC Or. 3.551). Yet as late as in 19th century the abandoned town was still generally called *Qal ʿat Bālis* 'Fortress Bālis'.[119] Even today its ruins are 8 m high and visible from afar across the flat valley of the Euphrates: on two sides, the waters of the Assad dam lap against them, but there are two imposing towers and a midsection forming a ghostly praetorian guard in the northwest of the Byzantine town, and a corner tower in the southwest. The towers were built as living quarters, and the Byzantine watchmen looked out in all directions, including eastwards, far into the floodplains of the Euphrates from where enemies could appear without warning. The ruins of the later Islamic citadel (*qaṣr*) were also clearly visible in the town centre until it was flooded by the waters of the lake.[120]

---

119 See, e.g., *Meyers Konversationslexikon* of 1888 s. v. *Balis*.

120 The ruins lie 6 km east of the town of Meskene/Maskanah, which today is on the Syrian M4 motorway. An archaeological investigation was carried out on Barbalissos-Bālis in 1972–1976 by a French team, another by a Syrian team in 1992–1995. 1996 an American team (Princeton University) and a Syrian-German research group led by Uwe Finkbeiner (University of Tübingen) has been working there, but the main focus of these two excavations has been the Bronze Age town of Emar which adjoins this site. The corner tower and the praetorium in Barbalissos-Bālis were stabilised thanks to the work of the Syrian-German team; a surviving minaret was relocated to an unflooded area by the American team. There are some impressive pictures of the Byzantine ruins in Finkbeiner/Finkbeiner (2004, passim), and much of the factual information supplied above is from this source.

None of the crusader states seem to have ever added Bālis to their own territory, and yet the town and its surrounding area were well known to the Normans in the Principality of Antioch and to the (mainly north-eastern) French in the County of Edessa. The events of this time are complicated and will take more than a few words to explain.

By 1104 the crusaders of Edessa and Antioch were cooperating closely even far to the northeast of Bālis, but they had no luck. Baldwin of Edessa (later to become King Baldwin II of Jerusalem) wanted to conquer Ḥarrān and called upon the Normans for reinforcements. When a Muslim relief army approached, a battle occurred to the south of Ḥarrān. The Turks in front of Baldwin pretended to flee and lured him into crossing the Balikh river (which flows into the Euphrates from the north, about 50 km east of Bālis, at ar-Raqqa), with the result that he was caught in a trap and taken captive. The Normans were not able to turn the tide of the battle.[121]

The two crusader parties had much closer contact with Bālis four years later. When Baldwin was released, Čawlī (also: Džavalī, Jawali etc.) of Mosul had made an alliance with him; on the basis of this he immediately captured the border fortress of Bālis in 1108 from his mortal enemy Riḍwān of Aleppo, and he even had some of Riḍwān's people crucified. This was an obvious precursor to a larger war, and Čawlī called upon Baldwin's assistance; Riḍwān, a warlike character who was a member of the Seljuk Grand Sultan's family,[122] suddenly found himself facing the prospect of an unexpectedly powerful enemy and called upon Tancred and his Normans for assistance. The decisive battle – which is thought to have cost the lives of almost two thousand Christians – then took place near Manbidž or Turbessel (Arab. *Tell Bāshir*, Turk. *Tilbeşar*) 40–60 km north-northwest of Bālis and ended in a victory for Riḍwān and the Normans, so that Bālis returned to Riḍwān's possession.[123] But because the town was the reason for the dispute, and its capture was the declared objective of the war, it must have been a focal point for both of the Christian parties at that time; crusader delegations to their respective allies, and possibly even some allied Norman troops themselves must have been

---

121 Runciman (1952, 33–35). And so the battle did not take place right next to Bālis (contra Boissonnade 1923, 217).

122 Runciman (1952, 10). He was a grandson of the great Alp Arslan, the victor at Manzikert. His name in the form *Rodoant/Roboan(t)* became a set piece in the OF epic, which could be inserted into any context as needed.

123 Runciman (1952, 91–93), Setton (1969a, 394). Unlike the events of 1104, these events of 1108, which were rather embarrassing for western participants, can only be reconstructed with the help of oriental sources (Matthew of Edessa, Ibn al-Athīr, Kamāl ad-Dīn ibn al-ʿAdīm, Ibn al-Furāt).

inside the town, and would have admired its fortifications and the view it afforded from the Euphrates into the unknown reaches of Mesopotamia.

At the turn of the year from 1110/1111, Tancred started a war with his former ally Riḍwān; he had heard a rumour that Riḍwān was planning to attack Antioch and wanted to pre-empt this. The first objectives of the "punitive expedition" were other places, and not Bālis (Runciman 1952, 95), but according to Ibn al-Athīr (RHC Or. 1.278) the Normans killed or sold their inhabitants into slavery, so that when the Norman enemy approached Bālis the citizens fled in panic, and the Normans arrived to find the whole town empty. They were not able to mount a defence of the town in the longer term, however, and so they set it on fire and headed off towards Antioch again.[124] This is what is meant when we sometimes read that the town belonged to Tancred for a time "around 1111".

Tancred and Riḍwān both died in 1113 (Runciman 1952, 100s., 102). After a period of some confusion, Ibn al-Milḥī, who was acting as regent on behalf of Riḍwān's young son Sulṭānshāh, assumed control in Aleppo; he wanted to wrest Bālis from an adversary named Ilghāzī, who had retreated back to that town, and so he besieged Bālis with the help of Tancred's successor Roger of Antioch. Once again, we find Christians in the immediate vicinity of the fortress of Bālis. But Ilghāzī managed to prevail, and he even won back Aleppo with the support of Ṭughtigin of Damascus[125] (Runciman 1952, 108).

Early in 1123 Baldwin, now Baldwin II King of Jerusalem, again attacked Bālis without success,[126] and was captured immediately afterwards by the Muslims, which meant that the crusader rule in northern Syria had passed its peak.

The crusaders – on this occasion Frenchmen from the County of Edessa – appear to have passed through or rather close by Bālis for the last time in 1144. Zengi (also: Zankī etc.) of Mosul advanced towards Edessa. Count Josselin thought that Zengi was about to unite with the forces in Aleppo, which would give him the upper hand. In order to prevent this, he launched a surprise attack with the majority of his troops and captured ar-Raqqa on the Euphrates 50 km east of Bālis, thus blocking Zengi's path to Aleppo. But Zengi did not need the Aleppo troops and took over Edessa in the November of that year. Josselin did not dare to mount a counterattack against Zengi and marched instead to Turbessel in the

---

124 Cahen (1940, 259) attributes this temporary capture and looting of the abandoned town to Josselin, but this makes no difference to us.

125 Other forms of this name: *Tog(h)-*, *-tikin*, *-tegin* etc. In the Latin historians of the Crusades, he is called *Doldekinus/Tuldequinus*, and he appears as *Dodekin de Damas* in the crusader epics, where a conversion is even attributed to him later in life; cf. Moisan s. v. and J. Richard (1982, passim).

126 126 Cahen (1940, 295), Grousset (1948, 585), Setton (1969a, 418).

west of his county, to wait for reinforcements from Jerusalem and Antioch. The obvious route from ar-Raqqa to Turbessel leaves the Euphrates somewhere near Bālis; if Josselin followed this route, and there is nothing to suggest he did not, then this was the last time any crusaders cast their eyes upon the town – and there was no possibility of any attempt to capture it. Edessa fell into Zengi's hands on Christmas Eve, before the reinforcements from Jerusalem could reach it, and the forces from Antioch did not come (as noted by Runciman 1952, 190–192, Setton 1969a, 446s., and Riley-Smith 1991, 35, map 2; a different account, with no mention of Josselin's march to ar-Raqqa, Setton 1969a, 460s. and Asbridge 2010, 214s.). This initiated the Second Crusade which did not, however, result in the Christians recapturing northern Syrian territories.

All in all, there are two points to note from these events: that Bālis with its Byzantine fortifications and the citadel built within the town really was *la fort,* and that for decades it was a key aspiration and at the same time a source of frustration for the crusaders in their adventures on the banks of the Euphrates. A poet could very well say from a distance (v. 3231): *Ço est une gent ki unches ben ne volt.* Beyond that place lay the core lands of Islam – the theme of our poet's second group of ten.

On [2]: Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 278s.) maintain that *Balide* or rather the variant *Balïë* is today's Albanian Cape Pallës, Ital. *Pali,* modern Gk. *Pallia*, where according to Anna (4.2.3) the Venetian fleet sent to aid the Basileus was attacked by Robert Guiscard's fleet under Bohemund but decisively repelled it. Once again, the attempted identification starts from a later [!] form picked out in disregard of any stemma. Although this time it would work in terms of phonology,[127] it is difficult to accept semantically: in OF a headland would hardly ever be called strong, but rather 'pointed', 'dangerous' or the like. Moreover, the Belgian scholars do not question why the name should appear in exactly this position; on the contrary, they maintain that *Baldise* (sic) *la lunge* in v. 3255, home of the 26th (!) *eschiele*, should again be interpreted as Cape Pali, and for reasons best known to themselves, they consider the epithet there *la lunge* is "une magnifique confirmation de notre identification".

On [3]: The idea that *Balide* might be the Ottonian Royal Residence of Pöhlde near Göttingen (Settegast 1917, 467), arises from excessive germanophilia and does not require any rebuttal.

---

127 On modern Gk. *P-* > Rom. *B-* cf. above n. 43.

A.1.1.12 Interim summary

When Baligant's army is described in the catalogue, the major part of North Africa (west of Egypt) had already been covered in the Marsilĭe section. Therefore, the fifth to tenth *eschiele* introduce us instead to the southwestern portion of Baligant's forces, between Armenia and north-east Africa south of Egypt; instead of a necessarily positive Jerusalem, Jericho appears as an Anti-Jerusalem. At the end of the group of ten, the poet's train of thought leads us back from Africa to the fortress of Bālis on the Euphrates. In the 12th c. Bālis was a place of great hope and even more frustration for the crusaders, so that in the poem it is a suitable marker of the border with the core lands of Islam, that is to say, with the second group of ten.

Colour symbolism is evident in *mors* and *nigres*. If we focus on pure negativity rather than negative colour symbolism, we can add the *Gros* to the symbolic elements. Yet whether we include it or not, only a minority of the peoples' names have a symbolic meaning; the spiritual element is important, but it is not the primary feature that underpins the structure of the poem.

If we look at the train of thought running all the way through the first group of ten, we notice how similar it is to the first part of the biography of Alexander the Great. Alexander started out with wars against the Triballi as far as the Danube and Illyria (in the year 335); Illyria could have made the Roland poet think of Butrint, and the Danube could have suggested western Slavia and the Wallachians. Alexander then marched through Asia Minor (in 334–333) and triumphed at Issos, which would have brought our poet to the Little Armenians. He did not pursue Darius in an easterly direction but turned instead to the south and came to Jerusalem, which the song replaces with Jericho. He reached his most south westerly point at the oasis of Sīwa, which could have prompted the poet to think of the northeast Africans. Then he turned back to northern Syria where he (in 331) crossed the Euphrates at Thapsakos, the exact position of which is unknown, but which may have been just a few miles away from Bālis;[128] this brought him into the core territories of his arch enemy, the Persian "King of kings". The thoughts of our poet take the same turn back from the south, crossing the Euphrates at Bālis to reach the central core of Islam's lands.

---

128 The most likely suggestions identify it as Džebel el-Ḥammām and Qalʿat (ed-) Dibse, both are a few kilometres from Bālis.

A.1.2 Second group of ten: the middle part

By way of a recap: in V4 and P the second group of ten is missing. The minimal remainders of it in T have been examined above in n. 14. There are also displacements and differences in the enumeration of items from the second *eschiele* onwards in the non-O versions. I proceed by considering the readings that belong together, on a case-by-case basis.

A.1.2.1 First *eschiele*: *des Canelius les laiz*

Des Canelius les laiz O 3238, *uon Dorkaniuessen* K (*Orkane/Orkanie* Stricker, *Orckanes* the *Karlmeinet*), *des Orqenois* (*-neis* V7) *irés* CV7: A replacement of *les laiz* by *irés* (< *iratos*) does not affect the syllable count, but spoils the assonance, because in the song (non-final) /ai/ becomes /ẹ/ and passim assonates with this (< Lat. *é*]), whereas /ē/ < lat. *â[* remains strictly separated from it; therefore, *les laiz* belongs in the archetype.[129] K has again agglutinated *d'* and added the German plural ending *-en* to his Latin-type plural ending *-es* (while the Stricker and the *Karlmeinet* correctly identify a land *Orcanie* or its inhabitants). Let us mention the possibility that in K's residual **d'orcaniu-* the *-u-* reflects a misread *-n-*; at any rate – and this is the main fact – the *d'orcan-* of K corresponds to the *des can-* of O (similar *e ~ o* and long *ʃ ~ r*). Inside the β-branch, the replacement of *d'or* in K by *des or-* in CV7 can hardly be anything but a correction of the number of syllables. In other words, the text that K reproduced – the oldest form of the β-text accessible to us – was too short by one syllable, presumably because *de* had become *d'*, when a name beginning with a consonant had been replaced with *Orcanius* or *Orcaneis*. This goes a long way toward proving that the *Canelius* of O belong in the archetype.

The meaning is much more likely to be [1] the Canaanites than [2] the Hyrcanians, but it is not [3] 'people from Kaninë' in Albania.

On [1]: The Canaanites were first suggested with supporting reasons by P. Meyer (1878, passim), who also investigated the term in later OF literature. In the Bible and Church Fathers, Χανάαν, *C(h)anaan* has a double vowel, but the ethnicon Χαναναῖος, *C(h)ananaeus* does not; on the Lat. cf. Peultier s. v. and TLL, Onomastikon, s. v. Regarding the *Ch-* or *C-*, in both Lat. and Gk. the usual spellings are those taught by Bede (*gramm.* VII 265.23): the Old Testament term (and the New Testament reference to the *mulier Chananaea* who came from there) has *Ch-*, but

---

129 The *Avers* (< *Avari*) is not a counter example, because the poet has trimmed (< *aversi*) to *avers* in order to give it a negative aura, cf. below (A.1.2.4) for more detail.

the New Testament place where the wedding was held is called *Cana* (and the disciple of Jesus is *Simon Cananaeus*). But *Ch-* and *C-* are sometimes confused in the Latin, and even more so in the Romance tradition, where *C-* gradually gains in popularity and prevails in the end. The OF form in the song has phonological weakening of the intertonic *-a- > -e-*, dissimilation of the *-n-n- > -n-l-;*[130] and Lat. *-aeum > OF -ieu* (dialectal > *-eu, -iu*).[131]

We must avoid the error of thinking that medieval people considered the Canaanites to have been wiped out. Indeed, God had commanded that no Canaanite should be left alive in the Holy Land (*Deut* 20.16–18), but not that all Canaanites should be eradicated. They lived on even in the northern part of Israel (*Ios* 16.10, 17.12s., *Iud* 1.27–33, 3.3, 4.2), and in the lands to the north of Israel: because Canaan's firstborn son was Sidon, and the territory of the Canaanites stretched from Sidon towards the south (*Gen* 10.15 and 19). Long after Moses and Joshua, the evil queen Jezebel came from Sidon (*1 Reg* 16.31), and Jesus evaded his adversaries by going as far as the region of Tyre and Sidon, where he met the woman who is called both *Syrophoenissa* (*Mc* 7.26) and *Cananaea* (*Mt* 15.22). This is how the early Church saw the situation (*Act Ap* 7.45), and also the Church Fathers, who would rather speak of the 'expulsion' than the 'eradication' of the Canaanites. A few examples: Jerome *quaest. Hebr. in gen.* p. 15.23: *terram quam Iudaei deinceps possederunt, eiectis Chananaeis*; Augustine *in ps.* 104.7: *excluso Chananaeo datur terra promissionis semini Abrahae*; Hilarius *in Matth.* 15.3: *Chananaei [. . .] bello consumpti vel in loca vicina dispersi vel in servitutem devictorum condicione subiecti*; Isidore 14.3.20 *Iudaea [. . .] prius Chanaan, a filio Cham* [Ham's Son is called Canaan] *dicta, sive a decem Chananaeorum gentibus, quibus expulsis eandem terram Iudaei possederunt.* An interesting variant on the gospel text about the *Syrophoenissa* alias *Cananaea* is found in a text from around 680, Adamnan (*De locis sanctis* 2.29) concerning Arculf's pilgrimage: the town of Tyre lies 'in the land of Canaan; this is where the Canaanite woman or *Tyrophoenissa* [sic] in the gospel came from'.[132] Occasionally people came across 'Canaanites' to the east of Israel as well: according to Adamnan (2.13, in CC 175.267 incorporated by Bede and Peter the Deacon) Arculf saw many houses belonging to the 'Canaanite population' (*Cananea stirps*) between the ruined town of Jericho and the

---

130 As it did within OF with *gonfanon > gonfalon*, and with an apparently opposite outcome in Lat. *Bononia > Boulogne*, in OF with *orphanin > orphelin*; but in all cases the new *-l-* appears at the start of the stressed syllable.

131 Elsewhere in O, triphthongs are generally simplified: *liues/liwes < leugas* 688, 1756, 2425, 2759, *fiu < feudum* 432, *fius < *feudos* 820 etc.

132 Donner (1979, 402 n. 173) draws our attention to this reference.

Jordan. However, it mainly referred to the land north of Israel: for Honorius Augustodunensis (*De imagine mundi* 1.16, PL 172.126) *Chananaea* is a region in Syria, and when in 1144 Edessa was lost – it lies only 90 km north-east of Bālis – the Latin hymns and French Crusade songs blame the *gens Chananea*, the *Chaneliu*, (P. Meyer 1878, passim, Bédier 1927, 50). At that time, the name was possibly on the way to becoming generalised, meaning 'the Muslim enemies of the northern crusader states'. Whether or not this is the case, the *Canelius* are geographically a good fit with Bālis.

Because they are banished from the "land flowing with milk and honey", they are now forced to live in much less fruitful regions, in *Val Fuït* (O 3239),[133] the 'valley avoided (by others)'[134] – an aptronym which is intended to help us imagine the huge Syrian-Arabian steppe and desert which lie to the east of the crusader states, starting at the Euphrates and stretching out southwards from there. From the *Val Fuït* they have now come *en traver*, i.e., 'straight across (the Mediterranean)' to Spain with Baligant.

The Canaanites appear once more at a slightly later point: ten of them march around the central cult objects (and Baligant's standard), loudly calling everyone to prayer.[135] They clearly belong here in the urtext, as the other references show: *Canelius* O 3269, *Chanineis* V4 (influenced by *caninus* 'dog-like') and *Chaveleus* T;[136] *des chüniges bruder Chanabeus* K (with a misreading of -*l*- as -*b*-), *chamels* CV7 and *chevalier* P arise from elementary misunderstandings, but they are based on the same archetype *Caneli(e)us* (and the -*l*- is certain here too). Jenkins (ad loc.) describes their role here briefly but accurately as "a sort of pagan Levites". After all, in the Old Testament the Hebrews as the people of God had an Ark of the Covenant, which was of course carried into the action whenever there was a war (cf. *Ex* 25.14, 37.4, most impressively in the march around Jericho, *Ios* 3–6, especially 6.4); the responsibility for carrying it, and looking after the tent in which it was kept whenever the people stopped for a

---

133 The whole verse is missing in (V4)CV7(T); it belongs in the original, however, because K reveals this through an apparent misunderstanding: he thought that *Falsen* [< *val* + -ſ (< f-)], was another group of people (the misinterpretation being prompted by the introductory *de*).

134 In OF. *fuir* can of course already be used transitively; cf. the dictionaries.

135 Their cry *Ki par noz deus voelt aveir guarison / Si's prit e servet par grant afflictiun!* looks in content and syntax like an antitype of the well-known opening sentence of the *Symbolum Athanasium* (also called *Quicumque* for short), which, although first attested from about 700 onwards, was ascribed to Athanasius and regarded as one of the three great Christian creeds throughout the Middle Ages; it begins: *Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est, ut teneat catholicam fidem* (*Rituale Romanum*, Vatican 1957, 857).

136 This *Chaveleus* is arbitrarily used by T as *Quavelleux* to mean the third of four peoples in his second group of ten; cf. above n. 14!

rest – as well as for the singing in worship – was assigned to the Levites. Yet the heathens also had objects like this, as we can see e.g., in Curtius (3.3.9–11): when the Persian king went to war (who as oriental 'King of Kings' with universal claims was not unlike Baligant) the *Magi* (~ Persian priests) led from the front with the holy fire, singing a *patrium carmen*; the tenor of this scene is astonishingly similar to this part of the story in the Rol. But whether the poet knew of this scene or not – Baligant's great Anti-People of God needed, along with an Anti-Trinity, some kind of sacred war object with its own evil custodians: just as the Levites were descended from the People of God in the Old Testament, so the Anti-Levites were fittingly descended from the Anti-People of God in the Old Testament, the Canaanites.[137]

The epithet *les laiz* for the Canaanites in O 3238 and the fact that they are called *Chanineis* in V4 suggest that the poet's idea of them has been influenced by the cynocephali, or dog-headed people. There are many versions of the cynocephali motif[138] but we are interested mainly in the legend of Christopher because

---

137 It is therefore absurd even in this second place to understand the *Canelius* (as does Raamsdonck 1939, 33–39) as *cane-lituos* 'clarion-sounders': *lituus* does not survive anywhere in the Romance language group; to assume that the poet consciously invented this as a word that does not sound like French would suggest that any random nonsense could be part of the structure; the further assumption that he would have dropped the intervocalic -*t*- in a 'regular' fashion but then retained the -*u*- is extremely arbitrary; and the context of the song shows the *Chanelius* not blowing wind instruments but calling people to prayer.

138 The ancient world knew about *Kynokephaloi* in Africa and India (exhaustively PW s. v., cf. also Lecouteux 1981, 117–120). The dog-headedness was mostly taken literally; we should note the softer form of this idea in Solinus (30.8), however: *Cynamolgos aiunt habere caninos rictus et prominula ora* 'the Cynamolgs [already a synonym in Gk. for the *Kynokephaloi*, and then also in Pliny (6.195) for the Ethiophians *caninis capitibus*] are thought to have dog-like throats and rather protruding mouths' – a race of humans, therefore, whose protruding mouth and throat parts were reminiscent of dog snouts. The Indian cynocephali live on in the medieval Alexander literature; cf. the list of references in Lecouteux (1982, 2.24–27) and especially the *Çoinocifal [. . .] lait [!]* in the *Roman d'Alexandre* III 3113–3119; in the letter of Pharasmanes (Pfister 1976, 366–373) they are located in small numbers around the *Mare Rubrum*, the Persian Gulf (not the Red Sea!). In the meantime, in central Europe, evidently as a result of literally interpreted accounts of Norse berserkers, belief in another kind of cynocephalus was formed, referring this time to the far north. Aethicus (8th c. at the latest) moves these *Cenocefali*, people *capite canino*, to an (unidentified) island of *Munitia* up there. Adam of Bremen (around 1075, 4.19 and 25) is familiar with these *cynocephali*: but now they have their head on their chest and are the children of Amazons. They live on in the Hereford Mappa Mundi and in that of Henry of Mainz (12th c., von den Brincken 1992, 152), and as a rumour in John of Plano Carpini (just before 1250, ed. van den Wyngaert 1929, 74).

this one links the cynocephali with the Canaanites.[139] In the Greek *Passio* of St. Christopher (oldest ms. 8th c.) this saint is described as a cynocephalus. The oldest Latin version of this *Passio* (AA.SS. Juli VI, 146–149; oldest mss. also 8th c., Rosenfeld 1937, 362) was included in the Mozarabic missal and breviary and was probably also known to the Aethicus Cosmographus (second half of the 8th c. at the latest), and certainly to Ratramnus of Corbie (before 865). Its author is unskilled both in linguistic and literary terms, and he does not use the term "cynocephalus" but his story begins: *regnante Dagno* in the Gk. texts: Δέκιος 'the emperor Decius', notorious persecutor of Christians, 240–251] *in civitate Samo homo venit de insula, genere Canineorum* [sic];[140] he is caught up in a cloud while praying fervently, and a heavenly voice tells him that he is now baptised; he then goes to the aforementioned town [which can only mean Samos] in *Syria*; he is brought before the king because of his *corpus hominis, caput autem canis* and then finally suffers martyrdom at the hands of the king, whereupon many other people are converted to the faith. We can see that, strictly speaking, almost nothing is said about the homeland of the *Caninei*; but rather this name merges the cynocephali and the Canaanites, so that the latter contribute the outline of the name *Can[.]n(a)ei das* and also the keyword Syria (although admittedly this does not match very well with *Samos*).[141] The saint remains a cynocephalus but not a Canaanite in the Greek tradition, and also in the Latin tradition for Ratramnus of Corbie[142] and for the anonymous rhythmic *Passio* of the 10th c.[143] He is both of these, however, in Walter of Speyer (983/984),[144] but the cynocephaly is deliberately toned down: *Erant [. . .] in eo maxime non erubescenda conditionis humanę vestigia. Longa enim, ut aiunt, et acuta facie Cynocephalum, id est canini capitis hominem, pretendens interioris hominis formam bonorum operum studuit ornare constantia* (p. 67).[145] From his *terra Cananea* he arrives in *quandam Syrię urbem nomine Samon*, where Dagnus holds the *sceptra Sirorum* (p. 26 and 70). In the Latin tradition after the lifetime of

---

139 The account that follows relies on Lecouteux (1981, 121–128, and 1982, 2.27s.), RAC and LCI s. v. *Christophorus*, Rosenfeld (1937, especially 347–366), Hallberg (1907 s. v. *Cynocephali*).

140 Lecouteux (1981, 121 n. 40) cites this place but accidentally omits *genere*.

141 According to the humanist Mombritius (1910, 364ss.) the Greek text and one of the Latin texts have *Antiochia* instead of *Samos* – which would fit with Syria! Even here, nothing explicit is said about the man's homeland, but he turns up in Antioch. Cf. on this also Rosenfeld (1937, 362).

142 Letter to Rimbert (MGH Ep.mer.&kar. 4.155–157, or PL 121.1153–1156).

143 MGH PLAeC. 4.807–840.

144 MGH PLAeC. 5.26–63 (Verse Passion of Saint Christopher) and 64–79 (Prose Passion). Respectively: *Chananea propago*, *Chananeus*, *de terra Chananea* p. 26, 66, 67; *Cinocephalicę formę*, *Cynocephalum*, *Cynocephalicus vultus* p. 26, 67, 68.

145 This is reminiscent of Solinus; cf. above n. 138!

Walter, Christopher is no longer a cynocephalus, but "only" a giant (as in the Old Testament, e.g., *Num* 13.22, where giants were the previous inhabitants of Canaan before the Hebrew people arrived).[146]

In summary then, the hypothesis is likely to be true, that the Roland poet was inspired by the Christopher legend to qualify the term *Canelius* as *les laiz* and thus allude to cynocephaly. The saga largely takes place in a vaguely defined 'Syria' and so there is no reason to locate the *Chanelius* anywhere other than the place described above: east and especially north of the Holy Land stretching as far as the region around the Euphrates, i.e., into Syria.

On [2]: The ancient region of *Hyrcania* is southeast of the Caspian Sea, more or less today's province of Golestan in Iran, where the capital Gorgan carries the old name of this place (Old Pers. *Wṛkāna* 'Wolf's land' > Middle Pers. *Gorgan*). The Caspian Sea was called the Hyrcanian Ocean until well into the Middle Ages.[147]

The *Hyrcani* in Alexander's army against Darius III formed an elite unit of six thousand horsemen (this can be read in Latin in Curtius 3.2.6); the associated renown of Hyrcanian horse breeding is reflected in the fact that about a dozen OF epics mention *chevaus d'Orcanie*, *chevaus Orcanois* (cf. Moisan s. v.). Referring to the year 329 B.C., Jerome's chronicle of Eusebius (ed. Helm[2] p. 123s., taken up in Orosius 3.18.5), mentions that Alexander subdued the *Hyrcani*. As we would expect, *Hyrcania* also appears in the late classical Latin Alexander literature,[148] moreover in interpolated versions of the medieval Latin Alexander, that is to say the *Historia de preliis Alexandri Magni*,[149] and finally as *Orcanie*[150]

---

146 This specific cynocephalus-Canaanite contamination is present in two single texts, one Indian and one Norse, but this is irrelevant for our purposes. Aethicus (cf. n. 138) says that the neighbours of the *Cynocephali* in the far north called them *Cananei* (he does not say they actually were *Cananei*; for transmission from the Christopher legend see also Lecouteux 1981, 121). And in the extremely fanciful *Vita Macarii* (BHL 5104, oldest mss. 11th c., introduced by Paul Meyer 1878, 444 to discussion of *Canelius* because of a reference from Gaston Paris), a report of a supposed journey through India mentions the territory of the *Chananaei*, who were called *Cynocephali* by other people; the story then extends beyond Alexander's tracks to St. Macarius, just outside paradise on earth.

147 Pliny *n.h.* 6.36, 6.46 etc., Solinus 55.1, Isidore 14.3.9, *Tabula Peutingeriana*, Ibn Khordāḏ-beh, Idrīsī and in Miller (1895–1898, III, 135) Marino Sanudo's world map around 1320.

148 *Itinerarium Alexandri* (cap. 68, 70, 72) in relation to the flight and death of Darius.

149 Cf. Bergmeister 1975: Zacher 1 = PfisterI 2= Hilka (1920) 10 and Zacher 77 = Hilka 150–152.

150 The phonology is perhaps influenced by Armen. *Wrkan* 'Hyrcania' (< Old Pers.), but it was quickly understood as a derivation from Lat. *Orcus*. Among the Latin writers, Robert de Torigni may have had the form *Orcania*, at least according to de Mandach 1990, 5 with n. 6 (unfortunately with no exact source; I have not been able to find the name in Robert's *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, ed. van Houts, nor in his *Chronica*, ed. Howlett). The Orkneys are also

in the Old French *Roman d'Alexandre* I 1132. In the *chansons de geste* genre, the epithet *Daire d'Orcaigne* 'Darius of Hyrcania' in the *Saisnes* is certainly connected with this trail of evidence.

Yet medieval fascination for this land appears to be thanks to the geographers, rather than the historians.[151] It is famous for its wild animals, especially tigers (*Aeneid* 4.367, Pliny 8.66, Solinus 17.4–11, Isidore 9.2.42 and 14.3.33); but its *gens silvis aspera* (Isidore 14.3.33) stands out because of its brutishness: the Hyrcanians throw their dead to the dogs for food (Cicero *Tusc.* 1.108). This wildness is probably also the reason why *Hyrcania / Hircania* appears on almost all medieval world maps, and usually in the right place.[152] An ambiguity made them even wilder: Isidore (14.3.32) talks about *Scythia* and *Hyrcania* together and says that certain tribes in that area *carnibus humanis et eorum sanguine vivunt*. The sentence could mean *Scythia*, since this claim had been a *topos* for that place and its neighbours since Herodotus (4.18 and 106); however, it was also applied to *Hyrcania* on a few medieval world maps (Miller 1895–1898, III, 101). Even Fulcher (3.49.8s.) the historian of the Crusades was fascinated by the *Hyrcani* as *gens silvis aspera* complete with tigers and panthers.

It is not surprising, then, that *Orcanie / Orquenie* and its *Orcaneis / Orqueneis* was a welcome additional Islamic land and people to authors of countless *chansons de geste* from the *Prise d'Orange* onwards, and that the inhabitants are called *irés* in our text because of their wildness. The name *Val Fuït* is also a suitable name for a territory that is full of wild animals and interchangeable with the vast and desolate land of *Scythia*. In geographical terms, the Hyrcanians are less clearly connected to Bālis than the Canaanites, but they are still a possibility because they undoubtedly belong to the core territory of Islam.

It is not easy, then, to decide in v. 3238 between [1] the Canaanites and [2] the Hyrcanians. Apart from the stemmatic reasons set out above, I have opted for the Canaanites (against Stengel and de Mandach,[153] but with all the editors

---

called *Orcanie* in the Middle Ages, which gives rise to curious uncertainties between the two meanings in some cases (cf. de Mandach 1990, 6 with secondary literature); yet we can see that these come about through homonymy, and not through the meanings, and so they are of minor interest to us.

151 Rome only ever came into actual contact with the Hyrcanians on one occasion, when this group launched a rebellion against the Parthians around 50 A.D. and wanted to forge an alliance with Rome (Tacitus *ann.* 14.25.2).

152 Cf. Miller (1895–1898, I 49, III 13, 25, 38, 101 etc.), Hallberg (1907, 253s.), Edson et al. (2005, 43, 63, 66, 71, 73).

153 De Mandach (1990, 5ss.) proceeds here with a very unsatisfactory methodology. He does not seem to be interested in the assonance; he also completely ignores the stemma issues here (as in other places in the same essay) – as if Bédier's famous justification of Müller's stemma,

from Bédier onwards); because *les laiz* fits astonishingly well with the Canaan-
ites-Cynocephali, just as *irés* fits with the Hyrcanians, but only the former does
justice to the laisse. It is understandable that β did not recognise the *Canelius*
in the purely geographical context of v. 3238, but then did recognise them in
the more religious context of v. 3269.

On [3] In Anna (1.14.4 etc.) Κάνινα, today's Kaninë in Albania, is always linked
with Ἰεριχώ, the neighbouring place called Orikum today. The objection we
raised above to Grégoire's identification (s. v. *cels de Jericho*, A.1.1.8) also ap-
plies here: there is no reason why a random town belonging to the Basileus
that was conquered by Bohemund should appear at a random place in the cata-
logue of peoples – and far apart from its sister town at that. Grégoire/de Keyser
(1939, 277s.) have to accept that some overlap of the Canaanite (~ cynocephali)
meaning is relevant here because this is what explains the function of the peo-
ple from Kanina as heathen priests. Why then do they not accept that it means
the Canaanites themselves? And a phonological low point is reached when they
suggest that *Fuït* in *Val Fuït* is the Albanian River Vojussa/Vjosë.

A.1.2.2 Second and third *eschiele*: *de Turcs, de Pers*

They share the same verse and are also discussed together here: *de Turcs e [. . .]
de Pers* O 3240, *uon den chunen Deden, die dritten uon den Peren* K (*von Sulten
und von Perre* Stricker, *van Esdos, van Pers* the *Karlmeinet*), in CV7 the whole
verse is missing:[154] the *Sulten* in Stricker are anticipated from the next verse but

---

Segre's expositions (1960) against the supposed *tradizione fluttuante* in the Rol. and Segre's
book of 1974 had never existed.

154 Since CV7 have skipped the *Turcs* and the *Pers*, leaving the narrative two units short,
they will insert two *eschieles* later after their fifth *eschiele* (which equates to the seventh *es-
chiele* of the main narrative): one referring to *des roi de Ro(c)hès* and the other to the *roi de
Mont Pant(h)ès*. *Ro(c)hès* is the town in southeast Anatolia/Upper Mesopotamia which has
been called *Edessa* since the time of Alexander (after the capital of Macedonia), and this name
was used by the Byzantines and often by the crusaders and European historians who followed
the example of the Byzantines. In pre-Hellenistic times it was called Ὀρρόη/ Ὀσρόη (and the
surrounding area then Osrhoëne), Armen. *Uřha(y),* Turk. *Urfa* (today officially Şanlıurfa 'glori-
ous Urfa'), Arab. *ar-Ruhā'*, pronounced approximately as /(ær)rŏhẹ/, from which OF and Old
Occ. often have /rŏẹs/, written as *Ro(h)ais*, *Rohès* etc., with the Fr. local *-s*, which was still
very much alive, even in the time of the Crusades, as in *Baudas* < *Baghdād*, *Gadres* < *Gaza* (+
-r-), *Rames* < *Ramla*, *Jaffes* < *Yāfā* etc. It is well known that the fall of the town in 1144 caused a
stir in the whole of Europe and led to the disastrous Second Crusade. CV7 evidently come up
with this name because of the *-ẹs* rhymes. *Mont-Pant(h)ès* can be considered a freely invented
name unless evidence to the contrary is found.

one, that is to say they correspond to the *Soltras* in O, and we shall discuss them at that point.[155] The explanation why the *Deden* and the *Esdos* are both in place of the *Turcs* is complicated and is provided in the footnote below.[156] There is another reason why *Turcs* should be included in the archetype: *L'altre est de* (or *d'*) in the first half verse can only be followed by a monosyllabic word starting with a consonant, or a disyllabic word starting with a vowel (both + optional ə); but there is no sign of the latter. *Pers* is confirmed via OK (as well as Stricker and *Karlmeinet*).

The *Turcs* appear on two more occasions, and as elite troops or reserves for the attack: 1) *Turcs* O 3284, *Turcli* V4, *Turs* CV7, *Tertres* P, and 2) *Turcs* O 3518, *Turcles* V4, *Turs* CV7. Here it is clear that *Turcs* belongs in the archetype. The undisputed meaning is [a] *Turcs* 'Turks' and [b] *Pers* the 'Persians'.

On [a]: There is no need for any references to show that the Turks belonged to "hard core" of the Islamic forces in the crusader age. We should remember, however, that the term *Turks* was used in a geographically much broader sense than it is today. In Anatolia the crusaders quickly learned to tell the difference between the two great dominions of the Rūm Seljuks in the west and south and the Dānishmendids in the north and east: the former were their main enemy all the way through Anatolia, while the latter captured Bohemund in 1100 and decimated the stragglers after the end of the Crusade. However, a great many Turks had not (or not yet) settled in Anatolia. By around 1040 the Seljuk Turks had partly Turkified Khurāsān (and occupied the rest of Iran). Shortly 1050 they had Turkified Azerbaijan for good, and some had spread out on the northern side of the Black Sea towards the west. In 1055 the Seljuk leader had captured Baghdad, and even in the 12th c. the political and military centre of the Turks as a whole continued to be with the Grand Sultan in Mesopotamia around Baghdad. Powerful Turkish groups had also brought the whole of Syria under their control (including Jerusalem from 1076–1098), where they often fought against each other and sometimes against their own overlord in Baghdad, while also consistently defending Aleppo and Damascus against the crusaders.[157] There were also later groups who migrated out of Central Asia and then merged into

---

155 Segre has included further readings from β here, which obviously belong in one of the two following verses; I discuss them at those later points.

156 There are a few references in OF (*Mélusine, Octevien*) to the variant *To(u)rc* with /ǫ~u/ (< modern Gk. Τοῦρκοι or Arab. *turk*) instead of *Turc* with /y/ (< Turk. *türk*). This variant explains the origin of *Deden*: *d-* via the German merger of stops, *-e-* misread from *-o-*, *r*-abbreviation overlooked, *-d* a misreading of *-cſ*, German plural ending. Similarly, *van Esdos* < des *Tor(c)s*.

157 Cf. for example EI, Art. *Saldjūḳides*, Part IV: *Les Saldjūḳides de la Syrie*.

established parts of the Turkish domain. This means that in our context it is not clear whether and exactly how this term 'Turk' could be narrowed down; we must be prepared to meet other specific Turkish groups later.

On [b]: And now for the Persians! OF *pers* as an adj. means 'blueish, livid'; thus in v. 1979 the dying Olivier's face is *pers*. Noyer-Weidner (1969, 55–57) rightly points out that it carries a dark symbolic meaning. In this case he also accepts the geographical meaning 'Persian' as "natural". Not quite, we might think, with a trace of irony. *Pers* as a singular would look like the phonologically regular form from Lat. *Perses* (the alternative to *Persa*), but this is nowhere to be found in OF as an ethnonym, neither as a noun, nor as an adjective. Occasionally, we do find in OF the forms *persis* (as an adj. v. 3304, 3354) or *perseis /-ois*, which after 1150 quickly recede in favour of *persan(t)* > modern Fr. *Persan* (Moisan, Flutre s. vv.; more on 'Persian' in Fr. in Klingebiel 1984, reference to this in Schweickard 1992, 77 n. 117). Here, too, the Roland poet has modified the ethnicon somewhat, in order to let the symbolic value shine through.

Today's Iraq was also part of the Old Persian and Parthian empires, and then a central part of the mid Persian empire, and so in the Middle Ages it continued to be regarded as part of 'Persia'. Just as the Romans sometimes thought of Babylon as a 'Persian' town,[158] the Carolingians thought of the Arab Harūn ar-Rashīd in Baghdad as *Aaron rex Persarum*,[159] and later, the historians of the Crusades even thought of the Seljuk Grand Sultan as *Soldanus Persiae* (*Gesta Francorum* 21 and later), S*oltanus scilicet imperator Persidis* (Fulcher 1.15.7), *Soltanus scilicet rex Persarum* (Fulcher 1.19.1) or just *rex Persarum* (Raoul de Caen cap. 72), and according to PT cap. 21 Marsirus and Beliguandus were sent from *admirandus Babilonis de Perside* to Spain.

These appellations were based to some extent on ethnicity. The Persian Empire had succumbed to Islam in 651, but just two hundred years later, Persians constituted the Caliph's bodyguard, and from 850 to 1050 they contributed at least as much to the expansion of Islamic power in Asia as the Arabs did. When Baghdad was occupied by the Turks (in 1055), they begin to fall behind the Turks, but (for cultural reasons) they do not retreat into irrelevance. The crusaders also often subsumed the Kurds, who spoke an Iranian language, into the *Persae*. Indeed, as lord of Mosul, Kerbogha, who was a Turk, had many Kurds in the large army which he hoped would annihilate the crusaders near Antioch.

---

158 Cf. Propertius 3.11.21, Lucan 6.449, Augustine *enarr. in ps.* 64.2.
159 Royal Frankish Annals for the years 801, 803, 807, Einhart *Vita Karoli* 16, Notker *Gesta Karoli* 2.8, 2.9.

All of these circumstances meant that in the minds of the crusaders and people in Catholic Europe more generally, there was a considerable overlap between the terms 'Turks' and 'Persians'. Thus Raoul de Caen, Tancred's historian, calls Kerbogha's soldiers indiscriminately *Persae* (cap. 72s., 81s., 86, 91) or *gens Persica* (cap. 88) or *Turci* (cap. 73s., 78, 83s., 87, 90, 92).

It is understandable, therefore, that the Roland poet does not quite identify them, but names them in one breath. And certainly by the time the events at Antioch occurred, there could be no doubt in the West that the Turks and the Persians, both taken in this wider sense, were *the* very central core of Islamic power. They also fit well geographically alongside the people named before them, whether these are Canaanites or Hyrcanians.

A.1.2.3 Fourth *eschiele*: *de Pinceneis [. . .]*

De Pinceneis [. . .] Segre 3241, *de Pinceneis et de Pers* O (+1!); *uon den Promten* K (as 'fifth'; *von Tronten* Stricker, *van Fers* the *Karlmeinet*), *(des) Proparte divers* CV7 (as 'third'): In *pincen(eis)* the *-in-* could be misread as *-m-* and the *-c-* as *-t-*; since **pmten-* was unpronounceable, it would be logical to see the *p-* as the abbreviation for the prefix *pro-*, which only differs from the standard *p* in that the loop underneath bisects the main stem to the left (Cappelli 1961, XXXVIII and 257, Bischoff 2009, 214): thus K read *promten*. Others added the customary transitional *-p-*: **promptē* or **prŏptē*; if the two nasal tildes in the latter joined up, then the result was an abbreviation for *-ar-* (Cappelli 1961, XXIV, Bischoff 2009, 211, example *marca*); so that the reading became *proparte*: as in CV7. In *et de Pers* in O the repetition of *de Pers* from the previous verse is a careless mistake; but the verse is only one syllable too long now, and not three. How do we explain this? The Roland poet in citing two equally important names regularly uses the *de X et de Y* structure, despite many opportunities to use either asyndetic placement (**de X, de Y*) or just a single *de* (**de X et Y*),[160] and this means that there is no room for a second people name at the end of the verse. In fact, therefore, instead of *de Pers* there must have been a disyllabic adjective with a negative meaning in this place, and as Roncaglia (1946–1947, 106) observed, this is exactly what the *divers* 'méchants' from CV7 is. The archetype therefore probably had: *Et la quarte est de Pinceneis divers.*

The meaning, which appears to be undisputed, is the [1] 'Pechenegs'.

---

160 This is the case not just for names but also for appellatives with a single exception where we cannot check O using other mss.: *d'or et argent* v. 645, as opposed to *d'or et d'argent* v. 32, 100, 130.

On [1]: In the 8th c. the Pechenegs were still living around the Aral Sea. As they were migrating westwards, they forged an alliance with the Bulgarians and drove the Hungarians out of southern Russia, where they then settled; in 914, 968 and 972 they were allied with the Byzantines, and in 944 with the Russians. In 1007 Bruno of Querfurt set out from Kiev to convert them but did not succeed. A few bands of Pechenegs got as far as Hungary in 1068 and 1071, but they were defeated and settled there as mounted border guards. The Pechenegs' main army was roundly defeated by the Russians in 1036, and raided the territory of Byzantine Empire in 1048, but then suffered defeat there too; in 1090, they threatened Constantinople and were only vanquished when Emperor Alexios set the advancing Cumans upon them (Anna 7.5.1–8.6.2). On the other hand, we find Pecheneg mercenaries in the service of the Byzantines as early as 949, and then consistently between 1069 and 1107 (Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 281–283, Grégoire 1942, 63); in this role they fought against the Normans who attacked the Byzantine Empire in 1081–1085 and 1107, and they were also involved in conflicts with the crusaders who were peacefully passing through in 1096/1097 and 1101 (Chalandon, 1900, 185, 229, Bédier 1927, 51). In 1122, the Pecheneg main army, attacking Byzantium once again, was decisively defeated by Emperor John Komnenos, and the survivors settled inside the empire (Golden 1990, passim; LM s. v. *Petschenegen*). The Roland poet evidently sees them being – in the Carolingian period – a south Russian people.

Their name in Turkish is *Päčänäg* etc.[161] In Greek there is no /tš/ or /š/ and no final /g/, and so they are called *Πατζινάκοι* (also *Πατζινακῖται*). In the Latin area non-Romanophone authors (such as Thietmar of Merseburg, a relative of Bruno of Querfurt, *Chron.* 6.55 etc.) call them *Pizenaci, Pezineigi* etc., and in Romance-speaking authors from the time of the First Crusade at the latest, they are *Pinc(i/e)n(n)a-ti/-tes/-rii* (RHC Occ. 3 and 5, Register). As the *pinc-* shows, connotations from OF *pincier* 'to pinch, bite, steal' had been introduced, even before the poet of the Rol. came to write his work. In other *chansons de geste* they are called *Pincenarz* (with the vulgarising suffix *-art*), and their country is called *Pincenie* or *Pincernie* (with intrusion of the "epic" toponym suffix *-erne*[162]); the Roland poet has given them the suffix *-eis < -ēnsis*.[163] Even the Alexander epic had to include this country: Alexander's father Philip wants to repudiate Olympias

---

161 As in LM s. v.; Golden 1992, 264, s.v. *Pečenäk/Bečenäk* provides a list of attested forms of the name, including even some from Tibetan and Hungarian texts.
162 Cf. below on *Oluferne* (A.2.4).
163 The name possibly had a connotation of 'nose' as well as 'bite' (**pince-nés* 'nose pincher'), which then was obscured by the change of suffix.

and marry a princess from *Pincernie* (I 1802), and the *duc de Pincenie* is one of the advisers to the *amiral de Babilloine* (déc. A 3972 and V 8060).

In both the Greek and Latin cultural areas, the real Pechenegs had a terrible reputation.[164] Bohemund made good use of this when some of the Basileus' 'terrifying' Pecheneg mercenaries fell into his hands: he brought them before the Pope (Anna 12.8.4s.) thus persuading the Pope to grant him a legate to go back to France with him and recruit for his "crusade" against Alexios. The Nibelungenlied (1340.2) also mentions *die wilden Petschenære* in Attila's court. Similarly, *divers* in the Rol. is anything but a filler word. The Lat. *diversus* (< *dis-versus*) has two basic meanings: 1) 'facing apart' (> 'many-faceted', and also 'inconstant, changeable'); 2) 'not facing the right way' (> 'hostile'). In OF the negative nuances are very pronounced: Godefroy s. v. suggests mostly references for 'méchant, cruel, pervers' – and this is what was meant in the archetype.

A.1.2.4 Fifth *eschiele*: *de Soltras e d'Avers*

De Soltras e d'Avers O 3242, *uon den Sulten, die ůneferren* (ed. *uone Ferren*) dar unter K (as 'fourth'; *von Sulten*[165] [. . .] Stricker, *van Fers* the *Karlmeinet*), *des Solteins et des Comès* C, *des Solitains et des Res* V7 (in CV7 as 'second'): The first people in O is *ſolt'aſ*, which editors (e.g. Segre) render as *Soltras* or (e.g. Hilka/Pfister) as *Solt(e)ras*. The first form aims to do justice to the metrical need for two syllables; the latter is chosen because O has written *la terce* as *la t'ce* (that is, with ' for syllabic -*er*-); however the brackets also indicate the metrical requirement of two syllables. In β this corresponds to *Soltains* (*Solitains* is too long). At the top of the stemma, the contradiction between *Solt(e)ras* O and *Soltains* β shows that either an -*(e)r* abbreviation has been misread as a nasal tilde, or vice versa. In the second people, the *dauers* in O is distorted to *deuers* (~ *de Vers*) in β. This becomes *uone Ferren / van Fers* in K and the *Karlmeinet* (for writers of German in the 12th–14th c. *v* [~ consonantal u] and *f* have the same meaning, i.e., voiceless lenis) and in V7 it even becomes *deu res*, interpreted as *des res*. Finally, the *Comès* (< *Comains*) in C are the 'Cumans', a substitution which makes sense in terms of the meaning.

The [a] *Soltras/Soltains* are more likely to be [a1] the Sugdeyans in Crimea than [a2] a plural of the term "sultan" or an ethnicon derived from that, and

---

164 Cf. Chalandon 1900, 3, n. 5. And e.g., the scholium 17 (18) on Adam of Bremen (ed. Schmeidler p. 80.19s., ed. Trillmich p. 254): *crudelissimam gentem Pescinagos qui humanis carnibus vivent.*

165 These are the *Sulten* from the verse before the last, who were discussed above s. v. *Turcs, Pers* (A.1.2.2).

they are not [a3] the Sogdians, a trading people on the Silk Road, nor[a4] the Stodorans, a Slavic people in the Havelland, nor[a5] the inhabitants of Soltaniyeh in Persia. I regard any reference to [a6] the word *sauterelles* as an error. The [b] *Avers* are the Avars.

On [a1]: Today's Sudak, on the southeast coast of Crimea, was the very important trading town of *Sugdea*, *Soldaia* etc. in the Middle Ages. It has an Iranian name; some scholars link it with the well-known central Asian Sogdians (cf. below [a3]), likewise a trading people with an Iranian name, and regard this town as being originally a trading colony of the Sogdians.[166] In the Latin tradition, the town is familiar to the Geographus Ravennas in around 700,[167] who sees it situated between the (Crimean) Goths (in south west Crimea) and the town of Phanagoria (opposite the eastern point of Crimea), which is exactly the right spot. In the 8th c. it was the residence of a Greek bishop and then probably came under Khazar rule, but shortly after the demise of the Khazar empire (around 1000) it came back under Byzantine control.[168] Epiphanius (9th c.) knows of an 'Upper Σουγδαία' in his description of the journeys of the Apostle Andrew, located on the eastern side of the Sea of Azov. The hagiographical tradition around the Apostle of the Slavs Constantine/Cyril states that he spent a considerable time in Crimea around 860, and it refers to the Σοῦγδοι as a people (!) located between the (Crimean) Goths and the Iberians (~ Georgians). Around 960 the town, known as *Sogdia*, also had a large Jewish community which survived until the time of Benjamin of Tudela around 1170. In the middle of the 11th c. Sugdea actually came under the control of the Cumans, who ruled it until the middle of the 13th c., but tolerated, among others, a strong Greek element in the population.

　　The town's location, the keywords Khazars, Jews and perhaps also the Sogdians, and the Cumans' toleration of Greeks all indicate that the town was a long-distance trading centre, and indeed it was obviously in competition with

---

166 As argued, e.g., by Haussig (1992, 155). It is true that in Arab. Sughdāq is attested meaning both the town in Crimea and the Sogdian people (cf. EI, Art. *al-Sughd* and *Sughdāk*). Das RussEW s. v. Судáк links the name with Ossetian *suydäg* 'holy'; Ossetian is another Iran. language.

167 Geographus Ravennas 4.5: *Sugdabon* (from the Gk. gen. pl. Σουγδαίων, misreading -*bo*- < -*ίω*-).

168 On this and the following items: ODB, Art. *Sougdaia* and *Black Sea*; EI, Art. *Sughdāḳ*; LM s. v. *Sugdea, Chazaren, Chersonnesos*; EJ (Supplementary volume, 1988–89), Art. *Krimchaks*, col. 373. It is difficult to harmonise the information in these articles, and this reflects the lack of harmony in their sources.

Kherson some 120 km to the west, which was almost continuously in Byzantine hands at least until the 11th c., and probably even until after 1200.

Around 1150, when Idrīsī was writing in Sicily, amidst the still Francophone elite within King Roger's Norman state, he cites this name in a new form: $S^*lṭāṭiya$,[169] with -lṭ- instead of -gd-. As the hypercorrect *nevold* in O shows, for example,[170] the preconsonantal <l> was already vocalised by then. This semivowel -u̯- was also the best substitution for the fricative /ɣ/; just as Arab. /baɣdād/ (or modern Gk. Βαγδά/Βαγδᾶ, also with /ɣ/) > OF *Baldas/Baudas*, Turk. (Arabised) /tuɣtikin/ > *Tol-/Tuldequinus* when spoken by the (Francophone) crusaders (cf. RHC Occ. 3, Indices), so this now happened to Gk. Σουγδαία (which had long been pronounced with /ɣ/).[171] Idrīsī's form has therefore passed through a Norman intermediate stage, more exactly through the written Latinised *Soldadia*.[172] The Norman intermediate stage shows that the south Italian Normans, who were naturally interested in Byzantine affairs, were also interested in far-away Sugdea at that time.

In Idrisi's form of the name, the -l-, but not the -ṭ-, anticipates the future trend: -gd was soon to be replaced by -ld-. For between 1250 and 1475 Sugdea experienced a golden age, under the aegis of first the Venetians and then the Genoese. There are some references that are interesting from a Francophone perspective: Simon of Saint-Quentin (passed through this area around 1247; ed. Richard p. 76): (Lat.) *Sugdania* 'eastern or south eastern Crimea', a notable name because it refers to a region from which we may conclude the name *Sugdani (in Fr. *Soldain/*Soudain) for the inhabitants; William of Rubruck (passed through the town, or close by it, in 1253/1254; ed. van den Wyngaert 1929, 166, 167, 170, 191, 209): (Lat.) *Soldaia* and *Soldainorum* (gen. pl.) for the inhabitants; Marco Polo: *Soldadie* according to probably the oldest, i.e. Franco-Italian version (ed. Ronchi, cap. 2 and 3), *Soldaie* according to the entirely French version (ed. Ménard et al., cap. 1s.),[173] *Soldania* according to the Tuscan and Venetian versions (ed. Bertolucci Pizzorusso, ed.

---

169 In Idrīsī 6.5 (in the Jaubert edn. 2.395). In the French translation (1999, 455) in *Sl*ṭâṭia* the unwritten vowel is mistakenly placed after the -l- instead of before it; since all short vowels are generally unwritten, we can interpret this simply as /ŏ/ or /ŭ/.

170 V. 824 etc. (7x); and also, *nevolz* 2420, *nevuld* 216, 2876, *nëuld* 171, 2894.

171 Cf. Adrados (2001, 230).

172 However, the *Zibaldone da Canal* (Venice, 14th c.) has *Salldadia* as well as *Salldaia* (Cardona 1989, 337 n. 6).

173 The edn. has *Soladaÿe* three times in the text according to the mss. B1, B2, but *Soldaÿe* in the (Old French) rubric; according to the commentary, however, A, B4, B5, C and D have only *Soldaïe*, the only form that can be historically evidenced.

Ruggieri, ed. Barbieri/Andreose, at the same places);[174] *Sodaya* appears in a Catalan map of the 14th c. (probably < Fr. *Soudaie*), *Soldana* in 1452 in the work of Venetian cartographer Giovanni Leardo (Hallberg 1907, 482). *Soldana/Soldania* have already been influenced by It. *soldano* 'Sultan', and the *Soltains* in the Roland archetype by OF *soltain* 'solitaire, écarté'.

Explicit statements about the trading town's significance are found in Rubruck and Marco. According to Rubruck, it was the greatest hub for traders of Russian fur and those of Turkish cotton, silk and spices, and it therefore linked up the long-distance trades of eastern Europe with those of the Middle East. Marco's uncle had a counting house in Sugdea, and his father and another uncle set out in 1260 on their famous oriental journey which took them via Constantinople and Sugdea all the way to Peking; Sugdea was therefore on a branch of the Silk Road.

This hypothesis fits in perfectly with the geography of the Pechenegs and the Avars, meaning peoples of the south Russian steppe. The significance of the town, the way its name is also used for the region, and the Norman interest in this place all make perfect sense.

On [a2]: Gottfried Baist (1902, 222), appears to have rather clumsily interpreted the word as 'Sultan', suggesting it was used by mistake as a people name – and Gaston Paris (1902a, 418 n. 3) objected to this immediately.

Arab. *sulṭān* '(rightful) lordship' shifted very early from the abstract meaning to a word for 'ruler' (much like our personalised 'Your Majesty') and it was "long since a part of the current vocabulary" when in 1055 the Seljuks captured Baghdad and it was given to the Seljuk leader as an official title by the now powerless, but still highly respected religious Caliph in that town (Setton 1969a, 146). Other Muslim rulers later included this word in their titles, in a chronological order that is difficult to unpack; but in the period and region that interest us, the only one seems to have been Sulaymān ibn Kutalmış around 1080.[175] Among the Greek writers, Kedrenos is already using σουλτᾶνος referring to the year 1057 and Skylitzes referring to 1081 (Sophocles s. v.). But the word is particularly

---

174 According to the EI some (unspecified) Italian sources also have *Soldachia*, corresponding to the Arab. *Sughdāq* and Russ. Судáк. In fact, the older Marco Polo, an uncle of the famous explorer, stipulated in his will (Venice, 5 August 1280) that his house in *Soldachia* should be bequeathed to the Franciscans located there, after the death of his son Nicolo and his daughter Maroca who were living in that area (Yule 1903, 1.25s., n. †, cited from the reprint of 1993). The form ending in *-dadia*, *-dadie* may have arisen from a misreading <ch> ~ <di>.

175 Cf. e.g., Cahen (1946–1948, 44); EI, Art. *Saldjūḳides*, col. 981. Similarly, Bancourt (1982a, 847).

familiar, as mentioned above, to the historians of the First Crusade, referring to the Grand Sultan in Baghdad: *Soldanus Persiae* (*Gesta Francorum* 21 and later), *Soltanus scilicet imperator Persidis* (Fulcher 1.15.7), *Soltanus scilicet rex Persarum* (Fulcher 1.19.1), *princeps magnus et sceptriger Soldanus super omnes gentes orientalis plagae*, residing in *Corrozan* (~ Persia, Albert of Aachen 4.3). We can see how correctly they understood its meaning in the *Gesta* cap. 21 of the letter supposedly written by Corbaran to Baghdad: *Caliphae nostro apostolico ac nostro regi domino Soldano militi fortissimo*. In OF the word is found from the time of the *Roman d'Alexandre* (II 1661, 2621) onwards, and as we might expect, referring to oriental rulers, mostly with the definite article suggesting "the" Sultan of Baghdad, but e.g., in Joinville also the Sultan of Konia (cf. the dictionaries); 'Sultan' has here, as in the Latin sources, -*d*- or -*t*-, the latter in the *Alexandre* II tradition at 1661 (*soltain* B, *soutain* DFGP, *soustain* TY, but *soudain* CEIJLMNQRSU)[176] as in the *Folque de Candie* 11435 (*soutain*), in the *Eracles* 32.4 (*sotans*) and in the *Godefroi de Bouillon* 149 (*soutain*). It is hard to imagine that the Roland poet would make such a major semantic error, and so Baist's hypothesis seems facile up to this point.

Now -*ain* makes people names (useable adjectivally or as noun) cf. *Romain* and *Puillain* in the Rol. itself; the *Roman d'Alexandre* (II 648) has a *Gadrain* 'from Gadres (Gaza)', the *Eneas* has a *Libicain* 'Libyan'; instead of **Chartein* (< *Carnutēnus*) there is *Chart(r)ain* from the very beginning; alongside *Loherenc* and *Tolosan* we have *Loherain* and *Toulousain* early in the tradition, and these predominate later. Even someone who knew 'Sultan' very well could have understood **solta (i)n-ain* as a haplological 'sultanish, subject to the Sultan'.

This is not just a hypothesis. Schultz-Gora 1936 indicated in the glossary of his edition of the *Folque de Candie*, s. v. *soutain*, that the word was also used adjectivally: *guaite soutaine* 'Guard of the Sultan' v. 1825, *terre soutaine* 'land of the Sultan' v. 3796.

This requires a more precise semantic differentiation, however. When Godefroi quotes *Et trespasse Surie, une tiere soutaine* from the *Roman d'Alexandre* and intends the adjective to mean 'lonely, deserted' (i.e., mostly like a desert), he could well be right. The situation is different, however, in the *Retour de Cornumarant*, ed. Mickel v. 2693 (~ ed. Hippeau v. 2680): Cornumarant and his comrade disguise themselves as pilgrims to spy on France. They receive hospitality from Count Robert of Normandy, *et li quens lor demande de la tere sotaigne* 'he asked them about the Sultan's land'. We know that it should be translated like

---

176 The variants are from F. B. Agard in *The medieval French Roman d'Alexandre*, V, Princeton, Princeton U.P., 1942, 207.

this because of two parallel scenes: in v. 2635 (~ 2622) it was the Counts Stephan and Alain who wanted news from the pilgrims and *demanderent de la terre au sodain, / Et del verai sepulcre,* and finally in v. 2724 (~ 2711) in Metz, the Duke of Lorraine *assés lor demanda de Soudant de Persie.* Admittedly in the part which interests us, the reading *terre sotaigne* in ms. BC has been changed in EG to the broader *terre lointaingne*; the writer of their common source must therefore have thought that *sotaigne* was an error.[177]

A second such reference is to be found in the *Chevalier au Cygne* (v. 2340–42 ed. Nelson). There is a sword belonging to the traitorous Saxon Duke Espaul(l) art which is described without further explanation as follows: *Li fevres qui le fist en la Tere Soutaigne / Ot a non Dionises, l'escriture l'ensaigne, / Si fu freres Galant [. . .]* The Old French epic has taken the master smith Galant 'Wayland' from the Germanic saga, but without his Germanic narrative context; it just places him wherever the best, most indestructible swords are supposed to come from: in the Orient, sometimes in the ancient Orient.[178] I therefore think it very likely that this Dionises works in the 'Land of Sultan' as a kind of guarantee of quality.

If we assume that this 'sultanic' meaning is two to three generations older than the four references mentioned above, then the 'Sultanic people' in the catalogue could have been the people directly subject to the Sultan *par excellence*, the Grand Sultan in Baghdad.

This chronological assumption is not the only thing that lacks supporting evidence, however. The 'Sultanic people' would be a pleonastic term alongside the *Turcs* and *Pers*, and within the same *eschiele* they and the Avars would come from different sides of the Black Sea; this would mean two more crossings would be necessary, as compared with the Sugdeyans. In sum then, the 'sultanic' people score several negative points versus the Sugdeyans.

---

177 The editor of the *Chevalier au Cygne*, who was not yet aware of the *Retour de Cornumarant*, writes *en la Tere Soutaigne* with capital letters, but interprets this – obviously without a more specific idea – as 'in the wilderness'.

178 In the *Roman de Thèbes* Galant together with *dans Vulcans* has forged Tydeus' sword; in the *Chanson d'Antioche* Galant's handiwork passes from Alexander the Great to Vespasian before it ends up in the hands of the Saracens; in the *Chevalerie Ogier* (v. 9614 ed. Eusebi), one of his swords is finally owned by the Pharaoh, and he forged another one on an *ille des Perçois* (v. 10596, so that when in the *Narbonnais* the Saracen King Gadifier rules over Abilant [~ the biblical tetrarchy of Abilene in Palestine) and also over the *Ile Galant* this is supposed to be the same oriental island; in the *Garin de Monglane* the smith is called *Gallanëus*; in the *Fierabras* he has two brothers who are also master smiths, named *Munificans* and *Haurifas* (~ 'aurifax'), and so he evidently belongs to a Mediterranean family in some vague sense (cf. Beckmann 2004a, 13–16, 19s.) – just as in this case he has a brother called *Dionises*.

On [a3]: The Iranian Sogdians (Gk. Σόγδοι, Σογδιανοί, Lat. mostly *Sogdiani*) based around Maracanda, today's Samarkand in Uzbekistan, constituted a north-eastern border satrapy in the old Persian empire (Haussig 1992, 20, 104s.), and they played a similar role later in the Parthian empire; during the Greek interlude, Alexander founded cities in their territory (Solinus 49.3, Justinus 12.5) and they revolted against him several times (Curtius 7.4, 7.5.19–8.1). Mela 1.12 and 3.36 (*Sugdiani*) and Pliny *n.h.* 6.49 know of them by the Oxus and Jaxartes rivers to the south of Scythia. There are also a few unremarkable references in later sources: Ammian 23.6.59 (*Sogdii*), Martianus Capella 6.692, Avienus *periegesis* v. 916–917, Priscian *periegesis* v. 723, Geographus Ravennas 17 and a few medieval maps (Edson et al. 2005, 43, Hallberg 1907, 481). There were eight city states that lasted for a long time (Haussig 1992, 102, 147, 161, 169), but they never managed to establish a unified empire, and instead found themselves repeatedly being ruled by Hunnic tribes including the Hephthalites (Haussig 1992, 102, 143s., 161), and then by the Pers. Sassanians (Haarmann 2012, 248), apparently also by Turkish peoples (Haussig 1992, 147, 161–163,166) and briefly by the Chinese (Haussig 1992, 175, 213), before they were Islamised between 653 and 712. Yet it was precisely this lack of political significance that made it easy for them to become "the" trading people of the Silk Road: they had established trading posts in China in the 2nd c. A.D., were in Constantinople from the 6th c. (Haussig 1992, 74, 96, 140, 149–155, 166, 193); in pre-Islamic times they were instrumental in spreading Buddhism (Haussig 1992, passim), Christianity, especially of the Nestorian kind (Haussig 1992, 218–231), and Manichaeism (Haussig 1992, 232–241) across the vast territories of Central Asia. They succumbed to Turkification when in the 10th c. increasing numbers of Turkish tribes embraced Islam and migrated into Sogdia.

Curtius makes Alexander's battles with the Sogdians sound dramatic and full of human interest but there is no great opposing figure like Darius or Porus and nothing wonderful to report; consequently, the Sogdians are altogether lacking in the account by Julius Valerius, and also in the medieval versions of the Latin Alexander Romance (*Historia de preliis*, versions J[1], J[2], J[3]), and they make only rare appearances in the rest of the Alexander tradition.[179] In particular, Isidore does not mention the people, nor the country, in the geographical parts of his *Etymologiae*, the "encyclopaedia" of the Middle Ages. Finally, in the OF Alexander epic and in the *chansons de geste* there is no trace even of

---

[179] In the early *Itinerarium Alexandri* (around 340), § 79, 86, 96 bis 99, they are unremarkable, and even more so in the *Metz Epitome* (approximately 10th c. ed. Thomas) 14.

their name.[180] This, and the fact that no names without -i- (and none with -t-) are attested, makes an identification of the *Soltains* in the song with the Sogdians rather improbable.

On [a4]: The Stodorans in today's Brandenburg were suggested by Boissonnade (1923, 176) as an interpretation of *Solt(e)ras* in O. Around 950 the Arab. geographer Masʿūdī (trans. Pellat et al., § 905–909) describes a people in the area stretching from today's North Germany to the Czech Republic (which was known to his sources from an eastern European perspective) between the Wilzi/Lutici (mainly in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) and the Doudleb (in Bohemia), called the *Uṣṭutrāna* (the initial vowel probably comes from the Arab.). But subsequently it turned out that the Stodorans, the south-western part of the Lutici federation, only captured the area roughly around Brandenburg-Potsdam-Spandau-Rathenow, a rectangular territory measuring about 60 x 30 km. In Ger. they were rarely known by the name they called themselves, but by the term Heveller, Helvelder 'Havellanders, residents of the banks of the Havel'; the comparative frequency of references is 6 against more than 30 (Hermann, 1985, 13). Alfred the Great in his extended version of Orosius' description of Europe took the name from the Ger.: *Wilte þe mon Hæveldan hætt* 'these Wilzi/Lutici, that are called Hevelders', and so not: Stodorans. These are all the Latin references: Thietmar of Merseburg 4.29 on the year 997 *Stoderaniam, qui Hevellun dicitur*; *Ann. Quedlinburgenses* on the year 997 *Ztodorania*; Adam of Bremen 2.21.12 *Stoderani*; Helmold of Bosau (3x) *Stoderani*; particularly valuable is the only mention by a Slavic author (†1125): Cosmas of Prague 1.15 *de durissima gente Luticensi, ex provincia Stodor* (cf. e.g., Niederle 1927, 143 n.1). There is no evidence that the name they used for themselves was ever taken up in western Europe.[181]

The Havellanders participated in the Lutici revolt of 983, which for a century and a half thwarted Ottonian attempts to Germanise the region; in 1150 their land was inherited by Albert the Bear, who used it to expand his "Northmark" into "Mark Brandenburg" and put an end to paganism in the region, but in 1157 he had to put down a revolt.

The phonological issues look hopeless. As all Medieval-Latin forms, whether written by Germans or by a Czech, begin with *St-*, Medieval (North) German, too,

---

180 Cardona's otherwise superbly documented work (1989, 337) notes laconically: "*Soydi ha dato in francese Soldains*" – though what makes him so sure is not specified.

181 The only trace of the Adam tradition that leads to France is a fragment attested there in the 16th c., and for which de Mandach (1993, 250–254) prepared a special edition of cap. 2.16–2.22. Even though he thought the fragment was very important, he did not equate the *Stoderani* with the *Soltras*.

evidently had *St-* (/st-/, not /ʃt-/ !), and this would have resulted in Wallonian and Lorrain French *st-*. In 'normal' French, it would have resulted in *est-*, since at that time initial *e-* was still added in new loans: *Estace* 'Statius' (Fr. later *Stace*) in the *Roman de Thèbes* (v. 2738, 7464) and in the *Rou* (*Chron. ascendante* v. 15), *Escanze* 'Scand(z)ia, Scandinavia' in the *Rou* (old *Première partie* v. 181), *li arcevesques Estiganz* 'archbishop Stigand' (an Anglo-Saxon!) in Beneeit's *Chronique* (v. 40240), *Estanfort* 'Stamford/Stanford' in the same work (v. 41297) and in the *Lai d'Haveloc le Danois* (v. 200) etc. (cf. Flutre s. v.). There is no reason why this pattern should be broken with *Stoderani*.

This, together with the absence of the name in the western European tradition is sufficient evidence to refute the hypothesis. From our perspective, the geographical context is clearly not persuasive either.

On [a5]: Jenkins (ad loc.) remarks: "There was [. . .] a region and city *Soltania* in Persia" and refers to Hallberg (1907, 483–485). But Hallberg's oldest source is brother Jordanus Catalani of the 14th c., and this is not a coincidence: today's Soltaniyeh is almost exactly half-way between Tabriz and Teheran, and it was founded in the late 13th c. by the Mongol Sultan Arghun and his successor Uldžaitu/Öldžeytü, who elevated it to the status of 'Sultans' city', using it first as their summer residence and then later as their main residence (EI s. v.).

On [a6]: Finally, the idea suggested by Mireaux (1943, 265) of linking *Solteras* with *sauterelles* 'grasshoppers' cannot be taken seriously. The connection between *sauter* 'to jump' and *sauterelles*, was no doubt always obvious, but in fact *solt-* or *solit-* have quite different associations from *saut-;* the change of suffix here would deprive the word of its second semantic element which is almost as important, the idea of lightness contained in the diminutive, and without it the word becomes unrecognisable.

On [b]: The *Avers* are the Avars. Lat. *Avāres* leads quite regularly to OF *Avēr*, as in the *Chanson de Guillaume* 2058: *Reis Mathamar e uns reis d'Aver* are among the fifteen 'heathen' kings who besiege William – as we might expect, in a laisse with *-ē-* < *-á*[-. The Roland poet, on the other hand, uses a technique that is familiar to us by now, making a small adjustment so that it will fit into a laisse ending in *-ę-* <-*ĕ*]-, and so the obl. pl. form here merges with the adjective *avers* 'hostile', 'repugnant' (cf. *gent averse* v. 2630, 2922, 3295) and thus assumes additional symbolic meaning. Once again, Noyer-Weidner (1986, 381–386) will only allow the symbolic meaning. Dufournet (1987, 101) is more impartial and therefore more accurate: "Mais plusieurs de ces noms révèlent un jeu de mots qui en enrichit la signification: les *Avers* du vers 3242 sont sans doute les Avares, mais ce sont aussi *la gent*

averse [. . .]", and Bancourt (1982a, 4–10) also takes issue with Noyer-Weidner in a similar fashion.

The early history of the Avars is uncertain, but they attract the attention of the Byzantines in 558 to the north of the Black Sea and were known to western Europe when they had a confrontation with King Sigebert on the banks of the Elbe in 566/567 and conquered Pannonia in 568 (LM s. v. *Avaren*, CHIA, Art. *Avars*). They were widely regarded as returning Huns until their power was destroyed by Charlemagne;[182] this perception, their paganism, their historically proven lust for gold and their brutal exploitation of the Slavs consolidated their reputation as a nomadic people from the south Russian steppe, who never created but only destroyed, and Charlemagne gained considerable renown when he defeated them.[183] According to Einhart (*Vita Karoli* 13), Charlemagne waged that was *animosius* and *longe maiori apparatu* than his other wars; the Royal Annals record this in some detail in relation to the years 788–805, and both Einhart and the Royal Annals, in their own right as well as through their inclusion in further chronicles, ensure that the Avars were never forgotten across the whole of western Europe – even though in the long run Charlemagne's war with the Avars was of less interest there than his wars against the Saxons and his Spanish campaign.[184] The Roland poet does not identify the Avars as the Huns, but he places them geographically in the middle zone, and so he is not thinking of their last-known places of residence, but rather of their "homeland", which he presumably imagined was in south-eastern Russia.

A.1.2.5 Sixth *eschiele*: *d'Ormaleus e d'Eug<l>ez*

D'Ormaleus e d'Eug<l>ez Segre 3243, *dormaleus e deugiez* O, *Darmoloten [. . .] Glessen* K (as in ms. P and ed. Wapnewski, but *dormaloten, glessen* ms. A; *Tarmalot* Stricker, *Ormalus* the *Karlmeinet*, both without a second name), *d'Orvalois les engrès*[185] C, *d'Orvaleis* (Foerster, Segre) / *d'Ornaleis* (Duggan) *les engrès* V7 (in CV7 as 'fourth'): For the first name, the *Karlmeinet* once again relies on a second route of access to the French tradition; otherwise, the German branch

---

182 Copious evidence of this – from Gregory of Tours to Orderic Vitalis – is found in Beckmann (2010, 36 n. 149).

183 Cf. e.g., Beckmann (2010, 36 n. 149, and p. 143–145).

184 Regino mentions the Avars in connection with the years 788, 791, 795, 796, 797, 799 and 805, Sigebert of Gembloux (whose work appears in Robert de Torigni and elsewhere) with 787, 788, 791, 797, 800, 804 and 805; Hugo of Fleury (MGH SS. 9.361) mentions Charlemagne's war with the Avars ending in victory after 8 years etc.

185 Unfortunately Segre adds incorrect diacritics in such cases leading to *engrés* instead of engrès, even though it is clearly a case of /ę/ < Lat. *ĕ[*; I insert *è* here.

has agglutinated *d-* or *t-* from the German dialectal merger of stops. CV7 have read the French toponym *Orval* into the name. The *-eus* (< Lat. *-aeos*) in O and the *-eis / -ois* (< Lat. *-ēnses*) of CV7 are similar enough to show that the (grimly hypocoristic) *-ot(-s)* in the German branch is secondary, but the decision between *d'Ormaleus* and *d'Ormaleis* still remains open.

However, same troop appears again, this time as an elite troop in a laisse with *ei*-assonance:

Ormal-eis O 3284, *Orchanì* V4 ('Hyrcanians', intelligent secondary meaning), *Ormanois* C, and *Ormanoir* V7, (here not influenced by *Orval*) *Valois* P (French region read into the name). The *-al-* of OP belongs in the archetype against the *-am-* of CV7; consequently, the archetype here had *Ormaleis*. The change of suffix in O makes it likely that semantically, only *Ormal-* is essential.

For the second people, it is difficult to reconstruct the archetype. The adjective *les engrès* 'the battle-hardened, aggressive ones' in CV7 is very common in the 12/13th c.; but we cannot put it in the archetype with Roncaglia (ad loc.), precisely because it is not likely that O and K would misread this ordinary word independently of each other. The *Eugiez* in O cannot be in the archetype either, because the laisse is on /ę/ not on /ie/. But since for normal OF /ie/, the scribe of O freely switches between <ie> and <e>,[186] he could have "corrected" the *Eugez* who were unknown to him, to *Eugiez*. This is why (according to Segre ad loc.) Konrad Hofmann and Eduard Boehmer put *Eugez* in the archetype; but then, it becomes difficult to explain *Glessen.* Most of the editors from Stengel onwards opt for the slightly more probable alternative <Euglez>. Indeed, as the dot (or originally the little dash) on the *-i-* was still unknown at that time, an *-l-* that had come out somewhat too short was easily misread as an −i-.

Although *Eu-* thus belongs in the archetype, it is predictable that we will find neither an ethnicon nor a normal adjective beginning with this. *Eu-* is an element which even people who did not know Greek could abstract from ecclesiastical Latin terms like *euangelium*, *eucharistia*, *eulogia/-um*, *euphonia*, *eusebia*[187] and the many saints' names starting with *Eu-.*[188] Such knowledge about the Greek

---

186 He has 3 *mier* and 5 *mer* (< Lat. *mĕrus*), 2 *pier(r)e(s)* and 4 *perre(s)* (< Lat. *pĕtra*), 25 *bien* and 99 *ben* (< Lat. *bĕne*); 14 *mielz* and 5 *melz* (< Lat. *mĕlius*); 17 *ciel(s)* and 8 *cel(s)* (< Lat. *caelum*); 4 *chiet* and 7 *chet* (< Lat. *cadit*), 1 *chiens* and 4 *chen* (< Lat. *canis*) etc. We can see that the orthography also varies before and after palatals.

187 These are all attested in many ecclesiastical Latin sources, cf. z. B. Blaise I, II and MLLM s. v.

188 Saints Eucharius, Eucherius, Eufemia*, Eufrasia*/-us*, Eufronius*, Eugenia*/-us*, Eulalia*, Eulogius*, Eumachius*, Euphrosyna, Eusebia*/-us*, Eusicius, Eustachius*, Eustasius*, Eustorgius*, Eutropia/-us were all revered in Galloromania too; the names marked with * are also (according to Morlet 1972 s. v.) attested as the names of other individuals. People who

origins of *eu-* contributed to the grotesque transformation of *Girart de Fra(i)te* into *Girart d'Eufrate* in the *Aspremont* (ed. Brandin, passim), and also led to hypercorrect variants in the courtly romance such as *Eumalgoras* 'Ermagoras', *Eurien* 'Urien', *Euvroïc* 'Evroïc, York' (cf. Flutre s. v.) and in appellative vocabulary such as *eugal* 'égal', *euspice* 'auspice', *eutropique* 'hydropique' etc. (cf. the dictionaries); in toponymy, Saint Eugène, Aisne, was originally *Saint-Ouen / Sanctus Audoënus*, and Saint Eulien, Marne, was originally *Sanctus Aquilinus* (Nègre 1990–1998, Nr. 27676, 27678). A large amount of (non-Greek) oriental material came to the west via Greek authors, but since the readers knew neither Greek nor those other languages, Greek elements like *Eu-* could be regarded as 'oriental' language,[189] and so came to be included in Oriental names. We are thus justified in considering the *Eu- in Eugez / Eug<l>ez* as a secondary element from the very start, which leaves us an even smaller portion of the name available for geographical meanings.

Now for the meaning of both names! The [a] *Ormaleus / Ormaleis* are much more likely [a1] the Rum Seljuks, who have never been suggested before, than [a2] the Greater Armenians; they are not [a3] the Ermlanders or [a4] 'people from Ramla'.[190] For the [b] *Eug<l>ez* there is no meaning that would be acceptable according to our usual criteria; three inferior options are roughly equal in their merits: [b1] the south Russian U(g)lichs, [b2] the Oghuz and [b3] the Abkhazians. We cannot accept [b4] a probably non-existent Arab tribe called the *Égées* and [b5] the English.

On [a1]: Why should we interpret the *Ormaleus / -leis* as the Rum Seljuks?

After the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert in 1071, when even Emperor Romanos IV was taken prisoner, these Turks surged into most of Anatolia, that is, into what is now the Asiatic part of Turkey, encountering little resistance on the way. In 1075, a distant relative of the Grand Sultan in Baghdad called Suleiman ibn Qutalmish led his Turkmen people as far as Nicaea (today Iznik, only about 80 km east of Constantinople), took up residence there, and brought most of the Turks in the west and south of Anatolia under his control. His *de facto* independent Seljuk

---

knew the Troy material, including readers of the *Roman de Troie*, would know even more Greek names starting with *Eu-*, cf. Flutre s. v. *Eu-*.

189 Cf. in the Rol. the 'heathens' *Eudropin* v. 64 (< *Eutropius* + *-in*), *Priamun* v. 65, in other epics e.g., *Ector*, *Telamon*, *Troïen* (cf. Moisan s. v.).

190 The fact that during the period of the great migrations there was a tribe called the *Armalaus(in)i*, who were neighbours of the Burgundians, Marcomanni and Gepids, and latterly also of the Huns, but then disappeared from history, is a rather strange coincidence, especially in phonological terms; cf. the references in the TLL s. v.

(partial) state[191] looked likely to shake off the overlordship of the Grand Sultan from Baghdad, and so conflict was inevitable: Suleiman lost his life in a battle against the brother of the Grand Sultan in 1086, but his son Kilij Arslan (I) was able to realise his father's ambition a few years later. During the First Crusade he was the crusaders' main enemy on their long march through Anatolia, so that within the now huge Turkish domain, they certainly perceived his state as an entity of its own; this makes it plausible that in the Rol., it deserved a name of its own and the status of an elite troop. Although Kilij Arslan had to move his residence from Nicaea back to Konia, his state grew even more powerful and prospered until the Mongol of invasion in the 13th c.[192]

The Arab. term *Rūm* 'Rome' in the context of the 11th century only rarely meant the old Roman Empire and was generally used to refer to the Byzantine Empire, whose inhabitants called themselves Ῥωμαῖοι 'Romans', considering themselves the only legitimate and direct successors of the old Empire. The Arab. term usually signified only the Asiatic part of the Empire, because at that early time the Muslims still had little interest in the European portion, apart from the capital city of Constantinople. But after 1071 the name of the territory did not keep up with events: *Rūm* as a term for 'Anatolia' took a long time to fade, which meant that the new inhabitants were called Rum Seljuks 'Seljukian Turks in the Asiatic [previously] Byzantine Empire' (more detail EI s. v. *Rūm,* p. 625a).

Against this background, two closely related explanations are in order.

This is the first: in Arab. – because Muslims normally wrote in Arabic or Persian, and not yet in Turkish – *Rūmī* was the normal expression for 'Rum Seljuk' (EI, Art. *Rūmī*). But what was the corresponding Turkish expression? The Arab. *-ī* corresponds to Turk. *-li/-lü/-lı/-lu* (with vowel harmony);[193] thus Räsänen cites (1971 s. v.) Turkmen. *rūm-ly*. However, we should pay attention to the actual pronunciation: since there are no words beginning with *r-* in the indigenous vocabulary of the Turkish languages; the few borrowings that made their way into everyday language quickly acquired an initial vowel, usually identical to the first vowel in the word.[194] In Old Turk. the differences in phonemic

---

191 According to Grunebaum (1963, 140).

192 EI, Art. *Sulaymān ibn Ḳutulmısh*, and Art. *Saldjūḳides*, part 5: *Les Saldjūḳs de Rūm*.

193 Such as e.g., *İzmirli, Köprülü, Ankaralı, İstanbullu*. Originally *-l-* + suitable vowel + -γ, cf. von Gabain (1974, § 77): 'belonging to something'; Clauson (1972, p. XLI): "forms Poss[essive] N[ouns]/A[djectives]"; DTS p. IX and passim; Prototurk. *-γ* is already dropped (except after *-a-*) in Old Turk. (Golden 1992, 21).

194 Clauson (1972, 70).

quantity also disappeared early.[195] In fact, Old Turk. *Urum* 'East Roman Empire' is well attested,[196] and this leads to the ethnicon **Urumlı/Urumlu*. The Turk. *u* is open as in Ger. *Wurm*, and so the initial *o-* in *Ormaleus/-eis*, especially before *-r-* + cons., is to be expected. In Old Turk. the stress is on the first and the last syllable of a word,[197] and the principle of vowel harmony makes it difficult to be precise about the middle vowels; even today multiple forms are cited alongside each other in scholarly transcriptions, e.g., *Kutulmış, Kutalmış* and *Kutlumış*.[198] Given this background, there is no need to look for further explanation of the middle vowel in the word *Orm-al-eis*. And finally: a Romance ethnicon suffix was needed to make the word comprehensible, and this swallows up the final vowel in the Turkish word.

The second possibility: about two hundred years after the Rol., Asia Minor, apart from Trabzon, was firmly in Turkish hands, which meant that *Rūm* by then meant 'the remainder of the Byzantine Empire *in Europe*'. Here too, the term outlasted the conquest that followed, albeit in an extended form: after *Rūm* the element *-ili*, later *–eli, -el* 'territory, homeland' was inserted. *Rūmeli*, literally 'territory of the Byzantines' then simply meant 'the [until recently still Byzantine] European part of the Ottoman Empire' and lasted for centuries with minor semantic alterations. The term even spread across the whole of Europe, when between 1878 and 1913 [north-] 'Eastern Rumelia' played a complicating role in the emergence of modern Bulgaria (EI, Art. Rūmeli).

Whichever of these two possibilities of word formation (with *-li/-lü/-lı/-lu* or with *–eli, -el*) may have applied in our case, we can expect *Ormal-eus* (or *–eis*) 'the Rum Seljuks'. The Rum Seljuks also fit well into the catalogue in geographical terms.

---

195 Erdal (2004, 50): apart from /a/:/ā/ they have already been dropped in the oldest texts.

196 Erdal (2004, 104s.); DTS s. v. *urum*; Räsänen 1971 s. v., "osm[anish] *rum, urum* '(East) Romish, Gk.'". Still *Urum* today, e.g., TA, vol.27 (1978), s. v. *Rum*. This is also the case in vernacular Armen.: the word for 'Rome' is *Hr̄om*, vernacular *Our̄oum*; cf. EI s. v. *Rūm Kalʿa*, p. 1271a.

197 Erdal 2004, 96: "Medial syllables [. . .] are often syncopated; here are a few of the innumerable examples: [. . .] This should mean that the first and the last syllable of a word had some prominence over the others, or that medial vowels were not stressed". Even today in Turk. the stress (which is an essentially musical accent with slight raising of the pitch) is "officially" mostly on the last syllable; but there is often, especially in geographical terms, a clear initial stress: Ánkara, Ádana etc.

198 Cf. EI, Art. *Sulaymān b. Ḳutulmısh*, p. 860a, Art. *Dānishmendides*, p. 112b, Art. *Seldjūḳides*, p. 980b!

On [a2]: Grégoire accepts the undisputed meaning of *Ermines* as Armenians, and then interprets *Ormaleis* also as Armenians, without giving any reason for the double naming (Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 301 n. 2, Grégoire 1939a, 243s. with n. 3).

It is just about possible to make his thesis plausible in terms of meaning and geography. We can rule out older divisions into two or more Armenias (on this in brief but sufficient detail, e.g., KPauly s. v. *Armenia*), but we cannot rule out the distinction between 'Greater' and 'Little' Armenia that was made from the late 11th c. onwards. Ancestral Armenia in the area around the source of the Euphrates and the Tigris, later called Greater Armenia, was conquered by the Arabs in the 7/8th c. but managed to break free from Islamic rule in the 10th c. During the Byzantine military renaissance, it formally became part of the Byzantine Empire, which in turn was keen to foster a good relationship with the Armenian nobility in particular (LM s. v. *Armenien* I); there were Greater Armenian troops in the Byzantine army, and Armenian officers and officials were still working closely with the Emperor under Alexios (cf. Anna, Index). However, the country succumbed to Islamic rule again after Manzikert (1071). Yet (as explained above A.1.1.7 [a1]) a fairly large portion of the population turned towards the south and set themselves up as 'Little' Armenians; these are the ones that the crusaders had constant dealings with. The spatial and political separation could very well have meant that a French poet would hear about them in two widely differing contexts, and therefore would think of them as two separate tribes.

There are, however, some significant phonological difficulties. On the issue of form, Grégoire (1939a, 243s.) observes: "quant à *Ormaleus*, l'*O* initial se trouve dans plusieurs textes latins et français et est régulier en polonais et dans certaines prononciations dialectales russes". But the Slav forms are irrelevant because they have arisen regularly within Slavic languages[199] and because it is not obvious where or when Slav transmission would be necessary or plausible, when whole corps of Greater Armenians and Francophones came together in service to the Basileus, e.g., there is evidence that this happened in the army that went to the battle of Manzikert with Emperor Romanos IV.[200] If Grégoire

---

199 Bräuer (1961, § 30).

200 Cahen (1940, 629). – Moreover *Armenia* (or the ethnicon *Armenius/Armeniacus*) is found in poets such as Ovid and Lucan, geographers such as Mela, Pliny, Solinus and Isidore, historians such as Curtius, Sallust, Florus, Eutropius and Ammianus, and it is even (according to von den Brincken 1968, 165) a core component of the medieval map tradition: from Jerome and Orosius via Beatus, the Cottoniana, Henry of Mainz, Lambert of Saint-Omer, Hugh of Saint Victor, the Psalter World Map, Ebstorf, the Hereford map to Ranulf and later examples.

had thought of even one Latin or French author by name when he wrote this sentence, he would surely have cited him; there is reason to fear, therefore, that his decision is based on his own vague recollection. The only references I could think of were from the *Itinerarium sancte terre* by Wilbrand of Oldenburg (dating from 1211/ 1212) where *Hormenia, Hormenii/Hormeni* are mentioned several times, and always with reference to Little Armenia.[201] The middle *-a-* only occurs in the variant *Armanie* in the *Melusine* (Flutre s. v. *Armenie*).[202]

In geographical terms, the 'Greater Armenians' meaning would be welcome, but the phonological problems make it much less likely than the Rum Seljuk thesis.

On [a3]: Gaston Paris (1873, 332) suggested rather doubtfully that *Ormaleus* could mean the inhabitants of *Ormaland* 'Ermland, Warmia' (the middle part of Medieval Prussia, i.e. of later German 'East-Prussia', today Polish), the *Jarmenses* in Scandinavian texts, but he saw the obvious objection immediately: "l'*l* fait ici partie du mot *land*". Boissonnade (1923, 173) with no new source and a brief reference to Gaston Paris just comments in relation to the *Ormaleus* "Il n'est pas difficile d'y reconnaître les voisins des Borusses, les *Jarmlenses* [!], qui habitaient l'Ermland [. . .]" – an incorrect quotation making precisely the mistake that Gaston Paris had warned against. Prioult (1948, 293) then writes, citing no sources at all: "Les *Ormaleus* (vers 3.243) ou *Ormaleis* (vers 3.281) pourraient être les habitants de l'*Ormaland* ou *Ermland*, plus souvent [!] appelés *Jarmlerses* [sic!]: voisins des Borusses [. . .]".

Apart from this problem, there are some issues regarding the date. Prussia first came into focus for Western Europeans when Saint Adalbert-Vojtěch, Bohemian prince and former Bishop of Prague was martyred there in 997; but it was not conquered and Christianised by the Teutonic Order until after 1230. The Roland poet therefore probably knew 'Prussia' as a territory in Eastern Europe which, unlike the peoples he had named in the first group of ten, had not been Christianised even in his own time; this could have induced him to put the Prussians into the middle group of ten. But *Ermland* is only the middle part of Prussia; how could the Roland poet already know the name of this partial

---

201 It seems unlikely that the *-o-* is only the result of Wilbrand's Low German dialect, because Middle Low German only knows e.g., *arm* and not *orm* (Schiller/Lübben 1875–1881 s. v.). – In the MHG epic, the country of *Ormanîe*, where *Kûdrûn* is abducted to, is generally interpreted as 'Normandy'; the whole story takes place around the North Sea, and so 'Armenia' would not fit at all.

202 Also, in the Arabic ethnic noun *al-Arman* and the adj. *Armanī* (cf. EI, Art. *Armīniya*, e.g., p. 638b and 639q); Russ. has *Armjanín*.

territory?[203] And why would Baligant count these Ermlanders alongside the Turks and the giants of Malpreis as his elite troops (*des meillors*, v. 3283s.)?

On [a4] Finally, Mireaux (1943, 261) suspected that the *Ormaleus* were the inhabitants of the town of (ar-)Ramla, nearer to Jaffa than Jerusalem. Now indeed there were three great battles there in September 1101, May 1102 and August 1105, between the crusaders and the Egyptians, and King Baldwin lost only the middle one. But in OF the town is called (cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.) *Rames*. It is situated deep inside the Arabic-speaking region, where it does not need an initial vowel, and even if it had one, we would expect **Arma-*, and not *Orma-*.

On [b1]: Jenkins suggested (ad. loc.) that the *Eug<l>ez* could mean the Old Slav tribe, later merged with the Russians, called the U(g)lichs, from near to the mouth of the Dnieper where it flows into the Black Sea, somewhat laconically citing Zeuss (1837, 622), who devotes two and half lines of text to it. Jenkins inserted it as *d'Uglez* into the text, which was in turn taken over by Hilka/Pfister.

   In fact,[204] in 1916 the great Russian language historian A.A. Šakhmatov argued for *Ugliči* as the primary form. But today scholars prefer *Uliči*; because in the Old Russian chronicle tradition (*grosso modo* from 1100 onwards) the oldest textual witness, the Laurentius Chronicle, has the form without *-g-*; in other editions (e.g., the Novgorod one) we also find *Ugliči, Uglici, Ugleci*, but there we cannot rule out the influence of the north Russian town name *Uglič* (with a stable *-g-*). Outside Russia, the tribe is named in at least one, and possibly two texts: in the late 9th c. the Bavarian Geographer includes the *Unlizi* as *populus multus* in his long list of Slav tribes, but the interpretation of this as U(g)lichs has been disputed,[205] and in the middle of the 10th c. Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos (cap. 9

---

203 I am well aware that the Eastern Vikings maintained outposts along the Baltic coast from around 700 onwards, such as Wiskiauten (today Mokhovoye) on the southwestern end of the Curonian Lagoon (50 km north of the northern tip of Warmia) from around 700 to around 1100, and possibly Elbing/Elbląg, (Jones 1968, 242–244), but there is no evidence to show that western Europe took any interest in them. [Good bibliography up to 2020 and weblinks now in the German Wikipedia s.v. *Wiskiauten*. Last access 19 April 2021.]
204 The following is based on the small monograph of the Soviet Academy of Science and Letters on the U(g)lichs (1950, 17 p.), the Eng. translation of the 3rd edn. of the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, vol. 26, New York 1981, Art. *Ulichi*, and the edns. of the Nestor Chronicle by Cross/ Sherbowitz/Wetzor (1953), Tschiževskij (1969) and Müller (2001).
205 The editors Horák/Trávníček (1956, 30) would like to locate them in Germany because of the context, and they compare it with toponyms such as *Uelzen* – but is there enough space there for a *populus multus*?

and 37) sees the Οὐλτίνοι[206] as a south Russian tribe which by then is paying tribute to the Varangians.

The U(g)lichs stood out from other Russian tribes because they resisted Kievan centralising efforts for much longer, that is to say from about 880 until 940. But their name does not appear in the Russian tradition after 940;[207] presumably they moved northwards to escape pressure from the Pechenegs and were gradually merged into the Russian sub-tribe of the Volhynians. We cannot *a limine* exclude the possibility that in the 11th c. quite a few U(g)lichs were among the 'Russians' in Byzantine service and that sticking to their proud tribal name attracted the attention of the Normans, but there is no hard evidence for this.

In phonological terms, the U(g)lichs hypothesis would be acceptable; it also fits well in geographical terms, even though it links two unrelated peoples from opposite sides of the Black Sea together in the same *eschiele*.

On [b2]: The eminent Turkish historian and politician Fuad Köprülü (1935, passim) and de Mandach (1993, 267s.) support the theory that the *Eug(i)ez* of the song are the Oghuz. They would be an ideal fit both ethnically and geographically with the Rum Seljuks. The Oghuz originally were the whole south-western group of Turkish peoples, i.e., more or less the ancestors of present-day Turks in Turkey, Azerbaijanis and Turkmens. Around 780 they were living east of the Aral Sea and began a slow migration to the west, which also led to a gradual differentiation within themselves. The name's meaning became narrower when other groups were excluded, especially the Seljuks in the wider sense of that word (Greater, Rum Seljuks etc., cf. above A.1.2.2 [a] and also [a1]), and when the Azerbaijanis and the portion of Turkmens that did not merge into the Seljuks began to settle down.[208] The name Oğuz (MGk. Οὖζοι[209]) mostly appears in Byzantine sources referring only to the Turkish groups north (!) of the Black Sea who had migrated westwards and who in 1064 crossed the Danube and attacked Constantinople before eventually being brought under control. Some of them settled within the Empire, and some were incorporated rather too quickly into the Byzantine army, since in 1071 at the battle of Manzikert, they defected

---

206 Konstantinos adds here (as with other Slav tribes) the Gk. plural ending -οι to a Slav singulative ending *-in* (Bräuer 1969, § 180s.), which in this case would be *Ul(i)č-in*; this was correctly explained by Marquardt (1903, 107).

207 Rybakov (1950, 17).

208 I hope this "minimalistic" account will have extracted the uncontentious core from the controversial discussions that Turkologists continue to have about the early Oghuz.

209 According to Köprülü (1935, 490) this form comes from a dialect of Turk., where even at that time the /ɣ/ (today written as ğ) was already silent between two velar vowels.

to the Seljuks (LM s. v. *Oğuz* and *Uzen*); from there they became part of the Seljuk Turkish domain. From a Byzantine and therefore also Norman point of view, what made them different from other Turkish people was the fact that they came from lands north of the Black Sea.

If this is the meaning, then the poet would again be pairing up two peoples from opposite sides of the Black Sea within in the same *eschiele*; in this case, however, he would also be reflecting a piece of recent history. In his youth he may well have heard of this people from stories told by Norman soldiers with Byzantine experience who knew them as two related tribes who had been physically separate and whose sudden reunification was a shocking and unforgettable event.

The phonology shows that the <z> in *Oğuz* was originally a /z/, whereas in *Eug(i)ez* it presumably represents a /ts/; but this is not a serious problem, because through automatic terminal devoicing, /z/ became /s/, in OF, and /s/ could very well have been in the archetype (because *Glessen* and *engrès* are in β).[210] A more serious problem is the replacement of /u/ with /ẹ/; this could only be a much bigger phonological concession to the assonance than anywhere else in the song, and one which cannot be understood as a recourse to a phonetically similar negative adjective.

On [b3]: The Abkhazians on the north-eastern shore of the Black Sea gained independence from Byzantium around 800 and founded a kingdom which fell by marriage to Bagat III, *kuropalato*s of Georgia, who then deemed himself ruler of the combined kingdom. This kingdom lasted until the end of the Middle Ages, and Abkhazia was part of his official royal title; moreover, the terms 'Abkhazian' and 'Georgian' or 'Iberian' were often used synonymously – by outsiders too – referring to the kingdom and its inhabitants.[211] Further relevant details about the history of this kingdom and its relations with Byzantium are provided above with reference to *Gros* (A.1.1.10, [3]); the Francophone people in service to the Byzantines, and the Normans in particular, could have known both the Georgians and the Abkhazians.

---

210 We could even accept the necessary assumption that the Francophones had heard the word outside the official Byzantine tradition with /ɣ/, although Tudebod (ed. Hill/Hill p. 44) and Raymond of Aguilers (ed. Hill/Hill p. 38) have the Byzantine-inspired forms *Usi* or *Husi*; because the /ɣ/ must have been audible in large parts of the Turkish language area until after Turkish spelling was standardised, long after the period that concerns us. – Instead of Turk. *Oğuz*, a phonologically more logical starting point on the way to *Eugez* might have been the Arab. explicit plural *(al-) Aghzāz* /æl-ayzǣz/, which existed alongside the more common non-explicit *(al-)Ghuzz* /æl-yuz/; but it is difficult to imagine that there was an Arab transmission of the name because the Oghuz mostly approached Europe from an area north of the Black Sea.

211 As by Skylitzes (p. 366s. ed. Thurn) in the late 11th c. and Kedrenos (vol. 2, p. 2.572s. ed. Bekker), and by Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī in the early 13th c.

Apart from the fact that two unrelated peoples from opposite sides of the Black Sea are paired together, the Abkhazians would be a good geographical fit. The reason why the neighbouring Georgians, since this is what is meant by the *Gros,* are mentioned in the first group of ten, while the Abkhazians are not mentioned until the second, could be that the poet thought of the Georgians as being linked with the Armenians, while the Abkhazians only came to mind when he turned his thoughts to the northern shore of the Black Sea.

In Arrian (2nd c. A.D.) the Abkhazians are called Ἀβασκοί, and for others writing in Greek, including those in the Middle Ages, they are the Ἀβασγοί, but in an inscription dating from before 1118, the country is called Ἀπχαζία, which corresponds to the Georg./Armen. *Ap'xaz(i)* (cf. RB, Art. *Abasgia*; Rus-sEW s. v. абхáз). Islamic writers call them Arab. *Abkhāz / Afkhāz*, but the Persian Ibn Rusta (early 10th c.) calls them *Awghāz* (EI, Art. *Abkhāz*). Later, at least since the time of the (Genoese-Venetian) Vesconte map of around 1321/ 1327, the toponym is represented as *Avogassia*, and the ethnonym as *Avogasi* (Schweickard 2012, 952). An -*o*- is inserted here to avoid an unusual consonance in Rom.; but the voiced consonants -*v*- and -*g*- can only have come from a Byzantine source (with MGk. <β> ~ /v/ and <γ> ~ /ɣ/, the latter automatically > Rom. /g/); they suggest there would have been a M.Gk. *Ἀβγασοί /avɣasí/ as well as the traditional Ἀβασγοί. This form with its /av-/ would offer a better basis for the *Eu*- (MGk. /ev-/) in *Eugez* than the name of the U(g)lichs and the Oghuz; also, the jump from /ẹ/ to /a/ in the second syllable would be less extreme than the jump from /u/ in the Oghuz.

On [b4]: Boissonnade (1923, 195s.) found that two Renaissance Geographers, the Spaniard Martín Fernández de Enciso (first impression 1519) and the Frenchman Jean Alfonse († 1544 or 1549, first known impression posthumously), mentioned an otherwise unknown Arab tribe called the *Egees* (written thus in Alfonse) on the Persian Gulf or in Arabia Petraea. Sainéan had discovered, and Boissonnade was also aware, that the Spaniard had copied from the Frenchman; there is therefore only one source behind the two versions. On the other hand, the Spaniard is famous for his colonisation efforts in what is today Panama, but he does not appear to have ever journeyed to Arabia. This means that the attestation is of very doubtful value, even for the period around 1500. It would stretch the imagination too much to place this term back in the time around 1100.

On [b5]: For Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 292) the *Eugiez* or, as both authors simply write, *Englez* 'Englishmen' are in service to Byzantium.

It is true that after 1066 many Englishmen felt they had no future in their homeland and so decided to serve the Byzantines, and some of them would have

been only too glad to take part in the military conflict against the Normans. But the organisation of the fifteen preceding *eschieles* has made it clear that the poet is following a plan based on geography, and so England would be ridiculously out of place at this point. The assonance does not work here either: the song makes a clear distinction between (non-nasal) /ei/ and /ę/. It is not until the 13th century that we find *Englès, Englais* (Moisan s. v., Pope § 230, 522), when in the west /ei/ had gone to /ę/, and in the centre and east the development /ei/ > /oi/ >) /ųę/ > (after consonant clusters) /ę/ took place even later.

And finally, are we really expected to believe that between the Norman poet and the Anglo-Norman scribe of O someone managed to misunderstand such a common term as *Engleis* 'English, Englishman' to the point of turning it into the exotic *Eugiez*?

In summary, then, we conclude that the *Euglez* or *Eugez* could be the U(g) lichs, Oghuz and Abkhazians. Although none of them fully meet our usual criteria, they all were, or still are, associated with the northern shore of the Black Sea, and so all three of them fit in with our geographical expectations.

A.1.2.6 Seventh *eschiele*: *de la gent Samuël*

De la gent Samuël O 3244, not present in K (nor in Stricker, but *van dem lande van Samuel* the *Karlmeinet*), *la gent Samuës* CV7 (as 'fifth'): Because Old Testament names belong to the phonological category of *mots savants*, the *-e-* was pronounced openly;[212] the poet links it here with /ę/ < Lat. *ĕ*] as in *Gabriël* v. 2262 and *Jupiter* v. 1392, whereas in *Michel* v. 37 he links it with /ē/ < á[, which is the more usual pattern in OF as a whole. The form *Samuës* in CV7 is because of the laisse rhyme there ending in *-ęs/-ęrs*.

The meaning is [1] Tsar Samuel's Bulgarians, probably connected with [2] the Byzantine troops serving his descendant of the same name, but not [3] the Sambians.

On [1]: The Frankish empire ruled by Charlemagne and his successors had much closer and often difficult contacts with the Bulgarians, their new neighbours on the south-eastern border, once the Avars had been eliminated. People living in western Europe possibly, and those in Byzantium certainly, remembered these Bulgarians (or at least their originally Turkish upper-class namesakes who had made them into a state) had come over on horseback from Asia; this could explain why the poet includes them in this section.

---

212 Cf. above n. 97.

Tsar Samuel of Bulgaria had been his predecessor's military commander, and he became Tsar when that predecessor died as a Byzantine prisoner in 997. While Emperor Basilios II was waging wars in Syria, Samuel triumphed over the Greeks and conquered much of the Balkan Peninsula. From 988 onwards, he attacked the Byzantine Empire about twenty-six times,[213] and it was only at the start of the 11th c., when Basilios was able to turn his attention to the Bulgarian war, that Samuel was forced onto the defensive and finally suffered a crushing defeat. Basilios had 15,000 Bulgarians blinded; only one in every hundred was spared one eye, so that he could lead the others home. Samuel died of a heart attack when he saw the blinded men. After a short and tumultuous reign by one of his sons and a nephew, Bulgaria remained entirely subjugated to Byzantium from 1018 until 1187. Basilios, who is still known today as *Bulgaroktonos* 'the killer of the Bulgarians', ruled until 1025 and led the Byzantine Empire to the peak of its military renaissance. Even far away in France, Ademar of Chabannes (*Chron.* 3.32), for example, wrote about the exceptionally brutal wars between the Bulgarians and the Greeks, devoting the equivalent of 14 lines of modern printed text to his expansive, though not very specific account. From 1038 onwards, the number of Normans and other Francophones in service to Byzantium increased quickly. The impact of the events of 1014 must have echoed down the whole of the 11th c., even reaching these hardened mercenaries, not least because in 1040–1041 Byzantium was severely troubled by Bulgarian revolts led by the supposed son of Samuel, then again in 1072–1073 and – by Bulgarians now accused of being Bogomil heretics – in 1086.[214] In the light of these circumstances, the term *la gent Samüel* was very fitting for these Bulgarians. People in Byzantium had no sympathy for them and felt no lingering pangs of conscience about them, as we see in Anna (7.3.4): for her, Samuel is one of those Bulgarians 'who attacked the west' and at the same time – we should note Anna's self-righteous and 'salvation-oriented' perspective – 'was the last of the Bulgarian dynasty, just as Zedekiah was for the Jews' [in 586 B.C., when the Babylonians conquered Jerusalem).[215]

On [2]: Grégoire agreed that this name referred to the Tsar of the Bulgarians (Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 287, and still Grégoire 1942–1943, 537), until he discovered what he believed to be a better solution (1946, 442–445). A relative in the third

---

213 According to Grégoire (1946, 445).

214 For details of the whole campaign cf. LM s. v. *Samuel* (1), ODB, the Art. *Bulgaria*, *Deljan* and *Voitech*.

215 De Mandach (1993, 262) also supports the Bulgarian Tsar interpretation, and provides a short justification.

generation after the Tsar, whose name was also Samuel, was a loyal commander in the Byzantine army. A few years before Manzikert, the leader of the Normans, Robert Crispin was so dissatisfied with his own pay and that of his comrades, that he tried to set up an independent state in Anatolia. Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes sent five regiments to put down the insurgents; they were drawn from the Armeniac Theme (in the far north east of present-day Turkey, on the Black Sea, but still outside Armenia) and under Samuel's command. They launched a surprise attack on the Normans on Easter morning, but they were rebuffed in a very bloody battle. Crispin now complained bitterly about the attackers, who wanted to shed the blood of Christians on the day of the greatest Christian festival; but he was soon reconciled with Romanos and resumed his role as leader of the Normans under his successor, Michael VII Dukas.

This episode marked out Samuel's people, quite literally *la gent Samuël*, particularly in their dealings with the Francophones, as enemies of the faith and it is too specific to allow us to rule out Grégoire's idea altogether. On the other hand, the naming of a Byzantine commander of five regiments in our catalogue of peoples would be unnaturally precise, if the poet did not know that he was a descendant of the other Samuel.

But it was the older Samuel's name that was linked to the fate of a whole nation which had been greatly feared, and not just to five regiments. Even if the poet knew both Samuels, he would consider the second as a welcome addition to the first.[216]

In geographical terms, both Samuels are almost equally suitable, since one comes straight from the Armeniac Theme, and the other is Bulgarian. Unlike the south-east European peoples in the first group of ten, the Bulgarians came to be regarded as heretics, and since Tsar Samuel's power reached as far as the Black Sea,[217] it was close to the U(g)lichs or the Oghuz, and even fairly close to the Abkhazians, so that it could be included as part of the middle or core territory of Baligant's peoples.

On [3]: The Sambians or Samlanders – between the Vistula Lagoon and the Curonian Lagoon, that is to say in the north-western part (about 70 x 30 km) of medieval Prussia (later German East Prussia) – were not Christianised until the

---

216 Admittedly, Grégoire could have argued against the older Samuel, and in favour of the younger one, by mentioning that Roland had conquered *Buguerie* (v. 2328) and Charlemagne predicted that the *Hungre et Bugre revelerunt* against him (v. 2921s.). However, this would mean not only the Bulgarians taking on a double role, but even more obviously the *Hungre* (cf. v. 3254) would as well, and so the argument does not hold water, *quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*.
217 Cf. e.g., Jedin (1970, map on p. 30 with commentary).

late 13th c., having mounted long and fierce resistance. In the Roland context they exhibit remarkable parallels with the above-mentioned (A.1.2.5 [a3]) Ermlanders. Boissonnade (1923, 173) pins his hypothesis on a single argument: Adam of Bremen (IV 18) mentions the *Semli*, the inhabitants of Samland. Not quite! He mentions the *Sembi* (with no variants): *Semland [. . .] hanc inhabitant Sembi vel Pruzzi*.[218] And once again, Prioult (1949, 292s.) goes further than Boissonnade without referring to any source: "La gent *Samuel* (vers 3244) désignerait, bien que le fait ait été contésté, les *Semli*, ou *Sembi*, ou *Samlandi* [. . .]" Once again, despite the most intensive search, I have failed to find *Semli* or even *Samlandi*[219] and I suspect therefore that once more by means of the ominous X-or-Y (-or-Z) formula, existent and inexistent forms have been mixed.

Finally, Dufournet (1987, 99) accepts Prioult's assertion without checking it, and then links it with the idea that there is another layer of meaning here, namely the *souvenir judaïque*, recalling the biblical Samuel. I am not, in principle, against such suggestions of additional layers of meaning – quite the opposite, in fact, cf. the commentary above on colour symbolism –, but I do reject this particular suggestion. The biblical Samuel is one of the most positive figures in the Old Testament, from the moment of his conception to his death. And furthermore, his typological function in medieval thought could not be more positive: his conception prefigures the conception of John the Baptist and Jesus himself, his offering in the temple prefigures the offering of Jesus; by anointing David, he establishes the "eternal" Kingdom of David, which was a crucial factor in legitimating Jesus as the Messiah. His place in medieval Christian thought is characterised by his significant role in iconography (LCI 4.38s.) and by the fact that the crusaders founded the *abbatia Sancti Samuelis* on the spot where he is supposedly buried in Nabī Samwīl, on a hill within sight of Jerusalem (Jerusalem-Röhricht Add. 15 No. 216 dating from 1143). I do not see how he can be conflated with a 'heathen' army leader whose name was bound to have negative connotations.

---

218 Also in I 60 *Semborum [. . .] populi* [come to Birka in Sweden to trade], II 62 *Semborum* (only BC, missing in A), III 22: *Inde* [that is, from the mouth of the Peene eastwards along the shore of the Baltic Sea] *ad Semland provinciam, quam possident Pruzi* [part of a journey from Schleswig or Oldenburg/Holstein to Novgorod], IV 1 *Semland* (var. *Semlant, Semlandiam*).

219 We do not need to examine here whether Ottar, in the report which Alfred the Great inserts into his Orosius translation, means by *Sermende* (1.1.12) the Sambians or the Sarmatians. An 11th c. Tegernsee ms. (MGH SS. 4.613) states: *in Sambiam terram, scilicet in Pruscie partibus specialem, in qua ab incolis beatus martyr Adalbertus martyrium consumavit*. The *Annalista Saxo*, writing around 1150 but referring back to the time of Otto the Great, mentions *Semland* (MGH SS 37.176). Another relatively early source is Saxo Grammaticus; he calls the land *Sembia*, and the inhabitants *Sembi* (ed. Olrik/Raeder p. 155, 232, 257, ed. Holder p. 187, 278, 308).

There is no other evidence to suggest that the poet or others before him would ever have made a play on the sound of the *Sam-* part of the word to identify the Sambians as 'Samuel's people'. In summary, then, this equation of the *gent Samüel* with the Sambians is indefensible, and even the appearance of 'Prussia' as the next land in the catalogue cannot alter this fact.

A.1.2.7 Eighth *eschiele*: *de Bruise*

De Bruise O 3245, *di Prussen* K (*von Prusse* Stricker, *van Bernisse* the *Karlmei-net*), *d'Orbrise* CV7:[220] In *Bernisse* the *-u-* has been misread as *-n-*, which meant that an *r*-abbreviation had to be read as a full syllable *-er-* (cf. Bischoff 2009, 211). The *Karlmeinet* reveals here once again that it has another route of access besides K to the French tradition, and also confirms the reading in O. The *dorb-rise* in CV7 is influenced by *Orbrie*, the name of an unidentified heathen country that appears frequently in epics after about 1200 (cf. Moisan s. v.).

The meaning is [1] 'from Prussia', and not [2] 'from the town of Prusa, today Bursa, in Asia Minor', and certainly not [3] a repeat naming of the 'Russians'.

On [1]: The Prussians are mentioned for the first time in the late 9th c. by the Bavarian Geographer: *Bruzi plus est undique quam de Enisa ad Rhenum* '[the land of the] Prussians is, wherever you measure it, wider than from the Enns to the Rhine'; but this assertion estimates the diameter of the land as almost twice its actual size. The Prussians had a bad reputation across the whole of Europe even from the time of the first missionary expeditions, because of the martyrdom of Saint Adalbert of Prague (997) and Bruno of Querfurt (1009). After that, there were military altercations with the Poles and the Russians, and so the Prussians are mentioned several times (Preface 1.6, 2.42. 3.24) in the chronicle of the Poles by Gallus Anonymus (early 12th c.); it was not until 1217 that the Cistercians initiated the next missionary expedition. When in 1226 this also appeared to be failing, the Polish Duke Konrad of Masovia invited the Teutonic order into the territory, and they subjugated the land despite fierce resistance until 1283.

At the time of the Roland poet, the inner parts of Prussian territory were hardly known, and the Prussians would have been seen as a people who had mounted unusually ferocious resistance against missionaries and who did not seem in the least ready to be Christianised. Therefore, in psychological terms they would have appeared more distant than they actually were, and could appear in the middle group of ten, while the Kievan Rus', who had been Christian

---

220 CV7 insert the above-mentioned (in n. 154) *eschieles* of the *roi de Ro(c)hès* and the *roi de Mont Pant(h)ès* before *Orbrise* as their sixth and seventh *eschiele*.

for more than a century and were closely tied to western European sovereigns through marriage – we might think of Queen Anna of France in particular – had been placed in the first group of ten. The Roland poet is actually quite measured in his approach; even in 1185 in the *Ligurinus* (6.102–104, ed. Assmann p. 334) the Prussians are named alongside the Russians, Parthians and Scythians.

The Prussians' name for themselves was *Prusāi*; the *B-* in the Bavarian Geographer goes back to the German dialectal merger of stops. This form was used by speakers of Middle and to some extent Upper German and was soon carried into French-speaking territories, as we see in Radulfus Glaber (1.[4.]10), who died around 1047: *venerabilis pontifex Adalbertus [. . .] civitate Braga [= Praga] egressus ad gentem Bruscorum, ut eis verbum salutis praedicaret [. . .]*; cf. also *Brusci* dating from around 1185 in the *Ligurinus* (6.102–104).[221] Jenkins (ad loc.) takes exception to the -*ss*- in the name *Prusse* (which he argues could not produce /is/), evidently considering Konrad's form of the name as the only valid one. But this is not even correct for the people name; cf. *Pruzzi* (var. *Prussi*, *Pruzi*, *Prusi*) in the oldest Adalbertus-Vita cap. 27 (ed. Karwasińska and ed. Hoffmann), *Pruci* in Thietmar of Merseburg 4.28. (19) (MGH SS.n.s. 9.165), *Prusci* in Herbord's *Vita Ottonis* (2.2, MGH SS. 12.775), *Prusc*i in *De Adalberto Ep. Pragensi* (MGH SS. 15/2, 1183) and especially the above-mentioned *Bruscorum*, and therefore **Brusci*, in the Francophone Radulfus Glaber, which suggests the pronunciation /bryis(–)/. *A fortiori* this is true of the country name, which already in its -*ia* had the palatalising factor that Jenkins was looking for, and so we find *Prucia* in Thietmar 6.95 (58), *Pruzia* (ed. Karwasińska) or *Pruzzia* (ed. Hoffmann using a different basic text, other variants *Prusia*, *Prussya*, *Pruzya*, *Prussia*) in the oldest Adalbertus-Vita cap. 27, *Pruscia* several times in the *Miracula Adalberti* (MGH SS. 4.613–615). And we know that even the single <s> in O can be /s/ instead of /z/, including between vowels, because of e.g. *Saisonĕ* (v.2330) < *Saxonia*. There is therefore nothing wrong with the form *Bruise*.

On [2] The town of Προῦσα in ancient Bithynia, near the Bithynian Olympus (today called Ulu Dağ), about 90 km south (east) of Istanbul was suggested by Gautier (Jenkins ad loc.), and Jenkins himself. Pliny 5.148 calls it *Prusa* (*prusa*

---

221 Ibrāhīm ibn Yaʿqūb has *Burus* and the Benjamin of Tudela tradition has *Brucia* as well as *Prucia* (both mentioned in de Mandach 1993, 259 n. 33), but this proves nothing, because there is no *p* in Arab. and *b* normally appears instead, and Benjamin or early copiers of his work could have been influenced by the Arabic form. The form *Borussi*, *Borussia* first appeared in the Renaissance, but it has become the more or less canonical Latinised form and according to Brückner (Archiv für slavische Philologie 39.283) arises from a pseudo-erudite equation with Βοροῦσκοι in Ptolemy 3.5.22 (reference to this in the RussEW s. v. Прусáк).

F²*B*), and not *Prusia*, as claimed by Place (1947, 880);[222] but later Pliny mss. (rou) already have *brusa* which is the medieval /brusa/,[223] the intermediate form on the way to Turk. *Bursa*. There are no forms with -*i*-, although these would be required in any precursor to *Bruise*.[224] The town was plundered by the Turks briefly around 1110 and fell, but soon returned to Byzantine control.[225] This alone is not enough to qualify the place as the centre of a 'heathen' people. From 1326–1368 it was the Ottoman capital city and today it is the fourth biggest city in Turkey, but none of this is relevant to our present study.

On [3]: Grégoire laconically suggests "Bruise, corruption de Ros" (1946, 443) referring back to the fact that he had determined the identity of the *Bruns* in the first group of ten (correctly in my opinion) to be 'Russians'; but you cannot expect the same term 'Russians' twice in the catalogue. A few years beforehand (1939a, 247 n. from 244), he had declared that *Bruise* meant [2] Προῦσα.

A.1.2.8 Ninth *eschiele*: *de Clavers*

De Clavers O 3245,[226] *uon Clamerse* K, *d'Esclavès* CV7:[227] Konrad Hofmann, Theodor Müller, Gautier and Hilka/Pfister correct O following CV7 to *d'Esclavers*, and rightly so. There is an analogous case in the *Chanson de Guillaume* 2362:

---

222 And Pliny the Younger has the same: *Prusa* 10.70 (75).1, 10.81 (85).1, and additionally the adj. *Prusenses* 10. 17a (28).3 etc. – In the same source at 5.148 Pliny the Elder mentions a different town called *Prusias* in north east Bithynia, about 180 km north east of Prusa, and this is confused with the first town in some mss: *prusias* DFEaυ(*J*), *prusa* R(?)E³(B) – but never seems to appear as *prusia*. It was totally insignificant in the Middle Ages, and today it is a small place called Konuralp (Üskübü) near Düzce.

223 MGk. *p-* > *b-* first in the sandhi form: τὴν Προῦσαν > /timbrusa/, and then generally.

224 Jenkins (1924 AD. loc.) identified Prusa/Brusa in Bithynia as *Brutia* 'in Mysia' in the Geographus Ravennas (ed. Pinder-Parthey p. 188, ed. Schnetz 49.95) but the Ravennas specifically states that *Brutia* is located in Lower Moesia and this means it is in Europe; according to PW, Art. *Brutia* and *Brucla*, it is the same as the Dacian *Brucla* in the *Tabula Peutingeriana*.

225 Anna 14.5.3; Chalandon (1900, 265).

226 Jenkins' assertion (ad loc.), that instead of Stengel's *la noefme declauers*, O has *la noefme Sclauers*, is incorrect. No other name in the catalogue of peoples is introduced without *de* or *des*, and no other name is written with a capital letter in O; above all, however: the first letter after *la noefme* is the curved δ, which is very common in O, but here there is a short diagonal stroke to the right at the top of it – a mark that in Cappelli (1961, 87, col. b, fourth line from the bottom) is explained as *de*, although this example is dated from the 13ᵗʰ c.; this is very similar to the two common medieval marks for *d* = *de* which are briefly crossed on the vertical stroke in Cappelli (1961, p. XXX, fourth line from the top). We cannot be sure whether a space between words is intended after shortened *de* or not, but it seems likely.

227 On *de Claivent* in T cf. n. 14.

Tedbald le clavun, which even the conservative editor McMillan emends to *l'E-sclavun*. The reference books acknowledge the silent *s-* in front of voiceless consonants only after around 1200; yet it is already attested at least in the south west in rhymes occurring in the *Roman de Thèbes* and *Roman de Troie* (Pope 1952, § 377s.), and in O we find *le chefs* (= *les chefs*) v. 44, *entre qu'* (= *entresqu'*) v. 956, *le freins* (= *les freins*) v. 2485, *pui te amerai* (= *puis t'amerai*) v. 3598.[228] The mistake must have happened independently in O and K (a safe assumption, since K also depends on Anglo-Norman material), or it was in the archetype and was changed back in CV7. Also, K misreads *-m-* instead of *-u-* and adds the feminine *-e* to show that a country name is meant, just as in *Rosse* and *Teclauosse*.

The meaning is (northern and north-eastern) 'Slavs', most of whom would have been north and north east Russians.

We have already established in our discussion of the *Esclavoz*, *Sorbres* and *Sorz* in the first group of ten that the poet was just as aware of the similarity between different Slav names as we are; *Sorbres* and *Sorz* turned out to be 'Serbs' and 'Sorbs', *Esclavoz* were slightly distorted 'Slavonians, Adriaslavs'. A similar slight distortion of the name of the 'Slavs' appears here, in the form *Esclavers*. This could be a crossover between the usual forms *Esclés / Esclers* (< *Sclavos*) and *Esclavons* (< *Sclavones*), or alternatively, it is an example of the rare form *Sclavarius*; admittedly, the poet takes a small liberty in a non-root syllable with the assonance vowel /ę/, because not only does *Esclers* have *ē* < *á[*, but the audience would also expect in *Esclavers* an *-arius* derivation, which would produce the assonance vowel *-ie-*.[229]

Where in Slavia does the poet think these *Esclavers* are? He has named Poland as *Puillaně* v. 2328, one of the states paying tribute to Charlemagne, who fears they might revolt; he does not mention Bohemia, evidently because around 1100 it was regarded as a solid part of the Empire; he has already mentioned Milceni and Sorbs, Adriaslavs and Serbs and Kievan Russians in the first group of ten, as well

---

228 There is even some loss of *-s* before the caesura, such as, so *des pulcele* 821, or before a vowel, such as *fesime a Charlun* 418, *le altres Sarrazins* 1163, *mal este oi baillit* 3497, here again with reversed forms such as *nercs* (= *n'ert*) 354, *humeles e dulcement* 1163, *tireres* (= *tirer*) 2283, cf. also *aürez* (= *aürer*) 124, *dunez* (= *duner*) 127. I have omitted cases where there is fluctuation between rectus and obliquus that cannot be fully explained.

229 The type *Sclavarius* occurs in Baldric of Dol cap. 12 (RHC Occ. 4.20) as *Sclavaria* with variant *Clavaria*, also (according to Schweickard in the DI s. v. *slavi*, p. 407b with n. 23) as Ital. *Sclavarìa* '(probably the whole of) Slav country' in the Ital. *Liber Antichristi* (after 1250) and in Triestine *S'ciavaria*. On *Esclers* cf. n. 79. Since the second half-verse in O begins with *et* and is too long by one syllable, most editors delete the *et*, and this is probably correct. The alternative suggested by Jenkins – to keep the *et* and emend the singular *Esclavers* to *Esclers* – would not explain the consensus between O and CV7.

as Bulgarians and perhaps U(g)lichs (~ southern Russians) in the second. In this group of ten his thoughts have been going from northern Syria across the region around the Black Sea and up to the Prussians, in effect from south to north. He is therefore now probably thinking of the north-eastern part of Slavia, the part which meets the Baltic region. The Kievan Empire had been broken up into smaller states since 1054; among these, Novgorod had been there since around 860, and from the 9th c. onwards, Russian rulers had expanded rapidly beyond Yaroslavl in a north easterly and easterly direction as far as Vladimir-Suzdal and even Murom (almost 300 km east of Moscow). Novgorod in particular, because of its role in trade, must have been a familiar name across more or less the whole of western Europe. The poet would probably have thought of these areas not so much as a part of Russia, but rather vaguely as 'more Slavs'. Moreover, the name of precisely the Russian tribe around Novgorod was *Slověne* (LM s. v.), which fits surprisingly well with *Esclavers*, though there is no evidence of this name being known in western Europe.

A.1.2.9 Tenth *eschiele*: *d'Occian l[e] desert*

D'Occian l[e] desert Segre 3246, *d'Occian la desert* O, *uon Turchopen* K (*Turkopel* Stricker, *van Ortallen* the *Karlmeinet*), *d'Olchan* (*Olceans* V7) *des desers* CV7: K (as well as Stricker) has not understood the source and then has arbitrarily inserted 'Turcopoles', Τουρκόπουλοι, who are actually 'sons of one Turkish and one non-Turkish parent', and whom west Europeans had known about since the First Crusade (e.g., Fulcher 10.10); the *Ortallen* in the *Karlmeinet* is a heavily corrupted form but it again shows another route of access to the French tradition. The correspondence *-cc-* O ~ *-lc-* CV7 can be explained palaeographically, but this does not tell us anything about the direction of the misreading. We can therefore only confirm at this point that *O(l/c)c + -e/i- + -an* is in the archetype.

But the same term appears four more times:
1) *Ociant* O 3286 and V4, *Ocean* C, *Olcean* V7, *Occidant* P;
2) *Occiant* O 3474, *Ociant* V4, *Occident* T;
3) *Occiant* O 3517, *Ociant* V4, *Oceanz* CV7;
4) *Ociant* O 3526 and V4, *Ocean* CV7.

This means the archetype has: 1) and 4) *Ociant*, 2) *Occiant*, 3) *Oc(c?)iant*. Consequently, in v. 3246 we can exclude *Olcian* in favour of *Occian*.

However, we cannot retain the *la* in *la desert* in the same verse O 324, because it would bring a crass Anglo-Normanism, the lack of *-e*, into the archetype

(Segre ad loc.).[230] But Segre's emendation *le desert* and also Jenkins' *al desert* are equally possible.

The meaning is [1] 'people from the wilderness by the ocean', in this case by the Arctic Ocean in the north(-east), and not [2] people from the 'west' near the Sahara, nor [3] 'people from the Byzantine Opsician Theme' nor [4] 'people from Oxiana' and certainly not [5] 'people ruled by the leader of the Turks, Aoxianus (= Yaghi-Siyān)'.

On [1]: According to TLL s.v., we find *-cc-* spellings of *Oceanus* in Varro *rust.* 1.2., and then frequently; I noted several dozen in the Middle Ages,[231] and then stopped searching. The spelling *Ocianus*, with *i* in hiatus, is found according to TLL in Pliny 4.94, Avienus *Arat.* 504, and in other places; it also occurs in the Middle Ages.[232] As we might expect, both developments can come together in the form *Occianus*.[233] Finally, variations between *-an* and *-ant* are very common

---

230 The inattention of the Anglo-Norman scribe can be explained either by the fact that he was thinking of 'la mer' when he was reading the erudite word 'ocean', or by the fact that he was expecting a country name, which would be feminine. Cf. on the one hand the expression *la mer Oc(c)eane*, which is according to Flutre in the prose *Graal* (vernacular version, ed. Sommer 89.4), and according to FEW s. v. *Oceanus* attested since Brunetto Latini; on the other hand, according to Flutre s. v. *Ociane*: the verses *Illuec arrive la navie / Qui vient de terre Femenie, / De Nubie et de Quartaige / Et d'Ocïane la sauvaige* (Floire II ed. Pelan 2318).
231 Lat.: Geographus Ravennas, ms. A 2.20 etc. (7x), ms. B 5.4, ms C 3.1 and passim (14x); Adam of Bremen 4.10, 4.35, 4.39; *Marvels of the East* (ed. M. R. James), Oxford, Bodl. 614, ms. early 12th c., § 18; Bernardus Silvestris, *Martian-Kommentar* (ed. Westra) 2.90 etc.; idem, *Cosmographia* (ed. Dronke), *Microcosmos* 1.5, 9.1; *Historia de preliis Alexandri Magni* cap. 113s. etc., base ms. from J² (ed. Hilka/Großmann, app.), text of J³ (ed. Steffens); *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* (ed. Sánchez Belda), cap. 104, ms. ALMD; Honorius Augustodunensis (cited in Hünemörder 1976, 274); *De monstris Indie* (12th c., ed. Hünemörder, 1976, 274). – OF Brendan and later *Occean* (according to FEW s. v. *Oceanus*), *Roman d'Alexandre déc.* A 2573 (= III 2897) *droit a Occeanon*, *déc.* V 5461 *e vit Occeanon*, II 1997 *tresq'a Occeanu* (*:revestu* etc.), ms. G v. 681 *jusqu'en Occeanon*. – MHG (cited in Caflisch-Einicher 1936, 248, 256 n. 1): Ulrich von Etzenbach, *Alex.* 27002, and Rudolf von Ems, Weltchr., 1433.18. The word 'ocean' was only used to refer to the sea surrounding the known world, and since from a European perspective, this was found in the west, it could become mixed up with *Occidens*.
232 Cf. Orosius, ms. D (8th c. second-best ms.) 1.2.34,1.2.46s. etc.; *Versus de Asia et de Universi Mundi Rota* (CC 175; 8th c. and also in the main ms.) 448, 449, 454. The *-e-* in hiatus is resolved into a syllabic *-i-* in other OF learned words: *crïer* < *creare* and still today *lion* < *leonem*.
233 As in e.g., 1119 Guido of Pisa (ed. Schnetz 139.59), ms. e and f; Geoffrey of Monmouth (ed. Hammer), ms. E, 1.274s., 4.12. Diefenbach cites *Occianus* (s. v.) first, meaning it is the most frequent form, in the glossary literature.

in the Old French epic, and the -*t* is usually secondary.[234] The forms *Occian* / *Occiant* / *Ociant* in the archetype meaning 'ocean' are therefore all within the range of variants we would expect to find. CV7 first made it into a meaningless *Olchan* / *Olcean*, but then understood it correctly; P and T have interpreted it, on the single occasion they each have used it, as *Occident* 'west'.

In ancient and medieval geography, the Ὠκεανός / *Oceanus* without any supplementary descriptors means the ocean which, according to most geographers[235] completely surrounds the three continents of the world. If we take the text very

---

234 In the following list, the asterisk indicates forms where the -*t* is unequivocally secondary. In O besides *Oc(c)ian(t)** there is also *Basan(t)**, *Tervagan(t)**. (We should also mention other appellative vocabulary: in O 16 times *olifan* / *oliphan* [+ once *olifans*], 6 times *olifant*.) In the Rol. tradition also: *Affrican(t)**, *Aleman(t)**, *Baligant* / *Paligân*, *Clarifan* / *Darifant*, *Guineman (t)**, *Jozeran(t)**, *Norman(t)** (cf. the index in ed. Stengel). In other epics: *Abraham* / *Abrehan* / *Abrahant**, *Adam* / *Adan(t)**, *Agolan(t)**, *Balan(t)**, *Bauçan(t)**, *Braban(t)**, *Braiman(t)**, *Bruban* / *Brusbant*, *Bertram* / *Bertran(t)**, *Bethleem* / *Belleent* / *Bellian(t)* / *Biauliant**, *Corbaran (t)**, *Galeran(t)**, *Herman(t)**, *Jehan* / *Johant**, *Jerusalem* / *Jerusalan(t)* / *Jursalant**, *Jorda(i)n* / *Jordant**, *Loherenc* / *Lohera(i)n* / *Loherant**, *Maltran(t)**, *Milan* / *Melant**, *Moïsen* / *Moïsan(t)**, *Monbranc* / *Monbran(t)*, *Moran(t)*, *Persan(t)**, *Pullian(t)**, *Rollan(t)*, *Samaritan(t)**, *Soliman(t)**, *Surian(t)**, *Tolosan(t)**, *Vivien* / *Vivian(t)**. In the courtly romances e.g., *Priam* / *Prian* / *Priant**. The -*t* is secondary in four out of five of the cases. The tendency is older than the Rol.: *Passion* 57a *Barrabant* (< **Barraban* < *Barrabam*, obl. of *Barabbas*). One of the reasons for this is that -*ant* was easier to incorporate into the assonance than other forms. In the Rol., for example, if we agree not to argue about isolated borderline cases, we find that among the masculine laisses, 16 end in -*an*(−), 13 in -*an*(−)/-*en*(−), 3 in -*an*(−)/-*a*(−), 4 in -*an*(−)/-*ain*(−)/-*en*(−), i.e. 36 altogether, in which -*ant* could be included; this is the biggest group, and the next-biggest is 19 laisses ending in -(*o*)*u*(−)/- (*o*)*un*(−).

235 As in Plato, Pytheas, Eratosthenes, or more precisely Crates of Mallus (middle of 2nd c. B.C.), and then based on these sources Orosius (1.2.1 *orbem totius terrae, oceani limbo circumsaeptum*), Macrobius, Martianus Capella, especially Isidore (13.15.1 *Oceanum Graeci et Latini ideo nominant eo quod in circuli modum ambiat orbem*, 14.2.1 *undique enim Oceanus circumfluens eius [scil. orbis] in circulo ambit fines*) and from there to the main medieval tradition (von den Brincken 1992, 34ss.). Two examples from the medieval Alexander literature: in the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* (ed. Kübler 204.13ss.) Alexander writes that in fact he has planned to start from the Indian coast and *orbem terrarum circumfluum navigare Oceanum*; and in the *Roman d'Alexandre* V 5461, we find: *e vit Occeanon qui tot lo mont aceint*; another OF example is Beneeit's *Chronique* v. 29ss. – There is no contradiction between this principle and the belief found in some ancient and medieval authors that one or more antipodean worlds exist, though they will always be beyond our reach – mainly because of the torrid zone which lies between (Edson et al., 2005, 58–67, especially maps p. 60 and 63). Another idea originating with Ptolemy was widespread in the Middle Ages and it, too, is compatible: namely that eastern Africa ('Ethiopia') is somehow connected to southern Asia by a large land mass, making the Indian Ocean an inland sea, and therefore the ocean encircling the world would also reach the area south of this connecting land mass (cf. Edson et al., 2005, map p. 63).

literally, then we should ask where this world-encircling ocean is most inhospitable, and the answer can only be: in the far north. But the Roland poet is probably under pressure to use a concise expression and he does not mean 'people from the inhospitable ocean that encircles the world' but rather 'people from the wilderness on the edge of the ocean that encircles the world'.[236] The question should be: where do people in the Middle Ages think the most inhospitable lands on the edge of the world-encircling ocean might lie?

Of course, we know e.g., from Pliny (5.6 and 6.199), that tracts of desert-like land in north western Africa reach as far as the Atlantic Ocean; Isidore (14.5.4 and 17) even believes that they are on the southern coast 'of Ethiopia', i.e. of sub-Saharan Africa, *loca exusta solis ardoribus*.[237] Such places exist also in or 'behind' India, as Herodotus (3.98) informs us, and as we see depicted in the Middle Ages e.g. in the Beatus Map dating from 787: *deserta et arenosa* by the ocean between India and the earthly paradise in the Far East (Leithäuser 1958, 67).[238]

But a 'wilderness' is not necessarily a burning or sandy desert, and the lands that are most often described in this way are the coastal areas by the Arctic Ocean of the north and north east. In his famous description of northern Eurasia Herodotus (4.16ss.) divides the land from west to east into strips running south to north, and in each case a non-Scythian people lives in the area above the Scythian territory, and then beyond that lies a 'land of wilderness'; if we go e.g. northwards from the Borysthenes (Dnieper), and then further still to the north (4.18), we travel through the land of the 'farmer Scythians ', then through a wasteland, and finally to the land of the Androphagi, or 'man-eaters', 'behind which there is nothing but wilderness'. Huge *deserta* by the ocean in the north are also mentioned by e.g. Pliny (6.33), Solinus (15.4) and Adam of Bremen (4.25). Similar descriptions are found in Geographus Ravennas 4.46: *ad partem enim septentrionalem habet ipsa Europa finem Oceanum qui tangit Scythiam eremosam*; and 5.28 AD *partem vero septentrionalem habet totus mundus finem praedictum Oceanum [. . .] qui Oceanus tangit Scythiam heremosam*. The first thing that King Alfred's informant Ohthere noted on his journey to the North Cape was that the land was all *wēste* 'waste' apart from a few places settled by

---

236 The text does not mean that the author thought of *Occian* as a country. Even today, Germans say, e.g. "He hails from the North Sea," meaning from an area of land not far from the North Sea.

237 More on the hot deserts of the south e.g., in Tattersall 1981, 248.

238 The supposed author of the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* (ed. Kübler 204.13ss.) states that 'in front of him' according to the local people, there are only *desertas in Oceano silvas camposque ac montes inhabitabiles*. Somewhere around this area is also referred to in *Baudouin de Sebourg*, the fantastical late epic of the Crusader Cycle (14th c., ed. Boca I 298): *Or s'en va le dromons où Bauduins estoit / En la mer des Désers, en Inde majour droit.*

the *Finnas* (probably in fact: Lapps; Kaiser 1955, 36.43ss.). John of Plano Carpini journeyed into Mongolia (shortly before 1250) and reports on a legend about the dog-faced people, north of the Samoyeds, 'in the wastelands along the coast of the ocean' (ed. van den Wyngaert 1929, 74). The Beatus Map also shows a *desertum* by the ocean, located to the north of the earthly paradise, which means the far north-eastern edge of the world; this then influenced the Saint-Sever Map (11th c.), which has *deserta arenosa* (Miller 1895–1898, vol. 1, map at the end of the book). *Desertus, eremosus, wēste* – these are the same keywords as *desert* in the song.

When we discuss this concept of the northern ocean, we must consider the fact that the ancient and medieval view of this part of the world was very distorted. The known seas, apart from the Caspian Sea, were all connected with the world-encircling ocean. This led to an unfortunate generalisation: with the exception of Herodotus and later Ptolemy, the mainstream tradition going back perhaps as far as the Presocratic philosophers and certainly stretching from Eratosthenes and the Latin writers Mela (1.9) and Pliny (6.28, 6.36) through Isidore (13.17.1) into the 14th c. felt obliged to view even the Caspian Sea as an inlet of the larger ocean,[239] and because the lands to the south and west of the Caspian Sea were too well known, this had to be the Arctic Ocean in the north. Moreover, there was a tendency to avoid large blank spaces on world maps,[240] and this led to an almost grotesque shortening of the north-south dimension of Asia in the Middle Ages. Orosius (1.2.48) was convinced that: *Mare Caspium sub aquilonis plaga ab Oceano oritur, cuius utraque circa Oceanum litora et loca deserta incultaque habentur.* Martianus Capella mentions the *Anthropophagi* – this name appears in Lat. instead of Herodotus' term *androphagoi* – first briefly (6.663, ed. Dick p. 329) as living far north of the Dnieper, then in more detail (6.693, ed. Dick p. 344): *Scythico oceano et Caspio mari, qua in oceanum Eoum cursus est, profundae in exordio nives dehincque longa desertio, post quam Anthropophagi excursus invios reddidere* 'to the northern ocean and the Caspian Sea (from where the coastline continues towards the Eoan [= eastern part of the north ocean]), [there is] first a region of deep snow, then a large wasteland, and then the region which the Anthropophagi have made inaccessible'; we see here that the Androphagi-Anthropophagi are now mentioned in the same breath as the northern ocean and the Caspian Sea. The Geographus Ravennas describes

---

239 KPauly s. v. *Kaspisches Meer*; von den Brincken (1992, 39 and 168). A few examples: Vidier 1911, table after p. 290 (Ripoll Map, 11th c., copy of the lost Theodulf map of the 9th c.); Edson et al. 2005, 63 (Wolfenbüttel Liber Floridus Map), 67 (London Psalter Map dating from 1262), 69 (Ebstorf Map 13th c.), 71 (Higden's Map, middle of the 14th c.).
240 On this von den Brincken (1970, 267).

the northern ocean just beyond the above-mentioned *Scythia eremosa* as also touching the lands of the Amazons, the Roxolani and the Sarmatians. On the Saint-Sever Map (11th c.) the above-mentioned north-eastern *deserta arenosa* are not just by the northern ocean, but also at its bay called the *oceanus Hyrcanus*, which is just another name for the Caspian Sea. On the Wolfenbüttel *Liber Floridus* Map (end of the 12th c., the *Liber* itself around 1120) there are lands by the northern, and then the north-eastern ocean, first the land where *inclusit Alexander XXXII regna*, and then the *Provincia Amazonum*, *Scythia*, *Hyrcania*, *Bactria* and *Aracusia*; also, in the London Psalter Map (around 1262) *Hyrcania* is on the eastern part of the northern sea.

The absence of vegetation in this vague, northerly territory goes hand in hand with an absence of civilisation, and an increase in wildness. This is why King Alfred's informant Ohthere did not dare to go ashore in in the land of the *Finnas* or the neighbouring *Beormas* (Permians in Karelia) *for unfriþe* (Kaiser 1955, 36.61) – 'because of the state of war', since he takes it for granted that the people's reaction to himself, a foreign sailor, would be hostile. And Herodotus notes about these Androphages at a later point (4.106), that they are 'the wildest of all peoples, without any laws or justice' (which corresponds in Mela to the *Androphagoe* 2.13 and 3.49, in Pliny to the *Anthropophagi* 4.88, 6.53 and 7.12).

The stereotype of civilisation gradually fading, the further north(-east) we travel, is artfully presented by Tacitus at the end of his *Germania* (45.3, 46.1–5). The Aestii, whom he counts among the Germani as their most north-eastern branch, rarely use iron.[241] The editor Anderson (1938, 219) continues: "working up to a climax [. . .]: the Peucini-Bastarnae are somewhat below the German type, the Venedi more, the Fenni most of all". The only thing wrong with the Peucini-Bastarnae (around today's Southern Poland) is the uncleanliness of their bodies, caused by their mingling with Sarmatians. The Venedi (in today's Northern Poland) love looting, but they still build houses and have shields to defend themselves (although they have no armour, we should probably add). But the Fenni (at that time in the Baltic area) are hunters and gatherers;[242] they do not seek any better kind of life and they can afford to be indifferent to the gods, because they do not even need them for oaths.[243] What sets them apart is their amazing wildness amidst such terrible poverty: they use animal pelts for

---

241 *[. . .] rarus ferri [. . .] usus.*

242 *[. . .] victui herba [est]; idemque venatus viros pariter ac feminas alit.*

243 They possess [. . .] *non penates* and are [. . .] *securi adversus deos [. . .], ut illis ne voto quidem opus esset.*

clothes; they have no armour, but rely entirely on arrows, in the absence of iron, made from sharpened bones.[244]

If we ignore for a moment the fact that Tacitus only talks about the Fenni in a hunting context, and not in war, then his depiction is quite similar to the poet's characterisation of the people of the *Occian*: (v. 3247–3251):

> Ço est une gent ki Damnedeu ne sert
> (De plus feluns n'orrez parler jamais);
> Durs ont les quirs ensement cume fer,
> Pur ço n'unt soign de elme ne d'osberc,
> En la bataille sunt felun et engrès.

This stereotype of the "wild north (east)" is evidently so deeply rooted, so widely known, that the Roland poet feels compelled to use it as the most suitable end point for the journey he describes from south to north in the second group of ten. He is describing in principle a culture that was previously widespread across northern and north-eastern Europe, or rather, a non-culture complex; but in keeping with most of the literary sources, he does this in a somewhat generalising, perhaps also archaising way – he is describing the time of Charlemagne, after all.

Bertoni (ad loc.) was of the opinion that the word *cuirs* refers metaphorically to the human skin; so the text would be saying that the people from the *Occian* fight with a bare chest, and not with leather armour. This interpretation is less likely, though not impossible. Let us consider a few facts by way of comparison through space and time, keeping both possibilities in mind! Paul the Deacon (1.5.6) knows that the *Scritobini* (with ~ /v/, Old Norse *Skrithifinnar*, 'Finns [= Lapps] travelling on skis' in Scandinavia) eat only the raw meat of wild animals, *de quorum etiam hirtis pellibus sibi indumenta peraptant*; but Adam of Bremen's scholiast introduces a variation to this around 1100: *Scritefingi [. . .] carne ferarum pro cibo et pellibus earum pro indumento fruuntur*.[245] In this reference, the use of animal pelts as the only form of clothing automatically means that metal armour and helmets are unknown. In Scandinavia during the great migration and the Vendel era, chainmail is rare, but it becomes more common after that,[246] yet Snorri Sturluson in the *Ynglinga saga* (cap. 6) states that the berserkers fought the battle without chainmail, 'raving like dogs or wolves, as strong as bears or bulls', and in

---

244 *Fennis mira feritas, foeda paupertas [. . .]: non arma [. . .]; vestitui pelles [. . .]; solae in sagittis spes, quas inopia ferri ossibus asperant.*
245 Adam of Bremen, Scholion 137 (preserved in the mss. A2, B1a, 3, 3a, C2).
246 RGA, Art. *Bewaffnung*, p. 439a.

other sources they wear a bear or wolf pelt instead of chainmail.[247] Procopius describes the Slavs of his time (6th c., *Bellum Gothicum* 3.14): 'They do not wear armour, and some even have no shirt and cloak, but just pull their trousers up over their loins and go towards the enemy just like that'.[248] But leather armour's *terre d'élection* is, as Olschki (1959, 207 with n. 21) rightly points out, the Altaic peoples' territory. One of the finest authorities on the early history of Central Asia, Peter Golden (1992, 60), describes the "Central Asian nomadic warrior", as he is referred to again and again from the 2nd c. B.C. onwards, as follows: "For body covering they used fur or leather". According to Strabo (around the time of Christ's birth, 7.3.306) the Roxolani 'and most of the others' [scil. peoples of the Steppe] at that time wore armour and helmets made of cowhide. But among the Roxolani, the chiefs at least wore 'armoured shirts made of small iron scales or hard leather' (Tacitus *hist*. 1.79). A few chainmail shirts have been excavated from graves in Hunnish territory, but they must be regarded as foreign elements in that context.[249] (Pseudo-?) Maurikios (around 600) says that the Avars wore suits of leather armour, and only the horses belonging to the nobility wore an iron breastplate; Leo the Wise (around 900) applies this statement to the Hungarians.[250] The archaeology shows that the situation generally changed in the 6th century approximately for those Steppe peoples who had contact with Europe: there is now considerable evidence of scale armour besides the leather collars;[251] but we must remember that organic material such as leather decays more easily. The normal armour for the last wave of Eurasian invaders, the Mongols, is still leather in the 13th c. – albeit partly with iron plates sewn into or onto it, as attested in Matthew Paris, John of Plano Carpini, William of Rubruck, Marco Polo and Vincent of Beauvais.[252]

---

247 *Vatnsdæla Saga* cap. 9, *Hrólfs Saga Kraka* cap. 33.

248 The early Turkish peoples were also mainly bowmen, and only belts and shoes are mentioned as their clothing. (Laurent 1913, 16 with n. 6).

249 As noted by J. Werner the RGA, Art. *Bewaffnung*, p. 454a.

250 RGA, Art. *Bewaffnung*, p. 454b, 455a.

251 RGA, Art. *Bewaffnung*, p. 450b–451a, 452b. There are added complications, however, in the fact that both scale and lamellar armour could be made out of leather pieces; in the RGA, Art. *Schuppen- und Lamellenpanzer*, p. 385b hardened leather (*durs unt les quirs!*) is also mentioned.

252 Matthew Paris (MGH SS. 28) for the year 1241: [Letter of Frederick II.] *[Tartari] cruda gestant coria bovina, asinina vel equina, insutis laminis ferreis pro armis muniuntur, quibus hactenus usi sunt. Sed [. . .] iamiam de victorum spoliis christianorum armis decencioribus elegantius muniuntur.* And for 1243: [Archbiship Ivo of Narbonne's report based on information from an English eyewitness] *De coriis bullitis sibi arma levia quidem, sed tamen impenetrabilia comptarunt.* – The most detailed account is by John of Plano Carpini in cap. 6 (ed. van den Wyngaert 1929, 77–79), which we can only briefly summarise here: Many have helmets and armour made of leather. (This is followed by a description of its manufacture. Horse armour has an

There is a second mention of the people from the *Oc(c)iant* which needs to be explained. Baligant constitutes his reserve attack force as follows (v. 3283–3287):

> Mais des meillors voeill jo retenir treis:
> L'un'ert de Turcs e l'altre d'Ormaleis,
> E la terce est des jaianz de Malpreis.
> Cil d'Ociant ierent e<n>sembl'ot mei,
> Si justerunt a Charle e a Franceis.[253]

The evidence from history makes it all too clear that Baligant would count Turks and especially Rum Seljuks among his elite; there is no need to justify why an army commander who has giants among his troops would choose these as his elite; likewise, there is no need to justify why peoples like those from the *Occiant* always seemed to Europeans to be *felun et engrès* (v. 3251) in the way they fought, and therefore *de facto* also were part of Baligant's "hard core". But how can we explain the syntax? Baligant orders three *eschieles* right next to himself; the following sentence can then only mean: the people from the *Ociant* will any-how be next to me. How can that be?

On the Christian side, Charlemagne does not appear until the tenth and last *eschiele.* It is the rear (and not front or mid) position that is typically taken up by the supreme commander, as we see in many battles[254] including the most famous

---

additional iron plate at the front.) The armour (for people) consists of four pieces of leather, including two shoulder portions which incorporate iron plates. Helmets are made of iron at the top, but the neck part is made of leather. Some have armour that is entirely made of iron. (This is followed by a description of lamellar armour.) William of Rubruck (ed. van den Wyng-aert 1929, 317s.) describes a dangerous situation where it turns out that of the twenty Tartars present, only two have iron armour, while the others have only armour made of animal pelts, and a further episode, where two Tartars come before their ruler wearing their armour of jer-kins *de corio rigido* (which reminds us of *durs*!). – Marco Polo (*Ottimo*-Text, ed. Ruggieri, 1986, cap. 62): *In loro dosso portano armatura di cuoio di bufelo e d'altre cuoia forti*. In editions based on other texts e.g., that of L. Foscolo Benedetto (1928) this is explained in more detail as 'boiled' [and therefore] 'very strong' [hard, *durs*!] buffalo and other types of skins. – Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale* 29.79: *[Tartari] armati sunt coriis, superpositis laminis ferreis coniunctis; laminisque vel corio brachia cooperiunt superius, sed non inferius. [. . .] Hac [scil. armatura] utuntur tantummodo barones ac pugnatorum duces eorumque signiferi et conestabuli. Unde non creditur decima pars ipsam habere [. . .] Capellos habent de corio multiplicato ad modum patellulae. [. . .] Non utuntur scutis.*

253 The variants of *Turcs, Ormaleis, Malpreis* and *Occiant* in these verses have been or will be discussed at the point where each people is mentioned in the catalogue.

254 Cf. Verbruggen (1954, 570): "Du IX^eau début du XIV^esiècle il y a plus de 30 actions où le prince commande la réserve; dans une dizaine d'exemples il participe à la lutte, mais un noble expérimenté commande la reserve".

battle of the 11th century, namely the battle of Antioch in 1098: all of the sources agree that this was Bohemund's position, including *Gesta*, Raymond of Aguilers, Anselm of Ribemont, Peter Tudebode, Tudebode *imitatus*, Robert the Monk, Albert of Aachen, Orderic Vitalis, William of Tyre and *Chanson d'Antioche*; Baldric of Dol even states explicitly: *Aciei sextae praesedit Boamundus, ut omnibus praevideret atque singulorum in necessitatibus adesset.* The biggest danger in this kind of battle is that the enemy breaks through at some point and surrounds part of the army via one of the flanks or drives them to flee in panic for fear of being surrounded, and so the supreme commander must stay at the back with a strong attacking force, ready to intervene; in fact, this is the sole reason why Charlemagne manages to contain the enemy when it breaks through (v. 3528s., 3533). And the converse is true: if a weak point opens up in the enemy forces, then the supreme commander can rush to that spot and support his own army's attack. Now Baligant fights in the twentieth *eschiele*, the last in the middle group of ten. This cannot be a coincidence; it shows quite simply how the poet imagines the way the groups of ten are positioned for battle, which is to say, in an order similar to the relative positions of their home territories: the first group of ten is the left flank, the third is the right flank, and the second is the centre;[255] this means that Baligant with his reserve attack force must be in the twentieth *eschiele*.[256] At the same time, this strategic position held by the two supreme leaders has a side effect that is poetically useful: both leaders can only appear late in the battle, but then they stand eye to eye against each other and can step in to bring the battle to a decisive end – as Baligant correctly predicts: it is the troops who are *ot mei* who *justerunt a Charle e a Franceis.*

---

[255] This appears to at least in principle mirror the real positioning of large Muslim armies since the time of the Abbasids: influenced by Byzantine and Persian practices, a battle order (Arab. ḫamīs) was established using five tiered units (right and left flank, centre, vanguard and rear guard) (LM s. v. *Heer, Heerwesen*, C. *Arabischer Bereich*). It may not have been easy to spot the separation between the vanguard and the rear guard and centre, from the perspective of the enemy, or perhaps the poet suppressed this distinction to make things simpler. The flanks are nevertheless distinct from the centre because the poet does not even hint at a structure on the Christian side: there, the first *eschiele*, which the poet represents with Rabel and Guineman, simply start the battle off (v. 3348ss.), and the tenth, which probably includes Naimes, and certainly includes Charlemagne, is the last one to join the battle (v. 3423 and 3443).

[256] The first scholar to realize that the positioning of Baligant's peoples was not just pêle-mêle, and the first to analyse it seriously was de Mandach (1993, 239–245); however, for reasons I do not fully understand, he places the first group of ten in front, and Baligant with the third group of ten to the left at the back, and the second group of ten to the right at the back.

On [2] Ruggieri (1953, 82) interprets *Occian le desert* as 'the Occident (as seen from Cairo), the Sahara'. This would mean that the poet expects his audience, with no prior warning, to understand the relative term "west" from Baligant's perspective rather than from their own, which is hardly likely. Furthermore, *occident* is only twice attested without the *-d-*: once in 1374 as *occien* (Godefroy s. v. *occien*, Tobler/Lommatzsch has nothing to add), and then in 1611 as *occiant* in the English author Cotgrave's French/English dictionary (FEW s. v. *occidens*). The word is elsewhere, like its antonym *orïent* (trisyllabic!), obviously a *mot savant*; it is highly unlikely that a variant of the word would have undergone the very vernacular transition *-d-* > -/ð/ > null, and thereafter have appeared only once in the late 14th c. and again once in the early 17th c. In my opinion, therefore, the reference from 1374 is a scribal error, and the one from 1611 a printing error or a mistake made by a non-native speaker. Admittedly, P and T each have a single *Occidant* or *Occident* and have evidently interpreted the *Oc(c)iant* in their source as 'west', but this tells us nothing about the poet's intentions.

On [3] According to Jenkins (ad loc.), Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 292s.) and Grégoire (1939a, 246s. n. from 244) the *Oc(c)ian* (read as a plural ethnicon) are the *Opsequiani* (as they appear in Lat. in the Chronicle of Bari referring to 1041); they were troops from the Byzantine Obsikian Theme in Asia Minor, south east of Constantinople, on the other side of the straits. However, there is a serious grammatical objection to this: we would expect an obl. plural ending in *-s*: **d'Occians* but there are no traces of this in any of the five citations in the archetype.[257] The writer of the archetype understood 'ocean' everywhere.

Jenkins thinks that Opsikion bordered *al desert*, meaning the Lycaonian desert. But if we look at the map (e.g., in the ODB, Art. *theme*) we see that from the 8th c. onwards only a rather short stretch of the border is next to the desert. Grégoire rather supposes that the *desert* is referring to the fact that at the time of writing, Opsikion had been *ravagé par les Turcs*. But even in the 12th c. Opsikion was still a 'lovely', 'rich and blessed' land;[258]

---

[257] We cannot work with *Opsikion* instead of *Opsiciani* either, as Jenkins does. Gk. Ὀψίκιον has the stress on /psi/, and not on the last syllable; this is evident not just from the placing of the stress in the Gk. tradition, but also from the etymology Lat. *obséquium* 'close followers' and from the Arab. rendering *Ubsīq/Absīq*, as e.g., in the *Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam*, 6.60 and 42.5 (trans. Minorsky p. 78 and 156); the case is therefore very different from that of *Butentrot*. The unstressed -ιον (the /-n/ of which was long silent in colloquial Greek, cf. above n. 16) would in Romance speakers at best have left an /-ə/ behind, and probably not even that.

[258] Eustathius of Thessaloniki (around 1150), *Laudatio S. Philothei Opsiciani* (PG 136, col. 144 δ'): καλὸν Ὀψίκιον, γῆ [. . .] πολυτελὴς καὶ εὐδαίμων.

On [4] According to Boissonnade (1923, 231s.) the poet is talking about the wild Turkmens from "Oxiana". The only reference to this form of the name is given by Boissonnade as "Plinius, *Hist.Nat.*, VI, 16 (Oxiana)" – but Pliny is talking there about something completely different, and judging by the index, *Oxiana* never appears in Pliny's work; and judging by its absence in Forcellini's *Onomastikon* and in the PW, it even seems nowhere to be found in any Latin texts whatsoever! As for OF, even if we accepted the arbitrary rendering of a Lat. *-x-* with *-cc-*, we would expect a feminine ending in *-e*. Boissonnade introduces here, as he often does, irrelevant material, and once again it takes a lot of time to check it; indeed, Honorius Augustodunensis discusses "sommairement ces regions" but he does not even mention the Oxus River, nor a region called *Oxiana*, and yet these names would be crucial.

On [5] The word *Occian* reminded Mireaux (1943, 263) of *Aoxianus*, which appears in the Crusade historians as a transcription of *Yaghi-Siyān*, the name of the ruler who defended Antioch. This is because the *imagination* of the poet would be *assurément capable de faire d'un émir turc une contrée déserte*.

A.1.2.10 Two special cases: *Enfruns* and *Arabiz*
When Baligant's situation becomes critical, Jangleu presses him to deploy the best troops immediately (v. 3517–3519):

> Mais reclamez les barons d'Occiant,
> Turcs e Enfruns, Arabiz e Jaianz.[259]
> Ço que estre en deit, ne l'alez demurant.

The poet evidently introduces a slight variation on the motif discussed above (A.1.2.9) of the reserve attack force made up of four *eschieles* (v. 3283–3287). Three of the four are explicitly named here: the people from the *Occiant*, the Turks and the *jaianz* (de Malprose); the fourth *eschiele*, the *Ormaleus* are Rum Seljuks and so they can here be included among the 'Turks'. But why do we now have *Enfruns* and *Arabiz*?

---

259 These are the variants: on *Turcs* O: *Turcles* V4, *Turs* CV7. On *Enfruns* O: *Unces* V4, *Enfrus* CV7 (V4 has suppressed an *infra*, CV7 have overlooked only a tilde). On *Arabiz e Jaianz* O: *tutti qui' de Persant* V4, *trestotz les Jaianz* CV7 (β is the same as CV7; its editor probably took exception to the idea that *Arabiz* referred to a single tribe that had not appeared in the catalogue).

A.1.2.10.1 The *Enfruns*

The primary meaning of OF *enfrun* is 'glouton, avide', or 'gluttonous, greedy (for food)' – as rightly noted by Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *enfrun* and especially the FEW s. v. *frūmen*. As far as I know, no one has ever wondered which type of food the *Enfruns* could have been 'greedy' for. The answer is linked to our discussion above (on A.1.2.9): for human flesh. From Herodotus (1.216, 4.26, 4.64, 4.106) onwards, ancient and medieval geographers locate the most famous anthropophagi of all firmly in the north, including Scythia (Pliny 4.88, 6.53, 7.12; Mela 3.49; Solinus 50.1; Martianus Capella 6.653. 693, ed. Dick p. 329, 344; map of Henry of Mainz; Hereford world map; and finally, the Ebstorf world map, here identified as Gog and Magog); though there were others in and around India as well as in Africa (PW s. v. *Androphagi*).

Can we identify the poet's idea more precisely? A peculiar pseudo-etymological connection may help us here. The *Ambrones* were a tribe who had joined the Cimbri and Teutones and were defeated along with the Teutones in 102 B.C. at Aquae Sextiae. But in the 2nd c. A.D. the great lexicon by Festus states (as cited by Paulus Diaconus, p. 17): *Ambrones: ex quo tractum est ut turpis vitae homines 'ambrones' dicerentur*. Similarly, there is talk in Gildas (6th c.), *De excidio Britanniae* cap. 16, of *ambrones, lupi profunda fame rabidi*, which emphasises the element of greed, albeit in a figurative way (TLL s. v. *Ambrones*). Bonifatius uses this name with the meaning '*homo avarus*' (cf. *enfrun* also meaning 'avare, chiche'!), but shortly before that Aldhelm and then in the late 9th c. Abbo of Saint-Germain use it meaning 'gulosus, vorax' (Mlat.Wb. s. v. *ambro*). The specialised anthropological/geographical meaning 'greedy' in the sense of 'man-eaters' appears at about the same time. The Irish scholar John Scotus Eriugena († around 877) mentions in his *Annotationes* on Martianus Capella (48.21 ed. Lutz): *Anthropophagi dicuntur 'Ambrones'*, and as one of the few people of his era who could speak Greek, he feels obliged to offer a Greek (pseudo-)etymology: he says it means ἄν[θρωπος] 'human being' + βρῶ[σις] 'food'. A few years later Remigius of Auxerre († around 908) states more precisely in his own commentary on Martianus, with reference to the same word (ed. Lutz): *Ambrones populi sunt Scithiae qui carnibus humanis vescuntur [. . .]* In the late 11th c. Adam of Bremen 4.19 follows suit: [somewhere north or north east of the Baltic Sea] *sunt etiam qui dicuntur Alani vel Albani, qui lingua eorum Wizzi dicuntur, crudelissimi ambrones*. As the context shows, Adam does not mean the Alans, nor the Caucasian or Balkan Albanians, but the Vepsians mentioned in the Russian Nestor chronicle, a tribe of east Finns located east of Novgorod (cf. the ed. Schmeidler p.242, n.4); here, too, *ambrones* obviously means 'man-eaters'. This meaning lived on in MLat. until well into the 15th c.; Diefenbach cites (s. v. *ambrones*) a glossary with the explanation: *lude de den menschen*

etet. The two above-mentioned commentaries (according to LM, Art. *Martianus Capella*) were key texts used by teachers to introduce the difficult writings of Martianus Capella to students of the quadrivium, and indeed this author was so highly regarded that in the 12th c. John of Salisbury claimed, somewhat grotesquely to a modern reader, that Vergil was *non inferior Marciano*. This all suggests that educated Francophones could think that Lat. *Ambrones* and their vernacular *enfruns* were one and the same word. We conclude for our context: the *Enfruns* are probably part of the northern lack-of-civilisation complex including the people from the northern *Occian(t)* 'Northern Ocean'. The poet had not managed to include this striking attribute of the "wild north" in his depiction of the tenth people, but he did not want to lose it, so he squeezed it in later, and it makes little difference whether he consciously "splits" the people from the *Occian(t)* or regards the *Enfruns* as a neighbouring people.[260]

A.1.2.10.2 The *Arabiz*

This brings us to the *Arabiz* and to *Arabe*! OF *Ar(r)abi(t)* has three meanings. The first is '(ethnic) Arabian' (as opposed, e.g., to 'Turkish' or 'Persian'), the second is more generally 'Muslim'. This second meaning is definitely intended when *Ar(r)abiz* refers to Baligant's army as a whole (v. 3011, 3081, 3481, 3511, 3640), although other terms are also used such as *paien d'Arabe* (v. 2810 and 3555), *oz [. . .] d'Arabe* (v. 2980), *cels d'Arabe* (v. 3331).[261] The first, ethnic meaning is attached to

---

260 Grégoire (1946, 442ss.) offers an alternative explanation: *Enfrun* is a bowdlerised *Afrum*, acc. of *Afer* 'African'. I think this is less probable, but not impossible, if we recognise at least that the aim of the distortion is to highlight the 'greedy' part of the meaning. We might add that the poet would then have identified the *Nigres* and/or *Mors* in the first group of ten as the African ('Ethiopian') anthropophagi in Pliny *n.h.* 6.195 and Solinus 30.7.– *Enfrun / Anfrun* (rectus pl.) also appear in a text that has survived only in fragmentary form, the Occitan *Aigar et Maurin* v. 467 and 700: they are men armed with axes from the region around the town of *Le Lans* (*sic*, unidentifiable). The plot of the epic is difficult to discern, but it is about a King *Aigar* (Edgar?) and a rebellious vassal, and it appears to take place in England, and so it has nothing to tell us about the *Enfruns* in the Rol.

261 V. 3473 can also be understood in this way, as it follows all of those previous mentions: 'Baligant's warriors (*li chevaler d'Arabe*), such as those from the *Occiant*, from *Argoillie* and *Blos*'; but it could also anticipate v. 3518. – The more general meaning is probably intended in *mule[t] d'Arabe* v. 3943; because ethnic Arabia was famous for its horse breeding, but not for its mule breeding, since the latter were mainly from Asia Minor (cf. below s. v. *Suatilie*, A.5.3). It could have either meaning in the *or d'Arabe* v. 185 and 652 which is in Marsilĭe's possession. The southern Arabian land of the Sabaeans had supplied gold in biblical times (*Isa* 60.6, *Jer* 6.20, *Ez* 27.22), and it was still known for this in Pliny's writings (*nat.* 6.161); but in Islamic times the main supplier of gold to the Muslims ceased to be Arabia, since it was overtaken first by Upper Egypt and then by north-west Africa (cf. below s. v. *Malcuiant*, A.7.1).

the country name *Arabe* in v. 2282: when the African soldier tries to steal Roland's sword so that he can take it as a trophy to *Arabe,* he is not thinking of this place as just 'an Islamic area' but – in accordance with the tradition of honouring the sovereign with especially valuable items of booty – he is thinking of bringing it straight to the court of his most senior feudal lord, from whom he hopes to receive the richest possible reward. We can surmise therefore, that Baligant is thought to be of Arab ethnicity (which indeed would only be natural for a ruler of all Islam and as such a successor of Muhammad). And now that he has to go to war in person, he does not do this alongside strangers, but rather with his closest entourage, i.e., his courtiers, including his bodyguards; the poet takes it for granted that these will be of the same ethnicity as the ruler, and that is why they, too, are 'Arabs'. This group is too small in number to be named in the catalogue, where the smallest *eschiele* is said to contain 50,000 warriors (v. 3219), but it is named here, precisely because Baligant himself is about to join in the fighting. In fact, it would be astonishing if the Arabians were never mentioned as an ethnic group in the Baligant section.[262] And it is natural that Jangleu regards this inner guard as belonging to the elite.

The keyword 'elite' leads us to the third meaning of *Ar(r)rabiz.* Whereas the two meanings mentioned so far go back to Arab. ʿ*arabī* '(ethnic) Arabian', in the OF word there sometimes appears to be another, less obvious meaning: Arab. *ar-rābiṭa* 'band of religious warriors who live together and carry out military and religious exercises' (cf. the FEW, vol. 19, s. v. *arab*). We are sure that this word reached Galloromania because we find it in the PT: he writes on the one hand about the *milites fortissimi qui vulgo dicuntur Arabit* (cap. 3), and on the other about a *rex Arabum* 'King of the (ethnic) Arabs' (cap. 9). But this clear distinction is exceptional. Even in the oldest attestations, *Arabitae* simply refers to the Orient, used with *Arabes* (cf. *Annales Altahenses* [around 1075], MGH SS.schol.4.67s. contra 69s.; Lampert of Hersfeld, *Annales* [dating from 1078/ 1079], MGH SS.schol. 38.94 and 98 contra 95–97). Similarly, in OF there is little evidence of a conscious separation of the two terms. Nevertheless, the third

---

262 On the other hand, this name is enough to identify who they were. The poet had already introduced the Muslims of al-Andalus and north Africa (apart from Egypt) in the first part of the song, without there being any reason to emphasise the fact that they spoke Arabic. He would have thought of the Arabic speakers from Syria and Iraq as being included in the *Canelius* and *Pers* because they played only a minor role in the Crusades; the three most famous enemies of the crusaders were Kürbuğa, Nureddin and later Saladin, none of whom where Arabs. The Egyptian Fatimid caliphs, on the other hand, relied mainly on black African and Armenian troops. The Arabian Peninsula did not take part in the First and Second Crusades. The small proportion of actual Arabs in Baligant's army is therefore not inconsistent with the real history of the Crusades.

meaning has possibly influenced the song in two places. In v. [1513]=1556, in the Marsilĭe section, when Olivier unhorses *set Arrabiz*, these may be 'guest warriors' from the Orient, just like Grandonĭe, the son of the King of Cappadocia (v.[1570s.] =1613s.); but we cannot exclude the idea of a group of *Rābiṭa* religious warriors.[263] And as this guard of *Arabiz* 'Arabs' who now join Baligant in the final battle are an elite unit, the third meaning could supplement the first meaning here.[264]

A.1.2.11 Interim summary

The peoples in the second group of ten are generally set out in a south-to-north direction, from northern Syria to the Arctic Ocean, in the opposite direction to the one used in the first group of ten; it is only when the other side of the Black Sea is reached, that there may be some crossing back and forth. Furthermore, the Avars and the Bulgarians are not counted from their last known location, but from the (correct) medieval awareness of them as "peoples of the Steppe"; the fact that the Kievan Rus appear in the first group of ten, whereas the clearly more western Prussians appear only now, can be explained by the history of the Kievan Rus, who by the poet's lifetime had already been orthodox Christians for

---

263 Elsewhere in the song, the enemies in the Marsilĭe section are always, that is to say 31 times altogether, called *Sarrazins* (though in v. 269 and in the derivation *Sarazineis* v. 994 with a single *-r-*); in the Baligant section this word only occurs twice (v. 2706, 2828) and it refers there also (in stark contrast with the surrounding context!) to Spanish, and not oriental Muslims. This semantic restriction of *Sarrazins* is unusual, when compared with the broader meaning 'Muslims' which is more common in OF and MLat. Dörper's research on the early history of the term (1993, passim) indicates that Ptolemy was the first to use Σαρακηνή to mean the territory of a tribe located in the northern part of the Sinai Peninsula (5.17.3) and the Σαρακηνοί meaning the inhabitants of *Arabia felix* (6.7.21) (and this could already indicate that the meaning of the name is beginning to expand), Eusebius, and even more obviously Jerome, equate the ethnonym with Ἰσμαηλῖται or *Ismaelitae* 'descendants of Ishmael', which amounts to 'Arabs'; Jerome also uses a word with the same meaning, *Agareni* 'descendants of Hagar', and with the advance of Islam, these became terms for 'Muslims' in general. The spelling with *-rr-* (Lat. frequently since Jerome) comes from a pseudo-etymological derivation from Σαρρα (as in the Septuagint) and Lat. *Sarra* (starting slowly to give way to *Sara* between the 4th and 9th c.) 'Sarah, wife of Abraham', because allegedly the Arabs falsely represented themselves as the descendants of Sarah (on this cf. in addition to Dörper especially LM s. v. *Sarazenen*).

264 It is noticeable that in O the country name *Arabe* has a single *-r-* in all of the nine places where it appears, but the ethnikon *Ar(r)abiz* has *-rr-* six times and a single *-r-* only once, on the last occasion, in v. 3513, where it does not make any difference to the meaning. The *-t* (which is hidden in the *-z*) is also not certain to have come from *ar-rābiṭa*; because there were no indigenous words ending in a syllabic *-I*, and therefore it could simply have been influenced by the *-ītus* participle form.

over a century and cultivated excellent dynastic connections with France and England, while the Prussians were unyielding heathens.

On the eastern side, the second group of ten goes in the south as far as Persia, and in the north as far as the lands on the edge of the Arctic Ocean. It may be almost meaningless to ask how far east it goes, because the poet, like all his contemporaries, will have imagined the Caspian Sea to be near there too.

There is colour symbolism in the word *Pers*, and another negative meaning in *Avers*, and both are made explicit through a slight, but deliberate deviation from the phonology we would expect. The poet also creates a negative aura on occasions by adding adjectives (*laiz*, *divers*), but most effectively, and with the emphasis that comes from being last of the list, in the explicit depiction of the uncivilised and wild tenth people.

In the second group of ten there are again certain, albeit vague similarities with the biography of Alexander the Great. After Alexander had crossed the Euphrates near Gaugamela (close to modern Mosul) he conquered Babylon near to what was later to become Baghdad; the second group of ten also begins on the other side of the Euphrates, after crossing near Bālis; Baghdad in particular, the residence of the Turkish Grand Sultan, supplied the poet with the name *Turcs*. Alexander marched onwards into Persia itself, and the poet turns to the *Pers*. Alexander headed northwards (in the year 330) as far as the Caspian Sea (which was thought to be a bay in the Arctic Ocean) and fought against the Scythians (in 329); this could have prompted the poet to think of the huge complex of (ancient or still active) nomadic horsemen, from the Pechenegs to the northern *Occian*.

A.1.3 Third group of ten: the eastern part – and contemporary events

A.1.3.1 First *eschiele*: *des jaianz de Malpr[o]se*

Des jaianz de Malpr[o]se Segre 3253, *des jaianz de malp(re)se* O (in an ǫ-ə laisse), *diu erste scar uon giganden, diu ander uon Malpʳose* K (*diu êrste sî von Gâzen: die sint lanc und alsô grôz, daz es noch alle die verdrôz, die wider si strîten solten, wan sis vil sêre engolten. diu ander sî von Precors* Stricker, *de eirste schar sy van Gyganden van dem lande Malprose, dat volk is lanck ind boese* the *Karlmeinet), de Gaiçant et de Malposse* V4, *jaiant de Val Proissie (Persie) la grent* CV7: In CV7 *Mal-* is misread as *Val-* 'valley', 'Prussia' or 'Persia' is read into it, and the addition of *la grent* is a requirement of the rhyme *-ent* in this laisse. There is a syntactical change *A de B > A et B* in K (and in Stricker, but not *Karlmeinet*) and independently of them in V4. *Jaianz* is confirmed by all the texts, and *Malprose* by O (corrected to

suit the assonance), by K (plus *Karlmeinet*) and (apart from an *r-suprascriptum* that has been overlooked) also by V4.

These are therefore the giants of *Malprose*, with the ǫ-ə confirmed by the assonance. Giants of course belong among the elite peoples, so their name occurs once more, only this time with *ei* assonance:

des jaianz de Malpreis O 3285, *de Gaiçant e Clentì* V4, *des paiens* (*jaiant* V7) *de* [kursiv oder nicht?] *Brunsoir* CV7, *de Chasains et de Rois* P: Although only *de(s?) jaianz (de)* is confirmed by OV4V7, *Malpreis* also belongs in the archetype, because only this cohort of giants has been mentioned before and so would be expected here, and *Malpreis* differs from *Malprose* only in the change of suffix (*-eis* < *-ensis* instead of *-ose* < *-osa*) caused by the assonance requirements. The subarchetype of β had only an illegible name or a gap, so that the non-O have made something up to fit in with their rhyme.

In the third place (v. 3518) the poet is able to refer to the people briefly as *Jaianz* (OCV7). The meaning is, although this has never been suggested before, [1] the Μακρόβιοι/*Macrobii* of India and not [2] the Bulgarians from 'Lake Prespa' or [3] 'people from Palmyra'.

On [1]: We shall consider first the Μακρόβιοι of India. If we ask ourselves *a priori,* which Asian country situated to the east of the peoples of the second group of ten was also most likely to be known by name in medieval Europe, there is no doubt about the answer: it would be India.[265] Alexander the Great is ultimately responsible for this: India was quite literally the *non plus ultra* of his all-conquering career. Without him, western literature of the Augustan age would not be full of material about this country, its inhabitants and its products (cf. Forcellini s. v. *India*), because at that time the Parthian Empire already blocked all further contacts. In late antiquity, and therefore also for the Middle Ages, the Alexander Romance by Pseudo-Callisthenes was even more important, as it was translated, extended, and increasingly surrounded by additional Alexander texts. It would have therefore been strange if India had not been part of our catalogue. But the poet could not simply name 'the Indians' there, because thanks to Pseudo-Callisthenes, and then also the Alexander corpus in Latin, two elements that would have been highly counterproductive in the catalogue had begun to dominate the general picture of 'India': first, the Indian

---

265 Of the 21 *mappae mundi* that were quantitatively evaluated by von den Brincken (1968, 163 and 165), 17 show *India*, (and 17 also show *Persia*, but e.g., only 14–15 show *Arabia*, 9–10 *Seria* and/or *Cathay* [~China], and 7 *Russia*).

Brahmans or Gymnosophists, who had repelled even Alexander's lust for conquest with their unshakeable pacifism and self-effacement; and secondly, most of the *monstra Indie*, which had inspired entire didactic poems, but in the song would distract the audience from the main story.[266] This is why the poet opted for the 'giant' and therefore terrifying, but otherwise quite human stature of the Macrobians.

The name Μακρόβιοι means 'long-lived people', and Pliny knows of Macrobians in this sense in Macedonia near Mount Athos (4.37), in Ethiopia (6.190) and indeed in India (7.28). The latter are already the most famous in Pliny's lifetime, because according to him, Ctesias of Cnidos, physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon, mentioned them shortly after 400 B.C. and then 'not a few' others after that. In Isidore (11.3.26) they have become human beings measuring 3–4 m in height, making them 'giants': *In India ferunt esse gentem quae Μακρόβιοι nuncupantur, duodecim pedum staturam habentes*. This reinterpretation must have come from someone who understood μακρός only to mean 'large', and not 'lasting a long time'. Isidore's information fell on fertile ground: it is echoed in Rabanus Maurus, Ratramnus of Corbie, Lambert of Saint-Omer, Honorius Augustodunensis, Bartholomeus Anglicus, Vincent of Beauvais, and in German literature in version E of the *Herzog Ernst* and in the *Alexander* by Rudolf von Ems.[267]

The Roland poet follows suit, but this information came down to him with a curiously re-interpreted form of the name. Isidore († 636) was conceited enough to demonstrate his all-round, and at that time unusual erudition by leaving some Greek words and names in the Greek script, and this is what he does in the sentence quoted above. His work was an ideal 'encyclopaedia' ("Konversationslexikon", E. R. Curtius) for the Middle Ages and so it very quickly spread across Europe: Bischoff states that it reached Ireland and England probably before 700, and Gaul by 780; Langosch maintains that of all the non-Spanish mss. that have been preserved to this day, over 50 originate in the period before around 900, at least twelve in France and eleven in Switzerland.[268] This also means: most of the early ms. tradition passed through the Merovingian realm, and therefore through the absolutely lowest point of written culture in the west. If you look through Lindsay's edition, for example, you will quickly ascertain that the Greek words are disproportionally affected by this fate; and since the best editions of the *Etymologiae* can only ever include a small proportion – where possible using only

---

266 Cf. Hünemörder (1976, passim).

267 These references are cited by Lecouteux (1982, 2.110).

268 Bischoff (1961, passim), Langosch (1964, 30 with n. 66 on p. 156), LM s. v. *Isidor von Sevilla*, III.

the best examples – out of a total of about 1000 surviving mss.,[269] we can assume that the situation is even worse if averaged across the whole of the ms. tradition. In the case mentioned above, someone had evidently not recognised that the name was written in Greek letters, and wrote it down in Roman letters that look similar: κ became lc, ρ became p, the accent on the *ó* was interpreted as an *r*-abbreviation, the vertical stroke of the β as a (long)ſ; this resulted in the word *Malcprof-*, which soon lost its *-c-* because of the three-consonant rule, and probably also because the name now sounded like many 'heathen' names beginning with *Mal-*. We cannot be sure how the ending of the word came about, but this does not really matter because the final result was just an /-ə/.

For us, the leap from the Arctic Ocean (*Occian*) to India is huge; it was much shorter for people who believed the Caspian Sea to be a part of the Arctic Ocean. For them, it was just a matter of crossing the mountain range that ran through Central Asia from west to east, and about which almost nothing was known except that it existed.

On [2]: Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 296) state that "il n'est pas certain que Malpreise [*sic*, G.A.B.] ou Malprose soit le petit lac de Prespa (en slave Prespa) [. . .]". This Lake Prespa, Gk. *Mikrí Prespa*, is located in Greece today, but close to the border with Albania and Macedonia. Tsar Samuel of Bulgaria had his residence in a small fortress on the Island of Saint Achillios in this lake (LM s. v. *Prespa*). There is no reason why the *gent Samuël* should be mentioned a second time, or why they should now be giants, quite apart from the phonological considerations.

On [3]: *Malprose* reminded Mireaux (1943, 262) of Palmyra. I am not sure why.

A.1.3.2 Second and third *eschiele*: *de Hums*; de *Hungres*

These two names are considered together for convenience: *de Hums e [. . .] de Hungres* O 3254, *uon Surse [. . .] uon Ungeren* K (*von Sibors [. . .] von Ungers* Stricker, *van Sures [. . .] van Ungres* the *Karlmeinet*), *d'Ongres [. . .] de Bolgre* V4, *de Huns [. . .] de Hugrent* CV7: The precursor of K must have had *deshums* > *desũs* > *de surs* (nasal tilde misread as *r*- abbreviation). V4 did not recognise the *Hums* either (or more probably knew that they did not belong in Charlemagne's era), brought the 'Hungarians' forward and completed the pair following the pattern found in v. 2922 (*Hungre e Bugre*) with 'Bulgarians', who also fitted the assonance. *Hugrent* in CV7 can be explained as a requirement of the rhyme (laisse ending in *-ent*). (K)CV7 confirm that the reading in O is correct. As far as

---

269 This estimate is from Langosch (1964, 30).

I know, there is no disagreement about the meaning, which is [a] the Huns and [b] the Hungarians.

On [a]: Until at least 1200, two forms of name of the Huns were used side by side, the spelling with *-n-* and alternatively with *-nn-*. Until around 1100, there was no curve on *-u-*, and no little dash on the final *-i* (the precursor of our dot above the i) and so the name was written with an *H-* and five or seven strokes. A scribe could think that he was seeing six strokes, and this led to the variant *Humi*, which occurs a few times in Latin. In OF an additional factor was the merger of the final nasal phonemes, attested for the (north) west in the late 11th c., and then also in O: *Loüm* v. 2097 ~ *Loün* v. 2910.[270]

The Huns came from central Asia when they crossed the Volga around 370 (Golden 1992, 85–88). But what did people know about that in the Middle Ages? According to Ammianus Marcellinus (31.2.1), who was the first and most influential witness to the Huns in the Latin-speaking world, this people lived initially *ultra paludes Maeoticas, glacialem oceanum accolens* 'beyond the Sea of Asov near the Arctic Ocean', which makes sense, as long as you believe that the Caspian Sea is a bay in the Arctic Ocean. They overwhelmed first the Alans east of the Don, and then the Goths (31.2.13, 31.3.1). Ammian adds that the latter had not heard of the Huns before this happened because they broke out suddenly *ex abdito sinu* 'from a remote corner of the earth' (31.3.8). Now the *paludes Maeoticae* at the mouth of the Don, or the Don itself, in both ancient and medieval geography were regarded as the boundary separating Europe from Asia. In any case the Huns came "out of Asia" and this is reason enough to qualify them for inclusion in the third group of ten. The core of Ammian's observation – 'from beyond the Sea of Asov' – remains unchanged in later authors too;[271] but later there is a clarification towards the south: the homeland of the Huns reached as far as the Caucasus. In particular, Orosius states in his influential *Historia adversum paganos* (1.2.45), that the 'Caucasus' lies *inter Chunos, Scythas et Gandaridas*, which makes the Huns northern inhabitants of the 'Caucasus'; on the other hand, he had previously (1.2.15) noted that the 'Caucasus'

---

270 I have explored this problem in detail in another publication (Beckmann, 2010, 38s.). This work gives detailed references showing the long co-existence *-n-* and *-nn-* in the name of the Huns, five references for *Humi* and the literature on the OF phonemic merger. Since then, I have found a sixth reference: in Claudian, *In Rufinum* liber 1 v. 321 (MGH AA 10, p. 30), mss. PB have *Humorum* instead of *Hunorum*.

271 Thus Claudian (MGH AA 10, p. 30, v. 321, 323–328) adds nothing new to Ammian's account, while Sidonius Apollinaris (MGH AA 8, p. 180, v. 243–245) reinforces the northern components.

was the northern border of India. He uses 'Caucasus' as a collective name for the large mountain range stretching from west to east through Asia (as he explains at greater length in 1.2.36–47), and these mountains are all that lies between India and the homeland of the Huns. This comes to the fore when Orosius later describes how the Huns (7.33.10) had broken out of a previously inaccessible mountainous land, and when Jerome (*ep.* 77) and following him also Isidore (9.2.66) count them as one of the peoples Alexander had once locked up on the edge of India – and this, too, explains the connection that lingered in the poet's mind between India and the Huns.

On [b]: The Huns are linked in the mind of the poet with the Hungarians, too, who were generally thought to be descendants of the Huns.[272] This alone is reason enough for their appearance here in the third group of ten. Moreover, around 1100 they were the most recent and insecure of the Christian peoples of Europe; although the country was Christianised under Saint Stephen in around 1000, it had experienced pagan uprisings in 1041, 1046 and 1061. If the poet introduces them "only" as a sister people of the Huns, then it is because he may have welcomed the gain of one more the *eschiele*.[273] The form of the ethnonym without the suffix, OF *(h)ongre* < MLat. *(h)ungări*, was superseded by *hongrois* in the late 15th and the 16th c. (Schweickard 1992, 75).

A.1.3.3 Fourth *eschiele*: *de Baldise la lunge*

De Baldise la lunge O 3255, *Bilisen* K (ms. P, but *Binisen* ms. A and Stricker, *Galose* the *Karlmeinet*),[274] *Baldixe la longe* V4, *d'Albanie et de Kent* (*Quent* V7) CV7: In the *Karlmeinet*, *Galose* rhymes with the following name *Valrose* (~ *Marose* in O), which might explain why there is an -*o*- instead of -*i*-; a palaeographic confusion is behind *G*- instead of *b*-. In V4 Venetian <x> is ~ /z/; OV4 therefore confirm the archetype. In CV7 *Kent*/ *Quent* has been randomly chosen to fit the rhyme ending in -*ent; Albanie* is also an arbitrary secondary meaning for *debaldise* or similar, which was no longer understood.

    As for the meaning it is difficult to decide between [1] Baghdad or the 'land around Baghdad', probably and [2] [*Balcia/Baltia/Baldia/Balisia*, an unidentifiable

---

272 There is a long list of references showing this, including some from the Roland poet's time and place, in Beckmann (2010, 36–38).

273 News about a *(H)Ungaria magna* in the region around the Volga did not reach the west until the 13th c., and so this could not have had any influence on the song.

274 K (along with Stricker, but not *Karlmeinet*) has held the name back, waiting until a suitable rhyme word becomes available in the form of *Targilîsen* (Stricker *Argilîsen*, corresponding to *Argoilles* in O).

island in the Arctic Ocean. Clearly less probable is [3] Badakhshān, and [4] the ancient town of *Berenice* on the Red Sea is quite impossible.

On [1] Arab. *Baghdād* appears in modern Gk. around 950 as Βαγδάδ (Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos, *De administrando imperio* 25.63), later as τὸ (also τὰ) Βαγδά/ Βαγδᾶ (Theophani continuatores 3.9, 3.26, Zonaras 3.406 ed. Dindorf, Anna 6.9.3), where the Gk. γ like the Arab. *gh* is a voiced velar fricative. This sound did not exist in OF; the French writers approximate it as <l> ~ /u̯/ before a consonant. The probably later forms *Gadres, Rames, Jaffes* and *Rohais*[275] show that the local -*s* was still very much alive, and if we add it, we obtain *Baldas/Baudas*.[276]

There are many variants in OF literature as well: apart from *Baldaç/Baldac*[277] there is also *Baldach, Baldaire/Baudaire, Baudar, Baudart, Baudic, Baldorie/Bondourie* and probably *Bauduc* (cf. Moisan and Flutre). These are mostly facile rhyme forms from a somewhat later period than the Rol.; nevertheless, they show that the speakers did not focus on the ending, and that *Bald-* was all they needed to identify the town. Two combinations are interesting, *en Baldorĭe le bele* and *en Baldorĭe le lee* (*Chanson d'Antioche* 4966 and 5176, *le* for *la* is a Picardism); as the form *Baudas* was not recognisably feminine, it would have looked odd before the feminine adjective. This could also have been a factor behind *Baldise la lunge*. But why should it be *Bald-ise* in particular? Noyer-Weidner (1979, 310s.) notes that in OF *baudise* means 'recklessness'; this is acceptable, not as a primary meaning (since that would make it facile), but it could very well have been the motivating factor behind the distortion.[278]

This brings us to *la lunge*! Godefroy lists s. v. *loin* eight and s. v. *long* three more references in which *lonc* (and not *loin*) means 'far, distant'; there are a few more, especially for *de longes terres* 'from distant lands' in Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *lonc*. This meaning, applied to our context, reflects the way the crusaders thought of Baghdad: when they initially had to fight their way through northern Syria to Jerusalem, and then later keep this territory open to serve as a lifeline to

---

275 Cf. n. 154.

276 Since *Baudaz* never occurs, and there are only a few instances of *Baudaç*, it seems that OF took *Bauda(s)* from Gk. and not from Arab. Transmission was therefore almost certainly via the Normans (and other Francophones) in the 11th c. in the Byzantine Empire. Another argument for (south Ital.) Norman transmission is the fact that in Ital. *Bald-* is found as well as *Baud-* before it finally becomes established as *Baldacco* (which then gave rise to the internationalism 'Baldachin', which originally meant 'expensive fabric from Baghdad' and then 'canopy', which used to be made from this material).

277 See previous n.!

278 However, there is a brazen disregard for methodology in Boissonnade's comment (1923, 220) "la forme employée par Turold *Baldace, Baldise*".

the new kingdom, Baghdad was a distant and unreachable place in the east. It represented a permanent threat, as the central location of the two worst enemies, where the 'Pope' of all the Muslims had his residence, as well as the Grand Sultan. The Roland poet understands *Babilonĭe* as Cairo, not Baghdad, and since he listed the *Turcs et Pers* with no explicit mention of Baghdad, *Baldise* 'Baghdad'cannot be rejected as a repeat naming.[279]

This sense that Baghdad was far away and out of reach is also a plausible reason why *Baldise la lunge* is listed in the third, and not the first, group of ten. After all, the town was on the banks of the Tigris, which was familiar from *Gen* 2.14, but which the crusaders never actually got to see; since people knew it flowed through the Persian Gulf and into the Indian Ocean, it qualified for the third group of ten.

On [2]: Solinus (19.6) notes that in the Arctic Ocean, off the 'Scythian' coast, lies an Island called *Abalcia* which is of *magnitudo immensa et paene similis continenti*; Pliny (4.95) calls it *Balcia* and also says that it is an island of *immensa magnitudo* three days' sailing away from the shores of Scythia, and that Pytheas of Massilia called it *Basilia*. The Irishman Dicuil, living and teaching in the court of Charlemagne, cites the Pliny reference word for word in his *Liber de mensura orbis terrae* (7.19, ed. Tierney/Bieler p. 76); however, several mss. based on a lost Codex Spirensis from the early 10th c. read *Balisiam* instead of Basiliam. Such an island would not only be 'remote' for the poet, but anyone sailing (or imagining a voyage) along its coast would probably describe it as 'long' instead of 'large'; this would make it **Balise la lunge* –but not *Baldise*. Finally, the *-d-* might have

---

279 Boissonnade (1923, 220) offers an alternative explanation for *la lunge*, pointing out that Baghdad was in actual fact 4–5 km long, but only 2 ½ km wide. I have found slightly different figures in the EI, Art. *Baghdād*: it was founded in about 762 as a round city, by 892 it was 7 ½ km long, 6 ½ km wide, by 932 8 ½ km long, 7 ½ km wide, but in the late 11th c., the walled eastern part of the city expanded 9 km along the Tigris, and this dimension – along the river – would have been the most obvious one. There is another factor to consider here. In the Bible (Jon 3.3s.) the description of Nineveh, which along with Babylon was a precursor of Baghdad, is as follows: *Nineve erat civitas magna itinere trium dierum [. . .] Et cepit Ionas introire in civitatem itinere unius diei.* Here, too, the size of a town is reported uni-dimensionally, with the emphasis on its length. In the Middle Ages this led to formulations such as that of Otto of Freising (*Chronica* 7.3, MGH SS.schol. 45.312): ancient Babylon is still partly inhabited and is called *Baldach*, and partly, following the words of the prophet, in ruins, and this part is *per X miliaria usque ad turrem Babel extensa*. An even closer parallel is: *[. . .] Babylon porro stadiis duodecim longa sit et pedibus ducentis atque viginti [. . .]*, in the *Laus Alexandriae* (ms. 11th.c., ed. Riese p. 140), which only survives in fragmentary form. *Babylon [. . .] longa* looks quite similar to *Baldise la lunge,* does it not?

come in through an influence e.g. of *baldise* 'recklessness' or even *Baldas*. The question whether or not such an island really existed is irrelevant, since the author had to rely on the geographical literature for the homelands of quite a few other *eschieles,* too. The only disadvantage of the island is that it would again require a jump from Central Asia to the Arctic Ocean and back.

On [3]: Badakhshān would be the best geographical fit. Measuring a maximum of almost 400 x 400 km, it includes today the north eastern part of Afghanistan and (as 'Gorno-Badakhshan') the eastern part of Tajikistan; this means that it does in fact occupy a middle position between the homeland of the Huns, which, as described above (A.1.3.2 [a]), in the Middle Ages was far east of the mouth of the Don, and therefore in Asia, and a place called *Valpenuse*, which will turn out to epitomise the valleys in the north west of India, where Alexander's armies ran into difficulties.

Marco Polo is the first person to make explicit reference to Badakhshān. Those who are familiar with the Polo manuscript tradition will know that all early versions have to be compared with each other. Polo first mentions Badakhshān fleetingly in a passage that is only preserved in the Franco-Italian and the Venetian version; later, he discusses this country in a complex that covers several chapters and is preserved in all of the different versions. Here are the readings in the order they occur in the respective version:

Franco-Italian version (Ms. F = Paris BN fr. 1116, first third of the 14th c.), which is likely to be the closest to the lost original of 1298/1299 in language terms, and whose content is "de loin le meilleur parmi toutes les rédactions conservées" (Ph. Ménard 2005, 409), in the ed. Ronchi: cap. 36. Then cap. 45 (end)–49 of the *Badasian; Balasian, Balascian* (3x), *Baldasciam, Badascian* (2x), B*adasciam, Badausian*;

French version from before 1312, has removed almost all Franco-Italianisms, critical ed. Ménard et al. (main ms. London BL Royal 19 D1, from the first third of the 14th c.): cap. 45 (end)–49 of the *Balacian* (9x, variants other than in F: often *Balaciam*, only in one ms. *Ballatian*);

oldest Tuscan ms., about the same date, critical ed. Bertolucci Pizzorusso (following Florence, Magliabechianus II.IV.136, 14th c.): cap. 45 (end)–49 in the *Balascam* (2x), *Balasciam, Balascia, Baudascian* (5x);

ed. Ruggieri, which remains true to the 'Ottimo' ms. within the Tuscan tradition (generally regarded as the best before Bertolucci's edition) (Florence, Magliabechianus II.IV.88, dating from probably before 1309, or middle of the 14th c. at the latest): *cap. 38 (end)–42 Balascam* (3x), *Bastian* ("per pure errore materiale"), *Baudascia ovvero Balauscian, Baudascia* (4x);

a Venetian (or more precisely Veneto-Emilian) version from before 1324: the isolated first mention from the ed. Barbieri/Andreose of the oldest fully preserved ms. (Padua, Civica CM 211, dating from 1445): cap. 22, then cap. 32 (end)–36 of *Baldaxia*; the complex in the ed. Barbieri of the oldest fragment (Rome, Casanatense 3999, first half of the 14th c. which does not contain the isolated mention but contains the complex as cap. 9–13): *Balasia* (3x), *Baldasia*, *Balasia* (3x);

Latin translation from before 1328 by Francesco Pipino, Ed. Prášek: liber 1, (list of contents and) cap. 33 (end)–37 of the *Balassie* (gen.), *Balascie* (gen.), *Balascia*, *Balascie* (gen., 4x);

early Latin translation Z, which is preserved in a ms. from the second half of the 15th c. (Toledo, Archivo Capitular 20.49 Zelada), but which sometimes has better readings than even the Franco-Italian text, ed. Barbieri: cap. 21–24 of the *Balaxian, Balascian, Balaxian*.

In the first mention, Marco simply notes *en passant* that part of a Mongol army had already passed through Badakhshān a few decades earlier. The complex begins at the end of a chapter, where the description has just reached Badakhshān. The first chapter fully devoted to Badakhshān describes this land as a Mohammedan 'great kingdom', whose rulers are, however, descendants of Alexander and the daughter of Darius; it produces large quantities of lapis lazuli, and especially the precious stones known as *balasi* (this is how it is written in the Venetian versions and therefore in Marco's own dialect, as well as in the anonymous Latin translation, *balasci* in Ronchi's Franco-Italian and Pipino's Latin text, as well in the Tuscan Ottimo, *balas[c]i* in the Tuscan ed. Bertolucci, *balais* in the corrected French version). After two digressing chapters, the first about the Pasha'i south west of Badakhshān, and the second about neighbouring but already Indian Kashmir, the last relevant chapter, according to its title, is about the *grande fiume / grandisme flum* of Badakhshān, which Marco had to travel up (and this would help us to understand the term *la lunge* used in the Rol.); it also describes two areas which are still under the control of the ruler of Badakhshān, and then the crossing of the Pamir mountains to Kashgar in Xin-jiang (China).

Apart from the Polo tradition, an Italian source from the 14th century is worth mentioning (according to DI s. v. *Badakhshān*) *Baudàche / Balàscia* in Pucci (dating from 1362).

We can see that the variants are generally formed via two processes: 1) The oriental forms /badaxšán, baðaxšán/, and the presumably dialect form /balaxšán/ (cf. Cardona in the Bertolucci edn. p. 551s.), are overlayered by forms with -*ld*- (> -*ud*-) due to the influence of Ital. *Baldac(co) / Baudac(co)*, OF *Baldas / Baudas* 'Baghdad'. 2) The oxytone /balaxšán/ > (pronounced by a Romance speaker) /balašán/, Northern Ital. probably also /balasján/, is written both with -*an* and as a variant with -*am* (e.g., via an intermediate form with a tilde); this

one was misread as a Latin-type acc. fem. (perhaps also *-an* as a graecizing acc. fem.), which then brought about a Latin-type stress; the result was a normal paroxytone fem. sg. ending in *-a*.

Both processes are attested in the first few decades after 1300. If they could be two centuries older, they would, in France, produce **Baldais(s)e*; the remaining discrepancy in the stressed vowel could then be resolved with reference to *baldise* 'recklessness'. But this is unlikely, given the name of the homonymous stone which never has *-ld-*.

The stone, a variant of the ruby or spinel, is evidence that there was a trade connection (obviously in stages) from Badakhshān via the Silk Road to western Europe at least a century before Marco Polo. It is quite frequently attested there from shortly after 1200 onwards, the first reference being apparently in Wolfram's *Parzival* 791.2, which means before 1210: in this case, the editor Karl Lachmann puts the word *Balax* from the main ms. D in the text, because the *Celidonius* etc. in the other mss. appears later 791.11 in the same list of precious stones and in all of the mss., meaning that it must be incorrect in 791.2. According to TLF s. v. *balais* the word is almost simultaneously attested as MLat. *balagius, balascius* etc. in about 1225 (first in Arnoldus Saxo, MLat.Wb. s. v.) and as OF *balais* (first in the *Guillaume de Dôle* and in Gautier d'Épinal, and still used today in the expression *rubis balais*; according to TLF from vernacular Arab. *balakhsh*, that goes with Pers. *Balakhshān*, the dialect form of *Badakhshān*, Pers. *-ān* making country names). Occ. *balais* in Gaucelm Faidit must be at least as old (*Ges no·m tuolh*, v. 71, cited in Raynouard s. v.). The *balai* in the second half of the Rose romance and the Cat. *balais* (today *balaix,* DECLC s. v.) attested in 1275 are still from before the time of Marco Polo, and so is the Rom. form attested in 1295 MLat. *balassus, balasci* (pl.) (DI s. v. *Badakhshān*; there is more detail there on the further development of the term in Ital.). Cf. also Span. *balax* (> *balaj*), Port. *balais, balax*, Middle Eng. *baleis* etc. (> today *balas ruby*); Ger. also has specialist terms such as the *Balas-Rubin* or *Balas-Spinell*.

On [4]: Edwin B. Place (1947, 877 s.) thinks *Baldise* means a place called *Berenice* on the Red Sea, which according to Pliny (6.170) is *in cervice longe procurrente*, meaning 'on a neck of land projecting a long way out'. Place italicises *in cervice longe*, which suggests he is assuming *longe* refers to *in cervice*, and he is in any case so fascinated by the correspondence of *longe ~ lunge* that he summarises his views on phonological issues with the following assertion: "As to phonological considerations, the mutation of *r* to *l* and vice versa is a well-known characteristic of Western Spanish dialects, and also, more significantly here – of Basque speech. *N > d* is likewise an orthodox mutation". One wonders

why the author does not see that this "method" of his could turn anything into anything, and for that very reason, it proves nothing at all.

A.1.3.4 Fifth *eschiele*: *de Val Penuse*

De Val Penuse O 3256, *uon Uallepenuse* K (missing in Stricker and *Karlmeinet*), *de Valpense* V4, *de Val Bruient* (*Brugent* V7) CV7: In V4 *-pense* is just a careless mistake since the assonance requires *-ose*. KV4 therefore confirm that the O reading is in the archetype. CV7 modify the word to suit the rhyme ending in *-ent* and the result is to change the 'arduous valley' into a 'roaring [river] valley'.

The meaning is [1] a 'valley of hardship' as the epitome of the many hardships and losses that Alexander experienced as he passed through the landscapes of central Asia and the north west of India, not [2] the Vale of Peneios in Thessaly and not [3] Paneas in the Upper Jordan Valley.

On [1]: When K writes *Vallepenuse*, he is evidently thinking of the Latin forms: *de Valle poenosa*; K therefore understood the *Val Penuse* in his source as a straightforward appellative grouping. The copyist of CV7 adopted a similar approach: he just switched the adjective because of the rhyme. And finally, the Saracen land *Valpenee* in the *Chevalerie Vivien* and in the *Aspremont* is probably modelled on the Rol., but the adjective is replaced by a participle with the same meaning in order to fit in with the assonance. All of this suggests that the *Val Penose* in the archetype should be taken literally.

In the early 12th c., it was impossible to imagine Central Asia and India without thinking about Alexander. In Latin, Curtius had often described in dramatic detail the hardships that Alexander and his army endured: there was his march into Hyrcania (6.4.3–22), using words like *gens bellicosa* and *perpetua vallis* (6.4.15s.); then the many nights marching through the burning *loca deserta Sogdianorum* where the army suffered greater losses through thirst or from uncontrolled drinking afterwards than it ever did in battle, followed by a six-day-long crossing of the Oxus *valley* where there were no bridges (7.5.1ss.); there were more losses during the march through the forests of the Hindu Kush due to storms lasting several days and freezing rain (8.4.1–6); finally – and if not before then certainly now, the idea of a valley takes centre stage – they journey along a tributary of the Indus enduring violent adventures all the while, and then down the Indus itself (9.3–6, 8s.). Van Thiel (1974, 236) maintains that the second of these scenes (7.5.1ss.) has been moved to 'India', probably because it has been modelled on chapters 11–32 of the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* which was a central text in the Alexander tradition; the last scene, on the other hand, (9.3–6, 8s.) appears in the Metz *Epitome* (10th c. or earlier) in an intensified narrative

where Alexander's army sails down the river on two thousand rafts, suffering heavy losses from ranged weapons fired from the banks. In the *Historia de preliis* (ed. Hilka/Steffens of version J[1], which is certainly older than the Rol.) they march into the area and then go straight to 'India' (p. 138) *per terram desertam et spatiosam et per flumina inaquosa et per colles* (many mss. have *valles*) *cavernosos*, and in in pursuit of Bessus (p. 154) they again march *per ardentissimum solem et per loca arenosa et inaquosa*; when they are marching along the edge of a river (p. 156) they come upon a fortress built in the water, and its defenders hide from them; when Alexander sends soldiers out to swim towards them, they are eaten by animals like crocodiles; at the freshwater lake (p. 158) six-handed *homines agresti*, supported by wild boar, attack the army; they come to a (p. 160) *locus desertus ac frigidus atque obscurus* and then find themselves unable to attack armed women who are on the other side of the river; the army is attacked in other river valleys by cynocephali (p. 174), and then by a hairy giant (p. 208) – and in between all of these events, there are great battles against Poros, the king of the Indians. *Val Penuse* evokes these experiences in a compressed, yet powerful fashion.

On [2]: Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 296) observe that we cannot doubt, – and Grégoire (1939a, 245n.) even says it is almost certain – that *Val Penuse* means the Vale of Peneios in Thessaly; in both places Grégoire also cites the Gk. form Πηνειός. It is true that Bohemund was almost captured by Alexios on a small island in this river (Anna 5.6.3–4, 5.7.3), and *Val /piniós/* could very well have been interpreted as *Val penuse*. Unfortunately, however, the name Πηνειός is irrelevant here; it is not mentioned anywhere in connection with this episode, and there is a very good reason for that. Even such a dedicated Atticist as the emperor's daughter does not know it but names the river instead – *proh pudor!* – with the Slav name *Salavrias*. Large parts of Thessaly had been overrun by Slavs in the 7th c. and were slow to recover their Greek culture; the Slav river-name had suppressed the Greek one completely and was used until at least 1900.[280] The modern name Pēneiós is due to a re-graecization "from above". But if neither Anna, nor *a fortiori* the people who lived there remembered the ancient name, where could a Norman have heard it? Even if he had read the name Pēnēus in e.g., Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, how could he know that the river he would come to see one day was that *Pēnēus*?

---

280 I carried out two random checks: *Meyers Konversationslexikon* of 1890 s. v. *Peneios* and the 8th edn. (1913) of Georges' *Lateinisch-deutschem Handwörterbuch* s. v. *Pēnēus, Pēnēos* state that the river is "now" called Sala(m)bria(s).

On [3]: Mireaux (1943, 260) suggests *Paneas* (as it was known to the crusaders, since this form is in Fulcher of Chartres, while others have *Belinas*, Arab. *Baniyas*, ancient forms *Panion* or *Panias*, in New Testament times more familiar as *Caesarea Philippi*, in the Upper Jordan Valley), but this needs no refutation, neither phonologically nor in terms of meaning.

A.1.3.5 Interim summary

Considered together, the first five *eschieles* in the third group of ten show that the western and middle parts of the enemy forces are going to be followed by an eastern part: the thoughts of the poet are moving through a space between Baghdad (or the Arctic Ocean), Central Asia and India. However, western people had had no experience of this part of the world since the end of the classical period, there were no new reports from anyone travelling to those regions, and the rudimentary medieval *mappae mundi* were spectacularly inaccurate in their representation of distances and directions, especially in the way they compress the north/south dimension of Central Asia. It is not surprising, then, if we cannot see any clear direction of travel *within* this group of five (as we saw with the north-south movement in the first, and the south-north movement in the second group of ten). Nevertheless, up to and including the twenty-fifth *eschiele,* there is no doubt that the overarching principle remains a connection within real space, to the extent that the poet could know it.

Even in the time of Alexander, Europeans had no experience of the lands that lay beyond Central Asia and north-western India to the east. We should not be surprised, then, if poet finds it difficult to follow this principle all the way through the next five *eschieles.*

What can he do instead? To give an advance indication: in the last, and most poetically important *eschiele,* there is a textual uncertainty which might encourage us to waver between two or three meanings, but each of these meanings clearly represents the eastern end of the poet's world; this means that the basic structure of the three groups of ten is maintained. In the case of the sixth to the ninth *eschiele*, however, I am much less certain about the guiding principle and the details.[281]

---

281 For a long time, I thought there was a different explanation for the sixth to ninth *eschiele* than the one outlined in the main text, and that the poet's thoughts moved from Central Asia through the north Indian region to the southern tip of India as follows: 6th *eschiele*: erasure in O, *Imanzen* K (with Ger. pl. *-en*; Jenkins puts it in the text as *Imance* but *Imanz* would be better): people from the *Imauus* 'Himalaya' (Pliny 4x, Solinus, Orosius 2x, Ammian 2x, Hereford *mappa*

For if the *prima facie* identifications are the ones intended by the poet, and not secondary meanings, then the question arises: what do the Lutici tribes living in the north east of today's Germany, the inhabitants of the Argolis in Greece, the people living on the banks of the river Strymon in today's Bulgaria and north eastern Greece, and probably the citizens of the south east Turkish towns of Kahramanmaraş and Araban all have in common? I see only one possible answer: in the years between 1147 and 1150 they could have delivered what we would call headline news, reporting events which were briefly topical even in western Europe. Thus, this last part of the catalogue, with the exception of the final *eschiele,* could have one particular purpose: to bring the material up to date. The Charlemagne of the catalogue had to fight against ever more distant enemies which most of the audience could only vaguely

---

mundi; alternatively *imanz* < **juanz / jo(i)anz* (*de Maruse*) 'Bacchantes from the Meros' either with *joer / juer* 'play revel' (as in Lat. *ludere* Ex 32.6) or with *jouir*; O considers this as unbelievable and so suppresses it; *iu-* > *io(i)-* > *joie* V4. *Maruse* (Central Fr. **Marose*): famous north-west Ind. Mountain of Meros with the debauched (~ Bacchantes-) Nysean people (Mela, Pliny, Solinus, Pompeius Trogus, Curtius, Justin, Orosius, Martianus Capella, Hereford *mappa mundi*; on the *-a-* cf. *Alexandre* III 5590 *Maros*, V 8506 *Marors*; paragogic *-e* as in *Denise* 973, 2347, *Mahume* 3641). – 7th *eschiele*: *Leus / leutiz*: assumed Lutici in Central Asia, thought to be the ancestors of both the European Lutici and the *Lëutiz* living in Laodicia/Λαοδίκεια (-díkĭa)/*Latakia* in Syria, which had been under south Italian-Norman rule from 1109 (*Troie, Alexandre, Antioche* 2x). *Astrimonĩes* (< **Estr-, Str-*): the people from *Estremont* (< *extra mundum* or *montes*, also *Outremons*), i.e., Gog and Magog on the Indian border (*Alexandre*). – 8–10th *eschiele*: the islands of *Argyre, Taprobane, Tylos / Tiles* of the Indian west and then south coast (all three are cited in this order in: Isidore, Rabanus Maurus, Hugh of Saint Victor, Geoffrey's *Vita Merlini*, Vincent of Beauvais). Individually: 8th *eschiele*: *Argoille(s) / Arguille* (**Argilles* β, *Argynen* the *Karlmeinet*): *Argyre/ Argire* (Mela, Pliny, Isidore, Geogr. Ravennas, Dicuil, Rabanus Maurus, Geoffrey, Hugh, Wolfenbüttel *Liber-Floridus* map, Ebstorf map, Vincent; *-r-* >*-l(l)-* next to *-i-* as in *Sulïan* 3131, 3191), increasingly overlaid with the secondary meaning 'Argolians'. – 9th *eschiele*: *Clarbone* (*Carbone* K): *Taprobane* 'Sri Lanka' (Mela, Pliny, Solinus, Servius, Martian, Isidore, Anonymous *de situ orbis, Versus de Asia*, Rabanus, *Waltharius*, Hugh, *Troie*, Wolfenbüttel and Hereford *mappa mundi*, Vincent; attested scribal errors: *Tapbane, Tatbane/Tarbane, Tabane, Caphane, Caprobane, Tabrabone*; by combining these forms: *Carbone; Clar-* is a typical first syllable for 'heathen' names; in K regression to *Carbone*, now with colour symbolism 'coal black land'). – 10th *eschiele* (as above in the main text): *barbez* with a loaded meaning: men with beards down to their knees, typical of India in the Alexander saga; *[Val] Fronde* (ed. Segre): Tylos/Tiles is the only wooded (*frons, frondis*) region of the earth that is always green. This interpretation would make the catalogue more poetic and more unified (and says nothing about the date of the Rol.), but it differs greatly from the interpretation given above in the main text. Especially in the 6th, 8th, and 9th *eschiele,* this interpretation would entail a reliance on lower methodological standards regarding scribal, phonological and stemma-related factors than have hopefully been maintained throughout the rest of this study; I therefore prefer the interpretation given above in the main text but consider the decision still open in principle.

imagine; but his would-be heirs also had to fight against some very real ones. Just like Charlemagne's earlier prediction about those who will rebel against him in the future (v. 2921–2924), and the ominous closing verses of the poem (v. 3994–4001), this complex could gently remind the audience that even the victory that Charlemagne is about to claim will not be a definitive one, because there can be no such victory for Christians until Judgement Day.

We cannot say, of course, that every single name in this last complex, taken in isolation, refers only to this short span of four years. It is the citation together of the 'Argolians' in the eighth *eschiele* with the 'Strymonians' and the 'Lutici' in the seventh that seems to be so significant for this narrow dating window. We shall therefore proceed to analyse these two *eschieles* first, taking their three peoples in the order just explained above.

A.1.3.6 Eighth *eschiele*: *d'Argoilles*

D'Argoilles O 3259, *uon Targilisen* K (*von Argalîsen* Stricker, *van Argynen* the *Karl-meinet*), *de Gargille* V4, *d'Erabe* C: C could not make out the meaning of his source and substituted 'Arabia' since this name is used frequently throughout the song (cf. A.1.2.10.2, A.5.10, A.5.12), and it seemed to merit a place in the catalogue. The (*T)argilis(en)* in K (with Bav. *t-* for agglutinated *d'*) and the (*G)argille* in V4 (in the source an incorrect *g-*, with an unclear stroke) lead to **Argilles* in β as opposed to *Argoilles* in O.

This people appears in two more places: *cels [. . .] d'Argoillie* O 3474, *d'Argoio* V4, verse is missing in CV7P: V4 has a north Italian /λ/ > /j/. The archetype must have *Argoill(i?)e*.

Arguille O 3527, *d'Orgoio* V4, *cil d'Arguel* CV7:[282] V4 once again shows Old North Ital. /λ/ > /j/, along with some influence from Fr. *orgueil*. Because of *Argu-* OCV7 the archetype must have *Arguille*.

The archetype thus had *Argoilles* or *Argilles* 3259, *Argoill(i?)e* 3474, *Arguille* 3527. The only way to harmonise this is to decide upon /argǫλ-/, which means in the third reference taking u> as /ǫ ~ u/, not only in O (as passim) but also in

---

282 Here the poet observes that the 'Argolians' bark like dogs. This kind of remark about foreign languages is a *topos* that can be applied almost at will: the cynocephali (Pliny *n.h.* 7.23, Solinus 52.27) 'bark' of course but other peoples do as well, since Corippus (*Joh.* 4.351) says the Moors do, while Isidore (*et.* 19.23.6) names the Irish (*Scotti*); Ademar of Chabannes (3.52) says the same about the Saracen slaves who were donated to his abbey, the *Pilgrims' Guide* (cap. 7) in the *Codex Calixtinus* said this about the people from Navarre, according to Wace *Roman de Rou* (2.8068s.), the Normans said this about the English. This kind of remark is of no more use in identifying the location of these peoples than the previous claim that the people from the *Ociant braient et henissent* (in other words like donkeys and horses).

the archetype, whose scribe, judging by this admittedly weak indication, must have been someone from the west. He seems to have been thinking of a people name ending in -*s* first of all, and then a feminine country or town name (like *Balide*, *Bruise*, *Baldise*)[283] but this makes no difference to the meaning.

This tribe can only be interpreted as [1] 'Argolians', 'Argolis' as Jenkins (on v. 3259)[284] tentatively and Grégoire (1939a, 247n., 1942–1943, 537, and 1950, 68 n. 5) more definitively suggest. We cannot agree that this name means [2] Heraclea, the site of the Cappadocian slaughter of 1097 or [3] *Harenc/Ḥārim*, the fortress between Antioch and Aleppo, or [4] Algiers.

On [1]: As 'Argolis', 'Argolish', 'Argolians' has no previous history in Lat. or Rom., the poet appears to have coined this *Argoille(s)* himself from Lat. *Argŏlicus*. If this is the case, we can forgive a tiny irregularity in the way the ending of this word is formed.[285] In Lat. literature, the regional name *Argolis* (Pliny *n.h.* 4.1) occurs rarely, but the adj. *Argolicus* is common, both in its precise meaning ('belonging to Argos or to the Argolis', Ovid, Pliny *n.h.* 4.17 and 4.56, Lucan, Seneca, Statius) and also as *pars pro toto* meaning 'Greek' (Cicero, Vergil *Aen.* 2.55, 78, 119 etc., Ovid, Seneca, Statius, *Ilias latina*, Silius, Claudian etc.; TLL s. v.). Grégoire (1942–1943, 537 with n. 6) supplies two examples of its usage in MLat.: Liutprand of Cremona (middle of 10th c.) mentions a Byzantine army called *Argolicus exercitus* (MGH SS.schol. 41.191), and William of Apulia often uses (1.379 and 499, 5.198) *Argolicus* with this meaning.[286]

Grégoire of course referred to this name in connection with the events of 1085, but we do not have to follow his lead. The name was once again important

---

283 Burger (1987, 543) agrees, but he then deletes an *e* 'and' in v. 3474 and does not put it in v. 3527 so that he can read the people name as /arɡǫʎəs/ and the country name as /arɡǫʎíə/; an argument against this is the fact that in v. 3474 only O and not β = V4, and in 3527 none of the texts indicates this form. Grégoire's (1939a, 271) suggested form *Argoïlle* (with diaeresis!) is quite absurd.

284 Jenkins' additional reference to smaller towns named *Argos* in Asia Minor is irrelevant.

285 Taking *apostolicus* > OF *apostoiles* as a model, we would expect /jl/, whereas <ill(i)> points to /ʎ/.

286 On *Argolicus* meaning 'Greek' Grégoire reported (1939a, 270) that the only medieval source was William of Apulia, but he later quietly modified this with the addition of the Liutprand reference. His later claim (also 1939a, 270), that the only reference in classical literature comes from Ovid, is also wide of the mark, – DuCange (s. v.) refers us to a third medieval reference in the preface (early 12th c.) of the charter of Saint-Père de Chartres (Chartres S. Père 1.5). *Argolicas phalanges* is mentioned there alongside *Romanas acies*, and therefore DuCange's suggested meaning 'nobilior', is incorrect; furthermore, the original has *indefessa*, and not *indefensa*.

in the Francophone context in 1147, this time in connection with the region or its inhabitants and defenders. We have already mentioned the unexpected war that Roger II of Sicily waged against Byzantium in the second half of 1147 (and perhaps even into the beginning of 1148) in our discussion of *Butentrot* in the first group of ten. While the Basileus and a large proportion of his troops were fully occupied leading the undisciplined German and French crusader armies through Byzantine territory, the Normans attacked Corfu; they then turned towards the Peloponnese, where they conquered and plundered Methoni in the south west, followed by Nafplio, the south western border town on the Argolis peninsula, whereupon they sailed round the Argolis and after a detour via Euboea and Thebes, – at last meeting stiffer Byzantine resistance – they conquered Corinth, the north eastern border town on the Argolis.[287] From then on, the name *Argolis* would have been current in the whole of the Norman sphere of influence, and even further afield in the Francophone regions. And Roger was in no way the villain of the piece; for at this very same time the crusaders with King Louis in Asia Minor were convinced that they had been betrayed by the Byzantines;[288] Louis even came back via southern Italy and allied himself with Roger (Setton 1969a, 511). This situation would have been enough to persuade the poet that 'the Argolians' were recent enemies and therefore suitable candidates to be included in the catalogue. But as we already emphasised in our discussion about Butentrot, these details arising from anti-Byzantine feelings in the song do not convince us of Grégoire's hypothesis that the whole song is a work of propaganda against the Greeks, or that we should suspect the Basileus lurking behind the figure of Baligant.

On [2] and [3]: The name of the battle location *(H)eraclea* (Fulcher 1.14.1), *Erachia* (*Gesta Francorum* 10), was suggested by Boissonnade (1923, 201) and Mireaux (1943, 262), but despite Turk. *Ereğli* its phonology is too different from the name *Argoille(s)* to be a serious contender for the meaning.[289] The same is true of *Areg(h)* (*Gesta Francorum* 12 and 17) which probably arises from a mishearing of *Ḥārim* or *Harenc*, in other crusader texts a fortress located east of Antioch which was suggested by Tavernier (1904, 21).

On [4]: André de Mandach (1993, 273s.) opts for Algiers. He takes his usual approach of implicitly ignoring stemma considerations and simply starting with the

---

287 Chalandon (1907, 2.135–137; 1912, 318–320).

288 Cf. Louis' letter to Abbot Suger in Runciman (1952, 223).

289 This is not helped by the later suggestion made by Villehardouin (§ 417 ed. Faral) of a different Heraclea, the one called *Arecloie* (var. *Arcloie*, *Arcdoi*) in Thrace.

form he has an association for, in this case *Arguel,* which can at least be found once in CV7 (corresponding to O 3527). He maintains, with no supporting references, that this is the older Spanish name for the town of Algiers. Quite apart from the fact that the scribe of CV7 was a northern Italian, I can only find *Argel* in Span. where there is a phonologically regular change from the Old Span. /(d)ž/ to /x/. It has come from a reciprocal metathesis in *Alger*, which is retained in Cat. and was passed into Fr. via that route. The town was not founded by the Zīrīd dynasty until the middle of the 10th c. and is written in Arab. as *al-Džazā'ir*;[290] but since in spoken North(west) African Arab. the written ā (as in al- Andalus) was palatalised at least as far as /æ/,[291] and unstressed vowels were often syncopated[292] Europeans heard something like /aldžzæ(j)er/ from the very start;[293] there has never been a /g/ ~ <gu> in the name. The EI (s. v. *al-Djazā'ir*) notes the relative unimportance of the town: "Jusqu'au début du Xe /XVIe siècle" [i.e. until the 10th c. of the Muslim calendar ~ until the 16th c. in the Christian calender], "[Alger] demeura une ville et un port de médiocre importance et participa sans éclat aux vicissitudes de l'histoire du Maghrib central". The term *aurum jasarinum* 'fine Arabian gold' attested in 1031 in Narbonne and *jaserenc* 'scale (armour)' in the Rol. v. [1604]=1647 are thought to be related to the Arab. adj. *džazā'irī* 'from Algiers' (FEW 19 s. v. *ǧazā'irī*), but there appears to have been no interaction between the inhabitants of this town or region and the Europeans until well after the time of the Rol;[294] there is no obvious reason, therefore, why

---

290 'Islands', pl. of *al-džazīra*, after the small islands that were originally just off the coast, and later became part of the port quarter (EI s. v.).

291 The drift /ā/ > /æ/ > /ē/ > /ī/ reaches its peak in late Andalusian Arab. (and /iə/ in Maltese) and is well known to Hispanists in this form (cf. Steiger 1932, 314–332). Its early stages were for many years – and sometimes still are – set in too late a period and much too narrow an area (cf. on this Corriente 1977, 22–25, 1992, 37s., Corriente/Vicente 2008, 155s., 193, 216s. and especially 291, 357, 385, 388, and [written in 1928!] Bergsträßer 1993, 160).

292 Corriente/Vicente (2008, 40, 291s., many examples including 311–317); Bergsträßer (1993, 161).

293 The pronunciation today – both Arabic and Berber – is /(ed-, le-)dzajer/ according to www.fr.wikipedia.org./wiki/Alger (last access 24. 3. 2021). – De Mandach (1993, 273s.) cites a *Chronique associée de Charlemagne et d'Anséis de Carthage* (Ms. Arsenal fr. 3324) without specifying the date, but this originates in the end of the 15th c., which renders its spelling of a Pseudo-Turpin place as *l'isle d'A[r]golite* irrelevant. In the PT (cap. 3, 9 and 10) the corresponding toponym is *Agabiba* (var. *Agabia, Agaia* etc.), which de Mandach himself (in Hämel/de Mandach 1965 on cap. 3) explains is Gabes, and not Algiers. It is irrelevant that Benjamin of Tudela writes the name with a single Gimel because we would not expect a diacritical stroke after the Gimel to have survived through all the copies until the final edition.

294 The south Italian Normans' temporary appetite for dominance in the west only reached as far as Annāba/Bône, which was briefly annexed in 1153 (Dalli 2008, 88, Chalandon 1907,

this town should send a whole *eschiele*. We must also consider the elementary fact that north Africa, at least the part west of Carthage, has already contributed its peoples to the Marsilĭe section, and the poet carefully avoids mixing those troops with the territory that is directly ruled by Baligant.

A.1.3.7 Seventh *eschiele: de Leus e d'Astrimonĭes*

De Leus e d'Astrimonĭes O 3258, *Deusen* K (*van Lyens ind van Mogyn* the *Karlmeinet* 477.51), *de Leus e de Stromone* V4, *des Nors d'otre orïent* C, *de Neirs d'oltre orïent* V7: CV7 have inserted *orïent* because of the laisse rhyme *-ent*; they could not imagine what *Leus* meant, and so they rewrote it as a facile *Neirs*. V4 agrees with O and therefore *de Leus* is confirmed for the archetype. Because in Old Ital. aphaeresis of initial *-e-* (or *-i-*) before *s-impurum* was more common than occasional aphaeresis of initial *a-*, the form *Stromone* < **estromone* in V4 suggests that in O *Astr-* 'star-' might be a secondary form of *Estr-* – just as O has already shown in v. 1304 by using the form *Astramariz* instead of his own *Estramariz* in v. 941.[295] *Deusen* in K is a misreading of *Leus* plus Ger. pl. ending. The *Karlmeinet* shows very clearly that it has access to the French tradition independently of Konrad. His *Mogyn* implies that there was a previous **estremognes*, in which the *estre-* – probably in the course of translation – was misread as the prep. *estre* 'additional to, apart from' and then considered redundant and omitted; on the other hand, the *-g[.]n* supposedly reflects a *-gn-* and thus supports the *-monĭe* in O rather than the *-mone* of V4. We therefore put **Estrimonĭes* in the archetype.

What is the meaning? As noted above (A.1.3.5) we will discuss the [a] *Astrimonĭes/*Estrimonĭes* first: these are [a1] people from the Strymon/Struma 'Strymonians'; we must reject [a2] Old Norse *Austmarr* 'East Sea, the Baltic Sea'. The [b] *Leus* are [b1] the Lutici; they are not [b2] the 'Lechites' (~ Poles) or [b3] the Livonians.

Index). The Italian towns' early trade, on the other hand (documented from just after 1150) went to Tunis, Bidžāya/Béjaïa/Bougie and even to Sabtah/Ceuta and Salé (near Rabat), as well as Wahrān/Oran, Tilimsān/Tlemcen and other towns in the end; but in the standard documentation gathered by Mas-Latrie (1865–1868, here II, p. 66) we have to wait until 1358 to find any reference to Algiers: on that date there was a contract with Pisa in which a Marinid ruler called himself Lord of Morocco as far as Tripoli, including (in the Italian version) *del Gier* 'of Algiers'.

295 There may have been some influence from *astr(o)-* words such as *astronomus/-ia*, *astrologus/-ia*, *astrolabium*; there are nine more formations like this in the MLat. Wb. under *astr-*; cf. also OF *astrenomien* (from Ph. de Thaon onwards), *astronomie* and *astrelabe* (from *Thèbes* onwards).

On [a1]: the ancient river Strymon has two names today: the Bulgarian part is called *Struma*, and the Greek part is *Strimon(as)*. We find the Lat. adj. *Strȳmonius* e.g., in Vergil *georg.* 1.120, *Aen.* 10.265 and 11.580, Ovid *Ibis* 600, Statius 3.526, Walahfrid Strabo (PLAeC 2.398.32) and in the early 12th c. in Baldric of Dol (*Poem for Adela*, ed. Ph. Lauer, v. 338). One form of the river name that is of interest to us is *Stromonem* (acc.) in the 9th c. translation of Theophanes by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (PG 108.1413) from Italy because it shows that V4 may have been thinking of the river Strymon when he wrote *Stromone*. In France, however, we find an automatic initial *e* before *s impurum* throughout the whole of the 12th c., as in *Estace* 'Statius', *Escanze* 'Scand(z)ia, Scandinavia' etc. (cf. the references above in the section about *Soltras*, A.1.2.4 [a4]). *Estrimonĭes* 'Strymonians' in the archetype (and from this *Astrimonĭes* in O through the influence of *astro*-words) is therefore phonologically acceptable.[296]

Until the time of Philip II, the river Strymon formed the border between half-Greek Macedonia and the land of Thrace, where both people and nature were wild, the land of the *saevissimi omnium gentium* (Isidore *et.* 9.2.82); this is the region's reputation in Latin literature (Pliny *n.h.* 4.38 and 40, Solinus 9.3, Nepos *Cimon* 2.2, Ammian 17.5.5, Martianus Capella 6.655ss.), and it was "notorious" (Mela 2.16, Ampelius cap. 6) and even a byword for everything uncivilised, physically cold and grim (Vergil *georg.* 1.120, 4.508 and *Aen.* 10.265, Ovid *trist.* 5.3.22 and *Ibis* 600, Lucan 3.199, 5.711, Statius 3.526, 9.437 and later), in every respect an introduction to Scythia that lay beyond.

---

296 Curiously, *Astrimonĭes* has a quasi-homonym. Gregory of Tours († 594) notes that among the seven oldest bishops of Gaul, there is one called Stremonius, apostle of the Auvergne, which means Bishop of Clermont (-Ferrand), in around 250. The first two times he is mentioned, both *h.F.* 1.30, the name does not vary; in later mentions *h.F.* 1.44 and *glor.conf.* chapter index and cap. 29, the critical edition also has Stremonius, but in each case a ms. of the 10th c. has *Austremonius*. In 700 at the latest, the *Vita Praeiecti* (preserved in a ms. of around 1000), reports that its titular Saint Prix has written the (apparently now lost) *sancti Astremonii [sic] martyris gesta*. The surviving lives of Stremonius (in mss. of the 10th and 11th c.) all have *Austremonius*. (More detail on this in Krusch 1893a, 640–649, 1893b, 13–45.) The name has therefore (like *Astremonies* in O) been influenced by the *astro*- words, only more permanently through the influence of Germanic *Austr*- names, including especially the name *Austremundus*. The original form of the name *Stremonius* must be a vernacular variant of *Strymonius* 'the man from Strymon'. The great hub for missionary activity in Gaul in the first few centuries A.D. was of course Lyon, only 130 km east of Clermont-Ferrand. His parish spoke Greek until 200 A.D., and so it must have included quite a considerable number of long-distance traders. Macedonia was also Greek-speaking but it belonged to one of the earliest and most densely Christianised parts of Europe (the river Strymon flows into the sea only 50 km west of Philippi, the town that was very closely linked with Paul, judging by his letter to the Philippians).

As a result of southern Slav expansion in the 6th–7th c., the Strymon region was also occupied by the Slavs. The Byzantine author John Kameniates (Thessalonica just after 900; CSHB 38, cap. 20, 21 and 41) calls them Στρυμονῖται, but he describes them in more detail as 'Slavs who were being managed by the Strymon Theme'; since Justinian II (around 700) had made them part of the empire. Anna mentions some Byzantine troops: once 'Macedonians and Thracians' (1.5.2), and once 'Macedonians', whom her father Alexios Komnenos deployed against Bohemund (4.4.3); Grégoire (1939a, 242) indicated that these could have been Strymonians, who then would be the *Astrimonǐes* in the song; in fact, the Atticist scholar Anna may well have preferred the classical term for this people over the more banal name after the river, whereas the Normans would have been familiar with the term 'the Strymonians' at that time.

A similar situation, albeit on a larger scale, affected the next generation. In the year 1138, which was nine years before the above-mentioned attack launched by the south Italian Normans against the 'Argolians' (A.1.3.6), John Komnenos had restructured his army into only four large corps: the 'Celts' (i.e., mercenaries from western and northern Europe), the Pechenegs, the Turks and the 'Macedonians' (Chalandon 1912, 141s.). Even if this last corps included people from other European areas who were subject to Byzantium, the expression shows that the Macedonians must have been disproportionately well represented. Since the Norman attack of 1147 was directed only at the European part of Byzantium, the troops that Byzantium sent to fight against them could largely have consisted of these 'Macedonians', whom the poet called 'Strymonians'. It is difficult to believe that their name appears by chance alongside the 'Argolians'.[297]

On [a2]: There are phonological and morphological reasons why it is not correct to assume that Old Norse *Austmarr* 'the East Sea, the Baltic' lies behind the word *Astrimonǐes*, just because the Lutici are nearby (Hanak 1971b, 414).

On [b1]: And now for the *Leus*! Just as Charlemagne entrusts Naimes and Joceran with the task of setting up his *eschieles,* so Baligant nominates a *rei persis*

---

[297] In the twelve-syllable part of the "decasyllabic" *Alexandre* (V 4914) there is a *Brot rei d'Estremont* (< *extra mundum* 'from beyond the civilised world, the oecumene' or *extra montem* 'from the other side of the mountain'), in the twelve-syllable *Alexandre* (III 1910) there is a *Goz roi d'Outremons* (< *ultra montes*, now with a clear decision in favour of the second meaning) who is an ally of the north-west Indian King Porus; judging by the context, this is King Gog, of Gog and Magog. Unfortunately, there is no indication that the term *Estremont* (only attested in OF) is older, and so there is no solid argument for a connection with the *Estremonǐes of the Song of Roland.

and a *rei leutiz* (v. 3204s.).[298] Of course, kings cannot be a part of Baligant's army without bringing their own troops along. The *rei persis* brings along his *Pers* (v. 3240); the *rei leutiz* would not have any troops unless we allocate the *Leus* (v. 3258) to him.[299] This word has been created by the poet, therefore, and is an analogous formation, of the kind we might expect because of his penchant for symmetry in matters of form. One could perhaps even go further. 'Wolf', Lat. *lŭpus*, is *lu* (v. 1751) in O, but in the middle of a verse so that it tells us nothing about the poet's form; in other dialects, even sometimes in Anglo-Norman,[300] *leu* also goes back to this period. Hence, this symbolic secondary meaning of *Leus* may have been consciously accepted or may even have been the reason why this short form was created.

Leutiz means 'belonging to the L(e)utician federation'. The Slav tribes in to-day's north eastern Germany who formed this federation in about 980 were previously known as the *Wilzi* 'Wends', a name that later remained in use as a synonym

---

298 Here are the variants for this *rei leutiz*: *konynck [. . .] van Turcken* the *Karlmeinet*, *roi de Letì* V4, *amiralt de Lerie* C and V7: the *Karlmeinet* has a *lectio facilior*; in the stemma β or γ went from the adjective to *de* + noun; but V4 confirms *Leti* (against the palaeographically explicable <r> in CV7), and since his reading and that of CV7 do not make sense, while O certainly does, the latter belongs in the archetype. There is no reason, however (contra Segre) to translate *un altre rei leutiz* as 'a second Lutician king'; *leutiz* is in apposition 'a second king, [a] Lutician'; cf. OF *un suen neveu vaslet* 'one of his nephews, who was a young warrior' etc. (Gamillscheg 1957, 36). – The same figure appears once more in v. 3360: *E Guineman justeṭ a un rei < de > Leutice* O, *al roi de Letie* V4, *a un rei de Leurie* CV7 (where the *-eu-* is also confirmed in the archetype), *d'Esclaudie* P, *de Claudie* F (where *de Claudie* 'from Chaldea' in P is deduced from *d'eclaudie* and completed with a presumably silent *-s-*; *Claudie* and *Esclaudie* also appear in other epics, cf. Moisan s. v.; Chaldea is of course familiar from the Vulgate, but Χαλδία is also the name of the Byzantine Theme around Trabzon). Here, again, the *un* does not mean a second Lutician king; because e.g. in v. 3819 it says *Frere Gefrei, a un duc angevin*, although it is quite certain that there was only one Duke of Anjou and he had already been mentioned seven times before. This tendency to introduce someone who has been named before, or who is to be expected in a particular situation, as if he is a stranger, occurs elsewhere in the song: Marsiliё's brother Falsaron (v. 879s. and 1213s.), the Berber king Corsablis (v. 885s. and 1235s.) and Esturganz (v. 940 and 1297) are introduced twice, which would be excessive by modern standards. This is not an example of lingering traces of individual oral songs à la Lachmann, but it does illustrate the poet's awareness that if his work is to reach a wide audience, then it will have to be recited orally in shorter pieces, and so it is beneficial to ensure that individual scenes make sense in their own right.

299 Prioult (1948, 290–292) correctly identified the connection between *leutiz* and *Leus*, but his account is confused and mixed with other arguments that are untenable.

300 Cf. *Hunfrid Vis de leuu / lew = Hunfrid Visdelupo = Hunfrid Viso lupi* 'wolf-face', *Willelmus Froisseleuu / Froisselew* 'wolf crusher (~ strangler)', *Leuet = Louet(h) = Luuet(h)* 'little wolf', all in the Domesday Book (Hildebrand 1884, 336, 338, 344).

for Lutici.[301] The federation carried out the great Slav revolt in 983 which can be considered the greatest defeat north of the Mediterranean in the history of Christendom and also the longest, because it was not resolved until 1147 by means of the so-called Wendish Crusade; until then, the Lutiz had recurring wars with the Germans (especially the Saxons), for example in 995, 1033/1036, 1045, 1058, 1066 (the great uprising during which Bishop John of Mecklenburg is sacrificed to the gods), 1100, 1114, 1121, 1123 (LM s. v. *Lutizen* and *Wilzen*, and also Hermann 1985, 14 and 345–379). Contemporary writers emphasised the fanaticism of the Lutici: such as Bruno of Querfurt in his *Vita Adalberti* (cap. 10) who describes *effrena gens, Lutici pagani*, and Cosmas of Prague (1.15) who mentions their tough belligerence, *durissima gens Luticensis* – in short: 'wolves'.

They are mentioned here and there by Francophone historians. Radulfus Glaber (4.8.23, ed. Prou p. 110s.) entitles his report on the battles of the year 1033 between this people and the Germans: *De Leuticorum prelio adversus Christianos in partibus aquilonis*. Ordericus Vitalis states that the heathen *Leuticia* contributed auxiliary troops to the Danish army that tried to take England from William the Conqueror in 1069.[302] Richard of Poitou's Chronicle which goes to 1172 states that (MGH SS. 26.84): *Rex vero Danorum et christiani qui regiones illas incolunt, que sunt in Germania et in septemtrione, bellum habent cum paganis, qui [adhuc] adorant idola et sacrificant elementis et dicuntur Leutices sive Lutoici, Christum nostrum novum deum appellant*. However, this claim was distinctly anachronistic by that time because the Wendish Crusade had taken place in 1147.

Louis VII and Emperor Conrad III were preparing for the Second Crusade in the winter of 1146/1147 with the aim of taking back Edessa, but north German princes refused to take part on the grounds that their lands would be left vulnerable to attack from the heathen Wends, including especially the Lutici; in the spring of 1147 they called upon Bernard of Clairvaux to persuade Pope Eugene III to write a Bull stating that a campaign against the Wends was as

---

301 According to Einhart (9th c. *Vita Karoli* 12) they were called 'by us/in our place' *Wilzi* and they called themselves *Welatabi*. According to Adam of Bremen (11th c., 2.22) they were now called *Leuticii qui alio nomine Wilzi dicuntur*, and he explains in more detail (3.22): in their own place they were called *Wilzi*, 'by us/in our place' *Leutici*; Helmold (12th c. 1.21) calls them *Lutitii sive Wilzi*.

302 Ordericus Vitalis, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.4.5 (ed. Le Prévost 2.191). Ordericus' claim that they worshipped Wodan, Thor, Freya or Frigg and other false gods should of course not be taken literally; it is probably an *interpretatio danica* from the Danish majority of the army, or from the Danelaw area, or an *interpretatio normannica* made by Ordericus himself, who would have inserted the names of well-known north German pagan gods to make the narrative more exciting for the Normans.

meritorious as a Crusade to the Holy Land or participation in the Reconquista. Among those who opted for the northern crusade were not only Henry the Lion, Albert the Bear, the rulers of the Danes and the Poles, who may have sought reinforcement of their own power, but also, among others, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, Hermann of Stahleck, and the *rector Burgundiae* Conrad of Zähringen, who were obviously intent on avoiding the trouble of a long journey to the east. The Wendish Crusade took three months and was successfully completed in the autumn of 1147: the Lutici were forced to become Christians, and their name vanished from history remarkably quickly. As a result of this effort, however, the Emperor's army set off for Asia Minor in the early summer at a much-reduced strength, and it was so thoroughly decimated that the Emperor and his survivors had to join the French army; they, too, suffered such great losses that those who made it to Antioch were not able to achieve anything there. Given that the north German reinterpretation of the crusader idea was tainted by egoism and certainly deprecated by other crusaders, and in view of the contrast between events in the north and in the Orient, we can be quite sure that almost everyone in the French-speaking territories would have heard of the Lutici around that time. The war with the Lutici and the south Italian Norman Crusade against the Argolis Peninsula and its Byzantine troops known as "Strymonians" both occurred at exactly the same time, and so it is unlikely that the appearance of these three names together would happen by chance, even more unlikely, in fact, than a random occurrence of just the last two names.[303]

On [b2]: Gaston Paris wondered whether another name might be lurking behind the *Leus,* that is to say the **Lęchъ*, secondary form *Lach*, an early designation for the Poles (Jenkins ad loc.), and Grégoire (1939a, 247 n.) also thinks this is possible. But this name never got through to the west, and in Polish it disappeared in

---

303 In the late 12th c., when the historical importance of the Lutici had faded somewhat, their name appears in the *Roman de Troie* (v. 12036, 18746 *Leütiz*), in the twelve-syllable *Alexandre* (I 2501 *Lutis*, probably better *Leutiz*, *Lautiz* judging by the variants) and in the surviving form of the *Chanson d'Antioche* (v. 376, 6914 *Lutis*, *Luitis*) where it has fallen victim to a reinterpretation and means, as Mireaux (1943, 258) correctly notes, a (fictional) people around Laodicea, due to mixing with the name of this great Syrian port, Gk. Λαοδίκεια /laoðíkja/, known today in Fr. as *Lattaquié*, Engl. *Latákia* with *-t-* from a medieval autochthonous (Armenian?) form. There is no evidence that this transformation took place at an earlier date than this; it should therefore not influence our interpretation of the name in the Rol. In the 13th c. the name stands for any oriental 'heathen' people, as used by Adenet in his *Enfances Ogier* 3801s. *d'Achopars, de Lutis / Et de Coumains, de Turs, d'Amoravis*, and in his *Beuve de Commarchis* 1823 *Et Turc et Achopart et Coumain et Luti*.

prehistoric times, surviving only in Old Russ. *L'ach* (> Crimean Tatar *läh*) and Lithuanian *Lénkas* (Vasmer, RussEW s. v. лях).[304]

On [b3]: Jenkins (ad loc.) reports only Gaston Paris' conjecture and writes in the index: "possibly the Livs of Livonia". But the mission to Livonia did not start until 1182, the Livonians are called *Livōnes* in MLAt., and I am not aware of any mention of them in a Francophone author, which means that the use of the nominative in particular, *Livo* – the only form that would be even vaguely possible in phonological terms – is very unlikely.

Within this complex of references to contemporary events, the two remaining *eschieles* – the sixth and the ninth – will appear to be as closely connected with each other as the seventh and the eighth.

A.1.3.8 Sixth *eschiele: de [. . . . . et de] Maruse*

E la siste est de [. . . . . et de] Maruse O 3257 (Segre with the comment "Dopo *de* ampia rasura"), *di sechste uon Imanzen [. . .], di sibente uon den Malrosen* K (*von Imanse sî diu fünfte [. . .] diu sehste sî von Malrôs* Stricker, *de funffte van Valrose, de seiste van Ymantzen* the *Karlmeinet*), *e la sexta è de Joie Marinose* V4, *et la siste est de Marmoise et d'Aiglent* C, *la siste est de Marmonoisse et d'Eiglent* V7: The second half of the verse in V7 is too long by one syllable with *Marmonoisse*; *Marmoise* in C is therefore better, all the more so since the inner *-m-* corresponds to the *-in-* in *Marinose* in V4. However, **Marmo(i)se/Marinose* is still a secondary version, because the OF source of K had obviously interpreted the prefix *Mal-* in the name, but otherwise confirms the *Maruse* (~ *Marose*) in O for the archetype. Stengel and Hilka/Pfister fill the gap in the first half of the verse with the *Aiglent* from CV7; this produces a serviceable meaning[305] and yet it is hardly acceptable.

---

304 Vasmer says that **Lęchъ* is a hypocorism for **Lęděninъ*, and this name did indeed pass into Old Russian, Hungarian, MGk. and Arab., but we cannot presume that the short form was widespread based only on the fact that the long form was.

305 The *Aiglent* are (with an ending dictated by the rhyme) like the *Aguilans* in the *Cansó d'Antiocha* v. 570, the *Agolant* in the *Chanson d'Antioche* v. 6570 and other epics identical to the *Agulani*, enemies of the crusaders during the First Crusade; cf. *Gesta* cap. 9 and 20s., Tudebod (ed. Hill/ Hill 1977, p. 54 *Gulani* [!], but 84, 89, 147 *Agulani*), Robert the Monk (RHC Occ. 3.808), Baldric of Dol (RHC Occ. 4.35), Guibert of Nogent (RHC Occ. 4.189). In 1931, Grégoire (1946, 456–458) correctly identified these Turkish armoured cavalrymen as the γουλάμιοι mentioned by the Byzantine historians: the term comes from the Arab. *alghulām*, which came into Rom. directly from the Arabic and not via Byzantium. The first *-l-* disappears by dissimilation from the second, and the unusual *-am* is replaced by the familiar *-ant*. The Arabic word means 'young boy, servant', but from the time of the Caliph al-Mu'taşim (833–842) onwards it was

In CV7 *Aiglent* is the ninth rhyme word in a laisse with *-ent* endings, and so it could be introduced there as a new item to fulfil the requirements of the rhyme; if we allow it into the archetype, the full *de* (instead of *d'*) in O would not fit, and secondly there would be no explanation for the change from *Aiglent* to *Imanzen* in K and to *joie* (*marinose*) in V4 (particularly as these two seem to be connected: *im-* ~ *⁺iui-* ~ *ioi-*). On the other hand, K and V4 cannot help us to achieve a certain reconstruction of the name that has been rubbed out in O.[306]

---

used to refer to Turkish military slaves who were soon to form an elite corps of guards (EI s. v. *ghulām*, LM s. v. *Türken*); their armour (especially that of young Khurāsān Turks) was designed for cavalry, i.e. with lamellar armour breastplates (even for the horses!) and heavy helmets with chainmail face guards in imitation of the late Sassanid heavy cavalry, the Cataphracts (LM s. v. *Waffe*, C. *Muslimischer Bereich*, col. 1901). The *Aiglent* belong geographically either in a vague sense "in the Orient" or towards Khurāsān (today's north-east Iran), and so they would fit quite well into the logic of the third group of ten. – This term should, in my opinion, be kept distinct from the *rex affricanus nomine Aygolandus* in the PT, and the *Agolant* in the *Aspremont*. As Szogs (1931, 26s.) correctly noted, their name derives from the Arab *(al-)Aghlab*, who gave his name to the Aghlabid dynasty (around 800–909), and whose troops set off from Africa and conquered Sicily between 827 and 902, carrying out raids on southern Italy in the area where the *Aspremont* epic is set (Amari/Nallino 1933, especially 432ss.). On the Romanised form of the name: Arab. /ɣ/ became, as we might expect, Rom. /g/; but because Old VLat. *-gl-* (which arose through syncope of Lat. *-gil-*, *-gul-*) had long been palatalised and was therefore unusual by this time, it was approximated with *-gol-*; there was no final labial stop in Italian, and it was rare in the rest of the southern Romance area, with the consequence that dentalisation and nasalisation could occur in borrowings from the Arabic; cf. e.g., Arab. *al-'áqrab* > Hispano-Arab. *al-'aqráb* > Span. *alacrán*, Arab. *al-múḥtasib* > Hispano-Arab. *almuḥtasáb* > Span. *almotacén*, Arab. *síqlab* > Hispano-Arab. *siqláb* > Span. *ciclán* (cf. DCECH s. v.). Bancourt's (1982a, 43) doubts regarding the etymologies provided by Grégoire and Szog are unfounded.

306 The erasure after *de* created a gap of about five letters or seven at the most (Bodleiana, ms. Digby 23 b, fol. 59r, cf. the photograph at https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/objects/ 79097275-ef1d-4107-85d3-e8402120f365/, last access 12.05.2021) but the metre requires a word of three syllables. If Segre's conjecture that we should insert *e(t) de* is correct, then the name is reduced to a monosyllabic word beginning with a consonant (+ optional -ə). We could imagine something like *⁺de Mar' e de Maruse* in which *⁺Mare* corresponds to MLat. *Mara* or *Marra*, cited by some crusader historians meaning Ma'arrat an-Nu'mān (almost 100 km south-southeast of Antioch), well known because it was taken by storm in December 1098, and the crusaders killed all of the male inhabitants, and even resorted to cannibalism because they were so hungry. The town was briefly lost in 1104 and 1119, but then soon reconquered by Tancred followed by King Baldwin II; the crusaders lost it for the last time in 1134, although Emperor John Komnenos did manage to hold it for a short time (cf. the indices of the RHC Occ. and those of Runciman 1950, 1951, and Setton 1969a). The poet would therefore have hoped with *⁺de Mar' e de Marose* to create the kind of alliterative effect that he previously had achieved in *de Sorbres e de Sorz*. The scribe who corrected O, and who exhibits less than

For *Maruse*, we can only just accept [1] Maraş but we cannot accept [2] Rusa in Syria.

On [1]: Maraş (the Turkish form, also Armen. *Maraš*; New Kurd. *Mereş*, Arab. *Mar῾-ash / Mer῾ash*), is today a southeast Turkish provincial capital with almost half a million inhabitants (officially: Kahramanmaraş 'Heroes' M.'), with an impressive medieval castle on a natural cliff overlooking the city, that was mentioned by Ibn Khurdādhbih (Honigmann 1935, 43). It lies on the old main artery of the Byzantine Empire, the road leading from Constantinople/Istanbul via Ancyra/Ankara, Caesarea/Kayseri and precisely this Germanicia/Maraş to Antioch/Antakya, which most of those who took part in the First Crusade would have used from Caesarea onwards (see e.g. Riley-Smith 1991, 31, map).

Maraş was suggested by Boissonnade (1923, 216) as the meaning of *Maruse* since in Tudebod (RHC Occ. 3, 34) the town is called Marusis. This is indeed partly true: one of the oldest mss. B. N. Paris lat. 4892 (12th c.), in the RHC printed at the bottom of the page, has *Marusim* (in the acc.).[307] Moreover, de Mandach (1992, 282 n.14) brought Ekkehard of Aura into the discussion: he called Maraş *Mar Ruscium*. In fact, Ekkehard (ed. Schmale/Schmale-Ott p. 150) describes how those who took part in the First Crusade crossed the Byzantine Empire and then *mare contingunt Ruscię* 'reached the sea of Russia', and finally arrived in Antioch. But as the editors of the RHC, Hagenmeyer and Schmale/Schmale-Ott rightly explain, the only place that fits in terms of meaning would be Maraş; Ekkehard appears then completely to have misunderstood **Mar(r)usia* or something similar. Since most of the mss. have something like *Maras-/Maraş* in both places,[308] we

---

impressive intelligence in other instances too, must then (just as he did in the only other place where he leaves a fairly large gap, in v. 2183) have erased a supposed dittography, without considering the implications for the metre; V4 would have replaced *Mare* (cf. OF *mare* < *malā horā*) with *joie*; the scribe of CV7 would have got rid of the name by bringing *Marmoise* forward to make room for *Aiglent*; only K would remain unexplained.

307 The new Tudebod edition of 1977 by Hill/Hill, which expressly states (p. 24), that it has listed "soigneusement" the variants, including those from B = B. N. Paris lat. 4892 in the critical notes, and even retained the "cacographies", only has *Marasim* here (p. 62) with no variants; however, I am grateful for correspondence from Laure Rioust, conservator of the B.N., (email of 7. 2. 2011), informing me that Ms. B (f. 218a, line 15) actually has *Marusim*, and a modern hand has written an interlinear *Marasim* above it.

308 The other Tudebod mss. have *Marasim,* which is confirmed by the acc. Μάρασιν in Anna (11.9.4) and the gen. Μαρασίου in Kinnamos (5.6), who however also has the gen. Μαραυσίου (1.7), and by *Marasim* in the *Gesta*, Tudebodus imitatus, Robert the Monk, Baldric of Dol and Guibert of Nogent (cf. in each case the indices in the RHC Occ.). The other Latin crusader historians call the town *Mariscum* (Fulcher and *Hist. Hieros.*), *Maresium* (Raoul de Caen), *Maresc* (Albert of Aachen), *Maresia* (and once *Marasia*, William of Tyre), which indicates the influence

can interpret the u>, if it really is a variant rather than simply a scribal error, as /ǫ ~ u/ rather than as /y/. This would make the phonological basis for this identification fairly acceptable.

During the First Crusade, and after his Cilician adventure, Baldwin of Boulogne came across the main army near Maraş; at that time, the town was controlled by the Armenians. Tudebod comments 4.6: *Cultores enim illius civitatis exierunt laetantes obviam nobis, deferentes maximum mercatum; illicque satis habuimus omnem copiam*; a similarly friendly reception is reported by Fulcher 1.14.2 and Albert of Aachen 3.27. The Basileus confirmed Ṭaṭul, the Armenian ruler of the town, as his vassal, and Byzantine troops repelled Bohemund's attempted attack in 1100. In 1103 Ṭaṭul gave the town to Josselin (I) of Courtenay, whose cousin and liege lord, Count Baldwin (du Bourg) of Edessa, had married an Armenian woman; at that time, the Armenians would still have hoped for a fair Armenian-Frankish condominium. The town was of great strategic importance to the crusaders because from then on, it was the most north-westerly stronghold supporting the County of Edessa (and indirectly the most northern stronghold protecting the Principality of Antioch), not only against the central Armenian principality of the Rumenids (later to become the Kingdom of Little Armenia) to the northwest, but even more importantly, against the powerful Turkish Dānishmendid Kingdom to the north (cf. the map in Runciman 1951, 88). In 1105 (and very briefly once again in 1111) it was controlled by the Norman crusader Tancred, whose uncle Bohemund had installed him as his representative in Antioch for the duration of his Balkan adventure, but who, while Baldwin was imprisoned by the Muslims (1104–1108) had also assumed the role of administrator of the County of Edessa; in any case the Basileus enfeoffed Edessa formally to Bohemund in 1108, when he made peace with Bohemund. But shortly after that, it was taken over by the Armenian Kogh Vasil, who had supported Baldwin after his release, and he retained control of it, no doubt as Baldwin's vassal, until his death in 1112. But Baldwin and his Franks now ruled Edessa harshly because of various Armenian conspiracies against them, and so in 1114 Kogh Vasil's widow put herself, and her three towns

---

of folk etymology from the OF *mareis* 'marais, marsh'; the cause of this was the final /š/, which did not exist in most French dialects, and which was therefore approximated here with /js/ (< Lat. *-sc-* or *-si-*, which led to these written forms). There is a certain analogy between the presence of both *Marus(im)* and /mareis/ here, and the fact that the poet names the giants of *Malprose* (v. 3253) but then later (v. 3285) says they are from *Malpreis,* both times in an assonance position; he may have regarded these pairs of forms as a kind of suffix change (Lat. *-osa* ~ Lat. *-ensis*).

including Maraş and Raban, under Turkish protection. Baldwin then seized her son Dgha Vasil, tortured him, and forced him to step down. This explains why we find Maraş in 1119 in the hands of 'Gottfried the Monk' who died in 1124 during a campaign led by the then Count of Edessa Josselin (I), who was probably his liege lord. In 1135 the ruler of the town was a man called Baldwin, and he, along with his liege lord Josselin II of Edessa managed, albeit with great difficulty, to repel an attack by the Dānishmendids. In 1146 this Baldwin of Maraş was killed when he took part in Josselin II's attempt to take back Edessa, and Maraş returned to its former position under the influence of Antioch; but in 1149 the new ruler of the town, Reginald of Maraş (probably a Norman from Antioch) together with Raymond Prince of Antioch died at the battle of Inab. The western parts of the old County of Edessa succumbed soon after that, and Maraş was captured by the Rum Seljuks.[309] The demise of two rulers of Maraş in quick succession, and in connection with the fall of the whole County of Edessa, and perhaps also the memory of the "betrayal" of 1114, may all have created the impression in faraway Europe that the 'people from Maraş' were to blame, or at least implicated in that catastrophe. This makes their appearance in the catalogue only just plausible; it becomes more plausible if we assume that the poet had a personal, perhaps even familial relationship with Franks from this region, e.g., with the presumably Norman Reginald.

On [2]: Jenkins ad loc. notes that near Antioch in 1097 the "region" called *Rusa* [alias the valley of *Rusia / Rugia / ar-Rūdž*] was captured [during a raid-like operation led by Pierre de Roaix, Runciman 1951, 158, Setton 1969a, 297]; but *Rusa* etc. is not *Maruse*.

A.1.3.9 Ninth *eschiele*: de Clarbone

De Clarbone O 3259, *uon Carbone* K (as tenth; but as ninth *von Karpîne* Stricker, *van Carbynen* the *Karlmeinet*), *de Clarbone* V4, *d'Abilent* C (as ninth *eschiele*, but there is no tenth!): C has inserted 'Abilene/Abila', which was especially appropriate as the last item on a list.[310] *Clarbone* in O and V4 belong in the archetype

---

309 Runciman (1951, 265s.), Setton (1969a, 165, 298, 373, 403, 405, 418, 516, 531, 533), Setton (1969b, 635), Grousset (1948, 400, 556), EI s. v. *Marʾash*.

310 As Gaston Paris (1880, 29) correctly noted, this *Abilent / Abilant* which often appears in epics, was originally Abilene (or its main centre Abila) the last (and from a Jewish perspective) most remote of the three tetrarchates mentioned in Luke 3.1, the Anti-Lebanon west of Damascus, and therefore mostly outside the area settled by Jewish people (even if we no longer identify Abila as Nabi Abil, but rather as a very small place called Suq-Wadi-Barada in Syria, EJ

because of their consensus; K is influenced by *carbo, -onis*, m., 'coal' (with apparent colour symbolism*). Clar-bon-e* appears to consist of the OF components *clar-* (as in *cler* and *clarté*) and *-bon-*. A freely invented name for a 'heathen' people would certainly not have such positive connotations. On the other hand, it would be a strange coincidence if this phonological form came about automatically; it is more likely the result of a slight deformation of an oriental name. This makes identification difficult, however.

What is meant here? We can just about accept the credentials of [1] Araban in today's southeast Turkey. It does not mean [2] *qalʿat-Džabar* between Bālis and ar-Raqqa or [3] Aleppo. It certainly does not mean [4] Corfu, and the least likely option of all is [5] Kürbuğa, the Turkish leader.

On [1]: Today's Araban, about 80 km east-southeast of Maraş in southeast Turkey, has always been much smaller than Maraş: unlike the latter, it was never mentioned by the Crusade historians and there is no article devoted to it in the EI. It has barely ten thousand inhabitants today, as compared with almost half a million in Maraş; and yet the town is dominated by a medieval castle which even today bears the Kurd. Pers. name *kale-i zerrin* 'gold-like (~ unsurpassable) castle' and gives the town its New Kurd. name *Kele* 'castle (*par excellence*)'.[311] The Turkish name has an initial *a*, because the indigenous vocabulary of Turkish languages has no words beginning with *r-*; the old oriental name is (according to EI, Index) Arab. *Raʿban* or *Raʿbān*, (according to RHC Arm. 1) Armen. *Rhaban*. The considerable significance of the castle (Arab. *qalʿa*) supports Boissonade's suggestion (1923, 224) of *qalʿat Raʿbān* 'the castle Raban, the fortress town of Raban'[312] as the meaning of *Clarbone*. Compared with Arab. *qalʿat Rabāḥ* > Span. *Calatrava* etc.,[313] *qalʿat Raʿbān* > *Clarbone* looks very uncertain as far as the phonology is concerned; the /tr/ group would have been impossible to suppress. But there is one solution, analogous to *kale-i zerrin*, the Kurd. and Pers. construction with izafet (or even with suppression of the izafet vowel), i.e., *kale(-i-) Raban*,[314] which might have been interpreted by Romance speakers as *clar-* and then *-bone*.[315]

---

s. v. *Abilene,* Riley-Smith 1991, Index s. v.) This remote position makes it a suitable end point after a long distance ('until/as far as Abilent') or in a list.

311 According to https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Araban (last access 29. 03. 2021).

312 The EI does have (cf. the Index) the equivalent term *Ḥisn Raʿban*.

313 There are twelve more examples of a retained *-t-* in the *qalʿat + X* nexus below in the section on 'The future rebels against Charlemagne' (C.4.4) s. v. *Califerne*.

314 Cf. Justi (1880, 127–130), Salemann/Shukovski (1888, 28s., 30–34). In Kurd. dialects the izafet vowel varies, but this need not concern us.

315 Cf. more generally on the crusaders' allocation of secondary meanings n. 19 above.

The history of Raban proceeded largely in parallel to that of Maraş. During the First Crusade it belonged to the above-mentioned Armenian Prince Kogh Vasil. As explained above in connection with *Maruse* (A.1.3.8), his widow placed herself under Turkish protection in 1114, but Josselin de Courtenay was able to mitigate this "betrayal" with an iron fist. In 1120, we find Josselin in possession of the town; in 1123 King Baldwin II was taken prisoner nearby, but this evidently did not affect the town, because its ruler from 1124/1125 was Count Mahieu, and then around 1143 a Frank by the name of Simon, whose daughter and heir married an Armenian called Thoros. Finally, in 1150 'la célèbre cité de R'aban', as the contemporary Armenian chronicler Gregor the Priest called it, was lost to the Turks.[316] It is entirely possible that in this case, as with nearby Maraş, an observer looking on from a distant European setting might have had personal connections with the Francophone people in the region, and this could have led them to accord greater significance to both of these fortified towns than might seem warranted to us looking back with a modern perspective.

On [2]: As an alternative to *qalʿat Raʿbān*, Boissonnade (1923, 224) suggests *qalʿat Džabar ~ Calogenbar/Columbar* on the Euphrates east of Bālis. It was never held by the crusaders; but its Muslim ruler was allied with the Franks around 1125, and perhaps later. The dreaded Zengi was murdered by one of his own slaves during a move against the town in 1146, but this was an inter-Muslim event (Setton 1969a, 452, 462). *Qalʿat Džabar* is therefore neither phonologically, nor semantically a suitable candidate to be equated with *Clarbone*.

On [3]: Jenkins (ad loc.) maintains that *Chalybon* [i.e., Χαλυβών in Ptolemy 5.15.17 and a few later Greek authors] was one of the names for Aleppo and wonders whether this is what lies behind *Clarbone*. But the identification of this Chalybon as Aleppo is vehemently disputed in the PW s. v. *Chalybon* and *Beroia 5*. Be that as it may, the early history of Aleppo itself is illustrious (EI s. v. *Ḥalab*), but it was called Beroia (after Beroia in Macedonia) during the time of the Diadochi; in the Byzantine period, the Greeks often used the local name Χάλεπ (PW, s. v. *Beroia 5*; cf. e.g., Anna 6.9.3 etc.), but precisely not Χαλυβών. It is therefore unlikely that the form *Chalybon*, whatever it meant, ever reached the Latin Middle Ages. Even if we forget for a minute that in the song *Oluferne* (v. 3297) is almost certainly an epic name for 'Aleppo',[317] which would make

---

316 Setton 1969a, 299, 403, 415, 419, 517, 533, Runciman 1951, 162, 1952, 270, RHC Arm. 1.138, 143, 165.
317 Cf. more detail below in the section on 'Oluferne' (A.2.4).

Clarbone an unnecessary duplication, the two other crusader names for Aleppo which are phonologically closest to *Clarbone* are *Caliptum* and *Halapia* (both e.g., in Fulcher 2.1.5). They are still not close enough, and so must be rejected on phonological grounds, however well the place might suit in this context as the biggest bulwark of Islam in northern Syria that the crusaders besieged, without ever managing to defeat it.

On [4]: Grégoire (1939a, 247 n.) writes "Enfin, nous ne savons que faire de *Clarbone* ou *Carbone*, à moins que ce ne soit une forme corrompue de Corfou (Corfon)". But we cannot accept such a substantial distortion of the name of this well-known island (cf. above A.1.1.1 [1] in connection with Butentrot!) without any supporting documents.

On [5]: Mireaux (1943, 264) was reminded of the famous Kürbuğa, the leader of the relief army of Antioch. No comment.

A.1.3.10 Tenth *eschiele: des barbez de <Val> Fronde*

Des barbez de <Val> Fronde Segre 3260, *des barbez de Fronde* O (–1), K no equivalent (*von Karpône* Stricker, *van Garbonen* the *Karlmeinet*), *de barun de Valfonde* V4, *de Val Fonde* P: Compared with *barbez* in O, *barun(s)* in V4 looks like a *lectio facilior*. The scribe of the common source behind the Stricker and *Karlmeinet* did not have a tenth *eschiele* and so made his own by applying a nice little vowel change to the previous two names *Karpîne/Carbynen* (cf. the ninth *eschiele*, A.1.2.8). From V4P we have *Valfonde* in β. Bédier retains O in the definitive edition, which is unsatisfactory because the archetype (and evidently also the poet) always pays close attention to the metre. The other two possibilities are more or less equally acceptable, as far as the stemma is concerned: Segre decides to stick as consistently as possible to the best ms., which is O, adding only minimal improvements from the others, which means he selects *Fronde*, but *Val Fronde* is found nowhere else in the Middle Ages;[318] this is probably why Stengel, Jenkins and Hilka/Pfister put *Valfonde* from β into the text. If we keep both options open, what do they mean? [1] The only attempt that I am aware of to find a

---

318 There is, however, a further variant of *Valfonde* in later epics and romances (from *Aliscans* onwards), namely *Valfondee*, meaning an unspecified heathen homeland, perhaps in southwest Asia (cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.). On the other hand, the choice of *Valfonde* means that there is a homonymy with Blancandrin's fiefdom in v. 23, but because this occurs with two names occurring only once each and separated by over three thousand lines, it is not significant; it unlikely that the poet or the copyist would have been influenced by that name at this point.

meaning that fits the historical period is Vonitza in northwest Greece, but this must clearly be rejected. We must turn therefore to [2]–[4] the interpretations that are possible within the context of scholarly geography and the Alexander saga.

On [1]: Grégoire (1939a, 245 n.) suggested *Vontitza* (Anna 6.6.1), today a small town called Vonitsa on the Ambracian Gulf, where Robert Guiscard sent most of his men in 1085 while he took a small troop across to Cephallenia, where he died a few days later. The phonology alone is sufficient reason to reject Grégoire's thinking here; it is also difficult to understand why 'the people of Vontitza' would become a formidable force of at least 50,000 soldiers (v. 3219); and finally, there is no reason at all why the catalogue should end with this people.

On [2]–[4]: It seems therefore *a priori* reasonable to see *Valfonde / Val Fronde* as an aptronym like *Val Fuït* and *Val Penuse*; *Valfunde* is a 'deep, dark vale' *par excellence*,[319] *Val Fronde* is a 'leafy valley'.[320] Even in the first and second groups of ten, the poet gave a slight emphasis to the tenth *eschiele; a fortiori* we might expect something similar here, at the end of the catalogue. But because this name is supposed to round off the depiction of the whole world, another contemporary event is not appropriate; instead, we are taken back to the more timeless geography of the first twenty-five *eschieles*, and to the place where we left them behind, namely India.

On [2]: This brings us to *Valfonde*! Pfister (1976, 9) notes that the idea of ends of the earth being covered in darkness is very old, citing Curtius (9.4.18ss.) who reports that Alexander's soldiers refuse to follow him eastwards to that place: *At Macedones [. . .], postquam integrum bellum cum ferocissimis Indiae gentibus superesse cognoverunt, improviso metu territi rursus seditiosis vocibus regem*

---

319 A *vallis fundi*, as it were. Significantly, K (v. 444) refers to the *Valfonde* of v. 23 as *Fundevalle*; in his v. 3522 (no equivalent in O) he has *Uallefunde*. Since these terms mean nothing in Ger., they must be intended as quasi-Latin words, and they show what these words sounded like in medieval Europe. Cf. also OF *fonde* (fem.) 'foundation' and Span. *hondo*, a shortened form from *profundum*. – In Fr. there is a long and slow change between the late 12th c. and the end of the 17th c. from *fonde* 'sling etc.' (< Lat. *funda*) to *fronde* (for a detailed explanation of this see especially R. Lévy 1960, Nr. 457). But as 'valley of the slings' does not suggest anything specific, the couple *Valfonde / Valfronde* has nothing to do with it and arises instead from palaeographical issues (omission or insertion of an *r*- abbreviation).

320 That is, a *vallis frondis* or *vallis frondĕa*. Lat. *frons*, *frondis* (fem.) 'foliage' left only marginal traces in OF; but we can assume *a priori* that names such as this sounded quasi-Latin; on this and the unsuitability of late OF *fronde* 'sling' cf. previous n.!

increpare coeperunt: [. . .] Novis identidem armis novos hostes existere. Quos ut omnes fundant fugentque, quod praemium ipsos manere? Caliginem ac tenebras et perpetuam noctem profundo incubantem mari [. . .]. A similar account is given in a late classical text, in mss. of the 8th or 9th c., a letter supposedly from Pharasmanes to Hadrian about the wild tribes of India, which is usually considered to be part of the Alexander tradition; in this text towards the end (Pfister 1976, 371, section 33) there is talk of scouts being sent out, only to turn back when they reached a certain point: *missi [. . .] regressi ad nos nuntiaverunt nihil alterius alii boni nisi tenebras.* In the late classical Alexander romance by Pseudo-Callisthenes, Alexander forces his troops to march through the darkness, which brings them deeper into this place: in the early Latin version by Julius Valerius (3.50, p. 158 ed. Kübler) Alexander writes a letter to Olympia describing a seven-day march through complete darkness from the Pillars of Hercules into the land of the Amazons; the description in Leo Archipresbyter is a little less dramatic: *loca frigida atque obscura, ut paene non agnosceremus nos* (Pfister 1976, 125). These 'dark mountains' from the late classical stage of the saga made their way into the Jewish tradition as *hārē ḥōshekh*: here they separated India from Africa;[321] 'behind' them lay either the land of the Amazons, which Alexander reached via this route, or according to other sources, Gehinnom (Bab. Talmud, *Tamīd* 32a and b; *Gen. rabba* 33.31d, *Lev. rabba* 27.170d); in its turn, this location of Gehinnom influenced the motif of the 'dark mountains' in the Hebrew *Josippon* (cf. Pfister 1976, 154). In the Arabic tradition, too, (in al-Khuwārizmī, first half of the 9th c., ed. von Mžik) Alexander marches all the way into the 'land of darkness'.

Martianus Capella (6.663, ed. Dick p. 329.10s.) sees things a little differently: for him, the place where the *regio caligantibus tenebris inumbrata* meets the world lies behind the Arimaspi by the *Riphaei montes*, that is to say, in the northeast. According to Aethicus (8th c., p. 154s. ed. Prinz, cf. also p. 158s. and 174) if you travel north out of the Taurus, past the Caspian Sea, in the north of the broad lands of Scythia you will eventually come to the *montes Umerosi*,[322] where the last people are *gens brutissima et valde iners*, and after that there is an 'abyss' (*barat[h]rum*) with the Acheron in it, which no one is able to enter.

---

321 The great Ptolemy's unfortunate idea that India and Africa join together at some distant place, implying that the Indian Ocean is an inland sea (cf. above n. 235), is reflected in this text too.

322 The editor Prinz (p. 92 n. 35) explains that because of the *humerosus* variant, *Umerosus* is derived from Arab. *ḥumar* 'pitch, bitumen', and this may be correct; but most Romance readers would undoubtedly have understood the word as *umbrosus* 'ombreux, shadowy'. This is explicitly shown in the key to a map in Miller (1895–1898, 4.26, cited in Hallberg 1907, 5s.), where Acheron is described as: *currens ab Umbrosis Montibus.*

Similar stories about a *région des Ténèbres ou province d'Obscurité*, a *valle iscura*, a land called *Iscurità* at the end of the world continue into the late Middle Ages in works by Marco Polo, Mandeville and others (cf. e.g., Hallberg 1907, 529s., and Cardona in the edition of Polo by Bertolucci Pizzorusso 1975, 646s.).

The word *barbez* in the expression *barbez de Valfonde* is placed at the beginning, and this happens in only one other place in the catalogue, with *jaianz* in *jaianz de Malprose*. The word *jaianz* was an important characteristic, not just an added detail, and so we should take this *barbez* seriously too. As it happens, India and its surrounding islands also provide the *barbez* κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν. The late Latin letter of Pharasmanes to Hadrian (cap. 16, Pfister 1976, 368) mentions an island there, where *nascuntur homines longi habentes barbas usque ad genua, qui appellantur idtofagi* [< *icht(hy)ophagi*]. *Pisces enim crudos vescuntur*. This is amplified in the closely related, sometimes identical treatise *De rebus in oriente mirabilibus*, which was also translated into Old Eng. (bilingual in Oxford Ms. Cotton Tiberius B V, 11th c.; Rypins 1924, section IX): *[i]n aliqua* [Krappe: *aliquo loco*] *nascuntur homines statura pedum .VI. barbas habentes usque ad genua, comas usque ad talos qui homodubii appellantur et pisces crudos manducant*. In the similar *Liber monstrorum* (oldest ms. 9th c.; I 18, Pfister 1976, 383) they live in a desert, however: *Sunt homines in Oriente in cuiusdam heremi vasta solitudine morantes qui, ut perhibent, barbam usque ad genua pertingentem habent et crudo pisce et aquarum sunt hausta viventes*. In the vernacular version of the *Roman d'Alexandre* (III 3188–3292) only two of these people appear, but they nevertheless represent the whole tribe: *Deus viellars yndiens ont es desers trovés / Qui ont longes les barbes jusqu'au neu des baudrés*. They are from the desert location *Rimost, ci est nostre regnés*. It is obvious that there is no attempt to identify specific locations within the general region of India and its islands. We should not be too concerned, therefore, with trying to find an exact geographical correspondence between the land of the *barbez* and *Valfonde*, and neither should we – as we learned with *Val Penuse* – try to make one or other of these quoted texts into the "source" of the Rol.; the important thing is the whole tradition that a man as interested in geography as our poet was, would have had ample opportunity to read or hear about.

On [3]–[4]: There is also a meaningful interpretation for *Val Fronde,* and indeed we can even find two.

On [3]: There is an unidentified island of Tylos/Tiles near the Indian coast, probably fictitious, where no tree ever loses its leaves. This is what Solinus writes: (52.49): *Tylos Indiae insula est; ea fert palmas, oleam creat, vineis abundat. Terras omnes hoc miraculo sola vincit, quod quaecunque in ea nascitur*

arbos, nunquam caret folio. When Isidore repeats this observation, its passage into the knowledge base of the Middle Ages is secured (*et.* 14.3.5): *Tilen quoque arboribus foliam nunquam carentem*; and once more (14.6.13): *Tiles insulae Indiae, virens omni tempore folia.* After this, e.g., Rabanus Maurus, *De univ.* (12.4): *Tylem [. . .] arborum foliis nunquam carentem*; Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Vita Merlini* v. 906s. *Tiles eterno producit verne virentes / flores et frondes [!] per tempora cuncta virendo*; Vincent of Beauvais (*spec.nat.* 32.3 and 32.16) dutifully copies from both Isidore and Solinus. Isidore, Rabanus, Geoffrey and Vincent name these islands after the probably fictitious islands of *Argyre* and *Chryse*, which according to Pliny (*nat.* 6.80) are located opposite the mouth of the Indus, and behind *Taprobane* 'Sri Lanka' (which was well known because of an exchange of emissaries with Rome in the first century A.D.). This made them look like the most distant of all from Europe and therefore an appropriate place for the end of the world in the poet's eyes. We find the island of *Tilos* in maps of the 12th c. in the Jerome tradition, in the Isidore tradition of the Victorines and in Henry of Mainz (von den Brincken 1992, 149, 151s.); on the Ebstorf map of the 13th c. it is merged with *Chryse*: *Crisa insula dives auro. Hic numquam arbores sine foliis sunt.* However, the word *Val* does not fit very well with this island.

On [4]: Finally, Roman and medieval scholars knew of a people somewhere vaguely to the east or northeast of India (LM s. v. *China*), although they had never seen them face to face because they left long-distance trading to foreigners. There was only one notable thing about this unknown people, the *Seres,* the Chinese, and that was the foliage on their wonderful trees: *Ignoti facie, sed noti vellere Seres,* writes Isidore (*et.* 9.2.40), quoting from an unknown source. The *Seres* always sprayed this foliage with water, and then a fine, fleece-like material came out of it, from which they spun silk – this is what people thought in classical times, and the belief survived in Latin-speaking Europe until the 14th c., albeit gradually receding towards the north. The young Vergil asks (*Georg.* 2.126): [why should I show you] *vellera(que) ut foliis depectant tenuia Seres*? Pliny's (6.54) explanation is as follows: *Seres, lanicio silvarum nobiles, perfusam aqua depectentes frondium [!] canitiem,* and Solinus (50.2s.) writes: *aquarum aspergine inundatis frondibus [!] vellera arborum adminiculo depectunt.* Later authors also describe this procedure, e.g., Ammian (23.6.67), Martianus Capella (6.693) and Avienus (*periegesis* v. 928). It was left to Isidore, first to hint at this older understanding (9.2.40): *Seres [. . .] apud quos de arboribus lana contexitur*, and then to provide more detail (14.3.29): the lands of the Seres are *nobilibus frondibus [!] fertiles, e quibus vellera decerpuntur, quae ceterarum gentium Seres ad usum vestium vendunt*, until finally (19.27.5) he provides a more or less correct understanding, which had arrived in the west from

Byzantium: *Sericum dictum quia Seres primi miserunt; vermiculi enim ibi nasci perhibentur, a quibus haec circum arbores fila ducuntur: vermes autem ipsi graece* βόμβυκες *nominantur.* As Chr. Hünemörder observes (LM s. v. *Seidenspinner*), Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas and Alexander Neckam know of the correct explanation; Vincent of Beauvais just copies out (*spec.nat.* 31.129, 32.6, *spec.hist.* 4.53) the old material from Solinus, Isidore, and the J² edition of the *Historia de preliis*, adding no commentary of his own, but including (*spec.nat.* 20.119) the new information supposed to be from the *Physiologus,* but in fact probably from Neckam. Finally, just before 1300, the Old Norse cosmographer Stjórn enthuses: [the land of the Seres] 'is richly endowed with famous, lovely and magnificent, leafy trees [!], which they comb like sheep and then sell on to other people for clothing' (Simek 1990, 532).

The term *frondes* sounds almost like a leitmotif in these descriptions of the land of the Seres, and as the last known land to the (north)east, as well as the famous source of silk, it would be a worthy location for the end of the non-Christian world. But the idea of the 'bearded ones' is usually associated with India and not with the Seres.

All three "ends of the world" would make an aesthetically pleasing end note for the catalogue, but only India with this *barbez* and its *Valfonde* or *Valfronde* fits two of the three possible terms, and that is why I favour this interpretation.

A.1.3.11 A special case: the *Sulian*

Uns Sulians O 3131, *Surian* K (*Surigan* Stricker, *sarian* the *Karlmeinet*), *andaor* V4, *Surïens* P, *Sulïen* T (Segre has none of the variants): The Stricker has *-g- < -j-* glide; *sarian* in the *Karlmeinet* is just a misreading of *Surian*, even if it was understood as MHG *sarjant* (< OF *serjant*); V4 replaces 'Syrian' with 'runner, messenger' (with North Ital. /d/ > /ð/ > ø); OKPT confirm that the meaning is 'Syrian'; T supports the minority spelling *-l-* in O.

There is also *mes més li Sulians* O 3191, *meo messaço Galfant* V4, *uns mens garzons esrant* CV7, *Blasmez li Surïans* P, *Basin le soudeant* T: OP guarantee that here, too, the meaning is 'Syrian' (in T misunderstood as '(mercenary) soldier'), V4 replaces it, arbitrarily it seems, with a proper name, CV7 have a *lectio facilior*.

The name 'Syrian' was borrowed twice into Lat. from Gk. Σύρος (with a short stressed vowel!): first, when it was still ~ /u/ as *Sŭrus,* and later with ~ /y/, as *Syrus* (but in Vulgar Lat. and in the Romance languages throughout the Middle Ages it was pronounced with /i/); this corresponds to Συρία > Lat. *Sŭria* and *Syria* (and then also from these two forms the new adj. in late and M.Lat. ending in *-ianus*). From the older borrowing *Sŭria* we have (sometimes with Vulgar

Lat. /ŭ/ > /ǫ/, sometimes retaining the Lat. spelling <u> Ital. (Old and literary) *Soria, Soriano* (less often with *-u-*, Battaglia s. v.), Old Occ. *Suria* (occasionally also *Soria*), *Surian* (Chabaneau/Anglade, Wiacek s. v.) and OF *Surie* (occasionally also *Sorie*), *Surian/-en* with (relatively rare dialect) variants *Sulie, Sulian/-en*. From the later borrowing we have all the later Romance forms, including OF *Sire/Sirie* (later written *Syrie*) and *Sirïen* (later *Syrien*) which are still rare in the *chansons de geste*, but occur much more frequently in the romances (Moisan, Flutre s. v.).

Unlike the rest of Baligant's peoples, who appear as a group, the Syrians are only represented in the figure of a messenger to Charlemagne, who is also acting as a spy. The immediate reason for this is clear and has been duly emphasised in the scholarly literature (e.g., Baist 1902, 221 n.1, Boissonnade 1923, 204, Bédier 1927, 52s., Mireaux 1943, 43, Bancourt 1982a, 13–15): the Syrians are Monophysite Christians and the Crusade historians report that they often acted as spies for the Muslims. In actual fact, they had been religiously oppressed by Byzantium, and then after the Muslim conquest they quickly switched, not to Islam, but mostly to the Arabic language (LM s. v. *Syrien*).

It is especially interesting in our context that Syrian Christians were sometimes sent by Muslim rulers as messengers to Christian rulers. Shortly after 990, Lu'lu', the *de facto* ruler of Aleppo, sent the Syrian Malkūtha to Emperor Basilios II (Tritton 1930, 35), and in 1098 the Muslim ruler of ʿAzāz (about 60 km northeast of Antioch) sent a Syrian Christian to Godefroi de Bouillon (Bancourt 1982a, 13–15 according to Albert of Aachen, RHC Occ. 4.437).

There is another piece of information which has, as far as I am aware, never before been mentioned in connection with this part of the Rol., and which might help us to understand the text. The basic legal statute (*dhimma*) governing non-Muslims living under Islamic rule is set down in the so-called 'Covenant of Umar', which probably does not refer to 'Umar I (634–644), the one who conquered Syria, but to 'Umar II (717–720); in any case, it had been in operation for centuries by the time of the Crusades. This covenant stipulated that non-Muslims had to not only pay a poll tax, but also provide certain services to the Muslims and their armies, including especially acting as a travel guide. Equally, the early and influential law teacher Mālik ibn Anas (Medina, 8th c.) decided that in the Muslim armies, non-Muslims could be in the auxiliary forces, serving as guides (Fattal 1958, passim, especially 63, 65, 68s., 232, EI, Art. *Dhimma* and *Omar, Covenant of*). The messenger and spying activities carried out by the Syrian in the Rol. should be understood as this kind of service.

A.1.4 Review of the catalogue of peoples

The longstanding impression that there is no particular geographical order-
ing of the peoples in this catalogue should hopefully now, in the light of the
analysis above, be consigned to the past. It is abundantly clear that a geo-
graphical ordering is the basic structural principle – just as it was in the cata-
logues of peoples that we find in ancient epics. Only some of the names have
additional symbolic meanings; this is intentional on the part of the poet,
who sometimes achieves these secondary meanings by modifying the sound
of the names slightly, and he does this most frequently in the early parts of
the catalogue. The result is a pale blue glint in the background, reminiscent
of hell, but by no means the main structural foundation of the catalogue. To
regard this as the only important factor, and to ignore the geographical prin-
ciple, is to write off this very respectable piece of poetry as structurally weak,
and little more than a cacophony of sounds.

The first group of ten in the catalogue is devoted to the western part of Bali-
gant's sphere of influence, excluding the Spain and North Africa complex that
had already been exhausted in the Marsilĭe section (North Africa in the medie-
val sense i.e., west of Egypt). In the first half of this group of ten, there are
mainly eastern European peoples, and in the second, mainly or exclusively peo-
ples from Asia Minor to northeast Africa, so that the main direction of thought
is from north to south. But the group of ten turns towards the Euphrates in the
end, finishing up at the easternmost point that the crusaders ever reached –
which leads us right up to the central zone of the enemy's territory.

The second group of ten describes this central zone. It starts at the place
where the first group of ten ended, and turns towards the Turks, Persians, and
the area around the Black Sea, heading northwards as far as sub-polar Scythia;
in other words, it reverses the direction of thought, leading this time from south
to north.

The first half of the third group of ten describes the eastern part of Bali-
gant's sphere of influence, as far as Central Asia-India, which takes us to the
far reaches, indeed almost to the limit of medieval knowledge. In order to make
sure that the catalogue will not fade into bland generalities for a less educated
audience, the poet seems to put aside his geographical framework in the sixth
to ninth *eschieles* and instead refers to contemporary events that took place in
non-Christian places and were associated with outcomes that would have been
perceived as negative by a French-speaking audience. Finally, the poet seeks to
round off the whole corpus of thirty *eschieles* by returning to his geographical
principle in the last one, and in so doing he makes his audience feel that they
have reached the very end of the world.

Alexander's shadow was already detectable in the first and second groups of ten, but the mention of the *Val Penuse* in the third group of ten brings it into focus. We should perhaps consider Jerome (PL 25.528) once more, by way of reminder: Alexander conquered *ab Illyrico et Adriatico mari usque ad Indicum Oceanum et Gangem [. . .] partem Europae et omnem Asiam [. . .].* Does this not sound just like the programme that the catalogue describes, taking us from *Butentrot* all the way to *Valfunde*?

Admittedly, the poet leads us to the edge of the world as he knows it, based on his own religious position – Christ is here, the Antichrist is there, *tertium non datur.* But his poetic ambition also seems to mirror that of another poet who was much admired in the Middle Ages: even though he knew better, Lucan describes the battle of Pharsalus, saying that Pompey's soldiers included not only the Persians and the people from the Indus and Ganges, but even the mythical (and according to tradition, one-eyed!) Arimaspi.[323] Is this similarity just a coincidence? Or is the Roland poet letting us see that he knows classical epics, even if we can never identify a direct quotation from one of them?

In comparison with the "erudite" geography of the time, which consists almost exclusively of passages copied from classical writers, the catalogue is much more striking, largely due to its considerable amounts of recent, real-life geography, especially in relation to eastern Europe. It is only when the narrative takes us far away from the poet's homeland that bookish geography necessarily takes over. The poet has not consulted the books just to find information for the Song – if he had, we would see specific borrowings from the sources – but we should think of him as a man who has long been fascinated by geography, probably even from youth, and is especially interested the real, temporal world. If he was a Norman, then he was in this respect a true son of his people. It is astonishing that minimal fantastical elements appear only briefly at the beginning of each of the three groups (bristles on the spines of men, cynocephaly, giants) adding only a judicious touch of spice to the narrative. The atmosphere of the sprawling Alexander saga is evoked only through the dark mood of the *Val Penuse*; the catalogue does not glory in the "wonders of India" as the Greek, Latin and Old French texts of the Alexander romance do.

Modern scholars tend to underestimate the poet's efforts to represent a realistic and ordered geography. A comparison is instructive in this respect: the poet of the Rol. portrays the martyrdom of his protagonist as the prelude to a much bigger conflict, one that has almost global proportions, and he does this by introducing the enemies of the Christians in a catalogue of peoples: the author of the Occitan

---

323 Cf. above A.1!

Chanson de Sainte Foy does this too. At the outset we must acknowledge that he has two disadvantages in comparison with the poet of the Rol.: he wrote in rhymes rather than assonances, and he was depicting events that had taken place not three and a half, but about seven and a half centuries before. Now to the content! The author of the *Sainte Foy* notes that Maximian and Diocletian were worse than *altre Judeu* and the (notoriously anti-Jewish, and therefore badly matched) Philistines (v. 484–485), and then he immediately embarks upon an account of their supposed allies v. 486–491): in quick succession, he lists the Jebusites (people who inhabited Jerusalem before the Jews), the *Arabid* (Arab or Muslim elite soldiers) and the Pherezeans of the Vulgate (today translated as the 'Perizzites', another, almost unknown and pre-Israelite people), the Armenians, the Amazons and pygmies, the hermaphrodites and the Hebrews (tautological alongside the Jews), as well as *Corbarin* (for which there is no conceivable association other than Corbaran-Kürbuğa) and the (once again biblical, pre-Israelite) Amoraim. There is obviously no geographical order, and instead we find two or three names from the contemporary world and multiple items from the scholarly cabinet of curiosities (exactly the opposite of the Roland poet's careful selection), all embedded in biblical elements. And then there is the second listing of Maximian's troops in the final battle (v. 509–522): Danes and Navarrese, black people, Moors, or Blackamoors[324] and the sons of Hagar (meaning Arabs), people from the tribe of Issachar (why specifically this one from the twelve tribes of Israel?), people of Cedar (one of the many grandsons of Hagar, who in the Bible gave his name to a nomadic Arab tribe near Babylon – why specifically this one, which is tautological alongside the 'sons of Hagar'?), and also 'all the people from the kingdom of [the Assyrian king] Salmanassar'; next come Bulgarians, Greeks and Chaldeans, Marcomanni and 'Macrobians', satyrs (!) and Idumaeans (in the Bible south of Israel), Englishmen, Scots and Canaanites – again these heterogeneous elements. Later, in a laisse with *-on* rhymes, *mil Esclavon* (v. 552) appear in the middle of a battle description. The poet may have thought that by bringing together these heterogenous elements he was creating a spectacular embodiment of the concept of "all the evil in the world". But there is no principle to guide his selection, and none even in the ordering of material, apart from the most obvious: the rhymes ending in *-eu,* then *-ar* and again *-eu*.

We can only truly appreciate the Roland poet's desire for structure and his sense of the real world when we look at his work against this kind of background. His understanding of the geography and history of the world may look

---

324 On *Mors* cf. above A.1.1.7 [b1] and [b2].

very medieval to us, but in fact it is much closer to our way of thinking than anything we see in the *Sainte Foy*!

A.2 The overarching structure of Baligant's realm

A.2.1 Baligant's centres

Alixandre O 2626 and CV7T, *Alexandria* K, *Allexandre* V4: *Alexandria* (in OF with the late classical adoption of the Greek intonation Ἀλεξάνδρεια as opposed to classical Latin *Alexandrīa*) was considered in ancient and medieval times to be within Asia, and not in Africa.[325] Even after it was conquered by the Arabs (in 642) it remained one of the largest ports and this made it famous in Europe throughout the whole of the Middle Ages: Pliny (*nat.* 5.62–64) acknowledged the value of the town and the port at length, while Josephus (*bell. Jud.* 4.10.5), and following him, Adamnan (2.30.8s.) described the port; Bede devotes most of chapter 18 of his *De locis sanctis* to Alexandria. In the early to high Middle Ages, pilgrims on the way to Jerusalem pass through Muslim Alexandria (e.g., Arculf around 680, Bernard around 870), and so the city appears on almost all medieval maps of the world (von den Brincken 1968, 162); Benedict of Soracte (around 1000) describes in his chronicle how King Aaron, i.e., Harūn ar-Rashīd, courteously escorts Charlemagne as far as Alexandria on his return journey from Jerusalem (MGH SS. 3.711).

In the Marsilĭe section of the song, the adjective *alexandrin* (< Lat. *alexandrinus*, Schweickard 1992, 75, 79, 212s., cf. also Schweickard in the DI s. v. *Alessàndria¹*) appears twice: *d'un palĭe alexandrin* O 408 (the adj. only in O), 463 ('from Alexandria' n) means that Marsilĭe's throne is covered with cloth from Alexandria, as indeed – quite in keeping with his character – is Ganelon's sable cloak (on the metre cf. v. 682, 1881, 2616, 3219). In the classical period, Alexandria exported fine linen from the Egyptian delta, and in the Middle Ages it also exported cotton, silk and luxury fabrics from gold brocade to gauze brought especially from Syria, all of which were, according to Isḥāq ibn al-Ḥusayn (10th c.), 'the most expensive textiles in the world'. Even in the papal *Liber pontificalis,* descriptions of the papal treasures sometimes include references to *panni alexandrini* (Lombard 1978, 151–174).

Babilonĭe O 2614, KV4CV7T, *Babilon* nw: the fact that Baligant gathers his army in Alexandria before crossing over to Spain, and not, e.g., in the port of

---

325 Cf. for more detail on this point n. 95 above.

Antioch (called St. Simeon by the crusaders) or in Laodicea has led scholars to believe, quite rightly, that when the poet talks about Baligant's capital, he means Cairo, and not Baghdad (as ancient Babylon's successor); in the Rol., then, the real model for the "Lord of the heathens" is not the historically more legitimate Caliph in Baghdad, who had by then long been politically side-lined, but his Fatimid rival.[326]

To be on the safe side, we should examine the strange double meaning that the name *Babylon(ia)* has had throughout history. According to the EI (Art. *Bābalyūn*) an Old Egyptian place name which happened to sound similar, though the detail is uncertain, attracted in Gk. the familiar name Βαβυλών of the Mesopotamian town. There are other theories about the early transmission of the name: according to Strabo (*Geogr.* 17.1) the Egyptian Babylon was founded by Mesopotamian immigrants during the Persian period and so – we might extrapolate – it had the same name from the very beginning, and according to Josephus (*Ant.* 2.15.1) it was built during the reign of the Persian King Cambyses; this is repeated with minor variations in the Middle Ages by William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Anglorum* IV § 371, Honorius Augustodunensis, *De imagine mundi* 1.18, in the romance *Robert le Diable* (according to Flutre s. v. *Babeloine*) and in an interpolation in the vernacular version of the *Roman d'Alexandre* (Laisses 24.1 and 24.2 of the ACFMY mss., Edwards 1955, 36s.). According to the TLL, the Egyptian town is called *Babylon* (acc. *Babylona*) or *Babylonia* in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, the pilgrim itinerary by Antoninus Placentinus, the Geographus Ravennas, twice in Palladius and once each in Rufinus, Jerome and Cassiodorus' translation of Josephus. Its defeat in 641 was considered the most decisive event in the Muslim conquest of Egypt (EI, Art. *Bābalyūn*). However, at that time the name was much more commonly used – and in theological contexts of course exclusively used – to refer to the Mesopotamian city, and sometimes also to Baghdad as its successor. But in the 9th to 11th c. the Caliphs of Baghdad lost influence and became pawns in the military activities of first the Persian and then the Turkish rulers, while from the beginning of the 10th c. onwards, the Fāṭimids were rival Caliphs, growing ever more powerful, first in today's Tunisia, and then from 969 in Egypt.[327] Al-Ḥākim (996–1021)

---

326 K has a noticeably different version: in v. 1871 and 2272 Ganelon says to Blancandrin and to Marsilĭe that Roland wants to conquer *Babilonĭe* in the end, but later K says that Baligant v. 7153 comes from *Persia* – just as the *Beliguandus* in the PT (cap. 21) comes *de Perside*.

327 To be precise, the Arab conquerors set up their military camp Fusṭāṭ (< lat. *fossatum*) right next to the Byzantine Babylon Fortress and the two merged to form what was later to be called Old Cairo; the Fāṭimids built their new palace town al-Qāhira 'the victorious' right next to this spot. From a western perspective this is all, of course, "the same" city.

ordered intermittent persecution of the Christians, including the expropriation
and plundering of churches and even the destruction of the Church of the Res-
urrection in Jerusalem. When Ademar of Chabannes († 1034, Rec α, 3.47.20s. ed.
Bourgain) blames him for this in around 1010 (and also accuses him of the mur-
der of the Patriarch of Jerusalem which in actual fact had taken place just be-
fore 969),[328] he calls him *Nabuchodonosor Babyloniae, id est admiratus* – i.e. (as
the destroyer of Jerusalem's inner sanctuary) a second 'Nebuchadnezzar of Bab-
ylon', where Babylon is used with both meanings at the same time. This pas-
sage makes it abundantly clear how the reputation of the old name carries over
into its new meaning. Not long after that, Radulfus Glaber († probably 1047, ed.
Prou 2.7.25, p. 73) refers in connection with the year 1009 simply to the *Ammir-
atus Babilonis*, which shows that the new terminology is being used. This is
then continued in the crusade historians and in the Rol.: *Babylonia* is Cairo,[329]
and the ruler there is quite often *rex* (as in e.g., Fulcher 1.31.1, 2.15.1, Albert of
Aachen 6.13s.), but almost as frequently a*(d/m)miratus*, *a(d/m)miralius* etc. (as
e.g. in the *Gesta* 39, Fulcher 2.44.5, Albert of Aachen 7.10), OF *amirail*.[330] The
Crusade historians consistently know the difference between him and his two ri-
vals in Baghdad, the secular *Soldanus Persiae* etc. (*Gesta* 21, Fulcher 1.15.7, 1.19.1
etc.) and the one sometimes called (e.g. *Gesta* 21) *Calipha illorum apostolicus*

---

328 Cf. below in the section on 'Valdebrun' (A.5.6).

329 If ever the Mesopotamian Babylon is meant, this is indicated clearly, as in Fulcher 1.24.5
and 3.30.5 (*Babylon maxima, antiqua*) – as opposed to more than 25 mentions of *Babylon, Bab-
ylonia, Babylonii, Babylonicus/-onius/-onensis* with reference to Cairo.

330 The Arabic Caliph title *amīr al-muʾminīn* appears in Latin in the Carolingian Royal Annals
for the year 801 as *Amir al Mumminin*, then in Anastasius the Bibliothecarius (9th c.) in short
form as *amiras, ameras*, and meaning the Caliph, more frequently in Sigebert of Gembloux
and from Ademar onwards, with increasing frequency also meaning other 'Emirs', as in the
anonymous *Gesta* of the First Crusade (cap. 21) meaning *Cassianus* as *ammiralius* of Antioch,
frequently for various people in Fulcher (as indeed the title *amīr* generally spread across the
Islamic world). However, this does not entitle us to claim with Gicquel (2003, 248) that the
admiralius Babilonicus "dans les récits de la croisade" was not the Caliph but the "émir el Dju-
jûsch du calife d'Égypte", i.e., the commander of the Caliph's army (*amīr al-džuyūsh*). The
spreading popularity of the title led to it gradually being used in the south Italian Norman
state to refer to several high officers, until finally (in the late 12th c.) the meaning was restricted
to the commander of the fleet; this development is outside the scope of our study, cf. Ménager
1960, passim, especially 14–16, 21ss., 157–164, and Takayama 1998, passim, also the LM s. v.
Admiratus. – By a strange coincidence, the Fāṭimid Caliph from 1101–1130 bore the name *al-
Āmir* (with, unlike the title, the stress on the first syllable); however, he was under the guard-
ianship of his vizier al-Afdal until 1121.

'their Pope'.[331] This was doubtless the perspective that prevailed throughout the following decades: the main outcome of the First Crusade was generally thought to be the establishment of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and the biggest threat to its existence seemed to be the Caliphate in Egypt. Europe's rude awakening occurred with the fall of Edessa on Christmas Eve 1144, but even then, nobody saw the triumphant Zengi, the ruler of Mosul and Aleppo, as the Lord of all 'heathendom'. The Song's perspective is therefore also compatible with the later dating of shortly after the Second Crusade. And since Cairo and the whole cultural background of Egypt was counted as part of Asia, and its Muslims naturally spoke Arabic (as did even most Copts at the time when the Song was written), it was fitting for Baligant to be implicitly identified as an Arab (cf. above the section '*Enfruns* and *Arabiz*', A.1.2.10.2).

We must remember, however, that the geographical circumstances here are overlaid with the overwhelmingly negative aura attached to the term "Babylon" itself, which the audience of the song would be bound to carry over from the ancient to the new Babylon. From a salvation-oriented perspective of history, the chronological starting point for this negative aura is the building of the Tower of Babel (*Gen* 11.1–9), the epitome of human hubris; after that, there are prophecies against Babel, especially *Is* 13, 14, 47, 50 and 51 and *Dan* 5 (Belshazzar); they culminate in the New Testament Revelation of John (*Apoc* 14, 16–19). The Church fathers consider Babylon to be the negative counterpart of Augustine's *Civitas Dei*; but even more influential in our context is the theological teaching that the Antichrist will come from Babylon;[332] this doctrine appears, according to Bousset (1895, 113) in the Daniel and Revelation commentaries by Jerome, Bede, Anselm of Laon and Rupert of Deutz, also in Haimo (on the 2nd letter to the Thessalonians, PL 117.780A), Adso of Montier-en-Der (*De ortu et tempore Antichristi*) and in the *Elucidarium* of Honorius Augustodunensis – which means it certainly would have been familiar to any 12th c. Francophone who was interested in theology, and in fact it is present in an Anglo-Norman version of Adso's treatise, the

---

331 Even Anna is familiar with the old Babylon, of course, (13.8.3, 14.2.4, 15.10.4), but understands it to mean Cairo in a contemporary context (11.7.1–3), and she knows 'the Babylonian' is the Fāṭimid Caliph *al-Āmir* (12.1.3) and 'the Babylonians' are his soldiers (11.7.2). Idrīsī (1999, 21) knows: the town of Misr (= Cairo) is called Babylon (*Banbalūna*) in Greek. Only in the – essentially conservative – European map tradition do we find that the Egyptian Babylon(ia) is less frequently mentioned (Edson et al. 2005, 63 and 66, von den Brincken 1968, 162) than the Mesopotamian one (von den Brincken 1968, 165).

332 There are also allegorical interpretations of the name *Babylon* running parallel to this; a typical example of this is the very influential *Allegoriae in sacram scripturam* which were attributed to Rabanus Maurus (PL 112.872): in this work Babylon *means civitas reproborum, mens prava, peccatum, impii qui in fine damnabuntur, confusio, infernus* etc.

Antéchrist (v. 62–64 ed. Perman 1961) dedicated to a certain Henri d'Arci. There is only one conclusion to be drawn: if Babylon is the breeding ground of evil from the beginning of time until the end of the world, then it must have been so in the time of Charlemagne. This means that the whole Baligant section is designed to be a new round in the eternal battle between "Jerusalem" and "Babylon" and as such is a prefiguration of the coming of the Antichrist: just as the Antichrist will rally all that is not Christian around him – *tertium non datur* –, so Baligant will do the same.[333] Thus the toponym at the very beginning of the Baligant section would give an educated audience an idea of what the "meaning" of the Baligant section might be. From a modern literary studies perspective, however, we should add that it is not the design or even the ideology of a work that determines its status, but rather it is how these aspects are made real, through all the concrete details that come together in the work; the ambition of this study is to lay out in as much detail as possible exactly how this process of realisation is carried out.

A.2.2 The fiefdom promised to Baligant's son

Baligant's son Malprimes is assigned the role of champion, leading his father's troops out to face the impending battle, and in anticipation of his victory, his father bestows upon him *un pan de mun païs*

   des Cheriant entresqu'en Val Marchis O 3208, *de Oriente tresqui a Valmarì* V4, *des Serventée desci a Val Morois* P (cf. below for CV7 and *Karlmeinet*): V4 misunderstood the *des ch-* in his source as the prep. *desque* 'until', replaced it (because 'until' does not fit very well before *entresque*) with an inherently correct *de* and interpreted the following *[.]riant* in a *lectio facilior* as 'Orient'; we know that conversely 'Orient' was not already in the archetype because of the similarity between *Cheriant* in O and *Serventée* in P and (where /s/ could be a mishearing of /š/ < /tš/ and <en> in French Lorrain P stands for /ã/). The partial consensus between O and V4, and between O and P, confirms that *Cheriant* belongs in the archetype. In the second part of the verse, V4 and P both agree – and therefore possibly also β – on a negative adjective instead of *Marchis*, where *mar(r)i* in V4 fulfils the assonance requirement, and *morois* in P is the result of the new requirement for a rhyme; this means we cannot be sure whether or not *Val Marchis* was in the archetype, or whether it meant 'Margrave Valley' there.

---

[333] We are indebted to Heisig (1935), Steinmeyer (1963), Rütten (1970) and Wendt (1970), for expressly pointing out the basis of this metaphysical dimension of history in the Rol.

The song's audience might well wonder why Baligant is giving away precisely this piece of land at this point. The poet explains:

Ço est de la tere ki fut al rei Flurit O 3211, *dat land* [. . .], *dat des konyncks Floryns was, / den ich ouch bedwank vp dem pas* the *Karlmeinet* (not in Segre; ed. von Keller, p. 732, v. 7–9), ([. . .] *un pan de paienie*) *terre au roi Floire qi tant a seignorie* C, *les terres Floires qui tant a seignorie* V7: the *q(u)i tant a seignorie* in CV7 is obviously added in for the sake of the rhyme; the *Karlmeinet* on the other hand, feels the need to explain that Baligant's authority to dispose of this land comes from an earlier victory.

But has he correctly interpreted the meaning of the scene? It is not very probable that at that moment one of Baligant's large oriental fiefdoms was by chance free for reassignment, and it is more likely that he is rewarding Malprime's bravery by promising him a worthy portion of the magnificent spoils of war that they expect to win; this is the only interpretation that closely links cause and effect, and it is reinforced by the partitive *un pan de* with the connotation of 'a sizeable piece of (the looted land)'. In any case, V. 3208 and 3211 both belong in the archetype, even though O is the only ms. that has both. CV7 (and perhaps also the *Karlmeinet*) seem to identify the *rei Flurit* in O as the eponymous hero of the love story of Floire, the son of a Muslim king, later king himself, in al-Andalus,[334] and the Christian *Blancheflor*.[335]

The editors have evidently accepted this connection with Floire and then interpreted *flurit* in O as a proper name. But linguistically, *Flurit* and *Floire* are not the same, and because the names *Floire* (< *Florius*) and *Blancheflour* in the story must have been closely modelled on each other from the very start, it is unlikely that there was ever a *Flurit* before *Floire*.

But why should *flurit* actually be a name here?[336] It occurs as an adjective seven times in the song: six times it means 'with flowing hair or (more often) beard', always with reference to French warriors, referring once (v. 3087) to the heads of the veteran soldiers around Charlemagne in the tenth *eschiele* and no less than five times to Charlemagne himself: his beard is *flurie* (v. 970, 2353,

---

334 As King of Almería he has conquered lands in Africa in the *Gran Conquista de Ultramar* (2.43, p. 175a ed. de Gayangos); this, too, could lead us to interpret *Cheriant* in O as 'Kairouan'.
335 The oldest French version of the Floire story (Floire I, the *version aristocratique*) cannot be dated much after 1160, assuming that the German *Trierer Floyris* (ms. end of the 12th c.) is from 1160–1170.
336 In the opaque double mention in *Ch. de Guill.* 653 ~ 991 *Fluri/Flori* could, judging by the context, equally well be a place or a person's name; Suchier (1905, 664s.) thinks that it means the famous Fleury Abbey (~Floriacum), also called St-Benoît-sur Loire, and which was plundered by the Normans in 865, 879 and 911. Elsewhere in the epic genre, *Flori* is the name of a horse or a dog ('magnificently hairy').

2605), his head is *flurit* (v. 117), and he himself is *fluriz* (v. 1771): *Ja estes <vus> veilz e fluriz e blancs* – the last statement is spoken by Ganelon, but there is no doubt about the meaning. And Charlemagne is called simply *le rei* dozens of times in the song. He could therefore quite easily be called *le rei flurit*, and the five preceding mentions of *flurit* referring to Charlemagne (and no other individual) would have been enough to create an association between this word and his person in the minds of the audience. Are we really expected to think that the poet would suddenly use this nexus to refer to a person who has never been mentioned before in the song?

If *rei flurit* refers to Charlemagne, the explicit information that he owned the land from *Cheriant* to *Val Marchis* would only be believable if the audience recognised that there was a real truth in there somewhere. Thus, *Cheriant* and *Val Marchis* in the mind of the poet are almost certainly [1] Kairouan and either simply 'the adjoining or desert-like land' or – much less probably – the land around Marrakesh; it does not mean [2] the Jordan Valley and Galilee, and it certainly does not mean [3] the Charzanes, today the Erzen, a river in Albania north of Durrës/Durazzo, and the Morača, a river in Montenegro that flows from the north into Lake Skadar/Scutari, nor [4] the ancient Caria region in the southwest of today's Turkey and the smaller river Marsyas there, nor indeed [5] Harran (today in ruins) and Maraş in south-eastern Turkey.

On [1]: Kairouan seems first to have been suggested by Settegast (ZrP 39.316), and then accepted by Jenkins (ad loc.) and de Mandach (1993, 272s.), but it needs further explanation. The town is called in Arab. *al-Qayrawān* ('the caravan town') and was often pronounced /qeru̯ān/. In OF phonology *Cher-* < /kair-, ker-/ is regular;[337] it is at least plausible that the phonological sequence /u̯a/ which does not exist in OF was replaced with the more common sequence /ia/,[338] and no further explanation is necessary for the ending *-ant*.[339] Kairouan, 150 km southwest of Tunis, with a population today of about 120,000, has been a UNESCO World Heritage Centre since 1988. According to tradition it was founded by ʿUqba, the Muslim conqueror of North Africa in around 670. It was the capital of the Aghlabid empire (800–909) – which covered roughly the same area as modern Tunisia – and thanks to its irrigation system, among other things, it developed into the most important (and also culturally significant) town in Ifrīqiya; evidence of this is still visible in the Great Mosque, one of the largest in all Islam.

---

337 We cannot even rule out the possibility that *Che-* is here simply a spelling of /ke/.

338 Does the <v> in the *Serventée* in P come from a /u̯/ via someone who still understood the name?

339 Cf. the previous n. and n. 234 above.

The immediate successors to the Aghlabids were the early Fāṭimids (909–969), who were Shiites while their predecessors had been (and most of their subjects were) Sunni, and so they founded a new town Mahdia on the coast (about 90 km east-southeast of Kairouan) which became their place of residence, but Kairouan with a circumference of 7.5 km retained its high population density. The Sunni Zīrīds (979–1156) favoured Kairouan once again,[340] where in fact (according to Courtois 1945, 113) there was still a Christian community in the middle of the 11th c. Kettermann (2001, 60) describes how Qairuan was a hub for trade with al-Andalus, Sicily, Italy and the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Even Idrīsī in the middle of the 12th c. (1999, 186s.) calls it 'the mother of metropolises' – although this can only be determined with hindsight. The Fāṭimids had moved their residence to Egypt in 969 but when the Zīrīds renounced their allegiance to them in the middle of the 11th c., the Fāṭimids sent Upper Egyptian Bedouin tribes who destroyed the immigration system for ever, and following several years of siege, the Bedouins plundered Kairouan in 1057, after which the population shrank to a third of its previous size; the Zīrīd rulers had escaped to al-Mahdiyya 'Mahdia' (LM s. v. *Kairuan*, EI, Art. *al-Ḳayrawān*). The much-weakened Zīrīd state thus fell into the target zone of the expanding Pisans and the south Italian Normans. The Pisans raided Mahdia in 1087, seized magnificent spoils and immediately claimed – quite inconsequentially as it turned out – that they had forced the ruler of the Zīrīds to become a vassal of the Pope.[341] In the longer term, the relationship with the Normans was more significant. The Normans concluded a treaty with the Zīrīds that, depending on the circumstances, was conducted as a trading agreement, an alliance, or a binding submission (von Grunebaum 1963, 155); this is why in the first third of the 12th c. Raoul de Caen (*Gesta Tancredi* cap. 79, v. 23, RHC Occ. 3.662) could say of the Norman people: *cui servit et Afer.* In actual fact, the Zīrīd state – largely due to the failure of their irrigation system – had become dependent upon Sicily for their grain supply (Idris 1962, 663, 665–667, Chalandon 1907, 1.368s.). This led to the growing involvement of the Normans; in 1123 they suffered a setback, but in 1135 they made it *de facto* into a protectorate and at the same time they began to capture individual locations (Djerba, Gabès, Sousse, Sfax); in 1148 King Roger II even captured Mahdia and proclaimed himself *Rex Africae* (von Grunebaum 1963, 156, Chalandon 1907, 2.157–165); according to Chalandon (p. 165) he also ruled over the interior

---

340 Cf. e.g., Idris 1962, 411–427.

341 In the frequently edited (first by du Méril 1847, 239–251) *Carmen in victoria Pisarum* v. 475ss.: [the Zīrīd] *terram iurat sancti Petri esse sine dubio, et ab eo tenet eam iam absque colludio, unde semper mittet Romam tributa et praemia [. . .].*

"jusqu'à Kairouan". It was only after Roger's death (in 1154) that his successor William I lost all of the African territories to the Almohads.

Now, the Roland poet has Charlemagne predict that *cil d'Affrike* will also 'rebel' against him (v. 2924), and 'Africa' in the late 11th and early 12th c. mostly meant the Zīrīd empire; Charlemagne must therefore have previously held control of this territory. The most obvious explanation why the poet was able to present this idea without fear of ridicule is his ability to link it with the genuine role that the Normans played in that country in his own time. He could then also have known Kairouan as the famous centre of this 'Africa'; its reputation had been tarnished for some two or three generations, but since he was portraying the Carolingian period, this was not an issue.

The simplest interpretation of *Val Marchis* is that of Tobler-Lommatzsch who include it in their article on *marchis* 'adjoining' and cite three further references with this meaning. It just means 'the neighbouring stretch of land, the surroundings (of Kairouan)'.[342] However, I would not wish to exclude the possibility that *val marchis* is a misinterpretation of *val marchi*, with the northern, including north Norman form *marc(h)i* 'wilted, drooping'; this would fit with the no longer irrigated, dried out land surrounding Kairouan and could conceivably lead to the forms *mar(r)i* 'in a sad state' in V4 and *morois* 'dark brownish' in P.

Jenkins suggested that *Marchis* here should be understood as *Marrakesh*, and de Mandach enthusiastically agreed. I am sceptical, not so much because the town was far outside the sphere that was under the influence of Francophone people (the poet could have been exaggerating), or because Marrakesh was not founded until 1070[343] (the poet would not necessarily have known that) but because both scholars have missed an important detail: the name of the town in Standard Arab. is *Marrākush*, pronounced in North Africa as *Merrāksh* (EI s. v. *Marrākush*), has the stress on -*rā*-, and stressed vowels are not reduced in Arab. nor in Romance. This example shows very nicely that in this early period the stress was retained in loan words. For in Arab. the name of the town is identical to the country name 'Morocco' that soon emerged out of it. In the Romance forms of the country name there is a rare but very old variant with /o/ in the stressed syllable, which is written in Arabic as *Marrūkush* (attested in the memoirs of the Zīrīd ruler ʿAbd Allāh, just before 1100, Lévi-Provençal 1955b, 197 with n. 16); this leads to Span. *Marruecos* (the diphthongisation proves that the stress position has been retained!) and Fr. (with removal of supposed -s inflection, but

---

342 *Val* is in the Rol. always masc. in the appellative (confirmed by the metre v. 814, 1018, 1084, 3065) and again at least in *Val Fuït*.
343 More detail on this at length e.g., Lagardère (1989a, 20).

retaining the stress position) *Maroc* (as in the Latin PT cap. 9).[344] In contrast to this, the stress on the last syllable in the modern French name of the town *Marrakech* is a later automatism.[345]

On [2]: Liebrecht (1880b, 372s.) suggested that *Cheriant* should be identified as (*ash-*) *Sharī'a* ('the watering place [*par excellence*]'), which was a medieval name for the Jordan Valley.[346] We could accept /tš-/ as a substitute for the /š-/ which OF had not yet acquired, but a plain unstressed *-a* (approximately ~ /-æ/) does not lead to *-ant*. Boissonnade (1923, 213), with no knowledge of this earlier theory, comes up with the same idea, but goes even further and takes *Val Marchis* to mean 'Valley of the Margrave', meaning the principality of Galilee around Tiberias which was founded by Tancred, the *Marchisides* or *Marchisi filius* of the Crusade historians,[347] shortly after the capture of Jerusalem (in July 1099). But Tancred formally gave up Galilee[348] in March 1101, so that he could be the administrator of Antioch (with only one break from 1103–1104) while his uncle Bohemund was imprisoned by the Muslims, travelling around France, and then fighting in the Balkans against Byzantium (Setton 1969a, 382). In 1109, King Baldwin I formally returned Tiberias (Setton 1969a, 398), but Tancred stayed in Antioch for the rest of his life, and he inherited it officially from Bohemund in 1111, before dying there at the end of 1112. Given these circumstances, it is very doubtful that there would have been time for the term 'Valley of the Margrave' ever to have been used with reference to Galilee. Since this hypothesis cannot explain what the *rei flurit* has to do with anything either, it is much less convincing than the Kairouan hypothesis.

---

344 This is how it is written in the *Codex Calixtinus*; the variants in other mss. as far as we can tell, are phonologically uninteresting: *Marroc, Maroch* etc.

345 I do not agree with de Mandach's idea here (1993, 273 n. 21) of explaining the *-i-* in *Marchis* with reference to Span. *Marroquí* 'Moroccan', in which *the -í* is indeed an 'Arabic-sounding' ending, but which actually is a purely Spanish formation from *Marruec(os)* (Corriente 2008, p. LVII). In Arab. the adjective is in fact *Marrákushi*, e.g., in the name of the historian of the Maghreb ʿAbd-al-wāḥid al-Marrākushī (died in 1227).

346 According to EI s. v. *al-Urdunn* the name is not attested until after the crusader era; both Boissonnade (1923, 213) and Marmardji (1951, 6 and 52) provide references from the 14th century onwards. Incidentally, this word 'watering place' eventually came to mean 'Islamic jurisdiction' via the meaning 'source (scil. of the law)' and it is still known as such even in Europe today.

347 His father Odo, son-in-law of Robert Guiscard, is often called just 'the Margrave', e.g., Raoul de Caen in the very first sentence calls him *Marchisus* (*Gesta Tancredi*, http://thelatinlibrary. com/raoul.html last access 03.06.2021).There seems to be no evidence of Tancred himself bearing the title of Margrave, but he would have been entitled to it unofficially at least, based on the inheritance system of the time.

348 He had obtained a fifteen-month period to change his mind but did not make use of it.

On [3]: Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 297) propose that *Cherïant* is the Charzanes (today the Erzen), and *Val Marchis* is Morača, two small rivers in Albania and Montenegro, and that *Flurit* is Prince Vladimir of Dioclea who was revered as a saint. *Charzanes* /xarzanis/ > *Cherïant* would be perhaps just about acceptable in phonological terms, but *Morača > Marchis* and *Vladimir > Flurit* are not, and the whole hypothesis seems to be motivated by a compulsion to find these names somewhere in the Balkans.

On [4]: Place (1947, 878s.) is as fixated on old Asia Minor as Grégoire is on the Balkans, and suggests the ancient region of Caria, Lat. *Caria* in today's south-west Turkey, and the Marsyas, a small tributary of the Menderes/Maeander River; he does not attempt to interpret *Flurit*. But the Latin name *Caria* has no role in history after the end of antiquity (and it was not used to refer to any Byzantine theme); who then among the poet's audience would have assumed this meaning of *Cheriant* or recognised the Marsyas?

On [5]: Mireaux (1943, 260) is interested in the town of Ḥarrān (the ancient Κάρ-ραι, *Carr(h)ae*, Fulcher's *Charram*, today the Harran ruins), which was well known to the crusaders, and Maraş (cf. above A.1.3.8) located in today's south-east Turkey. In the first name, there is no explanation for the (syllabic) -*i*-, the second name is phonologically too different, and *Flurit* is not explained.

A.2.3 The fiefdom belonging to Baligant's brother

Canabeus is the King of *Floredee* O 3312, *Florentera* V4, *Dorree* C, *Doree* V7, *Forssonnee* P: CV7 and P introduce obviously secondary meanings: 'gold land'[349] and 'land that has lost its senses'. Because V4 has 'elevated' *Balide* to *Baligera* (cf. above A.1.1.11), he is probably accountable for the -*era*, as indeed he is for the more melodious base form *florent(em)* instead of *florid(um)*. *Floredee* fits with the assonance, which means that O presumably represents the archetype.

The land ruled by Canabeus stretches as far as *Val Sevree* O 3313, *Valsevrea* V4, *Val Sevree* CV7, *Valserree* P: P (perhaps because of a simple misreading) makes the 'separate valley' or 'valley of separation' of the archetype into a 'closed' valley.

---

349 In keeping with the usual amplification that we find in the later versions, CV7 have pushed the term 'King' into a verse of its own and then they have to complete the rest of the verse: *rois ert de Turre* (in C, *Ture* V7), *d'une terre esfree* – this is a free invention that has no bearing on the archetype.

The meaning of [a] *Floredee* is [a1] Dorylaeum (Mireaux 1943, 259, Grégoire 1946, 445–448), but not [a2] the empire ruled by Philaretes (Grégoire 1939, 260 n.). The term [b] *Val Sevree* means [b1] 'valley of separation' which is about to be explained more precisely, and not [b2] Syria (Grégoire 1939, 260 n., Grégoire 1946, 446),[350] [b3] the Sophar Valley near Damascus where Paul was converted (Mireaux 1943, 260s.) or [b4 and 5] Golan area northeast of the Sea of Galilee (Lake Tiberias), called *Savada,* among other names, in the Middle Ages, or the neighbouring town of Sepphoris (Boissonnade 1923, 212).

On [a1]: *Floredee* contains the positive-sounding element *Flor(id)-*; we know that it was understood positively because of the variation *Flor(ent)-* in V4. This imaginary name could hardly be more positive, and yet it is referring to a 'heathen' place; thus *Flor(id)-* is probably a secondary meaning attached to a real name. Mireaux identified it correctly, but it was Grégoire who explained it in more detail. Dorylaeum (close to today's Eskişehir) is on the old main road from Constantinople to Antioch which the crusaders used as far as Dorylaeum in the First Crusade, and which the German army followed under Conrad III and against the advice of the Greeks in the Second Crusade. There was a battle at Dorylaeum in both Crusades: in the summer of 1097, the Christians recovered from a desperate situation to achieve a great victory there, and in October 1147 the Germans suffered a crushing defeat. As Grégoire explains, it is only Anna who says that the battle of 1097 took place near Dorylaeum (with a place name that is often attested in the literature from the classical period onwards),[351] while Bohemund's letter says it was *in valle Dorotillae*, the *Gesta Tancredi* says it was *in valle Dorecil*, and Raymond of Aguilers as well as the Fulcher mss. F and N say it was *in campo florido*; the anonymous *Gesta* describe the battle but do not name the place where it happened. *Dorotilla* and *Dorecil* show that the crusaders had some difficulty with the name Dorylaeum. Grégoire correctly points out that *florido* also comes from Dorylaeum via the metathesis *doril-* > **lorid-* with a subsequent secondary meaning **lorid-* > *florid-*. Therefore, the

---

350 Roncaglia (1946–1947, 98) mentions another hypothesis in his criticism of Grégoire's system, although sadly with no references: *Val Sevree* is for him "il Peneo in quanto denominato anche Salavria (cf. Anna Comnena V 6) oppure la città macedone di Servia". Unfortunately, I cannot find the reference; but we must reject both possibilities on phonological grounds alone.

351 In Gk. in Strabo 12.8.12, Lat. Cicero *Flacc.* 17.39 and Geographus Ravennas 2.19 (here *dorileo*, *doryleon*, KPauly s. v.).

development must have been something like *doriļeo*[352] > **loriđeo* > **floriđeo* > *in campo florido*. If we ignore the irrelevant variations between /i/ and /e/ in the unstressed syllable and the difference between the endings in /ęo/ and /ęə/, then *Floredee* can be explained as an intermediate stage in that development; it is very unlikely that this came about by chance. Even the /ęə/ instead of /ęo/ could subconsciously go back to *(vallis) *floridata*, or alternatively it could be a concession for the sake of the assonance, since we are in the eighth verse of a 24-verse laisse ending in -*ę*-ə.[353]

Grégoire, who famously dated the Rol. to 1085, tried very hard to prove that the Normans knew of this place even before the start of the First Crusade. We have a much easier task: we only have to show that it was known during the First Crusade, and then again in the Second. The Sultan of the Rum Seljuks was the main enemy in 1097, and the only enemy in 1147 near Dorylaeum; Baligant's brother's realm is therefore modelled upon that Sultan's empire.

On [a2]: Grégoire had suggested a few years earlier that the personal name Philaretes was behind the toponym *Floredee,* but the phonology and semantics of this do not add up, and as we see, he later rejected this idea.

On [b1]: If *Floredee* is Dorylaeum – then what is *Val Sevree*? From the perspective of the crusaders, the Rum Seljuk empire extended essentially from the northwest to the southeast.

Val Sevree is an aptronym, and unlike the positively tinged *Floredee,* it is a neutral one, which means that there is no need for a real toponym to be behind it: OF *severer* means, after all, 'to separate', e.g. troops into sections (also in this case 'to separate themselves', but *sevrée* is also 'separation').[354] *Val Sevree* can therefore mean 'valley of separation' and refer either to the southeast Anatolian valley, where Tancred and Baldwin separated from the majority of the crusaders, or alternatively the other valley, in front of the *Pylae Ciliciae* which forms a massive natural border in the Anatolian interior, where they parted from each other soon after that. A glance at the map shows that the stretch from Dorylaeum to the area in front of the in *Pylae* almost exactly describes the Rum Seljuk state.

---

352 This form is attested in Geographus Ravennas (cf. previous n.), but it also represents the MGk. pronunciation.

353 We might also wonder whether *Dor(r)ee* in CV7 really is a freely invente replacement or whether there was a reading before that which indicates a correct interpretation of *Floredee* as Dorylaeum.

354 On the latter Godefroy 7.411b, Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v., FEW s. v. *separare* (col. 473b).

On [b2–5]: These hypotheses are so thoroughly untenable in phonological terms that there is no point in discussing other problems.

A.2.4 The fiefdom belonging to Baligant's standard-bearer

Amborre is *d'Oluferne* O 3297, *d'Oliferne* V4, *d'Olinferne* V7: which is *Oluferne* α against *Oliferne* β, where the variation in the unstressed vowel can be regarded as insignificant. The meaning is [1] Aleppo, not [2] al-Farama in Egypt, and certainly not [3] Corfu.

On [1]: Two things about the name *Oluferne* are immediately obvious: it is influenced by the biblical personal name *(H)Olofernes*,[355] and it is one of a host of "epic" toponyms ending in *-erne*. First of all: Olofernes only appears in the book of Judith (passim), and there is normally a *glossa ordinaria* added alongside his name in the medieval Vulgate mss. to show that he is a prefiguration of the Antichrist.[356] He goes to war in the north of Israel for Nebuchadnezzar, who is said to be an Assyrian in this story, and thus lives in Nineveh (on the upper Tigris). The old main road from Nineveh to Israel goes through Aleppo, and so around the year 1100 the connotations of the biblical name Olofernes, however vague they were in geographical terms, would not have prevented its identification as Aleppo.

Secondly, the story of the "epic" names ending in *-erne* began when in the early 11th c. the Normans established themselves in southern Italy whereupon Salerno, in French called *Salerne* (Cligès 5746 and later references, remaining so until the present), became the main object of their desire. But soon Palermo also came into their sights, and it became *Palerne*, a form analogous to *Salerne*, (Rol. 2923 and later references). The Straits of Gibraltar were still under Muslim control, and so the main connecting route with their previous homeland went

---

355 The form *Olofernes*, without the *H-*, is historically the more correct form, because the only possible etymon is Pers.(-Gk.) *Orophernes*. It is also in so many Vulgate mss. (including good mss. from the Carolingian Renaissance and the Paris University Bible of 1270, BN lat. 15467) the only name (cf. the variants in BSCF, vol. 8, 1951), for which the decision for or against the *H-* is "on a knife-edge". The Beuron *Biblia Vulgata* of 1969 (4th edn. of 1994) does not cite any variants for this name but has decided upon *Holofernes* while the *Nova Vulgata* of 1979 which was commissioned after the Second Vatican Council decided upon *Olofernes*. – The <u> instead of <o> in O has arisen through dissimilation. The later epic and romance literature even has *Oliferne* (with the occasional variant *Oloferne*) both as a personal name and for the name of towns (cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.).

356 BLGO 1992, 344.

over land, the first staging point north of Rome being at Viterbo, and this name turned into *Biterne* (Rol. O 2991 and later references).[357] In the Norman wars against the Greeks, Cephallenia was important, and it accounts for *Californe* (Rol. 2924 and later references). In the year 1110, Alfonso el Batallador conquered Valtierra alias *Valterne* (Rol. 199 etc.). Other names in this group include *Belferne* 'Beni Ifrān/Ifræn' (Rol. 812), *Fine Posterne* (< *finibus terrae*) probably 'Finistère' (*Erec*, ed. Roques, ms. R 1902 etc.), *Volterne/Vouterne* 'Volturno' (*Girart de Roussillon, Eneas*), *Loquifer-ne* 'Messi-na under pagan rule'[358] (opposite form: *Lucifer* [the devil's name via context-related interpretation of *Is* 14.12, especially under the influence of *Lc* 10.18; here with tendentious graecization] ≠ Messi-as, *Aliscans, Bataille Loquifer, Enfances Renier*), *Luiserne-sor-mer* 'Lucena' (*Enfances Vivien* passim; cf. Beckmann 2004b, 253–262). This group of names suggests that *Oluferne* could also be understood as the name of a town.[359]

Now, Aleppo, Arab. Ḥalab, Turk. *Halep,* is often called *Aleph* by the Crusade historians, as in the *Gesta* cap. 2, and similarly in Tudebod, Raymond of Aguilers, Robert the Monk, Baldric of Dol, Guibert of Nogent, the *Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena* commissioned by Baldwin III, and Henry of Huntingdon.[360] When the "epic" *-erne* was added – perhaps as a joke at first – the resulting *Alepherne for Aleppo was attracted by *Oloferne*. This is no more absurd than the crusaders calling the town of Haifa *Caiphas* – like the name of the high priest at the crucifixion of Jesus (numerous references in the Indices of the RHC Occ.).

---

357 Phonemic merger of *b-* and *v-* is characteristic of southern Italian dialects, but it tendentially penetrated as far as Viterbo and beyond in a northerly direction (*Volsinii > Bolsena* etc.; Rohlfs 1972, § 167 and 150). The form *Bitervo* was already in the letter from Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne of 787/788 (MGH ep.mer.&kar. 1.613). The full French form *Biterne* is used in the MHG *Kaiserchronik,* and clearly meaning 'Viterbo' (v. 4348, 4356, 4566 ed. Edw. Schröder). This is still the case e.g. in the *Chevalerie Ogier* (v. 301–304 ed. Eusebi): *A cies paroles es poignant Alori,/ Qui de Bisterne iert fix a l'aumarchis;/ Dux fu de Pulle, mais Paien l'ont fors mis,/ Par .IIII. fois in bataille conquis.*
358 On the identification cf. Cremonesi (1965, passim).
359 More detailed references for this group of names in Beckmann (2004b, 260–262). The person who first "discovered" it is Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.437s.).
360 Curiously, there is no doubt that this form is influenced by the name of the Hebrew letter *Aleph*. This was familiar in the Middle Ages because it appears in the Vulgate (of course written out in Latin script) at the start of the alphabetic acrostic poems (*Ps* 36, *110, 111, 118, 144, Prov* 3, *Threni* 1–4), cf. the *Novae concordantiae* to the critical edition of the Vulgate s. v. *Aleph*; cf. also the Ambrosius and Jerome references in the TLL s. v. *āleph*, especially Jerome *ep.* 30, Letter to Paula, which is entirely devoted to the Hebrew alphabet and the alphabetic Psalms. Isidore 1.3.4 declares quite definitively: *Litterae Latinae et Graecae ab Hebraeis videntur exortae. Apud illos enim prius dictum est aleph, deinde ex simili enuntiatione apud Graecos tractum est alpha, inde apud Latinos A. Translator enim ex simili sono alterius linguae litteram condidit, ut nosse possimus linguam Hebraicam omnium linguarum et litterarum esse matrem.*

Let us now turn to the historical details! From the moment in 1097 when the crusaders first appeared outside Antioch, until after the time of the Rol., Aleppo, just about 100 km away,[361] was the largest western bastion of Islam, and a thorn in the flesh of the two crusader states Antioch and Edessa, especially from 1127/ 1128 when it fell into the hands of Zengi. In 1144 Zengi even conquered Edessa and thus triggered the Second Crusade, which turned into a disaster for the crusaders. Between the Rum Seljuk Empire in the north and the Egyptian Fāṭimid Caliphate in the south, there would be no more terrifying enemy than Aleppo. After Zengi's death (in 1146), his son Nūr ed-Dīn set out from Aleppo and liquidated the rest of the County of Edessa before inflicting an almost deadly blow on the Principality of Antioch through his victory at Inab in 1150. In the light of these events, Aleppo is an ideal location for the home of Baligant's standard-bearer.

One might object, however, that the great army defeated by the crusaders outside Antioch in 1098 did not come from Aleppo. It was led by Corbaran-Kürbuǧa, ruler of Mosul, who came from regions in the far northeast. And four-fifths of all occurrences of the name *Oluferne / Oliferne* in Old French epics occur in the compound name *Corbaran d'Oliferne* (as in *Ch. de Guill.* 2300, and then in the Crusader Cycle) – is this not an argument against the interpretation of *Oluferne* as Aleppo? Well, no. First of all, Kürbuǧa's army joined together with troops from Aleppo (Setton 1969a, 316). A second circumstance is noted by Baist (1902, 222s., accepted e.g., by Bédier 1927, 518, the orientalist Cahen 1940, 572, and implicitly by Segre in the index of the edn.) It is reported in the *Gesta* (cap. 22), then in Tudebod and *Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus*, in Baldric of Dol, Guibert of Nogent, Robert the Monk, the *Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Jerusalemitana* commissioned by Baldwin III[362] and Ordericus Vitalis (*Hist.eccl.* 3.9.11), that Corbaran's mother lived in Aleppo and went out from her home to warn her son about the disaster that was about to befall him – in vain, as it turned out. It follows then, that the crusaders did not think that Corbaran was the ruler of Aleppo, but they did assume that he originally came from Aleppo.[363] And although Baist would not have foreseen this, there is a grain of truth in this claim. Corbaran-Kürbuǧa first appeared in history as a Mamluk of

---

361 The name is pre-Hellenic, but from the time of the Diadochi until the Byzantine era the town was called Βέρροια/*Beroea*. However, the Byzantines soon reverted to Χάλεπ; by the time of the Crusades 'Beroea' had been completely forgotten (EI s. v. *Ḥalab*, PW s. v. *Beroea* 5).

362 Cf. the index of the RHC Occ., vol. 3–5.

363 This is evident from the fact that Corbaran's mother appears as the ruler of Aleppo in some texts (such as the mss. FKM of Robert the Monk, RHC Occ. 3.812, in the *Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Jerusalemitana*, commissioned by Baldwin III RHC Occ. 5.162, or in the *Chanson d'Antioche* v. 6843 ed. Duparc-Quioc [~ v. 6841 ed. Hippeau]).

Aksungur, governor of Aleppo, before he became ruler of Mosul in 1096.[364] His activities in Aleppo would have left their mark there, which in turn could easily have led to the idea that he was "actually" from Aleppo. That was certainly the original meaning behind the appellation *Corbaran d'Oliferne,* and the later expansion of the use of this name[365] was all but inevitable.

On [2]: Scheludko (1927, 31) was convinced that *Oluferne* is the Egyptian city of al-Farama, i.e., the ancient *Pelusium* in the north-eastern part of the Nile Delta, which was conquered by the crusaders in 1119. But there are phonological difficulties with this idea: the only Crusade historian to use the Arab. name is Benedetto Accolti from Arezzo (4.17, RHC Occ. 5.617) and he omits the article: *Farmia*, whereas William of Tyre equates *Pelusium* with the local name *Belbeis,* and this is also used in William's OF translation (RHC. Occ. 1 and 2, Indices). Furthermore, Scheludko does not even mention the whole *Corbaran d'Oliferne* nexus.

Ad [3]: Grégoire suspects (1939a, 233s.), that *Oluferne* first acquired the meaning 'Aleppo' during the First Crusade, but that it originally meant Corfu (Κορυφώ, which appears in a Malaterra ms. as *Corofirum*), at the time of writing of the Rol., which for him means around 1085. But this rests on a clear *petitio principii*.

A.2.5 Review of the overarching structure of Baligant's realm

Baligant himself resides in Cairo and maintains contact with the Mediterranean world via Alexandria – as did the Fāṭimid empire, which was considered the Crusader Kingdom's strongest enemy from 1099 onwards. Baligant's brother has his realm in today's Turkey – as did the Rum Seljuks who opposed the participants in the First Crusade and caused even more trouble in the Second. Baligant's standard-bearer has his fiefdom in the area around Aleppo; this means he represents the forces below Sultan level whose conquests in northern Syria had led to

---

364 Cahen 1940, 181, and also in Setton 1969a, 169.

365 It appears occasionally in the *Chanson d'Antioche*: in v. 765 and 5384 ed. Duparc-Quioc (~ 763 and 5388 ed. Hippeau) the mother lives in *Oliferne*, in v. 424 (422), however, Corbaran is addressed as *rois d'Oliferne*. In this text there is also an interesting mention in v. 6843 (6841): according to ms. D, Corbaran's mother lives in *Halape*, ms. B has *Galaffe* (both meaning 'Aleppo'), ms. A has *Galisse* (because of the similarity between *-ff-* ~ -ff- this is a misreading of *Galaffe*), but CEFGL (in agreement with the first two references) all have *Oliferne*; here we really do have evidence of the equivalence *Halape = Oliferne*.

the Second Crusade. Taken together, these are the three "hard core" elements among the crusaders' enemies.

There is only one further theatre of war for the Christian and Muslim world, apart from Spain, and that is North Africa, due to a temporary lust for conquest on the part of the southern Italian Normans. This is why Baligant promises his son a fiefdom there: it was under Charlemagne's – or in other words: Norman – control at the time.

A.2.6 A special case: Nineveh

For the sake of completeness in our list of the places in the Orient mentioned in the Rol., we must consider

le rei de Niniven (:ẽ) O 3103, *Ninevent* (correction of *uineuent*) V4, *Bonivent* C, *Niniment* V7: immediately before the start of the battle with Baligant, Charlemagne's prayer for divine assistance is modelled on standard examples from Old Testament situations of mortal danger. In the reminiscence part of his prayer, he cites the King of Nineveh and his whole city, who repented following Jonah's warnings and then were saved. In the Vulgate, the name of the city appears three times (*Jon* 1.2, 3.2, 3.3) in the graecizing accusative: *vade* (or *abiit*) *in Niniven*. The poet liked the sound of this form; he uses it as an oblique. Since V4 tends towards rhymes, and CV7 are rhymed texts, the form ending in -*ent* is perhaps to be expected. Despite the perfectly unambiguous context, C quite incorrectly names the city *Benevent* (OF consistently *Bonivent*, *Bonevent*), a name which appears frequently in epics, especially in filler rhymes.

A.3 Individual people in the Baligant section

A.3.1 Reflection on methodological issues around "Saracen" personal names in Old French epics

A.3.1.1 The basic problem
Old French epics are mostly about military engagements, very often with Muslim enemies. Elaborate strategies played a much smaller role in medieval warfare than they do in modern times, and so there is very little narrative value in explaining them, and battles are therefore mainly depicted as a series of single combats. The narrator cannot simply leave the Muslim opponents as anonymous characters, always listing 'another' and 'yet another' opponent; he must find a way to present his audience with a large number – often dozens – of "Saracen" names. Even a narrator who was based in the Kingdom of Jerusalem would have found it very difficult to

include so many authentic Saracen names, and it would certainly have been too much to expect of a narrator living in faraway Europe. The consequence is – as in the Marsilĭe section of the Rol. – a small assortment of authentic names, some real names taken from other places, many aptronymic or comic, all amounting to a miscellany that is specific to the genre. The Baligant section takes a different narrative approach which sets it apart from the norm. It contains relatively few personal names – as compared both with the number of whole people names cited within this section, and with the "Saracen" personal names in the Marsilĭe section. The reason for this is obvious: if the dimensions of the Baligant section are to be prevented from vastly exceeding those of the Marsilĭe section, then the number of names in it would have to be drastically reduced. This was achievable because the huge dimensions of the battle had already been evoked through the catalogue of peoples.

A.3.1.2 Saracen names for Christians

In the following sections we will often find that Saracen names – which *per definitionem* are supposed to have negative connotations – found their way from the epics into everyday Francophone onomastics and became the names of real people. In order to assist the reader in understanding the extent of this phenomenon and the psychology behind it, such names are presented here on a broader basis, i.e., using material drawn from outside of the Rol. itself. This problem was partially addressed by Rajna (1889, 6, 16, 18s.); I have included his references, at least those from before 1150, in the analysis that follows. My material[366] is presented in alphabetical order. These are chance discoveries, to some extent, because they came to my notice incidentally during my work on the French (and related Spanish and German) charter tradition from the period between 778 and 1150, rather than as a result of a deliberate search for them; I cannot therefore give any guarantee that the list is comprehensive.

Affricanus: Tournus 139 a. 1108 *terra Affricani apud Donziacum*; MaineMarmoutier 2.366 a. 1104–1120 *Africanus de Monte Thebaldi*; La Roë 47 a. 1141–1180 *Affricanus de Torineio*.

Agolant: Normandie-Ducs 191 around 1050–1066 *Willelmus Agolant*, witness to an original charter belonging to William, later to be the Conqueror.

---

366 There appears to be nothing similar in Germany from this period except the Marsilius family of Cologne; Socin notices the phenomenon, but he only knows of much later instances, for example (1903, 570) in the year 1297 in Magstatt or Sierentz in Upper Alsace there is a *Salathin* (also: *Theodericus dictus Salatin*) and a farmer called *Salatin* (the form *Salatin* 'Saladin' exists in Hartmann von Aue).

Almorabit: Ebro-Lacarra 1949 a. 1116 *Almorabit*, Lord of Marangón; Vizcaya-Balparda 2.309 a. 1118 *Don Pedro Momez Almoravit*, 2.324 a. 1124 *Lope López Almor-avid*; Navarra-Johanniter 18 a. 1131 [will of Alfonso el Batallador] *Guillem Aznarez Almorabet*, 27 a. 1143 [deed belonging to García Ramírez] *Garcia Amorabit*. Under-standably, this name has thus far only been attested on the Pyrenean Peninsula, where the Almoravids were an absolute nightmare. This case is all the more inter-esting for our methodology when we look at the chronology, because the "reason" for it occurs suddenly in 1086: thirty years later we find adults with this name.

Ar(r)abi(ta), Agarenus: Angers-S.Aubin 2.406 a. 1103 *Arrabi de Moliherne*, wit-ness for Geoffroi Martel, 2.165 a. 1103 *Arrabi de Mosteriolo*, witness, 2.194, a. 1082–1138 *Walterius Arrabi*, 2.268 around 1110 *Arrabita* (with his brothers *Tison* and *Carbonellus*, and his sister *Balduca*!), 2.278 a. 1116 *Arrabith, nepos* of the monk Hato. As a synonym to this there is also *Agarenus* 'son of Hagar, Arab man': Bourges-Archevêques 226 around 1050 S[ignum] *Agarini*.

Corbaran: Rajna finds *Corbaran* in Italy from 1146 onwards. Spain: Temple 329 a. 1148 [area around Saragossa] *Corbaran*, son of Orbelita. There is at least one later reference from France: according to Verbruggen (1954, 269) a certain *Curbaran* is put to death along with his band of mercenaries in 1183 near Millau in Rouergue.

Gormundus: From around 1075 (and not before) the variant *Gormundus/Gurmun-dus*,[367] appears for the name *War-/ Wermundus/G(u)ar-/Guermundus* (< Germ.

---

[367] The origins of the epic name *Gormont* are complicated, and I would like to sketch them out briefly, without commenting on some previous research on it, which tends to be more of a hindrance than a help. It starts with the figure of *Wŭrm/Worm* 'snake, (lind-)worm', one of the leaders of the great Norman army which resided in France in 882 and was probably the biggest and – thanks to the cowardice of Charles the Fat – the most terrifying example of its kind. (Cf. Hincmar's report in his *Annales* for the year 882: the two leaders who were not willing to be baptised, *Sigefridus* and precisely this *Vurmo*, received from Charles a huge amount of gold and were even given permission to plunder further parts of Galloromania.) The Germ. *w-* was bilabial and in Early Old Norse it was lost before a rounded vowel: Got. *waurms* ~ Old Norse *ormr*; in the West German languages, which have transmitted the name to our context, it was also still bilabial, but it remained in place before a rounded vowel. Hincmar's spelling, which is strictly speaking *uurmo* (dat. *uurmoni*), avoids a triple *u*. We would expect, therefore, early MLat. **Wŭrmōnem* > early OF **Guormon* > **Gormon*, because before a back vowel even prehis-torically *gu-* > /g-/. The ending of the name was then attracted by names ending in *-mundus*, especially *OF G(u)ar-/Guermont*, after which, as explained above, it began to influence this name. – In England, there was another figure alongside the continental one, namely the Dan-ish Viking *Guðþorm*, OE *Guðrum* († 890 as a Christian), in William of Malmesbury (cap. 121) *Gudram*, the adversary of Alfred the Great; some of his warriors went (according to Asser's *Vita Alfredi*) to the continent from time to time, and they seem to have taken part in the battle

Warimund, 14 Gallo-Romance references from shortly after 800 in Morlet), namely Angers-Ronceray 221 a. 1075, Maine-Marmoutier 1.34 a. 1090, Angers-S.Aubin 2.232 a. 1096, Villeloin (50 km southeast of Tours) 76 a. 1105, Gellone 239 a. 1106, Marcigny-sur-Loire 77 a. 1098–1114, Languedoc-HgL 5.854 a. 1117 and 5.882 a. 1119, Agde 102 a. 1123 and 133 a. 1124, Temple 63 a. 1134 and 260 a. 1146 [Pézenas, 25 km northeast of Béziers] (*in campo Gormundi, in horto quem fuit Gormundi*), GC 2 Instr. (Langres) 168 a. 1135, Bâle-Trouillat 1.262 a. 1136 [Vyt-lès-Belvoir, 25 km southwest of Montbéliard], Fontevraud 2. 682 a. 1136 (*Gaufridus Gormont*, Orbestier, Vendée), GC 10 Instr. (Amiens) 306 a. 1137. Even the archbishop Warmund of Vienne (1077–1081) was – evidently via Francophone transmission – called *Wormundus* by Gregory VII in 1077 and 1079, but in the year 1078 *Warmundus* (Jaffé-Löwenfeld 5026, 5118; 5082); he was also called *Gormundus* unofficially, e.g., Grenoble 63 a. 1081. Similarly, the Patriarch of Jerusalem Warmund of Picquigny (1119–1128) was referred to with the variant form *Gormundus* (Jerusalem-Röhricht 18 a. 1120, 31 a. 1128); according to William of Tyre 12.25 (RHC Occ. 1.553 a. 1124) he would even have signed his name as *Ego Gormundus*.

Mahumet: Caen-G&M 110 a. 1079–1101 Abbot Gislebert buys a piece of land *a Mahumet et Arturo [!]*; Le Mans-S.Vincent 223 around 1100 witnesses: *Mahomet, Bucchardus presbiter*; 356 around 1100 *Mahometh, subpistor monachorum*; Jerusalem-Josaphat 113 a.1108 *G. Mahumet*, witness for Baldwin I, 118 a.1115 *Gauterii Mahumet* (the same person); the editor Ch. Kohler comments: "sans doute Gautier Mahumet, seigneur de Saint-Abraham [= Hebron]" with a reference to DuCange-Rey 424; identified there as the *Gautier Mahumet* or *Baffumeth* in Albert of Aachen 10.33 and in an endowment of 1110 for the Hospitallers of Jerusalem.

---

of Saucourt (August 881). William of Malmesbury and *nostri*, i.e., his Anglo-Norman compatriots, thought that he was actually *Gurmundus*, i.e., they identified him as the epic *Gormont*. Almost fifty years after this *Guðþorm's* death, the contracted form *Gorm* is attested as the name of two Danish kings, and in fact continental authors such as Adam of Bremen (1.58), the Annalista Saxo (for the year 931) and Helmold (1.8) call one of these two Danish kings *Worm/Wurm* (in Adam with the ms. variant *Gorm*), which shows that they mixed up the two names, and therefore we cannot exclude the possibility that the image of Guðþorm has become merged with that of Wurm, just as Ferdinand Lot describes (*Romania* 27, 1897, 22); this assumption is not a necessary prerequisite for contamination, however. – As the *Gormont* epic and the Rol. both view the 'heathen' as a single entity, *Gormont* could become the name of an *Arabi* (v. 186, 443); and because in the late 11th and early 12th c. the Almoravids from (North) Africa represented the aggressive form of Islam in Europe, Geoffrey of Monmouth made him *Gormundus rex Affricanorum* (ed. Faral p. 281, 288; var. *Godmundus*, ed. Griscom p. 504–505) who, among other exploits, and like the Vikings conquered Ireland but also – and here Geoffrey simply follows the epic – allied himself with the renegade *Isembardus* in a plan to conquer Gaul.

***Paganus*:** Savigny 358 a. 1031 *Paginotus*; Philippe-I-Prou 53 a. 1065 *Rainaldus Paganus*, in the Gâtinais; Anjou-Guillot (Index) from 1070 at the latest *Raoul Paien*, Viscount of Vendôme, a. 1077–1107 *Paien de Mirebeau*, Castellan of Colombiers; Paris-Montmartre no.1 a. 1116 *miles strenuus*, *Paganus appellatus, a baptismate Walterus*; even clerics: Mesves-sur-Loire 199 a. 1134 *Paganus, prepositus*; La Ferté-sur-Grosne Nr. 166 around 1145 *Paganus, tunc existens prior de Firmitate*, etc. Morlet (1972, 87) names 8 *Paganus*, of which we can precisely date a. 1077 Corbeil, a. 1085 Angers, a. 1089 area around Paris, a. 1107 Conques, a. 1128 Liège. The *Domesday Book* on a. 1086 has *Radulfus Paganellus/Pagenell* (Hildebrand 1883, 340). A south Italian Norman: Anna 13.5.2 a. 1108 *Kontopaganos* (~ *comte Paien*), commander of troops under Bohemund. With reference to Italy, Rajna states: "Non si può credere quanto i Saraceni e i Pagani occorrano numerosi". The same is true of France in relation to *Paganus*.

***Sarracenus*:** Marca 818 a. 888 *Serracinus*; Correns (Var) 21 around 1060 *uxor mea Saracena* [of the donor]; Bretagne-Morice 1.384 soon after 1072 *Sarracenus* [charter of Marmoutier]; Saint-Jouin (Deux-Sèvres) 6 around 1080 *Sarazinus*, witness; Oulx (Susa Valley) 188 a. 1092 *pater meus Engelrannus cognomento Sarracenus* (deceased); Arras-S.Vaast 180 a. 1111 *Gerardus Saracenus*, Baron of the Count of Flanders; Ribemont 49 a. 1146 *Sarracenus*. South Italian Normans: Anna 5.5.1 and 13.5.2 a. 1082 and 1108 *Sarakenos* (~ *Sarrazin*), troop commander under Bohemund (two different individuals). In Italy, as mentioned above, Rajna notes many individuals called *Saracenus* from 1066 onwards.[368]

***Soltanus*:** Paris-Longnon 141 a. 1101 *Soltanus,* son of Garnier of Paris; Corbeil-Vicomtes 51 after 1131 *Sultanus filius Geroldi Gastinelli*; Tiron (Diocese of Chartres) 1.191 around 1132 *Sultanus, frater meus*. Rajna notes references to *Soldanus* in Italy from 1133 onwards.[369]

---

368 Moreover, the name is remarkably common in Spain, in contrast to France, from the very beginning; there was obviously some kind of connection with reality (perhaps converts to Christianity?): Asturias-Floriano, vol. I, 249, 253, 266 a. 853–855 *Sarrazinus / Sarracinus*, Priest in S. Millán, 318, 324 a. 863 *Sarrazino hic testis*, S. Félix de Oca, in vol. II then 12 individuals called *Sarracinus* (including a. 873 one *senior*, 883 one *majordomus*, 900 one *iudex*), one female *Sarracina*; Corias-Floriano 1.309 *Sarracinus* "abundante" nobles and also bondsmen; Vizcaya-Balparda 1.400s. from 864 until 1012 a *Sarracinus / Sarracínez* family in the circle of the count of Castile; Esp.crist. 91 around 885 Alfons III punishes a certain S*arracenus* for conspiracy.
369 The name *Amiratus* is attested in southern Italy, but it should probably be judged differently and therefore strictly speaking should not be included here*:* Bari-CD 3. 65 a. 1137 *ego Amiratus, filius Nicolai civitatis Terlitii* [Terlizzi near Bari]. Cohn (1926, 54 n.1) suspects that the name here goes back to an official role that the person carried out; indeed, *Admiratus /*

All things considered, the number of such names is relatively small, but they are part of a visibly connected naming fashion which must have started in France before the middle of the 11th c. and then established itself in the second half of the century. How can we explain the psychology of this? In some cases, there may be specific causes. Throughout history, there is a tendency to give people who have been in a foreign land for a time – even to participate in a war – a corresponding ethnicon. In 329 B.C., when Lucius Aemilius Mamercinus triumphed over the Privernates, he was given the title 'the Privernat'; but the Romans later used a more distinctive form for such cases, ending in -*icus* (Kajanto 1965, 52). In my own family, an uncle who did his military service just before 1914 in German East Africa was known as "the African". This kind of process could explain some of the names such as *Paganus, Saracenus* etc.; an equally likely cause of these names, however, could have been the intemperate behaviour or impiety of the individual in question.[370]

The forces that underpinned the whole naming fashion are more important than these individual causes, however, and so we need to take a wider perspective. In about 1000 the Christian west had succeeded in integrating the Normans and begun to integrate the Hungarians, and it had more or less overcome the danger from Islam; the demographic situation improved accordingly: the Italian cities blossomed, and north of the Alps, bishoprics and fortresses grew into proper towns. This meant that people had to manage a growing number of interpersonal contacts; there was a greater need for people to clarify whether they meant this person X, or another person X. At the same time, the Carolingian system of having one single (mostly two-part) name had been productive because it allowed an almost unlimited recombination of name parts, but it was now falling into disuse: there were fewer formations through new combinations, especially in Romance-speaking areas because people no longer understood what the name parts meant, and so this system was replaced by naming people after their ancestors. This principle of naming people after others in the family had developed in the early Middle Ages, especially in the hereditary dynasties (of which the

---

Admiralius was the name of a role in Sicily at that time, which gradually became specialised to mean the commander of the fleet (cf. above n. 330). Later, we find e.g., a certain *Amiratus,* canon in Trani (Cohn 1926, 54 n.1), by which time it is just a simple personal name; however, people may have been thinking of the Sicilian office by then, and not the original Muslim one.

370 Morlet offers an alternative explanation (1972, s. v.), that *Paganus* means 'rusticus, de la campagne', but we cannot accept this, because it transfers a meaning from the 3rd to 4th c. into the late 11th c.; indeed it would have been very strange if *Paganus* 'pagan, heathen', which was *the* most ideologically loaded term at the end the 11th c., had simultaneously carried the innocuous meaning 'from the country, backwoodsman'.

Merovingians are the standard example), because the name *eo ipso* announced a person's claim to power; from around the time when the Carolingian Empire was divided up, this naming practice was increasingly used by the nobility whose status was no longer determined by the complicated system of allods and other claims scattered across various parts of the empire, but was now tied up with fiefdoms that were inherited and tended to become coherent territories, each of them with its own ancestral seat, mostly a castle on a hill, all maintained through a preference for primogeniture. This meant that many names which had not been taken into an ancestral naming cycle were beginning to die out. Saints' names were not yet able to make up for this loss, because they only increase in number from about 1200 onwards, at the time when the towns were growing fast, and even then, only a few dozen in each town ever became really popular. The 11th to 12th century is therefore characterised by demographic growth coinciding with a decrease in the available primary names, i.e., the single names that had been used thus far; consequently, there was a need for new names, initially nicknames, but very often they became the name that the bearer normally used. Some of the more pedantic scribes write 'X cognomento Y' or at least 'XY', but many just followed everyday usage and wrote simply 'Y'. Later, the nicknames turned into our modern family names through a process of regularisation (elimination of bizarre names, preference for occupational, patriarchal and geographical origins or estate names, and most importantly, automatic inheritance) – but what we see in the course of the 11th to 13th c.[371] is still mostly an uncontrolled proliferation of names. Any larger collection of charters from this period will show here and there some picturesque and bizarre names which may well, from our modern perspective, appear to be quite insulting to the bearer. The Saracen names fit easily into this category.

A.3.2 The named individuals in the Baligant section

A.3.2.1 Baligant's son

Malpr[i]m[e]s Segre 3176, *Malpramis* O, *Malprime* V4T, *Malprimes* KCV7 (*Malprin* the *Karlmeinet*): He is also named in v. 3184, 3200s., 3369, 3421, 3498 with

---

371 These dates apply to France; the process happened a little earlier in Italy, whereas most Germanic countries followed more slowly, especially in the lower classes; in northern Europe there was even a fixed system of patronymics (changing from one generation to the next), but invariable family names were introduced by law in Schleswig as late as 1772, in Denmark in 1828, in Sweden and Norway at the beginning of the 20th c., and it has still not happened in Iceland.

essentially the same range of variants.[372] Therefore we have *Malpramis* O (which is metrically impossible in v. 3176 and 3184) as opposed to *Malprimes* (obl. *Malprime*) β; an extended justification for putting *Malprimes* in the archetype is provided by Segre in relation to v. 3176.

The meaning could be [1] following Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 296, the Byzantine commander of the fleet *Mavrix* or *Mavrika*s, called *Mambrica* in William of Apulia. However, the phonology of the name does not fit, and the role is not very well suited to *Malprimes*.

The more likely explanation is that it is [2] an aptronym: 'he who had the misfortune to want (or: with evil intent wanted) to be the first': before the battle, Malprimes demands (v. 3200) the right either to strike the first blow (β) or even (as the first in the hierarchy, so to speak) to fight against Charlemagne himself (O and in Segre's view the archetype).[373]

A.3.2.2 Baligant's brother

Canabeus O 3312, *Chanabeus* K (*Canabus* Stricker), *Çahrebels* V4, *Carmilleu* C, *Carminel* V7, *Canabars* P, *Cernubles* T;

Canabeus O 3429, *Canebeus* K, *Chanabels* V4, *Canabes* C, *Kanebex* V7, *Canabars* P, *Carnabas* T;

Canabeus O 3499, *Chanablés* (ed. Beretta) or *Chanables* (ed. Cook) V4, *Canabeus* C, *Chanabex* V7, *Canabart* P, *Clarembaut* T: P has added a (coarsening) -*art* instead of -*eu*. V4 replaces the -*u*- with a supposedly older -*l*-. T is thinking in the first instance and incorrectly of *Chernubles*, who has been dead for a very long time. We also find a replacement with a vaguely similar-sounding name in the first place in CV7, and in the third place in T. It is very obvious that in all three places, *Canabeus* belongs in the archetype.

The name is [1] superficially an aptronym, but [2] *Capaneus* may lurk behind it. The name has nothing to do with [3] Emperor Alexios Komnenos or [4] the 3rd century leader of the Goths *Canabas/Cannabaudes*.

On [1]: A speaker of OF with minimal knowledge of Latin could hardly avoid interpreting this name as Lat. *can(is)* 'dog'[374] + OF *abai(ier)* 'to bark' + -*aeus* (as

---

372 P has one instance of *Malpriamus* (admixture of the name *Priamus* from, among other sources, *Ilias Latina*, Dares and Dictys), CV7 has *Malpriant* or *Malprimant* in a supplementary verse.

373 O has changed the name to *mal pramis*, meaning something like 'object of treacherous promises', cf. his *pramis*, *prametent* (v. 1519, 3416).

374 Perhaps also *cane* 'mâchoire, jaw'. Whatever the reason, *Can(e)*- is a very common first element in Saracen names: *Canart*, *Canebaut*, *Canebel*, *Canemon* etc. (cf. Moisan).

in *Jangl-eu*), so as a kind of 'dog barking'. But there is nothing in Canabeus' behaviour to suggest a dog, or barking, and so there is a suspicion here that these meanings are only a humorous addition to a primary meaning.[375]

On [2]: We therefore ought to at least consider Jenkins' (*ad. loc.*) reference to the *Capaneus* in the *Thebaid* of Statius; *Capaneus* is the blasphemer κατ' ἐξοχήν[376] who is known for his proudly atheist saying *Primus in orbe deos fecit timor* 'in the whole world it was human fear that first created (=invented) the gods' (3.661). Jenkins could have added that the metathesis required for his interpretation is actually attested in Thebaid mss. of the 11th c. (ed. Klotz/Klinnert), namely in 5.586 (*canapeus*, ms. M) and 6.732 (*capaneus* as a correction of *canapeus*, ms. b from the region around Orléans). And he could have pointed out a very important similarity between the two situations. Capaneus had already climbed up the wall of Thebes during an attack on the city, when he mockingly calls out to Jupiter, challenging the god to stop him (10.904s.) – and a bolt of lightning strikes him down. Canabeus immobilises Count Naimes and is just about to deliver the death blow (v. 3441s., 3445), when Charlemagne rushes up literally within the last possible second and kills Canabeus with a single mighty swipe of his sword. God can still step in at the last second and kill someone who is celebrating a moment of supposed triumph.

On [3]: Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 295 and 302) and Grégoire (1939a, 250) maintain that the name Κομνηνός is behind both the *Kanathus* in the Arabic *Sayyid Baṭṭāl* and the *Canabeus* in the Chanson de Roland. If the first supposition is true – and I am not competent to make a judgment on this – then it does not support the second supposition in the slightest. "Le *m* de Comnène, devant consonne a dû développer un *b* qui subsiste dans une forme métathétique". A consonant glide arises between consonants, and then suddenly appears between vowels? A parallel case is cited: for *-os* > *-eus*, namely *Traulos* > *Torleu*, but this again is an identification that I cannot accept (cf. below A.3.2.4.1 [1]). No explanation is given for the vowel change o-η (which at that time was /o-i/) to *a-a*. And if the Emperor (Alexios) Komnenos appears here as Baligant's brother (and at the same time Palaiologos, the brother-in-law of the Emperor, as Baligant!), then this little game of musical chairs is not at all convincing.

---

375 The late Lat. word *cannabĭus* (in the Middle Ages *cannabeus* in Innocent III, *ep.* 5, according to Blaise s. v.) 'made of hemp', seems not to have any connection with this name.
376 His illustrative function in the Middle Ages is evident, e.g., in Dante's *Inferno* (14. 43–72): even when he is being rained on by fire in hell, he continues to curse God.

On [4]: It is perhaps understandable, given the early context, that Tavernier (1914–1917a, 101 n. 3) proposes, without any real evidence, that the poet borrowed the name of *Cannabas sive Cannabaudes*, leader of the Goths, from Flavius Vopiscus, and then uses this to show just how far afield Turold searched for his compound names. There is less excuse for the Gothomania exhibited by Broëns (1965–1966, 66) when he repeats this claim, again without supporting evidence, and writes "*Canabaut* [*sic*, G.A.B.], nom d'un frère de Baligant", in effect presupposing the very point he is setting out to prove.

A.3.2.3 Baligant's standard-bearer

Amborres O 3297, *Amhoch* K (v. 8403, but *Ambrosie* Stricker), *Alboin* V4, *Auberis* C, *Alberis* V7, *Ambroine* P, *Hihoine* T: even T is capable of a palaeographical interpretation: an ornamental *A-* in the source was not written out, an *-m-* with a left stroke that was extended a little too high was misread as *-hi-* and a *-b-* misread as *-h-*, an *r-* abbreviation was overlooked; *-oine* as in P (modelled on the names ending in *-onius* which appear in the song as *Antonĭe*, *Grandonĭe*). The northern Italian V4 is thinking of the Langobard King Alboin, and independently of him, CV7 is thinking of the name *Auberi* 'Alberich', the Stricker is thinking of the name *Ambrosius*. K has also misread *-b-* as *-h-* and *-rr-* probably as *-cc-*; *-ch* then turns it into High German. This means the archetype must surely have *Ambor-* via OKP, *-e-* via OPT, *-s* via OCV7.

In addition to this: *Ambure* O 3549, *Albois* V4, *Alborion* CV7, *Aubertin* P: P substitutes a pet name for 'Albert' this time. V4CV7 have the same name as in v. 3297, only now CV7 in the oblique, V4 in the rectus (and without the nasal tilde on the *-i-*).

 In β and in the archetype of v. 3297 Baligant's standard-bearer is meant, but in v.3549 O is thinking (as in v. [1546]=1589 and [1607]=1650, and on both occasions this is confirmed in the archetype via V4) of *ambure* 'both at the same time' (v. 3548–3550): *Si vait ferir celui ki le dragun teneit, / † Q'ambure cravente en la place devant sei* (+2), */ E le dragon e l'enseigne le rei*. Segre thinks that v. 3549 cannot be emended, and that v. 3550 is "sospetto". Even if we decide in favour of *ambure* for inclusion in the archetype (as does Burger 1987, 543–545), the context shows that *celui ki le dragun teneit* is unequivocally *Amborre*, because he is deployed as standard-bearer in v. 3297, and if another

person had fallen here instead of him, then Baligant's standard-bearer would have survived throughout the whole of the Chanson de Roland.[377]

I cannot recall any explanations for the name *Amborre* (or *Amborré*, as Jenkins reads it). The closest-sounding personal name – although I would not like to attach any importance to it – is *Ambira*, the name of the last king in India whom Alexander fought (first suffering huge losses, and then defeating him) before he sails back to Babylon and dies – as reported in Orosius 3.19.11 and in the Latin Alexander romance, version J[2] (ed. Hilka/Großmann line 115, there with variants such as *Ambrea*, *Ambra*).[378]

A.3.2.4 The King of the Persians and the Lutici

Just as Charlemagne entrusts the formation of the *eschiele* to Naimes and Joceran, so Baligant entrusts this role to the King of the Persians and the King of the Lutici.

A.3.2.4.1 The King of the Persians

The King of the Persians is called *Torleu* O 3204, *Curlenes* K (*Kurlens* Stricker, *Turiles* the *Karlmeinet*), *Turlleu* V4, *Tulles* C, *Turles* V7, *Tulis* P: K and Stricker

---

377 And for that reason alone, we cannot accept Tavernier's (1908, 125 n. 3) suggestion, which is altogether too complicated ("macchinoso", Segre ad loc.).

378 In the absence of any other suggestions, we might consider a rather daring hypothesis. If we are prepared to postulate that there is an error in the archetype, then the ethnonym *Amorrhaeus* could be worth considering. It occurs in the Old Testament 85 times and often appears in old Bible mss. and in clerical authors at least until Salvian (5th c.) with *-eus* instead of *-aeus* (and in hexameter endings in Cyprianus Gallus *Ios* 219, 384 and *Iud* 75 even as *Amorrus / Amorras*, which could indicate that the intonation *Amórreus* was also common, cf. TLL s. v. *Amorrhaeus*). An accidental displacement of the *-h-* in *Amorrh-* to *Amhorr-* would probably encourage a misreading as *Amborr-*.In the Old Testament the Amorites are sometimes part of the Canaanites, located across the whole eastern and north eastern parts of Israel (e.g., *Num* 21.13, *Deut* 3.8s., *Ios* 2.10, 9.10, 24.8, *Iud* 10.8), and sometimes the word is just a synonym for the Canaanites in general (e.g., *Gen* 14.13, *Ios* 24.12,15,18, *Ez* 16.45). They often appear as physically powerful warriors: they are 'as tall as the cedars, as strong as the oaks' (*Am* 2.9), managed to force the Dan tribe of the Israelites back into the mountains (*Iud* 1.34); King Og of Bashan (*Deut* 4.47, 31.4 etc. described as an Amorite) was one of the giants from ancient times (*Deut* 3.11, *Ios* 12.4 etc.), and God has to tell Moses not even to fear Og himself (*Num* 21.34), and then Joshua not to fear the Amorites (*Ios* 7.7ss.) – this would fit well with *Amborre* because the standard-bearer in a battle would have to be quite a strong person. Furthermore, since the poet believes that the Canaanites who were not eliminated were forced northwards out of Israel to Syria (cf. above A.1.2.1 on *Canelius*), the name would also be suitable geographically for a citizen of Aleppo.

(but once again not the *Karlmeinet*) presumably show a *t-c-* and *u-n-* misreading; C and apparently also P misinterpret the name as *Tulle* 'Tullius' (cf. Flutre s. v.); the *o-u-* variation is the normal one, but β here offers the more common writing of 'Thor' names which also occurs in α (*Turgis, Turoldus*), namely *Tur-*;

then *Torleus* O 3216, *Turleus* C, *Turles* V7, *Tulien* T, *Tulum* P;

and finally, *Torleu* O 3354, *Torleus* V4, *Turleus* C, *Turles* V7, *Milain* P, *Turlen* F: Now V4 also writes *Tor-*, so that *Torleu* here (and probably in the other two places as well) belongs in the archetype.

The real-life model is not [1] Traulos, a leader of the Paulicians in the Balkans around 1084 (Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 288s., Grégoire 1939a, 247n.) but [2] the Seljuk ruler *Tuğrıl* (de Mandach 1993, 263–267). Some influence on the form at most could have come from [3] the Irish royal name *Turlough,* proposed by Suchier (1905, 665).

On [1]: Traulos does not fit phonologically, and he did not have anything to do with Persia either.

On [2]: The Roland poet and his contemporaries found it hard to tell the difference between the Persians and the Turks because the whole of the ancient Persian territory was still occupied by Seljuk Turks. This is why de Mandach (1993, 263–267) – no doubt correctly – identifies *Torleu* as the great Seljuk conqueror and first Seljuk to bear the title of Sultan, i.e, Tuğrıl (nowadays usually: Tuğrul), who conquered Merv and Bukhara in 1028, Iran in 1040, captured Baghdad in 1055 and then died in 1063. A typical marker for the self-image of the early Seljuks in geographical terms is the fact that Tuğrıl's imposing grave is in Rayy in Persia (20 km from Teheran). De Mandach's remarks on linguistic factors affecting the form of the name are less reliable. We cannot assume that the /ɣ/ will be imitated as the "-R- parisien" that exists today, at least not yet in the 12th c. A diphthong glide developed at this time: /-u̯/ as in /baɣdād/ > /bau̯da(+s)/. However, after velar vowels a simplification takes place: /uu̯/ > /u/, as we see in O with Bugre v. 2922. With syncope of the /ı/ there would indeed be a need for a "voyelle d'appui en finale", namely /ə/: **Turle,* *Torle. But there is no parallel case to support the view that a French speaker would stress this supporting /ə/ "prononcé comme *torlé,* respectivement *turleu*". The more likely explanation is that the poet Romanised the name by making it end in *-eu* (~ Lat. *-aeus.* cf. his *Jangl-eu* and OF *jangler* 'to grumble').[379]

---

379 Cf. also *Canabeus* (in as far as it seems to be Lat. *canis* + OF *abaiier* A.3.2.2) and *Ormaleus* (A.1.2.5).

On [3]: We cannot entirely exclude the possibility that he equated this with the name *Turlough* etc., which would have been quite familiar to him.[380]

A.3.2.4.2 The King of the Lutici

The King of the Lutici is called *Dapamort* O 3205, *Clapamorses* K (*Clappamors* Stricker, *Clapemorsen* [acc.] the *Karlmeinet*), *Clapamors* V4, *Capamor* C, *Capamorz* V7: therefore, we have *Dapamort* O contra *Clapamort* β, linked by the palaeographical bridge of *d ~ cl*. There is also *Dapamort* O 3216, *Clapamors* V4P, *Capamorz* CV7: likewise. The name is very probably [1] an aptronym 'give (him) a deadly blow' and does not mean [2] 'with the Pomeranians'; neither is it [3] inspired by a leader of the Bulgarians called Dobromir, and it certainly is not [4] an amalgam of *Droscius-Dragawitus-Ratibor-Celeadragus*.

On [1]: OF *claper* 'to beat (loudly), to strike' is attested in Godefroy s. v. both for a deadly blow by a sword, and for a fall into hell (or perhaps being pushed into hell?). The name *Clapamort* in β easily fits in with more than twenty other aptronyms referring to Saracens in the Song, including e.g., *Gemalfin* and probably *Abisme*, both of which also anticipate the fate of the character.

Ad [2]: Prioult suggests (1948, 288s.), and de Mandach agrees (1993, 257s.), that *Dapamort* means "d'auprès de la mer, de Poméranie". Hardly! "Dans les langues

---

380 In the *Chanson de Guillaume,* we find a *Turlen le rei* (v. 656), *Turleis le rei* (v. 979) or *Turlen de Dosturges* (v. 1711, the half verse is one syllable too long), which could be an incorrectly written *Turleu*; **d'Osturges* must mean 'from Astorga' (in epics usually *Estorges*). If we believe that the *Chanson de Guillaume* is later than the Rol., then the name itself (without any geographical significance) could simply be taken from the Rol. Referring to both of these figures, Suchier (1905, 665) suggested a connection with *Turlough*, the (modern) name of an Irish King of Munster in the 11th c. More precisely, this Turlough O'Brian 1064–1086 was in fact 'High King' of Ireland; to be on the safe side, we should also note: Turlough O'Con(n)or, High King of Ireland 1126–1156, and the later Turlough O'Brian, King of Munster, who challenged the older Turlough for the title from 1142–1151 (on both of these later figures cf. Jefferies 1984, passim). Now, the form *Turlough* is generally used in the scholarly literature, and it is still in use today as a given name. There is still an issue, however, with the fact that these kings were known in the Middle Irish of their day as *Toirdealbach* (with /ð/ and the /v/ which was soon lost); cf. regarding this name also the article in the LM on Turlough O'Connor. However, since the Irish coastal towns were colonised by the Vikings, the name could have reached England in some Norsified form. We can think of Norse names for Thor such as *ÞorleifR* (with *f* ~ /v/). With no knowledge of this Irish background, von Richthofen (1954, 303) suggests *ÞorlákR* or *Þorlaug*, but the former is phonologically awkward, and the latter is usually a woman's name. – The unreferenced claim by Broëns (1965–1966, 67), that *Thorila* is attested as a West Gothic name, is questionable.

du littoral méridional balte, *pa* est une préposition, qui se transforme fréquemment en *po* [. . .]". But the Pomeranians, like the Lutici, were Slavs, not Balts, and the preposition in Common Slavic, especially in Kashub., Pol. and Sorb.[381] was *po* from the very beginning and not *pa*.[382] Prioult cites a form with *pa-* only in French, evidently based on a letter originally written in 1545 in Latin from the German theologian Peter Becker (Petrus Artopoeus), who was born in Koszalin in Pomerania, to Sebastian Münster, stating that the first inhabitants of Pomerania had called it *Pamorzi* in their native language, which was Vandalic (!). And this terrible source is supposed to be evidence demonstrating the exact quality of a vowel! Prioult continues: "Le mot *Pamorz* ou *Pomorz* signifie 'près de la mer'[. . .]" Once again we have an ominous 'or'! In fact, however, *Pomorze* ('close to the sea' >) 'Pomerania' is only attested with *po-* and final *-e*. But why does Prioult omit the *-e*? "*Pamorz*, converti par quelque scribe en *Pamort* [. . .]". Prioult obviously believed that he needed a root without *-e*. Finally: "Quant à la préposition *da*, elle est l'équivalent de la préposition *do*" – but in Slav. there is only *do*, and *da* does not exist.[383] This preposition, according to Prioult, "signifie jusqu'à, de". No, it means *jusqu'à* (in space, in time, and with other terms of measurement), and not *de*.[384] And a King's name meaning 'as far as the Pomeranians' would have been a bit too far-fetched even for Prioult. It seems also hardly credible that the name would then, through a chance misreading of *-cl-* instead of *-d-*, turn into a perfect aptronym. Therefore, *Clapamort* must surely be the primary form.

On [3]: The assertion made by Grégoire (1939a, 248 n.), that the person behind the King of the Lutici *Dapamort* is Dobromir, the leader of the 1079 Bulgarian uprising, has no specific reasoning behind it, and is phonologically untenable.

On [4]: The monstrous amalgam constructed by Hanak (1971b, 420) out of *Droscius-Dragawitus-Ratibor-Celeadragus* is so far beyond the realms of probability that it does not deserve any discussion.

---

381 In this section – to avoid missing variants and rare usages – I have included information from the relevant articles in both the great historical dictionary of Polish by Urbańczyk et al. 1955–2007, and the dictionary of Sorbian by Schuster-Šewc 1980–1996, as well as the Kashubian dictionaries by Ramułt 1893/1993 and Trepczyk 1994.

382 Only Belarus. (and the Standard pronunciation, but not the written version of Great Russ.) has made this into *pa*.

383 Again, o *da* comes later only in Belarus. (and in Russ. pronunciation).

384 Cf. the dictionaries cited in n. 381! There are also some occasional usages, such as Old Pol. to indicate purpose (*causa*), the beneficiary or affected person (*alicuius commodo seu alicui*) or the type 'find something (e.g., reprehensible) about/within/in a person or a thing', but nothing that would cover the type 'Lord of the (or with the, or over the)'.

A.3.2.5 Baligant's counsellor

Jangleu l'ultremarin O 3507, *Ioleun sinin man* K, *Glancel ultremaǹ* V4, *Angles* C, *Jangles un son ami* V7, *Juglant d'Outremarin* P: *sinin man* and *un son ami* are *lectiones faciliores* for the epithet, which the scribe did not understand. There is a change of suffix in CV7 (to northern Ital. *-és* < *-ensis*), in P (> *-ant*) and in V4 (> *-el*, with haplographical loss of the article *l'* that follows); also, in V4 there is reciprocal metathesis (*Jangl-* > *Glanç-*), in P a tilde has been overlooked (*Jangl-* > *Jugl-*); in the version before C an initial was not written out, which led to a reinterpretation meaning 'Englishman'; in K there is an unexplained simplification *Jangl-* > *Jol-*. The consensus across OV7 confirms *Jangle-*, the word ending in OK confirms *-eu*, and the consensus across OV4P confirms the epithet as belonging in the archetype. There is also

Jangleu O 3508, *Ioleun sin man* K (*Iohelim* ms. A), *Glancel* V4, *Jafer* (but *Jangles* V7) *de Valdormanz* CV7, *Juglant* P, *Dan Gui* T: *Jafer* must be associated with the well-known Arab name *Dža'far*. In T the very non-Muslim name *Dan Gui* could indicate that the figure is recognised as a renegade (cf. below).

This is an aptronym from OF *jangler* 'to whine, whinge, nag' + Lat. *-aeus*,[385] something like 'quibbler, fault-finder'. If the epithet *l'ultremarin* only meant 'having just crossed over the Mediterranean into the West with Baligant and his huge army', then it would be bland and unspecific. Therefore, it is preferable to interpret it with the opposite meaning 'having come from the West into the East'; precisely this qualifies the man to draw a comparison *d'Arrabiz e de Francs* as Baligant now requests. His brusque language is also very striking: *Morz estes, Baligant!* – while Marsiľe had addressed his liege lord as *Sire reis, amiralz* (v. 2831). It is even more striking that he says to Baligant *Ja vostre [!] deu ne vos erent guarant* (v. 3513), as if he were not a Muslim. How can we explain this?

In Herodotus (7.101–105) Xerxes, the Persian King of Kings, is setting out with a huge army to begin a campaign against Greece when he asks Demaratos, one of his accompanying men, a Greek king's son who has been exiled from his homeland, whether he thinks the Greeks will be a match for the Persians. Xerxes is surprised to hear that Demaratos considers the Greeks to be invincible. Xerxes laughs but remains favourably disposed towards him – and loses the battle.

---

385 For a detailed study of the word field around *jangler* cf. Levy (1960, 403–405), who agrees with Sainéan that it has an onomatopoeic origin – Mireaux (1943, 262) thought *Jangleu* was the same name as Džanāḥ ad-Dawla (approximately /dženaḥaddòlæ/, in Fulcher 2.1.5 *Ginahadoles*), the ruler of Homs (murdered by the Order of Assassins in 1103). This is rather unlikely just on the basis of the intonation alone; in any case it is not important.

In Curtius (3.2.10–19) Darius, the Persian King of Kings, asks the Athenian Charidemos, whom Alexander has forced into exile, what he thinks about the situation; Charidemos says in a fit of candour that Alexander's troops are better; Darius should immediately hire troops as strong as the Macedonians from the areas next to Macedonia in the north-western part of Greece. But Darius is very upset, has Charidemos executed – and loses the battle, and soon after that, his throne and his life as well.

In Raymond of Aguilers (RHC Occ. 3.260, cap. 12; less clearly also in Fulcher of Chartres, RHC Occ. 3.348s. or ed. Hagenmeyer 1.22.4–8, in a very watered-down form in the *Gesta Francorum expugnantium Jherusalem*, RHC Occ. 3.504, cap. 19) *Corbagas / Corbagath* 'Kürbuğa' is just about to go into battle and questions the Turk *Mirdalin / Amirdalis*, who has recently escaped from the crusaders in Antioch, and who is *notus per militiam suam* even among the crusaders.[386] Both look at the crusaders marching out of the town; then Mirdalin says that you could perhaps kill them, but you will not force them to flee; when asked again, he intensifies his statement: even faced with the whole of 'heathen'dom, they would not concede a foot's breadth, and (in the *Gesta*) God seems to be fighting on their side. Kürbuğa is *turbatus* but goes into battle nevertheless – and loses it.[387]

In all four cases, an eastern ruler marches with a huge army to take on a western, numerically much inferior force (with which the narrator naturally identifies). The ruler asks one of his advisers who knows both sides to evaluate them and receives an answer which is as devastating as it is unexpected, but which in Curtius and in the Rol. is also the only piece of advice that is of any use to him. He goes into battle and loses. It is irrelevant for the structure of the narrative whether the ruler reacts ignobly (like Darius) or magnanimously (like the others); nor does it matter whether he follows the advice (like Baligant) or not (like Darius), whether he dies in the battle (like Baligant) or shortly after it (like Darius) or not at all (like Xerxes and Corbaran); and finally it also does not matter whether the person who is asked owes his knowledge of both sides to random circumstances (as in the Crusade historians) or whether he is an exile from his homeland in the West (as in the two older stories). The Roland poet

---

[386] In the *Cansó d'Antiocha,* Kürbuğa asks a Christian instead, *Arloïs* 'Herluin', who then takes flight and runs back to join the Christians at the last minute.

[387] A rudimentary form of this story is to be found in the *Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus* cap. 82–84 (RHC Occ. 3.205s.), with an edifying but improbable addition, namely that this *ammirarius*, when the battle was lost, fled to Bohemund and became a Christian. The addition may have been thought up to answer relevant questions about the transmission of the material.

also seems to tend towards the exile variant, although he does not go into the circumstances surrounding him.

A.3.2.6 Baligant's messengers (*Clarifan*, *Clarïen*, *Maltraïen*)

Baligant's messengers to Marsilĭe are the brothers *Clarifan* and *Clarïen* O 2670, *Iclarions* (but *Clariun* Stricker, *Clarions* the *Karlmeinet*) and *Clariens* K, *Darifant* and *Darier* V4, *Clariel* and *Effraiez* (*Effragiez* C) CV7: In CV7 *Effraiez* 'fearful' is semantically a random change because of the rhyme requirements of the laisse; *Clariel* in CV7 and *(I)clarion* in K show a change of suffix. V4 misreads *cl-* as *d-*, presumably because the names starting with *Dari-*sounded like *Darius* and so had an oriental effect. The archetype has *Clarifan(t?)*, confirmed by OKCV7 *(Clari-)* or OV4 *(-fan)*, *Clarïen* via OK. Only *Clarïen* is named again several times:

    Clarïen O 2724, *Darien* V4, *Clariaus* CV7;
    Clarïen O 2771, *Clariel* CV7, *Clariés* P;
    Clarïens O 2790, *Darier* V4, *Clariez* C, *Clarielz* V7, *Clariés* P.

The names of the brothers have identical first parts, as on the Christian side, e.g., with *Basan* and *Basilĭe*,[388] and indeed as often happened in reality in the centuries before. They are aptronyms at the same time, however: even Saracen messengers can have a virtue, such as the ability to express themselves clearly,[389] and the poet has of course given them a suitable role (cf. v. 2711–2713, 2724–2733, 2754, 2771–2787, 2790–2801) – although in the adj. the physical meaning ('with a distinct, clearly audible voice') is also important.[390] Moreover, if we needed more proof that the Roland poet had learned scholarly Latin, then we would find it in a small detail here: in the second part of one of the names, he feels compelled to make it mean 'speaking' and finds instead of *dicens* or *loquens* the monosyllabic *fans*, even though *fari* 'to speak' had left no traces in Rom.[391]

---

388 Also cf. on the identical first parts in pairs of names in the song n. 88.
389 *Clarin* (v. 63) is also a Muslim messenger.
390 Kunitzsch (1972, 43 n. 32, and 1988, 262) notes in connection with this that the Crusade historian Tudebod (13.1) mentions *Clarandus* and *C(a)larfines*, who must have had a genuinely oriental background, and perhaps Turkish names with *Kara-* 'black' like *Kara-Arslan*. But 1) these two names are in inconspicuous places in the famous list of 75 (!) supposed kings of Antioch, the majority of which is pure fantasy; 2) the *Kara-* names must have had, like *Kara-Arslan* an *-l-* in the second part of the name; are there other examples beyond this one? Even if *Clarandus < Kara-Arslan* is the correct derivation, and if it set in motion the *Clar-* series, the etymological part would have been negligible compared to the aptronymic part in the Rol.
391 Alternatively, Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.429) suggests: "nom résultant du croisement de Clarin et d'olifan".

The father of the two had often been Baligant's messenger in the past; he was King *Maltraïen* O 2671, *Maltrens* K, *Etroper* V4, *Matragïez* CV7: In CV7 *-ez* is once again required by the rhyme. V4 takes the liberty of making a little joke with (*Estropier >) *Etroper*, referring to Ital. *(i)stroppiare* + *-arius*, meaning 'mutilator (of the message)'. The four-syllable *Maltraïen* in O consists of *mal* + the stem of OF *traïr* 'betray' + Lat. *-(i)anus*, which similarly points to a simple 'distortion' of the message.

A.3.2.7 Other confidants of Baligant

At the very moment when Baligant steps out of the ship – which is on the Ebro near Saragossa – and sets foot on Spanish soil, *Espaneliz* helpfully leads him ashore:

Espaneliz fors le vait adestrant O 2648. Alternatively, in V4: *In Spainellun el ven fore arestant*; the verse is missing everywhere else. In V4 instead of *-iz*, an augmentative *-on/-un* is used. *Esp-* was regularly Italianised to become *Isp-*; but a copyist thought he saw a nasal tilde, and this led to the misunderstanding. V4 therefore confirms that *Espanel-* belongs in the archetype.

In western European parlance, the term "Spanish" from around 800 until the late Middle Ages often means only the part of Spain (or of the entire Pyrenean Peninsula) that was still occupied by the Muslims. This explains why the term occasionally, and initially referring to refugees from this area, became a personal name, especially in the areas to the north. In the *Polyptychon Irminonis* (Paris, early 9th c. 13.49, here referring to the area around Dreux), and then in the Obituary of Moissac there is a certain *Hispanellus*, in the years 878 and 879 a settler in the Frankish Marca Hispanica is called *Spanla* or *Spanila* with a West Gothic form of hypocoristic (Morlet 202a, 2.60a), in the year 913 there is *Spanla/Spanlo*, a Catalan (Kremer 1972, 205).[392] According to the *Vita Faronis* (9th c., MGH SS. mer. 5.189.22) a miracle happened in the Marne area to a certain *Ispanellus* (correctly treated as a personal name in the index). In the years 1131 and 1133 a witness for King Alfonso el Batallador is called *Espagnol* or *Espanellus*, in 1144 in a charter issued by the Viscountess of Béarn, the bishop of Oloron is *Espag[n]ol* (Ebro-Lacarra 1949, 560 Nr. 164, 1952, 554s. Nr.332, and 1952, 574s. No. 354).[393]

---

392 In the Christian part of the Pyrenean Peninsula there are a few instances where *Span-* also appears in two-part names such as *Spanesindus/-a*; for more on this cf. Becker (2009, 568–572).

393 Between 1182 and 1200 in Burgos we find among the foreign names *D. Espinel* [with *-i-*!] *y hermana Galiana, casada con Abderramán* (Serrano 1935–1936, 2.214). By then at the latest the name seems to intersect with the epic Saracen name *Ospinel/Otinel*, whose basic form is found in the North African *Ospinus rex Agabibe* in the PT; the eponymous hero of the *Otinel* epic

The Roland poet probably knew this name in the form *Espanel*, and he extended it slightly (cf. *Astramar-iz*, *Escrem-iz*). At the moment of Baligant's landing, even Marsilĭe does not know that he is coming, and so *Espaneliz* cannot be a local person who welcomes Baligant, but he could be a Spanish Muslim who is at Baligant's court – a sort of intermediary with Marsilĭe – who from the perspective of Baligant and his court has quite naturally acquired the nickname 'our (little) Spaniard'. The poet now gives him the honour of quite literally escorting Baligant into his homeland.

Baligant waits at his landing site outside Saragossa for the return of his messengers who are supposed to bring Marsilĭe. When they tell him that Marsilĭe is on his death bed, he rides into the town with a small entourage, while the army proceeds up the Ebro under *Gemalfin* O 2814, *Geneasin* K, *Gemalfin* V4, *Fergalem* (*Fernalem* V7) *de Mont Nu* CV7, *Galien* TB: *Geneasin* can mostly be explained palaeographically (*m* ~ *n*, *f* ~ ſ), *Fergalem/Fernalem* is pure fantasy, probably influenced by the (Celt.) Romance name *Fergus* and the epic 'heathen' name *Fernagu/Fernagant*, *Galien* is a name that becomes very popular in later epics. OV4 confirm that *Gemalfin* belongs in the archetype. The name is meant as an evil omen here: *g(i)em-al-fin* 'groan-at-the-end'.[394] This is even more obvious in the second mention of the name; because

Gemalfin O 3495, *Gemalfi* V4 (in a laisse rhymed in -*i*), *Gelmafi* CV7 (as before, and with metathesis), *Salatin* T ('Saladin'), notifies Baligant of the death of his son and his brother.

There is one more follower to mention, namely the man who holds Baligant's stirrup steady just before the battle begins: *Marcules* O 3156, *Marçolli* V4, *Merguileis* C, *Merguilles* V7, *Malaquins* P, *Matulin* T: P and T replace what was probably a garbled name in their sources with *lectiones faciliores*: both hypocoristic forms

---

(second half of the 12th c.) is a Muslim, but active in Italy. There is no space to investigate this question here, but we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that the Roland poet knew of a similar figure.

394 From OF *giembre* < Lat. *gemĕre*, superseded around the 13th c. by *geindre*, which then competes with *gémir*. – Tavernier's (1914–1917, 101 n. 4) interpretation of *Gemalfin* as "the 'fine' Gamaliel or Gemalli in the Bible" is another of his hastily written ideas since there is no evidence of *Gemalli* appearing anywhere as a variant of Gamaliel. Moreover, with the best will in the world, there is no reason why the 'fine' Pharisee and teacher of Jewish law Gamaliel (*Act Ap* 5.43) should give his name to Baligant's bearer of bad news. – Neither can we accept Scheludko's (1927, 182) suggestion that "obviously" the name is based on "Gemal-Hafin", with no further explanation as to who this should be. At best, I would accept the possibility that the common Muslim name *Džamāl ad-Dīn* might have been caricaturised, producing *Gemalfin* through the alteration of a single consonant.

of *Malachias* (as in the Vulgate for 'Malachi') and *Matthaeus*.[395] CV7 were re-
minded of OF *merguillier* 'to roll in mud (and thereby desecrate)', as in the 12th
c. translations of the Psalms and Philippe de Thaon. In V4 we should not take
the cedilla too seriously; it broadly confirms O.

In the surviving French versions (13th c.) of the *Dialogus Salomonis et Mar-
culfi/Marcolfi*, Salomo's counterpart is called *Marcoul*, a form that is abstracted
from the nominative, where the progression is *-lfs* > *-ls* (cf. in the 12th c. *Salamos
ni Marcols* in Raimbaut d'Aurenga). The Roland poet obviously knew this form
and just added an *-e* onto it, as he did with (*Saint*) *Denise* instead of *Denis*. The
Latin *Dialogus*, a pithy debate between the wise Salomo and Marculf, a quick-
witted exponent of a secular world view, is first mentioned with any certainty in
Notker the German († 1022), and disapprovingly as a kind of parody of the *Prover-
bia Salomonis*, and it is just as definitely cited, albeit with a neutral evaluation,
by the Francophone William of Tyre (13.1). The surviving text of the *Dialogus* be-
gins: *Cum staret rex Salomon super solium David patris sui, plenus sapientia et
diviciis, vidit quendam hominem Marcolfum nomine a parte orientis* [the tradi-
tional home of wisdom] *venientem [. . .]*. The dialogue does not take place in a
vacuum, but in Salomo's court, so that the name 'Marculf' for a deuteragonist
who comes from even further east must *a fortiori* have been understood as an
Oriental name; this explains the emphasis here: *Marcules d'ultre mer*. Beyond
this, there is no recognisable meaning to the name; thus the Roland poet has just
selected this as a typical Oriental name and used it for one of the members of
Baligant's court.[396]

---

395 Biblical names, even positive ones and some from the New Testament, are sometimes
used in epics as Saracen names because they evoke the Orient. Even the Roland poet is willing
to use *Alphaïen*, derived from *Alphaei*, *Maheu*, a colloquial form of *Matthieu,* and *Timozel*, a
hypocoristic form of *Timotheus*. The author of the *Chanson d'Antioche* (v. 9015–9026), makes
especially liberal use of such names when he includes among the 50 kings who supposedly
joined Corbaran (and in his list there are 38) *Elyas*, *Faraons*, *Judas Macabeus*, *Sansons*, *Antio-
chus li rouges*, *Davis et Salemons*, *Erodes et Pilates* (and *Noirons* 'Nero'). Moisan lists the follow-
ing additional Saracen names: *Abraham*, *Adam*, *Barnabas*, *Cleofas*, *Jonas*, *Jonatas*, *Josué*,
Matusalé, *Manuel* (< *Immanuel*), *Salatiel*, *Samuel* and the group *Macabé / Macabré / Macabrin*
etc. (on this cf. the FEW, Art. *Macchabaeus* by Zumthor). In the case of *Malaquin* (*Malachias* +
-in) the origin can be found in the fact that the name in the *Chétifs* and in the KMS I (ed. Unger
cap. 43, ed. Loth A 40, B 41) refers to a Jewish weaponsmith or arms dealer and then in other
epics to Saracens (cf. Beckmann 2008a, 157s.).

396 The *Dialogus* has a long and interesting history. The wise Solomon of the Bible can, in
the post-Biblical Jewish tradition, make spirits do his bidding, including their prince Ashme-
dai, who is something of an ambivalent character (bab. Talmud, *Gittin* 68ab, and even more
clearly in later Jewish folklore), because in spite of all the apparent comedy and evil-doing,
Ashmedai's actions work out for the good in the end (EJ, Art. *Asmodaeus*). At the same time,

A.3.3 The name *Baligant* and the problem of the origins of the Baligant section

A.3.3.1 The name *Baligant*

Baligant O 2614 and passim, *Paligan* K (*Baligain* the *Karlmeinet*), *Bal(l)ugant* V4, *Bal(l)igant* CV7PTB (T also *Baligan*), *Galigans* F: In V4 the pre-Romance stem *ballūc-/*bellūc-* 'to shine, sparkle, flicker etc.' is visible (more detail on this in the LEI, vol. 3, s. v.; in Veneto this takes the form *balugar*, *sbalugar*).[397] K also consistently has Bav. *P-*, and there is a change of suffix (*-an* ~ Lat. *-anus*, in the *Karlmeinet* the ending is French *-ain*).[398]

The biggest unresolved problem in the immediate prehistory of the Rol. is the question of which comes first: the *Baligant* in the Rol. or the *Beliguandus*[399] in the PT. Since both come from Babylon and in the context of Roncevaux they

---

the Latin *Mercurius*, who is the crafty patron of thieves as well, acquires the Hebrew name *Merqulis / Marqulis* (as in the babyl. Talmud, *Sanhedrin* 60b etc.) and becomes the epitome of a false god for the Jews (EJ, Art. *Asmodaeus*; cf. *Prov* 26.8). In an intermediate version which has been lost, this name must have appeared in place of *Ashmedai*, after which – probably in the Byzantine area – the relationship between the ruler and the spirit developed more and more into an antithetical-dialogic form; the *Decretum Gelasii* (not by Pope Gelasius, but probably 6th c.) mentions a supposedly apocryphal and now lost *contradictio Salomonis*, in which the wisdom of Solomon was consistently contradicted. A more minor branch of the tradition has a more serious tone, and Saturn appears instead of Mercury; he is manifest in several related but notoriously enigmatic Old English dialogues called *Solomon and Saturn*. In the West European main tradition, *Mercurius/Marqulis* was reinterpreted as the Germanic name Marculfus (this is the name of an abbot of the 6th c. in the diocese of Coutances, who was venerated first in the 10th c. in the diocese of Reims, and then also from the 13th c. onwards across the whole of France as a healer of scrofula, and it is also the name of the author of the so-called *Formulae Marculfi*, an influential collection of models for charters dating from around 700). Besides the dialogic form of the material, and in essence quite independently of these sources, there was also a narrative form which is misogynous and in which Salomo's wife Salome is the protagonist.

397 The forms of the name with *-u-* survive in Italy until the 16th c.: the Franco-Italian *Prise de Pampelune* (Verona, first half of the 14th c.) still consistently has *Balugant*, the *Reali* then have *Balugante*, as does Ariosto (14.2.1, 14.107.6, 18.42.7, 31.81.4).

398 The variant of the name ending in *-an* was already present in the Francophone world; in 1161 at the latest, i.e., before K, a *clericus* by the name of *Ricardus Baligan* is attested in England (cf. below section A.3.3.5 'Baligant as a Christian name'), and the version that K is based on comes from England. The *-an* ending was then carried on in the German tradition: Wolfram, *Willehalm* 272.15 *der hôhe Baligân*, Charlemagne's opponent; *Biterolf* 315 *Baligân* from Libya with 80,000 'heathens' from Persia; and probably also *Salman und Morolf* 748.3 and *Orendel* 411 *Belîân* of Babylonia.

399 The variants in the PT tradition are insignificant: *Beligandus*, *Belegandus*, *Belvigandus* – the latter probably should be read as *Beluigandus,* with the admixture of *belua* 'monster', but a

both live longer than Roland, an independent genesis is out of the question. G. Paris (1882b, 493s., cf. 483) made a case for the priority of the figure in the PT, while Horrent (1951a) favoured the Rol., but in my opinion neither had convincing arguments. The question is more acute than ever today, however, because there has been a marked increase over the last few decades in scholars pleading for a late dating of the Rol. around the time of the Second Crusade (cf. especially Keller 1989, passim, de Mandach 1993, passim; also a few sections in the present study, especially A.1.3.5–A.1.3.9 above, on the 26th–29th *eschiele* and A.2.2 on *Cheriant*, and A.5.3 below on *Suatilie*), whereas it is more difficult to date the PT after 1148.[400] But first let us consider the attempts which have been made to explain the name thus far. We can dismiss several suggestions out of hand because they so obviously lack any methodological underpinning: [1] [essentially Old] Turk. *baɫg/balyk* 'town' + *-ant* (Olschki 1959, 206), [2] von Richthofen's (1954, 300s.) Old Norse *Baleygr* (one of the many epithets for Odin) + *gandr* 'spell,

---

compromise between *Beligand-* and *Belugand-* would not be impossible; cf. above on V4 (with n. 397) and below hypothesis [8] and scenario II (A.3.3.3).

400 This *in nuce* is the reason: the page f. 221 of the *Codex Calixtinus* as it exists today, with the fake bull of Innocent II († 24. 9. 1143), in which the list of cardinals fits in the period from 3. 4. 1138 at the earliest (Alberic of Ostia's promotion to cardinal) to 19. 6. 1142 at the latest (death of Cardinal Hugh of Saint Victor), is written in a hand that is not evident anywhere else in the surviving *Codex Calixtinus* which was written around 1150–1160 in Santiago and mostly copied from a previous codex (probably just because the previous codex had been sent to Compostela and they wanted to preserve the supposedly original version of the Papal bull it contained) and it may even have been added to the surviving Codex relatively late (Díaz y Díaz 1988, 193); but the bull cannot be separated from the PT because a (supposedly pre-) *Codex Calixtinus* without the PT would not have needed this forgery. And indeed Aymeric, (formerly) parish priest of Parthenay-le-Vieux, now as monk Olivier of Vézelay and appointed as priest of the church of Asquins belonging to Vézelay, and the Flemish woman Gerberga, together gifted the Codex to the Church of Compostela. This gift was the (now lost) original of the codex that had been verified by the Pope (according to the forged bull), and they had come to Compostela not long after the death of Innocent, because they did not want to be accused of keeping the codex with the precious Papal bull to themselves for too long, or even, of exposing it to unnecessary danger as they travelled here and there along the roads of Europe. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the texts in Books I and III (with the possible exception of the elements supposedly originating from Pope Calixtus) were written in Compostela, or that parts of II (the *Miracula*) could have gone through an editing stage in Compostela, that the author of Book IV (the PT) could have written his list of Spanish towns with (direct or indirect) knowledge of Spanish sources (essentially diocesan catalogues) and was personally acquainted with northwestern Spain, that the PT folios in the surviving codex that are not by the scribe Hämel I (or Díaz y Díaz 1b) presumably included some smaller changes to the text, and that finally, the second part of Book V requires an intimate knowledge of the whole of Compostela Cathedral (and certainly written notes about it, too).

charm', [3] only six years later again von Richthofen (1960, 5ss.) an almost carica-
ture-like construct of the biblical *Baal* + *ʿAlī* (Almoravid ruler) + *géant*, [4] *Wallia*
West Gothic king + -*ing* + -*ane* – according to the Gothomanic essay by Broëns
(1965–1966, 67), [5] a merging of the two sun gods *Bal* (*Belen*) – *Gargan* (*Gargon*,
Gorgiunt) – in the otherwise useful study by Rütten (1970, 26 n. 12), who here
blindly follows Dontenville (1948).

Another three explanations attracted more serious consideration because
they are based on real figures living in the 11th –12th c. The individuals sug-
gested as inspiration for Baligant's name are:

[6] Balak (variants Balag and Belek) b. Bahrām – according to Tavernier
(1913, 57). This Turkish leader lost control of Sarūdž to the crusaders in 1098
and had no significant power again until 1113/1114 when he married the widow
of the ruler of Malaṭya; he first became famous in 1122 when he captured Count
Josselin of Edessa and King Baldwin II in quick succession, and from then until
his death in 1124 he was ruler of Aleppo, a title he inherited from his uncle (EI,
Art. *Balak*). He was *a draco saevissimus* according to Fulcher of Chartres (3.31.8),
a *Turcus dolosus, miles vero armis et bello famosus* according to Albert of Aachen
(4,8)[401] – but, incidentally, he only earned these reputations from 1114 at the earli-
est, and probably not until 1122, which does not fit with Tavernier's dating of the
Rol. before 1110.

As far as the phonology is concerned: once -*ant* had appeared, the dissimi-
lation **Balagant* > *Baligant* was understandable; but where did -*ant* come from?
Scheludko (1922, 481) thought that "obviously Balec-Khân" was behind it; but
this would produce the form **Balican(t)*. Tavernier, on the other hand, thought
he recognised -*ant* as a well-known oriental ending; but no such thing exists. It
would have been more accurate to point out that the -*ant* ending is extremely
common in epic names;[402] however it is still suspicious to find it being suppos-
edly added on to a real name for no particular reason.

[7] (Georgios) Palaiologos, the brother-in-law of Emperor Alexios and de-
fender of Dyrrachium against Robert Guiscard (Anna 3.9.4 – 4.8.4) – is emphati-
cally proposed by Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 294s., 314), Grégoire (1939a, 247–258;
1942–1943, 531s.). We have indeed also identified here and there in the catalogue –
in the names *Butentrot* and *Argoilles* perhaps – a certain antipathy on the part of
the poet towards Byzantium, which was shared by the Normans even before the
First Crusade, and then by most Francophone people after the experiences of the

---

401 Cf. also William of Tyre (12.17, 13.11): *Turcorum princeps, magnificus et potens* and *poten-
tissimus Turcorum satrapa*.
402 Cf. n. 234 above.

First and especially the Second Crusade. But there is a big difference between this and the hypothesis that the poet would presume to present the Lord of all the heathens as a barely disguised[403] Greek Christian – not even the Basileus, but his brother-in-law, and this would also affect any judgement about the literary value of the Song.[404] And then there are issues with the phonology: MGk. (in certain combinations /b-/) > Rom. /b-/ is fine,[405] but no matter whether we start with the intonation Παλαιόλογος (as Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, Addenda-page explicitly do) or with Παλαιολόγος, which Grégoire himself considers (1939a, 256) *certaine* (and which is also the only one given in ODB s. v. and the critical editions of *Alexias* by Reifferscheid 1884, Leib 1937–1965, Reinsch 2001), a haplology of -*lĕŏl-o* or -*lĕoló-* > -*li-* is implausible, as indeed is the idea that unaccented -*oς* or (in the acc.) -*ov* (in common parlance only /-o/!) leads to accented -*ant*. (We present a different explanation than that of Grégoire for verse 2616 *Tut survesquièt e Virgĭlĭe e Omer* in section A.3.3.2 below).

[8] Yaḥya ben ʿAlī ben Ghāniya – is suggested by Poncet (1970, 132), and for the most part this is accepted by de Mandach (1993, 186). This confidant of the Almoravids and his brother Muḥammad made their first historical appearance (contrary to Poncet's suggestion) in 1126 (Bel 1903, 1), when Muḥammad became Governor of the Balearics; then in 1134, when Yaḥya was Governor of Murcia and Valencia, he set out on a campaign to the north against King Alfonso el Batallador near Fraga in Catalonia, in which Alfonso suffered a disastrous defeat, and was injured so severely that he died a few days later.[406] Poncet (1970, 131) notes – quite rightly within the context of his thesis – that the name Baligant must have

---

403 Grégoire was very evidently keen to point out that contemporaries were able to see through this game of disguises; this is most obvious, though also implicit, in his claim (1942–1943, 531s.), that King Belkām of Rūm in the Arab. *Romance of ʿAntar* is "Palaeologus himself, but under the French form of Baligan".

404 It was Bohemund and not Robert Guiscard – *nota bene* after the ambivalent experiences that people across the whole of Europe had had during the First Crusade – who persuaded the Pope to legitimate his crusader project against Alexios by sending a legate with the Normans back to France. But by then, a quarter of a century after Alexios had come to power, or even later in the 12th century, no one would have still regarded Palaiologos as the key figure among the enemy leaders.

405 Cf. n. 43 above.

406 Yaḥya later – after 1145 – became the Almoravid Governor of Córdoba, then capitulated to Alfons VII and kept control of the town as his liege man, but finally he handed it over to the Almohads in 1148; cf. e.g., Bel (1903, 8–14), Béraud-Villars (1946, 255, 266). His brother Muḥammad declared himself independent, as he was Governor of the Balearics when Almoravid power waned; his dynasty was not driven out of the Balearics by the Almohads until 1203/1204, but it still caused a lot of inner Muslim trouble in North Africa until 1237 (Bel 1903, passim, EI, Art. *Ghāniya, Banū*).

been in the Song before 1134; "sinon le poème eût été plus démoralisant qu'excitant". He is hiding the fact that before this date, the deeds of one or other of the brothers would have not in the least been enough to inspire the poet to make his name or character into the lord of all the 'heathens'.[407] As far as the form of the name is concerned, Poncet sometimes (as on p. 132 at the most decisive point in the argument) omits the second *ben*: "*Ben Ali Ghāniya*"; once again there are grounds for suspecting that here the reality should be 'adapted' to the epic. André de Mandach recognised this and overcame the problem with the smooth assumption: "Le nom simplifié de Ben ʿAlī Ghāniya (sans le second Ben) aura donné d'abord *beligandus* en latin, dans le *Turpin* [antérieur à 1139]" – but a reference is needed precisely for this *simplification* "sans le second Ben".[408]

Additional point on [6–8]: Besides the formal considerations, my main objection to all three historical figures is the same. It is obvious to all that Balak is lord of one or perhaps several towns, which means that despite his savagery he is only one of the Muslim provincial rulers, nominally a vassal of the Grand Sultan; Palaiologos and Yaḥya ben ʿAlī ben Ghāniya are also obviously just troop commanders in service to their lords – Baligant, on the other hand, is the autocrat *par excellence*. To give him the name of a dependent contemporary would be counter-productive to the narrative. But what other explanations for this name can there be?

[9] The idea that *Baligant* sounds like the biblical *Baal* (as suggested e.g., by Wendt 1970, 212, Duggan 1976, 78,[409] Brault 1978, 171), is attractive in so far as the audience presumably would notice the similarity in the two names; but this does not amount to a satisfactory philological explanation.

---

407 The article is mostly written in an incoherent and impressionistic style (fifteen of the author's statements trail off with an ellipsis) and is often pretentious ("Vérité de Baligant" at the outset in the title, and the "véritables BALIGANT" in capitals for both brothers, p. 131 n.10). A mass of irrelevant details cannot hide the fact that the identification comes down to only the names in the end and has nothing to do with the facts of the matter. Many details must be disputed, including the idea that the Muslim defeat at Martorell (1115) has anything to do with the events at Roncevaux (p. 129–131), or that the name *Al-Mustaʿīn* is the basis of the name *Marsilĭe* (p. 130 n.), or that the *Noples* of the Song is based on Niebla near Seville (p. 133 n. 14), or that the *belle Aude* in the Song takes her name from the river Aude (p. 133 n. 14).

408 The Orientalist Paul Kunitzsch (1980, 352 n. 4, and 1988, 259) deemed Poncet's hypothesis not very probable, because *ibn Ghāniya* is rendered elsewhere – in the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* to be precise –as *Abengania*.

409 In Duggan (p. 78–80) unfortunately amidst a horrible mass of complete irrelevancies, including names from later epics which clearly are just variants imitating the name *Baligant* in the Rol.

[10] Finally, the idea that the name *Baligant* (including the variants *Beli-guandus* with *-e-* in the PT and *Balugant* with *-u-* in the Franco-Italian tradition) is etymologically identical to Languedoc *belugant* 'sparkling', "*par allusion aux yeux brillants des Maures*" was proposed by Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.427s. and 3.373), and supported by Spitzer (1948–1949, 400) and Ruggieri (1965, 280).[410] Because this hypothesis assumes *belugant > Beligant > Baligant*, it has unexpected literary relevance: the *Beliguandus* in the PT[411] would be the older form! We cannot credit the PT himself with the idea of using this participle as a Saracen name; for this author consistently avoids aptronymic names for Saracens (apart from the name *Ferracutus* which is obviously taken from a regional tradition), because it would endanger his Turpin disguise. But he may well have used a Saracen name that existed already in a regional tradition in south-western France, just as he did with *Ferracutus*. In the process he replaced the /y/ with the /i/ that was much more common in an unstressed position. *Beli-guandus* in the PT, along with his brother *Marsirus,* is only the ruler of Saragossa, and so there is not yet any need for a Baligant dimension in terms of meaning (unlike for the real individuals [6–8]). But because the OF equivalent of Occ. *belugar* is *belluer*, later *berluer*, which is not at all suitable as the etymology of the name Baligant in the Rol., the hypothesis can only be accepted if we accord the PT the primary, i.e. earlier position. Over the years I have myself wavered on the question of the chronological priority between the Rol. and PT, and I am still not prepared to take a final position; because of this I will present two scenarios, with the intention of harmonising them in the end.

---

410 More precisely: in Old Occ. there is only the subst. *beluga* 'spark' (attested since Marcabru), an extended verb form *belugeiar* (13th c.) and from the simple **belugar* the compound *abel(l)ugar* (attested in the first-person sg. *abelluc*, 13th c.) and finally the postverbal *beluga-men* (14th c.), which means that it is only by chance that *belugar* itself is not attested; in Modern Occ. *belugar* (with the normal dialectal variations in phonology) is attested from the Dauphiné over to Marseille and the Aveyron as far as Périgueux (FEW s. v. *pompolyx*, p. 147a, lower half, and also the dictionaries of Mistral, Honnorat, Boissier de Sauvages etc.; Mistral also has the part. *belugant* 'sparkling, brilliant' as a lemma on its own). It would be hypercritical to doubt the existence of the verb in Old Occ.

411 In the southern half of France (including Poitou, which is where the author of the PT is thought to have come from) /gu̯/ went so early to /g/, that <gu> could be hypercorrect here, e.g., to ensure that in dialects which palatalised the old /ga/ (i.e., in the whole of North Occ.), the name would be pronounced with /g/. And, of course, it is entirely irrelevant that the PT Latinises the name with an *-andus*, and not with *-ans, -antis*.

A.3.3.2 Scenario I: Chronological priority of the Chanson de Roland

The First Crusade had greatly extended the geographical perspective of the average Francophone; the military achievements of the crusaders might even have seemed more impressive than those of Charlemagne. The Chanson de Roland, before it acquired the Baligant section, was in danger of seeming provincial. The poet resolved this problem by bringing into the poem the wider crusader dimension of a battle against a whole world of opponents. Roland's death was too firmly associated with the defeat of 778 in the Pyrenees, however, and this was reinforced in the collective memory by French participation in the Reconquista of the 11th c., so that it could not be transplanted into the Orient. But the poet had the brilliant idea of shipping the whole Orient over to Spain. This allowed him to broaden out the narrative into a new, almost apocalyptic phase in the old battle between "Jerusalem" and "Babylon", which would not be over until the Last Judgement. Babylon in this context, not in the contemporary geographical sense of 'Cairo' but in the soteriological sense, is an eternally idolatrous Orient.

The events of the years 1110–1118 probably provided him with the outline of a narrative structure. This was when Al-Mustaʿīn, the last Muslim King of Saragossa, made his way up the Ebro to carry out a surprise attack on Navarre (vaguely comparable with the surprise attack on the rear guard that is described in the old Song); when he had reached the border of the Muslim territory on his way back, he met his death near Valtierra (the *Valterne* in the Song) at the hand of Alfonso el Batallador who had rushed to the scene, and everybody thought that Saragossa would then fall. But a momentous setback then took place: the Almoravids, whose great empire was based in Africa (though not the Orient) reacted quickly and on the orders of ʿAlī, the *amīr al-muslimīn* (though not quite *amīr al-muʾminīn*), an Almoravid army occupied Saragossa.[412] Although it had not come directly from Africa, but from the part of Spain that was occupied by the Almoravids, it must have seemed to the many French knights in Alfonso's army as if the whole continent was attacking them. But the Almoravids were only able to hold onto Saragossa until 1118, when Alfonso launched a huge operation near Saragossa, again with considerable help from the French, and defeated a strong Almoravid relief army, so that the city surrendered a few days later. In the new Song, Charlemagne's revenge is directed first of all at Marsilĭe's army near the Ebro, but then a momentous setback occurs when Baligant and his army capture Saragossa and other places, and the town does not surrender until after Charlemagne's defeat of Baligant. These parallel elements in the two sequences of events constitute one of

---

412 Details also considering the Arabic sources e.g., in Bosch Vilá (1956, 186s.) and Turk (1974–1975, 70–74).

the strongest arguments for dating the song in the form that we have it now to 1118 at the earliest.

The lord of the 'heathens' is then, along with his name, invented by our poet. The poet introduces him with the statement (v. 2614): [Marsilĭe] *En Ba-bilonĭe Ba-ligant ad mandét.* The use of identical initial sounds in both names is not coincidental; the poet used this same technique in *Cap-uël de Cap-adoce*, *Tur-gis de Tur-teluse* and *Be-von de Be-lne*. In these three cases the toponym is clearly the main element, and the personal name is formed or selected with reference to the toponym;[413] it stands to reason that *Ba-ligant de Ba-bilonĭe* is constructed in a similar way. We know that the ancient, eternally idolatrous Babylon is meant because of the verse that follows: *Ço est l'amiraill, le viel d'antiquitét.*[414] OF *anti-quité* and MLat. *antiquitas* usually mean 'bygone epochs'; 'antiquity or the ancient world' in our modern sense is sometimes, but not always, clearly meant,[415] and here, with the key word 'Babylon' in the previous verse, there is no reason to interpret it as anything other than 'antiquity' including the ancient Orient, and especially including Babylon.

This does not mean that Baligant himself is of supernatural age,[416] but a straightforward metonymy is used, since by simply naming his dynasty and

---

413 *Capuël* is the poet's *ad hoc* invention, *Turgis* is a Norman name that is perhaps becoming slightly antiquated by the time of writing, *Bevon* (< *Bibo* or *Bovo*, Morlet 57a) in this form is a relatively rare Frankish name; more detail below in the analysis of each individual name (A.5.11, A.9.7, C.8.8).

414 I trust I will be forgiven for plagiarising my own work from the *Romania* (Beckmann 2004c, 540–542) in the discussion here.

415 As in Albéric (v.7s.): *solaz nos faz' antiquitas / que tot non sie vanitas* 'may [pagan] antiquity [here: the following Alexander material] bring us leisurely enrichment that is not just empty vanity'; or in the Munich *Brut* (v. 307): *l'antiquiteiz Albe la nome* 'antiquity called the town *Alba* (*Longa*)'.

416 Even though later readers have perhaps understood this passage in this way and have produced more or less serious analogies: *Chanson de Guillaume* 1334s.: William thinks he is about 350 years old; *Saisnes* 1194AR/1138LT: Tierri says that he was knighted more than 100 years ago; *Elie de Saint-Gilles* 14: the old Julien is over 100; *Guibert d'Andrenas* 177s.: the old Aimeri is 140; *Aquin* 854: Ohés is now 140, his father lived to the age of 300 (examples from Ménard 1969, 96). The corresponding motif of the *muʿammarīn* in the Arabic folk epic is more important, cf. EI s. v. *muʿammar*, and Heller (1931, 50 and 63–66). For some time, I was very worried about a possible model for Baligant, Hadhād ibn Balghām [!], who lived for 1000 years and built the pyramids (Heller 1931, 50), which of course are close to *Babilonĭe* 'Cairo'! But a little later, Heller calls him (1931, 66) Hadhād ibn Balʿām, which means son of Bileam (Vulg. *Balaam*), the biblical figure after all. Furthermore, in the ʿAntar romance, the king of Christian Spain, Yunṭāʾīl (according to Heller probably < *Santiago*), who also intends to conquer the Orient, is more than 270 years old. But even though Baligant is not (Hadhād ibn) Balʿām, the question remains: given the popularity of the *muʿammarīn* in the Muslim area, is it

explaining that it comes from the Orient of antiquity, he is immediately recognised as the last of this ancient pedigree. This image of him is then similar to the one given in the PT (cap. 17): there, too, the *gigas quidam nomine Ferracutus de genere Goliath*, who is sent from 'Syria' by *Babilonis Admirandus* to fight against Charlemagne, is a survivor of the almost extinct race of giants, but he is not unnaturally old himself, just a very lusty warrior, like Baligant. There is a giant in the Bible – besides Goliath, and more clearly than he – who is highly relevant to our context, and whose race, or we might even say dynasty, had survived from an early epoch of human history into the following one: he is Og, the King of Bashan, who *solus [. . .] restiterat de stirpe gigantum* (*Deut* 3.11, cf. *Gen* 6.4), when Moses defeated and killed him, after God had encouraged Moses with the words 'Fear him not!' (*Num* 21.35). The special test that the people of God and their leader are given, is not the opposing army, but rather its leader as the last of his dynasty, who emerges from a much more powerful age and now reaches into the present to strike fear into the heart of the people of God and their leader.[417] The Roland poet has carried this special test over and applied it to his people of God and their leader Charlemagne, and at the most critical moment, Charlemagne also has to be encouraged by God's angel, with the words *Reis magnes, que fais-tu?* (v. 3611).

The following verse (2616) can be explained in a similar way: *Tut survesquiêt e Virgilïe e Omer [. . .].*[418] Moses had to fight with a survivor from the preceding, much tougher epoch; but, from a medieval perspective, which epoch would have been the tougher one as compared with Charlemagne's? It would be the heroic world of the ancient epic, represented by the works of Vergil and Homer (the latter in the form of the *Ilias Latina*). Because Vergil appears here with Homer, the point is not to emphasise Vergil's role as a magician, as he tended to be seen in the Middle Ages, but it is about Vergil and Homer as poets;[419] and since they are nowhere portrayed as epitomes of longevity, the

---

just a coincidence that it is the Muslim Marsilïe who thinks Charlemagne is more than 200 years old (v. 524), or has the poet somehow got wind of this fashion and caricatured it?

417 It is not explicitly stated in the Bible that Moses defeated Og in single combat, but it was easy to imagine that this was the case; this is demonstrably what happened in the Jewish tradition (bab. Talmud, *Berakhot* 54b) and from there it was carried forward into the Arabic tradition (aṭ-Ṭabarī, trans. Zotenberg, vol. I, p. 51).

418 V. 2616 only exists in O. But the topic is already suggested in the directly preceding *antiquitét* 'antiquity', O generally does not tend towards amplification, and from our perspective of a modern reader we are well placed to understand why β left out such a curious-sounding statement.

419 Vergil and Homer are portrayed as the two authors who should be read above all others by Quintilian (*inst.* 1.8.5). Furthermore, the expansion of the Carolingian educational reforms

focus is not on the length of their lives, but once again, via simple metonymy, it is on their poetic works and the world that was represented in them: Baligant belongs to a dynasty (and this gives him a heroic dimension) which reaches all the way from the heroic world of antiquity into Charlemagne's time.

Does the fact that the Roland poet values the concept of dynasty so much in his representation of Baligant tell us something about how to interpret his name? Family relationships are often signalled in the Rol. through the use of identical or quasi-identical elements in the first part of names: Basan and his brother Basilië, Clarïen and his brother Clarifan, Guenelun and his uncle Guinemer, Machiner and his uncle Maheu, Malcud and his sone Malquiant. What did people in the Middle Ages think were the names of the kings of ancient Babylon? We must remember that even in classical antiquity,[420] and then also for the Church fathers,[421] Babylonia and Assyria were usually seen as one and the same thing. The most popular chronicle of all, that of Eusebius translated and continued by Jerome, adds a long list of Babylonian-Assyrian high kings taken from pagan literature. The first king in this line ruled Babylon for 65 years:[422]

Belus. Quite a few details about this king are interesting for our context. The story tells how after his death, his son Ninus helped to ensure that he would be worshipped as a god; thus, he became "Bel of Babel" who was called *Baal* by the Sidonians and Phoenicians (according to Jerome and Isidore) or *Bal* (according

---

meant that Vergil was ubiquitous, and admiration for him was often expressed by pairing him with Homer, as we see in dedicatory poems by Bertoldus, for Bishop Jonas of Orléans (MGH PLAeC. 4.1060); John Scotus, *Carmina* 2.1s.; *Gesta Berengarii* prol. 3s.; this is repeated in Scaliger's *Poetice* (1561), which rates the artistry of Vergil even higher than that of Homer (LM s. v. *Vergil im Mittelalter*).

420 Pliny 6.121 *Babylon, Chaldaicarum gentium caput, diu summam claritatem inter urbes obtinuit toto orbe, propter quod reliqua pars Mesopotamiae Assyriaeque Babylonia appellata est*; Solinus 56.1 *Chaldaeae gentis caput Babylonia est, tam nobilis, ut propter eam et Assyrii et Mesopotamia in Babyloniae nomen transierunt.*

421 In the Bible (*Gen* 10.8–11) Noah's great-grandson was Nimrod – the first person to ever set himself up as a king – becoming ruler of Babylon first of all, and then also founding Nineveh in Assyria; the book of Judith (*Iudith* 1.1) could not tell Assyrians and Babylonians apart either: *Nabuc(h)odonosor* 'Nebuchadnezzar' is 'King of the Assyrians in the great city of Nineveh'! Thus, the Church fathers were able to continue the ancient tradition (cf. previous n.): Augustine *civ.* 16.17 *In Assyria igitur praevaluerat dominatus inpiae civitatis, huius caput est illa Babylon*; Orosius 7.2.1 *Babylonam urbem Assyriorum tunc principem gentium*; Isidore 14.3.14 *Babyloniae regionis caput Babylon urbs est, a qua et nuncupata, tam nobilis, ut Chaldaea et Assyria et Mesopotamia in eius nomen aliquando transierint.*

422 Augustine *civ.* 16.17: *Beli, qui primus illic regnaverat sexaginta quinque annos.*

to Servius in the Aeneid commentary).[423] In Ovid (*Met.* 4.212) the seventh descendant of this *priscus Belus* ruled over Persia. In Vergil (*Aen.* 1.621, 1.729s.) Dido's father Belus was a distant descendant of the first Belus, and when the queen was making a toast to celebrate Carthaginian-Trojan friendship, she drank out of a cup from which every Belid king from the very first Belus onwards had drunk. The Latin authors' insistence on a long line of Belids may well have contributed to the citing of Vergil in the Rol. In Jerome's list of Belus' descendants, the sixth is a contemporary of the patriarch Isaac and is called

Baleus.[424] A century later, during the lifetime of Joseph, the ninth king is once more a

Baleus.[425] The Bible tells us about the time when the shadow of the Babylonian Empire (now in the narrower, more precise sense) was cast over Israel. The first *rex Babyloniorum* cited there is

Berodach Baladan, filius Baladan (2 *Reg* 20.12ss.). The last in the chronological line of Babylonian kings named in the Bible (*Dan* 5.1ss.) is known as *Belshazzar* and in the Vulgate as

Balthasar. Other Assyrian and Babylonian kings have certainly had a greater impact on Israel's destiny, such as the Assyrian Sennacherib or the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar. But there is no other chain of names that compares with (*Belus* –) *Bal-eus* (2x) – *Bal-adan* (2x) – *Bal-thasar*, in the number of links or in its durability through time; for according to Eusebius, Balthasar ruled 1280 years after the first Baleus. The formula behind the names of members of this dynasty was therefore *Bal- + -X*. The *-X* was left to the Roland poet's discretion; he must have freely invented the middle part *-ig-*, and for the ending he selected the popular epic ending *-ant*.[426] So much for the Chanson de Roland scenario.[427]

---

423 Jerome, *De nominibus hebraicis* 101.29 as well as on *Ez* 23.11 and *Os* 2.16; Servius on *Aen.* 1.642 and 1.729; Isidore 8.11.23–27.

424 Jerome *chron.* a. 161 after Abraham (27a ed. Helm); Augustine *civ.* 18.3; Jordanes *Rom.* 18; Cassiodorus *chron.* (ed. MGH AA 11) 2.121.13 – and the later authors who copied this.

425 Jerome *chron.* a. 264 after Abraham (30a ed. Helm); Augustine *civ.* 18.3.4 and 6; Orosius 1.8.10; Jordanes *Rom.* 21; Cassiodorus *chron.* (ed. MGH AA 11) 2.121, 16 – and the later authors who copied this.

426 On *-ant* cf. n. 234 above.

427 Even before the end of the 12th c., the Alexander epic writers were learning lessons from the Baligant section: analogous to *Ba-ligant de Ba-bilonie* they created *Ali-xandre d'Ali-er*, for which no explanation has ever been found (Armstrong 1942, 34s.). Furthermore, Alexander only captured Babylon on his way back from India, just before he was poisoned. What should its ruler be called? The *Bal* names were already taken for *Bal-igant*; that is why they resorted to the name of another high king, the *Nabu-c(h)odonosor* ('Nebuchadnezzar') of the Vulgate, and

How does the PT fit into this scenario? He had been familiar with a Chanson de Roland without any Baligant section since his youth, and then on his travels in France he gathered more epic material, but just before he finished his work, he came across the Baligant section. He was in a position to recognise this immediately as a recent work of individual fiction. He feared that if he included it, then any member of his audience who was as critical as he was himself would begin to doubt that he was the Archbishop Turpin, and everything would fall apart. If he did not include it, the many uncritical consumers of his work would complain that the biggest and most important part was missing – and he had boasted in his introductory letter that he was the first person to furnish a complete report of everything that happened during Charlemagne's Spanish campaigns. Thus, he only had one option: he must drastically diminish Baligant. Yes, there was this *Beliguandus*,[428] and he had indeed come from Babylonia/Persia, but along with his brother Marsirus, he was just a co-regent in Saragossa; when Marsirus died, he fled and we are not even told whether he was one of the four thousand Saragossans who, according to PT, were killed by Charlemagne when he pursued them along the banks of the Ebro.

A.3.3.3 Scenario II: Chronological priority of the Pseudo-Turpin

If we vote for the priority of the PT, then we will adopt Sainéan's etymology of *belugant* 'with glittering eyes' (A.3.3 [10]), although as explained above, this participle must have been used as a Saracen name in a southern French regional tradition before the PT. What kind of tradition must this have been? Only twenty years after Charlemagne's huge but disastrous Spanish adventure, the conditions that started it all off were beginning to repeat themselves. At the end of 796, when al-Ḥakam I. of Córdoba recalled Amrūs, the commander in charge of the upper military border and therefore also of Saragossa, to Córdoba, a local resident called Baḥlūl ibn Marzūq took advantage of Amrūs' absence and assumed control over Huesca, and then Saragossa as well. Just like Ibn al-Arabi before him, he now made advances towards the Franks: he had gifts sent over to the Frankish leaders in Aquitaine and sued for peace. This is how he appeared in the *Vita Hludovici* by the Astronomus (cap. 8), where the Franks shortened the name *Baḥlū[l ibn Marzū]q* to *Bah(a)lu-c*:[429] *[rex Hludovicus] necnon et Bahaluc [sic]*

---

his loyal assistant *Nabu-zardan*: in the romance, the ruler is called *Nabu-gor*, his nephew *Nabu-sardan* (Foulet 1976, 71–73).

428 The *-e-* shows either that he was influenced by Occ. *belugant* or that he wanted to alter the form of the name as a way of feigning authority.

429 The form *Bahaluc* does not have any variations, and so it must be taken seriously.

Sarracenorum ducis, qui locis montuosis Aquitaniae proximis principabatur, missos pacem petentes et dona ferentes suscepit et remisit. But al-Ḥakam sent an army after Baḥlūl, which first drove him out of Saragossa and into Alto Aragon, and in 802 Amrūs was once again sent out to be in charge of the upper military border, whereupon Baḥlūl was killed. This region was in no way pro-Christian, but it had its own distinctive and therefore anti-Córdoba attitude (which had played a crucial role in both the start and the end of Charlemagne's Spanish adventure), and so over the course of the following two centuries Baḥlūl was hailed as a half-legendary hero there. In fact, from 1018–1110 Saragossa *de facto* enjoyed independence under the Tudžībids and Hūdids, and the ever-expanding epic *ardžūza* about Baḥlūl's rise and fall came to be included in the writings of the historian al-ʿUdhrī (died 1085).

Some have claimed that the Germanic Walther and the Romance Gaiferos legends are based on the Baḥlūl legend, but this is improbable.[430] It is likely, however, that given Baḥlūl's fortunes on the southern side of the Pyrenees, at least his name and some basic facts about his morally distinctive character as the ruler of Saragossa would have been familiar even to people living on the northern side – in other words, this is what the PT would know about him.[431] In the spoken language of southern France, *Bahaluc* must quickly have turned into a simple /balyk/. It only differed in the -*a*- from the form /belyk/, the first-person sg. pres. indicative and in the first- and third-person pres. subj. of the verb *belugar*.[432] The process of secondary meaning acquisition, as we see in so many Saracen names, then led to the name being considered as having this word stem, and since a person could hardly be called a 'spark', but could definitely be described

---

430 On the whole topic of Baḥlūl I refer to my own work (Beckmann 2010, 87–90), where I also take issue with this hypothesis.

431 We could perhaps go even further: there was probably a historical model for the motif of the two brothers ruling over the one kingdom of Saragossa in the figures of brothers Maṭrūḥ and ʿAysūn; they were the real opponents of the Franks in Roncevaux (this is very convincingly argued by Menéndez Pidal 1960, 183–189, 204–209, 520). The Franks must gradually have learned about the role they played, because in Saragossa they could not keep their successful coup secret, nor would they have wanted to. The southern French legend might therefore have promoted the pair of brothers to the status of kings of Saragossa, and the less significant ʿAysūn, who was killed shortly after Roncevaux (*Akhbār madžmūʿa*, trans. James 2012, 109), might have been replaced by Baḥlūl/*Bahaluc*, who was less than a generation younger, was also in Saragossa when he rebelled against Córdoba, and who then twice made advances towards the Franks; similarly, the name *Maṭrūḥ* might later have been replaced by *Marsirus* (< *[al-] Manṣūr* x *Mundhir*): which would then give the pair of royal brothers *Marsirus* and *Beliguandus* in the PT. Cf. also n. 734 below!

432 A compound noun is attested in Old Occ. namely *abel(l)lugar* as *abelluc*; cf. n. 410 above.

as 'sparkling', i.e., having sparkling eyes, it could become *Belugant*, and finally in the PT *Belig(u)and(us)*. This concludes the PT scenario. The PT has done what he always does with epic material: he includes the existing material essentially as he finds it, except for occasional slight alterations that he needs in order to make it harmonise with the new context.

And the Rol.? The general conditions in the Baligant section (necessity, events of 1110–1118) are as outlined above in the introductory part of scenario I. But in order to pre-empt, at least in part, the unwanted accusation that this was "pure fantasy", the poet did not create the Lord of the 'heathen'dom *ex nihilo*, but instead he remodelled the one figure in the existing material who was best suited to that role: this Baligant, who came from Babylon to Saragossa and survived Roland, but whose eventual death had not been reported in any detail.

A.3.3.4 Harmonising the two scenarios

Thus, we have two scenarios, both of which promise illuminating information, except they contradict each other. But they only differ, strictly speaking, in the less important part. Even if scenario II is correct, the Roland poet has made *Beligant* into *Baligant*, phonologically at least. We have an impressive ms. corpus for each, that verifies both the *-e-* in the PT and the *-a-* of the Song, and it certainly is not a matter of chance, because a poet will surely consider very carefully how he is going to name one of his main characters. The obvious answer to the question "Why *Bal-* rather than *Bel-*?" is that the poet in this instance also wanted to bring the name *Ba-ligant* closer to *Ba-bilonĭe,* and he was no doubt thinking of the whole series of names from *Bal-eus* to *Bal-thasar* at the same time. Even if Baligant had been elevated from a pre-existing Beligant, one of two rulers in Saragossa, his most important attribute is his position now as the *vieil d'antiquitét*, as the representative of the wicked *Babylon illa magna* of ancient times; this elevation would then be a literary artifice no less admirable than the alternative, which is free invention.

A.3.3.5 Baligan(t) as a Christian name

Rajna (1889, 17) suggested a name from 1153 in Italy, a phonologically somewhat dubious *Barigando*, and then some more convincing references from the 13th century (*Balegantus*, *Baliganus*, *Belegantus*, *Bellagante*); later, Rosellini (1958, 257) added a *Belicant* from 1257. As far as I am aware, no one has yet found evidence of any person with this as a first name or epithet anywhere in Western Europe in the period before 1200; the first reference is in the Paris tax roll of 1292 to an epithet or family name *Baligan* (Michaëlsson 1927–36, 1.93). However, I recently found a reference to an Anglo-Norman priest called *Ricardus Baligan* in a charter

dating from between 1155 and April 1161;[433] the *terminus ante quem* is the death of Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury, who is named as a witness in the charter, making this a very definite latest possible date. The epithet is a reference to the Song complete with a Baligant section, or in other words, the Song in the form that we have it now; it is an extremely rare name, and so this is certainly not just coincidental. The fact that the epithet appears in a charter means that the bearer must have had it for at least a few years before 1161, and then the Song must be a few years older than that, even if it originated in England. This would fit well with a late dating of the Song to the period 1148–1150 if it were written in the Norman or Anglo-Norman area. It fits less well with the suggestion that the Song was written at that time in Saint-Denis, as suggested by Hans-Erich Keller (1989, 9–75).

A.4 Narrative technique in the Baligant section

A.4.1 The *descriptio* of Baligant's character

The darkness and evil which were associated with Babylon in medieval Christian thinking rub off on Baligant's character almost exclusively in one particular respect: in the hubris that of course was epitomised in Babylon by the building of the famous tower. Thus, he says in v. 2658s.: *Carles li reis, l'emperere des Francs, / Ne deit manger se jo ne li cumant.*[434] A *maltét* in his nature comes briefly to the fore in the naming of his lance. In all other respects, however, the poet grants him a status almost as high as that of Charlemagne.[435] *Deus! Quel baron, s'oüst chrestïentet!* (v. 3164). More than anything else, he remains absolutely true to his erroneous beliefs, and he shows no signs of the deliberate lying that is normally a clear attribute of the Antichrist and his followers; he is an instrument of the devil, but almost to the end *bona fide*, and the latter point is at least as important for the literary status of the Baligant section as the former. Here, too, a comparison is informative, e.g., with the *Chanson de Sainte Foy* which crudely (v. 484s.) calls Maximian and Diocletian *pejor qu' altre Judeu*. In the case of the Rol., on the other hand, as rightly emphasised by Jenkins (on v. 3164): "The poet enhances the greatness of Charles by magnifying his opponent". The greater the enemy,

---

433 For further details cf. Beckmann (2012, 500–502). Some points from this article are repeated here.

434 Cf. also v. 2682, 3288–3290.

435 I am aware that Brault (1978, passim) takes the very opposite view, but I think his judgement is biased, especially in this instance.

the greater the honour. Ideological factors fade into the background when they risk detracting from the narrative technique.

The outer appearance of Baligant is described as follows (v. 3158–3164):

> La forceüre ad asez grant li ber,
> Graisles <l> es flancs e larges les costez;
> Gros ad le piz, belement est mollét,
> Lées espalles e le vis ad mult cler,
> Fier le visage, le chef recercelét,
> Tant par ert blancs cume flur en estét;
> De vasselage est suvent esprovét.

As far as I am aware, an important trait of this description has not yet been mentioned in the literature. Although the description is quite condensed, it follows the traditional *descriptio* technique; but it shows a single, deliberate deviation from this model. We can see this if we compare it with its closest parallel, the description of Alexander by Albéric (v. 60–73):

> Saur ab lo peyl cun de peysson,
> tot cresp cun coma de leon;
> l'un uyl ab glauc cun de dracon,
> et l'altre neyr cun de falcon;
> de la figura en aviron
> beyn resemplet fil de baron.
> Clar ab lo vult, beyn figurad,
> saur lo cabeyl, recercelad,
> Plen lo collet et colorad,
> ample lo peyz et aformad,
> lo bu subtil, non trob delcad,
> lo corps d'aval beyn enforcad,
> lo poyn el braz avigurad,
> fer lo talent et apensad.

The two passages share some verbal overlaps, but only one of them is distinctive: *recercelét / recercelad;* I am not sure whether this points to a direct relationship between the two descriptions or not. If a late dating of the Rol. is assumed, then the chronological priority would lie with Albéric, and in the Rol. this would be just another of its "Alexander-inspired" elements. But precisely if there is no dependence of the one upon the other, this makes the comparison all the more revealing. Albéric's description follows the basic principle of proceeding from top to bottom, and this is the standard approach; after all, when we want to examine someone more closely, we look at the person eye-to-eye, taking in the head, first of all, and then letting our gaze slide downwards. In the Rol., however, the description runs from bottom to top. Why is this? If we

look straight in front of us, we see what is at our eye level – Baligant's lower body, and then our gaze slides upwards to take in the rest of him; this is because he is (according to v. 3155) mounted on his horse. The poet really saw him like this in his mind's eye and did not make him up following the rules of the textbook. It is this detail in the "truth of the gestures", to use Hofmannsthal's language, this apparently insignificant addition to, and alteration of, schoolbook learning that so often separates genius from talent.

A.4.2 The illuminated fleet

Baligant's fleet is described as it approaches Spain (v. 2632–2637):

> En sum cez maz e en cez haltes vernes
> Asez i ad carbuncles[436] e lanternes:
> La sus amunt pargetent tel luiserne,
> † Par la noit la mer en est plus bele.

And once again when it sails up the Ebro shortly afterwards (v. 2642–2644):

> Par Sebre amunt tut lur naviries turnent.
> Asez i ad lanternes e carbuncles:
> Tute la noit mult grant clartét lur dunent.

In the poet's own experience, or more precisely, as far as he knew from the personal experiences of others who reported back to him, there had only ever been one such illuminated fleet: in 1066 when William the Conqueror crossed over to England. The best source, the *Gesta Guillelmi* by William of Poitiers (before 1077, f. 164 ed. Foreville), only reports that the duke's galley had a lantern at the top of its mast. But the detail is different in the *Carmen de Hastingae proelio* (v. 106ss. ed. Morton, also quoted by Gicquel 2003, 236):

> Nox ubi cęca polum tenebrosis occupat umbris
> Et negat obsequium Cynthia tecta tibi,
> Imples non aliter facibus rutilantibus undas,
> Sýdera quam cęlum, sole ruente, replent.
> Quot fuerant naves, totidem tu lumina spargis.
> [One pentameter is missing.]
> Impositę malis permulta luce laternę
> Tramite directo per mare uela regunt.

---

436 On the blazing *carbuncles* cf. below s. v. Tervagan (A.13.2.2), especially n. 870.

This passage is addressed to William: in the black night, when the dark clouds obscure the heavens, when the moon is covered over and so refuses its services, William fills the sea with as many torches as the stars fill the sky after sunset, because he has supplied every ship with its own light source; the lanterns attached to the masts then shine a profusion of light to guide the ships straight to their destination across the sea.

The two descriptions do not necessarily contradict each other: the duke's ship is probably marked out from the other ships by its lantern, which is considerably larger than all the others.

The *Carmen* is preserved with the ending missing in a single ms. from around 1130 somewhere in Northern France or Flanders and some scholars have suspected it as being nothing more than a rhetorical *exercitium* from this period and region (e.g.,R. H. C. Davis 1978, passim), but today, thanks mostly to Barlow (1999, Introduction), it has been rehabilitated as an original work from the time shortly after the famous battle. Fortunately, there is a simple reason why we do not have to take a position in this debate. Contemporaries estimated that William's ships numbered somewhere between one thousand and three thousand (Douglas 1995, 453 n. 40). But even if it had been only one hundred to three hundred – they were filled with soldiers, many of whom would have had heavy armour and a horse; William won the battle largely because of his heavily armoured cavalry. Now, let us imagine a hundred ships loaded up like this, sticking as closely together as possible and sailing as fast as possible through the pitch-black darkness of the night, all aiming towards the same point on the English coast. If every ship had not been equipped with a top light, then collisions, and probably even mass collisions would have been inevitable; even those soldiers who would have been able to swim to safety would have been more of a hindrance than a help to William, and this whole episode would have been a demoralising omen before the battle had even started. No-one will accuse William, probably the best planner of his day, of failing to recognise this danger. Direct knowledge of the illumination escapade must surely have reached the poet independently of the *Carmen*, simply because it was such an unusual event.[437]

---

437 Under these circumstances it is almost irrelevant that there is one – and very probably only one – literary parallel to this (an early reference to it is in Freeman 1877, 3.397s.): according to Livy 29.25, when Scipio and his army were crossing over to Africa, he ordered that each troop transporter should be fitted with one lamp, each cargo ship with two, and the lead ship should have three.

A.4.3 Who killed Amborre?

There is a crux surrounding Amborre: who killed him in the song's archetype, Charlemagne's standard-bearer Gefrei or Ogier? Here is the relevant passage in Segre's edition (v. 3543–3554):

> Mult ben i fiert Carlemagnes li reis,
> Naimes le dux e Oger li Daneis,
> Geifreid d'Anjou, ki l'enseigne teneit
> {Mult par est proz danz Ogers li Daneis;
> Puint le ceval, laisset curre ad espleit,
> Si vait ferir celui ki le dragun teneit}
> † Ambure cravente en la place devant sei
> E le dragon e l'enseigne le rei.
> Baligant veit sun gunfanun cadeir
> E l'estandart Mahumet remaneir:
> Li amiralz alques s'en aperceit
> Quë il ad tort e Carlemagnes dreit.

The verses 3546–3548 in curly brackets are only in O (and even there 3546 from *proz* is written over an erasure); K deviates so far away from this that we cannot base any decision on it, and in the other β the verses are missing. Those who agree with O that it is Ogier who defeats Amborrre include Scholle and Bédier, while those who consider Gefrei as the victor include a) regarding V4 as the best among those in β, i.e., with athetization of v. 3546–3548, Perschmann, Stengel and Segre, and b) with athetization or bracketing only of v. 3546 Jenkins and Hilka/Pfister, and finally c) simply changing the part of v. 3546 that is written over the erasure, Burger; cf. on the history of the secondary literature Burger (1987, 543–545) and Segre (ad loc.). The debate has centred on the whole passage v. 3543–3554 and much philological ingenuity has been deployed in the process, which we need not consider here: all in all, Bédier argues here, as elsewhere, for the *précellence* of O, and Scholle assumes a jump from *teneit* to *teneit* in β, while the majority (in all three variants) argue instead – and in my opinion correctly – that the hugely symbolic duel between the standard-bearers should be kept, because its ending prefigures the duel between Charlemagne and Baligant that follows immediately after and decides the outcome of the battle.

Thus far, however, there has been a missing piece in the argument advanced by the majority of scholars, namely a tangible reason why O, or rather one of his predecessors, has interpolated Ogier into this scene. Verbruggen's informative section 'De tactische betekenis van het vaandel' (1954, 169–172, 557s.) in his major work on medieval warfare is a useful reference in this respect. He

starts with some examples showing how the dropping of the standard in the Middle Ages usually signalled that the battle was lost, and so for that very reason had to be avoided at all costs.[438] This is why before any battle commenced, the Templars organised a group of ten knights whose sole task was to prevent any enemy from ever touching the standard. In particular, in the Templar rules it was strictly forbidden, on pain of expulsion from the Order or even incarceration, to use a lance which served as the shaft of a banner – which in effect means the standard itself – as a weapon. Exposing the community to mortal danger through undisciplined bravado, no matter how well intended it might be, had to be punished. We can take it as read that this simple idea was very well known, and we can see signs of something similar even in the Song: *Kar vasselage par sens n'est pas folie: / Mielz valt mesure que ne fait estultie* – as Olivier says in v. 1724s. Gefrei breaks precisely this taboo;[439] but just as the poet is ultimately on Roland's side, and not Olivier's, so too, he is on Gefrei's side in this instance. The interpolator, however, fixed this problem very skilfully by inserting Ogier between him and Amborre, perhaps adding three verses (Segre), or perhaps – and this would still qualify as a kind *précellence* – by changing only verse 3546 from the word *proz* to the end (Burger).[440] The opposite explanation is indeed improbable: that someone by simply removing Ogier would bring a great duel between the two standard-bearers into the song.

A.4.4 The pagan insignia

Marsilĭe's standard-bearer Abisme carried only a *dragun* (v. [1641]= 1480), which means a flag made to look like a dragon, attached to the tip of a lance at the front, and with a tube of fabric flapping at the back; but richer symbolism is required for the Baligant section. By way of introduction (v. 3266–3270) it is said of Baligant: *Dedavant sei fait porter sun dragon / E l'estandart Tervagan e Mahum / E un'ymagene Apolin le felun. / D[i]s Canelius chevalchent envirun, / Mult haltement escriënt un sermun [. . .]* (It is more or less the same in β.) Since

---

438 There are also good examples in Baltzer (1877, 112).

439 A knight in battle normally fights with his shield on the left side, and with first his lance and then his sword on the right. The standard-bearer is equipped differently: he needs at least one arm to hold the standard. If he uses his right arm, or if he needs two arms (for larger standards), he is not able to use his sword. If he wants to attack someone suddenly, then the only thing he can do is use, or in fact misuse the standard.

440 In β the three verses are then missing with a jump from *teneit* to *teneit*, as Scholle supposed.

in v. 3279–3321 Baligant's army is still at ease at this point, *dedavant sei fait porter* means 'has [the objects] brought before him', and not 'has [the objects] brought out to the front [of the battle]', and the Canelius carry out their pagan ritual around the static objects.

There is not yet any mention of anyone carrying these objects. Then in v. 3297 Baligant gives out his order: *L'enseigne port Amborres d'Oluferne!* (In Segre's edition following Stengel; the subjunctive comes from β, while the other editors read *portet*, but this makes no difference to our analysis).

In v. 3330–3331 Charlemagne catches sight of these objects: *Carles li magnes, cum il vit l'amiraill / E le dragon, l'enseigne e l'estandart [. . .]* (This is essentially also the narrative of β, where *dragon* is in CV7PT, *enseigne* is in V4CV7PT, *estandart* appears as *stant* in V4; L has no Baligant section.)

In v. 3550, and again in v. 3551–3552 two objects are discussed, which fall with Amborre. In O, v. 3550 states: *E le dragon e l'enseigne le rei*; but according to Segre, the verse is "sospetto": it seems to call Baligant *le rei,* it is missing in V4PT, and it is almost impossible to decide whether the *Lors chiet s'enseigne a terre en un chemois* in CV7 is genetically related to it, or whether the circumstances dictate that the single word *enseigne* occurs in both. Perschmann (1880, 45, cited in Segre) believed that the verse in O could have been added in order to fill out the meaning of the preceding *ambure* 'both' (interpreted out of *Ambor[r]e*). Because of this, I shall not discuss the verse.

With v. 3551–3552, which describe the outcome of Amborre's downfall from Baligant's perspective, we are back on firmer ground. O states: *Baligant veit sun gunfanun cadeir / E l'estandart Mahumet remaneir [. . .]* (*remaneir* meaning 'rester sur le carreau, to founder or fail', Bédier: 's'abat, breaks down'; cf. also the negative sense of *remaneir* in v. 598 and 3798). V4 has: *Ballugant si revid ses insigna chai / E lo stendart Trivigant remani*. P reads: *Baligans vit son confanon cheoir / Et Aubertin [= Amborre] mort jesir devant soi / Et Mahommet enz el champ remanoir*. (CV7 on the other hand shifts the focus towards the emotion of the event: *Quant Balligant le vit, si fu plus noirs / Que poiz remise ne charbon de jarrois*; and finally, T talks about something else entirely.) V4 has therefore only changed the description of 'his (personal) *gonfanon*' to 'his (personal) *enseigne*' but does confirm the word *estandart*; P confirms *sun gunfanun* and (after an insertion that is understandable) the *estandart* too. The sub-archetype of all of β was the same as O – and so it is also the archetype of all.

And now the significance of the whole narrative is made clear. When Amborre falls, the first thing that Baligant sees falling is his personal symbol of authority; it was introduced as a '(flag with) image of Apolin', then taken up as 'the (personal) sign (*enseigne*)'and finally called 'his (personal) flag (*sun gunfanun*)'.

The second thing Baligant sees falling is the large *estandart,* the universal symbol of the whole 'pagan' religious community.

This sort of association of a universal and a personal standard was nothing out of the ordinary in western thinking of that period; e.g., in 1066 at Hastings King Harold had two standards at his side: the dragon of Wessex as a battle standard for the kingdom, and the "fighting man" as his own standard; cf. Douglas 1995, 204.

In the Battle of Ascalon in 1099, Robert of Normandy brought down the enemy standard-bearer and captured the banner; Boissonnade (1923, 257) thinks this has been our poet's inspiration. He may well be right; but since Robert was not himself 'the' standard-bearer of the Christians and also since he attacked the people around the enemy standard-bearer – and no doubt also the bearer himself – *ferro,* which means using his sword (cf. especially Robert of Reims 8.19, RHC Occ. 3.875), then even if this did inspire our poet, it still would have been the poet who added the grand symbolism of the two standard-bearers fighting with each other. This is the key to the whole scene because it is only through this symbolism that we understand the enormity of the moment: for both sides it is all or nothing.

A.4.5 Que fais-tu?

When Charlemagne is badly wounded in single combat with Baligant and about to fall, he hears the archangel's question (v. 3611): *Reis magnes, que fais-tu?* This instantly banishes all mortal fear from him (v. 3613); with his very next blow he kills Baligant, and the 'heathens' flee in panic.

Two parallels have been identified in the literature. Jenkins (ad loc.) refers to the *Descriptio* of Charlemagne's journey to the Orient. Bédier (1926–1929, 4.125) dated it later than the First Crusade, but before 1124. In the *Descriptio* Charlemagne and his army are lost in a forest full of griffins, bears, lions, lynx and tigers (which incidentally is reminiscent of Charlemagne's dream in v. 2541–2553); Charlemagne then sings the Psalm (118.35) *Deduc me, Domine, in semitam mandatorum tuorum*, and a bird appears, who leads the Franks out of the forest with his constant call *Quid dicis, France? France, quid dicis?* – 'to this day' the birds in that forest are still singing just like this (Rauschen 1890, 109). Here Charlemagne is once again in dire need; but *quid dicis* only vaguely fits the context and is really only intended to imitate the sound of the bird's tweet. Also, the idea of constant repetition is quite different from the crucial moment of mortal danger in the Rol. This means that the tale is simply an edifying miracle like many others.

Brault (1978, 466) is reminded of the scene in the PT (cap. 1). Its dating relative to the Rol. is a problem that has not been fully resolved. Here Saint James suddenly appears to the sleeping Charlemagne and asks the question *Quid agis, fili mi?*, and only then reveals who he is. He goes on to express his dismay about Charlemagne's failure to liberate his resting place in Galicia. (The significance of this idea is clear when we remember that the First Crusade was started because people believed that Christ was urging them to liberate the place where he died.) In this case, Charlemagne is not in immediate danger; the supernatural being expresses his bewilderment, but in relation to his own concern, and expounds at length on the subject; this sets up a long-term expectation, but it does not build suspense.

I cannot recall any discussion of a third parallel in the literature. Ordericus Vitalis († 1142) began his *Historia ecclesiastica* in 1122. He wrote the first two books, devoted to the wider history of the world, last of all. In book 7 at least one passage was written after the death of Henry I in 1135 (Le Prévost 1838–1855, 5 p. XLVII with reference to 3.159). According to this book (7.7, ed. Le Prévost 3.179s.) while Bohemund's father, Robert Guiscard, had gone to Italy to assist the Pope, Bohemund himself was on the point of being defeated by the Greeks. *Sed cum Buamundus in conflictu cum turmis suis vacillans trepidaret et anxius Deum ex corde invocaret, divinae pietatis auxilium adfuit et vox huiuscemodi desuper intonuit: "Buamunde, quis agis? Proeliare fortiter! Nam ille, qui patrem tuum iuvit, te similiter adiuvabit, si in illo confisus fueris eique fideliter militaveris." Hac voce Normanni recreati et confortati sunt, et in antea progressi Pelasgos acriter impulerunt [. . .] Buamundus vero [. . .] vulneratus fuerit in certamine [. . .]* The text surely does not mean that all of the Normans heard the heavenly voice, but only that Bohemund did. The addressee here is not Charlemagne; but in other respects, the narrative intention and the plot of the story are the same as in the Rol., and this is perhaps more salient than the identity of the person in the other stories. A connection between the two is highly likely, and unless a common source turns up, it is probably a direct borrowing, although I would not like to speculate which came first and will concentrate instead on the narrative differences between the two.

Ordericus' account differs from that of the Rol. mainly in the fact that the heavenly voice keeps on talking after the rhetorical question. This account is conspicuously logical and complete – a request, an acceptance with a comparison, a condition – and is a credit to the well-educated pastor and talented storyteller that Ordericus surely is. But there is one thing that Ordericus does not understand: in this context, less is more. What a contrast with the Chanson de Roland! Charlemagne does not need any heavenly reassurances in imperative, indicative and subjunctive form before he takes courage: he only needs to be

certain that the angel is with him, but he needs this certainty right now, and not ten seconds later; the apparently astonished rhetorical question hanging in the air must and will suffice, to make Charlemagne himself again. The insistence on less is what separates genius from talent here, no matter which text came first.

A.5 Oriental elements in the Marsilĭe section

There is a very longstanding debate among Romance philologists, and one which in my opinion is not leading us towards any answer; that is the binary question of whether the Baligant section of the song that we have now was written by the same poet as the Marsilĭe section or not.[441] One reason why this is so tricky is the fact that the Baligant section is essentially the creation of a single person, while the Marsilĭe section has a long previous history, and this explains some of the minor differences between the two. Another reason is the fact that the Baligant section is a condensed depiction of events which play out on a much larger scale, which means that it requires a different narrative technique, e.g. with fewer single combats, but a host of ethnically diverse *eschieles*, ranked in battle formation etc. I have a vague sympathy for the unitarians, but I would also like to hold open a possibility that is often overlooked, namely that one and the same poet wrote the two sections, but with a long break between the two. This could have been several decades – during which there was a shift in political relations in the wider world – and there could also have been a certain *mise à jour* of his Marsilĭe section after the Baligant section was written. The next section will investigate whether perhaps there is some subtle preparation for the Baligant section going on in the Marsilĭe section. To this end, the Orientalia found in the Marsilĭe section are considered together.

A.5.1 *Est<r>amarin*

One of the ten messengers sent by Marsilie to Charlemagne is *Est<r>amarin* O 64, whose name indicates that he comes 'from across the sea' and he is discussed below along with the anti-peer *Estramariz* (A.9.9) who is often considered to be the same person.

---

441 In this section I have repeated some material from Beckmann (2008b, 141–145)

A.5.2 *Malbien d'ultre mer*

Another of Marsilĭe's messengers is *Malbien d'ultre mer* O 67, *Mabriant* n, *Malbrant vone theme mere* K, *Malbruçant de [m]e* V4, *Marprinant de mer* CV7: For β we have *Malbri[.?]ant de mer*, presumably *Malbrivant* 'fleet-footed to a wicked end (~ messenger)' from the coast. Since the verb *briver* was seldom used, none of the scribes retained it: n copies it incorrectly, K substitutes MHG *brant* 'fire-brand, sword blade', V4 northern Ital. *bruçant* (~ Standard Ital. *bruciante*) 'burning (~ arsonist)', CV7 presumably a variant that is phonologically similar to *prenant* 'grabbing (~ robbing)' with simultaneous replacement of *mal* by semantically related *mar(e)*. In O *Malbien* is a person who knows how to turn something evil into something that appears to be good;[442] above all, however, he comes from across the sea, and so either he is an older person with some status who had taken part in the Muslim conquest of Spain (cf. the analysis in A.5.7 below on *Falsaron*), or he was sent out later from the Orient to Marsilĭe's court. In fact, we cannot rule out the possibility that O has interpreted a secondary meaning here[443] (removal of the incomprehensible *-brivant* and the vague *de mer* 'from the coast').

A.5.3 *Li reis de Suatilie*

Another Oriental element in the Marsilĭe section is the fact that the ten white mules, which Marsilĭe sends to Charlemagne, had been a gift *que li tramist li reis de Suatilie* O 90, *açil rei de Cecilie* V4. The metrically correct reading of *Suatilie* in O could be *Su-atílĭe* or *Șu̦atilíĕ* but in V4 *Cecílĭe* is shorter by one syllable, and therefore there is *açil* instead of *li*. *Cecilie* is a rather common pseudo-etymological form (modelled on the Saint's name *Caecilia*) for 'Sicily'; it emerged in France after about 1200, and later also in northern Italy through the change from /ts/ > /s/ (references in Moisan, Flutre, Chabaneau-Anglade and Wiacek s. v.); 'Sicily' is a *lectio facilior* here if we can find a meaning for *Suatilie*.

---

442 Dufournet (1987, 95) even writes about Malbien saying: "dont le nom fait penser à la doctrine de Zoroastre", but this information would hardly have been available in the Middle Ages. – In a few modern dialects of south-eastern and eastern France, *malbien* means 'peine éprouvée, regret' etc., and sporadically '(tourner à) mal' and 'vaurien' (FEW s. v. *bien*).

443 This is Stengel's view; but he has put an unattested variant *Malpriant* into the text. This is not acceptable, because we cannot just take the *-p-* in CV7 instead of the *-b-* in OnKV4 into the archetype.

In fact, it means [1] Attalia on the southern coast of Anatolia, today called Antalya, and not [2] Suzdal in Russia.

On [1]: In principle, Baist identified this correctly (1902, 219). Mules were indeed bred across large parts of the Mediterranean area, even as far away as in Hungary,[444] but in this case they are noble white animals, evidently a product with distinctive characteristics that was associated with a particular homeland. The oldest and most famous mule breeding territory is Asia Minor – not only in classical antiquity,[445] but also for readers of the Bible: mules were exported from Togarmah to the centre of world trade, which was Tyre (*Ez* 27.14), and most early Bible exegetes correctly thought this was somewhere around ancient Armenia, i.e. the north east of Asia Minor; only Jerome in his commentary on *Gen* 10.8 and on *Ez* 27.13s. (copied by Rabanus Maurus on *Ez* 27.13s.) places it in Phrygia, which is in western Asia Minor – we can be sure therefore, that it is somewhere in Asia Minor. In the Middle Ages the same location would have been familiar: when in 995 Emperor Basilios II crossed the whole of Asia Minor in an unprecedented forced march, his whole army was carried by mules (Schlumberger 1896–1905, 2.89). If the Roland poet was starting out with the same geographical idea, then the port where these animals would board the ships (*tramist*) would most likely have been on the south coast of today's Turkey, and there is only one first class port there, the Ἀττάλεια, Class. Lat. *Attalīa* of antiquity, familiar from *Act Ap* 14.25, today called Antalya. But in MLat from the early 12ᵗʰ c. onwards it is consistently known as *Satalía, Satellía*.[446] *Sᴜatilíe,* like *Satellíe,* has a weakening of the unstressed middle syllable or an assimilation with the stressed -*i*- that comes next; there is no obvious explanation for the -ᴜ-.

---

444 Old French epics mention mules from Arabia, Syria, Spain and Hungary (cf. Moisan s. v.), i.e., from the same places that were already famous for their horse breeding.

445 The land of the Eneti in the north of Asia Minor according to the *Iliad*; Mysia according to the *Iliad* and Anacreon; Galatia for luxury animals, according to Plutarch; Lydia according to Aesop – as in PW s. v. *Esel*.

446 The *S*- comes from meta-analysis either of the MGk. (εἰ)ς Ἀττάλεια()ν 'to/in Attalia' or the very common expression τὸν κόλπον τῆς Ἀτταλείας /toŋgòlpondisatalías/ 'il golfo di Satalía'. Fulcher of Chartres (3.57.3, and similarly 3.59.1) still writes *Attaliae gurgitem*, but in the 12ᵗʰ c. Daniil's itinerary and that of Sæwulf have *Satalia*, then Eudes of Deuil (middle of 12ᵗʰ c., cap. 64, 67 etc.) *Satellia*; according to William of Tyre (16.26, for the year 1146) *nostri* use the name *Satalia* for the town *Attalia* and they call the gulf *gulphus Sataliae*; later e.g. *Troie* 12329 *Satelee*, Ambroise 1315 *al gofre de Sartalee*, *Florence de Rome* 5590 *Satellie* (other examples, partly influenced by 'Satan', in Flutre s. v. *Satagnie* 1); *Satalia* in Italy still around 1321 Pietro Vesconte's map of the eastern Mediterranean (Edson et al. 2005, 82) and in the 16ᵗʰ c. e.g. Ariosto (17.65.7 and 19.46.5).

Today's Antalya was a target for Muslim attacks around 790 and apparently again around 860, and the gulf in that area was the main attack route for the Arab raids.[447] However, the Byzantines soon became the undisputed rulers again; according to Ibn Ḥawqal (10th c.) the central Byzantine tax office for trade with the Muslim Levant was there, according to Yāqūt (around 1200) it was also the most securely fortified and important naval port (ODB s. v. *Attaleia*, Le Strange 1905, 151). Anna (14.1.2) writes that after Manzikert the Turks 'laid waste the whole coast by Smyrna and even as far as Attaleia'. It is likely that the town itself was also captured (apparently around 1085) and Alexios had to take it back from the Turks after the First Crusade; his son John had to do this again in 1120.[448] It had no part to play in the First Crusade because of its geographical position, but this very factor ensured that its role in the Second Crusade was significant: when Louis VIII suffered a catastrophic defeat he and his army had to spend several days fighting their way through Turkish controlled territory before they managed to reach the Byzantine naval port. Its mention here is therefore an argument, albeit a weak one, for a late dating of the Blancandrin episode; even if the town itself did not ultimately fall to the Turks until 1207 (ODB and EI s. v.), it is understandable that the poet would think it was under Muslim control during Charlemagne's lifetime.

On [2]: Jenkins (ad loc.) was aware of Baist's explanation but believed that the breeding of mules implies a need for flat grassland (which is not quite correct), and came up with *Susdalia*, sometimes used to refer to the medieval Russian partial principality Suzdal, east-northeast of Moscow. Quite apart from the phonological difficulties with this suggestion, why would a provincial princeling have shipped gifts like this across land and sea to a ruler in faraway Spain, with whom he cannot have had any other common interest?

A.5.4 *De l'or d'Arabe, un palĭe alexandrin*

The fact that Marsilĭe can also send cartloads *de l'or d'Arabe* to Charlemagne (v. 185, 652), and that his throne and Ganelon's sable cloak are covered with a *palĭe alexandrin* (v. 408, 463), are discussed above in A.1.10.2 s. v. *Arabiz* (with n. 261) and A.2.1 s. v. *Alixandre*.

---

447 TAVO, instalment 6.8: *Kleinasien: Das Byzantinische Reich (7.–9. Jh.);* IA, Art. *Antalya*.
448 As reported in the TA s. v. *Antalya*. Cf. Chalandon (1900, 234, and 1912, 48 etc.). It is often very difficult to determine whether the sources are referring to the town or the surrounding area.

A.5.5 *D'ici qu'en Orïent(e)*

The word *Orïent* itself occurs twice in the Marsilĭe section, both times in the expression 'from here to the Orient': Ganelon characterises Roland first in his conversation with Blancandrin as being greedy for conquests *d'ici qu'en Orïent* (v. 401, hypermetrical, filled out in various ways in the β), and then in his conversation with Marsilĭe as a warrior without equal *d'ici qu'en Orïent* (v. 558). We can see that expression had much the same meaning as it does today in its third and last occurrence (v. 3594), when Baligant suggests that Charlemagne should become his vassal: *Ven mei servir d'ici qu'en Orïente* (because of the assonance it has a quasi-Latinising *-e* modelled on *in Orientem*); thus he is asking Charlemagne either (judging by *venir*), to come with him to *Babilonĭe* to swear his oath of vassalage, almost like Marsilĭe, who offered to follow Charlemagne to Aachen (albeit after some delay), or (judging by *servir*), to accept an obligation to provide troops in service to Marsilĭe all the way to the Orient.

A.5.6 *Valdabrun*

The complex figure of *Valdabrun* stands in the middle, between east and west:

Valdabruns (with *-õ-* assonance) O 617, *Valdabrun* n, *Valdebrun* K, *Valdebrun* V4, *Valebron* CV7, *Maldebrwm* w (*Maldabrwn* BW), and

Valdabrun (again with *-õ-* assonance) O [1519]=1562, *Valdebron* nV4C, *Ualdeprun* K, *Valenbron* V7, *Valebron* P, *Mandabron* T, *Valabron* L, *Maldebrwm* w (*Maldabrwn* BW), *Walbrune* h(V): *M-* instead of *V-* (T and w have this independently of each other) is down to a misreading of a decorative initial, assisted by attraction to the *Mal-* names; because *-n-* in T is a misreading of *-u- < -l-*. *Vald-* is confirmed in the archetype via OnKV4, *-brun* or in Central French handwriting *-bron* is confirmed by almost all of the texts.[449] The question remains whether the middle syllable *-a-* (OTL, variant in w, once also n) or *-e-* (KV4CV7, main form in w, once also in n) is the primary form. The archetype therefore had *Vald (a/e)brun* (both ~ /-õ/).

---

449 When other epics have this name, they retain the form with /õ/, as in *-brun* in the *Aspremont*, which is to be read as /õ/ (v. 6857!), *-bron* in the *Anseïs de Cartage* and *Galien*. Thus, the name has nothing to do with MLat. *valenbrunus*, OF *galebrun*, *walebrun*, *walenbrun* 'nondescript, probably dark-coloured fabric' (on *brūnus*, cf. DEAF s. v. *galebrun*). The Gascon *Galabrunus* in Saint-Sever 327 for the years 1107–1115 and 332 for the years 1140–1145 probably bears this epithet because of the type of clothing he liked to wear.

It is said of Valdabrun in v. 618: *Icil [levat le] rei Marsiliun* – this is what the critical editions, including that of Bédier, correctly determine; and once more in v. [1520]=1563: *Celoi levat le rei Marsiliun* 'He had been Marsiliĕ's tutor'.[450] It was customary for young noblemen to be assigned to a noble tutor who was a few years older (Span. *ayo, amo,* Fr. *maistre, garde,* archaic Ger. *Waffenmeister*) and whose task was to educate the younger man, especially in weapon skills;[451] this often developed, as here, into a lifelong relationship of trust between the two.

In the meantime, Valdabrun has become Marsiliĕ's admiral of the fleet, and is in command of four hundred ships (v. [1521]=1564s.). This figure is only a slight exaggeration. By the 9th c. Muslim fleets had achieved naval supremacy in the Mediterranean, and they retained this position until the late 11th/ early 12th c. In particular, a group of troublemakers were expelled by the Umayyad ruler of Córdoba in the year 827; they went on to conquer Crete, with a detour to Alexandria on the way, and they managed to hold on to the island until about 961;[452] they did not lose touch with their Spanish homeland during these adventures.[453] Between 889 and 972, the Saracen fortress Fraxinetum (La Garde-Freinet) on the Provençal coast played a similar role, since e.g., Muslims used this as a base when they raided one of the major passes through the Alps and kidnapped one of the most famous clerics in the West, Abbot Odilo of Cluny, who was on a journey to Rome at the time. In this same period, the Umayyads built the strongest war fleet in the Mediterranean at their new shipyards especially in Almería, but also in Denia, Tortosa and other places: it is said that by the middle of the 10th c. they had two hundred warships, and in the late 10th c. three hundred, with which they controlled the western part of the Mediterranean Sea, and sometimes

---

450 O has not understood v. 618 and trivialises it with *Il en vait al rei*, but then he does understand v. [1519]=1563 correctly (and there he simply uses as the subject the oblique form *celoi* instead of the nominative *icil, cil*); n has *lever* in both places, and has also misunderstood it, rendering it as the more trivial 'to stand up'; K omits both places; V4 omits the first one and trivialises the second one as 'V. was one of King M.'s knights'; CV7 make the first mention easier to understand by replacing *lever* 'to teach, educate' with *adober* 'to knight' and then (like P) omit the second; TL replace *lever* with *adober* in the second place. Evidently the meaning of the verses should be the same, and v. 618 shows this in the forms of the words as well as through the context: since Valdabrun takes the initiative in Marsiliĕ's presence without being invited to do so, and then Climborin and the Queen follow his example. This proves that Valdabrun had been the King's teacher, and not the other way round; this is correctly reflected in CV7TL too.

451 Cf. e.g., Holmes (1968, passim).

452 Cf. Theophani continuatores 2.20 (ed. Bekker p. 73–81); LM s. v. *Kreta*.

453 Lévi-Provençal (1957, 367 n. 155).

also the eastern part as far as Alexandria. Ibn Khaldūn writes derisively that the Christians at that time could 'not even make a plank drift in the Mediterranean Sea'.[454] One very striking aspect is the amount of independence that the admiral of the fleet had; a Muslim author writes: 'The admiral of the fleet to a certain extent shared power with the Caliph: one was ruler on the land, the other on the sea'[455] – just like Valdabrun (v. [1522]=1565): *N'i ad eschipre qui s cleimt se par loi nun.* According to the Latin song about the revenge of the Pisans in 1087 (a frequently edited text, first du Méril 1847, 239–251), Tamīm of al-Mahdiyya's fleet (he was in command from 1062 onwards) carried out raids from northern Spain and southern France to Rhodes, Cyprus and Crete.[456]

The Almoravid fleet continued raiding Gallegan, southern French and even Byzantine coasts until after 1125; it even went as far as Ascalon in the Holy Land[457] and intercepted some pilgrims heading for Jerusalem too. The *Miraculum 7* in the *Codex Calixtinus* recounts how in 1101 a ship owned by the Pisan Frisón[458] was saved from capture by the Almoravids through the intervention of Saint James.

Valdabrun has captured *Jerusalem* by treacherous means (v. [1523]=1566) – judging by the context, in his capacity as admiral of the fleet, that is to say, after a long distance voyage with a short march over land, which in the light of the above would not have been too hard to believe. The poet even assumes that Jerusalem had belonged to the Christians until that moment, or at least that pilgrims could freely access the city – as indeed is the case in the *Pèlerinage,* which is set in the period of Charlemagne's life before Roncevaux, because the twelve peers play a key role in it.

In the process, Valdabrun desecrated the Temple of Solomon and killed the Patriarch in front of the baptismal font (v. [1524s.]=1567s.). The crusaders considered the 'Temple of Solomon' to be the Al-Aqṣā Mosque built in 705–715.[459]

---

454 Ibn al-Khaṭīb and Ibn Khaldūn, cf. Vallvé (1980, 222) and Arié (1982, 154).

455 Lévi-Provençal (1957, 109).

456 A readable overview, although not up to date, is to be found in Mas-Latrie (1865–1868, 7–34).

457 Dozy (1881, 410–412); *Historia Compostellana* 1.103, 2.21, 2.75, 3.38; *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* (ed. Sanchez Belda) cap. 104.

458 We learn that Frisón is a Pisan in the *Historia Compostellana* 2.75.

459 The kings of Jerusalem used this 'Temple of Solomon' as their residence until around 1130 and then donated it to the order of soldier monks that had been founded just a few years before and from then on made its mark in European history as the new 'Templars'. The neighbouring Dome of the Rock, built in 691, had a better claim, perhaps not to contain remnants from Solomon's temple, but certainly to stand on the centre of Herod's temple (and therefore also Solomon's as well); this was given the name *Templum Domini* and the crusaders used it as

The Patriarchate survived in Jerusalem through the whole Islamic period, because Islam did not prohibit the two other religions of the book, Judaism and Christianity. Yet in 966 a Patriarch of Jerusalem was indeed killed by Muslims in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre because of a local dispute, as we are informed by a well-placed Christian Arab source from only slightly later.[460] In Europe, the only writer to register this event was Ademar of Chabannes (3.47), although he gave it by mistake the later date of 1010, at the time of the next bout of persecution of Christians during which the Caliph al-Ḥākim had the Church of the Holy Sepulchre destroyed; Ademar adds that the *patriarcha Hierusolimorum* was also *variis suppliciis occisus*. Tavernier (1903, 116), Boissonnade (1923, 207), Jenkins (on v. [1523]=1566) and Bédier (1927, 304s.) take note of Ademar; but since no Patriarch was killed in 1010, they do not know about the incident or they ignore it (Boissonnade); Mireaux (1943, 118) recognised the connection correctly. Brault (1978, 421), however, thinks that Heliodor's desecration of the temple (2 *Mach* 3.7–23) is a possible model for this; but we must reject this outright, because the incidents are not at all similar: in that source Heliodor is almost killed by divine intervention, and not the high priest Onias, and in fact Onias begs for Heliodor's life to be spared.

How can we explain the name *Valdabrun* or *Valdebrun* or (Central Fr.) -*bron*? Noyer-Weidner (1971, 41) takes *Val-* to mean 'valley' with the negative symbolism that this element has in the *Val*-toponyms and ethnonyms elsewhere in the Rol.; we know that a toponym like this can be used as an anthroponym from the name *Abisme*.[461] Boissonnade (1923, 208s.) went further and interpreted the whole name

---

a church. Cf. LM s. v. *Jerusalem*, and Murphy-O'Connor (1981, 84s.). It is possible that the poet is treating the two buildings as one and the same.

460 Cf. the very detailed account of what happened with exact dating in Yaḥya of Antioch, *Histoire de Yaḥya-ibn-Saʿid d'Antioche*, eds. and trans. Kratchkovsky, I./Vasiliev, I. (Patrologia Orientalis 18.5=90), Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1957, p. 798 [100]– 802 [104]. More succinctly cf. the EI, Art. *al-Ḳuds*, p. 327a.

461 Lambert Le Tort invented (in the Alexander Romance 3.706) an Indian warrior *Sichem de Valebron*, and this shows that *Val-* belongs in this name; but he uses it just as a toponym. Since we do not necessarily have to regard the 'chasm of hell' as a normal toponym, I would like to add a few other facts to Noyer-Weidner's argument (and Boissonnade's interpretation). In principle, it is about the question whether the later everyday usage of a place name (originally a fief name) as a personal name, but without *de*, like for example *Saintré* instead of *Jehan de Saintré*, was already possible when the Rol. was written, even though OF written texts usually avoided it because it sounded illogical in those days. The following arguments support this possibility: 1) Anna Komnene calls a) Guillelme de Grentemesnil *Guilelmos Grantemanes* (11.6.1), Guillelme de Gand (Ghent) *Gelielmos Ganzes* and Joffroi de Mailli *Iosphre Males* (both in 13.12.28); she also calls b) Raymond of Saint-Gilles *Isangeles* (Book 11, passim), a Count of Conversano *Koprisianos* and Richard of the Principate *Prinkipatos* (both in 13.4.5).

as 'Valley of Hebron'; we must then put *Valdebrun* (with -*e*-, not -*a*-) in the arche-type.[462] This interpretation is not unreasonable, in so far as Marsilĭe's brother is lord of the land of Dathan and Abiram (v. 1215, see below A.5.7), and this suggests to us another place that can only be located on the southern edge of the Holy Land; in the mind of the poet, the Muslim conquest of Spain had happened quite recently, and so the Muslims still had connections with their former homeland.

The nexus *vallis Hebron* occurs once in the Vulgate (*Gen* 37.14). In the Mid-dle Ages, there were a few dark shadows over Hebron. Due to a misunderstand-ing of *Ios* 14.15, it was thought that Adam lived there;[463] consequently, people visited the site near Hebron called *domus Kain et Abel* (according to the pil-grims' guide *Innominatus* VII) and the *Vallis* (!) *lacrimarum*, where for a hundred years Adam mourned the murder of Abel which had happened there (according to Rorgo Fretellus before 1137, John of Würzburg middle of the 12th c.).[464] Before

---

This demonstrates two clear stages of evolution: a) in the nexus *A de B* the *de* was left out, because *B* could initially be regarded as a kind of possessive obliquus; b) linguistic intuition gradually reinterpreted the *B* as apposition in *AB*, which then logically led to the use of this appositional part as an independent element. (The two-case system was in other respects still intact and one of the first signs of its decline was weakening of the congruence of cases in apposition, and since in O many names have no ending and are indeclinable, such *Apollin*, *Baligant*, *Oliver*, *Tervagan*, there was nothing to stand in the way of this kind of reinterpreta-tion.) 2) When in 1118 Alfonso el Batallador conquers Saragossa with the help of Rotrou du Perche, he appoints Rotrou as lord of a district in the city. This was called Alperche (cf. Bois-sonnade 1923, 62s.) even into the 17th c., and the only meaning it could have had from the start was 'belonging to the Perche (= Rotrou du Perche)'. 3) Marcabru sends his song 'Hueymais dey esser alegrans' (ed. Dejeanne p. 167) *aˑ N Cabriera* 'to the lord (Viscount of the castle) Cabreira (in the county of Girona)'. 4) Around 1215, Wolfram von Eschenbach in the *Willehalm* (286.19) calls his fellow poet *her Vogelweid*. There may well have been a touch of gentle mockery in this, since the meaning of 'Vogelweide ~ bird meadow' might suggest a tiny fief; but the joke would only have worked if by then it was quite normal to use the name of a fief as a personal name. This all suggests that the convention, like other courtly customs, points back to France, where it must have appeared earlier. – We could avoid this problem if we replaced the inter-pretation 'Valley of Hebron' with the meaning 'Wālī of Hebron'; cf. n. 471 below!

462 Boissonnade supports the form *Valdabrun* with a reference to *Ḥabrūn* in Arab.; but first of all, the town is more often called *al-Khalīl* in Arab., and secondly, the name *Hebron* has been so well anchored in the Lat. tradition through the ages, that we cannot seriously believe there was an influence from the Arabic. – Wendt (1970, 203) suggested a different etymology with *Val d'Abirun* (= Abiram, as in 'Dathan and Abiram') which would mean that *Valdabrun* had to be in the archetype. But the nexus **vallis Abiron*, unlike *vallis Hebron*, does not occur in the Bible; furthermore, a 'Valley of Abiron' does not fit geographically with Jerusalem as well as Hebron does.

463 Well explained in Donner (1979, 378 n. 4).

464 Rorgo Fretellus (cap. 7–9 ed. Boeren); Tobler (1874, 106 and 176).

Joshua, Hebron was the city of the giants (*Ios* 10.36s., 11.21, 14.13–15, 15.14; Isidore 15.1.24), and then also *Filistinorum metropolis*.[465] In Hebron, Joab murdered Abner, and Absalom set himself up as king in opposition to his father David (*2 Sam* 3.27, 15.7ss.).

On the other hand, however, according to Jewish, and then also Christian and Muslim tradition, the Cave of Machpela with the tombs of the patriarchs was in Hebron; this is the main reason why Hebron is to be found on a great many medieval maps of the world (von den Brincken 1968, 167). Herod surrounded this sacred area measuring about 60 x 35 m with a thick, windowless wall which still dominates the city. The Muslims already regarded it as a citadel in the 10th c.,[466] and the crusaders made it into the *Chastel Saint-Abraham*.[467] In those days, the region around the city was used for winegrowing, as indeed it still is today.[468] In the early 12th c., the 'Valley of Hebron' would have been considered an impressive fiefdom, and because at the time of the Crusades there was no other fortress in the 40 km between Hebron and Jerusalem,[469] Hebron would have been an ideal starting point for an attack on Jerusalem, and thus offered an alternative to a naval expedition.[470] This all depends, however, on how we explain *Vald(e/a) brun*, and I must admit that I regard the etymology suggested by Boissonade and Noyer-Weidners as unproven, even though I can see no better alternative.[471] Be that as it may, *Valdabrun* represents a link between east and west.

---

[465] Adamnan, *De locis sanctis* 2.8 (CC 175.209), Rorgo Fretellus (cap. 7 ed. Boeren), John of Würzburg in Tobler (1874, 176).

[466] Al-Maqdisī, quoted from Marmardji (1951, 48).

[467] Runciman (1951, 251, and 1952, 4).

[468] Al-Maqdisī (as in the n. before last); Karmon (1983, 207s., 259).

[469] Bethlehem was never fortified (EJ 9.270).

[470] Ambivalence about the interpretation of the name has also meant that in *Aliscans*, *Folque de Candie*, *Vivien de Monbranc* and *Partonopeus* the name *Ebron* is given to a heathen minor character, and in the *Baudouin de Sebourg* he is a devil, but in Robert de Boron he is the Roi-Pêcheur, the brother-in-law of Joseph of Arimathea.

[471] It is interesting that the name is quite close to a few semantically compatible Arabic terms: *wālī* (originally *wālin*, constructus state *wālī*) 'governor of a province' (in the 10th c. the admiral of the Caliphate's fleet was simultaneously the *wālī* of Almería), *walī* (or especially *walī al-amr*) 'friend, patron, guardian'; *baḥr* 'sea', especially *baḥr ar-Rūm* 'Mediterranean Sea', *baḥrī* (plur. *baḥriyyīn*) and *baḥḥār* (plur. *baḥḥārīn*) 'sailor' – although in a longer expression there would probably be some contraction (as in *amīr al-mu'minīn* > *miramolin* etc.), as well as incorporation of the augmentative *-on* (or of the diminutive *-in* with subsequent change of suffix to *-on*). – Broëns (1965–1966, 67) maintained that in West Got. the name Waldabrunus exists, but he does not supply a reference and so his claim remains doubtful.

A.5.7 *Falsaron*, Lord of the land of Datan and Abiram

Marsilĭe's brother is called *Falsaron* O 879, the same in nKw, *Falsiron* V4, *Falsagon* C, *Fauseron* V7, *Tauseron* T, *Franseroen* h(V), similarly in the second place

   Falsaron O 1213, the same in nKw, *Falsiron* V4, *Fauseron* CV7PTL, *Franceroen* h(H): h inserted the meaning 'Frenchman/person from France' into the name. T has misread an initial in the first place. Otherwise the γ (that is to say from V4 onwards) interpret the name as 'falsifier' (*falsarius* [> OF *falsaire*]+-*on*, constructed just like *bûcheron*, *forgeron*, *vigneron*, cf. Nyrop 1936, § 398s., Meyer-Lübke 1921, § 47). Based on OnKw, the archetype has *Falsaron* with -*a*- in the middle syllable,[472] which allows a spiritual interpretation as 'false Aaron' (as argued by Wendt 1970, 202, Metz 1981, 39). Surprisingly, this may well turn out to be the correct meaning, since Falsaron has the following characteristic:

   Il tint la tere Dat[ha]n e [Abir]un Segre 1215, *Datliun e Balbiun* O, *Datan ok Abiron* n, *Dathan unt Abiron* K, *entresque Albiron* V4, *Datan e d'Abiron* CV7, *d'Auton et d'Abiron* T: Modern Bibles follow the Hebrew original and have 'Datan and Abir*am*' in *Num* 16, but the Vulgate has *Dathan* (var. *Datan*) *et Abiron*. In our text the *Datan e d'Abiron* reading crept in because the second part could more easily follow after *de* than after *tere* (as in CV7; T then inserted *d'Auton* in the first part through analogy and deduction; there was some interference (evident in O and V4) from the name *Albion* in the second part (and this name had become quite familiar thanks to Geoffrey of Monmouth); finally, in O *Dathan* was misread as *Datliun* and *δalbiun* as *balbiun*. In contrast, n and K have the correct reading, but the evidence provided by the stemma tells us that they must have restored the biblical names.

   The Israelites Datan and Abiram were killed during their journey through the wilderness of southern Palestine, and so this reference in the Rol. can only mean the land where they met their death. This is more or less how n understands the reference: 'F. ruled over the land that had belonged to Datan and Abiron', and the same is true of K: *Do chom Falsaron: uon der / erden Dathan unt Abiron was er uerre geua-/ren.* When Moses organised an ordeal with sacrifices using censers, in which Datan and Abiram attempted to carry out a priestly sacrifice, they were revealed as false priests, as opposed to Aaron, who was the legitimate priest (*Num* 16.17); as the current lord of this land, Falsaron could thus be regarded as their heir in a way, making him a 'false Aaron' too. If he now rules a territory in southern Palestine, and his brother is the King of Spain, then the father of the

---

472 The name appears as *Falsaron* in the Merlin section of the vernacular *Graal*, and as *Fauseron* in later epics (Flutre, Moisan s. v.).

two must have come from Palestine and must have played an important role in the Muslim conquest of Spain. The poet would have imagined that in Charlemagne's lifetime, the conquest would have happened just one generation before – and this fits quite well with the historical facts.[473]

A.5.8 *Li amiralz de Primes*

Margariz de Sibilĭe describes the provenance of his sword: *Si la᷄ m tramist li amiralz de Primes* O 967, 'Amiral, the King of Kings' n, quite differently in K,[474] *li amirals d'Ongrie* C, *l'anmirals de Persíe* V7: None of the β group could make anything of *Primes* – but O could offer us a *lectio difficilior* which can be included in a critical edition of the text, as long as a meaning for it can be found. However, we should not see it as a toponym, as the editors have done. The term *amiralz* in the Rol. is the highest Muslim title, after all; this means that an *amiralz*, even if he ruled before Baligant's time, could not have had his seat in a relatively small, unidentifiable place. The meaning is, as in v. 589, 1924, 2845, simply the adverb *primes* 'previously, first' – here either in an adverbial expression *de primes* 'sent to me previously, some time ago' or a nominal one 'the *amiralz* from back then, the previous *amiralz* sent me'. The definite article suggests a certain uniqueness and so Margariz must be thinking – and therefore also the poet at this point, in the middle of the Marsilĭe section – that there is only one *amiralz* at that time, as there is again later in the Baligant section.[475]

---

473 The poet may have been influenced by the way in which the name *Moab*, referring to another border area in Palestine, had recently been changed: the name of the (Al)moravids had been reinterpreted as *Moabitae*. According to the MLLM (s. v. *morabatinus*) the earliest references to this is an indirect one: in a charter of 1083 from the Catalan monastery of San Cugat the Almoravid coin is called *moabetinus*. There are reliable and direct occurrences of *Moabitae* 'the Almoravids' from 1100 at the latest, as in the Papal Bull of Paschal II of 15th October 1100 (Jaffé/Löwenfeld Nr. 5838), and then frequently e.g., in the *Liber Maiolichinus* (bet. 1115 and 1127) and in the *Miracula* in the *Codex Calixtinus*.

474 K 3734s.: *thaberiske erde / han ich hie mit gewunnin*, 'the land around *Tabarie* (=Tiberias) have I conquered with it' – evidently following a French variant, now lost, of the text with *Tabarie* in *i-ə* assonance, which is interesting because it refers to the Orient.

475 On v. [1664]=1503, where Abisme wields a shield that has been sent over to him by *li amiralz Galaf<r>es,* cf. the section below on '*Li amiralz Galaf<r>es*' (A.7.6).

A.5.9 *Justin de Val Ferree*

In the very first phase of the Battle of Roncevaux, one man falls on the Muslim side: *Justin de Val Ferree* O 1370, *Justin* n, *Iustinen [. . .] uan Valle Pecede* K, *Gustin de Valbitea* V4, *Justin de Val Fondee* (*Fondrée* L, *Tornee* V7, *Dorée* T) CV7PTL, *Yttien* w, *Walbrune* h(V): h(V) has interpreted the toponym **Valbrune* 'brown valley' in his source as a personal name, thinking it is the same as his earlier reading of *Walbrune* from *Valdabrun* (v. [1519]=1562, cf. A.5.6 above); the other versions vary between the valley [that is] 'equipped with iron' or 'cut into pieces, rutted',[476] or 'clogged (with mud?) or frozen', the 'low-lying', 'crooked' or 'golden' valley. The most likely candidate for the archetype is the *Val Ferree* in O.

This is because *Justin de Valferree* is the only minor character in the Rol. who also appears in the *Roman d'Alexandre* (III 1725). And in the context of Alexander, the valley that is 'equipped with iron' suddenly makes sense as the valley that is 'barricaded with iron'. The legend says that Alexander locked up a group of especially vile peoples by placing a *porta ferrata* at the only access point to their otherwise insurmountable mountain territory; according to many versions of the legend, they unfortunately managed to escape at a later date (cf. Anderson 1932, passim, Cardona in the Polo edition by Bertolucci Pizzorusso 1975, 637–639).

Justin de Valferree in the Rol. appears, therefore, to have been borrowed from the Alexander legend, or at least to have been conceived with a nod to this source (and then taken over into the romance) – once again, the long shadow of Alexander falls upon the Song. The poet is presenting him as an oriental "guest warrior" in Marsilĭe's court.

A.5.10 *Arrabiz*

The seven *Arrabiz* defeated by Olivier (v. [1513]=1556) were discussed above in the section on '*Enfruns* and *Arabiz*' (A.1.2.10.2): they, too, are perhaps "guest warriors" from the Orient.

---

476 Baist (cf. Jenkins ad loc.) emended *pecede* in K to *betede* following V4 *bitee*, which means that β would mean a 'frozen valley', but this does not fit with Spain, and might just conceivably fit with the *Occian al desert*; and so even then, Justin would be a "guest fighter".

A.5.11 *Grandonĭe*, son of King *Capuël* of Cappadocia, and his horse *Marmorĭe*

Among Marsilie's warriors, we also find *Grandonĭes* O [1570]=1613, *Grandonis* (*Grandonies* Bb) n, *Grandon* Kw, *Grandonĭe* V4, *Grandoine* CV7PT; there is also
Grandonĭe O [1593]=1638, *Grandonis* (*Grandonies* Bb) n, *Grandon* Kw, *Grandonio* V4, *Grandoine* CV7PTL: -*oine* is a regular development from -*onĭe*, but *Grandon* also shows that the name was quite correctly understood as *grand-* + augmentative -*on*; the learned-sounding (or technically, 'semi-erudite') -*onĭes*[477] is confirmed as belonging in the archetype, and it adds to the comically pretentious tone of the name.
Grandŏnĭum(que) is also in the *Carmen* v. 319.

Grandonĭe is the son of *Capuël* O [1571]=1614, *Kapuel* n, *Chaduel* V4, *Capoe* C, *Caope* V7, *Gadoinne* P, *Cadol* T: P has changed the name to make it closer to the father's name *Grandoine*. V4 and T independently from each other are based on -*p-* > -*b-* followed by a misreading as δ. Following On(C), *Capuël* belongs in the archetype. Capuël is the King of
Capadoce O [1571]=1614, the same in CV7PLT, *Capadocie* V4, *Kappadocie* n.

In Francophone areas in the Middle Ages, knowledge about Cappadocia came from the Latin geographers (especially Pliny 5.83s., 5.146, 6.8s., 6.23s. etc., Mela 3.66, Isidore 9.2.30 and 14.3.37s.), from the New Testament (*Act Ap* 2.9s., *1 Petri* 1.1) and from the legend of Saint George (G. Paris 1880, 44); this explains why it is on most medieval world maps (von den Brincken 1968, 165, Edson et al. 2005, 46, 63, 71). Above all, however, many people knew about this place because they had seen it for themselves. Hundreds of Normans passed through the Cappadocian Theme in the 11th c. as mercenaries for Byzantium, and in 1073–1074 Roussel de Bailleul even tried to establish his own state there;[478] the anonymous *Gesta* (cap.11) describe how the people who participated in the First Crusade marched through the southern part of *Cappadocia*; then some of the people involved in the aftermath of that Crusade were killed at Heraclea/Ereğli by Rum Seljuks and Dānishmendids; Bohemund got to know the northern part of Cappadocia, the area ruled by the Dānishmendids, when they captured him in 1100, and held him prisoner until 1103, before the remainder of the straggling crusaders of 1101 were killed as they attempted to liberate Bohemund.[479]

---

477 As a Latinism with (non-nasalised) /ǫ/; cf. n. 97 above.
478 Cf. e.g., Grousset (1948, XXXIVs.).
479 Runciman (1952, 17–24), Setton (1969, 354–362), EI, Art. *Danishmendids*.

Given the reputation the Dānishmendids had acquired through these exploits, we can appreciate that Grandonĩe, the son of a Cappadocian king, is a particularly fierce warrior: he is an oriental "guest warrior" at Marsilĩe's court, seeking military experience and glory far away from the protection of his father, and as such he initially brings honour to his name; for he kills no fewer than five Franks – and there is no report of anyone else achieving this – until he catches sight of Roland and starts to flee in panic, – but he is too late; thus through his death, the meaning of his name is turned into irony.

But is *Grandonĩe* as an aptronym simply the poet's own invention? Unexpectedly, it seems not. Boissonnade (1923, 415s.) already provided the correct explanation in principle; de Mandach (1993, 80s.) filled out the detail. The young Norman, William of Grentemesnil (today Grandménil, Calvados; one of the Crusade historians, Raymond d'Aguilers already used the form *Grandis Mesnil*),[480] was initially a favourite of William the Conqueror, but he avenged himself of an injustice by committing murder, and so he thought it was advisable to move to Norman southern Italy, where his aunt Judith was Robert Guiscard's sister-in-law. He then fought bravely at Durazzo under Guiscard and was given Guiscard's daughter Mabilia's hand in marriage, according to Ordericus Vitalis with a dowry of about fifteen fortresses, and thus he became Bohemund's brother-in-law. But he rebelled in 1093/1094, was successfully besieged by relatives of his wife and had to flee to Constantinople for a time. He took part in the First Crusade alongside his brothers Ivo and Alberich, but in 1098, after a day of heavy losses against Kürbuğa's army, which was besieging Antioch at the time, all three of them panicked and left the city by night. The Cappadocian episode attracted a great deal of attention: the *Gesta*, the clerics from Lucca in their letter, Raymond of Aguilers, Tudebod, Tudebod's anonymous imitator and those who continued his work, Albert of Aachen, Baldric of Dol, Guibert of Nogent and William of Tyre give account of it; the harshest judgement comes from their fellow Normans: according to Raoul de Caen the brothers had been until that point *dignissima laude iuventus*, but now they had brought a shameful stain upon Normandy,

---

480 In the Tudebod tradition, ms. C also has *Grantamasnil*, D *Granmasnil*; the *Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus* has *Grandemasneda*. Grandménil is named after a certain *Grento* (Ordericus Vitalis 3.8 *in fine*; on this very rare name cf. Morlet s. v.); but it is well known that the phoneme boundary between /ẽ/ and /ã/ is already very porous in the Rol., and it must have been at least as porous in a 'colonial territory' such as Norman southern Italy. Moreover, most speakers would not have heard of the name *Grento*, but the form *Grandmesnil* would have made perfect sense to them.

according to Ordericus Vitalis, *ad suam diuturnam ignominiam*.[481] A generation later, in 1130, William's son Robert was even exiled because of an uprising against King Roger of Sicily, and this would surely have reminded everyone of the events of 1098 once again. Now the Raymond mss. B (13th c.) and D (14th c.), though not mss. A and C (middle of the 12th c.) which are more important for the reconstruction of the text, have *Granduna* instead of *Grandis Mesnil*. However, while mss. AC(FG) all contain the collection that William of Grassegals presented to his king, Louis VII, and which therefore passed through the French royal court in their early stages, ms. B contains, e.g., a work by Hildebert of Lavardin; the common sub-archetype of B and D could therefore very well be early and from the west. Since /-ynə/ makes no sense here, /-ǫnə/ is probably what is meant; and we must almost certainly assume that the nickname *Grandone*, which is *de facto* the same as *Grandonĭe*, was widely used for *Grentemesnil*, and probably from 1098 onwards at the latest.[482] This makes it difficult to argue that the Rol. came first, because this would mean that either the similarity in the names or the common motif of fleeing in panic which first caused the transmission would have to have been coincidental. A historical figure for the name Capuël[483] has also been suggested, but it is somewhat less convincing. Grégoire (1939a, 260) reports that the Armenian historian N. Adontz was certain that he recognised *Capuël de Capadoce* as Gabriel, the Armenian Lord of Melitene/Matalya in Cappadocia at the time of the First Crusade, and that Gabriel is pronounced as *Kapriel* in Armenian, *vulgairement Kapel*. But in the Armen. of the period around 1100, the man was not called *Kapriel* or *Kapel*, but *Khôril*, or at best *Khauril* (< MGk. *Gavriil*): this is what his fellow Armenian Matthew of Edessa calls him in a chronicle that is almost contemporary with Khôril (RHC Arm. 1.51), and this is how his name appears in Setton (1969a, 164, 299, 392 and index). Moreover, Khôril was a very passive ruler and a good friend of the crusaders, which ultimately led to his demise: in 1100 he called upon Bohemund for help against

---

481 I consulted the primary sources (these are easily found in the indexes of the RHC) and also Runciman, Setton, Boissonnade and de Mandach as well as Leib (on Anna 11.6.1) and Yewdale (1924. 33, 68, 70).

482 Interestingly, the form *grandis* + *-on* as an appellative has survived precisely in Sicily as *grannuni* (Rohlfs 1972, § 1095).

483 Because the ending *-el* is primarily associated with the archangel names Michael, Gabriel and Rafael, a freely invented Saracen name ending in *-el* might look odd, and this begs the question whether there was a real name behind it that just sounded similar. This dount is at least partly refuted, however, by the fact that in the Old Testament many anthroponyms are formed with *-el* endings, including *Daniel, Ioel, Iechiel, Salathiel* (in Luther: *Sealthiel*) and also by the fact that Old Testament names are quite unabashedly used as Saracen names in Old French epics, cf. n. 395 above.

the Dānishmendids; however they took Bohemund prisoner, and Khôril hurriedly took shelter with Baldwin of Boulogne, who had settled in Edessa; but Khôril was defeated in 1104 during another Dānishmendid attack, and they executed him; Baldwin of Bourg, who had succeeded his cousin Baldwin of Boulogne, then married Khôril's daughter (Runciman 1951, 265–267, 1952, 29–31). There is no obvious reason why the poet should make such a man the father of Grando-nĭe, who killed so many Christians.

Cappadocia was famous in western Europe in another, quite different, respect: for its breeding of horses: *Terra eius ante alias nutrix equorum* (Isidore 14.3.37). According to the Alexander romance[484] the most famous horse of all came from this place: Alexander's Bucephalus. The Roland poet cannot pass up this op-portunity, and he mentions Grandonĭe's horse named

Marmorĭe O [1572]=1615, the same in V4T, *Marmore* n, *Murmur* K, *Garamon* ('head high!') C, *Garemon* V7, *Marmorins* P, meaing 'marbled, coloured like marble' (< Lat. *marmorĕus*),[485]

and says about him: *plus est isnels que n'est oisel ki volet*.

A.5.12 *Arabe*

The African who tries to steal the dying Roland's sword wants to take it to *Arabe* (v. 2282, OCV7PTl, *Arabia* n, *arabiskiu erde* K, *Rabie* V4, *Arabien* h), so that he can be feted as the vanquisher of Roland. As we noted above (A.1.2.10.2), the sen-tence only makes sense if it means not just 'to the Orient' but rather 'to the court of his most senior feudal lord'.

A.5.13 Review of the oriental elements in the Marsilĭe section

All in all, the poet reminds us remarkably often in the Marsilĭe section of the existence of the Muslim Orient, and on quite a few occasions he clearly refers to

---

484 Ed. Hilka/Bergmeister cap. 14 = H 33 = Z 14 = Pf I 14.
485 Dufournet (1987, 94) and de Mandach (1993, 80) want to make a connection between *Marmorĭe* and the Sea of Marmara. But first they would have to prove that the poet knew the modern name instead of the classical and medieval name *Propontis* (still the only name used by Anna 3.11.1 etc.). Secondly, it is not clear why a horse should be named after the Sea of Marmara, a coastal region not known for its horse breeding, rather than Cappadocia, which is some 500 km away and famous for breeding horses.

the Orient as the home of the conquerors of Spain and Islam's true centre of power. If we think of this in the categories of medieval feudal law, it implies that the most senior feudal lord of the conquerors of Spain must have his seat in the Orient, and his beleaguered vassals would be entitled to expect help from him. Thus, we can read these passages as a way of anticipating the Baligant section that comes later. I have recently demonstrated (Beckmann 2008b, 143–146), that there are other, even more obvious, anticipatory indications; they are not connected with any names, and so I will only briefly summarise them here: Roland cannot kill Marsilĭe, but only cuts off his right hand, because in a scene that is heavy with grisly symbolism, Marsilĭe is supposed to hand back to Baligant the right-hand glove of his fiefdom that he is holding in his remaining left hand, thereby ensuring that Baligant will step into Marsilĭe's position, and take on his guilt as well; there is no relic of Christ in Roland's sword because the poet has reserved this for Charlemagne's sword, which is only introduced on the threshold of the Baligant section, because Charlemagne is going to use it to decide the outcome of the battle with Baligant; and finally in v. 2602 Bramimonde talks about *li amiralz*, and the definite article has a "suggestive" function, showing that there is only one *amiralz*, and since the fighting strength of Spain and Africa is already spent, he must be located in the Orient. But above all, the poet is talking here about the Anti-Trinity, which clearly is emanating backwards from the Baligant section; there is more discussion of this below in the section on the 'pagan' gods (A.13.2). If we are going to attribute the Baligant section to a different author than the writer of Marsilĭe section, then at least we will have to concede that this later author must have made significant alterations to the Marsilĭe sections – and indeed this insight defuses many of the arguments around this much-disputed question.

North Africa

Cherïant and *Val Marchis* have already been discussed above (A.2.2) because they are in the Baligant section.

A.6 The Algalife and his domain

After Marsilie's injury and flight, one person sets up the last act of the Battle of Roncevaux, along with his *neire gent – granz unt les nés e lees les orilles* (v. 1917s.) –

> ***l'Algalifes*** O 453, *Langalif* n, *li Algalifres* V4, *Laugalie* C, *Lagaillie* V7;
>
> ***l'Algalife*** O 493, *L'Agalifrie* V4, *Algalif* w;
>
> ***l'Algalifes*** O 505, *Langalif* n, *Algaphiles* K, *l'Algalifrio* V4, *Laugalie* CV7, *Algalif* w;
>
> ***l'Algalifes*** O 681, *Algafiles* K, *li Algalifrio* V4, *Algalif* w;
>
> ***[l'Algalifes]*** Segre 1914, *marganices* O, *Langalif* n, *l'Algalifrie* V4, Laugalie CP, *l'Agalie* V7L, *l'Argalie* T, *Galifier* h(V);
>
> ***Li [Algalifes]*** Segre 1943, *Li marganices* O, *Langalif* n, *Algarich* K, *li Algalifres* V4, *e l'Augalie* CV7P, *Ly Argalie* T, *l'Agalie* L, *Galifer* h(R);
>
> ***[l'Algalife]*** Segre 1954, *marganices* O, *Langalif* n, *l'Algalifre* V4, *Laugalie* CV7P, *l'Argalie* T, *l'Agalie* L, *Ghalifer* h(R).[486]

There is also *Agālifus* in the *Carmen* v. 398 (with dissimilating loss of the first *-l-*).

Before we deal with the figure of the Algalife himself, we must explain the several instances of *marganices* in O.

First question: what did the archetype read here? The Roland poet puts *li* slightly more frequently than *l'* in front of rectus sg. masc. words beginning with a vowel (such as *amiralz*, *arcevesques*, *emperere*, *uns*); cf. Duggan's Concordance with altogether several dozen references for each of these two options. Now if α (that is to say O or one of his precursors) writes *marganice(s)* twice but *li marganices* once, the arbitrariness of the syntax reveals that he has replaced *l'Algalifes* or *l'Algalife* once each, but on the third occasion he had to replace *li Algalifes*, which was longer by one syllable; this tells us the direction in which the change is made and proves that *marganices* is a secondary form.

---

486 Agglutination or separation of the article and the use of a capital letter in this list are largely decisions made by the editors, and so we must regard them as irrelevant.

Second question: why was this replacement made? It could be answered by supposing that α has failed to recognise that Ganelon's claim (v. 681–691) about the Algalife's being drowned was a lie; but this would seriously insult the intelligence of α (see the discussion in Bédier 1938, 233–235). There is a more rational reason, consisting of two parts.

First, O noticed that Margariz is the only enemy to survive the first battle (v. 1311–1321) and then to disappear from the scene. The usual explanation for his disappearance is that – just as later Gualter de l'Hum on the French side – Margariz, as the sole survivor of his troop, was supposed to bring news of the defeat to his superior, in this case Marsilĭe, and that this passage was accidentally lost from the archetype of all of the texts. Be that as it may, Margariz was 'in search of a new fate'.

And secondly, like many modern readers, O saw a relationship between two groups of verses in the Chanson where there is none. On the one hand, there are the words of the dying Olivier against a deceitful and scornful enemy (Segre v. 1959–1962): *Iço ne di, Karles n'i ait perdut! / †Në a muiler ne a dame qu'aies veüd / N'en vanteras el regne dunt tu fus / Vaillant dener que m'i aies tolut, / Ne fait damage ne de mei ne d'altrui*. 'I cannot claim that [through my own death] Charlemagne has suffered no loss; [but] neither will you ever be able to boast in your homeland, in front of your wife or any other ladies you have seen, that you have taken so much as the value of a penny from me or have caused harm to anyone else either!'[487] O takes this for a reference back to v. 957–959, the clearly sympathetic introduction of a young 'darling of the ladies' (who in vv. 1311–15 moreover turns out to be an excellent fighter): *Pur sa beltet dames li sunt amies: / Cele ne·l veit, vers lui ne s'esclargisset; / Quant ele·l veit, ne puet müer ne riet*. And as these words refer to Margariz, O felt that the dying Olivier's words would also have to refer to Margariz – and changed the text. To be precise: he was familiar with a dissimilated form of the name, **Marganiz*, which, moreover, did not have the *-e* or *-es* ending that would be needed if it were to replace *Algalife(s)*. *Qu'à cela ne tienne!* He just added it on.

Now to the Algalife himself! There is a general consensus that in principle the Caliph title is behind the name, that is to say Arab. (*al-*) *khalīfa* (where *kh* is

---

[487] It is curious that v. 1960, containing the generalising mention of *ne a dame qu'aies veüd*, has been changed by all the βs individually: it has been replaced by trivialities in V7PT and altogether suppressed by nKV4CL. Konrad Hofmann (1866) and Roncaglia (1947) would like to replace *veüd* with *oüd* (from *aveir*; cf. Segre ad loc.), which would make the text almost obscene – and thereby possibly induce the βs to their changes. – There is absolutely no need to consider *Marganices* as a new, third figure besides Margariz and the Algalife (as Bancourt 1982a, 773–775, and Dufournet, 1987, 94, proposed).

like the German *-ch* in *ach*). It came to western Europe via two routes. The first
is via Italian and/or French, where there were no velar fricatives, and /k/ was
substituted instead, as happened much earlier with borrowings from Gk. χ; this
covers e.g. the Crusade historians, such as the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*
(cap. 21) with *Calipha, illorum Apostolicus*, and the *Chanson d'Antioche* 4637
etc. with *l'Apostoile Calife* 'their Pope, the [Baghdad] Caliph' and then soon
after that across the whole of Europe 'Caliph, Kalif' etc. The second route that
the title took on its way to western Europe was via Old Span., which also (un-
like modern Span.) had no voiceless velar fricative, although it did have a
voiced one /ɣ/, written as *g*,[488] and this allowed an alternative kind of substitu-
tion: Old Span. *(al)galifa*, rarely *-fo*, and then in France *Algalif* by the middle of
the 11th c. in Radulfus Glaber (1.5 [17]) referring to the Spanish Umayyad Caliphs
of the period around 900 (although some of the detail is not very accurate) then
the *l'Algalife* we have here (later distorted into *l'augalie*)[489] and OF rarely *galife*
instead of *calife*.[490] *Algalife* continues to be recognised as a title in the Rol. as
the added (in fact pleonastic) western article shows.

According to v. 1917s. the Algalife has sub-Saharan ('black') Africans under
his command. The very fact that he attacks Spain with these troops would suffice
to mark him out as the archetypal Almoravid ruler Yūsuf ibn Tāsh(u)fīn, whose
spectacular victory of 1086 at Sagrajas/Zallāqa, with the help of his troops who at
least in part came from the area around Senegal,[491] rescued Muslim Spain. Before
Yūsuf's intervention in Spain, Berber troops had quite often crossed the Strait of
Gibraltar, most recently in the guise of the large groups of mercenaries who had
been recruited to invade Spain in the final epoch of the Umayyad State under the
Caliph al-Ḥakam and the dictator al-Manṣūr. But as far as anyone knows, groups
of sub-Saharan troops had not hitherto been among them. Indeed, Yūsuf was a
Berber, but he settled his clan, consisting of chiefs from the Lamtūna tribe, in the
southern half of Mauritania, which was only separated from Senegal by the re-
lated Džuddāla tribe (cf. EI s. v. *al-Murābiṭūn*, p. 584b–585a, Lagardère 1989b,
map on p. 20), where Berber and sub-Saharan African cultures come together

---

488 It is still there to this day in the nexus <lg>, e.g. in *acelga*, *algo*, *alguno*, *algazara*, *colgar*,
remilgo etc., all with /ɣ/ (cf. Quilis 1997, 60, Navarro Tomás 1970, § 127 and 212, Serralta/
Tusón 1970, 60, Harris 1969, 38).

489 It lived on as a name until Ariosto's *Argalìa*.

490 Steiger (1932, 117, 228, 343), alongside the later, but then more common /k/ forms; Ku-
nitzsch (1988, 264); FEW vol. 19 s. v. *ḫalīfa*; Godefroy s. v. *calife*. On phonologically parallel
forms in Span. cf. Corominas for example s. v. *algarroba*, *galacho*, *galanga*, *garrapo*, *engarzar*;
more in Corriente (1977, 54s.).

491 Cf. e.g., Menéndez Pidal (1969, 1.337), Dozy/Lévi-Provençal (1932, 129), Béraud-Villars
(1946, 94).

with no fixed boundary between them. This means that there would always have been many warriors with darker skin fighting in his army, and they would have been taken for sub-Saharan Africans by most Europeans of that time. Lagardère (1989a, 51) even writes about Yūsuf himself: "Cet homme [. . .] est probablement de sang nègre, si l'on en croit le teint brun, le peu de barbe et les cheveux crépus" – characteristics for which there is very firm evidence. "Métis ou noir, c'est un nomade [. . .]" Furthermore, Yūsuf had already formed a corps of two thousand sub-Saharan African slaves in 1071/1072 to act as his bodyguard (Lagardère 1989a, 30, 36), and they certainly fought alongside him when he personally took part in the battle near Zallāqa, entering the fray late to decide the outcome of the battle, and perhaps even distinguishing themselves on the battlefield (Lagardère 1989b, 119). The Almoravids were strict Sunni believers[492] and as such they recognised the Baghdad Caliph, although it cost them nothing, because he was so weak and far away from them; this is why they never made any attempt to claim the official Caliph title *amīr al-mu'minīn* 'Commander of the Faithful', even though their supporters already regarded them as such from 1073 onwards.[493] They took instead[494] the new title of *amīr al-muslimīn* 'Ruler of the Muslims' (complete with definite article!), which amounted to much the same thing, if not in the Muslim theological sense, at least in the political-military sense, because the 'the faithful' and 'the Muslims' were expressions for one and the same thing.[495] We can assume, then, that they were unofficially called 'Caliphs', since in Spain the Umayyads were often unofficially called 'Caliphs' before 929, and thereafter officially

---

492 Incidentally, the consideration and sense of justice that the Algalife demonstrates, in contrast with his irresponsible nephew Marsilĭe (v. 453–455), fits very well with the fact that the historical Yūsuf was extremely careful in political and military affairs, acted almost hesitantly, and is described as a very devout man, who was fair-minded and extremely self-disciplined.; cf. especially the *Rawḍ alQirṭās* (trans. A. Beaumier, 190s.) or e.g., Julien (1970, 82–86), Bosch Vilá (1956, 167).

493 Lagardère (1989b, 91). The Almohads, who conquered them and were their successors, then took on the Caliph title *amīr al-mu'minīn* unequivocally in around 1128–1130 (Julien 1978, 101ss.); but even if we assign a late date to the Rol., it is unlikely that this would be reflected in the song so quickly.

494 According to Lagardère (1989a, 36s.).

495 Cf. e.g., Arié (1982, 52), von Grunebaum (1963, 161s.), Lévi-Provençal (1955a, passim); van Berchem (1907, 270–275), the latter requiring correction by Wasserstein (1985, 158s.). The older scholarly literature reports that a few Arabic sources accorded them the title *amīr al-mu'minīn* (as in the *Rawḍ al-Qirṭās* according to Menéndez-Pidal 1969, 1.338 with n.2, and Mas-Latrie 1865–1868, 1.26, and according to him also Ibn Khaldūn). This is probably due to poor transmission of the sources, but it is especially informative in our context to see how easy it was for the old, familiar title to take the place of the lesser-known, new title.

used this title. In the 11th c., until after 1030, their weak and puppet-like, even partly pseudo-Umayyad successors appropriated this title for themselves, as did some random Taifa kings;[496] people were used to non-Baghdad Caliphs and were not too particular about the issue of sole religious authority.

A.6.1 *Kartagĕne*

The Algalife rules first over *Kartagĕne* (the metre dictates /kartadžnə/) O 1915, *Kartagia* n, *Kartagein* K, *Cartaine* V4, *Cartage* CL, *Chartage* V7, *Carraige* P: The older form *Kartagĕne* is confirmed by K and V4, the others have the newer OF *Cartage* or are based on that. The *K-* in OnK belongs in the archetype and there is a good chance that this is the form used by the poet.

Rather than [1] Cartagena, it means [2] Carthage.

On [1] and [2]: Since Cartagena was founded by citizens of Carthage, it bore the same name in antiquity, if necessary qualified by the addition of *Nova* or *Spartari*a 'located in the midst of esparto grass'; Isidore (15.1.66 and 72) mentions it as

---

496 Cf. the detailed discussion about the way this title was used in Wasserstein (1985, summarised 158). I therefore expressly concede that the Umayyad title influenced the general image of the Almoravids, because it helps to make the inexact use of the title plausible, but I do not believe that this is grounds for constructing the existence of an older scene behind the one that is now in the song. In other words: I do indeed believe in the existence of a Rol. before 1086, but I would not like to make this belief hinge on the claim that a 'Caliph' appears in the song. Gaston Paris (1902a, 413) believed that *only* the Umayyad title was behind this name, because he thought that the whole Rol. was older than the First Crusade, and the Marsilĭe section thus older than 1086, and this is understandable, given the research situation at that time. It is almost as understandable that Grégoire (1942–1943, 540s.) still insisted on defending this opinion: if you date the Baligant section as 1085, then you have to make the Marsilĭe section including the Algalife part even older, and so dismiss verses which do not fit with this scenario as secondary, in this case v. 1913–1919 on the theme of Africa – it was as easy as that. But this view is more astonishing in Bancourt (1982a, 835–839): as the Almoravids have no official claim to the title, the original meaning must have been the Umayyads; to make this possible, Bancourt has to downplay the African theme, even though it is an essential part of the narrative, and he comes very near to contradicting himself; for he seems to think it important that the Algalife is Marsilĭe's vassal (*sis fedeilz*, v. 505). – Bancourt, like Gaston Paris before him, emphasises the fact that the *Algalife* of the Rol. does not have a specifically religious function, whereas the participants in the First Crusade instantly saw the *Calipha* of Baghdad as the 'Pope of the Muslims'. Quite rightly, but is this surprising? Everyone thought of the Almoravids as great military conquerors, but the Caliph of Baghdad looked extremely weak in military terms especially alongside the formidable Seljuk Grand Sultan who also lived in Baghdad.

the capital city of the Diocletian province of Hispania *Hispania Carthaginiensis.* The Arabs also called both towns *Karṭādžanna* (< Lat. *Cartháginem*, but with a clearer indication of the fem. through -*a* and an early transition to penultimate stress) and again with additional qualifiers when required.[497] European use of the name Carthage was not influenced by Arabic (Fr. *Carthage* < early OF *Cartágĕne* /kartadžnə/ < Lat. *Carthagĭnem*), but Cartagena was not reconquered until 1244, and so the regional Arab. /kartadžéna/ was carried over into Span. (where later regularly Old Span. /dž/ > Modern Spanish /χ/) and from there it went into Fr. as *Carthagène*. But before this date, both cities were known in OF as *Cartage (ne)*, cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.; modern readers of medieval literature sometimes find it difficult to tell these two apart (or even to distinguish them from Carteia near Algeciras which was destroyed in late antiquity).[498]

On [1]: Idrīsī (1999, 278) describes Cartagena as the busy harbour of Murcia with fertile surroundings. But it was still politically a part of Murcia, so that according to the EI s. v. *Karṭādžanna* it does not appear to have enjoyed "much importance"; it is also not among the 70 towns included in the map *Al-Andalus à l'époque almoravide en 1086* by Lagardère (1989a, 25), for example. It had belonged to the Almoravids since 1091, when Yūsuf removed most of the minor kings from al-Andalus. If Cartagena is what is meant in the Song, this would explain why the Algalife – as younger brother of Marsilĭe's father or as brother of his mother – precisely in relation to Cartagena at least, is liegeman (*fedeilz*, v. 505) of his nephew Marsilĭe, the King of all Spain (v. 2747s., 2787), and the port of Cartagena would be the link to the Algalife's larger African estates. The main objection to Cartagena is its relatively modest importance.

---

497 Cf. Lombard (1978, 110s.), also on the economic importance of esparto grass in antiquity and Islam.

498 Two examples: 1) In the *Anseïs de Cartage* Charlemagne has conquered the whole of Spain (although nothing is said about Carthage) and before he returns to France, he appoints the young Anseïs as *rois d'Espagne et de Cartage* (v.105 ed. Alton), a formulation that is quite surprising if it means Cartagena, but there is nothing in the plot that would suggest it should be Carthage; Anseïs resides in an unidentifiable place called *Morligane* (v. 192, 201 etc.), and *Cartage* is never mentioned again. The editor identifies *Cartage* as 'Cartagena' in the index, probably correctly. 2) The PT (cap. 3) names a long list of towns that Charlemagne conquered *in Yspania*, but at the end of this list some North African towns suddenly appear such as *Besertum* 'Binzert/ Bizerta,', *Bugia* 'Bidžāya/Bougie', *Goharan quae est urbs in Barbaria* 'Waḥrān/ Oran', and then he turns back towards Spain via a few islands, before finally naming *Gibaltaria* 'Gibraltar', *Kartago* (in B1, of the *Codex Calixtinus*, scribe I; var. *Kirago*, unintelligible), *Septa* 'Ceuta'; this fits better with Carteia than with Cartagena or Carthage – but does the author know what he is talking about?

On [2]: If the *K*- in the archetype goes back to the poet, it would be a strong indication that he was thinking here of what he had learned in school, namely the Latin spelling *Karthago*, which survived alongside *Carthago* and was mentioned in elementary classes as an exception.[499] However usually in this context – and always in school – the meaning was Carthage and not Cartagena.

After the original Carthage was destroyed, a new, Roman city of the same name was built on the ruins, and by the end of antiquity it had become by far the biggest city in Africa (apart from Alexandria, which was regarded as being in Asia).[500] Most of the city was razed after it was conquered by the Arabs in 698 because they feared a counter attack by the Byzantine fleet; they expanded Tunis instead, which lay about 15km further south behind the protection of a lagoon, and made this the base of their fleet by linking the lagoon to the sea with a canal. At first, Tunis grew rather slowly, because the new capital cities Kairouan and al-Mahdiyya attracted people and fostered commercial activity. But when Kairouan was plundered by the Bedouins in 1057, Tunis benefited from an influx of refugees and became a very prosperous principality under the Benī Khurāsān which was independent of the Zirids in al-Mahdiyya until it was annexed by the Almohads in 1159/60 (EI s. v. *Tūnis*). Idrīsī (1999, 188–190) found that only the top part of their Carthage was inhabited and so he extolled the Roman ruins all the more.

We do not need to prove here that the Latin literature gives Carthage the attention it deserves. It appears as reliably on world maps as Jerusalem (18 out of 21 possible citations in von den Brincken 1968, 162). It is less well known that there still was considerable direct contact.[501] In the 11th c. – and possibly until the Almohad invasion after 1150 – there were still at least three bishoprics in North Africa.[502] Gregor VII three times contacted the bishop or the clergy and the people of *Carthago* in 1073 and 1076 (the bishop had recently visited Rome!) – although

---

499 The spelling *Karthago* goes back to the early stages of Latin when Lat. <C> was also used to represent /g/, and so only <K> was unambiguous. After the invention of the cross stroke in <C> which produced <G> the uncrossed <C> was reserved for /k/ and the spelling *Karthago* became much less common. But in later antiquity Priscian declared that *Karthago* and *Carthago* were equally good, and the grammarians after him preferred *Karthago*, partly with the erroneous justification that it was Greek (cf. the evidence in the TLL, Onomasticon, s. v. *Carthago*). Medieval schooling was then heavily influenced by Isidore (*et.* 1.27.13), who expressly says about the *K littera*: *Nunc autem 'Karthago' et 'kalendae' per eandem tantum scribuntur.*

500 On Alexandria cf. n. 95 above.

501 On the following, cf. Courtois (1945, passim).

502 The diocese of Gafsa (written in Arabic: *Qafsa*, in antiquity *Capsa*) seems to have survived in the rather remote south of Tunisia into the first half of the 12th c. (Courtois 1945, 110); according to Idrīsī (1999, 180) most of the inhabitants of this place still spoke 'African Latin'!

admittedly *Carthago* was perhaps meant in a broader sense (referring to Tunis?). There was also trade: Roger I of Sicily († 1101) profited greatly from a very lucrative trade agreement with the Zirids in 1076, and because of this, it was in his own interests not to take part in the great Pisan and Genoese expedition against al-Mahdiyya, nor to participate in the First Crusade (cf. recently Dalli 2008, 78s. and 82s.). As far as Tunis and Carthage in particular are concerned, it is especially illuminating to know that during Roger's time a trade ship from the La Cava monastery (!) regularly used the port of Tunis (Chalandon 1907, 2.368). Neither should we underestimate the role of refugees as bringers of news: the most famous of these was Constantinus Africanus, who was born as a Christian around 1010–1020 in Carthage, travelled to the Orient and then returned home, fled to Salerno and went into the service of Robert Guiscard, became a monk in Monte Cassino, and died probably in 1087, after he had translated many medical works from Arabic into Latin. Around 1148 Roger II ruled the African coast from Tripoli to Tunis, thanks to his fleet (Chalandon 1907, 2.165), apparently received tributes from Tunis for a time, but never personally attacked Tunis or Carthage (Dalli 2008, 88s.); his son William I had to relinquish the dynasty's African ambitions altogether in the early years of his rule (1154–1160) because of the unstoppable advance of the Almohads.

In the Song, *Kartagene* could have had this slightly broader meaning, similar to that intended by Gregor VII. The Almoravid state reached only as far east as Algiers (from 1082/1083 onwards, Lagardère 1989b, 99), and it never included Carthage. But the Almoravids had friendly relations with the Zirid state as early as 1086 (Lagardère 1989a, 193ss.), and when Roger I attacked the Zirid coast in 1118/1119, the Zirid ruler ʿAlī allied himself specifically with the Almoravids, whose fleet then plundered Nicotera in Calabria; in 1127 an Almoravid fleet went to Sicily once again, landing at Patti and Catania and even plundering Syracuse (Dalli 2008, 84s., Chalandon 1907, 2.372, 377); indeed, the reputation of the Almoravids in the whole of the North African area west of Egypt was so great that for example in 1146 in Tripoli (!), Almoravid supporters seized power for a short time, and were apparently even able to summon an Almoravid militia into the city, until the Sicilian Normans conquered it and made it their protectorate for twelve years (Dalli 2008, 87, Chalandon 1907, 2.161s.). Thanks to these events, people in the west could quite easily believe that the Almoravids governed North Africa as far as the border with Egypt. Thus, Carthage had a place in the Song because of its incomparable renown: a North Africa without Carthage would be an Africa that was not worthy of a Caliph.[503]

---

503 The fact that the Algalife is nevertheless Marsilie's liegeman may have been an echo from the Umayyad period: at that time, quite a few miscellaneous parts of the North African coast

A.6.2 *Alfrere*

The Algalife also owns *Alfrere* Segre 1915, *al frere* (with a clear space between the words) O, *Affrika* n, *Alverne* V4, *Oliferne* C, *Olinferne* V7, *Eufanie* P, *Ongrie* L: if we could believe that Halvorsen's stemma is correct, we could put *Affrika* from n into the archetype, and this fits well in terms of meaning. But this is not possible according to the Bédier/Segre stemma: as *al frere* in O and *Alverne* in V4 are related, the *Affrika* in n is an intelligent *lectio facilior*. But O evidently does not understand his source, *Alverne* 'Auvergne' in V4, *Oli(n)ferne* 'Aleppo' in CV7 and *Ongrie* 'Hungary' in L are secondary attempts to find a meaning; even *Eufanie* in P is by someone who knew the initial syllable *eu-* was 'good Greek' and had altered the name via **Aufanie* < **Alfanie*. *Al-* is likely because of OV4(P), *A[.]fr-* because of On(CV7), *-e* because all texts have it, and so altogether the form most likely to belong in the archetype is *Alfr[. . .]e*.

   What does it mean? Neither [1] *Oliferne* 'Aleppo' nor [2] al-Farama in Egypt nor even [3] Persia, but very probably [4] 'Africa' after all.

On [1]: The editors Theodor Müller, Gautier, Boehmer, Stengel, Jenkins and Roncaglia emend *al frere* to *Alferne*. They either simply equate this with *Oliferne* (Müller, and similarly Konrad Hofmann), which does not fit in terms of meaning, since there is no plausible meaning for *Oliferne* apart from 'Aleppo', and in any case it is located in the Orient (cf. above s. v. *Oluferne*, A.2.4). Or alternatively (as Stengel does in the Index) they indicate that it means a "country or city in the Orient", although there is no reason why the Algalife should be linked with "the Orient". Moreover, as Bédier (1927, 220) so rightly pointed out, one should never "emend" something to a form that is not attested anywhere else. It is editorially acceptable, on the other hand, to put *Alfrere* in the text, as do Bédier, Segre and Hilka/Pfister, as long as we remember that only the *Alfr[. . .]e* can be confirmed as certain.

Ad [2]: Scheludko (1928, 278) opted for al-Farama, known as Pelusium in antiquity, on what was once the north-eastern tip of the Nile Delta, the ancient border point between Egypt on the one side and Palestine/Arabia on the other, although he had previously (1927, 31) suggested *Oluferne*. The counter arguments noted above in relation to *Oluferne* also apply here. There is a further objection: from

which lay directly opposite Spain were under the control of the Umayyads, and this could have given the impression that North Africa was controlled by al-Andalus, and not the other way around. However, a basic narrative necessity must have been at least as important in the Marsilĭe section: no-one in this section could have a higher rank than Marsilĭe.

both ancient and medieval perspectives, Egypt was a part of Asia,[504] and even Alexandria far to the west of al-Farama was already under Baligant's direct rule. There is no reason for allowing Baligant's domains to interfere with those of the Algalife, and thereby confuse one of the clearest geographical principles in the Rol.

On [3]: The idea that *Alfrere* could be a corrupted form of Arab. (*bilād) al-Fārs* 'Persia' is a typical example of an incidental and semantically absurd identification, in this case thrown as an irrelevant aside into an otherwise decent article by Walker (1978–1979, 127 n. 18). No, since first there is no explanation for the considerable graphical and phonological variation, and above all secondly: if a potentate appeared in the Marsilie section who ruled over the lands from Carthage and the country of the Garantes, and 'Ethiopia' as far as 'Persia', then Baligant's arrival would be a stale repetition of what had come before.

On [4]: The name *Africa* was distorted during in the Middle Ages in two different ways: the least significant was a doubling of the *-f-*; this is quite commonplace from the 8th c. onwards[505] and appears in the Song in v. [1550]=1593 (*Affrike*, *Affrican*) and 2924 (*Affrike*).

The other was one of the most curious distortions ever to befall erudite names in the Middle Ages, i.e. interpreting the Arab. article into the name *Africa*. The Arab. term *al-Ifrīqiya*, generally used with the article, was evidently understood by a few westerners quite rightly as 'Africa', but then the longer term was accepted as the correct one, because the territory had been occupied by Arabic speakers in the meantime, and they would of course be the ones who would know. Thus, we find *Alfrike* in the *Chanson de Guillaume* 2016, 2211, 2784 and as a variant in the *Gui de Warewic*, *Alfrice* in the *Brut* (Flutre s. v.), *Alfrican* in the *Aspremont* (ed. Brandin, passim). *Alf-* then undergoes regular phonological change to *Auf-*, and there are dozens of references to *Aufrique* (also *Aufrike*, more rarely *Aufriche*) as well as *Aufricant* (all with variants starting with *Auff-*) (Moisan and Flutre s. v.).

    The writer of the archetype of all the texts of the Rol. shortened the name to *Alfr'*, a very common abbreviation *per truncationem*, which did not form a closed

---

504 Cf. on this point n. 95 above.

505 The *africam* in the Bobbiensis of Orosius (1.2.1, ed. Zangemeister) is from the beginning of the 8th c.; there are references from about 800 in the TLL s. v. *Afri*. In the 9th c., King Alfred the Great always writes *Affrica* in his translation of Orosius (ed. Sweet, passim), as does e.g. Geoffrey of Monmouth in the 12th c. References from the world map tradition in Edson et al. (2005, 43, 56, 63 and 77; and the same still in Hartmann Schedel's printed world map of 1493!).

category, but simply happened as and when the scribe felt it was appropriate.[506] Unfortunately, however, his first or second copyist did not understand this, and thus set off the chain of misunderstandings and reinterpretations outlined above.[507]

By the end of the 11th c. at the latest, 'Africa' in European sources is sometimes used with a much narrower meaning as a name for the Zirid state (~ Tunisia) or even as a city name for its later capital al-Mahdiyya.[508] But this is not very likely in this case; 'Africa' was much more commonly used in the Middle Ages just as it was in antiquity to refer to one of the three well known parts of the world alongside Europe and Asia (although as mentioned above, this Africa only reached as far as the western border of Egypt, where Asia began): *Terrarum orbis universus in tres dividitur partes, Europam, Asiam, Africam* – is what Pliny (3.3) says, echoed by Orosius (1.2.1) and Isidore (14.2.1). So, this basic meaning of the name is part of the elementary medieval curriculum, and in fact the historian Richer and the Norman chronicler Beneeit, for example, begin their works with a mention of these three continents.

This same meaning underpins the name, in principle, in our context too, but without evoking its full dimensions, since this would render the further naming of parts of Africa redundant. What it means, therefore, is 'most of, the vast reaches of [North] Africa'.

A.6.3 *Garmalie*

The Algalife also rules over *Garmalie* O 1915, *Gamaria* n, *Galiçe* ('Galicia') V4, *Caudie* ('Chaldea') CV7, *Nubie* ('Nubia') P, *Aumarie* ('Almería') L: V4CV7PL have

---

506 In fact, this was quite a reasonable supposition: for in Cappelli's handbook of abbreviations (1961, 432) we do not find *Alfr'* for 'Africa' since the handbook does not cover Fr., but we do find *Afr'* and even *Af'*, albeit from epigraphic sources.

507 In the particular case of *al frere* in O we can even go further. The long stroke curving to the left which Cappelli p. XIIs. presents as a truncation sign and illustrates with *f' = factis, filius* and *l' = legitur* appears on p. XXXIX again, but this time as an abbreviation for *rar . . ., rer . . ., re . . . .* Therefore O (or someone working on a previous version) could have thought he should render *alfr'* as *alfrer(e)*.

508 Cf. z. B. Mas-Latrie (1865–1868, 1.6), Moisan s. v., Flutre s. v. *Africe* 2° and supplement p. 323; it still appears as such on a Spanish maritime map of the 15th c. in Edson et al. (2005, 84). But then it often has a clarifying function: *cité d'Aufrique*, as in *Prise d'Orange* 1301 and later examples. It seems to me that this usage must have arisen, or have been much encouraged, by the great expedition that the Pisans made in 1087 against *Africa*, which was aimed at al-Mahdiyya.

secondary meanings; we can reconstruct *Ga(r?)ma(l/r)ie* from O and n for the archetype.

The meaning is the land of the [1] Garamantes, and not the land of the [2] *Benī Ghumāra*.

On [1]: The Garamantes, a Berber people (and according to KPauly s. v. *Garamantes* intermixed sub-Saharan Africans) were located in the Sahara, and their name lives on to this day in the name of the Džarma 'Germa' Oasis, 700 km south of Tripoli. Herodotus wrote on the one hand that they were a peace-loving people (4.174), but on the other that they possessed four-horse war chariots, which they used for hunting Ethiopians (4.183); this must have been enough to give them a reputation that impressed the Romans. The Garamantes provided auxiliary forces for Pompey's armies, a fact which was mentioned by Lucan (4.679). In the year 21 B.C., they were the target of a Roman campaign, and its commander L. Cornelius Balbus was even granted a triumph; thus Vergil, who had mentioned in the Eclogues (8.44) the *extremi Garamantes* 'the very distant Garamantes', in the *Aeneid* 6.792s. *ex eventu* "prophesied" Augustus would extend Rome's Empire as far as beyond the Garamantes (and Servius ad loc. explains that this people lived between Libya and *Africa*, i.e. the Roman Province of Africa). But in the year 24 A.D. they popped up again in some anti-Roman guerrilla activities, for which they were never punished, and so they inspired a kind of negative fascination in Pliny: he describes them in 5.26 and again in 5.34 as being located on the other side of the *deserta vasta*, mentions their *clarissimum* centre *Garama* in 5.36, counts twenty-five of their towns or smaller tribes in 5.37, which Balbus defeated. There is more detailed information about the *Garamantes* and their town *Garama* in Solinus (29.1–7; in 30.2–3 he calls them *Garamantici Aethiopes*) and Isidore (9.2.125 immediately before the *Aethiopes*, 14.5.6 and 13 between Cyrenaica and *Aethiopia*); Isidore also knows that they are named after their first king, Garamas, son of Apollo. Orosius (1.2.88, cf. also 90) mentions them together with the *Libyo-Aethiopes* (carried over into the *Cosmographia* by Pseudo-Aethicus cap. 43). The *Liber generationis* (1.197.69, MGH AA. 9.107) notes that the last of the peoples who have their own language are the *Garamantes qui et Marmaredae qui usque Aethiopiam extendunt*. According to Martianus Capella (6.671, ed. Dick p. 333) they live 'behind the deserts'. The *Periegesis* by Priscian (v. 202) and Avienus (v. 323s., ed. van de Woestijne) name them just before the *Aethiopes*. This ensures that they have a firm place in medieval general knowledge and are the most typical people of the Sahara: Fredegar (1.6, MGH SS.mer. 2.24) calls them *Caramantes*, Rabanus Maurus (*De univ*.12.4 and 16.2, PL 111.351s. and 444) repeats what Isidore says (on both occasions again next to the *Aethiopes*), the Geographus Ravennas (3.3/ 3.12, ed. Pinder/

Parthey p. 166) amalgamates the Garamantes with *Aethiopia* to make *Aethiopia Garamantium*; the more important world maps cite them (Beatus; the TO diagram for Bede's *De temporum ratione*, immediately before *Ethiopia*; Lambert of Saint-Omer, Hugh of St. Victor, Psalter-, Ebstorf- and Hereford maps, Ranulf; von den Brincken 1968, 162, Edson et al. 2005, 46); the Latin source of the MHG *Lucidarius* (end of the 12th c.) cites in quick succession the *magna Carthago*, *Aethiopia* and the *Garamantes* along with *Garama*. The poets are not far behind them: a Carolingian poet, probably Petrus Diaconus (MGH PLAeC. 4.912.13), uses them as a *topos* of impossibility: 'the Garamant will sooner drink from the Rhône, than I will ever forget you'; Geoffrey of Monmouth sneaks the *Garamantis* into his *Vita Merlini* (v. 1188, 1190, 1202, 1233) alongside *Affrica* and the *Ethiopes*. They are also not forgotten even in the earlier decasyllabic stage of the *Roman d'Alexandre* (appearing right next to *Etïope*) or in the *Athis* (Flutre s. v. *Agamaratés* or similar, *Garamanteis*, *Garimandois*, *Garimantés*).

Even this cavalcade of references could be extended further. Unfortunately, it is still very much needed, because the Garamantes were briefly introduced to Roland research by Tavernier (1903, 131 n.2) but then rejected by Boissonnade (1923, 162) on the incredible grounds that they are not attested in the Greek (!) geographers or in Honorius Augustodunensis!

We turn now to the form of the name in the Roland tradition. The Norse translator made a metathesis error: *Gamaría*. He was not the only one to do so: the Brussels ms. of Priscian's *Periegesis* (10th c.) has *Gamarendes* (ed. van de Woestijne v. 202), the Hereford map (13th c.) writes *Gamara civitas*, the *Athis* has *Agamaratés* (and also *Agaramatés*); this seems to be a typical error. But there was another difficulty with this name: no country name appears to have been deduced from the people name in the period before the Rol. The Norse *Gamaría* (< *Garam-ía*) can be interpreted as a regularly formed neologism from the city name *Garama*.

As far as the form of the name in O is concerned, the intermediate -*a*- is sometimes vulnerable as the weakest vowel in the name; thus mss. of Priscian's *Periegesis* from 9th/10th c. Western Franconia and from 12th c. Britain have *Garemantes*, the London Psalter map has *Garema[. . .]* (the rest of the name is hidden by a symbol of a mountain, Edson et al. 2005, 66), the Alexander epic has *Garimandois*, *Garimantés*; in O it is suppressed altogether, probably out of metrical necessity. A large *mappa mundi* from around 1250 (Simek 1990, 422) then has the country name *Garamannia*; the Premonstratensian William of Tripoli writing in 1271/1273 has *Garamania* in his *De statu Saracenorum* (von den Brincken 1970, Plate 2 after p. 272), where we must assume (as with all names that were relatively new at that time) that the stress was on -*ía*. If we do not want to accept that *Garmalíe* is a somewhat random neologism made from the

city name *Gar(a)ma*, there is an alternative: since *Garaman(n)ía* existed, *Garmalíe* can be a dissimilating form of this name (nasal-nasal > nasal-lateral).[509]

On [2]: Boissonnade's (1923, 162s.) preferred choice, the Benī Ghumāra, were a Moroccan Berber people south of Tangier and Ceuta, according to Ibn Khaldūn in an area measuring five days' journey in breadth and length. They had belonged to the eastern Moroccan Idrīsid empire from the late 8th to the late 10th c.; then they accepted the looser supremacy of the Spanish Umayyads, and then of the Ḥāmmūdids of Ceuta, and it was not until 1078/1079 that they were incorporated into the Almoravid empire by force (EI s. v. *Ghumāra*, Lagardère 1989b, 96s.). Boissonnade writes: "Leur intervention à Zalaca (octobre 1086), où ils avaient trouvé devant eux des Croisés français, avait décidé la victoire en faveur de Youssouf". He refers to three Arabic sources. However, these three sources, and indeed all Arabic accounts relating to Zallāqa, including the longest and the shortest, are easily accessible today in Lagardère (1989a, 193–224). It turns out that the Ghumāra are only mentioned in a single source dating from 1325 (!), the *Rawḍ al-Qirṭās* by Ibn Abī Zar' al-Fāsī (Lagardère p. 216), that is to say twice grouped together as 'Zanāta, Masmūda et Ghumāra'; and it was not they, but Yūsuf and his own corps who decided the outcome of the battle, by breaking out of cover and into Alfons' camp, creating so much panic that they and some additional troops including the 'Zanāta, Masmūda et Ghumāra' were able to put the Christians to flight. There is therefore no reason to assume that the Ghumāra played anything more than an average role in this battle – and this is not enough to give them precedence above the Garamantes, with all the multiple attestations of their links with *Ethiope*, which comes next in the song.

A.6.4 *Ethiope*

After all, the Algalife also rules over *Ethiope* O 1916, the same in V7P, *Etiopia* n, *Ethiopia* K, *Ethiopien* h(V), *Antioche* L: In the source of L, the *-p-* in **Aethiopia* must have been fairly illegible, and the rest do not need any explanation.

We have already discussed *Ethiope* above, in connection with the *Mors* (A.1.1.7): this is the normal classical and medieval term for 'black Africa', 'sub-Saharan Africa', and it does not mean (as Jenkins incorrectly maintains in

---

509 Similar to e.g. Gk.-Lat. *Panormus* > Ital. *Palermo*, Lat. *Hieronymus* > Ital. *Girolamo*. – The world map by Pietro Vesconte from around 1321 has in the Tanner ms. 190, f. 204ͬ (Edson et al. 2005, 73) the country name *Garamatia* (from which the nasal tilde has obviously been dropped); a misreading of the *-t-* as *-l-* would also explain how *Garmalie* could come from this.

relation to v. 1916) only East Africa. In fact, this Ethiopia, unlike today's Ethiopia, starts at the Atlantic coast; even in the *Aeneid* (4.480s.) there is talk of *Aethiopes* on the Atlantic, near the Atlas Mountains (or Mauritania, as Servius ad loc. explains); Mela (3.87) also knows about *Aethiopes* on the Atlantic coast, in Pliny 'Ethiopia' includes also the 'Ethiopian' Perorsi (5.10 and 16) and the 'Ethiopian' Daratita (5.10), both of which, judging by the context, are clearly on the Atlantic coast, many hundred miles south of the Atlas Mountains, in other words, in sub-Saharan Africa;[510] for Solinus (30.8, cf. 30.4) the *confines Mauretaniae* 'the (southern) neighbours of Mauritania' also belong to the *Aethiopes*; for Isidore, too, *Aethiopia* stretches from south of the Atlas Mountains to south of Egypt (14.5.14), and therefore it is also e.g. south of the Mauritanians, the Numidians, the Garamantes and the Cyrenaicans (14.5.4, 9, 13s. and 16).[511] This is what people still believed in the time of the Chanson de Roland: on the Liber-Floridus world map by Lambert of Saint-Omer (early 12th c.) *terra ethiopum* is immediately below Mauritania on the Atlantic coast (Edson et al. 2005, 63, clearer on the front cover of the book). Let us envisage *Etiope* here as 'the west of sub-Saharan Africa, as far as this could be known at the time of the Song of Roland'.

This also fits with the Almoravids: in an earlier phase of their existence, culminating around 1070, they had also carried the Islamic faith towards the south through military action and *grosso modo* Islamised the land west of the Niger bend (Kettermann 2001, 125, Lagardère 1989b, 84–90). Isidore (14.5.14s.) had already written that *Aethiopia* is named after the black skin colour of its inhabitants. But in the Song, the colour of their skin is mentioned (v. 1917 and 1933s.) as a qualification of *Etiope* as *tere maldite* and its inhabitants as *la contredite gent*; Noyer-Weidner (1959, 24) and Brault (1978, 226) rightly emphasise the fact that the poet believed that having black skin is a devilish quality. In the Middle Ages, the *Aethiopes* were generally thought to be the most southerly people on earth (Edson et al. 2005, 62), because the heat was so intense in the territory south of there, that no human being could survive – this is the view of the geographers from the Stoics onwards (Edson et al. 2005, 45, 58), also e.g.

---

510 Pliny mentions then (*nat.* 5.43) that some follow Homer in speaking of the 'Ethiopia divided into two parts' in Africa, the part facing to the east, and the part facing to the west (and this is copied later by Isidore 14.5.16); he himself, however, does not elaborate on this distinction.
511 It is only after 1200 that *Etiope* and *Açopart* in Fr. slowly begin to concentrate on the eastern part of sub-Saharan Africa, and essentially our Ethiopia, cf. Armstrong (1940/1941, passim, especially 246 with n. 10).

Isidore (14.5.17) and around 1100 emphatically Baldric of Bourgueil in his poem for Adela of Blois (ed. Abraham, no. 196, v. 934–941).

And so now the structure of the Algalife's attributes is clear, too. The poet's thoughts about Africa are moving in a southerly direction: the Algalife rules over the Mediterranean coast of Africa (represented by *Kartagene*), over 'white' North Africa (*Alfr[ik]e*) north of the desert, but also over the desert zone (*Garmalie*) and especially south of there, over black Africa (*Ethiope*), which now provides the majority of his troops. Could it be laid out any more clearly than this?

A.7 Other North Africans

In the Marsilĭe section there are three more North African magnates and one sub-Saharan African individual. All three have the title of king (the Caliph title is normally higher) and they all appear before the Algalife (since in the Marsilĭe section the personal intervention of the Algalife and his sub-Saharan Africans is intended to signal the last and best effort).

A.7.1 *Malquiant*, son of King *Malcud*, and his shield from *Tulette*

D'Affrike i ad un Affrican venut, / Ço est Malquiant O [1550s.]=1593s., *Malgide* V4, *Malqidanz* CV7PL, *Marquidaux* T, *Malquidon* w: T has replaced *mal* with *mar(e)* which has a similar meaning; V4 seems to be thinking of *mal(a) guida*. Forms of *cuidier* without *-d-* are to be found in OF at least from the south-west to the west as far as the Anglo-Norman area (Pope 1952, § 515, S.W. VIII, A.N. 1277), O alternates (4 times without, 9 times with *-d-*); based on the evidence in O and CV7PL the archetype therefore had *Malcuiant* or *Malcuidant* (or *-anz*) 'evil-minded'.[512] This Malcui(d)ant is *filz al rei Malcud* O [1551]=1594, *Malkus* (nominative) n, *Maalgù* V4, *Malduz* C, *Malguz* V7, *Maudus* P, *Maguz* T, *Macemuz* L: According to the orientalist Kunitzsch (1980, 354), *Macemuz* ultimately comes from the Berber tribe name of the *Maṣmūda* (in chronicles Latinised as *Mansamuz* etc.), while *Malduz/Maudus* are nominative forms attested elsewhere in the Romance epic of the Arabic personal name *Mawdūd*; *Maalgù* in V4 and possibly (as a later distortion) *Ma(l)guz* V7T seem to come from being equated with *Maëlgut* in O 2047 (even though the context suggests this is not correct); *Malkus* in n could simply be the

---

[512] I see no reason to derive the name *Malquiant*, as Scheludko (1927, 482) does, from an unexplained *Milkkâdam*.

rectus form of *Malcud* in O, but it is probably influenced by *Ioh* 18.10 *Malc(h)us*. β therefore had *Malcuz / Malcus* as opposed to *Malcud* in O, and for syntactical reasons, the latter belongs in the archetype. It is a back formation from *Malcuidant*, except the reduction *-ui- < -u-* is unexpected (*-ui-* would also fit in terms of the assonance): 'evil-minded', 'son of King Evilmind'.

I would be satisfied with this explanation of the pair of names as nicely invented aptronyms, were it not for two historical figures, both called (ʿAbd Allāh) *Ibn Mankūd* (var. *Mankūt, Matkūt*).[513]

The power of the Calbit dynasty which governed the whole of Sicily began to decline in around 1040 and the older Ibn Mankūd made himself ruler of Trapani, Marsala, Mazara, Sciacca and large areas of West Sicily. He was defeated around 1053 by a similar new ruler, Ibn ath-Thumna of Syracuse, who then found himself about to be defeated by a third new ruler Ibn al-Ḥawwās of Agrigent, and so he called upon the Normans to help him in Sicily, but they conquered the whole island for themselves by 1091. In 1154 Idrīsī (1999, 326) mentions *Qaṣr Ibn Mankūd*, a place about 15 miles from Mazara which must have been named after the older Ibn Mankūd, and it kept his name and memory alive.

The younger Ibn Mankūd[514] was in 1087/1088 Minister for the Zīrīd ruler Tamīm, when the Pisans and Genoese attacked al-Mahdiyya: Tamīm was not there, because he was putting down an uprising in the interior of the country; a bitter disagreement arose between the Minister and the Admiral of the Fleet, and this allowed the attackers to make a safe landing, which was a key factor in their eventual victory. The Normans did not participate in the campaign because they had signed a truce with the Zīrīd state; this is the reason why the Minister Ibn Mankūd was known to them. When we consider how popular Saracen names starting with *Mal-* are in the Rol., the change from *Mankūd* (or *Mankūt, Matkūt*) > *Malcud* is almost predictable (and it also explains the *-u-* instead of *-ui-* in *Malcud*).[515] There are two more factors in favour of this name, however. First, the name already exists in Arab. in a confirmed combination *Ibn* Mankūd; this produces precisely *le filz (al rei) Malcud*; and secondly, the fact that the name is confined to Sicily and the part of Africa directly opposite, which since the end of the

---

513 The following is mainly based on Amari/Nallino (1933–1939, 2.482 etc.) and Amari (1880–1889, 1.441, 2.33, 63, 727 and 729); cf. also Aḥmad (1975, 36).

514 Only the 30 to 35 years between them kept Amari/Nallino (1933–1939, 2.482 n. 2) from identifying both of them.

515 Since OF has automatic terminal devoicing, the question of whether it should be <-d> or <-t> is irrelevant.

11th c. had its centre in al-Mahdiyya, and which the Europeans often called simply *Africa* or *cité d'Afrique* (cf. above s. v. *Alfrere*, A.6.2).[516]

It is said of Malquiant (v. [1552]=1595s.): *Si guarnement sunt tut a or batud: / Cuntre le ciel sur tuz les altres luist.* Now in the Song, Charlemagne owns a folding throne made of gold (v. 115), and on the Christian side there is also a golden sword hilt, stirrup and spurs, gilded helmets, shield bosses, saddles, reins and banner, and even on one occasion (v. 3356) a gilded lance. In comparison, a set of armour entirely covered in gold must have seemed ostentatious.

Now in the Middle Ages the Islamic world was at least as rich in gold as Byzantium, and much richer than Catholic Europe. Has the poet therefore thrust this motif of ostentatious wealth in gold upon a random Muslim from among the over fifty individuals in his song? Certainly not! In the early days of Islam, the Nubian and Arabian mines supplied the Caliphate with gold as they previously had supplied the Byzantines; but from around 800 onwards, they were eclipsed by a new west African land of gold that was far superior to all that had gone before,[517] and that was referred to in the Arabic literature of the Middle Ages by the short name of *Ghāna*. It is not the same as the Ghana of today, which was named after the medieval land of gold by its founder, Kwaneh Nkrouma in 1957. The primary meaning of *Ghāna* is the name of a town which later was destroyed (and the secondary meaning was the land around it) between upper Niger and upper Senegal, but still only just inside what is now Mauritania (EI s. v. *Ghāna*). It was the great collection point for gold, and miners from further south brought their gold there, and then the caravans transported it northwards. The first mention of it is from just before the year 800, by al-Fazārī who calls it 'Ghāna the goldland'. Around 900 Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī reports: 'In the land of Ghāna, gold grows in the sand like carrots do in other places'. And: 'The most productive gold mine in the world is the one in Ghāna [. . .]'.[518] Just before 977 Ibn Ḥawqal describes the local ruler of Ghāna as the richest man in the world thanks to the gold mines that he controls. Idrīsī (1999, 74–77) devotes the equivalent of seven modern printed pages to 'Ghāna the Great', the most populous, active and wealthy town in sub-Saharan Africa, whose local ruler owns a block of gold weighing thirty pounds,

---

516 There are two additional homonyms: a Sicilian-Muslim poet and Berber of the 13th c. (Amari/Nallino 1933–1039, 2.482s.), and (with a further phonological variant) a place name identified from the 12th c. onwards, *Suwayqat* ('little market') *Ibn Mathkūd* in neighbouring Libya (Idrīsī 1999, 208) near today's Miṣrāta (cf. EI s. v. *Miṣrāta*), but they are only of interest to us in as far as they confirm the geographical limits of the name.

517 According to Kettermann 2001, 54 (cf. also 59). The following is based especially on Lombard (1974, 195 and 208–235) and EI s. v. *Ghāna*.

518 Cf. Dunlop (1957, 39).

and who along with all the inhabitants 'great and small', lives on prospecting for gold from his own gold territory a few days' march to the south, where the gold is famous not just for its abundance, but also for its purity. The routes from Ghāna and neighbouring areas through the Sahara led to Morocco, or Tunisia, or Cyrenaica; manufactured products and salt were transported to the south, while gold, as well as black slaves, were taken northwards.[519] In the 10th c., Kairouan profited the most (via the middle route); the huge supply of gold made it much easier at that time for the Fāṭimids to conquer Egypt from their base in Kairouan.[520] Even after that, until around 1050, the great wealth of Kairouan seems not to have changed very much: "Gold was used for ostentation in metalwork [! G.A.B.] and textiles".[521] From the second half of the 11th c. onwards, the Almoravids took some of the gold off to Morocco via the western route; but trade on the middle route continued to flourish, though following the quasi-demise of Kairouan it now went to several other places,[522] including not least al-Mahdiyya. From the late 11th c. onwards, the Zīrīd empire including al-Mahdiyya had to pay the Normans in gold for its essential grain imports from Sicily. This means, however, that the place that stood out to the Francophones as the most important centre of Islamic gold around 1100 was the part of North Africa directly opposite the Southern Italian Normans, in other words, it would have been mainly the Zīrīd state. Our *Affrican* must have been – as we can see from the name of his father – a representative of this state, and it is not a coincidence that he is the one to wear the gilded armour, rather than any of the other fifty or more fellow Muslims who are mentioned by name in the Song.

The golden covering on all of his *guarnemenz* must of course be compatible with the supreme quality of the *guarnemenz* themselves. To this end, the poet mentions only – and we should take this as an example of *pars pro toto* – Malquiant's shield from

Tulette O [1568]=1611, *Tolete* V4CV7, *Tollete* T, *Toulete* f 'Toledo', the famous armoury.[523]

---

519 Even in the 14th c. Ibn Faḍl-Allāh al-ʿUmarī (quoted in Lombard 1974, 223) could still make the aptly cynical remark: 'Worthless stuff is taken there, and camel-loads of pure gold are brought back'. More detail on the routes in Lombard (1974, 211–215, 222s.); clear sketch in Brett (1969, 350).

520 Cf. Lombard (1974, 230s.), Brett (1969, 358 with n. 73), Idris (1962, 675).

521 Brett (1969, 354), although he tries (in my opinion not very successfully) to play down the overall economic importance of gold.

522 On this see especially Brett (1969, passim).

523 Shields were not made entirely of steel, but they often had bands of steel on the edge to strengthen them, as well as a steel boss. Steel from Toledo was famous for its hardness, which was thought to be due to the water of the Tajo 'Tagus'. Even in antiquity, the sword blades of

A.7.2 *Reis Almaris del regne de Belferne*

Since Marsilĭe is king of the whole of Spain, and since, as his countless vassals show, there is no room for a second royal title in that country, the following king must be a North African:

Reis Almaris del regne de Belferne O 812, *Amalre* king of *Balverne* n, *Almaitin* of *Baiverne* V4, *Amauriz* of *Biterne* C, *Amaubriz* of *Bisterne* V7, *Margaris* of *Bitrine* T, *Amaris* e: *Biterne* 'Viterbo' (not 'Béziers', as Stengel thought) in C (and corrupted in V7T) is an incorrect *lectio facilior*. Similarly, *Baiverne/Balverne* in nV4 is influenced by OF *Baivière* (also *Balvière/Bauvière*) 'Bavaria'; but

---

Toledo were renowned (KPauly s. v.). During the Muslim period cf. Lacarra (1988, 620s.): "En la España musulmana, abundante en minas de hierro, eran famosos las aguas del Tajo por sus calidades para el temple del acero". Cf. also Lombard (1974, 149, 158s. and 241). – Lat. *Toletum* appears in Span. via normal phonological rules as *Toledo*, but in the OF epic (more than 60 times!) it always appears as *To(u)let(t)e*, and in Occitan literature it is *Toleta* (Marcabru, Bertran de Born, Peire Cardenal, Guiraut Riquier; cf. Wiacek s. v.). It would be very unusual for a place in the Pyrenean Peninsula to retain the erudite Lat. form, especially when there is a change of gender at the same time. We can offer a different explanation here: In Arab. the city is called *Ṭulayṭula*. Since Arab. does not have an /o/- phoneme, we would expect the first vowel to be -*u*-; feminisation (or making the feminisation more obvious) of city names with a final -*a* is very common in Arab. (cf. above A.6.1 *Carthagine* > Arab. *Karṭāǧanna* > *Cartagena*, and below n. 658 *Hispăli* > Arab. *Ishbilya* > *Sevilla*). Moreover, when the Arabs came to Spain, there was already a (dialectically or sociolectally limited) tendency in Arab. towards monophthongisation of the diphthongs, which in al-Andalus also produced hypercorrect forms (Corriente 1992, 41, Corriente/ Vicente 2008, 257); this explains the rendering of the Lat. -*ē*- with Arab. -*ay*-. Now in Arab. the sequence of vowels -*u-ay*- indicates a diminutive (cf. *al-qalʿa* 'the fortress' > Span. *Alcalá*, *al-qulʿaya* 'the little fortress' > Span. *Alcolea*); the name of the town thus suddenly looked like a diminutive, which gave rise to a hybrid, at first probably jocular and endearing formation when a pleonastic Lat.-early Romance diminutive ending was also added (Marcos Morín 1985, 603–605, thinks that the -*ul*- is a postpositive article like that found in Romanian. But throughout the Spanish-speaking area, the favouring of the prepositive article must have begun long before 700, which means that this would have to be an isolated case; also, there is no reason to have an article here at all.) Even after the Reconquista of 1085, Toledo retained its striking, Muslim-inspired culture for at least another 150 years (cf. the details in the EI s. v. *Ṭulayṭula*, p. 606). It is therefore understandable that it would be fashionable for the Arabic name of the town to be used in the Christian area shortly after the Reconquista; this is attested in e.g. datings such as a. 1085 *rex Adefonso in Toledola* (albeit here contaminated with a Span. -*d*-) in Sahagún or a. 1097 *rex domno Adefonso in Legione et in Toletola* in San Zoilo de Carrión, that is to say in two monasteries on the Way of St. James (reference from Marcos Morín 1985, 603). If the Arabic name were commonly used for a while in the court of Alfons and also all along the Way of St. James, it could have been taken up by the French. OF **T(o)uletle* would have then arisen, from which *T(o)ulet(t)e* emerged via loss through dissimilation of the second -*l*- (as in *flammula* > *flamble* > *flambe*).

the archetype is confirmed by O and by *B(e/a)l(f/v)erne*, and since -*a*- and -*v*-
can be explained by association with 'Bavaria', the *Belferne* from O is the most
likely one for the archetype. – Stengel puts *Amalris* instead of *Almaris* in his
critical edition and adds in the index that it is probably *Amalrich*, the name of a
West Gothic king, which a scribe could have confused with *Almarich*, the name
of two kings of Jerusalem. But in research nowadays the name of the King of
Jerusalem (and the King of Cyprus and titular king of Jerusalem in Acre) is also
Amalrich. *Almarich* is just a metathetical variant of *Amalrich* (-*Amaury*), when it
appears in the Merovingian period (MGH SS. 2.345), then is well attested in
(mainly southern) France from about 900 (Morlet 34, where e.g. in Marseille in
1051 the same person is called *Amelricus/Almaricus*; cf. also Kremer 1972, 55s.
with n. 114 and 119). In our context n and C(V7) have the older form, while O
and V4 (the latter with a misreading of the -*r*- as -*t*-) have the metathetical form.
I suspect that the archetype had *Almaris*, as in O, which would have sounded
like southern French to the poet, or perhaps even like Arabic because of the
al-[524] and which n and δ then "corrected" independently of each other.

The meaning of *Belferne* is not [1] the Benī Merīn, but probably [2] the Benī
Ifrān/Ifræn.

On [1]: Boissonnade's explanation (1923, 163–166) of *Almaris del regne de Belferne*
is one of the weakest passages in his book. He cites this personal name from the
outset as "Almaris (ou Aumarie)" although *Aumarie* is not attested as a variant;
and, we are surprised to read, it is to be regarded as identical with the city name
Aumarie 'Almería'. He goes on: "*Belmerin* ou *Belmarine*, altération phonétique qui
se retrouve dans la forme *Belferne* ou *Belmerne* du copiste d'Oxford", although *Bel-
merne* is not attested here, nor anywhere else. This random replacement of -*f*- with
-*m*- is enough on its own to discredit his thesis. It continues as follows: the Benī
Merīn had played "entre le XIe et le XIVe siècle un rôle considérable, soit au Magh-
reb, soit en Espagne". This formulation does not reveal that their first appearance

---

524 Broëns (1965–1966, 66) believes again that the West Gothic provenance of the name is
important (for convenience, he cites only the form *Amalri* unlike O and the majority of the crit-
ical editions). Since we will also come across quite a few Germanic names for Saracens in the
Rol., it should be noted that later epics evidently view Germanic names (which with the excep-
tion of the great dynastic names very quickly became archaic) as slightly weird, and therefore
suitable for Saracens. Cf. the long list of Saracens with Germanic names in Moisan (excluding
those which are already in the Roland material or the most dubious cases): *Aelran*, *Alistant/
Aristant* (< OE *Æþelstān*), *Angart*, *Anquetin* (< Old Norse *Ansketill*), *Antelme*, *Begon*, *Chlodué*,
Dagobert, *Estormi*, *Faramunt*, *Forqueré*, *Gaifier*, *Galerant*, *Galindre*, *Gaubert*, *Gaudelin*, *Gau-
demer*, *Gaudin*, *Gaudré*, *Gontier*, *Grimouart*, *Guibaut*, *Guinemer*, *Huidres* (< *Odilo*), *I(n)soré*,
Maingot, *Otran*, *Outré*, *Roart*, *Thibaut*.

in history (according to EI s. v. *Marīnides*) is in 1195 and that they did not play any significant role until between 1244 and 1269 when they took over from the Almohads; thus the only thing that Boissonnade can say about them in the 11th and 12th c. is the supposition that like so many other Berber people some Benī Merīn could have come over to Spain along with the Almoravids, e.g. also to Almería; this is supposed to be enough justification for the poet's use of Almería as a man's name.

On [2]: Boissonnade's reference to the Benī Merīn is helpful in only one respect: he reminds us that they were actually – albeit more than a century after the Rol. – widely known in western sources[525] as *Belmarin*, *Belmerin* etc. This suggests that the Beni Ifrān (widespread north west African pronunciation: /ifrǟn/[526]) are behind the *Belferne*, and that the second part of the name has aligned itself with the "epic" ending *-erne*.[527] Now it is only fair to mention that it was Boissonnade himself (1923, 158–160) who had first brought the Beni Ifrān into Roland research; but he had already used them to explain the name **Alferne* (cf. above on *Alfrere,* A.6.2) inserted by Theodor Müller, Stengel etc. and (mixed with other elements) to explain *Califerne* (cf. below C.4.5) – in my opinion both identifications are incorrect – and so he obviously did not want to use them again here to explain *Belferne*.

The complex history of the important Berber tribe, the Beni Ifrān (part of the larger Zanāta group) is recounted in a very accessible way by Tadeusz Lewicki in the article of the same name in the EI.[528] They were based in Tilimsān/Tlemcen, today in the western part of Algeria, which they had built as a new city on top of the old Roman *Pomaria*, but later they had to share it with their sister tribe, the Maghrāwa: these were – not atypically for Berber – often their arch enemy, and often their ally, and sometimes it was difficult to tell the difference between these positions. From around 950 onwards, the Beni Ifrān profited greatly from being loosely ruled by the Spanish Umayyads and controlled territories for a time in the east as far as Wahrān/Oran, in the west Fās/Fès and even Salā'/Salé on the Atlantic, until they automatically regained their independence for a time thanks to the

---

[525] Boissonnade (1923, 164 n. 4); more references in Flutre s. v. *Belmarin* and *Belle Marine*. Ariosto (14.25.1) still writes about *quei di Bellamarina*. In both *Belmarin* and *Belferne* there could be inner-Romance dissimilation of the first *-n-* from the second one. However, I suspect that this goes back to north west African Arab. since Corriente (1977, 42) cites from Morocco *Belmusa < Ibn Mūsa*.

[526] Cf. Corriente/Vicente (2008, 291).

[527] On this see above s. v. *Oluferne* (A.2.4).

[528] By way of contrast, the *Tilimsān* article in the EI covers the period before 1300 very cursorily; the Benī Ya'lā and Benī Khazar mentioned there are the ruling houses of the Benī Ifrān and the Maghrāwa.

demise of the Umayyads, but then between 1058 and 1082 they capitulated from the west to the east, mostly without bloodshed, to Yūsuf ibn Tāshufīn, who incorporated them into his Almoravid empire (cf. on this also Lagardère 1989b, especially 69s., 90–94).[529] A small part of this tribe had even crossed over to settle with the Umayyads in al-Andalus; from 1015–1065 they were one of the smallest Taifa realms around Ronda in Andalusia. This is what Lewicki reports. The Beni Ifrān were most significant in the middle of the 11th c. After this, news of their activities is sparse; nevertheless, in 1133 there is an Emir of Tlemcen in early Almohad circles (Mas-Latrie 1865–1868, 1.36).

But why should they appear in the Song? The *Belferne* people and their king *Almaris* encounter Gualter del Hum and his troops. They have the same role, only for the opposite side, which is to secure the mountainous flanks of the large military road, on which and around which, according to the Song, the battle takes place (as a cavalry contest!). The poet is thinking that Marsilĭe could allocate this task to one of his auxiliary peoples, and in particular to a people who are accustomed to fighting in the mountains. Now the ancient geographers write at length and in vivid tones about the Atlas Mountains in the very northwest of Africa (Mela 3.87, Pliny 5.5s., 5.11, 5.14 etc., Solinus 24.8, Orosius 1.2.11, Isidore 14.8.17; Ovid offers the most memorable poetic description in *Met*. 4.626–661 with the myth of Atlas holding up the world). But the Roland poet must have wondered which peoples were living there when he was writing his Song. He would have known very few North African names and if the only thing he knew about the Benī Ifrān was that they were not a Mediterranean people, since they lived further inland (Tlemcen is 800 m above sea level, in fact), then he could very well have brought them in here.

A.7.3 *Reis Corsa<b>lis, Barbarins*

This brings us to the last North African ruler in the song: *Reis Corsa<b>lis* Segre 885, *Corsalis* O 885, *Kossablin* n, *Cursabile* K (*Cursable* Ms. A), *Consabrin* V4, *Corsablis* C, *Corsabrin* V7T, *Borsabels* h(B): *Corsa-* belongs in the archetype based on OCV7T (and K), although K has used a Latinised form (as he sometimes does). At this point we cannot decide whether β had an -*is* ending as in OC (and h(B)) or an -*in* ending as in nV4V7T, the hypocoristic -*in* that is very common with Saracen names,[530] among others; but in β -*sabl*- nKCh(B) is older

---

529 The Ḥamāma and the Benī Yaʿlā mentioned there belong to the Beni Ifrān.
530 On this, cf. n. 81 above!

than *-sabr-* V4V7T (although the distribution does not strictly accord with the stemma). The archetype therefore had *Corsalis* as in O or *Corsabli(s/n)* as in β. And we turn now to the second mention of this name:

Corsablix (:i) O 1235, *Korsables* n (*Kossablin* B,b), *Cursabile* K, *Corsabrins* V4CV7TL, *Corsaprins* P, *Korsabrin* w, *Cursubles* h(H): The *-ix* in O is probably just down to a scribal whim. The *-b-* runs through all texts this time; therefore, *Corsablis* is in the archetype based on On(K) and the assonance vowel.

This king is **Barbarins [. . .]** *e mult de males arz* O 885s., *Barbarins* also in V4CV7T, *Barbarijn* h(B): *Barbarins* 'Berber (adj.), a Berber' is in the archetype. The name of the Berbers is probably etymologically identical with (Gk. and) Lat. *barbari* (EI s. v. *Berbers*, LM s. v. *Berber*); the Arabs took over this name from the Latinised inhabitants of North Africa, who used it to refer to their non-Latinised neighbours.[531] This led to Arab. *barbar* as a collective term 'the Berbers', and then Ital. *Barberìa*, *bàrbero* (*cavallo*, Mod. French *cheval barbe*), *barbaresco* (> archaic Ger. *Barbareskenstaaten*), but also modelled on widespread north-west African Arab. pronunciation,[532] Ital. *bèrbero*, Span. *bereber*, Port. *berbere* (and then from these the international term); additionally, Arab. *barbarī* 'Berber (adj.), Berber', leading to Old Occ. *barbarí* (Wiacek 1968 s. v.) and OF *barbarin*.[533] OF *barbarin* 'Berber' also appears five times in the *Chanson de Guillaume* (v. 773 etc.); on this see Bancourt (1982a, 19s.), with references from other epics.

Berber-influenced North Africa had been prone to sectarianism even in Christian late antiquity (Montanists, Donatists, especially Circumcellions), and even more so in the Islamic 8th to 11th c. (Kharijites, Şufris, Ibadis, Shiites, cf. EI s. v. *Berbers*, *c: After Islam*). This resulted in the Berbers being accused even by the Muslims of al-Andalus, and by the medieval Christians, of perfidy and black magic: and this individual is also *mult de males arz* (on this Bancourt 1982a, 19s.).

It is certainly no coincidence that he is killed by Turpin. The poet likes to give him those Saracens who most deserve to be his victims, not just because they belong to the Muslim faith, but because they are especially damnable for other theological reasons: in this case, because he practises black magic.

But what does the name *Corsalis / Corsablis* tell us? Bancourt (1982a, 47) thinks it is simply a typical name belonging to a whole group containing *Cors-* 'body', and he does not go on to explain the second part.[534] But in OF there is both

---

531 Admittedly in late Latin there was a split between the specific *Barbares* (reserved especially for the Berbers living in today's Morocco, TLL s. v. *Barbares*) from the more general *barbari,* and so there have sometimes been doubts about their etymological connection.

532 Approximately /bərbər/, cf. Corriente/Vicente (2008, 290), Corriente (2008, p. LII with n. 73).

533 MLat. *Barbaria* (e.g in the PT cap. 3) probably comes directly from the Lat.

534 Sainéan (1925–1930, 428) had previously expressed a similar view.

coursal and *coursable* with the basic meaning 'distinguished through fast or fre-
quent running'; this suggests, especially with O's vacillation between *-b-* and no
-b-, that the poet is not thinking of *corpus*, but of *curs(us)* or derivations from it.
Both *corsal* and *corsable* are also attested referring to fast ships, although in
French, only much later than the time of the Rol. Indeed, *corsal* in the French
Marco Polo text (just after 1300) it is even used as a noun, in the plural form *co(u)
rsaus*; Godefroy s. v., already knew of a reference to this, but now we find seven
references in the new, critical edition (Marco Polo 2001–2009, vol. 6, sections
177.10, 178.6, 178.14, 179.7, 180.10, 181.3, 184.16), and the editor of the volume,
Dominique Boutet, correctly translates this, not as Godefroy's vague 'vaisseau(x)'
but as 'pirates, corsaires'. If we now broaden the perspective from French to the
whole Romance area, then the chronological discrepancy with the Chanson de Ro-
land shrinks. In late Latin (in Sidonius Apollinaris) there were *(naves) cursoriae*
'fast ships' (here: packet ships), and new words with *curs-* have probably often
been formed to refer to fast ships ever since (cf. the references from the 13th c. in
DuCange s. v. *cursoriae*). In the 12th c. the MLat. *cursalis* 'corsair' appears in con-
nection with the year 1192 in the Genoese chronicler Ottobonus, who wrote up to
the year 1199 (MLLM s. v., MGH SS. 18.107); in 1200 there is a competing form *cur-
sarius* in a charter of the young Frederick II (Mlat.Wb. s. v., now MGH DD. F II/1,
Nr. 26). And although *cursarius* went on to establish itself across the whole of Eu-
rope, *cursalis* was by no means ephemeral: Battaglia attests that Ital. *corsale* is in
1264 in the peace treaty made by the Pisans with Tunis, *corsaro* does not appear
until Dante; *Corsale/Cursale* remained, along with *Corsaro,* a south Italian family
name (Caracausi 1993 s. v.). Moreover – and even more interesting for us – the *cur-
salis* type, and not *cursarius,* was taken over into Arab.: in modern Arab. it is *qur-
ṣān* 'pirate' (and even the root *qrṣn* is productive there),[535] but in the medieval
Arab. of the Pyrenean Peninsula, it was still *qorṣál* (Corriente 1977, 43, 1992, 139,
and 1997 s. v. QRṢL with a late medieval original reference from Granada and the
transcription *corçál* in Pedro de Alcalá). Finally, *corsal* 'corsair' is also to be found
in a Hebrew chronicle of the period around 1500 for a Genoese corsair (Sermoneta
1974, 196). This is, therefore, a Mediterranean word *par excellence*.

   As far as the historical facts are concerned, at the time of the Crusades, it
was even more difficult than usual to tell the difference between Christian ver-
sus Muslim pirate activity on the one hand, and regular naval warfare on the
other. On the Muslim side, large parts of the Barbary coast were involved, e.g.

---

535 Cf. the EI s. v. *ḳurṣān*, col. 506a; I do not know why the author of the article, Christian
Pellat, supposes that the word came into Arabic as early as in the 9th c.

the dockyards of Bidžāya/Bougie and Annāba/Bône (EI s. v. *ḳurṣān*, col. 506). But by far the most infamous corsair base in the 11th and 12th c. was the island of Džerba/Djerba (with its 500 km^2) in the Gulf of Qābis/Gabès, and the Christians were not the only ones with reason to detest it.[536] It was one of the last refuges of the Kharijite heresy; al-Bakrī (died 1094) and Idrīsī (in the year 1154; 1999, 205s.) write that its inhabitants have a devious character (cf. *mult de males arz*!); according to al-Bakrī, the inhabitants carried out 'robberies on land and sea'; Idrīsī not only emphasises their brown skin colour, but also specifically complains that even their upper class only speaks the Berber language (cf. *Barbarin*!). After 1060, when the Zīrīd state in Kairouan and al-Mahdiyya began to show signs of weakness, they extracted themselves from its rule and expanded their pirate activities, now targeting Muslims as well. In 1118 the Zīrīd rulers managed to suppress them for a time, but not for long. In 1135 the south Italian Normans conquered the island, which then became a support base for Norman piracy. In 1153 they brutally quashed an uprising, but in 1160 they had to relinquish Djerba to the Almohads.

It does not necessarily follow from all of this that the Roland poet imagined his *Barbarin* as the ruler of Djerba. He may also have been thinking of the Ḥammādīds, and the royal title would have been even more appropriate in that case. The Ḥammādīds, who were also of Berber ethnicity (from the Ṣanhādža group), had lived in Qalʿat Benī Ḥammād in the interior from 1068, but from time to time they left that area, until they definitively left it and from 1090 onwards came to live in Bidžāya/Bougie on the coast, where they, too, had to put up with Norman interference.[537] It does show, however, the kind of associations we might expect to find with *Barbarin*: the word was almost synonymous with 'pirate'. And this makes it difficult to separate the *Corsalis* in O from the *cursalis* 'corsair' that would have been prevalent in the same century. I therefore think that *Corsalis* is the first appearance, so to speak, of the word 'corsair', only in onomastic disguise. It appears that the word was largely unknown to the copyists, and this led them to think of the related term *co(u)rsable*; in the second mention of the name, O gives in to this trend.

536 This is based mainly on the EI s. v. *ḳurṣān*, col. 507a, and s. v. *Djarba* and Chalandon (1907, 2. 159s.).
537 For example, Roger II forced them to release some Christian monks (who had been in the Ḥammādīd empire all along!), in 1143 the Normans even destroyed Džidžal/Džidžel(l)i/Jijel near Bidžāya/Bougie during one of their raids (Chalandon 1907, 2.160, 369s.) etc.

A.7.4 *Abisme*

At the very moment when Marsilĭe finally enters the battle with his main troops (v. [1628]=1467ss.), the poet wants to make the heathen, diabolical character of this force especially obvious once again – in the figure of Marsilĭe's standard-bearer, the black African *Abisme* O [1631]=1470, *Abysse* K, *Albismie* V4, *Abinie* C, *Abisme* V7, *Abismes* P: C had *Abime* in front of him and misread -*m*- as -*ni*-. The association *albissimus* in V4 creates a nice name *e contrario* for the pitch-black (v. [1635]=1474) Abisme, but this certainly does not mean (contra Jenkins ad loc.) that it should be brought into the archetype. With *Abysse* 'abyss, chasm' K has correctly identified the etymology of the name, but the archetype evidently requires *Abisme*. This brings us to the second mention:

> *Abisme* O [1659]=1498, *Ambles* n (*Abison* B, b), *Albisme* V4, *Malcuidant* P: P repeats a name from v. [1551]=1594, although its bearer has already been killed, even in P (cf. Segre's apparatus on v. [1569] = 1612).
> *Abismus* also in the *Carmen* v. 334, 345.

The name is the same as the appellative 'abyss' which in Gallorom. (where it is attested from the 12th c. onwards) and in Iberorom., is influenced by the abstraction suffix -*ismus*. The source of the name is of course the abyss of hell, which is especially significant in the book of Revelation (*Apoc* 9.1,2,11, 11.7, 17.8, 20.1,3). The use of the word as the name of an individual does not seem to be attested before the Chanson de Roland. The closest to it is the reference noted by Heisig (1935, 33) found in the commentary on the book of Revelation by Beatus of Lié-bana (4.116): *abyssus enim sunt homines in tenebris ambulantes*. The meaning of the word for people in the Middle Ages is clear, e.g. in Rabanus Maurus (*De univ.* 6): *abyssus infernum significat [. . .] abyssus damnatio peccatorum sempiterna*, and it even looks as if the enumeration of Abisme's crimes (*mult granz felonies, traïsun et murdrie*) has been made with an eye on this sentence from Rabanus: *abyssus corda hominum denotat facinoribus tenebrosa*. Thus, we can agree with Heisig (1935, 33) and view Abisme as a "servant of the Antichrist".

The poet obviously holds some racist views, because he can imagine no better physical correlation for this "black" heart than the very black colour of his skin (v. [1635]=1474): *Issi* ['so', i.e. exactly like the being he has just described] *est neirs cume peiz ki est demise*. Abisme is therefore a black African, but unlike the Algalife and the North Africans of royal blood, he is accorded no inherited rank by the poet, and he is also set apart from Baligant's standard-bearer, since he is accorded no fiefdom either, and yet because of his impetuousness, he is much valued by the unscrupulous King Marsilĭe, and is his *drud* (v. [1639]=1478s.). Since the Roland poet always aspires to make sense on the literal level, we might ask: how does the

African come to be in Marsilĭe's court, and why is he the one to have this role? The answer must surely be this: because of his career as a military slave. In Spain, al-Ḥakam I (796–822) had already bought many slaves because he needed to protect himself from the constant unreliability of his various ethnic Arabian, Syrian and Berber army sections and even from the Arabic-speaking citizens of Córdoba. He obtained these slaves from wherever they could be purchased (Lévi-Provençal 1957, 108), and he formed them into a huge bodyguard; this then became the accepted practice, and so in the 10th c. especially, military slaves who were living in the inner circle around the monarch could work their way up to the highest military positions (Lévi-Provençal 1957, 328–330). In fact, in Spain during the time of the Umayyads, these were mostly *saqāliba* 'Slavs' (or more precisely: Europeans of very diverse ethnic origins), but especially since the time of ʿAbd arRaḥmān III, there were also black slaves who were imported from Africa, although they were usually barred from rising to the higher ranks (Lévi-Provençal 1957, 329, Clot 1999, 199s.).

The moment he first catches sight of Abisme (v. [1645]=1484) Turpin says to himself: *Cel Sarrazin me semblet mult herite [. . .]*. As the word 'heretic' appears somewhat surprising here, given its modern meaning, Brault (1978, 208s.) wonders whether it might be an allusion to Abisme's homosexuality, since OF *herite* from the *Roman de Renart* onwards is sometimes used with the figurative meaning 'homosexual'. But I do not think this is a necessary assumption here. In fact, Islam was regarded as a new 'heresy' when it first emerged, and this view prevailed for a considerable time,[538] in colloquial language sometimes even longer e.g. in the *Carmen in victoria Pisanorum*, Str. 52: *Machumate[s]/ Qui fuit heresiarcha potentior Arrio,/ Cuius error iam permansit longo mundi spatio*. Turpin senses that Abisme is in this sense 'very, unusually' heretical.

And his supposition is correct: Abisme has a personal relationship with the demonic sphere through his own shield; in fact, this shield (v. [1663s.]= 1502s.) *En Val Metas li dunat uns diables, / Si li tramist li amiralz Galafes*. In the β-branch there is no equivalent in n, K and V4; but the δ have (according to Segre): *En Val Mortal (Mortoi P, Molet T), ce dïent li plusor, / Uns vis (des PT) diables li dona par amor: / Cil (Si V7PT) le (ly T) tramist Galafre l'amanzor (son seignor P)* CV7PT – clearly just an amplification of O.[539] As Segre points out,

---

538 This was the view of the earliest specialist in heresy, and the one who first had contact with Islam, John of Damascus, *De haeresibus liber*, cap. 101 (PG 94, col. 764–774).

539 *Val Mortal* CV7 looks like a *lectio facilior*, *Val Mortoi* P and even *Val Molet* T (< *Moˈtel) appear to have come from this reading. Thus, there is a good chance that *Val Metas* O is the best reading. The fact that it is not attracted by the assonance, and that it is in first position, show that this detail is significant in the story. Boissonnade (1923, 195) emended it (with <t> ~ <c>) to *Val Mecas*, which (with local -*s*) would mean 'Valley of Mecca'. We can then understand this e.g.

Génin, Gautier, Th. Müller, Clédat, Bertoni and Roncaglia believed that the two sentences in O had to be rearranged: Galafre passes on to Abisme a shield that he has been given by a devil. Bédier questioned this (1927, 215s.), because the sequence of events in O is confirmed by the δ. Therefore, he translated this passage as follows: "En Val Métas un diable lui avait donné (à Abisme) cet écu, et c'était l'émir Galafre qui le lui avait envoyé (*à lui*, Abisme)". In the *Édition définitive* (1937), too, he retains O, but here he translates as follows: "au Val Métas un démon l'avait donné à l'émir Galafe, et l'émir à Abisme".[540]

Now we must understand that there is an element of narrative logic in this matter: Abisme is supposed to die while relying on his shield; this makes more sense if it is a work of the devil rather than just a trinket obtained from a devil. But in my opinion, we can only obtain this more plausible meaning from O if we grant that he has used a somewhat compressed manner of speaking: the devil brought Abisme a shield that he had manufactured for Galafre, who then immediately and generously passed it on to Abisme by asking the devil to take it to him.

It is not just his personal misdeeds – *mult granz felonies, traïsun e murdrie*, all of which would be crimes in *any* ordered society – that make Abisme into a suitable victim for Turpin specifically, but it is the fact that he places his trust in a gift of the devil. For the archbishop does not gallop towards his opponent with his spear raised, as one might expect, but he puts his own life in greater danger by going in with a raised sword and splitting the shield and the rider with one tremendous blow; this shows the incredible power that the sword of an archbishop has against a gift of the devil.

---

as follows: when Abisme was making his pilgrimage from Spain to Mecca, he was given a shield, via a devil, as a reward by Baligant's predecessor, the *amiralz Galafe<r>es*, who also had his residence in the Orient. But the identification is still uncertain: because Arab. *Mákka* appears elsewhere in French from the very beginning (*Couronnement de Louis*) until the present day as (*La) Me(c)que* (in OF occasionally also *Mec*, Old Pic. also *Mieque*, sometimes with local *-s*) with no variation in the stress (cf. Moisan, Flutre s. v.). This is true also of translations from the Latin: when Alexandre du Pont in 1258 translated the *Otia de Machomete* by Gautier de Compiègne into his *Roman de Mahon*, the *Mecha* in his source was turned into *Meke* (v. 1956).

540 Sandqvist (*Romania* 99 [1978], 448) attempted to defend Bédier's new translation, in my opinion without success: because the suggestion that the *li* in v. [1663]=1502 is a cataphoric reference to *Galafe,* who does not appear until the end of v. [1664]=1503 in a new main clause, is an unnecessary assumption which does not fit in at all with the otherwise straightforward syntax of the song. The supposed parallels from other texts suggested by Sandqvist are not appropriate, first, because they are taken from highly rhetorical and affected passages, secondly, because the element that is brought forward is not a personal pronoun, and thirdly, because this element never appears in a different main clause than the word it refers to.

A.7.5 Review of North Africa

The Song incidentally provides a wonderful picture of the key aspects of Muslim North Africa as it was in those days. The emphasis is on the Algalife and his battle-winning black African troops, clearly modelled on Yūsuf at Zallāqa, the historical ruler of the Almoravids and his battle-winning troops, at least some of whom were black Africans. The other three kings represent the great wealth in gold that was conspicuous in this era, pirate activity, and the mountainous interior of North Africa. Finally, Abisme stands for the black African slaves who even before the Almoravid period had come to Spain as part of the slave trade.

Affrike will be mentioned later by Charlemagne in v. 2924 as one of the lands that he foresees rebelling after Roland's death. As the other countries are all in Europe, this is dealt with below in section C.4.5 'The future rebels against Charlemagne'.

A.7.6 A special case: *Li amiralz Galaf<r>es*

And finally, a word on the above-mentioned (A.7.4) *li amiralz Galaf<r>es* Segre [1664]=1503, *li amiralz Galafes* O, Galafre *l'amanzor* CV7T, *Galafre son seignor* P: Since CV7PT mention this figure in a laisse with a rhyme in *-or*, the title *amanzor* could have been selected for the sake of the rhyme, and so it is not likely to have been in the archetype. Rather, the poet is casually mentioning a predecessor of Baligant – just as in the case of the *amiralz de Primes* (A.5.8).

In the older epic literature, excluding minor characters, there are two individuals called Galafre:

1) in the *Mainet,* the Muslim ruler of Toledo who comes from Africa (II 97), but who also rules over many *Surians* 'Syrians', gives refuge to the exiled (Charles) Mainet; he is called passim *l'amirans / amiraus / amiré* (II 90, 94, 99, 107, III 68, 97, 119, 149, V 52, 145), though once a certain Coldroés (III 87) has this title as well; in the PT too (cap. 20, in the *Codex Calixtinus* written by scribe II) he is called *Galaffrus, admirandus Toletae*. The fact that a ruler of Toledo can hold the Amir-al(-mu'minin)-title is of course a reminiscence of the glorious Umayyad time.

2) in the *Couronnement de Louis* there is a Muslim king called *Galafre* who has invaded Italy, and who is Supreme Commander over several other kings (v. 348); he is sometimes (v. 437, 472, 1419, 2239) given the title *amirant*, *amirez*, as indeed is a certain Corsolt (v. 302) on one occasion.

In the Chanson de Roland, the casual mention of predecessors does not notice-
ably impair the structural singularity of Baligant as *amirail*.[541] The poet most prob-
ably was thinking of the *Galafre* in the *Mainet* story, and there are several reasons
for this. First, *Galaf(r)e* comes from Arab. *Khalaf*[542] and the replacement of the /x/
by /g/ (via an intermediate stage /ɣ/) points to Spanish and not Italian transmis-
sion.[543] Secondly, the name *Khalaf* is not only well attested in Spain,[544] but in
fact one individual who bore this name merits our special attention. The Cordo-
ban Caliph Hishām II (born around 967) was probably murdered as early as 1009,
or possibly in 1012/1013, but in 1035 he was allegedly rediscovered alive by the
Taifa rulers of Seville. This pseudo-Hishām then ruled in Seville until around

---

541 In the supposed *li amiralz de Primes* (v. 967) we noted in A.5.8 above that *de primes* is an
indication of time.

542 Which means that when Bédier puts the *Galafes* in O into the critical text, instead of the
Galafres which other editors prefer, he may well be in the right: it could be a retention of the
current form rather than a chance return to the earlier form. The origin of *Galaf(r)e* < Arab.
Khalaf was recognised in principle by Baist (1902, 223), and by Scheludko (1922, 482), more
precisely by Warren (1929, 23), who especially notes that the Spanish *Gran Conquista de Ultra-
mar* re-corrects the name *Galaf(r)e* to *Halaf* in the retelling of the *Mainet* story. As we might
expect, there have been many incorrect explanations for this. We can reject on phonological
grounds the assumptions of Ph.A. Becker (1896, 17) and Zenker (Festschrift Gröber, Halle 1899,
217), that there is a South Italian Muslim *Apolaffar* or *Abū Džaʿfar* behind the name *Galafre*.
Contra Broëns (1965–1966, 67) the southern French name *Walafredus* > *Galafredus* has nothing
to do with *Galafre* because of the intonation (even if it were to have a Gothic origin). Further-
more, Sainéan's claim (1925–1930, 2.426) that *Galafre* is a joke form of *(Al)galife* is idiosyn-
cratic and facile. On the other hand, the fate of the name *Galafre* is more complicated because
it is part of a web of expressive terms which includes OF *galer* 'to treat oneself' (from the 13th
c. onwards), *luffre* (from the 13th c. and gradually also *louffre*, *lafre*) 'greedy' and *galifre* (12.
Jh.) 'a voracious kind of bird'; later (attested from about 1550) there is also *galafre* 'greedy'.
The explanation of how they are linked in the FEW (vol. 16 s. v. *leffur* and vol. 17 s. v. *wala*) is
certainly not the only one that could be offered, since for one thing, the FEW omits an impor-
tant element: the epithet *(Willelmus) Gulaf(f)ra* attested in the *Domesday Book* of 1086, which
Hildebrand (1884, 337) correctly interpreted as 'glutton, greedy'. This could be a humorous re-
interpretation of the Saracen name with Lat. *gula* > OF *gole*, *gule* (> *gueule*); if it came about
independently of this, it (and/or all the words related to *luffre*) could conversely have influ-
enced *Galafe* > *Galafre*.

543 Cf. the commentary in A.6 above on *Algalife*.

544 E.g., around the year 802 Khalaf ibn Rashīd murdered his lord Baḥlūl ibn Marzūq; around
930 Khalaf b. Bakr, lord of Ocsonoba, surrendered to the Caliph of Córdoba; around 1053, Fatḥ
b. Khalaf, ruled in the Taifa kingdom of Niebla, and from 1012–1045 a certain Hudhayl
b. Khalaf ruled in that of Albarracín, and there too, as late as around 1100 Abū Marwān
b. Khalaf ruled as one of the last Taifa rulers of all (cf. Dozy/Lévi-Provençal 1932, 2.111s.,
3.236–241, Valdeavellano 1955, 857, 1078s.), Ḥayyān ibn Khalaf ibn Ḥayyān (died in 1075 in
Córdoba) was the great collector of historiography regarding al-Andalus.

1059/1060 in a purely nominal role. According to Ibn Ḥazm (died 1064 at Niebla) this puppet figure was in reality a certain Khalaf al-Ḥuṣrī, and according to Ibn Ḥayyān (died 1075 in Córdoba) after 1035, these Sevillian intrigues were denounced by the Taifa ruler of Córdoba and others as a shameless deception; Ibn ʿIdhārī, who records both passages, also quotes from a satirical poem about the pseudo-Caliph.[545] It is easy to imagine how this man was mockingly referred to as 'the Emir (= Caliph) Khalaf', and that this combination of words – even if it was only a simple verbal link – could be the origin of *l'amiraus Galafre*.[546] Thirdly, the Romanisation of the name to *Galafre* is already attested in Spain: towards the end of the 11th c. the Monastery of Sobrado in Galicia had among its *servi* with a Muslim background a certain *Johannes Petri dictus Galafri*, also *Johannes Petri Feira qui vocabatur Galafre*,[547] which begs the question whether this form with a parasitic *-re* might already have been in the *Mainet* story.[548]

---

545 Wasserstein (1985, 119s., 123 n. 16, 156 n. 2).

546 This would then be the appropriate historical figure that Kunitzsch (1988, 261) was looking for to underpin *Galafre < Khalaf*.

547 Sobrado Cartulary, f. 50r–51r°°, cited from Lévi-Provençal (1965, 44).

548 There seems to be a second early indication of the existence of this epic Galafre. Petrus Tudebodus, an eyewitness to the First Crusade and the author of the *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* (around 1111), includes in his curious list of 75 'kings' of Antioch (13.1, in all mss.), which obviously takes some items from the arsenal of Saracen names in the Old French epic literature, a certain *Alapres amiralius*, which is almost indistinguishable from *Galafres l'amiralz*. Tudebod's phonology or – more probably – that of his informant, draws on the name of the town of Aleppo thanks to a kind of *genius loci*, since the crusaders sometimes called this city *Galaphia*, *Galapia*, and more often *(H)alapia* or *Aleph* (cf. the Indices of the RHC Occ.).

The Pyrenean Peninsula (with its northern foothills)

A.8 The Pyrenean Peninsula with its capital Saragossa: King Marsilĭe and his family

A.8.1 *Espaigne*

Espaigne 2 and passim OCV7PLT, therefore also the archetype, *Spanialand* n, *Yspania* (*His-*, *Hys* rarely; often inflected in Latin, rarely in German) K, *Spagna* and *Spagne* passim (*Espagne* occasionally, *Espagna*, *Enspagna* rarely, *Spant* only three times in *Saraçin de Spant*, a misunderstanding of *Sarazin espan*) V4, *Yspaen* w, *Spangien* h(LV).

Linked with this *Espaigne* (< *Hispania*) there is an adj. *espan* (< *Hispanus*) 269 (via emendation), 612, 2828.

In the Middle Ages, the term 'Spain' often meant only the part that was controlled by the Muslims at the time, but – since 'Portugal' only very gradually developed into an area of equal rank in the eyes of Europeans – it also meant the whole of the Pyrenean Peninsula. This is the case in the Chanson de Roland since the poet consistently ignores the existence of the Christian realms in the northern part of the Peninsula. Both definitions of Spain suppose that the southernmost tip of the country extends as far as today's Gibraltar and Tarifa; in the centuries before, during and after the Rol. there is no such thing as a 'Spain' that excludes Andalusia. Between 1082 and 1084, that is to say before the Almoravid invasion, when Alfons VI had extended one of his military campaigns as far as Tarifa near the southern tip of Spain, he rode a few paces into the sea to make it clear to his companions that he had conquered the whole of Spain.[549] This scene was transferred over to Charlemagne, either directly or via intermediate stages that have since been lost, and they influenced both the PT and the Rol. The PT (cap. 2) transposes the scene to the coast near Santiago de Compostela, beyond El Padrón. The Roland poet (v. 3) is speaking of Charlemagne and *Espaigne* when he writes: *Tresqu'en* (not *a*!) *la mer cunquist la tere altaigne*, and the *en* here mirrors that earlier gesture plainly enough.[550] In this context, the expression is based on the assumption that a huge country has already been crossed; to give a

---

[549] Lagardère (1989a, 69), Menéndez Pidal (1969, 1.299), Dozy/Lévi-Provençal (1932, 120) etc.
[550] The link between the gesture of Alfons VI and the PT was emphasised by de Mandach (1961, 38), and that between the gesture and the opening scene in the song was recognised by Jenkins (ad loc.), and further explained by Verelst (1988, passim).

counterexample, we would not consider the historical Carolingian advance, and then that of the Catalans, in the north east as a sufficient background for this gesture, because it proceeded along the line of the coast, and did not cross over the land. Since Alfons' gesture presupposes that the Reconquista was accomplished in a broadly north-south direction, and since Charlemagne, broadly speaking, invaded Spain from the north, this north-south idea is the most likely from the outset; so the Song has preserved the original image, but the PT has changed it in in favour of Compostela. I therefore understand, in agreement with Bédier's translation, *altaigne* (v. 3) as *hautaine*, and not as 'mountainous', so that *la tere* means the whole of Spain. Moreover, the idea that Charlemagne conquered the whole of Spain was not a new one in the period when the Roland poet lived. One source (overlooked even by Menéndez Pidal) is relevant here: the *Ann. Lobienses* from the Francophone province of Lobbes, which report events up to 982 and are preserved in an 11th c. ms (Bamberg E III 18), state that Charlemagne and his army *cuius multitudine tota Hispania contremuit, [. . .] Hispaniā totā subactā* returned to France (MGH SS. 13.229 for the year 778).[551] And it is well known that Ademar of Chabannes († 1034, Rez. βγ 2.1.90 ed. Bourgain) describes how Charlemagne extended his rule *usque in Cordubam civitatem Hispaniae*,[552] which *de facto* amounts to the same thing.

Marsilĭe is not just the only king of this Spain, he is specifically the King of the whole of Spain, *li reis ki tute Espaigne tint* (v. 409); according to Blancandrin (quoted in v. 224) and Ganelon (v. 697) he wants to take over *tute Espaigne* or *d'Espaigne le regnét* from Charlemagne as a fiefdom. Even after Charlemagne has overcome all the cities and fortresses including Córdoba, Marsilĭe (v. 848) can assemble *d'Espaigne les baruns,/ Cuntes, vezcuntes e dux e almaçurs,/ Les amirafles e les filz as cunturs*, a total of 400,000 men, who thus far have managed to keep themselves, if not their lands, out of Charlemagne's grasp. He gives *Espaigne* or *d'Espaigne le regnét* back to Baligant (v. 2747, 2787s.); his wife Bramimonde is *rëine d'Espaigne* (v. 3985).

---

551 Despite its laconic quality, the *Chronicon Suevicum Universale* (MGH SS. 13.63, 11th c.) is also worth noting: *Karolus Hispaniam invadens cepit*.
552 Even though Ademar's statement may rely on his misunderstanding of a written source, the facts remain that, 1) he must have had a very inflated opinion of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign if he thought this claim was true; 2) others may well also have fallen victim to this same misunderstanding; 3) his chronicle went on to publicise this legend.

A.8.2 *Sarraguce*

The capital of this Spain in the Song is *Sarraguce* 6 and passim (*Saraguce* 2818) O, *Saraguz* n, *Sarraguz* K, *Saragoça* (occasionally *Sera-* and *-çe*) V4, *Saragoze* C, *Sarragoce* V7P, *Sarragonde* T, *Saragoyse* h(L), *Saragoengien* h(V), *Sar(r)agis*, *-gys* w (but MR *Saragus*, ABFJRW *Cesar Augusta* with minor variants), *Saragos* e: Based on O(V4)CV7P *Sarraguce* or Francien *Sarragoce* belongs in the archetype.

The PT and the *Carmen* have *Caesaraugusta* (with minor variants). The development process Lat. *Caesara(u)gusta* > Arab. *Saraqusṭa* > Span. *Zaragoza*, OF *Saragoce* etc. presupposes that in al-Andalus there was a spoken-language (regional Arabic or Romance) tendency towards metathesis of the Standard Arab. /st, sṭ, ṣṭ/ > /ts/; parallel cases include *Écija* < Lat. *Astigi*, Span. *almáciga* < *al-máṣṭika*, Span. *alfó(n)cigo* < *al-fústuq* (Corriente 1992, 65s.).

In reality, Saragossa never was the capital of Spain: in Roman times it was subject to the provincial capital city Tarragona; in West Gothic times, the capital of the empire was Toledo; in Muslim times until just before 1018 it was subject to Córdoba, the city of the Caliphs, and then it was the capital of one of the approximately forty Taifa kingdoms, which were formed out of the many groups competing for the Caliphate. In 1110, it fell to the Almoravids; in 1118 it was conquered by Alfonso el Batallador and became the capital of the Kingdom of Aragón. How then can we explain its status in the Song?

We must make a few distinctions here. Apart from its position as capital city, the fact that Saragossa is the only city in the Song that takes on a structural role is based on historical facts. The historical Charlemagne took the largest army he could muster to Saragossa, believing that it was his ally, and no doubt planning to use it as a supply base for his planned further conquest of the whole of Spain. But the well-fortified city locked him out at the last moment through "treachery". He had no prospects of capturing it quickly, and he could not take the risk of proceeding further south against ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān without the city's resources, and with the city as an enemy at his back. It grew more and more difficult to supply the army as days passed, and then he also received the first reports of the Saxon rebellion.[553] He therefore entered into a peace

---

[553] See especially Menéndez Pidal 1960, 201 with n. 1, according to the *Chronicon Moissiacense*: the news about the Saxon rebellion reached *Karolum adhuc in Hispania degentem*. We know that the *Chronicon* was most probably correct because of a circumstance that even Menéndez Pidal has not noticed. According to the anonymous *Vita Hludovici* (cap. 2) Charlemagne had more or less followed what was later known as the pilgrimage route no. 1 Tours-Ostabat, taking his pregnant wife to the Chasseneuil Palatinate (just north of Poitiers, 700 km from Herstal!); this only makes sense if he had been planning to pick her up on the return

settlement with the city, according to which they gave him a few hostages,[554] probably paid a tribute[555] and most likely recognised his nominal supremacy.[556] Charlemagne had only just managed to save face officially by doing this, but everyone in the army would have been aware that the goal of the campaign had not been achieved. It meant that Saragossa turned into the main focus of the campaign and was its benchmark with at best ambivalent overtones. Even if the early legends about the ensuing Frankish defeat in the Pyrenees do not yet seem to have recognised or constructed a causal relationship between the events at Saragossa and the defeat – it is well known that scholars disagree on this point to this day – we must remember by way of introduction that the army came away from Saragossa without conquering it, and this would hardly have been possible without explaining why they did not do so. Saragossa's very fixed position in the narrative leads to the suspicion that among the Spanish Muslims in the Song, Marsilĭe must be one of the most senior figures. As far as the name is concerned, the poet of the song must have been constrained by the existing tradition.

But this still does not make Saragossa the capital of Spain; we need a particular perspective in time for this to be the case. In the year 1086, the Almoravid ruler Yūsuf crossed over to Spain for the first time and helped the Taifa

---

journey, by this time as a proud father. And he had good cause to do that on his return journey, because Hildegard had brought twin boys into the world. But the first place we find Charlemagne in France is Auxerre (Royal Annals for the year 778); Charlemagne heard much more detailed news there, telling him that the Saxons had pillaged the area on the right bank of the Rhine, but they had not yet crossed the river. Auxerre is only 50 km from Vézelay, which was the end- or starting point of what was later to become pilgrimage route no. 2 Vézelay-Ostabat; thus, Charlemagne had more or less followed this route, and so he could not afford the time to take a detour via Chasseneuil. If we draw a straight line from Ostabat to Auxerre, it does not point towards Charlemagne's starting point of Herstal, but to the Rhine south of Cologne. He must have heard about the Saxon rebellion in Ostabat at the latest, where pilgrimage routes no. 1 and 2 diverge, and probably even earlier, when he left Spain two days' march before.

554 *Ann. Mettenses priores* and *posteriores*, Royal Annals to 801 and to 829, *Ann. Lauresha-menses to 803* and *to 817*, *Ann. Petaviani*, the Poeta Saxo, Regino.

555 This is what usually happened in cases like this. I therefore see no reason to contradict the *Ann. Mettenses posteriores* (for the year 778), the Poeta Saxo (the victors at Roncevaux looted *ingentem praedam*), Regino, the (so-called) Monk of Silos, the *Nota Emilianense* and – *sit venia verbo* – the Rol.

556 This is the more probable scenario, because I believe that when Einhart weighed up Charlemagne's conquests (*Vita Karoli* 15) and concluded that he had subjugated 'all of the Pyrenean mountains and the land as far as the Ebro', he was doing that in good faith, and not as a blatant lie; he nowhere claimed that these lands were still effectively under Frankish control around the time when the *Vita Karoli* was written, i.e. around 829.

kings in their hour of need by defeating Alfons VI. But when they split up after that, and even began to form alliances with Alfons, he liquidated all of the bigger Taifa kingdoms from 1090 onwards[557] with the exception of the kingdom of the Benī Hūd around Saragossa-Lérida. Although this city was geographically the most exposed, it had until then resisted the Reconquista very well, and Yūsuf had no justification for an annexation; he would also have welcomed a buffer state between himself and the European massif that lay behind it. The situation did not change until after his death, that is to say when al-Mustaʿīn, the king of the Hūdids, was mortally wounded by Alfonso el Batallador at Valtierra in 1110 and the Reconquista of Saragossa seemed to be imminent, at which point the Almoravids hurriedly occupied the city. Between 1095 and 1110 there were thus two sovereign powers in Muslim Spain: the lord of Saragossa and the Almoravids. The latter were in reality the more powerful, but their main base was still in Africa and in the Song, they appear in the shape of the Algalife; thus, only one sovereign power had its residential seat in Spain itself: the lord of Saragossa. This explains how in the song, the king in Spain could become the King of Spain – especially as this expanded the dimensions of the story.

A very important methodological implication arises from the fact that in the Song, the Saracens consider Marsilĭe to be the King of *all of* Spain, whereas Charlemagne has left him in control only of Saragossa (and until v. 97 *Cordres*), having conquered all of the rest of Spain. We can be sure that the poet was most familiar with the parts of Spain that were reconquered with the help of the French in the late 11th and early 12th c. (or at least the areas that were contested), with the consequence that these parts will be mentioned disproportionally; but as we have noted before, he is also mindful of geographical reality, and so in order to give a general idea of the rest of Spain, he introduces a few names. It is therefore an unjustified dogmatism to require (with Boissonade and others) *all* of the Frankish conquests or *all* the fiefs belonging to Marsilĭe's people to be located within the Ebro Basin.

---

557 The annexation of the few remaining, very small Taifa kingdoms took until after 1100 (according to Wasserstein 1985, 84, in the case of Alpuente, it was not completed until 1106/1107).

A.8.3 *Marsilĭe*

Marsilĭe O 7 and passim (about 75 times, mostly treated as indeclinable; also rectus ending in -*s*, once -*ons*, obliquus ending in -*on*, but with a few incorrect cases; only one *Marcilie* 686 O, cf. Segre's apparatus), similar in CV7 (only in one supplementary laisse *Marsile*), *Marsilius* n, *Mars(s)ilie/-es* K (and often Ger. obl. *Marsilien*), *Marsilio* V4, *Marsil(l)e* PT, *Marsli* w (ms. M *Marsili*), *Marcielijs* h (L): n follows its usual tendency of (fully) Latinising the name. The archetype has *Marsilĭe*.

Marsĭlius also the *Carmen* 25 etc.

The form in the Rol. is "semi-erudite" as also e.g. *Basilĭe* and the poet would probably have thought it was Latinised – as indeed the Norse scribe certainly did. The PT has *Marsirus* (ed. Meredith-Jones B,[558] especially *Codex Calixtinus* = B1), *Marsirius* (ed. Meredith-Jones ACD), from which a few late epics take their *Marsire* (cf. Moisan s. v.). Since the PT should be regarded as a text that has, genetically speaking, equal status with the Rol., the forms with -*r(i)*- must be taken just as seriously as those with -*lĭ*-. How should we evaluate these two forms dialectally? The phonological tendency -*lĭ*- > -*r(ĭ)*- (> -*r*-) is, *grosso modo*, to be found in Anjou, Touraine and Poitou, and can be dated to the middle or the second half of the 11th c., as in: Poitiers-S.Cyprien 329s. a. 990–1000, 332 a. 1060–1108 and 330 around 1120 *Sanctus Mascilius*, but 71 a. 1071–1100 and 13 a. 1097–1100 *Sanctus Mascirius* 'Saint-Maxire (Deux-Sèvres, 35 km south west of Parthenay)';[559] a century later we find quite a few examples in the works of Benoît de Sainte-

---

[558] However, at least *one* ms., not mentioned by Meredith-Jones, from the B family, that is to say Florence, Bibl. Naz. II.VIII.48, 15th c. (previously Magliabecchiana G 8 plut. VIII. 48), starts off with several instances of *Marsilius*, cf. Karl (1940, 100, 101, 102), and then later has *Marsirius* (104 [3x], 105 [2x], 113) – The former is evidently from the vernacular tradition. A similar pattern could affect other mss., but certainly not the sub-archetype of the whole tradition.

[559] There is no surviving record of St. Mascilius himself (not mentioned in the lexica of saints from the AA.SS. onwards; not found in the monograph on places by Desaivre 1894, 40s.; I am grateful for information in the negative from Dom Baudouin de Gaiffier S.J. of the Société des Bollandistes dating from 18. 06. 1969 and from Pater Paul Hérault dating from 06. 05. 2014). The name *Mascillius* is found in late antiquity (e.g. CIL 3.4781 from Tanzenberg, 10 km north of Klagenfurt; CIL 7.1336.665 from York, UK), so it does not seem due to a confusion in the place name. But as the local church has been dedicated to St. Ma(t)thias (the apostle by election) since 1224 at the latest (cf. the charter in Desaivre 1894, 37) and *Ma(t)thias* is pronounced /masjá/ in the local dialect today, Desaivre believes that *Mascilius* is a way of rendering a corrupted *Mat(t)hias*, which is phonologically not acceptable; but it could be that once the name *Mascilius* had become meaningless, the phonological similarity of *Mat(t)hias* meant that this was chosen as a new patron. There is no evidence of any links (or confusion) with the epic name Marsilĭe; I believe that the similarity is a coincidence.

Maure who is from the southern part of Touraine – and I cite only those forms confirmed through the rhyme – *mire < milia* and *concire < concilium* (these two in both the *Roman de Troie* and the *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie*), *Sezire < Sicilia* and *Pire < Pylos* (in the romance) as well as *Saint Gire* (< *Saint Gilĭe, Rol.* 2096), *evangire < evangil(ĭ)e* and *vigire < vigilia* (in the chronicle).[560] In this region, therefore, one form has emerged from another form, and in the process we cannot even rule out the possibility that the direction of development was *-rĭ- > -lĭ-*, whether as a (hyper-) correction from the bigger normal French region (cf. the discussion above v. 3131, 3191), or as a dissimilation from the preceding *-r-* that could occur anywhere (just as *contrarier* formed the variant *contralier*, and the following developments: **Berthier-ot > Berthelot, *esquarterer > écarteler, ensorcerer > ensorceler, frigorosus > frileux* and *pruneraie > prunelaie*, Pope 1952, § 129). At any rate, we must assume that *-lĭ-* and *-rĭ-* were equivalents in this region and in the areas immediately around it.

The archetypes of both the Rol. and the PT have only *Marsi-*, and not *Marci-*. As the phoneme boundary between /ts/ and /s/ becomes porous, and then gradually disappears, so the *Marci*-variants gradually appear, occurring only once in O (and Bédier 1927, 261, points out that the etymologically incorrect *-c-* as in *fuce* instead of *fusse* is common in the work of Anglo-Norman scribes), and then they appear more frequently in later texts (cf. Moisan s. v.); however, the vast majority of texts in the non-French tradition (which Moisan counts as *textes étrangers* and *textes annexes*) retains *-rs-*.

The question of how we should evaluate the etymology of the name *Marsilĭe / Marsir(ĭ)us* and why it plays this role in the Song turns out to be complicated and awkward; we can only try to establish what is most likely to be the case. Let us first clear up a few trivial matters and incorrect opinions!

[1] When Brault (1979, 109) points to *mar < hora,* and in a similar vein Bancourt (1982a, 48) talks about the *caractère sinistre* of the *Mar-* element in the name, they may well be correctly describing the associations produced by the sound

---

[560] For the common authorship of the two works I refer to Beckmann (1965, passim), especially on the *-r-* spellings, on p. 13 there, with scholarly literature. – By chance I see 1) also in Wace's *Rou* III 10305 that Sibylle of Conversano, the wife of Robert Courteheuse, son of William the Conqueror, in the A mss. and therefore in the critical edition, is called *Sebire*, while in the B mss. B she is called *Sebile*, and 2) that in the dictionaries s. v. *apostoile* the forms *apostorie* and *apostoire* are even more widely used. The tendency towards *-r-* has therefore spread even further afield, but it is not possible to investigate this more thoroughly here.

of the name; but this is not enough to explain the name fully, since after all, in OF -silĭe is not a typical element for forming names.[561]

[2] Tavernier (1911a, 86) believes that *Marsilius* (from *Mars*) is directly fashioned from the Latin [by Turold]. We cannot accept his idea in this form, not just because a poet who could read Latin (and who according to Tavernier was even an enthusiastic reader of Statius!) would have known that a derivation from *Mars*, gen. *Martis*, just like *mart-ius*, *Mart-ialis* and *Mart-inus* would have to be rendered as **Martilius*, but above all because *Marsilius* is precisely not in favour of the war, but instead, under Ganelon's influence, launches an ambush to put an end to Charlemagne's wars.

[3] Menéndez Pelayo's early suggestion (1944, 163), taken up e.g. by Zamora Vicente (1946, on strophe 141),[562] that there could be an *Omaris* (or *Omari*) *filius* behind it, meaning ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUmar, who was after 772 briefly (and no longer in 777) governor of Saragossa on behalf of ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān I, is unconvincing from the start, because there is no reason why this man, who does not appear in western sources, and who had nothing to do with Charlemagne's Spanish adventure, should be mentioned here with just his paternal name; the additional presumption of a spoken aphaeresis caused by a palaeographical confusion around the everyday word *filius*, is not persuasive in morphological terms either.

[4] De Mandach (1993, 65s.) discovered that according to Hieronymus Blancas, a Saragossan historian from the Kingdom of Aragón (late 16th c.),[563] in Saragossa around 800 a certain *Ibnabalam* (correctly interpreted by de Mandach as a corrupted form of *ibn al-Arabi*) writes that someone called *Marsilius sive Massilius* ruled the city. He wants to equate this person with Marzūq, the father of the Baḥlūl ibn Marzūq, who was discussed above[564] as a temporary usurper of Saragossa around 800. He says the Roland poet must have come across the

---

561 The fact that a Saracen name *Garsilĭe* appears in later epics (cf. Moisan s. v.), does not prove the existence of a *-silie* element; the Spanish name *García* (> Fr. *Garcie*, *Garsie*) here is simply adapted to sound like the name *Marsilĭe* which everybody knows by then.

562 Both quoted in Moralejo et al. (1951, 462 n.6).

563 De Mandach (1993, 65s.) gives the date as 1606; this is, however, as de Mandach's bibliography shows, only the date of the *Hispania illustrata* by Andreas Schott, who incorporated large parts of Blanca's book in his account, and from which de Mandach quotes. Hieronymus (de) Blanca(s) died in 1590, and his *Aragonensium rerum Commentarii* was published in 1588.

564 In section A.3.3.3 'The name *Baligant*, Scenario II'.

name *Marzūq, sous l'une de ses nombreuses transcriptions fantaisistes*. But there is one important factor in the rise of Baḥlūl, and that is the fact that his father was only a minor member of the landed elite; there is no reason why a source from the period before 1100 would have made him the lord of Saragossa. Furthermore, no known medieval Latin text contains the name *Marzūq* or any kind of transcription of this name; *ses nombreuses transcriptions fantaisistes* are therefore pure conjecture on the part of de Mandach, and the adjective *fantaisiste* is an attempt to discredit in advance any discussion of the gap between the names *Marzūq* and *Marsiĭe*. Even Blancas has never heard of Baḥlūl, never mind his father. There can be no doubt about the origin of his *Marsilius sive Massilius*: these names come from the Chanson de Roland, probably from intermediate stages that have since been lost, and whose transmission we do not even need to know. This is the kind of approach taken at every turn by regional historians of the 14th –17th c. – we only have to think of Jean d'Outremeuse in Liège or Johannes Trithemius in Germany for example – they just filled any gaps in the written tradition with legendary material.[565] In my opinion, then, de Mandach falls into a circular argument here.

[5] According to Gina Fasoli (1967, 350) there was in the year 778 in Friuli (!) a *dux Massilius* but in her source (Paschini 1953, 137, 139, 146) the man is called *Massellio [. . .] dux* – and the difference is important. Moreover, the sole charter in which he appears is not entirely verifiable.

[6] According to Morlet (1972, 75s.) *Marsilius* was probably a written variant of *Marcilius*. In the middle and southern part of Italy in antiquity a few instances of *Marcilius* are attested (< *Marcus* + *-ilius* as in *Quint-ilius* etc., Schulze 1904, 188 n. 4, 456 n. 1: Cicero *ad fam.* 13.54.1, CIL 9.2662 and 5267).[566] There are many Fr. or Occ. names such as *Marcilly, Marcillac* etc. (nowadays sometimes with *-s-* instead of *-c-*), which Morlet cites without commentary alongside *Marcilius*,

---

565 De Mandach does not include the following information: Blancas also mentions that the victory at Roncevaux was achieved by Bernardo del Carpio, supported by this Marsilius; then he thinks it is questionable that 'Fortún, King of Sobrarbe' would have fought with them too, and is convinced instead that the victory is due to King Alfonso [II] 'of León' [*recte*: of Asturia-Oviedo], who at that time was also lord of Navarre. It is obvious that Blancas is liberally adding details, to avoid being accused of ignorance. (I am quoting from the Spanish translation of Blancas' work, *Comentarios de las cosas de Aragón*, by Manuel Hernández, Saragossa, Imprenta del Hospicio, 1678, which refers to a ms. of the original as well as the printed edition).
566 *Marsilius* does not appear to be attested in antiquity, although there are five instances of *Marsillus/-a* (on the tribal name *Marsi*, Kajanto 1965, 185).

but most of them, if not all, are associated with the much more common[567] name *Marcellus* (+ *j*- element of the suffix), which Longnon (1929, 80–94) had already noticed.[568] Above all, however, Morlet cannot find a single post-antique reference for the name *Marcilius* itself. In my own research – examining all possible charter material from Galloromania between 778 and about 1150 – I found no references to a *Marcilius* before 1140, and only one instance of *Marcilia* (Agde 46, around 1050: *uxori tue Marciliane*; on isolated later references cf. below!). Since the name has no useful semantic associations either, it cannot be the etymological basis for the epic *Marsilĭe*.

This brings us to the parts of the puzzle that can be more positively evaluated.

[7] Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.427) maintains that "*Marsile/Marsire* est un nom indigène familier au Sud de la France". If this is the case, what then is its etymology? And how can we show whether or not it predates the Rol. and Pseudo-Turpin? Rajna (1889, 12s.) indicated that from 1005 in Marseille the name *Massilius* is attested frequently, both as a single name, (in 1005, 1036 etc.) and also around 1050 for a local magnate *Pontius (cognomento) Massilius* (also *Marsilisius, Marseileso* with the *-r-*, which at that time pushed its way into the vernacular form of the city name).[569] Rajna rightly concludes that the name as an epithet meant 'the Marseillais', and then became a main name. There are parallels to this development: in Avignon around 970 the male name (not epithet!) *Avinionus* is attested (Morlet 1972 s. v.), in the March of Treviso *Tervisius* etc. is attested several times, in *Padua* we find *Patavinus* and *Paduanus* (Rajna 1889, 20, 28s.); the author of the *Maguelonne* is thought to have come from Maguelonne (FEW s. v. *Magalona*). There is therefore no reason to assume that the name comes from the Roland material and that the Marseillais then linked it to themselves later. On the other hand, it is not likely that the Marseillais had nothing to do with the later epic name. The real questions are why, where and when this transformation in the meaning of the name took place. These questions can be answered by looking at the form of the

---

567 Cf. Morlet (1972 s. v. *Marcellus*, especially the information from the secondary literature).
568 Even before a simple /λ/ by OF at the latest there is intervocalic *-e-* > *-i-*, cf. *pavillon*, *champignuel*, *tourbillon* (Pope 1952, § 422), as well as over 50 *Châtillon*, *Castillon* etc.; this then occurred all the more frequently thanks to the additional effect of the *-c-*.
569 Cf. the following charters: Marseille-S.Victor 1.61, 73, 465, 496, 497, 506, 509, 511, 513, 516, and (the oldest one) 2.527. The name Pontius has been the main name in the family of the Viscount of Marseille since the 10th c., and this family also produced two Bishops of Marseille bearing that name, cf. the genealogy of the family in Masson (1924, 2.177); Viscount and Bishop shared power in the city.

name *Marsir(i)us*; for this is the only form that shows signs of having a Spanish Muslim background, and in fact doubly so. The Marsilĭe character in the song has grown out of the fusion of two strands: one has contributed the basic form of the name, and the other its meaning.

We turn now to the strand with the meaning! The first possibility is al-Manṣūr, Grégoire's candidate (1942, 64n., 1942–1943, 539s., 1946, 431–433). From 978 until his death in 1002 he was the dictatorial lord of the Muslim Pyrenean Peninsula nominally under the Caliphate of Hishām II, and from the capital Córdoba he carried out 56 or 57 campaigns laying waste to Christian northern Spain, from Barcelona (985) to León (988) and Compostela (997).[570] This man was a threat to the pilgrimages to Compostela, and at that time Catalonia formally belonged to the Kingdom of France. These are the two main reasons – at least until the Almoravid victory of 1086 – why most Francophone people would probably have thought of his name first if they had been asked to suggest a "typical" Muslim warlord. In the PT (cap. 9, 15 and 18) the *Altumajor* of Córdoba, as he is called in an extremely unusual attempt at Latinisation, is bitterly opposed to Charlemagne. This shows how someone, perhaps a much earlier anonymous author, could have come up with this name in his quest to give the key adversary in the Roland story a suitably momentous personal name.[571]

As far as the form of the name is concerned, the /ns/ nexus had already disappeared in VLat. through simplification to /s/, but it came back into a few semi-erudite words (*penser* occurs in the Leodegarlied and three times in the Rol.); however, in the absence of any Latin correlates, it could easily have been misheard as /ts/ or as /rs/. There is an example of the former in a word that had become an appellative in OF: *almazor, almaçour* 'Spanish-Muslim ruler (rank)' (as also in the Rol.[572]). But a different form could possibly have evolved (without the Arabic article), such as **Marsur(ius)*.[573] Grégoire's hypothesis does not

---

570 There is a myth that he was put to flight at Calatañazor (or elsewhere, cf. the PT supplement B), but no evidence has been found to show that this is based on reality.

571 The idea that *Marsilĭe* is actually an *(al-)Manṣūr* was taken for granted by one scholar more than 500 years before Grégoire: the author of the Middle English *Otuel and Roland* consistently replaces the name *Marsilĭe* with *Mans(o)ur(e)*, cf. Moisan under the grammalogue Ro21. This is quite an interesting detail, since it shows that Grégoire's thesis is not *a priori* beyond the bounds of probability.

572 The more historically accurate form of the name is only known in Italy: in v. 909, V4 has *almansor*, V7 *almancor* (with a missing cedilla), in v. 1275 V4 *almansor*, C *aumanzor*, V7 *aumensor*.

573 Just as double borrowing occurred with one Muslim name which could rival *al-Manṣūr* in terms of sinister overtones: ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān > 1) *Derramé*, 2) *Braimant*. A somewhat different process, which led to the same result, is assumed by Grégoire: in the last of the three articles we have quoted (1946, 431–433) he expressly reminds us that within the evolution of *Massilia* >

explain the change in the stressed vowel -*u*- > -*i*-; it must have arisen through a mixing with *Marsilius* from Marseille.

The second name from real Spanish-Muslim history that springs to mind in relation to *Marsir(i)us* is *Mundhir*, the leading name in the Tujibid dynasty, which of course ruled in Saragossa. The Tujibids had been the dominant family in the Marca Superior since the later 9th c. and from 890 onwards, members of the family were governors of Saragossa. Thus, Mundhir I bin Yaḥya was appointed to this position in 1005, or by 1010 at the latest, by the Caliph of Córdoba. In 1017, when the Caliphate fell apart (an event which Mundhir actively assisted through his betrayal of a Caliph and a pretender to the Caliph title), he declared himself the sovereign lord of Saragossa, took Huesca from one of his relatives, and towards the end of his life enjoyed a highly respected reign until 1023. His son Yaḥya took over, and then from 1029–1039 his grandson Mundhir II ruled until he was murdered by one of his relatives. The Tujibids therefore constituted the first royal dynasty in the history of Saragossa, and of the three Tujibid kings, the two most important were both called Mundhir. The short-lived reign of the man who murdered Munhir II was brought to an end by Su-laymān ibn Hūd, lord of Lérida/Lleida, when he marched into Saragossa; he founded a second royal dynasty, the Hūdids, and they went on to rule Saragossa until 1110. The two rulers of Saragossa called Mundhir were very well known in Christian Europe. Around 1016, Ramón Borrel of Catalonia married the daughter of Sancho García of Castile as a guest of Mundhir I in the middle of Muslim Saragossa, and Arabic sources report with astonishment that a very large number of notable figures from both religions were in the city at that time. When in April 1018 Mundhir I made a move against Córdoba, he took Christian troops belonging to his Catalan friends with him, but he was defeated at Granada. According to the Arabic sources, Mundhir II also lived peacefully with his Christian neighbours. Meanwhile, between 1018 and 1035 the Norman Roger de Tosny and his people spent some time in Spain. He is said to have supported Ramón Borrel's widow Ermesinde against the Muslims, and it seems most likely that these would have been Saragossans. Be that as it may, Saragossa continued to thrive culturally and expand geographically after the end of the Cordoban Caliphate and the fall of Toledo (1085), becoming the irreducible metropolis of northern al-Andalus, and if people in France between, say, 1040 and 1060 had heard of the name of a king of Saragossa, then that name would

---

Marselha/Marseille a related form *Mansella* is attested three times, in the *Sainte-Foy* (v. 500, 516, 545), which of course is very closely connected to the Way of St. James; and then when this *Mans-* was replaced definitively and everywhere by *Mars-*, a similar personal name could have been carried along with this change.

surely have been Mundhir. Incidentally, both men of that name took on the ruling epithet *(laqab) al-Manṣūr*.[574]

Attention should be paid to the pronunciation of the classical Arab. name / múnδir/ in Hispano-Arab.: 1) the allophone of /u/ in closed position is heard as /o/ by speakers of Romance languages (Corriente 1977, 28, and 1992, 40). 2) The /δ/ persisted in educated pronunciation until the end of Hispano-Arab., since Pedro de Alcalá (a. 1505) describes it correctly, represents it with *dh* and distinguishes it from neighbouring phonemes. In the "substandard register" there was an "occasional shift" /δ/ >/d/ (Corriente 1992, 46). But there are also traces of the pronunciation /ẓ/ or /z/; in the case of /z/ at least, Corriente (1992, 46, and 1977, 44s. with n. 57) suspects that Romanophone speakers attempted to imitate the /δ/ sound that did not exist in their language. Arabic specialists writing in French in the 19th c. often transcribe the phoneme as *-dz-*, and Dozy (1881, 1.227ss.) cites *Mondzir*. 3) In al-Andalus the stress fluctuated in words formed in this way, but "the dominating rule" was stress on the last syllable.[575] A Romance speaker could have heard the name as /mon(d)zír/ (with -/n(d)z/ as in *onze*).

While *Manṣūr* persisted as the more familiar term, *Mondzír* was more specific (to Saragossa!) and chronologically closer to the preserved Song.

This, then, is the answer to the why question behind the epic name *Marsilius / Marsirius*: the southern Fr. name *Marsilius* acquired meanings that were associated with one or both of the two phonologically similar names *(al-)Manṣūr* (with /ns/ which was unfamiliar in Galloromanic and therefore liable to be substituted) and/or *Mundhir* /mon(d)zír/.[576]

A probable answer to the "where" part of this process can be found too: it may well have happened in the above-mentioned dialect area of Anjou, Touraine and Poitou, or on the edges of that area, where there was fluctuation between *-rĭ-* and *-lĭ* resulting in a form that was *de facto* equivalent to everyday experience.

This leaves the question of when. We must follow the name further into the French-speaking area, where, as we might expect, it is thinly spread. In this area there are about ten people bearing this name before 1150 (some crossing over the

---

574 Sources relating to the two men called Mundhir: Turk (1972/1973, 1974/1975, passim); de la Granja (1967, especially §§ 112–114 and Cuadro II); scattered comments in Arié, Wasserstein, Dozy, Dozy/ Lévi-Provençal.

575 Corriente (1977, 65 ["the dominating rule"], 107 n. 171 ["native stress"]), 1992, 107); in Steiger (1932, 93s., 96s.) there are comparable cases such as *muzlím*, *muxríf* (> Old Span. *almojarife*), *mucrím*, *mudníb*.

576 On the possibility that another, even older layer might be hidden behind this layer of the epic name for the lord of Saragossa, cf. n. 431 above.

linguistic border with Dutch and Germ.): Hasnon 563 a. 1086 *Marsilius*, witness, probably brother of Walter of Warnestin (near Arras; Baudouin II of Hainaut for the monastery of Hasnon near Valenciennes); Liège-S.Croix 9 a. 1099 *Marsilius de Antine*; Auchy 43 before 1122 *Grebodo de Matringehem, Marsilius et Hainfridus filii ejus* (Matringhem, Pas-de-Calais, which at that time probably had a Flem. majority, Romance upper class); Remiremont f. 43v° VII and 65v° V (scribe 53) last third of the 11th c. or 12th c. (probably before 1158) *Marsilius*, son of an *ancilla*; Afflighem 99, 121 and 125 around 1140, 1147, 1148, *Marcilius* [sic] *de Nederyscha* (Neerijse in Flemish Brabant), *Marsilius* [sic], nephew of Henry of Leez (Grand-Leez, Namur province, Francophone), *Marcilii* [sic] *signum*, probably the same person;[577] Cologne Registers 2.66, 67,74, 77, 81 a. 1140, 1141, 1145, 1147, 1149 *Marsilius* (consistently), an important minister for the archbishop;[578] Laon-évêques 340 a. 1143 *Marsilius* of Valavergny (10 km south west of Laon); Kaiserswerth 22 around 1145, *Marsilius*, canon; Belgique-Wauters 2.265 a. 1146, *Marsilius de Castilino* (for the abbey of Liesse at Aisne, Nord); Maine-Marmoutier 1.140 a. 1144–1148, and Reg. Reg. Anglonorm. 3.371 a. 1145–1150, *Marsilius de Fai* (Fay, Sarthe). For reasons relating to the form of the name, we should mention references from a little later: Saint-Sépulcre 131 a. 1160 *Marsirii quoque et Andree Andegavensis militum* (gen.), and 135, also a. 1160 *Marsirius de Ramatha* (probably the same person; Rama/

---

577 Here we see <c> alternating with <s> for the first time, occurring almost simultaneously with the single instance of *Marcilie* in O 686. As the phoneme boundary /ts/ ≠ /s/ is thought to have collapsed later in northern Fr. than in the centre (Pope 1952, N. § XXI), this is quite credible; in Middle Dutch there was either no, or just a marginal /ts/, and so we have to assume from the outset <c> ~ <s> ~ /s/. – In the Dutch-speaking area, the name *Marsilius* persisted for a long time, *teste* Marsilius of Inghen near Nijmegen (1335/1340–1396), Aristoteles commentator and twice University rector in Paris, in 1386 founding rector at Heidelberg.

578 The name continued to be popular in Cologne. Among the countless names of people supposed to have accompanied Saint Ursula, all of which were invented by the sexton Dietrich of Deutz in the years from 1156 to 1164 there is a *Sanctus Marsilius martyr* (AA.SS. for the 21.10., p. 244D, where the forgery has already been spotted); evidently Dietrich drew his inspiration in this case from the name of the minister. Wagner (1913, 42) provides 23 references to living individuals in Cologne who bear this name. Another *Marsilius*, no doubt a member of the same family as the minister, is recorded as a landowner between 1180–1189 in Cologne, and in fact in a place very close to the last remaining piece of the Roman water conduit; this small piece was misidentified as a Roman tomb, and from around 1220 onwards named after the family and called the *Marsilstein* (*lapis Marsilii*) (to this day the name of a street in Cologne). Very soon a new legend was linked to it, alleging that it was the coffin of a local man called Marsilius, who had once achieved a victory over the Romans; this story is then much expanded in the *Koelhoffschen Chronik* (Cologne, Koelhoff, 1499); for more detail on all of this cf. Keussen (1910, 6*, 11*, 20*). I am mentioning this only to pre-empt the erroneous suggestion that there might be another possible origin of the name *Marsilius*.

Ramatha near today's Lod, Israel; the crucial point linguistically is *Andegavensis* 'from Anjou').

Italy is also relevant, and most of the following is based on research by Rajna (1889, 12ss. and 66 n. 1) and Rosellini (1958, 259s.). Here we find a. 1109 a *Marsilius* [. . .] *de Carrara* (named after the Carrara Castle near Padua), a. 1114 probably the same person,[579] other instances of *Marsilius* a. 1123 in Prato, a. 1132 again in Padua, a. 1135 there once again (and in fact a relative of the Margrave Alberto d'Este); many later references after 1150, e.g. in Bologna, but 1155–1168 two more in Naples. Padua remains a central focus for this name (cf. now in Fassanelli 2014, 248, sixteen references from Padua and the surrounding area between 1150 and 1275); we should note the constitutional lawyer Marsilius of Padua as well as Marsiglio and Marsiglietto da Carrara, ephemeral lords of Padua, all three in the first half of the 14th century, which shows that the name was passed down over two hundred years or more in the *da Carrara* family. Finally, we should not forget Marsilio Ficino, born in 1433 in Figline Valdarno.

In the Francophone area, there are at most six bearers of the female name *Marsilia* who must also be mentioned alongside the male name:

Reims-Varin 89 around 1075 (??) *Marsiria* (with this date also in Morlet 1972, s. v.);[580] Seine-Inférieure pl. VI before 1079 *Symon et filia sua Marsilia* (region of Mantes); Angers-S.Serge 150 a. 1080–1083 *Marsiria*, mother of the donor; RHC Arm. 1, Register s. v. *Morfia: Morfia* or *Marsilia* was the name of the Armenian wife of Baldwin II (but references given there and in RHC Occ. 1–5 only have *Morfia*; this is also the version in modern standard texts such as Runciman 1951 and Setton 1969a; *Marsilia* was therefore at most an epithet once she was married); Neustria du-Monstier 186 a. 1107 *Marsilia*, Abbess of St. Amand in Rouen (the GC 11.287 notes on this point that there is also evidence of an Abbess *Macelina* of the same abbey who died in 1108, and she could be the same person as Marsilia; the abbess was probably named after St. Marcellina of Milan, sister and tutor of St. Ambrosius, and *Marsilia* was in this case an epithet through deformation); Laon-évêques 230 a. 1131 *Marsilia* of Jeantes (about 40 km north east of Laon); Fontevraud 1.465 a. 1136 *Marsilia* (Chemillé south west of Angers). There is one later literary reference: in a supplementary laisse of the T ms. of the Rol. (late 15th c.) Pinabel offers Tierri his beautiful relative Marsile in marriage, if he agrees not to have a duel.

---

579 My own reference, from Böhmer (1870, 72, No. 77): charter of Emperor Heinrich V.

580 On the dating cf. Reims-Varin 62n. I do not trust it because the editor (in one of the notes he provides in more than 40 pages of print!) has combined three Reims necrologies from different dates, based on his own copy, and without access to the printed version or the originals; he says that the oldest one was composed before 1075, but in fact it contains a few later entries, even as late as 1137.

It is important to note that there is no hagiographical foundation underpinning either the male or the female forms of the name.[581] Female names which have come about through motion are plentiful by the late 11th c.,[582] but they generally occur much less frequently than the corresponding male version of the name – as indeed we see here. The fact that in our case the female name appears around a decade earlier than the male name is probably just a matter of coincidence, given the very small number of instances that have survived. In our case, the female name fully merged with the Latin city name. This association was less clear in the case of the male name, but it cannot be ruled out entirely; nevertheless, I still think it is more likely that the epic name is being used – the psychological reasons and parallel cases are rehearsed above in the section on 'Saracen names for Christians' (A.3.1.2) – and I am also persuaded by the fact that the chronological connections fit well into the picture that we find with other names in the Marsilĭe section (apart from the even older main figures of Roland and Olivier). If the name was already an epic one at that time, then we might almost expect that it would cross the language boundary with Italy around 1090/1095 and shortly after that also the one with Flanders. What then would be the *terminus ante quem* for the epic character, given the evidence from the references that we have gathered? It would take at least a decade for a name that was originally an epithet to be no longer used as such, and to become instead the only name recorded in a charter, so that the given name is for all practical purposes forgotten; and before that, it would have taken at least another decade for the epic character to migrate from western France to the north of France; and finally it would have taken another five years before the newly created epic name could "catch on" in onomastic terms. Altogether this suggests a conservative *terminus ante quem* of "around 1060".

In summary, then, our suggestion is as follows: the epic figure of Marsilĭe most probably originated in the middle of the 11th c. not too far from the lower Loire, and it came about when the southern Fr. name *Marsilius* acquired additional meanings from the name (*al-*) *Manṣūr* (> *Marsurius*) and/or *Mundhir* (> *Mondzír*).

---

581 The above-mentioned place name *Sanctus Mascilius* 'Saint Maxire' (mentioned above in relation to and within n. 559) does not have any connections at that time, nor indeed later, with the epic name; that name always has *-sc-*, but *Ma(r)silius* never has *-sc-*.

582 Feminisation of a male name ('motion') using just *-a*, or sometimes *-ia*, is common in antiquity (*Livia*, *Iulia* etc.), but it also occurs in Germania e.g. in the famous Rosamunda, wife of Alboin (cf. Paul the Deacon 1.27, 2.28s.); according to Förstemann s. v. this name is attested 6–7 times in West Franconia/Flanders and in the 12th c. Henry II of England had a lover by this name. Likewise, in Galloromania, motion in Germanic and Latin names is well attested as early as around 800; cf. in Morlet s. v. *Abbelina, Adalberta, Adalfrida, Adalgaria, Adalgrima, Adrabalda, Agembalda, Autgaria* etc., in Morlet 1972 *Adriana, Albana, Albina, Alexandra* etc.

A.8.4 *Bramimunde, Juliane*

A.8.4.1 *Bramimunde/Bramidonĭe*
(and by way of phonological comparison *Gramimund*)

The name of Marsilĭe's wife appears in O in two different forms, five times in each form; to illustrate this more clearly, the table below shows the distribution in O and in the other mss.:

There are also isolated forms:[583] *Bamundi* n 634 (*Haimbunde* b,B), *Braimwnt* w 634 (*Braimwnd* BW, *Brainmvndia* M), *Barimonde* B 2822, *Braymunde* h(L) 2576; and also for the same person *Bramimunda* in the *Carmen* 92, *Bramimonde* in the *Galĭen* 265s., *Braslimonda* in the *Rollan a Saragossa* 59 etc., *Brandimonde* in the *Anseïs de Cartage* 3954 and passim as well as (according to Horrent 1951b, 136 n. 7) once each *Braidamonte* and *Braminonda* in the *Fatti di Spagna*, *Brandamanda* in the *Rotta*, *Blanda* in Pulci. On *Abraymamora* in the *Fuga del Rey Marsín* see below in section [6].

Regarding the variants in the Song itself, while almost the whole tradition confirms that the *-munde* or central OF *-monde* in O belongs in the archetype, the five occurrences of *-donĭe* can at most be categorised with the single instance of *Braïdomme* in P. However, the persistent use of *-donĭe* in O from v. 2822 onwards, with no exceptions, shows that someone thought a correction was needed, and we must assume that this form reaches back to the past, bypassing the archetype. In the first part of the name, the *-s-* before *-m-* in CV7 is just a writing feature; OCV7 confirm *Bra(i)mi-* is in the archetype.

Is *Braimonde / -munde* in V4 (10x, of which 1x accidentally without the tilde, 1x *-ia-* instead of *-ai-*) and in C, w and h(L) (each 1x) with two or (with hiatus) three-syllables (+ *-ə*)? The translations do not reveal this information; V4 and C are also metrically uncertain, but the proportion of 9:1 in V in favour of the hiatus form[584] is so clear, that this form must also refer back, although it bypasses the archetype. Moreover, we cannot consider the hiatus as part of the original; since in OF and mostly also in Old North Italian, intervocalic *-d-* had lapsed, *Braï-* < *Bradi-* must have happened and can be categorised with the *Braide-/Braida-* in V7 (1x) and P (3x) as a *Bra(i)d(i/e/a)* type. If the <ch> in K goes back to a generalisation of an early misreading of <d>,[585] we can add **Brad-/Bred-* to this group as well.

---

583 I have skipped over a few late references (compilations, prosifications, non-Romance derivations); on these cf. Moisan in the relevant sections.

584 In in the ed. Cook 2005 it is indicated with a trema.

585 The alternative possibility, namely a direct connection via Arab. *-ḥ-* > MHG *-(c)h-* is not supported by the geographical facts.

	O	K[586]	V4	C	V7	P	T
634	Bramimunde	Brachmunt	Braïmonde	Braimonde	Braydemonde		
2576	Bramimunde	Brechmunda	Braïmonde	Braimimonde	Brasmimonde	Braidemonde	Binamonde
2595	Bramimunde	Brechmunda	Braïmonde				Brinamonde
2714	Bramimunde		Braïmode	Braimimonde	Braismimonde		Binamonde
2734	Bramimunde	Brechmunda	Brïamonde	Braimimonde	Braymimonde		Binamonde
2822	Bramidonïe	Brechmunda	Braïmonde	Braismimonde	Braismimonde		Binamonde
3636	Bramidonïe	Brechmunda	Braïmunde	Brasmimonde	Brasmimonde	Braïdomme	Brunamonde
3655	Bramidonïe	Brehmunda	Braïmunde	Braismimonde	Braismimonde	Braidamonde	Brunamonde
3680	Bramidonïe	Brehmundã (Akk.)	Braïmonde	Braimimonde	Braismimonde	Braidamonde	
3990	Bramidonïe						

586 The Stricker has *Pregmunda*, the *Karlmeinet* has *Pregmunda, Premunda* once each. In K the name is mistaken for a man's name the first time it is mentioned, but not after that.

To sum up what we know thus far: the archetype of the surviving mss. had *Bra(i)mimonde*, but the elements *Bra(i)d(i/e/a)-* and *-donĭe* in parts of the manuscript tradition indicate that there may have been older variants of this name outside the archetype.

How can we explain this name?

[1] Let us begin with the correct explanation, which I do not recall being elaborated anywhere else. The name is clearly a feminine form of the great family of OF epic names that are derived from the Arab. *ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān.*

This is the name of the early military commander *ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān al-Ghāfiqī*, who fell in 732 in the bloody battle against Charles Martell at Tours and Poitiers, and also of the three most powerful rulers of al-Andalus, each of whom enjoyed a long period in office: ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān I (755–788) came to Spain as a refugee from the east and then established Umayyad rule with Córdoba as its capital, and he was Charlemagne's real, historical adversary, the target of Charlemagne's failed Spanish campaign, and the one who surrendered not a single foot-breadth of land to the Carolingians; ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān II (822–852) inherited a kingdom that was already very stable and he made it into a culturally and economically thriving oriental state. He, too, fought against the Carolingians without any territorial losses. Finally, ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān III (912–961), who reacted to the diplomatic advances of Otto the Great as well as the Basileus with sovereign disdain, led the kingdom, now with official Caliphate status, to its undisputed zenith. Córdoba became a metropolis more magnificent than anything that Latin-inspired Europe had ever known. All in all, therefore, there was no name in al-Andalus, apart from al-Manṣūr, that was more significant for Spain and France.

The name was Romanised twice, and because it had four syllables, it underwent compression. It was taken over with early aphaeresis of the *ab,* interpreted as a Latin or Occitan preposition, the *ḥ* was overheard, the *-n* became silent[587] then it was slotted into the development of *deramatus* > OF *deramé* 'ébranché, déchiré, détruit' and this resulted in the *Deramed / Deramé* from

---

587 The loss was probably a lingering and regional effect in the transfer from Arab. to Rom., since the ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān of the year 732 is called *Abdir(r)ama* in most of the early sources (Isidore continuation up to 754, Fredegar continuer, *Ann. Mettenses priores, Laurissenses minores, Fuldenses, Gesta Abbatum Fontanellensium* etc.; *Abderrama* from an earlier source persists in Ademar 1.52). It cannot just be a matter of a graphical slip, such as the omission of a nasal tilde, because in Spanish toponymy a *Pozo Durama* is attested in the province of León (Corriente 1977, 23, n. 3 from p. 22).

Cordres 'Córdoba' in the *Chanson de Guillaume* and in the William epic as a whole.[588]

In the second transfer, recognised by Milà (1874, 334) and Rajna (1884, 222) – which probably came about during the last third of the 11th c., coming in from Spain along with the *Mainet* story – only the *a-* was lost in the aphaeresis,[589] but then the unusual *Bdar-* was changed to *Brad-*; the fricative *ḥ* was voiced before *-m-* by assimilation and reinterpreted as the next available fricative /j/, or it was simply ignored; the *-d-* was often dropped (either between vowels, or through assimilation before the *-m-*); the *-mān*, here with a stable *-n*, occasionally became *-men*,[590] and otherwise remained as *-man*, but mostly was remoulded to *-mant,* sometimes with attraction by the frequent names ending in *-mont* (< Germ. *-mund*). This is how a whole bundle of closely related names emerged, that is to say (ignoring minor secondary variants):

a) retaining the *-d-*: *Bradmund, -t* (occasionally also *Brademound* and in isolated mss. *Bradamon, -nd* and shortened to *Brandon*) in the *Beuve* A, *Braidimont* in *Beuve* F I–III, *Chevalerie Ogier* and *Godin*, *Bradimon(t)* (var. *Brandimont*, *Braidimont*) in the *Melusine*;

b) with loss of the *-d-*: *Braimantus* in the PT (*Codex Calixtinus*, ms. families BCD ed. Meredith-Jones), *Braiman* in the *Ensenhamen* by Guerau de Cabreira (v. 147 ed. de Riquer), *Braiman(t)* (partly > *Braimont*) in *Mainet*, *Chevalerie Ogier*, *Enfances Ogier*, *Guibert d'Andrenas*, *Garin de Monglane*, *Doon de Mayence*, *Gaufrey*, *Maugis*, *Mort Maugis*, *Vivien de Monbranc*, *Entrée d'Espagne*, *Chanson d'Antioche*, *Chanson de Jérusalem* and *Bel Inconnu* as well as (for marginal characters) in the *Beuve de Hantone* F I and III.

It is obvious that we cannot separate our name from this family of names, nor can we regard it as the source of all the other names; it is just a branch of this family, especially since the latter also contains other feminine names ending in *-e/-a*:[591] we can include the *Brando(i)ne* in the *Maugis*, *Vivien de Montbranc*,

---

[588] The interpretation *déramé* is evident in the *Chanson de Guillaume* through the fact that in this text (v. 2062) a second Muslim king is called *Desturbed*, which is a nice parallel formation.

[589] There is even an exception to this: Span. *Abrasmonte* in the Gaiferos romance (WH 174), cf. Beckmann (2010, 66).

[590] Cf. the form *Abdrahemen* in Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim († after 973), *Vita Pelagii* v. 74 (ed. von Winterfeld, MGH SS.schol. 34); it already reflects the start of the inner Arabic, and most evident in Hispano-Arabic, drift *-ā-* > *-ē-* (cf. n. 291 above).

[591] On the feminisation of a male name ('motion') in Galloromania cf. n. 582 above. Cf. also for Catalonia Kremer 1972 s. v. *-berta*, *-era*, *-frida*, *-garia*, *-gisa*, *-iscla*, *-mara*, *-mira*, *-nanda*, *-rada*, *-rica*, *-salva*, *-sinda*, *-vig(i)a*, and also *Esperandea*, *Mauregata*, *Ovidia*, *Sancia* – all from the 10th c. *-munda* is attested there in 1134 with one *Raimunda*.

Élie de Saint-Gilles and *Hue et Calisse*, the *Brandonĭe / Brandoria* (and *Bradia-mont*) in late Franco-Italian and Italian *Beuve-de-Hantone* versions, as well as the *Brailimonda* in the Occitan adventure romance *Guilhem de la Barra* (early 14th c.); and finally, we cannot separate Boiardo's and Ariosto's *Bradamante* from the name forms *Braidamonte* and *Brandamanda* which were naturalised in Italy through *Fatti di Spagna* and *Rotta*, although the name of the new figure in the form of *brada amante* 'passionately loving' was suffused with new meaning too.

As a late dating of the Rol. is often argued these days, it is of interest to note that our epic figure is indirectly detectable around 1118. For just after 1118 at the latest, Roger III, Count of Foix had a daughter who married in 1131. In this year her name is to be found in the record of a gift from her father: *Ego Rogerius comes Fuxensis dono filiae meae Braidimendae et marito suo* etc. (Languedoc-HgL 5.980 a. 1131/1132).[592] We have already seen above,[593] how Saracen names were used as epithets and nicknames before they found their way into Christian anthroponomy. But *Braidimenda* of Foix has this name even in one of her noble father's most important charters. We would expect him to have used her baptismal name – perhaps *alongside* an epithet – but if he only uses *Braidimenda* here, then it must be the name she was baptised with. However, this would only have been possible if the figure called *Braidimenda* (or similar) who passed on the name had been a Christian, or rather, had become a Christian; for someone whose exotic name obviously points back to Islam – and of course from the southern French perspective of the time this would have been Spanish Islam – could not have been born a Christian, and must have become one through conversion. And because the Count would hardly name his daughter after a person from the lower classes, this figure bearing the exotic name must have held a very high rank in society. This makes her look very like our Bramimunde or Bramidonĭe, and so there is every reason now to look for an identification of both of them.

---

592 According to https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/TOULOUSE%20NOBILITY.htm (last access 22. 05. 2021) Braidimenda was Count Roger's oldest child, but she seems to have been born long before his only known marriage to Jimena of Barcelona, and so she was probably an illegitimate daughter; this fits with the fact that she married one level below her status, her husband being a neighbouring Viscount of Niort-de-Sault. If she was illegitimate, her father was not obliged to follow the custom of naming her after a relative (usually one of the two grandmothers).

593 Cf. the section on 'Saracen names for Christians' (A.3.1.2).

The structure of the name *Braidimenda* is so similar to our *type Bra(i)d(i/e/a)monde* in P (and once in V7) that it seems to suggest this is the genetically oldest form. In the year 1164 the wife of Aimericus de Lux (65 km south east of Toulouse) is called *Braidimunda* (Toulouse-S.Sernin 375), already showing attraction from the *-mund(a)-* names.

One form arising from *Bra(i)d(i/e/a)monde* was *Bramidonĭe* in O 2822ss. largely through metathesis *br-d-m-n(d)- > br-m-d-n-*, and another is the *Braïmonde* discussed above, especially in V4. But the *-mim-* in *Bramimonde* still needs explanation. Fortunately, *t*here is a parallel to the first case in the Song itself: Valdabrun's horse is called

Gramimund O [1528]=1571, *Gradamunt* n, *Gratamunt* K, *Gardemon* V4, *Marmoris* C, *Marmorins* V7, *Marmoiret* P, *Aragon* T, *Gaaillon* L, *Gardemont* h(V): here T and L make idiosyncratic changes. The sub-archetype of CV7P(TL), Segre's δ, has inserted the name of Grandonĭe's horse, *Marmorĭe*. In K, the *-t-* is probably a Latinising feature (*gratus*). The *Gardemon(t)* in V4 and h(V), probably meant as *garde-amont* 'Chin up!' is secondary from the n and K versions, which allows us to confirm that β must have had *Gradamont* (where the *Gra-*, and not *Gar-* is also supported by O), and this is made up of *gréd* (*de gréd*, v. 2000, 'spontaneously, willingly', Occ. *de grat < gratus*) or from Lat. *gradi* 'stride' + *amont* 'willingly jumping up, jumper'.[594] However, a comparison of the two cases now shows that the loss of the intervocalic *-d-* had left a hiatus which was needed to maintain the number of syllables required by the metre, but which a minority of scribes perceived as ugly, and reversed with a dittological anticipation of the *-m-* in the following syllable – a process that in the case of *Bramimunde* happened with the writer of the archetype, and in the case of *Gramimund* later with the writer of α (i.e. in a stage before O or O itself).

As such a process is not elaborated in the handbooks, some linguists prefer to assume in the case of *Bramimonde* that there was some kind of semantic influence from *bramer, brame*. In Fr. the verb is not attested until the 16th c. (although it does appear then with variants *brammer, brasmer, braimer*, which are the same as those visible in the name in CV7, and e.g. with reference to children crying because they are starving); but the postverbal *brames* 'cries, crying' appears earlier, in the late 12th c. in the story of *Richeut* (v. 681), where it refers to the complaints of *dames*; also Old Occ. *bramar* can be found in William IX (and it

---

594 This could be meant generally, in the sense of 'powerfully, energetically' or it could have a sexual meaning 'jumping eagerly on, mounting a mare'.

characterises in Marcabru the melancholy song of the nightingale), but it comes from Franconian *brammōn*, and so its absence in OF which lies geographically between the two is probably just a matter of coincidence. Since Bramimonde appears more than once in connection with sorrowful complaints, (v. 2576s., 2595ss., 2823ss., 3641ss.), the idea of a semantic influence seems plausible.[595]

[2] Bancourt (1982a, 640) suggests that this is the primary explanation of the name, but this cannot be true, because the association between *Braidimenda/ Braidimunda* and the large family of epic names described above cannot be a coincidence.

[3] It is linguistically impossible to have *braire* instead of *bramer*, which Keller (1989, 114) suggests. He starts with *Braimonde* in V4 but overlooks the fact that in the archetype the name already requires three full syllables + -*ə*.

[4] and [5] Gaston Paris (1875, 305) wanted to trace *Braimant / Braimont* back to a (naturally unattested!) Goth. *Wracamund*, but we cannot accept this nowadays. Neither can we agree with Gamillscheg (1934–1936, 1.312), who examined the 1164 reference from Toulouse explained above and declared the women's name *Braidimunda* to be Gothic.

[6] Kunitzsch (1980, 352 n. 3, 1988, 263) can be taken more seriously. He wanted to trace *Bramimonde* back to *Ibrāhīm*. He could have argued successfully that this name quite often appears with aphaeresis in transcription,[596] and that the *Fuga del Rey Marsín* in fact calls our queen *Abraymamora*, and thus like Kunitzsch interprets the meaning of the name as '(the Moorish woman) Ibrāhīma'. However, this etymology is improbable. First, Kunitzsch does not follow his own guiding principle that a historically renowned person must be identified for it to be plausible that a borrowing would reach Galloromania; secondly, there is no

---

595 A similar argument was made by Brault (1973, 145 n. 17, 178, 455 n. 4); on the other hand, I do not believe one suggestion that Brault considers, namely that the second part of the name contains *immonde* 'impure' or *idoine* 'suited, fitting' – Von Richthofen (1954, 302) refers to Old Norse *Brámi*, the name of a berserker (*HyndluljoP* 23.2) but this is irrelevant.

596 And in fact, both on the Iberian Peninsula: Portugal-Cortesão 9.127 a. 1016 *Brafeme*, a. 1142 *Brahamino*, Corriente (1977, 59 n. 84) *Brahem*, and in southern Italy: Steiger (1932, 269, 339, from Cusa) Βράχιμος, Βραχήμ, Malaterra 2.46 (ed. Pontieri 54) *Brachiem* (var. *Brachem*), and also in the Holy Land: Saint-Sépulcre 88, 95, 108 a. 1152, 1155, 1160 etc. *Brahim, Brahin, Braim*.

explanation for all the variants with -*d*-; thirdly, accepting the random addition of -*ant* with no justification considerably weakens this hypothesis.

[7] In his otherwise exceptionally well documented article on the word field around *brahman* 'Brahmin' Marcos Marín proposes (1977, 150, 157–160) that the *Braimant* in the *Mainet* along with another OF variant *Bradimant* (attested where?) come from *brahman*, then adds the daring claim that there is a crossover with ʿ*Abd ar-Raḥmān.* He mentions that Rajna (1884, 222) had already supported this ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān – but he does not realise that *Braimant / Bradimant* are part of a large family of names. His explanation would work phonologically for the name *Braim-ant* on its own; but the -*d*- in his second variant *Bradimant* and all the related -*d*-forms cannot just be explained away with a reference to medieval etymology of the name as *Bras d'aimant* in the *Fierabras* (Marcos Marín 1977, 159), because this etymology presupposes the existence of the -*d*- in the first place. And there would still be no semantic reason why *brahman* should lead to *Braimant,* and in fact it would be strange, because the Brahmins were renowned via the Alexander saga through the whole of the Middle Ages as people of peace *par excellence.* Given all these circumstances, there is no reason to assume a crossover of meaning is present here, if the name ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān is enough on its own.[597]

[8] Finally, a simple misunderstanding lies behind the hypothesis argued by de Mandach (1961, 37) and Sholod (1966, 174, 229) that *Bramimunde* is a lightly disguised *bru Maimun* 'the daughter-in-law of Maimun', where Maimun means Muʿtamid of Seville. This would mean that *Bramimunde* is just another name for Zaida, the wife of Muʿtamid's son Fatḥ al-Maʾmūn, who fled straight to Alfons VI

---

597 We can even go a little further. A short time before (1977, 149–156) Marcos Marín tried to explain a passage in the Old Spanish *Alexandre* (first third of the 13th c.): when Alexander is still fighting Darius, somewhere in the east of Persia, his army comes across the terrifying giant called Aristomoles/Aristamones, who even turns up on an elephant; *nunca ombre uio tan fiero breymante* (ms. O) / *nunca ome* [with a bar over the *m*] *non vjo tan fiero abramante* (ms. P). Marcos Marín has to concede that the meaning 'Brahmin' is not in any way appropriate here, and then in almost 7 pages of tortuous argument, he tries to make it plausible that the word in this passage, and only in this passage, has undergone a change of meaning from 'Brahmin' to 'giant'. In my opinion, this sentence in fact is bringing in the main character from the *Mainet* story who is already very well known to the audience (cf. similarly Corominas DCELC and DCECH s. v. *bramante*, n. 1, who points out that in terms of metre, the word has four syllables). Either it contains an underlying meaning 'No one was ever seen, even the Brahmin, in such a state of wildness'. Or (the sentence is grammatically ambiguous): 'Even Braimant [who after all was extremely strong physically and was also in command of an effective army] has never come across anyone as wild as this'.

when her husband died in battle, first becoming his concubine, and the converting to Christianity before becoming his wife and the mother of his only son and thus heir to his throne. I must confess that I was not convinced by this theory from the very start, because Saracen names in the epics do not come about via the misunderstanding or even mystification of everyday appellative elements like *bru*. And in fact, for Muʿtamid, the name or epithet *Maimun* (or *al-Ma'mūn*), unlike the name of his son, is simply not attested; neither is it concealed within his full name: Abū-l Qāsim Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿAmr ʿAbbād ibn Muḥammad ibn Is-māʿīl aẓ-Ẓāfir bi-ḥawl al-Lāh al-Mu'ayyad bi-l-Lāh *al-Muʿtamid* ʿalā al-Lāh (Scheindlin, 1974, 24). On the contrary, Lévi-Provençal clearly says (1948, 145): "Le surnom honorifique al-Ma'mun n'a été en effet porté, parmi les princes ʿabbadides de Séville, que par l'un des fils d'al-Muʿtamid, le second, qui se prénommait ʿAbbad ou Fath." There is therefore only one explanation, namely that de Mandach has mixed up Muʿtamid of Seville and his son Fatḥ al-Ma'mūn. A further, related error in the argument presented by de Mandach and Sholod is the assertion that Lévi-Provençal, in his article of 1934, had mentioned an affair that Alfons VI and Zaida had had, while he was still in exile in Toledo (1072). This is not true: Lévi-Provençal did not mention this at all, and there is no reason whatsoever to assume that the historical Zaida had ever met Alfons before she took refuge with him (1091).

Even though we must reject this far-reaching attempt to equate Bramimonde with Zaida, there is something that Bramimonde does share with her: her conversion. Her story is unusual: an Islamic princess, who after her husband's death in battle (in 1091) comes to the court of the Christian 'emperor' (Alfons VI greatly valued his title of emperor rather than king) and freely submits to baptism, even bearing him his only son and no doubt becoming his legitimate wife as well.[598] This would have been a singular and spectacular occurrence in the eyes of Europeans, and it would certainly have been famous even in faraway France, especially since relations between Castile and France had become considerably warmer thanks to the French support given to Alfons VI in 1087. Not only that, but it was also a welcome turn of events in a moral sense, in as far as this example could reassure Christians that Christian politics was not just about worldly power, and that even someone who found themselves very far from salvation could convert, and thereby not only save their soul, but also retain their social status.

---

598 On the historical facts cf. the Art. *Zai'da* in the LM and the secondary literature cited there.

The figure of Bramimonde must therefore have become what it is in the Song approximately between 1100 and 1115: the widow of Marsilĭe who converts.

A.8.4.2 *Juliane*

In the Song, Bramimonde's conversion is linked with taking on a new name, which is the name of a saint: *Truvé[t] li unt le num de Juliane* O 3985; the poet leaves the name in this Latinising form ending in *-ane* as we see from the rules of assonance. The word *trouvé* is there to show that the name was chosen for a reason. The poet has been guided here by several circumstances, and these have all been mentioned in the literature before, but we will summarise them briefly here and add a few more details and references.

Juliana of Nicomedia could not save her noble husband from his hardened heathen beliefs and so she chose to suffer martyrdom herself (BHL 4522) – and this is just like Bramimonde who could not save her husband who was likewise hardened in his 'heathen' beliefs.

Juliana's remains were brought to Pozzuoli, and then to Cumae in Italy, and from there they were soon passed on to other places. The most famous Juliana monastery, Santillana (< *Sancta Iuliana*) del Mar near Santander, that is to say on the minor coast road to Compostela, also had relics of Juliana before 987 (Asturias-Sota 638 a. 987, Vázquez de Parga/Lacarra/Uría Ríu 1948, 2:526). This meant that to some extent Juliana could be regarded as a Spanish woman – as Bramimonde was.

Juliana was also known from the year 800 at the very latest in Western Europe, as is attested in Cynewulf's Old Eng. poem and in the martyrologies. The Trinité of Caen Abbey in Normandy, for example, owned a Juliana relic, according to a list dating from around 1100 (Caen-G&M 141). Judging by visual representations and the older Vita, by the 12th c. at the latest, people in the West thought of her as a very powerful woman who was not afraid to have a physical altercation with devil (LCI s. v.) – as Bramimonde v. 2576–2591 did with the idols.

The name *Juliana* was used as a baptismal name in early Christian times. In the south of France, it is then attested occasionally from the 9th c. onwards (Morlet 1972, 67), but its popularity grew slowly, and it was not until the middle of the 11th c. that it was widespread in the areas further north. Boissonnade (1923, 414) cites the wife of Geoffroi le Barbu, Count of Angers (1064–1068, † 1080), who must have been one of the first women to bear this name in western France.[599] Boissonnade also names three Norman women with this name from

---

[599] Her name *Juliana* is clearly attested, but we also find *Julitta/Julietta* and *(H)Amelina* (as the daughter or Hamelin of Langeais); cf. Guillot (1972, 2.172) and https://fmg.ac/Projects/Med

the time around 1100. In 1092, one of them, whom he suspects was the original model for Bramimonde, became the wife of Gilbert de Laigle, one of the most powerful lords in Normandy. She also was the sister of Rotrou du Perche, and as such she governed the Perche, while her brother in Spain was enfeoffed with a portion of newly conquered Saragossa. Since this enfeoffment is reflected in the Song (cf. below section A.10.3 on *Climborin*), I also think it is possible that the poet was influenced by this individual as well as by the hagiographical perspective, and if this is too narrow an assumption, it is also possible that the relatively recent popularity of the name in the Norman upper class may well also have played a role.

A.8.5 *Jurfaret*, Marsilĭe's son

Roland is not allowed to kill Marsilĭe, and may only cut off his hand, because the mortally wounded Marsilĭe himself, and in particular the feudal glove he holds in his left hand, are destined to form a special link between the Marsilĭe section and the Baligant section. This robs Roland of the right to see Marsilĭe die in this life, and so the poet makes it up to him in a way when Roland kills Marsilie's son, under the very eyes of the one-handed Marsilie – and the loss of the ruler's only son must have been almost as bitter to him as death itself. We turn now to the name of this son!

Jurfaret O 504, *Orphalis* K, *Corsaleon* V4, *Gifeus* CV7: V4 seems to be rewriting *⃰Jorsal-* (with *-ſ-* instead of *-f-*) to make the new name *Cors-a-leon* 'lion's body' or he may be reminded of the Celtic name *Cursalem* (in Geoffrey one of Arthur's earls). In the source used by K, a decorative letter was missing (based on OCV7 it was a *J-*). There was therefore *Jurfar-* in O as opposed to *Jorfal-* in β, and the ending of the word is not clear.

Jurfaleu O 1904, *Jurfalon* n, *Iorfalir* K, *Corsaleus* V4, *Girfalés* V7, *Girfaut* P, *Sumelin* T, *Cornicas* L; and

Jurfaleu O 2702, *Corsalleon* V4, *Virfallé* C, *Girfales* V7, *Putalet* T: In v. 1904, T and L insert idiosyncratic names, and in v. 2702 T does it again. In both places the sub-archetype of CV7P had *Girfalés* (in P without the diminutive, leaving *Girfaut*). The archetype therefore had *Jur-/Jor-* everywhere; but since both V4, and even K, which depends on an Anglo-Norman source, have *-o-*, and not *-u-*, the *Jur-* should be read as /džǫr-/, and not /džyr-/. In the archetype, there was then in v. 504 *-far-*

---

or -*fal*-, and in the two later places, -*fal*-. The suffix alternates between -*ét* and -*eu*, but we cannot draw any conclusions about the archetype from this.

While Gicquel (2003, 160) thought this name was *fantaisiste*, Spitzer (1948/1949, 402 n. 2) thought it was "obviously" a diminutive of *ger*-, *gir-falc*, -*faut* 'gyr-falcon'. There is nothing wrong with this in terms of semantics; in the song there is also an *Esperveris* from *épervier* 'sparrowhawk'. And as a diminutive of *gerfalc* the name does indeed seem to have captured the meaning of the sub-archetype of CV7P, but this does not tell us anything about the archetype, because first, this consistently has *Jur*- (or even *Jor*-, and Stengel agrees), but the appellative is always *ger*- or *gir*-, very occasionally *jar*- (on the latter cf. FEW 16 s. v. *gīrfalke*). Secondly, in the archetype we only have a choice between *Jorfar*- and *Jorfal*- in the first passage, while both of the later passages have *Jorfal*-. But when *r-r* and *r-l* compete with each other, the latter usually comes about through dissimilation and the former therefore appears to be the primary form, and so we find in the Rol. *Arverni(a)* > *Alverne / Auvergne*, *paraveredus* (> MHG. *pferit*) > *palefreid*, *peregrinus* > *pelerin*; additional standard examples were provided above à propos *Marsilĭe* (A.8.3), and there are no counter examples. It is important to note in our context that this tendency was still in effect around 1100, in foreign names as well, so that we have *Marturano* (diocese in southern Italy) > *Martran* > OF *Maltran*, *Mautran* in crusader epics.

These are the reasons why, when we remove the suffix, we should be looking for /džǫrfar/ or something like that. Now in the song, Jurfaret is the son of the lord of Saragossa. In actual fact, the most powerful of all the lords of Saragossa was called *Abū Džaʿfar* Aḥmad bin Sulaymān al-Muqtadir (1046/1047–1081/1082). In those days, a ruler was usually known in public and recorded in history by his *laqab*, in this case *al-Muqtadir,* while his *kunya*, in this case *Abū Džaʿfar*, was a more intimate and yet still courtly form of address, in other words more formal than the use of his real (~first) name, in this case *Aḥmad*. But in the case of al-Muqtadir the *kunya* was in fact the most popular form of address. We can see this from the fact that in the 11th c. the name *džaʿfarī* was given to a gold coin that was current in al-Andalus, and the only person it could have been named after is precisely this Saragossan lord.[600] Another piece of evidence is the fact that this Abū Džaʿfar kept his official residence in the city of Saragossa, but also built himself a private castle a few hundred metres to the west of the city walls as they were at that time, and he gave this building a magnificent interior that is still much admired by art historians today;[601] in one of his own poems he called

---

600 Lévi-Provençal (1955b, 197).
601 Cf. Ewert (1971 and 1978, passim); DA s. v. *Islamic Art*, p. 189; Arié 1982, 432, 521.

it *qaṣr as-surūr* 'Castle of Joy', and it was commonly known as *al-Džaʿfariyya*,[602] today called *la Aljafería*. Some indication of the renown that the castle must have enjoyed in Christian circles even before the Reconquista of the city can be found in a charter from 1118, the year when Alfonso el Batallador (and his many French supporting troops!) marched into Saragossa; it is dated: *in illo anno quando fuit capta Caesaraugusta [. . .] ipso die quando [dominus rex Adefonsus] intravit videre illa Aliafaria;*[603] the reason why a close inspection of this place was worth documenting was that people far and wide had already heard of it.[604] The Christians would no doubt have known both the name of the castle and the personal name, so to speak, *(Abū) Džaʿfar* of the Saragossan prince. If the Roland poet had heard of the name in this form, then we can draw a very simple conclusion: since everyone in Spain knew that *Abū Džaʿfar* means 'father of Džaʿfar', the name *Džaʿfar* would appear to be a good name for the son of a Saragossan prince and adding the suffix *-ęt* could be a way of emphasising the filial relationship and the youth of the person. But even if the poet had not heard of the *Abū Džaʿfar* nexus, the impressive existence of *al-Džaʿfariyya* would have ensured that the name *Džaʿfar* remained current for a very long time and was associated with Saragossa.

As far as the phonology is concerned, in Hispano-Arab. both the pharyngal *ʿAyn* and postvelar *Qāf* required a so-called velar contour; this means that /a/ did not succumb to drift towards /e/, /i/, but instead it formed *allophones in the range of* [ʌ] *and* [ɔ] (Corriente 1977, 22 with n. 3, 25s.); these "han podido ser identificados por el oído romance como su /o/" and could even sometimes go as far as /u/ (Corriente 1992, 38s.). This explains the /o̞/ in Jur-. I do not have an example of the replacement of the /ʿ/ with (at that time in OF certainly still frontal) /r/, but I think it is at least highly plausible that the slight voiced pharyngal "something" that a westerner would hear in front of the /f/, in a place where it was not possible in OF to have a velar consonant, and where there was no possible substitution that would even come close, was rendered by the only possible *flap* before /f/, namely the alveolar /r/.

---

602 The Arabic name is mentioned referring to the year 1109, e.g., by Ibn ʿIdhārīs *Bayān* (Pérès 1953, 152s.).

603 Ebro-Lacarra (1946, 484s., no. 12).

604 In connection with this we should note that Gérard Gros (2011a, passim, especially 622), argues that v. 2594 of the song (about Marsilĭe's *cambre voltice*) *Plusurs culurs i ad peinz et escrites* (where according to Segre *culurs* can be masc. and *escrites* a noun, 'inscriptions', thus requiring no emendation) indicates that the poet is presenting a "vue sincère de l'art islamique en Espagne, à la fin du XIe siècle", in other words he is describing its carefully cultivated polychromy and deliberate avoidance of figural representation in favour of (vegetal or geometric) patterns and calligraphic elements.

Has no one really noticed this connection before? Well, to some extent Grégoire (1942–1943, 542s.) did notice something. But he described it in such a way that no one believed it, and indeed in a way that made it easy to miss. After devoting more than a page to the erroneous identification of Blancandrin of Valfonde with Yaḥya al-Qādir of Valencia, Grégoire adds almost as an afterthought that the name "Jurfaleu or Jurfalé or Jurfaré" [the last two forms are inaccurate!] relates to a King Jafar of Valencia, "1092–1095" [although he is referring to a certain *Qāḍī Džaʿfar*, better known as *Ibn Džaḥḥāf* (as mentioned by Wasserstein 1985, 97s. or in the EI, Art. *al-Sīd* by É. Lévi-Provençal)]. He then adds the sentence "I also find in Menendez' book, p. 307, the Palace of Aljaferĩa in Saragossa, from Abu-Džafar, end of XIth century". There is a short footnote to this. But sadly, that is all.

Moreover, it is possible that after the dissimilation *Jurfaret > Jurfalet* the audience of the Song may have understood a secondary meaning too, since *jo(u)r* 'day, daylight' can appear in OF with *fa(i)l(l)ir* 'go out, extinguish';[605] which would mean *jur-fal- ~* 'for whom the light goes out, 'doomed to die, moribund'. But we cannot take this as the primary etymology of the name, since that would mean assuming that the aptness of the name for the son of a prince of Saragossa was purely down to chance.

A.9 The twelve anti-peers

When the twelve anti-peers boast about their prowess (v. 860–989), they appear in the same order as they do later in the battle itself (v. 1188–1337) – this is the prime example of the Roland poet's awareness of structure in his work. Roland cites three of the domains that they rule: *Balaguez*, *Valterne* and *Sibilĩe*, saying that he has already conquered them (v. 199s.); this is not a contradiction, because in medieval warfare especially, towns were conquered relatively often, but territories were almost never completely occupied: and as noted above, the towns could not escape the attacks of the Franks but their lords and most of the troops attached to those places did manage to escape to safety.

Just as on the Christian side Roland, Olivier and Turpin form a "category of their own" in terms of their significance, so the poet has singled out the first three anti-peers with a special distinction: they are all of royal blood.

---

605 Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *falir*, col. 1612, Z. 4ss.: *Li jours lor faut, nuis vint obscure* (*Richeut* 895), *chevauchierent tant jor ert faillus* (Jubinal, Nouveau *recueil* I 120). Cf. also Rol. 2454: *Charle, chevalche! car tei ne falt clartét.*

A.9.1 *Aëlroth*

Marsilĭe's nephew is called *Aëlroth* O 1188, *Altoter* n (*Adalroth* B, b), *Adalrot* K, *Aderlot* V4, *Aderloth* V7, *Alsarot* w: the sub-archetype β had *Adal-* or *Adelrot(h)*, and presumably also the archetype as well, since this is the older form in relation to O.[606] This explains why Stengel puts *Adalroth* in the text.

 The name is almost indistinguishable from Old Eng. *Æδel-* (older *Aδal-*) *ræd* (or *-rēd*). After the Norman conquest of England, Old English names quickly fell out of favour. For example, in Winchester in 1066 the proportion of indigenous to foreign names was 85:15; by 1110 it had reversed, and in 1207 only 5.2 % of the population had indigenous names; "there can be few more eloquent demonstrations of the social impact of the Norman conquest" (Biddle 1972, 38; a similar trend took place across the whole of England: Withycombe 1977, p. XXIV–XXVII). From a Norman perspective, the Old English King Æthelred II (978–1016) had a particularly poor reputation. He married Emma, the daughter of a Norman duke and was the father of Edward the Confessor, but he was a weak king, and he suffered heavy defeats against the Danes, which meant he had to raise huge sums to pay the Danegeld. After his death, Emma married Knut/Cnut (Canute) the Great of Denmark (and now also England) and preferred the sons from this marriage over Edward. By 1066 at the latest, her first husband was called *Æδel-ræd Un-ræd* 'the Unready'. When William of Malmesbury writes about him saying he was "neither excessively foolish nor excessively cowardly" this shows *e contrario*, what people generally thought of him (LM s. v. *Ethelred II.*). In the *Rou* 3.260 etc. he is called *Alred / Aelred / Aeilred*. In the *Chanson de Guillaume* his name appears twice as a Saracen name: *Aelred / Ailred / Ailré* is the son of King *Aelran*, and a different King *Aildré*[607] is Renewardʼs uncle. The author of the Rol. has made a simplified hypocoristic form ending in *-ot* (as in *Esclav-oz*).[608]

 As a nephew of King Marsilĭe, Aelroth is the negative counterpart of Roland; thus, he asks his uncle for the privilege of fighting with Roland (v. 866), and he pays for that by being the first of all the Saracens to die, and it is Roland

---

[606] Although we should note that *Ail-* < *Æδel-* already appears very frequently in the Domesday Book (von Feilitzen 1937 s. v. *Æδel-*).

[607] The *-d-* is of course a glide (as in *molĕre* > **molre* > *moudre*, *melior* > **mielҋre* > *mieudre*); it could have emerged later here, however, and so we cannot draw any dialectal conclusions from its presence or absence in this case.

[608] Plenty of examples of double forms ending in *-et* and *-ot* are attested from the 13th century onwards: Morlet (1967, 25s.) cites, among others, *Henri-/Jaqu-/Michel-/P(i)err-et*, also with *-ot*. – The claim made by Broëns (1965–1966, 67), that *Adalhrod* [sic] is also a West Gothic name is not attested and unlikely. I see even less justification for the suggestion made by Scheludko (1927, 481) that it is derived from the name "Abd-al-Rutî", and he provides no further details.

who kills him (v.1188–1212). But along with the request for this privilege he also had another desire: that Marsilĭe should select twelve knights, including Aelroth, who would step up and fight with the twelve peers – and this is how the poet justifies his own creation of a group of anti-peers. But before the king can answer, eleven others push their way forwards, demanding this honour, just as the other peers immediately step up to support Roland when he is appointed as leader of the rear guard.

A.9.2 *Falsaron*

The second of the twelve anti-peers, King Marsilĭe's brother *Falsaron*, lord of the land of Datan and Abiram in southern Palestine, is discussed above in the section entitled 'Oriental elements in the Marsilĭe section' (A.5.7).

A.9.3 *Corsa‹b›lis*

As king of the Berbers, he is discussed above in the section on 'North Africa' (A.7.3).

The remaining nine peers are scattered across Spain. Since the Roland poet could have had, as far as we can judge, only a rudimentary understanding of the geographical structure of what was then still Muslim al-Andalus,[609] it goes without saying that his focus would mainly be on the Christian north, and especially on the parts that had been contested in the preceding few decades, and where the names would still be widely recognised.

A.9.4 *Malprimis* of Berbegal

The first person to put himself forward is *Malprimis de Briga[l]* Segre 889, *Malprimis de Brigant* O (but in a laisse with *a*, and not with *ã*), *Malwil* (*Malwir* A) *uon Ampregalt* K (but *Malprimes von Pergalt* Stricker), *Malprimos de Borgal* V4,

---

[609] The PT (cap. 3), on the other hand, can provide an impressively long list of towns including some from southern Spain, because he managed to gain access to lists in Spain, including especially diocesan lists from West Gothic times; cf. Anguita Jaén (2003, passim) – but this certainly does not mean that the PT is a Galician rather than a French text.

Malprimes de Brigart C, *Malpin de Mont Brigart* V7, *Malpin de Mombrebart* T, *Esloer van Burgan* h(B). Later, when Gerin strikes him down, he is called

Malprimis de Brigal O 1261, *Malprimis uon Ampelgart* K, *Malprimes de Borgal* V4, *Malpin de Mont Pregal* C, *Malpin de Mont Brigal* V7, *Malprime de Murgal* P, *Preamor de Rigal* T, *Manprine de Gerbal* L, *Malcabrin* w, *prise* h(L): CV7 (and in the first passage also T) have "ennobled the toponym by putting *Mont-* in front of it, and so they have to shorten the personal name by one syllable, which also brought about the loss of the *-r-* that was indicated by a superscript *r*-abbreviation (Cappelli 1961, p. XXIV and 276s., Bischoff 2009, 211). Since the *-mis* (not *-mes*) occurring twice in O is at least confirmed in 1261 by K, Segre puts it in the text in both passages and thereby makes this Malprimís and his name distinct from Baligant's son Malprímes (who is often and incorrectly called *Malpramís*), in line with the stemma. This does not explain, however, whether the name is to be understood as an echo of Latin: *malus* (*in*) *primis* 'evil above all else, from the beginning' or whether an association with OF *primices*, *premices* '*primitiae*, evil first fruit' is intended. For the toponym, in 889 *Bri-* is confirmed by OCV7, but then the *-gant* in O, which contradicts the assonance competes with *-gal(t?)* β (= KV4); in 1261 OV7 again affirm *Bri*, and then OV4CV7PT affirm *gal*. Thus, the editors from Gautier onwards have correctly opted for *Brigal* in both passages. What does it mean? It does not mean [1] Berguedan nor [2] ancient *Brigantia*, but rather it means [3] Berbegal.

[1] Liebrecht (1880b, 371) and Tavernier (1912, 141) suggested Berguedan (Cat. *Berguedà*) with its main town of Berga, about 90 km north-northwest of Barcelona. But neither of these two names fits phonologically. Moreover Boissonnade (1923, 95) points out that the county, and then viscounty of Berguedan was firmly in Christian hands at the height of the Carolingian period.

[2] André de Mandach (1993, 77s.) reluctantly opted for ancient *Brigantia* near the source of the Ebro in the Cantabrian Mountains – but unfortunately, we cannot accept this. For once again de Mandach ignores the editorial and stemma-related dimension; secondly, the town had been called *Juliobriga* from the time of Augustus (and is called only this in Pliny 3.21, 3.27, 4.111), was mentioned for the last time in the *Notitia dignitatum* of the early 5th c. and has existed ever since only as a collection of ruins near the village of Retortillo, 3 km southeast of the small town of Reinosa.

[3] Gaston Paris, however, identified it as the *opidum fortissimum Barbagalli* in the PT (cap. 3), which is named there between Tortosa and Cardona – obviously Berbegal, 15 km southwest of Barbastro or 90 km northeast of Saragossa, according to Madoz (s. v.) on the top of a rounded hill, steeply sloped on all sides,

at a height of more than 30 m.[610] As the battles over control of Barbastro were waged from 1064 to 1100, the Reconquista of Berbegal must have been a bit later. On the phonology: if the name is undergoing or has undergone regular OF syncope of the middle syllable *-e,* then the development is naturally **Berbgal > Bergal*, and there is also no problem with a subsequent metathesis *ber- > bre-*,[611] and no-one will quibble about the *-e-* or *-i-* in the syllable before the stress in a foreign name. And Boissonnade (1923, 96) actually found a charter from the 12th c. in which the name shows syncope to *Berg-*.[612] The syncopated form appears therefore to have existed at least as a temporary variant, and this is sufficient for our purposes. Finally, the identification as Berbegal is strengthened by the fact that the seat of the following anti-peer lies barely 70 km further to the east-southeast as the crow flies.

A.9.5 The *amurafle* of Balaguer

It is the *amurafle* of *Balaguez* O 894 (:ē), *Palvir* K, *Balaguer* nV4C, *Balesguer* V7. When in v. 1269 he is killed by Gerer, he is called *l'amurafle* for short. But Balaguer appears twice more in the song: among Marsilĭe's messengers there is a

  Clarin de Balaguét O 63 (:ē), *Balagued* n, *Parguel* K, *Balaré* V4, *Balaguer* CV7; and Roland includes in his conquests

  Balasguéd O 200, *Balavigie* n (but n-Fragment o [2nd half of the 13th c.] *Balague*).

  There has almost never been any doubt about the meaning here:[613] it is Balaguer. Ermengol II of Urgell (1038–1065) received tribute from the Muslims for Balaguer, as did Ermengol IV, who mentions it in his two wills of 1081 and 1090.

---

610 This is easy to see in satellite images, despite the view from directly above (www.maps.google.es last access 14. 09. 2021). The *Primera Crónica General* (ed. Menéndez Pidal p. 375s.) cites *Beruegal*, *Baruastro*, *Sobrarue* and *Montblanque* as the limits of the Reconquista achieved by Bernardo del Carpio.

611 Cf. (Lat. *vervecem* >) OF *berbiz > brebis*, OF *bertauder > bretauder*. We must also remember the similarity or indeed the ambiguity in the abbreviations for *-(e)r-* and *-re-* (Cappelli 1961, p. XXIV, XXVIs., especially Bischoff 2009, 207).

612 It is also quite interesting that V4 has the unmetathesised form *Borgal* in both passages, suggesting that he was quite sure of his facts.

613 Only Baist (1902, 217) hesitated between this town which was famous for its eventful Reconquista and a second Balaguer just northeast of Tortosa, at best the name of a *castillo* for a short time, but mainly just a *Sierra de Balaguer*, usually explained as a mountain range stretching from the town of Balaguer almost as far as Tortosa, and which only kept this name in the southern part; cf. Aebischer ([1959–1960] 1967, 231).

According to Boissonnade (1923, 36 and 91) Ermengol IV occupied the town briefly in 1091/1092. At any rate, it was conquered around the turn of the year 1100/1101 by Ermengol V, and shortly after that it was taken back by the Muslims, until 1105 or 1106 when the guardian of Ermengol VI conquered it once and for all (the most detailed account is in Ewert 1971, 9s.).

As far as the phonology is concerned, Aebischer ([1959–1960] 1967, 232s.) showed that the present-day local pronunciation of the name ends in /-é/, that is to say without any -r, and this is confirmed by Arabic documents from before the time of the Reconquista. The alternation between -ez, -ét and -éd in O and the forms ending in -ed and -e in n can therefore be explained very easily: the name is based, as Aebischer correctly insists, on the sound of the Catalan form, and the poet identified the end of the word phonemically, not with something like -(i)er < -arius (which would logically lead to *Balagarium* in the written form), but instead with -ē- < -āľ-. Since O did not know, or did not recognise, this phoneme at the end of a word, he always reflected the Lat. -atum, -atem and wrote -et or -ed (in our editions that is -ét, -éd), although even during his lifetime the dominant pronunciation was already the alternative -é. Aebischer sees the same Catalan influence as *Sebre* 'Ebro' (v. 2465, 2642, 2728, 2758, 2798); we will be adding our identifications Burriana (cf. A.9.6 below) and Marmaría (cf. A.12.6.5 below).

The lord of Balaguer is *amurafles* O 894, the same in V4, *Ammirat* K, *amoraive* CV7, *amorin* T, *amirael* h; and again

amurafle O 1269, the same in V4, *Amurafel* K, *amoraive* C, *amiraffle* P, *amaroine* L, *amoraine* T: Here CV7 has introduced the secondary meaning 'Almoravid' (OF *amoraive* < Span. and MLat. *Almorávides*); this could also explain (if there is a misreading of *u ~ n*) both L and T. K in the first passage and h have slipped into the secondary meaning *amirail* 'Grand Emir, Commander of the Faithful' (MLat. also *ammiratus*), and this is also behind the *amir-* instead of *amur-* in P. But OV4 (and in the second passage K as well) confirm that *amurafle* (with -*u*-!) is in the archetype in both places.

The Roland poet has already used this same term in v. 850, where it is plural: Marsiľĭe summons all his *baruns, / Cuntes, vezcuntes et dux e almaçurs, / Les amirafles* (the same in V4, *amoravies* V7) *e les filz as cunturs [. . .]* The *amirafles / amurafles* are therefore a specific rank just like the preceding *almaçurs*; but then in v. 894 a single *amurafle* steps out of the crowd and declares himself an anti-peer; from this moment onwards, he is a focus of attention in the song and so in v. 1261, he is "the" *amurafle*. Several etymologies have been suggested for the name of this particular rank.

[1] *Amirafle / amurafle* is just a playful form of *amir(ail)* etc., and so it is one of the terms that reflects the Emir title; this view is proposed by Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.392), the FEW, vol. 19, s. v. *amīr*, Bancourt (1982a, 839–841, and 1982b, 31s.), Kunitzsch (1988, 265). What I find facile in this explanation, however, is not that a phonetic sequence has suddenly been made into a suffix, since I did exactly that myself in the case of *-erne* as an epic toponym suffix, but the fact that this is done without any indication of a starting point, such as the fact that *-erne* in *Salerne* was carried over later when the Normans came into contact with Palermo, resulting in *Palerme > Palerne*. Gaston Paris would not have been satisfied with Sainéan's explanation either, since he writes (1902a, 414, n. 3): "On n'a donné jusqu'ici, que je sache, aucune explication du mot *amurafle* (*amirafle* 850 paraît une faute amenée par *amirail*), qui se retrouve, sous la forme *amuafle*, dans divers poèmes postérieurs, mais qui, chose notable, est inconnu aux chansons de gestes de la croisade".[614] In fact there are 60 references for *amira(i)l / amirant / amiré* listed in Godefroy and Tobler-Lommatzsch but just one late reference has *-u-* instead of *-i-*: *amurés* in the *Godefroi de Bouillon* 166.[615] Conversely, both dictionaries have a dozen or more references for *amurafle / amuafle* and only one for *amirafle*, in ms. C of the *Aymeri de Narbonne* (dated 1295). Now we certainly cannot say that the rounding power of the *-f-* was strong enough to reach beyond the *-ra-* in the previous syllable and cause *-i- > -u-*. Only one possibility remains: that the two words have different origins, and they only influenced each other sporadically – just as Gaston Paris thought.

[2] Tavernier (1913, 116) suspected that there was a certain *amīr al-Afdal* 'the Emir al-Afdal' behind *amurafle*, that is to say the title and name of the Shiite Caliph of Cairo at the time of the First Crusade. But this does not explain the *-u-*, and it does not fit in terms of meaning; because *amurafle* is never used to refer to a caliph and is always a second-level leader.

[3] Brüch (1922, 226s.) was also incorrect to start with Arab. *amīr aʿālī* [sic] 'higher leader', for which he has no references, and which he wrongly assumes is the etymology of *amirail*. Then he suggests *aʿālī* has a 'related form' *aʿla* [presumably the elative *aʿlā* 'the highest'], then he defines the *ʿAyn* as a "tönendes ḥ" (voiced

---

614 It is quite correct that the title as such is not mentioned in the crusader epics, but this is not quite the full story because Petrus Tudebodus includes in his list of the 'kings' of Antioch (13.1) a certain *Lamurafres* (var. *Lamulafres*).

615 The development /mir/ > /myr/ happened more quickly, albeit in a closed syllable: *Mirgulandus > Murgulandus* (more on this below s. v. *Murgleis*, B.1.7).

ḫ) before finally relying on the well-known substitution ḥ > f, even though there are no sources showing a substitution ʿAyn > f.

[4] Suchier is correct in his edition of *Aucassin et Nicolette* when he suggests the etymology *al-Muẓáffar* '(made) victorious (by God), triumphator' (cf. Jenkins on v. 850) – although not because this was the name of the ruler al-Ḥakam, the Córdoban contemporary of Charlemagne, but because it was the name of no fewer than thirteen rulers in al-Andalus in the 11th c., and apart from the first one, the name of minor kings competing against each other after the recent decline of the Caliphate:[616] ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muẓaffar, oldest son and successor of the dictator al-Manṣūr, Córdoba, 1002–1008; al-Muẓaffar aṣ-Ṣaqlabī, Valencia, 1010–1018; Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muẓaffar, Jaén, 1021–1028; Yaḥya b. Mundhir at-Tudžibī al-Muẓaffar, Saragossa, 1023–1029; Bādis b. Ḥabbūs al-Muẓaffar, Granada, 1038–1073; ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ḥakam at-Tudžibī al-Muẓaffar, Saragossa, 1039; Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh Ibn al-Afṭas al-Muẓaffar, Badajoz, 1045–1068; Yūsuf b. Sulaymān Ibn Hūd al-Muẓaffar, Lérida/Lleida, 1039/1046–1078/81) after 1078 (but before 1082);[617] ʿĪsā b. Abī Bakr al-Muẓaffar, Silves, 1048–1053; Īsā b. an-Nāṣir al-Muẓaffar, Silves, 1058–1059; ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-Azīz al-Muẓaffar, great-grandson of the dictator, Valencia and Murcia, 1060–1065; ʿAbd Allāh b. Bulukīn (Buluggīn) b. Bādis al-Muẓaffar, Granada, 1073–1090. It goes without saying that the Romance language speakers who knew about the Caliphate and had now heard this name in connection with several individuals would have seen it as a designation meaning a second-level ruler, something like 'dukes', who had only made themselves independent under these special circumstances; this allowed the term to have a plural form, as it appears in v. 850. And this ruler name was only prevalent in al-Andalus, which explains why the Roland poet only uses it in the Marsilĭe section, and not in the Baligant section (another point that is not explained by Sainéan).

On the phonology: the /ẓ/ is an 'emphatic' (~ spoken with a simultaneous throat compression) voiced consonant. According to Corriente (1977, 47s., 1992, 51) throat compression was already precarious in Andalusian substandard Arab. because of the Romance substrate, and it was *a fortiori* ignored when words were transferred into Romance languages. Corriente observes (1977, 46s., 1992, 50, 2008, p. XXVIII), following Pedro de Alcalá (1505), that the /ẓ/ phoneme was

---

616 The following section is largely based on Wasserstein (1985, 83–98), and the EI s. v. *Hūdides*.
617 On the end of his rule cf. Ewert (1971, 8s.) and the EI s. v. *Hūdides* II.

interdental.[618] Once the throat contraction was lost, therefore, people heard a /δ/ (which matches the normal Spanish transcription *Almudafar*), and we can quite easily imagine that the sound of this /δ/ would either be replaced in 11th c. OF with /r/ (postdental, single stop),[619] and the dissimilation *r-r > r-l* would produce the form *amurafle*, or this /δ/ was identified as the waning indigenous /δ/, which led to the earlier form *amuafle*.[620] The *-l-* in *alm-* was subject to dissimilating loss before the *-l-* in *-afle* or because of the influence of *amirail*.

Two further factors support the *amurafle < al-Muẓáffar* etymology. First: during the 11th c., Balaguer belonged to the minor kingdom of Lérida/Lleida; Balaguer was the second most important city after Lérida itself, some 25 km further to the northeast of it, and the northern pillar of its military force. Its long-standing ruler was the above -mentioned Yūsuf b. Sulaymān Ibn Hūd *al-Muẓáffar*.[621] Lérida was his family's home territory; when his father Sulaymān 1039 conquered Saragossa from his base in Lérida, he probably appointed Yūsuf, his oldest son, as governor of Lérida. In any case, on the death of his father in 1046, Yūsuf inherited the family centre of Lérida and assumed the ruling name of *al-Muẓáffar*; his brother Aḥmad inherited the much wealthier city of Saragossa, and from there he spent his whole life trying to oust Yūsuf. Yūsuf was able to withstand these efforts until at least the middle of 1078, but he was captured by his brother at some point over the next four years and died in 1082/1083 as a prisoner. Yūsuf was very well known to the Catalans, especially in his role as a payer of tribute: in 1078 Ramón II of Barcelona and his brother Berenguer promised each other that they would compel Yūsuf to keep on paying the tributes that he had previously paid to their father; Ermengol IV specified even more clearly in 1081 and 1090, in his two wills, the annual tribute that al-Muẓáffar had to pay *for the city*

---

618 I am simplifying things somewhat when I ignore the early, but short-lived additional laterality of the phoneme (on this recently Corriente 2008, p. XXXI). According to Corriente (1977, 46) Alcalá denoted the lateral pronunciation of the Arab. ẓ on principle by the letter ḍ; Corriente (1977, 47, § 2.14.4 *in fine*) explains that he forgot the diacritic on a great many occasions because in Span. interdentality was by then (as today) no longer distinctive. Steiger (1932, § 23) thought *d* was the normal transcription [which however, especially in intervocalic position, can mean /δ/!], and that its representation with Span. *z* was limited to a position in front of sonorant consonants or to the special case of Arab. *ḥafiẓ* > Span. *hafiz, haiz*. Cf. now also Corriente (2008, p. XXXI), on the additional possibility that the developments to null or to /r/, which I consider as Old French above, are phenomena arising in the Pyrenean Peninsula.

619 The parallels for /d/ or /δ/ > /r/ are, however, not fully conclusive; because the transformed sound is followed by either /j/ (*grammaire* group etc., Pope 1952, § 645b; thoroughly discussed by Brüch 1935, passim) or /n/ (apparently at least in *borne*).

620 Cf. in Rol. 200 the "overperformance" *Tüele* 'Tudela'.

621 The following section is based mainly on Ewert (1971, 8s.).

of Balaguer. The names al-Muẓáffar and Balaguer had therefore been closely associated with each other for several decades at least before the Roland poet used these two words in tandem: *Uns amurafles i ad de Balaguez.*[622]

And secondly: the semantic development of *al-Muẓáffar > amurafle* runs broadly parallel with the development of *al-Manṣūr > almaçur*, the rank designation of the anti-peer who follows next, the lord of *Moriane* 'Burriana' (v. 909). Al-Manṣūr was for Romance language speakers initially the quasi-individual name of the dreaded dictator of Córdoba (died 1002), and we evaluated it in those terms above from the perspective of the year 1050 when we discussed the name *Marsir(i) us/Marsiľe* (including its phonological development). But in the 11th c. it became the second most popular official name among the minor kings, as it was adopted by: Mundhir [I.] b. Yaḥya at-Tudžibī al-Manṣūr, Saragossa, 1017–1023; ʿAbd al-Azīz b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān al-Manṣūr, grandson of the dictator, Valencia (and briefly Murcia), 1021–1060; ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Afṭas al-Manṣūr, Badajoz, 1022–1045; Mundhir [II.] b. Yaḥya b. Mundhir at-Tudžibī al-Manṣūr, Saragossa, 1029–1038; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muḥammad Ibn Džahwar al-Manṣūr, Córdoba, 1058–1069; Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Azīz al-Manṣūr, great-grandson of the dictator 1075–1085. This meant that the name *al-Manṣūr* became, just like the name *al-Muẓáffar*, another designation for a second-level ruler. Its use in plural form in the epics (as in v. 849, directly before the plural *amirafles*) is therefore not just due to a vague lack of consistency, but in fact historically quite understandable. In the discourse of the Song, – just as "the" *amurafle* – one of the *almaçurs* who comes from *Moriane* and steps out of the group bearing that name becomes "the" *almaçur* when he declares himself an anti-peer (v. 909–915), so that Duke Sansun in v. 1275 can then dispatch *l'almaçur* just as Gerer in v. 1269 dispatched *l'amurafle.*

Moreover, there is a third parallel ruler name from 11th c. Andalusia which turns up in plural form in the epics: *al-Mustaʿīn* 'the one who requests (God's help)' was the name chosen by Sulaymān, great-grandson of ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān III, Caliph of Córdoba around 1009–1016, Sulaymān Ibn Hūd, Saragossa, 1039–1046, and great-grandson Aḥmad [II] b. Yūsuf Ibn Hūd, Saragossa, 1085–1110. Romance speakers did not hear the ʿAyn and contracted the vowel sequence to a diphthong: *al-Mustain*, and with the appearance of the common *-ant* ending this became *aumustant / amustant*, which crops up in late 12th century epics.[623] All in

---

622 In the last decade of the 11th c., things became rather unstable in Lérida, and around 1100 the Almoravids annexed the city and allowed Wālīs to govern it. Strangely enough, when the town finally capitulated to the Christians in 1149, the last Wālī was called al-Muẓáffar b. Sulaymān (EI s. v. *Lārida*), which looks like a Hūdid name.

623 The FEW describes this more or less correctly in vol. 1 s. v. *amustant*.

all, therefore, this trio of terms *amurafle-almaçur-a(l)mustant* clearly comes from the al-Andalus of the minor kings.

A.9.6 The *almaçor* of Burriana

The sixth anti-peer is the *almaçurs [. . .] de Moriane* O 909, *Eyrana* n (*Bursana* B, *Burlane* b), *Buriane* V4, *Babureigne* C, *Barburegne* V7, *Borcadoigne* T, *Bura [nien]* h(B), *Bouwaengien* h(Vba): In CV7 the name is too long for the metre, evidently because of the dittography of one syllable.[624] The *Eyr-* instead of *Mur-* or *Bur-* in the A version of n comes from a misreading of a capital B as a capital E, where additionally the *Bur-* in the B-b- matches V4. The *-iane* in V4 is confirmed by O; therefore in the B-b- version of n *Bursa-* or *Burla-* is a misreading of *Buria-*, and in C(V7)Th the *-i-* has been moved back. Therefore, *Moriane* O competes with *Buriane* β.[625]

Now let us first try to put Moriane in the archetype!

[1] Boissonnade (1923, 103s.), Jenkins (on v. 909) and ("peut-être") Bédier (1927, 516) saw here *Moriana*, near the uppermost part of the Ebro, 12 km west of Miranda de Ebro. It is misleading to say that this place lies on the "grande route des pèlerins de Compostelle", "on the old pilgrim route to Compostela": it does not lie on the classic Way of St. James which has been followed since about 1035, but rather on the route that preceded this, *per devia Alavae*, and it is not mentioned even once in the guide for pilgrims in the *Codex Calixtinus* (dating from about 1140). No source records any battles fought around Moriana; furthermore, this place has never been more than a small country town. To place an *almaçur* there would be ridiculous.

[2] The toponym *Moriane* appears once more in the song, in the expression *es vals de Moriane* O 2318, *ze Moriana in dem tal* K, *in la vals de Muraine* V4, *en val de Moraingne* P – and this time (based on OK) it belongs in the archetype. In this place an angel asked Charlemagne to give the sword Durendal to a *cunte cataignie*; and so Charlemagne gave it to Roland. I will explain this toponym below (C.4.3.1) in agreement with most other commentators as 'valley of Maurienne'. However, others want to identify it as the *Valmoria(e)l(e)* in Spain, where according to the

---

624 This arose when a correction was written over an incorrect spelling, but the incorrect spelling was not cancelled clearly enough: *Ḅa̩reigne* + *Bur-* written above it > *Barbureigne*.
625 Boissonnade's statement (1923, 103) that *Buriane* is only in one ms. is therefore literally correct, but factually misleading.

Mainet, Charlemagne looted Durendal; for according to Menéndez Pidal there is a real Spanish valley behind this *Valmoria(e)l(e),* northeast of Toledo and called *Valsamorial* or *-an*, while Horrent thinks it is a freely invented *Valmoriane, where *moriane* simply means 'Moors' land'. But for the seat of our *almaçur* we need a substantial town or city, like the ones his peers possess, and a valley or any town that played no part in history would be out of the question, as indeed would be a product of pure fantasy called something like a 'Moors' valley'. Therefore, there is no point in trying to compare the *vals de Moriane* in v. 2318 with the other passage; the two toponyms in v. 909 and v. 2318 have nothing to do with each other, and indeed they are absolutely distinct from each other in β. And it follows from this that the only remaining possibility for our passage is *Buriane*.

[3] It must, therefore, be Burriana/Borriana on the Mediterranean coast,[626] 12 km southwest of Castellón de la Plana, about 200 km south of Balaguer, but still part of the Catalan language area, as Balaguer was.[627] Burriana was briefly described for the first time by ar-Rāzī (*el Moro Rasis*, died 955).[628] At the time of the minor kings, it was a northern pillar of the kingdom of Valencia, just as Balaguer was a northern pillar of the kingdom of Lérida; and indeed *almaçurs* ruled there in the most direct way possible, since they were descendants of the great al-Manṣūr: from 1021–1060 his grandson ʿAbd al-Azīz b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān al-Manṣūr, and from 1075–1085 his great-grandson Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd al-Azīz al-Manṣūr. Even before El Cid set out in 1094 to conquer Valencia, he occupied Burriana as a kind of bargaining chip.[629] In Burriana between 1094 and 1096 he had his great encounter with Peter I of Aragón (1094–1104),[630] which reconfirmed the alliance with Aragón, that had been in place even with Peter's father and with Peter when he was a prince; Peter then *cum suo exercitu* even assisted El Cid against the Almoravids.[631] Since Aragón had maintained very close contact with the French nobility, even from the time of Peter's father Sancho Ramírez – Sancho's first marriage was with Félicie de Roucy, and Peter was married to Agnes of Poitou – it had drawn military advantage from this under Peter with his victory at Alcoraz and

---

626 Stengel put it in the text, Aebischer (1954a, 152) correctly identified it, and it was adopted by de Mandach (1990, 4s., and 1993, 69).

627 The *valenciá* language is, historically at least, a (southwest) Catalan dialect.

628 DGE s. v.; *ar-Rāzī* (ed. Catalán) p. 38.

629 Cf. (already cited by Tavernier 1912, 145 n) *Historia Roderici Didaci Campidocti* written in the 12th c. (now ed. Falque Rey) cap. 37.2, 37.9 *Rodericus autem permansit in Burriana tamquam lapis immobilis,* 42.40, 43.1. Cf. also the *Cantar de Mio Cid* v. 1094 *tierras de Borriana todas conquistas las ha* (cf. also v. 1110 *los de Burriana*).

630 *Historia Roderici* (ed. Falque Rey) cap. 64.22; Valdeavellano (1955, 848).

631 *Historia Roderici* (ed. Falque Rey) cap. 48 and 64–66.

the conquest of Huesca (both in 1096) and the conquest of Barbastro (end of 1100), and so Burriana must also have been a familiar name in France. After the death of El Cid (1099) Alfons VI soon had to relinquish Valencia and Burriana to the Almoravids; it was not taken back until 1233. In the PT (cap. 3) the list that is intended to show how Charlemagne conquered the whole of Spain includes Hora [= Ora 'area'] *Burrianae*. Idrīsī (1999, 275) describes Burriana: 'C'est une ville magnifique, prospère, dont le territoire est très fertile en vergers et en vignobles'.[632] We could describe this town today in very much the same way, since it has about 34,000 inhabitants and impressive orange groves. Burriana is also mentioned in several later epics (cf. Moisan s. v.). The *Siège de Barbastre* (probably late 12th c., and so before the Reconquista of Burriana, v. 4113) relates that while the other Aimerids were fighting over Barbastro, they could not reach Aïmer (his key characteristic had been, after all since the time of the historic Hadamar of the early 9th century[633] to fight as a guerrillero behind the enemy lines) and that he suddenly came back from *Buriengne*.

To sum up: *Moriane* in O is entirely unsatisfactory in terms of meaning, and if we essentially change one phoneme,[634] we get the excellent reading *Buriane*, of β.

A.9.7 *Turgis* of Tortosa

The seventh anti-peer is *Turgis de Turteluse* O 916, *Turgis* of *Turkulus* n (*Kurkulus* of *Turtulasa* B, of *Turkulosa* b), *uon Tortulose Targis* K, *Torquin de Tortolose* V4, *Torchis de Tortolose* C, *Torgins [. . .] de Tortolose* V7, *Torgijs van Torteloose* h(V); and also

Turgis de Turteluse O 1282, *Turgis* of *Turtuloso* n, *Targis* of *Tortulose/ Tortolose* K, *Torquin de Tortolose* V4, *Torgis [. . .] de Tortolose* C, *Torgins [. . .] de Tortolose* V7, a king of *Tortouloose* P, *Torgis [. . .] de Cortelose* T, *Estorgant [. . .] de Toulouse* L, a lord of *Tortelose* h(V): *Turgis / Torgis* is confirmed by On and once each by h(V), C and T; K has misread *u>* as *<a>*, V4 in northern Italy has perhaps been influenced by *Tarquin(ius)*, V7 has (just by adding a tilde) a diminutive ending in *-gin*, L has gone off at a tangent with the name *Estorgant*. *Turteluse* (~ Central Fr. **Tortelose*) O competes with *Tortulose* β, and the difference is negligible.

---

632 Ar-Rāzī gives a similar account of the fruitfulness of the area surrounding Burriana (cf. ar-Rāzī p. 38).

633 Cf. the Louis Vita by the Astronomus (cap. 15).

634 <o> ~ <u and <r> ~ <rr> are almost always unproblematic in the Rol.

Turgis 'Thor-gis' (that is, with /u~ǫ/) is in fact an exclusively Norman name, since the god is called *Thór(r)* only in North Germ., while in West Germ. he is called *Thunar* (in NHG represented as *Donar*) and this was not generally used as a personal name there.[635] We will not find an exact parallel for a name that was still barely normal in the 12th c. being used as a Saracen name; but nevertheless, cf. the rare Germ. names *Almaris* and *Guarlan* (the latter perhaps for the Norman *Werlenc*), the Old English name *Aëlroth* and the very Norman "nicknames" *Grandonĭe* and *Malduit*.[636] In our passage, of course, *Turgis* has been chosen because it sounds like Turteluse – just as in the collocations *Cap-uël de Cap-adoce* and *Baligant de Ba-bilonĭe*.

Turteluse is not [1] Tórtoles, but [2] Tortosa.

On [1]: Boissonnade (1923, 104–106) suggested Tórtoles, about 2.5 km north-northeast of Tarazona, that is to say 20 km south of the Ebro; in the 12th c. it was just a simple parish, and the bishop of Tarazona-Tudela was also its lord. Therefore, it is too small to be the seat of an anti-peer. Also – and this is a very important point for a specialist in the historical linguistics of Romance languages – the stress does not fit. At the time of the Rol. the stress had not yet shifted, and so Tórtoles would become *Tórtles > *Tortres or *Tortes.

On [2]: With the exception of Boissonnade, there appears to be a consensus from Gautier and Gaston Paris onwards which is in fact correct: what is meant is Tortosa, situated near the mouth of the Ebro, and for that very reason a key military location. In the 9th and 10th century, both Louis the Pious and the counts of Barcelona tried and failed to recapture it; because of these efforts, people in in western Europe would always have known about the city. In the year 944/ 945 ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān III of Córdoba extended it into the third biggest naval base after Almería and Denia (Arié 1982, 158); Idrīsī (1999, 274s.) still praises its large dockyards, and he, along with other Arabic authors praises its solid fortifications. After the fall of the Caliphate, it became the centre of a minor kingdom which was annexed by the Saragossan Hūdids in 1060, but it fell to the Léridan branch of their line soon after. When in 1100 Peter of Aragón's military achievements began to threaten the stability of Muslim rule in the whole of north-eastern Spain, the Almoravids occupied both Valencia and Lérida, and also Tortosa, which lay between the two, and in 1116 they foiled several Christian attempts to conquer Tortosa (EI s. v. Ṭarṭūsha).

---

635 Broëns' assertion (1965–1966, 67), that the name *Thorgis* is also West Gothic is not attested, and it is extremely unlikely in phonological terms.

636 Cf. additionally our discussion of *Clarin* (for *Clargis*), *Torleu* and *Valdabrun*.

After a long period of preparation, the city was finally taken back in 1148, by a coalition led by the Catalans.

In antiquity, and also in Einhart (*Vita Karoli* 15) and a few later texts, the city is called *Dertosa*, but it is apparently *Tortosa* in the anonymous Louis Vita (cap. 14s.), certainly *Tortosa* in Spanish mss. of the 10th c. at the latest (Díaz y Díaz 1958, Nr. 529), and consistently *Ṭarṭūsa/Ṭarṭūsha* in the Arabic sources (Steiger 1932, 156; EI s. v *Ṭarṭūsha*). It looks as if *Tortelose* means Tortosa, despite the curious infix, because the sub-archetype of CV7, which after O 2641, that is to say just as Baligant's fleet is sailing into the Ebro (*Sebre*), expands the text: *Laissent Marbrie et Marbroie sa per, / E Tortelose dont fu rois Josuer. / Amont lo Sebre font les voilles torner.* Admittedly, the infix is still awkward. But in Latin texts there is often a hypercorrect *Tortuosa* after the adj. *tortuosus*;[637] we could easily imagine a slight variation of Scheludko's idea (1927, 35) whereby *Tortelose* is a humorous, almost caricature-like imitation of the rhythm of this four-syllable form.[638] Several William epics also take over this form with the infix and clearly meaning 'Tortosa', such as the *Charroi de Nîmes* 451 and 482 when the town still has to be conquered, the *Folque de Candie* 10281 when the town has already been conquered by William (because *Candie* 'Gandía' lies on the Mediterranean coast, further to the south).

Now Tortosa lies *between* Balaguer and Burriana. Why then is it named in the Song only *after* Burriana? This might have been influenced by the fact that by 1094 people in France were hearing about Burriana when it was already in Christian hands (cf. above on Peter of Aragón's encounter with El Cid), but they did not hear about the conquest of Tortosa until 1116 at the earliest (even though both successes appear to have been fragile in the long run). This might have encouraged the poet to form an incorrect idea about the relative positions of the two cities on the Mediterranean coast. But even so, in the Song the cities of Berbegal-Balaguer-Tortosa-Burriana form a kind of semicircle: they represent "Spain" from the area northeast of and quite close to Saragossa, to the area far to the southeast of that city.

---

[637] E.g. Santiago-L.F. 2.173 a. 970; Bull of John XIII (mentioned in Boissonnade 1923, 105 n. 2); *Esp.Sagr.* 42.280s. (3x), 283, 288 (2x) a. 1050–1091; 7 further references from the 12th c. in Scheludko (1927, 35).

[638] Scheludko's second explanation (1927, 35s.), like a similar one suggested by D. Kartschoke (1965, 120s.), seems to be ultimately based on the pseudo-proportion Gironde (river): Toulouse = Girona (town, OF *Gironde*): Tortosa. I doubt the efficiency of the pseudo-proportion, because Tortosa is 230 km away from Girona as the crow flies.

A.9.8 *Escremiz* of Valtierra

A.9.8.1 Fiefdom and person

Can we assume then, that the next four of the anti-peers will likewise be arranged in a sort of semicircle, this time from an area quite close to Saragossa in the northwest to an area far to the southwest of that city? With some qualifications, yes, we can. We encounter first of all the eighth anti-peer,

Escremiz de Valterne O 931, *Eskrement* (*Eskarmeth* B, *Eskremet* b) of *Valterne* n, *Anterin de Valanterne* V4, *Estormis de Valterne* CV7 (V7 to be precise: *Ualt˜ne* with the *r*- abbreviation), *Margeris [. . .] de Gauterne* T; and then

Escremiz de Valterne O 1291, *Eskrement* (*Eskremet* B,b) *of Valterne* n, *Eschermunt [. . .] von Ualeterne* K, *Antermin de Valterna* V4, *Estormi* CV7T, a Saracen from *Tudelle* P, *Erreinet* L, *Astromorijs van Panthiere* h(V): This confirms *Escrem*- for the archetype from On, *-mi(s/z)* from OCV7 (and in the second passage also T), *Valterne* from On (as well as in the first passage CV7, in the second V4). *Panthiere* in h(V) is probably based on an intermediate form **Fauthiere*. Finally, P has replaced Valtierra with the neighbouring Tudela which would have been more familiar in France.

OF *escremir* 'to fight, fence' can also be used in a reflexive construction: *sei escremir* 'to defend oneself (fencing etc.)'. The second participle of a verb that is not fully transitive in OF often has a verbal adjective meaning: *sei taisir* 'to keep quiet' – *taisi* 'quiet',[639] *sei porpenser* 'to consider to oneself' – *porpensé* 'considerate' etc. *Escremiz* therefore means 'well practised in fencing (etc.), a good fighter', and this makes it an aptronym.[640] However, none of the scribes have understood the name: KV4L have deformations, n, who was good at Latin, seems to make a scatological joke out of it (which again his scribes do not understand), CV7Th(V) insert a different name. But the name has left a trace outside the Rol: in the *Aspremont* 3251 a Saracen minor character appears with the name of *Escremis*.

Valterne is not [1] Tiermas, but [2] Valtierra.

On [1]: Place (1947, 885) absurdly maintains that the development (presented below in [2], and quite straightforward) *Valtierra > Valterne* is impossible, and then opts for Tiermas on the road from the Somport to Puente la Reina. The warm springs in this place were in use from Roman times and it had a castle in the Middle Ages. But there are no reports of battles around Tiermas, and neither of

---

639 Gamillscheg (1957, 416). Cf. also Jenkins on v. 1932 *la condredite gent* 'the people who always deny (the religious truths)' and on v. 905 *redotez* (for Modern Fr. *radoter*) 'garrulous'.
640 Positive names for Saracens in the song include *Clarin / Clarien / Clarifan*, *Esperveris* and one interpretation of *Jurfaret*; a few more from other epics in Bancourt (1982a, 49).

Charlemagne's journeys, from Córdoba nor from Cortes on the Ebro, would pass this way – even if he would unexpectedly have to return to Saragossa – while Valtierra possesses these attributes in abundance.

On [2]: Leaving aside Place's incorrect reasoning, there seems to be a consensus: what is meant is Valtierra north of Tudela, 4 km north of the Ebro, about 100 km upstream (that is to say northwest) of Saragossa. As -*rr*- in OF is still mostly geminate, the central Iberorom. (including Navarrese and Aragonese) diphthongisation of the closed, stressed /ẹ/ is automatically reversed (or at least affected by *terre*); instead of *-erre we find the "epic" ending -*erne*.[641]

Muslim Valtierra was stormed by the kings of Navarre in the 10th c.; in 918 a suburb and its mosque were set on fire, but the fortress survived.[642] After this Valtierra remained a Muslim border town for almost two hundred years. Sancho Ramírez of Aragón († 1094) collected protection money from it for many years; this explains why in around 1085–1087 French-Aragonese forces (unsuccessfully) besieged Tudela which lay further to the southeast, and apparently left Valtierra alone; in 1093 Sancho Ramírez presented the Saracen protection money as a gift to the southern French monastery of Saint-Pons de Thomières (Ebro-Lacarra 1946, 475). But when in 1110 the *de facto* last Hūdid king of Saragossa, Al-Mustaʿīn, set out to invade Navarre, he was decisively defeated near Valtierra by Alfonso el Batallador with Gascon and Burgundian assistance, and he was mortally wounded; Valtierra fell to Aragón in the end.

Valterne appears in the Song on two more occasions, and then once more in V4. The first mention is unproblematic: Roland has previously conquered

Valterne O 199, the same in nKV7, *Vauterne* C. The second mention requires some commentary. When Ganelon is in Saragossa, Charlemagne and his army camp in

la citet [Valterne] Segre 662 (:*ẹ*), *la citet degalne* O, *Valterne* n, *Valente* V4, *Valterne* CV7 (in V7 more precisely *Ualt˜ne*, with the *r*- abbreviation): in this passage, β has *Valterne* (because of the consensus between n and CV7). This name has -*al[. . . ?]ne* in common with the *Galne* in α, which means they probably represent one and the same name in the archetype. Now *Galne* is not acceptable because it breaks the rules of assonance, but it can be explained as a rather simple error arising from *Valterne*: an early scribe had (perhaps by association with *gualt*, *walt* 'wood, forest') written *Uualt'ne* instead of *Uualt'*, which then resulted in *Gualt'ne*

---

641 See above on *Oluferne* (A.2.4).

642 Pérez de Urbel/Arco y Garay (1956/1997, 300, 303).

and then *Gualťne*;[643] the *r-* abbreviation was overlooked, and *Galtne* became *Galne* through unconscious application of the three-consonant law.[644]

    Valterne 'Valtierra' is practically compulsory here in terms of the meaning. Charlemagne and his army come from *Cordres* (v. 97) which has just been captured, and I will show below (A.12.4.1) that this means Córdoba (and not Cortes), and he intends to return to France via the pass at Roncevaux, as soon as Saragossa has surrendered. One of the shortest routes for this was (and continued to be, until the time when the motorways were built) Córdoba-Madrid-Medinaceli-Soria- (N 122)-Agreda-(N 113)-Valtierra-Pamplona-Roncevaux; Valtierra is the place where Charlemagne meets the road going from Saragossa-Valtierra-Pamplona-Roncevaux. And even today, if you drive on the A2–A4–AP15 motorways, this point has only moved by a few kilometres. Until Valtierra, every step taken by Charlemagne took him towards his homeland, but at the same time it brought him closer to Saragossa, and this meant it increased the level of threat he posed to Marsilĭe; but every step beyond Valtierra would lead him almost diametrically away from Saragossa, which would reduce his ability to pose a threat, and thus call Ganelon's mission into question.[645]

---

643 Baldinger (1976, passim) has clearly demonstrated how incredibly porous the phone boundary was in OF between /v/ on the one hand and /w~g̯~g/ on the other. – O usually retains *Gu-* at least in the written form, but it is pronounced as /g-/, as in *Gascuigne* 172, *galops* 731, *Gaifiers* 798, *Gaignun* 1890 and *garçun* 2437; this is where *Galne* comes from.

644 Burger (1953, 162) has the same basic idea. Boissonnade (1923, 118–121) reviews more than a dozen small and very small places in relation to *Galne*, rejects six of them, but thinks eight are possible; further discussion is not necessary. Jenkins (ad loc.) is quite convinced by Gelsa, about 45 km down the Ebro from Saragossa (and 15 km from Pina); but this place must also be rejected for phonological reasons. Mellor (1965–1966, 174s.) is also incorrect: saying that *Galne* is a *lectio difficilior*. The assonance would require that *Galne* be "emended" to *Gelne*. [No, it should be noted that the assonance fits with *Valterne*, but not with *Galne* – which is a strong argument in favour of *Valterne*.] And *Gelne* would probably mean Elne near Perpignan. [No, the random addition *ex nihilo* of an initial *g-* is in itself such an unwarranted assumption that it makes the whole hypothesis extremely improbable]. – Stengel suggests in his index that the *Galne* in O 662 relates to a *Garmes* that appears at quite a different place in K (there in v.1185) inside a long, list-like supplement (after O 171, cf. Segre). But *Garmes* is simply *Garmaise* 'Worms' which K has not recognised (this is the normal OF Form).

645 However, instead of Segre's *a la citét Valterne* we should opt for *a la cit de Valterne*. The type *urbs Roma* was already receding in late Latin and being replaced by *urbs Romae* (Gamillscheg 1957, 109), and I know of no instances in OF of the term "city" in juxtaposition, but we find *cit de X* in *Prise d'Orange* 525, 1246, 1430, *Charroi de Nîmes* 206, *Roman d'Alexandre déc.* A 392, 409, 447 etc. *Cit* could have come about through haplology in the nexus *citét de > cit de*, even if it became established early; the fact that *cit de* does not appear elsewhere in the Rol. could be a coincidence because the nexus 'city' + name of city only occurs here. There is a third suggestion, *a citet de Valterne*, in Burger (1953, 162 n.).

When the text refers (v.663s.) to Valterne saying*: Li quens Rollanz il l'ad e prise e fraite;/ Puis icel jur en fut cent ans deserte*, this could mean that when the poet was writing, people could still see damage from the role that Valtierra just only just relinquished, that is to say two centuries as a city on the border.[646]

A.9.8.2 Valtierra and the date of the Chanson de Roland

Finally, we turn to the mention of Valtierra which occurs only in V4; Burger (1953, 162ss.) recognised it as very interesting. Charlemagne has just destroyed the enemies who had survived at Roncevaux, killing some of them in battle and driving others into the Ebro where they drowned, when according to the Segre edition: *Franceis descendent en la tere deserte* O 2489, *entre Seybre et Valterne* V4, *sor le Sebre deza* C, *sor le Sebre deça* V7, *desore Sorbre* P, *en pré dessus l'herbage* T, *trestuit comunelment* L: Here T and L have obviously broadened the meaning; but otherwise, β has a reading that mentions the Ebro at least, whereas O has *terre deserte*. Did β have the *Valterne,* in one of the best of its mss., namely V4? The French had to pursue the fleeing enemy right up to the banks of the Ebro to make them drown, but Valtierra is on the road to Roncevaux,[647] and not on the Ebro but 4 km north of it and so the precision of V4 is remarkably appropriate, as Baist (1902, 217) recognised; Burger (1953, 164) writes: "‹entre Seybre et Valterne› ne peut avoir été écrit que par un homme qui a vu les lieux, et cet homme n'est pas un remanieur, mais Turold [. . .]". Burger therefore also (like Gautier and Stengel) is in favour of putting the reading from V4 into the critical edition. However, Segre does not agree, because CV7P only mention the Ebro; but the name *Valtierra* could have been dropped in δ (that is to say after V4, before CV7P), while it is not obvious why the logically sufficient 'on the Ebro' (cf. v. 2758) should be replaced in V4 by the unusually precise phrase 'between the Ebro and Valterne'. Furthermore – and Burger does not mention this – the reading *tere deserte* in O is weakened three verses later with the information *asez*

---

646 Moreover, on the maps, about 4 km southeast of Valtierra, right behind Argueda, a *Ciudad Romana* is shown, and a very striking monument in it, the Torraza, was always visible.

647 More precisely: on both of the roads to Roncevaux, the well-known one via Pamplona and the one via Aoiz/Agoiz, and then down the Irati and Aragón rivers; they meet in Valtierra, cf. Burger 1953, 161. Burger believes that the Roland poet is thinking of the latter, mainly because he does not mention Pamplona; but is a poet obliged to name interim stops on an escape route, where nothing actually happens? Could he perhaps even think that mentioning this would detract from the impression that he wants to give of their flight: a mad rush to get home at any cost? We do not have to make up our minds about this: but I would like to point out that Olite is on the road to Pamplona, and that in the campaign of 1110 it was this road, and not the other, that was important.

i ad fresche herbe, which is confirmed for the archetype by OV4. Thus far, therefore, I am inclined to agree with Burger's point of view.

I cannot agree with him, however, when he goes on (1953, 168) to date the Song in the last decade of the 11th c. on the grounds that the French must have got to know Valtierra in 1087 along with Tudela. But nothing happened in Valtierra in 1087, and it is hardly convincing that the poet or his informant would have noticed that a place they simply passed through was a few km away from the Ebro. In fact, it is much more interesting that there are similarities in the Song with the real history of 1110, and that the reading of V4 makes it clear that this is more than just a coincidence. Al-Mustaʿin of Saragossa carried out a surprise invasion in Navarre at the turn of the year 1109/1110 and destroyed Olite (half-way between Valtierra and Pamplona), but then had to retreat back towards Valtierra. He was pursued into Valtierra by Alfonso el Batallador of Navarre-Aragón with (especially southern) French support, and they delivered a decisive defeat, as well as the mortal injury; the Muslims fled down the Ebro. Alfonso could now, at least in the eyes of the French, enjoy a well-deserved rest and then prepare his army to storm Saragossa. But initially this hope was dashed. A rebellion against al-Mustaʿin's son broke out inside the highly fortified city of Saragossa, after which the Almoravids were called upon, and they quickly occupied Saragossa and the surrounding areas including the parts further up the Ebro. As they had already occupied the lower Ebro Basin including Tortosa since around 1100 (and even the more northerly city of Lérida) and had stationed a fairly large number of troops there, on the border with the Christian enemy, Christian observers would have seen the Almoravid occupation of Saragossa and its surrounding countryside as an advance up the Ebro of a world power that had inexhaustible resources because its centre lay mostly outside of Europe. Alfonso suddenly found himself facing this new threat, rather than just a lord of Saragossa. This is the situation that is presented in the Song too, most clearly in V4, and including the beginning of the Baligant section: Charlemagne pursues the enemy soldiers fleeing from Roncevaux almost to the banks of the Ebro, but he has to let his army pause for a short rest – according to V4: by the Ebro south of Valtierra – but unexpectedly a world power from outside Europe advances up the Ebro and takes Saragossa, and when it even carries on marching towards Charlemagne, he suddenly finds himself face to face with them. The *terminus post quem* of 1110 for the song *in its surviving form*, which we can broadly glean in any case from the main thrust of the action, becomes unassailable if we accept that the reading in V4 belongs in the archetype. And there is more: a poet would surely not have dared to turn the events of 1110 into poetry, unless he was already sure that the story would end well, that is to say, unless he was writing after 1118, which is when the conqueror of Valtierra had also

defeated and the all-powerful Almoravid forces, and the town itself had capitulated. This gives us a solid – and if we accept the reading in V4 an almost unassailable – argument in favour of the probable date of the song in its surviving form being after 1118.[648]

A.9.9 Estorganz

For the sake of poetic variation, the poet has characterised the next two anti-peers, between the lord of Valtierra and the lord of Seville, not by using the names of their fiefs – or at least not by explicitly naming their fiefs – but by

---

648 If the song in its surviving form was created after 1118, this admittedly adds fuel to the much-discussed question of why the poet describes Saragossa as being *en une muntaigne* (v. 6) when this patently is not the case. Noyer-Weidner (1971, especially 62, 1979, passim) rightly rejected more specific attempts to explain this (such as Klein 1978, passim, Roncaglia 1959, passim, Boissonnade 1923, 83) and emphasised instead the undeniable symbolic meaning of the mountain that rises up to defy God (cf. especially v. 2690–2693). But this does not solve the problem: because apart from the *merveilleux chrétien* (especially as far as the role of the angels is concerned) and from various numerical exaggerations (especially in terms of the size of the assembled troops on both sides) – and both of these are common medieval traits that are not unique to the Song – the poet appears to have tried his best to avoid any statements of a literal nature that his audience would have recognised as false based on their own experience, and so he does indeed try to write realistically. For there is quite a big difference between a poet who tells us – as great poets throughout the ages have told us – that behind an *acceptable* literal meaning, which is the narrative analogue of mankind's primary, empirical level of thinking, there is a second, symbolic and spiritual level, which lets us experience the "depth behind the face of the world", and a poet who foregoes the plausibility of a literal meaning altogether and like Prudentius and the allegorical poetry of the Middle Ages postulates that the second level (and possibly others beyond it) are the only ones that matter. This leaves only one alternative, which is that the poet was mistaken about the elevation of Saragossa. First of all, the Reconquista of Aragón had taken place in his youth, and still mainly in the mountainous land of the Pyrenees, where e.g. Huesca was conquered in 1096; this basic idea of a mountainous area appears also to have influenced him when he evidently imagines the Monegros as a craggy area (cf. v. 980: *Soleill n'i luist*, in stark contrast with reality). Secondly, he may well have heard a lot about the surroundings of the city, and about its capture in 1118, without there being any mention of its geographical situation; for his informants had no reason to emphasise a feature that would have made their achievements seem less illustrious. Moreover, in 1118 much preparation went into the conquest of Saragossa; Gaston de Béarn in particular, who had specialised in building machines of war even in the First Crusade in the conquest of Nicaea, Antioch and Jerusalem, had helped to build them here, and was involved in their use in this context too (EI, Art. *Aragón*, col. 80). Stories about it therefore had to give an impression that emphasised how difficult the conquest was, and one obvious way of making it seem so to medieval people was to visualise the city sitting on top of a mountain.

presenting them as a pair. Elsewhere in the song, pairs are also presented without indication of their fiefs; instead, they are characterised by the fact that they are a pair, including their indivisibility in the story. In order to draw attention to their paired nature, the first parts of their names *Estorgant* and *Estramariz* are matched, and they are both introduced in the same laisse – just as the Christian pairs are: Gerin and Gerer, Ive and Ivoře. This indication of the poet's awareness of structure begs the question whether he might also be thinking of some geographical connection between them. Could this be hidden in their names? We have first of all

Esturganz O 940, *Estorgant* nCV7T, *Astorgant* V4, *Astromoch* h(V); and again

Estorgans O 1297, *Estorgant* nKCV7PT, *Astorgant* V4, *Estordant* L: The archetype had with OnKCV7T *Esturgant* (or Central Fr. *Estorgant*).

L has interpreted the name as a form of *estordre*, which in the Song itself (v. 593) means 'to get oneself out of a tight spot, to escape'. This may well be the right meaning. For besides *tordre* (< *torzdre* < *torz-re* < VLlat. *tórcere* [cf. Ital. *tòrcere*] < classical Lat. *torquére*) Tobler/Lommatzsch find related forms occurring from time to time from the 12th c. onwards such as the indicative *torgent*, the subj. *torge* and the part. *torgant* / *torjant*, analogous to *sordre* < *surgere*, *terdre* < *tergere*, where the *-g-* belongs to the stem; however, in the whole group the new stem with *-d-* soon prevailed. The name could therefore have had the meaning supposed by L from the very beginning, that is to say something like 'dodger, shirker'.

But from the beginnings of Romance language studies, a second meaning began to push through. The most famous city in northwest Spain in the time of the Roland poet was undoubtedly Compostela. But if the poet was afraid, for religious reasons, to locate a Wālī there, or if he, knew, as the PT did (cap. 3), that Compostela was still a very tiny place at the time of Charlemagne, and only started to grow thanks to the pilgrimages, then in geographical terms the next most famous place was Astorga, the first large city further east along the Way of St. James. *Asturica* (*Augusta*) is described by Pliny (3.28) as 'magnificent'; it had been a bishop's see since the 3rd c., was taken back by the Christians in the 9th c., was given a new cathedral in 1069 (LM s. v. *Astorga*), was from 1111 the centre of Galician-Leonese opposition against the Aragonese Alfonso el Batallador, as such was the target of his intense military interventions (*Historia Compostellana* 1.68, 73, 84) and is not only mentioned in the PT and in the *Pilgrim's Guide* in the places we would expect, but it is also mentioned in several epics from 1200 onwards, there with the spelling *Estorges* (cf. Moisan s. v.). The ethnicon that goes with this word is in modern Span. either the latinising *asturicense* or the genuinely Span. *astorgano*, a form that probably existed even in the time of the Roland poet. Since *Tolosan* and *Tolosant* were already more common than *Tolosain* very early in the epic tradition

(*Couronnement de Louis*, *Charroi de Nîmes*), we need not have any reservations about interpreting *Estorgant* as 'from Astorga'. We know that it existed in the Middle Ages, because we see it in the early 14th Veronese poet of the Franco-Venetian *Prise de Pampelune*: he places his Saracen king *Estourgant* – whose name he has of course taken from the older epics – in *Storges* (= *Estorges* with Italian cancellation of the prosthetic *e*-); Charlemagne conquers it after he has captured Pamplona and all of the other important places along the Way of St. James, and this marks the achievement of the campaign's objective: it frees up the road to Santiago for Charlemagne's knights and all of Christendom. If the Veronese author knew this, then we might easily expect that the editor of V4 who was quite close to him in time and place would know it too: he could have used his knowledge to keep his spelling close to the correct form *Astorga* when he wrote *Astorgant*.

Francisque Michel (ad loc.) was the first to recognise that *Estorgant* derived from *Astorga*; Jenkins tentatively agreed (1923, Index s. v. *Estorgant*). Spitzer (1948–1949, 400 n. 1) accepted this as one of two possibilities.[649] De Mandach (1993, 75) finally categorises *Estorgant* correctly, although he provides almost no justification[650] as "le seigneur d'Astorga". I agree with this account of the name, but it is probable that the poet was being quite clever here: he made a little joke by forming a name from *Astorga* or *Estorges* which could also be understood as an aptronym meaning 'dodger, shirker'.

A.9.10 Estramariz

Esturgant's associate is *Estramariz* O 941, *Estormariz* n, *Estramariç* V4, *Estramant* CV7, *Astromarijs* h(V); also

---

[649] In his main text Spitzer mostly follows Sainéan, who wanted to derive the name from an Occ. "*astor* ou *estorc* 'autour'", that is 'goshawk' (with a parasitic -*c*!). But when Spitzer was checking Sainéan's findings he evidently could not find any appellative *estorc* with this meaning (and neither could I) and so he replaced it with "le nom de famille *Estorc*, *Estorgo*, Mistral". But this family name derives from the name of the two Milan saints *Estorgius* (4th and 6th c.), which was also prevalent in southern France in various related forms (such as *Estorgis*, *Austorgus*, *Astorgus*, *Ostoricus*); cf. below C.8.4 on *Austorje* of Valence.

[650] De Mandach has overlooked the fact that the town was important in antiquity as *Asturica Augusta*; when he talks about a West Goth. element *Austr*- in the name, this is correct at most in one variant of the name, *Austorica* (> *Ostorgia*, which appears e.g. occasionally in the *Historia Compostellana*); I wonder, however, whether in fact the influence of *Augusta* is behind the name.

(in obl. position) *[E]stramariz* Segre 1304, *Astramariz* O, *Estormant* n (*Estormaris* B,b), *Stalmariz* K, *Estramatis* V4, *Estormiz* CV7, *Estormaris* PL, *Esmaris* T, *Astromarijs* h(V); in addition to Segre's choices we must mention also *Ystalmarc* w (*Stalmarc* A, *Stalmark* M): De Mandach (1993, 75) noted that w and K have *stal-* (both of these mss. go back to an Anglo-Norman source) and this indicates that there was an **Estal-mar[r]iz* 'in his defensive position / steadfastness badly beaten up' which is due to a simple dissimilation *r-r > l-r*, but in any case, the whole of the rest of the tradition agrees upon *-stram-/-strom-/-storm-* and so this cannot be put into the archetype. Furthermore, h(V) and in the second passage O are influenced by the *astr-* words like *astronomia*.[651] PL and even n are influenced, independently of each other, by the well-known name *Estormi* or by OF *estorm* 'storm (in a battle)', *estormir*, *estormie*; the sub-archetype of CV7 has fully adopted *Estormi*, but the first of the two altered texts has shortened the name for metrical reasons. In V4 the *-t-* instead of *-r-* in the second passage can be explained palaeographically. O and V4 confirm that in the first passage the form *Estramariz* is in the archetype. In the second passage, *Astramariz* O competes with *Estramariz* β; for the sake of consistency, we will also opt for *Estramariz*.

Stengel, Bédier ("peut-être"), Jenkins, Segre and Hilka/Pfister in their indices and Boissonnade (1923, 92) and Spitzer (1948–1949, 401) believe that this anti-peer is the same person as a companion of Blancandrin, who is called (in the obl.) *Estamarin* Segre 64, *Estamarin* O (where the *r-* abbreviation has been overlooked), *Estomaris* n, *Stramariz* K, *Estramariz* V4, *Estomarin* C, *Estormarin* V7. But here, the stemma supports putting the *-in* from O and CV7 into the archetype (and so Bédier, Segre and Hilka/Pfister also put it in the text); furthermore, the Estramarin who accompanies Blancandrin has a *cumpainz* who is called *Eudropin*, while the anti-peer Estramariz has Estorgant, and elsewhere in the Song being paired with someone is permanent, because only an enduring companionship in arms that is meant to last a lifetime would be worth mentioning.

As far as the meaning of both names is concerned, [1] neither of them has anything to do with Tamarite, the place, but [2a] *Estramarin* means a 'person from overseas', [2b] *Estramariz* is an aptronym from OF *estre* / Lat. *extra* 'beyond, super-' and *mar[r]iz* 'ruined' and, if a geographical connotation is intended, it suggests *Extremadura*.

---

651 More on this in n. 295 above.

On [1]: Boissonnade (1923, 92) conflated the singular *Estamarin* emissary with the *Estramariz* messenger into **Estamariz* and thought he recognised Tamarite (de Litera) / Tamarit (de Llitera), a place that Christians and Muslims fought over between 1064 and 1149 in the Aragonese-Catalan border region (called *Tamariz* in the *Historia Roderici* 15.10 and 16.12). The *Es-* is not the only unexplained part of this; above all, it would be astonishing if the poet were to include in the anti-peer list a place half-way along the road between Berbegal and Balaguer "as an afterthought", and without using an ending to indicate that it was a personal name.

On [2] and [3]: Spitzer (1948–1949, 401) explained what he thought was the identical name of both characters as *extramarinus*, a neologism which is a synonym for Lat. *transmarinus* [and OF *ultremarin* (v. 3507) or *d'ultre mer* (v. 67), G.A.B.], coming from Occ. (or Occitanising) *-mari(n)* with an unstable *-n* [which then in the north would have been partly attracted by the form of the *-iz* participles, G.A.B.]. This is helpful in explaining the emissary *Estramarin*, but *-marin* does not appear in any of the range of variants for this anti-peer; and it is unlikely that this name would have left no trace of its genuine form in this core part of the Song. What the audience would have heard in the name of the anti-peer was an *Estra-*, which was between OF *estre* and Lat. *extra*, and which meant, as these do, '(going) out beyond', and *mar(r)iz* 'badly treated, ruined'[652] – that is to say it must be a prophetic name which anticipates the terrible fate of its owner, as in the case of other names in the Song such as *Gemalfin, Clapamort* (> *Dapamort* O), and probably also *Abisme*.

But with both *Estorgant* and *Estramariz* there is a geographical connotation along with the main meaning. *Estramariz* is the *cumpainz* of the man from Astorga. Astorga was in the kingdom of León, west-southwest of the capital city. An external southern zone to the south of this kingdom and inside Islamic territory very soon acquired the Latin name *Extrema* (neuter pl.), later also *Extremitas* or *Extremitates* and – gradually becoming established – *Extremmatura*; the *Historia Compostellana* (completed around 1149, the parts relevant to our passage probably

---

652 The phoneme boundary between /r/ and /rr/ is already very porous in OF, and inexistent in the song; O writes *tere* (including *teres*) 74 times as opposed to *terre / terres / terremoete* once each.

written around 1120) uses all four forms with one and the same meaning.[653] The meaning of the term moved with the Reconquista towards the south: in the late 9th c. (*Chronicon Albeldense*) it meant the county of Castile, from around the later 11th c. onwards, the land south of the middle Duero, that is to say south of Valladolid and Zamora, and this is what it means in the *Historia Compostellana*. In Spain, it became fixed around the time of the conquest of Badajoz (in 1260) to its current dimensions, i.e. in the west of Spain, south of the Castilian Sistema Central mountain range (i.e. at about the same latitude as Madrid) as far as the Sierra Morena, the border with Andalusia (LM s. v. *Estremadura*); in Portugal it initially meant the area south of the Duero/Douro as far as the Tagus/Tejo, then stretched further south roughly as far as the town of Setúbal (conquered in 1227) before finally contracting to its present dimensions around (what is today only unofficially called) the coastal region between Leiria and Setúbal. As even the modern name of the inhabitants demonstrates (Span. *Extremeños*, Port. *Estremenhos*), the semantic core of the word was only ever thought to be *extrem-*. At the time of the Roland poet, the term meant the land which lay approximately mid-way between the home of the above-mentioned man from Astorga and that of the following man from Seville. If the poet wanted to make a negative-sounding personal name out of this, as he did with Astorga/*Estorges* – as a poet, and not as a modern philologist –, he would have had to extend the name *Estrema* in some way; *-ma* reminded him of *-mar(r)iz*, which produced an apparent form of the *estre/extra + mar(r)iz*.

A.9.11 *Margariz* of Seville and Cádiz

In the section on 'The Algalife' (A.6) we showed that the reading *Marganice* in O 1914, 1943, 1954 did not belong in the archetype, but was an idiosyncratic change made by O; these passages therefore do not need any further commentary.

---

653 *Historia Compostellana* (ed. Falque Rey) 1.73.62 *per Campos* [= the land north of the Duero around Zamora and Valladolid] *et Extrema* [= the land south of that area], 1.83.7 [Alfonso el Batallador] *Extremitatem invadebat,* 1.84.45 *Camporum et Extremature gens*, 1.89.5 *in Extremitate*, 1.108.5 and 1.117.11 *in Extremitatem*, 1.101.62 *in Extremitatibus*, all in relation to events shortly after 1111.

A.9.11.1 Fiefdom and person

The eleventh anti-peer is *Margariz de Sibilĭe* O 955, *Margariz uon Sibiliæ* K, *Margariz* of *Sibili* n, *Maçaris de Sibilie* V4, *Margariç de Sebie* (*Sibie* V7) CV7, *Amaguis [. . .] de Sebile* T, *Margarijs [. . .] van Sabelye* h(V); and also

   Margariz O 1310, the same in nKCV7L, *Maçaris* V4, *Margelins* P, *Margaris* T, *Margarit* w, *Margarijs* h(V); finally

   Margariz O 1311, variants as in 1310: In CV7 *Sebie/Sibie* is based on Old North Ital. /λ/ > /j/ with loss next to /i/. In all three passages the archetype was the same as O. The *Carmen* (v. 279) has *Margārētus*.

   Other information about this character appears elsewhere in the Rol.: *Margariz tient la tere* entre <s>qu'as Cazmarine<s> Segre 956, *entre quascaz marine* O,[654] [he rules the land of] *Katamaria* n, [rules through conquest] *thaberiske erde* K, [*tient la terre*] *entresque a la marine* V4, *deci en Samarie* C, *d'Afriqe et d'Aumarie* V7, *d'Aufrique et d'Aumarie* T: Here C offers a facile secondary meaning ('as far as Samaria'). K made an adjective ending in *-isk* from *Tabarie* 'Tiberias', a name which not only referred to one of the great baronies of the Kingdom of Jerusalem from the First Crusade onwards but was also common in OF epics from the *Chanson de Guillaume* and the *Prise d'Orange* onwards;[655] the source of K may well have had *entresqu'a Tabarie* in this passage. If the archetype read *ascazmarine* as in O, the scribes may have copied its phonology with no understanding of the meaning, and the suppression of the preconsonantal *s-* and *z-* sound in the course of the 12th c. would have led to **acamarine*, or with the misreading *c~t*, to **atamarine*. This last form may well have been the reading of the sub-archetype of β. It is mostly retained in n as *(k)atamaria*; it is "corrected" in the stage before K to *atabarie* (to) 'beyond Tiberias', but in γ (with the misreading *t~l*) to *alamarine* 'to the seashore', which V4 retained, while δ imagined that the place was 'Almería' and replaced *the entresqu'* (for which he himself perhaps used *jusque*) with *Afrique*.

   For β Burger (1949, 164) constructs *entresqu'a(d) Almaríe* from nV7T, but he does not take account of K and V4. He even wants to put this in the archetype since he mistrusts the interpretation of *entre quascaz* in O as *entresqu'as Caz*, because the scribe evidently does not understand his source. But the fact that a scribe does not understand the text he is copying does not mean that that this source is

---

[654] It is doubtful whether a word boundary is intended after *quascaz* (as argued by Hilka/Pfister, and also Burger 1949, 163) or not (as argued by Bédier and Segre).

[655] Kartschoke (1965, 94s.) is correct in arguing this, along with Karl Bartsch and Golther against Minis. Moreover, K has *Margariz* appearing once before (in verses 2673–2678 of this text) in Marsilĭe's court in that passage, which is longer and missing in O, he is given the two kingdoms of *Sibilia* and *Taceria*, where the latter evidently means the same as *thaberiske erde*, and so presumably is incorrectly copied from *Taberia*.

wrong, and especially in this case, where O also has *entres qualaiurnee* (v. 3731), *entres qual* (*or, baptisterie*, v. 1056, 3668), *entres quen ual* (*marchis, seuree*, v. 3208, 3313). We therefore disagree with Burger and keep *entresqu'as Caz marine* in the archetype.

The poet highlights *Margariz* for other reasons besides geography when he singles out two further attributes. He is even more boastful than the other anti-peers (v. 962–973), which can be explained as the poet's endeavour to gradually intensify the boasting speeches leading up to this point, so that he appears as an exceptionally brave and competent warrior: we can see that in the phrase *N'i ad paien de tel chevalerie* (v. 960) the word *chevalerie* strongly connotes military courage and prowess when he appears later, *Margariz est mult vaillant chevalers / E bels e forz e isnels e legers* (v. 1311s.). In the only battle scene that the Marsiliĕ part describes in some detail, he is the one who attacks Olivier: he rushes towards him, splits his shield in two and only just fails to injure his body (v. 1313–1315); because his lance is broken in this attack, he simply rides away and (v. 1319) blows his horn to summon 'his people' to his side. This stalemate makes him a "category of his own" as compared with the eleven other warriors who are destined to die, even though the poet has accorded him this position out of narrative necessity: this exception prevents the whole battle of twelve against twelve from becoming monotonous and unbelievable, and it is likely that Margariz, as the sole survivor among the twelve anti-peers, was supposed to bring the bad news to Marsiliĕ.[656] Another indication that his bravery has been recognised is the fact that his sword had been 'sent over' to him as a gift by none other than the *amiralz* himself (v. 967).[657]

But Margariz is also – uniquely in the Song and therefore significantly – a ladies' man: *Pur sa beltét dames li sunt amies: / Cele ne'l veit, vers lui ne s'esclargisset; / Quant ele'l veit, ne poet müer ne riet* O 957–959 with variants that do not change the meaning in nV4CV7 and (without the last verse) T.

Ideally, this Margariz character should fit with the two city names. The meanings of these are [1] Seville and Cádiz, not [2] Zawīla and Al-Mahdiyya in today's Tunisia nor [3] Sevil and Alquézar about 20 km northwest of Barbastro; and *Caz marine<s>* is neither [4] Camarinas nor [5] Castro Marím.

---

656 On this especially Bédier (1927, 182–187, who is in my view very convincing in his reasoning about Margariz' going back to Marsiliĕ), the Segre edition p. 266–268 (with literature; I cannot share Segre's surprising skepsis p. 268, last paragraph; cf. especially v. 1440!) and Geith (1986, 140).

657 On the error that (*de) Primes* is a toponym, *recte: de primes* 'once, previously', cf. A.5.8 above.

On [1]: Sibiliĕ/Sebille etc. 'Seville' is well attested elsewhere in OF literature (cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.).[658] In 844 a Viking fleet had sailed up the Guadalquivir and then captured and plundered Seville, before it was partly destroyed by ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān II, and partly put to flight;[659] after that, the Normans would never have forgotten this name. The countryside around Seville was teeming with natural resources (olive and fig orchards, cultivated grain, herbs and plants to make dye from, sugar cane and cotton, silkworm and horse breeding); and between 1023 and around 1078 under the ʿAbbādids it not only grew into the most powerful of the Taifa kingdoms (with the possible exception of Saragossa), but also experienced its greatest cultural heyday (EI s. v. *Ishbīliya*). Even at that time, and especially from 1078 onwards, Alfons VI forced it to pay him higher and higher tributes (on this e.g. Dozy/Lévi-Provençal 1932, 120s.), and so people across the whole of France undoubtedly knew about this city.

Seville reached the peak of its development under al-Muʿtamid (1068/1069–1091). He, too, could be an excellent warrior. When he could no longer stand having to pay the extortionate tribute to Alfons VI and called the Almoravids

---

658 When Arabic speakers heard the name of the town in antiquity, *Hispălis*, they most often encountered it in the locative *Hispălī /ẹspăli/*. The Arab. *-sh-* was the most common way of representing the Iberorom. *-s-* (cf. e.g. in Wasserstein 1985, 83ss., the southern Spanish toponyms *Arkush*, *Shaltīsh*, *Shantamariya al-Gharb*, *Ukshūnūba*, *Shaqūra*, *Shilb* ~ Arcos, Saltes, Santa María de Algarve, Ocsonoba, Segura, Silves), as was the substitution *-b-* < *-p-* (the *p* was and is non-existent in normal Arab., and even in later Andalusian Arab. it was only ever a marginal phoneme; more detail in Corriente 1977, 34 with n. 31, 1992, 43 with n. 15) and also vowel harmonising in unstressed syllables was quite a common tendency in Hispano-Arab. (Corriente 1977, 69s., 1992, 66s.); out of all of this came *Íshbili*. The clearer feminisation of the name through the addition of *-a* (as with *Carthagine[m] > Karṭādžanna > Cartagéna* etc.) produced *Ishbilya*, where the now closed syllable *-bil-* automatically became stressed: *Ishbílya* (described several times by Corriente, 1977 and 1992; in the EI *Ishbīliya*, but here, too, with the stress on *-bīl-*). Now we find aphaeresis of the initial vowels of many toponyms in al-Andalus: *Illerta > Lérida/Lleida*, *Emerita > Mérida*, *Arunda > Ronda*, *Olisipo > Lisboa* (Corriente 1977, 59 n. 84); however, this could not happen automatically with *Ishbílya* because in Arab. only single consonants are allowed at the beginning of a word. But in those days Arab. had to adapt many western names which started with two consonants; this caused duplicate forms of the type *Ifrandža / Farandža* 'empire of the French, continental Europe' (and similarly today *al-Ifrandž* 'the Europeans' / *Farandžī* 'European'; some indication of this problem in Corriente 1977, 59 n. 84 at the bottom, and 1992, 69). Analogous to this, duplicate forms arose here: *Ishbílya / *Shibílya* (cf. also Corriente 2008, p. LII), and the second type soon got the upper hand in the spoken language because of the tendency towards aphaeresis. Cf. the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* (1.35.1, ed. Falque/Gil/Maya, written before 1157): *Sibiliam, quam antiqui vocabant Ispalim* – and passim over 30 times; the PT (cap. 3) also has *Sibilia*, apparently with no variants. – On *Se[b]ilie* Segre 200, emended from *Sezilie* O, cf. A.12.2.7 below.

659 Cf. Clot (2002, 77s.) and especially the RGA s. v. *Arabische Quellen*, p. 378.

into Europe in 1086, Yūsuf allocated him a position in the dangerous vanguard unit in the battle of Sagrajas/Zallāqa;[660] and so he fought in the first phase of the battle, long before Yūsuf himself intervened – just as Margariz fights in the first phase of the battle, long before the Algalife intervenes. The Muslim sources report unanimously that he fought very bravely, and especially tried to gather together his fleeing Andalusians (Lagardère 1989a, 29, 86s.).[661]

Above all, however: al-Muʿtamid was a hedonist, poet and friend of the ladies. "L'Andalousie des Arabes de Syrie, d'une incomparable richesse sous la dynastie abbadide de Séville, qui a supplanté Cordoue comme métropole intellectuelle, religieuse, économique, et qui règne sur la moitié méridionale de l'Espagne musulmane: n'est-ce pas de là que viendrait le courtois Margarit?"[662] And it was true: the splendour of a refined lifestyle, a penchant for pleasure which carelessly set aside the limitations stipulated by religious law, a finely judged delicacy of manners, and a rush of sensibility characterised many Taifa kingdoms, but Seville most of all: the poet king al-Muʿtamid of Seville (1069–1090) captured the mood of the time in a single line: 'pounce on life as if it were prey, for it lasts no longer than a day'.[663] He was "le produit d'une société en décadence: il buvait sec, attribuait aux femmes une importance considérable," was "instable, faible vis-à-vis des femmes [. . .] mais [. . .] intelligent et brave [. . .]".[664] But after Zallāqa, in 1090/1091 when he once again had been drawn into the see-saw politics between Yūsuf and Alfons, Yūsuf annexed al-Muʿtamids kingdom by force, killing his son Fatḥ al-Ma'mūn in the process, and exiled al-Muʿtamid to North Africa, where he died a few years later.

The contact between Alfons and Mu'tamid lasted for quite a long time, and in fact until after 1087, countless French knights came to Castile in answer to Alfons' call for help, and even until 1091, when Zaida, the widow of Fath, came to Alfons, apparently at al-Muʿtamid's behest, became his concubine, then the mother of his

---

660 Cf. here especially Dozy/Lévi-Provençal (1932, 128) with a Muslim source which says Yūsuf deliberately let the vanguard suffer losses before he intervened.

661 A few Muslim sources on the battle (cf. e.g. Lagardère 1989b, 118, or the 'official' version of the battle in the form of a letter from Yūsuf's chancellery, edd. Lévi-Provençal/García Gómez 1950a, 128s., which nowadays is no longer regarded as entirely genuine) and leaning upon them, the research carried out from Dozy to Menéndez Pidal, portray the figure of al-Muʿtamid in a heroic-anecdotal fashion; this contrasts with more recent scholarship (e.g. Lagardère 1989b, 118) which almost in principle regards such details with suspicion. I try to do justice to these stricter standards, but sometimes the suspicion seems excessive to me.

662 Dufournet (1987, 102).

663 Von Grunebaum (1963, 158); similarly, Arié (1982, 391s. with literature), Dozy/Lévi-Provençal (1932, 83ss.).

664 Béraud-Villars (1946, 58, 60).

only son and thereby the presumptive heir to the throne, before finally converting to Christianity and becoming his wife and Queen of Castile.[665] This contact is a guarantee that al-Muʿtamid was recognised as the epitome of a whole culture and whole region even as far away as in France.

Al-Muʿtamid's father al-Muʿtaḍid (1042–1068/1069) had already annexed large parts of Andalusia, including Huelva around 1052, and a few years later Ronda, Algeciras and Arcos de la Frontera.[666] Cádiz was never the centre of a Taifa state, but possessing these towns meant simultaneously possessing Cádiz, as we can see by looking at the map.

Hilka/Pfister's index opts for Cádiz in our passage – and correctly so. It was founded by the Phoenicians and in Roman times it was called *Gādēs/Gādīs*, usually in the feminine plural form (!), and only occasionally treated as a singular (which is why a good humanist such as Ariosto 33.98.1 still writes *le Gade*). When the Arabs captured Gades, the Semit. /g/ for most[667] speakers of Arab. had already moved quite far along the way towards /dž/. One of the possible substitutions for the foreign /g/ was /q/;[668] which gives Arab. *Qādis*.[669] This form not only became established in Span. *Cadiz* (and spread out from there into the other European languages) but its initial sound also influenced the Latin writings of the Middle Ages. Ms. L of Martianus Capella (11th c.) had (lib.6, cap. 612, p. 302.16 ed. Dick) *Cadibus*, but was soon corrected to *Gadibus*; the PT (cap. 4) explains that *Cadis* is the place where the *salam Cadis* is to be found (Arab. *ṣanam Qādis* 'the idol / the statue of Cádiz'); in the ms. tradition (from the 13th c. onwards) of the Geographus Ravenna (4.43) *Caditana* is a *civitas* by the Strait of Gibraltar; *Kades* (var. *Cades*) *Herculi* is the name in Michel Velser (94.1, 14th c.) for the Pillars of Hercules. Since in the Rol. the stress has not yet moved, we would expect *Cádes* or *Caz,* the latter when the loss of the final vowel has taken place, as e.g. in the *le Groing* 'Logroño' in several epics from *Girart de Roussillon* onwards or in the *Bors* 'Burgos' in the *Prise de Pampelune* (Bédier 1926–1929, 3.129s.).

Why then in the Song is specifically Cádiz named as an additional domain alongside Margariz' capital city of Seville? And why is it used in the expression

---

665 Cf. LM s. v. *Zai'da*.

666 Cf. Wasserstein (1985, 83–98).

667 On this qualification cf. Corriente (1992, 53, 55 with n. 42, 2008, XXXVs.). Corriente cites as a parallel form *Igabrum > Cabra* and *Caesara(u)gusta > Saraqusṭa* (where however the *-q-* in Span. did not prevail).

668 It was perhaps hampered by the fact that /q/ in antiquity and still today in many dialects tends to be voiced (Bergsträßer 1993, 135, Corriente/Vicente 2008, 71, 101, 153, 191, 289, 315s., 355 [Andalusian Arab.], 413). However, the problem may be much more complicated (cf. now Corriente 2008, p. XXIX n. 26).

669 The Arabic source texts are listed in Mizal (1989, no. 77).

la tere entre<s>qu'as Cazmarine<s>? The answer is revealed once again by the geographers of antiquity, who have an overwhelming amount of information to tell us about the city.

After the destruction of neighbouring Tartesso (around 500 B.C.)[670] there was a *Gadir* ('enclosure, fortress') as it was called, about 80 km as the crow flies (west north) west of the southern tip of Spain, which was the westernmost outpost of the Phoenician-Carthaginian world and therefore of the whole Mediterranean world as well. Some ships came from the north bringing tin from Britain, and Hanno went south down the African coast, but to the west lay the endless ocean, and more or less vague knowledge about islands in it which in any case were of no economic value. This view of Gades as the western end point of "our" world was also shared in principle by the Greeks, and then the Romans. The Strait of Gibraltar was called in Lat. *fretum Gaditanum*, meaning: 'the Strait opening towards Gades' (this perspective is still clearly evident in Mela 2.86). But Pliny (3.3) and later writers simply use *Gades* when they mean the Strait e.g. Lucan (9.413, 10.454), Juvenal (10.1), Silius Italicus (1.141 *hominum finem Gadīs*, 17.635 *terrarum finis Gades*), Claudian (8.43, ed. Birt p. 151), Martianus Capella (6.611); *Gades* is the western endpoint of Europe for Isidore 14.4.2 also. This is why Pliny gives the distance of several places on earth from *Gades* or from the *fretum Gaditanum*, such as Sardinia (3.84) and Sicily (6.206), the Kerch Strait (6.206) or the mouth of the Don (4.121, or similarly 2.242), or alternatively Agrippa also gives the distance of a river mouth on the northwest African coast (112 miles, 5.9); a similar habit is evident later e. g. in Martianus Capella (6.611–613, ed. Dick p. 214s.). And Orosius says (1.2.7 and 10): *Europae in Hispania occidentalis oceanus terminus est, maxime ubi apud Gades insulas Herculis columnae visuntur [. . .] Termini Africae ad occidentem iidem sunt qui et Europae, id est, fauces Gaditani freti.* These 'Pillars of Hercules' are for Pliny (3.4) and Solinus (23.13s.) a metaphorical expression for the two mountaintops on either side of the 'Strait of Gades'; for Lucan (3.278s.) they are probably two physical pillars placed by Hercules 'near Gades', and certainly for e.g. Martianus Capella (6.620, ed. Dick p. 216) and for Isidore (13.15.2, 'because Hercules hoped that the world came to an end there', cf. also 14.6.7, and this went into Rabanus' *De univ.* 12.5 and other texts). According to Rodulfus Tortarius (*ep.* 7.19ss.) Bohemund's comrades who had been recruited in England came past the Pillars of Hercules *Gadibus excursis*, into the Mediterranean.[671] The above-mentioned *salam* [*recte:*

---

670 Which in the years that follow is often just considered as an earlier stage of Gades, e.g. in Avienus (*or.m.* 263–266).

671 The Normans had already attacked Cádiz in 844 (just before Seville), and again in 859, after which they sailed on into the Mediterranean (RGA s. v. *Arabische Quellen*, p. 378). Cádiz was also quite well known in the area where Scandinavian influence was felt: the only Spanish

șanam] *Cadis* 'idol of Gades' of the PT (cap. 4) reappears here as Idrīsī's (1999, 69) tower with the statue of an idol 'in Qādis in the west of al-Andalus at the place, west of which no one knows of any inhabited land';[672] even Geoffrey of Monmouth thinks that this information is a way of showing off his cultural heritage in the *Vita Merlini* (v. 893): *Gadibus Herculeis adiungitur insula Gades.* Gades is included in all of the more important *mappae mundi* (von den Brincken 1968, 162); for example, on the Higden maps Gades is an island that so to speak blocks the exit of the Mediterranean and the 'Pillars of Hercules' are either written there in words or painted on it (Edson et al. 2005, 72).

But – more importantly for us – Gades marks not only a western, but also a southern beginning- and endpoint. For Pliny (4.116) it is 102 miles from the mouth of the Anas (Guadiana), and at the same time (3.17) it is the southern end of *Baetica*, that is to say of Andalusia (the same is true of Isidore 14.6.7; these two passages are closest to our passage in the Rol. in terms of their meaning). Moreover, in Pliny (4.94) Gades is mentioned as the southern end of his great description of Europe as a whole, which in principle takes the form of a periplus, recounting a journey along the coasts. Conversely, Gades is described at the bottom, and the author's thoughts head northwards along the whole western coast of the European mainland in Martianus Capella (6.620, ed. Dick p. 216). Claudian describes (26.202, ed. Birt p. 267) how the rumour of the disastrous move of the Goths against Rome spread at breakneck speed in the year 402 'from Gades via Britain to Thule'. For Orosius (1.2.72), Spain is triangular in shape and the third, southern corner is in Gades, opposite the Atlas in Africa.[673] This explains the 'as far as' idea, *entresqu'as Caz.*

What about *marine<s>*?[674] Gades was not just a coastal city, situated almost at the very point where the Mediterranean ends, but it was also a fascinating place in antiquity, because at that time its island location very close to the

---

city named by Alfred the Great is 'the island called Gades' (Kaiser 1955, 39), the Nestor chronicle even knows that it lies opposite Mauritania (Cross/Sherbowitz-Wetzor 1953, 51).

672 On this tower with the statue of a man cf. briefly the LM s. v. *Cádiz*. The most readable, detailed description of it is, I think, still that of Basset (1903, passim).

673 To a certain extent, all of these literary references are complemented by real events during the lifetime of the Roland poet; for Alfons VII also led a campaign in 1133–1134 through Andalusia to the south coast, and the target he chose was not Tarifa, which had been chosen by his grandfather Alfons VI around 1083, nor Málaga, chosen more recently by his stepfather and bitter enemy Alfonso el Batallador in 1125/1126, but in fact the above-mentioned Tower of Cádiz (*Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, ed. Falque/Gil/Maya 1.37.5, and its index s. v. *Gallice*), that is described in the PT and Idrīsī.

674 The question whether the singular/plural mixture in *as Caz marine* in O should be emended to *as Caz marines*, is irrelevant in our context. However, perhaps *tute Flandres* in O

mainland offered great protection. Strictly speaking in Roman times, it was even on two islands (as explained in KPauly s. v. *Gades*). The position of 'the island of Gades' is described in detail by Mela 3.39; 'the island of Gades' is described by many authors including e.g. Mela 2.86 and Isidore 14.6.7 (from where it went to Rabanus' *De univ.* 12.5 and later texts: *Gadis insula* is only 120 steps away from the continent); and yet there is also mention of 'the islands [called] Gades' by Orosius (1.2.7, 1.2.72), Isidore 14.4.2 and Hugo of St. Victor (*Descriptio mappae mundi* 3 and 23). The main island with the main temple of ancient Gades was dedicated to *Venus marina*;[675] the use of the same adj. may be a coincidence, but even so, it shows how dominant the idea of "the sea" was in Gades. The Roland poet did not want to miss out this characteristic alongside the monosyllabic name of the city, because it emphasised the fact that this place marked out the southernmost tip of Spain.

It is highly unlikely that such a "tailor-made" expression would be a secondary interpretation, i.e. one that had come about through a misreading of *ad Almaríe* and the insertion of a new meaning.

[**On 2:**] Burger (1949, passim) does not interpret *Sebile* as Seville, but as Zawīla (in today's Tunisia), the trading centre of al-Mahdiyya, and he understands *Aumarie* not as Almería, but as al-Mahdiyya itself, which means that Margariz would be a North African. The well-known Pisan expedition of 1087 did actually plunder Zawīla, but did not conquer the citadel of al-Mahdiyya; and so a truce was called, and the attackers retreated with their substantial loot. In fact, Zawīla in the *Carmen in victoria Pisarum* v. 153, 242 and 250 (and in Robert of Torigni's chronicle about an event in 1180) is not called *Zevila, as we might expect, but *Sibilia*; this shows that the name 'Seville', which everyone living around the Mediterranean knew well, was evidently already exerting some influence here.

However, like Robert Walpole (1952, passim) I have to reject Burger's suggestion. In addition to the arguments outlined above against *Aumarie*, there are further arguments against its interpretation as 'al-Mahdiyya' instead of 'Almería'.

First, Al-Mahdiyya is represented in western sources not as *Almadia, but as *Madia*, e.g. the *Carmen* v. 14, 201, 253, 261. This is by no means a coincidence, because scholars have accepted since 1931, and with thorough discussion of the reasons by Arabic specialists (most recently Corriente 2008, p. LXV–LXXI), that when Arabic nouns (including names) are borrowed into Italian, it is usually

---

1327 should be a warning against emending too hastily. Segre emends the former, and lets the latter stand, with no commentary.

675 Avienus (*or.m.* 311, cf. 263–266).

without the article *al-*, whereas in Spanish, the article often stays with the noun; a western name for al-Mahdiyya, however, because of the historical circumstances, could only have come from Italy. The FEW (vol. 19, Orientalia, s. v. *Mahdīya*) also cites only the derivation attested in around 1190, namely OF *madian* '(cloth) from al-Mahdiyya', and not *al-* or *aumadian*.[676]

Secondly, the western sources represent Zawīla and alMahdiyya as two different towns. But Idrīsī says, according to the translation by Nef (1999, 185s.): "Actuellement, Mahdia se compose de deux villes; à savoir, Mahdia proprement dite et Zawīla. [. . .] Les villes de Mahdia et de Zawīla sont séparées par un espace plus vaste que l'étendue d'un jet de flèche [. . .]". The older translation by Joubert (1837 [1992], 1.258) even says in this passage only: 'séparées l'une de l'autre par une aire de l'étendue d'un jet de flèche'. But in both cases, it is only a matter of less than 1 km. Would the statement that a count 'owns the land from the outskirts to about 1km from the town itself' not be counterproductive, when the poet obviously intends to indicate the breadth (and not the narrowness) of Margariz' county? Moreover, all of the African magnates mentioned by the poet are kings (Corsalis, Almaris), the son of a king (Malquidant) and the Algalife. Margariz is only a count (v. 1310: *li quens* O, *li cont* V4, and therefore confirmed in the archetype) and he would look strange in an outpost like al-Mahdiyya, where in reality a king was on the throne.

Finally, one more argument: while the character of Margariz reflects the highly cultivated and happy character of Taifa Andalusia, this would be out of place in a North African, a Berber king ruling over Berber subjects. Gérard Gros (2011, 21) is no doubt correct when he writes in his affectionately monographic article on Margariz: "Ainsi [. . .] Margariz nous reporte aux origines de la fine amor," which is *tras el Pirineo*, in Spain. He finds it necessary to qualify this as follows "malgré le flou du contexte historico-géographique" since he has accepted – with no arguments of his own – that *Cazmarine* is Galician *Camarinas* (cf. below under [4]), and Sibilĭe the North African Zawīla. This *flou* is removed as soon as we accept the most obvious meanings in both geographical and text transmission terms: these cities are quite simply Seville and Cádiz.

---

[676] Since splendid fabrics from *Aumaríe* are often mentioned in OF epics (about three dozen times, Moisan s. v.), we might hesitate for a moment and wonder if, after all, al-Mahdiyya lies behind the name. But this suspicion is not justified: Almería was much more famous for its textiles than al-Mahdiyya, cf. the EI s. v. *al-Mariyya* (p. 561b), Vallvé (1980, 18, 22), Arié (1982, 255, 292), Wasserstein (1985, 108), Clot (2002, 164 and especially 287–289). Lombard (1978, Index) mentions al-Mahdiyya twice as a textile city, but Almería twelve times.

[On 3:] In keeping with his dogma that the fiefdoms of all twelve anti-peers must be located relatively near Saragossa, Boissonnade (1923, 96–102) devotes several pages to discussions of places that are out of the question, and most of which no one has ever suggested, before settling on a place that is not attested until 1080, called *castrum Situli* on the Sierra de *Sevil*[677] (about 40 km north-northwest of Barbastro) and a neighbouring Alquézar, which was significant as a fortress in the battles of the 11th and 12th c. He then feels authorised to 'emend' *entre<s>qu'as Caz marine<s>* into *entresqu'Alcazarríe*. This is one of the most contrived ideas in the whole book.

[On 4:] Curiously, Bédier (1926–1929, 3.292 n.) writes about *as Caz marine*: "On peut songer à identifier ce lieu à Camarinas, port de mer de Galice, à soixante kilomètres au nord-est de Compostelle". But even the surface similarity which has convinced him and nobody else has its problems: the completely unexpected inner *-z-* comes from someone who must have analysed the name quite differently. Bédier says nothing about the history of Camariñas, today a small fishing port, and to this day no medieval sources have been found identifying this place; I was only able to ascertain that the name is not even in the *Historia Compostellana*, although this lists e.g. in Book I, Chapter 103, no fewer than 16 places and small regions on the Iberian northwest coast between Coimbra and Santillana del Mar. French people in the Middle Ages thought that the north-westernmost point on the Pyrenean Peninsula was not Camariñas, but Compostela or – if they wanted to be very precise about it – el Padrón west of Compostela, called *Petronus* in the PT (cap. 2). Above all, however, the distance from Seville to Camariñas is fully 962 km by road, and just under 700 km as the crow flies (and also from the Sierra de Sevil to Camariñas 994 km by road, over 700 km as the crow flies). This would not fit into a county, even accepting that the poet wants to give the *quens Margariz* a sizeable domain.

[On 5:] Finally, Place (1947, 880s.) suggested Castro Marin, which today marks Portugal's south-eastern border with Spain. And indeed: it is situated on a silted arm of the sea and was therefore originally directly on the mouth of the Guadiana, in a strategic position. According to the archaeological evidence, it had been fortified from the 4th c. B.C., but as the small town of Aesuri it was overshadowed in classical antiquity by Onuba on the other side of the riverbank: it

---

677 Madoz s. v. *Sevil* only knows the mountain range but says that its name comes from a place that was once there, leaving the ruins of a church and a few houses still visible (but no fortress!).

was fortified once more during the time of the Muslims, and the materials they used were turned into the fortress that is so impressive today, and which was built after the Reconquista (around 1240) and partly much later as a border defence against Spain. In comparison with Cádiz, however, Castro Marim is inferior in several respects: it was never named as a point marking the border with Spain or Andalusia and therefore was much less familiar to people, and it does not fit very well in phonological terms because the following two developments are not plausible: a reduction -*str*-> -*s*-or -*z*-[678] feminine gender for *caz marine<s>*.

A.9.11.2 The name *Margariz*

Apodictic brevity is not an option in this difficult question either. Pioneering work on it was done by Kahane/Kahane (1960, passim), and so we need not go into detail about the older research. I will now review the substance of Kahane's work, with some additional material of my own in square brackets []:

Arab. *muhādžir* 'emigrant' [with the pl. gen./acc., the form important for borrowings, *muhādžirīn*] was used with specialised meanings, first referring to the participants in Mohammed's *hidžra*, that is to say something like 'Ur-Muslims'. Its meaning broadened after the conquest of Egypt to refer to those conquerors who settled there as 'old Muslims' as distinct from the Egyptian converts; but soon it came to include 'Muslims' in general. In the last two meanings the word, graecised first as μωαγαρίτης, and then only as μαγαρίτης, is well attested in the Egyptian-Greek papyri of the 7th–8th c. Since from a Christian perspective the newcomers attracted the most negative attention, in the 9th c. the Greek word took on the meaning 'renegade from the Christian to the Muslim faith'. In translated Latin we find *magarita* (twice) and *margarita* (once) in 874/875 in the Theophanes translation by Anastasius Bibliothecarius [where I agree with Rajna (1885, 418) and see the first -*r*- which started to gain in popularity from this period onwards as being obviously influenced by Lat. *margarita* 'pearl']; in freely written Lat. it appears as early as 876 in a letter of Pope John VIII referring to apostates around Rome; it seems to have a similar meaning at around the same time in the old *Chronicon Casinense* (cap. 12, MGH SS. 3.226). It appears in Old French in what is probably the oldest (partly) surviving epic, *Gormont et Isembart*, referring to Isembart as *li margaris* 'the renegade' [with the article v. 422, 436, 451, 462, 628, without the article only in the vocative *margari* v. 585], synonym of *le reneié* (v. 302). [According to Tobler/Lommatzsch (s. v. *margari*) the only other reference to the word in OF with

---

678 Indeed Arab. *(al-)qaṣr* > Port. *(al-)cácer* does relate to *castro* but there are no parallels for the loss of the -*r*. Certainly there were the developments *nostrum* > Port. *nosso* and *nostros* > OF *noz*; but in phonology you cannot conclude fully-fledged nouns from pronouns.

the meaning 'renegade' is in Mousket's retelling of the Isembart story. There is also Occ. *margaritz* 'renegade' in Bertran de Born's *S'abrils e fuolhas e flors*, but only in ms. F, which was written in Italy; Zenker thinks the verse has been interpolated in Italy, Appel believes that Bertran has taken it from OF epic literature, which can only mean: from the *Gormont* (cf. the FEW s. v. *magaritēs*).[679] This tradition behind the term 'renegade' has thus far proved to be very thin, but it disappears completely in the late 12th c. In the *Partonopeus de Blois* [before 1188] there is a Sultan, who is called *li paiens* and *li mescreans* and is absolutely not a renegade from Christianity, and yet he is twice called *li margaris* or *le margari*. The meaning we can take from this context is therefore only '(high-ranking) Muslim'.

The last semantic nuance of the word in OF is found in *Fet des Romains* [around 1213/1214]: here the word refers to the time of Caesar and refers to a 'pirate leader' active in the Adriatic.[680] This can be explained as follows. When in the early 8th c., Muslim privateer ships were armed to fight against Byzantium, they were manned by μωαγαρίται 'Arab Muslims', as we are told once again by the papyri. This is how the word came to mean 'pirates'. [It seems to have kept this meaning at least in naval Gk. until the late 12th c., although in 1122 in Sicily Μαργαρίτος is attested as the name of an unimportant witness and was interpreted by Caracausi (1993 s. v.) as being derived from μαργαρίτης 'pearl'. For in the late 12th c. a famous pirate in the Adriatic who was of Greek heritage called himself Μαργαρήτος (MGk. with /i/), Lat. *Margaritus*. He was employed by William II of Sicily, and in 1185 he won for him the stunning victory at Thessaloniki as well as a second naval victory near Cyprus, after which he was promoted to Commander of the Fleet, Earl of Malta and lord of Brindisi and went down in history as Margaritus of Brindisi. The original charters for some of the donations he made to the churches in Brindisi, Messina and Peratico have been preserved; these documents record both his Greek signature and the Latin form of the name sanctioned by him.[681] He also helped the French and

---

679 The tradition reviewed above presumes that there was an early borrowing from the Arab., because Standard Arab. /dž/was taken over while still in its previous form /g/ (which is how it has remained in Egyptian Arab.). The form of the name *Margariz* in V4, that is to say *Maçaris* (with the contemporary North Ital. /dz/ ~ Standard-Ital. /dž/), is considered by Kahane/Kahane (1960, 201) to be a trace of a somewhat later duplicate borrowing; this question is not important in our context.

680 The meaning of the word stands out because it represents an extension of the passage that is being translated here from Lucan (4.433: *Illyricae custos undae*); cf. P.Meyer (1885, 14 n.), along with more nuanced insights from Flutre (1939, 478s.).

681 Garufi (1907, passim, especially the appendix of charters). According to Kiesewetter (2006, 45–68, especially 52), whose work on the whole topic is relevant, he came from Megara

English participants in the Third Crusade with their sea crossings (*Itinerarium pere-grinorum* cap. 14, ed. Mayer p. 271), and so the author of the *Fet des Romains* would still have remembered his title some two and a half decades later, when he was describing the commander of an Adriatic fleet.]

This completes our review of the work of Kahane/Kahane (1960) with some additions of my own. The complicated history of this word leads us to an important, although negative realisation: since nothing in the Rol. indicates any knowledge of the *Gormont*, we have no guarantee at all that the poet knew of the 'renegade' meaning, even though Dufournet (1987, 103) speaks of "Margarit, le renégat, qui est l'un des pairs de Marsile".[682] On the contrary, the religious zeal and direct characterisation which are hallmarks of the whole Rol. make it unimaginable that the poet would say of Margariz: *N'i ad paien de tel chevalerie,* then characterise him as *mult vaillant chevalers, / E bels e forz e isnels e legers*, if he would then go on to write in a later laisse which has since been lost that the man was "by the way" a renegade. We must add an important linguistic detail: in the Rol., Margariz appears – in contrast with *Margari(s)* in the *Gormont* on the one hand, and with *algalife*, *amurafle* or *almaçur* in the Rol. itself on the other – without the article and thus in the form of a name. Knudson, like Zenker before him and Grégoire after him,[683] is therefore correct, when he regards Margariz as "un nom quelconque". Except that in the Rol., names are not decided randomly.

We must therefore ask ourselves what association an educated Christian could have had in relation to this name. The answer is simple: he knew the pithy words of Jesus (*Mt* 7.6, 13.45s., cf. also *Apoc* 18.12, 21.21) the Latin word *margarīta* 'pearl' (in non-biblical texts also *margarītum*, in the Middle Ages sometimes also *-ēta*, *-ētum*),[684] derived from the Gk. masc. ὁ μαργαρίτης (always μαργ-, never μαγ-!) 'pearl', that is to say the same word that gave rise to the female name *Margarita/*

---

in Attica and was therefore originally named after it as ὁ Μεγαρείτης 'the Megarite', but the wider population soon called him ὁ Μαργαρίτης; this does not alter the fact that he referred to himself in all the charters only using the latter name (with a slightly different ending). Also, in Ambroise's *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte,* in v. 671 a certain *Margarit* appears, and in the edition by Ailes/Barber (2003) this means the Admiral.

682 The same is claimed by Horrent (1951, 220 n.4), who tries to avoid the dilemma about the meaning with what seems to me a tortuous explanation: "Seul des paiens échappe à la mort celui qui, un moment, a connu la lumière de Dieu".

683 Knudson (1936, 81), Zenker (1926, 479 n.2), Grégoire (1942–1943, 541 n. 11).

684 *Margarita* is always in the majority, but *margaritum* is in e.g. Sedulius, Hincmar, Aimoin, William of Malmesbury, *margareta* in Gregory of Tours (*vit.patr.* 17.6), Milo of Saint-Amand, *margaretum* in Walahfrid, Rather (NGML s. v.). The *-e-* forms are based on a reversal of a supposed iotacism and are therefore actually hypercorrect.

Margareta.[685] He will therefore have understood *Margariz* as the masculine of this name. (This is also how the *Carmen* v. 279 Latinises *Margariz* to *Margārētus*.) But did such a male name exist, aside from the one Sicilian reference of 1112, outside of, or even possibly before the Roland tradition? Surprisingly enough, yes it did: Diehl (1925–1931, no. 2997H = CIL VIII 13781) lists an early Christian *Margaritus* in Carthage, Piel (1948, no. 226) gathered four Galician and Portuguese toponyms (e.g. *villa Margariti* a. 1021) which the owners had named after themselves; when I was looking through some Catalan charters, I came across a *Margaritus monachus* (!) of the year 1028 Terrasa (Miret y Sans 1913–1914, 405), and there is evidently an unbroken series of such references from the 12th c. onwards, where *Margarit* is attested, especially as a family name in Catalonia.[686] The Roland poet evidently knew this name and thought it sounded typically Spanish; its supposed meaning 'pearl of a man' was appropriate for the brave and hedonistic character of this Andalusian.

A.9.11.3 The Chanson de Roland and Zallāqa

Over the last sixty years, quite a few researchers have attempted to define the exact relationship between the Rol. and Zallāqa using two small matters of historical fact: they linked the camels (v. 31, 129, 184, 645, 847) and the drums (v. 852, 3137) in the Song with the camels and drums of the Almoravid, which were allegedly unknown in Spain before 1086, but were introduced via Zallāqa – although in the Song the camels are only associated with Marsilĭe, and the drums with both Marsilĭe and Baligant. Now this kind of dating based on supposed innovations is problematic in as far as the conclusion is made at least partly *ex silentio,* and the first attestations of real-life elements can only ever be *termini ante quos*. In this case, it was not difficult for Michelle Szkilnik (2004, passim) to prove that camels and drums appear for the first time as characteristics of Zallāqa almost two hundred years later in the fantastic and colourful account of Ibn Khallikān, whereas the historical Yūsuf had already in 1086 switched most of his army from camels to horses, and to make matters worse, both camels

---

685 The female name *Margarita* is well attested in Christian late antiquity (Forcellini Onomasticon, Diehl s. v.), remains popular from then until the Middle Ages and is certainly well attested in Catalonia from the 9th c., and in France from the 11th c. onwards (Morlet 1972, 75a).
686 Kahane/Kahane (1960, 193 n. 4) based on an edition of Salvat's *Diccionari* that I was not able to access. – A preliminary stage of the masc. name *Margaritus* is to be seen in those cases where the appellative is used metaphorically with reference to a male entity: Kahane/Kahane (1960, 193) supply one ancient example of *margaritum* for a youth, and one of *margaritio* (affectionate form) for an infant. [And quite topical in this respect is *margarita* 'precious pearl' in the Vita literature relating to the various saints; four references in the NGML.]

and drums are attested in Spain before they are in Zallāqa. This in effect destroys both of these dating arguments. Yet in the collective memory of the French, the battle of Zallāqa undoubtably lingered for a long time as the epitome of a Christian defeat against Islam, and it offered a kind of blueprint for authors who wanted to write about a similar kind of defeat. As the sections above on the Algalife-Yūsuf from Africa (A.6) and Margariz-Muʿtamid of Seville (A.9.11.1) show, we do not need the camels and drums to be convinced of the longstanding and widespread view that the defeat of the Christians at Zallāqa (in 1086) is reflected in the core of the surviving Rol.

It was also shown above (A.8.3) that we can assume the name *Marsilius* became part of the Roland material around the middle of the 11th c. in the region around Anjou (-Touraine-Poitou). But we can only see a detailed structure behind the whole non-Christian side when we look at Margariz and the Algalife; it must originate, then, in the last decade of the 11th c. at the earliest. It was probably associated with a more detailed rearrangement of the narrative as well; just as the comparable rank of the lord of Seville and the (almost-) Caliph mirror the two phases of the battle of Zallāqa, in the Song the comparable rank of the lord of Seville and the Algalife reflect the two phases of the battle of Roncevaux.

A.9.12 *Chernubles* of the Monegros

In the case of Margariz, the expression 'as far as Cádiz by the sea' brought us to the south coast as the *non plus ultra* in the imagined journey southwards within the territory of Spain; to finish off the group of twelve and thus also his tour of Spain, the poet now wants to take us back into the centre, close to Saragossa. Andalusia was the most attractive area, and Margariz the brightest figure in the circle of the twelve anti-peers. But this is precisely not the impression that the poet would want to leave us with; after the brightest figure, the darkest one should follow. We are looking, therefore, for: a sombre personal name, a fundamentally uncivilised character and a desolate area near Saragossa.

Chernubles de Mun<e>igre Segre 975, *Chernubles de Munigre* O, *Gernublus* of *Valniger* n, *Cenubiles* K (*Cernoles* Stricker),[687] *Cornuble de Valnigre* V4, *Cornuble* (*-bles* V7) *de Mont Nigre* CV7, *Gesmenble* [. . .] *de Brunnorre* T; and then

Chernuble Segre 1325, *Cheruuble* O, *Gernublus* n, *Cornubiles* K, *Cornubla* V4CV7, *Cornubles* P, *Corsubles* T, *Corsuble* L, *Cherup* w (*Cernub* BMW, *Chernub*

---

[687] This is in K 3759 and 3794. Previously, in a scene that is missing in O, *Zernubele* K 2682.

A), *Turzabelin* h(V): The *-e-* in the first syllable is confirmed for the archetype by On (and K in the first passage, w in the second); the later passages (and K in the second passage) have not recognised *c(h)(i)er(e)* 'face' and have replaced it with *Cor-*, an element which is the first part of many other 'pagan' names (cf. Moisan s. v.) and no doubt usually interpreted as *cor(s)* 'body', but probably sometimes as the Latinising *cor* 'heart'. – In the toponym, the assonance requires *-ei-ə*; but all of the scribes copied down *-i-e* in the opening verse of the laisse, either because they did not notice this, or noticed it too late, especially since the previous long laisse had had endings with *-í-e* (v. 955–974). Presumably, the original had *-neigre* which consciously retained most of the Span. *-negro* (cf. the identification below). The scribe of the archetype was not aware of this reasoning, and so *-neigre* seemed wrong. He could not change this into *neire* because *mont* is masc.; therefore, he chose another minimal change, Latinising it to *-nigre*. A change from the 'black mountain' to a 'black valley' was made by n and V4 independently of one another, evidently because this fits better with *Soleill n'i luist* (v. 980).

Chernuble is of course an aptronym: *ch(i)ere nuble* 'darkface'. The nexus *chiere nuble* or *chiere enuble* is to be found in *Erec* (v. 1652 ed. Foerster, 1632 ed. Roques), the expression *n'ot pas nuble la chiere* in the *Joufroi* (v. 1772, Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *nuble*).[688]

Chernuble stands out because of two very unchivalrous attributes: he lets his thick hair grow long and unkempt, even letting it reach the ground, and he demonstrates his great strength by carrying heavy loads (v. 976–978). He carries them whenever he feels the urge to do it (*par giu quant il s'enveiset*), which makes it clear that he is just showing off to no useful purpose.

This is what we are told about Chernuble's fiefdom (v. 979–983):

> Icele terre, ço dit, dun\<t\> il [se seivret],
> Soleill n'i luist ne blet n'i puet pas creistre,
> Pluie n'i chet, rusee n'i adeiset,
> Piere n'i ad que tute ne seit neire:
> Dïent alquanz que diables i meignent.

If we overlook the fact that [1] Gaston Paris (1869, 174) tentatively suggested the Sierra Morena for this and that [2] Baist (1902, 218) even looked for *Muneigre* in Africa, then a consensus was formed quite early, led by Boissonnade (1923,

---

688 The loss of the *-e* from *chiere* in *Chernuble* is a slight contraction, which the poet has done in two other names also: *Siglorel* instead of *Sigleor-el*, *Gaignun* instead of *G(u)aaignun*.

94s.): the meaning is [3] the Monegros, the partly desert landscape[689] about 60 x 40 km in size (even today with only 8 inhabitants per square km), on average 50–60 km east of Saragossa north of the Ebro. Aebischer ([1963–1964] 1967, 245–247) cites references from 1188 onwards *in Montenigro*, which matches the Song. I can add two references in the singular even from the Islamic period: the chronicle of ar-Rāzī who died in 955, preserved only in the Old Spanish version of the Old Portuguese translation as *Crónica del Moro Rasis* (ed. Catalán/de Andres p. 49), includes *Montenegro* among the *sierras que nos fallamos en Espana*, saying it is so big that a good rider would need three days to pass through it; and al'Udhrī (late 11th c. quoted by Catalán) reports that it stands out from the areas opposite (= south east of) Huesca 'because of its height and great breadth, *al-džabal al-aswād* ['the black mountain'], in the language of the Christians *Munt N*g*r*'. The size of the area is greatly exaggerated by ar-Rāzī, and also emphasised strongly in al-'Udhrī. This probably reflects verbal reports of an exhausting journey across it. In the Occitan *Rollan a Saragossa* (v. 262ss.) Roland and Olivier arrive in Saragossa after a difficult overnight march through *Mont-Negre*.

The verses in the Rol. are evidently based on a description that the poet has heard. But, as Aebischer points out, he has misunderstood one detail: instead of *Soleill n'i luist* he should have said: in the summer, the sun burns mercilessly and there is no shade. If he thinks the sun does not reach the black and stony landscape, he appears to be imagining this as mountainous terrain. In any case, it is clear that he has not seen the area with his own eyes.

A.9.13 Review of the twelve anti-peers and looking forward to the Battle of Roncevaux

The group of twelve anti-peers is set out in a very careful order. It begins with Marsilĭe's nephew as counterpart for Charlemagne's nephew Roland. The fact that the second and third anti-peer are also of royal blood indirectly honours Olivier and Turpin: the triad of Frankish protagonists is contrasted with a Muslim triad. The geographical ordering starts with the fourth anti-peer: two sets of four anti-peers form semicircles reaching north to south, one on the east and one on the west, so that the poet covers the whole of Spain as far as the south coast with the fourth to seventh and then the eighth to eleventh positions, and

---

689 On the bleak Monegros landscape cf. the description in Aebischer ([1963–1964] 1967, 247).

not just the Ebro Basin. The eleventh anti-peer has a special destiny which prevents the whole anti-peer section from becoming monotonous. The twelfth and last position leads us back to a place that is as close as possible to the ideal centre, namely Saragossa; moreover, this position is the darkest and most striking of them all, reverberating through the description that follows.

This first part of the battle of Roncevaux is the most structured, because the group of twelve that has already been introduced (v. 860–990) is depicted now in battle in exactly the same order (v. 1178–1337), and now each anti-peer has a laisse of his own. This means that the section presents what looks like a fair fight overall, which sets twelve distinct individuals on each side against each other. The poet has for now – quite deliberately it seems – blocked out any thought of an overwhelming majority on the side of the enemy; despite the ominous escape of Margariz, it looks as if Roland and his optimism about the battle (v. 1058, 1069, 1081) will be proved right against Olivier.

However, in the middle part of the battle that follows, up to the point when the wounded Marsilĭe (v. 1912) makes his escape, another twenty Muslims are mentioned by name (all of whom quickly meet their deaths)[690] but only four of them, that is to say apart from Marsilĭe and his son Jurfaret only Climborin and Valdabrun, are already known to the audience of the Song, and they, too, appear at an unpredictable point; a few others – Siglorel, Malquiant, Grandonĭe, Abisme – appear with a short, distinctive character sketch, but most of them are just bare names. This alone creates the impression that there is no end to this enemy army. The first seven die quickly, without inflicting any damage (v. 1352–1395). But following the ominous interlude of the storm and earthquake in France (v. 1423–1437) and the arrival of Marsilĭe into view (v.1448-[1482]=1525) we have the laisses which report the deaths of one, and then several peers, and the revenge killing of the four victors (and two further enemies) (v. [1483–1609]=1526–1652). Parallel to this there are now quantitative details: the enemies died *a millers e a cent* (v. 1417, similarly 1439), *de cent millers n'en poënt guarir dous* (v. 1440), but Marsilĭe appears with his *grant ost* of no fewer than twenty *eschieles* (v. 1450s.). When this happens, the Franks realise that they are overwhelmingly outnumbered by their enemy. The moment Marsilĭe enters the battle with these troops (v. [1628]=1467), the individuality of each enemy recedes almost completely: the standard-bearer Abisme, a vague Faldrun de Pui to represent many more, Marsilĭe's son Jurfaret

---

[690] This section contains all the laisses which are subject to debate in the literature because they have been rearranged, but this rearrangement does not change the number of people involved. In my discussion above I follow Segre's arrangement of the laisses, which involves counting the rearranged verses twice.

as the last and all the more significant casualty in this section – these are the only names that appear now.

But the complete denial of individuality does not come until the very end of the battle (from v. 1913 onwards): of the fifty thousand of the *neire gent* under the Algalife, not a single one is acknowledged by name, not even the young African warrior, who tries to steal the dying Roland's sword from him. We can see how the poet skilfully uses the complementary relationship between the "plethora of names" and the masses as a literary device.

A.10 Other enemies at the Battle of Roncevaux

The enemies who are named in the middle and closing parts of the Battle of Roncevaux are here presented in the order they appear in Segre's edition. Since those who have not already been discussed are very minor figures, a cursory account is all that is required here.

A.10.1 First group

In v. 1353–1358 Olivier kills a group of three. They have one characteristic in common: their names are playful variants of names that occurred before.

Mal<sar>un Segre 1353, *Malŭ* O (where according to Lecoy the ŭ comes from the reviser; the verse is hypometric), *Massaron* n, *Malsaron* K, *Falsiron* V4, *Fauseron* CV7TL, *Nabigant* P, *Mawstaron* w, *Mancheroene* h(v): P has swapped the name he found with one of those *Nabu-/Nabi* names (cf. Flutre s. v.), which were popular when the *Roman d'Alexandre* used the Vulgate names *Nabucodonoso*r and *Nabuzardan* in a new context.[691] *Falsiron / Fauseron* comes from a "correction" in γ, because Falseron has already been killed (cf. v. 1229), but it is still interesting because it shows that the scribe intuitively thinks *Malsaron* is a (bad) modification of *Falsaron*. The *Maws-* in w continues the older *Mals-* (cf. in that text *Bawtwin*, *Hawtklyr*), and therefore supports the *Mals-* in K and not the *Mass-* in n. *Malŭ* in O is too short by one syllable; the only available improvement is the -*sar-* from nK (and thus from β).

It is a *Mal-* name like others in the Song such as *Malbien*, *Malcud*, *Malduit*, *Malpalin*, *Malpramis*, *Malprímes*, *Malquiant*, *Maltraïen*, although with a second

---

691 Cf. n. 427 above.

part that defies analysis, unless we accept that *Malsaron* is a playful modification of *Falsaron*.

Turgis e Esturguz (in assonance ending in /u~ǫ/) O 1358, *Torchen unt sinen pruder Estorchen* K, *Storgen* and *Storgion* V4 and also (as a subject) *Torgins* and *Liganors* C, *Torgins* and *Li Ganois* V7, *Estorcins* and *Lucanor* P, *Escorchins* and *Estorgant* T, *Maucuidanz* L, *Torcin* w, *Torny* h(V): It is very difficult to work out what should be in the archetype for both names, not only because they have a close but not *a priori* clear relationship with the names *Turgis* and *Esturgant* (or Central Fr. *Torgis*, *Estorgant*) which have been explained before, but also because they (like many of the other pairs of names) resemble each other (which makes K think they are brothers) and because K and V4 make the resemblance even more obvious: K makes them rhyme; V4 Italianises them by suppressing the initial *e* and can therefore expand the incomplete parallelism *Torg*-: (*E*) *storg*- into a complete parallelism *Storgen*: *Storgion*, which makes the second name look like an augmentative of the first.

In the case of the first name, the sub-archetype of P and T has been influenced by *estorse*, *estorce* 'extortion; turning to flee'; T misreads *-t-* as *-c-* which gives the name an association with *escorchier* 'écorcher'. The archetype must have *T(o/u)rgi(s/n)* because of OCV7. Since *Turgis* would only be a repetition of the name that was used for Turgis de Turteluse, the most likely form, as suggested by Theodor Müller and Stengel, is the *Torgin(s)* of CV7 as a hypocoristic modification of this name, given that KV4PTw have forms ending in *-n*; *Turgis* in O is then a pseudo-correction of the name of the warrior who has already died.

In the case of the second name, too, *Estorgant* in T is based on an echo from an earlier mention in the text, since Estorgant has also been killed in T (cf. v. 1302). Moreover, even δ has changed the name in the second position to *Licanors / Li Ganois / Lucanor* (< Gk. *Nikanor*, on this cf. n. 14 above!). Here K and V4 (and therefore also β before them) have *-n*, but only V4 has the right assonance vowel; therefore, *Estorgion* in β competes with *Esturguz* with /ǫ~u/ in O. However, in the latter, the ending to fit the assonance cannot be interpreted as a coarsening suffix /-ǫt/ (as *Esclavoz* is in the Song) nor as a participial /-yt/. The archetype should therefore probably have *T(o/u)rgin* followed by *Est(o/ u)rgion*, and so, although it has come about as a modification of *Estorgant*, another meaning intrudes: from (Old and modern Fr.) *esturgeon*[692] (ital. *storione*) 'sturgeon', that is to say the name of the huge, predatory fish.

---

692 *Esturgeon* 'sturgeon' (< Germ. s*turǐo*) appears in OF also with /g/ instead of /(d)ž/ (especially in the north) and until the 16th c. (Du Bartas) also with /ǫ~u/ instead of /y/.

This concludes the group of three. The next victim is *Justin de Valferree* O 1370. This name was discussed above because of its oriental associations in 'Oriental elements in the Marsilĭe section' (A.5.9).

Next comes *Timozel* 1382, *Timund* n (*Timodes* B, b), *Timodés* V4, *Tinodel* CV7, *Thymotel* P, *Thimodel* T, *Timordel* L, *Timot* w: The diminutive ending *-el* has been removed in n and w, in B, b and V4 it has become unrecognisable, but because it matches CV7PTL and O it belongs in the archetype.

Timozei is a hypocorism of *Timotheus* (or its vernacular pronunciation /tim-otsĭus/). In β, *-d-* instead of *-z-* has occurred; but the scribe of P recognised the name and restored it in the form *Thymot-el* (where, as so often in the Middle Ages <th> and <y> are just graecising additions for decorative purposes). The name *Timotheus* is not just from Paul's assistant in the New Testament, the addressee of the two letters *ad Timotheum*, but also from the books of Maccabees (*1 Mach* 5.6ss., *2 Mach* 8.30, 10.24) where there is a Seleucid military commander of this name who is defeated several times by Judas Maccabeus; the name could therefore just sound oriental. Biblical names are occasionally used as Saracen names in the Rol., cf. A.10.3 below on *Alphaïen* (v. [1511]=1554) and A.11.2 on *Maheu* (v. 66). However, in all three cases the poet consciously avoids using the original, sacred form of name without alterations.[693]

One of the most interesting minor characters is *Esp<er>veris, icil fut filz <Burel, / celui ocist Engelers de> Burdel* Segre 1388–1389, *Espue's* [=*Espveris*] *icil fut filz Burdel* O (−1), *Spemvalriz* K, *Espreçiaris [. . .] li filz Borés* V4, *Aprimereins [. . .] li fiz Abel* C, *as premereins [. . .] li fiz Abel* V7, *Esprevaris [. . .] li fiuls Abel* P, *Espervarins [. . .] le filz Borrel* T: The *saut du même au même* in O, from *Burel* to *Burdel* with the loss of one verse, was recognised by most editors from Gautier onwards, and corrected with the help of β, by Stengel, Jenkins, Segre, Hilka/Pfister.[694] Moreover O has overlooked the (high or low) cross-stroke in a *per-* or *prae-*

---

[693] More generally on biblical names used as Saracen names in OF epics cf. n. 395.

[694] Dufournet (1987, 96) retains *filz Burdel* and interprets this as 'son of the town of Bordeaux', *sans doute* a renegade, a slave who has gone over to Islam. In my view this a semantic fantasy, brought on by unconditional respect for O. For Dufournet would then have to accept the corollary of this, that with *filz Burdel* β was remembering the many *filz Borel* in the William epic, and then have ingeniously inserted this motif based on *filz* in a way that covers more than one verse, and in the process have revived the original *Burdel* by remembering *Engeler de Burdel(e)* at the right moment and making him defeat the *filz Borel*.

abbreviation in his source and misread the abbreviation as a single *-p-*; the missing syllable must be restored as *-per-* (suggested by e.g. Stengel, Jenkins, Segre) or as *-pre-* (suggested by e.g. Hilka/Pfister). In δ the second name is replaced by the biblical Abel as a *lectio facilior*; T once again has access outside the stemma to a tradition that is similar to O. *Esp-* is confirmed in the archetype by OV4PT, the missing *-er-* or *-re-* must be added from β, and this makes up the required syllable count; *-var-* in β competes with *-ver-* in O; the *-iz* in K might be more archaic than the other *-is* versions, and so it could belong in the archetype. According to V4T, the father's name is *Bor(r)el*.

The meaning of these two names is clear.

The small uncertainties in *Esp(er/re)v(e/a)ri(z/s)* are not important because the name in any case is interpreted as *esprev(i)er* (as it appears in v. [1492]=1535) / *espervier* 'épervier, sparrow' + *-īcius* or *-īvus*, that is to say it is an aptronym. The MLat. Name *Bur(r)ellus*, *Bor(r)rellus* (attested at least in Catalonia, France[695] and parts of Italy) is originally hypocoristic, probably from Lat. *burrus* 'fiery red' (which lives on in Galloromania, with the meaning oscillating between 'reddish, fauve' and 'blackish'), less likely from Lat. *burra* 'shorn wool, shaggy fleece, shaggy fabric', cf. the FEW s. v. *burrus* and *burra* as well as Becker (2009, 295s.).[696]

A more interesting point is the nexus *filz Borel* 'a son of Borel'; its form is remarkable because elsewhere in the Rol. only the sons of kings are given a father's name. The nexus is also interesting from a literary perspective. In the Hague Fragment, the Frankish *dux* (almost certainly Aimeri) kills *acre senium Borel patris* 'the still feisty Borel senior', then his son *Wibelinus* (later to become *enfes Guibelin*, Guibert d'Andrenas) *unum e natis Borel,* 'one of the sons of Borel', and finally *Ernaldus* (Guibert's brother Hernaut, later *de Gironde* 'from Girona') *alium fraternae stirpis*

---

[695] Once as *Borel* in the Domesday Book as well (Hildebrand 1884, 331).

[696] On the other hand, *burra* produces a homonym of the name in OF *bourel* 'collier d'une bête de trait ou de somme', also 'padding on a saddle'. Fr. *bourreau* 'executioner' does not arise until the 14th c. and is a development from *bourrer* 'to abuse', which is distantly linked with *burra*. On both of these cf. the FEW s. v. *burra*. – We should not entirely exclude the possibility that the name *Bur(r)ellus* has pre-Romance (Celtic or Iberian) origins and was only later linked through popular etymology with Lat. *burrus* (< Gk. πυρρός). The TLL s. v. *Burralus* cites just one reference for this *nomen viri barbarum* which is the inscription CIL 2.2633 of 27 A.D. from the Hispania Tarraconensis but much more common is the name *Reburrus* 'with shaggy, bristling hair', and Kajanto (1965, 236) endorses Holder's view that this comes from Celtic. However, we must reject the suggestion by Suchier (1900, 259), that the reference *usque in gurgite quem vocant borrello* (Catalonia, in 1011) comes from Old Catalonian *borrell* 'ravine' and should be linked with the name *Bor(r)el*. In the source, *borrello* must be written with a capital letter and is an ossified possessive; we can compare it with for example Bourgogne-Pe 2.215 in 1126–1135 *pratum quod Borellum vocatur* 'le Pré Borel'.

'another of the (many) brothers'. The 'sons of Borel' are a 'group of brothers', but each is killed here by a different Aimerid and they amount to quite a large part of the main story. In the later William epic, however, the whole *maisnie* of Borel, apart from a short interpolation, is mentioned in the form of flashbacks, concentrating on a sole victor, which risks breaking with the rest of the tradition. In fact, in the *Chanson de Guillaume* (v. 374ss., 643) it is stated, looking back to the past, that Vivien once *as prez de Gironde [. . .]* beheaded *les fiz Burel tuz duze* or in the presence of William on the *champ del [sic] Saraguce [. . .]* beheaded *les fiz Bereal [sic] tuz duze*. The *Prise d'Orange* (v. 601) only cursorily mentions 'Borrel and all his sons', and similarly the *Anseïs de Cartage* (v. 4771) mentions *la maisnie Borel*. In the *Aymeri de Narbonne* (v. 4571) it says, *li XII fil Borrel le desfaé* had once besieged Hernaut in Girona; a similar account is in the *Siège de Barbastre* (v. 3543). In ms. D of the *Charroi de Nîmes* (second half of the 13th c., v. 227–231) William reminds King Louis of the great battle *en prés desos Gironde*, where William killed *les fiz Borriaus tos XI* (the explanation for the number 11 is probably just the assonance ending in *-on-e*). And finally, in *Aliscans* there is an interpolation which claims that Rainouart has killed Borrel and his 14 sons. The simplest and probably most widely accepted explanation of this material is that these are vague memories of a story that was once much better known, and whose plot matches the Hague Fragment. Whether it was written in the vernacular,[697] or was the same text as the Medieval Latin epic that is reflected in the prosified Hague fragment, does not need to be resolved here. The palaeographical expertise of Charles Samaran (1932, passim) on the Hague Fragment, unlike most palaeographical dating studies, covers not only the conclusion ("around 1030"), but also the dating points and the items used for comparison. If we take account of the quasi-invariance of a single hand within a generation, then 1060–1070 would be a fairly certain *terminus ante quem*. Even without chronological considerations like these, it should be clear that the Rol. is not the source of the whole motif of Borel and his sons, but it is referring here to the William epic, and in fact to the early stage of that epic, where Borel's twelve sons were not killed by one and the same person; for this must be the case if it is now claimed that Engelier of Bordeaux killed one of them.

A.10.2 The origins of the motif of Borel and his twelve sons

It is interesting that the motif has two different connections with reality. One of these is with Catalonia: the oldest known *Bur(r)ellus* is the Carolingian Count of

---

697 As Gaston Paris (1865, 85) suggests, and e.g. Tyssens (1967, 120) agrees.

Urgell and the Cerdanya, and shortly before the year 800 he was given the task of resettling Ausona (Vic) and Cardona; a few years after that, he took part in a guerrilla raid far behind the enemy lines into the area south of the Ebro (Anonymi *Vita Hludovici* cap. 8 and 14). The name is then found in the house of the Count of Barcelona, and given to Wifred II Borell († 911), where Borell is not a patronym, but an epithet and attested from the year 908 (Sant-Cugat 1.6), and then to Borell II († 992) and Ramon Borell I († 1017).[698] None of them had been appointed by the West Frankish or French king any more, and they ruled the County of Barcelona and neighbouring counties through inheritance. They led the slow process of a *de facto* separation of Catalonia from France and in around 970 this even included a temporary rapprochement (going as far as a declaration of obedience) with the Caliphate of Córdoba,[699] although this was abruptly ended in 985 when al-Manṣūr launched a campaign against Barcelona, and in the emergency situation that this produced, there was a short and mutually inconsequential rapprochement with the newly enthroned Hugo Capet,[700] which led all the more definitely to *de facto* independence and alignment with Spain. Under Ramon Borell, gold coins (!) with Roman and Arabic (!) lettering were minted (Pérez/Arco 1956, 523s., 527), and from the first decade of the 11th c. until the time when the Almoravids attacked towards the end of the century, the Catalans were constantly intervening in the affairs of al-Andalus, often as allies of a Muslim party, in effect exploiting the political vagaries of the time. Between 1018 and 1035 Roger de Tosny and his people were the first Norman group to stay in Catalonia for any length of time, supposedly to offer assistance, but in fact embarking on various adventures. Thus, in France in the early 11th c., the name *Borel*, which in some parts of the country could already refer to an unusual (reddish to dark) complexion or hair colour was understood as

---

698 Cf. LM, art. on the individual counts and the genealogical table 'Barcelona, Grafen von' in vol. 10.

699 Pérez de Urbel/Arco y Garay (1956/1997, 482–486,526, 558 n. 70), Lévi-Provençal (1957, 383), Millàs Vallicrosa (1922, 35ss.).

700 Cf. especially Richer 4.81. The famous letter that Hugo Capet sent via Gerbert of Reims to Borell II (MGH-Ed. Weigle Nr. 112, p. 140s.) reveals Hugo's deep mistrust in phrases such as: 'if you want to keep the faith that you promised in your letters to our predecessors and to me, so that we will not be disappointed in our hope of support from you when we march towards you [. . .] if then you would rather serve me than the Ishmaelites [. . .]'. But Hugo chose to wage war in Lorraine rather than in Catalonia, and al-Manṣūr suddenly withdrew from Barcelona; thus, Borrel survived his temporary emergency, but he had learned that no help would be forthcoming from Capetian France. The objection noted by Ph.A. Becker (1896, 53), that the Counts of Barcelona were a very loyal family who could not have contributed anything to the figure of a Saracen Borel is therefore astonishingly one-sided, because it generalises the very short and atypical period around 987, immediately after al-Manṣūr's campaign.

an essentially Spanish name with ambivalent undertones; given the generally minimal knowledge people had about genuine Muslim names, this could be enough to make it serve as a Muslim name in epics.

On the other hand, however, there is an even more specific dynasty of counts with the very strange, stereotypically collective name *filii Borelli* in Abruzzo, which Ph.A. Becker (1894, 54) was the first Romanist to discuss. In the chronicle of Monte Cassino (around 1100, ed. Hoffmann p. 176, 181, 243, 310, 355, 390, 399, 416) Borellus [I] appears first, in connection with the year 1014, and then the expression *filii Borelli* appears relating to the years 1022, 1045, 1058, 1066 and 1071, where we see them noticeably "agire collettivamente" (DBI s. v. *Borrello*, two articles); additionally, relating to the year 1069 *Borellus [II] comes Borelli [I] maioris filius*. In the *Chronicon Sancti Vincentii Vulturnensis* (probably around 1120–1130) it is reported, retrospectively with reference to the time around 1045, how *iam tunc ii qui dicebantur filii quondam Borelli* attacked the monastery from the direction of the Upper Sangro Valley – and here we see once more a set phrase in the plural signifying an evil family. In the *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi* (around 1100, 2.165s.) for the year 1052/1053 William of Apulia includes among the enemies of the Normans *Burrellinā generosā propagine proles*. In Benzo of Alba (a. 1085–1086, 2.10, MGH SS. 11.616) in relation to 1061 there is mention of *filii Burelli, viri martifices ad pugnam novelli*. It is very important to note that they appear as troublemakers, and mostly enemies of the Normans: in 1038, the Norman Rainulf of Aversa and his troops made them see reason when they plundered the Sangro Valley, in 1052/1053 they fought in the Papal army against the Normans, in 1061 the Norman Richard of Capua had to confront them again, but then he was reconciled with them and was involved in a family dispute between two of the *filii Borelli* in the same decade. They were able to survive because they came to an accommodation with the Normans, being located right on the edge of the Norman sphere of influence: in 1139 they still owned land in the Sangro Valley, where King Roger II had to subdue them once again, and in 1155 and 1160 they took part in further uprisings against the Norman kings.[701] At around the same time, Idrīsī (1999, 393) calls the Upper Sangro area *džabal awlād B*rrāl* 'the mountainous land of the *filii Borelli*'. Precisely this enmity with the Normans, whose early interest in the William epic is beyond doubt, shows that the relationship between the *proles* of *filii Borelli* and the dozen hostile *filz Borel* in the epics cannot be coincidental, and since they appear in the year 1022 already as *filii* they can hardly have been on the receiving end.

---

701 Chalandon (1907, 1.86, 135, 214 n. 6, 220; 2.89, 206, 213), DBI s. v. Borrello.

Ph.A. Becker saw here only the possibility of a Borel "legend" being simply transferred from Italy to the south of France (Orange) or Spain and he made no comment on the dynamics of such a transfer. But it is difficult to resolve this without a mixing hypothesis: at an early stage (around 1040–1050?) the motif of the hostile, plural and expanding *filz Borel* arose in Norman southern Italy and travelled via inter-Norman relationships to the (northern) French-speaking area, where it encountered the same name *Borel,* which, however, had already acquired connotations such as 'Spanish' and 'ambivalent', and at the same time it encountered the early phase of an epic which was set in Spain. The motif then entered the epic tradition, where the *proles* easily developed into the figure of twelve. If this is true, then the Hague Fragment can hardly be dated before 1060.

A.10.3 The last group

Siglorel O 1390, *Sikoras* n, *Sigeloten* K, *Çenglorels* V4, *Singlorel* CV7, *Gloriel* PT, *Gocel* L, 'their [= the Muslims'] prophets' w: PT has with *-glor(i)el*, in return for suppressing the first syllable, more clearly brought out the supposed element *glori(a)* (which is then corrupted in L). V4 is perhaps influenced by OF *cengler* 'to flog'. *Sigeloten* in K contains the German acc. ending *-en*; the source had already replaced the word element *-orel* with a derogatory *-ot*. We cannot make anything of the corrupted *Sikoras* in n. OCV7 confirm that *Si(n?)glorel* is in the archetype, and OK confirm *Sig-*; ergo *Siglorel*.

Here, too, Turpin (as in the case of Corsablis and Abisme) kills not just a "normal" infidel, but one who is especially worthy of damnation, a sorcerer (v. 1390–1392):

> E l'arcevesque lor ocist Siglorel,
> L'encanteür ki ja fut en enfer:
> Par artimal l'i condoist Jupiter.

[1] Tavernier (1914–1917, 101) replaced *Siglorel* with *Siglurel* and interpreted this as an anagram of *Vergilius,* even though he recognised at the same time that Vergil was one of the Roland poet's mentors. I can only describe this as misguided ingenuity coupled with an inherent contradiction.

[2] If we remove the hypocoristic *-el,* the remaining *siglor-* can be viewed as a slight contraction of *∗sigleor*,[702] which means we have a *nomen agentis* ending in

---

702 Cf. below the analogous case of *Gaignun* (B.3.1).

-eor < -atorem. However, *sigler* 'to sail' does not fit semantically. Kahane/Kahane (1959, 221) suggested a very interesting explanation: in late antiquity *sigillum* in Apuleius, *apol*. 61, and *sigillarium* or *sigillare* in Tertullian [*de orat*. 16, G.A.B.] and Arnobius [*adv. nat*. 6.11, 6.13] all mean 'figure of an idol' [also in Prudentius *perist*. 10.233 and Lactantius *inst*. 2.4.19, cf. also Macrobius *sat*. 1.11.46]; the person who made them was called a *sigillarius* or *sigillariarius* [sic], which with a change of suffix could have become *sigillator*.[703] But even if the poet was only thinking of the meaning 'official sealer of royal charters, keeper of the seals', this would be in medieval minds the equivalent of *cancellarius*, a title that referred in Christian kingdoms to one of the most respected clerical ranks, a very close confidant of the ruler. In any case, Siglorel was a kind of anti-colleague of Turpin.

Climborins O [1485]=1528, *Klibanus* n, *Thibors* K, *Lonbonie* V4, *Cilborus* w (*Cliborinus* BMW), *Borijn* h(V); and then

Climorins Segre 627, *Climorins* O, *Klimboris* n, *Oliboris* K, *Deborì* V4, *Clibois* C, *Clebois* V7, *Kilbrwm* w (*Kliborin* A, *Cliborin* BRW, *Cliborinus* M): The *cl-* is misread: in [1485]=1528 by K as *d-* (and made Bavarian with *Th-*), in 627 by K as *ol-* and by V4 as *d-*; it is reduced to *l-* in [1485]=1528 by V4, because in the source text a capital *C* had not been filled in.[704] In [1485]=1528 n has veered off to Lat. *clibanus* 'oven', which was familiar from the Sermon on the Mount (*Mt* 6.30) in particular. The omission of the *-b-* in O 627 must, the editors agree, be a careless error because it is completely isolated. Since the nasal tilde can be interpreted as the little stroke of an *í-*, and the reverse is just as easy to do, the archetype must have had either *Climborins* or *Cliborins*.

But even if we do what the editors have done, and put *Climborins* in the text in both passages, the problem of *-mb-/-b-* returns to haunt us in the next step, when we investigate the question of the origin of the name (for which thus far no hypotheses seem to exist). For already in VLat. and OF we see a parasitic *-m-* used before intervocalic *-b-* (and also *-br-*) or *-p-*: Lat. *labrusca* > VLat. *lambrusca* > Fr. *lambruche*, Lat. *Sabis* > OF *Sambre*, Old Low Franconian *labba* (for Germ. *Lappen*) > OF *label, lambel* > modern Fr. *lambeau*, Old Low Franconian *grīpan* > OF and modern Fr. *grip(p)er, grimper*.[705] When the hypocoristic *-in* is removed, the following question arises: what could be associated with *climbor* or rather *clibor*? I can only

---

703 In the Middle Ages, *sigillator* is attested meaning 'seal maker' (cf. Forcellini and DuCange s. v.).

704 But V4 has a passably correct *Cleborin* in its v. 410, which corresponds with Stengel's extra verse 504 b.

705 We should see this tendency as an alternative to the regular (sonorization or) spirantization, that is to say an attempt to stop this happening to single words or (or to words that were

think of *Calibor*, the middle stage between the MLat. *Caliburnus* (as in Geoffrey of Monmouth) and (since Chrétien's Perceval) the normal OF *Escalibor*, which in the Perceval passage is attested as a variant at least (v. 5902 ed. Foerster or Busby) – that is to say the name of the most famous sword in the world of the Celtic saga, according to Geoffrey usually belonging to Arthur, but in Chrétien and a few others to Gauvain (cf. Flutre s. v.).[706] If this similarity is not just a coincidence, the Roland poet has given a 'heathen' minor character a name that just sounded exotic, and that he just thought of on a whim, just as he sometimes also reached for a Germanic, Welsh, Irish or biblical name,[707] – with the difference that here, he has, perhaps unknowingly, made the sword name into the name of a man. He is not even the only person to do this: in the prose *Tristan* (early 13th c.), according to Flutre, *Escalibor* was also a man's name. However, it would be risky to suggest on the basis of this possibility that the date when Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Brittaniae* was published, around 1135, could be a *terminus post quem* for the Rol.[708]

Climborins has half of the city of Saragossa as his fief. As there is no mention of the other half in the Song, we evidently should imagine that it is directly owned by Marsilĭe, because that is where his court is accommodated. This motif of partitioning only happens in Saragossa in the Song, and so it has a unique effect. It must also have appeared so to the French in reality: after the

---

adopted later) to avoid the intervocalic *-b-*, *-br-* and *-p-* which appeared strange in this phoneme combination.

706 Wace's *Brut* and the Didot *Perceval* have *Calibo(u)rne*, which is closer to Geoffrey; the *Harley Brut* has (according to Flutre, Addenda) *Caliborne* twice, and *Caliborc* once, which perhaps even reflects Welsh *Caledfwlch*. – On the parasitic *Es-* cf. René Louis (1952, 69s., 74s.).

707 Among the 'heathen' names in the Song we find Germanic eg. *Turgis* (A.9.7, < *Thor-gis*), Welsh *Maëlgut* (C.4.3.2, < *Maelgwn*), Irish perhaps *Torleu* (3.2.4.1, < *Turlough*), from antiquity *Justin* (A.5.9), biblical *Timozel* (A.10.1, < *Timotheus*). Celtic names are famously numerous in the courtly romance genre, but in later epics they are quite often used as Saracen names as well. These definitely include (cf. in each case Moisan s. v.): *Cadel* (< *Catellus / Catel / Cadell* Nennius, Geoffrey, the *Mabinogion*), *Cadoer / Cador / Cadot / Cadroer* (< *Cador / Cadwr / Kadwr* Nennius, Geoffrey, *Mabinogion*, Triads), *Cardos* (< *Karadocus / Caradoc / Cara(i)dawc* Geoffrey, *Mabinogion*, Triads), *Gorhan(t)* (< *Gurguint / Gorchan / Gurgant* Geoffrey, *Mabinogion*), *Mabon* (as in *Mabinogion*, Triads), *Morgant / Morhant* (as a man's name; < *Morcant / Morgan(t) / Morgen / Morhen / Marganus* Nennius, Geoffrey, *Mabinogion*, Triads). Cf. on the *Mabinogion* the index of the edition by J. Loth, on the Triads the indez of the edition by R. Bromwich.

708 Geoffrey is evidently borrowing from Gk-Lat. *chalybs* (in the Middle Ages often *calibs*) 'steel, sword'. But the prevailing view in Celtic Studies these days (cf. z. B. Koch 2006 s. v. *Caladbolg*) is that he Latinised the pre-existing Welsh sword name *Caledfwlch* (/kalédvulx/, < *caled* 'hard' + *bwlch* 'chink, gap', with the lenition that is to be expected in this compound /b/ > /v/) ~ Ir. *Calad-bolg* (as for example we find in the Ir. *Táin Bó* Cuailnge), and he did it such a way that the name would impress his readers, who had been educated in Latin. I am grateful to Bernhard Maier for his prompt and highly competent assistance with this question.

conquest of Saragossa in 1118, Rotrou du Perche, the most deserving Norman supporter of King Alfonso el Batallador, was given a considerable portion of the city as it was then, namely the area between the cathedral and San Nicolás, as a fiefdom, which he kept for over twenty years, and which still in the 17th c. was called *Alperche* (< *al Perche* '[belonging to] the Perche'); another part of almost equal size and the title 'Lord in Saragossa' was given to Gaston of Béarn. Boissonade has already correctly drawn parallels here between the song and historical reality,[709] and unlike the *Cliborin/Caliburnus* problem, this evidence can be accepted as confirmation of a *terminus post quem* of 1118, in this case even for an isolated motif in the Marsiľe section.

Some distance from these others, and only in retrospect, another man appears: *Grossaille* O [1649]= 1488, *Prosaie* (misunderstood as a place) V4, *Cesaire* CV7, *Blasaire* T, a king whom Turpin killed previously in Denmark, and whose horse he is now riding.[710] V4 shows the development already attested in Old North Ital. /λ/ > /ĭ/.[711] OV4 therefore confirm *-ros(s)aille*, and because *gros(s)-* makes sense while *pros-* does not, *Grossaille* belongs in the archetype. The primary meaning of *Gros* is 'massive, fat'. The suffix *-aille* (< Lat. *-alia*) could also appear in OF at the end of adjectives, e.g. *menuaille* 'trivial matters; plebs', *povraille* 'the poor people'; it had then, as it does today, a derogatory and at the same time collective meaning, suggesting that the individual items are completely lost in the idea of a 'heap' or a 'mass'.[712] The poet makes good use of this: the king is, quite frankly 'an amorphous heap of pieces of lard', corpulent and shapeless.[713]

The next victim is *le duc Alphaïen* O [1511]=1554, Duke *Alfien* n, *Alfabinem* (Latinising acc.) K, *Alfaniel* V4, *Alfacet* w: there is a change of suffix in V4 and w. If we ignore for the time being the question of spelling with *-ph-* or *-f-*, the archetype has

---

709 Boissonnade (1923, 62s., with evidence; cf. also 90); Defourneaux (1949, 158 and 217).

710 The Norse translator-editor n suppresses any mention of the king and writes instead that the horse had been sent over to Turpin from Denmark. He obviously did not like the idea that Charlemagne might have waged successful wars in Denmark – and historically speaking, his misgivings are correct.

711 The fact that V4 has changed the name into a place name, as the context shows, is not important for its phonology.

712 From the 17th c. onwards, the south-western *gro(u)ssaille* – which has no direct connection to the name, but still has the same form, is interesting – it means 'coarse grain, not wheat, gross foodstuffs including beans, potatoes, etc.' (FEW s. v. *grossus* 2a).

713 It is ridiculous to explain a name as transparent as this one, as von Richthofen does (1954, 203), by referring back to "*Groa(s)* (nombre propio noruego frecuente a partir del siglo XI)". Moreover, the only attested form is *Gróa*, which is feminine!

Alfa- from OKV4w, *Alf[.?]ien* from On, and therefore *Alfaïen* (with four syllables according to the metre).

As the *-ph-* shows, O associates the name either with the name of the letter alpha, which every scribe would have known from the *alpha et omega* (*Apoc* 1.8) or – more probably – from the New Testament name *Alphaeus*, which occurs in the Vulgate only in the gen. *Alphaei* (*Mt* 10.3, *Mc* 2.14, 3.18, *Lc* 6.15, *Act Ap* 1.13). As many oriental terms and names reached the west via the Greek-speaking parts of the world, they often came with Greek spellings, like *Pharao*, *Philister*, *Pharisees* or indeed *Alphaeus*, and as people in the west generally did not know Gk., or any other oriental language, the two categories were quite easily confused;[714] this is why the poet can take the New Testament names *Timozel* and *Maheu,* alter them slightly, and use them as Saracen names. Something similar seems to be happening here; the strange syllabic *-i-* could be an echo of the Lat. gen.: *Alpha(e)-ī + -anus.*[715]

Escababi (obl.-dat.) O [1512]=1555, *a Chabuel* V4, *c'est Rapadans* C, *c'est Rampadins* V7, *c'est Apadains* P, *c'est Capadoce* L, *Escaladis* T, *Balacawnt* w (*Blaccand* BW, *Blacand* M), *Eschabrise* h(V): w did not know what to do with his source and so he just inserted his form of the name *Blancandrin* – not a bad idea, because this gives Blancandrin an exit from the story. T (15th c.) is late enough to be affected by *escalade*. CV7PL (and therefore δ) are all based on *c'est Capadins*. In CV7 a small letter *c-* has been misread as *r-*; in the source of P, on the other hand, a decorative capital *C* had not been filled in; finally, L rationalised *Capadins* to

---

714 We might add the fact noted by Heim (1984, 17 with n. 67) that in several epics it is assumed that the Muslims understand Gk., and sometimes even that they speak Gk. among themselves.

715 There is another possible explanation that I would not like to exclude entirely, because this is a Muslim person, and *Al-* suggests the Arabic article. According to the Quran (surah 3, v. 97) every Muslim who has sufficient financial means should make the *ḥăddž*, the pilgrimage to Mecca; once he has completed this, he is a *ḥăddž*. (A form derived from this, *ḥaddžı*, has become popular, especially in Turk. as *hacı*, pronounced /hadžı/, which turned into Ger. *Hadschi*.) As the pilgrimage was much more difficult in the Middle Ages than it is today, the number of pilgrims was smaller, which meant that *ḥăddž* to some extent became an honorific title. The word was taken into Old Span. as *alfage*, *alfaje* (with the substitution /ḥ/ > /f~h/ that is customary in that language) and from there it went into OF, where however *aufage* underwent a dilution of meaning to just 'Sarazen (adj.) + strong/powerful', so that it referred on the one hand to the title of a Saracen ruler, and on the other hand to horses as 'noble Arabians' (FEW, vol. 19, s. v. *ḥăǧǧ*, Kunitzsch 1988, 262). As in the Middle Ages <j> and were just graphical variants and as in OF was often written instead of <ii> (as in *paien* instead of *paiien*), the word *Alphaiien* (meant as *Alfajien < alfage* + Lat. *-anus*) could have been incorrectly simplified by an early scribe.

Capadoce (~ Lat. *Cappadocem* 'the Cappadocian'), which about 60 verses later in this text is the name of the King of Cappadocia (corresponding with *Capuël, le rei de Capadoce* O [1571]=1614). But from the *c'est Capadins* of CV7PL (~δ) we can only accept the -*adin,* not the *c'est* (< *est* < *es*-) nor the *Cap*- via δ, because the *Esc(h)ab-Oh(V)*, is also the basis for *a Chab*- in V4. The latter has simply replaced the obl.-dat. with the prep. dat.

So, the archetype probably had **Escabadi(n),* perhaps an ad-hoc formation of *ex* + (*caput* >) *cab*- (cf. Old Occ. *escabessar* 'to decapitate') + -*atus* + -*inus* and this would make it into a prophetic name that is about to be fulfilled: *Escababi i od le chef trenchét.*

Valdabrun O [1519]=1562 and *Grandonǐes*, *filz Capuël, le rei de Capadoce*, O [1570s.]=1613s. have already been examined above in the section on 'Oriental elements in the Marsilǐe section' (A.5.6, A.5.11), the *Affrican Malquiant, le filz al rei Malcud*, O [1550s.]=1593s. and *Abisme* O [1631]=1470 in the paragraph on 'Other Africans in the Marsilǐe section' (A.7.1, A.7.4).

Faldrun de Pui O 1871, *Fabrin* n, *Falbinen* (with Ger. acc.-en) K, *Falsiron* V4, *Fabrin d'Espagne* CV7, *Maubruns dou Pui* P, *Albron des Puiz* T, *Maubin dou Pui* L, *Francheroene* h(V): In β there are fluctuations between augmentative -*on/-un* (which agrees with O) and hypocoristic -*in*, but they are irrelevant as far as the stemma is concerned. The sub-archetype of PTL replaced *Fal*- with *Mal*- (and in the source of T someone forgot to complete a decorative *M*). *Falsiron* in V4 is based on an incorrect recollection of the Falsaron who has already been killed, and whom V4 in v. 879 and 1213 had also named *Falsiron*. n and independently CV7 have interpreted *fabr*- 'smith' into *falbr-,* which had made no sense to them. OKV4 (PTL) guarantee that *Fal*- is in the archetype; O with -*d*- and β with -*b*- differ from each other through a misreading, therefore Francien *Fal(d/b)ron*. The vague *de(l) Pui* is in T replaced by an equally vague *des Puiz*, in CV7 by an even more facile *d'Espagne.*

In any case it is an aptronym. *Faldron* consists of a verb stem *fa(i)l*- (from *faillir*) + glide -*d*-, as in the future *faudrai* and in OF also in the occasional infinitive form *faudre*, where in the name the -*r*- can be pulled into the suffix as in *bûcheron*, *forgeron*, *vigneron*; and so it means something like 'failure'. The alternative *Falbron* can be associated with *falve* 'qui tire sur le roux', even if (according to FEW s. v. **falwa-)* the stop in this adj. is only found on the one hand in Wall. *faubite*, *fâbète*, and on the other hand in Occ. *falp*, *falbel.* Whether through the popular prejudice against people with red hair, or through the phonological similarity with *fals* 'false', the meaning was 'false, duplicitous' from a very early period,

as for example in the *Roman de Renart* in the expression *fauve anesse* 'hypocrisy'. The ending *-ron* can be explained as above in the case of *Faldron*.

Lat. *podium* is toponymically productive not only in the south of France (from about the lower Loire southwards, Le Puy-Notre-Dame, Le Puy, Puy-de-Dôme etc.), but also in Aragón (three Pueyos are listed by Boissonnade 1923, 88; there is also, e.g., Poyo del Cid in southern Aragón, *Cantar de Mio Cid* v. 902) and especially in Catalonia, from Puigcerdà on the border with France to El Puig near Valencia. A *Pui* is also mentioned in the *Mainet* (1.87), on the road that the exiles travel from France to Toledo; for Gaston Paris (1875, 317) it was *sans doute* Puigcerdà. But for the Chanson de Roland a precise geographical location is not necessary.

A.11 Spanish non-combatants

A.11.1 *Malduit*, Marsilĭe's treasurer

In a recent article about *Malduit le tresorer*, the treasurer at Marsilĭe's court (Beckmann 2012, passim) I have in particular examined the hitherto undiscovered and insidious double meaning that is to be found in O: an apparently simple, humorous name, like others used for 'heathen' minor characters, turns out to be, for people who know the Anglo-Norman court, the name of the real, historical *tresorer* family by the name of Mauduit, which from 1085 at the latest and throughout the whole of the 12th c. was responsible for the transportation of money to and from England and Normandy.

A.11.2 Marsilĭe's messengers

Marsilĭe has finished his council and now sends messengers to Charlemagne (v. 63–68):

> Si·n apelat Clarin de Balaguét,
> Est<r>amarin e Eudropin,[716] sun per,
> E Priamun e Guarlan le barbét
> E Machiner e sun uncle Maheu
> E Joüner e Malbrun d'ultre mer
> E Blancandrins por la raisun cunter.

---

[716] With no explanation the Hilka/Rohlfs edn. has *Eudtropin*, and the Hilka/Pfister edn. has *Eutropin*, both of which clearly contradict the ms.

The message that Marsilĭe sends to Charlemagne is a lie; precisely because of this, he has to wrap it up as impressively as he can.

This applies even to the accessories. The messengers will carry olive branches in their hands because *ço senefiet pais e humilitét* (v. 72s., 80) – this idea was familiar from antiquity and was carried forward into Christendom.[717] They will ride on mules; because anyone who rides on a mule or a donkey is showing that he is not coming to fight, and he will look like the epitome of peace – just like the Prince of Peace on the donkey or ass in the Old and then the New Testament (*Zach* 9.9; *Mt* 21.2ss. par.). The colour of innocence is white; this is why Marsilĭe is willing to send the white mules that he had previously received as an expensive gift from an oriental breeder.[718]

The messengers themselves also have to make a good impression. Charlemagne requires one messenger to carry his official message. Marsilĭe requires ten. When the poet is writing about the anti-peers, he cannot avoid the very positive number twelve, because they have to appear in single combat with the twelve peers, and this number is modelled on the 12 disciples of Christ, among other things. In the present instance, however, he is not constrained by structural necessity and so he chooses the more neutral and self-contained number ten.[719]

If the messengers were left with no names, this figure of ten would make little impression on the audience. This explains why they are given names, but – like a frame around the list – only the first and last have a fiefdom: the first messenger's fiefdom is now named, Balaguer,[720] and that of the last is known to us already, Valfunde (v. 23). The others, unlike the majority of the anti-peers, do not have a fiefdom. The anti-pairs in their twelve single combats have to fight in the first part of Marsilĭe's battle, when the contest is still "fair"; if monotony is to be avoided, some individuality is needed, and one of the easiest ways for the medieval poet to suggest this is to mention their fiefdoms, especially as the fiefs of the anti-peers as a whole are supposed to evoke 'the whole of Spain' which is the area Marsilĭe controls. The opposite is true when it comes to the messengers: with the exception of the spokesperson Blancandrin, who

---

717 More detail on this in the section about *Olivier* (C.14.4).

718 Cf. above s. v. *Suatilie* (A.5.3).

719 It is interesting to see how often the numbers 10, 15 and 20 appear on the 'heathen' side: Marsilĭe does not just send 10 messengers on 10 white mules, who are then looked after by 12 (!) of Charlemagne's servants (v. 160s.), but he has previously sent 15 messengers (v. 202), and is also prepared to use *u dis u vint* or *u dis u quinze u vint* or finally *vint ostages* (v. 41, 148, 572, 679). Ten idolatrous priests also process in front of Baligant (v. 3269).

720 On the form of this name Balaguét cf. above the section entitled 'The *amurafle* of Balaguer' (A.9.5).

has already revealed a great deal about his character through the depravity of his suggestion, it would be undesirable to give them too much individuality. Their role is to form an impressive block that channels the words of Blancandrin, and in their silent unanimity they serve as a guarantee that Blancandrin really does bear the message of his lord, thereby adding weight to his message. This is why they have only a bare name along with here and there a tiny detail about their characteristics: *le barbét*, an uncle-nephew relationship, a vague *d'ultre mer*.

In just one case, that of Clarin de Balaguét, we cannot rule out the possibility that he is the same person as one of the anti-peers, the nameless *amurafle de Balaguez* (v. 894); the fact that Est<r>amarin is probably not the same person as the anti-peer Estramariz (v. 941, 1304) is discussed at length above under the section on the latter. All of the others appear only here; none of them, not even Blancandrin, will appear as warriors later.[721] A young firebrand who is keen to achieve fame in battle would never be selected to take a message to the enemy, because his sense of honour could potentially endanger the mission at any moment; this is pointed out e.g. by Olivier, even with reference to his friend Roland (v. 255–257). The requirement was for men who were sober and past the age of physical combat, men who had learned from many years of chequered experience to hide their own thoughts for the sake of the state's objectives, and who would instead try to find out as much as possible about the enemy; even Turpin is not above taking on this spying role, when he offers himself as a messenger (v. 270): *Si·n vois vedeir alques de sun semblant*. The messengers in this case must not lose face even when they are engaged in a huge betrayal; Marsilĭe therefore selects *des plus feluns dis* (v. 69). And furthermore: even if they do not all have to be old men – Maheu has his nephew Machiner standing beside him – older messengers give the impression that they are peaceful, especially their leader, the white-haired Blancandrin with his beard reaching down to his chest (v. 48, 503).[722]

---

[721] Blancandrin's disappearance from the story was so striking, however, that four mss. independently of each other create an exit for him: C (following O 1764), P (following O 1462) and T (following O 3421) mention him again in extra passages added to the text, w replaces Escababi (v. [1512]=1555) with Blancandrin.

[722] Jules Horrent (1951a, 239) comes closest to this simple explanation when he asks "Voit-on Talleyrand à Austerlitz, a Wagram ou à Bailén?". Dufournet (1986, especially 184 and 186s.) argues very unconvincingly that the poet harbours a contradictory sympathy for the chevalier-diplomat Blancandrin, and therefore through *sobriété* and *goût de l'ellipse* spares him a demeanour that leads to an ignominious end. Even Gentil's (1955, 95) suggestion that this is down to the creative freedom of the poet is arbitrary and facile.

Linguistic analysis of the individual names reveals another interesting aspect. Let us examine the ten names one by one!

Clarin de Balaguét O 63, *Klargis* n, *Clargis* K, *Clarçis* V4, *Clarin* CV7: Like Baligant's messengers *Clar-ïen* and *Clar-ifan* (cf. section A.3.2.6 above on 'Baligant's messengers') this one also has a name consisting of *Clar-*+X. In V4 this is once again Venet. /(d)z/ ~ OF and Standard Ital. /dž/. *Clargis* appears as a Saracen name in several epics from the early 13th c.; after that it does not appear until the 17th century in England, where it is a family name,[723] and has been occasionally used to this day as a first name, and there are claims that it has been used (according to internet sources) as a family name in France since the 16th century. It must simply be a hybrid name from Lat. *Clar-* (as in *Clar-boldus*, *-em-baldus*, *-em-bodus*, *-erius*, *-munt*, *-uinus*, cf. Förstemann and Morlet s. v. *Clar-*) and Germ. *-gis* (as in e.g. *Tur-gis*, which in the Song is another Saracen name). Since *Clarin* can be understood as a simple diminutive of *Clargis*, O and CV7 could have formed it from *Clargis* independently of one another (perhaps with a sideways glance at the two other messengers).

On *Est<r>amarin* cf. the section above on the anti-peer Estramariz (A.9.10).

Eudropin O 64, *Eudropiz* n, *Estropiz* K, *Ynstropiz* V4, *Orebe* CV7: *Eudrop-* is confirmed in the archetype by On, whereas the ending *-in* in O competes with the *-iz* in β; the etymology helps us to decide in favour of O and thus *Eudropin*: for despite the *-d-* this name cannot be anything other than that of the late Lat. *Eutropius*, the author of a brief history of Rome (middle of the 4th c. A.D.) who was thought to be a Christian in the Middle Ages, and whose work was widely read. The poet has made the hypocoristic *Eutropin* out of it (just as he slightly modified the early Christian names *Timotheus*, *Alphaeus* and *Matthaeus* to make them into the Saracen names *Timozel*, *Alphaïen* and *Maheu*) and the scribe of the archetype accidentally wrote *Eudropin*. Later, thanks to the benefits of schooling in Latin, the form *Eutropin* was reinstated; but this realisation was almost immediately overtaken by a misreading of the unusual nexus *Eutr-* as the common one *Estr-* (in V4 then with Italianisation of the pretonic *estr-* > *istr-*

---

[723] For example, an aristocratic Sir Thomas Clargis/Clarges was active in the middle of the 17th c. under Charles II – The claim circulating on the internet that *Clargis* is a metronymic for *Claricia* (the name, for example, of a daughter of King David I of Scotland born between 1113 and 1131, a hypocoristic form of the saint's name *Clara*) is not proven and unlikely in terms of the meaning.

and a parasitic -*n*-). The Italian editor of CV7 replaced the name with *Oreb*, the name of one of the Midianite princes killed by Gideon *(Iud* 7.25), with a paragogic -*e.*

Priamun O 65, *Priamus* nCV7, *Priamur* K: In K the final -ſ is misread as -*r. Priamus* in β competes with *Priamun* in O, rectus and obliquus of the name *Priamus,* which was known in the Middle Ages mainly through the *Ilias Latina, Dares* and *Dictys*; the obliquus, and therefore O is preferable here, because it is in a series of other obliquus forms.

Guarlan O 65, *Greland* n, *Gerglant* K (but *Gralant* Stricker), *Çiraldo* V4, *Gualane* (before *et*) C, *Gualan* V7: *Gua*- is confirmed in the archetype by OCV7, -*r*- by O(n) K(V4), -*lan* by OnKCV7 – altogether therefore *Guarlan* as in O. Some influence from *Graelant*, the name of, among others,[724] the eponymous figure in a lai (late 12th c.) appears to be behind n or his Anglo-Norman source, and later Stricker. K has a dittographic -*g*-. V4 replaces the name with the Italian form of the mainly Fr. *Geraut/Giraut* (< Germ. *Ger(w)ald*). CV7 have overlooked an *r*- abbreviation and veered off with a variant of OF and Old Occ. *G(u)alan(t)* 'Wieland'.[725] This is based on either Germ. *War(i)land*, the name, e.g. of one of Charlemagne's counts (MGH DD. Kar. 1, no. 148 a. 782/783), in Galloromania thus far only *Warlannus* (Autun a. 865, Morlet s. v.). Alternatively, since the phoneme boundary between /ã/ and /ẽ/ is porous in the Rol., it could be from the name *Werlenc*: in around 1055 William the Conqueror confiscated the lands of Count William *Werlenc/Warlenc* of Mortain (Douglas 1995, 35, 145); this could be compared with the use of the Norman names *Grandonĭe, Malduit* and *Turgis* as well as the late Old English name Aëlroth (see above) for Saracens.[726]

Machiner O 66, *Batiel* n (but *Batuel* b), *Baiziel* K, *Baçiel* V4, *Babuer* CV7: β read *Batiel*, a slightly incorrect form of the Old Testament name *Bat(h)uel*, the father of Rebecca and Laban. In the Old Norse ms. tradition, b has corrected the name to match the Bible. K and V4 have read the prevocalic -*ti*- in a typical late Latin or medieval fashion as /tsĭ/. *Machiner* in O is Lat. *machinarius* 'schemer'. *Batuel* fits in semantic terms with the New Testament name *Ma(t)heu(s)* which comes next, while *Machiner* fits phonologically. As there is no obvious reason why someone should change *Machiner* into *Batiel,* and a very good reason (following

---

724 Cf. Flutre s. v. *Graelent, Grahelen, Grailenc* and *Grel(l)ain.*

725 Cf. Beckmann (2004a, 9s., 13–17).

726 The etymology from Goth. *Gairila* suggested by the Gothic fanatic Broëns (1965–1966), 67 is also incorrect; the initial sound does not fit.

the example of many other pairs in the Song) for introducing the alliteration in *Ma-chiner* ~ *Ma-heu*, I suspect *Batiel* is the original form.

Maheu O 66, *Mattheu* n, *Matheus* K, *Mathé* V4: *Mahieu*, also *Mahiu* < Lat. *Mat(t) haeus*, is the colloquial and phonologically regular development while *Mathieu* is a semi-erudite development. On the former, cf. Moisan s. v., Flutre s. v. (over 10 references) and especially Nelis (1938 passim, over 25 references up to the early 15th c. and additional allusions);[727] also, the form has been preserved in the place name Villiers-le-Mahieu (45 km west of Paris) and in the common family name *Mahieu*. One of the reasons why *Mathieu* persisted – characteristically in the age of Oresme and Bersuire – is probably the fact that whenever there was a reading from Latin gospels in the Mass, people would hear it being introduced as the *Evangelium secundum (sanctum) Matthaeum*. Stengel puts the *Matheu* from β in the text – though this is certainly not correct. For first of all, corrections generally go in the direction from and not to the colloquial form (which would make a secondary *Maheu* surprising); secondly, the poet, if he wants to use a New Testament name as a Saracen name will surely not pick the sacred form of the name, but rather a slightly altered form, as he did with the other Saracen names that he took from the New Testament such as *Alphaïen* and *Timozel* (cf. above on both of these).

Joüner O 67, *Joel* n, *Iomel* K, *Ençimel* V4, *Loenel* C, *Loenes* V7: The hypocoristic -*el* in β goes back to its sub-archetype. All of the scribes have difficulty with *Joun-*, probably because they would have expected *Jeun-* for 'to fast': n read *Jouuel* and "corrected" it to the biblical form *Joel*; K overlooked one stroke; V4 (with North Ital. ~ /(d)z/ for OF and Standard Ital. /dž/) ignored the -*o*-, read -*un*- as -*im*- and incorporated the *e* 'and' (+ a supposed nasal tilde) in front of it; one of the earlier stages of CV7 appears to have associated its *Ioenel* with *joene*, a variant way of writing *jeune* 'young', the next stage misread the capital *I* as a small *l*. Therefore, *Joün-er* in O, competes with *Joün-el* in β. Since OF *jeün* is also used as an adj. (< *ieiunus*), *Joün-el* is a correct formation. The form to be preferred, however, is *Joüner* < *ieiunarius* ~ 'endurance faster, fasting face'.[728]

---

[727] Two of these are interesting in literary and historical terms: Mahieu le Vilain, who translated Aristotle's *Meteorologica* from Latin into French in the second half of the 13th c., and Mahi(e)u le Poirier, who wrote a *Court d'Amours* at the beginning of the 14th c.

[728] Here too, the Gothic fanatic Broëns (1965–66, 67) has a view: *Joïmer* (a made-up, biased form!) goes back to West Goth. *Godimir*. Broëns ignores the fact that /go/ is never palatalised!

Malbien d'ultremer O 67 was discussed above in 'Oriental elements in the Marsi-
lĭe section' (A.5.2) because of the origins of this name. And finally, the only sig-
nificant heavyweight among them:

Blancandrins O 68. Between v. 23 and v. 506 he is mentioned by name sixteen
times. However, there is only minimal variation in the individual texts apart from
the Welsh ones, and so we can consider all of the instances together: *Blancandrin*
(occasionally *Blanchandrin*) O, *Blankandin* n,[729] *Blanscandiz* K, *Blançardin* (occa-
sionally *Blancardin*) V4, *Blanzardin* CV7, *Blacawnt* / *Balcawnt* / *Blaccand* / *Bla-
cand* w. There is also a single *Blanchandin* P and T in a later passage. In all of
these cases *blanc* means 'white', obviously not 'innocent', but 'pretending to be
innocent, hypocritical' or, in the words of Bancourt (1982a, 47) "l'homme aux
'blanches' paroles".[730] This basic notion of 'white' (and the hypocoristic *-in*) is
retained in all texts except w.[731]

We turn now to the middle part of the name, and the competition between
-andr-, *-and-* and *-ard-*. The *-andr-* here is clearly the Gk. word stem ('man'),
which could be extracted from the well-known name *Alexand(e)r(–)*, OF *Alix-
andre* (as we can see, if we compare it with e.g. the saint's name *Alexi(o)s*),
and in Vergilian or Ovidian names such as *Ev-ander*, *Le-ander*. But *-andr-* is
only found in O and does not even appear in n, K or w, all of which also rely
on Anglo-Norman foundations.[732]

Judging by these texts, the normal form in Anglo-Norman was *-and-*, which
means that O must have expanded this to *-andr-*. The continental French form

---

729 The *Blankandrin* in Moisan vol. 2 s. v. *Blancandin 1* is incorrect.

730 Cf. on this Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *blanc*, section on 'smooth, lying'. In most varieties of
Fr., /k/ > /tš/ (> North Ital. /ts/~ /s/) is to be expected before *-a-*, and indeed traces of this can
be found in O 311 and in KV4CV7.

731 Grégoire (1942–1943, 542) thought that he could see in the name *Blancandrin* a connec-
tion with the name of the Muslim King of Toledo, then of Valencia, Yaḥyā al-Qādir (1075–1085
or 1090, stress on -ā-; whom Grégoire calls "Ben Yahya al-Kadir", "Ben al-Kadir"), and in *Val-
funde* a connection with Valencia, but this is so improbable, that it is not even worth refuting,
especially since Gregoire himself inserted the incorrect *Ben*. Just as unlikely is Tavernier's "dis-
covery" (1910, 75, and 1914–1917, 101 n. 4), that *Blancandrin* is *blanc* + an anagram of the
name of the (white-haired) *Drances* from the Aeneid (which would not fit in terms of meaning
either, because although Drances is not a very sympathetic character, he is – especially when
acting as a messenger – an ally of the Trojans and not a liar).

732 According to Langlois and (with fewer details) also Moisan, there is a single *Blanchandrin*
(as well as two instances of *Blanchandin*) in the continental *Aye d'Avignon*. But the apparently
reliable edition by Borg which is cited by Moisan has *Blanchandin* in all three places. The fact
that the character is a courtier, not in Marsilĭe's court, but in that of his son Marcil is irrelevant
for our purposes.

is -and- in P and T; further evidence in favour of -and- includes *Blanc(h)andin* in *Aye d'Avignon*, *Tristan de Nanteuil* and *Galïen* as well as the fem. derived from it, *Blanchandine* in *Mainet*, *Enfances Vivien*, *Guibert d'Andrenas*, *Siège de Barbastre* and again *Tristan de Nanteuil*.[733]

Finally, the element -ard- has been extracted from Germanic names ending -*hard*, but in OF and Old Ital. it is a simple, often slightly derogatory formation, and so in the case of our name, probably the one that is most likely in terms of the semantics. The surviving ms. evidence shows that it only occurs in the three texts that are influenced by Italian, V4CV7; in Italy, this name type also survives in: *Blanzardino* in the *Fatti di Spagna*, *Biancardino* in the *Spagna in rima* and later *Blanzardino* in Ariosto 14.14.6. But as V4 is the oldest of the texts that are free from Anglo-Norman influence, and as such represents β, and because it has more weight than PT when it is combined with CV7, this type may well have reached back to France, and it could be just as early there as -and-. Both Rajna (1889, 11 n. 2) and Stengel (1890, 73) even think that the -ard- form is the "originaria", the most established of the three. While OF appellative vocabulary included neither **blanchandre* nor **blanchant*, the word *blanc(h)art* did exist: it meant 'white (horse)' and was used as a horse's name (sometimes *Blanc(h)ardin*, Moisan and Flutre s. v.), and from about 1070 it was also common as a personal name (as an epithet, but also as a main name). There are references from Holland to France and Sicily in Förstemann s. v. *blank*, Morlet (1971 s. v.), Rajna (1889, 11 with n. 2) and Caracausi (1993 s. v. *Biancardi*), several early ones in the *Domesday Book* (Hildebrand 1884, 331); I noted about 15 more from before 1150 when I was researching the cartulary literature.[734]

---

733 Also *Blanc(h)andin*, *Blanc(h)andine* (and only these) in a few romances (cf. Flutre s. v.).
734 An extreme traditionalist could discern much more from this name. Consider this scenario: "Charlemagne and his court are in enemy lands which through good fortune they have managed to conquer. Then suddenly, a high-ranking Muslim arrives on horseback straight from Saragossa and offers nothing less than the city's surrender! The audience is electrified – unfortunately, because this offer is going to bring great harm to the Franks". Is this Blancandrin at the start of the Rol.? Yes, but long before him also Ibn al-Arabi in the year 777 in Paderborn (Royal Annals, *Mettenses priores*, Regino for the year 777). The two scenes are strikingly similar, not only visually, but also in terms of their function: they introduce Charlemagne's Spanish drama – first in in the historical record, and then in the Song. And since in reality it turned out that when he was outside Saragossa, Ibn al-Arabi was no longer the lord of the city, the epic could have demoted him to the position of a mere messenger, who was telling lies. But what about the name? Foreign words with four or more syllables tended to undergo contraction (*amīr al-Mu'minīn > miramolin*, *ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān > 1) Der(r)amé*, 2) *Braiman(t)* etc., cf. above s. v. *Bramimunde*, A.8.4.1). Initial vowels are most at risk in this process (as in all three examples); in the case of *Ibn* (the unstressed variant of Arab. *bin < Sem. bin*) there is also the fact that the vowel (originally an epenthetic vowel) was especially unstable, so that the

As leader of the mission and above all as the one who suggested it, Blancandrin deserves to have his fiefdom mentioned before the scene begins: he is *de[l] castel de Valfunde* O 23, *Valsundi* n, *Fundeualle* K, *Valperdue* V7, '(from the) Low Valley' w. It was important to provide realistic-sounding place names for Baligant's peoples, just as it was for the anti-peers and the movements of the Frankish army; the reason for this was to give some idea of the vastness of the 'non-Christian world', or 'Spain'. In this case, however, it does not matter where Blancandrin's fiefdom is located. Thus, the poet can choose a name that is probably fictional,[735] and for that very reason it could be a symbolic one. Thus, *-funde* could represent an abbreviated form of *profunde* (cf. Span. *hondo*, Arag. *fondo*, Port. *fundo*) or a Latin genitive *fundi* (this is how the name might have been understood in the previous versions of n, before *-f-* in that text was misread as *-f-*), and it would be associated, as Noyer-Weidner suggests, with the depth and darkness of the Valley of Hell. The other manuscripts also suggest that this is how it should be understood: K swaps the two elements around, and so both have been consciously noted, V7

---

contemporary Frankish sources fluctuate between *Ibinalarabi* (Royal Annals), *Ibimlarbi* (*Laurissenses minores*), *Ebilarbius* (*Petaviani*), and *Abinlarbi* (*Laureshamenses*). There is an especially interesting form *Ibinalardi* (*Mettenses priores*, ed. by von Simson, for the year 777) with dissimilation of the second *-b-* > *-d-* from the first *-b-*. The resulting *$B(ę)nalardí$ may well have undergone a metathesis to *$Blanardi$, which then brings the word into possible attraction from the adj. *blanc*, inflected as *blan-s*, and the suffixes *-ard-* and *-in* which are very common in names; ergo: *Blanc-ard-in*. There could have been versions of the Roncevaux material with and without the introductory Blancandrin scene. And the poet of the Song as we know it could have incorporated this scene into a version that had not had it before. On Ibn al-Arabi's two sons, cf. n. 431 above! – I leave Ibn al-Arabi without diacritic marks. The only ms. (14th/15th c.) of the only Arabic work that has the epithet, that is to say, of *Akhbār madžmūʿa* (a collection of works that reports on events up to the year 961, and which according to some researchers was not fully completed until the 12th or 13th c., but which most scholars agree contains information that was first written down less than a hundred years after the events in question, James 2012, 3–42) consistently has *al-Aʿrābī* 'the Bedouin' (cf. ed. Lafuente y Alcántara 1867, 112s., trad. Jones 2012, 106–108, 190, Menéndez Pidal 1960, 519s.); but the contemporary western forms cited above are the only ones of interest in our context, and they all clearly point to *al-ʿArabī* 'the Arabian', even if this form of the name should indicate a secondary meaning. (According to Ibn al-Athīr, the man was a Calbit, which means he belonged to a tribe of Southern Arabian, i.e. Yemenite origins, which converted to Islam very early.)

735 There are several small locations called Valhondo in Spain, and there is even one – to mention just one place that fits especially well in terms of geography and phonology – called Valfonda de Santa Ana 50 km north-northeast of Saragossa, near the road to Huesca, on the edge of the Monegros; but this place was founded as part of the internal colonisation that took place around 1955. There does not appear to be anything in the toponymy of medieval Aragón that matches the type *vallis profunda* (cf. Ubieto 1972).

makes the moral dimension even more explicit, and w translates the name, and in so doing makes its meaning more obvious to the audience.

A.11.3 Review of the names of Marsilĭe's messengers

The names of the ten messengers differ from the other Saracen names in the Song in so far as the proportion of "erudite" or "(secular or religious) ancient" sounding names is larger. These include *Estramarin*, *Eudropin*, *Priamun*, *Batiel/ Machiner*, *Maheu*, and in O also *Clarin* and *Blanc-andr-in* – in effect 50 % or more. In the rest of the Song the proportion is only about 20%. It is important for messengers, but not warriors, to look respectable, and in the Middle Ages an ancient-sounding name achieves this effect. Joüner, with his 'fasting face' and Guarlan *le barbét*, through his epithet, also help to create this impression; Malbien is the only one where the devil cannot hide his cloven hoof. When the poet was inventing these individual names, he would have been looking for a very different tone in order to create an overall effect that is different from the one he created for the anti-peers: dignity, but a cobbled-together dignity that cannot really be taken seriously.

A.11.4 Marsilĭe's tribute to Charlemagne

Since real-life facts receive perhaps too little attention in Medieval Romance Studies these days, and since in the present case they are interesting at the structural as well as socio-historical level, we shall finish off our discussion of Marsilĭe's mission to Charlemagne with an analysis of the grand tribute, the one-off compensation for Charlemagne's retreat, which Blancandrin first suggests to Marsilĭe (v. 30–34) and then promises to Charlemagne on behalf of Marsilĭe (v. 127–133) and which Charlemagne also enumerates to his advisers (v. 182–186). As compared with the valuable interpretation of this same scene offered by Gérard Gros (2013, 131–136), I will focus my analysis more on the provenance and role of these luxury goods in Islamic culture, the grading of these gifts according to the social status of the intended recipients, the structure of the scene in the Rol. that emerges from all of this, and finally, the fine stylistic differences that the poet uses *ad hominem*. The poet's eagerness to repeat this enumeration – with certain variations – shows how much this topic fascinates him and his audience. Let us look mainly at the first account:

Vos li durrez urs et leons et chens,
Set cenz camelz et mil hosturs müers,
D'or et d'argent .IIII.C. muls cargez,
Cinquante carre qu'en ferat cariër;
Ben en purrat lüer ses soldeiers.

The bears are at the front. How then does this animal, the classic prey for hunters in the northern half of Europe in those days, relate to Islam? Just like the lions which come next in the list, these animals can only be intended as a contribution to a menagerie, perceived as a hobby fit for a king. As an experienced messenger, Blancandrin does not begin by talking about the mere material goods. He flatters Charlemagne first, by – implicitly, of course – showing how highly he values this cultivated and knowledgeable monarch, setting him on a par with the Islamic ruling style. In Roman Europe during the period of mass migration, the great wonders, or in fact horrors, of the Roman tradition of menageries and circuses had all but disappeared. As a result, any European ruler who hankered after this kind of spectacle had only the most rudimentary understanding of what it was, if indeed he had any at all. In Islam, on the other hand, there was a systematic menagerie culture which had developed mainly from Persian traditions.[736] This explains why the Islamic rulers had great zoo-like animal parks in places like Samarra, Baghdad or Cairo, which of course included bears and lions; we know that in Spain, for example, al-Manṣūr was given similar presents by a Maghreb ruler. Clever traps and ditches were used to catch large animals, and they also threw a hood over the head of the animal to blind it. Bear hunting in the Islamic world took place especially in the Pontic-Caspian forests; but there were also plenty of bears in the Syrian uplands, where they damaged the harvests, as they have done almost to the present day,[737] and if we can believe Notker Balbulus (*Gesta Karoli* 2.9), there was a messenger (a historical figure, who arrived in the year 801) sent by the Islamic (minor) ruler of al-Fusṭāṭ (Old Cairo) to Charlemagne who brought with him an *ursus Numidicus* and a *leo Marmaricus*, that is to say a bear from today's Algeria and a lion from Cyrenaica. Lions were hunted in Morocco, Numidia and Libya, and also in Syria until the 13th c.

Live bears and lions were luxury extras for a ruler, and so Blancandrin turns next to some more utilitarian gifts with the *chens* and the *mil hosturs müez*, because hunting was a passion shared by all the upper classes in both Christian and Islamic countries: the famous poet al-Muʿtamid declared that 'Love of hunting

---

736 This point and the rest of the paragraph are based on Lombard (1972, 177–183, 199 n. 17).
737 Cf. for example *Meyers Konversationslexikon* of 1888 s. v. *Bär*.

is a natural attribute of the noble man'.[738] When it came to dogs, Islam had something very special: a kind of sighthound from the Arabian deserts, the *s(a)lūqī* was bred to be an exceptionally fast hunting dog, which if deployed in packs would even attack larger prey. When speaking to Marsiliĕ, Blancandrin only uses the generic term *chens*; when speaking to Charlemagne, however, he is more specific (v. 128): he talks about *veltres enchaïgnez* 'sighthounds keen to hunt', that is to say, dogs which were kept on a chain until it was time to go hunting, and this is how they were to be handed over to Charlemagne. Falconry had also developed very early in Islam, and it was so important, that quite apart from its place in poetry, in the 10th c. it was the subject of a whole treatise of its own, and in Umayyad Córdoba the position of Grand Falconer was one of the highest offices of the state. The collection of one thousand hawks – whose regular moulting was a sign of the health of the creatures – sounds less excessive when we understand that Charlemagne would be expected to offer them as gifts to his noble warriors. It is admittedly surprising that instead of falcons, hawks are listed, because in Islam, as in the West, hawks were usually valued less highly; but according to Viré (LM s. v. *Beizjagd*) they were nevertheless popular in Iran, according to Mercier (1927, 88, 95) in the Maghreb, to help with hunting, and the same was true, according to Gérard Gros (2013, 135s.) in Spain until the 13th c. as well as in England, which means that this detail could even be one of the indications that the author was a Norman, in other words Turold.

As far as the *set cenz camelz* are concerned, the two-humped camel was confined mainly to the Central Asian-Persian area, and in classical antiquity was known to come from there. In our text the word means the one-humped camel of the Bible that was domesticated in the Arabian desert, and had spread westwards across the areas close to the desert in North Africa (cf. for more detail Gautier 1937, 190–210, 215ss.); it was brought mainly from the Islamic area to Spain as well (Lombard, 1974, 205–207), where it remained for quite a long time, even after the Reconquista. In the Almoravid reign of the 11th c. its military importance declined as the more manoeuvrable horse took its place[739] but it was still useful as a beast of burden. In the Bible, Job started out with 3000 camels and finished up with 6000 (*Iob* 1.3, 42.13); according to the *Chronique de Saint-Maixent* (p. 428 ed. Marchegay) the Christians captured 2000 camels in 1120 as victors at the Battle of Cutanda – why shouldn't Charlemagne deserve at least 700?

---

738 On this point and the following section cf. Lombard (1972, 177–180) and also the EI s. v. *Bayzara* and *Ṣayd* as well as Mercier (1927, 67–70 on the *s(a)lūqī*, 81–104 on *fauconnerie*).
739 Cf. the section above on 'The Song of Roland and Zallāqa' (A.9.11.3).

The camels are separated from the gold theme that follows by the *hosturs*; this shows that they are being presented because of their own utility as pack animals. The four hundred mules are different – these are normal mules, not the expensive white mules that were specially bred, ten of which were a worthy gift from one ruler to another[740] they are the lowlier beast of burden in use right across the Mediterranean world, and this notion of cargo brings Blancandrin to the vulgar, material level, which nevertheless is the main point: the gold. The Umayyad Caliphs of Córdoba really had managed to gain access to the gold of West Africa (Lombard 1974, 230s.) and they hoarded it in huge amounts: when ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān III died in 961, five million dinars were found in his state treasury, in the form of over 21,000 kg of gold coins; his successor al-Ḥakam II ruled for fifteen years, and during this time, the state central office spent 40 million dinars, which was about 170,000 kg of gold coins (Lombard 1971b, 135). The successors of the Caliphs, the Taifa kings, inherited this gold – and were obliged to pay constant tributes from it to the Christian north. The Almoravids again had direct access to West African gold; but they allowed so much of it to flow into Christian Europe that their gold dinar, Lat. *marabutinus* (etc., 'the Almoravid one'), soon became an established word for coins (MLLM, NGML and especially DuCange[741] s. v.). Silver was produced in large quantities mainly in Spain itself, in the southern mines, which were the most productive in the whole of the Islamic world (Lombard 1971b, 126, and 1974, 235s.). The audience of the Song would therefore have quite easily believed that Blancandrin would suggest that his king should promise Charlemagne four hundred mule loads of gold and silver, the equivalent of fifty cart loads.[742] When speaking to Charlemagne, Blancandrin is again more specific, and expresses himself almost in a western way (v. 132): the gold will be delivered in the form of the best-quality coins, that is to say in *besanz esmerés*, literally: 'in Byzantine dinars made of purified gold'. From the Merovingian period until after the time of the Rol., it was not possible to mint indigenous coins in Western Europe because of a lack of available gold[743] and so long-distance trade was carried out on the basis of the Byzantine gold dinar (δηνάριος χρυσοῦς, Lombard 1971b, 120),

---

740 Cf. above on *Suatilie* (A.5.3).

741 Cf. www.gallica.bnf.fr (last access 30.07.21).

742 Compare vs. 32–33 with 130–131 (and 185–186): mules being typical of the Mediterranean world, (ox-)carts of Western Europe, Blancandrin gives the value of the gold and silver in both 'currencies'; Charlemagne seems to understand this as a double offer.

743 I do not count Charlemagne's brief spell attempting to continue the Langobard minting of gold coins, nor Louis the Pious' failed attempt, no doubt using gold looted in the war against the Avars, to keep gold coins in circulation, nor the Catalan gold work that started in the 11th c.

which kept its full gold value until 1030, and then after a period of declining qual-
ity, was restored almost to its original state by Alexios I (1081–1118). In Blancan-
drin's mouth the expression *besant* is little more than a translation; for the
standard coin used across the Islamic world of the 8th – 11th c. was the gold
dinar[744] which the Caliph ʿAbd alMalik created around 695 in such a way that it
mirrored the name and the gold content of the Byzantine gold dinar, and which
in turn was imitated by the Almoravids: around 1100 all three coins were made of
4–4.5g of pure gold.[745] Blancandrin discreetly avoids suggesting that Charle-
magne is greedy for gold, and speaks instead of the fact that he will have to pay
his *soldeiers* 'mercenaries'. Having first addressed the ruler's need for luxury, and
then the noble warriors' lust for gifts, he turns to the broader mass of combatants:
he thinks they will want to be paid in gold. He, as a Spanish Muslim sees merce-
nary activity as a central reality: the Umayyadds already had a great number of
them, and then al-Manṣūr acquired many more Berbers as mercenaries, and the
Taifa kings, rightly or wrongly, also had Christian mercenaries.[746] The second Al-
moravid ruler, ʿAlī ibn Yūsuf, was not above using a troop of Catalan mercenaries
led by Reverter, first as a kind of tax-collecting force, and then later to counter the
Almohad rebellion. Blancandrin assumes that Charlemagne will have a similar
mercenary policy with a corresponding need for gold.

   This detail reveals something about the social history of the time. Charle-
magne repeats the proposed gifts that Blancandrin describes in the first council
scene, including the amount of gold, but he suppresses Blancandrin's reference
to *soldeiers* – not because this was embarrassing for him, but because the poet
thought that it was not appropriate for Charlemagne.

   The poet cannot possibly have been unaware that mercenaries were active
within his francophone world: William the Conqueror, for example, had too

---

744 Arab. *dīnār* < MGk. δηνάριος /dinár(is)/ < Lat. *dēnārius*.
745 According to Lombard (1971a, 219; slightly misleading 1971a, 148s., 1971b, 130) the Con-
stantine gold dinar weighed 4.58g, the oriental gold dinar 4.25 g (because when they were
made for the first time, they were modelled on used coins rather than new Byzantine gold de-
nars), according to Grierson/ Travaini (1986, 466) the Almoravid gold dinar and later the Almo-
had one (Lat. *massamutinu*s, after the Maṣmūda tribe) 4.45g. Blancandrin's words express the
almost-equivalence of the Byzantine and the Almoravid coin, and this is evident in the histori-
cal sources e.g. when the Genoese notary Obertus in 1186 twice speaks about *besancii marabo-
tini* (NGML s. v. *marabotinus*).
746 We should remember that shortly after 1000, when the Spanish Caliphate was in a phase
of gradual decline, Castilian mercenaries were used, and very soon Catalan mercenaries for
the other side were stationed in Córdoba (cf. below s. v. *Cordres*, A.12.4.1); there is also the fact
that El Cid and his opponent García Ordóñez were embroiled in an inner-Muslim war, and that
El Cid, exiled by his king, fought for Muslim Saragossa (!) against the Christians.

obviously depended on mercenaries in the year 1066 at Hastings, and again in 1067–1070, and yet again in 1085, and he used them against Christians. His son William Rufus used them just as much (Douglas 1995, 196s., 217, 219, 283s., 354; Hollister 1965, 168, 178–180).[747] But the audience might possibly have suspected that a Charlemagne who used mercenaries in his war with the infidels could easily have used them against Christians as well; the poet would have wanted to protect Charlemagne's memory from any such suspicion. His warriors are not above looting gold and silver (v. 99s.); but they are enfeoffed, not bought.

All in all, therefore, we can say that what looks at first glance like an almost random list of treasures turns out to be a carefully considered, literary set piece. It has an overarching structure: the poet lets Blancandrin's thoughts pass smoothly from the ruler to the noblemen and then to the supposed masses. And this structure is filled out in an original and concrete way: the poet links the ruler with the luxury of Islamic menageries, the noblemen with the high standard of Muslim cynegetics and falconry, and the masses of mercenaries in service to the Muslims with a greed for gold. Most importantly, however, he uses variation to create a series of different perspectives: Blancandrin talks about these things to his king differently than he does, *ad hominem*, to Charlemagne, and then Charlemagne talks about these same things differently again in front of his leading men. This triple presentation, with variation each time, exhausts the topic. About five hundred verses later, when there is a reference once again to the tribute that has been promised and is now due, Marsilĭe's treasurer describes it very briefly (v. 645) and in a way that contradicts the Blancandrin section: VII.C. *cameilz, d'or e argent cargiez*. At this point, for the first time, the 700 camels are laden with gold and silver, which in fact stretches credibility. Is this simple version nothing more than the *Urform* of the motif, a relic of the old main section that was later elaborated in the Blancandrin section? The more likely explanation is that it is driven by narrative requirements: the poet does not want to burden the audience with a fourth full account, and so he reduces this section to 'the familiar tribute'. However, because he wants to do this poetically, and in language that is as concrete as possible, he condenses it into a single verse consisting of the camels, as a distinctive opening

---

747 There is also indirect evidence that mercenary activity is acknowledged in the Song when the dying Roland drags himself away, just far enough to be out of range of a crossbow bolt (v. 2265). Early crossbows were drawn by a mechanism that involved the crossbowman holding the bow on the ground with his feet and pulling the string taut with his hands (cf. the LM s. v. *Armbrust*). In other words, the early crossbowman is a foot soldier, the opposite of a knight; he would not normally have had a fiefdom, and so he must have been paid for his service.

motif followed by the main motif of gold and silver; at this point, there is no need for absolute consistency in the detail.

A.12 The geography of Spain and its northern foothills

A.12.1 The Pyrenees

The names of the Pyrenean passes are interconnected, and so we must examine them as a coherent group.

A.12.1.1 The *porz de Sízer*
as meillors porz de Sízer (:*i-ə*) O 583, *ultra la grant port de Cesire* V4, *as porz de Cipre* CV7; and then also

    a[s] greignurs porz de Sízer (:*i-ə*) O 719, *in porta Caesaris K*, *ad un port de Cisre V4*, at the gates of *Yspaen* w; and

    as maistres porz de Sí[zer] (:*i-ə*) Segre 2939, *as maistres porz de Sirĭe* O, *al port grant Cesarie* V4, *le port de La Marmie* T: Here *La Marmie* in T is presumably idiosyncratic, *Cipre* 'Cyprus' in CV7 is erroneous (but interesting because the North Italian editor would have been more familiar with the Lusignan Kingdom in Cyprus than a pass in the western Pyrenees), whereas *porz d'Espeigne* in V7 is a correct synonym for *Port de Cize*, and not a reduction in meaning (cf. below A.12.1.2 on v. 824 and 1152). The form *Sízer* in O occurs twice at the end of a verse, and this confirms its place in the archetype, although its phonological structure (ending in unstressed /ər/) does not occur anywhere else in the Song. And precisely because of this isolated form *Sízer*, the single occurrence of *Sirĭe* in O does not have to be an erroneous reference to 'Syria'; it is more likely to be a later form arising via **Sizre*. There is then the slightly later form *Sire* for this pass in both the *Girart de Roussillon* 2345 and (along with *Sitre*) the *Enfances Vivien*. Unlike O, β has a type *C(e/i)s(.?)r(ĭ)e*, which also dominates the rest of the written tradition.

    There is no doubt that this refers to the Roncevaux Pass, and importantly it is seen from the French side, from the *Vallée de Cize* around Saint-Jean-Pied-de-Port. The *Nota Emilianense* (*grosso modo* around 1075) mentions the *portus de Sicera*; Bédier noted (1926–1929, 3.296s.) that (*Vallis*) *Cirsia* is in a Papal Bull of 1106 (transumpt of a supposed charter of 980), *Portūs Ciserei* (adjectival) and *Portūs Ciser(a)e* (substantival) in the *Guide for Pilgrims* (around 1140, several times each) [as well as *Portūs Ciserei* several times in the PT, which is from almost the same date, G.A.B.], *Cisera* in a hymn of the 12th c., *Burt Shizaru* or *Shīz*ruwā* around

1154 in Idrīsī;[748] we also find *Porta Caesaris* in the MHG *Kaiserchronik* (second third of the 12th c., v. 14943 ed. Edw. Schröder, taken into K!), *Portus Sizarae* in Roger of Howden (shortly after 1200, ed. Stubbs, 2.117) and *Cisara*, *Cisera*, *Cizia*, *Ciza* in the late 12th and early 13th c. in a cartulary from Bayonne in Raymond (1863, s. v. *Cize*).

Since in Arab. generally, and especially in Idrīsī (cf. the index of names 1999) Lat.-Rom. /s/ is often represented by -*sh*-, Idrīsī's form suggesting a Romance consonant sequence /s-z-r/ fits with O and with Roger of Howden at least in the initial sound (and probably also in the medial sound, if the -*z*- in *Sízer* or *Sizara* stands for /dz/ > /z/ as in *duze* 262, 325, *quinze* 109, 149, 202, *Sarrazin* 147 and passim, *Lazaron* 2385). All three here probably represent a name form that was known in Norm., but had come from the Occ., in the western part of which the sound structure of the type *crézer* < *credere* etc. was dominant until approximately the start of the 14th c.[749] The *Nota* has therefore taken its form from the Rol. itself, or from Occitan.

748 There is some variation in the transcriptions suggested by Arabic scholars; the former by César Dubler (in Menéndez Pidal 1960, 230) is probably the most sensible, the latter is by Bresc/Nef (1999, 357). – Idrīsī states that the length of the Pass of Cize (that is to say Roncevaux) through the mountains is 35 (Arab.) miles (~ 52 km), while the *Guide for Pilgrims* in the *Codex Calixtinus* (cap. 7) says it is only 16 (Rom.) miles long (~ 26 km). The distances in miles given by Idrīsī are quite often imprecise, and it is quite common for informants to exaggerate, especially in the case of a mountain pass; and so according to Idrīsī you would cross the Alps from Ivrea to France through a 'corridor' which is between ninety and one hundred miles long (~ 133–148 km). Ubieto Arteta (1963, passim) is not correct when he concludes that Idrīsī's form of the name *Shīzaru* indicates the Pass of *Siresa* almost 20 km west of Somport, i.e. the pass between Hecho (High Aragón) and Lescun (Béarn), through which the old Roman road went from Saragossa to Béarn, since by Idrīsī's time it had long since lost its significance because of the growing importance of the Somport (which means that in Ubieto Arteta's understanding of Idrīsī's account of the Pyrenean passes, the Roncevaux Pass, and the great road which even in Roman times had been the link between Astorga-Pamplona-Dax-Bordeaux would be missed out entirely). Ubieto Arteta goes on to argue that Charlemagne's defeat took place at the Siresa Pass, and even thinks that he can see two layers in the Rol. the older of which (9th or early 10th c.) refers to the Siresa pass, while the later from the 11th c. is "de carácter fantástico y musulmán" [!] and moves the event to Roncesvalles. But even in the contemporary Carolingian sources, Charlemagne's first act in Spain was to conquer Pamplona, and his last was the destruction of the fortress in Pamplona; neither of these fit with the Siresa Pass, but both of them fit with Roncevaux! And in linguistic terms, a metathesis of *Sirésa* > *Siséra would be possible, but a shift in the stress to *Sízer* would not.
749 Cf. Lafont (1991, 7). Later *creze* in Gasc., *creire* in Languedoc., cf. Ravier (1991, 88).

A.12.1.2 The *porz d'Espaigne*

Unequivocally the same Pass of Roncevaux is called *porz d'Espaigne* in two places in the Song: [Charlemagne] *As porz d'Espaigne ad lessét sun nevold* O 824, as in C, *al port de Spagna* V4; and

As porz d'Espaigne en est passét Rollant O 1152, *al port de Spagna* V4, *as porz d'Espeigne* C, *es porç d'Espeigne* V7, *as pors d'Espaigne* P: The archetype had the same as O.

We can probably interpret *porz d'Espaigne* in the Song as a place name (i.e. not just as a descriptive-appellative phrase), because in around 1200 Roger of Howden writes at this point (ed. Stubbs 2.117): *usque ad Portus Sizarae, quae nunc Portus Hispaniae dicitur.*[750]

A.12.1.3 The *porz d'Aspre*

On the other hand, the names of Pyrenean passes in two other places are editorially controversial. We will examine them together. Marsilĭe's nephew boasts: *De tute Espaigne aquiterai les pans / Des <les> porz d'[Aspre] entresqu'a Durestant* Segre 869s., *des porz d'Espaigne* O 870, (of) *Portaspere* K, *da li porti d'Aspre* V4, *des les porz Vaspre* C, *des les porz d'Aspre* V7: C has misread a *δ* as *v*. All in all, *des porz d'Espaigne* O competes with *des les porz d'Aspre* β.

And here is what some suggest is the parallel passage (v. 1099–1105):

> Dist Oliver: – Rollant, veez en alques!
> Cist nus sunt pres, mais trop nus est loinz Carles.
> Vostre olifan suner vos ne·l deignastes;
> Fust i li reis, n'i oüssum damage.
> Guardez amont devers les porz d'[Aspre]:
> Veeir poëz dolente rereguarde:
> Ki ceste fait, jamais n'en ferat altre.

---

[750] I think the hypothesis suggested by Rita Lejeune (1980, passim) that *porz* in the Song means 'Pyrenees' and not 'pass, passes' (~ *défilés*) is overblown. She is surprised that in the Song the term "Pyrenees" never appears; but the term "Alps" does not appear anywhere in the whole of the Old French epic genre either – quite simply because in both cases, no such blanket term was needed (since without a map or a satellite photograph, no one could imagine them visually as a single feature). Of course, the *porz* in the Song must be the Pyrenean passes and not any others, because the narrative requires this; but there could only be more than just a contextual factor if the original meaning were clearly not sufficient. In Occ. *ports* sometimes means 'Pyrenees', and this adds weight to an expression that is constrained by the real context (the physical and geographical proximity and importance for travel). And the fact that the Arabic geographical literature, especially Idrīsī, calls the Pyrenees *Džabal al-Burtāt*, literally 'the mountain range of the passes', does not allow us to draw any conclusions about OF.

Here are the variants for v. 1103: *guardez amunt devers les porz d'Espaigne* O, *Sire, gardé de çà ver li port d'Aspre* V4, *gardez amont ça devers les porz d'Aspre* C, *envers Espaigne deveriez esgarder* P: The reading in P is just an interpretive flattening and therefore it does not necessarily confirm O, and it also contradicts the consensus V4C. Thus, we have here, too, *devers les porz d'Espaigne* in O competing with *ça devers les porz d'Aspre* in β. In v. 1104, O reads: *dolente est la rereguarde* (+1!), V4 *dolent la reegarde* [sic], which together guarantees *dolente rereguarde* (or *dolent la rereguarde*) for the archetype. *Dolent* here has the second of two meanings listed by Godefroy 'qui éprouve ou fait éprouver de la douleur': the rear guard does not feel pain, but it causes pain to others, it is 'to be pitied', because, as v. 1105 pointedly says, it is doomed.

The *porz d'Espaigne* are the Pass of Roncevaux (as is evident in v. 824 and 1152 above), the *porz d'Aspre* is Somport or *Port d'Aspe* which lies 70 km further east as the crow flies (as is clearly shown e.g. by the term *Portus Asperi* in the *Guide for Pilgrims* cap. 1 etc. in the description of the southern Way of Saint James from Saint-Gilles and Toulouse via Jaca). Both terms therefore signify real passes, which means that the decision must be based on the context.[751] Let us analyse both contexts, then!

Marsilĭe's nephew has his seat in Saragossa, which is south of the mid Pyrenees, and he is evidently talking about the north-south extent of the whole of Spain. The Pass of Roncevaux is located north-northwest of the speaker, but the Somport lies almost directly to the north of him and is nearer (about 160 instead of 230 modern kilometres by road). This supports Somport; it is irrelevant that this pass was more difficult to cross than the Pass of Roncevaux, and rarely used by hostile armies in ancient and medieval times.[752] *Aspre* is therefore the most likely reading in the archetype.

---

751 The same would be true if the name *Espaigne,* which has already been mentioned a dozen times, had been shortened to *Esp'* or something like that in an early ms, meaning that the swapping of the two terms would have been caused by palaeographical factors.

752 At this point a note on the relative significance of both passes is required. We should not doubt that the Pass of Roncevaux was used all the time, both for heavy goods transport and by the majority of those travelling on horseback over the high route, using the old Roman road from Bordeaux-Dax-Pamplona-Astorga (maximum elevation 1493 m above sea level), while those making the journey on foot, or perhaps riding in single file also had the option of the road via Valcarlos-Ibañeta, roughly equivalent to the modern minor road (maximum elevation about 1060 m above sea level). We have ample proof of this in the discovery of coins, one minted by Charles the Simple (898–929) and one by Ethelred II of 991 in Ibañeta (Menéndez Pidal 1960, 223s.); in 1071 there was also a little monastery in Ibañeta, although it is not certain how long it had been there (Menéndez Pidal 1960, 223); there is an account of the Pass of Cize being used by thirty Santiago pilgrims on horseback in the year 1080 in the *Miraculum* IV of

Olivier's words must be assessed in a different way. If the Rol. had been the story of an advance towards the enemy, Roland would doubtless have been the leader of the vanguard, and this would have consisted, like the rear guard, of 20,000 men, so that it certainly would have been large enough to beg the question: where would Roland be located within it? He would naturally not be in the middle, or among the last troops, but among those out at the very front. But the Rol. is the story of a retreat; this means that Roland is the leader of the rear guard and he is among those right at the very back. Now since this rear guard had certainly not crossed over the crest of the Pyrenees Mountain range – this would be contrary to the basic thrust of the tale – it was still south of this point, and Roland is therefore the one who is furthest inside Spain. When Olivier urges Roland to look at his own people, then Roland must look towards France, in effect upwards along the steep military road (*guardez amont!*), where his people still are, while the majority of the army has already disappeared over the horizon. In short, he must look at the *porz d'Espaigne*. There would be no reason to look sideways to the *porz d'Aspre* some 79 km away – why should all of Roland's troops be to one side of him? – but as Bédier (1927, 156s.) explains with his own style of humour: "C'est comme si quelqu'un, voulant montrer, de la terrasse des Tuileries, une troupe massée sur la place de la Concorde, disait: 'Regardez vers Beauvais!'".[753]

the *Codex Calixtinus*; the *Crux Caroli* at the top of the pass in a spot that is no longer exactly identifiable today is noted in 1106 (as *Karoli Crux*) in a bull by Pope Paschal II and forms the boundary of the diocese of Bayonne (Menéndez Pidal 1960, 229). But it is entirely possible that for a time this pass was less important in real terms for the French upper class than the Somport. One possible reason for this is the fact that in about 1032 Sancho el Mayor (according to Defourneaux 1949, 20) reformed the monasteries of San Juan de la Peña and San Salvador de Leyre based on the Cluniac model; another important factor was the fact that in 1037 Aragón became an independent kingdom, and between the accession of Sancho Ramírez (1064) and the start of the 12th c. it needed and received considerably more assistance from France than Navarre received (which was attached to Aragón from 1076–1134); there is plenty of information about this in the famous accounts given by Boissonnade and Defourneaux. The importance of the Somport is highlighted in around 1140 in the *Guide for Pilgrims* in the *Codex Calixtinus* (cap. 4), which identifies the Hospital of Santa C(h)ristina in that place as one of the three great hospitals in Christendom – alongside the Hospital in Jerusalem and Great Saint Bernard Hospice. The manuscript evidence in Rol. v. 870 and 1103 shows that *both* of these Pyrenean passes must have been well known.

753 Burger (1953, 159–161) understood this passage quite differently: Olivier urges Roland to look at the enemy troops which are on the high ground (*amont*) alongside the two of them, over towards the *porz d'Aspre*. He reads the following verse in the same way as C: *Veoir poez delance* (= *dolance*) *a rererguarde*. The reason why Roland cannot be asked to look at his own troops is that they are not located *amont* Roland, but *aval*, down in the valley. However: 1) The

Thus, the archetype must have in Marsilĩe's nephew's words the *porz d'Aspre*, and in Olivier's words the *porz d'Espaigne*.[754] Just as modern philologists have seen parallels between these two passages, so also did two earlier scribes: O resolved this in favour of the *porz d'Espaigne*, β in favour of the *porz d'Aspre*.

A.12.1.4 *Rencesvals*

Since people today talk about the 'Pass of Roncevaux' and even Segre in his name index defines *Rencesval, Rencesvals* inaccurately as 'il passo di Roncisvalle', we will discuss this name right after the real pass names. There are only minimal variations in the different manuscripts because the name is so well known; we can therefore look at all the passages together. *Rencesvals* O 892 and passim (16x, *Rencesval* only 2716), *Runzival* n, *Runseval* K, *Roncival(s)* V4, *Rencesvals, Roncesvals* V7, *Rencivaus, Roncival(s), Ronchivaus* C, *Roncevax* P, *Reincevaulx* T, *Roncevale* h (B), *Glynneu* (var. *Glynn*) *y Mieri* 'valleys (var. valley) of the thorn bushes' w. There is also *Rozaballes* in the *Nota Emilianense, Runciavallis* (with internal inflection: *Runcievallis, Runciamvallem, Runciavalle*) in PT and *Guide for Pilgrims, Runcevallis* in the *Carmen, Roscida vallis* in ecclesiastical documents, the earliest dated around 1100 from the bishop's chancellery of Pamplona, then also in chronicles; and finally *Roscidea vallis*, a dubiously Latinate form that remains isolated and is to be

---

consensus in meaning between O and V4 (cf. above) makes it almost impossible in terms of the stemma, to take this *delance a rereguarde* from C (as *dolance a.r.*) into the archetype. 2) Olivier has only been able to see the enemy because he had just climbed up onto a hill, and from there he hurried down as fast as he could to Roland. There is no reason why Roland should be 'above' (in effect nearer to France) while his troops are 'below' (in effect lower down than he is, and still in Spain); this contradicts the narrative function of the rear guard's deployment as outlined above. The fact that Roland then (v. 1152) leaves the area of the Pass (now meant in the wider sense) and rides towards the enemy because he is looking to fight with them does not contradict what was said before. 3) Olivier does not call the enemy 'enemies' here but calls them 'disaster for a rear guard', which sounds very unnatural, especially since, as Segre points out, *dolance* does not occur anywhere else in the Song, but we could add that we find *dolensa* in Old Occ., and in French *douliance* but only from the 13th century onwards, later *doléance*, and occasionally *dolance* in the 16th c. 4) Burger's interpretation seems to me to break the continuity of the logical subject in the text: immediately beforehand, it says *n'i oüssum damage* 'we i.e. the rear guard of today, would not suffer any losses', while immediately after this, it says *ki ceste fait, jamais n'en ferat altre* 'we, i.e. the rear guard of today, will (thanks to your stubbornness) fight the last battle of our lives'.

754 It is unremarkable that *Espaigne* in v. 1103 ends in *a-e* assonance, and not *ã-e*, because this word also appears in the same laisse as words like *chevalchet* (826), *marche* (839), *barbe* (1843), *sale* (3707), *marches* (3716); cf. also Bédier's section 'Versification' in his commentary.

found in a poem dated around 1200 from the collegiate church of Roncevaux.[755] We find *Ronsasvals* in the Occitan, *Roncesvalles* in the Spanish epic tradition. Later epic and romance literature in OF generally uses the variants found in the Rol., and so we can refer to Moisan and Flutre for the big picture.

Soon after the reappearance of the *Nota Emilianense* in the 20th c., Dámaso Alonso realised that *Rozaballes* is the oldest documented form of the name, because this is based on a Basque etymology **Erro-zabal*. Erro is the small river that has its source about 7 km west of Roncesvalles, then gave its name to Erro (a place about 10 km southwest of Roncesvalles) and therefore to the valley community of Erro, to which the area from Ibañeta downwards belonged, that is to say the whole plateau of Roncesvalles. Basque *zabal* 'plateau, plain' is part of many other place names (and from there it goes into anthroponyms).[756] The French forms came about through interpretation as *ronce(s)* 'barbs, thorns', without there necessarily being any symbolic reference to the Roncevaux tragedy. The pre-stress, pre-nasal shift *-o- > -e-* corresponds to the same OF phonological tendency that we find in *truncare* > OF *trenchier* > modern Fr. *trancher*, **dominiarium* > OF *dengier* > modern Fr. *danger* etc., but it was much more often reversed through analogy within the word family or prevented altogether – as we see here in the majority of the forms that are a little older through the lingering effect of *ronce(s)*. *Roscida vallis* 'the dewy valley' is the result of clerical ennobling, but it is interesting because even in around 1100 it still seems to hark back to a form without *n*.

In the Song, as in reality, the meaning of the name is not the pass itself, but the plateau that is attached to it on the southern side. The discussion in the second council scene at Charlemagne's court is still only about the passes, and this is also the case in the report telling how the main part of the army marches away. The Saracens are the first to predict that the battle will take place at Rencesvals, because they have a more detailed knowledge of the area (v. 892–985). In the Song, the scene shifts when Roland ignores Olivier's warning and rides resolutely with the rear guard towards the Saracens, without first blowing his horn to call Charlemagne back (v. 1152s.). It is interesting to see that this same idea is already present in the *Nota Emilianense*: *At ubi exercitum*

---

[755] For a complete history of the name cf. Seringe (1982, 409–413).

[756] Alonso (1954, 51–56), Seringe (1982, 409s.). Basque has (like Gasc.) an initial *a-* or *e-* before words starting with *r-* (which is then geminated), cf. Michelena (1990. § 8.1); this results conversely in etymologically justified initial vowels not being recognised as such, especially in the Romanisation of names, where variants arise without this feature, and so we have here aphaeresis of the *e-*; Michelena (1990, § 17.4 n. 10) cites two examples that are parallel to *Roncesvalles*.

[the main army] *portum de Sicera transiret*, [not there, but] *in Rozaballes a gentibus Sarracenorum fuit Rodlane occiso*.

However, when Einhart writes that the Basques came from above and forced the Frankish rear guard down into the nearby valley (*desuper* [. . .] *in subiectam vallem deiciunt*), and when he attributes the Basque victory to the lightness of their weaponry and their territorial advantage, he uses the word 'valley' to mean a ravine that runs along the side of the road, and not the plateau of Roncesvalles, where the Basques would not have had their double advantage. The Einhart account is very clear. I think the shift of location in the Song is not due to this text, therefore, and I agree with Menéndez Pidal (1960, 434), that even before the *nota* was written down, the fictional account needed to make space for the only kind of battle that was worthy of the knights, in other words, a host of essentially simultaneous single combats, complete with long charges on horseback beforehand.

A.12.2 Roland's conquests on the Spanish campaign

Roland (v. 197–200) lists the conquests he has achieved in Spain:

> Set anz <ad> pleins que en Espaigne venimes;
> Jo vos conquis e Noples e Commibles,
> Pris ai Valterne e la tere de Pine
> E Balasgüéd e Tüele e Se[b]ilĭe.

What does he mean by each of these names?

A.12.2.1 *Nobles*
Noples O 198, *Nobilis* n, *Nables* K, *Nobles* CV7; also

Noples O 1775, *Nobilis* n, *Nables* K, *Noble* V4, *Nobles* CV7: The *-a-* in K cannot be allowed a higher position in the stemma because O and n along with the later versions have *-o-*. Therefore, *Noples* in O competes with *Nobles* in β. There is a narrative (v. 1773–1779) associated with the second passage; Ganelon reminds Charlemagne of something Roland has done:

> Asez savez le grant orgoill Rollant;
> Ço est merveille que Deus le soefret tant.
> Ja prist il Noples seinz le vostre comant;
> Fors s'en eissirent li Sarrazins dedenz,
> Si̇s cumbatirent al bon vassal Rollant.
> Puis od les ewes lavat les prez del sanc:
> Pur cel le fist, ne fust <ap>arissant.

The meaning is [1] Dax, and not [2] Grenoble, [3] Pamplona, [4] Naval, [5] Orthez, [6] Noblejas, [7] Niebla near Seville, [8] Constantinople, [9] Naples, [10] Navapalos or [11] Saragossa.

On [1]: the identification with Dax is the only one that explains not only the name, but also the narrative that depends upon it – and of course we must always remember that the epic is first and foremost a form of storytelling. The identification goes back originally to Guiette (1955, passim, 1961, passim), who found it in David Aubert (1458); de Mandach agreed with the most important aspect (1970, 127–139; although again with very unclear explanations in 1984, passim, especially 718). I contributed several additional arguments in 1973,[757] and am able to add more details here, while referring to my previous article in order to keep the discussion brief.

   We can assume that Roland begins his list with a conquest which also happened at the beginning of the Spanish campaign, that of a city near the northwestern point of entry to the country; because Charlemagne will leave Spain in the northwest, and it is quite natural in an epic narrative for him to have entered the country on the same road that he will use to leave it. However, Dax is north of the Pyrenees, on the road to Spain, but not in Spain. Is this not already a reason to disqualify it? No; for the epic renown of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign had already spawned legends of skirmishes taking place while he was still in France. Thus, the PT (cap. 9ss.) describes how the Saracen Aigolandus invaded as far as Agen and Saintes, and that it was precisely this invasion that led to Charlemagne's epically renowned Spanish campaign; if this is true of Agen and Saintes, it is no less plausible for Dax, which is even closer to the Spanish border.[758] Girart de Vienne brings us even closer to the beginning of the *set anz* period mentioned by Roland, and to Nobles, since he wants to record

---

757 Beckmann (1973 passim).
758 Moreover, the Gascons were themselves regarded as unreliable conscripts. They developed a hatred towards the French during the High Carolingian period, and this erupted most obviously in the early Capetian time, in 1004 when the Abbot Abbo of Fleury was murdered in his own priory La Réole. Sancho VI William, the last indigenous Duke of Gascony (1009–1032), frequently visited the court of his relative Sancho el Mayor of Navarre, also giving him military assistance, which means he may well have become his vassal. When in 1032 Gascony became part of the Poitou-Aquitaine house through inheritance, it took more than thirty years for the new dukes to break the resistance which gradually retreated back to the southeast. Alfonso el Batallador seems to have annexed the land around Bayonne for a time, from about 1131–1134. One part of today's Gascony in the south-east (from Labastide-Clairence southwards) belonged to Navarre, and not to France, until the beginning of the 16th c.

the prehistory of the Rol.: he ends his tale with the fact that the preparations for Roland's marriage to Alde must be interrupted because the Arabs have invaded Gascony and are already besieging Bordeaux. Dax is the capital of Gascony proper, i.e. not including Bordeaux. It is therefore quite probably that Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube was thinking of the Nobles episode and identified Nobles as Dax.

Dax has been known from ancient times, and still is today, for its hot springs. In antiquity, the town was called – with the plural that was characteristic of spa towns – *Aquae Tarbell(ic)ae* or *Aquae Augustae* (we can deduce the latter from Ὕδατα Αὐγοῦστα in Ptolemy 2.7.8, PW II/1.306s.). The tribal name of the Tarbelli disappeared like most tribal names during the great migration period. But since there were no hot springs as well-known as these ones in the whole of the surrounding region, the town could simply be referred to as *Aquis* > Gasc. *Acs* in the southwest, and then in modern times this developed as *d'Acs* > *Dax*. Beyond the southwest, a more explicit name was required, in order to avoid confusion with cities like Aix-en-Provence and Aix-la-Chapelle 'Aachen'; this explains why it is often called *Ais-en-Gascogne* in OF, instead of the simple *Ais* (cf. Moisan s. v.).

But there were people who still remembered the name *Aquae Augustae* in the 12th c.; we can see this in a charter that is cited here for the first time in a discussion about Nobles,[759] the forgery made by the Sorde Monastery in the name of Charlemagne (MGH DD. Kar. I, Nr. 230). In this document, Charlemagne declares that in order to ensure God's grace will not desert him during his campaign to liberate the oppressed Spanish Christians, he donates the land between the two Gave rivers (de Pau and d'Oloron) to pay for the foundation of the Sorde Monastery, and he removes this monastery from any kind of episcopal jurisdiction. *Actum Aquis Augustis anno regni nostri decimo.* The tenth year of Charlemagne's reign ended in October 778; the forger obviously took the date of the Spanish campaign from the Carolingian annals.[760] Sorde was in actual fact founded at the end of the 10th c. as a dependency of the Monastery of Saint-Michel de Pessan (Dioc. Auch), and it freed itself from this relationship with the help of forgeries in around the second half of the 11th c.[761] But even if the forged document had dated from another hundred years later,[762] this still would not

---

759 Bédier (1926–1929, 336s.) mentions it in passing, but he does not recognise its importance in relation to this context.

760 The editor Mühlbacher incorrectly understands *Augustis* as 'in August'; he did not look the name up in the PW.

761 Bédier (1926–1929, 336 with Lit.).

762 It only exists as a copy in the Baluze collection (17th c.) which famously preserves a large number of medieval mss. which would otherwise have been lost. The editor Mühlbacher suspected that it was not earlier than 1150, but probably created quite soon after that date.

detract from its importance for our purposes. This is because it shows that when it was made, the name *Aquae Augustae* for Dax was still recognised. In this name, *Augustae* was originally an officious adj. without an ending, of the type *via Appia*, *lex Iulia*, and so it meant 'belonging to Augustus, named in honour of him' to commemorate his visit to the spa in the year 14/14 B.C. But people would have long since forgotten about this by the Middle Ages, and it would have meant something like 'august, exclusive, noble' partly thanks to the nature of the place. However, Fr. *auguste* first appears as a Latinism in the 13ᵗʰ c. and it remains rare until the beginning of the 17ᵗʰ c.; whereas from the beginning of the manuscript tradition (*Rol.* 421 etc.) the vernacular (strictly speaking semi-erudite) term *noble* was widely used. Retention of the local *-s*, which remained productive until well into the 12ᵗʰ c.[763] – or here simply imitation of the Lat. plural – led to *Nobles*, which is nothing more and nothing less than the translation of *Augustae* into the vernacular.

Very probably[764] Ganelon's account contains not only *Augustae*, but also *Aquae* in v. 1778 in a simple OF translation in the form of *les ewes*. Roland has captured the city *seinz le vostre comant*. He was "usually" the commander of the vanguard (cf. v. 748!), and Charlemagne has sent him, evidently with the vanguard

---

763 The Fr. names *Rohais*, *Rames*, *Gadres*, *Jaffes* evidently did not appear until after the First Crusade (cf. n. 154 above). An Occitan example is also apposite in our context: when Roger II of Foix brought back relics from Apamea after the First Crusade and built a monastery to house them, the place that formed around it was officially called *Appamia* (a. 1111, 1129), but in the vernacular it acquired an *-s*: *Pamias* (14ᵗʰ c.), today in the Occitan patois /pámyos/, Fr. *Pamiers* (Nègre 1990–1998, no. 30497). Wace does not hesitate to make the *Alba Longa* in the *Brut* into A*lbelunges*, and *Logres* in Chrétien's *Perceval* is later than Geoffrey's *Loegria*.

764 "Very probably", because there is an alternative interpretation that I would not wish to exclude entirely. As we can see in the *Michelin Pyrénées* (approx. Ed. 1963, p. 119), the Adour, on the banks of which Dax is located, is France's only *fleuve vagabond*: throughout recorded history it has changed its course several times. Before 907 it flowed into the sea near Capbreton, then almost 20 km further north at Port d'Albret, today called Vieux-Boucau, in 1164 it shifted over 30 km southwards towards Bayonne, in the 14ᵗʰ c. it shifted back to Port d'Albret, in 1578 reached as far as Bayonne which was in danger of being silted up, and following desperate petitions to the king it was artificially rerouted when a 2 km-long channel was dug in the sandy ground. (The exact dates of these shifts, apart from the last one, are possibly debatable, but the basic facts are correct.) The former riverbeds are still easy to see today because they have turned into lakes and so doubtless the memory of these events would have lingered on for a very long time. These changes in the river occurred quite far below Dax; nevertheless, it is conceivable that the first of these river changes known to us today, perhaps with lingering memories of still older events of this kind, had earned the Adour a reputation for being divertible. The *les* in *les ewes* would then refer not to the spa waters, but to the river Adour which flowed past Dax but was 'movable'.

on this occasion as well, to put the enemy under pressure, but he forbade him from conquering it, because he (correctly) foresaw that he might suddenly need Roland's presence in a still more urgent situation. But Roland – regardless of the detail of the circumstances surrounding him – gave in to the temptation to disregard Charlemagne's wishes and conquered the city after all; in the process he and his people killed the Saracens advancing out of the city, or fleeing from it, on the meadows just outside it. In order to hide the traces of the battle from his uncle, *od les ewes lavat les prez del sanc*. The definite article before *ewes* has a "suggestive" function: these *aquae*, which have not appeared in the story until now, but which the poet thinks will be familiar to his audience, just as the audience would know *Aquis/Acs/Ais* simply from the name itself.[765] V. 1178 simply says: Roland cleaned up the meadows by temporarily diverting the famous springs.

Shortly after 1200, the *Chronique dite Saintongeaise* implicitly identifies Nobles, and it incontrovertibly is Dax. It describes how Charlemagne's troops camp in the *Landes* of Bordeaux, while Roland conquers Nobles, where Charlemagne then founds a St. Vincent Abbey and appoints a bishop over it; only then does he cross over the Pyrenees (de Mandach 1970, 129ss.). Judging by the geographical position alone, the place could only be either Dax or Orthez; but Dax, not Orthez, is an episcopal seat and centre of an intensive cult of St. Vincent: the first known bishop of Dax was called Vincentius and it is said that he suffered martyrdom outside the city, where today the Neo-Romanesque Church of Saint-Vincent-de-Xaintes stands. A basilica bearing the same name stood here in late antiquity,[766] and it could well have been[767] the unspecified Church of St. Vincent in which Charlemagne's historical seneschal Eggihard was buried,

---

765 For comparison, the poet even assumes in v. 154 that in the context of Ais(-la-Chapele), Blancandrin would know about the spa waters there.

766 Cf. e.g. the official website: https://diocese40.fr/eglise/eglise-saint-vincent-de-xaintes-a-dax/ (last access 06. 07. 2021).

767 Despite the arguments presented by René Louis (1966, passim). Louis argues for Saint-Vincent de Metz, because he wants to emend the incorrect form *mittis* in Eggihard's epitaph (v. 2) not to the form selected by editors before him, namely *mītis*, but to *Mettis* 'in or for Metz'. But his hypothesis is weakened by the fact that *mittis* is attested instead of *mītis* in Dhuoda, which is much closer in time and sociological terms to the epitaph (NGML s. v.); moreover, the grammar dictates *Mettīs*, while the metre requires *Mettis*, and a metrical error in this very common ending would be unusual.

according to the inscription on his epitaph which survives only in a 9th c. copy, and not *in situ*.[768]

A trace of the name *Nobles* being used for Dax is mentioned in Guiette (1956, 76s.): according to André Duchesne, Dax retained the honourable title *Cité des Nobles* until the beginning of the 15th c., because the twelve towers in the city's fortifications had belonged to the twelve most illustrious families in the city – a typical, non-specific re-interpretation, (which city would not have been entitled to call itself *Cité des Nobles* with an explanation along these lines?).

The *Nobles* = Dax identification explains the name, but unlike all other attempts, it also explains the narrative in the oldest surviving text on Nobles, and it is then also confirmed by later sources which reveal a detailed knowledge of the southwest, or even of the local traditions of the city. We have everything we could ever wish for an identification. The question still remains, however, whether the episode had been part of epic writings even before the existence of the Rol. in its surviving form, or not. And it is nevertheless astonishing how quickly the shift to Grenoble took place.

On [2]: Indeed, the PT leads us towards Grenoble (cap. 33, in all known versions, in *Codex Calixtinus* written by Scribe III): for seven years, Roland has been besieging Grenoble (*Gratianopolis*) which is occupied by infidels, when an order from Charlemagne reaches him, telling him to hurry to his aid along with his troops; Charlemagne has been surrounded by his enemies in the war against the Saxons and is trapped in a fortress near *Warmacia* (etymologically this is certainly Worms, although this is surprising in terms of the context). Roland has great difficulty deciding what to do, and so he prays and fasts with his army for three days; at this point, the walls of Grenoble fall of their own accord; and he is then able to rush to Charlemagne's aid.

In the KMS V (that is to say in the detailed account of the war against the Saxons, cap. 7–9) there is a similar, but apparently more original version, which according to de Mandach (1984, 719s.) comes from an early *Saisnes* epic. Charlemagne in his hour of need sends a messenger to Nobles, and this messenger rides there via Cologne and Étampes (*Stampes*); since Étampes is located on the great road running from Paris to the southwest, Nobles appears to be in a place that cannot possibly be Grenoble. When Roland receives the message,

---

[768] Bédier (1926–1929, 3.374). In around 1056–1059 Bishop Raimund relocated his seat into the centre of the city, and founded a clerical community for the cathedral there, which was also dedicated to Saint Vincent (LM s. v. *Dax*); for our purposes, it is irrelevant whether the *Chronique* is talking about the earlier or the later Church of St. Vincent.

he orders that Nobles should be stormed immediately, and he manages to capture it before he sets off to help his uncle near 'Saxon' *Garmasie / Garmaise* 'Worms'.

Both versions evidently seek to help Roland out of his moral dilemma. Even if we did not have the Norse version, we would have to conclude from the Grenoble version itself, that someone from Grenoble or the area around there had "nostrified" the story, along the lines of "Which Noble(s), if not our Gre-Noble?"; because as de Mandach correctly pointed out, Grenoble has no other role to play in the Charlemagne and Roland epic tradition. Thus, the Grenoble version has nothing to contribute to the localisation of Nobles, even though it must have been known to the PT just before 1140.[769] If we are convinced of a late dating of the whole Rol. (and not just the Baligant section), then the Chanson de Roland *in its surviving form* cannot be the first text to have mentioned Nobles. However, an earlier version of the song must have been quite likely to qualify as the first to mention it; for it suits the story of this song in particular to illustrate Roland's indomitable recklessness, even against his uncle's instructions, in a successful context first, before it plays its part in his heroic defeat.

It is worth mentioning that a 13th c. author has not just recognised the fact that the fable has been transferred from *Nobles* to Grenoble, but he has also identified *Nobles* correctly as Dax. In the French Turpin translation in the ms. Paris B.N.fr. 2137 (ms. from the late 13th c. ed. Walpole 1979) the Prologue (ed. Walpole 1979, p. 39) introduces the Grenoble chapter with the words: *Les miracles que Dieus fist pour Rollant en la cité d'Ais*, where *Ais* can only mean *Ais-en-Gascogne*.

On [3]: Pamplona could probably be considered as a meaning of *Nobles* because of the semantic similarity of the two names, although this has not been an issue in previous discussions. In answer to my queries, the co-founder of modern Basque Philology, the unforgettable Luís Michelena (Koldo Mitxelena, letter of 15. 7. 1969) told me: 1) The Basque name of the city, *Iruñ(e)a*, is made from a combination of

---

769 The PT (cap. 11 and 29) has a list of Charlemagne's *pugnatores maiores* which includes a certain *Berardus de Nublis*; in cap. 29 he is a Burgundian in the broader sense of this word, since he is buried in Arles. The toponym is regarded as unidentified; if it is meant to be read as /nǫblis/, it could refer to Grenoble. On the other hand, the ms. P of the *Girart de Roussillon* (v. 3539 ed. Hackett) has a place called *Valnubles* near Besançon which cannot be located (*Valnubes* L, *Vaus Rubes* O and Hackett text), but which contains within it simply the OF adj. *nuble* 'dark'. – In the *Aiol* (v. 8086ss.) the eponymous hero requests the following as fiefdoms from his uncle, King Louis: Nevers, Langres, Dijon, Angers, Nobles, Besançon, Trier, Piacenza, Cremona, Meaux, Provins, Reims, Châlons-sur-Marne, Amiens, Saint-Quentin, Laon, Soissons and the Duchy of Francia (in that order). If the poet was able to make anything at all of the name *Nobles*, he might well have thought it meant Grenoble.

Basque *(h)iri* (< Old Basque **ili*)[770] 'city' + an adj. element, and probably *on* 'good', + the definite art. *-a.* 2) The Roman (and then international) name of the city, *Pompaelo(n-),* contains the name *Pompe(ius),* since according to Strabo (3.4.10) *Pompĕlōn* (acc. *Pompēlōna*) means the same as *Pompēiopolis* [Pompey founded Pamplona as a Roman city in the winter of 54/53 B. C. on the site of a pre-Roman settlement, probably the main base of the Vasconians, G.A.B.]; it apparently retained the same Old Basque elements *-ili-* + *-on.* 3) Since the same name occurs again in the Basque country, this time for the place called *Iruña [de Oca]* in Álava/Araba, next to the heavily fortified [Roman and predominantly] pre-Roman Oppidum Veleia, the 'good city' probably means 'well-fortified city'. This concludes Michelena's contribution. A slightly poetic enhancement to the 'noble' city of *Nobles* would not, therefore, be surprising.

The other arguments are not as convincing. Aebischer (1954b, 10ss., and 1959 passim) in particular argued for Pamplona. When Charlemagne marched into Spain in 778, he forced Pamplona to capitulate (Royal Annals up to 829). Some smaller sources say that he conquered it (*conquesivit* etc.), the very old Ann. *Laurissenses minores* even expressly state: *contra Saracenos Pampalonam civitatem capit.* And finally, just before the year 900, the Poeta Saxo reported this event in verse with the words (v. 367 s.): *Ad Pampelonem, quod fertur nobile castrum / Esse Navarrorum, veniens id ceperat armis.* The formulation *nobile castrum* made an impression on Aebischer. But we must remember, first, that the *Ann. Mettenses priores* had already called Pamplona *firmissima civitas* and the Poeta only had to find a hexameter ending for the same content, and secondly, that the nexus *nobile castrum* occurs elsewhere, for example, with reference to Orthez (cf. below on [5]), or to Gordes (Vaucluse) (Apt 285 shortly after 1122) – if we were to carry out a more systematic search, we would probably find more.[771] Thirdly, there is no evidence to support Aebischer's assumption that there was once a broader distribution of mss. of the Poeta's work: there is only the one ms. from Saxony, and as far as I know, there is no trace of the work ever having reached any Romance-speaking territory.

Aebischer also finds it remarkable that no text from before 1200 cites both *Nobles* and Pamplona as two non-identical cities. However, what Aebischer

---

770 The change of intervocalic *-l-* > *-r-* happened in Basque after Christianisation (*aingeru* < *angelus*, *borondate* < *voluntatem* [Lord's Prayer], *gura* < *gula* ['gluttony', sin], *maradikatu* < *maledictus*), but mainly before 1025, which is when the first toponymic evidence appears (Michelena 1990, § 16.2).

771 As we might expect, the adj. *noble, nobile,* is more liberally used in the epics than in the charters: Heim (1984, 410) cites *Bouloigne la noble fermeté* (*Anseïs de Metz* v. 3942), *Greilemont le nobile castel* (*Gaufrey* v. 4375), *Maience la nobile cité* (*Doon de Mayence* v. 2298).

says about *Nobles* and Pamplona might also be said about *Nobles* and Dax, so that the not-being-named-together argument (even if we could accord it sufficient statistical support) balances the two theories out.

According to Contini (1964, 111 n. 1) the Franco-Italian *Mort Charlemagne* mentions a conquest of *Nobele* in Spain by Guillaume d'Orange, which then at the appropriate point in Italian *Nerbonesi* by Andrea da Barberino (late 14th c.) is replaced by *Pampeluna*. But if Andrea did not know the real meaning of *Nobles* anymore – and this would hardly be surprising for an Italian in the late 14th c. – and therefore thought this was an imaginary city, then he might well have replaced it with the name of a well-known northern Spanish town.

De Mandach (1970, 136s.), on the other hand, believes that at least in another Franco-Italian text, the *Entrée d'Espagne* (early 14th c.), the name *Nobles* means Pamplona. In this epic, Nobles has four gates which open towards Gascony (and finally Paris), towards Aragón, towards 'Spain' and towards the ocean (v. 6714–6717). Against de Mandach,[772] the description does fit with Dax because there is the road "towards (150 km of) Gascony and finally Paris (quite simply the Way of St. James) and also the ancient road to Orthez-Jaca and therefore Aragón (over the Somport, without going through Navarre at all!),[773] the road to Peyrehorade and thus to Spain (again the Way of St. James) and the road to the ocean near Capbreton (and from there to Bayonne)." And what is most of the *Entrée* about? It is about Charlemagne's siege of Pamplona, while at the same time Roland takes Nobles without Charlemagne's permission! This basic structure of the epic, and also the details in different passages, confirm beyond all doubt that the two towns are not the same, e.g. v. 6705–6707: Nobles is a rich and powerful city, and as long as it sends support to Pamplona, that city will not be defeated; or v. 9465s.: Nobles is weakened by the fact that many of its warriors are busy defending Pamplona. Therefore, the author recognises the narrative potential of Roland who is successful but disobedient at Nobles, and he makes it a major counterpoint to Charlemagne's siege of Pamplona.[774]

---

772 These four gates have other names, apart from the directional ones cited above, and de Mandach misunderstands two of them. According to him ((1970, 137) *la porte Vals* leads "vers la vallée, donc vers l'Aragon" – but in v. 9585–9587 it leads to 'Spain'; and the *porte Lice* does not mean *Galice* because of an abbreviation *par mutation* and it does not lead to Galicia, but in v. 9599 it leads to Aragón.

773 On this road cf. Lacarra in Vázquez de Parga/Lacarra/Uría Ríu (1948, 2.15).

774 This in no way contradicts the fact that the motif of Nobles having four gates appears to be much older than the *Entrée*. As Roncaglia (1961, passim) has shown, the allusion in the *Roman de Thèbes* (around 1150–1160, v. 8826) to the *quatre eschiles de Roland* must be referring to the four *eschieles,* which in the *Entrée* are under Roland's overall command, and which he orders his comrade Bernard to send out to attack all four gates of Nobles (v. 9410–9627). A

On [4]: Boissonnade (1923, 117s.) and Burger (1955, 127 n. 1) argued in favour of Naval (which is the official modern spelling, and not Nabal), pronounced /naβál/, about 20 km north of Barbastro. Naval did actually have an imposing fortress in an elevated position, which dominated the access routes from France to Barbastro. It capitulated to Peter I of Aragón in 1095 (not 1091). In the charters from around the year 1100, it is usually called *Napal*, and occasionally *Nabal*.[775] But first of all, the stress does not match, and this is an important argument against it until at least 1150; secondly, because of the stemma, the -*a*- in K cannot be put into the archetype. Even if we could accept that the name randomly resulted in the adj. *noble* before the start of the ms. record – thirdly – this would not fit the narrative. Fourthly, it is not located in the northwest of Spain, where, according to the normal epic tradition, Charlemagne first entered that country.

Admittedly, there is one exception to this tradition, which Boissonnade noticed; in the *Aymeri de Narbonne* (first quarter of the 13th c., v. 105s.); it describes how Charlemagne: *Pris ot Barbastre e Nobles* [not, as Boissonnade writes, *Noples*] *ot sessie, / E ot conquis la citét de Lerie.* Given the fact that Naval, Barbastro and Lérida/Lleida are very close to each other, we must conclude that the author of *Aymeri* identified the *Nobles* he found in the epic as the Naval that he knew very well. Because the perspective of whole William epic is from the northeast and towards Spain, the meaning of *Nobles* has been pulled towards the northeast.[776]

---

story about Roland's unauthorised conquest of Nobles with its four gates appears, then, to have existed before around 1140–1145. However, Roncaglia (p. 203) is correct when he expressly refuses to use this information to decide between Guiette and Aebischer, i.e. between Dax and Pamplona, because we cannot just take random details from the surviving text of the *Entrée* (with its almost sixteen thousand verses!) and put them in to the earlier story. In fact, the motif of the four *eschieles* (and with them the four gates) is fully compatible with the re-routing of the *ewes,* as the Nobles story in the KMS I 52 (which Roncaglia also mentions) clearly mentions both events. In other words: even if the story which the author of the *Thèbes* already knows is older than the Rol. in its surviving form, there is nothing to suggest that it comes from any other context, other than just an amplification of the story about Roland at *Nobles*-Dax.

775 Cf. Ubieto Arteta (1951, 76s.) and the charters there, no. 20, 41, 70 from the years 1095–1099; more charters and the literature are in Boissonnade (1923, 117 n. 7s.). This place is not to be confused with the less significant Napal about 15 km east-southeast of Aoiz/Agoiz, which is already in Navarre, as indeed some historians have done, according to Ubieto; it is also not to be confused with Novales (Arag. *Nobals*) about 15 km southeast of Huesca, which is located on a plain and has a fortress (which was apparently not built until the 15th c.).

776 Place (1947, 885) suggests another argument in favour of Naval that is irrelevant in the extreme. In Idrīsī the city of Naples/Neapolis is called *Nabalī* [because it came from Ital. *Napoli*

On [5]: There is no evidence to support Orthez, apart from the fact that a charter dating from 1265 is *actum apud Ortesium in castro quod dicitur Nobile* (Bédier 1926–1929, 3. 120; the charter in Béarn-Marca 605s.). According to Aebischer (1959, 325s.) this concerns the fortress that was built after 1242 by the House of Moncada who came from Spain (one tower of which is still standing today, the Tour Moncade). Apparently, the Moncada deliberately gave it this epic name. The historical Charlemagne did not go through Orthez on his way into Spain, or on his way back,[777] and the city is not mentioned anywhere in the epic tradition.

On [6]: Noblejas (15 km east-southeast of Aranjuez, 60 km south-southeast of Madrid) was suggested by Andresen (1883, 452) and Tavernier (1911a, 146). The place was conquered during the reign of Alfonso VI, but then it was lost through the defeat at Uclés in 1108, and it was not recaptured by Alfons VII until 1139. In that year it is called *Nobleas*, in the years 1193 and 1209 it is called *Nobles* (Hernández 1985, 230, Archivo de la Catedral de Toledo, Z.4A.52, Original; González 1960, 3.468). But it does not ever seem to have had a fortress, its location does not in any way fit with being the first conquest that Roland ever made in Spain, and it does not fit with the story either.

On [7]: A rather pretentious article by Poncet (1970, 133 n.14) suggests Niebla, near Seville, but there is literally nothing to support this.

On [8] and [9]: In his Rol. edition (1850) Génin translated *Noples* as 'Constantinople'. Mireaux (1945, 269s.) thought it was Naples: in the *Gaydon* (v. 28, 35) Nobles is on the coast and "évoque Naples presque invinciblement". Even this must be refuted: in the *Gaydon* this part of the story is not about Italy. But in the Rol. we read: *Set anz pleins que en Espagne venimes;/ Ja vos conquis e Noples e Commibles [. . .]* etc.; Roland is clearly weighing up how well the Spanish campaign has been going so far. However, Miraux' idea about Naples in our context is not entirely useless. For some time before Naples was finally annexed by the southern Italian Norman kingdom in 1139, it had been under its influence, and contacts between the Normans in southern Italy and those in Normandy and in England were reputedly very close. Since O is Anglo-Norman and K goes back to an Anglo-Norman source, it is possible that the *-p-* in *Noples* in O and the *-a-* in *Nables* in K go back to the superficial influence of the name *Naples*, without any

---

and there was no *-p-* in Arab. G.A.B.]; and so, the Muslims could have called Naval *Nabalī*. But what difference would that make?

777 Not even if he had taken the route through the Somport Pass on the way back (which in fact heads towards Auxerre!).

suggestion that a part of the story takes place there.[778] The *Gui de Nanteuil* may be relevant here, where there is talk of a valuable tent: *Rollant l'avoit conquis, de Naples l'aporta*. There is a similar instance in the aristocratic version of the *Floire*: in this text there is a *Naples* (v. 121, not *Napes*, as Flutre s. v. incorrectly states) in Spain (cf. v. 57–61), the residence of Floire's Muslim father, who is waging war across Christian Galicia; it takes two days to make the journey home from Santiago by boat (v. 117) as far as the harbour that belongs to Naples; *Naples* itself appears to be located a bit further inland.

On [10]: De Mandach (1984, 722s.) also incorrectly identifies Nobles as a tiny place called Navapalos, which is located on the southern bank of the upper Duero, about 12 km upriver from San Esteban de Gormaz, 7 km downriver from the ruins of the Gormaz fortress. In about 956–966, the Muslims made Gormaz into one of the biggest and strongest fortresses in al-Andalus (and the ruins that survive today leave no doubt about this), but it still fell to Ferdinand I of Castille in 1060 (*Chronica Najerensis* 3.1.19, 3.8.9) in a campaign which is recorded in history without any mention of French support, and Navapalos is not mentioned either. In 1081, Muslim troops briefly managed to plunder Gormaz during a raid, and then El Cid carried out a revenge mission in areas that paid tribute to Alfons VI and would therefore have been entitled to live in peace (*Historia Roderici* 10.5). When somewhat later Alfons VI was roundly defeated by the Almoravids, he thought it advisable to make peace with El Cid, and so he gave him Gormaz and some other fortresses as a fief (*Historia Roderici 25.2*). The *Cantar de Mio Cid* mentions both *Gormaz*, *un castiello tan fuort* (v. 2843), and *Navas de Palos* (v. 401), albeit both as places that the daughters of El Cid or he himself passed through, and not in connection with military events.[779] The proximity of the two places to each other in reality, although not at all in the

---

778 The *-p-* in *Noples* in O also begs the question whether there might have been an underlying local form during this period. In Haut-Béarn and the adjoining Alto Aragón it is well known that *-p-, -t-, -k-* have remained voiceless to this day (as in Basque, Michelena 1990, §12.2), and the area affected by this seems to have extended much further across the Gascon territory (Elcock 1938, 169, talks about *la majeure partie des Landes*, and this would also include Dax). The *-pl-* group appears also to have been a part of this; because Arag. has e.g. *dopl(l)e* 'double', *dopl(l)á* 'to double' as opposed to the *-bl-* in Span., Cat., Occ. and Fr. We also find 'hyperconservative' forms such as *nopleza* 'noblesse', which is still heard in Beniáns (about 60 km east-northeast of Huesca), (Andolz 1977 s. v.), or the form that seems to be common across the whole Alto Aragón *o diaple* 'the devil'.

779 De Mandach cannot produce any text that mentions a fortress called Navapalos/Navas de Palos. Nevertheless, he suggests (1984, 722s.): "En quittant les bords du Duero et le village actuel de Navapalos, et en prenant le 'camino vecinal' (chemin vicinal) pour gagner Vildé à 5 km

text of the *Cid*, made such a big impression on de Mandach that he simply presumes *Navapalos* is a sufficiently old form, and that he constructs his own intermediate form *Nauplos (by dropping the stressed vowel, even though this goes against the most elementary rules of phonology) which then had to produce Fr. *Noples* whereas – and we do not have to investigate this further at this point – *Gormaz* would produce Fr. *Gormaise*.

Since de Mandach had also supported the identification of *Nobles* as Dax (for the period around 1200) and as Pamplona (for a later period), and as Gre-noble in the early 12th c., his identification of *Nobles* as Navapalos in 1984 (for an even earlier period) was already his third or fourth attempt. He was not worried about the implications of this for his methodology, and even went on to express some sympathy with Boissonade's (1984, 723s.) suggestion of Naval. I am much more persuaded by Occam's *entia praeter necessitatem non sunt multiplicanda* and regard this, in my opinion, reckless multiplicity of transfer hypotheses as a major threat for research in the epic genre: the more often a term is used to support a facile both-this-and-that hypothesis, the greater the danger that the whole approach is discredited, even in the few cases where it is actually justified. In the light of this, it is misleading and broadly mistaken to claim, as de Mandach does, for example, that "travestissement" is the most important pillar of the Old French epic, since it is all about "camouflage systématique", "les Français ont coutume de transformer les toponymes étrangers", a "mouvement cyclique de travestissement" is at work across the whole epic genre, it is all about "le bal des 'noms-masques'" (1984, 720s.).

On [11]: In the same year as de Mandach's *Navas-de-Palos* hypothesis, a second construction was produced by Heim (1984, 409–413). This, too, builds on principles of confusion and misrepresentation, and it produces results that are characteristically quite different and, in my opinion, just as wrong. He finds my approach of rediscovering Dax's old name Aquae Augustae and of translating *Augusta(e)* as *Noble(s)* quite illuminating but applies it to *Caesar-augusta* 'Saragossa', even though the equally important equation of *Aquis* ~ *ewes* (v. 1778) does not fit. This creates the need for a game of hide and seek, confusion and misrepresentation, and he goes on to argue that the central event in the historical Spanish campaign, the confrontation outside Saragossa, was hidden in a supplementary narrative by the author of the Pseudo-Turpin chronicle, and "transformed into" a miracle which God performs to enhance Roland's reputation before he marches into *Espagne*. A

à l'ouest [*recte*: à l'est, G.A.B.], on est obligé de contourner une colline très escarpée où s'élèvent les ruines d'une forteresse. Serait-ce le château de Navapalos?"

very strange state of affairs indeed. He goes on to suggest that the plot proceeds with the first high point in a story that has two such high points [the second one being Roncevaux, G.A.B.], but from this moment onwards it is reduced to dark allusions or transformed so much that it is almost completely unrecognisable [. . .] the deliberately confusing [!] play on the names *Sarraguce*, *Noples* and *Costentinnoble* in the Oxford Rol. can therefore be explained as the consequence of the impenetrable [!] influence of material from several partly misunderstood sources dealing with Charlemagne's battles on the other side of the Pyrenees.

In actual fact, however, as Bédier rightly noted, the Chanson de Roland is one of the most carefully constructed poems in all of world literature, and its author, we might add, was not only highly educated, but also especially concerned with achieving maximum accuracy and clarity in his writing. There is not even the slightest trace of deliberate confusion. Great poetry here, as in most other cases, is the very opposite of impenetrable, hide-and-seek posturing.

I can only hope that the appearance in the same year of these two completely incompatible instances of the "unveiling" principle in medieval studies will serve to demonstrate just how misleading this kind of methodology is.[780]

A.12.2.2 *Commibles / Morinde*

Commibles O 198, *Morinde* n, K, V7, *Merinde* C: *Commibles* in O competes with *Morinde* in β. We can add to the latter *Morindia* in the *Carmen* v. 17.

---

[780] For the sake of completeness in relation to the topic of *Nobles*: the old edition of the *Chanson de Jérusalem* by Hippeau (1868) mentioned in v. 7401, 8152 and 8459 a Bishop of *Nobles* as a participant in the First Crusade, in the first passage with his name *Gui*. On the other hand, the new edition by Nigel R. Thorp (1992) with a new line numbering has v. 8132 (here with *Gui*) and 8900 *Nole*, but in v. 9204 *Nobles* again. Information on the variants can only be found in the index of names, but the author notes that the latter is intended more for illustration than as a complete account. This index tells us that in v. 8132 the mss. DT have *Nobles*. In other words, in this chanson, Nobles may be an intruder. Be that as it may, neither of the editors (and no other research known to me) provides any details about this person. In all three places this person is cited alongside the Bishop of Martorano (in Norman southern Italy) and the Abbot of Fécamp, who maintained close relationships with the southern Italian Normans; this makes us think primarily of the episcopal city of Nola (35 km northeast of Naples), whose name automatically must have been pronounced by the Normans as *Nole*. The list of bishops in the diocesan administration https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roman_Catholic_Diocese_of_ Nola only names a Guilelmus (attested 1105, 1123). (The lists of bishops from Dax, Pamplona, Grenoble and Naples have no Guido/Wido around the year 1100 either.)

Commibles is [1] Coimbra, not [2] Comillas, [3] Collioure, [4] Comellas or [5] Monubles. *Morinde* is more likely to be [6] Miranda de Arga than [7] Miranda de Ebro and is certainly not [8] Mérida. *Commibles* has a slightly better chance of inclusion in the archetype than *Morinde.*

On [1]: The ancient name of *Conimbriga* lives on with a slight geographical shift across to neighbouring ancient Aeminium, in a place called *Conimbrica* (with many minor variants) in the *Parochiale Suevum* (around 570) and *Conimbria* (again with variants) in the somewhat later *Parochiale Visigothicum* (both in CC-CM 175); both forms also appear in the early chronicles (MGH AA. 13, Index); *Conimbria* can then be accepted as the normal Middle Latin form (as e.g. in the Monk of Silos).[781]

The city was already Christian between 878 and 987, then it was lost to al-Manṣūr and reconquered in 1064 by Ferdinand I. This event had a much more visible impact than e.g. the Reconquista of Gormaz a few years before; the actual siege of Coimbra took about six months but it is recorded in the *Miraculum 19* of the *Codex Calixtinus* (put together before 1139) with the typically epic time frame of seven years. One of the reasons for the resonance of this event was the fact that many Frenchmen who had first been involved in Aragón in 1064 at the battles for Barbastro used the opportunity to undertake a pilgrimage to Compostela, and while they were there, they heard first-hand about the conquest. The city continued to be of interest to Francophone people because in 1090/1091 it came into the possession of Raymond, the son of a count from the Franche-Comté, and in 1096 of his cousin Henry from the Duchy of Bourgogne, both of whom were sons-in-law of Alfons VI. Henry installed French governors to look after it. In 1117, Coimbra briefly fell to the Muslims once again (EI s. v. ʿAlī b. Yūsuf), and even after this, it remained the centre of a disputed border area until the great Portuguese victory of 1139 near Ourique. From then until 1256 it was the centre of Portugal, whose first king, Henry's son Alfons I, was recognised as such in 1143 by his half-cousin, Raymond's son Alfons VII *el Emperador* of Spain.

The continuing French interests in this city are reflected in the place it has in epic literature (*Fierabras*, *Destruction de Rome*, *Siège de Barbastre*, *Enfances Vivien*, *Ansëis de Cartage*, *Orson de Beauvais*); in this context it is called *Con(n)imbre*, occasionally *Con(n)ibre* through the omission of a nasal tilde on the -*i*-, more rarely *Conibres*, *Cunibres* with the French local -*s*, very sporadically *Coïmbres*

---

[781] There are also forms written with -*l*- instead of -*n*- which are of no interest in our context; they are based on a false regression, because in Port. intervocalic -*l*- and -*n*- were both dropped.

which exhibits the Portuguese dropping of the intervoc. -*n*-. In the source of O, the *Commi*- arose because (before the appearance of the í stroke) the six strokes of *Conim*- were misread as seven strokes; the -*bles* instead of -*bres* could be echoing the word *Nobles* which comes immediately before it.[782]

If Coimbra belongs in the archetype, then it came into the Song as the first conquest of the middle phase of the Reconquista; it echoed down the decades as a great achievement, and so it was worth saying that Charlemagne, who had conquered the whole of Spain, must then also have conquered this place. If this fictional Charlemagne wanted to conquer the whole of Spain with Saragossa as its centre, he could have taken this western part first, to prevent any opponents attacking him from behind. The only weak point of this name is that it is less specific than *Morinde* 'Miranda de Arga' and could therefore be a *lectio facilior*.

On [2]: Comillas on the Cantabrian coast, almost 40 km west of Santander, suggested by Stengel in the Index of his edition along with Coimbra, is too insignificant and lacking in historical presence to be considered. Also, the -*bl*- instead of -*ll*- could be explained as a simple misreading.

On [3]: Collioure, today a coastal town in Roussillon 10 km from the Spanish border, and suggested by Place (1947, 883s.), appears in 673, in the year it was conquered by the West Gothic King Wamba, as *Castrum Caucoliberi* (Historia Wambae, MGH SS.mer. 5.511) and later as *Colibre* (Place cites a reference from the *Primera Crónica General* and from the 16th c.). It also had a fortress on a rocky outcrop, but after the time of Wamba it appears not to have been significant; at any rate it had been in safe Christian territory since before 800. Place favours *Colibre* > **Colible* > *Comible*; however, -*l-r*- > -*l-l*- is not attested, and only the opposite tendency is known. Also, there are no parallels to the following dissimilation of the -*l-l*- to -*m-l*.

On [4]: The strangest consequence of the dogma that the Ebro basin is the only relevant area is de Mandach's choice (1984, 718) of "*Comellas* ou *Comellis*" as a place that Roland conquered. De Mandach found this name in Agustín Ubieto's *Toponimía aragonesa medieval* (1972, 82) referring to a hamlet that was first recorded in charters from the monastery of Obarra near Barbastro in 1296 [!]; it no longer exists, and so Ubieto thinks it cannot be located, and it certainly could not have had a fortress. A re-examination of the charters of Obarra shows that the name only appears there twice (in no. 188 and 189, both from 1296), and not

---

782 Alternatively, we could follow Baist (1883, 453) and refer to the tendency in Spanish phonology of -*br*- > -*bl*- (as in *tenebras* > *tinieblas*).

even as a freestanding toponym, but only in the personal names *Dominicus de Las Comelas* and *Gillermus de Comellis*! Furthermore, in Arag. *-ellas* > *-iellas*, but it does not develop further as in Cast. into *-illas* (Álvar 1992, 20), which leaves the *-i-* in *Commibles* unexplained; we would also have to count the *-bl-* instead of *-ll-* as a misreading.

On [5]: If *Commibles* does belong in the critical edition, Boissonnade (1923, 122) would favour a place now lost called *Monubles* on the Jalón near Calatayud. The only argument in its favour is that it "peut avoir attiré l'attention des membres de la colonie de clercs ou de soldats qui habitèrent le territoire du fief de Rotrou du Perche," but it does not appear to have had a fortress or any other kind of defences, and so it would have not been much of a conquest for Roland. Also, it is hard to see how *M-* could be misread as *C-*.

On [6]: The two most famous Spanish places called *Miranda* have been suggested for *Morinde*.[783] Aebischer (1959, 320) argued for Miranda de Arga, "vieille ville dominée par un château, à une dizaine de kilomètres au nord-est de Tafalla". At first glance, its location on the map between the above-mentioned Nobles – whether this is Dax or Aebischer's choice of Pamplona – and Valtierra, mentioned below, looks very convincing; evidently the person who brought the name into the Roland ms. tradition – whether it was the poet or later the scribe of β – had acted *en connaissance de cause*. A second plus point appears to be the fact noted by Stengel (in the Index s. v. *Morinde*), that *Morinde* in the *Aye d'Avignon* (around 1200) is mentioned as the place where the pact between Marsilĭe and Ganelon is made, and in the *Anseïs de Cartage* (early 13th c.) simply as Marsilĭe's main seat.[784] This pact, or the main seat, cannot be too far away from Saragossa, or else it would destroy the whole narrative in the Rol., and so in the minds of these two authors, since no other possible identification was in sight,[785] *Morinde* must be Miranda de Arga.

---

[783] Among the other Span. Miranda places, only the one near Oviedo (Belmonte-Miranda or Avilés-Miranda?) seems to have had a fortress; it is mentioned several times from 992 onwards in the charters of the Cathedral of Oviedo, cf. Oviedo-Catedral (123 a. 992, 320 11th c., 452 a. 1171). This is not likely to be the place mentioned in epics, since Asturia was of practically no interest in this genre.

[784] Furthermore, the old edition of the *Chevalerie Ogier* by Barrois (1842) has a *Faussaron d'outre Morinde*, a rather less than plausible formulation, which then became *Fauseron d'autre marine* in the Eusebi edition (1963, v. 9571).

[785] There is no sign of any real *Morinda* or similar in Spain, or in the area around Saragossa in particular. Ebro-Lacarra (1949, 608) cites a *Martinus de Morendo* for the year 1142, but he does not identify the place name.

On closer analysis, however, the positive points melt away. First, Miranda de Arga did not appear in history until 1162 when Sancho the Wise conferred a *fuero* on it. This event would have raised the profile of the place and is in exactly the right time period to have prompted the scribe of β to put it in the Song; the name was then included in *Aye*, the *Anseïs* and the *Carmen*.

But Miranda de Arga was always a small place (today it has only about 900 inhabitants) because of its awkward location. The great road from Pamplona-Valtierra-Saragossa ran through Olite, about ten km east as early as 1109/1110, then as now bypassing Miranda altogether, when al-Mustaʿīn destroyed Olite as part of his surprise attack on Pamplona and then retreated to Valtierra, where the Navarrese troops pursued and roundly defeated him.

We must also consider the form of the name. In the Middle Ages, *Miranda* would have been understood as an aptronym, and this would have largely protected it from being altered;[786] it emerged in Spain in the 9th c. at the latest, and in around 1281 (certainly before 1288) the name was carried over to the newly founded French *bastida* (Gers) (which today is a *commune*) and then gradually appears in other places which are smaller today, or just *lieux-dits* in the southern half of France (*Mirande*, *Miran(n)e(s)*), as far as the line running approximately from Charente–Côte-d'Or, cf. Longnon 1929, 530, Polge 1959, 45–48). None of the Span. and Port. *Miranda*, Fr. *Mirande* names show any signs of variation towards *Morinda* / *Morinde*. This means that the epic name must be an isolated one, which combined a reciprocal metathesis of the vowels (> *Marinde*) with the development -a- > -o-. The fact that the target form sounded like *mor(o)* 'Moor or blackamoor' is not sufficient justification for such a drastic change in the phonology. It may have been more essential that the name had to be inserted into a pre-existing laisse of no less than 21 verses ending in -i-ə. But this is a much greater distortion than the minimal *coups de pouce* that we saw in the catalogue of peoples; there is no parallel example to support the view that it is the work of the Roland poet.

Morinde is, therefore, in comparison with *Commibles,* more likely to be an innovation on the part of β than a *lectio difficilior.*

---

786 The original meaning would have been 'attractive to look at'. The alternative 'place with a view, observation point' does not fit with most of the Spanish and Portuguese places, nor (according to Polge 1959, 45s., 47) with the first attested and presumably oldest of the places in the south of France, the *bastida* of 1281, it does fit the later attested and smaller places (cf. also Mistral: 'belvédère'). Since the name is not attested in antiquity, though, a Celt. etymology *Miro-randa* (P. Lebel in *Romania* 63, 166) is less likely; Coromines thought it was worth considering in 1985 (DECLC s. v. *mirar*, n. 8), but changed his mind in 1996 and chose 'llocs admirables, de bella vista' (OC s. v. *Miranda*) instead.

On [7]: If *Morinde* does belong in the critical edition, then Boissonnade (1923, 123) wanted to identify it as Miranda de Ebro. It seems to be the same place as the *Miranda* in the chronicle of Alfons III (late 9th c., 8.1, p. 45 ed. Bonnaz), one of the places which Alfons III is supposed to have destroyed (in about 757) when he set up his border region and then resettled its inhabitants. From then until well into the 11th c. it must have been practically non-existent. In 1099 it was granted a very profitable *fuero* from Alfons VI,[787] following a request from Count García Ordóñez, the lord of the territory and rival of El Cid, it was given a bridge across the Ebro and defensive walls, and it must soon have acquired a fortress too.[788] However, it was not on the "classic" Way of St. James, which runs further to the south, and probably not on its predecessor either, *per devia Alavae*, which seems to have run further to the north,[789] but the granting of the *fuero* was intended to ensure that the trade going from the northeast to the south and southwest through northern Spain should if possible go through Miranda, and this seems to have been achieved in the long term at least. The town of Miranda today has 38,000 inhabitants, and the pilgrim route via Bayonne instead of Roncevaux passes through it. Since the late Middle Ages, it has taken a lot of traffic from the classic Way of St. James and this eventually developed into the international route from Paris-Bayonne-Burgos (-Madrid or Lisbon), by rail as well as by road (Spanish national road 1, and parallel to it now European Motorway E 5). If this is the place mentioned in the Song, it would be understood – after Nobles – as a kind of gateway to the west of the Peninsula. But it cannot compete with Coimbra in terms of historical relevance, nor with Miranda de Arga in terms of geographical suitability; moreover, the same reservations about the phonology apply to this name as they did to its homonym.

On [8]: Gaston Paris (1882b, 489) does not name his source but says that *Mérida* (< Lat. *Emerita*) has been suggested for *Morinde*. He rightly rejects this but does not give his reasons. The phonology alone justifies this rejection: the stress is not in the right place, the *-o-* and the *-n-* do not fit either.

---

787 Span. *fuero* ~ Port. *foral* 'charter denoting the privileges and common law of a settlement'.
788 Cf. Vázquez de Parga/Lacarra/Uría Ríu (1948, 2.451–454, with an extract from the *fuero*). A fortress of Miranda de Ebro is mentioned in 1177 (cf. Cantera Burgos, 1945, 144 n. 177), even though the partly restored fortress that exists today was not built until the 14th/15th c.
789 Cf. Vázquez de Parga/Lacarra/Uría Ríu (1948, 2.15).

A.12.2.3 Valtierra

This has already been analysed; cf. *Escremiz* of Valtierra.

A.12.2.4 Pina

La terre de Pine O 199, *Pine* n, K, *Prince la garnie* CV7: *Pine* is confirmed for the archetype through OnK.

It does not mean [1] a Cape Finisterre in northwest Spain and probably not [2] the territory around San Juan de la Peña, but it does mean [3] the territory belonging to Pina on the Ebro.

On [1]: Ferdinand Lot's suggestion (1928, 364), that we should take *terre de Fine* to mean Cape Finisterre near the north-western tip of Spain goes against all the ms. evidence and is also unlikely because *finis terra(e)* could easily be **fin de terre*, and so does not lend itself to the formation of a toponym **Fine*.

On [2]: Boissonnade (1923, 115s.) declared his support for the Peña, which gave its name to the famous monastery of San Juan de la Peña, the burial place of the Kings of Aragon. But Lat. *pinna* turns into Span. *peña*, OF *pen(n)e*, Occ. (especially in toponyms in the Western Pyrenees) *pena*; we would therefore expect *terre de Pen(n)e*, or, in a mechanical transfer from Spanish *terre de Pe(i)gne*. The fact that medieval charters for the monastery contain both the correct Latinisation *Pinna* and less regular versions *Pinia*, *Pinno* etc. does not mean much, because epic literature does not necessarily rely on the language of charters. We could perhaps overlook the phonological problems, were it not for the fact that there is a better candidate.

On [3]: This better candidate is the territory belonging to Pina. Aebischer (1959, 319) argued for Pina on the Ebro, about 35 km downriver from Saragossa, following short remarks made by Baist and Tavernier, though no historical details were provided. We can remedy this omission. Immediately after the conquest of Saragossa (19. 12. 1118) Alfonso el Batallador allocated the forests as far as Pina to Saragossa in his *fuero* for that city: *In primis persolto vobis todos illos sotos de Noviellas in iuso usque ad Pinam* (Fueros 451 a. 1119). In the documentation which follows chronologically, up to 1150 in Ebro-Lacarra (1949, 1952, accessible via the Indices) Pina occurs six or seven times, including several times as the seat of one of the major figures in Aragón; for example, the charter 1949, no. 220, for the year 1141 mentions *Garcia Ortiz in Fontes et in Pina*. Between 1134 and 1198 six lords of Pina are documented by name. It makes sense, therefore, for the territory belonging to Pina to be called *terre de Pine*. In the 13th c. Pina was important enough for

people to use the expression 'the good King who rules Pina' (*lo bon rey cuy es Pina*) to refer to the King of Aragón Jaime I, as in Cerverí de Girona (47.15 ed. de Riquer).

A.12.2.5 Balaguer

Balaguer has already been analysed; cf. section A.9.5 'The *amurafle* of Balaguer'.

A.12.2.6 Tudela

Tüele O 200, *Rudile* n (*Crudele* o): O and the Norse fragment o confirm *T/C[.?]u [d?]ele* for the archetype, and since *Crudele* is obviously influenced by *crudelis*, *Tu[d?]ele* is more likely to be the correct form.

The – seemingly uncontested – meaning is Tudela on the Ebro, only 20 km south of Valtierra and 80 km further upriver from Saragossa. The heavily fortified city was tenaciously besieged in around 1087 by the Aragonese with help from the French, but in vain; in 1093 Sancho Ramírez gave the church of *Tutela* to Saint-Pons de Thomières "si Deus omnipotens eam mihi dederit" (Ebro-Lacarra 1946, 475). But the city did not fall until 1114 (or even 1119?) to Alfonso el Batallador, probably once again thanks to French assistance, in particular from Rotrou du Perche, to whom Alfons gave the fief of Tudela before 1121 (Defourneaux 1949, 158 with n. 3). This explains why *Tudel(l)e* appears in more than 15 epics. P has made the *Escremiz de Valterne* into an (unnamed) Saracen from *Tudelle* and is therefore probably aware of the proximity of the two places to each other; cf. above (A.9.8.1) the variants of *Escremiz de Valterne*.

The removal of the intervoc. *-d-* in O produces a hypercorrect form,[790] but there are no examples of this anywhere else with this toponym. Jenkins suspected that O may also have modernised some appellatives in his source in a similar fashion; he therefore restored all intervoc. *-d-* (as well as the *-dr-* and the secondary final *-d*, the latter as *-t*) in his edition, although this gives the whole text an excessively archaic appearance.

A.12.2.7 Seville

Se[b]ilĭe Segre 200, *Sezilĭe* O, *Sibili* n (*Sibilĭe* o): *Se(b/z)ilĭe* is confirmed for the archetype.

---

790 This is rare, but definitely attested, as in the *Rou* III 4669 etc. *Goïne*, *Goïgne* 'Godwin, father of King Harald', in the 13th c. then *Leríe* 'Lérida/Lleida' (Moisan, Flutre s. v.) with a shift in the stress which is attested in Marcabru (Lerída: *escremída*, ed. Dejeanne p. 126).

It does not mean [1] a mysterious *Sezille*, [2] Santa Cilia near Jaca, or [3] Santa Cecilia near Lerma, but it does mean [4] Seville.

On [1]: Bédier translated it (1937) as *Sezille*, which does not match O exactly, and does not correspond to any real place either, but it would have suggested *Sicile* to a French reader. However, one year later (1938, 236) he managed at least to express some sympathy for *Sebilĭe* 'Seville'.

On [2] and [3]: A Santa Cecilia 5 km northwest of Lerma was suggested by Theodor Müller in his second edition of the Rol. (1878), which I could not access (following Segre on v. 200). Place (1947, 882s.) argued for the medieval Santa Cecilia about 15 km west of Jaca, a place that emerged around the monastery of the same name that was founded before 1076, today called Santa Cilia with about 200 inhabitants. But apart from the fact that neither of these two places has any kind of fortress, both suggestions fail on the grounds that in the Middle Ages the words *Sanctus*, *Sancta* were almost never dropped from names.

On [4]: Since this must be a place that was well known in Spain, and yet the reading in O does not indicate such a place, it is methodologically correct to turn to β (in this case represented also by n), which necessitates only a small emendation of O: *Sebilĭe* 'Seville'. It is in fact quite easy to imagine that the Anglo-Norman scribe lost concentration for a moment and instead of 'Seville' inserted 'Sicily' which would have been much more familiar to him;[791] later, he paid more attention when writing the name of the *Margariz de Sibilĭe* (v. 955).

A.12.3 Review of Roland's Spanish conquests

When Roland lists his most important conquests over the last *set anz*, the poet is thereby letting us see how he imagines the rather complicated course of the war up to this point. After *Nobles* 'Dax', Roland conquers *Commibles* 'Coimbra' next, both in the west of the Peninsula, so that when Charlemagne approaches Saragossa – first coming to *Valterne* (β) 'Valtierra' – he will not have any enemies behind him. (Less probably: the king marches from Dax directly through *Morinde* 'Miranda de Arga' to Valtierra.) But Saragossa, *ki est en une muntaigne*, does not surrender. Charlemagne cuts the city off from its hinterland, and practically

---

791 The error is not unique: the *Guibert d'Andrenas* also has *Sezile* instead of *Sebile* (cf. below n. 802); according to Flutre (s. v. *Sebile*) the *Athis* has two variants of *Sebile*: *Secile* and *Cezille*.

surrounds it: in the southeast Roland conquers *Pine* 'Pina de Ebro' for him, with its surrounding territory as far as *Balasguéd* 'Balaguer', then makes the circle around Saragossa smaller on the other side by conquering *Tüele* 'Tudela' in the northwest. The city still does not surrender. Charlemagne decides not to try and take it by storm, because that would have entailed heavy losses or might even have failed; instead, *tresqu'en la mer cunquist la tere altaigne*, he conquers the whole of Spain, including even the south (with the symbolic gesture of Alphons VI) 'into' the sea. This phase of the campaign ended with the conquest of *Cordres* 'Córdoba', and Roland names a typical city that he has conquered: *Se[b]ile* 'Seville'. Only one city is named because the poet, of course, knows less about southern Spain than the Ebro Basin, and perhaps because of this, he underestimates the north-south dimension of Spain. When Seville was captured, and possibly some time before that, Marsilĭe had offered his submission, but shortly after this, he murdered the messengers that Charlemagne had sent in return, either in a fit of rage, or because he had managed to strengthen the city's fortifications in the meantime and felt more secure there. In spite of this, Charlemagne carried on with his conquest of southern Spain. But when the siege of the last bastion, Córdoba, approaches its successful conclusion, Marsilĭe sends messengers once again – and Roland responds to their message with his sketch of the campaign so far, complete with this, as yet unavenged, atrocity.

In this section we find again, as we did with the anti-peers, a well-constructed, neither random nor fantastical ordering of the geographical details.

A.12.4 Other geographical details

These are analysed in the order of their occurrence.

A.12.4.1 *Cordres*
Cordres la cité O 71, *Acordes* n, *Corderes* K, *Cordoa* V4, *Cordes* CV7; also

Cordres O 97, *Acordies* n (*Cordes* B, b), *Cordoa* V4, *Cordes* CV7, *Cordybi* w: at least V4 and w use the form of the name 'Córdoba' that is familiar to them. n mistakenly interprets the *a* in *il est a Cordres* in 71 as part of the name and repeats this in 97. The second *-r-* in *Cordres* in 71 is confirmed for the archetype by OK; in 97 the *-i-* in *Acordies* in n is due to a misreading of the *-r-* in the source text, and so the archetype also had *Cordres* there. However, the presence of *Cordres* in CV7 and the correction made by the scribes of B-b (not for the first time) show that this is a widespread later form.

In the Roland story this means [1] Córdoba; but we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that a secondary meaning of [2] Cortes on the Ebro is mixed in with it.

On [1]: The name *Córdoba* (with /β/) should in the period around 1100 go to /ko̧rdvə/ in Fr. But in post-cons. position the nexus /dv/ did not exist, and /dl/, /dn/ had started to disappear (*escándele > esclandre*, *órdene > ordre*); and so in this case the /dv/ underwent substitution and produced the only remaining option of /dr/.[792] The local *-s* was still in use, even after the First Crusade (*Gadres*, *Jaffes*, *Rames*, *Rohais*), and we find it here too: *Cordre-s*. Later, the second *-r-* disappears by dissimilation from the first: *Cordes*. (Even later, when the stress was no longer retained in foreign geographical terms, but the order of the letters was, we find the spelling *Cordo(u/v)a* with misinterpretation of the grapheme <u/v> as a vowel: modern Fr. *Cordoue*).

During the lifetime of the Roland poet, Córdoba would have been as well known in French-speaking areas as New York, Moscow or Beijing today. It had been the seat of the Muslim Governor of all of Spain since 719, and from 755 until after 1000 it was the undisputed capital of the Emirs – and then in the 10th c. the Caliphs – from the Umayyad dynasty. It blossomed into a major city, the like of which existed nowhere in Latin Europe. Arabic sources name more than twenty suburban quarters and talk about a population of over 500,000 (Kettermann 2001, 66). This figure may be exaggerated, but even in the Saxon monastery of Gandersheim the nun Hrosvitha († after 973) wrote about Córdoba in her *Vita* of Pelagius, who was martyred under the rule of ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān III in Córdoba (ed. von Winterfeld, MGH SS.schol. 34, v. 12–18):[793]

> Partibus occiduis fulsit clarum decus orbis
> Urbs augusta, nova Martis feritate superba
> Quam satis Hispani cultam tenuere coloni,
> Corduba famoso locuples de nomine dicta,
> Inclita deliciis, rebus quoque splendida cunctis,
> Maxime septenis sophiae repleta fluentis,
> Necnon perpetuis semper praeclara triumphis.

Al-Manṣūr launched his over 50 destructive campaigns from Córdoba: among others those against Catalonia (which formally still belonged to France) shortly before 966, and again in 985 and the destruction of Compostela in 997 caused considerable dismay, even north of the Pyrenees. Things changed after his death:

---

792 Cf. also *Chapre(s)* < /tšapvə/ 'Capua' in the *Couronnement de Louis* and in the *Enfances Vivien*.

793 The source was brought into epic scholarship by Tavernier (1912, 144 n.) but the reference was incomplete.

in 1008/1009 Castilian troops entered the Muslim civil war to help one of the parties when they captured Córdoba, in 1010 Catalan troops helped the opposing party to regain the city, and the Catalans were even allowed to plunder Córdoba. Although they were defeated shortly afterwards, they repeated this adventure in 1017/1018 (cf. e.g. Lévi-Provençal 1957, 465–471, 479, 488 n. 17, Pérez/Arco 1956, 248, 490s., EI s. v. *Umaiyaden*, p. 1094s.). Córdoba must have been an even more familiar name in France when between 1018 and 1035 Roger de Tosny and his people spent some time in Catalonia and gained first-hand knowledge about Córdoba. The *Ann. Lobienses* (MGH SS. 13.229), which covered the years up to 982 and are preserved in an 11th c. ms., maintained that Charlemagne subdued *Hispania tota*, and the historian Ademar of Chabannes († 1034, 2.1.90 ed. Bourgain) was convinced that Charlemagne's conquests had included Córdoba; he mentions the name *Corduba* no less than ten times.

In around 1082, Alfons VI proceeded down the Guadalquivir, narrowly bypassing Córdoba, towards Tarifa on the coast.[794] After 1091 the Almoravids made Córdoba the centre of al-Andalus again; although there was no longer any talk of the city flourishing on a cultural level, this was the operational headquarters for the military campaigns which remained a threat until 1135, in spite of the loss of Saragossa to the Christians (1118). This explains why Córdoba appears on the Beatus, Hugo of St. Victor, Ebstorf and Hereford *mappae mundi* (von den Brincken 1968, 164). All in all, it would have been astonishing if Córdoba had not appeared anywhere in the Rol.

There is formal proof that OF *Cordres* meant Córdoba in 1200 in Roger of Howden (*Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, p. 52 and 177): *Cordres, id est Cordoba.*[795]

It is also indisputable that in many other epics *Cordres*, *Cordes* stands for Córdoba, such as the *Chanson de Guillaume* (v. 12, 38, 963), where *reis Deramed* and *Cordres* support each other ('Abd ar-Raḥmān of Córdoba'), and the very conservative editor McMillan identifies *Cordres* as Córdoba in the index, also in the *Prise de Cordres et de Sebille*, where the meaning is clear from the narrative,[796] and in several romances too (cf. Flutre s. v.). Since in the Rol. itself at least V4

---

794 Lagardère (1989a, 69), Menéndez Pidal (1969, 1.299), Dozy/Lévi-Provençal (1932, 120) etc.
795 Introduced to Romance language epic research by Vàrvaro (1989, 14s.). It is also interesting that *Cordes* 'Córdoba' has had two places named after it: Cordes-Tolosanes (Tarn-et-Garonne) is already called *Corduba* in 1097 in a Bull of Urban II for Moissac (Jaffé/Löwenfeld no. 5646, GC 1.40, Vincent 1937, 14, Nègre 1990–1998, no. 30438); Cordes (Tarn) was founded as a *bastide* in 1222 by Raymond VII of Toulouse (Longnon 1929, 524ss., Nègre 1990–1998, no. 30437), and this, too, was still before the final Reconquista of Córdoba in 1236. For more detail on this phenomenon of renaming, with plenty of examples, see Longnon (1929, 524ss.).
796 In the *Siège de Barbastre* the situation is more confused, but this does not amount to a counterargument.

and w obviously mean Córdoba,[797] it is reasonable to interpret *Cordres* in O and in the archetype as Córdoba.

The closest parallel with the Rol., which is very instructive but thus far has not been considered closely enough, is the PT (cap. 18). Charlemagne's last military action in Spain before Roncevaux is his very difficult conquest of *Corduba*, which he then gives as a fief to the *Autumaior*, that is to say, al-Manṣūr of Córdoba, in return for a promise that he will be baptised and subject himself to Charlemagne; after this Charlemagne visits Compostela, an obvious addition in the PT, motivated by church politics. On his way home, he stops at Pamplona, because there he is closest to Saragossa,[798] and he sends Ganelon to Saragossa; Ganelon returns to Pamplona and the whole Roncevaux debacle takes place. The logic behind the story is very clear, internally coherent, and has appropriately epic dimensions: Córdoba simply could not be left out of Charlemagne's conquests, because in reality it had been Spain's capital for three hundred years, it had just become the capital again in 1091, and it had the reputation of being the southernmost of Charlemagne's conquests (cf. Ademar's formulation!); so it was represented as the last, most difficult of his conquests, with the exception of Saragossa and the events at Roncevaux.

Two more texts besides the PT reflect a version of the Rol. which has not yet acquired the Blancandrin part, so that Ganelon rides to Saragossa unaccompanied (cf. on this Gaston Paris 1882b, 500, and Menéndez Pidal 1960, 134–136): the *Carmen* and laisse 23 of V4 (there v. 283–295, but in O 365), which comes from an older version.[799] In the *Carmen* the actual story begins with the council scene that leads to Ganelon being sent out on his mission: he sets out from *Morindia*, which is the *Morinde* from Rol.-β, Miranda de Ebro or Miranda de Arga (cf. above A.12.2.2 [6] and [7]). In the older laisse from V4, the place from where Ganelon is sent out is not mentioned; but we learn from Ganelon's words to his

---

[797] In my opinion also K. For while Charlemagne is still outside *Corderes der stete* (v. 609), Bishop Johannes asks for permission to cross over the *Ualchart* (v. 1061; the same in P, *Valchart* S, *Ualkart* A) and preach the gospel in *Almarie*. The *Ualkart* (which I think is the original form) is more likely to mean the *Wā(dī a)l-ka(bī)r* 'Guadalquivir' (x German *-art*) than the Strait of Gibraltar, and *Almarie* is therefore Almería and not al-Mahdiyya; but in both cases *Corderes* is obviously in southern Spain, and is therefore Córdoba, and not Cortes.

[798] In modern km by road, of the two stations on the Way of St. James, Logroño is slightly nearer to Saragossa than Pamplona (175 as opposed to 178 km). But the PT bases his judgment on Galloroman experience: if you travel from France, the path from the Way of St. James to Saragossa starts in Pamplona.

[799] It is rather strange that Segre (after v. 1437) has room for five printed pages of a text from V4, but not (after v. 365) for this short laisse which is also from V4; he refers only to G. Paris' Text of 1882.

horse that they will have to cross the *Runa*, which means the Arga, the river running through Pamplona and Miranda de Arga.[800] A glance at the map shows that he evidently was sent out from the place on Charlemagne's homeward journey that is closest to Saragossa: Ganelon rides out from there alone, and he returns to that place as well. As Menéndez Pidal rightly points out, it is highly improbable that all three texts would have excised the figure of Blancandrin – and in such a similar way.

It is more likely that Blancandrin is a new element introduced to the Rol., though not, as Menéndez Pidal thinks, just as a simple amplification, but in fact for reasons connected to the narrative. Our author sets out to achieve much greater levels of psychological plausibility than his predecessors. He may well have found it difficult to imagine that Ganelon and Marsilĭe, who regarded each other with deep mistrust and fear, would have become co-conspirators in the course of a single meeting without the help of an intermediary; and he therefore invented Blancandrin to be this intermediary. It is he who immediately drafts half of the infamous plan that is about to be carried out. The question of how well he will manage to deceive Charlemagne and the Franks fills the first council scene with a tension that could not have been present in the older story, and it gives the poet a chance to develop the characters of all the Christian protagonists in quite a natural way. When Ganelon departs, the psychologically impressive conversation *en route* begins, in which Blancandrin discreetly leads Ganelon into firming up his hitherto vague hatred of Roland into a treacherous plan. The daring but successful coup follows next, in which both work together in complementary roles to quickly turn Marsilĭe's inactivity and resignation into feverish preparations for the famous ambush; this is followed by Ganelon's return with the treasure and his report to Charlemagne.

Given this new, extended narrative of Ganelon's ride to Saragossa and back, the reworker could find it awkward to keep Charlemagne and his whole army idly waiting in the place closest to Saragossa – in the Song it is Valtierra. He preferred to have him come to this place directly from his last victory, the one over Cordres, and arrive practically at the same time as Ganelon. This requires the first council scene to be moved back to Cordres: *Cordres la citét* (which means a larger city, not a town or simple *bourgade*!) is besieged in v. 71, but it does not fall until v. 97, after Charlemagne and his *cadables* had shattered the *turs* and *murs*; and just as Córdoba is e.g. for Hrotsvitha an especially wealthy place, so *Cordres* is very wealthy here (v. 99s., again not a *bourgade*):

---

800 On *Rune* as a name for the Arga, cf. Beckmann (2019, 276s.); also A. Thomas 1894, passim.

Mult grant eschech en unt si chevaler / D'or e d'argent e de guarnemenz chers. At this moment, Blancandrin arrives (v.120–121) and the first council scene takes place.

When later Ganelon returns from Saragossa, he reaches Valtierra a few hours after Charlemagne and his army (v. 667–668), and the second council scene takes place. The is no more idle waiting: the course of the plot has become much more elastic – at an inconspicuous price that even the modern reader hardly notices: Blancandrin, and to a lesser degree Ganelon, have to cover very long distances.

We know today that Saragossa and Córdoba are about 550 km apart as the crow flies, but most people know this, not from their own experience, but from a table of distances or from a map. However, in those days, there was no such thing as a map with distances in the correct proportions; even if both cities had been marked on a *mappa mundi,* no one would have been able to determine the distance between them from that, and no one would even have tried to do so. Moreover, there were psychological reasons why the poet would have almost certainly underestimated the distances in the part of Spain that had not yet been reconquered, especially the north-south distances, precisely because he only knew a few names to put into this area. Similarly, we cannot expect him to mention the overnight stops that the messengers may have made; most poets of his time, and many later ones, would not have mentioned them either. Chrétien de Troyes, for example, manages to have the eponymous hero in the *Yvain* ride from the Court of King Arthur in Wales to Brocéliande in Brittany, without any mention of the English Channel (reference to this in the Roques ed. p. XXII). And even in Ariosto (42.45.8 to 42.68.1) Rinaldo arrives in Basel just one day after entering the Ardennes on horseback. However, our poet at least intimates vaguely (v. 405s.): *Tant chevalcherent e veies e chemins / Que en Sarraguce descendent* [. . .]; and so the fact remains that he never once says something that demonstrably contradicts geographical reality.

On [2]: Following his dogma that the toponyms in the Song are to be found in the Ebro Basin, Boissonnade (1923, 128s.) thought *Cordres* was Cortes (de Navarra), 3 km southwest of the Ebro on the road leading from Tudela, 25 km away, to Saragossa about 60 km away. Unlike many of his other identifications, this one was successful: it was accepted e.g. by Burger (1953, 167s.), Aebischer (1959, 319, and [1963–1964] 1967, 248–250) and de Mandach (1993, 58s.).

But no one has yet been able to show that Cortes was ever linked with any military engagements. It was taken over by Alfonso el Batallador around the same time as (or very soon after) the fall of Saragossa and given as a fief to Raymond/*Ramón* the brother (or brother-in-law) of Rotrou du Perche. He appears

e.g. in a list of witnesses in a charter of 1127 that has not yet been discussed in this context (Ebro-Lacarra 1946, no. 57) merely as the 27th secular notable person on Alfonso's side: *Ramon frater comtis in Cortes*; Cortes was therefore not one of the more important places in Aragon; a *castillo* is attested in 1234 (Yanguas y Miranda 1840–1843, 1.338).[801]

Cortes would most probably appear in the Song as *Corz*, or alternatively as *Cortes*. In *Cordres* in OK or *Cordes* in CV7, the *-d-* is unexplained. Boissonnade states that switching from *-t-* to *-d-* is a common occurrence in philology – a remark that clearly shows how vaguely he understood the categories relevant to this case.

Burger draws a much more subtle conclusion: "on imagine en effet sans peine que les clercs qui accompagnaient les armées françaises en Espagne, apprenant qu'à quelque distance de Tudela, où opéraient les chrétiens en 1087, se trouvait une ville du nom de Cortes, l'aient immédiatement identifiée à la *Corduba* des chroniques latines, dont Adhémar de Chabannes disait qu'elle était le point extrême des conquêtes de Charlemagne en Espagne". We should clarify that when the clerics heard the name *Cortes*, they could only have been reminded of the form *Cordres*, not of *Corduba*; Burger implicitly accepts that they knew the equation OF *Cordres* = Lat. *Corduba* and thus concedes that the poet actually meant Córdoba but was only mistaken about its location. This largely resolves the literary problem: the poet is not guilty of deliberately presenting his audience with a *bourgade*.[802]

---

801 Cortes itself is not situated, as Aebischer claims (1959, 319) "sur une hauteur" but is on a plain, cf. Madoz s. v.: "en una llanura [. . .]; el terreno es [. . .] casi todo llano [. . .]; existe sin embargo al O[veste] una pequeña elevación que apenas se percibe".

802 It is still somewhat strange, however, that Burger invokes Grégoire, who interprets *Cordres* in the *Guibert d'Andrenas* as 'Corinth': Burger argues that if *Cordres* could even mean 'Corinth', it would be *a fortiori* possible to confuse *Cordres* with *Cortes*. It is very difficult to believe that a sceptical and critical philologist such as Burger would accept Grégoire's hypothesis relating to the *Guibert*. The Byzantine specialist Grégoire had got it into his head that *Andrenas* was Adrianople; this leads to other misguided identifications. They contradict basic elements of the plot: in the *Guibert*, the ageing Aimeri de Narbonne orders his youngest son to fight for a fiefdom, *in Andrenas sor la mer* in Spain, beyond *Leride* 'Lérida/Lleida' and *Balesguez* 'Balaguer', in the course of which the latter is conquered *en passant*; the journey goes past (not through!) *Sezile* (a common error for *Sebile*, as in O 200) and *Cordres*, obviously with the same meaning Seville and Córdoba, to *Andrenas*; the plot of the *Guibert* explicitly continues with the capture *de Cordres et de Sebille*, where there is no doubt that *Cordres* is Córdoba. At around the same time as the *Guibert*, the *Folque de Candíe* and the *Anseïs de Cartage* show that Gandía and Cartagena are being conquered, but the realm of *Andrenas sor la mer* borders further south on the kingdom of Córdoba and Seville, and so *Andrenas* (var. *Andernas*, *Andernai* etc.) must be somewhere on the southern coast of Spain. It has not been identified; but I think the name is identical to *Andarax* (Arab. *Andarash*). The mostly very fertile valley of the

I prefer the second perspective, mainly because I think that the Marsilĭe section of the Song may have been written before 1118 but was then carefully reworked by the last author after 1118. And after 1118, when people actually saw Cortes, it could not so easily be misidentified. Moreover, by this time (and probably by 1087) another difficulty would be obvious: if anyone were to travel, like Charlemagne, from Cortes (v. 96) to Valtierra (v. 662), he would be moving diametrically away from Saragossa. Does Charlemagne then weaken Ganelon's bargaining position in Saragossa by taking his army further away from Saragossa and back towards France, thereby giving the impression that the Franks want one thing above all else: to go home as quickly as possible?

Aebischer ([1963–1964] 1967, 249s.) agrees with Burger: "On ne saurait mieux dire". But immediately before that, he had suggested a different explanation of his own: "je croirais volontiers que la forme usitée par l'auteur de la *Chanson* a dû être *Cortes, et que ce toponyme, inconnu à presque tous, aux copistes de la *Chanson* en particulier, a passé à *Cordes*, *Cordres*, sous l'influence déjà de *Cordres* 'Cordoue'". Here the error is presumed to lie not with the poet located near to Cortes, but with the more distant scribes, and this makes it more plausible. Nevertheless, the solution is too dearly bought because it supposes that the poet is writing about a *bourgade*, and yet describes it as a *citét* which has been the target of a long siege – *Od ses cadables les turs en abatiét* – and as the location of *mult grant eschech*.

Finally, de Mandach thinks that the poet meant Cortes, but consciously describes it as Córdoba, either to honour Alfonso el Batallador, who carried out a lightning Andalusian campaign in 1125–1126 during which he only briefly and unsuccessfully besieged Córdoba (but in that case, *grant eschech* would sound

---

Río Andarax produces linen and silk (Lombard 1978, 52 and 982), and it widens out as it flows into the Bay of Almería; the river comes from the area at the edge of the Sierra Nevada and it was navigable in ancient times from Pechina, about 10 km inland. There were several fortresses in its valley; one of them is named in Ibn al-Khaṭīb *Ḥiṣn Andarash* 'the fortress Andarax', in al-Ḥimyarī *Madīnat Andarash* 'the town Andarax' (Idrīsī 1989, 258; EI s. v. *al-Mariyya*). The weak middle vowel could have turned into a neutral vowel in OF, and since most OF dialects do not have a final /š/, /s/ was substituted instead. In the epics then, as the variants *Andernas* and *Andernai* suggest, there is some influence from the names of Andernay, Meuse (a. 1126 *Andrenai*, 1180 *Andernai*) and/or Anderny, Moselle (a. 1282 *Andrenei*, 1484 *Andernay*). The *Guibert* is written from a perspective close to that of the Andalusian campaign of Alfons VII (1146–1147, Córdoba–Sevilla–Almería, which in reality only resulted in short-lived conquests). Interestingly, there is in an original charter (Corbeil-Vicomtes 64) belonging to Bishop Thibaut of Paris († 8. 1. 1158) a lay witness *Galbertus Dandernas*. The name is probably a misreading of *Guibertu*s; but even if it is not, *d'Andernas* should be "epic" because referring to the two above-mentioned real places there are no forms which end in -*nas*.

more like mockery!), or to honour Ramón, the holder of the fiefdom of Cortes – random justifications which can always be found for cases like this. I therefore judge Aebischer's and de Mandach's ideas less acceptable than those of Burger, but I am still not fully convinced by Burger's explanation either.

A.12.4.2 *Haltilĭe*

Es puis desuz Haltilĭe O 209, *el pui soz Aute Vile* C, *as porz souz Montoïe* V7; and also *as puis de <suz> Halt[il]ĭe* Segre 491, *as puis de Haltoïe* O, *al pont de Dalmacìe* V4, *es pres soz Aute Hoïe* C, *es prez soz Montoïe* V7: Because an expression like 'on the high ground below X' sounds rather strange, the *puis* in V4 are replaced by a 'bridge', in V7 in the first place by a 'pass', in CV7 in the second place by 'meadows'; V7 also replaces the higher *Halt-oïe / Aute Hoïe* with *Mont-oïe* for the sake of clarity. In V4 *Dalmacìe* gives an erroneous new meaning. In C, *Aute Vile* in the first passage is a *lectio facilior*, and in fact (because of the neighbouring *Mont-oïe* in V7) of *Aute Hoïe* rather than *(H)Altilĭe*. This leaves the *desoz Haltilĭe* in the first O passage completely isolated; in both passages, therefore, the forms in the archetype must be (in agreement with Stengel, Roncaglia and Hilka/Pfister but not Segre) *soz Haltoïe*.

Haltoïe '(at the), far-reaching sound', as a toponym something like 'High Echo',[803] is evidently a fictional formation and appears to come from the same acoustic sensibility that has such a moving effect in the Song through the motif of the horn; there is some basis for this in the reality of the Pyrenean landscape and its genuinely fascinating and far-reaching sound effects and echoes.

It is *a priori* unlikely that such a name would have arisen as a secondary meaning provided by a copyist.

But why then does O (or a previous stage) have what was initially a faulty "correction" *desoz Haltilĭe*? I suspect that a scribe had at some point heard the Old Span. *altiello* (developing over time partly > *altillo*) 'high ground', which is quite common in the minor toponymy of Spain,[804] and that he quite simply Frenchified it as *Haltilĭe*.[805]

---

803 OF *oïe* (> modern Fr. *ouïe*) means 'hearing' and often also 'echo' (following Rol. 1765).

804 Madoz mentions only two instances of *Altillo* s. v.; there are many more e.g. in the Gazetteer 1961 s. v. As Boissonnade (1923, 88) knew of at least one *Per-altilla*, he naturally thinks *Haltilĭe* is the correct form.

805 Of course, one does wonder if the *Haltilĭe* in O could perhaps be influenced by the supposedly Italian town (OF) *Atylíe/Hatelíe*, occasionally *Atílle*, (MLat.) *Atilia*, *Altilia* etc., which plays an important role in the *Otinel* and was later identified as Tortona, Serravalle or Venetian *Altinum* (Bédier 1926–1929, 270–285, Serra 1954 passim, Aebischer 1960a, especially 137s.). However, there are chronological difficulties with this idea. For both passages in Anonymus

A.12.4.3 *Carcasonĭe*

Carcasonĭe O 385, *Carcasone* C, *Cartasoine* V7: The *Carcas-* found in both O and C means that the *-t-* in V7 cannot be put in the archetype; the quasi-consensus between O and V7 in *-onĭe / -oine* confirms this, and therefore *Carcasonĭe* belongs in the archetype. The context: Ganelon wants to show Blancandrin how desperate Roland is to achieve conquests (v. 383–388):

> Er main sedeit li emperere suz l'umbre:
> Vint i ses nies, out vestue sa brunĭe,
> E out predét dejuste Carcasonĭe;
> En sa main tint une vermeille pume.
> « Tenez, bel sire », dist Rollant a sun uncle,
> « De trestuz reis vos present les curunes ».[806]

Ravenna, where Altinum was once 'also' called *Altilia*, are present only in ms. C (14th/15th c.) and were recognised by Schnetz (1940, 67) as *spurium additamentum librarii* (and in p. IV–V there is also a vigorous and negative assessment of ms. C); the *Otinel* itself was in any case written after 1150; all other attestations of the name are from the 13th c. at the earliest.

806 The text requires some interpretation. Since the meaning 'gilded (of something silver)' for *vermeil* does not appear until MFr., the meaning here is simply the OF main one, 'bright red' (like blood, roses, etc. cf. the dictionaries); this is therefore just a natural, fully ripe apple, and not a gem, which implies that the place that Roland raided is insignificant, and e.g. might be invented simply to fit the assonance. But Roland uses the apple as a symbol. Brault explains this (1978, 141–144) by reminding us on the one hand of a cathedral statue depicting the devil as a young, handsome man offering an apple (attested in the 13th, a representation of the temptation scene in *Gen* 3.1–6), and on the other hand of the devil who offers Jesus lordship over *omnia regna mundi* or *omnia regna orbis terrae* (*Mt* 4.8s., *Lc* 4.5–7); but this explanation is not sufficient, because Brault is just separating the symbolising item (the apple) from the symbolised (universal sovereignty) into two different scenes. He quite wrongly neglects the relevance of another symbol, which Jenkins (ad loc.) and other Roland researchers had discussed, and which links Roland's conduct with universal sovereignty: the apple of empire. The *globus* had been a key motif in the symbolism of the emperor even in the time of Augustus, and in late antiquity we find it mostly in the hand of the monarch in dozens of pictorial representations; in Christian times it usually has (as *globus cruciger*) a cross on it, sometimes a double cross (Alföldi 1980, 156, 226 n. 3, 235–238, with examples etc. in plates 1.1–3, 2.1, 3.1, 4, 6.1, 6.3, 7.1, 9.1–3, 10). Schramm (1958, 19) incorrectly believed that it was just a symbolic image, but the emperors carried it as a real insignia (as explained by Alföldi Deér 1961, passim, and Ladner 1996, 193s.). The symbol came to the West via Byzantium (an influence on symbolism that Schramm tends to underestimate greatly, cf. Deér 1957b, passim). The Metz statue of Charles on horseback has a physical globe in the left hand (representing either Charlemagne or Charles the Bald, around 870); there is an image of Charles the Bald (Schramm, 1958, 57–59) and Otto the Great; as Radulfus Glaber (*Hist.* 1.5.23) describes in detail, and therefore credibly, Pope Benedict [VIII] had a golden apple of empire made for the coronation of Henry II in 1014 (Schramm, 1958, 60–63); there is an image from around 1040 (e.g. in Weinfurter 2009, 153) of Henry III holding an apple of empire with a cross on it in his left hand; he did not

In this case [1] Carcassonne and [2] Tarazona have about equal chances of being the correct identification.

On [1]: In 778, Carcassonne was very probably in French hands. Narbonne is situated at about the same latitude as Carcassonne, but it had greater strategic importance, and so we know the exact year of its reconquest. It was in actual fact conquered by Pippin in the year 759, although all the epics say it happened in the time of Charlemagne: in the Rol., Charlemagne previously captured his horse Tencendur when Malpalin of Narbonne was killed, albeit apparently in a battle some distance away near the Rhône (cf. below A.12.6.6, s. v. *Marsune*); in all of the Aimerid epic it is said, or assumed, that Narbonne was conquered during the time of Charlemagne, not by William but by his epic father Aimeri when he was a young man – and it is quite probable that this Aimeri is the same person as the *dux* in the Hague Fragment; thus we will identify below (A.12.6.7) the *Nerbone* that Charlemagne and his army on the way back from Spain *passent [. . .] par force e par vigur* 'pass with a demonstration of military might' (v. 3683), not as Arbonne, but as Narbonne, immediately before it is conquered. In any case, the epic "early period" from the Aimerids' perspective vaguely overlaps with the events at Roncevaux; the fact that the Roland poet thinks Carcassonne has not

---

hold this until he was emperor, but soon after this time, in the 11th c., German rulers often held it when they were crowned as kings (Schramm, 1958, 76–83). For our purposes it is important to note the medieval term used to refer to this object: it was occasionally called μῆλον 'apple' instead of σφαῖρα even by the Byzantines (Schramm, 1958, 2), and over the course of the 11th c. in the West, it is also called *pomum* 'apple' instead of *globus* or *sphaera*. Before 1044 the Frenchman Radulfus Glaber (*Hist.* 1.5.23) calls it *quasi aureum pomum*. In around 1137 the Italian Petrus Diaconus in the *Graphia* Libellus states: *Habet autem imperator [. . .] pallam* (MLat. 'sphere, ball') *auream in manibus suis, sicut constituit Octavianus imperator propter nationes sibi in cuncto orbe subiectas, ut malum* ('the apple', that is to say the *palla aurea) figuram orbis designet* (Bloch 1984, 164; the date is wrong in Schramm 1958, 78). And above all: around 1080, about one generation before the Rol., Benzo of Alba (1.9, MGH SS.schol. 65.126) describes the emperor in full regalia: *portans in sinistra aureum pomum, quod significat monarchiam regnorum*. Can this be different from *une vermeille pume [. . .] de trestuz reis les corones*? Even if the author of the Rol. did not know of Benzo's writings, the symbols of sovereignty would have been considered immensely important during this time of the Investiture Controversy, and there would have been no reason to doubt the poet's knowledge of imperial symbols, perhaps even those brought by south Italian-Normans from Byzantium (cf. especially sections B.1.1.1 on *Joiuse*, C.2.1 on *orieflambe*, C.2.2 on *Munjoie*). The poet displays a knowledge of psychology unusual for his time and he is able to use overtones when he needs to, as in this case to introduce some humour: Roland appears to be joking – and (as Ganelon correctly observes) he would be only too willing to turn the joke into something more serious.

yet been conquered, and thus does not pay much attention to it, makes it a likely candidate for the city situated "on one side of" Narbonne.

The idea of Roland carrying out a raid 'in the area around Carcassonne' – we can agree with Bédier and interpret *dejuste* as '[aux] abords de'[807] – is therefore no surprise in itself, but how does this fit with the context? The temporal term *er*, normal OF *(h)ier*, occasionally means 'recently' and not 'yesterday',[808] and Ganelon may not have invented the episode, but he does at least select it from all the many stories that could be told about Roland, and therefore it could very well have happened at some time in the past, e.g. at the time when Balaguer was besieged (v. 200). Balaguer is about 200 km as the crow flies from Carcassonne; a man like Roland can do this in a week or two, and he could have done this, e.g. to deter any Muslims in that area from coming to help Balaguer and the surrounding area.

On [2]: Support for Tarazona (23 km southwest of Tudela) has been expressed by Aebischer ([1963–1964] 1967, 251s.) and de Mandach (1993, 40s.) in particular. The *Turias(s)o* of antiquity was called *Tiras(s)ona* and already a bishop's see in the Visigothic period (cf. Anguita Jaén 2003, 145s.). The Arabs called the town *Ṭarasūna* (EI, Atlas, maps 54, 55) and in the PT it is called *Terraciona* (cap. 3, written by scribe I in the *Codex Calixtinus*, just before *Terragona* 'Tarragona', in other words distinct from this place). Alfonso el Batallador with French support conquered Tarazona in 1119 soon after Saragossa, gave it as a fiefdom to Centulle of Bigorre and re-established the episcopal see (Boissonnade 1923, 49s., Defourneaux 1949, 159 and 219).

Tarazona does not appear in any other OF epics or romances. In fact, neither do Pina de Ebro and the Monegros – to mention just two places close to the Ebro – but there is no need to emend anything in connection with them. Indeed, we can make a virtue of a necessity: precisely because a scribe did not know Tarazona, he would be looking for a meaning and might try reading *tarasone* as *carasone* and then probably would "emend" it to *carcason(i)e*.

---

807 Jenkins (ad loc.) even translates *dejoste* as 'in the direction of' but I do not see any evidence of this meaning in Godefroy, Tobler/Lommatzsch or in the FEW.

808 Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *ier* provides two references: *Ier* ['a short time ago'] *venistes en cest païs, / Or estes ja issi soupris*, *Partonopeus de Blois* (v. 10209 ed. Crapelet); *de cel* (var. *tel*) *tendron qui ier fu nee* ['from that still very tender bud (i.e. of a very young woman)'], (v. 509 ed. Ebeling, v. 511 ed. Raynaud de Lage). Even in modern languages 'yesterday' can sometimes mean 'recently' as in: *ne connaître quelqu'un que d'hier*, or even 'in the past', e.g. *des méthodes d'hier* '(no longer valid) methods from the past'.

De Mandach has a good narrative argument in favour of Tarazona: precisely its position only about 15 km to one side of the great road from Valtierra-Tudela-Saragossa and from the Ebro which runs parallel to it, could have prompted the poet to introduce a short raid (more probable than the one to Carcassonne!) into the story. This would then have happened around the time when Roland conquered Tudela.

A.12.4.4 *Tere certeine*

Tere certeine occurs in O but has been eliminated by Segre. After Marsilĭe gathers his forces, they ride out from Saragossa towards the Pass of Roncevaux: *Puis si chevalchent par mult grant cuntençun, / La tere cer[cent] e les vals e les munz. / De cels de France virent les gunfanuns* Segre 855–857, *La tere certeine e les vals e les munz* (+1!) O, 'they filled mountains and valleys' K and w,[809] *Sì trespassent qui' tertre et qui' mon* V4, *Tertres, valées environ et entor* CV7: But *chevalch(i)er* is also used transitively in the Song, as in v. 3695, with *e les vals e les munz* as the object; in v. 856, therefore, O has three accusative objects of *chevalchent* in a row, which does not break any rules of syntax. While in β the 'valleys' and the 'mountains/hills' are retained, the *tere certeine* is replaced with trivialities ('fill', 'traverse', 'all over everywhere'), which are *lectiones faciliores* that no editor would dare put into the text. In the first half of the verse, therefore, O must agree more or less with the archetype, but because it is hypermetrical, it needs emendation.

The editors have addressed this in three different ways: [1] deletion of the *la*, taking *tere certeine* as appellative, [2] deletion of the *la*, but taking *des Tere Certeine* as a toponym [3] retention of the *la*, but replacing *certeine* with *cer [cent]*. I favour the first option.

On [1]: In the *Chanson de Guillaume*, *tere certeine* is mentioned five times, twice with the definite article (v. 229, 1117) and three times without it (1096, 1687, 1704). As Suchier quickly realised in the first full and scholarly edition of the text (1911, p. XLIII), and as McMillan (1950, vol. 2, critical note on v. 229) very clearly explained, the meaning is always the same, namely *terra firma*, i.e. the safe, or safely *passable* land, and in this text always as a contrast with the

---

809 As in K 3534. Shortly before this (3516–3523), K informs us that the Saracens had asked their gods to lead them unharmed from *Uallefunde* to *Salve Terre*. This should be taken allegorically, as Bartsch suggests, but it is obviously based on the two toponyms that are meant as real places in the Song, *Valfunde* and *Tere Certeine* (~ *Salve Terre*). To this extent, K also indirectly confirms *Tere Certeine*.

unsafe, sandy ground close to the sea.[810] In this expression at that time, therefore, the article was optional. If we accept that it has the same meaning in the Rol., then it is clear that the hypermetric error in O is simply the addition of the article, and that no other emendation is needed, or could be better than simply deleting the article as e.g. the editions by Jenkins and Hilka/Pfister have done.

I would suggest a slight alteration in the meaning of the expression in the *Chanson de Guillaume* into 'the land *passable on horseback*'. The Old French epic sees the world from the perspective of chivalry, which means riding, and most of the people in these stories travel on horseback, and not on foot; moreover, in the *Chanson de Guillaume*, riding is specifically mentioned very close to v. 229, 1117, 1687 and 1704 (in v. 227, 1115 and 1695), and 1096 relates how the leaders of the Saracens, their *demeines* and *seignurs*, proceed *une grant liwe* – certainly not on foot.

Following Suchier's findings, Bédier (1927, 509) also suggested a meaning for this in the Rol.: 'terre praticable (vide d'obstacles naturels ou vide d'ennemis)'. We should note the subtle difference between two possibilities here: the verse means, in both cases with escalation, either 'the land that's easily passable on foot or on horseback and (even) the mountains and valleys (that are no longer easily passable on foot or on horseback)' or 'first, the roads that are still far from the enemy, and then the mountains and valleys (near the enemy)'.

Ph.Aug. Becker (1938, 9s.) advanced the first possibility, arguing that it should be understood as open landscape with roads as opposed to the rough and pathless mountain terrain. Aebischer's long-winded discussion of *Tere Certeine* ([1963–1964] 1967, 252–259) describes this as "fantaisiste". He also understands *Tere Certeine* in the Rol. as 'safely passable land', but rather as opposed to the Ebro. However, the first mention of the Ebro is not until more than 1500 verses later; there is nothing to indicate that it is being considered at this point as a dangerous feature lurking in the background.

I therefore come back to Bédier's definition 'vide d'obstacles naturels' but suspect that the poet is not thinking of two phases of the journey – first easy, and then difficult in the mountains – but rather he wants to emphasise, as he did once before in the same laisse, the enormous size of this army: which is why it could not just remain 'on the beaten track' but had to fill up all the 'mountains and valleys' as well.[811]

---

810 There is another case suggested again by Suchier which is equally clear, in the *Waldef* (v. 16959–16962), where two knights save themselves and their horses when they come out of the roaring waters of a river onto the *terre certaine*.

811 This answers the objection raised by Mellor (1965–1966, 173), that the meaning *terra firma* did not make sense in the Rol.

On [2]: The interpretation of *Terre certeine* as 'Cerdaña/Cerdanya' was put forward rather hesitantly by Gaston Paris (1869, 176), more forcefully by Boissonnade (1923, 113 and 130ss.), and later especially by Burger (1953, 161s., and 1982, passim).

In phonological terms, it is possible, as I would like to show in more detail here. The ethnicon for it is in Avienus (*or.m.* 544) *Ceretes*, in Pliny (*nat.* 3.22s.) *Cerretani*, a Lat. form that also functions as an adj. as in e.g. *Puigcerdá* and is attested in the *Sancta Fides* (v. 115): *Diocletian Hespainna teg els montz Cerdans*; in the expression *Terre certeine*, it could only be this adjective for syntactical reasons. There is also the name of a region *Cerretania* (> Cat.-Occ. *Cerdanya* > Span. *Cerdaña* and Fr. *Cerdagne*). In Cat.-Occ. (and later in all modern forms) the syncope happened after the intervocalic sonorisation (*Cerdania* a. 835 etc., Aebischer [1963–1964] 1967, 255). However, there was also a (mainly OF) form with syncope before the sonorisation, which was then blocked. This includes (with the usual OF fluctuation between *-ar]* and *-er]*) the Crusade participant *comes de Sartengis/ Sartangis* (ms. A *Sartingis*) called *Willelmus* in Albert of Aachen (9.50 and 11.1–15, RHC Occ. 4. 623 and 663–669)[812] and *Sartaigne* in *Fouque de Candie*, *Cléomadès* and *Florence* (Schultz-Gora 1899, passim at least; Flutre s. v.; other instances could already be formulaic).[813] If the name of the region developed *-d-* and *-t-* forms, then the same could be true of the adj.

However, in real terms this identification would mean that the poet thinks the Saracen army will take a detour of some 300–400 km perpendicularly to the ordinary routes leading through the High Pyrenees. Burger argues that Turold did not have an atlas. But why have a complicated hypothesis, when a simpler one meets all of the requirements? Why would you accept the chance occurrence of a homonym for an appellative expression when a direct identification is possible without that? And should we not be suspicious when we see the expression 'the Cerdanyan land' instead of the simple term 'Cerdanya'?

On [3]: Compared with the simple elimination of the clearly optional *la*, Segre's emendation *La tere cer[cent]* is unnecessarily invasive. Furthermore, *cerchier* almost always has a connotation of searching (as it does in v. 2185 and 3661, the two other occurrences in the Song), which is not appropriate here: the

---

812 The identification is clear: this is Count Jordan of Cerdanya (1095–1109), cf. e.g. the LM s. v. *Cerdaña*.

813 The Saracen name of the region was also (*bilād ash-*) *Sharṭānīsh* (< *Cerretani* + Rom. *-es*, therefore retaining the Romance plural) in the *Akhbār madžmūʿa* (trans. James 2012, 108 with n. 21), or (*bilād ash-*) *Sharṭāniyyīn*, both with *-ṭ-* (Lafont 1988, 171).

Saracens do not need to search through mountains and valleys in order to locate Roland's troop, because this force is not hiding, but engaged in protecting the great military road.

A.12.5 A special case: The *perrun de Sard[a]nĭe*

To pre-empt any objections: the idea that *tere certeine* means 'land that is passable on horseback' does not imply that the poet did not know the name of the Cerdagne. The name appears in another passage: *Rollant ferit el perrun de Sard-[a]nĭe* Segre 2312, *Sardonĭe* (:ã-ə!) O, *Sardegne* V4, *Sartaingne* PL, *Cartaine* T: O must be rejected because it distorts the assonance; the scribe is evidently thinking of a *sardoine* 'sardonyx' (according to Segre ad loc.), but this semi-precious gem does not fit with the parallel expressions *pierre brune* (v. 2300) and *pierre bise* (v. 2338). V4's Italian scribe is thinking of Sardinia, which also goes against the assonance. But in O, the mistake may be due to the last scribe; so I accept Segre's emendation, since PLT clearly mean the Cerdagne (cf. above A.12.4.4 [2]). T agrees with PL apart from a missing cedilla.

As Urwin-Duddridge has shown (1942, passim; reference to this in Segre), Cerdanya was rich in granite. If the *perrun de Sardanĭe / Sartanĭe* is one of the *quatre perruns [. . .] de marbre fai[z]* (v. 2268, 2272) and therefore part of a ruined structure (Brault 1978, 246–250), we can take the term literally: a stone from Cerdanya; if it is not, then the term could be meant in the wider sense: a stone that is like the notoriously hard type of Pyrenean stone which is called Cardanya stone.

A.12.6 Other geographical details (continued)

A.12.6.1 *Durestant*
Marsilĭe's nephew wants to liberate Spain (with the exception of Saragossa) from Charlemagne's possession – from the Pyrenean passes *entresqu'a Durestant* O 870, the same in V4CV7, as far as *Urstamme* (where *-e* is a German dative ending) K: Konrad has interpreted this as *ad Urestant*. The archetype has *Durestant* because of the consensus in the other versions, probably to be read with /y/.

We must look at other OF epics in our analysis of this name.[814] It only ever occurs in the assonance or (laisse) rhyme, never in the middle of a verse; this alone shows that it is being used in a clichéd way. In the *Chanson de Guillaume* (v. 3366 and repeated in the following laisse as reported speech, v. 3390) we find a *tresqu'en Durester* (:*ē* < *á[*), in twelve other epics (*Aymeri de Narbonne, Aiol, Aliscans, Ami et Amile, Anseïs de Carthage, Anseïs de Metz, Beuve de Hantone, Destruction de Rome, Enfances Renier, Esclarmonde, Fierabras, Gaufrey*) we find a *de ci* (*qu'*, also *dusques* or similar) *en Duresté* – always meaning a geographical entity thought to be 'very far away'.[815] In addition to the up-to expressions, there are only four more references: in two epics (*Mort Aymeri, Jehan de Lanson*) a Saracen Lord of *Duresté* is mentioned, in a third (a version of the *Aspremont*)[816] Charlemagne has 'previously' looted his helmet *a Duresté*, in a fourth (*Beuve de Hantone*) a king will not permit something to happen 'even for all the wealth in *Duresté*' – obviously four instances where the authors have not been able to think of anything specific and so have simply fallen back on an established "epic" toponym in its normal form *Duresté*; we can therefore ignore these references in our search for an explanation.

But the meaning is not much clearer even in the up-to expressions, because it is obviously very unlikely that all thirteen authors shared precisely the same image of this place; the consensus on 'up to' makes it equally unlikely that *Durestant* and *Durester* could be anything other than *Duresté*. There remains only one expression, then, 'up to/as far as *Durestant / Durester / Duresté*' ~ 'very far away, to an undefined place'. It is important to note that neither the Rol. nor the *Chanson de Guillaume* are the original source of this expression. If that were the case, we would expect that one of these two texts would have more than one or two mentions of *Durestant* or *Durester*; after all, *-ant* and *-er* occur frequently in assonance position, or even in rhymed laisses, and so it would not be difficult to insert them into a text.[817] But even among the later texts, there is none that could have such a strong influence as to make a new *-é* canonical for all later texts, and to suppress the older *-ant* and *-er* without leaving any traces.

---

814 In relation to this section: the references are easily found in Roncaglia (1990, 192s.), the contexts (with the exception of the *Destruction de Rome*) in Heim (1984, 356–358); there is also *Esclarmonde* (v. 4343 ed. Schweigel): *armes [. . .],/ Il n'a si bones dusques en Duresté*. According to Flutre s. v. from the romances we could add *Sone* (v. 18841 ed. Goldschmidt); however, I cannot find *Duresté* or similar in the place referred to, or in the index of this edition.

815 The *Aymeri de Narbonne* 3590 states: *De Rochebrune de si c'an Duresté,/ Ou li soleuz giete premiers clarté*, which means that the author appears to think Duresté is in India.

816 In the Brandin edition, the verse should be between 4199 and 4200, but it is missing.

817 On *-ant* cf. n. 234 above!

We therefore have to assume that the expression with the form ending in -*é* is older than the Rol. and *Chanson de Guillaume*, and that it appears in both texts in a slightly altered form. This could have happened in the Rol. in order to fit in with the assonance; but there are extenuating circumstances for it, too: the altered form is uttered by a boastful Saracen, and the "correct" form was known to the audience, complete with its extremely vague meaning, which means that the alteration could perhaps have been intended to have a comical effect. On the other hand, it is questionable whether the two instances of -*er* instead of the expected -*é* in the *Chanson de Guillaume* are anything more than a caprice on the part of the author, who is guilty of an astonishing number of inconsistencies in his work's 3554 verses.[818] As for the meaning of *Durestant* or *Duresté*, then, it can only come from the original, i.e. the etymological meaning.

Neither the original expression nor the term in the Rol. refer to [1] Daroca between Saragossa and Teruel, [2] Estremadura or [3] the area called Turdetani in antiquity. Rather than identifying this with [4] the mouth of the Duero, I think the old assumption is more plausible: the expression originated from [5] the name of the Duurstede emporium.

On [1] and [2]: Boissonnade (1923, 75–77) argued in favour of Daroca, while Jenkins (ad loc.) tentatively supported Estremadura. Quite apart from the unsatisfactory geography, both are unacceptable in terms of the phonology alone.

On [3]: Place (1947, 876s.) found the name *Turdetania* in the Greek author Strabo (3.2) meaning a part of today's Andalusia. But as Strabo was not known to Latin speakers in the Middle Ages, this hypothesis would need a Latin source from antiquity or from medieval times. Place has no such source.[819] We could

---

818 We find the following inconsistencies that do not change the meaning (cf. the index in the McMillan edition): *Aelred/Ailred/Ailré, Aimeri(s)/Naimeri(s)/Neemeri/Neimeri/Nemeri, Arabe/Arabĭe, Arabiz/Arrabiz, Archamp/Archam/Larchamp, Balçan/Balzan, Barbarin/Barbirin (s), Bruban/Brusban, Bertram/ Bertrant, Comarchis/Cormarchis/Somarchiz, Deramé/Deramed, Durant/Duraz, Espaigne/Espaige, Florescele/Florecele, Galter/Walter, Girard/Gerard, Guiburc/ Guibur/Guburc, Guielin/Guelin, Guischard/Gischart/Guiscard/Guischart, Hernald/Ernard, Loün/ Leün, Lowis/Liwés, Mathamar/ Mathanar, Munjoie/Muntjoie, Reneward/Renewart, Sarazins/ Sarizins, Sirie/Surie, Tabur/Thabur, Tedbald/Tebald/Tebalt/Tedbalt/Tidbald/Tebbald, Turlen/ Turlei(s), Vivien/Vivié/Vivier, Willame/Villame*. He also has an unetymological -*r* in a single instance of *Vivier* 2607 and also in *Saint Martur de Turoine* 2262 'Saint-Martin de Tours' (who incidentally was not a martyr!). Conversely, an -*r*- has been omitted in *deste* 'right (hand)' 1214, *cunte* 'against' 2133, *quatoze* 2971, 3470.
819 Instead, Place covers up the fact that the name was unknown in the Middle Ages by stating that *Turdetani* or *Turdetania* appears "even on Renaissance maps" (dated 1570) as well as

add to this debate by citing Livy (21.6, 24.42 and 34.17), although his work was not well known in the Middle Ages.[820] As the phonology does not match either, Place comments:

> Under the influence of *estant* (from O.Fr. *ester*) suggestive in this context because of the hypothetical *-dura* of enigmatic *Extremadura* (L. *extrema* + Celtic *douros* confused with L. *durus*?) [no, simply < MLat. *extrematura*,[821] G.A.B.], early applied to the shifting Christian-Moslem frontier with perhaps some confusion with the ultimate etymon of the river *Duero* (Ptg. *Douro*) < *Doyro* < *Dōriu* (from Basque-Iberian?), it does not seem improbable that a late eleventh-century, French speaking Basque of the kingdom of Navarra might have pronounced in some religious establishment of the kingdom, situated on the much-trodden road from St.-Jean-Pied-de-Port across the Pyrenees, a gallicized version of *Turdetani* as Durestan[t], especially in view of the fact that the initial unvoiced stop consonants on the lips of Basques were voiced and through dissimilation the *d* of the second syllable might fall.

This is supplemented by a long footnote which is intended to underpin each claim with references. But the problem does not lie in the individual statements, it arises from the way they are all lumped together: Place does not see that when he piles up one *ad hoc* assumption after another, the probability of his hypothesis, including phonologically, quickly tends towards zero.

On [4]: Roncaglia's hypothesis (1990, passim) could be described as a radical correction of the above-mentioned paragraph written by Place, including, of course, a rejection of *Turdetania*. Roncaglia starts with the premise that it is reasonable to look in the western part of the Peninsula, but I cannot agree with him: Marsilĭe's nephew is located in Saragossa, and the *porz d'Aspre* to the north of him are the starting point for his train of thought (unless we opt for the *porz d'Espaigne* to the northwest of him); a statement of the type 'I will free Spain from the north (or even northwest) to the west' makes *a priori* no sense at all.[822] Roncaglia then pins his hypothesis to the name of the Douro/Duero, Lat.

---

in the fantastical early history section of a history of Spain dating from 1571, but these have taken the name from the rediscovered Strabo (Latin translation published in 1469, Greek original text in 1516)!

820 Cf. the LM s. v. *Livius*. There is also the humorous reference in Plautus *capt.* 1.2. but this would have been incomprehensible to medieval readers because of the missing geographical context – Pliny (*nat.* 3.8 etc.) mentions a closely related and neighbouring *Turduli* people (who were perhaps even the same people) but this obviously does not help us to explain Durestant.

821 Cf. above à propos *Estramariz* (A.9.10)!

822 Roncaglia helpfully suggests that the phrase *tresqu'en la mer* (v. 3) means reaching as far as el Padrón on the other side of Compostela as in the PT, that is to say, in the west. But the whole of the Rol., in radical contrast to the PT, never takes a Compostela perspective; it is

Durius [more accurately: *Dŭrius*]: in the *Primera Crónica General* the expression *fasta en Duero / fastal rio Duero* occurs [contingent on the context, almost as one would expect] and on one occasion there is mention of an ancient king who ruled 'from the Tajo to the Duero'; for this reason alone it would be "un aveuglement bien singulier" [!], to overlook a close connection with *entresqu'a Durestant*. But what about the ending? Roncaglia then postulates **Dur(i)i aestuarium* as an etymon for *Durester*; *aestuarium* is found in Romance languages from western France to Catalonia and Spain (as *estero*) and in Portugal (as *esteiro*), and the Catalan toponym *Engolasters* (near the outflow of a mountain lake in Andorra) shows that it could also be the second element in a compound name. "J'en conclus qu'aucun doute [!] ne devrait plus subsister au sujet de l'identification (linguistique et géographique) de Durester". He then postulates for *Durestant* a **Dur(i)o stante*, meaning something like 'the Douro, where it flows out through a sandbank that forms across the river's mouth and restricts its passage'; *stante* would then mean something like Seneca's (*nat.quaest.* 3.26.8) *aquarum stantium clausarumque natura*; it is also comparable with OF [*recte*: modern Fr.] *eaues estantes* in the *Jardin de santé* [cap. 311: *De Nymphea*; between 1491 and 1500, but this is a direct translation of the *Hortus sanitates*, which has *in aquis stantibus* here; therefore, it is just a Latinism!]. Finally, *Duresté* derives from *Durester* either through loss of the *-r* [at this early date and then without exception in eleven epics?] or through contamination with a second name, possibly even *Dorestad*.

All in all, this is competent philology. And yet: first of all the location in the west is difficult to accept, secondly, the /o/-/y/ question is not addressed, thirdly it seems to me that the distribution of the forms ending in *-ant*, *-er* and *-é* is not explained in a statistically acceptable fashion, fourthly and above all: even though a double borrowing is assumed to have taken place, in reality neither of the two etymologies is attested anywhere. If this hypothesis cannot be supported by the real toponymy of the area around the mouth of the Douro, then – at the risk of being accused of *aveuglement* – I cannot prefer this hypothesis over the old explanation that we turn to next.

---

therefore more likely that in the Song, the real events, i.e. the actions of Alfons VI on the southern tip of Spain, served as a model for the plot here (cf. the section above on '*Espaigne*', A.8.1), and that it was the PT which first transferred this incident to the area around Compostela. Furthermore, Roncaglia mentions that in an abridged version of the *Chroniques et conquestes de Charlemagne* [after 1458!] Charlemagne hurls a lance into the sea from a place called *Durestre*, which according to Roncaglia, the author possibly imagined as being in Portugal. Even if this is true – how do we know that this is anything other than the jumbled speculation of a compiler working some 300 years after the Rol.?

On [5]: In 1874, Konrad Hofmann identified *Durestant* as Duurstede (but this is recorded only in the name index of the Bartsch/Wiese chrestomathy), as did Gédéon Huet (1912, passim) in more detail. The name of the great Carolingian trading emporium (as it is called in its first ever mention, by the continuer of Fredegar cap. 6, MGH SS.mer. 2.172, with no variants), later also *Dorestadus* (also -*um*, -*ium*), lives on in *Wijk bij Duurstede* about 25 km southeast of Utrecht in the Upper Rhine Delta at the point where the Lower Rhine forks into the Oude or Kromme Rijn, which was a vital route in the Middle Ages, and the Lek, which today is more important. Duurstede was Frisian for a time during the 7th and 8th centuries, and then it became Frankish again (Boeles 1951, 269–287). In about 800 it was called *vicus famosus*, in 823 *vicus nominatissimus*, and it is also known as *emporium*, *castrum*, *portus*. In the High Carolingian period, it was the central customs post and therefore the main entry and exit harbour for trade with Scandinavia, which mainly passed through Hedeby (Schleswig) to Birka (Sweden) and Gotland, and it also handled a considerable volume of trade with England. An example of the importance of this trade is that fact that in 779 (MGH DD. Kar. 1, Nr. 122) Charlemagne granted even the Monastery of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris freedom from taxes in Duurstede and other places. Archaeology has shown that the jetties reached up to 200 m into the river, which was accessible to the sea-going ships of that period. Inside the emporium itself, metals, amber (from the Baltic Sea) and wool (no doubt already from England) were processed on arrival, and from the Merovingian period onwards, especially during the reign of Charlemagne, coins were minted too, and these were the model for the minting activity in Birka later. Duurstede's magnificence during its heyday was followed by a disastrous demise over a single generation: from 834 onwards it was the target of countless Danish raids which then led to permanent occupation from 847, until finally in 863 it was depopulated (*depopulato emporio*, *Ann. Bertiniani*); the place is mentioned in 867 for the last time, and the first appearance of the small settlement that replaced it was in 948: *villa quondam Dorsteti, nunc autem Uuik nominata*. When trading activity gradually resumed, it was not this Wijk, but Tiel and Deventer which turned out to be the successors of Duurstede.[823]

The oldest form *Duristate* and the modern form *Duurstede* seem to show that despite the frequent spelling with *o* in the 9th c., the name used to have a variant with /ū/ (> modern Dutch /ȳ/, just like *mūrus* > *muur*), which is needed in order to produce *Durestant*, *Duresté*. The syncope we find in *Dorsteti* did not

---

823 RGA s. v. *Dorestad*, Boeles (1951, 394–405), Pirenne/Hübinger (1963, 204–207, 283), Fehring (1992, 185). A natural disaster may have contributed to the eventual demise of this place, cf. the lecture cited by Heim (1984, 356 n. 45).

happen with Romanisation, because -rst- does not exist in OF. The -é in *Duresté* probably comes from adjustment to fit the proto-Fr. sound shift -á[> -ē- rather than from the Germanic umlaut -ă- > -ě- (as in 948 in *Dorstěti*).

It was known for its position as a boundary (in the literal sense between the Frankish state and Friesland, which in the 7th and early 8th c. was the Carolingians' most dangerous foreign enemy and then for some time after it was conquered, it was also regarded as a mission field,[824] *de facto*, therefore, the boundary separating the Carolingian Empire from Scandinavia and England) which meant that the *vicus famosus, nominatissimus Duurstede*, while it existed, must have been an ideal candidate for a vernacular expression of the type '(from here) to X'. Conversely, after Durstede's demise, at least in the French-speaking area, the position and earlier significance of the emporium would soon have been forgotten. This, in turn, made the expression even more generally applicable, with the simple meaning 'very distant'.[825]

A.12.6.2 *Galice*

Abisme loves betrayal and murder more than *trestot l'or de Galice* O [1637]=1476, *d'Ongarìe* V4CV7, *de Roussie* PT and again V7: 'Russia' is a late, random substitution. Moreover, *Galice* '(the southwest European Galicia' in α contrasts with *Ongarie* in β or later in γ. Stengel puts *Ongarie* into the text.

In other epics the choice of country name in an expression of this type would depend on the assonance requirements, and it would generally be considered as a random insertion; in the Rol., it merits more thorough investigation.

According to Pliny (*nat.* 33.78–80) *[aurum] vicena milia pondo* [~ about 6500 kg] *ad hunc modum annis singulis [!] Asturiam atque Callaeciam* ['Galicia']

---

824 We only have to think of the murder of Boniface (in 755).

825 As the case is of interest to linguistics more generally, we shall consider a modern parallel where another forgotten border place is used to signify an extreme, but not geographically specified distance. To this day in the whole northern third of Germany (most obviously in Westphalia) there is a vernacular expression "(from here) to Pusemuckel" (or similar), but the vast majority of people who say this do not know where it comes from. Until the second partition of Poland (1793), the paired villages of Groß- and KleinPosemukel, Pol. Podmokle Wielkie/Male, 80 km west-southwest of Posen/Poznań, were the first villages in that kingdom near the road from Frankfurt(Oder)-Schwiebus/Świebodzin-Bomst/Babimost, and from 1815 until 1919 they were the first villages in the Prussian province of Posen, though they remained mainly Polish-speaking and were unofficially perceived as such. According to Küpper s. v., this expression is documented from the second third of the 19th c, and so has doubtless, like many other linguistic features, spread across western Germany from Berlin. Cf. now the map with the reference 'abgelegenes Dorf (Frage 26)' on www.atlas-alltagssprache.de/runde.2/f26/ (last accessed 30.07.21).

et Lusitaniam praestare quidem prodiderunt, ita ut plurimum Asturia gignat. Neque in alia terrarum parte tot saeculis perseverat haec fertilitas. If Asturie comes first for quantity, then Galicia comes first for quality; for Pliny continues: *Omni auro inest argentum vario pondere, aliubi decuma parte, aliubi octava. In uno tantum Callaeciae metallo quod vocant Albucrarense tricesima sexta portio invenitur, ideo ceteris praestat.* And Justinus writes in his *Epitome* of Pompeius (44.3.4s.): *[Gallaecia] auro quoque ditissima: adeo, ut etiam aratro frequenter glebas aureas excidant.*[826] But the organised mining operations seem not to have survived the great migration; when the *Pilgrims' Guide* in the *Codex Calixtinus* (cap. 7) mentions among Galicia's many positive attributes *auro[. . .] et argento [. . .] felix*, this is either a lingering memory from antiquity or an early reference to Compostela's wealth in ecclesiastical gold.

Can Hungary compete with this? Yes, it can, but later: by far the biggest producer of gold in the Middle Ages was Hungary, which in those days included territory that later belonged to Slovakia, Romania and the Soviet Union. Mining started in the 12th century (LM s. v. *Gold*), but it was not fully developed until 1230. This is enough to explain the presence of *Ongarie* in γ; it is perhaps no coincidence that we only find this name in the Franco-Venetian mss. V4CV7, since the development of mining operations in the nearby kingdom of Greater Hungary was no doubt more closely observed from that area.

In summary, then: *Galice* belongs in the archetype, and *Ongarie* is interesting because it is a later updating of the text.

A.12.6.3 *Val Tenebr[e]s*

The enemies who survived the main battle and were chased from Roncevaux towards Saragossa were caught up by Charlemagne *el Val Tenebr[e]s* Segre 2461, *el Val Tenebros* O, *in einem uinsteren ualle* K, *en Val Tenebre* V4CV7, *a Val Tenebre* T, *aval un tertre* L: A trivial secondary meaning is introduced in L, where *a* and *val* have been misread (as in T) as an adverb. Although K has not translated this correctly (MHG *val* means 'fall, defeat', and not 'valley'), it was influenced by the *val* in the source text. Since in OF overall, the *Val-* forms that are followed by an adj. are more common (and often catchier in meaning) than those with a possessive obliquus, O chose an incorrec*t Tenebros* which does not fit the metre. The archetype therefore had *Val Tenebres* (as in Segre, minimally altering the best texts) or *Val Tenebre* (as in e.g. Jenkins and Hilka/Pfister, avoiding any unattested form).

---

826 On the gold of Galicia cf. also Pliny *n.h.* 4.112, Sil.It. 2.602, Martial 4.39.7, 10.17 (16).3, 14.95.1.

Judging by the context, the valley must have been near the bank of the Ebro. A few kilometres above and below the zone where the modern railway, motorway and major road from Pamplona reach the Ebro, there are still a few remaining *sotos*, including some that have been reforested, which gives us an indication that there must once have been a thickly wooded, 'dark valley' in this area. However, there is no sign of a real name that sounds similar. We should therefore understand *Val Tenebre(s)* in a symbolic way: Charlemagne overtakes the enemy there, because due to God's miraculous intervention the sun helps him, whereas in a stark contrast they finally meet their fate in the darkness of the abyss. According to Noyer-Weidner (1971, 31s.) the key word 'valley' is inspired by the 'Valley' of Ajalon which appears in the biblical account of the sun miracle in *Ios* 10.8–14, where it states: *Sol, contra Gabaon ne movearis, et luna, contra vallem Aialon*; we might add that in this story (v. 11) God's punishment was meted out to the enemies of Israel as they were fleeing and in particular *in descensu Bethoron* 'going down to Bethhoron'.[827]

A.12.6.4 The Ebro

All of the passages in which the Ebro (Lat. *Ibĕrus*) occurs can be examined together (although a few of them are missing in the later mss.): it is famously known in the Rol. as *Sebre* O 2465, 2642, 2728, 2758 (:*ē-ə*), 2798, the same in CV7, a big river n, *Saibre* K, *Sebre*, *Seibre*, *Seybre*, *Scibre* (the latter a misreading of *Seibre*) V4, *Sorbre* PL, *Sobre / Songe* T; V4CV7 also have this form in v. 2489, where O and the editors, apart from Gautier (cf. Segre ad loc.), read *tere deserte* (this passage was discussed above in A.9.8.2 '*Valtierra* and the date of the Chanson de Roland'). Since CV7 also have the same vowel as O, *Sebre* must be put in the archetype.

According to Foerster (1891, 517), Gautier thought that *Sebre < Ibĕrus* was a *corruption euphonique* – a rather vaguely worded explanation, while Theodor Müller thought that the poet wrote *l'Ebre*, and from there, a misreading led to *febre* in the archetype, and Baist thought there was a confusion or contamination with the name of the Catalan River Segre. Foerster first supported the theory that it should be understood as *s'Ebre ~ su Ebre* with the *ipse* article, which Aebischer then conclusively proved with his detailed investigation into the early spread and then decline of the *ipse* article ([1959–1960] 1967, 223–228, cf. also 1948, passim).

---

827 God's hailstones killed more enemies than the Israelites in that story. The Roland poet imitated this relationship – revenge is God's, the human victor is only the junior partner – showing that more enemies drown in the Ebro than are killed by the Franks; cf. Beckmann (2004c, 237–239).

A.12.6.5 *Marbrise and Marbrose*

Boissonnade (1923, 260s.) correctly points out that the Ebro in the early 12th c. was navigable as far as Saragossa, and even further to Tudela, and cites other factors which demonstrate that the voyage of Baligant's fleet up the Ebro was much more credible in those days than it would be today. When Baligant's ships reach the freshwater part of their journey (v. 2640), that is to say inside the mouth of the Ebro, we are told: *Laissent Marbrise e si laissent Marbrose* Segre 2641, *laissent Marbrose e si laissent Marbrise* (breaks the assonance rules) O, *Manbre [. . .] Mambrosa* V4, *Marbrie [. . .] Marbroie* CV7: the form in V4 is influenced by the biblical Mamre, always written in the Vulgate as *Mambre. Marbri(s?)e* is confirmed for the archetype by OCV7, *Marbrose* by OCV7 or OV4. *Marbrose* here is the nominalisation of the adjective *marbreux* 'marble' (although this is not attested until later).[828] As the sounds in *Marbrise*: *Marbrose* match more perfectly than *Marbrie*: *Marbrose*, it is likely that *Marbrie* is a *lectio difficilior*, assuming that we can find a meaning for it – but surely a verse that sounds so beautiful must have gone 'beyond mimesis'?

 Not at all. The poet is not thinking of [1] Mallorca and Menorca, nor [2] of the double peak of the Pic de Marboré, but rather [3] the Marmería region and is probably adding an allusion to the marble quarries of the Pyrenees.

On [1]: Jenkins rightly departs from earlier theories and objects to Mallorca and Menorca on the grounds that they are not located in the freshwater part of the mouth of the Ebro. Their phonology does not fit either.

On [2]: De Mandach (1993, 274) identified Marbrise and Marbrose as the 'double peak' of the Pic de Marboré (over 3200 m)[829] located today in the Parque Nacionál de Ordesa, which in the 12th c. was an extremely remote mountain in the High Pyrenees more than 200 km as the crow flies from the mouth of the Ebro. Why would it now appear at the mouth of the Ebro? De Mandach argues that it is because the poet did not know where this double peak was located.

On [3]: But what do we actually have in the Song? Anyone sailing into the mouth of the Ebro in around 1100 would have had to his left an area which was

---

828 OF also has *marbré*, *marbrerin* or *-iz*, *marbri*, *marb(e)rin*, *marbrinois*, *marbrois*, all meaning '(of) marble', and also *marbru* 'clad in marble' and *marmori*, *marmorin* 'marbled' (FEW s. v. *marmor*); it is fair to say, then, that the choice of suffix was still practically random.

829 The Pic de Marboré actually has a broad, flat peak about the size of a football pitch. De Mandach presumably means the two peaks of the Pico de Marboré (3248 m) and the Cilindro de Marboré (3328 m) which are about 1 km apart.

called *Marmaria*. Idrīsī (Part IV 1; 1999, 258, or trans. Dozy/de Goeje 211s.), no less, tells us this in his list of the provinces of Spain: the penultimate province is that of the [Eastern] Pyrenees with Barcelona, Tarragona and Tortosa; the very last one is then 'to the west [or more accurately in fact: southwest] the Province of *Marmaria*'; it includes among other places Kashṭālī on the coast (which he later [1999, 275] calls more precisely Rābiṭa Kashṭālī, Sant Carles de la Ràpita [!])[830] and – although in this case the reading and identification are more controversial – Cutanda (about 100 km south-southwest of Saragossa).[831] As Tortosa is near the mouth of the Ebro on the northern bank, and Sant Carles directly south of the river mouth, the mouth of the Ebro served as a boundary between the two provinces. If you were to sail up the Ebro, *Marmaria* would always be on your left, and since the centre of Saragossa was also on the southern bank, but was already in another province, you would have already sailed past *Marmaria* as it stretched back from the bank of the Ebro. On the journey to Saragossa, therefore you would actually 'leave' *Marmaria* behind on the left (*laissent*!).[832] It is very easy to prove that the Romance speakers also used this name: the *Marmeria* region even appears in Graesse's *Orbis Latinus* s. v. and is located in the Provinces of Castellón de la Plana and Teruel. The name must have been very important in the time of the Rol.: the coastal region around today's Sant Carles appears to have been ruled briefly by the Catalans in 1097 (Hernández Jiménez 1939, 323s.), took part e.g. in the naval battles around the Balearics in 1114–1115,[833] but was not definitively in Catalan hands until about 1148, after the Almoravids had collapsed. In Cutanda – if Idrīsī meant it – and in 1120, Alfonso el Batallador won one of his greatest victories. We should consider the appearance of the essentially Catalan name *Marmaria / Marbrie* alongside the Catalanisms discussed by Aebischer ([1959–1960] 1967, passim) such as *Sebre* (instead of *l'Ebre*) and *Balasguéd / Balaguez* (instead of *Balaguer*), and we should link these facts more widely with the knowledge displayed here of Berbegal, Tortosa and Burriana. These names show that the poet has an altogether above-average familiarity with the lower Ebro Basin, and the simplest

---

830 Its identification as today's Sant Carles was definitively demonstrated by Hernández Jiménez (1939, passim).

831 In favour of Cutanda according to Dozy Bresc/Nef in Idrīsī 1999, against it, but rather *en passant* with no real alternative, Hernández Jiménez 1939, 332.

832 The historical atlas by Vicens Vives, 1980, map 28, shows *Marmeria* south of the mouth of the Ebro as one of the approximately twenty provinces of al-Andalus. Moreover, we find the same in the good old school atlas by Spruner-Menke (1880), maps 15 and 16!

833 There is a good map in Calisse (1904, after p. LV).

explanation for this is that he must have had close contact with the warriors who were fighting in that area between about 1090 and 1150.

Of course, any French speaker will immediately associate *Marmaria* with *marbre* (phonologically < *marm-b-re* < *marm-re* < *marmo*r); *Marbrie* is therefore a very obvious OF formation. Did the archetype still have *Marbrie*, or had it already changed into *Marbrise* to match up with *Marbrose*? The former is more likely, because then CV7 would simply preserve the archetype, and V4 makes more sense. If this is not the case, the northern Italian who was behind CV7 would have to have known the name *Marbrie* and restored it; however, either way, he turned *Marbrose* into *Marbroie,* to match up with *Marbrie*.[834]

We have explored the real geography. But there is no place called *Marbrose* 'made of marble'. The poet was probably vaguely aware that there was marble on the Pyrenean side of the river – albeit further upriver – that is to say, there was a place that was *marbrose*.[835] This offered him an opportunity for symmetry, and he took it.

A.12.6.6 The *Gironde-Marsune-Nerbone* complex along with *Tencendor* and *Malpalin*

We will consider v. 2991–2995 together: Charlemagne

> Pent a sun col un escut de [Gironde],
> Tient sun espiét, sin fait brandir la [mure];
> En Tencendur, sun bon cheval, puis muntet
> (Il le cunquist es guez desuz Marsune,
> Si˙ getat mort Malpalin de Nerbone), [. . .]

[*Gironde*] Segre 2991, *Biterne* O, *Çironde* V4: *Biterne* 'Viterbo', marks the first stage for people travelling north from Rome, and is mentioned in several other

---

834 Dufournet (1987, 94) offers an example of uninhibited kind of over-symbolism that occurs quite often these days: he does not even look for a real meaning, but immediately sees in this pair of names "un double jeu sur *mar-* et *marbre*, ce qui signale le côté maléfique de la richesse sarrasine, autre thème de la Chanson de Roland: à la force et à la vertu chrétiennes s'oppose la corruption par l'argent des païens". He interprets all of this from the two simple place names. Why then *laissent* 'leave behind'? If Dufournet were correct in his interpretation, would this not be an extremely facile type of invention on the part of the poet? I have much more admiration for the poet's ability to imagine things that proceed from a basis in reality, and then to expand or embellish them in an ingenious way.

835 We should remember that in the scenery providing the backdrop to Roland's death there *were quatre perruns [. . .] de marbre fai[z]* (v. 2268) and one *perrun de Sard[a]nie* (v. 2312); this shows that the poet was interested in such things.

epics, but here it is just an absent-minded mistake because it does not fit in this *ǫ-ǝ* laisse. This is why editors from Theodor Müller onwards have put the reading from V4 (sometimes with the adjusted spelling *Girunde*) into the text. In epic literature *Gironde* is both the Gironde (as in *Girunde* v. 3688, Lat. *Garumna*) and also as evidently here (Cat.) *Girona*/(Span.) *Gerona* (Lat. *Gerunda*), from which the *-d-* also survived in Arab. *Džarunda* (cf. the EI) and in Hebr. *G (e)rundah* in Benjamin of Tudela (2.10, 13th c.). Just as we were told about Charlemagne's sword immediately before battle, now we hear about his horse, which will soon play a decisive role: *Tencendur* O 2993, *Entercado*r K, *Tenchadur* V4, *Cantador* P, *Cassebrun* T; also

Tencendor Segre 3342, *Tenceor* (nasal tilde above the second *-e-* + *-d-* added) O, *Tenchadur* V4, *Valos* F, and

Tencendur O 3622, *Tencadur* V4: T and F insert different names. P has a misreading of *t-* as *-c-* which produces the apparent meaning 'singer'. K has agglutinated *en Tencador* etc. ('Charlemagne sprang onto T'). OVT guarantee *Tenc-* for the archetype and OKV4P *-dor*; in the middle of the word, *-en-* in O competes with *-a-* in β. Since *Tenc(h)ador* and *Tencedor* make sense as *nomen agentis* forms for *tencier,* but *Tencendor* shows contamination from the participle *tençant*,[836] O probably had *Tencedor* in his source, but then correctly modernised this in the middle passage, making it into *Tenceor*, and then in the two other passages added an illogical *-n-* (or perhaps his source text did this with a simple tilde?). In keeping with the semantic breadth of OF *tencier* 'to exert oneself, fight, quarrel, protect' we should understand *Tence(d)or* as something like 'warrior' *par excellence.*

Marsune O 2994, *Vadune* K, *Marsone* V4, *Marsonne* P, *Marsoine* T: the translator K, who tells us himself (v. 9082s.) that he made a Latin interim translation of the French song first, seems to have let *vadum* (~ *guez desuz Marsune*) slip into his MHG text. OV4P confirm that *Mars(u/o)ne* is in the archetype.

---

[836] With *-an-* > *-en-* in the middle vowel as in *Normendie* 2324 as opposed to *Normans* 3045 etc, *Costentinnoble* 2329; *Durendal* is also in this category – my colleague Philip Burdy in his very kind reviews of my book on the Karlamagnús-Saga I (ASNS 248 [2011], 457f.) and of the German edition of the present book (*Beitr. z. Namenforschung* 54 [2019] 227–237, here 230f.) doubts the nomen-agentis character of this name, but I would like to insist on this point – and there are three specific reasons: 1) The β branch clearly has *-ador/-adur* formations, and O has a single *tenceor* which presumably reveals the form that was present in its source. 2) The fact that the (rather rare nomen-agentis from *tencier* 'to battle, to fight' is only attested meaning 'quarrelsome', and not 'combative, pugnacious' may be a coincidence. 3) I am not aware of any other attempt to explain this name; unfortunately, the reviewer does not offer one either.

The only serious candidate for an identification,[837] suggested with good reasons by Tavernier (1911a, 125s.), is Marsanne (Drôme), 9 km northeast of Montélimar, 5 km east of the Rhône, with an 11th c. ruined castle; the area around Marsanne and as far as the Rhône (containing only small villages) is generally called *Pays de Marsanne*, which means that the formulation *es guez desuz Marsune* makes perfect sense. In the early 12th c., Marsanne was considered the most important place in the county of Valentinois after Valence itself (J. Chevalier 1897, 170). There is just one negative point: no forms ending in *-on(n)e* rather than *-an(n)e* exist;[838] but because the poet only knew of these relatively small places by word of mouth, he would probably have been quite amenable to "bending" the assonance vowel, and furthermore *-one* (or *-ona*) is a characteristic element in southwestern and Catalan town names (as in Narbonne, Carcassonne, Girona/Gerona, Cardona, Barcelona, Tarragona, Tarazona) and this could have exerted some attraction. The idea, therefore, is that the area west of the Rhône was still held by the Saracens under Malpalin of Narbonne, but Charlemagne fought his way across the Rhône – and incidentally, the historical Charles Martell once found himself more or less in the same situation. The author of the *Aymeri de Narbonne* (v. 2377s.) shows that he correctly understands the name when he mentions it between the *Nerbonois* and the *Viennois*, as does the author of the *Girart de Vienne* (v. 326), when Hernaut de Beaulande (~ Nice) marries the rich heiress of *Marsone* (both sons of Aimeri famously became lords of Narbonne).

Malpalin O 2995, *Apollin* V4, *Malprime* P: The partial similarity in the phonology of Malprime in P has caused it to be affected by the name of the Lord of Berbegal or that of Baligant's son, whereas *Apollin* in V4 is shows some interference from the name of the pagan god. *Mal-pal-in* is an aptronym: 'Evil-pale-one', comparable with the (nick-) name *Pall-in-us* in the *Domesday Book* (Hildebrand 1884, 340).

Nerbone O 2995, the same in V4P (and therefore in the archetype), *Narbune* K: This clearly means 'Narbonne' here. In OF epics, the forms *Nerbone* and *Narbone* are both common; they show the well-known Old and Middle French vacillation between *-ar-* and *-er-*. This episode is not known outside the Old French

---

[837] Marson (Maine-et-Loire) had a castle that was contested in 987 but it is too far away from Narbonne. *Marsan* in Mont-de-Marsan (Landes) is a region name that is always masc. (*in Marciano* a. 1143–1144); the Midouze that flows through the Marsan is too small for there to have been a ford that was realistically worth fighting over, and Narbonne is not located within Marsan's hinterland. Other places called Marçon, Marsa, Marsan, Marsô, Marsoin, Marson, Massanes appear to have always been insignificant; most of them do not fit with the geography and/or the term 'ford'.

[838] At least not in the DT Drôme (1891) or in Nègre (1990–1998).

epic genre; narrative factors lead me to believe that it has been freely invented by the poet. At the very moment when Charlemagne is stepping up for the most dangerous single combat he has ever faced (and, as we soon find out, the most glorious), the poet turns our attention to a snapshot of an earlier victorious single combat which, in keeping with the geography, must have happened at some point near the beginning of Charlemagne's battles for Christianity and for France. This draws a huge biographical arc showing a double ideal of continuity and loyalty, a continuity that the poet captures – precisely because he also reworks and fleshes out a previous version – using perhaps the most beautiful symbol of loyalty in the world of chivalry: the relationship between a rider and his horse, in this case the *only* companion who has been with Charlemagne for many years. There is also a suggestion that the previous victory will be a good omen for the fight that is about to happen now.

A.12.6.7 *Nerbone* again

One of the trickiest parts of the Song is the account of Charlemagne's return journey from Roncevaux to Bordeaux: *Passent Nerbone par force e par vigur* O 3683, *Nerbona* V4:[839] This is not [1] today's Arbonne (5 km south of Biarritz), but rather [2] the familiar Narbonne (Aude).

On [1]: Judging by the name itself, Arbonne could certainly be a contender. Aebischer (1954a, 289 n. 6) could only find one medieval reference for Arbonne: *Narbona* a. 1186 (from Raymond 1863, s. v. *Arbonne*), but there are other references from 1194, 1303, 1349, 1481, 1516 and 1521, all with *Narbona*, *Narbon(n)e*, and the first one with *Arbonne* is from 1588.[840]

The picture changes completely when we consider the narrative content. Gaston Paris (1869, 176) did not know of Arbonne, but he thought Narbonne (Aude) was completely unacceptable in terms of its geography and therefore wanted to replace *Nerbone* with *l'Adour*, a shockingly violent solution. Soon after that, local researchers from the southwest reclaimed the Arbonne interpretation,

---

839 Noyer-Weidner (1963, passim) thinks that verses 3682–3704 are a later addition in praise of Saint-Romain de Blaye; Segre (ad loc.) disagrees. But even if Noyer-Weidner were correct, these verses would still need to be interpreted.

840 Jullian (1899, 234), Bayonne-Veillet 1.70, 108, 173. – Curiously, for Narbonne there are also variants without *N*-, although from a much earlier period, in the pervasive Arab. *Arbūna* (cf. e.g. the EI, map s. v. *al-Andalus*), but also *Arbona* in the *Ann. Guelferbytani* and *Nazariani* for the year 756 (MGH SS. 1.29). Generally, however, at the time of the Rol. the names of the two places were completely homonymic. The forms without *N*- in both toponyms go back, of course, to an interpretation of late Lat. *in Narbona* or Occ. *en Narbona* as *in/en Arbona*.

including first Saint-Maur (1870, passim); Camille Jullian's work was well received in Romance studies, and he argued at first hesitantly (1896, 169 n. 2) and then more emphatically for Arbonne (1899, 234). His opinion was carried on by Bédier (1926–1929, 3.332–334, although not repeated in the *Commentaires* of 1927) and then by Burger (1953, 168). But Arbonne does not lie, as Burger claims, "sur la route de Roncevaux à Bordeaux", but rather is some 40 km west of the only road that is relevant to this story, namely the great Roman road from (Astorga-) Pamplona-Roncesvalles-Dax-Bordeaux and therefore "the" Way of Saint James; furthermore, it is not on the coast road via Bayonne either, which later attracted some of the pilgrim traffic. The fact that Arbonne seems to have existed even in Roman times (Jullian 1899, 236s.), is more than counterbalanced by the fact that there is no trace of any fortification there throughout the Middle Ages; why then would Charlemagne's army have to pass it *par force e par vigur*? Arbonne obviously does not merit spontaneous selection on the part of the Roland poet. In the next section we will reject even the possibility that he knew Arbonne by chance and incorrectly transferred a pre-existing tradition that had originally referred to Narbonne onto this place.

On [2]: All relevant medieval sources support Narbonne (even though there are some differences between them).

Within the Old French epic genre, there is the rhymed form of the Rol. itself, attested in γ. For resolving stemma issues, it is of almost no use from this point onwards because it is too different from O. But at exactly this point it reports that on his way home, Charlemagne conquered Narbonne, which at that time was still controlled by the Saracens, and in the course of the conquest a miracle occurred. He gave the town to the young Aimeri, as a fief, thus charging him with its defence after Charlemagne's warriors had all turned it down, as they were tired of war and longing to go home. This is very similar to the start of the *Aymeri de Narbonne* itself, except there, Aimeri plays a decisive role in the actual conquest.

Among the Latin texts, the PT is of particular interest. According to this version, the two main sections of the army separate from each other after the battle of Roncevaux, in Ostabat which is on their way home, just north of the Pyrenees. Charlemagne takes one section via Belin, where they bury the noble dead whose remains cannot be preserved long enough for the journey back to their far-away homelands, then via Bordeaux, where they bury those fallen warriors who came

from the southwest, and to Blaye, where Roland is buried.[841] But then he rushes towards the southeast, via Toulouse, to catch up with the other section of the army, the 'Burgundians' in the broader sense of this term, who are from the whole of the south-eastern part of his realm (from the Champagne southwards), and whose leaders are buried in Arles. From there, Charlemagne starts his journey home to Aachen, passing through Vienne, where the ailing Turpin is left behind. On this occasion, as before, Charlemagne and his court are expected to cross the whole of the south of France because of their duty to honour the dead – if not via Narbonne itself (like the Roman roads and today's motorway and rail routes) then about 60 km north of it (along the later Way of St. James).

The KMS version of the Rol. (Aebischer 1954a, 236s., 284s., 288–290) is like a much shorter (and at the same time simplified) PT: after Roncevaux (but without the fight with Baligant) Roland and all the peers are buried in *Arsis* (var. *Arsers*), the capital of *Proventa*, which (with a misreading of -*l*- as -*f*-) is *Arles*, the capital of Provence. Aebischer thinks this is an old *version arlésienne* of the Roland material, a version that competes with the Song that we have now, is possibly older than this one, and that the *Nerbone* in our version is possibly a faint relic from that older version.

But there are some even closer parallels. Demaison (1887, p. CXLIV n. 1) realised that in Hugo of Fleury's *Historia ecclesiastica* (at least in the second version, probably from 1110, and certainly before 1122, here MGH SS. 9.361) there is a claim that after the defeat at the hands of the *Wascones* in the Western Pyrenees (meaning: after Roncevaux) *domnus Karolus rex, subjugatis Narbonensibus, in Franciam est reversus.* Ph.Aug. Becker (1896, 62 n. 3, and 1898, 20 n. 3) pointed out that according to Waitz, Hugo's source is Ado of Vienne, but the corresponding passage (Bouquet 5.319) in Ado states: *subjugatis Navarris et Wasconibus, in Franciam revertitur.* Hugo's *Narbonensibus* is not sufficiently similar to *Navarris*[842] to enable us to agree with Becker that Hugo's text is nothing more than the result of palaeographical absent-mindedness. On the contrary, Hugo evidently knew of an epic tradition – either simply that of the Song (since he is the first to mention Roland's burial in Blaye) or a similar one that

---

[841] I have explained the (very simple) basis of the distribution of the bodies of the fallen warriors to the various places elsewhere (Beckmann 2009b, 399s., and in more detail in 2011, 38–42).

[842] This would also be the case if Hugo's writing were based on the Royal Annals and not on Ado.

was possibly more specific; this is why he does not think there is anything wrong or unclear about Charlemagne travelling homewards via Narbonne.[843]

There is one other version of interest that appears not to have been mentioned before in this connection. It seems also to have been written around 1120 and is preserved in several relatively short annal texts of the 12th and 13th c. from Normandy and England:[844] *[Karolus] apud Caesaraugustum exercitum (var. exercitum suum) coniunxit (var. ad Caesaraugustam exercitum admovit) et acceptis obsidibus, subjugatis(que) Sarracenis (var. Saracenos subjugat) per Narbonam (et) Wasconiam Franciam rediit (var. revertitur)*. These annals do not mention the defeat at Roncevaux, but they are explicit about Charlemagne's return journey: he departs from Saragossa and heads for home, not via (Roncevaux,) Gascony and Narbonne (as in the PT), but in reverse order via Narbonne and Gascony – and so surely over the eastern Pyrenees?

Is there another early source for this version of his return journey? A few Romance scholars think that the Oxford Roland itself is this source. An almost forgotten dissertation (Wilke 1910, 76) states that Charlemagne's second return journey out of Spain as recorded in the Rol. appears to have followed the coast road in the eastern Pyrenees because the itinerary from Narbonne-Bordeaux-Blaye-Aachen only makes sense if he had used the eastern Pyrenean road plus the old Roman road from Narbonne-Toulouse-Bordeaux. This was endorsed immediately by Tavernier in a footnote (1912, 140 n. 23). We could argue this hypothesis from evidence in the Song as follows. After Charlemagne has avenged himself on the fleeing 'heathens', returned to Roncevaux and uttered his lament over the dead Roland, the bodies of the fallen are ceremoniously laid to rest in a *carner*. Only the three most illustrious bodies are prepared for transportation to

---

843 Hugo of Fleury is then echoed by Hugo of Saint Victor († 1141, *Excerptiones allegoricae priores*, 10.7, PL 177.231): *Carolus subjugatis Narbonensibus in Franciam regressus est*; similarly, in the *Carolinus* (shortly before 1200): "Gilles de Paris, dans son *Carolinus*, dit aussi que Charles fit enterrer les morts de Roncevaux, *tamen ante redactis sub juga Narbone populis* (ms. 6091, f. 17 v°)" (G. Paris 1865a, 257 n. 1).

844 Ms. Bodl. Laud. 636 from Peterborough, this part of which appears to have been written shortly after 1121 (MGH SS. 13.103, cf. 93!); then the ms. printed in Migne PL 162.215 from Saint-Évroult, which is based on an exaggerated panegyric to Henry I of England and states that he ruled for 30 years, meaning that it was written after 1135. There are also the *Ann. Gemmeticenses* (from Jumièges), *Rotomagenses* (from Rouen), *Uticenses* (from Saint-Évroult, all MGH SS. 26.490–493) from the late 12th and early 13th c.; finally, the *Ann. Dorenses* (from Dore in Herefordshire, MGH SS. 27.515) around 1300. Unfortunately, I do not have the time to familiarise myself with the complicated background to these mss. or update these references in a way that fully reflects contemporary scholarship.

Blaye, and Charlemagne gives out orders to four trusty followers, Tedbald, Ge-buïn, Count Milun and Margrave Otes (v. 2970–2972): *En .III. carettes les guïez [al chemin]* – as the Segre edition has it; O has *En .III. carettes tres ben les guïez*, but overwritten with an amendment by the "corrector" which does not fit the assonance ending in *-i*; the emendation to *al chemin* following V4 has been standard since Theodor Müller, and even Bédier (1938, 190) approved of it. The *guïez* sounds like a definite command to start marching, all the more as the Emperor himself is about to leave: *Venir s'en volt li emperere Carles* (v. 2974) – but at that moment Baligant's vanguard messengers appear. After he has defeated Baligant, Charlemagne conquers Saragossa, and this leads him further eastwards into Spain than we have thus far seen in the Song. The further east you find yourself, the more logical it is (relatively speaking) to leave Spain through the eastern Pyrenees. However, a look at a modern Atlas shows that even from Saragossa, the journey to Bordeaux is still considerably shorter via Roncevaux than via Narbonne. But the poet did not have an atlas; he did have some familiarity with Catalonia in particular (Balasguét, Sebre, Marbrie), and so he was probably familiar with the 290 m-high, and therefore easily passable Col du Perthus, which in those days was an important supply route from France to Catalonia. This is why it would have seemed quite natural to him that Charlemagne, having finished his business in Saragossa, would head for home over the Perthus.

But there is one difficulty with this hypothesis: three of the four men entrusted with bringing the remains of the three illustrious dead to Blayes actually take part in the Baligant battle as well! Tedbald and Otes are in charge of the sixth *eschiele* (v. 3058), Gebuïn and a comrade lead the second (v. 3022) and are even killed by Baligant (v. 3469). This is too significant to be an oversight on the part of the poet. As we can rule out the possibility that the three bodies were taken into the Baligant battle or to the conquest of Saragossa, the poet seems to think it is obvious that Tedbald, Otes and Milun will carry out their orders after a short delay and bring the remains of the fallen from Roncevaux to Bordeaux. Charlemagne brings his army via Narbonne to meet them there, and then *cunduit* (v. 3689) them to Blaye. If we accept that the poet assumes all this without explicitly saying so, then the Narbonne problem is resolved without any contradictions. I must admit, however, that I am not sure that this is the case in the Song in its surviving form.

Be that as it may – all of these authors presume that Charlemagne makes a big detour, either via Narbonne or passing by slightly north of this place, and some rely on material that is not in the Rol. in its surviving form.

If we want to resolve this problem, then we must follow the principle: *En el principio era la historia.*

In the year 737, Charles Martell won a great victory over the Muslims at the River Berre, just south of Narbonne, which was still under Muslim occupation at the time. After that, he marched – coming from a southerly direction – towards the city, but he soon had to give up his siege because a dangerous uprising against him had broken out in Provence. This kind of event can be linked with the name of a place for a long time, and it is somewhat similar to the constellation we find in γ and in the *Aymeri*: 'Charlemagne' marched with a great army from the south intending to conquer the city, and then he turned towards home.

Pippin did conquer the city in 759. In 778 one half of Charlemagne's army – according to the Royal Annals from Burgundy, Austrasia, Bavaria, Provence and Septimania – made their way to Saragossa through the eastern Pyrenees, having passed through Narbonne; the local memory may well have preserved this latter information in a simplified form: 'During Charlemagne's Spanish campaign, his army came through here'. This half of the army could then have taken the same route on the way back: 'Charlemagne's army came through here on their way to Spain and back'.

But a somewhat different scenario is almost as likely for the historical return journey of the eastern half of the army. By compromising and failing to conquer Saragossa, Charlemagne had lost his aura of victory, and by imprisoning Ibn al-Arabi, he had forfeited the friendship of Girona and Barcelona, el-Arabi's homeland.[845] Under these circumstances, Charlemagne may have thought it was safer not to send the eastern half of his army through what was now enemy territory and better to keep them with him until they reached Gascony, where they would separate. From Gascony, he himself rushed with a part of the army – including the Austrasian men at least – to Auxerre, towards the rebelling Saxons,[846] while the rest probably were released to return to their respective homes in the west and southeast of his realm. This would show that the account given in the PT is historical to some extent. Then, for example, some of the warriors who fought at Roncevaux could actually have been buried in Arles, and when the PT heard about their burial places, it would almost certainly have led to his depiction of events. But in this scenario, too, troops belonging to Charlemagne and returning from Spain would have passed through Narbonne, or just north of this place.

All this must have added weight, but also diversity, to these rumours of Charlemagne's eastern journey home.

Someone or other then recognised that a tale of this type was the ideal link between the two great complexes of the epic that were forming, that is to say the

---

845 Cf. z. B. Menéndez Pidal (1960, 190).
846 More detail on this in n. 553 above!

Roland material and the William (or Aimerid) material. This brings us to the figure of Aimeri de Narbonne. In terms of history: a certain Count *Haimricus* in Septimania or in the Marca Hispanica is a historical figure in around 800; according to the Royal Annals he was freed from Saracen imprisonment in the year 810, which had *olim* befallen him. The first time the name *Aimericus* appears with a clear link to Narbonne is in the name of the archbishop who held office there between 928–977; we can assume that his origins lie in the regional nobility (and evidence shows this was true of his successors over the next hundred years), because in this period neither the King of France nor the Pope had any influence over the appointment of bishops there. He was possibly related to the Viscount Aimericus I (attested 1080, † 1105) and Aimericus II (1105–1134). The viscounts in those days had ranked equally with the archbishop for many years and were the real rulers of the city, whereas the Count of Narbonne title, which in the late 9th c. had been united with the Duke of Gothia title, had already moved over to the far-away House of Toulouse which – represented in around 1100 by the famous Raymond of Saint-Gilles – retained only nominal sovereignty over Narbonne (LM s. v. *Narbonne*).

The William or Aimeri epic emerged out of this background. In the Hague Fragment, *Carolus in(du)perator* fights alongside the Aimerid clan against an unnamed city, which might have been either Girona or Narbonne. The next in rank after the emperor is a *dux*, and he could not have remained anonymous throughout the whole of the poem. In the fragment, however, he is the father of *Wibelinus puer*; since *Wibelinus puer* can only be *li enfes Guibelin* of the *Chanson de Guillaume*, that is to say, Aimeri's youngest son Guibert/Guibelin, the most economical assumption is that Aimeri was already the *dux* in the fragment. As Aimeri (also *N· Aimeri*) de Narbonne, father of William and his brothers, he then appears in the *Chanson de Guillaume*, the *Charroi de Nîmes* and the *Prise d'Orange*, in other words, in the oldest surviving works of the William epic tradition. And he is not just an epic figure invented as an adjunct to his sons, or to William in particular. The *Pilgrims' Guide* in the *Codex Calixtinus* (around 1140, cap. 8) sees Saint William of Orange, not in accordance with history, but in agreement with the epic, as the liberator of Nîmes and Orange; if the figure of William's father had been a fictitious addition, then he would surely not have been given a fief against geographical logic in Narbonne, which lay far to the southwest, but rather a city further up the River Rhône, such as Valence, Vienne or Lyon.

Even though we cannot be entirely sure how the story developed before the Rol., if we put all of these facts together, it is extremely likely that the Roland

poet knew about and respected an established tradition of Aimeri having been given the fief of Narbonne when Charlemagne came back from Spain. And since Aimeri and his whole clan only ever appeared in the eastern Pyrenean-Mediterranean region, and not in Gascony, he could not have confused Ameri's Narbonne with Arbonne.

Non-Christian ideas

A.13 The 'heathen' gods

A.13.1 Jupiter

Four 'heathen' gods appear in the Rol.: in more than a dozen passages, the poet mentions one or more gods of the Anti-Trinity (Apollin, Tervagan, Mahum / Mahume / Mahumet), but he only mentions Jupiter once. Given the tight structure that is evident throughout the whole of the Song, this special case certainly needs to be explained. This is what the text says (v. 1390–1392): *E l'arcevesque lor ocist Siglorel, / L'encanteür ki ja fut en enfer: / Par artimal l'i cunduist Jupiter.* 'And Turpin killed Siglorel, the sorcerer, who was once in hell; Jupiter had led him there through sorcery'. Segre adds in the index: "Giove, ma considerato come divinità demoniaca". This is of course true in the generic sense that in the Song every god except the Christian one must be a manifestation of evil. But because Segre describes the other three gods differently, as "una delle persone della trinità pagana", he means this more specifically, and this then merits further discussion. For catabases usually do not happen under the aegis of the god of the underworld, who would then be tempted to try and keep the visitor down there in his realm. They usually happen under the aegis of another god, and one who can exert power over the god of the underworld, if necessary. We need only think of the catabasis that the poet *a priori* knew best, which was, apart from that of Christ himself, the descent of Aeneas: the ghost of his father passes on to him 'Jupiter's command' to go down to the underworld (*Aen.* 5.726), and then Aeneas informs his comrades about 'Jupiter's command' (5.747), and the Sybil also warns him that only 'Jupiter's favourites' are able to survive a trip to the underworld (6.130). Another fact is relevant here, too: previously (4.638), just before Dido took her own life, she made a sacrifice to 'nether Jove';[847] Servius explains: *hoc est Plutoni*, but Vergil's expression could easily be mistaken here as referring to the normal Jupiter, who exerts power even over the underworld. This confusing expression lives on into the Christian era: this is how Prudentius, in his widely read *Contra Symmachum* refers to the underworld god first as *Dis* (1.379 ed. Cunningham), then (in the gen.) as *Iovis infernalis* (1.388). Thus, the poet seems to have found inspiration for the special role played by Jupiter either in the *Aeneid* or in Prudentius. But he would probably not have seen him as one of the normal 'heathen'

---

847 The same term is used in Ovid *fasti* 5.448.

gods, as a member of the Anti-Trinity, because ever since the Carolingian Renaissance,[848] the poets had turned Jupiter into a harmless figure through expressions like *armiger Iovis* 'an angelic messenger',[849] also the use of *tertia comparationis* such as *Tonans* or *regnator Olympi*[850] made him more like the true God, at least in formulaic forms; we can therefore assume that educated people in around 1100 had an image of Jupiter that no longer displayed any grotesque or actively demonic features.[851]

A.13.2 The Anti-Trinity

In the Marsilĭe section, one or two names from the Anti-Trinity are mentioned on ten occasions,[852] but all three together do not appear until just before the start of the Baligant section (v. 2580–2591), and then frequently (v. 2696s., 2711s., 3267s., 3490s.).[853] In other words, the coherence of Evil worldwide (as a tenet of medieval Christianity) is made manifest on both levels at the same time;[854] this synchronising of symbolic and geographical material is obviously the result of a very deliberate and artistic intention. Now, we cannot really assume that the poet of the Marsilĭe section introduced all three elements, but by chance just named one, or at the most two of them at a time, and that it was only the poet of the Baligant

---

848 This, too, rests on earlier sources: Varro had identified the God of the Jews as Jupiter; Augustine (*cons.evang.* 1.23.30s.) found a positive side to him first, before he went on to show the limits of this identification. The Christian Flavius Merobaudes (around 435, *Panegyricus* 2.97, MGH AA 14, p.14) describes the Christian God as *summum numen, mens Iovis*, according to Curtius (1939, 140), though in my opinion this refers more accurately to the Holy Spirit. *Tonans* is the heathen god in Commodian and earlier authors, but the Christian God in Boëthius, Juvencus and later authors, and he is both in Dracontius (Raby 1957, 184s., cf. also 223).
849 MGH PLAeC. 2.21 and 364.
850 LCI s. v. *Götter, heidnische*, C, *Synkretismus und Antithese*, vol. 2, col. 178.
851 By the middle of the 12th c. in France it had got to the stage that God the Father or Christ could be addressed as Jupiter in the Chartres School (Piper 1847–1851, 1.140, Seznec 1953, 99); and so it was that Bernardus Silvestris in his great, Neoplatonic vision *Megacosmus et Microcosmus*, which deals with the creation story as if Genesis did not exist (Bezold 1922, 78), also has Jupiter appear in royal majesty. In Italy in 1183, Gottfried of Viterbo exclaims to the young Henry VI in the *Speculum regum*: *Cum Jove summo deo superi tibi regna dederunt!* (Bezold 1922, 25), which by its very language already anticipates Dante's *sommo Giove* (Purg. 6.118).
852 That is to say in v. 8, 416s., 611, 853, 868, 921, 1336, [1616]=1667, 1906, 2468.
853 And additionally, only twice Mohammed alone (3552, 3641).
854 Although in the Rol. this Trinity only becomes manifest at a comparatively late stage, we can see that contemporary readers would have been very aware of it because of the way it was taken over e.g. into the *Chanson de Guillaume* [II] 3253s.

section who suddenly realised that they could be combined to form the (Anti-) Trinity. This means that if we believe there are two poets, only one possibility remains: the author of the Baligant section is responsible for the avoidance of a triple naming in the Marsilĭe section, and this is another indication that he made retrospective changes to the Marsilĭe section, as we already suspected above in the section on 'Oriental elements in the Marsilĭe section' (A.5.13).

The Anti-Trinity motif is not the Roland poet's own idea, as it has a long history going back many hundreds of years to the early days of Christianity,[855] and it persisted until at least around 1600. Usener wrote a famous article (1903, passim) about pagan antiquity's liking for divine trinities; when these gods degenerated into demons, the idea of an Anti-Trinity running parallel with the true Trinity was an almost obvious development. Erwin Panofsky (1930, 1 with n. 2)[856] discusses representations of the Anti-Trinity which were common in medieval art and notes that an early idea of the devils' trinity occurs even in Origen (*Comm. ad Rom.*, V, 562). [Although here it is still in a relatively abstract form: the devil is according to *Ioh* 8.44 'the father of lies', and so the lie is his son; the *spiritus* is the third part, that is to say *erroris* of the pseudoprophets; the text is preserved only in the Lat. trans. by Rufinus (Migne PG 14.1040), G.A.B.] Within figurative depictions of both the Trinity and the *Trinité satanique* we can differentiate between an older and a later type: the older type links with Gallo-Roman images which combine the three faces into a single formation with three noses, two (or four) eyes and three mouths [. . .], while the later type shows three complete heads growing out from a single torso [although incidentally, Dante's *tre facce alla sua testa* (*Inf.* 34.38) illustrates the 'older' type, G.A.B.]. Figurative artists would have enjoyed the technical challenge of finding a way to represent monsters in an image, but the Roland poet through the medium of writing preferred the classical-polytheistic form of three separate figures, with the consequence that he had to find names for them – even though there appears to have been no existing tradition that he could latch on to in this respect.[857]

---

855 The Romance scholar Spitzer realised this and refers to it in a footnote (1948–1949, 403 n.).
856 The older literature on this topic is cited there too; Panofsky investigates the metamorphoses of this motif up to the work of Giordano Bruno. There is some discussion of the Anti-Trinity idea in the late Middle Ages in Usener (1903, 182), and a few references also in Edelstein/Edelstein (1943, 109, 150); there are useful sketches on its development in Kirfel (1948, passim, especially 158–162), in the RdK s. v. *Dreikopfgottheit*, sections V and VI (1958), and very brief coverage in the LCI s. v. *Drei Gesichter*, *drei Köpfe* (1968; cf. there also s. v. *Cerberus*). I have not been able to keep track of this large topic in more recent publications.
857 However, it is very similar to a passage in the *Gesta Tancredi* by Raoul de Caen (cap. 129): after the conquest of Jerusalem, Tancred plunders the temple, which had been used as a mosque until that point; he allegedly comes across some images and wonders "Quid sibi vult haec

The *crute* (v. 2580, in *o* assonance) in Saragossa, which functions as the temple of the Anti-Trinity, is according to the Hilka/Pfister edition a 'crypt, grotto, cave', and so could either be a natural cave or a crypt. The poet may have been thinking of the *antrum*, where the Sybil performs her duties as priestess of Apollo and Diana (*Aen.* 6.9–13, 42, 156) or of the countless heathen hypogees of late antiquity which people in the Middle Ages knew at least from reading about them (including especially the one made for Mithras in Statius *Theb.* 1.720, as well as Tertullian *cor.* 15, Firmicus Maternus 5.2, Jerome *ep.* 107.2; for the *Sol Invictus* Paulinus of Nola *carm.* 32.113s.; generically Ambrosius *enarr.in ps.* XII, 45.24).

A.13.2.1 Mohammed

Of the three named figures in the Song, Mohammed is by far the most frequently mentioned,[858] ten times as *Mahum(m)et* (with *-t* through automatic terminal devoicing),[859] six times as *Mahum* (with suppression of what was thought to be a hypocoristic ending *-et*)[860] and once (v. 3641) as *Mahum<e>* (in the vocative, and so to a certain extent latinising, but mainly because of the assonance requirements).[861] There is admittedly an enormous distortion of the facts here: Islam has never tolerated the idea of a trinity, nor the idea of Mohammed being elevated to

---

effigies? Quid gemma? Quid aurum?/ Quid sibi vult ostrum ['purple']?" *Nam gemmis totus et ostro / Mahumet redimitus erat, radiabat et auro.* "Forsitan hoc Martis vel Apollinis simulacrum". Mohammed, Mars and Apollo – consensus over two out of the three possible options! I have carefully checked this and am convinced that Tervagan cannot be Mars; cf. n. 914 below.

858 For the variants of the name in the non-O versions cf. Stengel's index. I do not examine these in more detail, because they seem not to be related to the stemma, but rather to the milieu within which the respective scribes were working.

859 The form with *a-o* instead of the *o-a* that we might expect was the usual form in Romance-speaking Europe by around 1100 (cf. the examples above in section A.3.1.2 'Saracen names for Christians') and remained so throughout the whole of the Middle Ages and beyond. According to the FEW (s. v. *Mahomet*) it goes back to the form *Mahummad* which is attested in North Africa.

860 This is not the Roland poet's own idea, because the formulation *mahomeria* 'mosque' (cf. *Rol.* 3662 *mahumeries*) is already attested in the earliest historians of the First Crusade (*Gesta* 18 etc.), *Mahummiculae* in the *Gesta Tancredi* by Raoul de Caen (cap. 20), *Mathomus / Machomus* even in Robert of Reims (4.22, RHC Occ. 3.878 etc.). But this form is prompted by the assonance rules: in the Song, *Mahumet* never contributes to the assonance, whereas in five of the eight occurrences, *Mahum(e)* is in the assonance position.

861 Robert of Reims (RHC Occ. 3.878) takes a similar approach: *O Mathome, Mathome!* However, Old Span. has a phonologically equivalent form *Mahoma* (alongside *Mahomat, Mahomet*; cf. Steiger 1932, 261; many examples are given in Ebro-Lacarra vol. 5.).

the status of a god; both of these are a negatively-tinged projection of the Christian faith which had of course built its founder into its own Trinity. Unfortunately, the poet has included an even more negative motif (v. 2590s.): *E Mahumet enz en un fossét butent, / e porc e chen le mordent e defulent.* This is a reformulation of the Christian legend that Mohammed was eaten by dogs.[862]

A.13.2.2 Tervagan

These are the occurrences: ***Tervagan*** O 611, *Terogant* n, *Trivigant* V4C, *Tarvigant* V7;

Tervagant O 2468, the same in KPTL, *Terogant* n, *Trivigant* V4, *Triviganz* C, *Tervigant* V7;

Tervagan O 2589, the same in C, *Tervigant* V7, *Tervagant* PT, Tervogante h(L);

Tervagan O 2696, *Tervigant* CV7, *Tervagant* PT, *Tervogante* h(L);

Tervagan O 2712, *Tervagant* K, *Trivigant* V4, *Tervagans* C, *Tervigant* V7;

Tervagan O 3267, 3491, the same in C, *Tervigan* V7, *Tervagant* PT, *Tervogante* h(L): The forms containing *o-*, Old Norse *Terogant* and Dutch *Tervogante,* do not add anything to the stemma.[863] In V7 the one occurrence of *Tarvi-* alongside the other occurrences of *Tervi-* shows the OF hesitation between *-er-* and *-ar-* before a consonant. Furthermore, V4CV7 have Franco-Italian characteristics: even in V7 (13th c) Italian articulation is noticeable first from *-a- > -i-* in the middle syllable; then there is also – partially in C (around 1300), and then fully in V4 (first half of the 14th c.) – the fact that in Italian almost all compounds begin with *tri-* 'triple' and not with *ter* 'thrice'.[864] *Tervagant* in 2468 belongs in the archetype because O agrees with KPTL, *Tervagan* in 2589, 3267 and 3491 because O goes with C. In 2696 and 2712 *Tervagan(t?)* goes in because O and PT or K

---

862 For more detail on Mohammed in the OF epic, including the Rol., and with reference to the legend about his death, see Bancourt (1982a, 357–376). When the Roland poet adapts this legend to his context, he inadvertently introduces an improbable situation: animals would be interested in a corpse, but not a statue.

863 But both are 'ecological types': the Old Norse *Terogant* in n spreads out in the KMS to the other branches (sometimes with *-rr-*); the Dutch form *Tervogante* belongs with the *Tervogant* in the Picardian epics *Octevien* and *Baudoin de Sebourg.* A further ecological type, *Termagant* (influenced by the word field around 'magical') crops up in 14th c. English and survives from the 16th c. down to the present day meaning 'a nagging person, especially a woman' (MED s. v.).

864 The later Franco-Italian and Italian epic also retains the *Trivigant* type (cf. Moisan s. v.): we find only this type in Pulci (*Trivigante* 2.70 etc., occasionally *Trevigante*, *Trivicante*, *Trevicante*), Boiardo (*Trivigante* 1.192 etc.) and Ariosto (*Trivigante* 12.59.5, 38.18.6). The occasional *-c-* in the Pulci tradition is a hyper-Tuscanism caused by the popular verb formation Lat. and Standard Ital. *-icare* ~ northern Ital. *-igar* (cf. Rohlfs 1969a, § 1164).

agree, and the only remaining question is that of the final -*t*. Because of these six occurrences of *Tervagan(t?)* we can also put *Tervagan* in 611 in O into the archetype. Now, the stock of OF names is full of variation between -*an* and -*ant*; in more than four out of five cases the -*t* is parasitic (cf. n. 234 above), and this is evidently the case here: in the archetype and in O it occurs only once, in the sub-archetype of β, -*ant* appears to be in the majority, and in all of the β mss. except C(V7) it has replaced -*an*.[865] The poet must therefore have only used the form *Tervagan*.

Tervagan is clearly [1] the ancient goddess in triple form, Hecate (Trivia or Proserpina)-Luna-Diana, here referred to as *ter vaga* or *ter vagans*. Let us discuss this identification first, before we tackle the daunting spectrum of other etymologies that have been suggested in the past.

On [1]: In 1819, Ugo Foscolo identified the *Trivigante* in Ariosto (and his predecessors) as *Diana Trivia* in an anonymous article.[866] Skeat (1882) s. v. *termagant* also described the etymology correctly: it is *tri-* + *vagari* referring to the *dea trivia* as a characterisation of the moon, as it wanders through the heavens, the earth and the underworld and is called *Selene*, *Artemis* (*Diana*) and *Hecate*. Grégoire explained the derivation with reference to the Rol., first in around 1940, and then twice more citing Foscolo and arguing against Spitzer a decade later (1949–1950, passim, 1950, passim).[867] But Grégoire over-simplifies the issues when he ignores the stemma and starts with the Franco-Italian form *Trivigant*, and since in my opinion his account (especially in the two polemical articles) is tangential and fragmentary, and it did not deter the publication after 1950 of other hypotheses by scholars such as Virolleaud, Olschki, Broëns, Viré, Pellat and Bellamy, I will take this opportunity to set out my own account of the matter.

---

865 Beyond the Rol., *Tervagant* mostly prevailed, but not completely. Here are a few late examples of the form *Tervagan* lingering on: Jehan Bodel, *Li Jus de Saint Nicolai* (ed. Pauphilet), p. 47 *lagan: Tervagan*, p. 48 *engan: Tervagan* (and also only this form in the middle of a verse); *Bataille Loquifer* (ed. Runeberg) I 1205h (ms. Boulogne, a. 1295) *Tervagan*; *Enfances Renier*: not part of the rhyme (3030, 6791, 12520) *Tervagan*, only once towards the end (18464) *Tervagant*, however in the rhyme position between 3778 and 17735 always (14x altogether) *Tervagant*.

866 In English in *Quarterly Review* [London] 21 (1819), 515 (not accessible to me). Foscolo was identified as the author by Agostino Pertusi, cf. Grégoire/Mathieu (1949–1950, passim).

867 Grégoire (1939–1944, passim), Grégoire/Mathieu (1949–1950, passim), Grégoire (1950, passim). Accepted (despite several contrary Arabist explanations!) by the Oriental scholar Kunitzsch (1988, 267).

Until now, almost all attempts to explain the name *Tervagan* have carried out a rushed and incomplete review of previous research into the name itself before attaching it to some etymological construct or other. But the epic genre is all about storytelling. Let us therefore investigate this figure of Tervagan in the two passages where this deity appears alone, i.e. not syntactically bound by "and" to one or both of the other deities in the Anti-Trinity.

When Charlemagne is pursuing the enemy warriors who have survived the battle of Roncevaux, they have to cross the River Ebro; but there are no ferries there, with the consequence that (v. 2468s.) *Paiens reclement un lur deu, Tervagant,/ Puis saillent enz, mais il n'i unt garant*, they drown. In this case, then, Tervagan cannot be a river deity; because such a deity would be tied to the local area, whereas Tervagan appears to be worshipped universally across heathendom because of his or her position within the Anti-Trinity, as indeed he or she is worshipped by the Oriental Baligant and his army (v. 3267). But Tervagan cannot be a sea deity either because the power of such a divinity would not reach as far as 300 km upriver from the sea. Then another hypothesis emerges: Tervagan is being asked to find an escape route for the warriors in their flight, and so he or she must be a deity of roads – as Hermes was in antiquity and as the Hecate part of triple deity Hecate- (also called Trivia, sometimes Proserpina)-Luna-Diana. There is no need to supply references for Hermes here. The triple deity (according to the RAC s. v. *Hekate*) already has the classical function of guarding the roads as *Triodotis*, *Trivia*, which is why according to Servius (on *Aen.* 4.511, cf. also *Aen.* 4.609, Varro *ling.lat.* 7.16 and Ovid *fasti* 1.141s.) temples were built specifically near junctions of three roads. Macrobius 1.9.6 says of her: *Dianae vero ut Triviae viarum omnium tribuunt potestatem*; she is expressly described as *viarum praeses* in Augustine (*civ.* 7.16, CCL 47.199), repeated by Isidore (8.11.55), Rabanus Maurus (*De univ.* 15.6) and the Second Vatican Mythographer (cap. 35; probably 11th c. preserved in ten mss.).[868]

But does the expression *un lur deu* not suggest that this is a male divinity? Not at all! Lat. *dea* does not survive into OF, and the OF neologisms *déesse* and *dieuesse* do not appear until the second half of the 12th c, (*Eneas* or Marie de France); the Roland poet therefore probably did not have a word for "goddess" in his native language. We can therefore assume that he was following the Latin usage, and in fact *deus* is perfect Latin for a goddess: Catullus 61.64 refers to Venus using *huic deo*, Cicero *Verr.* 5.139 *inventorem olei deum* to Minerva-

---

868 From the faithful perspective of Christian martyrs, of course, this sounds more polemical; as indeed in the *Passio Sancti Symphoriani* (BHL 7967) where Diana is *Trivia: per compita currens [. . .] triviis insidiatur*.

Athene, Vergil *Aen.* 2.632 *ducente deo* to Venus, *Aen.* 7.498 *deus* to Alecto, Ovid *Met.* 10.586 *audentes deus ipse iuvat* to Fortuna, Prudentius *contra Symm.* 1.371 *deum* to the triple deity, Augustine *civ.* 7.23 *quam Varro deum esse confirmat* to Terra – and thus also Turold's *deu* refers to the female Tervagan.[869]

The second passage is even more specific within its particular context (v. 2580s., 2586–2591):

> Ad Apollin curent en une crute,
> † Tencent a lui, laidement le despersunent:
> [. . .]
> Puis si li tolent s[on] sceptre e sa curune,
> Par mains le p<r>endent <de>sur une culumbe,
> Entre lur piez a tere le tresturnent,
> A granz bastuns le batent e defruisent.
> E Tervagan tolent sun escarbuncle,
> E Mahumet enz en un fossét butent,
> E porc e chen le mordent e defulent.

It is immediately obvious that Apollin and Mahumet are physically mistreated, whereas Tervagan only has the symbol of her power removed. This fits with the idea that Tervagan is a goddess: the poet consciously or unconsciously holds back from allowing a female figure to be assaulted. Unlike the two other divinities, she has a distinctive carbuncle stone in her possession. Across the whole of the medieval world, this item has just one attribute, which is fictional but all the more widely recognised: it illuminates itself.[870] To cite only the most impactful reference, Isidore (16.14.1) writes of this gem: *Omnium ardentium*

---

869 There are many more examples in the TLL s. v. *deus*, section 2. – By way of comparison: in Homer θεός (m. and f.) is 'god, goddess', whereas θεά is later. One 8th c. Anglo Saxon author even turned Venus into a man (Curtius 1954, 408, according to Levison). It is not obvious in the Vulgate (*Iud* 1.13, *1 Sam* 7.3s., 12.10, 31.10, *2 Reg* 23.13) that Astarot(h) is female. Thus, we even find in the *Chanson de Guillaume* 2139 *d'enfern le veil Astarut* (in the index of the McMillan edition incorrectly listed as '*roi* païen', and similar examples are to be found in later epics; 'he' was the inspiration behind Pulci's to *Astarotte*.

870 There are dozens of references on this point. Ziolkowski (1961, passim) deals with all aspects of the carbuncle thoroughly and readably. The two most important stages in its evolution are as follows: Pliny (*nat.* 37.92–98) reports that some people think a particular type of carbuncle is able to illuminate itself, but he himself believes that this effect can only be obtained very briefly if the gem is steeped in vinegar; Epiphanius of Salamis (end of the 4th c.; Lat. translation from the 5th c. CSEL 35.2, here p. 749) did not have these doubts, but may have been the victim of deception because certain priests used to coat precious gems with the luminescent organs of sea creatures to persuade the faithful observer that the gem was self-illuminating – and so once again we find that there is an unexpectedly rational basis for medieval superstition. Furthermore, I think that belief in self-illumination, as well as Epihanius, are behind

gemmarum principatum carbunculus habet. Carbunculus autem dictus quod sit ignitus ut carbo, cuius fulgor nec nocte vincitur; lucet enim in tenebris adeo ut flammas ad oculos vibret.[871] Here the term 'night', 'darkness' is probably meant in an exclusionary sense; some sources – such as Epiphanios in the 4th c., and Philippe de Thaon who was closer in time and space to the Rol.[872] – state specifically that it does not illuminate itself during the daytime. This has inspired the Roland poet in several different ways. Since the carbuncle is the most valuable of the gemstones, the Saracens gladly flaunt it: Chernuble has a helmet with carbuncles (v. 1321), Abisme has a shield with carbuncles, which *li amiralz Galafres* had previously sent to him with the help of a devil (v. [1660–1664] =1499–1503), and Climborin makes Ganelon a gift of *sun helme e s'escarbuncle* (v. [1488]=1531, which we should understand as 'his helmet together with its carbuncle'). And because its rays *nec nocte vincitur*, all of Baligant's ships carry a carbuncle when they are sailing by night (v. 2633, 2643).

But which divinities emit light during the night? Luna, who is one of the triple goddess figures, Venus as evening and morning star and Mithras as torch bearer.[873] Now, according to Cicero (*nat.deor.* 2.68) the Greeks also called the triple goddess – or more precisely, Diana as one part of the triple goddess – *Lucifera*, literally 'woman carrying a light'. If a medieval poet was inspired by this name, or perhaps independently of this name, wanted to give such a goddess a source of light as a characteristic attribute, then it could hardly be one of the

---

some other statements that are not mentioned in Ziolkowski, such as for example (according to TLL s. v. *carbunculus*) Ambrosius *parad.* 3.15 *splendidum [. . .] carbunculum in quo quidam animae nostrae vivit igniculus*, or Jerome *in Is.* 54.11 *carbunculus [. . .] videtur mihi ignitus sermo doctrinae, qui fugato errore tenebrarum illuminat corda credentium*; it is even quite clear in Augustine *doctr. chr.* 2.16 *nam et carbunculi notitia, quod lucet in tenebris, multa inluminat etiam obscura librorum, ubicumque propter similitudinem ponitur.* Furthermore, there is now a reference which fills the gap between Isidore and the 11th c. (according to the Mlat.Wb. s. v. *carbunculus*): Bonifatius *epist.* 9 p. 6.7 *divinam sapientiam, quae est [. . .] ignitior carbunculo.* In the spatial and temporal context of the Rol., the self-illuminating property of the carbuncle is dutifully mentioned in three books about precious stones: an English text of the early 11th c., a Latin text by Marbod of Rennes (around 1070) and an OF text by Philippe de Thaon (before 1135), cf. Ziolkowski (1961, 303s.). Modern science does not use the term 'carbuncle' referring to gems. The genuine elements in old descriptions more or less fit with ruby and garnet; cf. Ziolkowski (1961, 317).

871 The Isidore reference is included by Lambert of Saint-Omer, for example, in his *Liber floridus* (ed. Derolez p. 458 = f. 229v°, 39s.).

872 Ziolkowski (1961, 301, 304, 315) on Epiphanius (incidentally also in the Latin translation, CSEL 35.2, p. 749), Philippe de Thaon and Conrad of Megenberg. We should add Thomas of Cantimpré (ed. Boese p. 359): *nocte magis lucet quam die.*

873 On the latter, Vermaseren (1960, 63).

feeble sources of light that were familiar in the Middle Ages, such as an oil lamp or a candle. It would have to have been a steady source of light, and ideally one that would only emit light during the night. A carbuncle was the obvious choice.

The overlap between the two passages consists of *only* the triple divinity, but in her disaggregated components: as the road guardian Hecate, as the night-time light bearer Luna. This begs the question: did the poet recognise the composite character of the triple deity?

Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.434) thinks this is impossible: "Le moindre [but also the only one that Sainéan mentions] inconvénient de cette conjecture [by Skeat] est d'impliquer une érudition mythologique absolument étrangère au Moyen Âge". But he is very much mistaken: the triple deity is a strikingly consistent presence in Western education from Hellenistic times through the Latin literature and was even mentioned by Goethe!

In Catullus 34.1–17 the celebrated *Diana* (who for him, as for the Greeks, is the same person as the goddess of birth, *Lucina*) is also *Trivia* and *Luna*.[874] Vergil *Aen.* 4.511 mentions *tergeminamque Hecaten, tria virginis ora Dianae*; and Servius: *'tria virginis ora' iteratio est: Lunae, Dianae, Proserpinae*. Festus (2nd c., here according to Paulus Diaconus, ed. Lindsay 89.2) offers the definition: *Hecate: Diana eadem probatur et Luna et Proserpina*. Among the Christian authors, Ausonius in his poem on trinities (26.2, MGH AA. 5/2.129) repeats the Vergil verse cited above. Prudentius rants against Apollo in a passage more than forty lines long, and then (*contra Symm.* 1.334–378, CC 126.199s.) devotes another forty or more lines to the triple goddess: this *Proserpina* rises up from her Stygian cave and informs the Romans that she rules from the heavens to the underworld, also as *Luna*, in whose form she *sublustri splendet amictu*, and as *Trivia*, and that she can *ter(que) suas eadem variare figuras* – even though she is only a *daemon tartareus*! Prudentius commentaries compress this information: *Triviae, id est Lunae, Dianae vel Proserpinae*.[875] According to Augustine (*civ.* 7.16, CC 47.199), she is the sister of the sun god Apollo and simultaneously *Diana, Luna* and *viarum praeses* [that is to say Hecate]. Fulgentius the Mythographer (who in the Middle Ages was thought to be the Church Father Fulgentius) writes (*myth.* 2.16): *Lunam ideo ipsam voluerunt etiam apud inferos Proserpinam [. . .] Ipsam et*

---

874 Horace, in his *carm.* 3.22 includes Diana and also Lucina in the *diva triformis*, but this is done implicitly for both. The fact that Diana and Trivia are one and the same is assumed by Ennius (in Varro *ling.lat.* 7.16), Lucretius 1.84 and Ovid *Met.* 2.415s. and *Pont.* 3.2.48–71. Cicero *nat. deor.* 2.68 notes that Diana and Luna (and Lucina) are known to be one and the same entity.

875 Cf. Burnam (1910, 152).

Dianam nemoribus [praeesse] volunt [. . .]. The eclectic Christian author Dracontius, who was born into a patrician family, mixed Christian and pagan content rather freely and wrote in around 500 (*Romulea* 10.188–190): *'omen adest' inquit, 'Triviam te, Luna, Diana, / confiteor perstans, heres Proserpina mundi, / nam tria regna tenes: [. . .]'*.[876]

Cassiodorus writes in the year 523 on Theoderich's behalf (*var.* 5.42, MGH AA. 12.168, *Diana* was mentioned in a previous version): *hanc triplicem deam falsa imaginatione finxerunt, ipsam in caelo Lunam, ipsam in silvis dominam* (var. 12th c. at the latest: *Dianam*[877]), *ipsam apud inferos Proserpinam esse firmantes*. In the glosses, *Trivia* is explained as Ἑκάτη or *Diana et Luna* or *Proserpina* (CGLL 3.8.73, 4.292.31, 5.487.11, 5.581.23). This material is finally broken down into bite-sized pieces by Isidore. He mentions Apollo, and then immediately turns to Diana (*et.* 8.11.56–58): *Dianam quoque germanam eius [scil. Apollinis] similiter Lunam et viarum praesidem aiunt. [. . .] Ipsam et Lucinam adseverant, eo quod luceat. Eandem et Triviam, eo quod tribus fungatur figuris*; thereafter, Vergil's *tria virginis ora Dianae* and the most salient Prudentius comments are cited. In 800 the important *Glossarium Ansileubi* (ed. Lindsay s. v. *Trivia*) condenses this to: *Trivia: Diana, Luna, Proserpina*. Rabanus Maurus (*De univ.*15, PL 111.430s.) copies out the whole of Isidore's text on this topic. Martianus Capella (Book VII, ed. Dick p. 369) had only alluded to the triple goddess; when his work began to be used as school textbooks in the 9th c., his two most influential commentators explained what the allusion referred to. John Scotus Eriugena writes (ed. Lutz 1939 on 369.1s.): *ergo Lucina dicitur in caelo, Diana in terris, Proserpina in inferno*. Remigius of Auxerre (ed. Lutz 1965) repeats this and adds: *'quaedam virgo': Diana, Luna, et Proserpina. 'huic numero': id est ternario*. The Mythographus Vaticanus I (between 875 and 1075, cap. 111) departs somewhat from the Isidore text and names *Diana-Luna-(Lucina-)Trivia-Proserpina*, while the Mythographus II (probably 11th c. cap. 35) simply copies out Isidore along with the Virgil and Prudentius citation. Finally, coming closer to the time and location of the Rol., Baldric of Bourgueil devotes twenty-five lines (ed. Abrahams, Nr. 216, v. 757–781) to a rather tortuous explanation of why Proserpina, Luna and Diana are the same entity.

---

[876] At roughly the same time, Arnobius (*adv.gentes* 3.34) has a slightly different view: the pagans *Dianam, Cererem, Lunam caput esse unius Dei triviali germanitate pronuntiant*, although we should remember that Ceres was also the goddess of seed which is buried in the ground and then rises up again, which means she has a strongly chthonic side.

[877] The editor Mommsen confirms in his introduction (p. LXXXIX) that that the writer of the ms. 'not infrequently' found errors in the archetype (!) and corrected them.

It is not necessary to follow this tradition into later periods. But we should at least note that two of the world's greatest writers will eventually be a part of it. The first is Ariosto (18.184.1–6, Medoro to Luna):

> O santa dea, che dagli antiqui nostri
> Debitamente sei detta triforme;
> Ch'in cielo, in terra e ne l'inferno mostri
> L'alta bellezza tua sotto più forme,
> E ne le selve, di fere e di mostri
> Vai cacciatrice seguitando l'orme [. . .]

The second is Goethe, when in the Classical Walpurgis Night (Scene 'By the Upper Peneus, Again') he has Anaxagoras cry out: 'Du droben, ewig Unveraltete, / Dreinamig-Dreigestaltete, / Dich ruf ich an bei meines Volkes Weh, / Diana, Luna, Hekate!' [You up there, never ageing, / Triple-named, triple-formed, / I cry to you by my people's woe, / Diana, Luna, Hecate!].

Further evidence for this identification of Tervagan lies in the sibling relationship between Apollo (*Apollin* in the Rol.) and Diana – first the 'pure' Diana, later automatically the triple goddess – which at the same time means (Augustine *civ.* 7.16), between the sun and the moon. This pairing came as an established one from ancient Greece to Rome. Horace's great *Carmen saeculare*, for example, was devoted to the pair of siblings; moreover, when Aeneas journeys to the underworld, the Sybil acts as priestess for both of them *Phoebi Triviaeque sacerdos*, and Aeneas promises to build a shared temple for *Phoebo et Triviae* (*Aen.* 6.35 and 69). There are a great many explicit references to this, and we have already noted Prudentius, Augustine, Isidore and those who copied them. The J[2] version of the Latin Alexander romance mentions almost the complete Roman pantheon at some point or other (mainly in the Brahmans' letter responding to Alexander, J[2] cap. 99), but as we also find in Archipresbyter Leo and in J[1] (apart from the unique role that Alexander gives to Ammon) only Apollo and Diana feature in their own, individual episodes, and these are the two divinities Alexander approaches in search of a prophecy (J[2] cap. 38, 41, cf. also 39 and 61); in J[2] (cap. 129) the dying Alexander sends a last votive offering to the Temple of Apollo in Athens. The reader is therefore led to believe that Apollo and Diana are the Greek civilisation's greatest cult divinities. This pairing also lingers on into some of the saints' lives: as in the *Passio Sancti Symphoriani* (BHL 7967, passim) where the Saint is commanded to make offerings only to Berecynthia (i.e. the mother of the gods, Cybele), Apollo and Diana; Apollo occupies the top position among the heathen gods in the George legend, and Diana follows some

way behind, but still higher than Jupiter.[878] In the lives of Saint Juilana, Saint Martina, Saint Marcellus and Athanasius, Saint Patroclus and in the *Acta fabulosa* of Saint Paphnutius (BHG 1419, Latin: AA.SS. 24. Sept., col. 683Bss.) only Apollo and Diana are mentioned. There are of course also some texts in which Diana alone is denounced, as in the life of Caesarius of Arles (BHL 1509, 2.2.15) and in the *Historia Francorum* (8.15) by Gregory of Tours, or texts where she plays a leading role, such as the Old Occ. *Sancta Fides*, where she is mentioned four times, v. 211, 250, 266, 275, whereas other gods are only mentioned once. More evidence for this idea of paired divinities can be found in the biblical background: worshipping 'sun, moon and the heavenly host of stars' is the most dangerous temptation, because according to *Deut* 4.19, 17.3 and *Ier* 8.2 it is the most obvious one; Job (*Iob* 31.26–28) considers it a *negatio contra Deum altissimum*, if he has ever secretly blown a kiss to the sun and the moon.

Thus, if Tervagant is Diana, the Anti-Trinity has an astonishingly simple structure: apart from Mohammed, whom the poet is forced to include because of the real situation (even if he represents this in a very distorted way), this trio contains the most familiar pair of divinities from ancient mythology.

With this structure, the poet exploits all three components of the triple divinity: the pairing with Apollo comes from Diana, the guardianship of the roads from Hecate, and the self-illumination by night from Luna. But this makes it difficult for him to pick any one of the three names for her. Thus, he makes a descriptive name out of the two most important elements that are characteristic of this goddess: her triple identity and the fact that she "wanders".[879] The *ter* comes from the two most influential poets of the Middle Ages: from Vergil's *tergemina*[880] and the *ter [. . .] variare figuras* used by Prudentius.[881] The idea of "wandering" by night and the triple-formed divinity lying in wait for people is most memorably reflected in Prudentius, although he uses the verb *discurrere*; however, there are many references with the stem *vag-*: *Omnivaga* is the triple deity in Cicero *nat.deor.* 2.68;[882] in Vergil's Aen. 10.215s., her *Luna* form drives

---

878 Haubrichs (1979, 220 and other places), judging by the number of reviews mentioning this point.

879 Also: 'roams, strays, tramps', always with a negative connotation.

880 Repeated in Valerius Flaccus *Argon.* 1.781 and in the quasi-quotation in Ausonius. The related *tri-* appears passim in *Trivia*, sometimes in *triformis* (e.g. Ovid *Met.* 7.177, CIL 2.2660), *triceps* (Ovid *Met.* 7.194) or *trina* (Dracontius 10.188).

881 Related to this is *ternis Hecate variare figuris* in Claudian *rapt.Pros.* 1.15.

882 Valerius Probus in his commentary on Vergil's *Eclogae* and Georgica (ed. Keil 20.2ss.) adds *en passant* that Cicero's *omnivaga* means *quod semper vagatur*.

around on her *currus noctivagus*, she herself is *vaga* in Horace *sat.* 1.8.21, Statius *silv.* 1.4.36s., Ausonius *epist.* 13.9 and *noctivaga* in Seneca *Oed.* 253, her Diana form is *vaga* in Sidonius Apollinaris *carm.* 9.224.[883] In prose we read that *luna vagatur* in Cicero *nat.deor.* 2.103 and Pliny *n.h.* 2.66. This explains *ter-vag-*.

This brings us to the endings *-an* or *-ant*! In the early stage, *-an*, as we saw above, is more widely attested; but it is no surprise that *-ant* almost completely replaces it, because it is a legitimate participle form, and in four fifths of the many parallel cases, the *-t* is a secondary addition. But in that case, why do we have *Ter-vagan* in the first place? It goes back to the feminine acc. *ter-vagam*. In early OF and Old Occ., there is a tendency to adopt unusual names from the Lat. complete with the accusative ending, but in the process, *-m > -n* takes place.[884] The Passion

---

[883] We must at least briefly consider another possibility, whereby Diana herself turns out to be more intrinsically 'wandering'. In around 900 the canonical collection *De synodalibus causis* written in the late Carolingian middle kingdom by Regino of Prüm († 915; vol. II, cap. 371, ed. Wasserschleben p. 354s., ed. Hartmann p. 420s.) was the first to mention the popular superstition – noting that it is gravely sinful! – that some women *cum Diana paganorum Dea* would prowl around by night. Regino quite absurdly cites the Council of Ankara (a. 314!) as his source. This passage, complete with its apparently authoritative source, was included in the ecclesiastical law collections by Burkhard of Worms († 1025), Ivo of Chartres († 1115) and finally also Gratian († before 1160 in Bologna), which guaranteed its widespread familiarity in the Christian world through time and space, even giving rise to debates around and after 1500. By Regino's lifetime, Diana is almost certainly only the learned interpretation of a vernacular name which must admittedly have shown some variation across different regions. Such a figure is attested later in German, consistently through several centuries: in Central Germany as 'Frau Holle', in southern Germany as 'Frau Percht', in parts of the Low German-Dutch region with other names. But in the Middle Ages she also had a following in parts of France, at least in Île de France in the 13th c., where she is mentioned as *Satia* or *Domina Abundia ~ Dame (H) Abonde* in the writings of the Parisian Bishop Guillaume d'Auvergne († 1248), and in more detail around 1275–1280 in the *Roman de la Rose* by Jehan de Meung (v. 18394–18467 ed. Lecoy). The latter mentions the detail that these women themselves believed they should go out three times per week – and so their female guide would literally still be *ter vagan(t)*, on a weekly basis! On this whole topic Timm (2003, passim). As far as the Rol. is concerned, however I strongly doubt, based on geographical considerations alone, that the author was familiar with this superstition, and I am even less convinced that he would have associated it with the name Diana suggested by the learned writers of ecclesiastical law books, but not mentioned by Bishop Guillaume, nor by Jehan de Meung. Moreover, I am not aware of any other passage in the Rol. where French popular superstition shines through, or even where it is transferred into paganism.

[884] The merger of Lat. *-m* and *-n*, when they do not disappear altogether, is already an early Romance phenomenon; cf. Fr. *mien/mon* etc., *rien*, Ital. *spene* (as well as *speme*, both with paragogic *-e*), Span. *Adán* etc. In early OF – in the northwest by the end of the 11th c. at the latest – it extends to final sounds that have been added later (cf. Beckmann 2010, 39 with n. 158).

of Clermont-Ferrand (v. 225) has *Barrabant* < *Bar(r)aban* (as it has remained in Occ., Appel *Chrest.*, items 116 and 118) < Lat. (Vulgate) *Barabbam*. There are countless further examples from the Lat. *a* conjugation in the *Roman de Troie* (ed. Constans): *Arisban* 'the town, Arisba', *Clitemestran* 'Clytaemnestra', *Corcire Menelan* 'Corcyra Melaina', *Eboëan* 'Euboea', *Esionan* 'Hesione', *Larisan* 'the town, Larissa', *Scillan* 'Scylla', *Ypodamian* 'Hippodamia'. We can see that the Roland poet did not reject this process altogether from v. 2385 *Saint Lazaron*[885] and v. 3103 *Niniven*.[886] Since he had given the triple-formed wandering goddess a new name made from Lat. elements, he followed this pattern, calling her *Tervagan* in the six obliquus occurrences (v. 611, 2468, 2589, 2696, 3267, 3491), and for the sake of consistency, or for ease of comprehension, he kept this form even in the single nominative occurrence (v. 2712). We are entitled therefore to regard *Tervagan* as the original form, and as such, a welcome confirmation of the female identity of this divinity.

I am aware of the following alternative identifications of Tervagan: [2] (Hermes) Trismegistus,[887] [3] *terrificans* in a phonologically semi-erudite development,[888] [4] *terrā vagans*,[889] [5] *terram vacuans* '(Earth) desolator',[890] [6] *Tarbagan*, Turkish name of the marmot that was thought to be the cult animal of Asian religions other than Islam;[891] [7] the Syrian Atargatis [who was, however, not widely known by this name in the Latin-speaking West],[892] [8] a [grotesquely

---

885 Modern Fr. *Saint Lazare*; and *-on* is not augmentative/hypocoristic here, and indeed this would not be appropriate given the seriousness of the situation and the liturgical background (*Ordo commendationis animae*). Parallel examples of *-on* < *-um*: the Passion of Clermont rhymes *Jhm* with *menton*, *felon*, *ladrun*, the *Roman de Troie* has *mer Adriaticon*, *Arabicon*, *Caspion*, *Egeon*, *Persicon*, *Rubron*, the Roman *d'Alexandre* has *Occeanon* and the *Perceforest* still has *Dardanon* (along with *Dardanum*, *-us*).

886 Here the Vulgate (*Ion* 1.2, 3.2s.) already has the Greek accusative *Niniven* (but in 3.3s., 3.6s., 4.11 the nom./gen./abl. *Ninive*). Parallel examples of *-en* < *-em*: *Xersen* in Alberich of Briançon/Pisançon and (cf. Burger 1948–1949, 470) *Arsen*, a fictional river name in the *Girart de Roussillon*, acc. of *Arsis* in the *Vita Girardi*.

887 Jacob Grimm (1876, 1.124), Henri Régnier in his edition of the *Contes et nouvelles* within the La-Fontaine complete edition of the *Grands Écrivains de la France*, vol. 4, Paris, Hachette, 1887, p. 402; furthermore, Michel Bréal, quoted without bibliographical details in Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.431–437), takes up this hypothesis and tries to improve upon it; Heisig (1935, 35–37) tries then to do the same with Sainéan's account.

888 Spitzer (1948/1949 passim).

889 Merk (1914, p. XVII).

890 Wendt (1970, 208).

891 Olschki (1959 passim).

892 According to Pliny (5.81) she was worshipped in Hierapolis in Syria, according to Tertullian (*nat.* 2.8 and similarly in *apol.* 24) in Syria, according to Macrobius (*sat.* 1.23.18, *Adargatis*)

bad] anagram of Saturn,[893] [9] an abbreviation of *(Liber Pa-)ter* + **vagus*, because in Macrobius (*sat.* 1.19) the Liber Pater (according to a verse in Naevius) is called *vagus*,[894] [10] the Gaulish Tarvos Trigaranos [which is known only from a single inscription[895] discovered under Notre-Dame de Paris in 1711!][896] [11] Gaulish *tarvos* 'bull' + *Ogmios* 'the Gaulish god of eloquence' [randomly put together as a compound name],[897] [12 and 13] a compound name including Thórr, that is to say *Thor-Vagan* [with *Vagan* unexplained, though it is probably a simple error in the writing of 'Wodan'][898] or *Öku-Thórr* [*Öku-* unexplained],[899] [14] Old Eng. 'very mighty' [from an unexplained first part + *maga (n)* 'able (to do something)', in a *circulus vitiosus* with late Middle Eng. *Termagant*],[900] [15] the Therwingi, an early or poetic name for the Visigoths [with the change of category unexplained],[901] [16] the same – or Old Norse *Tyrfingr*, the name of Angantyr's sword [again with the change of category unexplained],[902] [17] Armen. *Ter vekan* 'The Lord (be) witness',[903] [18] an Arabic

---

in Assyria (but he means Syria); Macrobius adds that she is subordinate to the god Adad there. Furthermore, according to TLL s. v., she is mentioned only in the Baseler *Aratea* Scholia. That is all: nothing spectacular relating to the name Atargatis is reported anywhere else. – I only know of this hypothesis from Bellamy (1987, 269, who unfortunately gives no indication of sources).

893 Tavernier (1914–1917b, passim).

894 Voile (1950, passim).

895 On this Maier (1994, s. v. *Nautae Parisiaci*).

896 Jean de La Fontaine, *Fables*, avec notes [par Georges-Adrien Crapelet et Charles-Anastase Walkenaer], Paris, Crapelet, 1830, here on the conte *La Fille du roi de Garbe*, quoted in Sainéan (1925–1930, 2.431).

897 This is another hypothesis that I only know from Bellamy (1987, 269, with no indication of sources).

898 Paulin Paris in his analysis of the Rol. in the *Histoire littéraire de la France* 22 (1852), 742: he thinks he can see "dans Apollin le culte des Romains, dans Thor ou Vagan celui des Gaulois ou des Germains, et dans Mahomet celui des Sarrasins". Agreeing with this, but more tentatively, Boissonnade (1923, 248): "peut-être la forme altérée du Thor scandinave".

899 C. Rosenberg, *Rolandskvadet, et normannisk Heltedigt*, Copenhagen, 1860, 144s. (quoted in Tavernier 1914–1917b, 226).

900 Stricker (1909, 50) blindly accepting a hypothesis from Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765).

901 Broëns (1965–1966, 67). He is even convinced that the (supposedly) Gothic names in the Rol. "ont dû entrer dans la tradition épique française bien avant la chûte du royaume de Tolède" – that is to say, in the Merovingian period!

902 Von Richthofen (1954, 300s.).

903 I have this again from Bellamy (1987, 269, no source given).

word for 'dragon' [we are not told which one; the dictionaries do not have anything that sounds similar!],[904] [19] Arab. *ta-rabbī l-kaʿbātī* 'by the Lord of the Kaʿba' [a formulaic oath that is very thinly attested],[905] [20 and 21] the idea that the formulaic *Mahom e Tervagan* (v. 611) should be read as *Mahumet ervagan*, where *ervagan* is a distorted version of *al Furqān* ('the revelation', i.e. of the Quran)[906] or of *ar-radžīm* 'the one who was stoned' (one of the devil's epithets; it is meant here to be used by a Christian as a negative allusion to Mohammed),[907] [22] a [grotesque] misreading of Arab. *bin ʿAffān*, a patronymic of ʿUthmān, the third Caliph [why would this little-known patronymic be used?] (as *Apollin* is an [equally grotesque] misreading of *Abū Bakr*, the name of the first Caliph, so that Mohammed would appear alongside two close comrades-in-arms within the Anti-Trinity),[908] [23] the Muslim figure of Khadir, who wanders through the world as the benevolent patron of travellers and was venerated by the Alawites (whom the crusaders encountered e.g. at Margat and Crac) using the name *Khodr* etc. and was known in Persian as *bâbâyé dévendégâné ʿâlem* 'patron of those who travel the world', and whose name the Christians supposedly turned into the vaguely similar-sounding *Tervagant*.[909]

I will discuss only [2]–[6]. Points [7] to [23] are, in comparison with [1]–[6], obviously untenable because many contain elementary errors related to phonology or transcription, and also because many of them do not make the circumstances around a borrowing situation plausible enough, or because they rely on specially invented or thinly attested compounds or formulaic names, or because there is an unexplained change of category. It seems that when there is a problem that cannot be solved, especially an etymological one, people think it is appropriate to keep publishing marginal attempts to solve it.

On [2]: Grimm and Régnier decided upon (Hermes) *Trismegistus* because they started with Eng. *Termagant* – although there is no justification for this because *Tervagant* (Anglo-Norman soon to be *Tervagaunt*) was also adopted in Eng. (*Brut* around 1275, a book of legends around 1300) while *Termagant* (probably

---

904 Graevell (1880, 150).

905 P. Casanova (1909, here 393s.), refuted in Bellamy (1987, 269s.).

906 Viré (1953, 148s.), refuted in Bellamy (1987, 270s.).

907 Pellat (1964, 267), refuted in Bellamy (1987, 271).

908 Bellamy (1987, 271s.).

909 Virolleaud (1953, passim). This author has a tendency to omit important elements in his argument: I had to read the article twice before I remembered that the majority of the Alawites speak Kurdish, and that Kurdish and Persian are related languages.

through an overlap with *mag-us*, *mag-ic*) does not appear until the 14th c. (Mannyng, Chaucer, MED s. v. *termagant*). And *Tervagant* itself is phonologically too different from *Trismegistus* (late antiquity passim), and from its occasionally incorrect form *trimegistus* in Lactantius (CSEL 19, 19.14 in two mss. of the 9th and 10th c.) or from its translation *ter maximus* e.g. in Isidore (8.11.49). This is why Sainéan does not need to cite a source when he states that *Tervagant* is a poetic distortion of *Trismegistos*, which characterises Hermes, the messenger of the gods, as the god who is "trois fois errant"; he could have cited Isidore (8.11.46), for whom the messenger of the gods is neither *vagus* nor *vagans*, but rather *velox et errans*, because he is moving through the air. Heisig (1935, 35–38) argued against this idea of a random distortion and suggested instead the hybrid form *Termagnus* [unattested!] x *vagans*, but this was rejected by Spitzer (1948–1949, 398) because hybrid forms would depend on semantic proximity, and this is not the case with *magnus* and *vagans*. No matter what one might think of these objections, the important fact remains that Hermes, both the classical one and the Trismegistus one, unlike the triple goddess, cannot be matched up with *vagus* as an attribute, nor *vagari* as a predicate.[910]

In order to do justice to the ideas in this hypothesis, I carried out a thorough search of the literature on both the classical Hermes and on Trismegistos,[911] but I found nothing that would give precedence to him above the triple goddess.[912] I cannot see why he would carry a lamp, nor why he, unlike his two

---

910 Heisig (1935, 37) tries to fill this gap by pointing out that Prudentius (*cath.* 1.37) gives the generic name *vagantes daemonas* to the nocturnal demons who are banished by the call of the cockerel. But we need something specific for *Tervagan* that distinguishes this figure from these other demons.

911 PW, *Kleiner* and *Neuer Pauly* as well as RAC s. v., ER s. v. *Hermes*, *Hermes Trismegistos*, *Hermetism*, Festugière (1950–1954, passim), Copenhaver (1992, passim), Holzhausen (1997, passim).

912 On the contrary! In early Latin Christianity (Tertullian *adv. Val.* [ed. CSEL 47, p. 194], Lactantius *div.inst.* 2.8.68 and often, *epit.* 4.4 etc., *ira dei* 11.2, Filastrius 10.8, 103.1, Augustine *civ.* 8.23–24, 8.26, 18.29, Marius Victorinus *in Cic. rhet.* 1.26 etc.) and curiously, later again in the *Decretum Gratiani* (pars 1, dist. 7, can. 1) and in Thomas Aquinas (*s.th.* pars 1, qu. 32, art. 1, argum.1 with *responsio*) Hermes Trismegistus (who was in no way identified as the Greek Hermes!) was regarded not as a god or demon, but unequivocally as an ancient Egyptian sage, and in fact in Lactantius as a herald of Christ, from Augustine onwards, as a dangerous heretic, in Gratian and Thomas again as a sage, from Marsilio Ficino onwards as the author of great, arcane wisdom. Isidore, too, describes him first of all (5.1.2) as the oldest lawgiver in Egypt, just as Solon was in Athens, but then later (8.11.49) adds a note to his description of the classical Hermes saying that Hermes was also called *Trismegistos* because of his knowledge of many arts and he was worshipped in the form of a man with the head of a dog. With the

comrades, would not be physically abused, nor indeed why the form *Tervagan* without -*t* would be the first one associated with him.

On [3]: Dissatisfied with the Trismegistus hypothesis, Spitzer (1948–1949, 403) postulated a **terrificans* in a semi-erudite (Occitanising and therefore supposedly "southern" sounding) form: with phonologically regular -*f*- > -*v*-, semi-erudite -*c*- > -*g*-, regular elision of the first -*i*- and assimilation of the second -*i*- with the stressed -*a*- – though the last point is far from convincing; for how on earth would the participle ending -*ant* ever influence the preceding vowel?

Above all, however, the hypothesis lacks any foundation unless evidence can be found for **terrificans* as a meaningful description of a *specific* pre-existing figure. Apollin and Mahomet have a massive pre-existing presence; should then the third member of the group consist of a participle that no-one has been able to link with any *specific* demon? Even worse: because of the semi-erudite distortion, no one can work out the appellative content behind it. There is no obvious reason why the made-up **terrificans* in the original or semi-erudite form would guard the roads, carry a carbuncle as an emblem, or unlike his comrades, avoid being physically abused, nor why he is called *Tervagan* in the first instance, and not -*gant*. In the tightly structured and internally consistent Rol., even in the details, this would be a strangely indeterminate expression![913] Spitzer anticipates similar objections because he insists in a long footnote (p. 399) on the *caractère littéraire de ces formations* – and quite rightly, but would **ter vagans*, if we ignore for a moment its above-mentioned historical explanation, and even *terrā vagans* (cf. below on [5]) not be simpler than the very forced and semi-erudite **terrificans*? Finally, Spitzer postulates for the name *une longue période de gestation* – all traces of which, one might smugly add, have naturally not survived.

---

exception of Isidore, (according to Copenhaver 1992, p. XIV) in Latin-speaking Europe from the late 5th c. until almost 1100, almost nobody was interested in Trismegistus.

913 Later epic authors take a different approach, however, when they quite simply have pagan gods appear with names like *Barat(r)on* (βάραθρον > *barathron* / -*um* 'abyss, underworld', e.g. Gregory the Great *in Iob* 9.66 and 32.10 *inferni barathrum*), *Belgibus* etc. (< *Beelzebub*, *Mt* 12.24–27, *Mc* 3.22, *Lc* 11.15–19), *Cahu/Chaü* (probably < *chaos* 'underworld' [in the Itala also *chaus*], as already in Vergil *Aen.* 4.509 as *Erebumque chaos*, often in Ovid, Lucan, Seneca, Statius, very common in the patristic authors especially in connection with *Lc* 16.26 [Lazarus parable!], also *inferni chaos*, *infernum chaos*, *gehennae chaos*; sometimes declined as masc.), *Luciabel* (< Lucifer [devil's name via reinterpretation of *Is* 14.12 following *Lc* 10.18] x *bellus*) and even *Ne(i)ron* / *Noiron*, *Pharaon*, *Pilate* and *Platon* as well as (with an etymology I cannot determine) *Fabur* and *Margo(i)t* – cf. on this Grégoire (1939–1944, passim), Bancourt (1982a, 355–357, 383–385), Subrenat (2013, passim). But this just demonstrates the qualitative difference between later epic works and the Song of Roland!

On [4] and [5]: Merk's *terrā vagans* 'roaming over the Earth' and Wendt's *terram vacuans* 'Earth desolator' suffer from the same defects that we saw above in Spitzer's critique of *terrificans,* i.e. they do not take account of the narrative elements and the stemma.[914] Merk perversely uses the one instance of *Terrevogant* [sic] from the *Octevien* (v. 1414 ed. Vollmöller; single ms. around 1300, Picard language) as a vital support for his etymology, as if the original form could have survived there, or as if this author's interpretation could somehow be crucial. Wendt's reference to *vague < vacuus* does not hold; because the fact that the adj. *vaque* 'vacant' does not start to merge with *vague < vagus* until the second half of the 13th c. tells us nothing about the period of the Rol. Furthermore, the verb *vaquer > vaguer* does not mean 'to empty' (= Wendt's 'make desolate'), but it 'to be vacant or empty'.

On [6]: Leonardo Olschki (1959, passim) is responsible for discovering that the Siberian marmot is called *tarbagan* in a few northeast Asian and Turkic languages and has this as a secondary meaning in south-eastern and Siberian Russian,[915] with very minor variants in the phonetics, and it is first attested around 1240 as *tarbahan* in the *Secret History of the Mongols* when it is used figuratively in a speech made by Genghis Khan. There is nothing wrong with the phonology behind Olschki's hypothesis because no one will object to *ar- ~ er-* before a consonant in OF.

The same is unfortunately not true when it comes to the meaning. A visit to the zoo will quickly confirm that the animal is about 40 cm long and likes to stand up on its hindlegs outside its burrow on sunny days, often bringing its front paws to its snout and visibly chewing on its meagre rations of grass, at the same time constantly moving its head, and looking out for danger; it looks comically human in this pose.[916] At the slightest sign of danger, it flees into its extensive burrow, which is also the place where it spends the very long Siberian winters in hibernation.

This animal is the subject of a folk tale that is widespread across its habitat, relating how it was once a skilful human hunter, but one day in a fit of exuberance, he shot at the sun, and that is why – for most of his lifetime at least – he

---

914 The same reasons make it impossible – and as far as I know this has never been argued – to understand *ter vagans*, *terra vagans*, *terrificans* etc. as Mars; this adds to the point made above in n. 857.

915 RussEW s. v. and the large, descriptive dictionaries such as Dal' etc. s. v.

916 I recall rushing to the zoo with high expectations immediately after reading Olshki's essay . . . and then laughing out loud: this is supposed to be Tervagan?

was banished underground.[917] In view of the conservatism and huge scale of the hunting cultures involved, Olschki thinks that the name *tarbagan* and this tale were popular among the Turkmen hordes who were some of the most deadly enemies of the crusaders; they had converted to Islam just a few generations before, and had held on to some of their pre-Islamic culture, now recast as superstition.[918] This story is very probably a simplified derivative of a myth that came out of China in pre-Christian times about 'shooting at the sun'; this myth tells us that there were once several suns, all threatening to dry out the Earth, until a hero from that culture shot all of them down but one, and received recognition in return (sometimes even as far as being worshipped as a god).[919]

The reverse tale of the archer who is punished rather than rewarded probably originated in China, too, and is almost the only one known north and northwest of China; in that area, it almost always refers to the marmot. But in this form, it is only a simple and indeed etiological saga, not about the sun(s) but about the animal[920] – a very ordinary animal story amongst many comparable, often also etiological animal stories which made up a necessarily large part of the oral culture of these northern Eurasian peoples who lived in very close harmony with nature. Indeed, there is no indication of a cultic veneration of the animal – in

---

917 This tale is so well known that by chance I found it mentioned in the otherwise prosaic article 'Murmeltier' in *Meyers Konversationslexikon* for the year 1890.

918 Even this is problematic. Olschki's information on the prevalence of the name in Turkic languages is suspiciously vague. The comparative dictionaries of Turkic languages by Radlov (1893–1911) and Räsänen (1969–1971) list this word only for Teleut and Sayan (Soyon, Soyot), minor languages in the common border area between Russia, Kazakhstan, Mongolia and the Chinese region of Xinjiang, and they make reference to its origins in Old Mongolian and its existence in modern Mongolian Kalmyk and Manchurian. These origins are the reason why it is not mentioned in Clauson (1972). Mongolian does have a significant influence on the Turkic languages, but not until the 13th c. with the rise of Genghis Khan's great empire. On the other hand, some of the Turkish peoples have a different word for 'marmot', e.g. Kyrgyz *suur* and Chuvash *səvər*, which is related to the normal name of this animal in Russian, namely *surók* and regarded by some researchers, though not all, as genuinely Turkic (cf. RussEW s. v. *cypók*). These facts make it somewhat risky to assume that the word ever existed in the Turkmen language.

919 Cf. e.g. Naumann (1993, passim, with lit.) and Maenchen-Helfen (1937, passim), Olschki's main informant. There is a German translation of a version of the Chinese myth with the best of all endings – immortality and being worshipped as a god – in Wilhelm (1914, 35–37; cf. there also p. 45), and a similar one from the Tungusic Oroqen (near Khabarovsk, eastern Siberia) in Doerfer (1983, 151s.).

920 Naumann (1993, 125) also argues this correctly, but with reference to a Japanese variant about a mole rather than a marmot, saying that it is one of the many etiological stories that explain why an animal or plant has this or that attribute.

the non-Islamised nor in the Islamised ethnic groups. And without any such veneration, would the story have been noticed by the crusaders, or even have aroused their interest enough to ask about its name and meaning?

A.13.2.3 *Apollin*

Apollin is of course [1] Apollo, acc. *Apollinem*. The verdict *Omnes dii gentium daemonia*, which Augustine repeated literally more than a dozen time in his works,[921] automatically included him. Indeed, Christians generally thought of the pagan gods, and especially Apollo, as evil demons (RAC s. v. *Apollo*);[922] the most likely targets were his shady oracles, who cast people into perdition.[923] But his very name must have been detrimental to him: the Vergil commentator Servius indicates (with reference to *ecl.* 5.66) that Apollo is also an *infernus deus et noxius* and that is why he is named after the verb *apollýein* 'to destroy' (an etymology that he repeats with reference to *Aen.* 3.138). The Mythographer II (11th c. cap. 29) translates this: *Apollo* means *perdens* in Lat. The Greek form remains important; in the book of Revelation (9.11) when the fifth trumpet sounds, the army that rises out of the abyss has as its leader *regem angelum abyssi cui nomen est hebraice Abaddon, graece autem Apollyon, latine habens nomen Exterminans*. We have already noted references showing Apollo as a demon in our discussion of the sibling pair Apollo and Diana; but of course,

---

921 *Civ.* 8.24, 9.23, *enarr. in ps.* 47.15, 49.2, 95.6 (5x!), 105.36, *ep.* 102.19, *serm.* 27, 163, etc.

922 It is worth remembering that even the "Apollonian" part of him, his connection with the Muses, could not protect him from this fate, because this connection weakened over time. As for the Muses, we can clearly see in the exceptionally rich examples presented by Curtius (1939, passim) from the late Latin period until after the time of the Rol., there were always some poets who expressed contempt for the (ancient) Muses, but none of them called them 'demons'. And alongside these authors, from the early days of Christianity onwards, there were very many authors who thought of the Muse(s), set loose from Apollo, as a purely spiritual principle (Curtius 1939, 133), i.e. as a personification of poetic inspiration, music, or of erudition more generally, and who therefore valued them positively (such as Sidonius, Corippus, the unknown author of the *Asclepius* treatise, Macrobius, Martianus Capella; from the Carolingian Renaissance: Dungal, Alcuin, Angilbert, Modoin, even Rabanus Maurus, then Sedulius Scottus, Heiric of Auxerre, Abbo of Saint-Germain and later authors). Some authors even spoke of 'their' Muse, or the Muse of one of the friends they were speaking to (such Paulinus of Périgueux, Boethius, Venantius Fortunatus, Walahfrid, who addressed her as *Musa soror*, Odo of Cluny). From the Carolingian Renaissance onwards, it was once again possible to call the individual Muses by their classical names without fear of being misunderstood (as did Theodulf, Ermoldus Nigellus, Hucbald of Saint-Amand, and even Hrotsvitha).

923 Minucius Felix *Oct.* 26.6, Lactantius *div.inst.* 1.7.1s., 4.13.11ss., 4.27.14, Arnobius *adv.nat.* 1.26, Augustine *civ.* 3.17, 19.23, Orosius 6.15.14ss., Jerome *in Is.* 17.60.21, *ep.* 84.4, Commodian *instr.* 1.1 (acrostic).

there are also texts in which the polemic is directed at Apollo alone, such as the Latin Eustachius Vita and its translations into Old French.[924]

This is sufficient commentary on the true Apollo. As far as the pseudo-Apollines are concerned, and after the long discussion devoted to Tervagan above, it is perhaps a relief simply to note that the *Apollin* in the Song is neither [2] the Caliph Abū Bakr[925] nor does he represent [3] an Arab. *ibn* (> *aben*) *al-laʿīn* 'son of the damned one', where 'the damned one' is a common Muslim name for Satan, and Arabophone Christians would have called the Prophet Mohammed 'son of Satan'.[926]

A.13.2.4 The inner structure of the Anti-Trinity

"In the first instance" the three members of the Anti-Trinity are clearly meant to appear as equally important. This is obvious from the fact that they are named in varying order: Apollin, Tervagan, Mahum(et) v. 2580–2590 and 3490s.; Tervagan, Mahum, Apollin v. 2696s. and 3267s.; Mahumet, Tervagan, Apollin v. 2711s. For the sake of poetic flexibility, however, the poet has also been careful to differentiate between them. Apollin is *nostre sire* (v. 2712) and possesses a sceptre and crown (v. 2585), and so he represents the epitome of "sovereignty". Tervagan as a female deity has her defined sphere of influence: she is in control of the roads and has the powers traditionally associated with the moon; she exercises her power therefore, not by using brute force but by wandering about all through the night. Finally, Mahumet *nus ad en baillie* (v. 2710). OF *baillier / baillir* originally meant 'to carry a burden' (like Lat. *baiulare*) but this gave way almost completely to the figurative meaning 'bear the responsibility (of an official position)', 'avoir à sa charge, gérer'; thus *baillie* means the authority that rules over everyday life, in this case religion as the sum of commandments and prohibitions, and this results in Mahumet being by far the most frequently mentioned. It is typical that a Muslim utters the words (v. 921): *Plus valt Mahum que seint Perre de Rume*. The naming of Peter here instead of Christ could partly be due to the fact that the poet does not want to commit blasphemy against Christ even through the mouth of a Muslim, but his formulation shows that he holds Mahumet (like Peter and his successors) responsible for the preservation of doctrine and ritual.

---

924 A reference for this is to be found in M. Zink (1983, 506 with lit.).

925 Cf. above regarding Tervagan (A.13.2.2), hypothesis [22].

926 Pellat (1964, passim), Pellat/Pellat (1965, passim), endorsed by Michel Zink (1983, passim), but then unfortunately he goes on to make an argument that implicitly undermines Pellat's hypothesis.

A.13.3 Review of the 'heathen' gods

The poet needs a god for the special task of protecting someone on a journey to the underworld, and this must be a god who is more powerful than those who rule the underworld, and therefore Vergil's Jupiter is the obvious choice.

In the other cases, he builds on the idea of an Anti-Trinity, which he adopts from theology and possibly also from objects from the visual arts, and which he fills with three names of his own choice: Mahumet is essential because he plays a dominant role in the contemporaneous reality (although he is described in a severely distorted way), and the two others embody the principle of sun and moon worship which is regarded as the most obvious temptation even in the Bible, but they are personalised through their classical representatives Apollo and Diana. The poet includes the already triple-formed Diana-Luna-Hecate but does not pick one of the three names at random. Instead, he uses the aptronym Tervagan so that he can emphasise the nightly wandering characteristic of this divinity. It is especially impressive in terms of narrative composition that the Anti-Trinity as such does not become manifest until the beginning of the Baligant scene, and at this same moment the geographical unity of the 'heathen' world is revealed, thus making the Anti-Trinity a symbol of that world. This artistic weaving of classical-mythological ideas into a Christian frame marks the Rol. out as being quite different from other *chansons de geste*, where negative characters from the Bible are repurposed as 'heathen' gods.

B **Between Islam and Christianity**

B.1 Weapon names

In the Song, the approach taken in the naming of weapons, textiles and horses is very similar for Christians and non-Christians – there is even an antithetical connection between *Precïuse* and *Joiuse* – and so this section analyses both sides together. We should note, however, that though OF epics often claim that a weapon is of Muslim origin, this tells us almost nothing useful for the etymology of the name – just as the fact that a character in an epic is a Muslim does not in the least guarantee that his or her name will be Arabic or Turkish.

B.1.1 Charlemagne's and Baligant's weapons

B.1.1.1 The swords: Charlemagne's *Joiuse*, Baligant's *Precïuse*

Joiuse O 2501, the same CV7PTL, *Jouis* n, *Çoüse* V4; also *Joiuse* O 2508, the same CV7P, *Çuiose* V4; *Joiuse* O 2989, the same CV7P, *Ioíosen* (German gen.) K, *Çuiose* V4: In n the three strokes are incorrectly linked. Ç- in V4 is the north Italian spelling for /dz/ > /z/, the normal equivalent of OF and Standard Italian /dž/. *Joi(u/o)se* belongs in the archetype in every case.

Precïuse Segre 3146, [a verse has clearly been omitted by mistake] O, *Preciosa* K, *Preçiosa* V4, *Preciose* CV7, *Preciouse* P, *Precieuse* T; also with minimal variance in 3471, also as a battle cry in 3564 and in 3298: since K tends to Latinise such names, and V4 tends to Italianise them, they both happen to agree on the *-a*; the *-e* in OCV7PT therefore belongs in the archetype.

On the Christian side, the name of Charlemagne's sword *Joiuse* and the battle cry *Munjoie* are closely related (cf. on the latter C.2.2), but they are not identical; on the non-Christian side, the poet does not feel the need to differentiate between the two: *Precïuse* refers to both. Baligant's name for his sword 'the precious, valuable one' deliberately imitates the name of Charlemagne's sword 'the embodiment of joy' (and this is made clear in v. 3145s.). But the meaning is restricted to the object's material value, whereas according to v. 2503–2508 *Joiuse* refers to the relic of the Lord which is embedded in the pommel,[927] and so the *joie* refers

---

927 As Hibbard Loomis (1950b, passim, and 1959, 486s.) has shown, people in early 10th c. France were convinced that in the year 800 Charlemagne had received among other gifts from Jerusalem (cf. the Royal Annals relating to this time) the so-called Lance of Longinus (which had pierced Christ's side when he was crucified, as related in *Ioh* 19.34). We know of this belief because there is a 10th c. English poem in hexameters from which William of

to the joy that Christians have in their salvation through the sacrificial death of Christ, and it applies especially to those Christians who are ready to die while fighting for their faith.[928] We can therefore understand the relationship between *Precïuse* and *Joiuse* as an example of a belief based on *Ex* 7.11s. and *2 Cor* 11.14, and expounded first in Tertullian's *De praescriptione haereticorum* cap. 40 before spreading widely during the Middle Ages, namely that the devil imitates God (although Luther was the first to use the formula that the devil is "God's ape"). Baligant cannot be expected to grasp this distinction, and therefore acts *bona fide* in this respect, but this is not the case when it comes to his lance.

B.1.1.2 *Maltét*

Maltét O 3152, *Malter* (perhaps misunderstood as a person) V4, *Mater* CV7P: In β (or γ) the *-r* instead of *-t* arises from palaeographical factors (since *-t* in the

---

Malmesbury (*De gestis regum Anglorum*, ed. Stubbs 1.149–151) took long quotations, turning them into prose; furthermore, there is evidence from Hariulf of Saint-Riquier which shows that in the 11th c. (and perhaps even the 9th) people thought that the *summitas acuminis* of this lance was presented to Saint-Riquier by Louis the Pious. We could also add a third piece of evidence: according to the *Ann. Altahenses Majores* (MGH SS.schol. 4.4), the relevant parts of which were written in around 1032, the messengers from Jerusalem in 800 also gave Charlemagne *lanceam*; a valuable lance from Jerusalem and presented as a gift could in this period only have been the relic of Christ. The Roland poet therefore agrees with the hexameter poem and the Althahenses, when he claims that this relic was given to Charlemagne, and also with Hariulf, when he only talks about the tip of the lance; he then adds the idea, attested nowhere else, that Charlemagne had incorporated this relic into the hilt of his sword. This passage in the Song cannot be used for dating purposes (before or after 1098) because shortly after the Antioch lance turned up, the Normans no longer believed in it, and after the death of its finder through divine trial by fire, disbelief in the relic spread much further afield; the poet may therefore have just quietly skipped over the Antioch lance.

928 Lombard-Jourdan (1989, 60) who on the one hand recognizes that the Roland poet emphasises the connection between the names *Joiuse* and *Munjoie*, but who on the other erroneously agrees with Gamillscheg that the second part of *munjoie* is Germ. *Gau* 'area, region', finds a solution as violent as it is arbitrary: she separates *Joiuse* from the adjective *joiuse*, claiming it means something like 'celle [épée] du pays' . . . – *Gaudiosus*, *Gaudiosa* and *Preciosus*, *Preciosa* were quite common as normal names in the early Middle Ages (Kajanto 1965, 260, 276), but their use among Christians retreated back to the area south of the Pyrenees in the 9th century at the latest (Becker 2009, 543, 885, Morlet 1972, 55s. and 92). Among the Jews of Galloromania, on the other hand, Seror (1989, 144–146) can only find in relation to *gaudium* a single reference to *Gauzios* (Toulouse 1244) and the short *Gaudius*, *Gaudia* (occasionally extending to *Joyon*, *Joyel*, *Joyete* etc.), wheraeas *Preciosa* is already attested as a Jewish female name in late antiquity, and it remained popular throughout the Middle Ages (6 references from France and one each from England and Barcelona in Seror 1989, 219). We cannot rule out the possibility, therefore, that the poet knew that *Preciosa* or *Precïuse* was a Jewish name.

Carolingian minuscule has no upper vertical, while in early Gothic it starts to have a small upper vertical part). O is the only one that makes sense and so belongs in the archetype.

Baligant's lance is the only one in Old French literature that has a name. If we consider how normal it was for lances to be split apart in battle, it must have seemed absurd to have given it a name, and so this is a sign of Baligant's hubris. Furthermore: the name *maltét* 'wickedness' does not refer to any physical attribute of the lance, such as its hardness, for example, but rather provides a negative premonition of the moral dimension, and it creates a small, but evidently deliberate dissonance within the otherwise positive depiction of Baligant. It is a warning sign.

B.1.1.3 *Trente clartez*

Charlemagne's sword is characterised in v. 2502: *Ki cascun jur müet .XXX. clartez.* This phrase describes the shimmering impression that a so-called *wurmbunt* 'snakeskin, dragon scale' blade would make on an onlooker. In the second half of the first Christian millennium, two manufacturing processes were developed independently of each other in the Orient and in the West, and the origins of both go back to ancient times. In the Orient, "genuine" Damas steel was made, and it was traded primarily out of Damascus: this process involved making steel with optimal oxygen content in small crucibles, and then welding the pieces of steel into blades. In the West, on the other hand, there was a process which nowadays is called *Schweißdamast* 'pattern welded' which involved heating the iron ore to the highest possible temperature achievable in normal furnaces, which was below the melting point of iron, mixing metal and slag together, and then gradually removing the slag with repeated cycles of heating and hammering; the resulting wire- or rod-shaped pieces were of different quality and they were wound around each other and welded together in an extremely laborious process. New layers were added one by one while the material was hot, until finally there was a long, flat piece. The hardest available strand of metal was welded onto this and then sharpened, to serve as cutting edge. Thanks to the mix of different quality materials in the blade, it was very flexible, and this saved the knight from the fate of taking a mighty swing and breaking his sword, which would lead to almost certain death. This manufacturing process produced slight variations in the colour, reminiscent of a moving serpent's skin – and that is why it was known as *wurmbunt*. literally: 'snake bright, dragon scale'. The blade shifted colour depending on the angle of the light falling upon it; even an onlooker standing still and looking at a blade at rest would see slowly 'changing' effects (*müet*!) – where the number

trente in this case just means 'many'.[929] Since the poet goes on to talk about the Lance of Longinus in the very next verse, and its tip which is contained in the pommel of the sword, the shimmering of the sword looks like the halo of a deeper mystery that is being revealed.

When Charlemagne steps up to fight with Baligant, and again, when he is seriously wounded by his opponent but then fortified by the angel's words, he knows that he must win the battle with the next blow that he makes, and that France's fate hangs on this very sword; when the victorious blow falls, the sword gains an honorific title *sui generis* (v. 3615): *Karl fiert l'amiraill de l'espee de France . . .*

B.1.2 Roland's *Durendal*

There are narrative reasons – and also diachronic ones – why Roland's sword merits a thorough investigation.

Durendal O 926 and *passim*, *Dyrumdal* n, *Dur(e/i/-)ndart* (sometimes with German inflection *-e*, 23x) K, *Durendal* (1x) / *Durindal* (3x) / *Dur(e/i)ndar(t/d/-)* (7x) / *Durindarda* (11x) / *Duridarda* (2x, probably just minus the tilde) V4, *Durendal* (9x) / *Durendart* (19x) / *Durenda* (1x) C, *Durendal* (19x) / *Durendart* (11x) / *Durenda* (1x) V7, *Durandal* (1x) / *Durandart* (25x) / *Durandars* (1x) P, *Durandal* (18x) / *Durendal* (2x) T, *Durandart* L, *Dirondar(t)* l, *Durandal* b, *Durenda(e)l(e)* h(BLV), *Durendard* w (*Dwrndal* BW): These instances can be discussed together. They show that the archetype of the surviving version of the song has *Durenda-* from O (K)CV7(PT)hw, *-dal* from OnTbh and w(BW), and therefore *Durendal*. In the middle syllable, the *-in-* in V4 is an Italianism, the *-an-* in PTLb reflects the central and eastern French pronunciation, the *-on-* in *l* is Lorrain. At the end of the name, however, *-dal* competes with a *-dart* type (sometimes *-dard*, *-dar*) as well as, in the Italian V4, a feminisation *-darda*; there is also a single instance of *-da* in CV7 in a laisse with an *-á* rhyme. It is obvious that this distribution cannot entirely be explained in terms of the stemma, and that the *-dart* must radiate from somewhere outside the preserved Song and must be very old, since it has already fully superseded *-dal* in K. What we have, therefore, is a rare but psychologically plausible situation: many scribes already know about a *Dur(a/e/i/o)ndart* and do not

---

929 On genuine Damascus steel cf. e.g. B. Lombard (1974, 165s.), on pseudo-Damascus steel (*recuit*) Salin/France-Lanord (1943, 61–63) or, following on from these, Lombard (1974, 91–94, 96–99, 176).

want to leave it out; this results in some more or less random compromises between the two types.

Sources outside the Song itself add to our understanding of this situation.[930] The PT (cap. 22)[931] calls Roland's sword *Durenda* and immediately attempts an etymology: *Durenda interpretatur 'durum ictum cum ea da' vel 'dure cum ea percute Sarracenum' quia frangi ullo modo nequit.* Here we have the source of *Durenda* (according to Flutre s. v.) in the Franco-Italian *Hector et Hercule* (beginning of the 14th c.); perhaps the PT even helped to legitimise the variant *Durenda* in CV7 (via the laisse rhyme ending in -á), and it may be the source of the *Duradans* in the Spanish prose romance of the 14th c. *Cuento del Emperador Carlos Maynes y de la Emperatris Seuilla* (in Moisan II s. v. *Durendal*).[932] But this is a very small influence in comparison with the influence the PT has had in other respects, which leads to the suspicion that this text has pruned the name to make its etymology evident,[933] just as the name *Altumaior* in this text instead of *Alma(n)zor* obviously comes from an attempt to create an etymology for the name.

The situation is different when it comes to the form ending in *-art. Durindart* appears in the ten-syllable *Alexandre* (V 2069), whereas *Durendal* does not appear until the twelve-syllable version (II 973). In around 1175/1185, Chrétien de Troyes uses *Durandart* in the rhyme in his *Yvain* (v. 3231 ed. Roques); a rhyme ending in *-al* would not have caused any problems for a poet of his rank, and so he must still have regarded *Durandart* as the usual form. *Dur(e/a/o)ndart* also appears in *Girart de Vienne*, *Renaut de Montauban*, *Garin de Monglane*, *Bataille Loquifer* II (v. 3096 ed. Barnett), some of the *Aspremont* tradition and once only (alongside one single instance of *Durendal*) the LT version of the *Saisnes*; the Occitan works (*Ronsasvals*, *Rollan a Saragossa*, *Occ. Fierabras*, *Roman d'Arles*) have it too, and only the pseudo-Philomena has *Durendarda* as well (and *Durandarda* in its Lat. version). After that, the *-art* forms have dried up in northern France.

---

930 I gladly acknowledge I would have found it very difficult to make my way through the tangle of different forms of this particular name without the work of Rohlfs and Moisan (1936 and 1969 passim).

931 As in the *Codex Calixtinus* itself and the PT editions (Castets, Ward Thoron, Smyser, Meredith-Jones, M. Karl, Hämel/de Mandach, H.-W. Klein), and therefore also the archetype of all surviving mss. Since Maria Karl in her transcription of the *Codex Laurentianus* (1940, 106) reads *Durenda*, the statement in Rohlfs (1936, 59), that this has *Durandarda* seems to be incorrect.

932 The OF translations of Turpin including Mousket do not need to be examined separately here.

933 As Rohlfs suspected (1969b, 859).

The situation is different in Germany, Italy and Spain. In the German-speaking areas, *-art* is by far the most prevalent ending. In the same period as Chrétien and K, Veldeke's form *Durendart* is confirmed in the rhyme (*Eneide* 5730). We only find *-art/-ard* forms in the Stricker, in the *Karl Meinet* (along with one instance of *Durendar*), in the *Morant und Galîe* and the World Chronicle by Heinrich von München.

Among the Franco-Italian and early Italian texts, the *Prise de Pampelune* has both *Durindart* and *Durindal*; in other texts the most prevalent form is *Dur(i/e)ndar(t/d)(e)* (*Entrée d'Espagne*, *Aquilon de Bavière*) or a further development of this, *Dur(i/e/a)ndarda* (inscription on Verona Cathedral, Franco-Italian *Chevalerie Ogier*, *Mort Charlemagne*, *Orlandino*, parts of the *Reali di Francia*; the *Karleto* has both). Shortly after the transition to pure Italian, and after a few minor variations back and forth that do not need to be listed here,[934] one or two innovations occur: instead of the slightly impolite *-arda* and at the same time in dissimilation from the *-r* in *Dur-*, the suffix is changed to *-ana,* and sometimes after the *Dur-* an *-l-* is squeezed in, which presumably is intended to soften the *duro* through association with *lindo* 'dapper, highly polished': and so we have *Durlindana* in Pulci, *Durindana* in Boiardo and Ariosto.

In Spain, finally, apart from the single above-mentioned instance of *Duradans*, and the later form drifting across from Italy, *Dur(l)indana*,[935] we find only *Dur(e/a)ndart(e)* (*Roncesvalles*, Mainet story in the *Primera Crónica General*), and this has turned into a personal name in the *Romancero*.

Let us take a bird's eye view of this whole development, to see the force behind it. The hidden source of the radiating form *Durendart* must surely be an epic that has not survived. And very probably, this was the stage of the Rol. itself which immediately preceded its surviving form.[936] The narrative content supports this hypothesis: the theme here is Roland's sword, and where could this item be more significant than in Roland's final battle at Roncevaux? This older Song was superseded in France by the only Song that was capable of this feat, that is to say by a revision that was even better, the Rol. in its surviving form. For the poet of the lost Song, the masc. words *brant* and *glaive* still were the common poetic words for 'sword', and they would have subconsciously

---

934 On these, Catalano (1939, 374).

935 From 1600 onwards in Span. *durinda(i)na* is a familiar expression meaning 'sword', and in the 17th c., it is also a colloquial term for 'the law, justice system' among criminals; cf. the DCECH s. v.

936 *In nuce* Rajna (1884, 444 n. 2) realised this, but he incorrectly assumed that it was based on a "Germanic" *dûrent*. Cf. below n. 944.

determined the gender of the name *Durendart*.[937] In the next generation, this was no longer the case: the word *glaive* is no longer in the surviving form of the Song, and *brant* only appears five times in comparison with 56 mentions of *espee*. French had opted for *espee* as the only normal word for that weapon, and sword names generally align[938] with the female gender from now on. The poet of the surviving Song solves this problem in the most elegant and straightforward way: without changing the number of syllables or the stressed vowel, and hence the key elements of the laisse structure, he simply changes the suffix from the rather rough *-art* to the more refined *-al* (which sounded slightly Latinised or southern). This produced not only a name with a pleasing sound, but also a form that in those days, like the Latin two-termination adjectives, (*mortalis* m./f., *mortale* n.) or their one-termination OF successors (*mortel* m./f.), was indifferent to the gender of an ending,[939] and so he could treat it as a feminine: Durendal is *bone* (2304), *clere e blanche* (2316), *bele* (2344).[940]

As often happens, many areas on a periphery are immune to innovation, and this applies here to Germany, because Germ. sword names are almost always

---

937 There is possibly an even older reference to a masculine sword name from Galloromania. In the so-called Ademar-A (also known as Ademar-α, line 166 ed. Bourgain 1999), which certainly goes back to Ademar himself († around 1034), it says that Count William Sector-Ferri of Angoulême earned his epithet through the fact that with *ensem* [read: *ense*, G.A.B.] *Corto proprio nomine durissimo* he struck a huge blow that cut through the armour and body of the Norman leader Storin. (The old edition of Ademar-A in the MGH SS. 4.127 only read here *ense corto durissimo*). In Ademar-C (or Ademar-γ), however, which also seems more or less to originate from Ademar, we read (3.28 ed. Bourgain 1999; listed as a variant in the MGH SS. 4.127): *ense Corto nomine durissimo, quem Walandus faber cuserat.* If the masculine gender of the sword name has not arisen just by being made to fit with *ensis*, the later sword *C(o)urte* (f., but according to KMS I and *Chevalerie Ogier* still forged by Wayland) must at that time still have been called *Cort*; alternatively, if the editor is wrong and the name was not *Cortus* (= *curtus*), but *Durissimus*, we would already have a sword name beginning with *Dur-*.

938 Ganelon's sword *Murglais* (cf. below B.1.7) probably bucks this trend, and perhaps *Bautisme* in the *Fierabras* while in the romances Arthur's sword *Escalibor* certainly does (on this item cf. the section above on 'Climborin', A.10.3, with n. 706 and 708). In the *Enfances Ogier* 5054 *Escalidars* is the name of the sword owned by Richard of Normandy, a nice cross between *Escalibor* and *Durendart*. However, *Brumadant* in the *Chevalerie Ogier* (v. 1657 ed. Eusebi) is not, as Langlois s. v. supposed, the name of a sword, it is the name of its previous owner, who was a pagan.

939 Cf. *la leial cumpaignie* 1735, *mortel bataille* 658, *mortel rage* 747, 2279, *gent criminel* 2456, *feste anoel* 2860; also *tel bataille*, *chevalerie* etc., *tels paroles*, *itel valor*.

940 However, not everyone follows suit: the *Aspremont* (v. 15 or 3366 ed. Brandin) has *Durendal le trencant* or *le forbi*.

masculine.[941] In Italy, as in France, but later and with a different result, the *spada* as the carrier of meaning began to catch on: *Durindarda*, and then looking for a more pleasing sound: *Dur(l)indana*. Spain retained a conservative form of this name[942] but at the expense of having it eventually misunderstood as a personal name.

This brings us to the etymology! The oldest form *Durendart* almost certainly goes back to [1] the personal name *Durand(us) + -art*. However, we cannot entirely exclude the possibility that it is [2] a name made from a phrase *dur-end-art* 'hard it burns out'. It does not go back to [3] a *durant-dail* 'hard sickle', [4] the ancient name *Dardanus*, [5] an Arab. *Dhū'l-anḍar* 'possessing brilliance', [6] an Arab. *Dhū'ldžandal* 'master of stone, stone-master', [7] a simple onomatopoeic *drelindal* or similar [8] the Old Norse dwarves Durinn and Dáin or Dvalinn and [9] a Bret. name made from a phrase.

On [1]: The onomatologist Albert Dauzat (1939, 375, and 1952, 39) argued, I think correctly, for *Durand(us) + -art*, although he provided hardly any supporting evidence. *Durendart* almost certainly appeared as a literary name in the earlier Song of Roland, which the song in its surviving form was based on, and in that older Song, the main attribute of the sword can hardly have been anything other than its hardness, which means that in principle, approaches based on *dur-* 'hard', that is to say [1]–[3], are correct.

The name *Durandus / Durantus / Durannus* was known across the whole of France (including Catalonia, Becker, 2009, 421) from the 9th c. onwards, and

---

941 Of the 176 Old Norse sword names (including *kenningar*) listed in Falk (1914, 47–65), over 170 are masculine. Cf. also in German the masculine names *Balmunc*, *Brinnic*, *Freissan*, *Mimminc*, *Nagelrinc*, *Schrit*, *Waske*, *Welsunc*. As the many Germanic male names ending in *-brant* according to Schramm (1957, 89) represent an Ur-Germanic type of name and the *-brant* in them does not mean 'burning', but simply 'sword (blade)', the masculine *brant* as the main carrier of the meaning may well have (at least partly) dictated the masculine gender of sword names in general. MHG *Eckeleit*, *Eckesahs* and *Hornbîle*, and perhaps also *Mâl*, are neuter because they are based on appellatives. Autochthonous Germanic sword names are feminine in only a few isolated cases, where a woman's name or a feminine appellative became a secondary meaning for the sword name, cf. in Falk (1914, 47–65) *Grásiða*, *Gróa*, *Kvǫl,* and also Old Norse *Dáinsleif* and perhaps MHG *Vreise*. Those names which were already feminine when they came into Germ. from Rom. remained feminine. The *-e* was sometimes latinised to *-a*: as for example *Almacia* in the KMS I, *Alteclere*, *Preciosa*, *Ioiose* in K.

942 But this was not always the case: while the *Cantar de Mio Cid* (v. 2426 and passim) always calls the sword that the Cid took from King Búcar *Tizón*, the enduring effect of *espada* in the modern language meant that it became *Tizona*, even in the Army Museum of Madrid and in the translated part of the bilingual edition of the *Cantar* in the Colección Austral (15th edition 1995).

even further afield (Förstemann, s. v.), but it seems to have been most popular around and after 1000 in the mid-Rhône area (cf. Morlet 1972 s. v.). Evidence of the active participle form *Durans* (acc. *Durantem*) is very hard to find in France,[943] and so the name means rather 'capable or destined to endure or prevail', this vague connotation being caused by mixing *-antem* (which is where the active to middle voice of the verb comes from) and *-andum* (which is where the nuance of wishing and futurity comes from);[944] cf. Gamillscheg 1957, 437–439.[945]

Philipon (1914, 31–36) assembled copious references to show that *-art* was used as a name-forming element very early, and it was not just attached to adjectives: *Flavardus* a. 614 Agen, a. 970 Lyonnais and a. 983 Autunois, *Malardus* a. 639 Chartres, *Probardus / Provardus* a. 644 *servus* in the Ardennes, around 800 Colombes near Paris and a. 814 advocate in Tournon, *Magnardus* a. 909 Bourgogne,

---

943 I could only find one *Durans ebreus* in the cartulary of Saint-Victor de Marseille (1.215 a. 1021). The name can only be found in Italy, and especially central Italy, and there it is mostly in the strictly logical form *Durante* (> *Dante*).

944 The Dutch-Frisian-German word family around NHG *dauern* 'to last, to endure for a long time' is a borrowing from Lat. *durare,* which happened in the northwest, and it did not move from there into the High German area until the MHG period (Kluge/Seebold 2011 s. v.); this suggests that the origin of the name was not Germ., as Förstemann and others assumed. But even if they were correct, for our purposes only the meaning would be relevant, which the Romance speakers would then have added into the name. The vast majority of parents who gave their son this name would certainly have understood it as a wish: 'may he exist for a long time' i.e. 'may he be granted a long (or: eternal) life'. This is the only explanation for the widespread popularity of the name, and especially its astonishing prevalence (with a peak around or shortly after the year 1000) in the mid-Rhône area; cf. especially the index of the digital edition of the Charters of Cluny (www.uni-muenster.de/Fruehmittelalter/Projekte/Cluny/CCE) and the index of the joint edition of the two Cartularies of Savigny and Ainay (both Dioc. of Lyon, ed. Bernard). It is here in Savigny, that (around the year 1000) we find the oldest reference to the name *Olivier* (C.14.1.1) and where simultaneously (as early as in the 10th c.) the name *Roland* was at its most prevalent in the whole of Gaul (C.15.7.3*). Durandus / Durantus / Durannus* is much less common in the area around the mouth of the Rhône, as we find it for example in the Cartulary of Saint-Victor de Marseille (ed. Guérard). This leads to the suspicion that the sword name *Durendart* was not invented by the Angevins in the middle of the 11th c. but already came from the Vienne area around 1000 (on this see below C.14.2, 14.6, 14.10).

945 The Catalan male name *Durabilis / Durabile* is in some ways comparable. It is well attested from the year 878 onwards (cf. Morlet 1972, s. v., Kremer 1972, Index). *Durandus* only appears once in a name made up of two parts, as *Durandomarus* from a. 697 in Pardessus no. 442, a private charter that is only preserved in a cartulary but is probably authentic for the most part (it can be compared with the Royal Charter no. f. 153 a. 702 in Kölzer 2001), although it has a few details that are suspect (two witnesses are anachronistically described as *miles*).

Morardus a. 995 Dauphiné and Lyonnais, *Bonardellus* a. 1036 Viennois etc.[946] It also was attached to pre-existing names: we could equally well include the six names just quoted, and add *Leonardus* 6th c. servant of Chilperich I, and also probably the 6th c. Limousin saint, *Candardus* [< *Candidardus*] a. 1147 Bourgogne; there is also (in Morlet s. vv.) *Dodalhardus* around 820 north of Paris (based on the common name *Dudilo*; *Polyptychon Irminonis* 17.34), *Elisardus* a. 949 Chartres, and then many references (based on the Vulgate name *Elisaeus* 'the prophet Elisha'; soon after that also with aphaeresis *Lisiardus*), *Ponçardus* a. 1075 Reims, *Richinardus* 11th c. Conques (based on the name *Rich-in*).[947] Indeed, -*art* was added to all kinds of elements: *Cassanardus* a. 932 Rouergue, *Trenc(h)ardus* a. 900 Bordelais and a. 1090 Saintonge, *Curardus* a. 976 Valais, a. 980 Lyonnais and 10th c. Auvergne, *Coxardus / Coixardus / Coisardus* a. 1025–1074 Provence, *Cattardus / Chatardus* a. 1100 Dauphiné; we can also now add (thanks to Morlet s. v.) a participle: *Raptardus* a. 832 Marca Hispanica. If -*art* can be added to any elements, including polysyllabic elements names and participles, and if *Durand(us)* was a linguistically acceptable name from the 9th c. onwards, then there is nothing surprising about the formation of *Durand-art*. Finally, as far as the -*en*-, and not -*an*- in *Durendart* in the surviving Song is concerned, we only need to look at *Normendie* (v. 2324) and *Costentinnoble* (v. 2329).[948]

On [2]: Rohlfs (1936 passim, especially 63; 1969b, passim) also thought that *Durendart* was the original form, but he could not find any satisfactory parallels in Philipon's material; Morlet's material was not yet available to him. Thus, he had to interpret the name as one made from a phrase: *Dur-end-art* 'hard it burns out of it', 'a terrible flame bursts out of it'. Now '(fire)brand' as a metaphor for 'weapon', especially 'sword' is almost omnipresent in the Middle Ages, from the Germ. *brant* to the *Tizón* of the Cid; also, in 1978 a sword was discovered in France, which was probably from the 12th c. and bore the inscription ARD(-*ens* or -*eat*) OSTIBUS (Bautier 1978–1979, passim). But we cannot, as Rohlfs does, take the many imperative (and conjunctive) phrases as strictly comparable, and we

---

946 We can add here epic horse names such as *Baiart*, *Blanchart*, *Liard*.

947 Morlet's research on Picardian names (1967, 28) includes from the 13th c. (unfortunately the research only starts with this date) some additional formations such as *Denisardus*, *Jakemardus*, *Philipart*, *Stephanardus*.

948 Looking at the laisses, it appears that in the surviving Song, the mixing of -*an*- and -*en* is still not entirely random, but it is already an observable trend (although we cannot go through all the details of this here); hypercorrect forms are not surprising, especially in the weakly stressed middle syllables. The fact that this did not happen with *estandart* (3267, 3330, 3552) is not a counter argument, because this form only appears in the Baligant section.

must confine our comparisons to the very few assertive phrases. Among the swords, we would then have only *Bat-servellas-e-cant* (*Ronsasvals* 88), unless we read this (with Lewent in Rohlfs 1969, 866 n. 1) *Bat-servel la secant*; in the place and personal name category, we find support in the references provided by Schultz-Gora, which Rohlfs (1969b, 866 n. 2) mentions, but not until *Mar-i-vas* a. 1199 Aube or *Fol-s'i-prent* in the *Folque de Candie*. In my own material, I can only find one instance before 1150, of the place name *Merdeplud* from around 1050 ~ *Merdeplued* a. 1055, today *Eauplet* [!] (Seine-Maritime, cf. Adigard des Gautries 1958, 306), and (apart from the *Deusdedit* and *Quodvultdeus* from late antiquity) the personal name *Gualterius Facit-malum* before 1117 in Anjou (Anjou-Chartrou 338). There is therefore a suspiciously limited amount of material for comparison. Rohlf's explanation is not very tempting in semantic terms either: the claim that 'it burns hard out of it' could be made for any good sword, e.g. for Olivier's or Turpin's; the attribute that makes *Durendart* special is the fact that it *is* unusually hard.

On [3]: Lejeune argued for *durant-dail* 'hard sickle' (1950a, 155–160, 1970, 301, Lejeune/Stiennon 1966, 1.66). But in the Middle Ages *Durendal* never appears with /λ/, (essentially southern) Fr. *dail* never appears with /l/, and a sickle, which after all is only intended to cut crops, is not the epitome of hardness, but rather of sharpness.[949] This is not altered by the fact that Roland's sword on the Cathedral of Verona and in the glass window of Chartres is slightly bent.

On [4]: Dardanos, the mythical ancestor of the Trojans, turned into a sorcerer in late antiquity and an Egyptian magical papyrus of the 4th c. contains a chapter entitled ξίφος Δαρδάνου 'the sword of Dardanos' – where 'sword' is just a metaphor for 'sorcery'. The Latin translation (7th or 8th c.) of an Alexandrine chronicle contains the incorrect spelling *Durdanus*, and an Arab. treatise mentions the sorcerer *Dardaris*. Kahane/Kahane (1959, 217s.) combine the two forms into **Durdaris* and suspect, without any other supporting evidence, that this form came to mean

---

949 There is an obvious objection in the fact that the ideology of the *premier âge féodal* does not tend to rate the tools of a farmer favourably in comparison with a sword, but the Belgian scholar Lejeune disagrees (arguing differently than in the case of the *alme hache* for *Almace*) with a reference to the Son of Man who is carrying a sickle in *Apoc* 14.14, and who brings death to unrepentant parts of the world, which would mean that *durant-dail*, if there ever was such a thing, could be interpreted typologically as the slayer of the unrepentant heathen world. According to the LCI s. v. *Tod* death occasionally appears in Christian iconography from the 11th c. onwards with a sickle as well as other weapons, but initially as the one who has been defeated by Christ; it is only after his sickle is exchanged for a scythe, sometime around the 14th c., that the image quickly becomes more prevalent.

'Sword of Durdaris' through metonymy and that the OF sword name comes from **Durdar-*. They do not say where the *-en-* comes from. The most important steps in the argument rely on a chain of random hypotheses.

On [5]: Galmés de Fuentes (1972, 230s., 239s.) believes that the Arabic demonstrative particle *dhū* 'possessing' is also the first component of sword names, e.g. in *Dhū'l-Faqār*, the name of the famous sword which Muhammad had acquired as booty and then gave to the later Caliph ʿAlī.[950] The form *Durandal* could then come from (unattested) *Dhū'l-ʿanḍar* 'possessing brilliance' with a reciprocal metathesis of *-l-r-* as in *milagro*, *palabra*, *peligro* [where however *-l-*, and not *-r-*, takes the first position G.A.B.]. but the nexus postulated as an etymology is unattested in the language where it is supposed to have come from.

On [6]: We must also reject a – similarly constructed – *Dhū'l-džandal* 'possessing (quality of) stone', meaning something like 'made of stone, hard as stone' in Bellamy (1987, 273). Moreover, the phonological development postulated here /ldž/ > /lž/ > / žž/ > /ž/ > /r/ is out of the question.

On [7]: Leo Spitzer (1939, passim), in a fit of over-enthusiasm for Sainéan's approach, suggested an onomatopoeic **drelindal* as an etymology for *Durendal*, but in the following year (1940, passim), he retracted this in favour of Dauzat's explanation *Durandus* + ending. This is nevertheless an instructive case, because it shows just how far a stylistics expert can be tempted to go when he is listening out for onomatopoeia.

On [8]: Liebrecht (1880a, 179s.) and von Richthofen (1954, 324) thought that the name came from the two Norse dwarves, Durinn and Dáinn/Dvalinn, who forged Angantyr's sword. But two dwarves do not add up to one sword. Quite apart from the questions of how the borrowing occurred and why, where else is there a parallel for a product name being formed in this way?

On [9]: According to Place (1949, passim) *Durendal* comes from a name that he constructed into a phrase using Le Gonidec's (1850) Bret. dictionary: *diren* 'un morceau, une lame d'acier, le trenchant d'un outil' + *dall*, 3rd person sg. of *dalla* 'aveugler, émousser, ôter la pointe ou le trenchant à un instrument', that is to say, 'blade dulls cutting edge (i.e., of another weapon)'. Why should it come

---

950 Two more sword names beginning with *Dhū* are mentioned in Bellamy (1987, 274).

from Breton? Well, Roland was Margrave of the Breton March! Once again, we have a nexus from another language that is not attested there.

B.1.3 Why is Roland not allowed to destroy Durendal?

It is likely that at the time when the Rol. in its surviving form was written, as Menéndez Pidal (1960, 87, 174–178) and Kurt Wais (1976, passim) suggest, one or more versions of the material existed, in which either the dying Roland himself, or Charlemagne a little later, cast Roland's sword into a body of water. It is probable that an old mythical motif had found its way to the author via some route that cannot be reconstructed any more: this is the myth of a dying hero who is only allowed to destroy his sword (or to have it destroyed) at the third attempt, as Joel Grisward theorised in an article which caused quite a stir when it was first published (1969, passim). But even if the poet was not aware of such a motif in this particular form, we can be sure that he would at some point in his life have come across the universal narrative pattern (e.g. in fairy tales) of the notoriously difficult task that can only be completed on the third attempt. On that assumption, the most interesting aspect here is a very specific detail, namely that *e contrario* Roland's third attempt to destroy his sword also fails.

In other words: God denies the dying hero his last and deepest wish. Why is this? The answer is in the text itself. When Roland first attempts to destroy the sword, he prays to *seinte Marie, aiue*! and speaks to Durendal for the first time; he is afraid that the sword might fall into the hands of a coward. On his second attempt, his long speech to Durendal is about the conquests that he was able to make with the sword, and it ends with his fear that it might fall into the hands of unbelievers. His third attempt also fails. It is only then, *quant veit li quens que ne la freindrat mie*, that Roland remembers his sword is *saintisme* because of the relics in its pommel. And at this point the audience is supposed to realise, too, how inappropriate, almost blasphemous it is – especially from a medieval perspective – to call upon Mary while attempting to destroy a sword which is protected by this kind of relics, including a relic of Mary! The moment Roland remembers this, his conscience is at peace, and he is able to lie down and die in the position that Charlemagne will find him later; he then says his prayer *in articulo mortis*.

It is essential to see that here the meaning of the *two* consecutive scenes is revealed: God had sent the African as Roland's last temptation: he is killed, but at the same time he triggers in Roland the concern about the fate of his sword after death. Roland must free himself from all worldly concerns, including his desire to determine the fate of his beloved sword after his own death. Roland

finally passes this test, but only in a feeble, human way, after he has tried and failed three times.

I think this passage is important because it clearly shows that Roland has not been a perfect hero from the very beginning, nor is he free from all human weaknesses, as Brault (1978) maintains in his admirable, but also one-sided book.[951] Even Christ prayed in Gethsemane saying at first: 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me!' But on reflection he said, '. . . nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt!' (*Mc* 14.36). Where in world literature from Gilgamesh and the Iliad to the present day are heroes monolithic? Such heroes would be boring.

B.1.4 A special case: Roland's Olifant

Roland's Olifant is not a weapon. But because Roland uses it to split the skull of the Saracen trying to steal from him (v. 2287–2291), we will examine it briefly here, even though the definite article shows that it is not a name, but an appellative. The forms in O are: *olifan* (15 times, always obl.), *oliphan* (retaining the Gk. *-ph-*, one instance, obl.), *olifant* (6 times, including one rectus), olifans (rectus, one instance). The OF word (< Lat. *elephas/-phans*, also *-phantus* < Gk. ἐλέφας, gen. -ντος) means 'ivory', in other words the material that elephant tusks are made of, and also, significantly, 'bugle and drinking horn made of ivory'.[952] The material 'ivory' itself is only mentioned once in the Song in v. 2653: the folding throne that has been brought from the Orient is made of *olifan*, and Baligant sits upon it when he first sets foot on Spanish soil; the poet seems to be aware of the exotic provenance of this material. Elsewhere in Song, the word always refers to Roland's horn.

Even though some 60 oliphants have survived until the present day, measuring between 45 and 65 cm in length and mostly liberally decorated with carvings,[953] and even though there were some oliphant collectors in the Middle Ages such as Bishop Henry († 1173), who visited Italy and bought no less than nine oliphants for his cathedral in Winchester, the oliphant was still a rare and

---

951 Brault did not notice the contradiction between Roland's evocation of Mary and the presence of relics of Mary in particular in the sword (1978, 251–253).

952 Outside the Rol. also 'elephant', for which *elefant* is only rarely used. An olfant can be used as a drinking vessel if you cover the mouthpiece with your hand or plug it with something; in the song we see this usage in action when Turpin goes to fetch water to revive Roland after he has collapsed (v. 2224ss.).

953 This information and the following section are based on DA s. v. *Oliphant*.

expensive item, since it was made of a material that came from Africa or India. Thus, in the Song, only Roland possesses such an artefact, and this explains the definite article (with its implied possessive function); elsewhere in Charlemagne's army there are only ordinary *corns* (v. 1796, 2132).

Experts say that all surviving oliphants come from the 11th and 12th century; the oldest of them are decorated in a way that matches the style of ivory carving techniques used in Egypt in the early 11th c. Most of them appear to have been made in Italy, however (Amalfi, Venice). Thus, the term *olifant* only made its way into the Roland material in the course of the 11th c. at the earliest. This is also the period when Saint-Seurin de Bordeaux was given the oliphant that was supposed to have belonged to Roland (v. 3685; also PT cap. 29, Pilgrims' Guide cap. 8).

B.1.5 Turpin's *Almace*

Turpin's sword is called *Almace* O 2089, *Almicem* (Latinising acc.) K, *Dalmuçe* V4, *Almice* CV7, *Aigredure* PL; also

[*d'Almace*] Segre 2143, *des mielz* O, *Dalmuçe* V4, *de [. . .] Almice* CV7, *d'Aygredure* P: PL replace an incomprehensible or illegible source with a randomly chosen aptronym.[954] In 2089 *Almace* in α competes with *Almice* in β (KCV7). In 2143 the misreading *des mielz* is more likely to have arisen from *dalmize* than from *dalmaze*. First, the dictionaries have plenty of references to the spellings *milx*, *milz*, *mis*, *mius*, *mix* instead of *mielz*. Secondly, even O accidentally has *miez* instead of *mielz* in v. 2473; this scribe has therefore no doubt "corrected" the source's spelling without /λ/ into *mielz*. Furthermore, in 2143, where an *e(t)* follows after *d'almice*, the *-e* was dropped through haplography. In *d'almiç* or *d'almiz* a scribe did not recognise that this was a name; he believed it was a misspelling of *al mielz* 'in the best way'. But because *les colps d'al mielz* was syntactically unacceptable, he corrected it to *les colps des mielz* 'blows of the best'; on the adjectival use of *mielz* cf. v. 1822: *des mielz e des pejurs*. Based on OCV7, therefore, (and *per analogiam* also in the first passage) I think with Stengel that *Almice* is more likely to belong in the archetype than *Almace*.[955]

---

954 *Aigredure* is somewhat older and appears as the hapax name of Guibert's sword in the *Mort Aymeri*, but the *Aygradura* of one of the warriors who fell at Roncevaux in the *Ronsasvals* v. 90 is perhaps later.

955 References to Turpin's sword outside the Song do not help us to decide between *Almice* and *Almace* either. On the one hand, we find the following, albeit in each case hapax names: *Autemise* in the *Renaut de Montauban* and *Hautemise* in the *Gaufrei*, all derived from *Almice*,

The etymological basis for the name is [1] the ironic idea of an *almities* 'blessing power', and therefore not [2] an Old Norse epithet of God and Odin, [3] a Hebr.-Arab. 'sword of Moses' [4] an Arabic word for 'cutting', [5] the Arabic word for 'diamond' or [6] the image of an 'axe with the power to bless'.

On [1]: I am not aware of any explanation for *Almice*. However, it is reminiscent of the admittedly rare Lat. and MLat. *almities* 'ability to bless'[956] as a deeply ironic name. Just as Archbishop Turpin would normally raise his arm in the name of the cross to make a blessing, so he raises his arm here, albeit with the opposite result.

If *Almice* belongs in the text and is to be understood in this way, how can we explain the variants *Almace* and *Almuce*? According to DuCange (s. v. *Almaci*a) a French glossary dating from 1352 translates MLat. *Almacia* as *almaticle*, which according to Tobler/Lommatzsch (s. v., with a reference from Mousket) is a corrupted form of *dalmatique* 'dalmatica'; incidentally as *almatica* it spread as far as Old Span. and Old Port., as *almatike* into Middle Dutch (FEW s. v. *dalmatica*), and so certainly it was more widely used in the spoken language of French priests than its sparse traces in writing seem to indicate; the *Récits d'un ménstrel de Reims* (around 1260, §181 ed. de Wailly) vary between *aumatique* (Mss. AB),

---

where the first parts of the names are influenced by *haute* as in *Halteclere*, Olivier's sword. On the other hand, the KMS I has three instances (cap. 44, 56, 58 ed. Unger, A41, A43, A55 ed. Loth) of the Latinising acc. *Almaciam*; but in terms of the stemma, KMS I cannot be called upon to support KMS VIII (= n) (and thereby force us to decide in favour of *Almace*), because the two branches of the KMS have very different historical backgrounds (cf. Beckmann 2008a, 55–60, 63). KMS I in the first passage probably attempts to provide a kind of etymology for the name: there, Charlemagne tries out three newly acquired swords by striking them on a test block made of steel, after which he gives each of them a name: the first sword loses its point, and he calls it *Courte*; the second one remains intact, Charlemagne says it is good, *at hǫggva heidna menn med* 'for knocking down heathens', and calls it *Almacia*; the third one slices off a foot-long piece of the block and is given the name *Durendal*. Since the first and third names are clearly supposed to be derived from the outcome of the test, we can assume that the same its true of the second one. I can see only one possibility: the author of the French source of KMS I was thinking of *mater* 'to kill' and/or of *mace* 'cudgel, mace'; furthermore he would probably have been able to guess, even if he didn't know for sure, from new foreign words in OF (such as *alcube*, *alfage*, *alferant*, *alfin*, *algalife*, a*lmaçor*, *almustant*, *alqueton*, all attested before 1200), that *al-* is the article in Arab.

956 From Festus onwards, this word appears frequently in gloss literature, but it also appears twice in Hrotsvitha (TLL, Steinmeyer/Sievers 4.31.47, Mlat. Wb., DuCange, Diefenbach s. v.). The gloss writers have trouble providing a brief explanation of what it means: explanations range from *pulchritudo* and κάλλος ἀνατροφή[ς?] 'beauty (of?) nourishment' to *sanctitas*. I translate it by sticking with the meaning of Lat. *almus* in classical poetry.

maticle (C), *daumatique* (D) and – of special interest to us – *dalmike* (EF). The dalmatica is a liturgical overgarment worn by bishops and archbishops, among others, and in their particular case it was usually made of damask, brocade or silk, often with gold edges (description of examples that have survived in Enlart 1916, 3.324–330); because of the key word 'archbishops' a scribe could have replaced *Almice* with *Almace.*

The *almutia,* OF *almuce,* is another liturgical garment, but this one was worn mostly by canons, and it was originally a kind of long hood, with a shoulder cape; it could have led to *Almuce,* or with the additional influence of the dalmatica,[957] to *Dalmuce* in V4. Interestingly, the DuCange (s. v. *almucia*) has a reference, unfortunately undated, from the *Monasticum Anglicanum* with the form *amicia* (which I have not been able to verify); if *almucia* and *a(l)micia* coexisted early enough, then this could have assisted the transition.

On [2]: Many of von Richthofen's etymologies are excessively Germanophile but perhaps the most unexpected of these is the suggestion (1954, 325), that the name of Turpin's sword *Almace* is based on Old Norse *almáttigr* 'the Almighty', "(denominación tambien de Odin)" [!].

On [3]: Kahane/Kahane (1959, 218) started with *Dalmuce < d'Almuçe* in V4. In the second half of the first millennium, there was a mystical treatise in the Jewish-Aramaic tradition called *Ḥarba de-Mōšeh* 'Sword of Moses' [although in that context it is meant in the figurative sense of a 'great magical power', G.A.B.]. Since Moses is called *Mūsā* in Arab., the authors suspect that the form *(d') Almuçe* is based on Arab. * *al-Mūsā,* '[the one (scil. sword)] belonging to Moses' and that this belongs in the archetype.[958] But you cannot put a form from V4 into the archetype against O on the one hand and KCV7 on the other.

On [4]: We must also reject Bellamy's (1987, 273) hypothesis. Without any underpinning semantic or idiomatic support from references, he starts with Arab. *al-māḍī* 'the sharp, penetrating one'. There would "only" have to be a missing diacritical mark over the *-ḍ-* (ض) for a Spanish person to read *al-māṣī* and adopt this form [although it does not mean anything at all], turn the *-ī* to *-e* just as *vīgintī > veinte* and then pass it on to speakers of French as a genuine Arabic and therefore valuable name for a sword. It is also a point of concern that

---

957 S. v. *dalmatica* the DuCange also has a sub-section entitled *Dalmutia*; however, the only reference, from the year 1532, has *Dalmatiis*, which renders this sub-section useless.
958 They do not have any references for * *al-Mūsa*, and for some reason they do not mention the fact that in modern Arab. *al-mūsā* means 'the razor'.

Bellamy did not mention another Arabic-based, but more appropriate solution which at that time had already been suggested twice before. Because:

On [5]: Galmés de Fuentes (1972, 238s.) and independently of him Clemens/ Hammam (1983 passim) argued for Arab. a*l-mās* or *(al-) almās* 'the diamond' (< Gk. ὁ ἀδάμας 'the steel'). The Arabic fricative -s- and the OF (still!) affricate -c- (+ -e, -i) /-z- were similar in so far as they were both narrowly post-dental, while OF -s- was still apico-alveolar. The -e can be seen as a feminisation in line with *épée* and the vast majority of other sword names. People in the Middle Ages were aware that diamonds can cut through steel, which in this context means the opponent's armour. Even though *al-mās* is not attested in Arab. as a sword name, I would support this hypothesis, if I thought that *Almace* belonged in the archetype.

On [6]: Lejeune (1950a, 162) argued in favour of *alme hache*. The palatal phoneme here does not fit; but it could be argued that in O there are more than 20 instances of *ceval(-, -s)*, a Norman writer's hypercorrect form: since he would have heard *cherise / cerise*, *lanch(i)er / lancier* etc. he presumably began to think that the second forms were more refined. Even then, however, we have to question whether an author so infused with the ethos of chivalry would have compared the knight's favourite weapon with the humble axe, which was both weapon and working tool for the common man.

B.1.6 Olivier's *Halteclere*

Halteclere O 1363, [1507]=1550, 1953, CV7T the same, *Hatukleif*, *Hatakle*, *Atakle*, *Aakleif* n, *Alteclêre* K, *Altaclera* (and 1x each *Altacler, Altaelere*) V4, *Hautecleere* P, *Autecler* L, *Hawtykylyr*, *Hawtklyr* w (*Hawtcler* BW), *Hautecleer* h(R), *Antecleer* h(F): The three passages can be discussed together. *Halteclere* belongs in the archetype based on the evidence in OCV7PT(KV4Lwh). Only n assumes *Halteclef / clé*, where *clef / clé* is obviously meant to be understood in the musical sense.[959]

---

[959] *Clavis* appears from the 11th c. onwards in literature about music; until the end of the 12th c., according to LMLMAe s. v. it means 'uppermost (or lowest) note (in an ecclesiastical key)', 'key showing the level of a note', 'note level'. There is, as is so often the case in the Middle Ages, no clear definition. In John of Salisbury's *Metalogicon* 1.20.24 (written in around 1159) *musicae claves* seems to be a collective name for 'neumes or notes (in writing)' as a whole. The name in n must therefore have the general meaning *alte clef* 'high note, high sound'.

If Roland's sword, in keeping with his character, is 'hard, indestructible', then Olivier's, equally appropriate to his character, has a 'high/loud and clear' tone.[960] But while *Durendal* was a modernisation of the older name *Durendart*, *Halteclere* has a more immediately obvious meaning and for that reason alone is probably later. It reveals an acoustic sensibility that echoes the beautifully crafted scenes with the horn, the toponym *Haltoïe* and the three messengers *Clarïen*, *Clarifan* and *Clargis*, suggesting that it may have been added by the author/editor of the song in its surviving form.

B.1.7 Ganelon's *Murgleis*

Ceint<e> Murglies Segre 346, *Ceint Murglies* O (-1), *Muraglais* n, *Mulagir* K (*Mugelar* ms. A),[961] *cinta Mordea* V4; also *Murgleis* O 607, *Mordea* V4. In this case the supplementary verses are also interesting, P 5152 (ed. Rejhon) *Murgie*, T 3952 (ed. van Emden) *Morgée*: P(T) retain the *Murg-* in O (which is thereby confirmed for the archetype), but they adjust the name to fit their rhyme scheme. V4 has altered it even more with the verb *mord(ere)* 'to bite' + *-ea* (similar to other forms in that version, e.g. *perd-ea* 'loss', v. 1215 and 1485 ed. Cook). How should we evaluate the spellings in O? *Murgleis* 607 is in the assonance position, albeit in a badly corrupted laisse; it comes between the assonance words *plaist* and *forsfait*. Since *forsfait* in v. 1393 fits into an ę laisse, the poet pronounces it as /forsfęt/; we must *a fortiori* assume /plęst/ for *plaist* ending in two consonants, and therefore also /murglęs/ ~ *Murglais (instead of *Murgleis*). We find further confirmation for this in *paleis* (normally *palais) 3736 in an ę laisse, where O again has the inconsistent spelling <ei> instead of <ai> (both times probably under the influence of the usual *-eis* < Lat. *-ensis* trend), although in

---

960 Lejeune (1950a, 155) thinks the etymology should start from *halt' e clere*, rather than simply *halteclere*. I see no need for this here, nor in the similarly constructed *Aigredure* (cf. above s. v. *Almace*, B.1.5.3); because in Occ., where there is no way of covering up the difference by altering the way words are written, the *Ronsasvals* has v. 86 and 90 *Autaclara*, *Aygradura*, and not **Aut' e clara*, **Aygr' e Dura*. Dvandva compounds are rare in French, though not impossible: *une sourde-muette*.

961 When Konrad, who is from Regensburg, adds here that this sword was forged by Madalgêr in Regensburg and brought by Naimes to France, he may well be mixing the name of a smith in a local legend with the existing etymology of the name of the sword; since Naimes in this text is a Bavarian, but also one of Charlemagne's trusted men, the reference to Naimes would have been an obvious way of showing how the sword found its way to Charlemagne's brother-in-law in France. In my opinion, therefore, this supplementary passage does not have any bearing on the French text.

this manuscript the two graphemes usually indicate different phonemes except when they precede a nasal. On the other hand, since in O <ie> and <e> constantly alternate – *cel / ciel* 'sky', *ben / bien* etc. –, *Murglies* 346 is probably a hypercorrect spelling of /murglęs/, i.e. *Murglais*. The *-glais* is then confirmed by n and thus should be put in the archetype. Now we have some more clarity regarding K (and its ms. A): first of all, *murglaif* has been misread as *murglair*, and this led in A to the loss through dissimilation of the first *-r-*, but in K it also led to a metathesis.

The gender of *Murglais* in the Rol. itself is indeterminate. *Ceint<e> Murglies* 346 is only Segre's emendation, mainly based on *Ceinte Joiuse* 2501; other editors such as Jenkins, Roncaglia, Hilka/Pfister have *Ceint a(d) Murgleis*. From γ on, the name is feminine, with clearly feminine endings; compare also the *Murglaie* of the later Crusades epics (*Jerusalem*, *Beatrix*, *Baudouin de Sebourg*, *Bâtard de Bouillon*) and the *Murgleie / Morgleie / Morgelei* of the *Beuve de Hantone*. Since it always led to the *Murglaie* type, and never to **Murglaise*, the earlier -s would have been interpreted as marking an inflection.

As for the meaning of the name, [1] an (unspecified!) etymology from the Breton seems to be based on a confusion. We must clearly reject [2] an Arabic interpretation, but we can accept [3] the deduction that the second part of the name means 'gladius' and [4] a connection between *Murgl-* and a type of Saracen name. [4] and [5] can be combined into [6] a satisfactory hypothesis. An Old Norse interpretation [7] is less likely.

On [1]: Roques writes (1940–1941, 386): "[. . .] pour *Murgleis* mon confrère Joseph Loth [† 1934, G.A.B.] me dit, il y a quelques années, qu'il y reconaissait sans hésitation du breton et que ce nom signifiait 'qui entaille bien' ou 'qui a des entailles'". It is curious that Roques does not mention any attempt on his part to clarify Loth's idea with the help of a Bretonist; one suspects he attempted but failed. On the other hand, I cannot help remembering that for Durendal (!) Place (1949, passim) suggested a Bret. (!) etymology from elements meaning 'lame d'acier' + 'ôter la pointe ou le trenchant à un instrument, i.e., of another weapon' (discussed above in the section entitled 'Durendal', B.1.2 [9]). Aren't Loth's 'to make a notch (in the enemy's sword)' and Place's 'to make the point or the blade of the enemy's sword useless' translations of one and the same name? Remembering a conversation about sword names inexactly, Roques may well be applying to Murglais what Loth had said about Durendal.

On [2] Bellamy (1987, 273) suggests for *Murglais* an Arab. *māriq 'alyas* 'valiant piercer', once again an unattested, phonologically ill-fitting nexus.

On [3] Lejeune (1950a, 163s.) argued for *maurus gladius* as the etymology. The native word *glai* < *gladius* is attested in OF only with the derivative meaning 'sword-lily, gladiola, etc.', but it is still marginally attested with the meaning 'sword' in Old Francoprov.; so in around 1100 *glai* may still have meant 'sword' in some corner of OF that has not left any visible trace, or the Roland poet may somehow have understood the etymological connection. There is therefore no real objection to *-glai*.

On the other hand, in O's writing system, the spelling *Mur-* instead of *Mor-* for *maur(us)* was impossible. Lat./Germ. *-au-* > *-u-* only occurs before a nasal (*hunir*, *huntage*, *hunte* < Germ. *haun-*; *unt* < **habunt* and *vunt* < *va(d)unt*).: whereas over 70 forms of the verbs *orer* (< *aurare*), *otrïer*, *oïr*, *oser*, *lo(d)er* (< *laudare*), the words *jo[i]us*, *oisel*, *oréd* 'storm' (3x), *orieflambe*, *oreille* (4x) and the names *Joiuse* (3x) and *Oger* (< Germ. *Audigarius*, 4x) have <o> without exception. Only the almost always unstressed word for 'or' is more often written as *u* than *o*.

Consequently, Lejeuene's explanation is only acceptable for the second part of the name.

On [4]: Leo Spitzer (1947–1948, 402 n. 2) categorised the sword name *Murglais* (which he took over in Stengel's suggested form without comment) alongside two epic Saracen names, each of which is represented by a long list of occurrences. These are: *Murgalant* (*Jerusalem*; *Roland-CV7*, *Saisnes*, *Mort Aymeri*, *Narbonnais*, *Gui de Bourgogne*, *Anseïs de Cartage*, *Maugis*) and *Murgalé* (*Chanson d'Antioche*,[962] *Chétifs*, *Baudouin de Sebourg*, *Bâtard de Bouillon*; *Charroi de Nîmes*, *Aliscans*, *Enfances Guillaume*, *Gui de Bourgogne*, *Enfances Renier*, *Elie de Saint-Gilles*).[963] This idea is correct in principle: we cannot separate *Murglais* /murglęs/ from *Murgalé(s)* because they are phonologically too similar, nor *Murgalant*, because to the Francophone speaker of those days, the only difference would be in the well-known morphemes *-ant* and *-é*.[964]

---

[962] His name is *Murgalé* (v. 406 ed. Duparc-Quioc), but just before that, in a laisse ending in *-íe*, he is called *Murgalíe* (v. 404).

[963] The feminised form of the name *Murgalie* appears only once as a place name: in the *Aspremont* (v. 6319 ed. Brandin), *Murgalíe* is Maraclea in Syria (conquered in the year 1099 by the crusaders; today Maraqîya ~ Marqeh, an insignificant location), described there as being close to Hama, Caesarea, Aleppo, Tiberias, Tyre, Beirut and Iconium and as being ruled by the *amustent* of *Fenie* (Apamea, Arab. Afāmiyya). The vernacular form of the name cannot have come organically from an oriental or Gk.-Lat. form, but the pre-existing personal name must have exerted some attraction.

[964] Moreover, this is confirmed by another circumstance. In the late 12th c., the author of the *Chanson de Jérusalem* says that when Cornumaran is fighting for control of Jerusalem (presumably around 1099) he has a sword called *Murglaie*, but he does not believe that Ganelon's

However, we must disagree with Spitzer on two points. First, he tried to make all three names go back to Lat. *mūscus* 'moss; musk' (> Cat. *musc* 'brown', which Spitzer takes to mean the skin colour of the Moors) even though this is phonologically untenable. The origin of *Murgalant* can be traced back to the First Crusade. Petrus Tudebodus, who witnessed the First Crusade and was its chronicler, included in his work (before 1111) a curious list of 75 Muslim dignitaries[965] from Antioch; the very first is called *Mirgulandus* (mss. A and C) or *Murgulandus* (mss. B, D and Duchesne edition). No historical person can be found to match this name;[966] but it must, as the oriental scholar Paul Kunitzsch (1972, 43 n. 37) notes, be a 'Saracen name' made out of Arab. *amīr* and an Arab. personal name.[967] Whether we think *Murgalé* also goes back to an Arabic name,[968] or is just a play on the name *Murgalant*, there is no need for an etymology from *mūscus*.

Secondly, Spitzer unnecessarily interprets *Murglais* as another random and playful variation on the form of the name; he therefore overlooks the fact that *-glais* meaning 'sword' is an obvious part of it.

On [5]: This all suggests a simple and psychologically plausible synthesis of [3] and [4]: the poet was presented with *Murgalant* and/or *Murgalé* which purported to be Saracen names; he changed the ending of the words to *glai(s)* 'sword' to make a sword name, but in the process was happy to retain the association of a 'Saracen origin'.

On [6]: Finally, von Richthofen (1954, 325) referred to Old Norse *myrkleyg(r)* 'dark flame', which is first attested in around 1170 as a kenning for 'sword' (not

---

sword has somehow fallen into the hands of the Muslims. He may well have thought that any Muslim sword could be called *Murglaie*, because this is a Muslim name. (The fact that Beuve de Hantone has a sword with this same name does not contradict this assumption, because Beuve came to the Orient when he was still a boy.)

965 He calls them *reges*, but then he says that the last of them was the *dux* of all of them, which seems to indicate that they are all living at the same time.

966 Pigeonneau (1877, 102) suggests an *amīr Ghaylān*. *Ghaylān* is indee an Arab. name (cf. the EI s. v.); but no bearer of this name is attested anywhere in connection with the First Crusade and its context.

967 We know that *amīr* + X was shortened to *mīr-X* by the participants of the First Crusade themselves, e.g. from the historical identities behind *Amirdalis/Amyrdalis* in the anonymous *Gesta* and Foucher of Chartres as well as *Mirdalin* in Raymond d'Aguilers.

968 According to Pigeonneau (1877, 102) this would be a certain *amīr Ghālib* or *Khaleb*, but there is no reference to a *Ghālib* in any of the Crusades historians; I could not locate Khaleb as a name in any sources at all.

as the name of a particular sword).[969] This expression would be acceptable, both semantically and phonologically, if we assume that *kl- > gl-* is contaminated by OF *glais*; but *myrkleyg(r)* is just one of hundreds of kenningar for 'sword' in Old Norse literature. This would mean that we would have to regard the similarity between OF *Murglais* and *Murgalant / Murgalé* as pure chance, which is difficult.

B.1.8 Review of the weapon names

There are elementary narrative reasons why it was crucially important that individuals, including enemy characters, should have personal names, not least because of the large number of single combats. When it comes to the swords, however, the opposite is the case: a plethora of sword names would only distract the audience from the most important aspect of the story, which is the warriors themselves. This is why the poet is sparing with his sword names: only Charlemagne, the trio of Roland-Olivier-Turpin, Ganelon and Baligant carry named swords. In other words, the ownership of such a sword singles the bearer out as a main protagonist in the story. However, at the same time, the sword naming is done in a subtle and meaningful way: the sword reflects something of the bearer. On the Christian side, Charlemagne's sword *Joiose* reminds us of the source of his power and the legitimation of his rule, that is to say, the *joy* that Christians have in their salvation through the sacrificial death of Christ; this is conveyed through the fact that the sword encapsulates the tip of the Holy Lance. Moreover, this joy is the same joy that comes in anticipation of everlasting bliss with the battle cry *Mun(t)joie*. Roland's *Durendal* reminds us of the *inflexibility* of its owner; Olivier's sword *Halteclere* signifies *brightness* and *clarity*, the major key, so to speak, of his thinking, feeling and action; Turpin's *Almice* reminds us of the fierce and warlike way in which he carries out his priestly role. Finally, Ganelon's sword *Murglais* evokes a dark connection between its bearer and the Saracen side. Baligant himself is the only opponent of Charlemagne who is deemed worthy to have his weapon named: his *Preciose* is the perversion of Charlemagne's *Joie* into a purely material object. The very naming of his lance *Maltét* reveals the arrogant extravagance of its bearer, and at the same time the meaning of its name points to the absolute evil that sustains his rule.

---

969 These days, the *editio citanda* is Attwood 1996; there *Harmsól* 61.4.

B.1.9 Origins of the weapons

Details about the origins of weapons are relatively common in later epics because they make it easy to have lots of different options for building assonance and rhyme schemes. The Roland poet, however, uses this stylistic technique very sparingly, except in one passage where he deliberately presents a whole group of such examples (v. 994–999):

> Paien s'adubent d'osbercs *sarazineis*,
> Tuit li plusur en sunt dublez en treis.
> Lacent lur elmes mult bons *sarraguzeis*,
> Ceignent espees de l'acer *vianeis*;
> Escuz unt genz, espiez *valentineis*,
> E gunfanuns blancs e blois e vermeilz.

If we take them one by one, we have: *sarazineis* O 994, *saragocés* V4, *saracis* C, *sarragoceis* V7, *sarrasinois* T; *sarraguzeis* O 996, *saracenés* V4, *constantis* C, *sarracineis* V7, *sarragonceys* T, (from) *Sarragose* h(B); *vianeis* O 997, *vianés* V4, *veneneis* C, *valentoneis* V7, *viannoys* T, *vianose* h(B); *valentineis* O 999, *vianeis* V7, *valantinoys* T, (from) *Valense* h(B): The changes within the first and (only in V7) with the second pair of adjectives are easily explained by the methods of memorising several verses at a time, and writing them down all in one go.

After having presented each of the twelve Anti-Peers individually first, the poet is keen to also characterise the huge, anonymous mass of enemy forces. This is why he uses a few deft strokes to show that they too were very well armed.

In around 1100, the weapons used in Islam and Christendom were of roughly equal quality, and despite various prohibitions, there was a lively arms trade back and forth.[970] We see this reflected in the Song twice, and in both cases, the indigenous weapons are mentioned before the imported ones: in v. 3089 the French have *espees franceises et d'Espaigne*, while the enemy has 'Saracen' and 'Saragossan' weapons as well as some from Vienne and Valence. In the OF epic, especially the later ones, swords, lances, shields, helmets and breastplates from Vienne are mentioned more often than those from other places (cf. Moisan s. v. *Viane*, *vianeis*),[971] which leads to the presumption that there was some historical reality behind the association. In their indices, Jenkins, Segre and Hilka/Pfister derive

---

[970] Swords from *Firandža*, the Frankish empire or the realms that followed in its wake, are well known in the Muslim world of that time, but their reputation often rests only on the blade (cf. for example Lombard 1974, 174–176, 179).

[971] Celt-Lat. *Vi(g)enna* becomes OF *Vien(n)e*, regularly pronounced /viãne/ in some parts of the Francophone area (cf. Pope 1952, § 448; see also *Erec* 2405s. ed. Roques *jame* [< *gemma*]: *dame*, *Yvain* 4871s. ed. Roques *assane* [~ modern Fr. *(il) assène*]: *barbaquane* etc.); therefore

valentineis from Valencia, probably for the simple reason that this city, apart from its episodes under the rule of the Cid, was always deep inside Muslim territory until well into the 13th c. But Valencia appears nowhere else in the OF epic tradition, while Valence is very frequently mentioned; in our passage, it fits perfectly with the immediately preceding Vienne (just 50 miles upstream), and *valentinois* means 'from Valence' to this day, *valencien* 'from Valencia' (Span. *valenciano*).

Besides this list, we must add only the African Malquiant's shield from *Tulette* 'Toledo' (v. [1568]=1611, cf. A.7.1), the shield from *Gironde* 'Girona' (v. 3688), which Charlemagne puts on before his duel with Baligant (cf. A.12.6.6) and the *elme de Provence* owned by Tierri d'Anjou (v. 3916).

B.2 Textiles and their origins

B.2.1 *Palĭe alexandrin*

The *palĭe alexandrin* (v. 408, 463), owned by Marsilĭe, but also by Ganelon – and which at that time did feature in international trade – were discussed above in 'Oriental elements in the Marsilĭe section' (A.5.4).

B.2.2 Palĭe galazin

The three most illustrious casualties are prepared for their final journey[972] by being covered with a *palĭe galazin* O 2973, laid out on *almariske sîde* n 'silk

---

also OF *vianeis*. Later, with support from Lat. and Occ., the alternative form *Vienne*, *viennois* was dominant once again.

972 In the Middle Ages, when a person died far away from home and was being prepared for the journey back to be buried in his homeland (something that was only possible for high status individuals), the body was first undressed and washed (subsumed here in the verb *costeïr* 'care for, look after', v. 2962); then it was opened and the inner organs were removed, to limit the rate of deterioration (although only the heart was preserved, separately from the body, v. 2965); then the body was soaked with wine and aromatic substances, again to limit decomposition (v. 2969). This was done, e.g. when Charles the Bald died in the Alps, *Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 877 (reference is made to this in the comprehensive study by Schäfer 1920, 493s.): *Karolus [. . .] mortuus est. [. . .] Quem aperientes qui cum eo erant, ablatis interaneis, et infusum vino ac aromatibus quibus poterant et impositum locello coeperunt ferre [. . .].* But even after these interventions, a body like this had to be transported with as little exposure to the air as possible, in order to minimise the odour. This is why Charles the Bald soon had to be

from Almería' K, covered with *un pallio alexandrin* V4: *Almar̈i(i)en* or *almariois* (cf. Flutre s. v.) do not fit with the assonance, and so K does not belong in the archetype. It is impossible to choose between *galazin* and *alexandrin* on metrical grounds, or in terms of the stemma; the editors, including Stengel, opt for O.

Galazin does not refer to [1] *Lajazzo* in Cilicia, and in this passage probably not [2] Galatia, but rather [3] Galata, just outside Constantinople.

On [1]: Francisque Michel (1852–1854, 1.329) was reminded of a "*Glaza* ou *Glacia*" in the edition of Marco Polo that he used; this was the ancient Αἰγαί [Ptolemy 5.8.4; *Aegae* or *Aegaeae* Pliny, *n.h.* 5.91, G.A.B.], the *Ayás* [from the acc. Αἰγάς] or Lajazzo of the late Middle Ages [also Arab. *Ayās,* still *Ajás* e.g. in 1889 in *Meyers Konversationslexikon*, today Yumurtalık on the south coast of Cilicia, 80 km southeast of Adana]. We find, in fact, not only *Glacia* and *Giazza* each in a respective edition from the 16th c.[973] but also *Llagiaza/Laglaza* in the *editio citanda* of the Venetian Polo text (cap. 10, ed. Barbieri/Andreose), whereas the French and Tuscan Polo texts[974] all have *Laias/Layas*.[975] Jenkins quotes Michel's form as "*Glaza* or *Galaza*", although with no references, and yet the debatable point is precisely around /gal/. Moreover, this place did not play a significant role until Venetians and Genoese used it as a port in the kingdom of Little Armenia, that is to say until after 1196.

On [2]: Galatia, the land of the Galatians (*Galătae*) in central Anatolia around Ancyra/Ankara, was of course known to medieval Christians through the letter

---

moved from the *locellus* into a *tonna*, which was then sealed with pitch and animal skins, *coriis*. In the Rol. there is talk of aromatic substances and wine (v. 2968): *En quirs de cerf les seignurs unt mis*; *ben sunt lavez de piment et de vin*, and this means that the bodies were first laid out on these deer skins and then treated with aromatic substances and wine, before being finally being sewn up in the skins ready for the journey. The *palῐe galazin*, then, which covered them (v. 2973), once they were loaded onto the *carettes* (v. 2972), were intended to protect them from the weather and from impious curiosity.

973 According to Hallberg (1907, 308) in Grynaeus, *Novus orbis regionum*, Basel, 1532, or in Ramusio, *Navigazioni e Viaggi*, Venice, 1583.

974 I have checked this name in the Ronchi edition of the Franco-Italian text (1982), in the large OF edition started by Ph. Ménard (2001–2009), in the Tuscan editions by Bertolucci Pizzirusso (1975) and Ruggieri (1986). Hallberg (1907, 308) lists *Layas* in the Polo edition by Yule (1871) and Nordenskiöld (1882), *Laias* in the Pauthier edition (1865).

975 *Glaza/Glacia* only fits with the development trajectory of *(εἰς τὰς) Αἰγὰς* > /ajás/ > (L') *ajazz(-o, -a)* through a Latinising written form of what a listener has interpreted as **la G(h)iazz(-a)*. There was therefore never a /gl/ or /gal/ in the *pronunciation* of this name.

of Saint Paul, and as such it appears on the most important *mappae mundi* (Beatus, Lambert, Ebstorf, Hereford, Ranulph and later examples). It is mentioned by Pliny (*nat.* 9.141 and 16.32) as a producer of crimson (the dye made from an insect that lives in the kermes oak), and also (29.33) as the original home of the famous *lana [. . .] Galatica* which was shorn from the neck part of a sheep. But quite apart from the fact that our context suggests neither scarlet-coloured nor woollen cloths, Galatia was captured from the Turks immediately after Manzikert (1071), and so at the time of the Song it had long since stopped functioning as an exporter of both of these goods.

On [3]: In their index, but with a question mark, Hilka/Pfister opt for Gálata, a city just to the north of Constantinople, on the other side of the Golden Horn. In the 11th c, probably around 1060, the Jews were forcibly moved to this place from Constantinople itself, and they remained there until 1203; Benjamin of Tudela, who visited the Jewish community shortly before 1168, mentions its characteristic 'artificers in silk and many rich merchants' (Adler ed. p. 16, trans. p. 14), and the EJ s. v. *Constantinople* explains: "There were Jewish finishers of woven material, dyers, silk weavers, and makers of silk garments". Before about the middle of the 12th c., which is when silk production first began in Western Christian Europe (starting in southern Italy)[976] every piece of silk was imported either from the Orient or (almost twice as often) from Byzantium and therefore very expensive. Pieces of fabric large enough to fit the purpose described in our context would only have been owned by ruling princes and bishops, both of whom would usually donate them to a church or monastery at some point; they would then often be used as shrouds for saints – especially those who were being exhumed and reburied – or for these high-status individuals themselves.[977]

---

976 This is the conventional dating; Guillou (1975, 1976, both passim) argued that the dating is one to two hundred years earlier in Sicily and Southern Italy, but Muthesius (1997, 113–115), for example, regards this as doubtful.

977 On the use of silk in Christian Europe before 1200 cf. the admirably well-referenced book by Muthesius (1997), especially the sections on how the bodies of saints were wrapped (e.g. in Sens, Deutz or Siegburg, 119s.), the grave of Charlemagne in Aachen (120) or that of Bishop Gunther of Bamberg († 1065), who came back from his trip to Jerusalem with the silk cloth in which he was subsequently buried (101–103), as well as the sections on ecclesiastical tapestries (124–126) and the Western silk patrons (141–144 with map, and also the book's informative index). Smaller pieces of silk cloth were used to wrap individual relics (passim) or made into liturgical garments for high-ranking clerics (121–124), sometimes also luxurious clothing for some members of the aristocracy (126s.), and finally bindings for expensive mss. (128–132).

Since this practice was still happening during the lifetime of the Roland poet, this explanation is preferable to the two alternatives; it may well even be a further indication that there was a southern Italian-Norman connection. The spelling -zin- is unusual, however. In Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *galacïen*, *galacin*, the Rol. is the only reference with *galazin*, while the other twelve (including ten referring to the name of the textile!) have *galacïen*, the semi-erudite equivalent that we would expect to find for *galat-ianus*. The poet may have modified the suffix because it comes in the twelfth and last verse of a laisse which already had the personal names *Turpin* and *Gebuïn* in the assonance position; the -*in* (*us*) ending is also used to make many ethnica, as in Rol. itself *alexandrin*, *angevin*, *barbarin*, *peitevin* (cf. also Meyer-Lübke 1921, § 41, or more precisely Wolf 1964, 50–52).

The participants in the Fourth Crusade burned Galata down in 1203. The Jews were only allowed to live in Galata again after the Latin emperor lost Constantinople to the Greeks in 1261, but the Jewish community never managed to regain the position it had previously enjoyed. This explains why V4 in the early 14th c. may have replaced *galazin* with *alexandrin*, since by then, pieces of cloth 'from Galata' would no longer have meant anything. There may also have been some changes to the burial conventions: since Jesus was buried in pieces of linen cloth (*lintea*, *Ioh* 19.40), the Church increasingly insisted on linen cloth, although exceptions were still allowed for bishops and monarchs – and Alexandrian cloth was mostly made of the finest linen.

Conversely, there is no obvious reason why O would have amended *alexandrin* here (but not in v. 408 and 463). We will therefore agree with the editors and put *galazin* into the text.

B.3 Horse names

B.3.1 The individual names

These, too, are examined in alphabetical order.

Climborin rides *Barbamusche* O [1491]=1534, *Amus* n (*Amer* b), *Barbanoselle* V4, *Barbemor* CV7, *Barbamor* P, *Barbanoc* T, *Brandorant* L, *Samparduck* h(V): Here h(V) has allocated Malquidant's *Salt Perdut* (cf. below) to Climborin. L has made a random change to the phonology of his source. T has misread -*m*- as -*n*- and -*r* as -*c*, which means he is referring to the *Barb(a/e)-mor* 'Moor's beard (~ thin or small beard)' in CV7P; in V4, however, -*o*- is a misreading or mis-spelling

of *-a-*: *Barb-a-naselle* 'beard by the nostril'[978] – both reinterpretations of the 'beard the size and form of a fly' in O. n was only able to read a small portion of *(barb)amus(che)*. The archetype therefore has *Barba-* following OV4PT, *Barb(a/e)m(o/u)-* following OCV7P, *-amus-* from On, /ǫ~u/ + *-e* because of the assonance – and therefore *de facto* the *Barbamusche* in O. The scribes were obviously not familiar with this expression.[979]

Marsilĭe's horse is called *Gaignun* O 1890, *Guenun* n, *Gascon* V4CV7, *Graimons* P, *Gaavinon* T: The *Gaignun* in O is the equivalent of *g(u)a(a)ignon* 'greedy for loot, cruel; guard dog, mastiff',[980] and related to *g(u)a(a)igner* meaning 'to loot, to pillage'. First of all, O generally still writes <gu-> for the Germ. *w-*, but this is pronounced with a simple /g/, as we see from his *Gaifier, galops, garçun, Gascuigne* (v. 172, when there is *Guasc-* elsewhere). Moreover, n has retained the older spelling with *gu-*. Secondly, the Roland poet does not normally contract after a lost /ð/, but he has *Siglorel < siglëor* (< *sigillatorem*) + *-ellus* (cf. above A.10 'Other enemies at the Battle of Roncevaux', section A.10.3 'The last group') and thus, when necessary, he can "compress" this kind of hiatus. The slightly derogatory meaning of the name is evidently intended to be appropriate for Marsilĭe;[981] γ then thinks 'guard dog' is not suitable as a horse name and replaces it with 'inhabitant of Gascony'; Gascon horses were of course a well-known entity in the epic genre (cf. Moisan s. v.).

Valdabrun's *Gramimund* O [1528]=1571 (<*Gradamont* β), the 'jumper' has already been discussed together with *Bramimunde* in A.8.4.1 above because of the

---

978 Godefroy s. v. *nasele*, f., the OF form related to *nasel*, m., cites a reference from 1364: *cheval liart moucheté* (!) *aux naselles fendues*, where the association of *mouche(té)* and *naselle (s)* illustrates how the transition from O to V4 may have occurred.

979 The Fr. dictionaries have no other case of *Barbamouche* or *barbe à mouche* as a name, nor used in an appellative sense. Two other attempted explanations are not correct. First, it is unlikely that the name echoes the *(cheval) barbe* 'Berber horse' (< Ital. *bàrbero*) because this is not attested until the 16th c.; the only adjective for 'Berber' in OF is the full form *barbarin*. Secondly, *mouche* 'fly' (in German sometimes more obviously *Fliegenbart* 'beard of a fly') meaning a very small beard originally under the lower lip (in German more often: above the upper lip) according to TLF s. v. *mouche, B3*, is first attested in the 19th c, although this style of beard was already fashionable for a while in the first half of the 17th c. and then again under Napoleon III.

980 Horses in the epic genre often have names relating to other animals such as *Arondel, Delfin, Papeillon* and *Pertris* (Bangert 1885, 46), but *Gaignun* is the only one that is pejorative.

981 Once again, Richthofen's (1954, 325) etymology is unsatisfactory, since he suggests Old Norse *vakinn* 'vigilant' but does not explain the borrowing route nor the reason for borrowing (and it is not attested as a horse name, or indeed as any other kind of name).

phonological parallelism, and Grandonĭe's *Marmorĭe* O [1572]=1615, the 'marbled one, dappled one' was discussed in A.5.11 along with his master, who comes from Cappadocia, in relation to the link with the Cappadocian tradition of horse breeding.

Gerier's steed is called *Passecerf* O 1380, *Passacers* V4, *Otivel* T: V4 confirms that the reading in O belongs in the archetype. The horse is 'faster than a stag'.[982]

Just as the king's son from Africa, Malquiant, has the most opulent, gold-encrusted armour, so he also has the fastest horse – *Beste nen est ki poisset curre a lui* – called *Salt Perdut* O [1554]=1597, *Salpdunt* n, *Salperdù* V4, *Saus perduz* V7PL, *Sauperdouz* T: n has overlooked the *er* stroke at the bottom of the *-p-* and imagined there was a tilde on the *-u-*. The etymology 'saut perdu' is clear, but the exact meaning is not.[983]

Gerier's comrade Gerin calls his horse *Sorel* O 1379, 'tawny, reddish-brown', or *Livrés* V4, 'well-groomed', or *Morel* CV7, 'dark brown': The archetype has *[.] orel*, and based on the *précellence* of O, the editors opt for *Sorel*.

Ganelon's *Tachebrun* O 347, *Taskabrun* n, *Taskprun* K, *Tenebrun* V4, *Chachebrune* V7, is doubtless as O says a 'brown patch', but then K (with Bavarianising *-p-*) and n must go back to a (north Norman, because of the *-k-*) form; V4 gives the name of the traitor's horse a negatively loaded, symbolic meaning through its association with *tenebres, tenebros*.

---

982 Speed is the attribute that impresses the poet most about a horse: Barbamusche is 'faster than a sparrowhawk or a swallow' (v. 1535), Gramimund 'faster than a falcon' (v. 1572), Marmorĭe 'faster than a bird in flight' (v. 1616), and twelve times in the Song other horses are described as *curant*. The idea of a horse overtaking a swallow has precedents in Greek, is also depicted in a Byzantine miniature in the ms. of a riding textbook of the 10th c., and it even reached as far as China (Haussig 1992, 115). We can also compare this with the historical evidence from the early 12th c. (as does Gicquel 2003, 242), which shows that according to Albert of Aachen (cap. 68, RHC Occ. 4.90) the horse owned by King Baldwin I. of Jerusalem *lingua saracenica Gazela appellatur, eo quod ceteris equis cursu sit potentior* (cf. Arab. *ghazāl*, fem. *ghazāla* 'gazelle').

983 It is not very typical to name a horse after the circumstance that other horses are unable to beat him at jumping, or unable to compete against him by jumping up in a battle, which in effect means taking a 'lost jump'; if this name is to be plausible, it must refer to the horse who bears the name. Does this horse tend to jump in a way that is exuberant and out of control? Or is this the jump of a stud mounting a mare, so that *salt perdut* would mean the lost seed of a wild horse that has been spent *en passant*, outside of human breeding plans?.

Charlemagne's *Tence(n)dur*, the 'belligerent' horse par *excellence*, was examined above in connection with the *Marsune* episode (A.12.6.6).

Roland's horse is *Veillantif* O 1153, *Velantif* n (*Veliantif* b) and C, *Uelentich* K (*Ualentiç* E), *Valiantig* V4, *Vielantif* V7, *Viellantin* P, *Valantin* L, *Valentijf* h(H);
    Veillantif O 2032, *Valentis* V4V7, *Velantis* C, *Viellantins* P, *Viellautis* T;
    Veillantif O 2127, *Valiantis* V4, *Velantir* CV7;
    Veillantif O 2160 and 2167, *Uelentich* K, *Vailantig* V4: Since the consistent *Veill-* in O is flanked by *V(i)el(l)-* in nKC and once in V7, it should be given preference over the *Va(i)l(ĭ)-* forms which are due to the secondary influence of *vaillant* or Lat. *valent-*. The *-if* in O is confirmed in nh(H) and once in CV7, and also almost as clearly through the *-is* in V4CV7T and the one instance of *-ir* in CV7 (a misreading of *-if*); *-in* comes from a change of suffix; *-ig* is discussed in [2] below. The *Veillantif* in O therefore belongs in the archetype, but since O often has *-e-* instead of *-ie-* (the adj. *vieil(z)* in particular occurring only four times with *-iei-* and twelve times with *-ei-*), it is ambiguous: *vieil-antif* or *veillant-if*.

This name is not [1] based on an Arabic word; however, having wavered myself several times, I prefer to leave the decision between [2] and [3] to the reader: [2] *vieil-antif* 'tried and true' vs. [3] *veillant* 'vigilant' + *-ivus*.

[1] Bellamy (1987, 275) argued that the name came about through two misreadings of the Arab. *dhayl katīf* 'thick tail, bushy tail', but this is not attested as a horse name in Arabic either.

[2] De Reiffenberg (1836–1845, p. CXIX) and later scholars, including recently Philipp Burdy in his review of the German edition of the present book (*Beitr. z. Namenforschung* 54 [2019] 227–237, here 230), saw the name as a compound made out of *v(i)eil* 'old' + *anti(u)* / *antif* 'ancient'. This is not supported by the fact that in v. 2615 – albeit in a very different sense[984] – Baligant is described as *le viel d'antiquitét*. In OF the combination v*ieil (et) anti(u)/f* 'extremely old' (apart from in *Aucassin* 1.2 always with the *et*) is attested many times, but strictly speaking, this proves nothing, because we cannot rule out the possibility that the homonymy is an accident. A stronger argument is the fact that *-antig* in V4 (which occurs in a supplementary verse as well as the two cases cited here) cannot easily be separated from Ital. *antigo* and that V7PT with their *Viel(l)-* (just like *Aspremont*, ed. Brandin, and *Galien* with similar forms), even more clearly Mousket with his *sur son destrier, le*

---

984 On this Beckmann (2004c, 540–542).

viel anti (v. 5828 ed. Reiffenberg, referring to Roland), are all thinking of *vieil + anti (u)/f*. On the meaning behind this, cf. two references in Godefroy s. v. *antif* and *anti*: *Garin le Loherain* (Part I, Laisse 32, p. 99 ed. P. Paris): *S'ourent chevaus grans et fors et antis*;[985] and *Gaufrey* (v. 6375): *Berart fiert le premier du bon bourdon anti*. If both good, strong horses and the huge pilgrim's staff with which Bérard kills several Saracens can be *anti(u)/f*, then the word in our context must mean something like 'tried and true'; when applied to a horse in those days, it would mean more or less 'battle-tested', suggesting it would obey its rider and not panic in the heat of the battle. Thus, *Vieillantif* in the above-mentioned later texts must have been understood as a kind of quasi-tautological intensification: 'tried and tested in many battles'.

Alternatively, [3] Gautier, in the index of his *édition classique* (and at around the same Bangert 1885, 469, and also Gaston Paris 1900, 288) understood it as *veillantif < *vigilant-ivus*; it is the common OF word *veillant* 'vigilant, active, diligent' with an additional suffix,[986] constructed in a similar way to *Durend-al* (or *-art*) and *Tencend-ur*. A horse is not named when it is already several years old. It is named when it is young, when people could hardly talk about it being 'tried and tested in many battles'; but they would certainly be able to tell whether a young horse was alert and likely to react quickly to the instructions given by its rider, or stubborn and phlegmatic.

In the Song, Turpin represents written culture, despite his willing participation in the military action, and his horse is not named, but merits a *descriptio* instead, which portrays him as a model specimen of his whole species – and which in itself is a model of its genre (v. [1651–1657]=1489–1496; cf. Faral 1912, 480, and 1913, 198).

B.3.2 Review of the horse names

Horses in the Song, like weapons, are rarely given names, and for the same reasons: more horse names would take the audience's attention away from the warriors. But the distribution of the horse names is different.

---

985 Ms. A (Paris, Arsenal 2983, Laisse 37, p. 155 ed. Vallerie) does not have this verse, however. Paulin Paris' suggestion that in this context it means 'fleuris, élégants, de bonne grâce', seems to be based solely on the realisation that the word must have a positive meaning here.
986 The use of *-ivus* is the oldest way to turn participles into pure adjectives in Lat.: *capt-ivus*, *nat-ivus*. We know that this was also possible with present participles and was quite common in everyday usage from *absent-ivus* 'frequently absent or absent for a long time' in Petronius; cf. Meyer-Lübke (1921, § 132).

Among the protagonists, Charlemagne and Roland have, as we might expect, true helpers in Tencendor and Veillantif: these horses are brought into the story shortly before their rider charges into battle (v. 1153, 2993); Tencendor survives, as does his master, and is also mentioned at the end of the battle (v.3622), and like his master, Veillantif dies, but not until he is struck thirty times in the final hail of lances and spears which the now cowardly enemy fires off before they flee (v. 2167). Ganelon's Tachebrun is mentioned once, at an appropriate point in the story, when his master mounts his horse to set off on his lonely ride to Saragossa.

But the seven other horse names all appear as *hapax* forms (as does the *descriptio* of Turpin's horse) in the middle part of the Battle of Roncevaux, after the *eo ipso* tight structure of the preceding battle of twelve against twelve and before the mercilessly advancing tragedy of the closing section: at this point even such episodic figures as the Christian warriors Gerin and Gerer (v. 1379–1380) and the enemies Climborin (v. [1491]=1534), Valdabrun (v. [1528]=1571), Malquiant (v. [1554] =1597) and Grandonĭe (v. [1572]=1615), as well as Marsilĭe (v. 1890) all ride on a named horse. In this middle section, the poet must have thought that he needed to add a few more splashes of colour. *E contrario* it is very significant that when Baligant's horse subsequently appears, he is not deemed worthy of a name, even though he and his rider perform a jump that is fifty feet long (v. 3167).

C **The Christian side**

Christian ideas

C.1 God, Christ, angels, saints and Satan

In the analysis of the non-Christian side, we examined the 'heathen gods' last, and so we will mirror this in the present section by considering the corresponding ideas on the Christian side first.

C.1.1 God (the Father)

C.1.1.1 Deus, Damnesdeus

The regularly inflected, but in Fr. monosyllabic word *deus, deu* means on the one hand 'heathen' gods in the sg. or pl. nine times (including the invocation *mi damnedeu*, v. 3492). On the other hand it refers to the Christian God 109 times [including 11 occurrences of *damne(s)deu(s)*], albeit once in the mouth of Marsiľe (*par le soen deu* referring to Charlemagne, v.82) and three times in the mouth of Blancandrin (directed at Charlemagne in v. 154 and referring to Charlemagne in v. 420; also directed at Charlemagne in the interreligious formulaic greeting v. 123s. which is also used by Ganelon v. 428s. directed at Marsiľe). As in other OF poems and unlike the (popular) main development into modern Fr. *Dieu*, the word is always found in assonance with *ē* < lat. *á[* (10 times altogether, plus *damnedeu* 5 times); under the influence of the Church Latin form *deus, deum* that was heard in every Mass, the diphthongisation (or effectively triphthongisation) was suppressed.

While the prayers that the Christians make to God until around v. 2300 are always (almost 20 times) formulated in the third person subjunctive, the prayers that occur from the scene of Roland's death onwards are almost as often in the imperative, first directed at Mary (v. 2303), and then at God, beginning with v. 2337 (negative imperative in infinitive form, albeit uncertain in O). In these prayers, God is mostly addressed in the 2nd person sg. (v. 2369, 2384–2387, 3100–3108). There are also some plural address forms, not only in the linguistically difficult v. 3277 (on this Segre ad loc., 1989 correcting his work of 1971!), but also in 2430 and 3891.

C.1.1.2 *Veire paterne*

The vocative *Veire paterne* is a particularly poignant invocation of God. It introduces both Roland's prayer at the time of his death (v. 2384ss.; *patene* O, following Gautier corrected by all except Bédier) and Charlemagne's prayer before the

battle with Baligant (v. 3100ss.). Both readings are confirmed in the archetype, the first through *Vere paterne* V4 and partially through *voirs peres* P, *vrai doux pere* T, *verais rois sire* L, the second through *Voire paterne* V4CV7PT.

Veir means here 'truly, steadfastly standing by his word and deed', because the person uttering the prayer firmly believes that God as *Deus verus / verax* (*Sap* 15.1, *Ps* 85.15, *Ioh* 3,33, 8.26, *Rom* 3.4; Blaise 1966, 293, reference to this in Brault 1978, 444) will intervene now, just as he did on behalf of the biblical figures who are then named in the two prayers (on these see below C.1.6.2).

The term *pater* is precisely the most appropriate term for God in his role as redeemer, and this is apparent several times even in the Old Testament (*2 Sam* 7.14, *Is* 63.16, *Ier* 3.4, *Mal* 1.6). This linkage takes on a central importance in the New Testament. The fem. (!) *patern*e 'God the Father' is attested in Occ. as *paterna* in the *Boëci* (according to Selig 1993, 152 with lit., probably not before the last quarter of the 11th c., ms. from the early 12th c., v. 150–154, especially 151): *bos xristias, qui cre perfeitament / Deu la paterna, lo rei omnipotent, / et en Ihesu [. . .] / e Sanctum Spiritum*, where *paterna* clearly means the first person in the Trinity and v. 151 paraphrases the corresponding part of the *Credo*: *Deum patrem omnipotentem* (Schwarze 1963, 105); in OF it is already to be found in the *Gormont* (probably later 11th c., v. 221): *Deus, la grant paterne*, then more widely in OF and Old Occ. (references are to be found in Debenedetti [1922] 1986, 243s., with more details than those found in the dictionaries), formulaically still in modern Occ. *paterno* (Mistral, *Trésor*) and as a full hapax *paterna* a. 1814 in Piedmontese, into which it appears to have migrated (Debenedetti, n. 2 etc.). In earlier texts, *paterne* or *paterna* generally appears with *voire / v(e)raie* or *vera*, and increasingly also with *sainte voire / vraie*, which means that at least the forms with 'true' probably had a (partly indirect) influence on the Rol., as long as no Latin reference to *vera paterna* can be found.

There is still one problem with the origin of the expression, since as far as I am aware, there is no nominalised Lat. *paterna* until around 1400, and thereafter it occurs a few times by the start of the 16th c. (the first reference is in DuCange s. v. *paterna*, the next in Debenedetti [1922] 1986, 248), referring to an idol which could be a sculpture (G. Martin 1911, 274 with n. 1) or just an illumination (Debenedetti a. a. O. with n. 4), since its exact nature is contested (according to DuCange '*imago Patris aeterni*', according to Martin et al. 'crucifix', which in my opinion is oversimplified). The FEW s. v. *paternus* makes the bold claim (with no knowledge of Debenedetti's article) that the reference in DuCange (the date of which is not known) goes back to a Lat. concrete noun **paterna* 'representation of God the Father' from the 11th c.; this is unsatisfactory, in particular because Debenedetti's belief that the Latin usage came from Romance has still not been

proven wrong. Conversely, however, Debenedetti's categorical claim that in the 11th c. there was not yet any representation of God the Father as a person distinct from Christ has recently been undermined by a few exceptions (cf. for example Boespflug/Zaluska 1994, passim, especially 197–202).

There is even some dispute over the etymology of the expression. Debenedetti starts with *paternitas* in *Eph* 3.14, which from the 6th century onwards has sometimes stood for 'God the Father' himself, but he has only one reference from Avitus to substantiate this. He laconically supports the transition from Lat. *paternitas* to OF *paterne* with a reference to semi-erudite words, which underwent apocopation rather late, of the *prince, page, vi(e)rge* type, that is to say he assumes a phonological development. Admittedly, if we assume there is (parallel to VLat. *tempesta* instead of classical Lat. *tempestas*) *patérnita* instead of *paternitas*, this could have developed as /patérnǝðǝ/ > OF *paterne*, although it could not have become the earlier attested Occ. *paterna*. But secondly, Debenedetti cites as a parallel Venet. *fratèrna* 'confraternità', which requires a semantic explanation (probably via an ellipsis) and not a phonological one.

In fact, it is simpler to assume an ellipsis for *paterne* as well, e.g. of *majestas* (as Hilka/Pfister state in their Index).

According to Brepols' *Library of Latin Texts* the nexus *paterna majestas* or *majestas paterna* occurs from Ambrosius over sixty times before 1100, and often as an *abstractum pro concreto*, simply meaning 'God the Father'. The ellipsis is still not attested in 11th c. Lat., but it may have crept in during the transition to the vernacular.

C.1.2 Jesus Christ

Jesus is only mentioned by name once, in v. 339s. when Ganelon takes his leave before setting out on his mission: *Ço dist li reis: – Al Jhesu e al mien! – / De sa main destre l'ad asols e seignét*. The poet is here obviously imitating the *benedictio finalis* which abbots performed when missionaries were sent out to heathen lands (cf. Schutz 1947, passim). The similarity between these contexts is clearly intended to allow Charlemagne to appear here more like a priest than he does elsewhere in the Song. For *asols e seignét* (or *seignez*) refers to the three other situations where the liturgical actions of priests come into play (in v. 2205 and 2957 in connection with funeral liturgy, evidently with explicit absolution at the same time, in v. 3859 in connection with absolution in the sacrament of

confession), and then the simple *asoldre* in the two remaining places (v. 1133, 1140) where absolution via the priest in the sacrament of confession is meant.[987]

Brault (1978, 140), who seems not to be aware of Schutz' article, maintains somewhat apodictically with reference to this passage that although absolution was usually granted by priests, "Charles is a priest-king and absolution is simply an extension of his role as a representative of God on earth". But hardly anyone in the period around 1100 thought of this so simply, and with so few reservations. This becomes clear if we try to imagine the grotesque idea that Emperor Henry IV or V would ever claim that being the 'representative of God on earth' meant he was entitled by virtue of his office to dispense sacramental power.

It is, however, worth pondering whether this momentary alignment of the worldly ruler's role with that of the priest might be a brief flash of the same anti-Gregorian spirit that the poet demonstrates in his depiction of Turpin. There were, of course, anti-Gregorian, pro-royal currents in France and even more so in England; we could mention in particular the fascinating question of the so-called *Norman Anonymous*, whose writings appear to have emerged between 1096 and 1110 in the very Archbishopric of Rouen, within which Turold was simultaneously bishop of Bayeux (cf. the LM s. v. 'Anonymus, normannischer' and English Wikipedia 'Norman Anonymous'. It is noticeable that in all β manuscripts, *Al Jhesu e al mien!* is replaced by a simple expression meaning '(go) with God's blessing!' without any mention of the emperor himself. Here, the word *Dé* appears in assonance in V4, *soiez* in C, *allez* in V7; but even if the alteration had not already been made in the sub-archetype β, we can assume that the direct syntactical equivalence of the type 'Jesus and I, the Emperor' must have aroused a certain unease at a later date; there is no obvious motivation for the alternative assumption, namely that O would have added this expression into the text.

Furthermore, the formula *asols e seignét* is preserved in V4 (v. 265 ed. Cook), but there is no corresponding expression in nCV7, nor in K, despite an

---

987 More generally on absolution in the funeral liturgy cf. Sicard (1978, 234), Kunzler (1995, 471s.). Absolution for a deceased person is attested e.g. in 1144 in Peter the Venerable's often quoted *Absolutio*, which he sent to Héloïse for Abelard's funeral: *Ego Petrus Clunia censis abbas, qui Petrum Abaelardum in monachum Cluniacensem recepi et corpus eius furtim delatum Heloisae abbatissae et monialibus Paracleti concessi, authoritate omnipotentis Dei et omnium sanctorum absolvo eum pro officio ab omnibus peccatis eius.* On the manuscript basis cf. e.g. Luscombe/Radice 2013, p. LXXIII. The document is also an early proof of the indicative absolution formula *Ego [. . .] absolvo* instead of the older, purely deprecative formulae of the type *Misereatur Deus [. . .]*; on this problem cf. Kunzler (1995, 417). Turpin's concise *Asoldrai vos* (v. 1133) probably also reflects the *Ego vos absolvo*.

unctuous speech by Charlemagne in this ms., and it is reduced in w to its uncontentious second part 'with his raised right hand, he blessed him'. The majority of editors therefore avoid the verb *asoldre* with the emperor as the subject – presumably because they are thinking of the absolution that is given in the Sacrament of Confession and do not want to give the impression that an emperor was as entitled as a priest to administer this sacrament.

C.1.3 The angels: Michael, Gabriel, Cherubin – and Satan

Three angels[988] come down to be with Roland at the moment of his death (v. 2389–2396):

> Sun destre guant a Deu en puroffrit:
> † Seint Gabriël de sa main l'ad pris.
> Desur sun braz teneit le chef enclin;
> Juntes ses mains est alét a sa fin.
> Deus <li> tramist sun angle Cherubin
> E seint Michel <de la Mer> del Peril;[989]
> Ensembl'od els sent Gabrïel i vint:
> L'anme del cunte portent en pareïs.

The belief that angels escort the soul of those who die in a state of grace to heaven is found in the New Testament (*Lc* 16.22); it is a firm belief especially in relation to martyrs throughout the early Christian period, as for example shortly after the year 200 in the *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, in the 4th c. in Gregory of Nyssa.[990]

But in this case, there are three particular angels. From the second half of the 4th c. onwards (Synod of Laodicea) and even more energetically from the 8th c. (Lateran Council of 746) the Church reduced the number of archangels to three, that is to say to the angels who are individually named in the Old Testament (including in the book of Tobias, which was considered canonical): Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael. A fourth archangel, Uriel, appears only in the 'fourth' book of Ezra (*4 Esdras* 4.1, 5,20), which the Church considers apocryphal; veneration of him was not allowed, and he was pushed into a marginal position.[991] He is relevant in our context thanks to one particular fact, namely that in the Middle Ages he was sometimes identified as the cherub who stands at the

---

988 On the angels, I refer to my own previous account (Beckmann 2004c, 534–537).

989 <de la mer> is missing in O, but the metre requires it, and it is present in V (*Michael de la mere*).

990 Cf. RAC s. v. *Engel (IV)*, col. 167.

991 Cf. DACL s. v. *Ouriel*; RAC s. v. *Engel (IX)*; Perdrizet (1928, passim).

entrance to Paradise with a flaming sword (*Gen* 3.24);[992] the identification is based on the etymology of his name: *Uriel interpretatur ignis Dei* (Isidore *et.* 7.5).

C.1.3.1 Michael

Saint Michael is one of the three canonical archangels and the soldier of God *par excellence*: he appears in the book of Daniel (*Dan* 10.13 and 21, 12.1) as the battle-tried protector of the people of God, and then in Revelation (*Apoc* 12.7ss.) the leader of the heavenly host that fights against the dragon's forces. His second role, as Christian psychopomp, is obliquely referred to in the epistle of Jude (v. 9) and fully depicted e.g. in the *Visio Pauli* and in a prayer at the end of the *Commendatio animae*, which was also included in the Requiem Mass, where it says: *suscipiat eum / eam Sanctus Michael archangelus Dei*;[993] during the lifetime of Gregory of Tours this was accepted as part of the sacred tradition (MGH SS.mer. 1/1².296.13, SS.mer. 1/2.39.25 and 141.18). It stands to reason that Michael would appear at the moment when Roland is dying. It is very strange, however, that the poet sees him in this situation, which has nothing to do with the Mont-Saint-Michel nor with the perils of the sea, if the expansion in O, and confirmed by V4 is correct, as *Sanctus Michael in* (or *de*) *periculo maris*, an expression that is almost a *terminus technicus* for the Mont-Saint-Michel. Even at this moment he is therefore, freely translated, 'Saint Michael, the one from Mont-Saint-Michel', which makes this one of the most obvious Normanisms in the Song.[994] (There is further discussion of *Seint Michel de P[e]ri[l]*, occurring as a simple place name in v. 1428, in the section on the geography of France in C.4.8 below.)

C.1.3.2 Gabriel

Saint Gabriel is God's *legatus a latere*, the special messenger angel moving between God and his chosen people, as he was in the book of Daniel (8.16, 9.21); he informs Zacharias about the birth of John the Baptist and tells Mary about

---

992 Perdrizet (1928, 242); Réau (1955–1959, 2.1.42).

993 RAC s. v. *Engel (VII)*, col. 249s.

994 Here are the other mentions of Michael in the Song: Blancandrin, who is cynically familiar with Christian traditions, speaks of his festival in v. 37 *feste seint Michel*, in v. 52 *a seint Michel [. . .] la mult halte feste*, and in v. 152, in the speech to Charlemagne, where he must speak with ceremonial precision, even *la grant feste seint Michel del Peril*. Since this refers to a date, and indeed to a very famous one, it means 29ᵗʰ September (the great Autumn target date across Christian Europe, 'Michaelmas', which marked the start and end of working contracts even as late as 1900), and which of course was celebrated with special fervour on the Mont-Saint-Michel; it does not mean the second festival of Michael on 30ᵗʰ October which is also celebrated there but is only significant in that particular region.

the birth of the Redeemer (*Lc* 1.11ss., 1.26ss.). And thus, in the Rol. he stands guard by night, when the exhausted Franks do not set up any watchmen (v. 2495), watches over Charlemagne when he is sleeping, and at the same time sends him important dreams (v. 2526, 2847), encourages him at the most critical moment in his single combat with Baligant (v. 3610)[995] and in the last verses of the Song, urges him to start a new campaign (v. 3993).[996] In medieval times, people believed he also worked in the opposite direction, and so he carried messages from believers to God. This is what he is doing here: the dying Roland calls out to him (v. 2262), and the gauntlet that Gabriel takes from Roland's hand (v. 2390), symbolises – in this instance at least – largely a plea to God for forgiveness.[997]

C.1.3.3 The *angle Cherubin*

The role of Saint Raphael, the third of the archangels, is a healing one, and specifically physical healing: he heals the bride and the father of Tobias, he is the angel *qui medicinae praeest* in the words of Origen (*In Numeros homiliae* 14.2)[998] and the patron saint of pharmacists and doctors.[999] But in Roland's case there is no prospect of physical healing, and so Raphael is not appropriate.

In his place, 'the angel Cherubin' appears. Has the author here made an *ad hoc* decision to use the generic expression *Cherubin* as a proper name? Or is he thinking of something more specific? Jenkins (on v. 2393) vaguely mentions the cherub who stands at the entrance to Paradise but gives no further details. In fact, from the early Christian period onwards, this Bible reference (*Gen* 3.24)

---

995 Cf. above A.4.5 '*Que fais-tu*?'

996 The poet is naturally not obliged to provide a name for every angel who is mentioned. He omits the name whenever he is not playing the role of omniscient author, but rather speaking through the mouth of a mortal who does not need to know the name of the angel; thus, in v. 836 Karl tells Naimes only briefly about an *avision d'angele*, and Roland remembers in v. 2319, that God once instructed Charlemagne through *sun angle* to give Durendal to one of his warriors. This allows the poet to postpone the actual naming of the angel, holding the name back so that it can enhance the climax of the Song, which is the death of Roland. The only other mention is in v. 2452, where there is talk of *un angle ki od lui* [scil. Charlemagne] *soelt parler*, which comes very close to naming Gabriel.

997 Brault (1979, 1.257–259). But there is no need to deny that the usual symbolism of this gesture, meaning the return of a fiefdom (here the return of the fiefdom of life that is given by God) is also relevant; the new symbolism of this particular context is built upon the foundation of that other symbolism.

998 According to RAC s. v. *Engel (VIII)* col. 253.

999 This really only impacts fully upon his character in the 16th c. (Réau 1955–1959, 2.53s.; LCI s. v. *Erzengel*).

more than any other has led to the interpretation of the original plural, which is retained by the Septuagint and the Vulgate, as a singular. According to the Hebrew Bible, God stations *kərūbīm* (plural) wielding the 'flaming sword' (singular) outside the entrance to Paradise from which the pair of humans have just been banished. It is difficult to imagine a single sword being wielded by several angels, and so the Christian imagination interpreted the form ending in -*im* specifically in this case as singular, and then this was pronounced as -*in*,[1000] which was passed on into the Romance languages.[1001] Works of art have interpreted the Genesis verse in the singular since at least the 5th c.; for example, the Leonine wall paintings in Rome have a single cherub and this continued to be the norm in iconography.[1002]

We can see that the Roland poet is also thinking of him in this passage if we compare it with the Middle Latin poem about the expedition launched by the Pisans and their allies against Mahdīya in the year 1087 which was written soon after the events described in it.[1003] In this poem, when the Pisans are preparing to start their hostile action, it is said of Jesus Christ: *Cherubin emittit illum cum aperit [h]ostia / qui custodit paradysum discreta custodia*. During these great battles, which take place in the 11th and 12th c. against the 'infidels', a great many Christian warriors fall, and 'Christ opens the gates (*ostia*) of Paradise and sends out the Cherub(in) who can normally be relied upon to guard the entrance' – where else, than to the battlefield, so that he can escort the souls of those who die for their faith with full honours into Paradise? If we suspend for a moment all criticism of the crusades, which were thought to be so

---

1000 In the few cases where final -*m* was not in an unaccented syllable, it became -*n* in VLat. (Ital. *io son[o]*, Fr. *rien*, Span. *quién*, *Adan* etc.). In our case a supporting or legitimising factor may have been the fact that in late biblical Hebrew, the -*in* from Aramaic instead of -*im* was gaining ground. There are many references for the sg. *Cherubin* from the early Christian period onwards (Itala, Tertullian etc.) in the TLL, Onomasticon s. v. *Cherub*. The word *Seraphim* (> -*in*) then followed the same pattern.

1001 It is also in medieval Eng. and Ger. (on the latter cf. Lexer s. v.); even Luther has here "*den Cherubim*" (sg.!), although the modern translations (including the modernised Luther translation) revert back to the plural of the original. The "correct" sg. form *cherub/cheroub* appears sporadically in OF from about 1300 onwards, more frequently in the 16th century, but it was never popular (FEW s. v. *cherub*); in Eng. it is used in Wycliffe's Bible translation and gradually became established (OED s. v. *cherub*). In Ger., too, humanist accuracy prevailed soon after Luther, and the form *Cherub* was used from then onwards; Nikolaus Herman, in his hymn of the year *1560 Lobt Gott, ihr Christen, alle gleich*, wrote the line *Der Cherub steht nicht mehr dafür* 'The cherub no longer stands in front [of the entrance to Paradise]'.

1002 LCI s. v. *Adam und Eva*, col. 65s.; Réau (1955–1959, 2.90).

1003 It was published several times after the du Méril edition (1847). Cf. for example the Scalia edition (1971, the passage that interests us is on p. 603, v. 55ss.).

Christian and yet diverged so far from the Sermon on the Mount, can we not acknowledge that there is a hint of austere beauty in the Cherub's willingness to relinquish his stern role and engage in a brief mission of mercy? The Roland poet evidently recognised this motif and included it in his angel triptych. And because he is a poet, and not his own commentator, he leaves it at that, with no further explanation.

C.1.3.4 Satan

For the sake of completeness: in principle, the fallen angel *par excellence*, Satan, is also one of the angels; he brings (v. 1468) the soul of Malprimis de Brigal into hell: *L'anme de lui en portet Sathanas* (*Satan* nh(L), *Setenal* [probably a disguised form of *Satanel(lo)*] in a rhymed laisse ending in *-al* V4). Jerome retained the Hebr. *śāṭān* 15 times in the Vulgate in the form *Satan* (as in *Iob* 1.6 etc.); but he equally retained σατανᾶς unaltered in the Gk. New Testament (as in the words of Jesus *Mt* 12.26, *Mc* 3.23, 3.26, 4.15, *Lc* 13.16, 22.31) as *Satanas*. The latter form does not come directly from the Hebr., but from the Aram. *status determinatus* ending in *-ā*, which then in Gk. (and Lat.) crept into the declination of names ending in *-ās*. Consequently, we find, judging by Brepols' Library of Latin Texts, that in the Latin Church fathers and in MLat., *Satanas* occurs three times more often than *Satan*; the (historically unjustified) spellings with *-th-* appear occasionally from late antiquity onwards, and then become much more frequent from around 1100.

C.1.4 Saints: the relics in Durendal's hilt

Let us begin with the relics in Durendal's hilt (v. 2345–2348):

> En l'oriét punt asez i ad reliques:
> La dent seint Perre e del sanc seint Basilĭe
> E des chevels mun seignor seint Denise;
> Del vestement i ad seinte Marie.

C.1.4.1 Basil

'Basil' (Lat. *Basilius*) requires some commentary in relation to the stemma: Basilĭe O,[1004] *Blasi* n, *Plasien* K, *Baxillie* V4, *Dionïe* CV7, *Denise* PL, *Denis* T: Here

---

[1004] As is customary in the Latin-speaking area, the poet puts the stress on the first *-i-* (in accordance with the tendency in genuine Lat. of *vocalis ante vocalem corripitur*), and not, as

'Dionysius' in δ (= CV7PLT) simply goes back to the reduction of two verses into one ('a tooth of Saint Peter and the blood of Saint Dionysius'). As far as 'Blaise' (Lat. *Blasius*) is concerned, n and K are the oldest elements in β; but both originate in the Anglo-Norman cultural area (within which they represent a later stage of development than O); therefore, their agreement with the name 'Blaise' against OV4 does not guarantee that they belong in β and certainly not in the archetype. Instead, 'Basil' is confirmed for the archetype through OV4 and the assonance vowel.

This resolves the editorial problem, but not the problem of the meaning, which was first recognised by Jenkins (ad loc). Basil, Bishop of Caesarea is – and Blaise, Bishop and martyr in Sebastea would be – in this list the representative of early *eastern* Christianity (at that time still untouched by any split from Rome!). Basil has always been venerated just as much in the west, as an anti-Arian religious teacher and founder of eastern monasticism. Even Benedict in his Rule (cap. 73) revered him as 'our holy father Basil';[1005] but Basil died of natural causes, and so there can be no blood relic of him. Blaise, on the other hand, according to his *Passi*o (BHL 1370) suffered brutal martyrdom being torn by iron combs, an event which, as Jenkins notes, afforded devout women an opportunity to collect drops of his blood. A relic of his blood would therefore be in keeping with his history. Jenkins also cites a reference from the First Crusade which shows the two saints being confused; the poet may well also have accidentally allowed his image of Basil to be tainted by elements of his image of Blaise.

It is likely that δ noticed this mistake and therefore eliminated 'Basil' by combining two verses into one; the tradition behind K and n probably also noticed this. Blaise has been the family saint of the Guelphs from a time that cannot be exactly dated, and certainly by the lifetime of Henry the Lion at the latest, who commissioned the work of K and at the same time (1173) built the Cathedral of Saint Blaise in Brunswick (replacing an older collegiate church). It stands to reason, then, that K, who was not constrained by any assonance

---

purists today will insist, on the second one, with regular retention of the quantity instead of the accented syllable (*Basilīus* < Βασίλειος).

1005 We might also think of e.g. Bishop Adalberon-Ascelin of Laon who in his *Carmen ad Rotbertum regem* (PL 141.785, v. 409) bemoans the fact that in the realm of the king who supported the Cluniac monastic movement, 'Basil and Benedict' held sway. In southern Italy and Sicily, Basilian monasticism had the firm support of the Norman and Hohenstaufen rulers and was even tolerated by the Pope until it came under Papal control around 1220 and then gradually declined; cf. e.g. Schwaiger (1993 s. v. *Basilianer*), Jedin (1970, map p. 45). It is possible that the Roland poet was prompted to think of Basil thanks to his connections with Southern Italian Normans, without knowing much about his life.

rules, resolved the discrepancy in favour of Blaise. Moreover, because Henry spent time in exile at the English court (in 1182–1185, and again in 1189) it is possible that the previous stage before n also came under the influence of this culture.

C.1.4.2 Dionysius

The second representative of early Christianity is *seint Denise*, Dionysius. It is well known that in early 9th century France, this name was used to refer to three individuals whose identities then merged into one: the student of Paul, Dionysius the Areopagite (*Act Ap* 17.34), the Parisian martyr Dionysius (probably 3rd c.) and the author of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite writings (probably early 6th c.). This then led to the impression that Dionysius was the apostle of the whole of France. Because people celebrated not only the anniversary of a martyr's death, and his or her *dies natalis* 'birthday', but also the place where the martyrdom occurred, he appears in our list to represent the earliest stage of *western* Christianity; and because he was thought to be a student of Paul, this also brings us back in time to the era of the apostles.

From the early 9th c. onwards, Dionysius is especially remembered as a 'cephalophore' who after his beheading carried his own head for almost two miles; it is therefore probably no coincidence that Durendal contains a part of his head, namely some of his hair, as a relic. It is interesting that the title *mun seignur* is used in his case, as compared with the plain *seint Perre* and even *li ber <sainz> Gilĭe* (v. 2096), *seint Sevrin le baron* (v. 3685) and *del baron seint Silvestre* (v. 3746), where *ber / baron* is an honorific title and not a feudal one. This seems on the face of it to be a clear pro-Saint-Denis and pro-monastic element in the Song. We should also remember, however, that large amounts of property and land in Normandy and in England were managed by Saint-Denis[1006] and that all Normans and Anglo-Normans were called *Franci*, even by William the Conqueror and his successors (as opposed to *Angli*),[1007] and so they were entitled to see themselves as belonging to the nation that was Christianised through the missionary work of Saint Dionysius. Furthermore, any such apparently pro-monastic element must be weighed against e.g. Turpin's sarcastic, anti-monastic affirmation (v. 1880s.), that a bad knight *ne valt .IIII. deners, / Einz deit monĭe estre en un de cez mustiers* – just as the hope of Margariz de Sibilĭe (v. 972s.), that his side will have conquered

---

1006 The property associated with this saint was even more extensive in the Church than in the monasteries: in England there were about fifty Dionysius parishes (LM s. v. *Dionysius*, II, B).
1007 Cf. Douglas (1960, 110): "The normal address of the Conqueror's charters is in fact *omnibus fidelibus suis Francis et Anglis*."

France within a year and be able to camp in the *burc de seint Denise*, must be weighed against the fact that both Blancandrin (v. 36, 52, 135) and Baligant (v. 2667) regard Aachen, and not Paris, as the centre of Charlemagne's kingdom, and in the Song, Aachen is mentioned nineteen times, Laon twice (including once as a Palatinate belonging to Charlemagne), while Paris is not mentioned at all. – The name's semi-erudite variant *Denise* is very common in OF literature (Moisan, Flutre s. v.) and is not even confined to the Saint; there is, for example, Rutebeuf's *Dit de frère Denise*, where admittedly the author plays on the ambivalent gender of the name.

C.1.4.3 Peter

After the representatives of the eastern and then western parts of Christendom, we come to *Seint Perre* who is a direct disciple of Jesus, and *primus inter pares*. It was once again Jenkins who (ad loc.) noted that the Norman Abbey of Le Bec, according to its list of relics dating from 1134, owned *de s. Petro apostolo unus dens*, that is to say *la dent seint Perre*. This in itself could count as an (admittedly weak) Normanism in the Song.

C.1.4.4 Mary

Finally, we come to Mary, who brings us as close to Christ as it is possible to be in the human sphere. The *vestement seinte Marie* was a very famous relic in medieval western Europe. As G. Paris (1880, 36) explained, according to the *Descriptio* (p. 117 and 120 ed. Rauschen) and the *Pèlerinage*, Charlemagne brings back from his pilgrimage, among other items, the *camisia* or *interula* of Mary. This fits with the fact that in Aachen, the "robe of Mary" was displayed as one of the its four holiest objects (LM s. v. *Aachenfahrt*); but other places claimed to have it or parts of it as well: Compiègne, Laon, above all Chartres (Favati 1963, 120), Prüm[1008] and again, Le Bec (Jenkins ad loc.), but not Saint-Denis. In Le Bec and in Prüm it was described, as in the Song, as *de vestimento sanctae Mariae*.

[1008] Emperor Lothar's diploma for Prüm from the year 852 (no. 121, p. 281, line 11s., ed. Th. Schieffer).

C.1.5 Review of the relics in Durendal's hilt

The account of the relics is thus well structured, both in its material variation, that is to say each item *dent*, *chevels*, *vestiment* and (incorrectly remembered) *sanc*, is specific to one person, and in the way it refers to each person, that is to say they are listed in increasing proximity to Christ, with a representative from early eastern and early western Christianity, traced back to the period immediately after the apostolic era, and framed by the two great pillars of the Christian faith: the leading apostle Peter, and the mother of Jesus. If we look at them all collected together, it is obvious that something has been left out deliberately: a relic of the Lord. This is reserved for Charlemagne's sword Joiuse.

C.1.6 Other mentions of saints

C.1.6.1 Mary

In addition to the reference to the relics of Mary (cf. section C.1.4.4 above) Mary's name appears three times. The appeal to her at a moment of dire emergency (v. 2303) needs no explanation. Use of the term 'God' (and not 'Jesus' or 'Christ'!) as *le filz seinte Marie* (v. [1634]=1473, 2938) is theologically correct at least from the time of the Council of Ephesus (a. 431) which formally preconised Mary with the designation 'God-bearer' (Θεότοκος). This formula also occurs frequently in other epics.

C.1.6.2 Lazarus and figures from the Old Testament

This section examines the figures used as examples in the two great prayers (v. 2384ss., 3100ss.), (cf. C.1.1.2 above).

In keeping with Roland's particular situation, his prayer only names two examples, both referring to one individual: the "resurrection of Lazarus" (*Ioh* 11) and "Daniel in the lions' den" (*Dan* 6). For Charlemagne, however, the whole of his kingdom, and with it Christianity itself, is at stake; thus his more expansive prayer includes not only "Jonah and the whale" (*Ion* 2) and "Daniel in the lions' den" but also two more highly specific examples: the solidarity of "the three youths in the fiery furnace" (*Dan* 3) and "the salvation of the king – and implicitly also the people – of Nineveh" (*Ion* 3).

As Frappier 1965, 135 argued, and others later, it is obvious that Charlemagne's prayer is modelled on that of Roland, and as Valenti (2015, 245–247) notes, the connection between the two is profound and intended to be picked up by the audience: Charlemagne will also have to face mortal danger before

God grants his heart's desire, the real purpose of his prayer: *Que mun nevold pois‹se› venger, Rollant!* (v. 3109). So, Roland's death is the theme of the first prayer, and retribution for this death is the theme of the second – we might say: much like the two pictures in a diptych.

The variants in the two prayers in the later Roland mss. have been intensively researched; it is sufficient to cite here Caluwé 1981 (with the older lit.) and with particular reference to K also Buschinger 1981.

It has long been known in principle that both prayers draw upon elements of the medieval liturgy for the dead and dying, more precisely from the *Commendatio animae* (there is a reference to this in Tavernier 1914–1917, 414 n. 1, and especially from the litany-like *Libera, Domine, animam servi tui X sicut liberasti Y* (where Y stands for a person or a group of people in the Bible); the priest spoke these words on behalf of the dying person (and it was not the dying person who spoke, as suggested by Valenti 2015, 237s., following Ariès).

But nowadays we can better understand the origin, structure and further dissemination of the *Libera* and the variation in space and time of its *Y* thanks to the comprehensive and precise information provided by Sicard (1978, 366–372), and Vogel/Elze (1963–1972, 2.277). This research clearly demonstrates that the invocation of Daniel, the three youths and Jonah in fact come from the *Libera*. On the other hand, the "resurrection of Lazarus" is very thinly attested in the *Libera*, where it does occur in the German-Roman Liturgy of the 10th c. (Vogel/Elze etc.). It found its definitive place in the prayer vigil that followed a death, and to be precise, in the responsory: *Qui Lazarum resuscitasti a monumento fetidum, Tu ei* [scil. the person who has just died], *domine, dona requiem et locum indulgentiae. ʀ′. Requiem aeternam dona ei, domine, et lux perpetua luceat ei*, sometimes with the order of the two parts reversed. Sicard (1978, 170s. [no. 21], 172 [no. 24], cf. 73 with n. 67) provides a long list of references; Martène published an example from Salzburg dating from around 1100 (1702, 613s., cited in Gicquel 2003, 228). Martène (1702, 653) also demonstrated that the tradition was no different in Normandy: the ms. of the *Commendatio animae* from Saint-Georges-de-Boscherville just to the west of Rouen has (like many liturgical mss.) only the opening words of the individual prayers; thus, at the expected time (which is after the body has been taken into the church) it states briefly, but unambiguously: *Suscipe, domine, animam servi tui, &c. ʀ′. Qui Lazarum. Requiem.*

Finally, the only reference to the "salvation of the Ninevites" that I am aware of in connection with the funeral liturgy is from the *Ordo* of the last confession and the anointing of the dying in the 10th c. Germano-Roman liturgy in Vogel/Elze (1963–1972, 2.273, here no. CXLIV). In this case, another explanation is more likely: when the poet was thinking about Jonah in the whale (*Ion* 2, v. 3101s.) he

may have simply remembered how Jonah went on to preach a sermon of repentance to the Ninevites (*Ion* 3, v. 3103).

In summary, then: four of the five examples are drawn from the liturgy for the dead and dying (three of them from the *Libera*), and the fifth comes from an association within the book of Jonah.

The form *Lazaron* is of course not an augmentative, but a phonic spelling of the Lat. acc. *Lazarum* based on the pronunciation of the time.[1009]

The poet gives the title of Saint to Lazarus, but not to figures from the Old Testament. For the latter, there was no fixed usage in the medieval language, though they were included in the calendar of saints (Daniel 21st July., Jonah 21st/22nd September, three youths 17th December).

On the *temple Salomon* (v. [1524]=1567) cf. above A.5.6 with n. 459.

C.1.6.3 Sylvester

At Ganelon's trial (v. 3745s.) we are told: *Halz est li jurz, mult par est gran[t] la feste, / Dïent alquanz del baron seint Silvestre.*

We should imagine time passing in the Rol. in an entirely realistic way. Based on the assumption that Marsilĭe would be subjugated in an amicable way, Charlemagne originally planned to be back in Aachen by Michaelmas, on the 29th of September, or probably just a few days before; if he had thought he could be there much earlier than that, Marsilĭe could not have made a convincing case for postponing his baptism until this date. But as it turned out, Charlemagne was held up because he had to go back to Roncevaux, mourn the dead, and bury most of them where they fell. He was detained even further by the battle with Baligant, the conquest of Saragossa, the baptism of the survivors there, and the safeguarding of the city. If we estimate that this all took two weeks, then Charlemagne could not have got back to Aachen until the middle of October. Once he had arrived, and not before, he would send for the judges who would preside over Ganelon's trial, including some from Brittany (v. 3699–3704). The shortest route from Aachen to Brittany is about 800 km long; the messengers' journey to Brittany, preparations for the journey back to Aachen (the party would have to gather provisions first), and the journey itself, again 800 km, would have taken at least two months. The middle of December, therefore, would have been the earliest possible date for the trial in Aachen. In the Carolingian period, the administrative sessions held to deliberate the most important matters of state took place around Christmas and Easter, as we can easily see in the Royal Annals, and by the year 1100 not much had changed in this respect. Fleckenstein (1966, 29), for

---

1009 Cf. above regarding *Tervagan* (A.13.2.2), especially n. 885.

example, describes the importance of the winter *palatium* from the year 778 on-wards for dealing with major issues affecting the state, especially those held at major festival periods; in 778/779, according to the Royal Annals, the historical Charlemagne celebrated Christmas in Herstal, 35 km as the crow flies from Aachen, which at that time was still being built. The Christmas period, the Dodecahemeron 'twelve days', ran between the two great festivals of Christ's birth and Epiphany, that is to say from the 24th/25th December until the 6th of January. These two feast days, as well as the eighth day of Christmas, January 1st which in those days was the festival of the circumcision of Christ, would have been out of the question as dates for the trial, because they were all happy occasions celebrating the Lord; Em-peror Theodosius had previously prohibited the holding of trials on these days across the whole of Christendom, and it seems that this instruction was followed to the letter in the Middle Ages. On the other hand, there was a tendency to elevate the religious significance of the court in a few very rare, and highly political cases by holding it on a religious holiday, although this generally meant one of the second-level holidays (Schaller 1974, 10s.).

One remaining day in the Dodecahemeron stands out, and that is the festi-val of Saint Sylvester, the Pope in the time of Constantine: his feast day celebra-tes the *public triumph* of truth, the widespread recognition of the truth of the faith of countless *martyrs* who have gone before. According to the legend that had formed around this feast in the 5th century (*Actūs beati Silvestri*, third and largest part, making up about two thirds of the whole *Actūs*), Sylvester had to defeat some rabbis in a *verbal debate*, but at the last moment it seemed doubt-ful that he would win: he defeats eleven of them, but the twelfth adds a new dimension to the debate by killing a bull using nothing more than magical charm formulae; however it is Sylvester, and not the rabbi, who brings the bull back to life. Then Sylvester defeats pagan priests, once again while in *mortal danger*: he goes down into the den of a dragon who has been killing people with his *miasma* and binds up the dragon's mouth. The parallels with the narra-tive in the Song are obvious: here too, there is a *public triumph* of the truth, that is to say the truth of those who have become *martyrs* because of Ganelon's crime; this truth must be defeated by Tierri, first in a *verbal debate* with Pina-bel, and then in *mortal danger*, which at the same time is a victory over the hitherto prevailing *miasma* of lies and cowardice.

Sylvester was venerated with special enthusiasm in the Papal States as a result of the Donation of Constantine (LCI s. v. *Silvester*). Because the southern Italian Normans had fared very well as allies of the Pope from 1059 onwards, it

may be that their point of view is being reflected here.[1010] Admittedly v. 3746 with the mention of Sylvester is only in O, and not in the β mss.; but all the editors retain it. I agree with their decision, because the mention is exceptionally well anchored within the chronological train of events in the narrative; furthermore, the *précellence* of O is largely based on the fact that the ms. is (almost) free of added material. The sub-archetype of all β mss. may simply have suppressed the verse, because it appeared to be the opinion of 'a few' and therefore not worth passing on.

C.1.6.4 Aegidius

One passage has been the subject of especially heated debate (v. 2095–2098):

> Ço dit la Geste e cil ki el camp fut;
> Li ber <sainz> Gilĭe, por qui Deus fait vertuz,
> E<n> fist la chartre el muster de Loüm.
> Ki tant ne set, ne l'ad prod entendut.

The form of the name is more precisely *Gilĭe* O, *Egidie* K, *Guielmo* V4, *Gilies* P, *Jelijs* h(L): In the Gallo-Romance area, the very popular saint's name *Aegidius* underwent aphaeresis, and then (probably when *-dĭ-* > *-ĭ-* seemed likely to happen) an unusual substitution *-dĭ-* > *-lĭ-*, probably intended as an attempt to retain the name. The Dutch form of the name goes back to the French. V4 (with what was by then Old North Ital. *-lĭ-* > *-ĭ-*, which then disappeared next to *-i-*) misunderstood the name as that of Saint William, which would be acceptable in terms of the meaning, but cannot be put into the archetype because it does not agree with the other mss.

I must also record here my objection to the emendation, made by Gautier and generally followed ever since, of the *e* 'and' to *en* 'of it, about it' in O 2097 (the form following P and T), because this changes the syntax and therefore also the meaning. This would only be justified if there was something wrong with the reading in O either linguistically or in terms of the meaning; this is not the case. Segre lists three supposed reasons for the emendation: [1] "La possibilità di considerare *E* come forma anglo-normanna di *en*", [2] "la presenza di *en* in δ", [3] "la

---

1010 Hans-Erich Keller, however, (1989, 136) is convinced that "[l]e vers 3746 de la version d'Oxford de la Chanson de Roland [i.e. the mention of Sylvester, G.A.B.] illustre pleinement l'attitude de Saint-Denis". I do not accept his extended but very non-specific argument, which seems to be based on the basic assumption (incorrect, in my opinion) that the interests of Saint-Denis and the Papacy were identical, and I do not see any connection with our particular context.

necessità sintattica"; these three "impediscono di accettare l'interpretazione di *E* come congiunzione [. . .]", an 'interpretazione' which in my opinion was quite correctly defended by, among others, Gaston Paris (1881, LXXVIII–LXXXII) and Rita Lejeune (1961, 349–352). On [1]: a frequent or even complete mixing of *e* and *en* would give rise to considerable confusion in any French text, including any Anglo-Norman one; its very existence must be doubted. If there should be a few isolated cases in Anglo-Norman (e.g. by a scribe forgetting to write the nasal tilde), this tells us nothing about O; we would have to find evidence of this in O itself. However, in O the conjunction *e* 'and' occurs more than 1000 times, and the pronominal particle *en* 'of/about it' well over 300 times, without there ever being any confusion; this is very strong statistical evidence. On [2]: a reading in δ means little compared to a reading in O. On [3]: O produces, as Gaston Paris recognised, a syntactically perfect text: 'The *Geste* tells us this, and [also] a man who was on the battlefield [namely] Saint Aegidius, for whose sake God [frequently] enacts miracles and [especially once] produced the charter in the monastery of Laon. Anyone who does not [even] know this much, has not understood what happened.'

What meaning, then, are these verses intended to convey? That Turpin, already pierced by four spears, had given up the struggle and was preparing himself in prayer for death, possibly even being overtaken by repentance because he was a priest and yet had killed other people? It means quite the opposite: as soon as he knew that his death was imminent, and regardless of state of his own body, he was like a wounded lion, and set about causing a bloodbath and slaughtering as many of the enemy as he possibly could. There was no way for him to leave the scene of this massacre because he was badly wounded and had lost his horse; even when he tries to fetch some water for Roland, who is unconscious, he does not manage to cross the distance of *un sul arpent* (v. 2230). Roland, on the other hand, will drag himself away from Turpin's body *[plus qu']* *arbaleste ne poet traire un quarrel* and up to the top of a hill (v. 2265–2267). This is why Charlemagne finds Turpin's (but not Roland's) body close to the massacred enemies, and even before there is any talk of Aegidius, Charlemagne recognises that they have been killed by Turpin (v. 2091s.): *Puis le dist Carles qu'il n'en esparignat nul, / Tels .IIII. cenz i troevet entur lui [. . .].* Only then do we learn that Aegidius, *ki el camp fut*, records 'this very thing' (*ço*, v. 2095); he therefore witnesses more or less what Charlemagne has already witnessed, that is to say the large number of warriors who had been cut down before the badly wounded Turpin finally died.

The word *camp* 'battlefield' means not just 'field where a battle is *currently* being fought', but also a 'field where [at some point, e.g. shortly beforehand] a particular battle took place', which is what it clearly means in v. 2939 and 2947.

Ki el camp fut therefore does not have to mean (as the Stricker believed), that Aegidius was in some state of trance and able to witness the battle itself, but it can simply mean that he inspected the battlefield along with Charlemagne.

But why is he in Charlemagne's entourage at this moment? In my opinion, previous answers to this question have been very vague; it is possible, however, to be more precise. The most important element in the Aegidius legend – especially the *Vita Aegidii* (*Acta Sanctorum* for 1.9.), which was probably written in the 10th c. (Jones 1914, 31ss.), certainly was used by Fulbert of Chartres († 1028/1029) and is preserved in mss. from the 11th c. (G. Paris 1881, XXXVI, XLVII) – is the well-known miracle that God performed for Charlemagne at the request of Aegidius (*Vita* cap. 3, 20–22): Aegidius, summoned by 'King Charles',[1011] leaves his monastery near Arles and makes his way to the King via Orléans, where he performs a miracle *en passant*. After long and edifying conversations, the King only dares to ask Aegidius to intercede on his behalf with God because he has once committed a *turpe facinus* which he has never confessed, and which he also cannot reveal to Aegidius.[1012] When Aegidius celebrates the Mass on the

---

1011 The general understanding of the legend is that this is Charles the Great, i.e. Charlemagne. The fact that the authors of the *Acta Sanctorum* assume from certain chronological details (and despite the inappropriate title 'King') that Charles Martel is the person who was originally meant, does not have any bearing on our context.

1012 The work of Lejeune (1961, passim) is required reading for the incest motif that is attached to this story, including especially the motif's development in OF literature; on the Latin versions cf. de Gaiffier (1955, passim). Some discussion of the *Vita Aegidii* is also relevant here, however. First, (according to Speyer 1970, 23–41, and the handbooks): the 'letter from heaven' genre originated in the written culture of the ancient Orient and travelled from there into classical antiquity; in Christendom, it appears towards the end of the 6th c. in Carthage in the form of a letter warning that the end of the world will come if people continue to desecrate Sundays (PL 72.699). In Galloromania in the year 745, we find the first case of a clumsily egotistical forgery, which was disseminated by a wandering priest Aldebertus, *natione Gallus*, in opposition to Boniface (MGH *Ep*.mer.&kar. 1.320); in the year 789 Charlemagne also had to issue a warning across the whole of his realm about one of these letters from the preceding year (MGH Capit.r.F. 1.60). It seems that the first time a letter from heaven was used to further the interests of a monastery, in this case Saint-Hubert-en-Ardenne, was recorded in the *Vita Beregisi* for the year 937 (BHL 1180, AA.SS. regarding the 2nd October); this is also the first case of a prince or princess being involved in the forgery: Plektrud, wife of Pippin the Middle is said to have found the letter. The author of the *Vita Aegidii* falls into this tradition; the fact that he is able to use the figure of Charlemagne to elevate the status of Aegidius presupposes that a generally positive image of Charlemagne prevailed in his environment, probably sustained by legends. Secondly: Einhart's enumeration of Charlemagne's illegitimate children (*Vita Karoli* 18 and 20) may well indicate that Charlemagne's reputation, even among his contemporaries, was one of sexual excess (albeit of a normal type). This provides more than sufficient explanation for the reasons behind the monk Wetti's vision: ten years after the death of Charlemagne,

following Sunday and intercedes for Charlemagne in the Eucharistic Prayer, an angel places a charter on the altar, which names the sin but at the same time announces that following the intercession by Aegidius, the King is forgiven, as

---

Wetti saw him in purgatory suffering painful harm to his genitals (MGH PLAeC. 2.266–277, 301–333, especially 271 and 318s.). This is the revenge fantasy of someone who not only saw sexual intercourse purely in the Augustinian sense as a mediator of original sin but had also abstained from it himself. The *Vita Karoli* and *Visio Wettini* were widely read; they must also have contributed to a memorable and mildly scandalous *On-dit* circulating orally and suggesting that 'Charlemagne was an *homme à femmes*'. This means that the author of the *Vita Aegidii* could be quite confident that his audience would have interpreted the purportedly unnamable *turpe facinus* as a sexual sin. But neither he nor his audience would have wanted this to remain unexplained; such a vacuum would have gone against human nature. But what was the sin? Adultery was too common to be something that could not be confessed. Homosexuality does not fit with Charlemagne's general reputation – thus incest was the most obvious remaining sin; one would only need to interpret *in malam partem* Einhart's statement (*Vita Karoli* 18), that Charlemagne *magna coluit pietate* 'cherished great affection' for his sister. (The only other explanation of Charlemagne's sin is that it was necrophilia instead of incest, but this is late, and confined to Germany; cf. Paris 1865a, 382–385, and 1881, p. LXXXIVs.) The incest interpretation of the Aegidius episode therefore appears to be the original one; it took the form of a rumour accompanying the work at first and was not discussed openly until a later date (cf. Lejeune 1961, passim). Furthermore, at least seventy years after the *Vita Aegidii*, the relationship between Alfons VI of León-Castile and his sister Urraca may very well have helped to reinforce this impression. Two questions are more important: whether the Roland poet thinks that a) Roland was incestuously conceived, and b) his death is therefore God's way of punishing Charlemagne. Since the poet puts the letter from heaven to Aegidius in a positive light, he believes it is genuine. If he thought the *On-dit* rumour associated with it was defamatory, we would expect him to counter it with a brief mention of Roland's real father (like the mention of Olivier's father); it could have been quite naturally introduced e.g. to the beginning of the dying Roland's monologue looking back over his career. The complete absence of any such remark in an epic of 4000 verses that mentions his stepfather, half-brother, mother and uncle provides food for thought. Even if the poet regarded the *On-dit* as true or likely to be true, as Lejeune (1961, 361ss.) argues, it does not necessarily follow that he regards Roland's death as God's way of punishing Charlemagne. After all, the Aegidius story also insists that the letter includes God's assurance that he has forgiven Charlemagne. This means, in effect: *Deus locutus, causa finita*; in the Middle Ages, if God has already forgiven someone, there is no conscience or similar 'ethical' authority that could mete out any further punishments. And above all, if the poet was thinking of such a divine punishment, would we not expect that after Roland's death Charlemagne would utter a dark, but nevertheless unequivocal confession of his guilt? Charlemagne addresses the dead Roland in verse 2900 *Cum en Espaigne venis [a]mal seignur!* (Hilka/Pfister) – but *Cum en Espaigne venis ma[re], seignur!* (Segre) or *Enz in Spagna vegnis a mal, signor* (V4 with Segre's punctuation) – but this is not such a confession, even in Hilka/Pfister's interpretation, because it only says that Charlemagne has been a 'bad liege lord' because of his decision in Spain regarding the rear guard. – On Roncaglia (1984) cf. n. 1707 below!

long as he is repentant and avoids falling back into the same sin again. This endears him to the King so much, that it takes a very long time for him to obtain permission to return to his monastery.

The location of the miracle is not given in the *Vita*; it is evident from the context, however, that it must have been a royal palatinate some considerable distance north of Orléans. Because Laon was the last bastion of the Carolingians in the 10th c., this city appears frequently in epics, as indeed it does in the Rol. v. 2910, as an important palatinate even in the time of Charlemagne. Why then should it not be Leon here? The word *m(o)ust(i)er* in OF can also mean 'église en général' and *el muster de Loüm* does not need to refer to *la chartre* itself but can refer to the whole sentence: this is where the charter from heaven appeared (and it does not have to be still on show there; after all, Charlemagne's sin is not supposed to be public knowledge). Furthermore, anyone who knew the gist of the *Vita*, but could not remember its content *verbatim*, could easily assume that Aegidius was Charlemagne's confessor. A king would naturally take his confessor with him into the battlefield. Aegidius could therefore – in the mind of the Roland poet – also be present in this scene, which later 'the *Geste* and he' reported. This formulation possibly does not mean that Aegidius wrote his own report, but only that the *Geste* referred to him as an eyewitness. I will show in C.3.1 why I think the *Geste* itself is an invention on the part of the poet,[1013] and so the idea of a report written by Aegidius must also be an invention, if indeed this is what is meant.

This is all we have to say about O. When δ in v. 2097 replaced *e* with *en* the syntax and also the meaning were changed considerably: it is said that God performed miracles for Aegidius; on the other hand, Aegidius now is definitively put forward as the author of a charter, at the very least concerning the finding of Turpin, and perhaps even about the whole Roncevaux incident.

No matter whether the original version is retained by O or by δ, the question remains: why precisely Aegidius? And why precisely now? If Charlemagne himself sees what needs to be seen, and says what needs to be said, why do we need another witness?

In the English-Norman realm of William the Conqueror and William Rufus, warrior prelates such as Odo of Bayeux or Turold of Peterborough could still do very well. It would be difficult to identify similar characters by name in continental France of the same period. The Gregorian reform's prohibition against clerics killing people seems to have been taken more seriously on the continent. But even the strictest interpretation of the Gregorian rules never prohibited clerics

---

1013 Cf. section C.3.1 '*La Geste, Geste Francor*' below.

from preparing for, otherwise participating in, or even leading what was considered to be a just war: bishop Ademar of Le Puy was appointed by Urban II as the leader of the First Crusade. There was, however, a very clear limitation when it came to the physical bearing of arms: when Ademar took part in the Battle of Antioch, the battle for the faith *par excellence* in a specific situation that can be categorised as purely defensive, he carried only the Holy Lance. The onomastic evidence[1014] and the *Nota Emilianense* show that Turpin is part of an early stage of the OF epic, and in the *Nota* he is one of the twelve peers which makes him almost certainly a warrior, as he is in the Rol. The poet of the Rol. in its surviving form was obviously very keen to continue this line of tradition, and indeed to take it to its apogee; when Turpin dies, he sums up as follows (v. 2242s.): *Par granz batailles e par mult bels sermons / Cuntre paiens fut tuz tens campiuns* – the battles are mentioned first, and even the sermons are concerned less about the gospels than about the war against the 'heathens'. In continental France, and from a very early period onwards, there was some resistance to the fact that the epic genre effectively promoted such a concept of the office of archbishop: there were for example some angry sermons which lambasted the poetic 'lie' of the 'jongleurs', and some protesting voices from the archbishopric of Reims, where people knew that Tilpinus had survived the events of 778 and died a natural death, and there were even competing stories which made Turpin out to be a non-combatant – all of this must have been a source of annoyance for the poet. The pseudo-Turpin must have annoyed him even more. Turpin does admit in a half-sentence in cap. 11 that he not only preached in Spain and absolved people from their sins, but also fought personally against the Saracens; but this is only a minor concession on the part of the author, who harmonises opposing views more than once, keeping Turpin out of the Battle of Roncevaux and turning him instead into its historian. If the Roland poet already knew the PT – and because of the uncertainty in modern scholarship about the dating of the two works, we cannot rule this out – the depiction of Turpin in that text must have been a red flag to him. But even if it was only these other voices who opposed the image of a killer archbishop, the Roland poet only needed to counter their moral objections by providing an eyewitness of his own who enjoyed the highest moral stature, ideally a well-known saint who was alive at the time of Charlemagne and part of his entourage; the only suitable candidate for this would be Aegidius. And in fact, his need of this eyewitness was most acute when he was describing Turpin's violent death. His emphasis is important: *por qui Deus fait vertuz* is literally the definition of saintliness – if there are no miracles performed by God 'for'

1014 Cf. section C.11 below.

a saint, then he or she is not a saint; the mention of the miracle illustrates Aegidius' high status among the saints – there is no other example across the whole of Catholic Christianity in this period of forgiveness without confession – and reminds us also that Aegidius is already anchored in Charlemagne's entourage so that his appearance is nothing out of the ordinary.

C.1.6.5 The innocent children

Turpin promises the warriors who are doomed to die at Roncevaux (v. [1479s.]= 1522s.): *Seint pareïs vos est abandunant: / As Innocenz vos en serez seant*. The infants murdered by Herod (*Mt* 2.16–18, venerated in the Church as saints on the 29th of December) are the clearest example of innocent martyrs. Turpin had previously in v. 1132–1142, pre-emptively at this point in case they are killed, absolved them of their sins in the Sacrament of (in this case collective) Confession, Repentance and Reconciliation, as was usual in the Middle Ages before battles, but he now gives them more concrete assurance in view of the fact that they are all certainly about to die: the promise of Paradise is as certain for martyrs who are absolved of their sins as it was for the innocent children.

C.1.6.6 Severin of Bordeaux and Romanus of Blaye

The saints examined above are all included in the Song because of their fervent and very widespread veneration. This is not the case when it comes to the next two saints: Severinus (*seint Sevrin* Segre 3685 for metrical reasons,[1015] *seint Severin* O) was from 410–420 Bishop of Bordeaux, while Romanus (*seint Romain* O 3693) was a student of Martin of Tours who died in 397 and was a missionary in the region around Blaye; both died of natural causes and their veneration was strictly confined to their local region (LCI, s. v. each name). Their presence in the Song is due to this geographical situation: both were final resting places, the Collegiate Church of Saint-Seurin de Bordeaux built at the end of the 5th c. and the probably somewhat older Church of Saint-Romain de Blaye (from around 800 a canons regular monastery; Lat. *Blavia* > OF *Blaive*, as in O 3689 and 3938) they were situated on either side of the Gironde at the point where the road crossed the river. This road was there in Roman times, if not before, and is described by Jullian (1896, 162) as "l'une des cinq ou six artères vitales de l'ancienne France" and long before the year 1100 it became the *via Turonensis*, the pilgrimage route from Britain, Scandinavia, northern Germany, the

---

1015 This could also be read in Occitan fashion as *Seurin*, which is the form that was commonly used for his church.

Netherlands and the Paris Basin to Compostela, via Tours; thus the *Pilgrims' Guide* in the *Codex Calixtinus* (cap. 8) also recommends a visit to the graves of both saints. This road was therefore the first and most important aspect of their location, but the two religious buildings each had something special to offer as well.

Saint-Seurin had a cemetery more famous in Gaul than any other except Arles. According to the PT (cap. 28–29) this is where the *pugnatores* who came from the southwest and were killed at Roncevaux are buried;[1016] moreover, Roland's Olifant was inappropriately (*indigne*) transferred to this place from Blaye. According to the Rol. (v. 3685), however, Charlemagne himself donated Olifant to this place. It appears that an oliphant purporting to be the one belonging to Roland was indeed displayed there[1017] (and the PT takes up the complaints of the monks of Blaye in this matter). Even if, according to the Song, Charlemagne travelled back to from Saragossa to France via Narbonne,[1018] he must have taken the old Roman road from Narbonne to Bordeaux, and this is where he would have re-joined the pilgrimage route heading north. The Song lists the stages of Charlemagne's journey as Blaye (v. 3689), then Laon, and finally Aachen (both references in anticipation of the trip, in v. 2910 and 2917).

Blaye originally belonged to the Bordelais region. But when this passed to Gascony through inheritance, William IV Taillefer, Count of Angoulême, annexed the part north of the Gironde which included Blaye. Although Bordeaux was part of Gascony from about 980 until just after 1032, this was a Gascony that was part of the *regnum Francie* in name only and in actual fact was full of resentment against France, and so Blaye was treated as one of France's border towns. Jullian (1896, 168s.) realised that at that time, and only at that time, it would have been the first place on Charlemagne's way back from Spain where he could fulfil his sworn duty to bury the bodies of his own liege men in a place that was not considered to be foreign ground.[1019] Blaye's claim to be the place where Roland's body was laid to rest is therefore probably one of the earliest pieces of evidence pointing to the Roland material. The first mention of Roland's grave in a non-literary text is by Hugo of Fleury (probably in 1110, and certainly before 1122,

---

[1016] The PT distributes the fallen of Roncevaux, as we might expect, following a very simple geographical principle, even though it remains implicit in the text: those whose homeland is so far away that transportation of the bodies is impractical before decomposition sets in are laid to rest in in Belin; those from (Greater) Burgundy and the surrounding area are buried in Arles, those from the south west are buried in Bordeaux; more detailed information in Beckmann (2011, passim).

[1017] Cf. on oliphants in general, and on Roland's in particular, section B.1.4 above.

[1018] There is detailed discussion of this problem above in A.12.6.7.

[1019] For more detail on this point cf. Beckmann (2011, 45s.).

MGH SS. 9.361); he takes his description of the battle of 778 from Einhart, but after naming the three fallen warriors Eggihard, Anselm and Roland, he adds the following sentence: *Ex quibus Rollandus Blavia castello deportatus est ac sepultus.* The PT likewise only records that the grave of Roland is in Blaye; evidently, he asserts his own authority to count Olivier among those buried in Belin and says that Turpin (in "Calixt's" epilogue) dies in Vienne after he has completed his report. According to the Rol. (v. 3689–3693) however, Roland, Olivier and Turpin are laid to rest in white marble coffins in Blaye. The poet would hardly have dared to say this unless the three coffins were on display at that time, and in fact they did remain there until the 16th c.[1020] This discrepancy between the PT and the Rol. is another disquieting detail which makes us wonder whether perhaps the PT represents the older stage of the tradition.

C.1.6.7 Peter – and the French Royal Banner

The verse *Plus valt Mahum que seint Perre de Rume* (O 921, *Peter* n, *Per* V4, *Pierre* C, *Peres* V7) has already been discussed in the section on 'Mohammed' (A.13.2.1) above.

Blancandrin also knows this about Charlemagne (v. 372s.): *Vers Engletere passat il la mer salse, / Ad oes seint Perre en cunquist le chevage.* The conquest of England by Charlemagne is mentioned here in n and K also, which means that at least v. 372 belongs in the archetype; v. 373 is present only in O but it demonstrates some awareness of history (carried over into the 11th c.). William the Conqueror had requested the support of Alexander II for his mission in 1066, and he received a *vexillum sancti Petri* under conditions that we can only reconstruct with some difficulty out of the dealings that William had with Gregory VII in around 1080. At that point, Gregory demanded that William should, as he had promised, arrange for England to pay Peter's Pence and pay homage to the Pope (in the same way that Gregory obtained this e.g. from Hungary, Croatia and Aragonia). William expressly agreed to the regular payment of Peter's Pence, but he refused to pay homage, because he had not promised this in 1066, even in the event of his campaign being successful (Douglas 1995, 343, 346s.); Alexander II probably interpreted the *vexillum* as a war banner, and Gregory VII tried to turn it retrospectively into a symbol of investiture (Erdmann

---

1020 However, the third coffin was rededicated from Turpin to Alde by 1200 at the latest, and then finally to the Church's own patron Romanus in the 16th c. The first transfer is connected to the fact that Alde developed into one of the favourite figures in the later versions of the Rol. and at the same time, because of pressure from the PT there was less interest in a warrior-like Turpin, and the second transfer is due to a subsequent decline in people's interest in Alde.

1935, 172s.). In any case, we can conclude that William had in fact agreed in 1066 to pay the Peter's Pence and that because of this, many Normans would regard the gathering of this tax as a sufficient reason for a just war.

This brings us to the last and most important mention of Saint Peter (v. 3092–3095): the *baruns de France*, Charlemagne's tenth *eschiele*,

> Munjoie! – escrïent; od els est Carlemagne.
> Gefreid d'Anjou portet l'orie flambe;
> Seint Piere fut, si aveit num Romaine,
> Mais de Munjoie iloec out pris eschange.[1021]

No matter how *Munjoie* is understood, and no matter whether we think *iloec* 'there' refers to the immediately preceding verse 3094 (where the banner is given to Charlemagne by the Pope, who is the representative of Peter, that is to say 'in Rome') or whether it refers to verses 3092–3093 (which are about current events in the narrative, that is to say 'in Roncevaux'), and finally no matter what the etymology of the word *oriflamme* is, verse 3094 certainly states: Charlemagne's banner of state originally was called *Romaine*, because it was a – or probably even the – banner of Saint Peter in Rome, that is to say, the banner of the Holy See. Here we must remember both the evidence from the time of Charlemagne, and a series of events that occurred in the poet's own recent past.

As far as Charlemagne's time is concerned, Charlemagne had, strictly speaking, not actually received the (or a) *vexillum Romanae urbis* in Rome, but it had been sent to him in Gaul by Pope Leo III shortly after the Pope's election at the beginning of 796 at the latest, along with the keys to Peter's tomb (Royal Annals for the year 796; Bédier 1926–1929, 2.246–248).[1022] However, one circumstance

---

1021 On the ms. tradition cf. especially Segre's explanations in his commentary: V. 3092 is confirmed for the archetype through V4, which has only slightly trivialised the second hemistich to *çoè l'insegna Çarle*. V. 3093 is identical in O and V4. V. 3094 is missing in γ (that is to say, V4 etc.), but the meaning of the first hemistich is conveyed by Konrad, even though he misunderstands the text: he says the banner is showing *unsers herrē bilde, sent Peter zesinin fuzen, also er im den gewalt hete uerlazen* 'the image of our Lord, Saint Peter at his feet, when he granted him the power'; the second hemistich is lacking, but without it v. 3095 would be unintelligible. Finally, this verse is missing in δ (that is to say in CV7PT), but it is more or less confirmed by V4, where instead of *Munjoie* (following a reminder of v. 2508–2510) *Çuiose* appears, the second hemistich is slightly altered, without any change in the meaning to *si a pris un ecange*.

1022 But according to the Royal Annals, in the year 800 the Pope sent the king who was advancing towards Rome *Romanae urbis vexilla*. The more subtle discussions between the historians about the exact meaning of this banner (or these banners) are not important for our context, including – to cite just one example – Deér's hypothesis (1957a, 18–23, 36–42), that

helps us to understand this passage; it was discovered by Gaston Paris (1865a, 458) and then Bédier based his explanation on it: a mosaic was constructed under Leo III between 796 and 799 in the Lateran Palace in Rome (which was the residence of the Popes from the 4th to the 14th c., *because San Giovanni in Laterano* and not *San Pietro in Vaticano* was the episcopal church of Rome and therefore the mother church of all of Western Christianity) and this mosaic was on view to everyone who made a pilgrimage to Rome. It depicted Saint Peter seated on a throne above Leo and Charlemagne and handing over the Pallium to Leo and a banner to Charlemagne. This banner was bedecked with six golden-coloured spots edged in black, similar in shape to petals, on a background that could be described as bluish rather than greenish, and it tapered into three long points. The inscription at the bottom reads: *BEATE·PETRE·DONAS / VITA·LEON·PP·E·BIC / TORIA·CARULO·REGI· DONAS.*[1023]

In addition to the mosaic in the Lateran Palace and its inscription, there was a similar one which has long since disappeared. It was commissioned by Hadrian, that is to say before 795, and constructed in the Old Saint Peter's Basilica, and it was viewed by at least as many pilgrims.

It must have depicted a very similar scene with Hadrian and Charlemagne; the inscription that went with it, which Janus Gruter cites from a *Codex Palatinus*, reads (Gregorovius 1869, 389 with n. 1 = 1926, 387 with n. 1 = vol. II, fourth book, cap. 5): *[Christus] Tradit oves fidei Petro pastore regendas, / Quas vice Hadriano crederet ille sua:/ Quin et Romanum largitur in urbe fideli / [Vexillum] famulis qui placuere sibi. / Quod Carolus mira praecellentissimus rex* (−1) */ Suscipiet dextra glorificante Petro.* '[Christ] entrusts the leadership of his sheep to Peter, the Pastor of the Faith, so that he can in his place (*vice sua*) entrust them to Hadrian. / But he also gives the Roman [banner] in the true City [= Rome] / to servants who have pleased him. / Charles, the unparalleled King will now receive this banner,

---

the *vexillum* of 796 was only a collection of the banners of the corporations in the city of Rome, or that the banner on the Lateran mosaic is Constantine's *labarum* and therefore shows Charlemagne as the Defender of Christendom but not specifically the ruler of Rome. The key point for literary historians is only what a Francophone audience in the time around 1100 imagined this word and these images meant, and the ideas they would have had were necessarily much more basic; we can assume that people believed the mosaic was related to Charlemagne's coronation.

1023 Clement XII (1730–1740) ordered the badly decayed original to be destroyed. Benedict XIV (1740–1758) had a copy of it made in another location based on a coloured drawing of 1624 which still survives today; this shows the background colour as more or less blue (Erdmann 1932, 179), at least not red or gold-coloured. There is a reproduction in colour in du Sommerard (1838–1845), Album, Series 8, plate X; two black and white pictures of it (including one of the 1624 drawing) are in Menéndez Pidal (1960, plates 6 and 7 at the end of the book).

whereby Peter with his powerful rights guarantees him renown.' (Less likely: 're-ceived powerful rights, whereby Peter guarantees him renown.') Here *Vexillum* is an emendation by Gregorovius of the *Pontificatum* recorded by Gruter, which is impossible in terms of meaning, grammar and metre;[1024] but in this inscription, unlike the Lateran inscription, this term is explicit. Not only that, but it states that the banner was that of the city of Rome (*Romanum [. . .] vexillum*)[1025] and that it was given to Charlemagne in Rome (*in urbe fideli*). Individuals who had read this inscription, as well as (or instead of) the one in the Lateran Palace, would have thought it necessary to write *si aveit num Romaine* along with the following *iluec ~* 'in Rome'. This inscription seems, therefore, to be the (main) source of inspiration for the poet, and as it is quite improbable that a pilgrim vis-iting Rome would have brought back the exact text of the inscription, we are en-titled to suspect that the poet himself had visited Rome.

Both the Latin inscription and the text that was created by the Roland poet based on this text are very interesting from a literary-historical perspective. The subject of *largitur* is more likely, grammatically speaking, to be *Christus*, the sub-ject of the previous main clause, than *ille* (= *Petrus*), the subject of the (immedi-ately) preceding subordinate clause. But because the presentation takes place in *urbe fideli*, that is to say in Rome, the person who presents the gift on the earthly plane is the overall governor of the city, namely Peter. People looking at the mo-saic in the period around 1100 are not thinking of visits made by the king and *patricius* Charles, but of his coronation as Emperor. And because in the Song the *Emperor* Charlemagne uses *only* this banner, it automatically becomes trans-formed from the banner of the *patricius* of Rome, the military protector of Rome and the Papacy, into a banner of the emperor as military protector of the whole

---

1024 Bédier (1926–1929, 2.245 n. 2) relegates the inscription to a footnote and supplies a somewhat different text: *Hadrianus* instead of *Hadriano*, *merito* instead of *mirā*, in the last line *Petri* instead of *Petro*. Because other emendations competing with *vexillum* have been sug-gested, claims a *non liquet*, in my view incorrectly. The *imperium* hypothesised by Papebroch is improbable because (1) the inscription was clearly associated with a visual representation in which Charlemagne received a concrete object and (2) Charlemagne did not receive the *Impe-rium,* the title of *Imperator* from Hadrian or before 795; finally, the *Patriciatum* hypothesised by de Rossi is correct in terms of the meaning, but it is too obviously bad in terms of the metre to fit into these lines which are otherwise tolerably well written – this leaves *Vexillum* as the only possible solution. The future *suscipiet* could mean either 'in this picture is in the process of receiving', or that the mosaic was made before Charlemagne's arrival, and then revealed in his presence later.

1025 I would not like to exclude entirely the possibility that *Romanûm [. . .] in urbe fideli* meant 'in the faithful, true city of the Romans' but it is doubtful whether most pilgrims would have understood in this way.

of Christendom. Thus, Charlemagne is established and legitimised in this role through this presentation event; the whole reason for narrating this scene is to demonstrate this. In the process, the poet is using the contemporary papal concept of the two powers (~ two swords): worldly power is not given to the emperor directly by God (though some emperors explicitly wanted it to be this way from the late 11th century onwards) but by Peter acting as an intermediary (or *realiter* by the governor of Peter's city).[1026] Admittedly, the importance of this statement is slightly softened by the following *Munjoie* verse (v. 3095); this is discussed in more detail below (C.2.2.6).

Besides this mosaic, we should also consider the well-known fact that from around 1063 (after some isolated unclear cases between around 1044 and 1053) the popes used to send worldly rulers a *vexillum Sancti Petri*, i.e. a banner of Saint Peter. This was not usually done for the whole duration of the ruler's reign, as a sign of investiture, but in fact it was usually sent to indicate support for a war that the Pope had declared was just: such a banner was sent in 1064 to Erlembald of Milan for his battle against the heretics, in 1063 to Count Roger of Sicily for his confrontation with the Muslims, in 1087 to the Pisans for their campaign against Africa, in 1096 to Hugo of Vermandois, the brother of the French King, for the First Crusade, in 1105 to Bohemund of Tarento and Antioch for his pseudo-crusade, in 1113 to the Pisans for their campaign against the Balearics. On the other hand, it did signify the founding or the confirmation of a real feudal relationship – with the exception of the attempt discussed above which was made in 1066/1080 to do this with England – and this was what happened at least in 1059, 1061/1062, 1073/1080 with the banners presented to the south Italian leaders Richard of Capua and Robert Guiscard (Kehr 1934, passim, Erdmann 1935, 166–179), that is to say in cases which must have made a big impression on the collective consciousness of the Normans.[1027] We must assume, therefore, that most contemporaries did not notice the difference and were simply under the impression that a banner used in a battle for Christendom should if possible be legitimised through its papal provenance. Anyone who approached the mosaic in the Old Saint Peter's Basilica around the year 1100 or the one in the Lateran Palace with this impression in mind would have been happy to see that it was confirmed in the case of Charlemagne as well.

There could hardly be a bigger contrast than the one that exists between the Roland poet's view of the French royal banner, and Suger's view of the

---

1026 Cf. e.g. the LM s. vv. *Zweigewaltenlehre* and *Zwei-Schwerter-Lehre*.
1027 William of Apulia (4.408) expressly records that Robert Guiscard relied especially on this *vexillum* during his battles in the Balkans.

same item, as laid out in the *Gesta Ludovici Regis cognomento Grossi* (cap. 27, ed. Molinier p. 102) and in *De rebus in administratione sua gestis* (cap. 4). According to Suger, (French) Vexin (within the feudal structure of the *regnum Franciae*) was part of the fiefdom of Saint Dionysius; the right to carry *jure signiferi* the *vexillum* of Saint Dionysius, that is to say the banner of his abbey, is granted in wars to the greatest worldly liegeman of the abbey, indeed precisely the person to whom the abbey has given Vexin, as well as the feudal title of Count (because of course it is not able to carry out the worldly responsibilities that are required with these roles); this person is now the king. [Because Philip I had taken control of Vexin and made it part of Crown property, at the same time bringing the title of Count into the royal house. There is no direct evidence of the restructuring that Suger claims; but because Louis does not contest it, this is probably what happened.] The fact that the King of France and the Count of Vexin are at this time one and the same person means, as Suger accepts, that Louis, because he is the king, does not have to swear an oath of fealty for the County. When in 1124 Louis VI mobilised all his vassals to take part in a war against the invading Emperor Henry VI, he recognised this construct of Suger's in a celebratory fashion and accepted this banner *jure signiferi* 'by virtue of his standard-bearer office'. Suger does not explicitly claim that from that time onwards it became the royal banner of France, but this must have seemed appropriate, because Saint Dionysius was by then recognised as the patron of France. During the campaign, Louis entrusted the banner to a liegeman who was physically near to him, but otherwise did not hold a significant position in the feudal hierarchy. When he returned from the war victorious within a year – Heinrich V had avoided an open battle and withdrawn – he granted the Abbey more donations and spoke himself of the *vexillum*, which he *jure signiferi* leads. This banner genuinely was from that time onwards France's royal banner; we know what it was made of from the descriptions of many later witnesses: it was "made of red silk, without any imagery [both according to Guillelmus Brito, *Philippide* (dated 1217, revised 1224), 11.32–39, G.A.B.], attached to a pole that was gilded in the late Middle Ages" – as noted by one of the best qualified experts, Philippe Contamine, in the LM s. v. *Oriflamme*; moreover, it was *fendue par le milieu en forme de gonfanon* according to an old inventory in Saint-Denis (DuCange s. v. *Auriflamma*). It is only in the very late Middle Ages that we find images of it with golden stars, beams of light, and similar decorations woven into it.

Suger thus knowns nothing of any papal provenance for this banner, nor of Charlemagne ever owning it; he does not even claim that any previous king of France has used this banner, but is only convinced that it has this status because of the fact that Saint Dionysius is the apostle of France; and he uses

neither the term 'Oriflamme',[1028] which does not appear outside the vernacular epic until much later, at least quite some time after Suger's death (1152),[1029] nor the word 'Mon(t)joie' or similar. Conversely, the Roland poet knows nothing about any role of Saint Dionysius in this matter, nor anything about French Vexin being his fiefdom, but he assumes that the term *l'orie flambe* is familiar to his audience; the standard-bearer is not the king himself or one of his minor noblemen who has been charged with this task, but one of the greatest feudatories in the realm (who in reality was the representative of a dynasty that Louis VI and Suger, especially from 1118–1120 and again from 1128 onwards must have regarded with mistrust because of its connection by marriage with the English royal house, which means they would certainly not have entrusted this office to him). The two accounts could hardly be more different.

It was not until later that the two traditions merged at least to the extent that Suger's *vexillum*, which had by then become "the" royal banner of France, was called *Oriflamme* thanks to the influence of the Rol. (and over time also other *chansons de geste*). The acclaimed historian Philippe Contamine (LM s. v. *Oriflamme*) has no difficulty seeing the factually evident order of events in this way. The same cannot be said about experts in the field of Romance Studies: Hans-Erich Keller (1989, 54ss.) equates even the banner of the year 1124 with the *orieflambe* and does this in what appears to be an *a priori* fashion. He is convinced that the Song reflects some elements from the presentation event of 1124 and the second presentation of 1147 when Louis VII started out on the Second Crusade, although his key witness Eudes de Deuil (PL 185/2, 1209s.), referring to the year 1147, only mentions the *vexillum* and not the *orieflambe* or anything similar. Thus, I am afraid I cannot agree with Keller's early equation of the two terms, and since he makes this a central part of his hypothesis about the Saint Dionysian origins of the surviving Rol., I cannot accept this hypothesis either.[1030]

The later merging of the two banners into one was then almost to be expected; because 'the' banner of France had to be a single item, subsuming both of these elements of meaning. Thus, Gervase of Canterbury († around 1210, referring to the year 1184, ed. Stubbs 1.309): *Protulit hac vice rex Francorum*

[1028] It is not until ms. F of Suger's *Gesta Ludovici Regis cognomento Grossi* from the 14th c., which often changes things, that the expression *auriflamma* is inserted here, and not just once, but twice; cf. on this Hibbard Loomis (1959, 477 with n. 18).

[1029] On this see also Hibbard Loomis (1959, 478–480).

[1030] This means that in the most important points I am going back to the explanation that was already presented with admirable clarity partly by Erdmann (1932, 889–893), and partly by Hibbard Loomis (1959, passim).

Philippus signum regis Karoli; quod a tempore praefati principis usque in prae-sens signum erat in Francia mortis vel victoriae.

We might reasonably wonder whether the respective gaps in the Roland poet's and Suger's accounts might tell us something about the dating of the Song. Unfortunately, this turns out not to be the case.

If Suger had been familiar with the surviving form of the Rol. in 1124, he would certainly not have been inclined to regard the connection with the Pope and Charlemagne as a useful support for the elevated status of his banner. The interests of Saint-Denis were clearly different from those of the Papacy; nothing would have been further from Suger's intention than to offer the Pope an op-portunity to extend his influence over the King of France. This is already obvi-ous in the ceremony of 1124 itself. After all, Papal banners had been issued to Francophone leaders in support of 'just' wars many times over the preceding sixty years, including the Capetian Hugh of Vermandois, Louis VI's uncle, as the *de facto* representative of France in the First Crusade! But on this occasion, Suger makes it clear *ex silentio* that nobody, not even a pope, could come be-tween Saint Dionysius and the King of France.[1031] This explains why Suger may

---

[1031] The same message is apparent in the charter purporting to be in the name of Charle-magne which was forged in Saint-Denis (MGH DD.kar. 1, no. 286, allegedly dating from 813), which Hans-Erich Keller (1989, 135–138) discusses at length, although he underestimates – among other things – its covert anti-papal bias: Charlemagne orders not only that all future *Franciae reges* can only be crowned in Saint-Denis (and therefore not in Reims!), that the mon-astery at Saint-Denis is the head of all the churches in the kingdom, and that its abbot is the Primus of all the Prelates (instead of the archbishops and bishops!), but also that the latter may only be ordained by the Holy See if he has been approved by the abbot of Saint-Denis (!!). Quite apart from the negatively tinged allusion to the Holy See, the Pope is only notable by his absence in this forgery, which is clearly intended to set out the ground rules. This concoction of lies is directed primarily against the Reims coronation tradition (cf. Groten 1988, passim), but intends also to prevent any questions relating to the coronation of the king or the ecclesi-astical hierarchy, and any contact with the Pope, from reaching France without going through Saint-Denis first. This is, however, is precisely the kind of direct contact that is narrated in the Rol. As Groten (1988, 16–20) in particular convincingly demonstrated, chapter 30 of the PT was based on the forged charter, and not the other way around. For this reason alone – I ex-clude Groten's other arguments in favour of its emergence shortly before 1129 – the forgery must have originated in Saint-Denis before 1150 at a time when it was still under Suger († 1152). Even if we do not argue, as Groten does, that Suger himself was responsible for the clumsy forgery – he never actually referred to it –, this does reflect an atmosphere in the monas-tery which could not have existed without the approval of the abbot. It is entirely possible to trace a line of tradition from Hincmar through Suger to the open Gallicanism that prevailed after 1300, and from there further to Henry IV, Richelieu and Bossuet, which was characterised by the basic tenet, implicit at least, that recognition of the Pope reaches its limit whenever the interests of internal French politics or ecclesiastical hierarchies are at stake.

have consciously ignored the representation of events in the Rol. and in a way appears to have countered it with different facts.

But neither is it possible to draw any chronological conclusions if we approach the problem from the opposite direction. If, as we assume, the Rol. poet lived under Norman rule, or within the Angevin territory which came under Norman rule from 1128 at the latest, he could not have known about Suger's claims before 1124, and he could have implicitly denied them after 1124. Let us therefore avoid making any assumptions about the relative chronology of the two traditions and let us simply regard them as being independent of each other.

C.2 More about Charlemagne's banner and battle cry

C.2.1 The term *orie flambe*

I favour the classical etymology of the Oriflamme, since – apart from a few details – it was the only one current in the Middle Ages, and until after 1960 it remained the prevailing view: *orie flambe* O 3093 is more likely to go back to [1] *aurea(e) flammula(e)* < χρυσᾶ φλάμουλα than [2] *laurea flammula* or [3] *aurīta flammula*.

On [1]: Not just because of the use of the article but also because of the meaning, it is *a priori* extremely unlikely that the poet would have invented the term *orie flambe*. In fact, its etymology as *aurea flammula* has been regarded as almost certain since Erdmann (1933–1934, 23), despite some dissenting claims.

A banner tapering into one or more pointed 'tongues' when it flaps in the wind looks like a flickering flame and that is why Lat. *flammula* – besides the obvious meaning 'flame, little flame' – is attested from Vegetius *mil.* 2.1.2 and 3.5.8 until at least almost 800 meaning 'banner, pennant'.[1032] We can easily see that the second part of Fr. *orie flambe* really contains *flammula* and not *flamma* by looking at the sources e.g in Tobler/Lommatzsch: Lat. *flamma* 'flame' survives and becomes OF *flam(m)e* (12 references), but we also find *flammula*

1032 *Liber pontificalis* (1.270, *à propos* Pope Stephen IV, around 770) as well as (according to the Mlat.Wb. s. v.) Angilbert (*inst.* 7, p. 297,9, around 800) and *Ordo Casinensis II*, Ms. C (19, p. 121,11; early 10th c., but in my view the evidence from reference is not entirely reliable). From a later period in DuCange s. v. *flammula,* a double reference from the year 1382, which is isolated and therefore probably the result of an idiosyncratic reading; another, undated reference in the same place is interpreted correctly by Blaise II s. v.*: cum [. . .] flammulis ceu taedis* 'with torches and similar lights'.

'flame, little flame' as OF *flamble* (6 references), and from this with loss of the second *-l-* through dissimilation *flambe* (13 references); correspondingly also *oriflamble* (4 references) as well as *ori(e)flambe* (29 references), and finally *oriflame* (1 reference).

But the path from *flammula* meaning 'flame' to *(orie) flambe* meaning a banner was not a straight one. Within the Romance languages this meaning is also attached to Venet. *fiamola* and Rum. *flamură*, but both are within the region influenced by Byzantium. During the same period, the late Lat. form gave rise to the usual Gk. φλάμουλον 'banner, especially war banner' (Leo *tactica*, around 900, several times; Niketas, Kodinos and others), and also φλαμουλάριος 'standard-bearer' (already in John the Lydian, 6th c.). In the centuries around 1000, we expect to hear about 'golden' banners in particular in association with Byzantium which stored great quantities of gold and was very focused on ceremonial matters. In fact, they are monopolised by the emperor, and they are called χρυσᾶ βασιλικὰ φλάμουλα or χρυσᾶ φλάμουλα for short, as we find in Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos (p. 502 and 577, cf. also 576 ed. Bonn), which then led via back-translation into Lat., to the sg. (as fem., following *flammula*), *aurea flammula*.

Erdmann had not touched upon the question of the path that this reborrowing back into Francophony had followed; but Heisig (1951, 308) then saw what was almost evident. No Francophone people knew more about Byzantine state affairs than the Normans – not only the many southern Italian Normans who were at first mercenaries fighting on the Byzantine side and then later became their bitterest enemies and at the same time their would-be successors, but also those living in Normandy, who had returned to their homeland after a few years in service to Byzantium. From a Norman perspective, therefore, an *aurea flammula* was essentially an 'emperor's banner' – and then of course Charlemagne would also be worthy of such a banner.

Admittedly, there seems to have been a growing sense of competition against the Byzantine emperors. This happened to a minimal extent with the western empire; we cannot take seriously the claim made by Benedict of Monte Soracte[1033] that Charlemagne was gave a *vexillum aureum mire magnitudinis* on his pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre.[1034] There was more substantial rivalry

---

[1033] MGH SS. 3.710 at the bottom; reference in Erdmann (1935, 183 n. 60).

[1034] According to Erdmann (1933–1934, 7, with a reference back to SB Berlin 1932, 870) Amatus of Monte Cassino also described the feudal banner that the Normans received from the Emperor as golden; however, I am not convinced by his complicated harmonising of three different statements (lib. 2, cp. 6, lib. 3, cap. 31 and 39, ed. Delarc p. 57, 87, 133). Moreover, according to Erdmann (1933–1934, 22) a treasury inventory from Monte Cassino dating from the end of the 11th c. mentions a *fano imperialis totus aureus*; we can conclude with a small

from the Papacy: according to Erdmann (1935, 5) the earliest representation of *Ecclesia* in the Drogo Sacramentary (around 855) carries a golden pennant with two tongues at the end, and according to Anna Komnena (10.7.3) at the beginning of the First Crusade, when Hugo Magnus, who was the brother of the French King and thus could be his representative and the non-clerical leader of the Crusade, was passing through, the pope entrusted him with the 'golden banner of Saint Peter'. If we take these two references together, and the Pope could give someone a 'golden banner of Saint Peter ending in two tongues', that is to say literally an *aurea flammula*, it must have seemed appropriate that the banner which Charlemagne received from Saint Peter and *de facto* from the Pope, would be just such an *aurea flammula*,[1035] and indeed the banner in the Lateran Palace mosaic was at least decorated with golden spots.

The precise form of the words also requires some commentary. Besides the *orie flambe* nexus, the Rol. has the adj. *orĭe* < Lat. *aureus, -a*, e.g. *En sun puign destre par l'orĭe punt la tint* (v. 466). It is 'semi-erudite', but quite close to the regular phonological development of the vernacular: a little later, it became *oire* and then it disappeared in the 13th c.[1036] Compared with the simple adj., the nexus emerged later and from then onwards was regarded as a rather

---

margin of probability that this is referring rather to the western than to the Byzantine emperorship.

1035 As we might expect, golden or partially golden banners are mentioned in connection with other rulers here and there, but there is no obvious tradition forming around this phenomenon: according to the article on *Feldzeichen* in the RGA, Bede (*Hist. eccl.* 3.11) writes that the Anglo-Saxon King Oswald († 641) had a banner made of gold and purple; when Henry of Huntingdon († 1155) in his *Hist. Angl.* (4.19) for the year 752 talks about the West Saxon *regis insigne, draconem scilicet aureum*, the historicity of the gold is questionable; Ademar, on the other hand, writes referring to the year 763 that Pippin gave Saint Martial of Limoges a *bannum aureum* taken from Waifar, and according to William of Poitiers (2.31, p. 224s. ed. Foreville) Willliam the Conqueror sent to the Pope, among other things *memorabile quoque vexillum Heraldi, hominis armati imaginem intextam habens ex auro purissimo* 'la fameuse bannière de Harold, portant, tissée en pur fils d'or, l'image d'un guerrier en armes'. (Here the whole banner is not woven with golden threads, as some accounts would have it, but only the image woven into it is golden – and this makes a big difference to the quantity of gold used in the banner).

1036 In addition to this *orĭe* < *aurĕus* the Song also has an *oré(t)* < *auratus* (as we have in the 12th c. *doré* < *deauratus*), as in *L'escut li freint desuz l'oree bucle* (v. 1283), *En l'orét punt l'ad faite manuvrer* (v. 2506), *E cil espiez, cil orét gunfanun* (v. 1811). It is not certain that any difference in meaning was associated with these terms; because – if we just look at the two instances confirmed for the archetype v. 466 and 2506 – Ganelon's sword pommel cannot very well be solid gold if Charlemagne's is only gilded. And in O there are also mixed forms, first of all in hypermetric verse: *De l'oree sele* (+1) [*les*] *dous alves d'argent* (v. [1605]=1648), which Stengel and Hilka/Pfister explicitly (and Jenkins with no commentary) emend into *orĭe*, whereas Bédier and Segre just let the hypermetric form stand; secondly there are some mixed forms

technical term; thus, its phonology remained a bit more 'semi-erudite' and therefore more conservative. It occurs only once in the Song (v. 3093) where it has four full syllables (+ -ə), not just in O: *Gefreid d'Anjou portet l'orie flambe*, but in V4 as well: *Çufrei d'Ançoi porta l'oriaflambe* – and therefore also in the archetype. Early editors from Theodor Müller onwards reduced it to the trisyllabic form **orĭe flambe* and compensated by inserting an *i* 'there' in front of *portet*; but this intervention goes against the stemma, and it is also pointless because the further development of the expression does not lead to **oireflamme*, but to *oriflamme* (as in *poliement > poliment*). Moreover, the retention of the syllable count is characteristic of 'semi-erudite' terms, as in *afflictïon* etc., *chrestïen*, *Vivïen* etc., and the same is true in this case as well; also, as in OF (predominantly) *crïer* < Lat. *crĕare* shows, Lat. *-ĕ-* before a hiatus even goes to *-i-*, if not eventually to /j/. This development is also reflected in the (re)Latinisation process: in around 1224 William Brito writes in the passage cited above from his *Philippeis* (11.32–39) *orieflam(b)e* as *flamma [. . .] aurea*, which is one of the oldest Lat. references, if not the oldest, to this name; as we might expect, he could no longer detect the diminutive *flammula* behind *-flam(b)e*, but he helpfully confirms the *aurea*. But soon after that time, *oriflamme* (by this time without the internal *-e-*) gives way to the Latinisation *auriflamma*: it appears, e.g. in a text from Saint-Victor dating from 1304 and is still the normal form used by scholars such as André Duchesne and DuCange; cf. DuCange s. v.

On [2]: Since we cannot separate the χρυσᾶ φλάμουλα in Konstantin Porphyrogennetos from its simple translation **aurea(e) flammula(e)* I do not see any need to look back any further chronologically than the time of Constantine, despite that fact that in 1892 Schuchardt and Gustav Meyer suggested the etymology which Gamillscheg (EWFS s. v.) and Kahane/Kahane (1962, 136s.) repeated and Migliorini (1975, 544) considered not impossible, namely **laurea flammula* (parallel to the uncontentious etymology *labarum* < λάβαρον / λάβουρον < *laureum*).[1037] But even if, against all expectations, there did turn out to be an unseen continuity between the naming of the *labarum* / **laureum* and the *oriflamme*, we would have to assume that the interpretation **aurea* into it happened at the time when it was

that go against the usual writing system: *Le cheval brochet des oriez esperuns* (v. 1225), *En l'oriet punt asez i ad reliques* (v. 2345).
1037 When in the 11th c. Ekkehart IV in his continuation of the *Casus Sancti Galli* (cap. 3 or 38) states that Charles III (the Fat) ordered a *labarum* in 883 for himself, this is, according to the Art. *Feldzeichen* in the RGA (p. 317b and 319b) only an *antikisierende* 'archaic' expression which tells us nothing about the nature of the battle standard itself.

Frenchified at the latest, and this almost certainly predates the Rol., because the poet obviously assumes that his audience is familiar with the term in French.

On [3]: Burger (1968, passim) thought that the syllabic *-i-* in v. 3093 was important enough to warrant its derivation, against the medieval consensus and the broad, but not absolute, modern consensus, from *aurīta flammula,* where *aurītus* means 'long-eared'. However, *aurītus* is not retained in Romance which means that the nexus would have to have survived much longer than the single word, leaving no references. The semantics are equally uninviting. *Aurītus* 'equipped with (long) ears' signifies in Lat. the long ears of donkeys, hares and a breed of hunting dogs.

Metaphorical use of *aurītus* referring to other concrete nouns is rare; it is used to refer to round things attached to something else, such as when a jug has a loop or handles (Paulinus of Nola) or a felt cap is 'eared' because it has ear muffs or flaps (Richer of Reims).[1038] The only reference to a metaphorical usage with any visual resemblance to the meaning 'equipped with tails, pointed ends (referring to a pennant)' is the meaning 'equipped with a double mould board (referring to a plough)', (Palladius 1.42.1, inspired by *binae aures* 'the two mould boards on such a plough' in Vergil *georg.* 1.172). I doubt whether this is enough to bring about a transfer of meaning to the tail ends of a banner. And above all, there is the fact that *every* normal medieval *gonfanon* had one or two points at one end, which means that using the term 'eared' for the war banner of an emperor or a king would not, in fact, capture this specific distinction. In short, there is no evidence to support Burger's etymology.[1039] It is difficult to see why the minor phonological problem with *orïeflambe* should cause anyone to consider the linking of χρυσᾶ φλάμουλα and *aurea flammula* as coincidental and replace it with a historical and semantic vacuum.

C.2.2 The term *Munjoie*

Issues surrounding the battle cry (and banner name) *Munjoie* have become complex and multi-layered, making this one of the most problematic questions in the whole field of Roland studies; I cannot fully support any of the answers that have been provided so far. The only way to find a properly substantiated

---

1038 Cf. TLL and Mlat.Wb. s. v. – The meaning 'only an ear witness' (as opposed to 'eye witness') can be excluded.
1039 Cf. in a similar vein, and with further objections to Burger's suggestion, especially Christmann (1970, 613s.).

solution is to separate these issues from each other one by one. In this section I hope to show:

[1] In the first 150 years of its attested existence – from about 950 until 1100 – the *gaudium* part of the toponym *Mons gaudii*, today *Mon(t)joie* etc. means the joy of pilgrims who catch the first glimpse of their goal, and this is its *only* meaning. There was a huge growth in pilgrimage activity during this period, which explains why the toponym is extremely common across a very wide area stretching from Rome through France and as far as Germany, and even to the borders of Christendom, from Santiago to Jerusalem. As a result of this, this term or its translation into local languages was understood in Britain, Flanders and probably Russia. It is so widely familiar in France that the very thought that the *Munjoie / Monjoie* of the Song has nothing to do with this tradition, or could have arisen independently of it, is just inconceivable. Whoever introduced this term into the Song knew that the audience would naturally expect it to be a toponym.

[2] The toponym does not develop further until 1150. [a] As a toponym (along with its vernacular and dialect equivalents) it is used for such a large number of different places that it can no longer refer to the pilgrimage tradition, and it must simply mean 'look-out points, viewpoints' etc.; the sheer number of examples prevents us from investigating each of these places. [b] It is not until the late 12th c. that the appellative (that is to say deonomastic) usage establishes itself in French with a rapidly expanding spectrum of meaning, the step-by-step spread of which we nevertheless can trace through the underlying toponymic meaning. [c] The fact that this happens so late, and the ease with which the appellative usage can be traced, allow us to conclude that the toponym (and all the terms derived from it) does not have any other, supposedly "deeper" etymology than its obvious meaning 'mountain of joy'; it arose out of the simple combination of its two component parts in the context of pilgrims, and therefore of popular devotion. Moreover, each of the other etymologies suggested for this also turn out to be wrong.

[3] [a] In the theological language of late antiquity – as Heisig shows – both *mons* and *gaudium*, are independently of each other closely associated with the central concept '(place of) eternal bliss', but – contra Heisig – there is no evidence to show that they were combined into *mons gaudii* specifically *with this meaning* before the Rol. [b] It is not until the Song (possibly: the stage before the Song in its surviving form) that the pre-existing toponym that was familiar to the audience (in its pure form) came to have this more elevated meaning '(place of) eternal bliss' through its theological association with Paradise, which then meant it could be used as Charlemagne's battle cry and banner name.

[4] Just like the battle cry in the Song, the Capetian battle cry *Mon(t)joie* (attested from 1119 onwards) does not come from *meum gaudium* but goes back to *mons gaudii*.

[5] It cannot be satisfactorily derived from the toponymy of Île-de-France, and it is much more likely to have been taken from the Song.

[6] A case-by-case interpretation of the term's occurrences in the Song confirms the present study's interpretation of the meaning of *Munjoie*.

We turn now to the details.

C.2.2.1 MLat. *Mons Gaudii*: the toponym before and after 1100 (Hill of the Pilgrims)

Löffel (1934, 5–10) collected most of the toponymic references to *Mons Gaudii* in his dissertation which is still useful today; in this section I have gratefully used his data (and added to it quite considerably).

C.2.2.1.1 A hill 5 km north-west of the centre of Rome[1040]

The *Chronicon Venetum* (going up to the year 1008, preserved in the author's own hand; MGH SS. 7.31) reports for the year 998 that Romans rebelling against Otto III had barricaded themselves inside the Engelsburg: *in monte Gaudio* [sic] *imperiali decreto suspensi sunt*. We can explain the *Gaudio* instead of *Gaudii* as evidence of the author's poor command of Latin. In the Middle Ages, it was usual to carry out hangings on a hill, ideally as high as possible and clearly visible from the relevant city; in the case of Rome, the highest hill of this kind is clearly Monte Mario,[1041] which rises 139 m above sea level (i.e. 90–115 m higher than the city) and lies 3 km north-northwest of the Saint Peter's Basilica or almost 5km northwest of the Capitol. At about the same time, or perhaps

---

1040 Before this section we could cite an isolated *mons Jocundiacus* from the year 862 (from 1207 *de mont Jove*, from 1220 *in memore montis Jovis*, 13th c. *de monte Jovis vulgo de Montjavou*, 15th c. *mont Jaoust*, today *Montjavoult*, Oise), if we were able to agree with Herbillon (1977, passim) that this is a somewhat precious stylisation of a *Mons Gaudii / Montjoie*, although according to Herbillon himself, it is only an ephemeral and specifically monastic re-interpretation of the etymological *Mons Jovis* (*Mont Jou* or with imparisyllabic Obl. *Mont Jovon*); but the monks could at least as easily have thought that *iocundus* was the etymology of /džovon/. (The *-iacus* element in both explanations is redundant.) Even if Herbillon is right, it would only be a brief thought experiment on the part of the monks, and it would not have influenced the real historical use of the name

1041 The top of Monte Mario is also the location of the Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma owned by the INAF (Istituto Nazionale di Astrofisica), from where (and not from Greenwich) many Italian maps measured longitude until the middle of the 20th c.

even a little earlier, Benedict of Monte Soracte (40 km north of Rome) reports in his *Chronicon* (up to the year 962, which survives in the author's own hand in an incomplete ms. written around the turn of the century; cap. 26, MGH SS. 3.713 or ed. Zuchetti p. 151) that Louis II advanced in 846 against the Saracens who had invaded Rome and he came [from the north] *usque ad montes Malum* [sic], where he took fright when he saw the enemy in the Leonine City of Rome and Saint Peter's; here, too, the location is obviously Monte Mario. The Venetian author calls it 'Mountain of Joy' because it offers travellers, most of whom were probably pilgrims, their first glimpse of their destination, which was *Roma nobilis*; Benedict, on the other hand, is only a day's journey from Rome, and he thinks like a Roman, seeing in the 'evil mount' either the hill where hangings were carried out, or the hill over which northern invaders would pass as they approached Rome.

The second reference appears just a decade after the first, and it has not been identified until now. Adalardus Blandiniensis (i.e. of Saint Peter's Abbey in Ghent) describes between 1006 and 1011 in his *Vita Dunstani Cantuariensis* (*lectio* 4)[1042] a dream that the future Archbishop Dunstan of Canterbury (*sedit* a. 960–988) once had: on his journey back from a visit to Rome, *cumque ad Montem Gaudii applicuisset*, Saints Peter, Paul and Andrew appeared to him. In class. Lat. *applicare* means 'to berth (at the end of a sea voyage)', but in Mlat. it often simply means 'to arrive', including after journeys over land and at a stopping-off point (Mlat.Wb. s. v.; cf. also Lat. *plicare* > Span. *llegar*). We can tell that this is the meaning, and not for example a *Mons Gaudii* somewhere near Dover (there has never been such a place there) but rather the *Mons Gaudii* just north of Rome because of the reworking of the older *Vita*, that is to say the *Vita Dunstani* by the Norman writer *Osbernus* (AA.SS. for the 19th May, cap. 5, § 26); there, we find that *quasi de urbe Roma egredienti* the three saints appear to him *ad Montem Gaudii sibi se adjungentes*. The passage in Adalard of Ghent proves, therefore, that shortly after the year 1000 in Flanders and presumably also in Britain, people could talk about the *Mons gaudii* near Rome without having to explain any further details about its location. The vision that is described here is in Dunstan's life story even before the year 956, and we cannot help but wonder if the hill was already called *Mons Gaudii* in Dunstan's own report of his vision.

A similar question arises in relation to the third reference, which appears less than a decade later. Thietmar of Merseburg reports in his *Chronicle* (written

---

1042 William Stubbs (ed.), *Memorials of Saint Dunstan*, in: *Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores* 63 (1874), 53–68, here 57.

in 1012–1018, preserved in his own hand; lib. 4, cap. 32, MGH SS. N.S. 9.171) the oral tale of a Count Ansfrid, later Bishop of Utrecht (from 995–1010), who as a young man was the sword-bearer of Otto the Great when the latter set off on the journey to his coronation in the year 963: because the loyalty of the Romans was questionable, Otto impressed upon him that he must always hold his drawn sword over him while Otto prayed "*Deinde redeundo ad montem Gaudii, quantum volueris, orato.*"'Only when we are on the Mons Gaudii again, can you pray for yourself – as much as you want.' The use of Latin in this quotation sounds like authentic speech, but was there a German name for this mountain in Otto's time? References cannot be expected until the time when we have longer narratives in German about Rome, which means in effect in the *Kaiserchronik* (around 1155). In this text, there are two mentions of a mountain near Rome (v. 10581 and 14573) called Mendelberg, and in the second passage it is clear that it is the place where you first see Rome if you are approaching the city from the north: *Duo die hêrren kômen, / daz si sâhen ze Rôme / ûf Mendelberge [. . .]* 'when the gentlemen came / to the place where they looked upon Rome / on Mendelberg'. Apart from this reference from the *Kaiserchronik*, MHG *mendelberc* can only be found in a Sallust gloss likewise from the 12th c.[1043] for *Aventinus*, the southernmost of Rome's seven hills, which is not the right meaning but understandable, nevertheless. There are only two other occurrences (according to Lexer s. v.) of MHG *mendel-* '(of) joy-' in compound words; and even the independent subst. OHG *mendî*, MHG. *mende* 'joy' can be found (according to Lexer and Findebuch s. v.) before 1200 only in four texts, but from the beginning of the MHG period (around 1050) the normal word is *vröude*. As a *spontaneous* equivalent of *Mons gaudii*, *mendelberg* must be older than 1050 and may well have been in existence around 962.

Between 1063 and 1081, the author of a description of the foundation of the Brauweiler Abbey, a monastery near Cologne (*Brunwilarensis monasterii fundatorum actus*) writes in his report of Otto III's crackdown of the year 998, (MGH SS. 14.131), that the expression *Mons Gaudii* is still commonly used by Germans even during his own lifetime: the leader of the insurgents *ductus vero in montis illius planitiem, qua totam videre possis urbem, capite truncatur; idemque mons usque hodie ob triumphatum tirannidis presumptorem a Teutonicis Mons Gaudii, a Romanis autem Mons Malus vocatur.*

There is a report of Henry V's expedition to Rome in the year 1111 in the *Registrum Paschalis II* (MGH Const. 1.147): *obviam ei domnus papa misit in*

1043 In the Codex Vaticanus Palatinus lat. 889 of the 11th/12th c. from Lorsch, the gloss itself is 12th c.; cf. Steinmeyer/Sievers 2.609.66 and 4.608.

Montem Gaudii, qui et Mons Malus dicitur, signiferos cum bandis, scrinarii, iudices et stratores.[1044] The event resonated as far afield as France, where Suger († 1152) included it in his *Gesta Ludovici Regis cognomento Grossi* (cap. 9, p. 29 ed. Molinier), although he regarded Henry's behaviour as a sign of his hypocrisy; according to Suger, Henry swore his oath of peace for the first time in Sutri, for the second time *in eo qui dicitur Mons Gaudii loco, ubi primum adventantibus limina apostolorum visa occurrunt*, and for the third time in the portico of Saint Peter's Basilica. After the Venetian chronicler of the turn of the century, therefore, Suger is the second non-German to use the expression without negative undertones.

Petrus Diaconus describes the same expedition to Rome in his part of the chronicle of Monte Cassino (written not long after 1140, 4.37, p. 503 ed. Hoffmann) but adds to the term *Mons Gaudii* the phrase *qui et Marii dicitur*, which is the first mention of the name that is used today.

In connection with Barbarossa's expeditions to Rome, the *Mons Gaudii* is mentioned for the year 1155 in the *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris* by Otto of Freising (2.32, MGH SS.schol. 46.140) and for the year 1167 by the continuer of *Ann. Laudenses* by Otto and Acerbus Morena, who was likewise based in Lodi (30 km southeast of Milan; MGH SS.N.S. 7.202) – and so once again a non-Germanic author.

There are a great many other, mostly later references but we need only look at the *Ordines* of the emperor's coronation: these all emanate from the Papacy from the first half of 12th c. (edition XIV, known as Cencius II.) until the start of the 15th c., and they all mention the descent of the emperor-elect from the *Mons Gaudii* (MGH Ord. p. 47, 69, 87, 102, 104, 129, 139, 140, 145), with explanatory comments only in the 14th c. (p. 140) *qui hodie vulgariter dicitur Montemalo*, and in the 15th c. (p. 145) *qui hodie appellatur Mons Marii*, whereas in the 16th c. (p. 166) only the term *Mons Marii* is used. Like the Venetian author of the first reference in around the year 1000, Suger and the continuer of Morena's chronicle, the Romance-language speaking editors of the 12th and 13th century editions use the expression without any negative qualification, even when they are thinking of an expedition approaching from the north.

In summary, then, we can say that as early as the middle of the 10th c., the name *Mons Gaudii* was probably so well known to everyone from the north (including people from Venice, for example) as the name of the hill north of Rome which offered the traveller a first view of the city, that it could be used without further explanation in Flanders or Britain, and probably also in Germany. The

---

1044 Also included verbatim in the *Ann. Romani* (SS.5.774).

claim made by Hibbard Loomis (1959, 483), that the hill near Rome only acquired the name *Mons Gaudii* in the 12th c is therefore groundless.

The most important factor in the dissemination of this name was doubtless the stream of pilgrims who travelled to Rome, year in, year out. The emotion they felt when they first set eyes on the city is clearly echoed in the *Ligurinus* (around 1185, lib. 4, cap. 12ss., p. 265 ed. Assmann), whose poet, however, had to change the name slightly because of the metre: *Huic populi festivum Gaudia nomen / Imposuere loco; siquidem qui menia clara / Illa parte petunt, ex illo vertice primum / Urbem conspiciunt et te, sacra Rhoma, salutant.* The contribution made by pilgrims will become even clearer in the way this name is used for other pilgrim destinations, and these are the places we shall consider next.

C.2.2.1.2 A mountain 10 km north of the Notre Dame Cathedral of Le Puy

Löffel omitted the *Mons Gaudii* near Le Puy. It is mentioned in the two oldest *Vitae* of the Abbot Majolus of Cluny († 994), by Nalgod/Nagold and by Syrus (both written in the decades immediately following his death, and before the one written by Odilo; replicated in the AA.SS. for the 11th of May, the Syrus *Vita* is better in the AA.SS.OSB 5.760ss., located there on p. 797). When describing a pilgrimage made by Majolus to the Notre Dame Cathedral of le Puy, Nalgod says (cap. 2, § 15) briefly *in loco qui Mons-Gaudii dicitur*; Syrus (lib. 2, cap. 11) expands this with the explanation: *in locum quidem qui Mons-Gaudii dicitur, quod hinc Christi Matris (*var. *Matris Christi) ecclesia spectatur*, which means this is the place where the pilgrims approaching from the north first see the Notre Dame Cathedral of Le Puy situated on higher ground. This *lieu-dit* (about 10 km north of Le Puy, district of Polignac, Haute-Loire; Dép. Haute-Loire) is attested in 1266 again as *Monjauzi* (Vincent 1937, 197s.), and it continued to be called *Montjauzi* until about 1600. This event occurred when Majolus was already the abbot, but before he was captured by Muslims for a short time, and so it must have been between 948 and 972; it is very likely that the hill already bore this name at that time.

C.2.2.1.3 A hill almost 1 km northwest of Saint-Martial in Limoges

At the Council of Limoges in November 994, the body of Saint Martial was exhumed because of an epidemic and taken to the nearby *Mons Gaudii*. A *pactum pacis* in the spirit of the Peace of God movement was enacted, and he was reinterred in his original grave, whereupon the epidemic is said to have ended (cf. more detail on this in Hoffmann 1964, 27–30). This *Mons Gaudii* is mentioned in the *Translatio beati Martialis de Monte Gaudio* (ed. Sackur 1892–1894, 1.392–396), and in a sermon (Paris BN lat. 2469, f.86v°) preserved in Ademar's († 1034) own

hand, replicated in Hoffmann (1964, 257, called *usque hodie Mons Gaudii*), as well as in Ademar's *Commemoratio abbatum Lemovicensium* (according to Manitius probably around 1028; Migne PL 141.82s.). Today, it is the part of Limoges known as the *Quartier Montjovis*. Nègre (1990–1998, no. 20988) is not aware of the early references to today's Montjovis, but he does know about a *Mons Gaudii* from the year 1266 and a *Mont Jauvi* which is not dated. The Occitan expert Nègre correctly notes that this dialect form can, for phonological reasons, only go back to *Mons Gaudii*, and not to *Mons Jovis. Nevertheless, an incorrect scholarly interpretation is the basis for the name *Montjovis* used today.[1045] As far as I am aware, there is no evidence to support the notion that the *Mons Gaudii* was once a pagan *Mons Jovis.

C.2.2.1.4 [With a doubtful dating:] A hill 8 km northeast of Saint-Calais (Sarthe)

This is another case that has not been discovered until now, but it is suspicious in terms of its chronology. It is found in a surviving cartulary of Saint-Calais monastery, from the very late date of 1709, where (on p. 50s. of the published edition) there is an undated charter written in the third person (strictly speaking therefore only a "notice of charter") purporting to be from this Abbey's medieval cartulary which has since been lost. It concerns a certain *Willelmus*, who is specified in the title as *dominus castri Sancti Carilefi* and is in fact generally believed to have been the founder of the castle of Saint-Calais, which was erected on the top of a mountain on the eastern bank of the River Anille, alongside the monastery which was located down in the valley below.[1046] Willelmus obtained the agreement of his liege lord *Herbertus Cenomannensis comes praenomine Canem Exitans* [= *excitans*],

---

1045 We must beware of the belief that a place called *Mons Jovis*, because it is based on pagan thinking, must necessarily be older than a Christian place called *Mons Gaudii*. During the early and high Middle Ages, most pagan ruins were deliberately destroyed, but in the late Middle Ages and even more so during the Renaissance, antiquarian interest in them began to grow, and quite often additional pagan elements were interpreted into things believed to have been pagan. It is typical that it the first attempt to interpret the battle cry (not the toponym) *Montjoie* as *meum Jovem* was made by two scholars in about 1500 (Löffel 1934, 15).

1046 An engraving from 1695 showing the monastery, castle and small town of Saint-Calais can be viewed online at: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint-Calais (last access 01.11.2021). Unfortunately, I am only now realising that the deed is not only 'suspect', but that the addendum in question is clearly forged. Here is the proof: 1) A *Mons Gaudii* is almost always high up; to this one you climb about 50 m from the Braye valley. 2) A mill next to a *Mons Gaudii* is inevitably a windmill; because so far up, a stream, if it existed, would have neither enough water nor sufficient gradient for a water mill. 3) The oldest windmills north of the Pyrenees/Alps were built in the 12th century, the oldest one that can be dated somewhat more precisely, only in

in other words the well-known Count Herbert I Éveille-chien (in Ordericus: *Evigilans-canem*) of Maine (1015–1036), then turned to the Abbot Herbert, *qui tunc regebat ecclesiam beati Carilefi*, and made a carefully documented donation to the Monastery in return for his spiritual salvation. This is followed by the statement: *Insuper pro hac re dedit monachis terram de Monte Gaudio cum molendino et pratis qui ad eam pertinebant*; and then there is a list of witnesses (none of whom can be verified from other sources).

The cartulary contains some charters from the Merovingian and Carolingian periods (the latest of these is from the year 863), followed by this one, which is the only one from 11th c., and then the next one was dated by the editor to the 13th c. but by Havet (1887, 18) to the 14th c. The toponym is not found again until the year 1511 (p. 77 of the published edition), but now in a French charter as *Montjoye*, including the mill once again, and now an additional building. Both buildings, situated 1.2 km to the north-northwest of the place called Rahay, were still listed as *maison* (*ancien moulin*) and *ferm*e in 1952 (cf. DT Sarthe s. v. *Montjoie, Le Bas- et le Haut-*).

Given the sparseness of the documentation, it is impossible to test the authenticity of this charter against other evidence from the 11th century; however, the large chronological gaps in the cartulary are a reason to be suspicious, as well as the almost 5 centuries that separate the first reference to this toponym from the second. The style raises questions also, because the writer (1) mentions the Count under his picturesque nickname, as if to make sure that he is differentiated from his grandson Herbert II of Maine (Count from 1051–1062); also, he (2) speaks of the abbot as being in office 'back then', and he (3) only mentions the estate of *Mons Gaudii* and the mill in a supplementary clause at the end; this type of clause is sometimes evidence that false information was added to the original charter in a later act of forgery. It is possible that the toponym is considerably later and originates from a time when the name *Mons Gaudii* or *Montjoie* was being applied much more freely to a number of locations.

Indeed, even the factual foundation here is much more ambiguous than the evidence underpinning the other cases from the time up to and around 1100. Practically the only conceivable pilgrimage destination in the area is the monastery of Saint-Calais, situated 8 km further to the southwest. It is already mentioned in the 6th c. as *Anisola* (preserved in the river's name *Anille*) by Gregory of Tours (*h.F.* 5.14, p. 207 [2]ed. Krusch) and is the place where Saint Carilefus the

---

the late 12th century (cf. Wikipedia, Art. *Windmühlen* with lit.); the deed claims to have been written before 1036.

hermit died. His posthumous veneration, according to the LCI (s. v.), was centred on the area between Chartres-Châteaudun-Blois-Le Mans. But anyone who climbed up from the Braye valley to the top of the *Mons Gaudii*, would not yet see the monastery in the Anille valley below, but would perhaps be able to see the castle of the same name on the mountain above it. Moreover, the monks of Saint-Calais owned not only *Mons Gaudii,* but also a large part of the small town of Rahay right next to it (cf. the cartulary p. 53), which means that in effect you would be entering the monastery's territory at that point.

C.2.2.1.5 A mountain almost 7 km northwest (?) of Saint-Liutwin of Mettlach

Yet another reference that has never before been discussed in our context is surely the oldest *Mons Gaudii* in Germany.[1047] The *Miracula Sancti Liutwini*, preserved only in a single ms. from the late 15th c., but according to its edition in the MGH (SS. 15.2, 1261) written in the year 1095 by a monk from Saint L(i)utwin of Mettlach, tell us in cap. 4 (p. 1262) about a fellow monk who had gone *supra montem, qui imminet monasterio et ad austrum situs est, qui et Mons-Gaudii dicitur, ad ecclesiam inibi positam.* The editor identifies *Mons Gaudii* as the place called Freudenberg between Mettlach and Saarburg, which (at a height of about 440 m above sea level) is located seven kilometres north-northwest of Mettlach (which is about 170 m above sea level). The place has been called

---

1047 If they were valid examples of the term *montjoie* the following two toponyms would have to find their place before the above section: (1) the *Tour Montjoie* in Conflans-Sainte-Honorine (25 km northwest of Paris), erected probably between 1080 and 1090, if the name is as old as the tower, but I can find no reference to prove this; it is situated only 60 m from the Seine, and so the name probably refers more to the building itself than the small hill upon which it stands; (2) a *Mons alacer* from the year 1089, if this is the same place as the later "*Montjay* ou *Moissenans* du baill. d'Auxonne" (as argued by Herbillon 1977, 130, with a reference to Vincent 1937, 191); the idea is that *Mons alacer* and *Montjay* together would suggest a *Mons Gaudii*. The place in question is Montjay (Saône-et-Loire), which was previously called *Mois(s)enans* until about 1780, when it took over the name of the local Montjay castle. This Montjay is attested in many references, but from the first one in 1157, none of them fit with *Mons Gaudii /Montjoie* and all or almost all of them refer to *Mont-jai* 'Jay Mountain'; cf. the new *Dictionnaire topographique de la France* published by the CTHS, www.cths.fr/dico-topo /index/Recherche (last access 14.10.2021), which has many references for Saône-et-Loire in particular, but none for a *Mons alacer*. The toponymic type *Mont-jay* is also used in other places; cf. for example Dép. Seine-et-Marne s. v. with four such places, one of them attested several times since the beginning of the 12th c. as *Mons Gaius*. *Mons alacer* is therefore probably not linked with *Montjay* (Saône-et-Loire), and as long as it is unidentified, it need not be cited as a reformulation of the name *Mons Gaudii*, not least because there is also a toponymic type *Montal(l)ègre* (e.g. for a medieval castle in the Rodez municipality).

Freudenburg, not *-berg* for centuries, but Jungandreas (1963, s. v. *Freudenburg*), who unfortunately does not mention the reference from the *Miracula* under *Mons Gaudii*, nor under *Freudenberg* or *Freudenburg*, tells us that until 1570 this place was mostly called *Freudenberg* and it was only after the building of a castle there in the early 14th c. that it gradually started to take on the name *Freudenburg* after the castle. However, there remains a discrepancy that the editor of the MGH did not notice, namely that Freudenburg is located to the northwest of Mettlach and not *ad austrum*, and therefore (in medieval Latin usage) to the southeast. I think it is unlikely that there were two *Montes Gaudii*, one on either side of Mettlach, and more likely that the author had a momentary lapse: *ad austrum* is not where the mountain of Mettlach lies, but where Mettlach lies when seen from the mountain.

Mettlach is slightly less than 50 km from the linguistic boundary, and throughout the whole of the Middle Ages, it was influenced by Francophone culture. In the 10th/11th c. it was especially influenced by Gorze or Saint-Vanne de Verdun (LThK[2] s. v.), which, like Mettlach, came under the archdiocese of Trier, which at that time even had several Francophone archbishops; Mettlach also had close ties with Gerbert of Reims, to whom they sent, among other things, two monks for the purpose of gaining knowledge of the secular (!) sciences (Lager 1875, 29–37). It has been a place of pilgrimage from time immemorial; the traditional "Lutwinus Pilgrimage" (between Ascension Day and Pentecost) was revived recently and still takes place annually in Mettlach.

C.2.2.1.6 A Mons Gaudii planned in 1098 to be located west of Arles

Löffel (1934, 6) cites a reference from the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jherusalem* by Raymond d'Aguilers (cap. 13, RHC Occ. 3.264) in such a brief way that his readers might well think, incorrectly, that he is referring to a *Mons Gaudii* near Jerusalem. But Raymond is reporting that in the year 1098, Peter Bartholomew, the man who discovered the Holy Lance of Antioch, and who never actually reached Jerusalem, was dying of his burns following an ordeal by fire and gave his sovereign lord Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse and Margrave of Provence (whose confessor the author was), the following instruction: *Tu autem, quum reversus fueris* [to the West], *prope quinque leugas ecclesiam Sancti Trophimi* [of Arles] *lanceam Domini pones, et ecclesiam ibi fabricari facies; et fiet ibi moneta, quam tu jurabis ne falsa fiat; sed neque aliud falsum ibi fieri permittes. Vocabitur ille locus Mons Gaudii; et fient haec infra Provinciam.*

Etenim beatus Petrus Trophimo discipulo suo[1048] *promisit quod lanceam Domini ei mitteret.*

But Raymond of Saint-Gilles never did return to his homeland because he died in 1105 in the County of Tripoli which he founded; this explains why the instruction was not followed. The visionary was probably thinking of the road from Saint-Gilles to Arles,[1049] and more precisely the place where the Cathedral of Saint-Trophime in Arles comes into view. Because the Little Rhône, and not the Great Rhône formed the traditional boundary between Languedoc and Provence, the road came in slightly east of Saint-Gilles *infra Provinciam*,[1050] and because the north edge of the Camargue is very flat, people could see a very long way from that point. Even if the idea that forms the basis of this – a holy place coming into view, in this case Saint-Trophime in Arles – is the same as it is in the other older references, the hill in question can only have been a few metres high in this landscape; for that reason alone, the term *Mons Gaudii* in the mind of the dying man must also – or perhaps even mainly – have been spiritually intended: his aim would have been to endorse the significance of the new church as the owner of the Holy Lance. This desire to add even more spiritual meaning to the pre-existing toponym *Mons gaudii*, is as we shall demonstrate, shared by the poet of the Song of Roland.[1051]

1048 Just as Ado of Vienne and Usuardus in their 9th century martyrologies had stated, so Peter Bartholomew also believed that Saint Trophimus of Arles (3rd c.) was identical to the Trophimus (*Act Ap* 20.4, 21.29, *2 Tim* 4.20) who was a student of Paul, but who was then made into a student of Peter, for the sake of the apostolic succession.

1049 That is to say, on the road that we may consider as the beginning of the fourth and southernmost of the well-known roads in the Pilgrims' Guide, since it says in the introduction to cap. 8 that anyone who sets off on the road from Saint-Gilles to Compostela must [first] visit Arles where the grave of Trophimus is located.

1050 I must defer to the experts in deciding whether this refers to French miles (*lieue commune* ~ 4,4 km, *lieue de poste* ~ 3,9 km) or perhaps Gallic miles (~ 2,2 km), which is the only one recognised even by Isidore (*et.* 15.16.3).

1051 We could take this comparison further. The visionary links the 'lance with which Christ was pierced' (of course meaning the lance that was found at Antioch) with the term *Mons Gaudii*, just as the Roland poet (v. 2503–2511) links the *lance [. . .] dunt nostre Sire fut en la cruiz nafret* (whose *mure* Charlemagne has had inserted into the pommel of his sword) through the name *Joiuse* with the battle cry (and in v. 3094 the banner) *Munjoie*. However, the way this is done is quite different when we consider the finer details, which suggests that the similarity is coincidental.

C.2.2.1.7 A mountain 8 km north-northwest of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem

Three historians of the First Crusade cover the moment when the crusaders approach the city of Jerusalem (*Gesta* 10.37, p. 194 ed. Bréhier; Raymond d'Aguilers cap. 20, RHC Occ. 3.158s.; Albert of Aachen 5.45, RHC occ. 4.463), but none of them mentions a *Mons gaudii* at that point;[1052] however, Albert describes how the crusaders look upon the city *prae gaudio lacrymantes*. The Russian Igumen Daniil, who visited Jerusalem in 1106/1107, writes: 'About one verst (~ 1067 m) before Jerusalem there is a hill; they all dismount and erect small crosses, and bow down on the way to the city in awe of the holy Church of the Resurrection [Orthodox term for the Church of the Holy Sepulchre G.A.B.]. Every Christian is filled with great joy when he sees the holy city of Jerusalem.'[1053] A map of Jerusalem preserved in three mss. from the 12ᵗʰ c. (Saint-Omer, Brussels, Stuttgart), which according to Miller (1895–1898, 3.61–67) originated from the time of the *Gesta* or even earlier, shows the *Mons Gaudii* just outside Jerusalem; on the one from Brussels at least, the first of the pilgrims raises his hands to greet Jerusalem (EJ, Art. Maps of Ereẓ Israel, fig. 2). An undated plan from the estate of Count Riant (Miller 1895–1898, 3.64 and 67) has instead the more explicit term *Mons peregrini gaudentis*. There is a charter of King Baldwin I (MGH DD.lat.K.Jer. 1.187 a. 1114) which can be more precisely dated and which mentions a property *ultra Montem Gaudii*. Even if there is no evidence that this mountain acquired its name before the First Crusade, it certainly must have had it soon after that time. In the year 1143 we hear for the first time about an *abbatia Sancti Samuelis in monte Gaudii* (Jerusalem-Röhricht Add. 15 no. 216); there is a corresponding reference from the 13ᵗʰ c. by one of the OF continuers of William of Tyre's work in relation to an event in the year 1192 calling it *Saint Samuel, que l'en apele la Montjoie* (RHC Occ. 2.184 bottom). From around 500 A.D. onwards, the hill was thought to be the burial place of the prophet Samuel (cf. Donner 1979, 205 n. 38, Löffel 1934, 25–27), which explains why it is still called in Arab. today *Nabī Samwīl* (Murphy-O'Connor 1981, 316s.). In around 1169 the German pilgrim Theodericus (cap. 3 and 41, ed. Huygens 1994) defines the *Mons Gaudii* again as the point, *a quo ab aquilonari parte introitus patet in civitatem;* there at the *ecclesiola [. . .] ad primum*

[1052] Today, that point is in the West Bank; the modern road (Jaffa/Tel Aviv-) Lod-Jerusalem was rebuilt by the Israelis and runs further to the south.

[1053] Quoted following Klaus Müller (1991, 40s.). The French translation by de Khitrovo (1889, 11s.) has instead of "erect small crosses" the phrase "making the sign of the cross", which would be trivial, and based on the evidence of the Theodericus text cited above, it is clearly incorrect.

ipsius civitatis intuitum peregrini magno gaudio exhilarati cruces ponere solent [. . .] sese discalciantes [. . .].

C.2.2.1.8 A mountain 3.5 km east-northeast of Santiago de Compostela

The *Historia Compostellana* (1.20.1, ed. Falque Rey), which was completed shortly after 1139, reports that the *ecclesia in Monte Gaudii fabricata et consecrata* was the work of Diego Gelmírez, Bishop (from 1101), later Archbishop (1124–1140) of Compostela, in the years after his journey to Rome to receive the bishops' pallium (a. 1104), and also mentions certain renovations carried out most probably before 1110; later (1.112 *in fine*) the crowd runs towards the bishop, as he is returning home with a newly acquired relic *ad Montem Gaudii*, *id est ad Humiliatorium*, and from that point onwards, everyone including the bishop returns to the city *nudis pedibus*. At around the same time as the *Historia Compostellana* the *Pilgrims' Guide*, that is to say the 5th book in the *Codex Calixtinus*, mentions the mountain at appropriate places in the narrative (cap. 6 *in fine*, cap. 9 *in init.*). Today there is even a monument on this *Monxoi / Monte de(l) Gozo*.

C.2.2.1.9 Summary of the early toponymic findings

All in all, therefore, within a century and a half, we find an unparalleled expansion of the term *Mons Gaudii* referring to at least six mountains within sight of significant holy places, located from the far west to the far east of Western European Christendom. Löffel, who clearly understood the basis of this phenomenon in the historical pilgrimage tradition,[1054] thought that the idea radiated out from Jerusalem (1934, 30ss.). But even though evidence from before the First Crusade eludes us, Rome is much more likely to have been the place where it originated, because the number of pilgrims going to Rome in the 10th/11th c. is many times greater than the number going to Jerusalem. Furthermore, the two places which are nearest to Rome, in southern France, would have been affected first. The two furthest corners of Christendom would have been affected later, probably both at the same time as this naming tradition travelled northwards as well as eastwards, all of which amounts to an almost perfect concentric

---

1054 This connection with lived experience permits us, methodologically speaking, to highlight a term from medieval Latin rather than Latin or Vulgar Latin, even though medieval Latin was nobody's native language. Although the term may have been first formulated in one particular Romance language, in this case the medieval Latin underpins it, highlighting how closely related the Romance languages are through their Latin origins, and this in turn is what helped the term (and also its translation into German) to spread further afield.

spread. Be that as it may, the force behind this movement is clear: it is the tradition of pilgrimages, which increased dramatically in the West as soon as the danger from the Normans, the Hungarians and to some extent the Saracens had been eliminated. The immediate motivation behind each naming is clear. Pilgrims would have had their first glimpse of their goal from high ground; this explains why the expression is precisely *Mons* Gaudii.

Because the term *Mons Gaudii* is not attested with any other meaning apart from this one until after 1100, and because there is no record of any kind of similar expression that could have led to *Mons Gaudii*, our analysis resolves the etymology of *Mons Gaudii* and all of the corresponding vernacular toponyms such as Occ. *Mon(t)jauzi* and *Mont Jauvi* (and the pseudo-erudite *Montjovis*), Fr. *le* and *la Montjoie*, Gal. *Monxoi* and Span. *Monte de(l) Gozo* as well as early MHG *Mendelberg* and early modern High German *Freudenberg*.

This leads us to the following important conclusion: the expression with this meaning must have been familiar to the poet of the Rol., and he must also have been aware how familiar with this – and only this – meaning it was to his audience. We must therefore beware *a priori* of any hypotheses which start with the assumption that the battle cry has nothing to do with the toponym.

C.2.2.2 Further toponymic and French-appellative developments

If we ignore for the moment the use of this expression as a battle cry and as the name of Charlemagne's banner in the Rol. and elsewhere,[1055] which we will discuss below (C.2.2.3–C.2.2.6), it is not until the 12th c., and broadly speaking after the middle of that century, that the expression seems to enjoy something of a second wave of expansion, especially in its vernacular equivalent forms. In order to avoid etymological aberrations, we will sketch these out in this section.

[a] First, the toponymic usage, that is to say the number of places bearing this name, increases sharply after 1150, and often there is no longer any obvious connection with a nearby sanctuary. It often simply means a place on high ground with a good view, and so this name was used for mountains.[1056] (This

---

1055 As well as the meaning "town crier, herald" which derives from the battle cry and is first attested at the end of the 15th c. (Löffel 1934, 41s.) and which therefore need not be part of our analysis.

1056 With no claim to completeness, research thus far has identified many examples in France: Löffel (1934, 31s.) counts twenty, Nègre (1990–1998, no. 20985–20992) counts eighteen additional such places, some of which are different or have older sources. A borderline case is the *Mons gaudii*, a hill 5 km east of Vézelay, according to Nègre "XIIe s."; the oldest *Mons gaudii* that I have not found an explanation for is the one near Sibiville (Pas-de-Calais) from

numerical increase in particular confirms in retrospect that the early phase of *Mons Gaudii* was linked to pilgrimages, and not just contingent on the terrain; for if it had been contingent on the local terrain, we would expect to find that one or more of the many new *Montes gaudii* would already have been documented at that time.)

[b] Secondly, a broad spectrum of deonomastics, that is to say appellative formations developed out of it. Cf. Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *monjoie, montjoie*, col. 214s.: here the simplest meaning, attested from about 1200 onwards, is 'point from which you can see a particular castle, town or similar for the first time' with references for 'the' *monjoie* of an unnamed *chastel*, an erstwhile mosque, or cities such as Mainz or Toul, or an unnamed town; an extension of this is 'elevated position (hill, mountain, peak) from where you have a good view' (from now on without specifying a particular place), as for example the city of Laon *siet sus la monjoie*; another extension leads to the simple meaning 'castle, fortress' just as Reynard the fox's burrow is his *monjoie*; there are also figurative expressions with this meaning: *Desesperance* (as an allegorical place name) is the *monjoie* of hell (does it give you a first view of hell when you are on the road to that place, or is it even the epitome of hell?); the joy of Paradise is the *monjoie*, the pinnacle of joy; the Holy

---

the year 1179. The *Montjoie* near Saint-Calais could also fit into this category, cf. above the qualifying comments in C.2.2.1.4. (The name of the *Joyenval* monastery founded in 1221, 25 km west of Paris, is intended to contrast with a neighbouring *Montjoie* castle near Marly according to Houth-Baltus 1965, 216.) – In Italy, Pellegrini (1990, 220) cites eight places with an etymology of *Mons gaudii*, including six from Calabria, evidently with Norman origins. – I do not know of any list of these for Spain; I can think of relatively old forms such as the *castrum totum quod dicitur Mongaudi*, which Ramon Berengar of Barcelona donated to the Templars in 1143 (Temple 204, *Montgaudi* in the papal confirmation of 1150, Temple 387) and the *villa de Monte Gaudii* of the year 1184 (Oviedo Cathedral 484), today La Manjoya 3 km south of Oviedo. (The Spanish knights order *de Monte Gaudio* 'Order of Mountjoy' was founded shortly after 1170 and was named after the *Mons Gaudii* outside Jerusalem but soon moved its operations from there to the Pyrenean Peninsula, where part of it merged with the Order of Calatrava, and part of it with other orders shortly before and after 1200). – I have come across only two old cases from Germany: (1) Monschau castle, built by the Limburgers (in 1217 *Montjoie* according to Gysseling 1960 s. v.); moreover, the castle and small town were called *Montjoie* until their Germanisation at the behest of William II in August 1918 (three months before his abdication!); (2) Freudenberg am Main; *Frouwedenberch* Castle was built in the second half of the 12th c. by the Bishops of Würzburg and the Counts of Wertheim who were their vassals; the name *Froudenberc* referring to the place located below the castle is first attested in 1200 (it was previously called *Lüllenseit* or similar), (original charter Staatsarchiv Wertheim StAWt-R US 1200 a); before 1225 the Archbishops of Mainz built a contrasting castle about 9 km downriver called the *Miltenburc* (today Mildenburg) with its *Miltenberc* (today Miltenberg); cf. MHG *milte* 'kindness, generosity'.

Virgin or another individual woman is the *monjoie*, the *non-plus-ultra*, of everything that is good or lovely.[1057]

Löffel (1934, 43ss.) made another nuance of meaning plausible when he considered the ancient transcultural habit of using cairns as road or boundary markers. The original meaning of this is disputed: some think they were erected at suitable intervals to function as genuine road markers or boundary markers; others think they have always been linked with superstitious ideas, as for example when in antiquity travellers placed or threw a stone at the statues of Hermes on their way, which can be interpreted as an act of homage [as the Talmud confirms, and for this very reason it forbids Jews to do it [cf. Levy Wb s. v. *Marqulis*, G.A.B.]. In the Christian era, there was initially an attempt to forbid this tradition (Löffel, 1934, 53s.), but later, it was tolerated in a Christianised form. This practice continued especially at the *montes gaudii* of pilgrimage routes,[1058] where adding a stone to the pile may be interpreted as the pilgrim's symbolic way of integrating himself or herself into the collective group of godly pilgrims, simultaneously offering thanks to God for the success of the pilgrimage thus far and praying for the continued success of the rest of the journey. In the case of the *Mons Gaudii* outside the most illustrious pilgrim destination of all, Jerusalem, we have the special form of this tradition in the account given by Daniil and Theodericus: people didn't place a stone there, but they erected a small cross that they had brought with them for that purpose. At other *montes gaudii / mon(t)joies,* the simple stone cairns remained. On the popular pilgrimage routes, these soon grew very large, making them look like small *monts,* so that the first part in the expression began to be linked with the cairns instead of entire mountains. Thus, the word *montjoie* took on the meaning 'tas de pierres'; cf. the references in Godefroy s. v. *Montjoie 1*, s.f., in the FEW s. v. *mons* 3.a., p. 90b, and especially in Huguet s. v. But a Medieval Latin reference here is one of the most interesting, because it exemplifies the link between the old and new meaning: written in approximately 1221,[1059] the *Vita* of Robert of Molesmes, who founded the Abbey of Molesmes (Côte-d'Or) in 1075 and died there in 1111, mentions a

---

1057 The continuers of William of Tyre's work (RHC Occ. 2.589, Löffel 1934, 41) make an isolated mention in the context of 1249 a ship bearing the name (*la*) *Montjoie*. This could simply be understood as a (quasi-) fortress or the *non-plus-ultra* of its class.

1058 Cardinal Hugo de Sancto Caro (Hugues de Saint-Cher, around 1250), quoted by Löffel (1934, 33), who incorrectly dates this to 1530: *Gentiles faciebant acervum lapidum ad honorem Mercurii et aliorum deorum; sicut etiam apud nos faciunt peregrini, ubi primo vident monasterium ad quod vadunt, ubi constituunt acervum lapidum et ponunt cruces et dicitur Mons Gaudii.* On a very similar custom in a few parts of the Islamic world, cf. Löffel (1934, 33s.).

1059 Cf. Spahr (1944, p. XVs.).

posthumous miracle which takes place in a location close to Molesmes, a *locum, in quo erat quedam congeries lapidum, que vocatur Mons Gaudii, unde videri potest ecclesia Molismensis*[1060] (cap. 21, p. 28 ed. Spahr); after about a century of pilgrims' stones being left there in a pile, this cairn seemed to be the origin of the name, even to the monk from Molesme. This meaning also underwent an expansion, to signify in general a 'heap, pile, profusion', cf. Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *monjoie, montjoie*, col. 215, the FEW s. v. *mons* 3.a., p. 90b at the bottom, and once again especially Huguet s. v.[1061]

[c] Because all of these meanings are attested two hundred years or more later than the old, toponymic usage and can be derived from it in small steps without difficulty, it should be evident that they require no further etymological explanation. Unfortunately, however, some researchers have shown a remarkably determined reluctance to accept this finding.

This is especially true of Gamillscheg from 1928 (EWFS[1] s. v. *Montjoie*, here still hesitatingly) to 1951 (135) and 1967 (passim) and even 1969 (EWFS[2] s. v. *Montjoie*) with his concept of Frank. *mund-gawi* 'protective zone, protectorate'. Gamillscheg's last two articles have literally identical introductions, stating that Fr. *montjoie* 'road marker', 'cairn' is first mentioned in 998 as *mons gaudii* in a chronicle, and citing *A Teutonicis mons*[1062] *gaudii, a Romanis mons malus vocatur*, René Louis, Fr.mod. VI, 296 [. . .]. But this statement is factually incorrect: the quotation is not in the *Chronicon Venetum* for (not 'from') the year 998, but in the report of the founding of Brauweiler which originated 65 years later; it is only the fourth-oldest reference to the mountain near Rome, and the seventh or eighth oldest for the expression *Mons Gaudii* (cf. above C.2.2.1.1). Thus, in 1968 Gamillscheg is still using a misunderstood statement from the *Français moderne* of 1938, and without verifying it, he makes it the basis of his argument, even though criticism of his article ranging from emphatic to virulent from the likes of Spitzer (1928, 108), Löffel (1934, 24), Heisig (1951, 295s.) and Sperber (1955, 139–141) should have made him more prudent. He continues with the claim that this clearly[1063] indicates

---

1060 Ms. T has *ubi* instead of *in quo*, mss. Ms and Bx suppress the sentence beginning with *unde*; the stemma (p. XXX ed. Spahr) shows that neither can influence the critical edition of the text.

1061 Löffel (1934, 38–41) cites interesting material on the afterlife and further diversification of these meanings up to the present day from southern France, Catalonia and (marginally) Portugal.

1062 A. 1967 (369) the word *mons* is missing by mistake.

1063 The word is omitted in the slightly condensed phrasing of the EWFS².

the expression belongs in the vocabulary of the Germanic peoples, in this case the Franks. Absolutely not! The article in the *Français moderne* cited the *Chronicon Venetum* as the origin of the first reference, but Gamillscheg's generic phrase "in a chronicle" misses the point that the author of the first reference was a Romance-language speaker, quite apart from Suger, the continuer of Morena's work, and the authors of the Ordines of the 12th and 13th (cf. above C.2.2.1.1). Because Gamillscheg is also unaware of the use of this expression in Le Puy and Limoges (or later in Santiago), he cannot see its original connection with the great pilgrimage destinations, nor the spiritual driving force behind the expression. There is also no mention of the fact that a corresponding term for *Mons Gaudii* does exist in the "vocabulary of the Germanic peoples", albeit in that of the Germans, and not the Franks: it is not **mund-gawi*, but *mendelberg*. Gamillscheg claims that we would expect a word originating around 950 or 1000 to have already become **Mont de joie*, but Rohlfs (1974, 448) counters this, maintaining that "Il suffit de citer les toponymes *Montdragon*, *Montfaucon*, *Montgardin*, *Montmartre*, *Pontpierre* (*Pompierre*), *Puylaroque*, *Villedieu*, *Chaise-Dieu*, *Portejoie*, pour se rendre compte du peu-fondé d'un tel argument". It is true that in purely phonological terms, **mund-gawi* would be acceptable; because until just a few generations ago, the *Ajoie*, the territory around Porrentruy, Ferrette and Montbéliard was called in Ger. *Alsgau / Elsgau* (< Germ. **alisgawi*).[1064] But this is the only positive part of his argument. First of all, it is chronologically incorrect: if a Germanic legal expression first appears in the south of Frankish realm (Rome, Le Puy, Limoges!), then it must have originated in the 8th c. at the very latest; why would there then be no record of it for so long? Secondly, Gamillscheg tried very hard but still failed to find any evidence for the narrowing of *Gau* from 'area, zone' to mean a single mountain, or even an observation point, or road marker. Thirdly, his idea is factually wrong: the Merovingian Empire, like the early and late Carolingian Empire, did not have any protectorate-like zones, but only (tribal) duchies which they had subjugated; they held sovereignty over them because they had conquered them (which they then sometimes had to reinforce with another campaign) and they did not consider that relationship one of *mund* 'protection', a word that is never used of territories, but only of socially defined groups of people (from

---

1064 I wonder if Gamillscheg, perhaps when he was researching for the *Romania Germanica*, ever concluded from the term *Ajoie* that the *-joie* element in *Montjoie* must have come from the same original source; his unexpected discovery of an ingenious and phonologically unassailable idea may well explain the psychology behind this otherwise illustrious philologist's stubbornness.

extended families gradually to whole professional groups). This **mund-gawi* is not only unnecessary, unattested and has the wrong spatial dimension; it also sounds completely wrong from a legal perspective.

These problems do not go away if we replace Germ. *mund* with Lat. *mons* but retain Germ. *gawi* and then assign this hybrid form the astonishingly vague meaning 'lieu de montagne' (cf. Bugler 1972, passim); nor do they disappear if we replace **mundgawi* with a phonologically impossible **mundigalga* (> **monjauge*!) 'protective cross' (Kaspers 1958, 177). It is even bolder to argue that in the Plaine Saint-Denis the *butte* by the name of *La Montjoie* [3 km south of the Abbey church and first attested with this name in the year 1233, Paris-Notre-Dame 2.477, quoted in Lombard-Jourdan 1989, 31] was a Gaulish sanctuary, later the burial place of Saint Dionysius, called **Mundgawi* by the Franks, which meant not 'protective zone' but 'Protège-pays' [as an imperative compound from OHG *muntôn* 'protect'; but *gaw*i does not mean 'land'!] (cf. Lombard-Jourdan 1989, passim, summarised 1993, 172s.).[1065] There is even less justification for stepping still further into the shadows of linguistics and suggesting it is based on a compound made from Gaulish **mant-/mont-* 'way' and **gauda* 'hill', which is neither phonologically nor semantically convincing (Arnould 1971, passim, especially 99–102). In comparison with these suggestions, it is just harmless and irrelevant to suggest that single places which are only attested after 1180, or considerably later, as *Mons Gaudii* had the attributes of a *hauteur stratégique [. . .] d'où l'on observe la région en vue de la défense militaire* (R. Louis 1939, F. Bar 1942–1943, Favière 1946–1947, all passim).

Finally, the suggested etymology *Mons Jovis* was revived by Diament (1970–1971, passim, with further work 1971–1972, passim). I cannot *a limine* exclude the possibility that one or other of the many instances of *Montjoie* (including, of course the dialectal variants of the name) could have been a *Mons Jovis* in pagan times,[1066] but the burden of proof for this kind of claim lies with the person who makes it. It is not plausible to claim – and this applies especially to the *Montjoie* of Saint-Denis which is not attested until 1233 – as Diament (1970–1971, 453) attempts to do, without any attested examples of a *Mons Jovis*, that there has been a purely graphical confusion or even a phonological development *Jŏve* (obl.) > *Joe*, "puis réinsertion d'une autre semiconsonne, [J], donnant donc *joie*". On the contrary, we would expect Fr. diphthongisation; this is shown

---

1065 The author favours drastic solutions, at least in philological matters (cf. the review by M. Pfister 1993, 188s.), and also seems too attached to her own (unsupported) ideas about the early history of Saint-Denis (cf. the review by Gérard Moyse 1991, passim).

1066 Only one of the 18 instances of *Montjoie* or similar cited by Nègre (1990–1998, no. 20985–20992) is a realistic possibility, and that is Montjoi (Tarn-et-Garonne): *Mons Jovis* dating from 1326, *Mons Gaudium* 14th c.

incontrovertibly in the most famous *Mons Jovis*, later called the Great Saint Bernard, with its many Old French references, especially in the epic tradition (cf. Moisan s. v.): *Mongieu/Mongeu* and related forms, which were generally matched up with *jeu* and *lieu*; this then became **jueu*, which meant homophony with **jueu < iocum*,[1067] then *jieu* with the usual dissimilation, where usually the [ĭ] was swallowed by the [dž]. At best we can consider the third of Diamant's suggestions, that one name was substituted for the other, either in a deliberate Christianisation or to replace a supposed 'Mountain of Fun (*mons ioci*)'[1068] with a 'Mountain of Joy'. But this would mean that the newly created 'Mountain of Joy' would be the first term worthy of our interest, and it would then be treated no differently than all the other places originally named 'Mountain of Joy'. But this substitution has not even been proven for the *Mons Gaudii* of Limoges, let alone the *Montjoie* of Saint-Denis or all other instances of *Montjoie*.[1069]

Unfortunately, Diament repeatedly talks about *Montjoie Saint-Denis!* as 'the' battle cry of the French (or of the Capetian armies). He overlooks the fact that the first record of the simple *Mon(t)joie* being used as a battle cry, apart from the Rol., is from the year 1119 as reported by *Ordericus Vitalis* writing between 1123 and 1141 (book. 4, p. 341 ed. Le Prévost), whereas *Mon(t)joie Saint-Denis!* is not attested until the middle of the 12th c.; Hibbard Loomis (1959, 481) found a reference in the Lorraine epics of the late 12th c. (*Garin, Girbert*) indicating that *Montjoie* was *l'enseigne Saint-Denis*; at around the same time, the full *Mon(t)joie Saint-Denis!* appears (cf. the table in Löffel 1934, 13)[1070] – that is to say, at a time

---

1067 Cf. the much-quoted verses from the *Fecunda Ratis*, 1.1054–1056: *Mons Jovis ab Jove, quem prisci coluere profani, / Dictus, non, ut vulgus ait, de calle jocoso, / Quemque viatores per multa pericula repunt*. 'The Montjoux is named after Jupiter, not after some supposedly amusing little mountain pathway upon which in reality travellers encounter many dangers as they go'. In *Jŏve > *jueu* the vocalisation of the -*v*- > -*u* instead of desonorisation to -*f* is probably an Occitanism (cf. Occ. *Montjou(x)*, and also *nau, trau < navem, trabem*). In *Jŏvis diem > OF juesdi*, however, the -*v*-, as we would expect in OF, is assimilated; but here, too, we should note, diphthongisation occurred as well.

1068 Cf. the previous n.!

1069 All of the other borderline cases eagerly gathered by Diament are equally unhelpful. For example, our Monschau is *Montjoie* from 1217 (Gysseling s.v.) until 1918 [sic]. It is *Montioue* just in 1262 in the *Chronicle* of the Frisian Menko (MGH 23.550). But even in Menko, we need not think of Jupiter; the <ou> may be a way of writing MHG /öü/ without umlaut.

1070 The cry *Monjoya, Sant Denis!* in the Occ. *Fierabras* (v. 365 ed. Bekker) is not mentioned there, but it could be slightly older, if we support the early dating of it. According to Löffel's table it would have been already in the *Couronnement de Louis*. But that text has in v. 1940: "*Monjoie!» escrie, «sainz Denis, car m'aidiez [. . .]*"; and v. 2615: "*Monjoie!" escrie, "Deus, sainz Denis, aidiez! [. . .]*", where the rectus after the caesura is to be understood vocatively. Furthermore, the *Couronnement* v. 2331 has a simple *Monjoie!* According to Löffel's Table, *Monjoie*

when thanks to Suger and his successors, the monastery's importance for the Ca-
petian kingdom had grown enormously. Finally, I think Diament (1971–1972, 179s.)
is not justified in postulating an originally logical nexus between the two parts of
Montjoie Saint-Denis! showing a from-to relationship, which possibly – as long as
Montjoie (following Diament's etymology) was still understood as 'Mountain of Ju-
piter' – symbolised the transition "du paganisme au christianisme, de la mé-
créance à la foi, du péché au salut"; this would mean that the demonstrably older
Montjoie would grotesquely have symbolised *paganisme*, *mécréance* and *péché*.
The more obvious relationship is surely a juxtaposition that serves to make the
meaning more precise.[1071]

   We can therefore summarise our analysis of this toponym as follows: the
spread of *Mons Gaudii* 'the place from where a pilgrimage destination could be
seen for the first time' across Western Christianity from around 950, until around
1100, was unprecedented. It probably emanated from Rome and was popular
from Jerusalem to Santiago; we must assume that the Roland poet knew about it,
and that he was also aware that his audience would be familiar with it too. There
is no evidence for the idea that there was an older and different etymology, hiding
behind this main one. If we ignore for the time being the special case of the battle
cry and the name of Charlemagne's banner, which will be analysed below, then
Mons Gaudii – excluding its further onomastic development – did not start to take
on a host of additional appellative meanings until after the middle of the 12th c.

C.2.2.3 *Mons*, *gaudium* and *mons gaudii / Munjoie* as theological terms

[a] Following the work of Johannes Jeremias, who had explained in his study *Der
Gottesberg* (1919, passim)[1072] how the term "mountain" even in the Bible became
a symbol of the 'dwelling place of God', Heisig (1951, 298–302) went on to

---

Saint Denis! was much less common in the epic tradition throughout the 13th c. than the simple
Montjoie! DuCange, in his *Dissertation* XI, p. 41 (published with the *Glossarium*) lists from the
battle of Bouvines (1214) both *Montjoie* and a *Montjoie Dieux et Saint Denys* in Mousket, and
then *Mon(t)joie Saint Denys* for events dating from 1217–1221, 1297, 1303 (2), 1304, 1328, 1426.

1071 Along the lines that the troops under the Capetian sphere of influence felt the need for a
more precise meaning from around the time when Philip Augustus started to call the whole of
the *regnum Franciae* to arms. (Later, this distinction in the meaning could have been lost). We
can compare this with the later distinction if original meaning in the battle cries of the type
Nostre Dame + X: *Nostre Dame Bourgogne / Bearn / Auxerre / Sancerre / Gueldres / Hainaut* in
DuCange, *Dissertation* XI (published with the *Glossarium*, p. 40b.)

1072 Heisig mistakenly cites the author as Joachim Jeremias (1900–1979) instead of Johannes
Jeremias (1865–1942 or 1945).

demonstrate with over twenty examples from Ambrosius to Bernard of Clairvaux (14 from the period before 1050) that the word *mons* continued to have this meaning in the figurative thinking of the Church Fathers and the Scholastics – sometimes expanded into the spectrum of meaning covered by *patria coelestis / ecclesia / Christus.*

Heisig started with the fact that in the words of Jesus *intra in gaudium domini tui* (directed at the two good and faithful servants in the parable of the bags of gold, *Mt* 25.21 and 23) the word *gaudium* was often interpreted anagogically in the Middle Ages as 'eternal blessedness', and he then demonstrated (1951, 302–305) with the help of about forty references (more than thirty from the period before 1050), how frequently the word *gaudium* (and a few times g*audere*), which this literature refers to, means precisely eternal blessedness, mostly with corresponding explanation in the accompanying text.

[b] Because in theological terms the 'dwelling place of God' and 'eternal blessedness' are very closely related, we are justified in wondering, as Heisig does, how often *mons* and *gaudium* or their inflected forms appear together in the same sentence. This occurs five times in Heisig's corpus (cf. his discussion on p. 305–307). In the middle of the 9th c.[1073] Sedulius Scottus s (MGH PLAeC 3.195) says of the deceased Louis the Pious: *Gaudia longa metit Ludevicus in arce polorum, / Montibus aeternis gaudia longa metit.* The same Sedulius wishes the addressee, in a semi-serious praise poem (MGH PLAeC 3.216): *Vere florente mundo / Te gaudeas beatum / Post longa saecla patrem / Montis Sion in arce.*[1074] In the early 11th c., Dudo of Saint-Quentin (p. 146 ed. Lair) reports how Rollo dreamt that he was in France, standing on a high mountain from which a clear spring was flowing down, and how a Christian prisoner interpreted this *mons Franciae* as *ecclesia illius* (scil. *Franciae*), which apparently was an indication of Rollo's future baptism; later (p. 153) Dudo turns to Rollo in an aside, saying: *En mons ecclesiae, quo te gaudere videbas; / En lavacri quo te leprā purgarier hic fons.*[1075] In the second quarter of the 12th c. Bernard of Clairvaux interprets *Is* 2.2, which speaks of the 'mountain of the house of God' (in the literal sense, this is Zion as the place where the Temple is), as follows:[1076] *Erit enim mons*

1073 Heisig thinks the poem was written between 877 and 879 and addressed to Louis II the Stammerer of France (which does not fit with the dates of Sedulius' other works, written around 840–860), but according to the MGH-Editor Ludwig Traube, it was addressed to Louis the German (840–876).

1074 Heisig only refers to this in a footnote, perhaps on account of the semi-serious tone.

1075 In Heisig's account, the *hic* is missing, which distorts the metre of the verse.

1076 *Sermones de diversis* 33, § 2; vol. 6/1, p. 222 ed. Leclercq/Rochais.

pacis, mons gaudii, mons gloriae: et hi omnes montes unus mons consummatae felicitatis. And speaking of a person who according to *Ps* 83.6 experiences God's help, Bernard says,[1077] he is *perventurus quandoque ad te in montibus gaudiorum.*

If we extend Heisig's review of Bernard further,[1078] we find Conrad of Eberbach – who lived in the mother monastery at Clairvaux for many years before he became the Abbot of Eberbach – in the *Exordium Magnum Cisterciense* (lib. 1, cap. 22, CC-CM 138; this part written between 1186 and 1193) referring to the death of a brother at the monastery with the following statement: *Dixit et post modicum de convalle plorationis ad montem gaudii, ad montem aeternae beatidunis feliciter ascendit.* Finally, the sermons of the Parisian Bishop William of the Auvergne from the first half of the 13th c. have three references to *mons gaudii*, now without any variation in the number: the *claustrum* is the *mons gaudii unde pax eterna et Ierusalem celestis videtur*; if a Christian is in a state of grace (*in bono statu*), it means that he is *in sanctitate christianitatis que est mons gaudii unde videtur paradysus*; and finally, the good Christian himself is a *mons gaudii cui omnia bona placent*.[1079]

What can we conclude from these findings? Heisig (1951, 306s.) believed that Dudo's statement was a poetic paraphrase of the simple *mons gaudii* that had been coined at the time of the conversion of the Normans in the first half of the 10th c. and was understood as an allegorical term for Christ, and then used for the church in its role as the *corpus Christi mysticum* which guaranteed eternal blessedness to believers through its means of grace. In other words, it was a complex symbol of the whole doctrine of salvation contained in the Christian message.[1080] If his chronology were correct, this *mons gaudii* would have emerged entirely independently of the toponym *Mons gaudii*; indeed, Heisig even believed (1951, 312), that the earthly-toponymic meaning had come from the meaning associated with allegories and the afterlife.

1077 *Sermones super Cantica canticorum* 21, § 2; vol. 1, p. 123 ed. Leclercq/Rochais. Here, too, Heisig only mentions the reference in a footnote.

1078 I used the search function in Brepols' *Library of Latin Texts* for this.

1079 William of Auvergne, *Sermones de tempore* 155, 282A and 152 (CC-CM 230A, p. 79, 548, 71). Sermon 155A, which also contains *mons gaudii* (p. 88), is only a slight reworking, in this case an abridgement, of sermon 155.

1080 Harris (1956–1957, passim) also comes to the general conclusion that *Munjoie* must be "primarily a religious symbol", based on his interpretation of all the occurrences in the Song, but apparently without any knowledge of Heisig's article; however, he avoids an in-depth interpretation of the two explanatory passages in v. 2501–2511 and 3092–3095 when he judges them to be "somewhat obscure" (p. 171).

But the material facts do not support his chronology at all. For if the usage connected with the afterlife had been transferred onto earthly matters, then we would expect the pilgrim destinations themselves to have been called *Mons gaudii*; for medieval Christians, the usual prefigurations of Christ's heavenly Jerusalem tend to be the city of Peter, the one who holds the keys, or the city of the second apostle James (Santiago), or the earthly Jerusalem, but not the hills near these places. Furthermore, in terms of quantity, there is no more than a random overlap between the two until after 1100. Both *mons* and *gaudium* appear apparently randomly in singular or plural until after the middle of the 12th c. and this evidence suggests the term was not newly minted; we do not find a single *mons gaudii* until after 1125, but there are some explanatory expansions: *montes aeterni*, *arx Montis Sion*, *mons ecclesiae*; and when a *mons gaudii* finally appears in Bernard of Clairvaux in the 12th c., it does indeed have the meaning that Heisig postulates, but it appears as the unremarkable middle part of a list, sharing the same value as *mons pacis* and *mons gloriae*, and this is an argument against rather than for its conscious coining. Towards the end of the century, Conrad of Eberbach again uses *mons gaudii* with this meaning, but he, too, feels it is necessary to explain that this *gaudium* is *aeterna beatitudo*. Finally, in the 13th c. the singular *mons gaudii* seems to have solidified into this form, but at the price of gaining semantic breadth, just like the contemporaneous vernacular *montjoie*: Bishop William twice uses our familiar pilgrims' toponym *Mons gaudii* 'place from where a pilgrimage destination could be seen for the first time' in a figurative sense, and on one occasion he simply seems to use the Old French meaning '(positive) *non-plus-ultra'* in his Latin writing. All of these references gravitate towards a central meaning concerned with 'salvation of the soul', but there is no consistently singular theological term *mons gaudii* 'place of eternal blessedness ~ Paradise' before the middle of the 12th c. – and we can find only one example with this unambiguous meaning towards the end of the century. In view of all these facts, the interpretation of Dudo's verse as a paraphrase of an expression *mons gaudii* that was established in its singular form by the 10th c. is simply not plausible.

Heisig's article only requires one modification. We can certainly conclude from Heisig's two sets of references, for *mons* and for *gaudium*, that a poet who had a basic training in theology – as the Angevin in the middle of the 11th c. probably had, and the poet of the Song in its surviving form certainly had – would have understood the two individual elements *mons / mont* and *gaudium / joie* along with their associated theological meanings 'dwelling place of God' and 'eternal blessedness'. It is almost as certain that he would have also been familiar with the pilgrims' toponym *Mons gaudii* which had already become established in a number of different places. It is therefore quite reasonable to

assume that the two levels of meaning overlapped in his mind. We can think of this as two closely related avenues of thought. Either: when he thought of the normal meaning of the toponym *Mons gaudii*, his theological training also prompted him to think of a new anagogical meaning 'God's dwelling place as the place of eternal blessedness that people strive to reach'. This would be a very logical figurative meaning because the pilgrims had gone through many hardships before they arrived at their *Mons gaudii* and caught their first glimpse of their earthly destination, and they had taken on these hardships so that they could come closer to the higher, 'anagogical' destination, the place of eternal blessedness. Or alternatively, there could have been a different emphasis: inspired by the toponym, he then combined the two theologically tinged expressions into one. The fact, therefore, that his audience knew the toponym *Mons gaudii* and were accustomed to the use of toponyms as battle cries,[1081] made the expression *in terms of its form* suitable for use as a battle cry. But at the same time, the poet had to take his audience with him *semantically* to the higher level of its theological and ultimately more important meaning. A *mons gaudii* with this meaning and being used as a battle cry would only possess its true value if the context were a battle against infidels; this condition had indeed been fulfilled in the Roland material for a very long time.

Thus, through this long historical process which brought the two theological terms *mons* and *gaudium* together, and which Heisig documents, the poet is not, as Heisig thought, the recipient of an expression that had already become established, but rather he was inspired by the pre-existing pilgrimage term, and he elevated it further, actively drawing the two separate parts of the expression together, including their theological meanings as well.[1082] This theory

---

1081 Without any claim to exhaustiveness, Galmés de Fuentes (1975, 357–359) cites from the Old French epic tradition (with sources for each one): *Afrique!, Bordelle!, Borgoigne!, Canbrai!, Clermont!, Coloigne!, Damas!, Danemarche!, Frise!, La Roche!, Mes!, Monglane!, Navarre!, Nantueil!, Nerbone!, Portingal!, Rossillon!, Sarragoce!, Terascon!, Toleite!, Toulouse!, Valee!, Vienne!* There is a similar list in Erfurth (1911, 25 n. 5, 26 n. 5).

1082 Marianne Cramer Vos (1981, passim) then substantiated Heisig's interpretation even more christologically. – Kahane/Kahane (1959, 223–225) are not happy with Heisig's account, because it rests on "purely allegorical grounds". In their opinion, *Montjoie* meant the unnamed mountain in Galilee mentioned in the gospel (*Mt* 28,16–20), where the risen Jesus called upon his disciples to take on the mission to the whole world. For in the *Sophia Jesu Christi* which probably originates in the 2nd c. and is preserved only in Coptic, this mountain is referred to as "the mountain which is called '. . . and Joy'". This is probably referring to Mount Tabor, which is mentioned in *Ps* 89.13: "Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in Thy name." However: the Coptic-German edition by Sophia von Till (1955, 196s.) translates this (with an explanation p. 303) "*Berg, den man Ort von Reifezeit und Freude nennt*", 'mountain that is called

still leaves us with the fact that the pilgrim term was the midwife, the catalyst behind this expression.

C.2.2.4 The battle cry *munjoie < mons gaudium* or *meum gaudium*?

Discounting attempts made in the pre-scientific era,[1083] there is only one suggested etymology for the battle cry and the banner that we have not yet discussed, and that is *meum gaudium,* because it has nothing to do with the toponym described above but means directly and only 'eternal blessedness'. While the *mons gaudii* etymology was supported especially by Diez, Rajna, Bédier, Bertoni,[1084] Löffel (1934, passim, most explicitly p. 24), Heisig (with his new supporting explanation) and von Wartburg (agreeing with Heisig, FEW s. v. *mons*, section I/3, in vol. 6/3, published 1969), the *meum gaudium* etymology was emphatically supported by Hibbard Loomis (1950a and 1959, passim) and (in ignorance of the Hibbard Loomis article) Galmés de Fuentes (1975, passim). Let us therefore compare *mons gaudii* and *meum gaudium*, making sure we examine their phonology closely, as well as other factors.

There are no phonological difficulties with *mons gaudii*. For in OF, the phonemic contrast /ǫ/ ≠ /ọ/ is neutralised in favour of /ọ/ before a nasal consonant (Pope 1952, § 426); this explains why O always writes *cuntre munt* (419), *li munt* (2112), *les munz* (856, 2185, 2434, 3695), *es munz* (1851) etc., and therefore also *munjoie*. The genitive *gaudii*, like most similar genitives, did not undergo phonological development, but was rendered by the possessive obliquus with the

---

place of maturation and joy'. The English translation of the Nag-Hammadi codices (Robinson et al., 1988, 222) has "the mountain called Divination and Joy", the German translation by Hartenstein (2007, 243) similarly has "*Berg, der 'Weissagung und Freude' genannt wird*", "mountain that is called 'divination and joy'", which means that the Kahane/Kahane ellipsis does not stand for a missing word, but for a word that they regard as untranslatable. The reference from the Psalms in the Vulgate reads: *Thabor et Hermon in nomine tuo exultabunt*; it does not contain any *gaudium* or *gaudere*. Mount Tabor is mentioned by, among others, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, the anonymous pilgrim of Piacenza (around the year 570), Willibald (a. 723) and it is mentioned frequently in the crusader period (the German town of Montabaur is named after it), because between 1099 and 1187 it was in Christian hands and a Benedictine monastery was located on Mount Tabor (Murphy O'Connor 1981, 352), but it was never called *Mons gaudii*. Moreover, there is not the slightest indication of there ever being a Latin version of the *Sophia Jesu*; this means that the probability of material from that source reaching the Roland poet is almost zero. Are Heisig's 'allegorical' references from the context around the Roland poet not many times more concrete than Kahane/Kahane's references to a 'concrete' mountain which originate a very great distance away from it in both time and space?

1083 On these cf. Löffel (1934, 14–16, 22–24).

1084 Cf. on these Löffel (1934, 16s.).

same meaning, in Fr. (not Occ.), that is to say by the fem. *joie* (since *gaudia* as a sg.f. seems to appear occasionally as early as in Gregory of Tours, cf. the FEW s. v. *gaudium*; MGH SS.mer. 1/2.187.26 and 385.12). At the latest when **munt-joie* was understood as a single expression, the three-consonant rule must have kicked in: since the group did not end in *muta* + *liquida*, the middle consonant was dropped (Pope 1952, § 365): *munjoie*.[1085]

If, on the other hand, *munjoie* < *meum gaudium* is the etymology, then *meum* here, as we would expect, continues in the enclitic masc. *mon,* which in O is written all 36 times as *mun*. However, the prerequisite for that is the masculine *joie,* a rare Old French variant form.[1086]

Both etymologies are thus acceptable phonologically. I think the *meum gaudium* etymology is unlikely, however, because of its first-person reference. A battle cry is a collective matter *par excellence* because its purpose was more than just to make it clear who was friend and who was foe: its job was to strengthen the army's we-mentality before and during the battle. I cannot imagine that someone would have hit upon the idea of launching (even in shortened form) a first-person exclamation as a battle cry, not even a cry like 'my soul's salvation!' No matter where we look: battle cries are made from either those

---

1085 We have some evidence of the prompt effect of the three-consonant rule in compounds with *mont* in some examples from Cluny, because in that place, not only the charters, but also the cartularies themselves are old: cartulary A, written before 1049: 3.93 a. 990/991 *Monrisald*; cartulary B, written partly at the end of the 11th c., partly at the beginning of the 12th c.: 4.14 a. 1036 (?) *Monpancerii*, 4.123 a. 1037 *Monmalardis*, 4.72 a. 1031–1060 *in monte Moncanino*, 4.541 around 1070 *Moncuc*, 4.324 a. 1059–1109 (?) *Monmoret* etc. etc.

1086 Hibbard Loomis and Galmés de Fuentes should ideally have defined the distribution of the rare OF masc. *joie* more precisely, but neither of them gives anything like an adequate account of this. Hibbard Loomis (1959, 489 n. 42) cites only one relevant case, namely *Erec* 6636 Förster (= 6576 Roques) and a variant of ms. R of *Cligés* 6616 Förster (~ 6496 Micha, although it is not mentioned there). In Galmés de Fuentes there are six supposed references but three of them are wrong: *Alexius* 101c (*il* 'it' not recognised as the subject), Rol. 1627 (not realising that *grant* in *grant joie* is still the 'adjective of one ending'), *Cligés* 6616 (*li* not recognised as stressed fem. pronoun). The other three are taken from Tobler-Lommatzsch s. v. *joie* col. 1717s. although Galmés de Fuentes cites the text of *Troie* 22987 with the reference "*Chans. d'Ant.* II, 148". – The material is almost all given in Tobler-Lommatzsch, and a broadly correct explanation is given in Formisano (ed. Gontier de Soignies 1980, p. LVII with lit.). Near the border with Occ., there was an overlap between southwestern *joi* m. (indigenous to Poitou, perhaps also the Périgord, according to FEW s. v. *gaudium*, p. 81 b at the bottom, but more widely also early troubadour language after it was used six times by William IX, cf. Denomy 1951, passim) and northern *joie* f.; outside the OF southwest (*Troie*, Benoît's *Chronique*) the mixed form joie m. was taken up by the young Chrétien (occasionally *Erec*, *Gu. d'Angl.,* perhaps even *Cligés*, later only *joie* f.), and then as a literary set piece by the Picards Gautier de Dargies and Gontier de Soignies, and the Francien Herbert le Duc de Dammartin.

toponyms that best embodied whichever idea of 'our homeland' was relevant,[1087] or religious expressions,[1088] but we never find a battle cry containing a first-person element. So, the derivation from *mons gaudii* is by far the more preferable.

Moreover, battle cries are shouted much more often than written; so we may expect phonetic spellings and, if it is not one's own battle cry, even errors of interpretation. In my opinion this is what happened to Ordericus Vitalis, who had to translate the vernacular cry into Latin (*Hist.eccl.*, vol. 4, p. 341 ed. Le Prévost).[1089] He describes how in the war of 1119 between the English and the French, a group of traitors abruptly switched from Henry I's battle cry *Regale!* to Louis' *Meum gaudium!* In his native Norman dialect Ordericus had the normal OF fem. *la joie*, pl. *les joies*,[1090] and he had learned while he was a young oblate that this word corresponded to the Lat. neuter *gaudium*, pl. *gaudia*; therefore, he translated *joie* as *gaudium*. He may have been somewhat astonished that the putative pronoun in front of it, OF *mon-* (~ Lat. *meum*) already had the 'correct' (~ Latin) gender – but not being a linguist by profession, he didn't give it a second thought.[1091] Unlike Hibbard Loomis, therefore, I cannot see any etymological significance in this reference.

In the whole of the Roland manuscript tradition, only T (end of the 15th c.!) has *Montjoie* with -*t*-. The other mss. have: *Munjoie* OCV7PL, *Monsoy* K, *Monçoia*, *Monçoie*, *Monjoie* V4, *Monjoye* hL, *Monjoy* e, *Brynn (y) Llewenyd* 'Hill of Joy' (3x) / *Mynyd Llewenyd* 'Mountain of Joy' (1x) w. I think – unlike Hibbard

---

1087 Cf. above n. 1081, and 1071.

1088 DuCange provided a long list of religious battle cries in his *Dissertation XI* (published with the *Glossarium*) which I do not wish to duplicate here. The following can be added: the Christians in the battle of Saucourt called out *Kyrrieleis!* (sic; *Ludwigslied* v. 47) in 881 (like the *Kyrieleison!* of the crusaders in Antioch, RHC Occ. 3.805, and *Chirielés!* of the Germans in the *Girart de Roussillon* v. 5938); *fram, fram, kristsmenn, krossmen, konungsmenn!* of the Christian Olaf the Holy in the year 1030 in Stiklastaðir according to Snorri's *Heimskringla* (ed. Aðalbjarnarson 2.377s.); *Alierot!* 'Hālȝe rōd!' ('Holy Cross!') and *Godemite!* 'God ælmihtiȝ!' Harald's troops in 1066 at Hastings according to Wace (*Rou* 3.7983–7988); *Petre auxiliare tuis!* Mathilde's troops in 1084 (Donizo, *Vita Mathildis*, MGH SS.12.387); *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat!* the Christians in the year 1105 in Ramla (RHC Occ. 3.413); *Godehelpe* and *Godeherre* the Germans in the *Aymeri de Narbonne* (v. 1635, 1734. 2821).

1089 Since the work of Ordericus was well known over many centuries, it is not surprising that his etymology *meum gaudium* is still to be found in the 17th c. in Estienne Pasquier and Jules Chifflet (cf. Löffel 1934, 15).

1090 Whether he knew the (north) Occ. and marginal southwest Fr. masc. *joi* or the rare OF masc. *joie* or not is moot; these were in any case not his normal form, and this is what is important.

1091 See n. 1090.

Loomis and Galmés de Fuentes – all forms without the *-t-* are simple phonetic spellings. If anyone doubts the statistical evidence behind this, the article *Monjoie, Montjoie* in Tobler/Lommatzsch provides the detail: in later OF, after the Roland period, and with the meanings 'battle cry' and 'banner' there are about 24 instances of *monjoie* but only 3–4 *montjoie* (1 in Mousket, † 1282, the others in Eustache Deschamps, † 1404); and for all (post-Roland) meanings 'knoll, hill, mountain, point of observation, fortress,', 'high point', 'heap, pile' there are 17 *monjoie* but only 2 *montjoie* (in the *Escoufle* by Jehan Renart, first half of the 13th c., and in the *Songe de la Barge* by Jehan de Werchin, † 1415). In other words: the phonetic spelling, including application of the three-consonant rule, defines the picture for both of these sets of references, since it constitutes 86–89 % of the first group and 89 % of the second. The difference between the two groups of meanings is very slight, although in the second group, the basic idea of a 'mountain' remains much more recognisable than in the battle cry and banner.

And what about the *-t-* in ms. T from the late 15th c.? The explanation is evident in the article on *Montjoye* in the Huguet dictionary: here we find only 7 *monjoye* but 31 *montjoye* (among which a few even appear as *mont-joye*).[1092] The ratio has therefore been reversed: the re-composition of the expression to take account of its etymology affects over 80 % of the references in the 16th c.; after that time, this trend has become thoroughly established. Thus, we can see the basic trends that were dominant in these two periods: the OF period has phonetic written forms, while MF written forms show more of an effort to reflect the etymology. Looking back, we can see the start of the MF tendency in Deschamps and Werchin, and these authors are indeed usually categorised as being in the MF period.

C.2.2.5 The Capetian battle cry: is it dependent on the Chanson?

Ordericus translated the Capetian battle cry *monjoie* incorrectly into Latin, but he nevertheless provides evidence that it was being used in 1119. How did it emerge?

Löffel (1934, 35) tried to show that there is a common source for both the Capetian cry and the *munjoie* of the Song; the same cry radiated out from Jerusalem, starting at the time of the First Crusade. Löffel must have convinced his

---

[1092] I am ignoring the purely graphical change between *-y-* and the already rare *-i-*. – Because the Godefroy dictionary aims to capture French up to the end of the 15th c., and it does in fact contain many late references, it offers a mid-way position between the account in the Tobler/ Lommatzsch dictionary and that in the Huguet dictionary.

doctoral supervisor Gerhard Rohlfs of this supposedly simple theory, since Rohlfs put it into the index of Hilka's edition of the Rol. which Rohlfs was overseeing. However, this theory is very improbable. First of all, the battle cry *Mon(t)joie!* is not attested in any of the historians writing at the time of the First Crusade, nor at any time in the region around Jerusalem[1093] – and it is psychologically unlikely: crusaders and pilgrims who arrived at the *Mons gaudii* just outside Jerusalem and looked down for the first time on the holy city would not have cried *Mon(t)joie!*, but rather *Jerusalem!* or *Deo gratias!* And secondly: Löffel does not explain why the Capetians, but not e.g. the Normans, Provencal people, Franco-Flemings or people from Lower Lorraine would have taken up this cry.[1094] Precisely the Capetian group, which was in any case not very big (Runciman 1951, 118), played a less than glorious role in the First Crusade: their leader Hugh Magnus, the brother of King Philip, was sent to the Basileus after the conquest of Antioch to fetch reinforcements; he did not succeed but did not return to the crusaders, choosing instead to go back to France, whereupon the Pope threatened to excommunicate him. Hugh's people must have merged into the other groups from different countries; when the *Gesta* (10.34–37, p. 180–194 ed. Bréhier) describe the siege of Jerusalem, they mention only the Counts of Flanders and Normandy as well as Gottfried, Tancred and Raymond of Saint-Gilles with their people, and so does Raymond d'Aguilers (RHC Occ. 3.293), except that he does not mention Tancred. And it was the groups from Lower Lorraine, southern France and Normandy who were active in setting up the Kingdom of Jerusalem.

But if the Capetian battle cry was not taken to Paris from Jerusalem, the alternative subsists: does it derive from the Song or rather from an earlier stage of the term *Mons Gaudii*, presumably the toponymic stage? For either possibility, it is difficult to find arguments.

1093 However, we find – something that Löffel does not discuss – in the Occitan *Cansó d'Antiocha* (in the form that survives, dating from the late 12th c.) *Monjoia* (v. 153 ed. Sweetenham/Paterson*)*, *Monjoi* (v. 516) the *senje de Paris* (v. 152), that is to say from Franciens, not from other crusaders. But either this is historically accurate (and therefore originates in the early song by Gregori Bechada), which means that the Franciens took up the battle cry even before the First Crusade; or as seems much more likely, it is an anachronistic innovation in the song's surviving form. Either way, it does not fit with Löffel's explanation. – It is widely recognised that when Wace (*Rou* v. 3.3955,3957 ed. Holden) and *Benoît* (*Chr.* v. 35746 ed. Fahlin) say that in the year 1047 at Vales-ès-Dunes the Franciens following Henry I cried *Monjoie!* and William's Normans cried *Deus aïe!*, these are obvious anachronisms.

1094 This differentiation is maintained in the epic tradition for a long time, too: thus, in the *Siège de Barbastre* 6897ss. Louis and his seneschal cry *Monjoie*, but Beuve and his sons cry *Conmarchis*, William *Orenge*, Hernaut *Gironde*, Aïmer *Espaigne*, Garin *Anseüne*, Bernart *Brubant*, Aimeri *Nerbone*.

On the one hand, the preserved song is not a useful witness here, because at least the Baligant part was very probably written after 1118. So, when of all ten *eschieles* only the *baruns de France* (that is, essentially from the later Capetian *domaine*) spontaneously shout *Munjoie!* as soon as their *eschiele* has been established (v. 3092), a sufficient reason is that now *od els est Carlemagne* in person; but even if the poet remembered at that moment that they are the only ones that would still shout *Munjoie!* in his own time, this would prove nothing for the origin.

On the other hand, Saint-Denis has so clearly been the favourite sanctuary of the later Merovingians, the Carolingians and the Capetians that DuCange (1678), Littré (1882), Scheludko (1927, 14) and (with a different etymology and argument) Lombard-Jourdan (1989, 1993) were convinced that the battle cry *Montjoie* must somehow refer to the martyrdom of Saint Dionysius.

But the Paris Basin and especially the area around Paris-Saint-Denis is not exactly lacking in written documentation from the 11th and 12th c., and yet there is no record of anything that would support this theory: at any rate, the *butte* by the name of *Montjoie* in the Plaine Saint-Denis, which does not appear with this name until 1233 – by which time the expression *Montjoie* was being used for almost any hill – is not sufficient evidence.[1095] The lack of any manuscript tradition on this point is an important factor, including especially the fact that Suger does not mention it. Unless a new reference can be found for this, we must conclude that the other option is the correct one.

When King Philip I gave his son, born in 1081, the Carolingian name 'Louis' he made it clear that he no longer feared the renown of the Carolingians as a covert criticism of his dynasty, but instead, he now regarded it as established enough to allow him to step into the Carolingian ideology and represent his dynasty as its only legitimate heir; for the Ottonians and then the Salians had, from the perspective of the French, only usurped the imperial title, after all, and taken it to Germany, where they expanded it further. The fact that Philip chose the name 'Louis' and not 'Charles' is not necessarily an indication of modesty or piety; this choice meant that he was placing himself in a position analogous to that of Charlemagne. If there was a version of the Rol. with *Monjoie* as Charlemagne's battle cry in it, then it would have cost nothing for Philip

---

1095 The *Tour Montjoie* in Conflans-Sainte-Honorine, which was never in the hands of Saint-Denis, nor in direct Capetian possession during the period in question, is likewise of no use in supporting this hypothesis, even though in the second half of the 14th c. a legend is attested, saying that in this place the cry *Montjoie Saint Denis!* was first invented when Clovis (!) started a battle on the plain, but then finished it victoriously on the hill – an explanation that is so clearly a retrospective invention, that it is almost comical (Löffel 1934, 15).

or (in his first decade of rule) Louis VI, to introduce this phrase as the Capetian battle cry, thus making it a very effective expression of Capetian pretentions to the throne.[1096]

I think this is the most plausible assumption, given the documentary evidence that is available at the present time: the cry was invented within the Roland tradition by a poet (most probably the Angevin in the middle of the 11th c.).[1097] He changed the toponym – which could be seen as a suitable battle cry on the grounds of its form – into a term that would now also be suitable *semantically*, with the more elevated and traditional theological associations of *mons* and *gaudium*. If a new (probably toponymic) reference were to be found which showed the Capetians using the battle cry even before the time of the core part of the Song, the poet would still be able to claim credit for this 'elevation' of its meaning.

C.2.2.6 Interpretation of the occurrences

We will now cross check this finding by examining the occurrences one by one.

The cry is heard for the first time in v. 1181, immediately before the first battle scene which starts in v. 1188. From a position on a hill, Olivier was the first person to see the huge number of enemies, and he asked Roland to blow on his horn, because he knows that without this, the *rereguarde* is heading for its demise: *Ki ceste fait, ja mais n'en ferat altre* (v. 1105). But when his plea falls on deaf ears, all he can do is encourage the French to fight bravely, and so he says: *L'enseigne Carle n'i devum ubliër. – / A icest mot sunt Franceis escrïét. / Ki dunc oïst – Munjoie! – demander, / De vasselage li poüst remembrer*.[1098] The tragedy expressed in these verses lies in the fact that the only person who clearly sees everyone's fate, and who has tried to prevent it, is the very one who now knows that it is his duty, out of loyalty to his friend and current commander, to encourage his countrymen to fight: he does this by reminding them of the battle cry. If we interpret this in the way that Heisig does, there is

---

1096 Cf. Harris (1956–1957, 168).

1097 I would not like to exclude Turold entirely, however, assuming that he wrote in two separate phases some distance apart in time: he first (before 1118) worked on the old core section and added (after 1118) the Baligant section onto it. If he was Turold of Envermeu, there could been several decades of his life between the two parts – a possibility that we should never forget: it shows us immediately why both the Unitarians and the Separators stick so strongly to their arguments.

1098 Nitze (1955–1956, 15) thinks that the meaning of *munjoie* even here could be 'boundary'. If they wanted to head for the 'border', that is to say away from the enemy lands, was that an act of *vasselage* worth remembering?

another, complementary tragedy here: the warriors who declare in their battle cry that they are ready to die for eternal blessedness, have no idea how soon this sacrifice will be required of them. The verb *demander* is very striking here; I have tried without success to find it in another epic as a *verbum dicendi* or rather *clamandi* in connection with a battle cry.[1099] If the audience of the Rol. do not know of this from elsewhere, then the entry in Tobler/Lommatzsch (s. v.) "*demander* [. . .] rufen, anstimmen (Feldgeschrei)" 'call, intone (battle cry)' is strictly speaking misleading: the audience hear this – and the poet intends them to hear it in this way – with the direct meaning 'ask for, request'. If it carries this meaning, it does not fit with any toponymic battle cry. However, we could avoid Heisig's interpretation in this instance if we take *demander Monjoie!* simply to mean 'asking for battle'.

The cry is then used in the course of the battle in the usual way. Olivier himself is the first to take the path that he is calling others to follow: he is the next one, who – after his first victory – cries *Munjoie!* (v. 1234).[1100] He is followed by Turpin, initially after his own victory (v. 1260), and then, reviewing the course of the battle on behalf of everyone, when the twelve anti-peers have been eliminated (v. 1350); the cry is therefore worthy of an archbishop. Finally, in the middle act of the drama, when the Franks are still winning the battle, the battle cry is heard (v. 1351–1419) quite appropriately *de tutes parz* (v. 1378).

Then the tide turns (v. 1448): *Li reis Marsilĭe od sa grant ost lor sort*. At first this comes as a shock to the majority of the rear guard (v. [1469–1470]= 1512–1513):[1101] *Suvent regretent Oliver e Rollant, / Les .XII. pers, qu'il lor seient guarant*. Now the archbishop has the difficult priestly task of not glossing over what is happening in this life but reminding everyone of the life that is to come (v. [1477–1482]=1520–1525): *Ultre cest jorn ne serum plus vivant; / Mais d'une chose vos soi jo ben guarant: / Seint pareïs vos est abandunant; / As Innocenz vos en serez seant.– / A icest mot si s'esbaldissent Franc, / Cel n'en i ad Munjoie ne demant*. It is much more difficult to avoid Heisig's interpretation at this point. For the Franks no longer need to 'ask for' the battle; it is coming towards them with deadly certainty, and it comes, as everyone knows, in the shape of death. Thus, it is entirely natural that guided by Turpin, they would use their battle cry to look beyond death to the ultimate reward, which is eternal blessedness, following Heisig's interpretation.

1099 Even if it did crop up in some late epic or other, it would have to be seen as an imitation of the Rol.

1100 Harris (1956–1957, 169) also highlighted the importance of *demander*.

1101 In this context it does not matter whether we carry out the usual rearrangement of the laisses or not, because we are only concerned with the connection that exists within this single laisse on its own.

The end is coming for Olivier also, but later. Around v.1181 we had heard these three verses: *L'enseigne Carle n'i devum ubliër. – / Ki dunc oïst – Munjoie! – demander, / De vasselage li poüst remembrer*. Now the same verses echo once more, with a variation due to the particular circumstances: when Olivier receives a tricky blow from behind and senses that he is *a mort nafrét* (v. 1965), he uses all his remaining strength to throw himself at the enemy: if anyone saw him at that moment (v. 1972–1974), *De bon vassal li poüst remembrer. / L'enseigne Carle n'i volt mie ubliër: / – Munjoie ! – escrïet e haltement e cler [. . .]*. This is one of the passages which show how the poet deliberately structures his work with sweeping arcs of narrative. There is another such arc: although the poet obviously favours Roland in terms of the ideology of the work, he depicts Olivier as not only the more intelligent of the two, but also the more altruistic. Only a great poet is capable of creating important scenes which go against the grain of his ideology, and this is because his deepest source of power is not his ideology, but his ability to give shape again and again to the *condition humaine.*

The cry is heard one last time in the core section of the Song, and this time it is uttered by the main army which is rushing back to the scene (v. 2151): *Grant est la noise de "Munjoie!" escrïer*. It has the power to rally Roland and Turpin to victory, although they are both mortally wounded at that point: the enemy are startled by the battle cry and fire a salvo of projectiles which kill Roland's horse, but do not hit the man himself; after that, they flee. The medieval view is that a battle is won by the party who holds the field; thus, Turpin can say (v. 2183): *Cist camp est [n]ostre, mercit Deu: vostre e mien*. The battle cry brings victory – in death.

This concludes our analysis of the substance of the core section. We cannot find the slightest sign of a real toponym behind the simple toponymic form of the cry; on the contrary, as the plot advances, Heisig's interpretation becomes more and more persuasive.

The Baligant section develops this idea seamlessly: its introduction makes this explicit: *Joiuse* is named after the *joy* that people have in their salvation through Christ's redemptory death on the cross, and for people who believe in relics, this is unsurpassably present in the tip of the spear that once pierced the body of Christ (v. 2501–2508); but then *Munjoie* is derived from *Joiuse*: *Baruns franceis ne·l deivent ubliër: / Enseigne en unt de Munjoie crïer; / Pur ço ne·s puet nule gent contrester* (v. 2509–2511). Whenever a medieval person tells us A is derived from B, we do not have to take this seriously as an indication of the actual direction of derivation in linguistic terms; even Isidore (*et.* 1.29.4) suggests the derivation *prudens a prudentia*. The important point in this statement is that the two instances of *joie* mean one and the same thing; and in the battle cry, too, the power to bring victory – even if this only comes in death – is that

same joy of salvation. This is what the last verse containing the battle cry means, and this is also precisely Heisig's interpretation.

This brings us to the *crux*, the double reference which according to Sepet, Gregorovius, Rajna, Bédier (with a slight cautionary clause)[1102] and Tavernier (1913, 132s.) supposedly underpins the toponymic interpretation of *Munjoie* as the *Mons gaudii* near Rome (v. 3002–3005): *Munjoie!* cry the *Franceis* of the tenth *eschiele*; *od els est Carlemagne. / Gefreid d'Anjou portet l'orie flambe; / Seint Piere fut, si aveit num Romaine, / Mais de Munjoie iloec out pris eschange.*

Only in this last passage and only in the Rol. does Charlemagne's banner have the same name as the battle cry *Munjoie*[1103] – in addition to its originally appellative but then unique name *l'orie flambe*; therefore, we can say (agreeing with Scheludko 1927, 12) that the name of the banner is more obviously the creation of the poet than the battle cry, but it has much less relevance to the story. Erdmann (1933–1934, 36 with n. 91) provided a satisfactory explanation for this double usage: like MLat. *signum* and MHG *zeichen*, OF *enseigne* originally simply a 'sign' was commonly used both as a 'battle cry' and as a 'banner'.

The big question remains: to which place or situation does the phrase *iloec* 'precisely there' refer? Does it refer to the immediately preceding situation when there was a change of ownership, that is to say Rome, or to the situation mentioned in the preceding verse, that of the standard bearer Gefrei, which means the current battle location of Roncevaux? The first option was supported by the above-mentioned supporters of the Roman *Mons gaudii*, the second by Erdmann (1932, 890, very definitely), Jenkins (ad loc.) and Brault (1978, 289). Who is right?

On this point, quite unexpectedly, the first group are correct. Firstly, *iloec*, later *il(l)ec*, *-e(c)ques* 'precisely there' in the Middle Ages and the 16th c. almost always refers to what has been mentioned immediately beforehand (cf. Godefroy, Tobler/Lommatzsch and Huguet s. v.).[1104] Secondly, the *iloec* verse and the one before it have the same semantic structure: in both cases, the subject is the banner's change of status, once with regard to its name (*out pris eschange*), and once in regard to its owner (*Seint Piere fut*, but now no longer); it is probable,

---

1102 The bibliographical details are in Löffel (1934, 16s., 19s.).

1103 According to Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *monjoie*, section 'Bezeichnung des Banners Karls d. Gr.', there is another reference in Rutebeuf (ed. Faral, vol. 1, p. 428), but I do not think it is entirely convincing: *Mort sont Ogier et Charlemaine; / Or s'en voist [scil. Chevalerie], que plus n'i remaingne! / Loiautez est morte et perie: / C'estoit sa monjoie et s'ensaingne, / C'estoit sa dame et sa compaigne / Et sa mestre herbregerie.*

1104 This applies when used to refer to both place and time, and moreover judging from over 100 references in Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *iluec*, the ratio is about 10:1.

therefore, that the two changes of status are connected and not separated by 1500 km and a long period of time (at the very least *set anz toz pleins!*). Thirdly, this semantic parallelism is also causally based: the office of the Pope (as the Lord of Papal State) and the office of the emperor are very different, which means that if the ownership of the banner changes, there must be a change in its function as well, and the poet thinks that this should be reflected in the name also. Fourthly: even though the three narrative tenses *praesens historicum*, *passé simple* and *passé composé* are freely interchangeable in the Old French tradition, the *passé antérieur*, in our example *out pris 'il eut pris'*, is used in the majority of cases to look further backwards, referring not to the current point in the story 'the Baligant battle / Roncevaux', but to a time before that. And finally, the option of Roncevaux as the moment when the name was changed would lead to a strange consequence: while the battle cry has been in existence for a long time – Olivier can elicit it without having to say its name, and the rear guard and returning main army use it in the same way –, the banner would only be named after it for the first time in Roncevaux. The change of name in Rome is clearly justified as the result of a change of function, but no such justification is available for it in Roncevaux.

But however right the group led by Sepet *et alii* are with their option of Rome, they do not fare so well when it comes to the next step in the argument. For they must now explain why the mention of Rome should mean that the particular expression *mons gaudii* comes into play as the inspiration for the name. There are some *ad hoc* suppositions along the lines that in the mind of the poet, the handing over of the banner took place not in a church, but in front of Charlemagne's assembled army on the *Pré Noiron*, the old *Campus Martius*, which is actually located between Saint Peter's Basilica and the *Mons gaudii*. But there is a more serious error here: namely the idea that on the occasion of the renaming of the banner, the poet must also explain its new name. In fact, however, he has already provided an explanation of the name *Munjoie* in v. 2501–2511, where he says that it is derived from the name *Joiuse*, and if he now switches from Charlemagne's *enseigne* no. 1 to Charlemagne's *enseigne* no. 2, this name stays the same! We cannot expect him to defy all logic and think up a second, new explanation for the same name. Nor should we consider this sufficient reason to assume that two different authors are at work within the Baligant section, as Bédier unfortunately does – even though he is in other respects a unitarian *par excellence* – and he has no manuscript evidence for this (1926–1929, 2. 249 n. 1): "Les deux étymologies ne proviennent pas nécessairement du même auteur: l'un des deux passages peut être une interpolation".

No, this verse means something else: at the very moment when Charlemagne receives the banner, he does not give it the name of a Roman banner, or a Saint Peter's banner, as the recipients of the Saint Peter's banner proudly did in the 11th c., but instead he names it after the immaterial *Mons gaudii*, the centre and the goal of joy in salvation, for which Christians must be prepared to die. Charlemagne's office and Charlemagne's wars are not for the Papacy, but for Christendom as a whole, for its protection and expansion. Of course, the banner's legitimacy must be confirmed through its unmistakable provenance from Christ himself, which was only possible on earth via Peter or his successors; but unlike all other individual Saint Peter's banners, it stands for a mission that is not limited by time or place, but rather, it expresses in its very name the Carolingian Empire's pan-Christian claim to universality.

The remaining occurrences of *Monjoie!* can be summed up quickly. Immediately before the Baligant battle begins, the two armies are lined up in sight of each other and the enemy battle cry *Preciuse!* is answered by Charlemagne's whole army crying *mult haltement Munjoie!* (v. 3330). The last two cries of *Munjoie* are both uttered by Charlemagne (v. 3565, 3620), and they frame his duel with Baligant: with the first cry, they recognise each other, and the second cry comes immediately after Charlemagne's kills Baligant with a mighty thrust of his sword.[1105]

C.2.3 Review of *orie flambe* and *Munjoie*

Orie flambe is a loan translation of χρυσᾶ φλάμουλα (strictly speaking, of the singular χρυσοῦν φλάμουλον) and means in the Rol. 'Imperial banner' (later in reality it was transferred to the banner which became the royal banner of Vexin or Saint-Denis 'the French royal banner'). *Munjoie* means 'eternal blessedness' and the term was coined within the Roland tradition when the toponymic form *Mons gaudii* was infused with the specifically theological meanings of *mons* and *gaudii*.

1105 The cry is made here *pur la reconuisance* 'out of thankfulness (to God)', as Harris (1956–1957, passim, and especially 171–173) correctly works out; but as in other situations, where it is uttered after a particular victory (v. 1234, 1260, 1350), for a Christian, the manifest protection from God at that moment is always at the same time a renewal of his acceptance of eternal mercy.

C.3 The shadow of the poet

A few facts are assembled under this heading which may, among other things, and however shadowy they might be, tell us something about what kind of person the poet was.

His mention of *Virgilĭe e Omer* (v. 2616) has been examined above in the section on the name of Baligant, Scenario I (A.3.3.2).

C.3.1 *La Geste*, *Geste Francor*

Until now, little attention has been paid in Roland scholarship to the fact that the term *Gesta Francorum* has been used from the early Carolingian period onwards to refer to a very wide range of different historical works, including the chronicles of the Frankish empire, that is to say the *Liber Historiae Francorum* (which before the MGH Ed. Krusch of 1888 was generally known as the *Gesta Francorum*!) and (going only as far as the death of Clovis) the *Gesta Francorum* by Rorico (11th c., PL 139.589–616), occasionally also the *Historia Francorum* by Gregory of Tours and Aimoin's *Gesta regum Francorum*, the Royal Annals, Regino's and Ademar's chronicle, and possibly also similar works such as the (still quite unpretentious) Saint-Denis *Gesta gentis Francorum* up to 1108 (cf. Spiegel, 1978, 40s.); in addition to these texts, the term *Gesta Francorum* is also used as a short title for the work of historians of the First Crusade, that is to say the anonymous writer and Fulcher.[1106] In practice, therefore, expressions such as 'read about it in the *Gesta Francorum*' etc. could only mean 'in a work of this genre' – just as we might say today 'look it up in the dictionary' meaning 'in any dictionary'. This fact has an important consequence that has not been considered before in relation to Roland scholarship: a poet who cited these generalised *gesta Francorum* as his source was not risking anything at all; anyone who wanted to check up on something and failed to find it would just be

---

1106 On these two different ways of using the term cf. for example MGH SS.mer. 1/1².3, SS. mer. 2.182 and 241, SS. 1.22, SS. 2.220 and 297 [the latter = SS.schol. 28, p. 57], SS. 4.37, SS. schol. 60, p. XIV with n. 17, SS.schol. 64.128s. etc. and Manitius (1911–1931, 1.229, 2.472, 2.477, 3.9, 3.43, 3.444). – Bernard Gicquel (2003, 59–66, especially 65s.) took the references in the Rol. to its sources at face value and dated this *Gesta Francorum* to 1108 at the latest, and shortly after this, Le Maho (2011, passim) adopted an approach that is diametrically opposed to my own explanation in the present volume of a literary fiction with a precise direction of focus. In my opinion these two hypotheses are equally mistaken, both in terms of their method, and their conclusions. I cannot go into it here, but I will rely upon the reader to compare the arguments and come to his or her own conclusions.

unlucky: he would simply have been looking in the wrong work in this genre. One certain example from the 12th c. of a bogus reference to something defined only as the *Gesta Francorum* is the forgery in the name of Charlemagne MGH DD.kar. 1, no. 282, p. 421.16.

When it comes to the Rol., we can leave aside for now the *geste que Turoldus declinet* (v. 4002); this is discussed below (C.3.2.1) together with the analysis of the Turold question. All other occurrences of the word *geste* in the Rol. – that is to say simply *la geste* with article (v. 788, 1685, 2095), only once (spoken by Baligant) in the plural *plusurs gestes* (v. 3181), and with extensions *l'ancïene geste* (v. 3742), *la Geste Francor* (v. 1443), *Geste Francor* (v. 3262) – refer not to a series of (great) deeds, but to a continuous written record (v. 1443, 3742) of these exploits. The poet imagines that they have been created more or less at the time when the events occurred, because Roland (v. 788), Turpin (v. 1443) and Baligant (v. 3181) all speak of them; and for that reason – implicitly, but unambiguously – the poet represents them as authoritative sources. In the last three cases, the word is found in a passage of direct speech and simply implies that Charlemagne's reign (including his and his men's exploits) was documented in this way (which in principle was and is not contested). It is only in the other four cases, that is to say v. 1685, 2095, 3262 and 3742, that the word is used in a statement by the poet himself, which means that only these occurrences are relevant to any question about the poet's sources. It is always used with the singular definite article except v. 3262, where *Geste Francor* is constructed in a Latinising fashion (*gesta, -orum*, n.pl.) with the plural *numbrent*, where the lack of an article can be explained as another Latinism; in any case, there is no reason to think *Geste Francor* means anything different than it did in v. 1443 *la Geste Francor*.

The question whether this source is real or fictional is very important: for it would have to include not only Roncevaux (v. 1685, 2095) and Ganelon's trial (v. 3742), but also the Baligant plot with its *dénombrement* of Baligant's thirty *eschieles* (v. 3262), which means that it would not be 'old' (v. 3742), but rather a product of the period after 1100. However, there is another good reason which has been overlooked until now, to regard it as fictional. All four of the statements supposedly coming from this source are used by the Roland poet to achieve one and the same purpose. According to v. 1685 this *Geste*, in some unclear parallel with *cartres* and *brefs*, is supposed to show that even before the last enemy attack, Roland, Olivier and Turpin (alone or with the other Franks?) had killed four thousand 'heathens': in the naming of Turpin, it differs from the tradition exemplified by the Pseudo-Turpin account, which denied that Turpin was present at the Battle of Roncevaux, and minimized Turpin's contribution to any battle, on the grounds that priests were prohibited from killing people.

According to v. 2095 the *Geste*, now in some unclear way parallel to Saint Aegidius, is cited to show that when Turpin was wounded by the four spears and was about to die, he immediately hacked down the enemy all the more fiercely, with the consequence that Charlemagne found more than four hundred of them there: it is especially obvious that the *Geste* takes precedence over the PT tradition here. Furthermore, the *geste Francor* according to v. 3262 provides a list of the thirty sections of Baligant's army: the PT tradition, of course, has no knowledge of them, because its Baliguandus is not the Lord of Heathendom. And according to v. 3742, it is intended to show that Charlemagne did not hold the trial of the traitor Ganelon in the field, but rather – *um la sue grant ire* (v. 3989) – at a huge state event which he organised at Aachen with judges summoned from many of his lands: once again, this runs counter to the PT tradition (cf. on the latter Beckmann 2008b, 148–151). All in all, then, this 'source' is only ever brought to bear when the poet needs to bolster his work's opposition to the clerical tradition embodied in the Pseudo-Turpin (possibly, but not necessarily, even against the Pseudo-Turpin itself, because by definition, its forged claim to be authoritative constituted a threat to all other versions). These are the reasons why I think this source is fictional.

It is worth remembering that there are very many references in the Old Testament to further detail that can be found in 'chronicles' which no longer exist, for example *Num* 21.14 refers to a *Liber bellorum Domini*; *1 Reg* 11.41 to a *Liber verborum dierum Salomonis*; *1 Reg* 14.19 to a *Liber verborum dierum regum Israel*; *1 Reg* 14.29 and in this book another 8 times to a *Liber sermonum dierum regum Iuda*, as well as *2 Reg* 1.18 and another 20 times along with *2 Paralip* 9.29 and a further 13 times; according to *Esth* 2.23 the Persian Royal Annals were also recorded in a diary-like fashion, and this is mentioned again in *Esth* 10.1–3. This background, too, must have added weight to the idea that every state (or indeed every self-respecting state) maintained a continuous central historiography – and that its output might not be available for future generations to read.

C.3.2 *Turoldus*; *Vivïen*; *(E?)Bire, (N?)Imphe*

The closing verses of the Song (3991–4002) are best dealt with together:

> Passet li jurz, la nuit est aserie;
> † Culcez s'est li reis en sa cambre voltice.
> Seint Gabrïel de part Deu li vint dire:
> – Carles, sumun les oz de tun emp[ir]e!

Par force iras en la tere de Bire,
Reis Vivïen si succuras en Imphe,
A la citét que paien ont asise:
Li chrestïen te recleiment e crïent.
Li emperere n'i volsist aler mie:
– Deus! – dist li reis – si penuse est ma vie!
– Pluret des oilz, sa barbe blanche tiret.
Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet.

There are two points to note in relation to the editing of this section. First: Jenkins puts a comma after *Reis*, and therefore understands it as a vocative. Most editors, however, interpret *Reis Vivïen* as an obliquus showing the start of a breakdown of the two-case system (as Segre does) or simply athetise the *-s* (as Hilka/Pfister do). Secondly: Stengel understands the *debire* in the ms. as *d'E-bire*, while most other editors understand it as *de Bire*.

These last twelve verses of the Song unexpectedly introduce a new element into the plot, complete with three new names, after which this new turn of events is halted, and there is a lament, followed by the fascinatingly cryptic last line.

There are some incorrect assumptions about this passage, including that of Jenkins (1928, p. XXIII) and Brault (1971, 6), suggesting that Charlemagne is being asked to set off immediately on *two* more campaigns at once. This would not make sense in narrative terms because if you announce a doubling, this relativises what has gone before. It would also be questionable in theological terms: God requires continued and undiminished efforts, but after Charlemagne's Spanish campaign, which had secured victory with such heavy losses, he would not so quickly raise the bar to double its previous height. And above all, it does not fit well with the text: it would mean that the first campaign he is asked to start would appear only with its country name, but no information about why it is urgently needed, whereas in contrast the second campaign, linked with *si* 'and (so)', the name of the country is not given, but the precise nature of the emergency is described. No, these two statements complement each other; they are referring to just *one* campaign.

C.3.2.1 *Turoldus*

In this section my most pressing aim is to do the passage justice in literary terms. There are several trivialising interpretations that must be dispelled in brief.[1107]

[1107] In the process, I must occasionally repeat *verbatim* the analysis that I carried out several years ago (Beckmann 2008a, 202–206, and 2008b, 152–156). On the copious and controversial literature on the closing verses I include only those references that I feel obliged to cite.

First: the episode as such is only found in O. However, this is not an argument against its authenticity, since all the other manuscripts have already finished before this point.[1108] The ending of the Rol. is in fact preserved in only one manuscript, fortunately the best one. Some very strong and inherent justification would have to be found before parts of this ending could be declared inauthentic.[1109]

Secondly: in v. 4002 *Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet* the position at the end of the text and the wording do not mean that this is only the signature of a scribe, although even Segre himself thinks is the more likely option (in the index of names s.v. *Turoldus*). A few decades, or a few years, later Wace undersigns his *Vie de sainte Marguerite* with the words: *Ci faut sa [scil. Margaretes] vie, ce dit Wace, / Qui de latin en romans mist / Ce que Theodimus escrist*, and his *Roman de Brut* with: *Ci falt la geste des Bretuns / [. . .] Puis que Deus incarnatïon / Prist, pur nostre redemptïon, / Mil e cent cinquante e cinc anz / Fist mestre Wace cest romanz*[1110] – and both works are complete. Furthermore, in spite of occasional claims to the contrary, *decliner* does not mean 'copy out',[1111]

However, my argument should make it clear why I do not agree with one or other of the views that are not cited here.

1108 From v. 3682 onwards, V4 and the rhymed versions are comparable only 'sporadically' (according to Segre on v. 3675); more on each of these in Brook (1989, passim). K has even less to offer: it ends with Ganelon's death (v. 9016), and then turns into a panegyric on Henry the Lion. The Danish version n has adapted the final laisse of O into a piece of narrative (more on this below in C.3.2.3.5), but for that reason it cannot be used to analyse the fine details of Old French wording, which is the main point at issue here.

1109 Furthermore, from v. 3975 onwards, i.e. even for Bramimonde's conversion, it is not possible to make comparisons with other parts of the stemma (K has a different version, which is even positioned before Alde's death and Ganelon's trial); but no-one would doubt its authenticity, because advance notice of it is given in v. 3674 and 3680. If O is the only ms. and yet provides sufficient evidence for this, why then would it not be sufficient for the final laisse?

1110 There is also, as G. Paris (1865b, 57) was aware, the closing remark in a ms. of the translation by John of the PT: *Cy fault et fenit l'estoire de Charlemaigne que maistre Jehan translatait.* – The first of the two Wace passages was cited in this connection by Curtius (1954, 99), the second by Jenkins. In view of the quality of the Roland poet's work and his own self-confidence, what was good for Wace must have have seemed right and proper to the Roland poet; as far back as in the Carolingian Renaissance, Latin poets liked to sign even their smaller works in the closing line, and there are examples of this in Curtius (1954, 504).

1111 Aebischer ([1960c] 1967, 209) arrives at his translation *recopier* through logical slippage without any references: he goes from the meaning found elsewhere of *faire connaître*, *proclamer* [but which both in the *Sancta Fides* and in the tenzone between Uc Catolá and Marcabru, and also in Anselm always mean an original formulation!] straight to *présenter*, *offrir au public* [which no longer has to be an original formulation!], and finally turns this into *sous la plume d'un copiste* meaning *recopier . . .*

but something more like 'give a written explanation (of a claim that has been made, or more specifically of a text)',[1112] and so *Turoldus* clearly signifies more than a scribe merely copying a text, and at least a 'reviser', apparently of the whole *geste* – where 'reviser' would mean the highest possible grade of such a role; for even a poet in the usual sense of the word would, in those days, hardly have dared to call himself the original creator of the material.

Thirdly, and finally: it is very unlikely that the version before O (or one of the even earlier versions) ended with v. 4001 at the bottom of the page in a fragmentary way and that O (or this preceding version) would have added v. 4002 as a commentary with *ci falt la geste*[1113] (regardless of what exactly he then would have meant by *que Turoldus declinet*). One reason for this is that in the Wace parallels cited above, the *ci falt* is not an indication that the text breaks off. It constitutes a natural ending, and there are two further reasons as well. At one time this earlier version in its intact state would have linked two epics together – at a time when there is not yet the slightest trace of any other compilation manuscript. Furthermore, the narrative pace of these verses is much too fast; an epic author could not compress his valuable material into this cryptic brevity. If he wants to present a *chanson de geste* about Bire, (N?)Imphe, Vivien he would have to start with an introduction explaining all three elements in much more detail. He would set it all out, something like this: how the evil 'heathen king' X launched a surprise invasion of Bire with overwhelming forces, how the Christian king (?) Vivien was besieged in his last city despite putting up fierce resistance under difficult circumstances, and how he doubted whether he would be able to get a call for help out to Charlemagne, who was far away, when God performed a miracle and summoned Charlemagne with the help of an angel etc . . . This means, however: the *wording* of the verses in O. shows that they were never the opening lines of a story, but rather, from the outset they were written, complete with their

---

1112 It concerns a claim that has been made in the *Sancta Fides* and a text in Marcabru, texts in Anselm. Relevant references include those from antiquity (which are of limited usefulness) suggested by Olschki (1935, passim), the (more useful) Romance ones suggested by Stone (1936, 345–350); the most interesting usage in a letter by Anselm of Canterbury was examined by Leblond (1957). The references are also frequent enough and sufficiently close semantically to suggest that the other translation of *decline* as 'physically deteriorates' (with *que* 'because', which occurs elsewhere in the Song only in v. 356) is very unlikely. This 'physically deteriorates' would also have very little influence on the interpretation of the previous verses. For even an author who communicates or feigns his own physical deterioration after only eleven verses of a completely new part of the plot would have to be motivated in the way outlined in the explanation given above in order have any reason for wanting to add these eleven verses.
1113 This is Aebischer's view ([1960c] 1967, 205).

indeterminate ending, as the closing lines of the Rol.[1114] They therefore serve – and this is the important point – as a very deliberate literary device.

But a storyteller cannot cease his narrative without putting a kind of seal on his story, that is to say, without giving a formal signal that the end has come; its absence would suggest that fate had forced him or his scribe to put his pen down. Just one line is needed here to make a masterfully short seal: *Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet*. Its truncated brevity echoes the brevity of the preceding line, but at the same time, it shares one very important thing in common with the opening line of the whole Song, that is to say, its Latinising character. In comparison with the sophisticated exordial topic used by the authors of antiquity and those writing in Medieval Latin, it appears modest, but quite different from the rest of the Song of Roland which has relatively few Latinisms.[1115]

The person who wrote the Song of Roland – or even just, if we want to think of this in a chorizontic way, major portions of it – was a cleric and lived first and foremost in a scholarly environment where everyone spoke Latin; all, or almost all of the manuscripts he had ever seen, from the time of his youth onwards in the monastery or cathedral libraries were in Latin. This explains why he built for himself and for the educated people among his audience a little 'half-Latin' bridge into the still rare milieu of a written vernacular: *Carles li reis, nostre emperere magnes*; here, the tmesis *Carle(s) . . . magnes* encourages the audience to see *magnes,* which had been reduced to the mere second part of the name, once more as derivation from Latin *magnus*, thereby restoring its

---

1114 I do not think there are any true parallels to this, at least not in the older *chansons de geste*. The *Chanson de Guillaume* ends in a somewhat pithy and compressed way with a recognition scene, but the narrative is complete. The *Couronnement de Louis*, on the other hand, ends with a verse that vaguely points towards the *Charroi de Nîmes*, but it is not intended to create the impression that it is itself the start of a new plot. From the *Fierabras* onwards, there is a marked increase in the number of open endings which refer to another epic, especially as the popularity of the *Vorepos* and compilation manuscripts starts to grow – as far as I am aware – but they do not end, as our case does, with such a critical decision hanging unresolved.

1115 The most evident Latinisms similar to the *Turoldus* and *magnes* are *Tere Major* v. 600 et al. (six times altogether), (*gent/enseigne*) *paienur* v. 1221, 2639, *Sathanas* v. 1268, *Geste Francor* v. 1443, 3262, *seintisme* v. 2344, *Orïente* v. 3594 (as opposed to *Orïent* v. 401, 558) and *omnipotente* v. 3599 (in both of which the *-e* imitates the Lat. *-em*) as well as probably *Veire Paterne* v. 2384, 3100 – which amount to one clear Latinism on average per 250 verses. There are more words we could compare with *decliner*, such as in the first six hundred verses *humilitet* v. 73, *glorïus* v. 124, 429, *poësteïfs* v. 460, *enluminét* v. 535, *martírie* v. 591 and perhaps *chrestïentet* 431, which amount to something like one occurrence per eighty to one hundred verses. Given these numbers, the Latinising character of precisely the first and last lines does not look like a coincidence.

special significance.[1116] Just as the opening line introduced the topic, so the closing line names the person responsible. It mirrors the opening verse in leading from the vernacular back into the world of Latin over a little 'half-Latin' bridge: *decliner* is a Latinism because of its semantics; the main text exhibited sensitivity to the style of the *vernacular* when it called the Archbishop Turpin *Turpin* and not *Turpinus*, but there is no break in the style if it now returns to the *Latin*-speaking world of learning and the Latin form *Turoldus* appears. Therefore, the 'reviser'(-author) is not being pretentious if he signs his name in this way, as any editor or witness would have done when signing a charter, which at that time would naturally have been written in Latin. We cannot entirely exclude the possibility, however, that a final reviser who had carried out only minor work would have wanted to honour a predecessor whom he knew had been 'the' main author/editor of the material or believed to have been such. We should therefore leave it as an open question whether the complementary relationship between the first and the last line is due to a shared educational background, or sympathy for an illustrious predecessor, or to the fact that both lines were created by the same person.[1117]

But what is the function of the preceding verses? The answer to this is quite easy, at least on the anagogical level. They studiously avoid giving us any positive closing signal, and so they leave us 'hanging' in this critical and agonising moment when a decision needs to be made, as if they are not able to answer this question for us. In the 12th c., this can only mean that they, following Gautier and others, in the words of Brault (1978, 337, 477) – and in this case he is correct – are intended "on a plaintive note" through "the prospect of never-

---

1116 He uses this revitalised *magnes* three more times (v. 2321, 3611, 3622) after *reis*, and eight more times (v. 703 et al.) in the formulaic line opener *Carles li magnes*. In other words, it is only ever used with reference to Charles.

1117 The relevance of the name *Turold* itself in our context comes from the fact that it is certainly Norman (< Old Norse. *Þór-/Þor-valdr*), because it is only in northern Germanic (~Scandinavian) that the name of the God was derived from Germanic **Þunraz* > Old Norse *Þórr* (Heusler 1967, §82.2), while in western Germ. it remained as OE *Thunor*, Old Saxon *Thunær* (and afterwards NHG *Donar*) (and it was very rarely used to make personal names). The name *Turold* passed from Normandy to southern Italy to a limited extent: Caracausi (1993, s. v. *Toroddo*) cites a Τουρόλδος dating from 1102 in Calabria and the Sicilian family name *Toroddo* from Palermo. I will not go into the attempts that have been made to locate a historically attested bearer of the Turold name, because I have nothing new to offer in that respect. However, I would dearly like to see a historian who is very familiar with the Norman and Anglo-Norman monasteries of the 12th c. investigate whether we have established all the knowable facts about the prosopography of Turold of Envermeu and look especially into the second half of his life and the probable date of his death.

ending warfare" to show us that "man must struggle unceasingly if he is to gain eternal life". Because, one might add, as Jesus insists in his words of farewell (*Mt* 24s. ~ *Mc* 13 ~ *Lc* 21) and as the Book of Revelation teaches, until the Second Coming of Christ, Christians are not promised any kind of final victory in this life. Because the entitlement that God promises to Christians extends beyond the span of a single human life, the apparently never-ending travails of the ageing person begin to feel excessive; someone in this position – like Job in the past, and like Charlemagne now (v. 3999–4001) – is entitled to utter a lament, whether he is still physically able to accept the challenge once again, or not. This does not mean, however, that the challenge is removed from Christendom as a whole, or that it is relieved of its obligation.[1118]

And thus, the Song ends with the implicit exhortation – not directed at Charlemagne, but at the Christendom of the time – to maintain the spirit of the crusades even though people might be growing tired. But the question remains open, whether this exhortation was intended "only" in a timeless sense, or whether it serves to promote a particular project relating to the crusades.

C.3.2.2 Vivien

Among the names, I shall start with the one that has caused the smallest amount of discussion so far, with *Vivïen*, I shall argue that the author is thinking of the epic Vivien from the William epic (which means that like Jenkins, I interpret *Reis* as a separate item in the vocative).

Vivianus is in the first instance a saint's name, or more precisely: in Continental Europe[1119] it is the name of a particular saint who was not even a *martyr*, but only a *confessor*. He joined the Church at Saintes as a young man, at some

---

1118 Precisely at the end of the Rol., such an exhortation would have brought the audience from the exuberance of the fictional victory over Baligant back into harsh reality; in an age when most of the audience did not in any way recognise the legitimacy of fiction, this reduced the danger that the whole Baligant section, when compared with reality, would have been dismissed out of hand as a 'a fairy tale' or as 'a lie'.

1119 I am excluding here the *Vezian* form of this name and with it the obscure St. *Vidianus* (Occ. *Vezian*) of Martres-Tolosane, whose veneration in that place is not attested until after 1100; on this cf. n. 1124 below! The *Acta Sanctorum* (for the 6th or 10th of March) mention also a very insignificant *Vibianus* in an Italian collection of twelve martyrs, and a Little Armenian collection of forty martyrs. Morlet (1972, s. v.), on the other hand, mentions a Cappadocian bishop (4th c.) and a Scottish saint and bishop of this name (7th c.) but these must be fictional or much more obscure than the Bishop of Saintes, because they are not even mentioned in the *Acta Sanctorum*. A supposed 10th c. Bishop of Paris by the name of *Vivianus* in the 5th c. (Gams 595, GC 7.15) is (like the 11th –14th Bishop) just a name, and perhaps an invented one; the oldest list of bishops dates from around 900 (Du Chesne 1899, 2.460ss.).

point during the first half of the 5th c. and later as its bishop was 'a good shepherd'. He once led a delegation to Toulouse to see the Visigoth Theuderich I (419–451) and died a natural death, apparently in about 460. Between about 533 and 549, under his patrocinium which survives to this day, a church was built in the suburbs of Saintes; Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* 1.12) devoted eleven distichs to it, and Gregory of Tours devoted a paragraph in *De gloria confessorum* (cap. 57) to the bishop himself. The oldest surviving *Vita* (probably 8th c. ed. MGH SS.mer 3.92–100) claims that it was thanks to his prayer that some Saxon pirates who had been lurking on the nearby coastline suddenly saw a host of heavenly armies on the walls of the city, and seized by terror, begged for peace and withdrew from the area.[1120] All in all we must agree with Krusch's stern evaluation of the *Vita* when he notes that the author had very little to say about his patron, and even that is not credible.[1121] Nevertheless, veneration of Vivien spread across southwestern France: in his diocese about fifty parishes and three priorates were under his patrocinium, and there were quite a few in other dioceses of the southwest[1122] as well as several elsewhere.[1123] All in all, however, Vivien was always a typical regional saint.[1124] If the fate of the Christian

---

1120 Lejeune, who has devoted several pages to this bishop (1986, 118–121), describes his actions in a rather confusing way (p. 119): "L'évêque Vivien se fit le défenseur du pays saintongeais: il se porta à la rencontre des païens." No, he just continued praying devoutly, and as a result of this, the host of heavenly armies appeared!

1121 In the preface to his edition (p. 92): "Pauca igitur de patrono memoriae tradere potuit auctor, eaque fide non sunt digna."

1122 There is a long list in Lejeune (1986, 120) which is not complete; it omits, e.g. the two parishes in the diocese of Bordeaux (Higounet 1963, 221). Some of his relics were transferred to Figeac (Lot) shortly before 1000.

1123 According to the *Acta Sanctorum* a parish church in Rouen, according to Félibien (1706, pièce justificative 64) there was already a parish church in Bruyères-sur-Oise in 797.

1124 *Acta Sanctorum* for the 28th of August – Venantius and Gregory call him *Bibianus*, but some Gregory mss. have *Vibianus*, *Bivianus* and a few already have *Vivianus*; the 10th c. ms. of the oldest Vita has *Vivianus*, and the others still have *Bibianus*. Outside the Vitae and the lists of bishops, the form *Vivianus* soon established itself; it is the only attested form referring to the Count who was killed in 851, and this is the only form among those mentioned that need concern us. In ancient Rome, however, there was a branch of the *Vibienus* family called *Vibius* (later, from the time of Diocletian onwards also *Vibianus*, e.g. in 463 the Consul for the Orient, MGH AA 13.535, occasionally also *Vivianus*, PW s. v. and Kajanto 1965, 159), but there was also in the 4th c. a Saint *Bibiana*; there was also a Bishop of Agen called *Bebianus* who attended the Council of Orléans in 549 (Duchesne 1894–1915, 2.63). Today's phonemic merger of /v/ and /b/ (with the exception of modern Spanish) which is limited to Sardinia, southern Italy and southwest France even in initial position, once continued in a more or less northerly direction beyond Rome (cf. n. 357 above), and also, albeit more weakly, via the Gironde towards the north (according to ALF 1742 *verrat* has /b-/ as far as Vendée and Deux-Sèvres, that is to say, far

name *Vivianus* had relied on him – and not on the epic – it would have at best remained a regional name only.

We can say this today thanks to the work of Rita Lejeune (1986 passim). She revealed the key role played by Count Vivianus of Tours (who was killed in 851 as commander of Charles the Bald's army in a battle with the Bretons and renegade Franks), and she also showed that the name had spread out from Tours in the 10th c. [and from nearby Poitou south of there, G.A.B.] (but not from Saintes) in a concentric fashion, and so successfully that by around 1100 it was known in the whole of France and even crossed over the border into Italy.[1125] I conclude from this, as she does, that the constantly increasing popularity

---

beyond Saintes); thus *Vib-* and *Bib-* can be regarded as more or less the same. The form *Vivianus* on the other hand, emerged as a reinterpretation of *vivere*, first as used by Christians with reference to the promise of eternal life. I also believe that the name *Vivian* is the same as the Occitan name *Vezïan* (dissimilated from /vizian/ [parallel to Old Occ. *vezin*, *devin*, *devis*, *fenir*], a phonologically regular development from of /viðian/, which is dissimilated from /vivian/); I think *Vidianus* is a secondary Latinisation of this name, which was only to be expected once the dissimilation / vivian/ > /viðian/ had broken the etymological link with the other forms, especially *vivere*. In marked contrast to *Vivianus/Bibianus*, there is no basis to be found for *Vidianus* in late antiquity; these are the oldest references I know of to the *Vidianus* form of the name: before 994 in Sauxillanges (Puy-de-Dôme; Sauxillanges 280), in 1062 Abbot of Sainte-Sigolène de la Grave (Tarn; Languedoc-HgL 5.518), in 1075 a monk in Lézat (Ariège) or Peyrissas (HauteGaronne; Languedoc-HgL 5.622 = Lézat 1.616 a. 1085–1096), before 1085 a priest in or near Ségur (Tarn; Ségur 22); we can add from the 10th or 11th c. a *Vidianus* who cannot be dated more precisely (Nîmes no. 97; also in Morlet 222b, although here it is in the wrong category); and finally, *Vedianus*, Abbot of Peyrissas (Lézat 1.313 around 1105–1110). http://fmg.ac/MedLands/France/South West France/Gascony (with indication of the sources, last access 11.02.2022). A son of the Viscount of Lomagne is attested with the name *Bezanius* in 1062, *Vivanius* in 1084, (now himself the Viscount), *Vivianus* in 1091, and *Bibianus* in 1103, while his grandson is attested as *Vizianus* in 1178 and 1204; and the Church of Notre Dame in Martres-Tolosane, where (according to a Bull of Gelasius II of the year 1119 for Saint-Sernin de Toulouse, Jaffé/ Löwenfeld 6678a) the body of the obscure St. *Vidianus* was laid to rest, is in 1251 called *ecclesia Sancti Viviani* (*sic*; G. Paris 1893, 144, according to A. Thomas) – and in my opinion this proves that the two names are one and the same, if any such proof were necessary.

1125 I myself had also been systematically searching for occurrences of the name *Vivianus*. A large number of items on my list of references overlap with and are confirmed by Lejeune's results. For the period after 851, I have a reference that is earlier than her first one (dating from 904), namely *Vivianus* from 868 in Cormery (p. 57; 20 km southeast of Tours) and another *Vivianus* that is rather atypical in terms of its location 898 in Brioude (no. 26; 300 km as the crow flies southeast of Tours, a little less than that from Poitiers), both are also in Morlet (1971 s. v.). There are two instances of *Vivianus* that may be even more aberrant in geographical terms: before 927 and then in 986 from Cugat del Vallés in Catalonia (Sant Cugat 15 and 162); but they are only preserved in cartularies, and in that region the name *Vivas* (in inflected form

of the name can only be a reflection of the epic Vivien who is mentioned in the *Couronnement de Louis*, even though we can only track it fully when it appears in the *Chanson de Guillaume* and the *Aliscans*.[1126] For the purposes of our present

Vivan-, and from that sometimes nom. *Vivanus*) is common. If we set these aside, because they may be misleading, then my research shows very little that is new from this early period; however, there is a huge explosion in the frequency of references to this name – hardly noticeable in Lejeune's work – throughout the whole of the 11th c.

1126 However, I do not agree with Lejeune's further inference that the Vivianus of 851 is the prototype for the epic Vivien and the battle of 852 is the prefiguration of the battle at Archamp – even though this is also the view of Suchier (1905 passim), Grace Frank (1939), de Riquer (1957), Bezzola (1960, 1970), Moisan, René Louis (both 1973) and Wathelet-Willem (1975); the shifting of the battlefield from the west to the south of France is a difficult pill to swallow. I would modify this line of thinking as follows. I do believe that the memory of Vivianus of Tours and perhaps also some details from the battle of that time would have exerted a long-lasting and perhaps also transformative influence over the Archamp story (something similar to the way in which René Louis' research showed how King Boso influenced the figure of *Girart de Roussillon*); this would in fact show that Tours was an early focus for this name's adoption. But I doubt that this was the foundation level of the story. Where could we expect to find this foundation level, then? Anyone familiar with the social history and prosopography of the Carolingian Empire knows that it is well-nigh impossible for Vivian and his older brother Rainald, Charles the Bald's best military commanders, to have belonged to a non-*grafenbar* family, i.e. a family which did not belong to the high-nobility-of-fact out of which the king picked his (removable!) counts. Suchier and Lejeune have overlooked some of the circumstances: their family comes from north-?(west) Aquitaine (*genere Aquitanici*, Dhondt 1948, 37 n. 7, 86, 87 n. 2, 88, 322s.; cf. also Vivian's support for the monks of Noirmoutier, Suchier 1905, 667, witnesses II, III, IV) and that this family carried out the functions of a count there even before 840 (e.g. Rainald in 835 in Herbauges, Lot/Halphen 1909, 76 with n. 7), presumably even in 793 in Louis the Pious' Kingdom of Aquitaine, which only just included Herbauges – but they probably only had small counties; for Charles had already made sure by 778 that he had filled up the big, important counties with his own trusted people *ex gente Francorum* (Astronomus, *Vita Hludovici* 3). *Vivianus* the witness in 830 in Redon (only 70 km north of the Herbauges), and almost certainly the Count *Vivianus* who was killed in 834 while fighting on the side of Louis belonged to this family (because the pro-Louis side in 834 went on to be part of the pro-Charles side of 840 and later). And finally, there is one interesting document that has not been noticed before: a will of Count Rotgar of Limoges who was buried in 778, and his wife Euphrasia (Lasteyrie 1874, 13–15, 89–96, the citation 91). The text we have now is admittedly a compilation from the end of the 11th c. at the earliest, and it contains some forgeries, but it is based on genuine charters. In this document, Rotger bequeaths to a monastery, among other things, the fishing rights on the Charente, which he had bought from a certain *Vivianus*. The Charente flows through Saintes, and also through Angoulême, where in about 840 Rainald maintained a key military base (Dhondt 1948, 37 n. 7), and in a private charter from this time the seller's title of Count, assuming he had possessed one, would naturally not have been included. We can deduce two things from all of these facts: first, precisely because non-Germ. names in families with the rank of Count in the time around 800 are rare, the standard name *Vivianus* in

discussion, we only need to draw one conclusion from this: the author of the clos-
ing verses of the Rol. was certainly aware of the epic Vivien and knew that this
man was widely known – and in fact was the only person named Vivien who en-
joyed such fame – which meant that many of his audience would have understood
automatically that the name Vivien referred to him. If he had wanted to create a
new figure in the closing verses, he would have been keen to avoid this predictable
misunderstanding. The fact that he did not create a new name suggests that he,
too, was thinking of the epic Vivien.

If we convince ourselves to agree with Jenkins and regard *Reis* as a separate
vocative,[1127] and to see in Vivien nothing more than the young, tragic hero of the
William *geste*, these verses suddenly shine with a special depth of meaning, and
this cannot just be a coincidence. We have a marvellous intertextual reference
here: the poet sees that alongside the *geste* of Charlemagne, the key elements of
which he has just superbly recast into a wonderful new work, a second epic com-
plex is about to be born: the *geste* of William which largely, though not entirely,
plays out under the reign of Charlemagne's son, and with these closing verses,
he passes on the torch. As he does this, he carefully selects the only figure in the
William *geste* who will be a new Roland, another beloved nephew who is des-
tined to die an early and heroic death for the faith, only this time he is the epic
William's nephew. This also explains why we, the audience of the Rol., do not

---

this family from Aquitaine comes ultimately from the memory of the Bishop of Saintes, and
because of the tradition of naming people after others, it may have been bestowed over several
generations; and secondly, the members of this family owed military service year after year to
their king, Louis of Aquitaine, or his *de facto* regent, and so a young Vivianus could very well
have been in the army led by William in the year 793, and could have been one of the bravest
casualties of the defensive battle. This made him, then, the first blood sacrifice from this Aqui-
taine family for the Carolingian dynasty (before the Vivian in 834, and the brothers Rainald in
843 and Vivian in 851!), and as such his memory would have been greatly honoured; for his
death was tragically prophetic when the family's centre of power shifted to Tours, and then
the male line of the family evidently died out. Judging by Lejeune's references, this family ap-
pears to have been valued not least by the nobility of this region. As the list drawn up by As-
tronomus tells us nothing about the many smaller counties such as Saintonge, Herbauges etc.
(Dhondt 1948, 170), and as the other narrative source from this time evidently cite none of the
B-list counts, it is not at all surprising that there is no mention of the Vivianus of 793.

1127 Monosyllabic or quasi-monosyllabic vocatives at the start of a verse are to be found in
v. 2138 (*Sire, a piéd estes*), 3713 (*Soer, cher'amie*) as well as 2369 and 4000 (*Deus!*), whereas in
v. 716, 840, 1849, 1982, 2412, 3164 and 3386 *Deus!* is vocative in form, but the meaning is a
simple interjection. However, cf. the words at the beginning of a verse *E! reis, amis!* (v. 1697).
There is just one instance where a vocative *reis* is at the start of a verse in the *Charroi de Nîmes*
203: *Reis, quar te membre de l'Alemant Guion!*

need to know whether the elderly Charlemagne did set off on a campaign to rescue Vivien in his hour of need, or whether he was too frail to do that: no matter what Charlemagne does, Vivien will still die young for the faith. This is what gives the scene its above-mentioned (C.3.2.1) anagogical meaning – that the struggle will go on until the Second Coming – not just in terms of the flesh and blood elements of story, but also in terms of an impressive consistency of ideas. We have seen Rol. poet achieve this before, and so it is entirely in keeping with his work that we see it again now.

Rütten (1970, 68) came to the same conclusion, arguing from the history of ideas, that the narrative thus moves on in a loop, in a kind of repeating cycle, where Charlemagne appears again to free a country from the enemy, Roland must be sacrificed again, and to guarantee that the next victory will be won. He goes on to quote v. 3994ss. including the mention of Vivien.

One argument could be advanced against the identification of the two Vivien figures, and that is the fact that William's nephew carries out his military service in the southern French-Catalan area, and this is precisely where Charlemagne has predicted no 'rebellion' will take place (v. 2921–2924). However, Vivien does not fight with rebels. He fights with enemies of the faith, and indeed the very enemies who – in real life as well as in the epic tradition – *after* Roncevaux sometimes harried and at other times actually governed this area; there is therefore no contradiction.

The question whether the closing verses of the Song contain an appeal to support a particular crusade or not is not influenced by the identification of the two Vivien figures; for even if they are accepted, the epic name *Vivïen* could have a secondary meaning accorded to a figure from contemporary reality.

C.3.2.3 *(E?)Bire*, *(N?)Imphe*

We shall start with the ambiguous form of the two names. The ms. has *debire*; Stengel reads it as *d'Ebire*, Bédier, Jenkins, Segre and Hilka/Pfister as *de Bire*. Editorially, the first option is at least as tenable as the second. Normally, the scribe of O appears to write the preposition together with the name that follows[1128] only when elision occurs, that is to say when the word begins with a vowel. If we leave *debire* aside, there are no instances of *d'Eb-* in the Song, but there are 25 cases where we find *d'E-,* of which 24 clearly have the two letters written together as *de-,* such as *dermines* etc.; there is only one case where it is

---

[1128] The argument that follows only applies to names, because in the case of appellatives, the speaker's grasp of its etymology or the way the name is used in different situations usually helps him or her to know intuitively where the word boundaries are.

not clear whether O is using a small abbreviation.[1129] This is what we would expect to find: the author would not be familiar with the apostrophe, and a word written as a single consonant would be a complete (and not very fortunate) innovation, and so the only option left is to join the letters together. The balance between the ways in which the *de B-* nexus is written is very different: it occurs 21 times, and on 13 occasions there is a clear separation between words, as in *de baivere* etc.; in 5 cases it is less clear, but if forced to choose, one would probably opt for separate words; in two cases it is impossible to decide; only one case shows a clear joining together of the two parts into one word.[1130] We must also take into account the fact that O usually writes in such a condensed fashion, that it just so happens that boundaries between words can be difficult to see. O tends to follow the simple rule 'space after *de*, no space after *d(')*'. Thus, he probably understands our only example of *tere debire* as *ter(r)e d'ebire* 'land of Epirus'. But this proves very little: O is an (Anglo-) Norman and as such he knew about the adventures of his southern Italian countrymen Robert Guiscard and Bohemund in Epirus (and perhaps also those led by Roger II near Epirus); he may have applied this knowledge to his reading of his source. An editor therefore still has a choice: either to assume that O is anything but infallible when it comes to proper names, and may have interpreted it with a different meaning, leading him to put *Bire* in the text – and this is what most of the editors have done; or alternatively, to give precedence to arguments which relate only to the manuscript itself – and this is what Stengel does. We must therefore take *Bire* and *Ebire* as equally valid starting points for any analysis.

The ms. also has *en imphe*. Medieval scribes tend to use the digraph *-ph-* when they have a word with Greek (or Oriental) origins, or a Greek (or Oriental) name in front of them, or – and unfortunately this point is important – if they think they have such a word. This can lead to variation in the way words are written; thus, O has *olifan* / *olifant* 23 times, but only in the last instance (v. 3686) *oliphan* (< Gk. acc. ἐλέφαντα). Also, words which are similar in the way they sound (but not in meaning) can influence other words in a way that

---

1129 These are *d'Ermines* (1), *d'Esclavoz* (1), *d'Espaigne* (21), *d'Eugiez* (1); the only problematic one is *d'Eclavers* or *de Clavers* (v. 3245), cf. above n. 226, 229.

1130 Clear cases where there are two separate words: *de Baivere / Baviere* (v. 3028, 3977), *de Balaguez* (v. 894), *de Baldise* (v. 3255), *de Basan* (v. 490), *de Belne* (v. 1892), *de Biterne* (v. 2991), *de Borgoigne* (v. 3077), *de Bretuns* (v. 3052), *de Brigal* (v. 1261), *de Bruns* (v. 3225), *de Burdele* (v. 1289), *de Butentrot* (v. 3220). Less clear cases: *de Balaguet* (v. 63), *de Bascle* (v. 3474), *de Belferne* (v. 812), *de Brigant* (v. 889), *de Bruise* (v. 3245). Impossible to decide: *de Blaive* (v. 3938), *de Blos* (v. 3224). Clearly joined together: *de Balide* (v. 3230).

looks ridiculous to modern readers; thus in v. [1511]=1554 O has *Alphaïen* because of the influence of *Alpha* and/or *Alphäus*, but all β mss. have *Alfa-*. While it is difficult to find anything Greek in *imphe*, the word *nimphe* inevitably suggests *nymphe* which was well known in the Middle Ages because people came across it in the Latin poets (albeit pronounce with -*i*- and sometimes written in that way too).[1131] I therefore think that *Imphe* and *Nimphe* are equally valid starting points for analysis. But because these two names, as explained above (C.3.2) are almost certainly part of one and the same military campaign, I think the only hypotheses suggested so far that are worthy of discussion are those which suggest a phonologically appropriate name for both *(E)Bire* and *(N)Imphe*, and not just one of them[1132] within one and the same scenario.

Let us start by stating the conclusion of our analysis: It is most likely to mean [1 and 2] a small place or a small territory near Narbonne plus the city of Nîmes, probably not [3] Epirus and the Nymphaeum, not [4] two places in the northern crusader states or [5] a southern Italian-North African scenario, and certainly not [6] Thuringia or [7] the area around the mouth of the Oder. We shall deal with these interpretations one by one.

C.3.2.3.1 A small place or area near Narbonne (version 1) and the city of Nîmes

Konrad (1883, 429s.), suggested that *tere de Bire* is the territory by the river Berre (MLat. *Birra*) just south of Narbonne, where in 737 Charles Martel achieved his second great victory over the Saracens, and that *(N)imphe* is a corruption of *Ni(s)mes*. Participants in a battle will not usually be familiar with the local pronunciation of the place where it is fought, and therefore I think it is just acceptable to start with a name from the 8th c., long before the Romance languages were properly written down, namely MLat. *Birra* (Einhart, *Vita Karoli* 2) rather than the local place name /bẹrra/. The -*r*- instead of -*rr*- is not an issue for a scribe who has just written the word *tere*.[1133] If the Archamp, as Lafont (1988

1131 References from the 10th –13th c. from France and Italy for the spelling *nimpha* are in the NGML s. v. *nympha*.

1132 I think it is unnecessary to investigate the suggestions e.g. that behind *Bire* lies Vera/al-Bīra/Elvira in southern Spain or the Port. territory Beira, or even al-Bīra just outside Jerusalem, because in each case, there is no suggestion for *(N)imphe* to go with it.

1133 If we were to think not of the small river Berre but rather of the Étang de Berre between Marseille and Arles (*Berra* to the troubadours), we would come closer to Nîmes (that is to say about 80 instead of 140 km from there as the crow flies) and to Arles, where according to the *Vie de Saint-Porcaire* and the *Roman d'Arles* (around and after 1300) *Vezian* was treacherously

passim) deduced, is close to Narbonne, then the 'land by the Berra' must also be close to the Archamp.

The *(N)imphe~*Nimfe* is then a misreading of **Nimfe* 'Nîmes'.[1134] In the *Chanson de Guillaume* 651 and 989, Vivien in his hour of need sends a messenger to his uncle William to remind him of a battle that they once had to endure in *Limenes la cité*. The editor McMillan, who is normally very cautious in his identifications, explains this in the index and without a question mark as "Lymne (Angleterre)", which means Port Lymne in Kent, not far from Dover. But quite apart from the question of whether medieval Lymne would have merited the label *cite*, it is difficult to believe that the two protagonists in this episode would once have fought together in England rather than in the south of France; it is much more likely that the Anglo-Norman scribe, who is generally unreliable when it comes to personal names,[1135] has misinterpreted a southern French toponym. The most straightforward assumption is therefore that he read *nimfe* as *nimle* and equated this with the *lim(e)ne(s)* that he already knew. Just two laisses after the first mention of *Limenes*, in v. 668, there is talk of the battle around Orange (as the crow flies, about 50 km northeast of Nîmes), where Vivien and William have also fought and won together. Vivien's epic life is spent between Orange in the northeast and the Archamp in the southwest; Nîmes lies between these two places.

Hofmann's suggestion is therefore acceptable for both toponyms, and it also explains how they are connected with the epic Vivien. Despite the early date of this work, and the laconic approach of its author, I think this is one of the best suggestions that have been made so far.

---

killed. But this advantage is cancelled out, in my opinion, by the fact that no battle took place by the Étang, and therefore there is no possibility of finding a MLat. form *Birra* recorded in any of the chronicles.

1134 Cf. on the one hand the Occitan standard form *Nemse* from the year 1168 and later (*DT Gard*; Nègre 1990–1998, no. 2554), *Nems/Nemz* in two troubadours (Wiacek 1968 s. v.), *Nemze* in the *Roman d'Arles* (Flutre s. v.), regularly derived from the (Gall.-)Lat. *Némausus*, and on the other hand, the OF standard form *Nimes* (Moisan s. v.). *Nimfe* is an intermediate form or a hybrid of the two; this is Lafont's view (1988, 164 n. 6), and he also thinks that the early proximity of *-e-* and *-i-* shows a Celtic background.

1135 Cf. the long list of double forms in n. 818 above!

C.3.2.3.2 A small place or area near Narbonne (version 2) and the city of Nîmes?

Lafont (1988, 162–164) also identifies *(N)imphe* as Nîmes, Vivïen as the epic Vivïen from the battle at Archamp,[1136] but he understands *tere de Bire* as '*terre de Bize*', suggesting that this name indicates the territory on both sides of the lower Aude. It would be nice to have a reference to underpin this statement, because the usual reference works, including the DT Aude and Nègre (1990‑‑1998), only know of Bize-Minervois on the northern edge and Bizanet on the southern edge of the area that Lafont was talking about; according to the DT both names go back to an attested *Bidanum*, but according to Nègre to the personal name *Bisius* + *-anum* (in the case of the northern place "avec recul de l'accent" attested in the name *Biza* from the year 1537). Unfortunately, Lafont then relies only on regional development during the 13th/14th c. for *-r-* instead of *-z-*; there is an isolated *Byran* from 1381–1391 referring to the northern place after centuries of *Bidanum*, *Bizanum* (in the DT) but no guarantee that the *-r-* is very old, quite apart from the age of the shorter form *Biza*. The phonology and the type of formation behind this are therefore, to say the least, unclear; unless specialists can offer more assistance here, this explanation is less convincing than that of Hofmann.

Be that as it may, Lafont's *terre de Bize* and the hinterland of Hofmann's *Berre* are almost touching each other, which means that the difference between these two theories remains minimal as far as the geography is concerned.

C.3.2.3.3 Epirus and the Nymphaeum?

Following Stengel's reading *d'Ebire*, several scholars have argued in favour of Epirus: Tavernier (1911b, 272, and 1914, 54), Jean Györy (1936, 27) and Grégoire/de Keyser (1939, 298–301, 303s., 312). This is a tenable position as far as both form and meaning are concerned. Authors writing in Latin in the 12th c. use *Epirus*, or for the inhabitants *Epirotae*, with no need to explain these names, such as for example Raoul de Caen (*Gesta Tancredi* cap. 3), William of Tyre (2.4, 2.18), the commentator on Lucan, Arnulf of Orléans, even when Lucan does not

---

1136 The fact that he assumes (due to events that occurred late and were mainly to do with ecclesiastical politics) that this figure is an extremely complicated blend of a southern *Vezian* and a northern *Vivien* is irrelevant for our context. Assuming that the two individuals are one and the same historical figure (as G. Paris 1893, 144 n. 3 correctly regarded as self-evident; and cf. n. 1124 above on the form *Vezian* of this name!), I could agree *in principle* with the blending of a northern and a southern narrative tradition, if I were convinced that *Chanson de Guillaume* showed more than a very superficial knowledge of the geography of the south; *pace* Lafont (1988, 169–171), however, I am still not convinced that this is true.

use those names (1.24, 2.626, 3.159, 3.171, 5.1). In the vernacular, we find *Epir* in the Occitan Alexander fragment, as well as *Epir*, *Epyr* and more often *Epirus*, *Epyrus* in the Old French *Fet des Romains* (just after 1200; ed. Flutre/Sneyders de Vogel).[1137] I am only aware of one reference for *-b-* < *-p-* in this name, in the late Merovingian rhythmus *Versus de Asia et de universi mundi rota* (MGH PLAeC. 4.2/3.558, strophe 41):

Tracia atque *Hiberus*,	Hilladas, Dalmatia,
Peloponensis et Thessali	iuncta Macedonia,
Achaia atque Archadia	nectitque Pannonia.

Hilladas is of course *Hellas*, *-adis*, f. here, so that *Hiberus* means neither the Spanish Ebro nor Caucasian Iberia, but it clearly does mean 'Epirus' (and the editor K. Strecker agrees) – not least because the source, Isidore (*et.* 14.4.6–16), has *Epirus* at the appropriate place.

The final *-e* in *Ebire* suggests a 'semi-erudite' name, similar to other names in the Song such as *seint Denise* (v. 973, 2347) and *Orïente* (v. 3500) – an option that the poet must have appreciated in a laisse with *-í-ə*.

The key word 'Epirus' prompts all three supporters of this hypothesis – in the absence of any other connecting factor – to think of one of Bohemund's two expeditions in Epirus against Alexios. Grégoire thinks of the first expedition in 1081–1085, where Bohemund was his father Robert Guiscard's right-hand man, and even took over supreme command when his father was away in 1082–1084, while Tavernier thinks of the second expedition from 1107–1108 for which Bohemund bore sole responsibility, and Györy thinks of the propaganda that he disseminated in 1106, in preparation for that expedition. Bohemund ran into difficulty on both of these campaigns: during the first one, in 1084, he had to call upon his father's help, and he himself went back to Italy because he was ill, and then during the second one, in September 1108, he had to make peace with Alexios in a way that amounted more or less to capitulation; he died in 1111, while he was once again raising an army against Alexios. Tavernier and Grégoire assume that the closing verses are a call for support, and that *Vivïen* here is the literary incarnation of Bohemund; however, Györy thinks that *Ebire* refers to Bohemund's expedition, and *Vivïen* refers to his nephew Tancred who had found himself at that time 'in a critical situation'.

By making a quasi-equivalence Vivïen ≈ Bohemund, Tavernier and Grégoire overlook one key argument. Who is the epic Vivien? The nephew of *Guillelme Fierebrace*. And who is Bohemund? The nephew of *Guillelme Fierebrace*.

1137 In the *Florence de Rome* (v. 1351) *Epire* seems to be nothing more than a reconstruction.

Regarding the first one: Vivien is always William's nephew, although it is not clear who the connecting member of the family is. The epithet *F(i)erebrace* is already used to refer to William in the *Chanson de Guillaume* 447 (and again in 479, although the ms. only has *Willame brace*, clearly a careless mistake). This is his permanent epithet in the *Couronnement de Louis*, in the *Charroi de Nîmes*, in the *Prise d'Orange* etc. The origin of the name lies evidently in the deadly blows that the epic William – unlike the other epic heroes – likes to deal with his fists, and we are told about the *historical* William's exploits with his fists – in marked contrast to the exploits of others – in around 828 by Ermoldus Nigellus (lib. 1, v.489);[1138] William's epithet must therefore be very old.

Regarding the second one: the person who contributed most to the establishment of a Norman centre of influence in southern Italy was Robert Guiscard's eldest brother William. He entered the service of Guaimar IV of Salerno in 1036 with two of his brothers. In 1038, Guaimar loaned his Norman forces out to Byzantium who were then attempting to reconquer Sicily; but the campaign failed in 1040 largely due to rivalries within Byzantium. As a result of this, William and his family consistently despised Byzantium; they took over the County of Melfi and parts of Apulia, and at a critical point, William was elected by his countrymen to the position of 'Count of the Normans'. He died in 1046, but just a year later, his brother and successor Drogo was able to harvest the fruits of William's lifelong labour when Emperor Henry II appointed him as Count of Apulia and Prince of the Empire. He is already called *Guilielmum cognomine Ferrea-Brachia* by the Francophone historian of the Normans *Gaufredus Malaterra* (around 1090; 1.4), and also William of Apulia (before 1111; 1.524–526, 2.23–24); this epithet was therefore widely known during the lifetime of the Roland poet. Later, Romuald of Salerno († 1181, MGH SS.19.405) calls him *Brachiferreus*, and William of Tyre (2.13) calls him *Ferrebrachia*; the small variations in its Latinisation show that its origins lie not in the Latin, but in the OF *Guillelme Fierebrace*, which is then what appears at this place in the Old French translation of William of Tyre.

Now if A=B and B=C, we can normally assume that A=C. Does this mean that Vivien = Bohemund? We cannot apply this logic to Györy's Tancred because his uncle is called Bohemund and not *Guillelme Fierebrace*; this fact detracts from this variant in comparison with the other two.

But then what is *(N)imphe*? Györy does not even attempt to identify it, which is a second, very serious minus point. The vague statement that Tancred

---

1138 There have been occasional attempts (e.g. by Bédier 1926–1929, 1.189) to say that this highly specific consistency is insignificant. Anyone who agrees with this should be asked to name any other figure in the Carolingian era who fights with his fists; I'm afraid we would have to wait a very long time for an answer.

had found himself at that time *dans une situation dangereuse* (1936, 17), conceals the fact that Tancred was never besieged while inside a city. Tavernier takes an unfortunate approach (1914, 56s.), and Boissonnade (1923, 217ss.) follows him: they think it is Edessa in its Arabic. [*recte*: Turk.] name *Urfa*, which when spoken by a Norman would have sounded "almost like Irfa". First, *(N) imphe* is geographically distinct from *Bire,* secondly the remark about Norman speakers is dialectologically incorrect, and thirdly /irfə/ would still not be the same as Imphe.

Grégoire, on the other hand (Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 301), thinks that *Nimphe* is the famous Nymphaion between Vlorë/Valona and the Vjosë/Vojussa, which in antiquity was still part of the city of Apollonia.[1139] "Ce doit être à Nymphaion que Bohémond avait organisé son dernier camp retranché dans l'Albanie méridionale". The phonology here is fine: in the Ancient Greek period, the stress varies between νυμφαῖον and νύμφαιον; but in about 1100 the prevailing pronunciation is νύμφαιον; for this is how Anna writes it in both places (14.1.6, 14.1.7, ed. B. Leib), and this is required to produce after 1071 the Turkish city name *Nif* (for the city near Izmir/Smyrna, today Kemalpaşa). The identification is more problematic; for we only know that Bohemund had gone to ground for a quite a long time near Valona before he went back to Italy (Anna 5.7.5, 6.5.1). Grégoire could have strengthened his argument if, instead of referring to the whole PW article *Nymphaeum (3)*, he had worked out that this *Nymphaeum* would have been a good place to hide during this crucial time in history: when Rome launched an attack eastwards across the Adriatic for the first time, at the start of the Macedonian war in 172/171 B.C., five thousand foot soldiers and three hundred cavalry disembarked and built their camp *ad Nymphaeum in agro Apolloniati* (Livy 42.36.8); the leader of the expedition followed later with the whole army, and they also set up their camp *ad*

1139 Pliny (*n.h.* 2.237, 2.240 and especially 3.145 [sic], calls it *Celebre Nymphaeum*, briefly also in 24.41 and 35.178), because this is the place where an "eternal fire" (a burning oil source) came out of a cliff (more precisely in Ampelius 8: *in monte*), although the fire sometimes went out. This fiery source has inspired an incredible number of authors: among the Greeks from Ps-Aristotle *mirab.* 36 and 127 via Strabo 7.5.8, Cassius Dio 41.45.1–3, Plutarch *Sulla* 27, Aelianus *var.* 13.16, Antigonos *hist.mir.* 148 to Isigonos *frg.* 11, among the Latin-speaking authors from Pliny via Mela 2.37, Solinus 7.2 (2nd ed. Mommsen, *olim* cap. 6), Priscian *Perieg.* 390–395, Ampelius *lib.mem.* cap. 8, Augustine *civ.* 21.5.1, Isidore *et.* 13.13.10, Rabanus *De univ.* 11.1, Ps.-Ovid *De mirabilibus mundi* 65, Lambert of Saint-Omer f.53ͬ (ed. Derolez), Geoffrey of Monmouth *Vita Merlini* 1231 (ed. Clarke), Honorius Augustodunensis (*De imagine mundi*, PL 172.128s.) to Thomas of Cantimpré 13.5 (ed. Boese). But after Pliny, of all the authors writing in Latin, only Ampelius retains the word *nymphaeum,* and all the others locate the phenomenon only 'in Epirus', which means that this whole tradition is of no use to us.

Nymphaeum in agro Apolloniati (42.49.10), and it was not abandoned until some three years later (53.2). We can be certain that the Roman *exploratores* had examined all the locations closest to Italy and selected the most secure one for their camp. The same logic would have applied to someone choosing Epirus as the location for a temporary bridgehead with a view to returning to Italy later. However, a camp of this kind (or even the small place nearby in Albania)[1140] cannot seriously be called a *citét*.

Grégoire soon (1949 passim) replaced his Nymphaeum with Durrës/Durazzo; he argues that *Imphe* means more or less 'la ville d'Amphion', because the mythical brothers Amphion and Zethus are cited in 1100 especially in Anna Komnena (3.12.8) and William of Apulia (4.241s.) as the (re-) builders of Dyrrhachium. We can reject this hypothesis in its entirety. First, you cannot just insert the (or one of the) founder(s) of the city into the expression *en Imphe* instead of the city itself. Secondly, *Imphe* is not **Aimphe*; and in the period around 1100, *Imphe* was absolutely not pronounced as /ɛ̃f(ə)/, even though Grégoire seems to rely on this, without mentioning it specifically. Thirdly, the mannered way in which this is expressed would not be in keeping with the aesthetics of the whole Rol., and neither would it correspond with the postulated nature of the final verses (or in Grégoire's view, of the whole Song!) as a call for emergency assistance for some crusade-like project: a person who is calling for help, would not do so using riddles that most of the audience of the time could not understand.

All in all, therefore, we have to reject the Epirotic solution, in spite of the surprising plus points that we noted above. There is already enough to worry about in the fact that in both of the possible dating scenarios, only a few months will pass – during which either Robert Guiscard will have died or Bohemund will have returned sheepishly to Italy – before these verses will evoke a bitter taste of defeat which surely would have felt like mockery; it is very doubtful that these verses would have survived if this were the case. Hardly any modern scholar could support the view that this verse dates from before 1085; too many parts of the Song have been shown to be later than this, especially the Baligant section, for anyone to think only they have been added later, while the closing verses remain untouched. In 1108, on the other hand, Bohemund was not besieged in a place called Nymphaeum, nor in Durrës/Durazzo. Györy's

---

1140 Grégoire is convinced that the name *nymphaeum* lives on in the name of today's *Mifol(i)* in Albania, 16 km north of Vlorë, just south of the Vjosë. On the other attempts to locate this place, cf. PW *Nymphaeum* (7). This *Nymphaeum* is not to be confused with another place on the Albanian coast, but much further to the north, namely PW *Nymphaeum* (6), which is mentioned in Pliny (*n.h.* 3.144 [sic]) and Lucan 5.720.

solution is impossibly simplistic, since he assumes there are two different thea-
tres of war and cannot identify even one of them.

C.3.2.3.4 Birecik and Inab?

If there is some kind of appeal for assistance for a particular initiative in the
closing verses, it is likely to have something to do with the crusader states. In
the case of *Bire*[1141] such a connection is not hard to find: it is Arab. *(al-) Bīra*,
today Turk. *Birecik* on the upper Euphrates, where the road from the Mediterra-
nean to Edessa, today (Şanlı-) Urfa, crosses the river. Scholars who support
Bīra include Génin (1850), Baist (1902, 226), Tavernier (1903, 192, before he
switched to 'Epirus'), Boissonnade (1923, 218s.) and de Mandach (1993, 278s.).
Today, the little town (Turk. *-cik* is a diminutive suffix) is still dominated by the
huge castle that was mostly built before the First Crusade (Arab. *al-Bīra* < Syr.
bīrtha 'fortress, castle'). The town was in Armenian hands when the crusaders
travelled through it in 1097, from 1099–1104 it passed to the Franks, and then
through fiefdoms it went back to the Armenians until in about 1117 Baldwin of
Edessa married the Armenian heiress to his Cousin Galeran du Puiset, which
brought the fief back into Frankish possession; it was briefly captured by the
Muslims and then (by this time King) Baldwin (II) recaptured it in 1122, and
after the fall of the city of Edessa (end of 1144) it became the centre of the re-
maining portion of the County of Edessa west of the Euphrates. However, as
William of Tyre (17.16s.) reports, it had to be given over to the Byzantines dur-
ing the crisis of 1150, and they lost it to the Muslims almost immediately.[1142]
William calls this place *Bile* (var. *Byle*), the *Itinerarium peregrinorum* (p. 255 ed.
H. E. Mayer) *Byla*, *Bila*; I think that this place is also what is meant by the *Bile*
in the *Roman d'Alexandre* 1.2501 and in Ambroise v. 10798 as well as the *Bile*
and/or *Bire* in the *Athis*.[1143]

   In the case of *(N)imphe*, the only identification that merits discussion is
that of de Mandach (1993, 199–203, 280, 296–301) with the crusader castle (as
the crow flies about 70 km south-southeast of Antioch/Antakya, 10–15 km

---

1141 The *Bire* (*al-Bīra*) just outside Jerusalem is too small (*viculus quidam*, Fulcher 3.33.1s.).
The facts that the crusader army gathered there in 1099 before the conquest of Jerusalem, and
that the town, not including its citadel, was briefly overwhelmed by the Ascalonites in 1124,
have no implications for us.
1142 Cf. also Cahen (1940, 122, 257, 276, 284s., 291, 295, 386); Setton (1969a, Index).
1143 The variation between *-r-* and *-l-* here probably stems from Oriental origins; for even to-
day's *Birecik* is called /beledžik/ in the local dialect, EI s. v.

southeast of Džisr ash-Shughur on the Orontes),[1144] beside which Raymond of Antioch[1145] died a hero's death at the end of June 1149, and which is known to scholars by the Arab. name *Inab* (recent detailed account of the battle: Mallett 2013, passim).

We turn now to the detail. In June 1149, after the inglorious end of the Second Crusade, Nūr ad-Dīn of Damascus invaded the Principality of Antioch and besieged one of the last remaining castles east of the Orontes, which was in fact Inab. Raymond of Antioch could only manage to raise a small number of troops in the time available and took them on a forced march to rescue the castle. As he approached, Nūr ad-Dīn ended the siege, but lay in wait nearby. When Raymond arrived, he assumed he had rescued the castle and so he left some of his men inside and made the mistake of setting up an overnight camp in the open country outside. Meanwhile, Nūr ad-Dīn had found out that Raymond had very few troops and so he surrounded him during the night. When Raymond and his people tried to break out in the morning, nearly all of them were killed. The people of Antioch heard this dreadful news and successfully readied their city for defence, while in faraway France people called for a new crusade, but it never actually happened.

Inab is called the place of the castle according to the Arab. historians; in Ibn al-Qalānisī, the oldest of them (died 1160), the name is in fact vocalised as *Inab*. In the French map of the État-Major of 1920, the first accurate map that was made in Europe, the place is very small and is called "Inib (Ainib)";[1146] the *only* medieval Westerner who uses this name is William of Tyre (17.9), and he has *Nepa*, which his Old French translators turned into *Nepe* (RHC Occ. 1.771).[1147] Starting with the fact that Arab. does not have /p/ and sometimes substitutes /f/ [when there are recognisable inter-Semitic connections], and sometimes /b/ [with other kinds of loan words], de Mandach writes (1993, 297), that the name is "un dérivé d'*Inepa qui a donné en arabe soit Inab, Innib, soit Infa". But the first

---

1144 Cf. the sketch in de Mandach (1993, 280) and the (less than clear) description of the terrain in Dussaud (1927, 167s.), Cahen (1940, 158s., 161) and Élisséeff (1967, 210).

1145 He is the younger son of the troubadour William VII (IX) which makes him the uncle of Queen Aliénor, who is said to have committed adultery with him during the Second Crusade in Antioch, an allegation which her husband Louis VII soon made to his inner circle as a justification for the divorce that he sought (and later gained).

1146 Dussaud (1927, 168 with n. 1 and 3). I have not been able to find this place on the Google satellite maps e (www.maps.google.com) because it is too small these days.

1147 There is probably an intermediate form in a third language between the Arabic and Latin form of the name, which would explain the -*p*-. Is it Turk. *Inep* (like Turk. *Halep* < Arab. *Ḥalab* 'Aleppo')? Or is it an Armenian form (with the West Armen. *p* < *b* as spoken by the Cilician Armenians, with whom the crusaders had contact)?

part of this statement is a random starting point (which language does *Inepa* come from then?), and the second part is biased, because no *Infa* is attested in Arabic.

De Mandach thinks he has found proof that *Inab / Nepa* could look like *Infa* to a Westerner in a double interlinear gloss on the older version of Fulcher of Chartres (2.45, p. 553 ed. Hagenmeyer; RHC Occ. 3.423s.). Fulcher's text here is referring to an event that happened in April 1111: King Baldwin I came up from the south and met with Tancred of Antioch who was impatiently waiting for him near his southern border; they wanted to advance together towards the north and bring assistance to Baldwin of Bourg who was under pressure in Edessa. This meeting is described in the later (~ standard) version of the Fulcher text, which says of King Baldwin's troops: *[. . .] cum pervenissent ad oppidum quod Rugeam nuncupant, prope Russam [. . .]* (they met up with Tancred, to the delight of both). Hagenmeyer's commentary supplies Fulcher's older version: *[. . .] cum pervenissent usque ad castellum vel villam quam Rugeam nuncupant, ab altera quae Russa dicitur IV milia distantem.* In the three best mss. of this older version, A = Paris BN lat. 14378, B = Paris BN lat. 5131 and (not listed in the RHC) O = London BL addit. 8927, both toponyms have interlinear glosses. Above *rugeam* all three mss. have *vel rubram*. Above *russa* in O there is *vel ruffa*, in A and B according to RHC, Hagenmeyer and de Mandach *vel infa*.[1148] According to Hagen-meyer, the rather plain ms. B was copied from the elaborate ms. A, but de Man-dach (1993, 202) has probably assumed the opposite. O is independent of both of them, and so in principle provides equally valid information.

De Mandach thinks that the *Infa* in B and A is both the scene of the battle *Inab / Nepa*, and at the same time, the *Imphe* in the Rol. We must disagree, however. The first question that needs to be answered here is: what is the inten-tion behind the two interlinear glosses? The anonymous *Gesta Francorum* (cap. 11) already mention the *vallis de Rugia*, in Arab. known as the *arRūdž* valley (cf. Setton 1969a, 655), a valley that runs roughly parallel to the Orontes (cf. Dus-saud 1927, 166s.). The crusaders built a castle there, and a settlement formed around it, so that Fulcher calls them *castellum vel villam* (later he changes this to: *oppidum*) *[. . .] Rugeam*. Naturally, speakers of OF understood this *Rūdž*, here superficially Latinised to *Rugea*, to be a quasi-homonym of their own *rouge* /rudžə/ (~ Lat. *rubĕa*) 'red', and they may even have thought this was the etymology of the name. In Latin, *rubeus* is not the only word for 'red', since there is also *ruber*, *russus* and *rufus* (with only minor nuances, if any, to differ-entiate them). When the glossator offers in the first case *Rubra* as an alternative

---

1148 The *vel* in all cases, as usual, abbreviated as *.l.*

for *Rugea*, he is only pointing out what seems to him a better Latinisation of the same name. The second place, *Russa*, is difficult to identify, because it is not mentioned by any other historian of the crusades. Dussaud (1927, 167 with n. 4) interprets this as *Allarūz*, which appears on the French map of the État-Major of 1920 as *(Ain) el-Erouz,* arguing that the crusaders must have projected their *(a la) rousse* (~ Lat. *russa*) into it; de Mandach (1993, 280), on the other hand, thought that *Russa* was the same as *Ruwayḥa*, but I think this is phonologically impossible. Be that as it may – if we assume that in the second place *infa* is the original text of the gloss, this leads to the apodictic and therefore also suspect claim that the place called *Russa* is also called *Infa*. The fact is, however, if we ignore for a moment the digraph *ff* in ms. O, that *rufa* is the original reading; because it shows that at the second place, the glossator does exactly what he did in the first: he offers instead of *Russa* a synonym which he thinks is better, namely *Rufa*. In short, his intention in both cases is that of a philological purist; he does not want to add any expansion or reinterpretation to the Fulcher text.

But how could *infa* then take the place of *rufa*? By means of a double misreading: of *-r-* as *-i-* (which appears in A and B without the little *i*-stroke, the precursor of our dot over the *i*) and of *-u-* as *-n-*. I would not have dared suggest this, had I had not come across some incontrovertible evidence purely by chance. While checking the facts, I had ordered photographs of the relevant page in A and B in the National Library of Paris and cited as justification the fact that I was interested in the second interlinear gloss in both mss. I was both grateful and surprised to receive an accompanying note with them from the conservator Me Charlotte Denoël (dated 29. 12.2005 which stated: "Les additions interlinéaires qui vous intéressent se présentent dans les deux manuscrits comme suit: ms.latin 5131 [=B], f.79: *vel rufa*; ms.latin 14378 [=A], f.79: *vel infa*. Il ne semble y avoir aucun doute possible quant à la lecture de ces additions, qui diffèrent d'un manuscrit à l'autre". Therefore, in B, which according to de Mandach is the older of the two ms., the editors of the RHC, Hagenmeyer and de Mandach read *infa,* but Me Denoël reads *rufa*, and looking at the photograph, I tend also towards her reading. But no matter who is right in this matter, the very fact that such a discrepancy can occur between extremely attentive readers shows how easily this double misreading could have arisen.[1149] The *ruffa* in O

[1149] De Mandach (1993, 299) makes essentially the same judgement, only in the opposite direction, when he regards the *ruffa* in O as "mélecture" of *infa*. – Curiously, there is a striking parallel to this, which Tavernier (1914, 57 n. 29) suggested, although he did not know what to do with it. In a French obituary of the 13th c. on the 15 February, *Helena Inforum regina* is commemorated, and in another one from about the same date *Helena Ruforum regina*. The woman in question is Ol'ga, baptised as Helena, the renowned almost-Christianiser of Russia, that is

and potentially the *rufa* in B represent, therefore, the purely philological intentions of the glossator and this shows that (apart from the *-ff-*) they are the correct reading, while the *infa* in A and possibly also in B can be more than adequately explained as a purely palaeographic issue. Thus, there is no reason to look for any further factual information to explain the difference between *infa* and *rufa*, and most certainly no grounds for making a phonologically dubious equivalence between *Inab* / *Nepa*. We must therefore reject De Mandach's hypothesis.

C.3.2.3.5 A southern Italian-North African scenario?

The Danish *Karl Magnus Krønike*, essentially a reworking of n, has instead of the closing verses of the Rol., a short, corresponding narrative; literally translated, it reads as follows:

> The next night, the angel Gabriel came to the emperor and said, 'Go to the land of *Libia* and help the good King *Ywan*; the heathens are fighting vigorously in his land.' During the Easter week, the emperor raised a great army in Rome and went to King Ywan. The king of the heathens was called *Gealwer*; when he heard that the emperor was coming, he went to intercept him and fought with him. Many people died on both sides. *Wdger* the Dane struck the king's helmet and split him [scil. the king] in two [down] to his saddle, and the emperor was victorious and freed king Ywan's land. Then he went back home to France.

There is a good chance that this text is the only surviving remnant of the Ur-KMS (Steitz 1908, 665–669, 672, supported by Halvorsen 1959, 64s., Aebischer especially [1960c] 1967, 197s., 202s., and Segre ad loc.) or even of the lost *Vie de Charlemagne*, most of which lives on in the KMS I (Skårup 1990, passim, Beckmann 2008a, 202–204). But even this *Vie* dates from the early 13th c. (Beckmann 2008a, 48), and in this text too, the length and style of the text shows that it is just a plot summary. This suggests two things: first, that it has been spun out of the closing verses of the Song of Roland, and secondly, that it never was an independent story in its own right.

In fact, it is likely that in the 12th c. quite a few of the audience (like most modern editors) assume that in v. 3996 of the Song, *Reis* refers to *Vivïen*,[1150] and this is evidently how the editor of this text interpreted it.

---

to say, *Rus(s)orum regina*. Her grandson was Saint Vladimir the Christianiser of Russia; his grand-daughter Anna was Queen and Imperial administrator of France, and this meant she was worthy of permanent commemoration. Both obituaries are therefore simply honouring an ancestor of the reigning dynasty, which was very common in medieval obituaries.

1150 This seems to be supported by the fact that in a charter from about 1187 (Dunois-Marmoutier 187) *a Vivianus Rex* appears; as *Rex* is a personal epithet, it may have been given to this man a few years earlier.

This is methodologically significant; because this nexus, despite its double interpretation, can hardly have happened twice by accident, and it reduces to almost nil the already slim chance that the closing scene in the Song (v. 3993–4001) could have been created by the last scribe before O; it existed for n and therefore also for a branch of β, and so it must have been present in the archetype of all surviving mss.

Moreover, this apparently empty name of a 'King Vivien' must have been sufficient to inspire someone to give this nexus a certain amount of narrative substance. This is in fact what happened, and we can track it as follows.

The *uiu(i)-* in this 'King Vivien' was (probably only in the north) misread as *iuu-,* and then written as *yw-,* which resulted in a King *Ywan*.[1151]

Charlemagne could not leave this Christian king in the lurch, of course, and so he went – where exactly? The name *Bire* can be found in other epics, too, (that is to say in different contexts and therefore possibly also with a different meaning) and it appears to alternate with *Bile* (cf. Moisan s. v.).[1152] There are also cases where *Bile* is located in North Africa,[1153] where it alternates through metathesis with *Libe* as well.[1154] In OF *Bire* could therefore in v. 3995 have stood for *Bile* and this for *Libe.* The term *Libya* was well known from the Vulgate (*Dan* 11.43, *Nah* 3.9, 2 *Paralip* 12.3, 16.8, *Act Ap* 2.19), and so it was also correctly understood in 12th c. France. It fitted in well with the fact that in v. 2924 Charlemagne had predicted that a rebellion by *cil d'Affrike* would take place there.

The most suitable starting point for the expedition was certainly Rome, and the most suitable time was usually the days immediately after Easter (Easter itself could then be celebrated in Rome!), the most suitable hero (from the relatively few who had survived Roncevaux) was Charlemagne's specialist for Italy, Ogier. The expedition ended in victory, of course; because the point of the story was to resolve the ending that the Roland poet had left hanging.

1151 Also, according to Halvorsen (1959, 250) the name *Ivain* (Old Norse, but elsewhere *Iven, Ivein*) may have influenced it. De Mandach (1993, 296) is not correct when he supposes a relationship with *John* OId Norse *Jón*; because Old Rus. still has *Ioannъ*, and it does not have *Ivannъ* until the 14th c., which today is *Ivan* according to RussEW s. v.

1152 In one case, this even happens in real life; cf. n. 1143 above.

1153 In the *Ansëis de Cartage* (v. 4039 ed. Alton) and probably also in the long version of the *Athis* (v. 13888, 13898 ed. Hilka).

1154 In the *Prise d'Orange* (v. 346 ed. Régnier), which has *Bile* in the archetype but *Libe / Lybe* in branch B, where it appears that the context is also North Africa.

And finally, it would not be hard to invent and insert the name of an aggressor, the only element that cannot be deduced from the Rol. verses.[1155]

But how did the reviser understand the name *Nimphe* in his source text, and why did he delete it? Baist (1902, 225–227) provided two answers to this double question: Ninfa and the answer he prefers, namely Memphis in Egypt.

Memphis was well known because it is found in the Vulgate, the Latin geographers, and Isidore.[1156] However, there are some problems with the phonology, and it stretches the narrative to the limits of credibility in geographical terms.

Ninfa is more acceptable, almost 60 km south(east) of Rome, about 5 km northeast of the Via Appia, almost half way between Rome and the infamous Saracen bridgehead of the 9th and early 10th c. at the Garigliano: first attested in 750, it was by 1100 a well-fortified *civitas* with seven churches; it could be regarded therefore (at least with the benefit of hindsight) as Rome's bulwark against the Garigliano Muslims.[1157] This would have been the last northern bastion where a southern Italian King Vivian would have been able to take shelter from his North African attackers. It is most likely to have been the Old Norse

---

1155 Whether (Old Norse) *Gealwer* is freely invented here or not, is for the most part irrelevant; but the name bears little relation to Saracen names in the Old French epic tradition such as *Galafre*, *Galifre* or even *Cara(h)uel*. In the case of name *Galafre*, which is common in Old French epics (Mireaux thought of this in 1943, 40; from Arab Ḥalaf), the Old Norse stress on the first syllable would explain the loss of the middle -*a*-, and in Old Norse fashion could be taken for /v/ in intersonorous position, and the -*re* could be reinterpreted as the -*er* (< -*ier*) that is common in French names (and indeed, the Old French *Mort Aymeri* also has the form *Galafer*). De Mandach (1993, 301s.) reminds us of the 'Caliph' of Bagdad, the name *Galifer* instead of *Algalife* in the Dutch *Roelantslied* and a Saracen *Galifre* of Tyrus (hapax in the *Ansëis de Cartage*). On the vague possibility that *Gealwer* could be connected with the *Carahuel* in the *Enfances Ogier*, cf. Beckmann (2008a, 203s.). – The Catalan Guilhem de Berguedán († between 1192 and 1196), in a surprising aside, moves the battle between Ogier and Carahuel from Italy (which is where it belongs in *Chevalerie Ogier*) to *Berra*, that is to say, to the Étang de Berre or the River Berre, but unlike Lejeune (1948, 130–145) I do not think this is an original idea; it is more likely that Guilhem has conflated Ogier's battle in Italy against Carahuel with Ogier's Italian campaign against *Gealwer* or similar in *Bire,* and has understood *Bire* as *Berra*. If this is the case, the narrative interpretation of the closing lines of the Rol. would not have happened in the north but would have occurred by 1170–1180 at the latest in Galloromania. Cf. also n. 1150!

1156 *Is* 19.13, *Ier* 2.16, 44.1, 46.14, 46.19, *Ez* 30.12, 30.16, *Os* 9.6; Mela 1.51, Pliny *n.h.* 5.50, 61; Isidore *et*. 6.10.1, 15.1.31.

1157 It was destroyed in 1378 and has been in ruins ever since, making it in the eyes of Gregorovius "the Pompeii of Christendom"; on its history cf. Tomassetti (1910, 2.393–407), Stoob (1972, passim, the Gregorovius reference 99 n. 30).

editors who deleted the name of this town because it would not have been important to them.[1158]

In summary, then, the editor of this passage has done nothing wrong except the most important thing: he failed to appreciate the poetic problem at the end of the Rol. and turned its closing verses into an anti-climax that is quite obviously banal.[1159]

C.3.2.3.6 Thuringia?

Settegast (1894 passim) thought that *Imphe* and *Ebire* were Memleben and Nebra in Thuringia. These places are attested in the 8th and 9th c. as *Mimileba* (and probably also *Imileba*) and *Nebiri* respectively, but they are located in the area where in 531 the Thuringian empire was destroyed. Memleben is not close enough phonologically, and neither is *Nebra*, considering that the stress is *Né-bĭrĭ*. In terms of the meaning, Rajna's interesting idea that there is continuity between the Merovingian-Germanic and Carolingian-Romance epic turns here into its own caricature.

C.3.2.3.7 The area around the mouth of the Oder?

Hanak (1971a passim) claims that all of the research on the closing verses has been based on incorrect starting assumptions; he maintains that his own work starts with the right assumption (p. 434): the Rol. is reflecting the *collective consciousness of the North and Northwestern European cultural area* – in itself a grotesquely baseless claim, given that the Song or an important early version of it originated in Normandy, and given the presence of Oger de Denemarche and the (in no way exaggerated!) Baltic Coast elements of the Baligant hordes. Hanak thinks *Imphe* is the prosperous 10th and 11th Slav centre on the island of Wolin/ Wollin in the mouth of the Oder, where the Danish, or "Viking", enemies of successive Danish kings used to set up bases. Apparently as a kind of *captatio benevolentiae,* Hanak introduces it first of all (p. 445) with the name *Impne*, which

---

1158 In the context of Ninfa, Baist tentatively suggested altering the text from *tere de Bire* to *tere de rive*, meaning the Marittima south of Rome. But it is unlikely that a stretch of coastline outside France could be introduced as *rive* without any further details, nor is it likely that the common appellative *rive* would have become corrupted to *Bire*. The combination of Ninfa and Libya is discussed by Steitz (1908, 637s.).

1159 The only other Vivien who is more than an extra in the Old French epic, Vivien de Monbranc, was probably also derived from the closing verses of the Rol., to show that Charlemagne did not answer the call for help, and instead, Vivien's own people, that is to say the family of Maugis (-Renaut de Montauban), had to step in and help (cf. *Vivien de Monbranc*, ed. W. van Emden, especially vv. 302–336).

he has taken from Zedler's *Universal-Lexicon* (from the 17th c.!);[1160] the reader only finds out later that this totally isolated form must be a simple printing error for **Iumpne* or similar, which no longer fits with the assonance. After the importance of this place diminished, it appears in the Danish chronicles of the late 12th c. and in the time around 1200 (and in the Old Icelandic *Jómsvíkinga saga* from roughly the same time) with the name *Jomsburg*, *Julinum* or *Hynnisburg* (which could be a misinterpretation or a misreading of **Hyumsburg*), but in Adam of Bremen († between 1081 and 1085) it is called *Jumne*,[1161] and this is, as Hanak now rightly points out (p. 451), the form that is closest to the *Imphe* in the Rol. – but it is not close enough, because the stressed syllables *Jum-/Jom-* and *Im-* are too different, and a *-p-* (or even *-ph-/-f-*) does not appear in the historically relevant forms of the name. *Tere de Bire*, Hanak argues, means simply 'Denmark', that is to say, the land of Björn Ironside, *Bier Costae Ferreae* in Guillaume de Jumièges, who was the most notorious Viking of all in the period around 850. But even *Bier* does not give us *Bire*, and the idea that Denmark would be clearly named in other parts of the song but wrapped up in a riddle only in the closing verses is another, in my view, pointless and random assumption that would only devalue the literary merits of the text; it is especially inappropriate here because neither Hanak's *Imphe*, that is to say Jumne, nor his two Vivien figures belong in the 9th c. He suggests as historical prototypes for Vivien two Danish kings: Sven Forkbeard, who succeeded in conquering most of England in 1013, which his son Knut/Canute the Great then consolidated, and Sven's grandson Sven Estridsson, who was the pretender to the Danish throne for many years before he finally became king († 1074/1076), later passing his kingdom on to several sons by a number of different women; but neither of these two individuals bear even the slightest resemblance to the epic Vivien. The extent of Hanak's bias is obvious in the following remark which introduces Sven Estridsson (p. 453s.): "But there is also Sven Estridsson, son of Knut's sister, and his rivalry with Magnus Olafson, son of St. Olaf of Norway, which must [! G.A.B.] have left traces in Turoldus' Roland". Magnus of Norway did indeed, between 1042 and 1047 when he was also King of Denmark, launch a punitive expedition against Jumne, but Sven Estridsson did not take part in it; none of this material is relevant to our context. Nevertheless, Hanak goes on to conclude "We may assume that in Northern Europe

---

1160 Hanak only states (443 n. 5), that it was published in "Graz, 1961", but does not mention the fact that it is an anastatic reprint of the edition of 1732–1754. The editors of *Romania* add in square brackets and in French that Zedler gives his source as vol. 9 of the Inedita collection by Johann Peter Ludewig, Frankfurt/Leipzig/Halle 1720–1741.

1161 With variants such as J*umme*, *Vimne*, *Vimme*, but these do not affect the main reading *Jumne*, and they are no closer to the *Imphe* in the Rol.

the names of Bier-Vivien-Imphe mentioned in an epic recital were hardly news, nor had they an exotic ring". This is one of the most ludicrous statements ever made in the field of Roland studies.

C.3.3 Review of *Turoldus*, *Vivïen*, *Bire* and *Nimphe*

Turoldus is more than just a copier of the Rol. He is at least an editor of the Rol., and the abrupt ending is a conscious, and admirably well-constructed, literary artifice. For Vivien, Bire and Nimphe the best 'positivist' solution turns out to be the most revealing in literary terms: *Vivïen* is the Vivien of the William epic, *Bire* is near Narbonne, *(N)imphe* ist Nîmes. With this ending, the Roland poet is not just leading into the William epic (which follows on chronologically) and at the same time creating a very interesting literary-historical intertextual reference, but he is also drawing a parallel between the two nephews who were killed in battle when they were young, Roland and Vivien, all of which skilfully illustrates the idea that for a Christian, the struggle goes on until the Last Judgement. But there is no call for action in support of any contemporary, crusade-like activity, and so these verses do not help us to determine the date of the Song.

Geographical details and minor figures

C.4 The basic geographical structure of Charlemagne's empire

It makes no sense here to devote a separate section to the southern part of France, represented by the Pyrenean passes (cf. A.12.1.1–A.12.1.3), along with *Nobles* (Dax, A.12.2.1), *Carcasonĭe* (A.12.4.3), *Nerbone* (Narbonne, A.12.6.6, A.12.6.7) and *Marsune* (Marsanne, A.12.6.6) because this was the location for Charlemagne's Spanish campaign and has already been discussed above together with the geography of Spain. We have also already covered: the mention of Saint-Denis as a place (v. 973) along with the Dionysius relic in Durendal's hilt (C.1.4.2), the mentions of Saint-Seurin de Bordeaux (v. 3685) and also Saint-Romain de Blaye (v. 3689/3693) in section C.1.6.6.

The remaining, more specific geographical details about Charlemagne's empire, that is to say the tribes that form the *eschieles* (C.6.1) and the fiefdoms belonging to a specific person (parts of C.6–C.8), will be presented later. In this initial section we shall examine the more general aspects of his kingdom's geography.

C.4.1 The whole: *Tere major*

Tere Major O 600, *Spanien* n, *trestuta Spagna* V4;
  Tere Major O 818, *Ter Major* V4, *Terre Major* CV7, *Terre Majour* T;
  Tere Major O 952, *Tera Major* V4, *Terre Major* CV7;
  Tere Major O [1489]=1532, *Tera Major* V4, *Terre Major* CPL, *terre de France* V7, *Terre Majour* T;
  Tere Major O [1616]=1667, *Tera Major* V4;
  Tere Major O 1784, *Terre Major* CV7T, *terre de France* P, *Terre majour* T, *France la vaillans* L,*<Lan>tmayoer* h(R): In the Rol. this expression, whenever it occurs, always clearly means 'France' or 'the Empire of Charlemagne'.[1162] In v.

[1162] Later, Bertran de Born (*Tortz e guerra e joi d'amor* v.15) also understands *Terra major* to mean France, as does the *Chanson d'Antioche* (ed. Duparc-Quioc 1825, 1948, 6941) and probably also the *Fierabras* 4578. Flutre s. v. *Terre Maior* suspects it is a land "à l'Ouest de l'Inde?" in the following passages: *Roman d'Alexandre déc.* V 6276 (similarly 3.3611): *Mais li solels si basse devers Terre Maor, / Adonques ont sentue atemprée calor* (3.3611 *froidor*) – but the meaning is: 'When the sun sank away from the Orient and towards our land' (because in the Middle Ages people were generally taught that the sun rises every day over India and sinks into the sea behind Ireland, Western Europe and Spain); also *Vengeance Alexandre* by Jehan Nevelon

600 β and Stengel (in the index of his edition) misunderstand it as 'Spain' because this is where Ganelon promises Marsilĭe that after Roland's death, *Tere Major remeindreit en repos*. Bédier (1927, 146s.) corrected Stengel's error: Ganelon is not presenting himself as a brazen and therefore implausible friend of Spain, but as a Frank who wants to see peace at last in his own land, which is the *Tere Major* – and the implication is that Spain would have peace, too. O reproduces here what is in the archetype, while β has grasped the implication, but not the primary meaning.

It is not clear whether this expression is based on [1] *Terra maior* ('the great land') or [2] *Terra maiorum* ('the land of the ancestors').[1163] Thus far, no one appears to have considered any references to either of these forms from Latin or Medieval Latin literature in connection with the field of Roland studies. I would like to demonstrate that *Terra maior* is the right one, and furthermore, that the term existed well before 1100, and with the exact meaning that we have here, and probably even in a version of the Song of Roland.

C.4.1.1 *Terra maior*

According to the dictionaries, OF *major* appears alongside other nouns, including toponyms, often simply as a way of making that noun stand out: *siecle major* 'the better world, the hereafter', *la Vierge major* 'the Virgin Mary', *Dieu le majour*,

---

(v. 1831) *jusqu'en Terre* (var. *Inde*) *Major* (people will talk about a deed) – but this just means 'even all the way to our land (from the Orient)' (because this means 'over a huge distance'). Langlois (1904 s. v. *Majour*) sees a "pays sarrazin" in the *Destruction de Rome* 688–690: *Labam, l[i] emperere, est de moult grant valour, / XXX roi sont ou li et XIIII amaceour / Et tot li sarrazin jusqu'a Terre Maiour* – but 'up to' can be intended in an exclusive sense: 'and all Saracens up to the borders of our land'. Moreover, this could have become a fully formulaic expression 'as far as the *Terra maior*', with the meaning 'as far as the edge of the world', in the *Croisade contre les Albigeois* 365 (cf. the P. Meyer edition at this place) and in the *Folque de Candie* (cf. the Schultz-Gora edition 3.447), and we should acknowledge also a secondary meaning 'the Holy Land' for Aimeric of Belenoi (*Cossiros cum*, cf. Raynouard, *Lexique* 5.354); there is no need for a discussion of this, because these passages can tell us very little that is relevant to the Rol.

1163 Gautier was in favour of *Terra maior* in his edition (but gave no explicit explanation), and Tavernier (1903, 89) was the first to argue in favour of *Terra majorum*. There is a review of the literature in Walker (1978–1979, 123–126), and he is prepared to accept both explanations as correct (p. 129s.), and this may well be in tune with the intentions of the Rol., but it cannot be the full explanation, since the expression almost certainly was coined only once. Walker did not know about Galmés de Fuentes (1970, 246), who cites semantic agreement with the equivalent Arab. expression to show that this must be the source of the Rol. usage.

Cypre la majour, *Rome la majour*, *France la majour* (although the latter not until the late *Baudouin de Sebourg*).[1164] Quite clearly Lat. *maior*, and not *maiorum* is behind all of these; similar expressions which could contain the Lat. *maiorum* are not known. In the Rol. we can compare semantically the *greignor pareïs* 1135 and *France l'asolue* 2311. In the same way, therefore, the *Terre major*, even if its article is missing, *can* mean the 'unsurpassable land' and therefore France or Charlemagne's empire.

But there is another possible origin for this. In Arab., *al-arḍ al-kabīra*, literally 'the great land', means the Western and Central European land mass north and northeast of the Pyrenees.[1165] The expression exists at least from the time of Ibrāhīm ibn al-Qāsim al-Qayrawānī (i.e. 'from Kairouan', first half of the 11th c.).[1166] Several times it is stated that 'the great land' is separated from Spain by the Pyrenees, or that it is 'beyond' Spain,[1167] and that it shares a border with the Byzantine Empire;[1168] occasionally, the Italian mainland is included.[1169] In both cases, therefore, the term overlaps approximately with Charlemagne's empire.[1170] Even if no connection exists between the Arabic and the Old French term, the parallelism in thinking would still be a valid argument. But I think a causal relationship is *a priori* more likely; even if the direction of the influence has to remain open, it follows that the expression in one or other of these two languages must be considerably older than 1100.

As far as the Lat. is concerned, I thought of a now defunct *Terrae Maioris* monastery near Foggia in the north-western tip of Apulia; this form of the name is used in relation to an event from the year 1071 in the *Chronica Casinenesis*

1164 Cf. the dictionaries. In terms of form, but not semantics, this category also includes OF *Inde (la) Major* and *Lombardie la Major*, because geographers knew, besides *India Maior*, also an *India Minor* (and sometimes an *India Media*) and understood *Major* and *Minor Langobardia* to mean Upper and Lower Italy; the same pattern is evident in MLat. *Major Britannia* '(Great) Britain (as opposed to Brittany)', *Major Graecia* 'Great (= colonial) Greece', *Major Rhaetia* 'High Raetia' (NGML s. v. *major*), where in every case *Major* possesses an objective meaning.

1165 Boissonnade (1923, 72) was the first to link *Terra major* with the Arab. expression.

1166 Quoted in al-Maqqarī (trans. de Gayangos, 1.75s.).

1167 E.g. in Ibn ʿIdhārī (*al-Bayān* 1.491 and 2.1), Shams ad-Dīn of Damascus (ed. Mehren, p. 343 and 372), Abū'l-Fidā' (trans. Reinaud, 2.1.42, 2.1.85 et al., quoted in Walker 1978–1979, 126) and al-Maqqarī (trans. de Gayangos, 1.19).

1168 Shams ad-Dīn (ed. Mehren, p. 375).

1169 Ibn ʿIdhārī (*al-Bayān* 1.150, 158). Probably also Abū'l-fidā' (2.169): across from Africa lie Sicily and 'the great land'.

1170 Lévi-Provençal (1938, 34) translates the term rather too simply as 'l'Europe'. – As Walker (1978–1979, 126s.) demonstrates, the oldest Span. prose romance, the *Libro del Cauallero Zifar* (around 1300), uses this Arab. term in a mangled, but clearly visible form (*Alar Vire*, var. *Arquibia*, *Alarquebia*) as a name for France and translates it as *la grant tierra*.

(ed. Hoffmann 392.8, 515.3), which was begun in 1099 by Leo Marsicanus (born before 1050). The name lives on in a slightly altered form in the name of the small town of Torremaggiore which sprang up around the monastery. Even if it had nothing to do with the *Terre major* of the Song, it would be a further argument for its etymology as *Terra maior*, and not *maiorum*. It would be very strange if one and the same expression had two syntactically different foundations. However, quite unexpectedly, the name of the monastery does in fact have something to do with the term in the Rol., and probably even something to do with the Song itself.

How old is the monastery, how old is its name, and what does it mean? Don Tommaso (Domenico) Leccisotti (1895–1982), Librarian/Archivist of Monte Cassino and an expert in the history of southern Italian Benedictine monasteries, devoted a monograph to the history of his place of birth, Torremaggiore (Leccisotti 1942, 115p.). According to this work, the monastery was probably founded in the 10th c. (1942, 13s.). Certainly (Basil) Boioannes, the Byzantine catapan of southern Italy (1017–1028), confirmed its estates in a charter, since lost, which was quoted in the later confirmation document by Robert Guiscard dated July 1067 (Leccisotti 1942, 12s., 73). The latter is preserved at least as a word-for-word transsumpt in yet another confirmation of estates by King Tancred dated January 1192 (text Leccisotti 1942, 85–87). After a long period of excessive debts, the monastery was dissolved in 1295, and the estates made over to the Templar order (Leccisotti 1942, 47–52 and the charter and register p. 73–115); any buildings that had survived over the following centuries including the monastery's chapel were destroyed in the earthquake of 1627 (Leccisotti 1942, 8).

Robert Guiscard's mention of the Byzantine charter does not tell us the name of the monastery in its Byzantine period. Leccisotti (1942, 11s.) discusses the question of the name as follows: "Non potrei però asserire senza ombra di dubbio che il nome di *Terrae Maioris* sia stato attribuito al monastero fin dai suoi inizii. Esso veniva designato col nome del titolare, S. Pietro. [. . .] Che se poi l'appellativo di *Terrae Maioris* non fosse contemporaneo alla fondazione, sarebbe azzardato il riscontrarvi una derivazione e un'evidente allusione alla Terra Maggiore per eccellenza, la Francia, d'onde derivarono quei nuovi dominatori del paese, i Normanni? Essi avevano scelto per deporvi le salme dei loro cari questa Terra, quasi terrasanta. Diversamente, non ci resta che spiegarlo con il linguaggio dell'epoca feudale, in analogia all'espressione *curtis maior*. Come la *corte*, residenza del feudatario, era la *maggiore* rispetto alle altre, così questa *terra*, capo e centro del piccolo stato, era *maggiore* per le *terre* che ne dipendevano. La mutazione di *Terrae Maioris* in *Turris Maioris* è dei tempi Angioini. Qualche accenno infatti se ne trova già prima, ad es. nel *Liber censuum* [of the Curia, from the year 1192, G.A. B.]." But is Leccisotti's second attempt at an explanation not rather circular, and

suspiciously non-specific? He says that the monastery is called 'St. Peter of the central land' because its erection elevates the piece of land on which it is built to a higher status, relative to the lands of those who are dependent upon it? Could this not be said of almost any medieval monastery? And above all, what does *qualche accenno* mean?

Let us therefore draw up our own chronological account of the forms of the name appearing in the collection of charters and registers (Leccisotti 1942, 73–115)! This produces a surprising result. When the monastery appears in the *Chronica Cassinensis* from the year 1071 to the year 1275, it is mostly called *Terrae Maioris / de Terra Maiore*, but it is already called de *Turri Maiore* in 1067 (!) in Guiscard's charter (reproduced in Leccisotti 1942, 86, cf. now ed. Ménager 1980, no. 18, with a detailed commentary), and then also in 1134 and continuously from then on until 1277; moreover, the Curia uses both names in 1192 and (retrospectively) in 1372. We can take the form in Guiscard's charter literally, (*ecclesia*) *beati Petri apostoli de Turri Maiore*, because the surrounding charter context of King Tancred in 1192 has *monasterium Terrae Maioris*, once before and once after the transsumpt (Leccisotti 1942, 85, 87);[1171] therefore, the form from 1067 has been intentionally copied in 1192, and this is not a careless error – and indeed it is obvious that the basic, error-ridden Latin of 1067 is scrupulously preserved, and it stands out against the elegant Lat. of the royal court of 1192. The 1067 text contains (in the equivalent of almost one and half pages of modern print) no fewer than ten errors mixing up nominative and non-nominative cases, meaning that the notary who wrote it, *Johannes Franconi filius* was obviously not from Normandy (which at that time still essentially retained the full two-case system), but grew up locally (with the one-case system).[1172] This fact as well as the presentation of the Byzantine charter and precise description of the monastery's estate boundaries mean that the charter is more likely to have been drawn up by those who received the properties and not by Robert Guiscard. This tells us nothing more, and nothing less, than that *de Turri Maiore*, meaning the same as today's Torremaggiore, was the local, pre-Norman name of the monastery (named after some local factor or other). *Terrae maioris* was almost always used for a long time after that; it first appears in a text dated in the monastery itself and written on behalf of Urban II, a Frenchman and friend of the Normans,

---

1171 I have checked each of Leccisotti's readings of this charter in the edition by Kehr (1902, 460–462).

1172 He only wrote one other charter for Guiscard, in the year 1065 and this was also in Troia (Ménager 1980, no. 14). Enzensberger suspects that he was the son of the notary called Franco/Francus who is also attested in Troia between 1045 and 1078. Guiscard did not have a permanent notary until 1079 (Enzensberger 1990, 62s., Ménager 1980, no. 27).

of the 25th April 1093, which Leccisotti missed, no doubt because it has the wrong date in Jaffe/Löwenfeld 5643, and as a consequence of this was given entirely the wrong location, and then corrected only in the Errata;[1173] in about 1100 we find an entry from Monte Cassino relating to 1071. The new name then became the norm; but the old one, suppressed in the local area, lived on in occasional written references and it took only two decades after the end of the Norman and Hohenstaufen period for the old name to revive and displace the newer one for ever.

We therefore come to the unavoidable conclusion that the term *Terra maior* originates with the Normans: they took the simple name of the *Tour majour* in the monastery and its surrounding territory and turned it into a term that was already familiar to them, namely *Terre majour*, and this happened early enough for the name to have become the norm by 1093. For them, *Terre majour* must have meant exactly what it means in the Rol. They had a more concrete motive to change this name than the one Leccisotti suggests (in the first of his two theories). We read in the Royal Annals and in Einhart, and also in southern Italian sources such as Erchempert's chronicle of Benevento or the *Chronicon Salernitanum*, that Charlemagne had subjugated the Principality of Benevento, which at that time included a large part of Apulia, including Monte Gargano and with it, the region around Torremaggiore. Byzantium did not extend as far as what is now the northern border of Apulia about 30 km northwest of Torremaggiore until the late 10th c. When the Normans took possession of this area between 1042 and 1054, the memory of the Benevento rule was chronologically and geographically close. And since the Normans of the 11th c. thought of themselves as *Franci* with aplomb whenever there was a benefit to be had from this ideological stance, in this instance, they would think that name signified the *Terra maior*, Charlemagne's land, returning to the rule of the *Franci*. Even though the renaming of this place could have been initially a bit of a joke, it soon turned into reality. But because of the fact that *Terra maior* is nowhere to be found with its original meaning in the historians writing in Latin, we can assume that the term did not sound neutral or "objective" in its written form, but rather it would have emotional connotations of being "ours". Where else could it have had its connection with life than in the epic tradition? And where in the epic

---

1173 The text is incorrectly dated to three years later, April 1096, which leads to the location being incorrectly listed as a place on Urban's journey from Saintes to Bordeaux! The error is corrected in the Erratum (vol. II, p. 713): the charter is from April 1093 and therefore from the Apulian monastery of *Terrae Maioris* (because there is evidence showing that in this month Urban visited Troia and the Monte Gargano, which are a good day's journey south and east of Torremaggiore).

tradition would be a more probable location for this than the place where the emphasis later fell: in the Roncevaux epic? It is not excessive to attribute this kind of thinking to the Normans of that time; for a few decades earlier, a few laisses from the Chanson de Roland had been recited at the Battle of Hastings, and a few decades later, in the surviving version of the Song, Charlemagne had already conquered *Puille e trestute Calabre* and was worried about a possible rebellion in *Palerne . . .*

C.4.1.2 *Terra maiorum*?

We must now consider the other alternative: is there any reason why we should look for a *Terra majorum* 'land of the ancestors' as the meaning behind *Terre major*? The answer is: no. In the Song we find *Geste Francor* (v. 1443, 3262), *enseigne paienur* (v. 1019) and *gent paienor* (v. 1221, 2639). In all of these cases, the *-or* part of the Lat. genitive ending *-orum* can still be heard, but if *Major* were to come from *Maiorum*, the whole genitive ending would be cut down to *-um*, and this would mean that no indication of the case could then be heard. Therefore, the analogy does not work. As *Tere Majur* in v. 600, [1616]= 1667 and 1784 is in the rectus, we could counter it (along with Walker 1978–1979, 125) with the question whether in the Lat. base form *Terra maior* could possibly be *Terre maire*, since in the feminine the obliquus form *maior* is not attested with a rectus function until the *Florimont* (dated 1188, as *maor*), (Godefroy s. v. *maior*). The answer is, I believe quite simple: *Terre major* is a Latinism.

C.4.2 Review of *Ter(r)e major*

Terre major meaning 'Charlemagne's empire' is the equivalent of Lat. *Terra major*, not *Majorum*, and the word *major* here, as in similar Old French expressions, is essentially intended to make the name stand out, and it also had an emotional connotation. The expression clearly had this meaning going back well into the 11th c., probably by this time in the context of a version of the Chanson de Roland, and it is first attested as being uttered by a southern Italian Norman.

C.4.3 The size of Charlemagne's empire: the *vals de Moriane* and Roland's conquests outside Spain

Roland talks about his conquests on two occasions. In v. 198–200 he tells the assembled court that he has conquered the round number of 7 cities in the course

of the Spanish campaign, in order to evoke the thus-far successful progress of the expedition. He then uses this as the background against which he castigates Marsilĭe's treacherous behaviour, which has still not been punished; we examined this passage above in A.12.2 because the names he mentions are confined to Spain. In v. 2322–2334, however, Roland is speaking to his sword, and so in effect this is a soliloquy; he looks back on the whole of his military career from the moment when Charlemagne knighted him with this sword. This military career began in France: a fact which is both rather surprising and emphasised by the poet. Why did it all start in France?

C.4.3.1 The *vals de Moriane*

Es vals de Moriane O 2318, *ze Moriana in dem tal* K, *in la vals de Muraine* V4, *en val de Moraingne* P an angel once told Charlemagne to give the sword Durendal to a *cunte cataignie*; 'therefore' Charlemagne gave it to Roland. What are these valleys of *Moriane*? Outside the Rol. itself, two explanations are given for this same expression, or for something so similar that we need not worry about the difference.

In the KMS I (based on a French original probably from the first quarter of the 13th c.; ed. Unger cap. 45, ed. Loth cap. A 42) the scene very obviously takes place in the *Moniar-dal* (a misspelling of **Morian-dal*) between France and Italy, that is to say in the Maurienne Valley; it is described with a little more detail in that source: the angel Gabriel appears to Charlemagne one night, tells him about the relics in Durendal and instructs him to give the sword to Roland when he makes him a knight, which Charlemagne then immediately does (cf. Beckmann 2008a, 162). The Valley or Valleys of Maurienne are the strategically important mountainous area near Mont Cenis, through which the historical Charlemagne travelled when he went to Italy in 773. This interpretation 'Valleys of Maurienne' is perfectly correct in terms of the form in our Rol. context too.[1174]

[1174] The *Mauri(g)enna / Morienna* (the latter e.g. in Hincmar's *Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 877) was cited as *Mauriane / Moriane* (i.e. with -*a*-) in later epics (Bédier 1926–1929, 2. 157 with n. 2, Moisan s. v.), and also in historical reality (e.g. *Morianna* around 1050 and *usque in vallem Moriannae* in 1103, Tavernier 1911a, 121s., and 1912, 138 n. 21; *Moriana regio* around 1150, *en Maurianne* in 1390, Nègre 1990–1998, no. 10335; phonologically like OF *Viane* alongside *Vienne* < *Vi(g)enna*). The link with *val(lis)* was common across the whole of the Carolingian Empire, ever since the half-brother and bitter enemy of Pippin and Grifo was killed *in valle Maurienna* in the year 753 when he was fleeing to Italy (*Ann. Fuldenses*, *Mettenses priores*, *Laurissenses minores*); the plural is used e.g. in the *Historia Compostellana* (1.17.1, *usque ad valles Maurianenses*) or in ms. 2 of the *Itinerary* by Matthew Paris (a. 1253, Miller 1895–1898, 3.88, *vaux de Moriane*). – There was an identification of this toponym in our passage as Morienval (Oise, *Mauriana vallis* in a charter of Charles the Simple 250s., a. 920) made by Tavernier (1911a, 116, 120–123) but he later withdrew this himself (1912, 138 n. 21) arguing for the Maurienne instead.

The *Mainet*, however, (of whose original form from shortly after 1100, only a few fragments have survived, second half of the 12th c.) told us how the yet-to-be-crowned Charles left France and went into exile at the Muslim court of Toledo, and how he took the sword *Durendart* from his dead opponent Braimant, in a valley which is called *Valmoriaele* in the surviving German (Low Rhenanian) *Karlmeinet* (< Fr. *Valmorial),* but *Val Samorial* (var. *-an*) in the Spanish *Primera Crónica General.* The linking together of the names Charles – *Durendart/Durendal* – *Val(sa)morial / Vals de Moriane* is the same in the two stories. In an article that is rightly regarded as one of his most famous pieces of work, Menéndez Pidal (1932, passim) understands *Val(sa)morial* to mean a valley northeast of Toledo, some parts of which are still called *salmoriales* today; Horrent (1951b, 178–193), on the other hand, believes in a freely invented *Valmoriane* or similar, which simply meant something like 'Valley of the Moors'. But we do not have to choose between these two explanations of the origin of the name, because we do not need to know how the story KMS I and the one in the *Mainet* came about (it is very possible that the *Mainet* form is the older of the two). We are interested in knowing which of these two places the Roland poet had in mind.

There are practical reasons why this question is easy to answer. If the angel had issued this instruction that Charles should give the sword to a *cunte cataignie* while he was in exile in Spain, then Charles would have done this immediately after his return and enthronement (which occurred very quickly), and he would not have dared to wait until his nephew was old enough to bear arms. This means that he must have received this instruction in France, and not in Spain, and the *vals de Moriane* can only be the 'Valleys of Maurienne'.

C.4.3.2 Roland's conquests outside Spain

We turn now to Roland's exploits with his sword Durendal (v. 2322–2332):

> Jo l'en cunquis [e Anjou] e Bretaigne,
> Si l'en cunquis e Peitou e le Maine;
> Jo l'en cunquis Normendie la franche,
> Si l'en cumquis Provence e Equitaigne
> E Lumbardie e trestute Romaine;
> Jo l'en cunquis Baiver e tute Flandres
> E Bu[guerie] e trestute Puillanïe,
> Costentinnoble, dunt il out la fiance,
> E en Saisonïe fait il ço qu'il demandet;
> Jo l'en cunquis e Escoce e (Vales) I[rla]nde
> E Engletere, quë il teneit sa cambre [. . .]

The Maurienne leads to Italy; therefore, at that time Charlemagne was already powerful enough to operate inside Italy, leaving behind the land he had

inherited, France, which was not yet obliged to defend itself against Muslim invaders. Whom then did Roland 'subjugate' – for that is the best way to translate *cunqui*s here – in (northern) France? He fought against the most typical of all medieval opponents: he subjugated vassals who took advantage of the absence of their lord to fight for their own independence, abuse the rule of law, and start feuds with each other. At that time, peace prevailed only in the central part of *France*, including Touraine, Chartrain and Vexin; for Roland pacified initially *Anjou*,[1175] *Bretaigne*,[1176] *Peitou*,[1177] the *Maine*[1178] and Normandy, which amounts to the whole of western France. Why did he start specifically in Anjou and not in Normandy, for example? There can only be one answer: because

1175 In O the reviser misread *7anıou (= e Anjou)* as *Namon* 'the Naimes'; the editors from Theodor Müller onwards correct this with reference to nKPT. –The name of the *Andecavi* (var. *Andegavi*, Pliny *n.h.* 4.107 and later) was given to their main base *Iuliomagus* in late antiquity, so that it became *Andegavis* > OF *Angiers*, and similarly their region was called *Andegavum* > OF *Anjou*; this in turn gave rise to the expanded new ethnonym (noun and adj.) *And(e/i)(c/g)avinus* (adj. e.g. Council of Orléans in the year 511, MGH Conc. 1.11; Greg. Tur. *Virt. S. Martini* 1.22, MGH SS.mer 1/2.150) > OF *Angevin* (Rol. 3819).

1176 Confirmed by O and (albeit altered in different ways) nKP. – The name of the insular *Britannia* (Catullus *carm.* 29.1 and later), sometimes also *Brittannia* (Pliny *n.h.* 33.54 and later), both rarer, and also with a single -*n*-, appears from the 6th c. onwards (Greg. Tur. *h.F.* 5.16, MGH SS.mer. 1/1.214 for the year 577) also for the Continental *Britannia* of the returning emigrants, which is called, on the (relatively rare) occasions when it is deemed necessary, *Britannia minor* (as in Venantius, *Vita beati Maurilii* 16.81, MGH. AA 4/2.93, and later), and the insular one is *Britannia maior* (as e.g. in Hugh of St.-Victor, *Descriptio mappae mundi* 26). OF *Bretaigne* is used for both; its usage referring to the island was gradually replaced by *Engletere*, *Vales/Guales*, *Escoce* (as in the Rol.), but then its popularity increased again through the Arthurian romances.

1177 Confirmed in OK and (slightly altered) n. – From the name of the Πίκτονες (Polybius 10.6 and later), *Pictŏnes* (Caesar *b.G.* 3.11.5 and later), late antiquity (noun and adj.) *Pictavi* (Ammian 15.11.13 etc.), their main base was called *Lemonum Pictonum* and also in late antiquity *Pictavis* > OF *Peitiers*, and their territory was *Pictavum* > OF *Peitou*; from this latter form the new ethnonym developed (noun and adj.) *Pictavinus* (adj. e.g. episcopal letter of around 567 in Greg.Tur. *h.F.* 9.39, MGH SS.mer. 1/1.462) > OF *Peitevin* (Rol. 3062 etc.).

1178 Only in O, but the context shows this is correct; misunderstood (*e le Maine* >) *Livonie* 'Livonia' n, *Alemaigne* etc. V4L and (altered in different ways) n (only B,b) KPT. – From the name of the *Cenomani* (Caesar *b.G.* 7.75.3), more accurately *Cenomanni* (e.g. *Notitia dignitatum* occ. 42.35), their main base *Vindinum/*Vindunum* in late antiquity was called *Cenomannis*, and their territory (*pagus*) *Cenomannicus*. From the 6th c. onwards a dissimilation of the first -*n*- > -*l*- before the nasal is attested (*Celem-*, *Caelom-*, *Celom-*, Council of Orléans in 511, Council of Mâcon in 585, MGH Conc. 1.9–11 and 1.173); the town name that we would expect from this OF *Celmans* was interpreted as *cel Mans* and simplified to OF *le Mans* (cf. Moisan, Flutre s. v.). The parallel development (*pagus*) *Cenomannicus* > *le Maine* is semi-erudite and comparable with *canonicus* > *chanoine*, *monachus* > *monicus* > *moine*.

that place or somewhere near there is where his homeland or perhaps his first fiefdom was. The first insubordination that he tackled was of course in the place he knew best, or the place he had been given to look after, or possibly the place where the rebellion threatened his own borders. All of the surviving historical evidence, and the Roland poet too – although he never spells this out – assumes that Roland is a Frenchman from the western part of northern France, or a "north-westerner" so to speak.[1179]

1179 The historical *Britannicus limes*, which Roland governed, was made up of the three counties of Nantes, Vannes and Rennes. But France lost this territory in 851, and Nantes was only reconquered sporadically between 909–919. This area now belonged to Brittany, and as such it was indirectly and in effect only nominally part of the French realm for a very long time (cf. LM s. v. *Bretagne*). After 851 a new defence zone against Brittany was established, which included Anjou and Maine. A reader of Einhart in 950 or 1000 would therefore have assumed that Roland's march, or territory, was located there. This explains why the PT describes him as *comes Cenomannensis* 'Count of le Maine' and also – in contradictory fashion – as *dominus Blaviensis*, because people evidently thought that he must have been the ruler of the place where people could visit his grave. The PT says that his father is *Milo de Angleris* (as in the *Codex Calixtinus*; *de Angulariis* A1 etc.). The toponymic type *Angulares/-arios/-arias* can be found today (excluding *Anglars* and similar in southern France, which do not match this particular context) in Poitou (which I believe to have been the home of the PT) in two places called *Angliers*, one about 90 km southwest and the other about 45 km northeast of Parthenay (that is to say near La Rochelle, Charente-Maritime, and near Moncontour, Vienne respectively); but these two places are too small to be serious contenders, and they probably just provided a written form for a name that the author had only heard. A more suitable possibility would be an *Angulata*, sometimes also *Angularia* (as in Touraine-PU 133 for the year 1144, Henri-II 2.65s. from 1172–1177), today *l'Onglie* (cf. the DT Maine-et-Loire s. v.) at the confluence of the Maine and the Loire, fortified at least for a time during the 11th c., just outside Angers. It is noticeable that neither Angers nor Anjou appear anywhere else in the PT, and no *pugnator* from these places is to be found in Charlemagne's army, even though Angers as Milo's seat would fit very well into that context; for if the father Milo was Count of Angers, then it is quite logical that the son Roland, evidently while his father was still alive, would receive from his royal uncle the fief of Le Mans, located about 85 km away, which makes it a neighbouring county. As far as the phonology is concerned, in the home of the PT, the standard Fr. *-gl-* is found today in the dialectal */-gj-/* (cf. e.g. ALF 942 *ongle*, 1141 *réglisse*, 1646 *avoir l'onglée*, 1741 *verglas*); the strength and regularity of this development suggests that it is an old phenomenon extending from the lower Loire southwards (in the Berry region it can be traced back to the 13th c., cf. Simoni-Aurembou 1995, 357). If the author of the PT pronounced the name of the two places called Angliers nearest to him as /ãŋgjēs/, and Angers as /ãn(d)žēs/, it is possible that a spelling error occurred favouring the places that were closest to him; in the history of legends, it would therefore just mean Angers. The Old French epic tradition, including the KMS I, seems to depend on the PT when it mentions the name of the fiefdom of Roland's father. But in the mss. of the KMS I we can see *Anglers* being gradually replaced by the *lectio facilior* Angers 'Angers', and here, too, Angers fits very well with the context: Milo ruled from this place, and then Roland ruled the neighbouring land of Bretagne (more details on this in

The last territory that Roland subdued was *Normendie*[1180] *la franche*. We certainly should read *franche* as an embellishing epithet: 'Normandy, the free'. But in addition to the military pride that every Norman of that time would have felt about the achievements of his countrymen in England and southern Italy, and also in Spain, in Byzantium and in the First Crusade, there are two more dimensions of this 'free' epithet which the audience of the time would have picked up, but which might be easily overlooked by a modern reader who is not a historian.

First: most researchers see the famous treaty of 911 between Charles the Simple on one side and Rollo with all his Normans on the other, signed at Saint-Clair-sur-Epte on the border of Normandy as it was then constituted, more as a *donation collective* than an *inféodation* (as argued by de Bouard in Lot/Fawtier 1957, 1ss.); according to the Norman historians from Dudo onwards, the homage section contained in it had a Norman even making a fool of King Charles during the ceremony. The precedent created by this event at Saint-Clair-sur-Epte meant that from that time forward, whenever changes in succession took place in Rouen or Paris, the rulers of Normandy always maintained that they only had to go as far as the border to pay homage and were not obliged to go all the way to Paris (*hommage en marche*, cf. Lemarignier 1945, passim).

Secondly: as Léopold Delisle once demonstrated in a celebrated essay (1851, 2ss.), by the middle of the 11th c. in Normandy there was no longer any

---

Beckmann 2008a, 143 n. 148). Quite a few Old French epics found it hard to interpret *Milon d'Angliers* and so it was changed to *Milon d'Aiglant*, in OF *aiglant* 'églantier, sweet briar' – which is not a bad idea, since the briar rose *rosa canina,* is especially widespread in western France, and one of its most attractive varieties is called precisely *rosa canina Andegavensis* 'Anjou Rose'. No matter where we look, when it comes to Milo, all roads seem to lead to Anjou.

1180 This line is only found in O. In n and K there is no mention of 'Normandy'. V4 has a line *E Normandie et trestute Bulgraçe* (= *Bulgar-* + northern Ital. *-aça ~* standard Ital. *-accia*, pejorative), but it comes later. Stengel (showing a lax or incorrect understanding of the stemma) sees it (according to the index) as a reference to both 'Normandy' and 'Bulgaria'; Segre (with a broadly correct understanding of the stemma) sees it as an invention of V4, but this makes no difference to structure of the text. Segre also puts *Bu[guerie]* in the text four lines later, and then also includes – along with all the other editors – the 'Normandy' line from O; the omission of Normandy would indeed be very strange in this context. β has either carelessly overlooked this line, or consciously suppressed it, either because of a pro-Norman stance, because the reviser thought the 'conquest, subjugation' of Normandy even by Roland was unimaginable, or because of an anti-Norman stance, because he was jealous of the Normans due to the fact that they were in control of the *franche*. – As far as the form *Normendie* is concerned: in the Rol. *an[* and *en[* even when stressed are very difficult to differentiate; when <en> appears (rarely) as an unstressed syllable we have: *Normendie, Costentinnoble, Tencendor*.

such thing as *servage*, no hereditary, personal bondage: "l'absence de servage [. . .] est, dans la France du nord-ouest, un fait spécifiquement normand, dont la frontière politique limite très exactement l'extension" (de Bouard in Lot/ Fawtier 1957, 17). But the distinction between *tenure féodale* and *tenure roturière* was also blurred, because the latter was also called *fief*; even the *hommage,* then, was not a sign of nobility (de Bouard in Lot/ Fawtier 1957, 7).

When he had finished with western France, Roland brought peace to southern France, that is to say *Provence e Equitaigne*[1181] – and at this point the poet's thoughts seem to be shifting from peace-making to actual conquest – and then northern and central Italy, that is to say *Lumbardie e trestute Romaine*;[1182] he then rushed back to the north, to knock sense into *Baiver [= Baiv(i)er'] e tute Flandres,*[1183]

1181 *Provence* is confirmed by OnKV4, *Equitaigne* by OL and (altered) n (only b,B) and mangled as *Progetaneam* by K (with dittography from the preceding *Provinciam*). – *Gallia Transalpina* or *Narbonensis*, founded in 121 B. C., was Rome's first *provincia* on the other side of the Alps, and so colloquially it was the *provincia* κατ'τξοχήν > OF *Provence*, although the name only stuck to the eastern part of it, where from the 10th c. onwards the Counts of Arles called themselves Counts of Provence. – *Equitania* instead of *Aquitania* is quite common from the 9th c. onwards at the latest, as in the *Epitaphium Aggiardi* (ms. 9th c.; v. 14 ed. R. Louis), in King Alfred's Orosius translation (late 9th c.; p. 22 ed. Sweet: 2x *Aequitania*, 1x *Equitania*), in a TO diagram for Bede, *De temporum ratione* (ms. 11th c.; Edson et al. 2005, 46: *eq_tania*), in the variants for Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (ed. Acton Griscom, several times) etc. Do we have here an influence from *(a)equē* 'equal', or from *eques, -itis* 'rider, knight'?

1182 *Lumbardíe* is confirmed by OnKV4T, *Romaine* by OnTL. – The forms derived from late Lat. *Lango-, Longobardia* heavily suppressed the name *Italia* in the vernaculars of Western and Central Europe in the Middle Ages. But *Lumbardíe* here borders on the obviously more southerly *Romaine*, and so this already shows a restriction of meaning to 'northern Italy' (which later was narrowed further to mean 'Lombardy'). For more detail on *Romaine* cf. n. 1196 below. – After v. 2326 the β texts apart from n (along with b,B) have one or two lines referring to southern Italy and Spain. Stengel edits as follows: 2326a *Puille et Calabre et la terre d'Espaigne* following P(L)T and following *Pulle* on its own in K; 2326b *Malf* [because of V4 *Melf* more likely to mean 'Melfi' than 'Amalfi'] *e Palermes, Obríe* [in other epics *Orbríe*, in my opinion originally the Judicate of Arborea in Sardinia] *e Ormuraine* [dittography of 'Arborea' or of *Romaine*?], the first hemistich following KV4, the second only V4. Although these elements seem to fit the context, there are some valid objections to them, namely 1) that they do not appear in n, nor in O, 2) that V4 and PTL are very different from each other (and their linking by K is tenuous, and perhaps only illusory). The poet may have omitted southern Italy and Spain at this point because he had already dealt with them in v. 198–200, 371s. and 2923.

1183 *Baiver* is confirmed by OnK, *Flandres* by O and (distorted as *Flasanie*) n. –In O the final *-e* in *Baiv(i)ere* is dropped, after the fashion of the elision that occurs in the spoken language, although this goes against the usual pattern in written texts. Here (as in v. 3028 and in the people name *Baivers* v. 3028) it still has the *-ai-* from Medieval Lat. *Bajuvaria* that we would expect, in v. 3977 it has already turned into *Baviere* (as in the people name *Bavier* v. 3793,

from there to the southeast into *Bu[guerie]* – or *Ongueríe*?[1184] – and apparently northwards again to Poland, into *Puillanĭe*.[1185]

From there, he went to the Holy Land, where the Franks – as in the *Pèlerinage* – must have been peaceful pilgrims, because there are no reports of conquests there, and then on the return journey he went to *Costentinnoble*,[1186] *dunt*

3960) with the first *-i-* being dropped through dissimilation with the second one. – The plural *Flandres* (Medieval Lat. *in Flandris*, first half of the 8th c., Gysseling s. v.) is etymologically justified, because in Dutch *Vlaanderen* is after all a locative dat. pl., probably Old Low Franconian *Flandrum* < Ingvaeon. **flâmandrum* 'in the flood-endangered regions' (Germ. *flaum(a)* + *-andra* + dat. pl. suffix). Eng. *Flanders*, Span. *Flandes* are borrowed from OF. As most of the country names are fem. sg., early Medieval Lat. *Flandria*, OF *la Flandre*, Ital. *Fiandra*, emerged as well, which exerts a syntactic influence on the pl. here: *tute Flandres*. The corresponding adj. (also when made into a noun) has no *-andra-* midsection: Ingvaeon. *flâm-* + *-ing* > Dutch *Vlaming* > OF *Flameng* (v. 3069), *Flamenc* > *Flamand*.

1184 In 2328 O has *Burguigne* which is metrically impossible (–1); as V4 mentions *Bulgraçe* a little later (on its form cf. n. 1180 above), many editors including Theodor Müller, Segre and Hilka/Pfister emend it to *Buguerie* (which suggests that there is only a slight inaccuracy in O). The β branch has here *Hongrie* P (and also the slightly altered *Ungeren* K and *Ongrie* L); since 'Hungary' fits better than 'Bulgaria' between 'Flanders' and 'Poland', G. Paris, Stengel and Jenkins put it in the text. This could be justified by considering the circumstance that Charlemagne waged a war with the Avars, which brought the majority of what later became Hungary (as far as the River Tisza) into the Frankish empire.

1185 *Puillanĭe* O, *Poulaingne* P and (altered) *Polan* K are confirmed for the archetype. However, *Puillain* (v. 2923) very clearly mean 'Apulians' (< *[A]pulia* + *-ani*; thus, it means 'Pugliesi', as Segre argues, and probably not 'the inhabitants of Puillanie', as Hilka/Pfister state in their index), but the corresponding country name is *Puille* (v. 371). The poet is not likely to have invented an ad hoc hyper-formation **[A]puli-ani-a um* for the sake of the *a-ə* assonance. The Medieval Latin name of the 'Poles', on the other hand, (derived from Old Polish *polje*, modern Polish *pole* 'field') was initially formed quite often with *-an-* or *-ian-*; the two oldest Adalbertus *Vitae* (written in 999 and probably 1001) have *Polani*, the *Ann. Hildesheimenses* for the year 1003 have *Polianicus* (adj.), the *Ann. Sangallenses Maiores* (Pseudo-Hepidannus) for the year 1032 (1038) have *Pulani*, the *Vita Meinwerci* (middle of the 12th c.) have *Poliania* (country), *Polianicus* (adj.), the Francophone Ademar-βγ 3.31.22 (ed. Bourgain) has *in Pollianam provinciam*, very like Ger. and Fr. until the 15th c. (Lexer s. v. *Pōlān/Pœlān, pōlānisch*; Moisan s. v. *Poulane*, Flutre s. v. *Poulaine, -lane, Poullain*); a considerable time passed before *-on-* prevailed. It remains a cause for concern that Poland has never been represented in any historical or epic source as having been either at war with Charlemagne or conquered by him; however, the same can be said about Britain, which comes next. If the poet depicts Poland as having been annexed by Roland on behalf of Charlemagne, but the Milceni and Lutici (and perhaps also the Wagrians) as being ruled by Baligant, the reason may have something to do with the knowledge that from the year 1000 until the poet's own lifetime, Poles have been Christians, while the peoples of Eastern Germany have been heathens.

1186 In phonological terms, with the usual loss of the *-n-* (as often happens in the OF form of the word, later even *Cout-*, cf. Moisan and Flutre s. v.), and with a similarly normal

il out la fiance 'Constantinople, from which [Charlemagne] received feudal homage'. The syntax here implicitly continues the signal statement *Jo l'en cunquis* from the previous verses, but the poet does not explicitly repeat it – and this is certainly intentional. He softens the statement somewhat: Constantinople is never taken by force in the Old French epic. Even in the *Pèlerinage*, Charlemagne and his peers prove their superiority over the Greeks through their personal attributes (and God's special favour) alone, and Roland plays a minimal role; after this, Hue li Forz of Constantinople pays homage to Charlemagne. At least the statement in the Rol. formally fulfils Robert Guiscard's lifetime ambition.

But then another war in the north was looming: Roland had to help Charlemagne so that now *en Saisonĭe fait il ço qu'il demandet*, Charlemagne 'can do whatever he wants' over there. This passage is discussed below, along with the other mentions of the Saxons, with the enumeration of the 'future rebels against Charlemagne' (C.4.5). For now, it is important to note that – while the entirety of the surviving *Chanson des Saisnes* by Jehan Bodel takes place after Roland's death – in this episode in the PT (cap. 33) and the two accounts of the Saxon wars in KMS (I 46s. and V passim) Roland (in the KMS with Olivier as well) is only summoned when Charlemagne does not know what to do (KMS I) or when he finds himself in the middle of a dire emergency (PT, KMS V), whereupon Roland secures the victory. To this extent, then, in the epic tradition the Saxon war is never primarily Roland's war, but (with the exception of Bodel's account) the victory (which throughout Roland's lifetime is never challenged again) is his achievement – and this enables the poet here to talk about the victory rather than echo the first-person signal statement that opens the section.

---

development *-bl-* < Lat. *-pl-* (as in most OF words) – and e.g. closer at hand exactly like *Grenoble* < Lat. *Gratianopolim*. In O we have *-en-* < *-an-* before a consonant in the unstressed middle syllable as *Normendie*, *Tencendor* (cf. n. 1180). The dissection *Costentin + noble* (< *nobilis* instead of *-(o)polis*), in O only visible in the written form, occurs quite often later, and is even taken seriously in phonic terms: *Constentin le noble* or just *Constentin* 'Constantinople' (cf. Moisan, Flutre s. v.).

The situation is different when it comes to the last great exploit: *Jo l'en cunquis e Escoce*[1187] *e (Vales) I[rla]nde*[1188]/ *E Engletere, quë il teneit sa cambre [. . .].* The focus shifts to the northwest; and this is the main reason why Roland, the "Northwesterner" is responsible. Precisely because the other French epics know nothing of this exploit, we must suspect that it is the poet's own contribution, and as such it merits a closer look.

When the Norman conquest of England took place, Scotland was an established kingdom. After 1066, Anglo-Saxon fugitives sought refuge there, including the pretender to the throne, Æþeling, and this is why William the Conqueror waged war against Scotland in 1072, with some short-lived success: King Malcolm drove Edgar out of Scotland, took hostages and paid homage to William, but perhaps only for two border provinces (Douglas 1995, 229–231) and there were no further consequences. It was not until after the death of Malcolm in 1093 that William's son Rufus was able to push back the border and force Malcolm's three disunited sons to take the feudal oath. On the basis of this feudal subservience, then, the Roland poet was able to view Scotland as being subjugated, from the perspective of the decades that followed. After

---

1187 *Escoce* (< *Scottia*) is confirmed in the archetype by OK; and the *Ysorie* 'Isauria' in V4 is entirely inappropriate (because it is southwest Anatolian) and only a misreading of the *⁺Yscoc (i?)e* that we would expect to see. The *Scotti* (*Scoti*) appear in the geography of late antiquity as the inhabitants of *Hibernia*, which is the island of Ireland; this is the case still in Isidore (*et.* 14.6.6 et al.), and an echo survives today in the German term *Schottenmönche* meaning 'Irish monks'. But by the 4th/5th c. at the latest, the *Scotti* pushed into the northern part of Britain, and a single realm was gradually formed there consisting of Scots and Picts, and – as in the case of France, Lombardy etc. – it was named after the conquering party. From the 11th c. onwards, *Scottia* unequivocally means Scotland.

1188 After the name of the 'Scots' had been transferred over to the territory called Scotland today (cf. previous n.) the people who were left behind called their country (Old Irish) *Ēriu* (> modern Irish *Éire*), which gave rise to Old Eng. and Old Norse *Irland*, which then, made more clearly feminine with an added *-e*, was taken into OF. – The erroneous *Iſlonde* 'Iceland' instead of the correct form *Irlande* (nKV4, *Bierlande* P) is at least partly due to the similarity between *-r-* and long *-ſ*. Perhaps the scribe also knew that before 1149 no Anglo-Norman had ever been to Ireland, while Iceland was settled by northern people (which was almost the same as 'Normans'). I am unsure about the two forms *-londe* and *-lande*. The Anglo-Norman *-au-* spellings of the type *braunches* (where *-au-* perhaps stands for /ǫ/) are not found, according to Pope (1952, § 1152), until the 13th c.; the Old Eng. type *lond* instead of *land*, however, according to Sievers/Brunner (1951, § 79 with n. 1) around the time of the transition from Old to Middle Eng. retreated to the southwest and west of England, and according to Horn/Lehnert (1954, 529s.) Middle Eng. *hond* instead of *hand* was a characteristic of the south and central territories, and until 1500 it was also common in London. Be that as it may, in this case some English influence appears to be involved.

the death of Henry I (in 1135), the country defected and remained fully independent for the next 130 years (LM s. v. *Schottland*).

Vales 'Wales', only in O, breaks the metre, and so it was eliminated by all editors from Konrad Hofmann (1866) onwards. It is an addition made by an Anglo-Norman who could not resist putting it in. The Norman conquest of Wales began just before 1069, but it proceeded very slowly. It was not until the start of 1097 that the country was fully conquered thanks to a campaign led by William Rufus. The fierce national revolts that followed were eventually quashed in the year 1114 by a campaign led by Henry I, after which North Wales also took the oath of fealty. After Henry's death (in 1135) the country was briefly independent again. The poet does not count Wales as one of Roland's conquests, but he has not forgotten it: Roland's aide Gualter del Hum once conquered *Maëlgut* (v. 2047), and in the Welsh tradition *Maelgwn* is strictly speaking 'the' king of the nation (just as Arthur was the king of the whole of Britain), and he was in fact a historical king of Gwynedd ~ North Wales in the 6th c.); Roland therefore entrusted the battle for Wales to his aide as a secondary objective (cf. Beckmann 2010, 13–25).

The situation is different when it comes to Ireland. If we can believe Giraldus Cambrensis, who was writing a century after the event, in 1097 Wilhelm Rufus believed that he had subjugated Wales once and for all, and as he and his fleet were sailing along the west coast of Wales, he looked over to the east coast of Ireland and announced that Ireland would be the place he would conquer next (cf. Beckmann 2010, 17s.). Whether this is literally true or not, it would have correctly reflected Anglo-Norman mentality in the period around 1100 and in the first decades of the 12th c. But for the next sixty years, none of the Anglo-Norman kings realised this ambition. It was not until 1159 that the first Anglo-Normans set foot in Ireland, as mercenaries summoned by a minor king who had just been dethroned, and they quickly spread across the divided land. In order to prevent the creation of another Anglo-Normannia that was independent from him, King Henry II followed them in 1161 and without too much effort obtained homage from the Irish bishops and most of the minor rulers; even though this was only a verbal fealty at first, it marks the beginning of the gradual Anglicisation of the country (LM s. v. *Irland*). The Rol. is certainly older than this; the poet is therefore writing, not on the basis of factual Norman history, but on the basis of a Norman dream – and this in particular makes it very difficult to believe that these lines were written by a non-Norman.

By far the most important of the three countries is left until last. *C(h)ambre*, Lat. *camera* (*regis*), meant the royal household, where one of the most important functions was financial administration, which was gradually taking on a clearer and more institutional role. The subsidiary clause therefore signifies

something like this: the king could govern the whole of England in any way he wished, exactly in the same way as he governed on the continent, through his court and domanial territory. At this point, the power of William the Conqueror is at its most visible. In the decade before 1066 he was able to take firmer action against disagreeable vassals than Louis VI was able to do fifty years later, against Hugues du Puiset, for example; he could also rely on higher income from taxation in Normandy as well as better proceeds from his own domains, than most continental rulers could (Douglas 1995, 141). But William set up quite different arrangements in England. Until his death there was not the slightest chance of the great fiefdoms in that land being passed on through inheritance: William accused the holders of the highest offices of treachery and had them put to death, including the *earl* of Huntingdon Waltheof in 1076, and for other crimes he disinherited people, including the *earl* of Norfolk Ralph de Gaels in 1075, or he had them imprisoned, as in the case, also in 1075, of the *earl* of Hereford Roger de Breteuil; thanks to these interventions, he left increasing numbers of *earl* positions unoccupied, which meant that the rank immediately below, the *sheriffs*, had roughly the same rank and controllability as the Norman *vicomtes*, and they became his highest regional officials (Douglas 1995, 300s.). When it comes to the financial arrangements, by the time he had completed his endeavour, two years before his death, the Domesday Book of 1085 was so unique both in its planning and execution, that William possessed more accurate information about every last parcel of land in England than other rulers could muster for the proceeds of their own domains.[1189]

If we are to understand the full meaning of this passage and its intention, we must look at it alongside the other statement about the this conquest that the poet puts into Blancandrin's mouth (v.372s.): *Vers Engletere passat il* [= Charlemagne] *la mer salse,/ Ad oes seint Perre en cunquist le chevage.* If the poet attributes the conquest of England to Charlemagne, does this not mean that the uniqueness of the Norman achievement is lost? Perhaps, but the Normans gain more than they lose. According to these lines, the Anglo-Saxons reneged on their Christian duty back in the time of Charlemagne and refused to pay the Peter's Pence; Charlemagne then "had to" subjugate them. And in William's period, they had relapsed again. It is Charlemagne's earlier example that legitimises the actions of 1066, and indeed ennobles them. Once again, this clearly ideological dimension makes it difficult to believe that a non-Norman is

---

1189 Douglas cites (1995, 355–357) *verbatim* three contemporary descriptions of the process that was carried out, and at least two of them reveal an underlying dimension of horror; these must be read in full for their powerful effect to be felt, and any summary would water down the impression that they give.

speaking here. Of course, we must remember that the poet thinks of himself as a good *Franceis / Francus*, as most Normans did at that time, and all in all, he manages to achieve an admirably balanced image of a single, united France, and yet on several occasions a specifically Norman pride, a Norman ideology, comes clearly to the fore, and we cannot ignore this when we investigate the question of the poet's homeland.

Finally, let us look at the ordering of the 18 items in this list! The enumeration begins with an "internal" group of five, in north-western France, where Roland first had to establish order, and it also ends in the northwest, this time with an "external" group of three, the countries on the other side of the Channel, which in the eyes of the Normans were evidently Roland's greatest achievement. This represents a circular train of thought, forming a spiral that opens out and shows an empire in the process of expanding. But among the nine items in between, there are only two obvious pairs (*Provence-Equitaigne*, *Lumbardie-Romaine*), and there is a distinct lack of coherence in the geography of the others. The reason is that this list should give the audience the impression that Roland has to dash across Europe, like a kind of imperial fire brigade, dealing with outbreaks here and there. This, too, is portrayed quite well in the historical record: anyone who quickly reads through all the Frankish Annals for the time of Charlemagne's reign, that is to say from 768–814, and then imagines how many times the Carolingian army had to go on the march, will have a similar view of the situation.

C.4.4 Review of Roland's conquests

Roland's list of conquests with its 18 items in total has a very deliberate structure: an "internal" block of five at the beginning, an "external" block of five inspired by Norman ideas at the end, both in the northwest, turning with a circular sweep into an opening spiral movement; in the long mid-section, jerky displacements give an impression of maximum agitation.

C.4.5 Threats from within the empire: the future rebels against Charlemagne

After the death of Roland, Charlemagne foresees that many tribes will rebel against him, most of which were previously subjugated by Roland (v. 2921–2924):

> Encuntre mei revelerunt li Seisne,
> E Hungre e Bugre e tante gent adverse,

> Romain, Puillain e tuit cil de Palerne,
> E cil d'Affrike e cil de Califerne.

Li Seisne O 2921, *Sachsen* K, *Sasne* V4: the name of the Saxon tribe (that is to say the ancestors of people in modern Westphalia, Lower Saxony [excluding East Friesland] and Holstein) was taken into MLat. and Romance-speaking areas in two forms: one retains the Germanic stress position as *Saxŏnes* (as in e. g. *Waltharius* 768), and the other follows the usual Lat. pattern Saxōnes (as probably in the *Farolied* with *Saxonum* in ǫ assonance, and in e.g. the Poeta Saxo for the year 772 v.5 and passim). The prevailing OF form *li Saisne*, obl. *les Saisnes* comes from the former, and the other *les Saxons* comes directly from the MLat.[1190] An isolated case of <ei> instead of the <ai> that one would normally expect in O shows the start of the western merger of /ei/ with /ai/ into /ę/ (Pope 1952, § 230, 528s., 1157s., W. VI). *Sasne* instead of *Saisne* in V4 is influenced by Ital. *Sassoni.*

The Roland poet's knowledge about the Saxons is interesting both in historical and in literary terms. Roland had helped to conquer *Saisonĭe* (O 2330, the *Sachsen* K, *Sansogne* V4) in the past, so that Charlemagne can 'now' do *ço qu'il demandet* there; furthermore, Turpin had previously captured his horse in Denmark (OVCV7T [1649s.]= 1488s.), which could only have been possible in the context of an (expanded) Saxon war. There had therefore been a Saxon war even before Roncevaux – which is indeed historically accurate (in the years 772–777) and is also essentially the case in the older texts within the Saxon epic tradition (PT cap. 33, KMS I and V). But at this time Charlemagne is in command of the Saxons: he did not take them on the Spanish campaign, either because he thought they were unreliable conscripts, or because he had entrusted them with the defence of the eastern border; but he appoints them, along with the other peoples, as judges in the trial against Ganelon (v. 3700, 3793), to ensure that the trial does not look like a private act of revenge on the part of Charlemagne, but rather like a judgement of the whole empire on a traitor who has betrayed the empire. But just as Charlemagne foresees the rebellion of the Saxons (in v. 2921), the Roland poet has also much earlier had Ganelon foretell that his son Baldwin will be a brave knight (v. 314), and Baldwin's single major role in the Old French epic is to be the Frankish protagonist in the *Saisnes*. The poet therefore knows about a Saxon war *after* Roncevaux, as indeed there was in the years from 778–804 and knows that he alone survived in Bodel's *Saisnes.*

[1190] Flutre cites from the *Perceforest* (1.1) *Saxons-Anglois* 'the Anglo-Saxons', the first part of which was probably an isolated form for a very long time. But *la Saxe* meaning modern (Upper) Saxony instead of *la Saissoigne* (tribal) Saxony, is a new borrowing from the German.

Bédier (1926–1929, 4.401) with his basic tendency to belittle the role of history in poetry, emphasised that Charlemagne was only in Spain for three months, while he fought in and around Saxony for thirty years, and that the relative importance of the two theatres of war is the very opposite of the ratio depicted in the epic. This is true, but until now it has not been recognised that this in no way predictable simultaneity of the Spanish war with a quasi-endless Saxon war is a very important historical moment, which lives on both in the Rol. and later in the Saxon epic, and which only dies out after 1200 with Bodel.[1191]

Hungre e Bugre[1192] O 2922, the same in P, *Ongres*, *Bolgres* V4: The Hungarians qualify as 'rebels' because they emerged out of the south-eastern regions, just as the Huns and the Avars had done; they were often regarded as practically the same tribe. After they were officially Christianised, there were several heathen rebellions in Hungary (1041, 1046, 1061) which caused concern across Europe. The Bulgarians, on the other hand, had become neighbours of France at the end of Charlemagne's war with the Avars – the River Tisza was agreed as the border between them –[1193] but if they are shown rebelling in this area, then this is rather from the Norman, mostly pro-Byzantine perspective; for from the perspective of Byzantium itself, the Bulgarians were the very epitome of rebellion and unbelief.[1194]

1191 But while in the Rol. the Spanish war (despite its supposed *set anz toz pleins*) is still situated in the historically correct place "bracketed" within the Saxon war, there is still a vague consciousness of the approximately simultaneous occurrence of the two wars in the *Karlamagnús Saga* I and V and – slightly less clearly – in the PT (cap. 33) it led to a somewhat ahistorical solution, a kind of reversal of reality; the Saxon war interrupts the Spanish war just as it is beginning: Roland (KMS V, PT; with Olivier, KMS I) besieges Nobles (= Dax, the identification is certain, cf. Beckmann 2008, 179s.; in the PT transferred to Gre-noble), which one could interpret as the overture to the Spanish war; then he is called to assist his uncle, who has got himself into difficulty in the Saxon war; Roland obediently (with Olivier) breaks off the siege of Nobles, rushes to his uncle's assistance, and conquers Nobles later (KMS I), or alternatively he takes Nobles by force quickly before setting off (KMS V), or finally, he spends three days praying and fasting after which the walls of (Gre-)Noble fall down by themselves (PT).
1192 *Bugre* < MLat. *Bulgări* with the usual loss of the unstressed -*a*- after the main stress, added -*e* after -*gr*- and merging the expected -*ŭ*- (< precons. -*l*-) into the preceding -*u*-. O normally preserves the -*l*- (*halt*, *mult* etc.), but he slips up twice, with a hypercorrect *ne(v)uld* and here with *Bugre*, where he seems not to have remembered the Latin written form.
1193 The Hungarians and the Bulgarians already appear marginally in the Saxon epic as Charlemagne's enemies (cf. for example *Saisnes* 7066–7097, KMS V cap. 2 and 12).
1194 Admittedly, there is a second possibility that we cannot rule out completely. Between 864 and 879 the newly baptised Boris of Bulgaria pursued a see-saw policy in his relations with the Pope and Byzantium regarding his country's ecclesiastical allegiance; in 879 at the

Charlemagne is not pessimistic enough about Hungary and Bulgaria; because at that moment he is not yet aware that Baligant has already turned them against him and taken them into his army as *Hungres* (v. 3254) and *gent Samuël* (v. 3244).[1195]

Romain, Puillain e tuit cil de Palerne O 2923, *Roman, Pullan, Palerme* V4, *Romain, Polain, Palerne* P: V4 has carefully (re)Italianised the names with *-an* and *-erme*.

These are the 'Romans', that is to say the inhabitants of the region immediately around Rome or the wider surrounding area, either the Papal States or more generally Central Italy,[1196] then the Apulians and (as *pars pro toto* for the Sicilians) 'all the people of Palermo'. In the case of 'Apulia', from the very

---

Reunion Council of Constantinople, this came to an end with formal confirmation of their allegiance to Rome, although in actual fact the opposite is what happened. Now the Curia never forgets anything, especially situations where its own rights been temporarily unenforceable, and as the southern Italian Normans used to join forces with the Curia in such matters when there was mutual advantage, they may well have thought among themselves that Bulgaria belonged "by rights" to the West, and *ergo* should ideally be part of the Carolingian empire.

1195 Anyone who believes that the Marsilĭe section and the Baligant were written by two different authors may perhaps think they have discovered a contradiction here and assume that Charlemagne's premonition is part of the old Song, but they would have to separate the surviving text into several pieces because Baligant's first appearance (v. 2614ss.) comes before Charlemagne's premonition (v. 2921ss.).

1196 Grégoire (1939a, 231) suggests an alternative to the Romans in brackets: "(Romains de Rome ou Byzantins". MLat. *Romania* and OF *Romaníe, Romeníe*, but also OF *Roma(i)gne, Romaine* mean not only 'region around Rome ~ Papal States ~ Central Italy' (as in Lat. in the Diploma of Lothar I. of 840 for Farfa and later, OF very clearly e.g. the *Couronnement de Louis* 885–888, *Aspremont* 149, 343, 4377, 5847, *Enfances Vivien* several times in all mss., *Narbonnais* 208–214, additional clear references in Flutre s. v. *Romaigne*; it only slowly narrowed down to mean Romagna, which is attested in Italy with this name from about 1200 onwards, Schweickard in the DI s. v. *Romàgna*, but in MLat. it was mostly called *Romandiola* until the 14th c., LM s. v. *Romagna*), but these names also mean – when taken over by Byzantine authors (Ρωμανία, land of the Ρωμαῖοι, East Romans, Byzantines; Wolff 1948, passim, especially 32–34; Schweickard in the DI s. v. *Romania*[1]) – 'the Byzantine Empire', in the crusade historians often meaning only its eastern part (Lat. RHC Occ., passim, on the OF Moisan and Flutre s. v.). But the terms gradually become separated: *Romái(g)ne, Romáine* 'area in Italy' ≠ *Romaníe* 'owned by Byzantium'. In particular, I know of no case where the simple (subst. or adj.) ethnonym OF *Romain*, recognisably derived from what clearly is Rome, can mean 'Byzantine'; instead, cf. in the Song v. 3094 *Romaine* 'the Roman = Papal' as the original name of the Oriflamme. – Hilka/Pfister suggest in their index a further possible alternative to the Romans, namely the Romanians. But apart from the fact that the meaning 'Romanians' would break the geographical unity of this verse, the Romanians in the Rol. are called *Blos*, and elsewhere in OF (and across the whole of western Europe) of the 12th and first half of the 13th c. *Bla(c)s* etc. 'Wallachians', their country *Blaquie* etc. 'Wallachia', cf. above A.1.1.3.

beginning, French adopts the aphaeresis (Ital. *Puglia*, also pl. *Puglie*): OF *Puille/Pulle/Poille*, today *Pouille(s)* (cf. also MHG *Pülle*); from this the adj./ethnicon in OF often ends in *-ain/-an(t)*, although sometimes also (corresponding to Ital. *pugliese*) in *-eis* (cf. Moisan, Flutre s. v.). In the case of *Palerne* instead of *Palerme* in OP cf. above in relation to *Oluferne* (A.2.4).

In 799–801, the historical Charlemagne (according to the Royal Annals) had to protect Pope Leo from his opponents in the city of Rome, and also used moderate military force in 787, 800–803 and 812 to subdue the Beneventans – although this can only be at best a vague background to our verse. No Roland poet would have had Charlemagne fear a rebellion by Roman citizens, and probably not by the Apulians and Sicilians either, unless he was interpreting history from a Norman perspective. This passage therefore largely reflects the battles of the southern Italian Normans. There are plenty of them to choose from: in 1059, Robert Guiscard led an expedition on behalf of the Pope through the area around Rome to subdue local forces, enthroned Alexander II in 1061 in Rome using military force, subdued Apulian rebellions in 1072–1073, 1078 and 1082, after the Romans had captured Emperor Henry IV, liberated Gregory VII who was under siege in the Castel Sant'Angelo, ransacking large parts of Rome in the process, caused a bloodbath when the Romans rebelled (!), but then finally left the city with the Pope (who died in Salerno), so that he could return to his Balkan war against Byzantium, which is where Robert also died unexpectedly in July 1085. His son and designated successor Duke Roger Borsa († 1111) immediately vacated the Norman positions in the Balkans; but then he and later his childless son William († 1127) also allowed anarchy to creep into their southern Italian estates, especially in Apulia where there were many revolts including at least in 1091, 1097, 1099, 1105, 1111 and 1118–1127.

Robert Guiscard's brother Count Roger I (1101) kept a much tighter rein on affairs in Sicily, which was fully conquered by 1091; but after the conquest of Palermo (1072), he still had to fend off an African relief fleet in 1075, put down Sicilian rebellions in 1082 and reconquer Catania in 1081, after it had fallen back into Muslim hands through treachery. Anarchy was rife in Apulia in 1127 after the death of William, and three years passed before his cousin and successor, Roger II, son of Roger I of Sicily, could claim to have Apulia firmly under control – at which point he took the title of king. But the next rebellion in Apulia began in 1131, and it was not until 1138 that the king could quash it brutally and for good.[1197]

1197 Chalandon (1907, 1.168, 213, 223–225, 252ss., 273, 276–282, 286, 298, 303, 308, 310s., 313–325, 334–337, 382, 397–403; 2.13, 22, 27–30, 80–84, 87).

E cil d'Affrike e cil de Califerne O 2924, *e Saraçin e quilli de Galiverne* V4: In V4
the very unspecific 'Saracens' is a *lectio facilior*. Capital *C* and *G* look similar; as
there is no obvious meaning for *Galiverne,* the better option is *Califerne*.

The most important aspects of *Affrike* in this connection were already dis-
cussed above s. v. *Cheriant* 'Kairouan' (A.2.2). In particular, the Normans suf-
fered a defeat at the hands of the Zīrīd state in 1123, which they certainly could
have regarded as a rebellion.

Finally, *Califerne* is not [1] a *qalʿa* 'fortress' of the Benī Ifrān, nor is it [2a]
the same as *Oluferne* 'Aleppo' or even [2b] cobbled out of the names of two Sy-
rian rivers, one of which flows through Aleppo, and it certainly is not [3] a
mountain of holy fire in southern Persia, but it is [4] Cephalonia.

On [1]: In Boissonnade's long plea (1923, 159–162) for a "Kalaa-Ifrène ou Kal-
Ifrène" (with an unexplained 'or' he brings himself one step closer to his goal)
it is immediately obvious that five sixths of his plea refer to toponyms located
far from the Benī-Ifrān area, including on the one hand places in al-Andalus,
and on the other, places in the Ḥammādid realm, which was generally hostile
to the Benī Ifrān. Boissonnade finds only two wholly insignificant *qalʿa* loca-
tions belonging to the Benī Ifrān, and nothing is known about them except the
approximate date when they were founded; but because he thinks that the
place by the name of "kalaa Ifgan" seems to fit phonologically, he opts for this
one. There is too little firm evidence here, especially because it is not at all ob-
vious how this place, which was never in European hands since late antiquity,
could ever 'rebel' against Charlemagne.

But this also raises formal issues. When in ancient times the Arab. word
qalʿa 'fortress' forms a toponymic composite, it appears, as we might expect, in
the construct *qalʿat*. Thus in al-Andalus: Calatañazor < *qalʿat an-nusūr*, Cala-
tayud < *qalʿat Ayyūb*, Calatorao < *qalʿat turāb*, Calatrava < *qalʿat Rabāḥ*, Calatar-
age < *qalʿat al-aʿradž*.[1198] Thus also in Sicily: Calatafimi < *qalʿat (al-?)Fīmī*,

---

1198 EI s. v. *ḳalʿa*; Corriente (1977, 87 n. 128). An error that is difficult to understand then
follows when the EI adds "Calahorra (castle of Hurra)", which because of the missing *-t* would
be a counter example to the above; but Calahorra is the *Calagurris* of antiquity, the place
where Quintilian was born, and whose inhabitants the *Calagurritani*, are mentioned in Pliny
(3.24). – Corriente in Corriente/Vicente (2008, 360s.) also emphasises the fact that Andalusian
Arab. retains the normal Arab. construct *-t* (e.g. *madínat as-sulṭán*), but believes he has found
an exception: Cantaralcadi appears to mirror an (unattested!) *qánṭara (instead of *qánṭarat*)
al-qáḍi. However, I think this is a haplology of *Can-*ta*-ra-*ta*-lcadi. – *Calahonda* near Marbella
does not belong here; Madoz correctly says of it s. v.: "Su puerto es una cala ['roadstead'] pro-
funda [. . .]".

Calatrasi < *qal'at aṭ-ṭirazī*, Calatubo < *qal'at Awbī*, Caltabellotta < *qal'at al-bal-lūṭ*, Caltanissetta < *qal'at an-nisā'*, Calatabiano < *qal'at + ?*.[1199] And finally, in medieval North Africa, we have on map 57a of the atlas in the EI *Qal'at Banī Huwwāra* and *Qal'at Banī Ḥammād*. We would therefore expect **Cal(a)tiferne*.

On [2a] and [2b]: Jenkins (ad loc.) had the unfortunate idea of equating *Cali-ferne* with *Oluferne* 'Aleppo'. However, he does not tell us how the Oriental hometown of Baligant's standard-bearer could threaten a 'rebellion' against Charlemagne. Instead, he suggests an unexpected further etymology: "More ex-actly, *Califerne* may be a compound of *Chalus*, the river which flows by Aleppo, and *Ferne* (Lat. FERNUM, FERNA) the popular name of the lower Orontes, after it has traversed Antioch". Such a composite name is not attested, and further-more, this explanation as a 'land or town between two rivers' is not justified, because the parallel with 'Mesopotamia' does not fit: this is never called **Euphratotigridia* or **Tigridoeuphratia*.

On [3]: There is no need to refute Carnoy's (1922, 226s.) claim that the two Mid-dle Pers. elements *Kār* 'name of a holy mountain in southern Persia' and *farn* 'holy fire (of the Zoroastrian religion)' form an unattested composite *Kār-i-farn*, which then crosses over with 'caliph' and thus explains *Califerne*.

On [4]: Grégoire (Grégoire/de Keyser 1939, 289 n., 309, Grégoire 1939a, 232 and 266 n.) argued for Cephalonia. The name of the island appears (according to TLL, Onomasticon s. v.) in classical Lat. in the equally valid forms *Cephal(l)ānia* and *Cephal(l)ēnia*; in late Lat. there were also occasional examples of *-lēna*, iso-lated itazistic *-linia* and (attested in Gk. from Procopius onwards, although it never really took hold there) *-lonia*, which then in Lat. in the 11th (e.g. in Lupus Protospatharius, William of Apulia and the *Ann. Barenses*) became the domi-nant form. An *-a-* in the first syllable appears in the *Caphaleniae* of Servius ms. H (11th c., with reference to *Aen.* 3.270) and in the *Chaphaloniam* of ms. A by William of Apulia (5.285 ed. Mathieu). The *l-f-* metathesis can be found in the

---

1199 Pellegrini (1990, 284s., 288), where a few more places no longer in existence are listed. "*Cunsarìa < qal'at al-ḫinzarīa*" is also mentioned there, but only *ḫinzarīa* (= *khinzariyya*) lives on in the name today; either the form of Collesano ~ *qal'at aṣ-ṣirāt* has been significantly changed or (I think more likely) the place has been renamed. Amari (1880–1889, Index) adds also Caltagirone < *qal'at al-džanūn* and Calascibetta, which at first sight looks like a counter reference, but it is attested in the 11th c. as *Calatasibet*, *-th*, *Calataxibet*, which means it has later been reduced by one syllable.

ms. used by Bouquet of the Royal Annals for the year 810 as *Celafaniae* and also on Idrīsī's map (Miller 1895–1898, Idrīsī, fol. IV) as *Džalfūnia*, which could equally well be transcribed as *Džale-* or *Dželafūnia*, and where the /dž/ represents the /tš/ that does not exist in Arab.[1200] Instead of *-onia* or *-ēnia*, the Song has the "epic" toponym ending *-erne* (more detail on this above in the section on 'Oluferne', A.2.4). Both the place of the *-f-* right before the ending and the new appearance of the *-r* in the Rol. were taken over in the hybrid form used for the real Cephalonia, namely *Chifornia*, *Chrifornia* in the pilgrim report by the Lord of Anglure (a.1395, § 25 of the Bonnardot/Longnon edition); this retroactive effect is further evidence to support the identification of *Califerne* as 'Cephalonia'.[1201]

From the island of Cephalonia (and also from Corfu) it is possible to block access to the Adriatic, and (unlike from Corfu) this applies also to the Gulf of Corinth and with it the central part of Greece; moreover, Cephalonia is closer by sea to Byzantium than Corfu is. When in the 8th c. the Muslim raiders pushed as far as this point, Cephalonia's enormous strategic importance became clear. Byzantium made the island, along with a few neighbouring islands including Corfu, into its own Theme, and its ruler was at the same time the Commander of the Adriatic fleet. This arrangement lasted until another enemy came along: in 810, Charlemagne's son King Pippin of Italy laid waste the Dalmatian coast with his fleet, but as the Royal Annals report, *cum Paulus Cefalaniae praefectus*

1200 When William of Apulia (5.229 et al.) writes *Chephalonia* or Roger of Howden (ed. Stubbs 3.161) writes *Chefelenie* in MLat., this could mean (dialectal OF or Ital.) /tš-/ (as today in Ital. Cefalonia), but it could also mean /k-/. A /tš-/, later /š-/, however, is certainly present in the modern name for a place called Chalifert near Meaux: *Chaillifernum* 1179, *de Califerno* 1182, *de Chalifer* 1182, *Califerni* 1213, *Challifer* 1277, *Califerne* 13. Jh., *Challifernum* 1301 (Stein 1954, s. v.). The name of this place seems to belong to a large group of toponyms – including the places where Napoleon scored his victories and the battle locations in the Crimean War – which were a conscious reminder to returning French people of their experiences abroad; if this is true, then the only possible interpretation is Cephalonia, which many people knew as a stage on their journey to and from the Holy Land. (A German parallel for this type of commemorative naming is e.g. Montabaur < *Mons Thabor*, attested in this form in 1227).

1201 The form ending in *-fornia* might also be interesting for other reasons, which I am not able to explore further here. *Salvo errore*, it is still not certain how Montalvo († 1504/05) in his Amadís continuation *Las sergas de Esplandián* came upon the name *California* for a fictitious Amazonian island to the east of India which was rich in gold, and whose name by 1540 at the latest was transferred over to the newly discovered California in America. If there is now in the *Califerne*-Cephalonia complex a form ending in *-fornia*, which exists more than a century before Montalvo, the chances are all the greater that there is a connection, even if this is not "the" missing link.

cum orientali classe ad auxilium Dalmatis ferendum adventaret, regia classis ad propria regreditur. Nothing could illustrate the central importance of this island better than this report, which explains that the Franks knew Cephalonia was the residence of the Commander of the Byzantine Fleet and, by their own admission, retreated without engaging in battle with that fleet. In 850 this fleet also won a naval battle against the Arabians. When in about 870 Byzantium succeeded in driving the Arabians from the Italian mainland, the importance of the Theme of Cephalonia increased once again: in the late 9th c. its rulers are also rulers of the Theme of Longobardia (Byzantine southern Italy).[1202]

Robert Guiscard must also have been aware of the importance of Cephalonia from the opposite perspective. He had admittedly settled further north near Butrinti when he first started to wage war against Byzantium, because from there it was easy to access the southern branch of the Via Egnatia, and then even at Durazzo, where the northern branch of the Via Egnatia began, that old Roman main road through the Balkan Peninsula, which led to Byzantium via Thessaloniki. However, as the war gradually became more difficult, thanks to Alexios' tireless resistance, Bohemund – who was in command while his father was assisting Gregory VII in Italy – moved further south, securing a broad hinterland before the planned final Norman march on Constantinople. In the spring of 1085, when Robert was finally able to return to his Balkan war, he sent his younger son Roger – Bohemund was seriously ill and had to go back to Italy – to occupy the island of Cephalonia in advance. But the main town on the island mounted fierce resistance, forcing Roger to besiege it in every possible way. Then Robert Guiscard followed Roger south, but according to Anna Komnena (6.6.1–3), Anonymus Barensis and also William of Apulia – and after them e.g. Chalandon and Grégoire[1203] – he died shortly after setting foot on the north-western tip of the island. His designated successor Roger hurriedly surrendered the island along with the other occupied territories east of the Adriatic, presumably because he feared that his elder brother Bohemund might usurp Robert's succession in Italy in the meantime.

The strength of Grégoire's explanation rests on two points: it is the only explanation which does not interrupt the clear southern Italian-Norman perspective of the sequence through Rome-Apulia-Sicily-Africa-X in the middle of the line; after the core territories of the Norman empire, namely Apulia and Sicily,

---

1202 This is based on LM s. v. *Kephallenia* and especially Zakythinos (1954, passim).
1203 Chalandon (1900, 93); Grégoire (with whom I agree on this point, 1939a, 266–269) with a detailed discussion of the sources, which partly contradict each other, since they include the view that Robert was on the way to Cephalonia but died in Corfu (as in e.g. Yewdale 1924, 23).

we have here their two problematic outposts: in North Africa and in the Balkans. And it also explains rather unexpectedly why they would be 'rebelling'. The reason is that the Normans regard the resistance of Cephalonia as a rebellion; William of Apulia (5.228–232) writes that Robert

> [. . .] Hōc [scil. Boamundo] abeunte Rogerum
> Jussit adire suo cum milite Chephaloniam,
> Ut, tantā fuerat quae tempestate *rebellis*,
> Victa refrenetur. Haec insula dum capietur,
> Undique terrendas Graecorum noverat urbes.

'Since [very sick] Bohemund had to go back [to Italy], Robert ordered his son Roger and his troop to attack Cephalonia, so that he could defeat and tame this place which had rebelled in the midst of such a crisis. Because Robert knew: the moment this island was captured, this would create fear in all Greek cities.' This text therefore has the very same key word signifying rebellion that is used in the Song! The last sentence also shows how vitally aware the Normans were of the above-mentioned strategic importance of the island.

Contrary to Grégoire, I can see no evidence for an early dating of the Song in this interpretation of *Califerne* as 'Cephalonia'; the long Guiscard tradition is too strong. On the one hand, we can see how big an impact he had, even on the island, through the fact that a port on the north-eastern tip of the island is attested around 1200 in Roger of Howden (ed. Stubbs 3.161) as *Portus Wiscardi* and to this day it is called Phiskardo; Roger then also reports that Guiscard died there.[1204] On the other hand, after Robert's death, southern Italian Norman politics remained anti-Byzantine for a whole century, in keeping with his dream of making the Normans rulers of Constantinople: thus we see Bohemund's failed "crusade" against Alexios in 1105–1108, his preparations for another war which continued until he died in 1111, the looting of the Byzantine coast in 1130/1131 by the fleet of Roger II, and the attack by Roger II on Byzantium in the middle of the Second Crusade, his preparations in 1149–1150 for another Byzantine "crusade", in 1156 emperor Manuel's counter attack with a landing in Apulia and its catastrophic failure due to the victory that William I secured at Brindisi, in 1157–1158 another attack by William on the Byzantine coast, in 1183–1185 another major Balkan war including the destruction of Durazzo and Thessaloniki and the annexation of Cephalonia, in 1195 the grandiose extortion, backed up by military threats, that Henry VI carried out against a now weakened Byzantium in pursuit of his fantasy of a global empire . . .[1205]

1204 Mentioned in Grégoire (1939a, 269).
1205 It will suffice to refer to Chalandon (1900, 1907, 1912, passim).

Wherever Guiscard's spirit lived on, the memory of his life and death must also have survived.

C.4.6 Review of the Rebels

The list of rebels – like the catalogue of peoples – is structured as a mental sweep through real geographical space. Even after Roland's death, Charlemagne need not fear rebellion in his core territories, but he does have to worry about rebellion around the periphery, not in the southwest, where he has just spent seven years quashing all resistance, but in the east. Thus, the enumeration goes from the northeast to the southwest: the list opens with the obligatory first mention of the Saxons, whom the poet already knows from their role in the Saxon epic; the Hungarians are taken from an all-European experience, the Bulgarians from an experience specific to the Normans. The Romans, Apulians and Sicilians reflect the central issues facing the southern Italian Normans, while Africa and the Balkans represent their two greatest external adventures. This is a "Normanogenic" list.

C.4.7 An external point of view: Blancandrin on Charlemagne's conquests

In v. 370–373 Blancandrin describes Charlemagne's conquests in a cursory fashion, as they appear from his point of view: *Merveillus hom est Charles / Ki cunquist Puille e trestute Calabre! / Vers Engletere passat il la mer salse, / Ad oes seint Perre en cunquist le chevage.* As above (C.4.6), the achievements of the Normans reflect the real historical background, first of all of the southern Italian region (which e.g. Boissonnade 1923, 472 pointed out), and then of the ancestral homeland in France. And in fact, the only features that impress Blancandrin about Charlemagne's France are – and this is important precisely because it is anachronistic – the Norman ones. It is even more difficult here to imagine that a non-Norman could have written this. From Normans, on the other hand, similar passages were quite common at that time; Gicquel (2003, 152s.) cites a passage from *De capita Bajocensium civitate* (v. 109–117) by Serlo of Bayeux (a. 1106 or a little later) and another from the *Gesta Tancredi* (RHC Occ. 3.662, cap. 79, v. 19–23) by Raoul de Caen (after 1112, and certainly within the first third of the 12th c.).

C.4.8 The core: the four corners and the main residence. *Antelme de Maience* and the principle of regional conformity

As a consequence of the earthquake that occurs at the time of Roland's death the following also takes place (v. 1428–1430):

> De Seint Michel de<l> P[e]ri[l] josqu'as Seinz,[1206]
> Des Besen[ç]un tresqu'as <porz> de Guitsand,
> Nen ad recét dunt [li] mur ne cravent.

Here are the variants: *porz* is missing, *Michel de Paris [. . .] Besentun [. . .] dunt del mur* O, v. 1428–1429 are missing in V4, *De seint Michel desc'as poz d'Egricent* (*de Grecent* V7) CV7, *de Bezanson jusqu'as pors de Wissant* (*Huichent* T, line is missing in L), *des S. Michiel jusqu'a Rains* (*as Rains* L) *ausiment* PTL.

We shall deal first with the scribal errors in O: The *seint Michel de Paris* is probably just a careless mistake, and certainly not acceptable because the aim here is to set out some boundary points. Since the expression *seint Michel del Peril*, corresponding to the Lat. *Sanctus Michael in periculo maris*, also appears in v. 152 (even though in this passage it refers to the saint, and not the abbey on the Mont Saint-Michel), and since in terms of the meaning only the Mont on the border between Normandy and Brittany is a possibility, this must be emended accordingly. In *Besentun* instead of *Besencun* (the cedilla was often omitted in the 12th c.) O may well have just written the letter badly, or else this could be a common misreading of *c* as *t*. The word *porz* has been forgotten, although it is to be expected metrically and also syntactically, and it can easily be reinstated with reference to the *pors* in P and T (and the *poz* in CV7).

Since P and T list four points just as O does (three of which are the same as in O), the reduction to just two points in CV7 is incorrect from the outset, even if *d'Egricent / de Grecent* are likely to be misspellings of *de *Guicent*[1207] and if one could agree with Lejeune (1948, 236–238) who thought that *seint Michel* refers to the place in the Western Pyrenees. In PTL *as Seinz* is replaced by *a Rains* 'as far as Reims', an obvious *lectio facilior*; since this (< *Rēmis*) did not fit with the assonance, however, the filler expression *ausiment* had to be added after it, which then made it necessary for the expression *seint Michel del Peril* which is so typical of the Rol. to be shortened, thus losing its second part; the switching of the order of the two lines in PTL is probably a secondary interpretation: to a

---

1206 Jenkins' statement (ad loc.) that O has *Senz*, and not *Seinz*, is incorrect.
1207 Cf. the spelling *Wincent* in the *Siège de Barbastre* 1467 and 4515. Heim (1984, 137) suggests *Girgenti*, but this would only be possible as a secondary interpretation of the northern Italian sub-archetype of CV7.

poet more likely to be from the (north-?) western part of France, the Mont-Saint-Michel would have been nearer than Besançon.

It is not Charlemagne's greater empire that is being described here, but evidently a central part of it called *France* (although this is still much bigger than the Île-de-France which is meant today in toponyms like *Roissy-en-France*). Three of the four points are quite straightforward.

The Mont-Saint-Michel is situated on the border between Normandy and Brittany, which at that time was a mostly non-Francophone dukedom, and there could be no more visually impressive border marker than this place right on the coast.

Besençun[1208] 'Besançon' represents the south-eastern corner of this *France*. As the main centre of the Free County of Burgundy it was already the first city outside of the *regnum Franciae*; but in this area the nobility on the two sides of the border were especially closely interrelated, and indeed the two most important families in the whole of Burgundy (duchy plus county, the descendants of Richard the Justiciar, Duke of Burgundy, and those of Count Alberich of Mâcon, came from the *regnum Franciae*. On the other hand, before 1100 there was no politically important interrelationship with the nobility east of the Jura (that is to say in what is now Switzerland). When in 1032/1033 the succession to the Kingdom of Burgundy had to be determined, the Counts of Besançon sided with Odo of Blois against the Salian Conrad; the outcome was not in their favour, but until the marriage of Barbarossa and Beatrix of (the Free County of) Burgundy (1156) the sovereignty of the Salians and then the Staufen dynasty over the Free County was not much more than a nominal one (LM s. v. *Besançon* and *Burgund* [5]). We might think it is symptomatic of the way that Besançon thought of itself as belonging to Francia that e.g. in the middle of the 12th c. in Mâcon an immigrant from Besançon was called *Francigena* (Duby 1971, 340). Just behind Besançon is where (linguistically) the Franco-Provençal area began; admittedly it was not so much this "language" divide (*cum grano salis*!), which led to the choice of Besançon as a border point, but rather the fact that most people who went further than Besançon were heading for Italy.[1209] Directly opposite Besançon was the north-western port of France during the time of Charlemagne, that is to say Quentovic just to the west of Montreuil-sur-Mer; it fell into decline in the late 9th c., when the constant Norman attacks brought an end to trade with

---

1208 In *Vesontio(ne)* > OF *Besençon* the middle syllable *-o-* is treated in the same way as in *calumniare* > *chalengier* etc. (Pope 1952, § 447.5 and 601); in non-western areas the development normally continues further from /ẽ/ > /ã/.

1209 Heim (1984, 206s.) cites many examples of the expression 'as far as Besançon' where there is an underlying, implied concept of France ('from *here* to B.').

England. Its place was taken between the late 10th and the 12th c. by Wissant[1210] (< Dutch *Witsand*), 50 km further north, half-way between Boulogne and Calais at the narrowest point of the Channel. At that time, most of the population still spoke Flemish, although the upper class spoke French. Knowledge of this place was proverbial even in southern France and in Germany: *Guisan* in Bertran de Born (Wiacek s. v.), *zwischen Wîzsant und Stîre* 'from Wissant to Styria' in Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Willehalm* 366.28. The demise of Wissant started when the Dukes of Boulogne founded Calais in 1173 and then was complete when they collaborated with the Capetians and extended Calais into a naval base in 1220.

Furthermore: Wissant and Besançon are not just linked together in the Song, but also in reality: the great road from England to Rome began in Charlemagne's time in Quentovic, and therefore later in Wissant, and went via Amiens-Soissons-Reims-Langres to Besançon and thereafter via Lausanne, the Great Saint Bernard and the Aosta Valley to Milan;[1211] Wissant-Besançon is therefore familiar in daily life as the great northwest-southeast axis cutting right across the *regnum Franciae*.

Where is the fourth corner? Certainly not [1] Saintes, [2] Sens, [3] one of the small places by the name of Sain(t)s or even [4] Heiligenberg on the lower Neckar, nor [5] Cologne, but rather [6] Xanten.

When the size of a territory is indicated using the linguistic formula 'from A to B, from C to D', there are only two logical possibilities: either the two lines AB and CD intersect each other as diagonals of a rectangle, or the two lines form opposite sides of a rectangle.

1210 The DT Pas-de-Calais provides references for *Quantovic* until the end of the 9th c, and for *Wissant* from the 11th c., the oldest precisely datable one from 1048 as *Whitsand*. In 1036 Alfred the Æþeling set off from the *Portus Wissanti* to reconquer England from Danish rule, according to William of Jumièges, and according to William of Poitiers it was from the *Portus Icius*; the deduction from this that Wissant can be identified as the famous Roman port that was used for voyages to England is presumably correct (as DuCange argues, Dissertation 28 in the supplement to his dictionary; cf. for example R. Louis in the Bull. Soc. Ant. de France 1948–1949, 163–167). – O retains the *-ts-*, but unlike the *Huichent* in T and the *Wissant* in P and also unlike the modern written form, which all follow the Picardian dialectal *W-*, O has Romanised the first part as *Gu-*. O, Bertran de Born and the *Girart de Roussillon* (*Guisanç*, ms. O and ed. Hackett, v. 1857) are not the only ones to do this, since Nègre (1990–1998, no. 18516) cites a *Guizant* from the year 1088 as well as other written forms with *Hw-* or *W*. *Wissant* is used with the same meaning as in the Rol. at the beginning of the *Gui de Bourgogne* (p. 3, ed. Guessard/Michelant): *De Huiscent sor la mer de ci que a Saint Gile.*

1211 Cf. for example the map *Reich Karls des Großen* in *Westermanns Atlas der Weltgeschichte* (p. 54 of the 1956 edition).

On [1]: The second option appears to have been very rarely used,[1212] probably because it does not clearly provide coverage of a whole area, and because the selection of only two out of the four sides (instead of an explicit 'from A via B and C to D') seems somewhat arbitrary. Nevertheless, some have argued that it is present here: *Seinz* would be Saintes, and the four points would refer to the borders of the *langue d'oïl* (de Manteyer 1933, 344, Migliorini 1936, passim, Mellor 1965–1966, 175s.). It is true that the name *Saintes* < Lat. *Sántŏnes*, as the *-i-* shows, is influenced by *sanctus*, but we would not expect a monosyllabic form, and there is no evidence for it.[1213] An even bigger difficulty lies in the implications for the meaning: if the line from Mont-Saint-Michel–Saintes represents the western border of France, the line from Wissant–Besançon would be the eastern border, and *Ais* 'Aachen' would be further east of this line, and therefore not included, even though it is mentioned nineteen times (17 times *Ais*, twice *Eis*) and its location inside *France* is repeated as a leitmotif: *en France ad Ais* 36, 135, 2556, *en France a sa capele ad Ais* 726, or it is even cited as the capital of *France*: *Li empereres est repairét d'Espaigne, / E vient a Ais, al meillor siéd de France* 3705s. (which is then echoed later in the *Aymeri de Narbonne* 3837: *A Es en France, en mi la roiauté*). We cannot assume that Charlemagne would have his capital city outside the central core of his territory, in a part of his empire where foreign tribes are based, in what amounts to a vassal state; it is not possible, then, to understand *France* in this passage as 'the whole of Charlemagne's empire'. 'Saintes' must therefore obviously be rejected.

On [2]: A strange hybrid form between these two possibilities arises with Sens (Yonne), suggested by Tavernier (1903, 110, retracted in favour of Xanten 1912,

---

1212 After an extensive search, I could only find one example. In the *Chevalerie Ogier* (v. 9584s. ed. Eusebi) it is stated that Charlemagne was seeking warriors to fight the Saracens and called up all able-bodied men *De Saint-Omer dessi a Carlïom / Et de Poitiers entressi qu'a Digon*. In the *Brut* and from Chrétien's *Lancelot* onwards in a great many courtly romances, *Carlion* is Caerleon on the River Usk in South Wales, one of Arthur's main residences (cf. Flutre s. v.), and this must also be what it means here, because in the *Chevalerie Ogier* Charlemagne rules over England, although this is only mentioned once, more than 9000 lines earlier (v. 205). Some ambiguity remains, however, not so much because the northern border includes the sea, but because the story indicates that this northern border refers to Charlemagne's greater empire, while the southern border only indicates the historical boundary of the rule of Philip Augustus after 1204.
1213 We would not expect to find it: *San(c)tŏnes* with relatively early syncope would result in **San(c)tnes*, which then according to the three-consonant rule would become **Sa(i)n(n)es* or (with *-tn-* > *-tr-*, as in *ordinem* > *ordre*, **Londne(s)* > *Londre(s)*) **Sa(i)ntres*. But there is a late loss of the final syllable, as in *ange(le)*, *image(ne)*, *orgue(ne)*, *terme(ne)*, *vi(e)rge(ne)*.

124) and René Louis (1960, 64s., retracted in favour of Xanten[1214]): the line from Mont-Saint-Michel to Sens indeed runs, as we would wish, perpendicular rather than parallel to the line from Besançon–Wissant, but does not touch it. This means that Sens is just too centrally located within France to be a border city. During the lifetime of the Roland poet, the three other points are still far outside the Capetian crown territories; it is not clear why the poet would respect the crown territories and yet exclude the County of Burgundy with Auxerre-Autun-Dijon, not to mention the problem of Aachen.

On [3]: In the index of names in the Hilka edition of the Rol. (e.g. the 3rd edition, 1947), the supervising editor Rohlfs had even asked the question: "City of Xanten; or one of the places by the name of *Sains* in the Dep. Aisne, Nord, Pas-de-Calais, Seine-et-Marne, Yonne?" This is possibly the most blatant example of toponymic trivialisation in all of Old French epic studies.[1215] For what possible geographical logic could there be in naming small places of no significance in any historical period, located either in northern France quite close to Wissant (i.e. in the Dep. Pas-de-Calais, Nord and Aisne) or in central France quite near to Paris (Seine-et-Marne, Yonne)? The index of names in the Hilka/Pfister edition fortunately reverted to just "Xanten" without a question mark.

On [4]–[6]: The suggestions which follow are based on the first of the two possibilities outlined above; the four points mark the corners of a rectangle with two diagonal lines running across the territory and crossing each other in the middle. This type of territory description is common in other sources[1216] and in

---

1214 René Louis had previously, (Louis 1956, 457) clearly argued for Xanten, then opted for Sens in 1960, before finally going back to his choice of Xanten (letter to Eugen Ewig, cited in Ewig 1982, 481, i.e. in the Festschrift for René Louis).

1215 The list of names may be based on a cursory reading of Longnon (1929, 388).

1216 First, there are two examples from Heim (1984, 196): Friedrich von Sonnenberg, *Spruch*: the author knows the whole territory von *Metze hin ze Bruneswîc, von Lübeke ze Berne* [Verona]. Reinbot von Dürne, *Georgslied* v. 58–63: *alliu tiutsche lant* extend from the *Tyrol rehte unz an Bremen und von Bresburc* [Bratislava/Pressburg] *unz an Metze*. Also, Alfonso el Batallador 1130–1131 states in a charter that he is the ruler from Belorado to Pallars and from Bayonne to Monreal (cf. the Lema Pueyo edition 1990). Sometimes there are border lines (e.g. rivers) instead of the four border points: *Ex* 23.31: Israel will extend 'from the Sea of Reeds ['Red Sea', southeast] to the sea of the Philistines ['Mediterranean', northwest] and from the desert [southwest] to the Euphrates river [northeast]'. Walther von der Vogelweide (Lachmann 73,3, Wilmanns 31,13): *Ich hân gemerket von der Seine unz an die Muore* [Mur in Styria], *von dem Pfâde* [Po] *unz an die Traben* [Trave]. I remember a song from my childhood in which a land is described "von der Maas bis an die Memel, von der Etsch bis an den Belt". Finally, mixed

my opinion it is the only plausible one; on the other hand, the fact that it exists is of course no guarantee that it is correct, as we shall see in section [4] next.

On [4]: In this case – and this is not the first time[1217]– Settegast (1917, 460) made a most unlikely suggestion: *Seinz* is the Heiligenberg 'Holy Mountain', today part of Heidelberg on the right bank of the Neckar. No comment.

On [5] and [6]: The two remaining identifications, Cologne and Xanten, both rest on the fact that in the late Carolingian period and also in the first few centuries of Capetian rule, France never gave up its claim on the Rhine border, even in times when this could not be enforced politically. We must remember, too, that there was no natural border between Aachen and the Rhine, nor any kind of obvious indication of a boundary; whoever ruled or claimed Aachen therefore ruled or claimed the Rhine border, at least in the Duchy of Lower Lorraine.

Let us review the most relevant references. Charles the Bald was the youngest son of Louis the Pious and his lifetime ambition was to be the heir of all his relatives. When in 869 his nephew Lothar II died without any legitimate sons, Charles immediately occupied Aachen, Cologne on the Rhine, Metz, Verdun and Alsace, and had himself crowned as King of Lorraine; but then Louis the German forced him to accept a compromise with the Treaty of Meerssen. When Louis died in 876, Charles tried again to usurp all of Louis' estates *in occidentali litore Rheni fluminis* (*Ann. Fuldenses*); in particular, *Aquisgrani palatium cum multitudine venit, sed non ita ut debuit* (*Ann. Vedastini*) – the latter words an allusion to the fact that he had at that time taken relics from the Aachen treasury; shortly afterwards, he suffered a military defeat near Andernach and then retreated to Compiègne where he used the relics to establish his own substitute for Aachen.

Charles the Simple, on the other hand, occupied Prüm, Aachen and Nijmegen on the Waal branch of the Rhine in 898 but had to withdraw again. In his charters he called himself only *rex* at first, and it was only after the death of the last East Frankish Carolingian (in 911), and after he had acquired Aachen and reached the Rhine border, that he called himself *rex Francorum* (Parisot 1898, 599s.); he married a woman from Lotharingia and preferred advisors from Lotharingia. In 920 he attacked Henry I on the left bank of the Rhine area opposite Worms (even though this had always been part of the Eastern Empire) and was

---

constructions are also possible: Peire Vidal, *Ab l'alen tir vas me l'aire*: Provence stretches *de Rozer tro qu'a Vensa* [Vence west of Nice], *si cum clau mars e Durensa*.
1217 Cf. the secctions above on *Balide* (A.1.11 [3]) and *Imphe / Ebire* (C.3.2.3.6).

defeated; in 921 he made peace with Henry by signing the famous Treaty of Bonn on the Rhine which made him ruler of Lotharingia with Trier, Cologne and Aachen (cf. LM s. v. *Bonn, Vertrag von*).

Henry was not able to make Lotharingia part of the Eastern Empire until after the imprisonment of Charles the Simple (in 923), but Lower Lotharingia in particular was still prone to pro-western uprisings, and very quickly, e.g. in 939 just after Henry's death, it submitted to Louis IV, and in 973 after the death of Otto the Great it submitted to Lothar, on both occasions frustrating the Ottonians. In 978 Lothar launched his famous surprise attack on Aachen, but he left it unscathed a few weeks later; in 985, just before he died, he was reconciled with his brother Charles (whom Otto II had appointed Duke of Lotharingia to bring peace to the territory) and at the same time allied himself with the powerful Lotharingian family, the sons of Reginar Longneck; thus, he ruled this territory for a very short time. His son Louis V, the last of the Carolingian kings, clearly inherited his father's ambitions, but only one year into his reign, he died in a hunting accident. It is safe to say, the Carolingians fought for Lotharingia until their last breath.

As for the Capetians, Parisot (1898, 195) writes: "Quant aux Capétiens, qui n'avaient pas sur les deux Lorraines les mêmes droits que les Carolingiens, ils se contenteront, durant près de trois siècles [! G.A.B.], de vagues revendications, qui ne méritent pas qu'on s`y arrête". Is this not too brief a summary? By 1024 the Ottonian century, a nightmare period in French history, was finally over, and in Germany an apparently weak Salian was in charge. In 1026 Robert II, Odo of Blois and William of Aquitaine came up with a short-lived plan to take the three territories of Italy, Burgundy and Lotharingia out of German control; but on this occasion the Lotharingians stood by the Salian Conrad II. When he died in 1037, Odo once again launched a surprise attack on Lotharingia: he took Bar-le-Duc but was killed in the battle with the local inhabitants (Luchaire 1901, 58s.). By 1044, Duke Gottfried II was sick of the Salian Henry III, who had become too powerful, and so he joined up with France, but Henry managed to have him removed. When in 1046 Henry III set off on a campaign against Italy with the full force of his empire behind him, the French king Henry I prepared for military action against the empire as his advisors encouraged him in his belief that the imperial palace in Aachen would legitimately come to him and Lotharingia was now defenceless,[1218] whereupon a revolt broke out in Lotharingia, which Henry

---

[1218] According to Anselm of Liège, *Gesta Episcoporum Leodiensium*, cap. 61 (MGH SS. 7.225).

III was not able to quash completely until 1050; in 1056 tensions rose again, and Henry I of France openly reproached the emperor Henry III saying that the emperor's predecessor had occupied *partem magnam regni Francorum* – meaning Lotharingia – by deceitful means;[1219] on both occasions, however, the French king did not dare engage in military confrontation with the German imperial state, which at that point had reached the peak of its power (cf. Dhondt 1946/1947 passim).

This completes our sketch of the political background. But what of the history of consciousness? In the 10th c., Flodoard of Reims, for example, regarded emperor Arnulf retrospectively as only a *rex transrhenensis* (*Hist. Rem. Eccl.* 4.5) and the *regnum Lotharii* (II, that is to say Upper and Lower Lotharingia) as *pars Franciae* (*Ann.* for 919, ed. Lauer p. 1). At the end of the 10th c., Richer of Reims calls King Henry I in his first edition (1.20, 35s.) only *transrhenanus* and 'Duke', as if he were a subject of Charles the Simple, while in his second edition (2.18) he maintains that when Charles the Simple, 'who was entitled to be the sovereign' was still a minor, Henry was only 'made' (*creatus*) King of the Saxons in order to repulse the Slavs, and his son Otto then falsely claimed that he had been appointed Prince of the Belgians by his father. In the 11th c. the Burgundian Radulfus/Raoul Glaber refers to the German kingdom of Henry I (1.4), the realm of emperor Henry II (3.1) and the country in which Bamberg is situated (3.1), as 'Saxony' or 'Saxon'. In the 12th c., the *Raoul de Cambrai* (v. 763–765) is based on the assumption that King Louis was able to award fiefdoms *entre Loire et le Rin*, and the *Garin le Loherain* (v. 6274s., 7540s. ed. Iker-Gittleman), that King Pippin rules *des Saint Michel qui desor la mer sist / jusqu'a Gormaise* [Worms] *qui siet desor le Rin*. In the 13th c., the *Beuve de Commarchis* (v. 2560–2562) has a Saracen say: *Le roiaume de France croi que nos conquerrons, / Tout le pays qui est dou Rin jusqu'as Bretons / Doit l'amustans conquerre ains que nos retornons.*[1220] Finally, in about 1300 Girard d'Amiens rhymes as follows: *Entre Loire et le Rhin, tant com l'on peut errer / Souloit on le pais adonc France clamer* (cited in Burger 1961, 291 n. 112). There is therefore no possibility that at the time of the Rol. the Rhine border (excepting perhaps in Alsace) had been forgotten in favour of a smaller *France,* and if the poet envisages that the *France* of Pippin and the *France* of Louis both have this border, this must *a fortiori* be true of Charlemagne's *France* also.

Furthermore, the Roman habit of taking *Gallia* to mean more or less everything as far as the Rhine (as for example the typical remarks in Caesar *b.G.* 1.1–2

1219 According to Lampert of Hersfeld, *Ann.* for the year 1056 (MGH SS.schol. 38.68).
1220 The last two references are from Heim (1984, 352, 373).

or Pliny *nat*.4.105) lived on in the ecclesiastical (and theoretical-geographical) traditions of the Middle Ages (references in Lugge 1960, 49 and 93ss.).[1221] A typical example of this in the 12th c. is Honorius Augustodunensis (PL 172.130A), who defines the *Gallia Belgica*, also known as *Francia*, as the territory which stretched, *a Rheno* 'from the Rhine' [scil. westwards], and from the *mons Jovis*, that is from the 'Great Saint Bernard' [in the south], as far as the Breton Ocean [in the north]; then in the west it turns into *Gallia Comata* or *Togata*. Similar statements from inhabitants in the territories on the left bank of the Rhine reveal a remarkably confident sense of their own identity. When Barbarossa had Charlemagne canonised in 1165, he was presented with a deed supposedly relating to Charlemagne that had obviously been forged in Aachen, which he then incorporated verbatim into his charter. In this text, Charlemagne decrees that Aachen is to be considered as *caput Gallie trans Alpes,* as *caput omnium civitatum et provinciarum Gallie* and that all *episcopi, duces, marchiones, comites Gallie* were obliged to protect it (cf. for example Meuthen 1967 passim, the quotation 56).

In the light of all of this, it would be astonishing for a poet to name Aachen as Charlemagne's main residence in his main territory, and then not also mention the Rhine as the border of this land – and all the more so when the point on the Rhine marks the start of the formula 'from A to B, from C to D' as way of indicating two intersecting diagonals, which is precisely the most natural, if not the only natural way of describing this.

Therefore, only two cities can be considered for *Seinz*: Cologne and Xanten. In both cases *as Seinz* is assumed to be from *ad sanctos*. We shall deal with the objections to this interpretation in terms of the form first.

The *scribe* of O has collapsed (diphthongic) /ãi/ and /ẽi/ into /ẽi/, for which he clearly prefers the spelling <ei>. He writes *ainz* only once (v. 2035), but *einz* (< *antius*) 17 times, *pleindre* (< *plangere*) 10 times, including inflected forms without any alternatives; he does write *sainte* 4 times, but *seint* 22 times,[1222] *seinte* 4 times, *seintes* three times, *seintisme* once and *seinz* once (v. 1134, 3718).[1223] *As Seinz* < *ad sanctos* is exactly the spelling that we would expect to see.

On the other hand, the poet does not mix (monophthongic) /ã/ and /ẽ/ (> central Fr. /ã/) in a random fashion in masculine laisses, but he does mix them often (in 15 laisses according to Jenkins 1928, p. CIII), as he does in the laisse we have here: on the one hand *Rollant* (twice), *Guitsand*, *granz*, on the other hand *rent*, *nïent*, *comunement*, *cent* etc. More importantly for us, he even

---

1221 The position had not changed, therefore, in relation to the existence over many centuries of the Roman provinces on the left bank (!) of the Rhine, *Germania superior* and *inferior*.

1222 In the concordance by Duggan, three of them are listed as personal names.

1223 There are also *sein* (v. 2847) and *sent* (v. 2395), which may be careless errors.

admits an occasional (dipthongic) /ãi/~/ẽi/ between them: *cumpainz* (< *companio*) is in v. 559 linked with *grant*, *blancs* etc., but also with *Orïent*, in v. 941 with *avant*, *Rollant*, *sanc*, but also with *gent*, *present*, *veirement*, in v. 3194 with *Rollant*, *tant*, *guant*, *granz* etc., but also with *veirement*, *orgoillusemen*t; and *mains* 'hands' is in v. 1158 linked with *Rollant*, *blanc*, *grant*, but also with *fierement*, *dulcement*, *curteisement*. Since no editor has managed to emend these four cases, we can assume there is nothing wrong with the fifth case either, our Seins in v. 1428.[1224]

On [5]: As Heim (1984, 352–354) has shown, the Rhine border of France is often marked by the city of Cologne: *Chevalerie Ogier* (v. 982) *Et vint de France, de Cologne sor Rin*; *Moniage Guillaume II* (v. 4234) *France prendrons jusc'as pors de Coloigne*; *Galeran de Bretagne* (v. 5352) *Et en France jusqu'a Couloigne*.

However, in v. 1428 we find *as Seinz* and not *a Cologne*. Gautier (ad loc.) supposed that it meant Cologne because of the Church of Saint Gereon in that city. This is a magnificent building built in late antiquity that was dedicated to a possibly legendary officer in the Theban legion and his supposedly 60, later 360, fellow martyrs and was notable for its large, much admired and glittering gold-ground mosaics. From Gregory of Tours (*De gloria martyrum* cap. 61) onwards until around 1100 (*Vita Annonis*, written 1104–1105, cap. 17, MGH SS. 11.491) it was called *ad Sanctos Aureos* or *ad Aureos Sanctos*.[1225] But all these references appear with previous statements making it clear that the context is Cologne. Presumably a German person who was not from Cologne would have had trouble understanding the expression without the key word 'Cologne', and a French person even more so; this is all the more likely in the Song, where even the clarifying term *Aureos* is not provided.

1224 *Saint* itself including all its inflected forms never appears in the Song in the assonance position, and so we do not have any closer points of comparison.

1225 On Saint Gereon: Schäfke (1996, 91–126). Further references for the expression 'to the golden saints' are in e.g. the *Passio Gereonis* (BHL 3446, AA.SS. for the 10.10., 2.20; second half of the 10th c, against the Bollandists W. Levison 1931, 353) and the *Vita Dagoberti III.* (SS. mer. 2.512, cap. 11; written before 1100). The building from late antiquity seems to have been fully intact when Archbishop Hildebold was buried there in 818; but by the 11th c. at the latest, it had fallen into such a state of ruin that the mosaics were lost during the renovation works. Traces of the mosaics and pieces of glass with a layer of gold are still found occasionally in archaeological investigations (Schäfke 1996, 95).

We cannot assume either that *Seinz* refers to the saints' relics of all churches in Cologne together.[1226] This would likewise have been much too non-specific for a French audience; the Roland poet does not create puzzles for his audience.

On [6]: Xanten was first suggested by Hermann Suchier (1880, passim), and this was accepted by, among others, Gaston Paris (1881, 301), Ferdinand Lot (1928, 374–376), René Louis (1956, 457, and later[1227]) and Eugen Ewig (1982, passim).

The decisive advantage that Xanten has over Cologne is the fact that the plural *Sanctos* here is not an unattested *pars pro toto*, but it is the real, post-antique name of the place. The settlement that grew up around the location of the Roman *Colonia Traiana* is referred to as *locu[s] qui vocatur Sanctos super Rhenum* in a letter written shortly after 855 (copy from the end of the 9th c., MGH Ep.mer.& kar. 4.132); in 863/864, the Normans came *ad Sanctos usque* '(up the Rhine) as far as Xanten' according to the *Ann. Xantenses* written in the 9th c.; there is an isolated singular form that can be explained by the context: *Troia quod et Sanctum dicitur* in a charter by the emperor Henry III from 1047 (MGH DD H III no. 207, more on *Troia* in the next paragraph below), but there is a plural *(de) Sanctis* again in a Cologne archbishop's charter dating from 1080, and the *Vita Norberti* A (MGH SS. 12.670s., middle of the 12th c.) informs us that Norbert is from *municipio de Sanctis*. This place is mentioned as the indeclinable *Sanctis / Santis* (and second Troy) in the late 12th c. by Italian-born Gottfried of Viterbo (MGH SS. 22.149.19, authorial addition, and 174.24). The form with *S-* carries on into MHG: the *Annolied* (around 1080) has the singular *Sante*, the *Nibelungenlied* 20.4 has the plural *ze Santen*, 708.3 *Santen*, where the place is called a 'wealthy castle', whose lords (Siegfried in particular) even wore a crown, which means they held the title of king (on these matters Hawicks 2004, passim). There is also the report written in Hebrew around 1140 by Salomo ben Simeon about the pogroms of 1096 with the form *z*nt*ś* /zantəs/ (Neubauer/

1226 The Ottonian-Salian wave of church building started in Cologne, under Otto the Great's brother Archbishop Bruno, with St. Pantaleon, which was then consecrated under Archbishop Warin in 980 (Schäfke 1996, 9). We can read in Schäfke (passim) how the Romanesque churches in the city that are much admired to this day (St. Andreas, St. Aposteln, St. Cäcilien, St. Georg, St. Gereon, St. Kunibert, St. Maria im Kapitol, St. Maria Lyskirchen, Groß St. Martin, St. Pantaleon, St. Severin and St. Ursula) were all in existence around 1100, although not all of them in their modern form, since "Romanesque" building continued in Cologne into the early 13th c.; this only started to change when the old cathedral was rebuilt in the Gothic style (the foundation stone for this was laid in 1248).
1227 Cf. n. 1214 above.

Stern 1892, 21), which is the Germanified word stem, but with a plural -*s* end-ing. The form in the Rol. is simply the etymologically correct Old French form of the name.[1228]

There also exists, admittedly, an alternative form *Xantum* in MLat from the 10th c. onwards. It is based on the fact – in connection with Fredegar's fable about the Trojan origin of the Franks and their founding of a new city of Troy in the Lower Rhine area[1229] – that the *Colonia Traiana* had turned into *Troiana*, and then a *secunda Troia* or even *sancta Troja* 'the Christian Troy'. In parallel, it was assumed that the settlers carried the name of the Trojan river called *Xanthus* in Vergil (*Aen.* 1.473 and 3.350) over to a stream and from there onto the place itself (as e.g. in the early MHG *Annolied* v. 391ss.; on this too, Hawicks 2004, passim). This 'more erudite' form of the name with *X-* took over completely after 1200. Fre-degar's fable was well known and believed across the whole of Europe; if anyone asked the logical question where this new city was situated, then the answer – and until the time of the Rol. to my knowledge the only answer – would have normally been Xanten.

But this place had more to offer than just its claim to be the second Troy and therefore the mother city of the whole Frankish realm. The *Colonia Traiana*, not much smaller in size than the *Agrippina*, i.e. Cologne, together with the *(Colonia) Vetera* (today Birten), which was a century older and lay 5 km to the southeast, was the most important Roman military outpost of the Rhine border

---

1228 René Louis (1960, 60) – before he came back to Xanten (cf. n. 1214) – as a *péremptoire* against Xanten, had noted that the name is not attested anywhere else in OF. But this argu-ment could be used to deny the existence of every *hapax legomenon,* no matter where it occurs. If in the Old French epic we find references (albeit at a later date) to *Clerves* 'Kleve', *Cologne* 'Köln/Cologne', *Covelenche* 'Koblenz', *Estrabort* 'Strasbourg', *Garmaise* 'Worms', *Juliers* 'Jü-lich', *Lamborc* 'Limburg', *Maience* 'Mainz', *Nimaie* 'Nijmegen', *Saint Herbert (dou Rin)* '(today Cologne-) Deutz', *Sallebruge* 'Saarbrücken', *Tre(f)* 'Maastricht', *Treves* 'Trier' and *Tremoigne* 'Dortmund', why should we not recognise *Seinz* 'Xanten'?

1229 Fredegar 2.5s. and 3.2s. (MGH SS.mer. 2.46 and 93). Fredegar first reports very generally how the migrants from Troy took over some land by the Rhine and the Danube. While those who settled by the Danube later became the Turks, those who settled near the Rhine under their leader Francio founded the second Troy, which however remained *imperfectum*, and they later made a push initially towards Cologne. Fredegar is therefore already thinking of a place on the Lower Rhine; he calls it *imperfectum* because at the time when he was alive, there was no place in the Lower Rhine area that was anything like as large the Troy he was imagining. In the century when the Rol. was written, Honorius Augustodunensis (*De imagine mundi* 1.29, PL 172.130) for example, was convinced that *Francus* from Troy, a friend of Aeneas, *Trojam iuxta Rhenum condidit* and in so doing gave the *Gallia Belgica*, as it stretches from the Rhine towards the west, the name *Francia* with this same meaning.

between Cologne and Nijmegen, and a permanent base for one, sometimes two legions; the famous legions of Varus probably left from here to march towards their doom, the legions of Drusus certainly did so on their revenge campaign, and finally, in the year 360, emperor Julian crossed over the Rhine here on his campaign against the Germanic peoples. The *Colonia* was destroyed during the mass migrations, but a Christian *memoria* building with the tomb of two martyrs survived. Before the 8th c., a legend emerged claiming that 'the martyr Victor and his companions' were buried there. Shortly after 800 there was even a canons' monastery in their honour there, with an impressive basilica (58 x 22m), *mirifico opere constructa*, which was renovated after the Norman attacks of the 10th c. and in the 9th c. this place was already a *locus opinatissimus*. Perhaps even in about 600, or at the latest in Ottonian times, 'Saint Victor and his companions' were also counted as part of the Theban legion. The *Passio Gereonis* from the second half of the 10th c. which was also widely read in France,[1230] gives Victor an honourable place just behind Gereon and commemorates his martyrdom *im oppidum Francorum, quod ex maiorum suorum sedibus Troiam sive Xantum nuncupabant*.[1231] The three most important places for the Rhenish-Theban martyrs, St. Victor in Xanten, St. Gereon in Cologne and St. Cassius-and-Florentius in Bonn together form the spiritual axis of the (Arch) Diocese of Cologne and accordingly enjoyed the favour of the archbishops there, with the result that Xanten easily surpassed Birten in importance: from the 11th c. onwards, it has its own mint, in 1096 there is a Jewish community and the bishop's castle is documented for the first time, in 1128 the new Saint Victor Cathedral is consecrated, all of which shows that the significance of the monastery is growing, and that of the *oppidum* itself as well.

But perhaps the most interesting, and indeed most obvious reason why Xanten should appear in the Rol. is one that to my knowledge has almost never been mentioned in French studies: it is the strategic and also tribal/geographic dimension. Roughly opposite (Xanten-)Birten lies the mouth of the Lippe, where presumably even in Roman times two natural travel routes met at the Rhine: the route along the Lippe from the area which later became Dortmund (later the northern side branch of the Hellweg, which was the main route across Westphalia to the Weser),[1232] and from the northeast, the route from the area

---

1230 At least two of the three oldest mss. originate in France, that is to say in Saint-Bertin and in Châlons-sur-Marne (Ewig 1983, 485).

1231 *Passio Gereonis* (BHL 3446, AA.SS. for the 10.10., here 1.15). The information here is based on the PW Suppl. 8.2 (1958), col. 1801–1834, the *Kleinen Pauly* s. v. *Vetera*, the LM s. v. *Xanten* and Ewig (1983, passim).

1232 Cf. e.g. Weczerka (1966, 196).

which later became Münster, that is, from the Baltic Sea and the North Sea. This was the most likely location on the eastern bank of the Rhine for hostile Germanic bands to gather in; that is why Rome stationed its legionaries directly opposite, on the western bank. After Charlemagne's great Saxon campaigns had gradually moved from the southern Westphalian theatres of war (Hohensyburg, Eresburg near Niedermarsberg) to northern Germany, Charlemagne usually crossed the Rhine near the mouth of the Lippe at a place called Lippiaham, as in 779, 784, 799 and 810 (Royal Annals). This place must have been on the northern side of the Lippe, approximately opposite Birten, because its *raison d'être* was to eliminate the need to cross the Lippe after crossing the Rhine. And while at the height of Cologne the tribal border between the (Germanophone) Franks and Saxons ran some 60 km further east of the Rhine, opposite Xanten it had come within about 10 km east of the river, which is closer than anywhere else. Xanten was therefore, among all the places on the left bank of the Rhine, the Franconian (though not precisely French) border town opposite Saxony. This circumstance cannot be a coincidence in our context; for France's traumatic experience during the Ottonian century – the Saxon people whom Charlemagne had defeated had turned into an overpowerful enemy! – no doubt had left behind a specifically anti-Saxon resentment even in our poet's lifetime. The poet knew about the tribal border near Xanten and quite rightly recognised its importance during Charlemagne's lifetime. In the light of this, we can see that the naming of Xanten in the French rectangle is the best possible choice, and it is all the more appropriate because the diagonal line from Mont-Saint-Michel – Xanten crosses over the diagonal from Besançon – Wissant at an angle of almost exactly 90°.

Ferdinand Lot (1928, 374–376) thought that the four-point concept of France including Xanten was an archaic one which must have originated in the time of Charles the Simple shortly after 911. I think this is far from certain.[1233] We only have to look briefly at the reigns of the last Salians, Henry IV (1056–1106) and Henry V (1106–1125), to see that within their realm the tension between Franconians and Saxons erupted several times (between 1073 and 1088, and from 1115 onwards) into full-scale wars with huge battles and a *de facto* partition of the realm into two, even though the fighting now mostly occurred in East Saxony. It is very unlikely that people in France would have failed to notice this or would have seen the Saxons as anything other than a tribal enemy; the Salians were not popular with the French, but attitudes towards the Saxons were even worse.

1233 Hollyman (1958, passim) also disagrees with Lot, but in my view with a rather weak argument.

The Roland poet seems also to imply the Rhine border in another passage. When Charlemagne observes his army approaching the battle with Baligant, he expresses his faith in them in a discussion with *Jozeran de Provence, / Naimon li duc, Antelme de Maïence* (v. 3007s.).[1234] Naimes is Charlemagne's friend, Joceran will organise the *eschieles* together with him, and then be one of the two commanders of the southern French *eschiele*; they are both, therefore, high-ranking figures, and their status is reflected to some extent on Antelme, even though he is only mentioned here. With the obvious exception of Rome and possible exception of the *Pinabel (del castel) de Sorence* nexus, where the poet must have thought it essential to retain the toponym in order to identify the individual (cf. on this point section C.8.13 below), the other cities mentioned elsewhere in the Song are not all inside the four-cornered France, but they are all within the French-Occitan language continuum. *Maïence* 'Mainz' is not within this continuum, but the left side of the Rhine was part of the Frankish ancestral territories, and the alternative, which would be to see it as the only named city located in a "vassal state" (belonging to the *Alemans* or the *Tiedeis*) would look even stranger. Moreover, Doon de Maïence in the well-known passage by Bertrand de Bar-sur Aube (beginning of the 13th c.) is still a very positive figure: *Doon a la barbe florie, / Cil de Maïence qui tant ot baronie*, and in the surviving *Doon de Maïence* he is a Frank and a great warrior against the Saxons.

Antelme < Germ. *Ant-helm* (< *and(o)-* 'zeal' + *helm* 'protection'), a regularly derived but relatively uncommon name, is (despite occasional mix-ups) not the same as the more common names *Anshelm*, *Nanthelm* or *Lanthelm*, which means that even in southern France we should not assume (as Boissonnade does, 1923, 374s.) that references for *Nanthelm* or *Lanthelm* can be taken as references for *Anthelm*. The first genuine references to an *Anthelm* are to be found in Bavaria (after 756), Alemannia and the French Jura (Abbot Anthelmus of Saint-Claude 804–815), after which it occurred more frequently in (south-) eastern France (where in the 12th c. Saint Anthelm, Bishop of Belley was active), less frequently up to the level of Reims (cf. Morlet s. v.), and it was much less common from there to the west of France, although Boissonnade did find a few Norman Antelms. To a French person from the period around 1100, therefore, the name sounded vaguely 'eastern', and this made it a suitable name for the minor character from Mainz. Here we see for the first time a key principle of epic names, one that we might call the "principle of regional appropriateness".

C.4.9 Review of the four corner points

The poet uses the two almost perpendicular diagonal lines from Mont-Saint-Michel to Xanten and from Besançon to Wissant to represent France (as required by the mention of Aachen as the capital city) stretching up as far as the Rhine border, which in the consciousness of the French had never been relinquished, and this is made most evident through the mention of Xanten, which is characterised as the place nearest to Saxony.

C.5 Two fundamental questions

C.5.1 Apparent anachronisms

The Normans also have their place in the Rol., complete with their Duke *Richard / Richart li velz / le veill*.[1235] In real-life history, this name refers to Richard I (943–†996), who (after a tumultuous start) enjoyed a long and mostly peaceful reign over the Norman state. More than any other leader before William the Conqueror, he was responsible for its internal stability, and he is remembered especially for his restoration of ecclesiastical organisations in Normandy, including the Mont-Saint-Michel, and as the founder of the powerful Abbey church of Sainte-Trinité in Fécamp, which is where he was laid to rest.[1236] This raises a fundamental question: even if it is forgivable that the poet does not know the date of Richard's death – is he also unaware of the fact that the Normans only settled in France long after the time of Charlemagne? Of course not, since in France around 1100 everyone with even the most minimal amount of formal education, and *de facto* every adult, would have known this.

Is the poet then consciously writing something that he knows very well is historically inaccurate? In my opinion, we should approach this question by

---

1235 He was mentioned before in v. 171 as one of Charlemagne's most noble courtiers right after Ogier and Turpin; at that point, however, he is called *li velz* only in O, whereas K gives him a different homeland instead (*Ritschart uon Tortune* 'Tortona' – or is this already the epic *Dordone*?) and CV7 reduce the verse to *Li cons R. qi mot fu ses norriz*. In this passage, on the other hand (v. 3050) *li velz* is confirmed by KV4P. Finally, in v. 3470, where *le veill* is once again only in O, his status as a Norman is confirmed by CV7; he is the last-named blood sacrifice on the Christian side, killed by Baligant himself.

1236 It may be relevant in this context that according to René Louis (1956, 357), Richard was regarded as the founder of a *festa ioculatorum*, which fell into decline after 1135 but was founded anew in 1188.

remembering the strong historical continuity of the landscape through the Norman conquest and beyond. Wace at the beginning of his *Brut*, Marie de France at the start of her *Lais de Deux Amants* and the author of the *Perceforest* (1.14) all agree that *Neustria* is simply the older Latin name for Fr. *Normandie*; and therefore, if someone was speaking in the vernacular, which did not have the word *Neustria*, he or she would have to retrospectively refer to Normandy *avant la lettre* as Normandy. Even German speakers unthinkingly talk about "the Romans in southern Germany" for example. And, even more importantly, Dudo of Saint-Quentin claims (perhaps incorrectly, but *bona fide*), that Rollo married Gisela, daughter of Charles the Simple, and (probably correctly) also later married *more danico* a local woman by the name of Poppa/Papia (apparently the daughter of a Carolingian Count Berengar of Bayeux). Both cases, and Rollo's conversion to Christianity – and the fact that by far the majority of Normans had assumed continental names just two generations later – manifest a desire for spatial continuity: the Normans did not want to replace old structures with new ones, nor even maintain their genealogical distinctiveness (and they were mostly men!), but they just wanted to slot themselves into the organisation of the pre-existing society, complete with its feudal system and connubium with the old upper class – adopting a ready-made framework, so to speak. This way of thinking was probably still in living memory at the time when the Roland poet was writing. And as Richard was not a northern name, but (as people at that time would have recognised very easily) a Frankish one, the poet may well have thought that there was already a Richard de Normendie in place during Charlemagne's lifetime, who had even, through some female member of the family tree, been the ancestor of the man of the same name who died in 996, and who then, of course, would have deserved the epithet *li velz* even more than that later individual. There is no need to explain why the fame of the contemporary Normans would have radiated back upon these pre-'Normans' of Carolingian times. This is the case *a fortiori* for the non-Norman individuals. The poet lives in a world where fiefdoms are hereditary, and people also tend to be named after their older relatives, and so changes in social history or in onomastics are simply not in anyone's mind. Thus, if there is a *Tedbald de Reins* (~ Champagne) at the time of writing the Song, it is entirely reasonable to assume that there would also have been a *Tedbald de Reins* living during Charlemagne's lifetime. This kind of assumption need not be regarded as an error, therefore, and it does not detract from the desire to create a poetic universe which can also be taken quite literally at the same time. The historical Richard the Old, the historic Theobald of Champagne are simply the people who handed down their names, and this does not run counter to historical reality but rather reflects a genuine probability.

C.5.2 Regionality and supraregionality in the Chanson de Roland

It is noticeable that the poet characterises by far the majority of the minor characters on the Christian side by mentioning their fiefdom or their homeland, but he does not provide this information for the four main characters Roland, Olivier, Naimes and Ganelon, though such details might seem to be even more relevant for these individuals.[1237] This cannot just be a coincidence. Nevertheless, both tactics serve the same purpose: the poet wants to prevent people from reading his work as a judgemental account of regional antagonism, and from interpreting sympathy and antipathy towards this or that part of Charlemagne's empire into his work. He offers a diverse range of places in association with the minor characters to give an impression of genial impartiality, because without these attachments to particular locations they would easily lose their distinctiveness and become interchangeable. Using the opposite strategy, with the same goal in mind, the poet must keep his main characters free from attachments to a particular locality; for every member of the audience should be able to identify with the *merveillus vasselage* of Roland and Olivier, or with the selfless ingenuity of someone like Naimes, but no-one should feel that his or her homeland is tainted by association with the traitor Ganelon.

In line with these two strategies, the poet ensures that the peoples within Charlemagne's army who are now about to engage with Baligant are depicted using carefully balanced and calibrated characteristics, as we shall see in the next section.

C.6 The ten *eschieles* and their leaders

C.6.1 The *eschieles*

Two spatial concepts must be distinguished in the depiction of the *eschieles*. The first refers to the moment when the army is ready for battle: the *eschieles* are standing there, lined up one behind the other from the first to the tenth, as was customary from the 10th c. onwards, if not before.[1238] At the same time, we might also wonder about the order in which the poet's thoughts lead him through Charlemagne's empire.

1237 I am repeating some points here that I have made before (Beckmann 2010, 26–28).
1238 Convincingly demonstrated by Baltzer (1877, 104ss.) with supporting evidence.

The first and second *eschiele* are made up of a group of younger *Franceis* who thus were expected to prove themselves in battle;[1239] the veteran *Franceis*, with *chefs fluriz* and *barbes blanches*, make up the tenth *eschiele*, which in me-dieval times would serve initially, if necessary, as a quick-reaction force, and then they would naturally play their part in the closing phase of the battle as well.[1240] With a total of 130,000 men, the Franks are by far the biggest people in the Christian army, and also the alpha and omega of the whole formation, since they act as a bracket holding everything spatially as well as militarily to-gether. The ordering of the other peoples of the Empire – and I don't remember reading this anywhere else[1241] – is modelled on the formation that God com-manded the Israelite army to have, that is to say, one tribe after another (*Num* 2) divided into the four parts of the compass, and in the characteristic order of east-west-south-north, with a distribution of the 'tribes' as equally as possible in each of the four compass directions. Since the editor of the *Numeri* has twelve tribes available to him,[1242] his distribution is three tribes in each com-pass direction; but since the Roland poet only has ten 'tribes' at his disposal, he allocates two to each compass direction. But then he has to have a fifth sec-tion for the two remaining 'tribes', an eastern central one, which alters the cir-cular shape of the imagined space and makes it into a spiral that is growing smaller, and pointing towards the middle, where the tenth *eschiele* is stationed. Exactly as in *Num* 2, the numerical strength of each 'tribe' is given, and then the name of the leader, except that the Roland poet – who unlike the *Numeri* editor is concerned about stylistic variation – takes the liberty of deviating somewhat from the one-to-one principle. Thus, we find one after the other in the Song: from the east with 20,000 men each, the people from *Baivere* and the *Alemans*, then from the west the 20,000 *Normans* and the 30,000 *Bretuns*, from

---

1239 There is a comparable description of a group of select young soldiers: in Tacitus (*Germ.* 6) he reports that the Germanic peoples used to select a hundred especially proficient young foot soldiers from each district, and these were placed in front of the main army between the (still relatively few) cavalry. It was a great honour to be chosen. Caesar reports a similar prac-tice (*b.G.* 1.48) likewise with reference to the Germanic peoples.
1240 We came across this tactic above in the description of the opponents of the tenth Chris-tian *eschiele*, that is to say the twentieth 'heathen' *eschiele,* the people from *Occiant* (A.1.2.9), among whom Baligant himself takes his place.
1241 Even Brault (1978, 287–290) did not notice the biblical parallel.
1242 Whereby as usual, the tribe of Joseph (according to Joseph's two sons) is divided into the tribes of Ephraim and Manasse because the tribe of Levi does not form part of the army itself but instead guards the Ark of the Covenant in the middle of the army.

the south the 40,000 *Peitevins* and *barons d'Alverne*,[1243] from the north the 40,000 *Flamengs* and *barons de Frise* (whereby MLat. Frisia was until around 1100 understood to have included the areas known today as the Dutch provinces of Holland and Seeland, cf. the LM s. v. *Friesen, Friesland*), and finally in the eastern middle section the 50,000 *Loherengs* and *cels de Borgoigne*.[1244]

Two *eschieles* require some explanation. The broadening of the meaning of the word *Alemans* from 'Alemanni' to 'Germans' is far from complete in the Rol. The poet counts the Franks on the left bank of the Rhine (Xanten, Aachen, Mainz) as belonging to France (cf. C.4.8 above), and besides the *Alemans* in the list of *eschieles*, we find the Bavarians, then, amongst the judges in Ganelon's trial first (v. 3700–3701) the Bavarians and the *Saisnes* '(tribal) Saxons (including people from today's Westphalia, Lower Saxony and Holstein, minus the Frisians)', then even (v. 3793–3795) the Bavarians, the *Saisnes* and the *Tiedeis*, and finally (v. 3961) – evidently in order to avoid pedantic repetition – only the Bavarians. Charlemagne had not taken the *Saisnes* with him on his Spanish campaign because he mistrusts them (cf. later v. 2921); he includes them in the panel of judges, however, because the panel is intended to represent whole empire.[1245] If we subtract all these peoples, all that is left, then, for the *Tiedeis*

1243 On *Peitevin* cf. n. 1177 above. – Lat. *Arvernia* > OF *Alvergne, Alverne* with dissimilation of the first -r- from the second. In the -n- instead of -gn- there is either an echo from *Arverni* (which was from the start of the OF tradition replaced by the Latinism **Arverniates* > OF *Alvergna(t)s*), or there is a tendency towards phonological simplification as we see occasionally in *borne* instead of *borgne*.

1244 The ethnonym *Frisia* (> OF *Frise*) or *Fresia* (from the 8th c. onwards, Gysseling s. v.), from classical Lat. *Frisi(i)* (as in Pliny *n.h.* 4.101) was in MLat. largely replaced by *Frisiones* (as in e.g. Fredegar IV, Rubric 108, MGH SS.mer. 2.122, Pippin's surviving original Diploma no. 6 from the year 753 MGH DD Kar. 1,9 and the *Lex Frisionum,* from 802/803), also *Fres(i)ones* (as in the common title *comites Fresonum*); from the first OF *Frisuns* (as in Rol. 3700 in Ganelon's trial). – OF *Loherenc* < MLat. *Lotharingus* < Ger. *Lotharinc*, here not yet with the change of suffix (x -*anus*) *Loherain* > *Lorrain*. Originally it referred to the whole territory ruled by Lothar II (that is to say, the north part north of the Alps of the middle kingdom ruled by his father, Lothar I), but in the late 10th and 11th c. increasingly limited to the southern part of this area, the county of Upper Lorraine, now just Lorraine for short. This is also the case in the Rol., because here the cities of Aachen and Xanten which are in the old 'Lower Lorraine' are counted as part of France; cf. section C.4.8 above, on the four corner points and the main residence. – The people from *Borgoigne* (< *Burgundia*) are included in Ganelon's trial v. 3701 as *Borguignuns* (< *Burgundiones*).

1245 However, the Italians as a group are not included in the Spanish campaign, nor in Ganelon's trial; but they are nevertheless also Charlemagne's subjects, because he collected the imperial standard in Rome, and because, like the Saxons, the *Romain, Puillain et tuit cil de*

mentioned in v. 3795, are the Franks on the right bank of the Rhine (including the Thuringians) ~ central Germans'.[1246]

The second *eschiele*, which requires a short clarification, are the people from southern France: only those from Poitou and the Auvergne are named, but the other southerners are implicitly included, because Joceran *de Provence* is the commander of the *eschiele*.

The poet provides a short characterisation of each people, and in so doing his ability to offer variation is on display. The young *Franceis* are *noz meillors vaillanz*, the veterans *noz meillors cataignes*; Charlemagne values the whole contingent of *Franceis* above all his peoples because they *les regnes conquirent*. Surprisingly, the Bavarians are Charlemagne's next favourite people after the Franks; this statement is left hanging with no supporting information, if we assume that in the Song Charlemagne's only personal friend and confidant, Duke Naimes – whose fiefdom is not mentioned – was not yet a Bavarian.[1247] The *Alemans* on the other hand, *pur murir ne guerpirunt bataille*, and are therefore above all steadfast. The poet says of the Normans: *Suz ciel n'ad gent ki plus poissent en camp*, thereby narrowly missing the superlative form; the additional thought that resonates here is clearly that of the Normans in Spain, in southern Italy, in Byzantium, along with Bohemund, who is the military commander of all the crusaders in Antioch. When it comes to the Bretons, on the other hand, their fighting prowess is not mentioned, but it is simply noted that they ride up *en guise de baron*; for from about 900 onwards, through internal divisions, and also through their proximity to the Normans and finally because of the growing

---

Palerne would later rebel against him. On the question of whether the poet thought Pinabel of Sorence was a southern Italian, cf. C.8.13 below.

1246 *Tiedeis* < *þeodisk-+-os*, etymologically the same as *deutsch*, is one of the few cases of a lingering intervocalic *-d-* in O; soon > *tieis* > *tiois*, as in CV7 in additional verses. In any case, 'Middle German' is the meaning in the Rol. and not 'Low German', as Segre and Hilka/Pfister have suggested in their indexes. But because the word in Salian and Stauffen periods was used by all Germans to describe themselves, it already means just 'German' in Chrétien's *Cligés* (very clearly in v. 2664, 3483, 3572 ed. Micha). Here, too, it does not mean 'north German' as Micha suggests in the index and can now through synonym doubling have the same meaning as the similarly broadened *alemant* (*Cligés* 2925, 3592 ed. Micha). But soon there is a separation of meanings once again: *tiois* is increasingly used to refer to the Netherlands (since this people call themselves *dietsch*), especially in sources from the north of France, and only traces of the more general meaning *deutsch* 'German' remain, as we find even today in *Audun-le-Tiche* alongside *Audun-le-Roman*, both near *Longwy* (where the fem. *tiesche* has influenced the masc.).

1247 I dealt recently with this very difficult question, which for some time appeared to have been resolved using materially incorrect information in Hämel (1955), (Beckmann 2008a, 40 n. 6, and in more detail 2011, 42–44).

power of the County of Anjou, the former might of the Breton County as a state entity was less and less in evidence. And in the case of the southern French people, too, the poet only praises the horses and weapons; moreover, they are positioned somewhat apart from the others, in a valley – could this be a hint of a specifically Norman resentment against the southern French people which comes from the First Crusade, or is the poet only symbolising the general cultural divide between north and south?[1248] (No matter which it is, the poet quickly compensates for this thought with the fact that he makes the Provencal *Joceran* the only person to have an honoured dual function of helping to organise the *eschieles* and leading an *eschiele* as well.) The Flemings and Frisians are, like the Alemanni, steadfast: *Ja devers els n'ert bataille guerpie* 'Là où ils seront, jamais bataille ne fléchira' (trans. Bédier); Charlemagne can depend on them: *Cist ferunt mun servise*. In the case of the people from Lorraine and Burgundy, bravery is measured by the consequences that are likely to follow: *Si Arrabiz de venir ne demorent, / Cil les ferrunt, s'il a els s'abandunent.*

Even more important than the variations is the overarching fact that something positive is said about each of the peoples. The integrative power that is evident here, and not only here, is one of the main factors assuring the literary excellence of the Rol: it is meant to represent the whole of Charlemagne's empire. The quasi-cross-shaped mention of the non-Franks creates, among other things, the impression that the poet is avoiding a falling or rising order of merit. If we need any convincing that this impartiality on the part of the poet is extremely unusual, we only need to look at the history of the late 11th and 12th centuries, which were characterised by the centrifugal structures of the west, or sudden outbreaks of war between rebellious knights of the royal domains such as Hugues du Puiset and Thomas de Marle, or between the whole of Champagne and the Capetians, or the near independence of the whole of the south and the fact that the broad swathe of Romance-speaking areas to the east belonged to the *Imperium* rather than the *regnum Franciae*.

1248 The First Crusade was not the cause of a certain polarisation between north and south but it made this phenomenon more visible; however, this did not destroy the overall unity that was needed in times of danger. Raymond d'Aguilers illustrates these two features very clearly (cap. 5, RHC Occ. 3.244): *namque omnes de Burgundia* [= *regnum*, not *ducatus Burgundiae*] *et Alvernia et Gasconia et Gothi* [Septimania, here including Toulousain] *Provinciales appellantur, ceteri vero Francigenae; et hoc in exercitu inter hostes autem [!] omnes Francigenae dicebantur* (cited in part and with incorrect author details in Tavernier 1912, 149 n. 40).

C.6.2 The numerical strength of the *eschieles*

It is generally accepted that even serious medieval authors tend to inflate numbers over a thousand, and sometimes even numbers lower than that, to levels that are simply impossible, given the basic demographic and economic facts of the period. This is especially true when they write about the size of military units; one is quite often tempted to divide them by ten. Behind this excess lies not only a widespread and unbridled human tendency to exaggerate, and in the period around 1100 a lack of precise statistics (the Domesday Book is the magnificent exception that proves the rule), but also the objective circumstances: at no time did medieval armies ever consist only of knights,[1249] but the proportion of soldiers on horseback and foot soldiers varied greatly from place to place – are the foot soldiers counted too? Each knight brought at least one squire with him, who also was on horseback – are they not included in the count? What about the baggage train? It is easy to imagine that someone from this period looking at such a non-homogenous army, especially if it was an enemy, could quite easily arrive at a wildly inaccurate estimate of its numbers.

We must make similar allowances for the Roland poet: he is describing the Carolingian empire, which was regarded as a kind of ideal past; this necessarily includes an idea of healthy demographic growth and perfect compliance with military conscription.

An acknowledged expert on medieval armies, Philippe Contamine, estimates that if Charlemagne had assembled all the forces available to him, he would have had an army of several thousands of men on horseback and an even greater number of warriors on foot.[1250]

Though the numbers in the Song might appear fantastical to us, the poet's account of Charlemagne's army (of knights) with altogether a bit 'more than' 350,000 men is still considerably smaller than the Israelite army with 603,550 (adult) men in *Num* 2. Furthermore, in Charlemagne's army the proportion of troops in each group is carefully thought out: 130,000 *Franceis*, 50,000 from Lorraine and Burgundy, 'more than' 40,000 southern French, Flemings-and-Frisians respectively, and 20–30,000 of each of the four other peoples. There is obviously a certain focus on the *Franceis*, Charlemagne's own people, because they are the ones *ki les regnes cunquerent*, and they must also for narrative reasons be the main force in the battle. This is skilfully managed through the

---

1249 In Western Europe, where people lived in settlements, there were never any armies consisting solely of warriors on horseback, of the kind that the nomads in the eastern and Eurasian regions had (Ph. Contamine in the LM s. v. *Heer, Heerwesen*, A. *West- und Mitteleuropa*).
1250 Ph. Contamine in the LM s. v. *Heer, Heerwesen*, A. *West- und Mitteleuropa*.

narrative device of having them act as a frame around the whole army: they are the alpha and omega; the impetuousness of their 30,000 sons starts the battle off, and the steadfastness of their 100,000 veteran warriors brings it to an end. Of Baligant's thirty *eschieles*, we are only told that the smallest consisted of more than 50,000 men (v. 3219), meaning that the whole army contained well above 1,500,000 warriors; this figure with its vague upper limit and the absence of a more detailed breakdown signify the quasi-innumerability of the enemy. Overall, then, the proportion of Christians to non-Christians is about 1:5; it is a huge empire – but it is quite literally facing the rest of the world, as I trust I have already shown above (A.1) when all the names of the different peoples were deciphered.

C.6.3 The leaders of the *eschieles*

C.6.3.1 The first *eschiele*: young Franks led by Rabel and Guineman

Roland and Olivier were not married when they died, and so they were *jeunes* in the sense of Duby's seminal article (1964, passim); they would doubtless have been the commanders of the first *eschiele*. Charlemagne does not force his younger contingent to accept an experienced warrior from another section of his army in this situation, such as Gefreid d'Anjou or Ogier, for example, but rather he indicates that he has confidence in the youthful troops by choosing successors from out of their ranks, young men he regards as *primi inter pares*: *Rabel* and *Guineman*.[1251] These two names have not appeared in the Song before. And yet they make an interesting geographical statement.

The name *Rabel* is limited geographically to the northwest, and even there it is not common;[1252] the two most north-easterly references I am aware of refer

---

[1251] Charlemagne says: *Seiez es lius Oliver e Rollant: / L'un port l'espee e l'altre l'olifant.* Menéndez Pidal (1960, 175) observes that a perfect parallelism arises if Olivier's sword Halteclere and not Roland's Durendal is meant; this would fit with the versions in which Durendal is thrown into a body of water and therefore no longer available. But Halteclere is mentioned only four times in the Song (most recently in v. 1953), Durendal 17 times (most recently in v. 2780), not least in Roland's unforgettable death scene, where it is addressed as if it were a dear friend; a simple *l'espee* cannot very well refer back to the last mention of Olivier's sword which occurred more than a thousand lines before. If, on the other hand, Durendal is meant here, and I agree with the majority of scholars that it is, then the meaning is clear: Charlemagne cannot hope that Roland's military power will be reincarnated in a single person, but he symbolically shares Roland's mission between two individuals.

[1252] In terms of the form, it is probably an *-ellus* hyporistic form of *Ra(d)-b(ald), -b(ert)* or *-b(od)*, just like the more familiar *Robin* is an *-inus* hypocoristic form of *Ro(d)-b(ert)*; however

to *Willelmus Rabel* Cambrai-évêques 225 in the year 1083 (issued in Aalst, Imperial Flanders) and *Guluricus Rabel*, dating from 1072–1083, a Châtelain of Saint-Omer, the most south-easterly to a *Rabellus* who is difficult to identify (middle of the 12ᵗʰ c.) in the obituary of Pontlevoy (40 km east of Tours, Tavernier 1913, 83 n. 117). But the name is most prominent in Normandy, as both Tavernier (1908, 115, 1913, 81–83) and Boissonnade (1923, 414s.) have clearly documented; the only two widely known individuals by the name of Rabel are Normans from the Tancarville family, who occupied the office of chamberlain for a long time, practically in hereditary fashion, first for the dukes and then for the kings: the older Rabel used a Norman fleet to pillage the Breton coast in 1030 on behalf of Duke Robert (Guillaume de Jumièges 6.11, followed by Beneeit, *Chronique* v. 33382) and signed a charter issued by the young Edward the Confessor for the Mont-Saint-Michel (Normandie-Ducs 76 = MontSaint-Michel 89; the same person as the *Ratbellus* in Morlet s. v., there given as the only reference for the name *Rabel*); the younger man of this name, chamberlain of Henry I of England, is attested in 1120, 1128, 1130 and 1137 (Ordericus 13.13, ed. Le Prevost 5.81 with n. 3). The Domesday Exchequer contains five references for *Rabellus* (Hildebrand 1884, 355), but they refer to only to two actual persons, namely *Rabellus artifex* or *carpentarius* in Norfolk and *Rabellus* of Tregunnick in Cornwall. Tavernier and Boissonnade cite a few more Norman individuals who have this name including a monk from Le Bec. Conversely, my spot checks of several large cartularies from Maine, and especially from other regions in France turned up nothing.

The situation is very different with *Guineman*, Ger. *Winnimann(us)*.[1253] This name is likewise not very common overall, but it is most prevalent in Germany (Förstemann provides about a dozen German references); in the French-Occitan language continuum it then reduces in frequency from east (especially southeast) to west at a ratio of at least 2:1, although it does not seem to disappear altogether (Morlet 1971 s. v.). Probably the only bearer of this name who is

---

we cannot entirely exclude the possibility that it is also a hypocoristic form of *Raoul < Rad(w) ulf*, because the grandfather and a grandson of the younger Rabel were called *Radulfus*. O has *Rabe* (v. 3014) when it is first mentioned (which can be corrected using *Rabels* V4, *Rabel* CV7), and in the two later mentions (v. 3348, 3352) the correct form *Rabels* (in this case confirmed via V4P); this initial *Rabe* may be due to indecision because in the year 1060 a Raberius of Vernon is also attested (Chartres-S.Père 1.142). Because of its regionally restricted nature, *Rabel* is replaced by a full *Rapoto* 'Radbod in K', initially replaced by *Samson* in P but later copied correctly, initially copied correctly in CV7 but later interpreted as *Raimbaut* 'Raginbald', in T interpreted as *Renault* 'Raginwald, Reinold', later becoming *Reinbaut*.

1253 The *Guineman* in O is confirmed by the *Winnemannen* in K (with German acc. ending *-en*) and is thereby confirmed for the archetype; it is well known that the Baligant section is not present in n; the later β versions have forms with a parasitic *-t* from the present participle.

known across the whole of France was *Winiman(nus)*, Archbishop of Embrun in 1055/1058–1066;[1254] the second most famous person bearing this name, *Guinamand*, in 1077 and 1081/1082 in La Chaise-Dieu (Le Puy Diocese) attested as an architect and sculptor (Chevalier 1905–1907, s. v.), is also from the south of France, but only experts in the field would have heard of him. We can be sure that the name is rare in the (north)western part of France because Tavernier (who was looking for evidence of the authorship of Turold of Envermeu) was entirely focused on Normandy and the surrounding areas, and he only found one acceptable *Guiomond* and one *Guinemundus,* which is partially acceptable because the spelling with *-mundus* occasionally occurred by mistake with reference to the Archbishop of Embrun. Boissonnade (1923, 417s.) only does a little better: apart from the archbishop there is only one knight from Noyon (second half of the 11th c.); because his *Guiomand*, *Guinerand*, and *Guinemer* are of no use in this instance.

The complementarity between (north-)west and (south-)east that we find in the two names is very nicely replicated in the corresponding complementarity between the data we have on the traditional origin and role of the north-western Roland and south-western Olivier figures; these two individuals are intended to symbolise the whole French-Occitan language continuum.[1255]

1254 Cf. GC 3, instr. 179 a. 1058 *clerus et populus Ebredunensis eligimus, laudamus et corroboramus Winimannum archiepiscopum* [. . .] Also *Guini-/Guina-mannus/-mandus*, occasionally reinterpreted as *-mundus* and according to GC 1.1070 (although here the 21st and 22nd archbishops are in fact one and the same person) in charters from Oulx *Vinimannus*, and (via a misreading) *Viminianus*. Correctly understood as *Winiman* Languedoc-HgL 2.528.

1255 I do not agree with Hans-Erich Keller's idea (1989, 48s.), that *Rabel e Guineman* contains the name of Radulf of Vermandois (*Radulfus* [*comes*] *Viromandensis*), who was a royal administrator for Louis VII during the Second Crusade. His philological argument is as follows: Keller points out that *able* in Vermandois [and more extensively around that area G.A.B.] became *aule* in the vernacular [with a genuine diphthong which later went to /o/ cf. modern Fr. *tôle* < regional OF *taule* < Lat. *tabula*]; this would explain why the poet interpreted the /aul/ in Raoul as *-able* [but in the name *Raoul* < *Radulfus*, as the metre indicates, it is always /a-u/ with two syllables, and this makes a big difference for French speakers; moreover there is no *-ə*, G.A.B.]; he then calls this "la hypercorrection *Rabel*" [but how can this be hyper "correct", if the development from *-abilem* > *-able* never produces *-abél*?] And: since in the north of France, Germanic (still bilabial) *w-* went to *v-* and not *gu-*, the poet would interpret *Vermand* (< Lat. *Viromandui*) as **Guireman*, "which appears in the Oxford version – through an error of transmission – as *Guineman*". [But in all of the textual evidence we only ever find *Guineman/Guinemant*!] All of these statements suggest that Keller is not aware of the two genuinely attested names *Rabel* and *Guineman*. And if the poet hid the names of contemporary potentates in the poem in such a manner, how many people were able to figure this out at the time? We surely must resist the idea that a great poet, who presents everything as concretely and clearly as he can – *sit venia verbo* – would stoop to such a gratuitous and petty-minded fit of ingenuity.

C.6.3.2 The second *eschiele*: young Franks under Gebuïn and Lorant

Immediately after Rabel and Guineman, Charles nominates *Gebuïn* and *Lorant*, as the leaders of the second *eschiele*, and this happens in the same laisse, which gives the impression that they, too, are going to be standing in for Roland and Olivier.

The only one of the four who has appeared before in the Song is Gebuïn (v. 2432, 2970).[1256] He had been teamed up with Tedbald of Reims, Tedbald's cousin (v. 173) Count Milun (there are four or five Counts of Tonnerre, 30 km east of Auxerre, who are called *Milon* from probably the 9th c. and certainly the 10th and 11th c. as well as two Viscounts of Troyes around 1100) and a certain Otun (with *-t-* the name sounded Burgundian or German in the time around 1100), that is to say they formed a definitely eastern to south-eastern French group, and they were given the task of guarding the fallen from Roncevaux while Charlemagne pursued the surviving Saracens. Shortly after that, Gebuin had only just been given the task of escorting the three most illustrious fallen warriors to Blaye, when suddenly Baligant's emissaries appeared and challenged Charlemagne to a battle.

The poet imagines the warriors named together in situation like this as being geographically close to each other. For in reality *Gebuin* was, as Boissonnade (1923, 380) correctly noted, and as one can see also in Morlet's dictionary (s. v.), even more obviously an eastern French name than *Guineman*, with only a few outlying examples in the area around Paris-Laon. Boissonnade mentions a Lord of Sassenage near Grenoble, a Canon from Besançon, an archdeacon in Troyes, a Bishop of Laon, and two Bishops of Châlons-sur-Marne (between 947 and 1004) plus an Archbishop of Lyon (1077–1082, canonised), all three from the family of Counts of the Atuyer territory around Dijon alias Counts of Beaumont-sur-Vingeanne (35 km north east of Dijon), whose name appears passim in the chronicle of Bèze; apart from individuals from this family, we can now add a perhaps illegitimate son (attested in 926–951) of the Burgundian Duke Richard the Justiciar and another son of a count, *Gebuinus* (1027–probably after 1043), who mentions *Gebuinus proavus meus*.[1257] The Archbishop of Lyon caused something of a stir in Normandy especially. Gregory VII made him 'Primate of the

---

Does this 'explanation' not distort the beautiful and important principle of geographical complementarity that is in evidence here?

1256 The name is confirmed for the archetype in all its occurrences (v. 2432, 2970, 3022, 3469) by OV4T, in 2432 also by K and P, in 3022 by K. In other places we find random other names such as *Begun*, *Joiffrois*, *Richer / Ricart*, *Guibelin* or *Girbert*, and this confirms that the name was not well known outside the eastern regions.

1257 Cf. fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/BURGUNDY.htm#_Toc62306513 and fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgdatuy.htm; last access 21.04.2022.

Gauls' in 1097, putting him in charge of the archdioceses of Lyon, Sens, Tours and Rouen, an office that had never existed before, and Gebuin immediately dismissed the Bishop of Le Mans and the Abbot of La Couture. But William the Conqueror was not happy to have prelates in one of his areas of interest owing allegiance to someone other than himself (and nominally at least, the Pope); since Gregory did not want to see William join forces with his other enemies, he then reinstated the two who had been removed, and this brought an end to all talk of Gebuin's Primacy (Douglas 1995, 345s.); this issue became virulent gain, however, shortly after 1100. Boissonnade concluded that the name "Gebuin fait généralement défaut dans les provinces de l'ouest, du nord et du midi", and I was able to confirm this through a broad spot check of relevant cartularies.

We might therefore expect the two commanders of the second *eschiele* to be selected chiastically, and the remaining *Lorant* 'Laurentius' to be a westerner.[1258] However, Saint Laurentius was a famous Christian martyr who gave his name to one of the seven main churches in Rome, and he was celebrated first by Ambrosius and Prudentius, and then a little later across the whole of Christendom, which meant that in around 1100 his name was well-known (though not frequent) across the whole of France (Morlet 1972, s. v.). Nevertheless, the earliest evidence of his veneration is to be found in Normandy: he is the second patron of the monastery of Saint-Wandrille which was founded in the 7th c., and as early as 739 there is a monk there by the name of Laurentius (*Gesta Abbatum Fontanellensium*, written shortly after 835, cap. 7 and 12); in the same place (after the period from 850–1000 from which almost no written records from Normandy survive) we find another *Laurencius* in 1024, in 1038 one in Anjou (Morlet s. v.) – this is remarkably early for a saint's name used as a personal name in the west of France. Nègre (1990–1998, no. 27778) cites four places in the west from the time before 1100, all named Saint-Laurent (Eure, Eure-et-Loir, Maine-et-Loire, Indre-et-Loire). Tavernier (1911a, 108) contributed the important detail that in around 1100 Bishop Turold of Bayeux together with his brother donated the Saint-Laurentius Church in his hometown of Envermeu

---

1258 In v. 3020 O absent-mindedly repeats *Guinemans* and in v. 3469 he has the more generic *Lorain* 'man from Lorraine', which must be a mistake, rather than his individual name. V4 has *Lorant* 'Laurentius' first, and then later *Loterant*, which is also a superficially Frenchified Lat.-Ital. *Lot(h)aringi*; only the former can be accepted into the archetype because it is the name of an individual, and because it has the two syllables that the metre requires. In δ it is probable that the author forgot to paint in the initial letter L; consequently, the later versions have *Normant* / *Morant* CV7, *Joscerans* / *Josserant* P, *Jorant* / *vaillant* T. (Finally, in the first passage *Jorans* also appears in the German *Karlmeinet*, as many features in this text come from a secondary source and not from K).

(Seine-Maritime) to the monastery of Le Bec, where he later retired as a monk (cf. the charter now appearing as no. 1 in the copy of the Cartulary of Saint-Laurent which was made in 1770, BNF Ms.lat. 10058, Stein no. 1259). The donation was so generous that the monks of Le Bec quickly built the new Priory of Saint-Laurent, which by 1151 already had its own additional Church of Saint Laurentius (Porée 1900, 1.427–429) – this is a good example of the expanding veneration of Saint Laurentius in Normandy at this time. Whether "the" Roland poet was Turold, or another individual from the west of France, thanks to this widespread popularity of Saint Laurentius, he may well have had a particular commitment to this saint's veneration, or some kind of relationship with one of the men who bore this name. The oldest French *Vie de Saint-Laurent* (in verse, between 1140 and 1180) is in fact Anglo-Norman. In the light of all these factors, a kind of geographical complementarity is probably present in the second *eschiele*, too.

Among the four commanders of the first two *eschieles*, only Rabel will survive the Baligant battle, and the other three are mown down by Baligant himself in an early phase of the battle (v. 3463–3472). This demonstrates another of the poet's key convictions, as we saw above (C.3.2.1, C.3.2.2) in connection with the closing lines of the epic: the battle of Roncevaux was not an isolated incident, and Christians will be required by God to offer up similar sacrifices until the end of time.

C.6.3.3 The third *eschiele*: the Bavarians led by *Ogier le Daneis*

The third to the ninth *eschieles* are regionally defined. The better this kind of *eschiele* knows and trusts its commander, the better it will generally fight in battle. In *Num* 2 all of the leaders belong to the tribe they command. In a well-managed empire such as that of Charlemagne, the best leader will usually be the regional duke or count, and when an *eschiele* is drawn from a wider area, he will be one of several such individuals, a *primus inter pares*. However, in two cases we will have to show why this honour is given to a commander who is not from the local area.

We turn, then, to the Bavarians in the third *eschiele* who were so loved by Charlemagne: why are they to be led by *Oger li Daneis*?[1259] First: Ogier had been a

---

1259 On the name of the Danes in OF: the ethnicon MLat. *Danus* 'Dane' was replaced in OF before recorded history, probably because of its brevity, by the adj. *Daneis* (< Germ. *dan-isk*). Gregory of Tours (*h.F.* 3.3, MGH SS.mer. 1/1², 94 and 99) mentions a Danish attack at the mouth of the Scheldt, and so the adj. must have come into OF before the German *i*-umlaut had taken place (and that is why he is always *Oger li Daneis* v. 3033, 3544, 3546). On the other hand, the name of the country 'Denmark' was taken over much later, because at first it is mostly called *Denemarche* (as in *Oger de Denemarche* v. 749, 3856, and just *Denemarche* v. [1650]= 1489), where the umlaut is more likely to come from the Ger. than from the Eng. (Old

major figure in OF epic literature long before surviving version of the Rol.: he was called *Oggero Spatacurta* in the *Nota Emilianense*, and *Otgerius spata curta* is an epithet taken from the epic tradition which was used as a kind of nickname for a real person in a charter from Oulx[1260] dating from 1063 at the latest. This nickname must have already been in use for a few years for it to have been suitable for inclusion as the witness's permanent identifier; the epic narrative behind it must therefore have existed a few years earlier than that, which means it must have been used by around 1050. It is typical that the epithet does not appear in the Rol., but that *Courte* appears as the proper name of Ogier's famous sword in the later Rol. tradition, in KMS I and in about a dozen other Old French epics, passim in the two great Ogier epics, *Chevalerie* and *Enfances Ogier*. This alone should make it obvious that the Ogier figure does not originate in the Rol., but rather that the Roland poet could not ignore him and was obliged to incorporate him into the story.[1261] And thanks to his superior military qualities, this Ogier now deserved to take command of an *eschiele*. However, there could not be any Danish *eschiele*, and there was no Saxon *eschiele* either; nevertheless, from the perspective of the French, Ogier was still in a vague sense an 'Easterner' – so the Roland poet gave him the Bavarians.[1262]

Norse *Danmǫrk*, Dan. *Danmark*, has no umlaut because the middle -*i*- syllable was previously lost through syncope); we should probably be thinking of the last phase of the Saxon wars. But in v. 3937 it is already called *Danemarche*, a form which soon becomes the most popular one in verse romances (cf. Flutre s. v.; probably influenced by *Daneis*). The second part of the word is the correct etymological form derived from OF *marche* (from OF we still have Ital. *Danimarca* today). The hapax *cheval de Danemart* (*Prise de Pampelune* 7, around the year 1330) appears to be an early trace of modern Fr. (*le*) *Danemark,* and thus marks the start of an epoch in which more exact or authentic forms were in demand.

1260 Francophone, but today just inside Italy, and (since the building of the road tunnel from Fréjus/Fregiusa) on the E 70 Lyon-Chambéry-Turin route.

1261 On the charter from Oulx cf. Beckmann (2004d, passim). Here I traced the figure of Ogier in detail from the historical Audegarius of the 8th c. to the Ogier of the *Chevalerie* through all the stages of his development and all historical sources, and I believe I have explained both the continuity of the tradition through oral sources, and at the same time Ogier's complexity, his epithet 'from Denmark', his sword's name *Courte*, and his father's name *Gaufroi*.

1262 There is another influence that comes to mind with the naming of Ogier as the leader of the Bavarians. In about 1100–1125, two forgeries claiming to be in the name of Charlemagne and Pope Hadrian (MGH DD.kar. 1, no. 222s.), saying that in the year 774 Charlemagne had, on the occasion of his visit to Rome at Easter time (that is to say shortly after his victory over the Lombards) and with Pope Hadrian's agreement, appointed the thus-far non-clerical nobleman Audogarius as the first Abbot of Kempten (at that time in Swabia, but not far from the border with Bavaria); it is clear that this is supposed to be the famous Audegarius-Ogier, whom Charlemagne had just sent to an (unknown) monastery at that time. In about 1170, Metellus of

It is doubtful whether the Roland poet already considers Naimes to be Duke of Bavaria (cf. below C.12.4). But however that may be, Charlemagne may have wanted to have him, his only personal friend and confidant, close by him during the battle, as he did earlier (v. 250): *Vos n'irez pas uan de mei si luign*; and indeed Charlemagne is close enough to him in the battle to save his life (v. 3444–3450).

C.6.3.4 The fourth *eschiele*: the Alemanni led by *Herman, le duc de Trace*

The commander of the *Alemans* is *Hermans, li dux de Trace*. In France, *Herman* (later > *Armand*) is very widespread in the 11th/12th c. in the northeast, radiating as far as Lorraine; the medieval Latin author Herman of Tournai († 1147), the French biblical poet Herman of Valenciennes (late 12th c.) and (in the 10th/11th c.) various Counts of Hainaut, Namur, Toul and Verdun are examples of individuals who bear this name. The name is also present in western Germany; *Hermann* occurs among the nobility in two main areas. First, between Ardennes and the Middle Rhine: especially the Counts Palatine Hermann I to III of Lorraine 945–1085 with large estates in Lower Lorraine, originally around Aachen, then *bei Rhein* "of the Rhine" (~ Ezzonids), and finally Count Palatine Hermann of Stahleck 1142–1156; also the Counts of Salm, Hermann I 1056–1088 (1081–1088 the German counter-king!) and Hermann II 1088–1135 (with large estates including some in Alsace), as well as the Counts of Virneburg in the Eifel, Hermann I around 1100 (perhaps the same person as the unidentified Count Hermann whose homeland is not known and who made an outstanding contribution to the First Crusade in Nicaea and Antioch, according to William of Tyre 1.29, 3.6, 6.22)[1263] and Hermann II around 1150. In the light of our discussion above in relation to Aachen, Xanten and Mainz, however, (C.4.8) it is very doubtful that the poet would

---

Tegernsee is convinced that this Otker (this is the same name as Audegarius-Ogier), who founded the monastery of Tergernsee (130 km east of Kempten, at that time in western Bavaria) with his brother Adalbert in about 760 is the same person as the epic Ogier, who according to Metellus, is still celebrated in song in 'Burgundy'. I do not think that Metellus is correct (although the Bavarian could have been a younger, distant relative of the Frankish person); but this is not important: if the belief in an Ogier with Bavarian connections had travelled westwards so that it reached the world of the Roland poet, this would be enough to persuade him that the 'Dane' was a suitable candidate for the role of leading the Bavarians.

1263 Boissonnade (1923, 387s.) thinks he is the original prototype for our *Herman*. Alternatively, de Mandach (1993, 233s.) opts for the Saxon Hermann Billung, Margrave on the (Lower) Saxon border with the Slavs († 973), whom the poet would have known through his reading of Adam of Bremen. But the poet calls the Saxons *Saisnes* and excludes them from the whole of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign, including the Baligant battle, focusing instead on their future rebellion. We should not be fixated on one particular Hermann, but instead, we should simply be aware of the widespread usage of the name.

have named these noblemen from the tribal Frankish area on the left bank of the Rhine as *Alemans* and not as belonging to *France*. The second, and much more important main area where the name Hermann occurs is the Alemannic tribal area itself, with the Counts of Swabia and Alsace Hermann I to IV (from the years 926–1038) and their descendants, the Margraves of Baden Hermann I († 1074 as a monk in Cluny), II (1089–1130), III (1130–1153) and so on until VII († 1291); a typical example of the regional nobility is the Swabian author and son of a count Hermannus Contractus on the island of Reichenau († 1054). The simplest and sufficient assumption, therefore, is that the poet knew that the name *Herman* was from the east and probably had German or even specifically Alemannic language origins.[1264]

The personal name *Herman* fits very well with the *Alemans*, but Herman's home fiefdom is problematic: he is *de Trace* O, *uon Sutria* K, *de Traspe* V4. OV4 confirm *de tra(c/s)e* for the archetype. However, in the middle of *Trace* 'Thrace' lies Constantinople; Charlemagne has accepted the oath of allegiance from its emperor (v. 2329), but precisely because of this fact, he can hardly appoint one of his own dukes to rule there.[1265] Konrad's *Sutria* is *Sutri* located 50 km north of Rome, which had been part of the Papal States since the 8th c. and had become famous through the Synod of 1046 (removal of Gregory VI by Henry III with the help of Cluny), and then again attracted widespread interest thanks to the meetings there between Emperor and Pope in 1111 and 1155; but this reading does not belong in the archetype. In V4 the *-s-* is already silent, and the northern Italian editor was probably thinking of Tràpani on the island of Sicily;[1266] it is true that the poet believed Charlemagne ruled over Sicily (cf. *Palerne* v. 2923), but a Duke of Sicily would hardly have his residence in Tràpani. Furthermore: if there were, contrary to all our expectations, a Duke of Thrace, Sutri or Tràpani, in Charlemagne's empire, there is no obvious reason why this person

---

1264 *Herman* is confirmed for the archetype by OKV4. The name is not present in CV7; P and T have misread it as *Hernaus/Ernault* 'Arnold'.

1265 Arguing in support of Thrace, Tavernier (1914, 58 with n. 32) points out that according to Ordericus (4.212 ed. Le Prévost) when Bohemund was on his anti-Alexian recruitment campaign through France, he took 'Greeks' and 'Thracians' with him, who accused the Emperor Alexios of being a usurper and traitor to their families. But this complaint is implicitly founded on the very fact that the Thracians are citizens of the Byzantine Empire.

1266 For in the C version (perhaps late 13th c.) of the *Couronnement de Louis*, laisse 14, we are told that the Saracens attacked Italy and conquered *Trapes*, so that the Pope had to call upon the Emperor for help; according to Flutre (s. v.) *Trapes* 'Trapani' also appears in the *Robert le Diable* and in the *Sone de Nausay*; Matthew Paris, *Historia minor* 3.283, reports in relation to the year 1241, that Richard of Cornwallis stopped off *apud Trapes in Sicilia* on his way back from the Holy Land.

should be the leader of the Alemanni. Jenkins' suggestion that we should put *Sŭabĭe* or *Elsace* into the text runs counter to the stemma because it is precisely the *(-)tr-* portion that is common to all the source texts.

In view of this complicated situation, we shall advance a rather daring hypothesis. If we recall that the *d'Esclavers* of the archetype was already distorted to *de Clavers* in O (v. 3245), this raises the possibility that the *s-* from *Sutria* might belong in the archetype too, so that we would have **d'Estrace* or **d'Estrase*. The post-classical name *urbs quam Strateburgum vocant* of the late Roman episcopal town of *Argentoratum* appears for the first time in Gregory of Tours *h.F.* 9.36 and 10.19, the form *Strazburg* with the German sound shift in a Wissembourg charter from the year 774, and from that time onwards passim, it was written as *Straceburg(ensis)* in Helmold (MGH SS.schol. 32.56), *Stracesborch* in the *Ann. Stadenses* (MGH SS.16.340), *Strazeburc* occasionally in the works of Romance-speaking scribes of the 12th and 13th c. (6 references MGH AA. 9.593, cf. also 512), *Straceborgo* once in the 15th c. (MGH AA. 9.593); an initial vowel is possibly present in the hapax *de Estrabort* [sic] in the *Garin le Loherain* (I 292 ed. P. Paris), although the later edition by Iker-Gittleman (v. 5371) puts *de Straaborc* into the text. If the poet understood *borc* with its OF meaning 'relatively small place' (as opposed to *vile* or even *cité*), he may have suppressed it because he thought the meaning was inappropriate.[1267] As a fortified episcopal seat, Strasbourg was even then the most important town in Alsace, and Alsace is populated mainly by people of Alemannic stock, and not Frankish. Even if the poet knew that the Prince-Bishop was simultaneously the worldly lord of the town, this would not have worried him, and indeed several other Old French epic authors did not hesitate to move secular magnates into the archiepiscopal sees of Reims and Mainz.

C.6.3.5 The fifth *eschiele*: the Normans led by *Richard le veil*

The fifth, Norman *eschiele* fights under the command of *Richard le veil*, as we noted above,[1268] which is to say – and how could it ever have been otherwise – under their own Duke.

1267 A tendency to separate the two parts of the name also occurs occasionally in the manuscript tradition of Gregory's *h.F.*: *Strata burgum* Ms. D 1 (Clermont-Ferrand 12th c.), *Stratem-burgum* Ms. D 3 (Saint-Mihiel 11th c.), cf. MGH SS.mer. 1/1². 457 and 513, author's apparatus.
1268 Cf. section C.5.1 above on the apparent anachronism.

C.6.3.6 **The sixth *eschiele*: the Bretons under eastern French leadership**

The contrast with the Bretons is all the more striking in the sixth *eschiele*. Their lord is called *Oedun*. Boissonnade (1923, 408) correctly identified the man who provided the name: he can only have been Eudes, 1034–1079 Count of Penthiè-vre/Porhoët on the north coast of Brittany.[1269] When his brother Duke Alan III (1008–1040) died, Eudes made himself guardian of Alan's son Conan II and ruled alone from 1040 until about 1055, and then until 1062 he ruled nominally alongside Conan but *de facto* he was Lord of Brittany; with this authority he entered a coalition, for example, in 1054–1055 against William, later to be the Conqueror, but suffered a bloody defeat.

In the Song, Oedun relinquishes his command for the duration of the battle and gives it to three non-Bretons. This motif of Bretons fighting under non-Breton command also reflects historical experience: it is true that Breton armies had achieved almost no victories after 900, but brave Breton noblemen were very welcome in the service of others. We see them especially acting in support of William when he conquered England, including no less than four sons of the above-mentioned Eudes of Penthièvre, who had evidently switched sides, even though William had still been at war with their cousin Conan, the Duke of Brittany in 1064. All of these Bretons were handsomely rewarded by William; however, his sympathy towards them cooled very quickly when many of those who had accepted these rewards became the core of the resistance of 1075 on both sides of the Channel.[1270]

1269 We must clearly reject outright Tavernier's (1913, 83s.) choice of Eudo, who served as steward of William the Conqueror and William the Red, who was not of noble rank, and who was not even a Breton. – *Oedon* is the obliquus form of *Oedes* < Germ. *Ŏdo* (with the diphthong carried over from the rectus form). Eudes de Penthièvre was actually called *Eudo* (as for example in the charters of Alan, Bretagne-Ducs 11 and 13, dating from 1015–32; also, William of Poitiers 1.33, ed. Foreville 78, on the occasion of his anti-Norman adventure calls him *Eudo Britannorum comes*). This is originally a different name, e.g. of the Duke or King Eudo of Aquitaine who lives on in the *Renaut de Montauban* around 720, the obl. *Eudōne* undergoing strictly regular phonological development via **Ieδon>Yon* (as in the *Renaut*). But the Medieval Latin written form *Eudo* was by about 1100 at the latest (with the diphthong taken from the spoken language) regarded as the equivalent of *Odo*. (For example, in the charters from Angers-S.Aubin 1.127, 136, 237, 2.266, all between the years 1098 and 1119, the same person is sometimes called *Eudo Blanchardus*, and at other times *Odo Blanchardus*.) Boissonnade's unexplained equation of the two names is therefore correct. Even for modern French historians *Eudes* is the usual Frenchified form of *Odo* ("le roi Eudes").

1270 On William's war against the Duke of the Bretons, on Eudes' sons and on the rebellion centred around the participation of the Bretons on both sides of the Channel cf. Douglas (1995, 182s., 272s., 235–239).

Probably because of this very ambivalent relationship between the two peoples, the poet does not force the Bretons to accept a Norman commander, but instead has them led by Count Nevelun, Tedbald of Reims and Margrave Otun. The order in which they are named reflects the assonance requirements; it turns out that Nevelun and Otun are associates of Tedbald.

Anyone who mentioned the name Tedbald[1271] in France from around the year 940 onwards would have been thinking of just one very famous family: the Tetbaldines, i.e. the relatives of Thibault *le Tricheur*, as he was later called, who died between 975 and 977. He was Count of Blois, Tours, Chartres and Château-dun (cf. the LM s. v. *Tetbald Tricator*) and married off his sister to the Duke of Brittany Alain Barbetorte, so that he could be the guardian of their son when Alan died in around 952. He then arranged for Alain's widow to marry Fulk the Good of Anjou and gave him Nantes and Vannes, while he himself took over the main central part and the north of Brittany, which he retained when Drogo died young, and this fiefdom remained in his family until just before 1000 (cf. Lesueur 1963, 169–177). I suspect that a vague recollection of this sovereignty prompted the poet to choose Tedbald as the temporary commander of the Bretons.

The *Tricheur* gained most from a third marriage, his own: it brought him a claim on Champagne which came partly to his son and partly to his grandson and was gradually expanded,[1272] soon becoming the largest of the family's possessions. There is little to report about Thibaud II († 1004) (cf. Lex 1892, passim); his nephew Thibaud III, 1037–1089 Count of Blois, left Champagne to his brother at first, but then in 1045 took over the guardianship of his nephew and when the latter went to England in 1066, he finally took over Champagne as well. In 1102, his grandson Thibaud IV the Great († 1152) received the western part of the eastern estates, including first Meaux, Provins and Sancerre[1273] and in 1125, when his uncle entered the Order of the Templars, the rest of Champagne, i.e. the county of Troyes and the very useful fiefdom over the counties of Bar-sur-Seine, Braine, Brienne, Dampierre-en-Astenois, Grandpré, Porcien, Rethel and Roucy (cf. Lot/Fawtier 1957, 125). Since Reims was the capital of

---

1271 *Tedbald* < **Tiedbald* < Old Low Franconian *þeudbald*. Pretonic *-eu-* regularly goes to *-ie-* (as in OF *tiedeis* < *þeudisk*, *Tierri* < *þeudrīk*, cf. also OF *tiefaigne* < late Lat. *theophania*), which, because a diphthong was not usual in the pre-stressed syllable, often was simplified to *-e-* or *-i-* in the dialects. We can put this in the archetype because of v. 173 and 2070 in OK, v. 2433 in OKV4PTh(V), and v. 3058 in OV4PT.

1272 Cf. e.g. Champagne-d'Arbois 2.29–41 just in the years from 1040–1090.

1273 And also various other small estates (cf. Champagne-d'Arbois 2.277–282).

Champagne, the poet has consolidated the family's estates into the epithet *de Reins*, even though their main residence was in Troyes.[1274]

In the Song, Tedbald de Reins, again with Margrave Otun and two other associates, had undertaken a previous task before his temporary command of the Bretons, namely guarding the bodies of the warriors who had fallen at Roncevaux (v. 2432ss.),[1275] while Charlemagne chased after the surviving enemies, and then Tedbald escorted the revered corpses as they travelled back on their cart to Blaye (v. 2970ss.). These are the only two non-combatant tasks in the Song, and Charlemagne did not assign them to a servant such as Besgun or Basbrun because of the inherent honour that they implied. In medieval reality, a king would have entrusted them to a person of high official rank, and in fact because it was not a very specific task, it would go to the most general position, *maior domus*, *comes palatinus* or *palatii*, *dapife*r.[1276] In Capetian France, this office was more or less handed down through inheritance within the Tetbaldine family: they are expressly attested as such before 1048, again after 1077 (LM s. v. Theobald III) and after a gap from 1099–1127 again during the lifetime of Suger, who e.g. in his *Gesta Ludovici Regis cognomento Grossi* (cap. 10, p. 35 ed. Molinier, and frequently thereafter) mentions the *comes palatinus Theobaldus*,[1277] and then consistently until the death of Theobald V (1191), after which Philip Augustus left the post unfilled (Lot/Fawtier 1957–1958, 2. 52). As was customary among the great court offices in Europe, they carried out this role personally at most on

---

1274 In v. 173 and 2433, *de Reins* is confirmed for the archetype by OKV4, in v. 2970 also by T. – In Reims itself, however, the rights of the Count remained with the archbishop (Lot/ Fawtier 1957–1962, 1.125). But Reims was a small island surrounded by the huge Tetbaldine area, and the poet possibly knew that in the time of Charlemagne, the bishops were not yet territorial lords.

1275 It is interesting for stylistic reasons in v. 2435, that Charlemagne impresses upon them the need to make sure that no *esquïer ne garçun* should tamper with the bodies of the fallen. This incident reminds us that armies contained not only large number of servants (who appear briefly also in v. 1817ss.), but (at least in the time when the poet lived) also (noble-born) squires (who wanted to become knights one day), whose existence remained hidden, reflecting the exclusivity that Karl-Heinz Bender correctly notes is a feature of the Rol. and most older *chansons de geste*.

1276 Lot/Fawtier (1957–1962, 2.52): «Le plus important de ces grands officiers était, à l'origine, le sénéchal (*dapifer*). Il est extrêmement difficile de savoir très exactement quelles étaient ses fonctions, étant donné leur multiplicité. Mais on a quelques chances de ne pas trop s'éloigner de la vérité en disant qu'il est l'ancien maire du palais de l'époque mérovingienne (*major domus*), le grand maître de la maison du roi. Comme tel, il est à la tête de tous les domestiques de la cour [. . .]».

1277 More references for this title of Count of Blois and Champagne from Suger, Ordericus and the charters of Theobald II (IV.) in Champagne-d'Arbois 2.410–412.

great court assembly days, even then simply supervising others; the rest of the time, they were just nominal holders of this position. This explains why in the Song Tedbald is entrusted with the tasks of a *major domus*.[1278]

We turn now briefly to his associates; in the mind of the poet, they should come from the Champagne region, or the area around it. First, *le cunte Nevelun*:[1279] there were only three counts by the name of *Nibelungus*, *Nivelongus* (and occasionally in the 9th c. even for the same person *Nivelo*, *-nis*) in the history of France, all in the 8th and 9th c., probably all part of the same family, the earliest probably, the later two certainly office bearers in northern Burgundy. The earliest, a cousin of King Pippin (on his father's side, a half-brother of Charles Martel) and mentor of the Fredegar continuation dating from 751–768 (cf. MGH SS.mer. 2.182), was presumably Count of Autun; the middle one, attested in 805 and 818, processed in his official capacity around estates in the Autunois region (and had his own estate in the 'Hespaye', which was the homeland of the Pippinids); the last one received lands in the Auxerrois region (and in the Gâtinais) as a gift from Charles the Bald in 843, worked as his *missus* in the Auxerrois region (that is to say only 75 km from Troyes, the central city in Champagne), in the Avallonnais and Niveranais regions, was then a duke in the Vexin region in 864, was present at the session of the Royal Court in 868 and is remembered by the historians as the executor (and probably brother) of Count Eccard, who had owned several counties in Burgundy († 876/877; there he is *Nivelongus*, but in the accusative this becomes *Nivelonem*); cf. on this family Chaume (1925–1937, 1.540s.) and Levillain (1937, passim). Thanks to this association with Burgundy the name *Nibelungus* in the 8th or 9th c. is in some way connected with the prehistory of the Nibelungen material, but this is not relevant to the later history of the name and the people who bore it in France.[1280]

1278 Tavernier (1913, 74s.) is simply wrong when he sees in *Tedbald de Reins* the young Louis VI. as co-regent in the year 1106 because Ordericus (3.189 ed. le Prévost) is the only person to claim that Louis was known as *Ludovicus Theobaldus* in his youth. Ordericus is not always reliable in his account of the Capetians, but if he were correct in this instance, it would only mean that Theobald III (I) as one of the most important vassals of the crown – the only one whose territories were practically flanked by the Capetian – would have been his godfather.

1279 *Nevelun* O is confirmed by *Nevelon* K, *Novellun* V4 (contamination with *novel*), *Nevelons* P; *Genelons* in T is a thoughtless error.

1280 In the 10th–12th c. the name is never completely unknown anywhere in France (over 20 references in Morlet s. v.), but there is no count by this name. Viscounts by the name of *Nevelongus* are attested in the years 962, 1016 and 1033 in Provence, with a residence probably in Cavaillon (cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/provaixmar.htm#_Toc28604183 (last acccess 21.02.2022). cf. also de Manteyer 1908, 348 n. 1); there could also be a link with a *Nevolongus* family near Aix, in 1016–1079 in the cartulary of Marseille-S.Victor. There were some ordinary

In the other three mentions of Tedbald (v. 173, 2433, 2970) it is not *Nevelun* who stands next to him, but a Count *Milun*, Tedbald's cousin.[1281] After 850, we find the following people with the rank of count in France: in the late 9th c. two counts by the name of Milo of Langres (according to Chaume 1925–1937, 1.540); five counts called Milo were active from the late 9th c. until around 1050 in Tonnerre, 50 km south of Troyes;[1282] the name passed through marriage to two counts of Bar-sur-Seine (1st half of the 12th c.).[1283] Here is an early example of the diffusion of the name from the rank of count to the lower status class of *châtelains*: in 1042 Milo was also the name of the lord of the castle Montfélix above Épernay (Bur, Index). Soon, the name proliferated widely in Champagne, so that in Longnon's list of fiefdoms in Champagne for the years 1171–1361 the index contains over 200 instances of Milo (as compared with 150 of Theobald and only 7 of Olivier and 3 of Roland!). But there is another family of Tetbaldines which is particularly close, which indeed mostly lived in Troyes, and which Tavernier (1913, 76s.) correctly noted: Milon Lord of Bray and Montlhéry, counted variously as I or II († after 1102), became Viscount of Troyes and is attested as such in around 1100; his son of the same name († 1118), who even married a niece of Theobald IV in 1111/1112 also took this title and role.

In the case of the *marchis Otun* – or in the nominative *Otes* (v. 2971) – the fact that he is not the same person as *O(e)dun* 'Odo' shows that the poet regards the *-t-* as distinctive. Otun was also mentioned before in v. 2432 and 2971 alongside Tedbald of Reims when the latter was given the task of guarding the fallen

---

lords of castles: from Fréteval in the Vendômois region from about 1050–1150 Nivelon I–IV 1047–1161 cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/cfrachacha.htm#NivelonIVFretevaldied1146 last access 25.02.2022); from Pierrefonds west of Soissons likewise Nivelon I–IV from 1047–1161 (cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/parclerdam.htm#_Toc40251003 last access 25.02.2022). We might quote as a curiosity a charter of Theobald IV of Champagne and Blois dating from 1138 (Tardif 1866, 242) which mentions: *Nevelo camerarius meus*. But even d'Arbois de Jubainville in his six-volume *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne* (Champagne-d'Arbois 2.414) only knows of this charter's reference to him and evidently has no information about his family connections.

1281 *Milun* is confirmed for the archetype in v. 173 by K, in v. 2433 by (n)T, in v. 2971 by OKV4T.

1282 Cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgdtonne.htm#_Toc503339979, last access 25.02.2022. And 20 km south of Tonnerre, between about 1075 and 1150, three to five lords named Milo of Noyers, but this place already belonged to the county of Burgundy. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgdtonne.htm#_Toc503339990 last access 25.02.2022.

1283 LM s. v. Tonnerre; cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/chambarsein.htm, last access 25.02.2022.

warriors.[1284] Now in France around 1100, *Odo* was a common name, but the related form *Ot(t)o*, which to French ears sounded eastern if not even German, was much rarer. There are only four onomastically certain and sufficiently significant individuals by the name of Otto(n).[1285] Duke Otto of Burgundy († 965) who died young, brother of King Hugh Capet took the name of his uncle on his mother's side, the young Otto, later to be Otto "the Great"; the Duke is called *Otto Burgundiae marchio* (!) in the Cathedral of Auxerre's *necrologium*.[1286] The three others would also merit the title of *marchis* (which still had connotations of *marche* 'border') because they were active on the eastern border of France.[1287] Duke Otto of Lower Lorraine, the last of the Carolingians (991 until 1012 at the latest), vassal of the Ottonians, owes his name also to Otto the Great, his great-uncle. Duke Otto/Otho of Verdun († 944) was an enemy of the West Frankish Charles the Simple, and he surrendered to the West Frankish Raoul, the German

---

1284 The form *Otun* or in the rectus case *Otes* (not *Atun/Ates* etc.) is confirmed in all three passages (v. 2432, 2971 and 3058) by OKV4T; he is confused with the other *Otun/Otes* alias *(H)atun/ (H)ates*, the peer who had fallen in Roncevaux in n in v. 2432, and in P in v. 3058. Stengel and Segre also identify the two of them incorrectly in their indexes; they are correctly listed e.g. in Hilka/Pfister.

1285 Spelling seems to vary among Vermandois authors: *Odo* († shortly after 946, named after his relative on his mother's side, the Capetian King Odo), son of Heribert II; but *Otto* († sometime after 958, named after his relative on his mother's side, Otto the Great), son of Albert I, and *Otto* († 1045), son of Herbert IV; and finally, after the end of the Ottonian period, again *Odo* "l'insensé" († 1085) who was disinherited by his father Herbert VI. None of these were important people, and none of them could be called *marchis*. The rather unimportant Counts of Chiny *Otto* I († around 987) and II († after 1131) are already within the Francophone part of the Empire.

1286 Cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/BURGUNDY.htm; last access 25.02.2022. He is also called *Otto*, *Ot(t)ho*, and not *Odo*, in Flodoard *Ann.* relating to the years 961 and 965 (ed. Lauer 149s., 156) and in the *Historia Francorum Senonensis* (MGH SS. 3.366). But the later Dukes of Burgundy Odo (Eudes) I–IV between 1078 and 1349 are in fact called *Odo*, and not *Otto*, even though they were actually part of the same family; by this time they have given the name its genuinely French form. Boissonnade (1923, 383) thinks that he can see "Eudes Ier (1078–1103), duc de Bourgogne" (in the charters always: *Odo/Oddo, dux Burgundie*, cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/BURGUNDY.htm#, last access 25.02.2022) in *Otun le Marchis*, but neither the name nor the title match. – Even among the Ottonians, the first person to bear this name († 912), later called Otto the Illustrious, appears in the original charter of Emperor Arnulf dated 10.06.888 as *Oddoni* (dat.). But in the falsely amended charter of Arnulf dated 28.01.897 and in all the Ottonian charters, the form *Otto* prevails (with occasional variations in the spelling, Kienast 1990, 273s. n. 907s., and the indexes in the MGH volumes of charters).

1287 The same could be said of a Count of Maurienne (1051–1060), whose daughter Berta later married Emperor Henry IV. However, the LM s. v. *Otto / Odo* (26) cites both forms of the names for him; furthermore, the territory he governs is located far away from Champagne.

Henry I., again to Raoul, then to Louis IV d'Outremer, and finally as Duke of Upper Lorraine, to Otto the Great (Flodoard *Ann.* relating to the years 922, 923, 925, 939, 944, ed. Lauer 7, 18, 29, 72, 91). But there is one more who deserves a special mention because he is one of the most famous men of his time, thanks to the tumultuous life that he lived: *Otto*,[1288] alias *Otto cognomento Wilhelmus*,[1289] the 'Otte-Guillaume' († 1026) of French historical research, son of King Adalbert, was driven out of Italy, through his marriage became Count of Mâcon (in the *regnum Franciae*) and of the later Free County of Burgundy (in the Kingdom of Burgundy), by adoption unsuccessful candidate for the Dukedom of Burgundy and therefore until he was ruled out of that position (1004/1005) enemy of King Robert II, and then because of his Italian and Burgundian claims, enemy of Emperor Henry II and his weak ally King Rudolf III of Burgundy. Thereafter he had to relinquish his claim on Italy in 1019 but in the Kingdom of Burgundy he was for a time *miles [. . .] regis in nomine, dominus in re* (Thietmar of Merseburg 7.30), and finally claimed both Mâcon and the Free County, thereby becoming the patriarch of both noble families whose efforts made the Free County famous throughout the whole of Europe in the late 11th and early 12th c.[1290] He was remembered in Normandy because of the fact that while Otto was still alive, his father-in-law Richard II sent a Norman army to Burgundy to help Otto's son, which was led by his own son Richard, later the III; this Burgundian-Norman alliance forged between Otto and Richard is the reason why men such as William of Volpiano-Dijon († 1031), Lanfranc († 1089) and even Anselm of Canterbury († 1109), all born in northern Italy, were so influential in the Norman and then the English Church. The memory of him (and perhaps also his cousins of the same name) gave the poet the idea of an *Otun le marchis* in the area to the south of Champagne, which bordered on the Imperium.[1291]

1288 As in the diploma of King Rudolf of Burgundy dating from 1026 (MGH DD.burg. no. 118).
1289 As in the diploma of King Rudolf of Burgundy dating from 1029 (MGH DD.burg. no. 121).
1290 Whereas in Mâcon his grandson of the same name, Count Otto II. († between 1040 and 1050), remained an insignificant figure.
1291 When characters by the name of *Oton* in other Old French epics are more than just minor characters, they take their name from the – usually negatively viewed – Ottonians: as did the King of Rome in the *Charroi de Nîmes*, who rebelled against Louis, then the King of *Espolice* 'Spoleto' in the later epics of the *Aimeri* and especially the *Renaut* cycle, the traitor *Othon l'Alemant* in the *Aye*, the weak German-Roman ruler in *Yde et Olive* and the Emperor in the *Beatrix*. – Konrad der Pfaffe evidently also sensed that the name Otto sounded German. Therefore, in his text we find the people from Lorraine and Burgundy followed by *Otto der marcgrave* with the *chunen Rinfrancken* (v. 7849–7851). De Mandach (1993, 232, 284s.) pointed out that Konrad was thinking of Otto I and his son Otto II of Rheineck († both between 1148 and 1150), who were pretenders for the Palatinate of the Rhine and perhaps even took this

C.6.3.7 The seventh *eschiele*: the Southern French led by *Jozeran de Provence* and *Godselme*

The seventh, southern French *eschiele* is led by *Jozeran de Provence*[1292] and *Godselme*.[1293] The name *Joceran* (or in the south *Gauceran*, < Germ. *Gaut-s-hramn*) is known in the whole of France, but as we see in Morlet (s. v.), the lion's share of the references from the beginning of the manuscript tradition is to be found in the south-east.[1294] Noblemen who held the rank of lord of a castle or higher are only to be found there, and indeed roughly speaking, in Dijon and places located further south of there: Joceran of Semur-en-Auxois († 992) and an additional son of this family (before 1070), Joceran I–III of Digoine (Upper Loire, before 1048 – after 1150), Joceran I–IV of Brancion (northeast of Mâcon, early 11th c. until 1175) along with two more sons from this family, Joceran de Bâgé (Bresse, around 1130), Joceran Count of Die (before 1149), two Joceran Counts of Antibes (before 1028) and, evidently related to them, three lords of castles in Grasse (between 1050 and 1150, 25 km northwest of Antibes), three instances of a Joceran of Pinós (north-western Catalonia 12th c.);[1295] also, probably from the regional nobility and all between 1050 and 1150, an Archbishop of

---

title, even though they still resided in the area around Koblenz and (*contra* de Mandach) not in Heidelberg (LM s. v. *Pfalzgrafschaft bei Rhein*) and although the younger Otto came to a different and less edifying end than de Mandach suggests.

1292 Apart from small deviations, the name *Jozeran* is confirmed for the archetype: in 3007 and 3113 by OV4PT, in 3044 O(V4)CV7PT, in 3067 OKP, in 3075 OCV7, in 3535 OV4KV7CT. In 3023 there is no support for O; a decision has to be made based on the other passages. The later versions exceptionally replace *Jozeran* with *Loterant* '(Ital.) Lotaringo' (V4), *Josce* 'Jodocus' (V7), *Josué* 'Joshua' (C), *Anjorran* 'Eng(u)errand, Ingel(h)ram(n)' and *Ammauri* 'Amalrich' (P); they do not seem to recognise the name. – *Provence* appears only in 3007 and is confirmed there by OV4P.

1293 The name itself is confirmed by O(V7)P, although V7P have *J*-.

1294 One might compare the single references e.g. in the cartularies of Jumièges, Château-du-Loir, Vendôme, Paris, Fleury, Troyes, Langres or the five references in Remiremont on the one hand with the approximately 70 references in Mâcon, 60 in Savigny and Ainay, and 25 in Lerins (according to the indexes of the cartularies) . . . .

1295 The easiest way to check this is to look at the relevant sections of *MedLands*: Digoine: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgdautun.htm#_Toc58324428; Semur: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgdautun.htm#_Toc58324430; Brancion: https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/BURGUNDIAN%20NOBILITY.htm#_Toc478368930; Bâgé: https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgkbresse.htm; Die: https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/provvaldi.htm#_Toc28766326; Antibes:: https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/provnice.htm; Grasse: https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/provnice.htm#_Toc31542619; last access 25.02.2022.

Lyon, a Bishop of Langres, Mâcon and Belley respectively, and one or two Bishops of Viviers.[1296]

Even more certainly than *Joceran, Godselme* (< Germ. *Gauz-helm*) is a southern French name in around 1100; there are only a very few references to it north of the Loire. But the seventh *eschiele* has to include all of the southern French people, and explicitly the people from the Poitou and Auvergne regions. So, if *Joceran* is the south-eastern name of a Provencal person – is *Godselme* then a mainly southwestern name? In around 1100, it was indeed, as Boissonnade (1923, 365s.) correctly reported. In the 9th c. and shortly after 900 there was a family of Counts of Gauzhelm-Helmgauz who were active in the area from Meaux to Langres (Werner 1960, 94 with n. 28, 1966, 104, no. 64), but it does not seem to have left any traces in onomastics. But from 950 at the latest we find in Morlet (s. v.) most references to this name in the south, and within that, an emphasis on the southwest (from the Loire southwards, including Languedoc and Marca Hispanica). The name is never exactly rare in the southeast – Boissonnade points to a Bishop of Fréjus (1010–1044) and an Abbot of St. Victor in Marseille (1129) – but most of the occurrences are in the southwest. *Gaucelmus* († 834), one of the sons of the great William of Toulouse, was Count of Roussillon in 812 and as such probably active until his death either there or in the Marca, like his brother Bernard of Septimania. Among the higher nobility in France, I have only found the name in the southwest, and even there only sporadically:

1296 André de Mandach (1993, 192–198, 206–219) thought he could see one of the two historical individuals named Josselin de Courtenay in *Joceran de Provence*. But Courtenay and the family's second early estate, Montargis, are both about 100 km south-southeast of Paris, in an area north of the Loire, and the Courtenays have never had any connections with an area south of the Loire. Josselin I went to the Holy Land when he was a young man in 1101/1102, where he was in the slipstream of his cousin and benefactor Baldwin du Bourg and became first Lord of Turbessel/Tell Bāshir/Tilbeşar, and then in 1119 Count of Edessa before he died in battle in 1131; his son Josselin II lost Edessa to the Muslims in 1144 and died in 1159 having been blinded and taken prisoner by the Muslims. There is no reason why either of the two should be specially selected to lead the southern French contingent (who also played no role in the Josselins' estates in the Holy Land). Here, too, I cannot agree with a method which I regard as facile, namely, to take a well-known bearer of the name as the model for a person in the Song when there is no specific overlap between this person and his role in the Song. – And on the relationship between the name *Josselin* (< Germ. *Gauz-lin*) and *Josseran(d)* (< germ. *Gauz-hramn*): *Josselin* is originally a hypocoristic form of the various *Gauz-* names. In France, however, it became a name in its own right, during the 9th c. at the latest, mainly because of the famous Bishop Gauzlin of Saint-Denis, Charles the Bald's, who later assisted King Odo and died during the defence of Paris against the Normans in 886 (LM s. v., K. F. Werner 1979, passim). Unless someone is found with both names, I cannot acknowledge, at least in the later period, the two names as equivalent.

there are two Lords of Châtelaillon (Charente-Maritime, around 1000 and 1075) and in 1011 in an endowment for Condom on the part of Bishop Hugh of Gascony.[1297] There is also the troubadour Gaucelm Faidit from the Limousin region (probably from Uzerche, about 50 km south-southeast of Limoges). Boissonnade lists a number of individuals of knightly rank by the name of Gaucelm, including possibly a few lords of castles, from Rouergue and the area around Bordeaux. Here, too, he feels obliged to opt for one individual, and chooses Gaucelm of Lesparre (Médoc), who made a handsome donation to the Monastery of Conques in 1108, from which he assumes that this man, like other knights from the Médoc region, must have fought in Spain at some time between 1080 and 1120. I prefer the simple observation that the name was essentially a southwestern one; for in the cartularies, both names are most frequently found in those from the Cathedrals of Angoulême and Bordeaux as well as from the Monasteries of La Grande-Sauve (east of Bordeaux) and especially Conques (in the Rouergue region, with 15 instances of *Gaucelmus* in the index).

It is interesting in terms of phonology that the palatisation /g-/ (+ /a/) > /dž/ or / dz/ is found in the southeast of the whole Fr.-Prov. and north Occitan area downstream of the Rhône via Valence, whereas in the southwest, the Rouergue and Bordelais regions are free of it; even the contrast between the initial sounds in *Joceran* and *Godselme*, although it is only present in O, seems therefore plausible.

C.6.3.8 The eighth *eschiele*: the Frisians and the Flemings led by *Rembalt* and *Hamon de Galice*

The leaders of the eighth *eschiele*, *Rembalt*[1298] and *Hamon de Galice*,[1299] are one of the most interesting pairs in the Song. They are from Friesland and Flanders (although we must remember that in around 1100, the Francophone half of the

---

1297 Cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/poitwest.htm#_Toc499880523; and https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/GASCONY.htm2; last access,25.02.2022.

1298 Confirmed in terms of the stemma by OKCV7.

1299 *Hamun* (< Germ. *Haimo*, Morlet s. v.) in O with *-a-* instead of *-ai-* because of the intrusion of the pre-nasal *ai* and *a* (as in OF *aime-amer*) into the declension; Morlet s.v. has references also for MLat. *Hamo* instead of *Haimo* from the year 1082 in Normandy. In terms of the stemma, the name is confirmed partly by K and P (*Haimunt*, *Hyaumont*; influenced by names ending in *-mund*), partly by V4CV7 (*Naimun*, *Nemon*; confusion with Duke *Naimon*). – *Galice* is confirmed for the archetype by OV4P, whereas CV7 have changed it to *Galie*, the name of a small area near Versailles (*val de Galie*); their editor no doubt had the impression that a man from Spain, which had just been conquered by Charlemagne, could not already be the commander of a troop of northern French combatants.

County of Flanders which included Arras, Douai and Lille was demographically and economically roughly the equivalent of the 'Flemish'-speaking half around Ghent and Bruges). Rembalt is the *Raimbaut de Frise* of many later epics (and slightly changed also the *Rabeu le Freis* in the *Girart de Roussillon*). There, this epithet has not just been taken out of the Rol.; for the figure is a historical one: he is the only figure of epic status in Frisian history, Duke *Rādbod(us)*, as his name is written in the Frankish sources, or *Rēdbad*, as he was called in Frisian († 719).[1300]

In France, the frequency of the name *Radbodus* declines rapidly in manuscripts from 950 onwards; of the eleven references in Morlet (1971, s. v.), only one comes from the time after that (around 1025).[1301] I can find no evidence of a French form of the name. Given these circumstances, it is quite logical that the name of the duke would be replaced by the more popular name *Raimbalt* (< Germ. *Raginbald*).[1302] The historical Duke was at first an enemy of Pippin the Middle, after that the father-in-law of Pippin's son Grimoald, and then once more an enemy of 'Charles' (now Charles Martel), but this did not prevent him

---

1300 The Frisian form *Redbad* e.g. in K. F. Werner (1961, 55) and in the LM s. v. *Friesland*. The oldest *Vita Bonifacii* (*auctore Willibaldo*, MGH SS.schol. 57.16, 17, 23, ed. W. Levison) still writes *Redbodus, Raedbodus*. In East Friesland the sound of the Frisian language lingers on in C*onrebbersweg* 'King Redbad's Way', a military road from before recorded history which ran from west-to-east through East Friesland, today also a district in the city of Emden; but in the legends from that area which are written in the Low German language and no longer Frisian (e.g. in H. Lübbing, *Friesische Sagen*, 214) the king is called *Rowold* (< Low Ger. *rād-* + *-bald*) or even *Robolius* with late, pretentious Latinisation.

1301 The most notable individuals in the French-speaking area are a Count *Ratbodus*, who in 863 exchanged estates in the district of Chambly (north of Paris) for others by the Oise, a Bishop *Radbodus* of Sées in around 1025–1030, and one or two Bishops *Rabbodus* of Noyon around 968 (doubtful) and until 1098. A Count of *Lake et Ysella* (in the year 875, Lair 1865, 55), a Bishop of Utrecht (899–917, not, as Morlet s. v. states, "a. 889–987") and an Archbishop of Trier (883–915) are no longer within the French-speaking area (Kienast 1990, 402, 523, 296).

1302 Morlet (1971, s. v. *Raganbaldus*) offers 30 references from Galloromania, including 10 ending in *-boldus*. It is significant that Wace (*Roman de Rou* 321, 328, cf. also 330, 338 ed. Holden) also translates the name *Radebodus* referring to a (perhaps anachronistic) Frisian enemy of Rollo and his Normans, whom he found in his source (Dudo of Saint-Quentin 2.10 ed. Lair), quite simply as *Rembaut le duc de Frise*. On the power of attraction of the name *Raimbalt* in Fr. we might also note that in the Rol. the regionally restricted name *Rabel* is replaced in CV7T by *Raimbaut / Reinbaut* (cf. n. 1252 above). – The views of Tavernier (1913, 88) and Boissonnade on this point are entirely arbitrary, since they think they see the Count Raimbaud II of Orange (!) as the commander of the Flemings and/or Frisians.

from being turned into a positive character in the Rol.[1303] This is no different from the enmity that existed in history between Ogier and Charles (the Great 'Charlemagne'), between Girart de Roussillon and 'Charles' (the Bald) and (if in v. 798 we agree with most of the editors and take O as the basis) Gaifier-Waifar of Aquitaine and (Pippin the Younger and) Charles (the Great 'Charlemagne').

But what is *Galice*? In other epics, and indeed in almost thirty texts (Moisan s. v.), it is always (Spanish) Galicia, as it is in the Rol. v. [1637] = 1476 and later passages, recalling the ancient gold from Galicia;[1304] the experience of Compostela pilgrims was enough to guarantee that people would have a good idea where this territory was located. On the other hand, however, if the *eschieles* are always led by local men, apart from the third and fifth where there are good reasons for an exception, why do we have *Galice* here? Aebischer ([1957] 1967, 45) understandably wonders about this too: "mais s'agit-il vraiment de la région d'Espagne ainsi dénommée?" Driven by this same doubt, I once spent a whole week using the extensive resources of the National Library of Paris looking in vain for a place or area with this name, or a similar name, in the north of France, Belgium or the Netherlands. It was only after that fruitless search that I seriously asked myself whether the meaning 'Galicia' could somehow still make sense, and suddenly the answer came to me. In the KMS I[1305] the following tale is told, based on a French source from the early 13th c. that has since been lost. When *Haim af Galiza* and *Reinballdr friski* heard that King Pippin had died and Charlemagne had acceded to the throne, they set off from their respective homelands to offer their services to Charlemagne; they met each other just outside Aachen and in an argument about who should take precedence, they entered into a duel, but they soon realised that they were in fact good warriors of equal standing and swore blood brotherhood with each other. They helped Charlemagne to crush a conspiracy, and Haimo was given the traitor's fiefdom, Pierrepont (Aisne), and his widow. Unlike Aebischer, I think *Galiza* here is Galicia. For what is the underpinning thought behind the story, if we examine it according to Menéndez Pidal's principle: *En el principio era la historia*? When the historical Charlemagne came into power in the year 768, the southern edge of Christian Western Europe was Galicia and its northern edge

---

1303 Only in the *Girart* is *Rabeu le Freis* still Charles' enemy – this is not the only time when the poet shows a surprisingly good grasp of historical facts in the middle of an extended flight of fancy.

1304 Cf. A.12.6.2. above.

1305 Ed. Unger cap. 18, 25–32, ed. Loth cap. A 18, 24–30, B 16, 25, 28–30.

was most of Friesland.[1306] Therefore, the point of the story is as follows: immediately after Charlemagne acceded to the throne, there were individual men who came to him from the ends of West European Christendom, thus becoming followers from the very start – which of course looking back would certainly have been counted as a special honour. It is very unlikely that this story was created by being spun out of the Rol; for that would mean that the original author would have had to know something that Aebischer and other modern philologists with their much superior historical resources did not know: the meaning behind what looks at first sight like a ridiculous pairing of Galicia with Friesland. If the story has not been spun out of the Rol., then its foundation must be older than the Rol., and the main point is not obvious in the Rol. because the Song only alludes to it in passing. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the special reference to Pierrepont is late; for the person behind the French source of the KMS I was one of the two Prince Bishops of Liège between 1200 and 1239, both of whom were from the Pierrepont ruling family. But even if this were the case, after Haimo had achieved glory in his service to Charlemagne, he must have been given a Fiefdom to provide himself with a living in the version of the story that existed previously, and since he was the Frisian's blood brother, this fiefdom must certainly have been located in the northern part of the Francophone territories.[1307] This was enough to make him seem suitable to join the Frisian as a commander of the northern *eschiele*.

C.6.3.9 The ninth *eschiele*: the people from Lorraine and Burgundy led by *Tierri le duc d'Argone*

The ninth *eschiele* consists of the people from Lorraine and Burgundy led by *Tierris, li dux d'Argone*. If we take *Argone* literally (also in modern Fr. *Argonne*),

---

1306 Because it included central Friesland, i.e. as far as the River Lauwers west of Groningen (LM s. v. *Friesland*).

1307 I discussed this whole question in great detail in my monograph on the KMS I (Beckmann 2008a, 25–37, 118s., 132s., 138–140) and explored some further issues that are less interesting for our purposes in an article (Beckmann 2005, passim). – Tavernier (1913, 87s.) first identifies the *Hamon* in v. 3073 with Naimes, although the obliquus of this name elsewhere in the Song is *Naimon / Naimun* four times, and this would be metrically possible in v. 3073 also, then this combined figure with the historical Raimund of Saint-Gilles, because the latter had fought in Spain before the First Crusade. Boissonnade (1923, 383s.) made a slightly better suggestion, when he identified Hamon as Count Raimund of Galicia who was born in Burgundy and was the son-in-law of Alfons VI; but quite apart from the problem of why this man is a worthy commander specifically of the Flemings and Frisians, I cannot support an identification hypothesis that involves arbitrarily changing the name (and of course the Spanish form of the name *Ramón* cannot be made to explain this).

only two dukes from (Upper) Lorraine come to mind who, however, turn out to be too insignificant:[1308] Thierry I (978/984–1026/1033) and Thierry II *le Vaillant*, (1070–1115). The latter was the father of the more famous Thierry "d'Alsace" Count of Flanders (1127/1128–1168), whom Hans-Erich Keller (1989, 43s.) thinks he sees behind Tierri d'Argone (and Tierri d'Anjou), but who in Lorraine only inherited Bitche, which lies opposite the Lorraine part of Argonne and at the other end of Lorraine. Other epics do not have a *Tierri d'Argon(n)e*, but they do have a *Tierri d'Arden(n)e*, and indeed we find him in a dozen epics or more. This prompted an interesting reaction in the Rol. manuscripts in the level just below O: the Italian V4 in both places (v. 3083, 3534) has replaced *Argone* with *Bergogne* 'Burgundy', an obvious *lectio facilior*, but the first passage in V7, and the second in CV7 has replaced 'Argonne' with 'Ardennes' – this shows how strongly the scribes felt that this person must be Tierri d'Ardenne.[1309]

Whenever Tierri d'Ardenne appears in the epics, he is a loyal, often elderly supporter of Charlemagne, but never to the point of becoming the titular hero.

1308 Cf. fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/LOTHARINGIA.htm#_Toc359914664 and fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/LORRAINE.htm; last access 25.02.2022. *Tierri* 'Dietrich', a very common name at that time, is confirmed with minor phonological variations by OKV4CV7P. *Argone* is confirmed in 3083 by OCP and (despite some confusion) K as well as by the assonance, in 3534 only by O and the assonance. –Boissonnade (1923, 392) makes the unlikely suggestion that in the case of *Tierri, duc (!) d'Argone* and commander of a whole *eschiele*, the poet was thinking of the ordinary lord of a castle Thierry d'Avesnes († 1106), purely because this man was married to Ada of Roucy (in what was her third, childless marriage) and thereby uncle by marriage of King Peter I of Aragón and of his (half-?) brother Alfonso el Batallador.

1309 The Roland poet is not the only author to have slightly changed the name *Tierri d'Ardenne* (OF also *Ardane*) There is another variant of this figure called *Teiri / Tieri, dus d'Ascane,* in the G*irart de Roussillon*, an important supporter of Charlemagne, who despite his advanced age kills Girart's father Drogon and his uncle Odilon in the battle of Valbéton. Because, as the poet explains, *d'Ardane li contat* are dependent on *Ascane* (v. 8974s.); this man Tierri could also be called Duke of Ardennes. The poet of the *Girart* evidently knows that in his lifetime the Ardennes region, apart from the part ruled by the Counts of Luxembourg, consisted of many small counties (Vianden, Salm, Arlon, Durbuy, La Roche-en-Ardenne, Clermont-Duras, Chiny, Rethel). *Ascane* is intended to signify the name of a region ('area around *Asca*'), a unique reformulation of MLat. *Asca*, *Ascha* 'Esch-sur-Sûre' with one of the most imposing of all the castles in the Ardennes (already attested in the year 937 as a *castrum in pago et comitatu Arduennense*), its lords, according to Albert of Aachen and William of Tyre, were the brothers Henry and Gottfried who, acting as vassals of Gottfried of Bouillon, excelled themselves through acts of exceptional bravery during the First Crusade and therefore were doubtless very famous across the whole of the French-speaking territories (cf. Beckmann 2008d, 55 n. 3 with secondary literature). The great Ferdinand Lot's uncharacteristically incorrect idea that *Ascane* might be *Scania* 'Scandinava' (*Romania* 70 [1948], 225), unfortunately encouraged Heim (1984, 320) to pursue some even more ridiculous ideas in this vein.

There is therefore no epic to serve as the model for the others.[1310] Since, in my opinion, he was already there when the Rol. came into being, the question arises: was there a historical Tierri d'Ardenne?

Present-day historians of the 7th–12th c., who are accustomed to thinking in terms of clans with their characteristic proper names and vested interests will find this question easier to answer than literary historians, who are more concerned with individuals.[1311] The names *Theuderich* (> OF *Tierri*, Ger. *Dietrich*), *Charibert* (> OF, Ger. *Herbert*) and *Ber(h)trada/Berta* are first and foremost names used by the Merovingian royal family, all three attested before 600. If at the beginning of the 8th c., when the Merovingians were still on the throne, we find a noble family with all three names in it, we can be sure that it is a minor branch of the Merovingians; this is the family of Charlemagne's mother, the 'younger Bertrada' or Berta. In the oldest surviving charter relating to this family, that of 721 documenting the foundation of the Monastery of Prüm sponsored by the 'older Bertrada', Charlemagne's great-grandmother, *Theodericus* appears. He is evidently a close relative of the donor,[1312] and Prüm was located in the Ardennes district.[1313] This type of monastery foundation is often intended as a burial location for the whole family, and as such it becomes their traditional point of focus, their "home". The family's close collaboration with the Pippinids also dates from this early period; for in 723 Theoderic is the first of four *comites* attested in the court of Charles Martel in Zülpich, and then as a benefactor in the Bliesgau region. A generation later, Pippin the Younger married into this family and this was – like almost all marriages between the noble families of that time – a political union which was intended to benefit both sides: on the one hand it bolstered the power of the Carolingians in the section of the nobility that still maintained a Merovingian perspective, and on the other hand, it strengthened the position of the Theoderic family in the area around the Meuse and the Moselle (cf. K. F. Werner 1960, 101ss., 1966, 105).

The exact extent of the family's filiation is difficult to determine; however, by 755 a *Theodericus* was Count of the important Burgundian County of

---

1310 The *Tieri d'Ascane* in the *Girart* (cf. previous n.) has the appropriate status, but not the name.

1311 If we read Bédier's *Légendes épiques* with this insight in mind, we see that Bédier is always concerned with individual people; this is the main reason why he finds it hard to grasp the broader sweep of history.

1312 Pardessus (1843–1849, 2.329, no. 516), reprinted many times.

1313 Just as Charlemagne in the Song can look out from Aachen towards *Ardene* (v. 728, 2558). Cf. e.g. Beckmann (2008a, 7 and 69). Chaume (1925–1937, 546) also indicates two Counts called *Theodericus* (816–821 and before 840), namely Thierry II and III of Autun.

Autun[1314] (evidently as a close friend of Pippin), and other counts of the same name and in the same town are attested in around 804, 815, 861 and 879 (key word *Borgoigne*!).[1315] But the greatest member of this family emerged probably a generation after 755, the *Theodericus comes, propinquus regis*, Charlemagne's trusted friend who looked after the Ripuarian region and the Saxon front. When in 782 Charlemagne himself had just gone back from Worms to Gaul, and the Saxon rebellion started, Theoderic assembled all the troops of the Ripuarian region (which stretched as far as the 'Ardennes' as this term was understood in that period) and successfully challenged the rebels; it is very possible that his official seat or his home was in the 'Ardennes' (as indeed the home of his older relatives was!). And when in 793 Charlemagne was tied up with the war against the Avars, the same Theoderic marched from the same region against the rebellious Frisians, but was killed, which triggered a Saxon ambush in Rüstringen (Royal Annals relating to these two years, longer version).[1316] In the Ardennes region and probably in northern Burgundy, he would have been remembered for a very long time, with the consequence that he might appear in the 11th c. in the emerging *chansons de geste* genre[1317] as one of the regionally defined noble supporters who served the purpose of adding more detail to literary depictions of France in the time of Charlemagne.

But why then Argonne instead of Ardenne? Here is at least a hypothesis possible. The Ardennes do not extend into Lorraine or Burgundy, so a Thierry d'Ardenne would be an outsider. The Argonne, however, is mostly within Lorraine.

C.6.3.10 The tenth *eschiele*: veteran Franks led by Charlemagne himself

The tenth and last *eschiele*, consisting of veteran Franks, is led by Charlemagne himself. We have already noted the reason for this in our discussion above (A.1,

---

1314 Dijon did not surpass Autun's importance until much later.

1315 LM s. v. *Autun*; K. F. Werner (1961, 178, 182, 190, 197, 202s., 206ss. with n. 150a, 217); fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgdautun.htm; last access 25.02.2022.

1316 There are good reasons why he can be identified as the person of the same name who was the father of the epic hero William of Toulouse; cf. for example Settipani (1993, 175s.). If this is true, then in this same year of 793, the father would have died while serving Charlemagne in the north-east, while the son survived the great defensive battle to the west of Narbonne. Did any family ever serve the Carolingians more faithfully than this?

1317 If (according to Heim 1984, 317–320) later epics also make him the father of Bérart de Montdidier, and a relative of Morant de Riviers and Ogier, this is nothing more than the well-known tendency of linking epic heroes through genealogical interpretations, and if they mention him especially often in connection with Naimes, the reason is simply that they are associated with each other through their (relatively) 'eastern' status in the circle around Charlemagne.

A.1.2.9 with n. 254) relating to Baligant's position in his twentieth *eschiele*: historically, the supreme commander (like Bohemund at Antioch) waited behind like this, with an attacking force that was ready to intervene if the enemy broke through at any point, or alternatively, if a weak area in the enemy position developed anywhere, to move the troops quickly and take up defensive or offensive positions; in poetry, there was a further advantage, which was the fact that the two supreme commanders would then necessarily meet to engage in the final duel which would then decide the outcome of the battle.

C.6.4 Review of the ten *eschieles* and their commanders

In his account of the *eschieles* and their commanders, the poet proceeds with great narrative skill and very methodically. The actual numbers are, admittedly, fantastical – as indeed they frequently were even in medieval chronicles – but there is a reason behind the sizes of the groups in relation to each other. In Charlemagne's army, the Franks must be in the majority because of their central importance in the story; but in representing this, the poet had a way of making this both structurally beautiful and full of narrative possibilities: the impetuous youths are in the first two *eschieles* and the steadfast older warriors in the tenth *eschiele*, representing the alpha and omega of the army, acting as a bracket on either side, at the same time also foreshadowing the course of the battle. The number of non-Christians has no upper limit, and this suggests that there are too many of them to be counted, but the overall proportion of Christians to non-Christians is at least 1:5. Charlemagne's empire is huge – but it is up against the rest of the world.

The characterisation of the ten Christian *eschieles* is done with artful variation, and above all, it is carefully balanced: only positive things are said about each *eschiele*, so that no one in the audience would feel that their homeland had been neglected, and all of their hearts would beat faster because their ancestors had belonged to this *one*, this *whole* empire of the Franks: this reveals the integrative power of the Song, especially against the contemporary background, and it is also one of the work's greatest literary achievements. You would have to investigate the text very carefully indeed before you would find just a few undertones, such as the author's pride in relation to the literally unsurpassed battle prowess of the Normans, or his sceptical attitude towards the Bretons, as long as these would be led by their local commanders.

The personal names are even more surprising: none of them are chosen arbitrarily, and each one has to be chosen specifically for its troop. The commanders of the young warriors in the first two groups *per definitionem* are not yet famous;

the poet ensures that they embody the hope of becoming worthy successors of Roland and Olivier, in their clear pairing, but also in the fact that both elements of the pair, exactly like Roland and Olivier, turn out to be onomastically (and not just through the mention of their fiefdoms) sons of the two complementary parts of France, and thus they *in nuce* are meant to represent 'the whole of France'; and yet at the same time, to show that *one* pair cannot fully replace the two illustrious fallen warriors, the poet has doubled the pair motif, both in the story and onomastically. The commanders of the other troops can be mostly local men; the desire to introduce some variation may have played a part in the exceptions, but there is still a good reason for choosing them: in one case Ogier had to have the leadership position that he deserved (and perhaps also, Naimes had to be kept in close proximity to Charlemagne), and in the other case, the Bretons had to have a trio of leaders worthy of Charlemagne's trust, which would also form a coherent grouping in its own right. When the poet could not find a suitably famous regional (real or epic) figure, he had enough experience of the world to know of typical names for the region in question.

C.7 The twelve peers

C.7.1 From the *aulici* to the *pers*

Charlemagne's defeat of 778 in the Western Pyrenees was unique across an enormous range of space and time, and this is due to, among other things, largely overlapping, but not identical facts.

First, among the men who were killed in that event were *plerique aulicorum* '(very) many/most of the courtiers', a fact which *corde regis obnubilavit* the outcome of the whole campaign (Royal Annals up to 829); they were killed because at that time they had been guarding the baggage train that was travelling with the rear guard, and the enemy had been aiming at the baggage train.

Einhart (*Vita Karoli* 9) cites two or three names as examples. The two mentioned in all manuscripts, Charlemagne's seneschal and his Count Palatine, were two of the highest-ranking men in Charlemagne's inner circle, with whom he would have had daily contact. The third, the Margrave of the Breton March, was the holder of one of the highest and most important of the Empire's regional military commands, a role that the king no doubt would only have given to someone he knew well and trusted implicitly. These people are, therefore, truly from the highest rank of noblemen in the Empire.

And the second fact reported by Einhart: on that day *every* man who was in the rear guard was killed, without exception.

When the memory of this defeat was passed down through the generations via the oral tradition, it is to be expected that these two characteristics ('high-ranking' and 'complete group') would be merged into the idea of one *court circle* that was wiped out completely. This brings us so close to the peers of the Rol. that a chance resemblance is improbable.

The Annals had described this battle using the strictly classical term *aulici* (which did not pass on into the Romance languages), but by the end of the 9th c. we find in the Poeta Saxo (v.29) the term *palatini* (*ministri*) which is present in late Lat., predominant in MLat. and passes on into the Romance languages. Rajna (1902, 264) and Menéndez Pidal (1960, 370–372) rightly noted that the standard expression in Italian for Charlemagne's twelve peers from the beginning until now has always been *i dodici paladini*. This word was therefore possibly the oldest vernacular equivalent of *aulicus* in France, too, which means that the circle of fallen courtiers may have been described as Charlemagne's *palatini*.[1318] But Menéndez Pidal cites an entry for the year 939 from the *Annales Sanctae Columbae Senonensis*, which were written from 868 onwards by various more or less contemporary hands in the margins of a 19-year Easter Cycle, and which uses the term *Francorum pares* with the meaning 'the noble Frenchmen directly under the King' (MGH SS.1.105, cf. also 102).[1319] It is therefore quite likely that from the 10th c. onwards, whenever people talked about Charlemagne's defeat in the Western Pyrenees, they spoke of a circle of *pers*.

Nevertheless, such a circle of courtiers must surely have sought sooner or later to limit its size, because it would have wanted to retain its exclusivity. This was achieved through the use of the number twelve. How did this number come to be used in connection with Charlemagne's group of warriors?

1318 Thanks to the popularity of the Italian Renaissance epics, the expression 'the twelve Paladins' travelled across the whole of Europe. In Ger., it was even more popular than 'the twelve peers'; the *Deutsche Wörterbuch*, for example, s. v. *Paladine* mentions those serving Charlemagne but s. v. *Pärs* [sic], *Peers* there is no mention of Charlemagne.

1319 The question mark within brackets that appears in the MGH edition next to the date 939 only means that the marginal note could also belong with one of the neighbouring dates. – However, this medieval Latin term *pares* that was based on a contemporaneous political context – unlike the poem – is not tied to any specific number until after 1150. Only after that date, and clearly as a loose imitation of the poem, a *cour des pairs de France* appears consisting of twelve senior vassals of the crown, which then had some sort of real meaning until about 1300 (cf. Sautel-Boulot 1955 passim, Lot/Fawtier 1957–1962, 2.296s. with n. 1). The idea proposed in older research (e.g. by Jakob Grimm in the preface to his edition of the German Song of Roland) that the literary peers could be based on a real set of twelve, is incorrect.

C.7.2 Why are there twelve peers?

C.7.2.1 Are they modelled on the apostles?

The Christian religion ensured that the idea of Jesus having twelve apostles was so deeply embedded into everyone's consciousness, that this was regarded as the 'perfect number' for any positively valued group of men. The *Pèlerinage* (v. 113–140) thus relates how Charlemagne and his twelve noblemen sat on the very chairs in Jerusalem that the disciples sat upon during the Last Supper, and since that day no-one else had ever sat upon them; a Jewish man enters the room and thinks they are Christ and the apostles. Brault (1978, 392s.) and others rightly emphasised the fact that Charlemagne's group of twelve is here presented as an imitation of the apostles.[1320] In the KMS I (ed. Unger cap. 59, ed. Loth cap. A56) Charlemagne even explicitly sets up the group of twelve peers for the battle against the 'heathens' in memory of the twelve apostles of Jesus, and thus he also personally selects the twelve. Menéndez Pidal (1960, 397s.) is of course aware of these passages, but expressly denies that they can tell us anything about the reasons behind the choice of twelve peers because Charlemagne's *duodecim neptis* in the *Nota Emilianense* are earlier and they are not formed in memory of the apostles. This is, however, an extreme position; we should recognise that the disciples of Jesus are a more or less unavoidable or perhaps background element which automatically contributed to the choice of the number twelve.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that there is more to it than this. The *Nota* is very short, and the *Pèlerinage*, in keeping with its own particular theme, depicts them with a very atypical function. Given all these circumstances, the oldest French text to give us typical information about the existence of the peers is the Song of Roland itself. A fundamental attribute of the apostles is that Jesus chose them; but in the Rol. there is not even the slightest indication that Charlemagne chose the peers. Another fundamental attribute of the apostles is the fact that they form the most intimate fellowship with Jesus, and no other group could ever be closer to him; Charlemagne's closest associates, however, are not the young peers, but the older advisers, especially Naimes, Turpin, Gefreid d'Anjou and Ogier. And the final fundamental point about the apostles is that the traitor emerges from this group, as Jesus himself predicts at the Last Supper (*Mt* 26.21, *Mc* 14.18, *Lc* 22.21, *Ioh* 6.71, 13.21) and as the gospel writers also

---

1320 The twelve here are not explicitly called *pers*; but the narrative sets up an analogy with the twelve apostles and this is enough to guarantee that the author of the *Pèlerinage* has a well-defined set of men in mind, and not a group that has come about by chance.

bitterly emphasise: 'one of the twelve' (*Mt* 26.14 and 47, *Mc* 14.10 and 43, *Lc* 22.3 and 47, *Ioh* 6.72); but Ganelon never was one of the peers. The only passage in the Song where reference is clearly made to the disciples of Jesus is v. 178: at the end of a list, we find here *Guenes i vint, ki la traïsun fist* which clearly echoes the words 'and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him', which are at the end of the list of twelve apostles in the synoptic gospels (*Mt* 10.4, *Mc* 3.19, *Lc* 6.16). But apart from Ganelon, the list in the Song does not refer to the peers: it lists seven other courtiers and then four peers; what we have here, then, is a group of twelve that arises out of the circumstances, which purports to be nothing more than a random cross-section of Charlemagne's court, and the traitor is indeed also a member of Charlemagne's court.

What are the twelve peers in the Rol. then? A *compagnonnage*, as Gaston Paris (1865a, 417) rightly defined them, a spontaneous formation of especially brave, mostly fairly young warriors from the Empire's upper class, who have confidence in each other's fighting prowess. Before they take any part in the action, the poet highlights them twice (with admirable stylistic brevity) as a tightly-knit league of men: when Olivier says that his friend Roland is temperamentally unsuited for the role of emissary to be sent to Saragossa (v. 256s.), Charlemagne extends this assessment to all twelve peers (v.262); and when Ganelon announces his enmity with Roland, he immediately includes the *duze per* (v. 325).

C.7.2.2 Did they reflect Charlemagne's real court officials?

Rajna suggested a different reason for the choice of twelve in an article (1902, 264) which is so rarely read these days that even Menéndez Pidal (1960, 370–372) does not seem to be aware of it. Hincmar of Reims lists in his *De ordine palatii* (written in the year 882, p. 62–65 ed. Gross/Schieffer)[1321] the highest secular court officials,[1322] and Rajna counts them one by one: there are twelve, namely the *summus cancellarius*, *camerarius*, *comes palatii*, *senescalcus*, *buticularius*, *comes stabuli*, *mansionarius*, *venatores principales quatuor*, *falconarius*

1321 Rajna could have known only the printed version of *De ordine palatii* that was based on the *editio princeps* (where the passage is to be found in cap. 16). The MGH edition by Gross/Schieffer of 1980 (F.iur.schol. 4) is based on the only surviving ms. which was discovered in 1930, but which dates from the 16th c.; however, there are no changes to the passage we are interested in here (which appears following the new chapter numbering in Cap. 4).

1322 Hincmar – who is an Archbishop! – indicates that the spiritual office of the *capellanus* has supreme moral authority over the twelve secular offices (though there is no trace of this in historical practice), but he makes it clearly separate from the secular office of the *summus cancellarius* in particular.

unus – that is to say archchancellor,[1323] treasurer,[1324] Count Palatine,[1325] seneschal or high steward,[1326] cupbearer,[1327] stablemaster,[1328] quartermaster,[1329] four principal hunters[1330] and the falconer. Hincmar relies on the now lost treatise of Adalhard, the cousin and confidant of Charlemagne who died in 826, on the arrangements for the court at Aachen; because of this, we should consider his account as factually correct even for the time of Charlemagne himself. On the other hand, Hincmar sets them out as recommendations: this is what a Frankish royal court should look like – and because of this they could be imitated or seen as an ideal for others to follow, long after the time of Hincmar. At some point before or after Hincmar, the number twelve of these *aulici* would have been introduced into the accounts from the year 778.

At first sight, Rajna's hypothesis seems quite convincing, especially its conceptual economy: most of the *aulici* were killed; the names (and the King's grief) show that the highest-ranking individuals were among them; there were twelve high-status *aulici*; would it not be strange if the number 12 were forgotten here, but then introduced again later, with no reference back to the first mention? On closer analysis, however, the hypothesis loses some of its appeal.

1323 Head of the chancellery, and also the keeper of state secrets who is responsible for carrying out the king's policies.

1324 Responsible for administering income and supplies.

1325 In the Carolingian period, we see him mainly as a legal expert in charge of the Royal Court. However, this would not have been a full-time occupation. His office as *comes palatii* carries on the same function as the Mayor of the Palace which had become a very powerful position in the Merovingian period; he would probably have had other responsibilities in the king's household, but there is no way of knowing exactly what these were. In Einhart's account of the attack on Charlemagne's rear guard (*Vita Karoli* 9) he is likewise called *comes palatii*.

1326 LM s. v. *Truchsess*: from the time of the Franks onwards, the office of high steward was the same as the office of seneschal, and this was the highest court official. His duties included the administration of the court and the estates, supervision of the staff and stocking the royal larder with provisions. As time went on, the task of providing for the royal table became more and more important. Since this was the most visible part of his role, Einhart, who is more of a purist in his use of Latin than Hincmar, makes this clear in his depiction of the attack on Charlemagne's rear guard (*Vita Karoli* 9) by calling him the *regiae mensae praepositus*. Another synonym for this was *dapifer*; cf. n. 1276 above.

1327 Responsible for the provision of drinks and for the wine cellars in the royal palaces.

1328 Responsible for the stables and transportation.

1329 The official with a special responsibility for setting up the court as it moved from place to place.

1330 They were in charge of the royal hunting events, and they also had to ensure that the court had a constant supply of game.

The figure of twelve court officials in Hincmar arises almost incidentally be-
cause there are exactly four principal hunters. It is not even certain that Hinc-
mar would have noticed the number twelve; at any rate, he did not accord any
significance to it, because he did not even mention it. An even more important
circumstance is the fact that this number is never mentioned in connection
with real official roles until after the time of the Rol. A story can exist for a long
time without any written record; a key principle behind the organisation of the
court, on the other hand, must surely have left a trace here and there. It is
highly probable, then, that Rajna's hypothesis is illusory.

C.7.2.3 Were they modelled on other groups of twelve men?

Apart from the limited influence of the twelve disciples of Jesus, 'the' model of
the twelve peers is legion: it is simply the near omnipresence of such groups of
twelve in the Early Middle Ages specifically under Germanic influence.[1331] Since
this point is usually made only in a general sense within Romance Studies, we
shall attempt here to lay out the most relevant examples. However, from the
lengthy lists made by e.g. the constitutional historian Georg Waitz (1880, 499–
510) and by the literary historian Althof (1905, 2.160) we have to exclude the
great many examples which could have been influenced by either the number
of disciples[1332] or even – however indirectly – the twelve peers themselves; this

---

1331 From the earliest days of the first civilisations onwards, the number twelve was thought
to signify perfection and completeness; reasons for this include the fact that it is easily divisi-
ble (by 2, 3, 4 and 6), and even more importantly, that the solar year (~ 365 ¼ days) equates
more closely to 12 than to 13 circuits of the moon (~ 354 or 384 days); and because the time of
each circuit of the moon was almost the same as the average length of the female menses, it
seemed to be fundamentally linked in some way with human procreation. Through the prac-
tice of astronomy, the (usually standardised) twelve months led to the twelve constellations;
the easy divisibility of the number twelve then led to the partitioning of the year into (usually
four) seasons. The cosmic principle of ordering things using the number twelve was then ap-
plied by analogy to human organisations, and especially to sets of people (either twelve
groups, or twelve individuals). This idea is also very old; we might consider for example the
twelve tribes of Israel, the twelve ἄρχοντες as Ancient Persian army commanders (cf. Wideng-
ren 1969, 54s., 248) or the twelve gods of classical antiquity (cf. KPauly s. v.). Even in prehis-
toric times, the number twelve was accorded a special role in Germania (as we see, for
example in the particular importance of 60 and 120 in the early German counting system); in
this culture, it was astonishingly widespread, particularly in the context of groups of men.
1332 Some influence from the apostles cannot be completely ruled out, for example, in the
fact that the great hero Beowulf has twelve companions, or that twelve aethelings ride around
his grave (Beowulf 2401, 3170), that King Gunther is flanked by twelve warrior comrades in the
Waltharius, that according to Snorri Sturluson (around 1230, *Heimskringla* II, *Óláfs Saga Helga*
cap. 96) King Olaf the Holy († 1030) always had 12 wise men around him, acting as his advisers

latter restriction applies to practically all French and Middle High German narrative literature, but also some Old Norse works such as the *Thidrekssaga*.

Compurgators: Twelve compurgators are already present in the oldest form of *Lex Salica*, the *Pactus legis Salicae* (§ 58.1 ed. Eckhardt, all mss.), and are therefore of pagan origin. They were equally well known in Friesland (von Richthofen 1840, 1097s., cf. also 971s.) and in parts of Scandinavia (where however there are also variants on the number 12 with 6, 24 or 36 compurgators, Waitz 1880, 501). The *Pactus legis Salicae* (§ 56.2 ed. Eckhardt) also has twelve sworn witnesses in addition to the twelve compurgators. In the year 811, peace is sworn on the border between the Frankish and Danish empires by twelve noble individuals – meaning of course pagans as well as Christians – and the Royal Annals list them by name. There are also some random references in unexpected places; in the year 1101, twelve witnesses willing to swear an oath are requested in a charter on behalf of Countess Matilda of Tuscany (MGH. DD MT no. 65; Ughelli 1717–1722, 2.284s.). Not quite as important, but closely related to this, is the expression *sei duzime* 'being one of twelve persons': this is found in the Anglo-Norman collection of laws known as the *Lois de Guillaume le Conquérant* of the twelfth century (ms. early 13th c.) as the oath taken 'as one of twelve persons' (*si jurra / s'en escundira sei duzime*, § 3, 14 and 15 ed. Matzke).

Judges and the like: Councils of twelve judges and similar decision-making bodies are more important and more widespread. Twelve arbitrators resolved a dispute between Chlothar II and his son Dagobert (Fredegar 4.53, MGH SS.mer. 2.147). According to Saxo Grammaticus (Book 9, p. 305 ed. Holder) in Denmark the (pagan) King *Regnerus* [Ragnar Loðbrók, 8th/9th c?] set up a council of twelve judges to deal with difficult cases; similarly, there were 12 judges in the later Danish, Swedish and Norwegian legal systems (Waitz 1880, 500s.). A jury-like council of twelve was also used in Friesland (von Richthofen 1840, 1097s.). A Carolingian count was ideally supposed to have 12 aldermen (*scabini*) with him during negotiations, and if necessary, he would fill the number up to twelve with the 'best men in his county' (MGH Capit.r.F. 1.289, Louis the Pious, the year 819). 12 arbitrators on the side of Henry V and another 12 on the side of the princes resolved a dispute (Ekkehard referring to the year 1121, p. 351 ed. Schmale/ Schmale-Ott). In Germany, groups of 12 judges are very common from that time forward, and we find them in the Schwabenspiegel legal code, "in courts run by the empire, regions, cities, fiefdoms, the nobility, in wars and at sea, all through the ages, and in almost all parts of Germany, as well as local

and judges, or that again according to Snorri (*Ynglinga saga* 2.7) Odin had twelve lesser gods who were his 'princes'.

committees or governments and advisory councils regularly consisting of twelve individuals, in Bavaria, Austria, Württemberg, Brunswick and Schleswig-Holstein" (Waitz 1880, 507s.). In England, writing in Anglo-Norman, Nicole Bozon (around 1320) used the word *dozain* meaning a 'jury composé de 12 personnes', and on the Norman islands there were the *douzaine* 'conseil administratif de 12 membres élus' (FEW s. v. *duodecim*).

There are also some further legal-institutional references. Fredegar states (4.45, MGH SS.mer. 2.143), that during their 12-year interregnum, the Lombards were governed by 12 dukes, although this cannot be confirmed in the Italian sources. According to Saxo Grammaticus (Book 5, p. 121 ed. Holder), the early king of the Danes Frotho III, who was only seven years old when his father died, was given 12 tutors. In pagan Saxony, 12 *nobiles*, 12 *liberi*, and 12 *lati* from each district came together at the annual tribal Thing in Marklo on the banks of the Weser (Hucbald of Saint-Amand, † around 930, *Vita Lebuini antiqua* cap. 4, MGH SS. 30, 2.793). According to the Royal Annals, Charlemagne received 12 hostages respectively from the Saxons in the year 772, from Thassilo of Bavaria in 781 and 787, and from Arighis of Benevento also in 787. In Norway – along with a few other individual dignitaries – 12 men came from each district to choose the king, although there are only a few references confirming that this principle was actually carried out in practice (Waitz 1880, 501). The German Henry II was accompanied by 12 senators when he moved into Rome (Thietmar of Merseburg 7.1, MGH SS.n.s. 9.396). The Normans in southern Italy who had not yet set up proper structures, in a critical situation elected 12 counts from among themselves (William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti* 1.231–236, MGH SS. 9.246, and Amatus 2.18). Philippe de Thaon (*Cumpoz* v. 3279) mentions a council of 12 bishops. There is an aposterioric group of twelve: in the *Gesta comitum Barcinonensium* (cap. 4 of the original, cap. 11 of the definitive edition, ed. Barrau-Dihigo), it is stated that 12 Muslim kings paid tribute to Ramón Berenguer I († 1076).

Warriors: Finally, we have groups of twelve warriors. In the area ruled by the Franks we find that Dagobert sent an army led by 12 *duces* to fight the *Wascones* in around 636/637 (Fredegar 4.78, MGH SS.mer. 2.159s.). Again, aposteriorically in the East Frankish realm, it is said that in the year 880 the Saxons, when they were roundly defeated by the Normans, lost 12 counts (in addition to 2 bishops) that is to say Duke [*dux*] *Brun*, the Queen's brother, and 11 others (*Ann. Fuld.* relating to the year 880). There are countless references from the northern regions; they mostly refer to pagan times. However, because the written records necessarily come from the Christian period, we can never be sure about the historicity of the number 12 in this context; nevertheless, non-historical sets of 12 are just as useful to us, because they show how popular this literary motif was. Particularly relevant for us is the number twelve noted by Höfler

(RGA², Art. *Berserker*) referring to berserkers, where the context makes it certain that there can be no linkage with the disciples of Christ. The following cases appear in the times before recorded history in the Nordic regions: when King Frotho was alive (5th/6th c.?) the 12 wild sons of Arngrim all died in the same battle (Saxo Grammaticus, Book 5, p. 166 Holder), and all were berserkers, according to the Edda songs (*Hyndlulióð* Str. 25 and 'Kampf auf Sámsey', trans. Genzmer 2.99, 1.204–207); at almost the same time, another 12 rowdy Norwegian brothers whom Höfler interprets as berserkers fell in battle, and their names all contained the element -*bjǫrn* (Saxo, Book 6, p. 173 Holder);[1333] King Hrólfr *kraki* (probably early 6th c.) also had 12 berserkers as his bodyguards according to several sources from 1200 onwards, including Snorri's *Skáldskaparmál*; in the *Grettissaga* (14th c., cap. 19) there is a story about *þórir þǫmb* and 11 other berserkers (around 1000). Although as far as I know they are never called berserkers, there were also 12 similarly rowdy and violent sons of Westmar, who were all killed at the same time (Saxo, Book 6, p. 120–139 ed. Holder). The next two cases have more chance of being historically accurate, at least in Höfler's view: Harald Fairhair (died in 933), King of a large part of Norway, kept berserkers, according to a praise poem written by his own skald Þórbjǫrn Hornklofi, and in fact there were 12 of them according to the *Egils saga* (between 1220 and 1240, 9.3); King Olaf the Holy of Norway died in the battle of Stiklastaðir in 1030, and in fact was killed by a *Þórir hundr* with his group of 12 berserkers according to Snorri's *Heimskringla* (*Ólafssaga Helga* cap.193). Olaf's son, King Magnus of Norway and Denmark not only killed Ratibor, Prince of the Wends but in 1043, when the Wends attempted to strike back in revenge, he also killed all Ratibor's sons, of which there were twelve according to Saxo (around 1200, Book 10, p. 363 ed. Holder), eight according to Adam of Bremen (around 1080, MGH SS.schol. 2.137). Groups of twelve also crop up *a posteriori*: Regner's son Withsercus allowed himself to be burned to death along with 12 comrades who were imprisoned with him (Saxo 9, p. 311 ed. Holder); Rollo used threats to obtain the release of twelve of his best warriors when they were imprisoned on the island of Walcheren (Dudo 1.10).

We can see, then, that many groups of twelve go back to pagan times, and many more which do not remind us of the disciples of Jesus are older than the Song of Roland. The groups already in existence influence the emergence of other groups in a more or less cumulative fashion, and so it makes no sense to try and trace each new group back to a specific earlier group. It follows, then,

---

1333 One of these brothers also had an evil dog, who 'often tore down 12 men on its own' (Saxo, Book 6, p. 173 ed. Holder).

that the group of twelve peers owes more to the cumulative effect of many groups already in existence than to the twelve disciples of Christ.

C.7.3 The group of 'twelve peers' outside the Song of Roland and its composition

Whenever a group is defined by the fact that it is made up of twelve members, the number tends to be more constant than the precise membership of the group. The Ionic-Attic canon of twelve gods was composed of pairs: Zeus-Hera, Poseidon-Demeter, Apollo-Artemis, Ares-Aphrodite, Hermes-Athena, Hephaistos-Hestia; but in the regional cults a few of them were replaced by other gods who were regarded as essential in each particular place, including the likes of Dionysos or Hecate (cf. KPauly s. v. *Zwölfgötter* with lit.). Since in Israel the priest and Levite tribe of Levi was forbidden to own property, when it came to dividing up large areas of land, it was replaced by the most populous tribe, that of Joseph, through the sub-tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, named after Joseph's sons. Jesus modelled his group of twelve disciples on the twelve tribes of Israel, making them into the nucleus of a new Israel (cf. *Mt* 19.28, *Lc* 22.30); but in the gospels we already find some variation in the names, even though the people do not change: Simon/Cephas/Peter, Simon the Canaanite/the Zealot, (Jude) Thaddeus/Jude the brother of James, probably also Matthew/Levi and Bartholomew/Nathanael. And after Judas Iscariot left the group, Peter ensured that Matthias was chosen to take his place, and this shows that for the apostles, too, – at least until this point in time – sustaining the group of twelve as a whole was more important than keeping each of the individual members the same.

There is much greater variation in the twelve peers of the Old French epic tradition, where there was no pressure to find any religious legitimacy for the individuals making up the group. Gaston Paris (1865a, 507) drew up some lists of the twelve peers from outside the Song of Roland – from the *Pèlerinage*, *Fierabras*, *Otinel*, *Gui de Bourgogne*, the KMS I and the Chronicle of Weihenstephan, and then Gautier (1878–1897, 3.185s.) identified no fewer than sixteen lists. There is no apparent trend towards a consensus, and we do not need to look at all of them here. Only Roland and Olivier are constant members of the group; the *Fierabras*, even though it is from as early as the 12th c., only agrees with the Song of Roland in respect of these two figures. This explains why Gaston Paris concluded that the concept of the twelve peers was accorded a relatively low importance in the Old French epic tradition.

Today, we can see from the partial list in the *Nota Emilianense* (written around 1080, discovered in 1953) that this concept is older than the Song of

Roland. According to this text, during his Spanish campaign, Charlemagne had *duodecim neptis; unusquisque habebat tria milia equitum cum loricis suis. Nomina ex his: Rodlane, Bertlane, Oggero Spatacurta, Ghigelmo Alcurbit(u/a)nas, Olibero et episcopo domini Turpini.*[1334] Again, only Roland and Olivier in this list are consistent with the Rol.; for Archbishop Turpin and of course Ogier are not peers there (cf. section C.7.4 below). However, the partial list in the *Nota*, when seen from the perspective of the Rol., contains an even stranger anomaly: the presence of two figures from the second-largest complex – after the Roncevaux complex – in the Old French epic, namely that of William *al curb nés* himself, the central figure, as well as *Bertrandus palatinus*.

This anomaly recurs in a more extreme form in what is probably the second-oldest list, that of the *Pèlerinage* (v. 61–65),[1335] which was discussed by Dámaso Alonso (1954, 23–25) and Menéndez Pidal (1960, 400): *Rollant et Oliver [. . .] / Guillelme d'Orenge et Naimon l'aduret / Ogier de Danemarche, Gerin et Berenger, / l'arcevesque Turpin, Ernalt et Aïmer / et Bernart de Brusban et Bertran l'aduret [. . .]* – so that along with *Ernaut* (*de Gironde* rather than *de Bellande*), the notoriously fief-less *Aïmer* and *Bernart de Brusbant* five of the twelve figures come from this second complex.

However, we should not assume that in an earlier version of the Rol. all of these figures were killed at Roncevaux. The *Pèlerinage* is set in the time before Roncevaux because Roland and Olivier appear in it, and it has no reason to offer any opinions about Roncevaux. The *Nota* on the other hand concludes: *Deinde placuit ad regem, pro salutem hominum exercituum, ut Rodlane, belligerator fortis, cum suis posterum veniret. At ubi exercitum portum de Sicera transiret, in Rozaballes a gentibus Sarracenorum fuit Rodlane occiso.* Here, Roland's *cum suis* may well have been understood as the *tria milia* who were mentioned in the introduction, and no-one else.[1336] At any rate, the fact that this text from

---

1334 On the form of each personal name cf. D. Alonso (1954, 29–50). On the term *neptis* instead of *pares*, Menéndez Pidal (1960, 395ss.) explained this – probably correctly – with his reference to the ambiguity of the Spanish word *primos*. He regards the statement in the *Nota*, to the effect that each of the *neptis*, with his men, was obliged to serve the King on a rota basis for one month of every year as *folklorique* and compares it in terms of quality with the *Bibliothèque bleue*, but in fact it is modelled on the court of King David (*1 Paralip* 27.1–15).

1335 They are not explicitly called peers here; but the fact that Charlemagne sits with them on the chairs in Jerusalem on which Jesus and his disciples once sat shows that this group of twelve is more than a chance arrangement, and in fact it was a high-status grouping that no other in Charlemagne's vicinity could ever emulate.

1336 Curiously, if this statement is taken literally – the death of only one of the twelve – it is not completely isolated. According to Fredegar (4.78, MGH SS.mer. 2.159s.; transferred verbatim, with elementary correction of the Latin, in the *Gesta Dagoberti* 36, MGH SS.mer.2.414, and

outside France separates Roland from Olivier[1337] diminishes its informative value.

There is a simple explanation for the anomalies in both lists, essentially due to Menéndez Pidal (1960, 401s.): towards the end of the 11th c., the definition of the twelve peers as 'a group consisting of Charlemagne's 12 best warriors who died at Roncevaux' produced a simplified variant as 'Charlemagne's 12 best warriors' (of all time). The *Nota* and *Pèlerinage* actually answer the question about the identity of Charlemagne's twelve most famous warriors.

---

more freely in Aimoin 4.28, Bouquet 3.132) in the year 636/637 Dagobert sent an army to fight the rebelling *Wascones*, which was led by 12 *duces* listed by name. One of them, Chadoindus, is described as the Supreme Commander, and among the rest, the first named person is an Arinbertus. All in all, this army defeated the Wascones following the scorched earth principle; the rebels asked for peace and promised to appear before Dagobert himself very soon and subjugate themselves to his rule. Everything seemed to be heading towards a satisfactory ending, 'except that . . . ': *Feliciter haec exercitus absque ulla lesionem ad patriam fuerunt repedati, si Arnebertum docem maxime cum seniores et nobiliores exercitus sui per negliencia a Wasconebus in valle Subola non fuisset interfectus*. Fredegar's *vallis Subola* (> Basque *Zuberoa/Xiberoa*, Fr. *Soule*), corrupted in the *Gesta Dagoberti* and in Aimoin to *Robola*, is the region called Soule around Mauléon-Licharre which to this day is still partly Basque-speaking, about 40 km east-northeast of Roncevaux as the crow flies. Here the enemy lay in ambush, likewise after having promised to submit, and the victorious army was on its way home, but of the twelve quasi-peers in the Frankish army, only one was killed. In fact, the reason for this was similarly his own disregard of strategy, and he died with his men in such a way that the army could not avenge the loss by military means. The only plausible explanation is because that in the moment of the ambush, this section was physically separated from the rest of the army, because it formed the vanguard, or more likely, the rear guard. Even the linguistic style looks like a precursor of Einhart's admission, which is similarly saved until the very last moment (cap. 9): *salvo et incolumi exercitu revertitur, praeter quod* . . . or that of the Astronomus (cap. 2): *Sed hanc felicitatem transitus, si dici fas est, foedavit* . . . or that of the Royal Annals up to the year 829; for Fredegar refers to the main victory of the campaign as *feliciter*, the Astronomus has *felicitas*, and these Annals also mention the *res feliciter in Hispania gestae*. Rajna (1902, passim) examined the episode from the year 636/637 very thoroughly. He explains in detail (1902, 253–258), why Paulin Paris, Gaston Paris and Godefroy Kurth believed it exerted a considerable influence on the Rol.; however, Rajna uses clever arguments to argue essentially the opposite opinion. Would he have been able to argue this position if he had been aware of the *Nota*? Is it not possible that the older narrative component ('one of the twelve') exerted some influence and interfered with the later component ('all twelve') for a while?

1337 Menéndez Pidal (1960, 435–438) seems to think that the separation of Olivier from Roland is an – if I understand him correctly inner Span. – archaism, because they are not listed immediately next to each other in the Span. *Fernán González* from the 13th c. (v. 358s.) and in a few even later Span. chronicles. Even if he is right, there would be no justification for making inferences from this about France.

But soon, the Roncevaux material and the William material began to expand quickly in both volume and dissemination, and considerable parts of the William material were – more correctly – rearranged under Louis the Pious (who was historically responsible as [sub-]king of Aquitania). The variant disappeared, and this new clarity greatly benefited the Roncevaux epic in a poetic sense: the twelve peers all share the same fate.

C.7.4 The group's composition in the Song of Roland

C.7.4.1 The list of peers in the archetype
To a certain extent, variability in the composition of the group of twelve in the Rol. takes the form of an initial discrepancy between O and β, where the latter turns out to be the same as the archetype. The Song lists the peers on two occasions: in v. 792ss. they are not explicitly called peers, but because the rear guard is being set up at this point, there are elementary narrative reasons why they have to be listed one by one; in v. 2402ss. Charlemagne is in a distressed state, and he calls out their names first, before explicitly summing up this list as *li .XII. per.*[1338] We can take Segre's analysis (with reference to v. 798) as the definitive one, even though it is very short; his key points are summarised here, in a slightly different order.

First: In the initial list (v. 792ss.), which shows the composition of the rear guard, the following eight names are the same in the two versions O and β, and they therefore belong in the archetype: *Rollant*, *Oliver*, *Gerins*, *Gerers*, *Otes* [or *Ates*], *Berengers*, *Ansëis*, *Gerart de Rossillon*. They also appear in Charlemagne's lament, and this qualifies them to be counted as peers.

Secondly, in this list, *Astors* and the *dux Gaifiers* in O correspond to the *Sanson* and *li Gascons Engeliers* (later also *de Burdele*) in β. But then in the fight with the anti-peers, instead of *Astors* and *Gaifiers*, O (v. 1275, 1289) now also has *Sansun li dux* and *Engelers, li Guascuinz de Burdele*; the latter two also appear in Charlemagne's lament (v. 2407–2408).[1339] This therefore qualifies these two as peers in the archetype as well.

1338 When it comes to the fight between the peers and the anti-peers, however, we do not find a complete list of the peers, because the poet nominates Roland and Olivier to fight with the first and second anti-peers, and then again to fight with the eleventh and twelfth anti-peers.

1339 Presumably, O (or a previous stage before O) has replaced *Sansun* with *Astors*, in order to make an alliterative pair to match *Astors e Ansëis*; also, *Engeliers de Burdele* is replaced by the more famous Gascon Duke Gaifiers, who in other epics is also *de Burdele*. – Lat. *Burdigala*

Thirdly: In the first list, *l'arcevesque* and *Gualters* are found in both O and β; at that point, therefore, they belong in the archetype, but this does not mean that they are peers, and they are only mentioned as important members of the rear guard. Because β has fourteen names rather than twelve in the first list, his no. 13 and 14 do not count as peers: the archbishop (because he is a cleric) and Gualter (because according to v. 801 he is Roland's 'man', *ergo* not Roland's 'peer').

But O evidently counts them as peers, and for that very reason can only list 12 names, rather than fourteen, and therefore suppresses the Ive and Ivořie who appear in β; but O includes these two in v. 1895, and again in Charlemagne's lament (v. 2406). These two then also qualify as peers.

Fourthly: in O and in β (and therefore in the archetype) Charlemagne's lament contains thirteen names, because Charlemagne includes the archbishop. He is of such a high status that Charlemagne cannot just leave him out, even though he is not a peer, but he can omit Gualter, because he was Roland's 'man' and not directly Charlemagne's 'man'.

It follows then, that the list of peers in the archetype is: *Rollant* and *Oliver*, *Gerin* and *Gerer*, *Ote* [or *Ate*?] and *Berenger*, *Ive* and *Ivořie*, *Sansun* and *Ansëis*, *Engeler*, the Gascon from Bordeaux, and *Gerart de Rossillon*.

C.7.4.2 New aspects in the structure of the group

What can we make of this list? Against a background of great variation in this list throughout history, the Roland poet has managed to find some new, structurally important ideas in the basic idea before him.

The first of these is the idea of the twelve anti-peers, which turns out to be very fruitful, since at one stroke, so to speak, it provides a firm structural foundation for laisses 59–68 and 93–104, which represents the whole of the first act of the Battle of Roncevaux; this act was thoroughly examined above (A.9.13).

Secondly, William and his family, the Aimerids, are now excluded from the list. Instead, their epic complex appears in the closing part of the Song through their key words *Nerbone* and especially *Vivïen* (C.3.2.2). Thus, the poet of Roland and Charlemagne, within the narrative timeframe as well in his own

---

> OF *Burdele* (v. 1289), only just still commonplace in OF (cf. Moisan, Flutre s. v.). Furthermore, the name appears with the local -s, and in two different variants: mostly, it was soon drawn into the trend affecting plural-locative tribal names ending in Lat. -īs: *Burdigalis* > OF *Burdels* > modern Fr. *Bordeaux*; but occasionally, this trend only took place after the development -is > -s had happened, and then it was just added on to the end: OF *Burdeles* (v. 3684). Finally, the rare form *Burdel* (v. 1389) is probably a hybrid (loss of the -e as in *Burdels*, but retention of the sg. as in *Burdele*) and because it only seems to occur in OF verse literature, there are probably technical reasons for this form (requirements of the metre, assonance or rhyme).

historical time, hands over the mantle of responsibility to the many William and Louis poets who come after him.

Thirdly, and in contrast with the *Pèlerinage*, Turpin, Naimes and Ogier are excluded from the list of peers, presumably because the poet – at the time of the Battle of Roncevaux at least – did not want to see them as young hotheads. Nevertheless, Turpin is allowed to die at Roncevaux, because the poet is obviously keen to show that his clerical office is compatible with military exploits against the 'heathen', even culminating in Christian martyrdom. The poet is obliged to reserve Naimes and Ogier for Charlemagne's retinue in the Baligant section. Since Charlemagne the man, rather than the king, needs at least one true *intimus* and friend, Naimes is given this role, and so he must always remain in as close proximity as possible to the monarch; the friendship between these two men culminates in the Baligant section when Charlemagne saves Naimes from certain death. Ogier, on the other hand, survives Roncevaux, probably because the poet needs a rude character in the Baligant section, that is to say someone who, in the most dangerous moment when the enemy is breaking through, dares to challenge Charlemagne with the words (v. 3238s.): *Ja Deu ne placet qu'el chef portez corone, / S'or ne ferez pur venger vostre hunte* – and incidentally, this is a strong indication that the poet also knew about a previous enmity between the two men, which in fact was the main theme of the *Chevalerie Ogier* and a historical reality (in the years 772–774). Moreover, it may be that Ogier's epic biography was already so extensive that the poet felt obliged to imagine parts of it occurring after the Battle of Roncevaux.[1340]

This extensive elimination of heroes from the list of peers has some positive consequences: it causes the Roland poet to introduce many *homines novi* as peers, figures who had existed before, at the most for a short time, perhaps in a narrowly provincial context, who were largely unknown, or were perhaps even the poet's own invention. And he knows how to make a virtue out of necessity, using this to intensify the tragic element in the narrative: the men who are mown down are not the well-known worthies, but the best of the empire's promising young men.

This is linked with the fourth element of structural innovation: the new inner structure of the twelve, showing them consistently listed in pairs, which is not seen in any of the other lists of peers. The poet was given the first two names to start with: Roland and Olivier;[1341] this then provided the "recipe" for

---

1340 On Ogier from history to epic literature cf. Beckmann (2004d, passim).
1341 Because even the sharpest critics of the pre-history of the Roland material acknowledge the pair of brothers Olivier-Roland from Béziers from the year 1091 and from Saint-Pé de Générès

all the others. We see the hand of the poet in the onomastics of two pairs at least: Gerin-Ger(i)er and Ive-Ivorĭe, which resemble Basan-Basilĭe,[1342] Guenelun-Guinemer, Malquidant-Malcud, Estramariz-Esturgant (-Escremiz), Turgis-Esturguz and Clarïen-Clarifan. But the poet is careful to avoid using this artistic technique too often: he only lists two pairs of peers with similar names, and they are separated by a different pair between them. And since the poet generally does not include any names of fiefdoms in the pairs of names – because their pairing with each other is enough to define them – we are left with the question of where in France he imagines them to be from, and we have to rely on indications of the regional popularity of many personal names in the upper class. There is one exception: because the first pair in the list, Roland and Olivier, has to be the most important in terms of the story, the poet felt the need to place a certain counterbalance at the end of the list, and so he added some weight to the form of the pair *Engeliers li Guascuinz de Burdele* and *Gerart de Rossillon li veillz*; in this instance, therefore, he deviated from his usual practice by naming the fiefdoms of both men. The epithet *li veillz*, adds extra weight because we imagine the other peers who are modelled on Roland and Olivier as relatively young men; the list is appropriately rounded off with the most vigorous of the older ones.

C.7.4.3 The individual peers (excluding Roland and Olivier)

Roland and Olivier are discussed as main characters in sections C.13–C.15 below. We shall deal with the others here.

C.7.4.3.1 Ge*rin*

Gerin: despite many variants in the β versions (cf. Stengel's index) the form of the name is confirmed in v. 794 (OnCT), 1379 (OCV7T), [1575]=1618 (OnCV7), 2186 (OnV4PT), 2404 (OPT), and therefore should be put into v. 107, 174 and also (instead of the *Engelers* in O which does not fit the story at all[1343]) into v. 1261. It is based on MLat. *Gerinus* (as it is in the *Carmen* v. 241, 267), originally with the hypocoristic *-in* ending in any number of Germ. names beginning with *Ger-*. Morlet (1971 s. v.) lists 13 references scattered across an unremarkable geographical area. In the higher nobility I could only find *Gairinus* (in the year 654 his original signature, later *Gaerinus / Gaerenus / Gerinus*), the brother of Saint

---

from the year 1096; these pairs must have come into being by about 1075 at the latest, and the Song that they came from, a precursor of the surviving Song, by about 1065 at the latest.

1342 On this pair as the poet's own invention cf. Beckmann (2008b, 131–134).

1343 Cf. Segre ad loc.

Leodegar; he was a *vir illuster* and between about 654 and 675 Count of Paris, although he came from a Neustro-Burgundian family, which we can assume was based in Autun and Poitiers.[1344] Some evidence for the pre-existence of the peer Gerin might be found in the fact that he is also present in the list of peers in the *Pèlerinage*, and as we explained above (C.7.3), this text appears to be immune to influences from the RoI. The same is true of Gerin's comrade:

C.7.4.3.2 *Ger(i)er*

Ger(i)er: once again, despite many variants in the β versions (cf. Stengel's index) the form of the name is confirmed here in v. 794 (by OCT), 1269 (OnT), 1380 (OCV7T), [1580]=1623 and 2186 (OV4V7CT), 2404 (OT), and therefore should also be put into v. 107 and 174 (and not the *Gergers/Gergirs* in K). It is based on MLat. *Ger(h)arius* < Germ. *Ger-hari*, in Morlet (s. v.) with 8 references across an unremarkable geographical area; there is no sign of anyone bearing this name in the higher nobility. The *Carmen* (v. 241 etc.) replaces this name with *Gēro / Gĕro,* and this is interesting because although this name is common in Ger., Morlet cannot find any evidence of it in the French- and Occitan-speaking areas.

The PT calls the pair *Gelinus* and *Gelerus*, and some later epics or mss. of epics which are probably influenced by this text have *Gelin* and *Gel(i)er*; it is likely that dissimilation occurred in *Gerer > Geler* first, and then the *-l-* was transferred onto *Gerin*. If, however, the less likely development occurred, and *Gelin* was the primary form, then we could mention two members of the higher nobility, the Counts of Valence *Geilin* I (around 961) and II (around 1058). The PT assumes that both peers are from the southwest, since this text has them laid to

---

[1344] Cf. MGH DD.mer. (ed. Kolzer) no. 55, 149, 155–156, as well as the forgery no. 89–90 and the Deperditum no. 271–272; *Fred. cont.* 2 (MGH SS.mer. 2.169), LHF 45 (MGH SS.mer. 2.318s.), *Passio Leodegarii* I 29 and II 12s. (MGH SS.mer. 5.310s., 333–335), *Vita Lantberti Fontanellensis* 3 (MGH SS.mer. 5.610). Leodegar was the Bishop of Autun and, together with his brother Gerin, leader of the mostly Burgundian opposition against the centralising policy of the West Frankish Palace Mayor Ebroin. Leodegar had been brought up by his uncle Dido, Bishop of Poitiers, became Archdeacon in Poitiers, then Abbot of Saint-Maixent in the Poitou region and finally Bishop of Autun; if Settipani (1989, 18) is correct, even though he relies on a very late source, Gerin was also known as Gerwin and was Count of Poitiers, before he became Count of Paris just before 651. Since Paris was the *sedes regia*, Gerin took on a key position when he became the Count of that place. When Leodegar was exiled for the second time, more decisively than the first, he was sent first to Champagne, and then to the monastery at Fécamp in Normandy; he was put to death in a forest in the in the Artois region; his mother Sigrada was exiled to a monastery in Soissons – all of this confirms *e contrario*, that the family's centre of power was further south, in the region around Burgundy-Poitou. Cf. also Ebling (1974 s. v. *Gaerinus*) and the LM s. v. *Ebroinus* and *Leodegarius*.

rest in Bordeaux (cf. Beckmann 2011, 40s.). The Roland poet also appears to think of them as southern Frenchmen: when he relates in v. [1575–1583]=1618–1626 how Grandonĭe cuts down Gerin, Gerer and the southern Frenchmen Berenger, Guiun of Saint-Antonĭe (i.e. from Saint-Antoine-l'Abbaye, Isère) and Austorge of Vale[nce] one after the other, the poet must have imagined them as a group of men from the south of France who fought together. We see in the Baligant section too (and in historical medieval battles) that people from the same country position themselves next to each other on the battlefield.

C.7.4.3.3 *Otun* or *Atun*

The name of the next peer presents a dilemma. For *Atun* is not a variant of the name *Otun* (< Germ. *Otto*), but rather a name in its own right (< Germ. *Atto* and *Hatto*, in Morlet 19a and 119b–120a, evidenced by 10–15 references from France for each form[1345]). Other epics cannot help us to decide this question because the two names are more or less equally well represented in the sources: the peer is called *(H)Aton* in the *Couronnement de Louis* (v. 565, also next to *Berengiers* here), *Gui de Bourgogne*, in the *Saisnes* (version L), in the *Galien, Mort de Maugis*, *Roman d'Arles* and in Girard d'Amiens; on the other hand we have *Oton* in the *Cansó d'Antiocha*, in the *Otinel*, *Jehan de Lanson*, *Macaire*, the Occitan *Fierabras*, in the *Entrée d'Espagne* and the *Prise de Pampelune*; both forms appear next to each other in the *Aspremont* (ed. Brandin).

    This brings us to the Rol.: *Otes* O 795, the same in CV7, *Hatun* n, *Atto* [sic] K (*Ato* A), *Hoston* T;

    [*Otes*] Segre 1297, *Gualter* O,[1346] *Hatun* n, *Hatte* K, *Astolfo* V4, *Otes* CV7, *Othes* P, *Oste* T, *Huez* L;

    [*O*]*tu*[*n*] Segre 2187, *Atuin* according to Segre, *Atum* according to Stengel and Hilka/Pfister, *Attun* according to Bédier and my own reading O, *Hatun* n, *Astolf* V4, *Oton* CV7T;

    Otes O 2405, *Astof* V4, *Estoult* P, *Hoton* T, *Oton* L: here the only instance of *Huez* 'Hugo' in L is an arbitrary substitution. *Hoston / Oste* in T has a hypercorrect silent -*s*-; *Othes* in P takes its -*th*- from the occasional MLat. *Otho* in place of *Otto* (falsely derived from the name of the Roman Emperor Otho).

1345 To be on the safe side, I am not counting the forms *Ad(d)o* and *Had(d)o* which are also found there.

1346 This is obviously incorrect because Gualter is to be found elsewhere; more detail on this in Segre ad loc.

We must look a little more closely at *Astolf(o) / Astof* in V4. In the Rol., it is an intruder, but it lives on in the *Astolfo* figure in Italian epics. It is the Germanic name *Haistulf* (*Aistulf*). The most famous bearer of this name is the King of the Lombards (from 749–756), enemy of Charlemagne's father Pippin; but the name also occurs north of the Alps, since for example we find Haistulf, Archbishop of Mainz (from 814–826), and also in France, according to Morlet, four times in the 9th c. (*Aist-*), then in 916 (*Ast-*) and (in the Champagne region) in 1075 (*Haist-* as well as *Hast-*).[1347] As the name of a peer, it probably originates in France, and not in Italy at a later date; for the *Astulfus*, who according to the *Otia Imperialia* (around 1210, III 90, ed. Banks/Binns p. 736) by Gervasius of Tilbury is buried in Arles along with other illustrious figures from the OF epic tradition, can only be the same person as the *Astolf(o)/Astof* in V4.

As in the Rol. oral non-final *-ai-* was already monophthongised (and was soon merged with /ẹ/ in certain unstressed cases), so even at that time OF /estǫłs/ (with loss of the *-f-* in accordance with the three-consonant rule) > /estǫus/ corresponded to the Lat. rectus *Aistulfus*; but this name was soon indistinguishable from *estolz* /estǫłts/ > /estǫus/ 'hardi, audacieux, d'une bravoure fière et téméraire' (< Lat. *stultus*, perhaps x Germ. *stolt*); it must have been tempting in France to interpret the latter into the former, perhaps jokingly at first. This explains the *Estoult* in P. But this name, too, is much older than P, even in the epic tradition.[1348] Because the PT (cap. 11 and 29) already has an *Estultus, comes Lingonensis*, and because Langres was still counted as part of Burgundy, he was laid to rest in Arles, just like Gervasius' *Astulfus*. From about 1200 onwards, he is to be found (probably following the PT) as *Estolz de Langres* in many other epics.[1349] The hybrid form *Estouf* occurs several times in Gaul, in reworkings of *Simon de Pouille* and once in the *Entrée d'Espagne*, and the hybrid form *Estolfo* in the Spanish *romancero* (cf. Moisan s. v.).

In the PT, however, the person who corresponds most closely with our *Aton / Oton* is not this *Estultus*, but a certain *Ato*, whose location is not specified, and who in cap. 11, much as in the Song, stands right next to *Berengarius*, although in cap. 29, when the names of those laid to rest in Arles are listed, the

---

1347 Morlet (26a, 43a, 123a) hesitates between three etymologies, but the only tenable one is probably on p. 123a (Got. *haifsts*, OE *hæste* with its original meaning 'display of power, vehemence').

1348 Outside the epic tradition, *Estolz* as a name is perhaps behind the toponym *Estouteville* (Calvados) (a. 1106 *Stuteville*, perhaps even before 1089 *Stotavilla*).

1349 As Léon Gautier (1878–1897, 3. 177–179) pointed out, in *Otinel*, *Gui de Bourgogne*, *Entrée d'Espagne* and *Prise de Pampelune*, he has some heroic-comic attributes, probably due to the interpretation of his name, and this occurs right up until Ariosto's Astolfo.

two are separated by three other names. The coexistence of *Estultus* (< *Aistulfo*) and *Ato* in the PT forces us to evaluate *Asto(l)f(o)* / *Estoult* in the Rol. tradition (V4, P) as an intruder; but since his *Ast-/Aist-/Est-* is nonetheless closer to *At(t)-* than to *Ot-*, he is more likely to have replaced an *Aton* than an *Oton.*

This factor and the *Ato* already in the PT add considerable weight to the argument in favour of choosing *Aton* as the name of this peer. But the main argument is the narrative content: we already have an Oton in the Baligant section. Even if we accept the theory that the Baligant section was written by a different author, the question still arises: would an Oton without a fiefdom toponym have been introduced here, if in the main section there had already been a peer by the name of Oton, likewise without any fiefdom toponym? The problem only increases if the same poet wrote the whole Song.[1350]

As O is here inconsistent in itself, whereas the two other manuscripts which point back to twelfth-century Anglo-Norman England, n and K, are consistent in their *Ates / Atun*, we should generalise that name.[1351] This is also the view taken by Konrad Hofmann (cf. the note in *Romania* 17, 1888, 425), then *en detail* by Baist (1894, passim) and Jenkins (on v. 795).

Can we then put *Ates /Atun* in the archetype of the Rol.? If we take an impartial approach to different editorial techniques, we can do this at least in v. 2187 along with Stengel, Bédier and Hilka/Pfister but against Segre. In v. 795 and 1297 n and K but have *Ates / Atun*, and although they are not independent of each other, together they lead us back to Anglo-Norman England in about 1170. There, the name *Hatto(n)* is not unknown, but it is hard to accept the *Astolf(o)/Astof* in V4 as indirect evidence of *Aton*, and not *Otun*, then it is possible that β had *Ates / Atun* everywhere, and that it was only in δ (as occasionally in O) that the still universally familiar *Otun* was introduced; with this argument, we can put *Ates / Atun* into all relevant passages in the text. This is the view taken by Konrad Hofmann (cf. the note in *Romania* 17, 1888, 425), then *en detail* by Baist (1894, passim) and Jenkins (on v. 795). In terms of the stemma, this is much more complicated than Segre's opposite solution, but it is a better

---

1350 The fact that there is both a Tierri d'Argone and a Tierri d'Anjou is not a counter argument, because in this case one is mentioned with his fiefdom in eastern France, while the other is the as yet fief-less younger brother of Gefreid d'Anjou, and therefore recognisably comes from the west of France, and it is unimaginable that in the Song there would be two brothers, one with a duchy (cf. v. 3083, 3819) in the west of France and the other with a duchy in the East as their fiefdoms.

1351 O is evidently influenced by the name of the Ottonian dynasty; Otto the Great's first wife (who bore him four children) was the English princess Eadgyth (> Edith), daughter of King Edward I.

reflection of the narrative content of the Song, and indeed also of the early epic tradition (PT, *Couronnement*). It is interesting that Bédier (first edition 1922 until *édition définitive* 1937) has *Otes* three times in the text itself, and *Attun* once, but in the commentary (1927, 306) simply mentions "Berengier et Haton".

How does the name appear in the higher nobility? For *Otun* cf. C.6.3.6 above in connection with the 'leaders of the *eschieles*'; we shall deal with *(H) Atun* here. In the first half of the 9th c., the Hattonids were an influential family in the eastern part of the Empire (with centres of power in the Middle Rhine region),[1352] after the division of the Empire, there was a Hatto in the Middle Empire as Bishop of Verdun from 847–870, and Lothar II in 869 (MGH DD.kar. Lothar I/II no. 439) still had a Count Atto in what is today the Département Jura whom he called his *consanguineus*; after this time there appears to have been no other significant bearer of this name in the eastern or northern parts of the French-speaking region.

In the west, Atto I and II, Viscounts of Tours around 878–900, and then of Melle in the Poitou region (cf. K. F. Werner 1959, 176, Settipani 2004, 263), remained isolated. But even at that time, the name began to grow in popularity, slowly at first, in the extreme south of France. Charlemagne had given Mèze Castle (Hérault), half-way between Montpellier and Béziers, as a fiefdom to a refugee from Muslim Spain; his descendant *Ato* had Charlemagne's charter, which had already been confirmed by Louis the Pious, reconfirmed by Charles the Bald on 29.04.844 (Kienast 1990, 207 n. 660, 385 n. 1340); this makes him the first southern French castellan to bear that name. After this we find: the three Viscounts of Albi, Aton I (attested in 898), II (in 942) and III (in 1025, 1032; cf. on him Settipani 2004, 150s.), the Mozarabic Bishop Ató of Lleida/Lérida in 923–955, the two Bishops of Toulouse called Atto (from 973–974) and Attus[1353] (from 990–1000), the Viscount Aton of Soule (in 1005), the two Viscounts Peire Aton I (married in 1069) and Peire Aton II (1139) of Bruniquel (about 25 km east of Montauban), and, more powerful than all of these, almost equal in rank to his feudal lord Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Bernart Aton, Viscount of Albi and Nîmes (on his father's side) from 1074, of Agde, Carcassonne and especially Béziers (on his mother's side) from 1099 († 1129).[1354]

1352 Tellenbach (1939, 47); we might add to this: Hatto is the eighth of fifteen counts who are witnesses to the last will of Charlemagne in 810.

1353 The nom. *Atto* in Occ. goes through regular phonological development to *At*; we need only think of the Toulousian troubadour At de Mons. This *At* could of course have been incorrectly re-Latinised to *Attus* here and there.

1354 The southern French Aton mainly from http://fmg.ac/MedLands/France/ (last access 28. 12. 2015). Kremer (1972, 65) also states that the name is unusually commonplace in Catalonia.

Interestingly, *Aton* after *Peire* and *Bernart* here is not the name of the fa-
ther, but rather a second name to differentiate the individual from the many
other men called Peire and Bernart. Tavernier (1913, 89) was only aware of Ber-
nart Aton and thought that he alone gave his name to the epic Atun. This is too
narrow a viewpoint; but it is certainly correct that at that time the name must
have sounded 'southern'. Since not only Nîmes and Béziers, but also Albi and
Carcassonne are closer to Arles than to Bordeaux, we can see why the PT has
its *Ato* laid to rest in Arles.

C.7.4.3.4 *Bereng(i)er*

Bereng(i)er (v. 795,1304, 1624, 2187, 2405): MLat. *Berengarius* (in Morlet s. v.
about 30 references) is an established Latinisation of Germ. (*Bern-gair* >) *Bern-
ger*. This peer is named in the list in the *Pèlerinage* which means there is a good
chance that he already existed before. The occurrence of this name in the
higher nobility is similar to that of *Aton*: until just after 900 it is distributed al-
most equally across the north and south,[1355] but then it very clearly turns into a
southern name (spreading mainly across a coastal band about 100 km wide
from east of the Rhône to Catalonia, including many members from the higher
nobility).[1356] It is likely that the Roland poet understood him in this way, all the

---

1355 *Berengar* in the 9th c. is above all the main name used by the great (H)Unruochinger
family, which was probably based initially around Lille (where the family burial place Cysoing
was later to be found); their members include: probably Count Berengar, sent to Aquitaine in
768 (Oelsner 1871, 411); then certainly Berengar, who in 819 defeated Lupus Centullus of Gas-
cony, was Count of Toulouse and of Brioude, in 832 also of the whole Duchy of Narbonne-Sep-
timania, † 835/837 and was mourned as the *dux fidelis et sapiens* by his relatives, the
emperor's family; Berengar (one or two individuals?), in 825 and 853 *missus* in the north, in
846 Count of Boulogne (and later in Italy Berengar, through his mother Gisela grandson of
Louis the Pious, 874/875 Margrave in Friaul, in 915–924 emperor; his grandson Berengar II,
from 950–961 King of Italy, exiled to Bamberg by Otto the Great). Also: in 892 Berengar Count
of Maine and perhaps of Bayeux, perhaps the same person as the Count Berengar of Rennes
who married into Brittany; around 907–919 Berengar, Count of Namur; there were also multi-
ple individuals called Count Berengar in the German-speaking regions (Mayen- and Lahngau).
1356 In the north I could only find two or three people called Berenger, politically unimpor-
tant members of the Norman Tosny family, attested from 1063 onwards, after 1066 landowners
in England (cf. https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/NORMANDY%20NOBILITY.htm#; last ac-
cess 31. 3. 2022.); the name seems to have come into the family through the Catalan wife of
Roger I. In the south, by way of contrast, we find: Berenger I, II and III, Counts of Melgueil in
922 and before 980 (cf. Settipani 2004, 132s.) and around 1065; Berenger I and II, Viscounts of
Millau (Aveyron) in 937 and 1051–1070 (cf. Settipani 2004, 138s.); Berenger, Viscount (some-
times called Count) of Avignon around 1030–1065; his son Berenger, Viscount of Sisteron until
after 1063; Berenger, Viscount of Narbonne from around 1020 until after 1067; his two

more since Berenger belongs to the above-mentioned (C.7.4.3.2), probably exclusively southern French group of Grandonĭe's victims, Gerin, Gerer, Berenger, Guiun de Saint-Antonĭe and Austorge de Valence. The same is true in the PT, which has him laid to rest in Arles.

C.7.4.3.5 *Ive*

Ive (v. 1895, 2406): MLat. *Ivo* (in Morlet with about twenty references) is quite well attested in France from about 800 onwards, but in the higher nobility only from about the turn of the millennium in the northwest and west, between Vermandois and Maine, with density focus around Bellême, and even there we find no illustrious bearers of this name apart from the Bishop of Chartres.[1357] It is also to be found occasionally in Sicily, probably carried there by the Normans, where it is attested from 1118 onwards (Caracausi 1993 s. v. *Ivone*).

---

grandsons of the same name (including the one mentioned by Tavernier 1913, 89 n.129 who took part in the First Crusade, brother of Viscount Aimery I); finally, the Counts of Barcelona Berengar Ramón I 1017–1035, II 1076–1097 as well as Ramón Berengar I 1035–1076, II 1076–1082, III "the Great" 1097–1131 (from 1113 onwards also Count of Provence, from 1114–1116 reconqueror of the Balearic Islands) and IV 1131–1162 (where Berengar II and IV is not the name of the father, but part of a double name), and lastly his brother Berengar Ramón from 1131–1144 Count of Provence.

1357 That is to say (mainly based on Wikipedia s.v. *Bellême* and on different articles from http://fmg.ac/MedLands): Ivo of Creil Lord of Bellême, at least from 997–1005, other individuals called Ivo of Bellême until at least 1070, including Ivo Bishop of Sées around 1035–1070 (cf. LM s. v. *Bellême*); Ivo, son of the Viscount of Beaumont-sur-Sarthe, Archdeacon of Le Mans, shortly after 1000; Ivo I Count of Beaumont-sur-Oise (30 km north of Paris) around 1022–1059, II † 1059, III about 1070–1090 (from Tavernier 1913, 80s., arbitrarily declared to be the person who gave his name to the peer), his grandson Ivo 1110; Ivo I of Courville (near Chartres) around 1050, II at least from 1094–1127; Ivo of Ham (near Péronne) about 1055–1089; Ivo I of Nesle (near Péronne) 1076, II becomes Count of Soissons, 1141–1178; Ivo I, II and III of Mello (45 km north of Paris) at least from 1087–1146; (Saint) Ivo Bishop of Chartres 1089–1115; Ivo of Grantmesnil until after 1102, his son Ivo † 1120. – A short-lived Bishop Ivo of Marseille (only 781) is, if not dubious, at least very atypical. The popularity of this name among the north-western nobility from about 1000 onwards could perhaps go all the way back to an English saint and bishop, who supposedly came from Persia around the year 600, was initially laid to rest in the place known today as Saint-Yves (Cambridgeshire), and then in 1001 reinterred at Ramsey Abbey; at the beginning of the 11th c. a *Vita* was written about him, which was soon revised (BHL 4621s.). We cannot exclude a Saint *Ywius* (according to the AA.SS. for the 3rd of October), according to Mas-Latrie also *Yvio*, in the late 7th c. a student of Saint Cuthbert and deacon in England, who died in Brittany. Quite apart from his shadowy biography, the great popularity of this name *Yves* in Brittany and the area under its influence seems to have been a late medieval phenomenon, inspired by the activities in Brittany of Yves Helory († 1303), the 'Advocate of the Poor'.

Evidently, in the Song the name is not due to an individual, but to its north-western or western sound. This figure does not exist in the PT.

C.7.4.3.6 *Ivorĭe*

Ivorĭe (v. 1895, 2406): his name is homonymous with the noun **ivorĭe > ivoire* 'ivory' (and before recorded history also the adj. 'ivory' derived from Lat. *ebor-eus*). This is most likely to be its etymology here also; however, early Celtic references are also possible (cf. on this Becker 2009, 422). In any case, the Lat. adj. is attested as a name between 70 and 100 A. D. in *Aulus Eburius Celer* (CIL 3.14358/17, Petronell-Carnuntum in Austria; more individuals are called *Eburius* in Solin/Salomies 1994, 71 and 499). A Bishop *Eborius* of York attended the Council of Arles in 314 as one of three British bishops (ODNB s. v.); even though the Church of York declined over several centuries because of the Anglo-Saxon invasion, his name was not forgotten, one reason being the fact that it appeared in the Council documents which were later included in the Pseudo-Isidorian de-cretals (ed. Hinschius p. 322 a top). From this time onwards, the name some-times appears without the Lat. ending. The *Annales Cambriae* (revised in the late 10th c.) record the death of a Bishop *Ebur* in the year 501, although the ad-dition of *CCCL etatis suae* could possibly make it look as if the Bishop of York is meant here; the *Ebur* in ms. A, and therefore in all the editions, is replaced by the vernacular form *Ywor* in ms. B. At about the same time around 500, or a little later, there is an Irish Saint, Bishop *Íbarus* (AA.SS. for the 23rd April; ODNB s. v. *Munster*, *saints of*, section *Ibar mac Lugna*) and in his *Vita* it is said that he was also called *Yvorus* (there is a long verbatim quotation in Ussher, 1687, 335s.), whereas in what is probably the oldest *Vita Brigidae* (BHL 1455, AA.SS. 01.02., cap. 7) he is called *Yborus*. Mas-Latrie lists him under the 23rd of April, and then another "S. Yvore, Eburius, évêque en Irlande" under the 25th of April, but this is probably just an accidental doubling; none of the great lexica of saints list him (AA.SS., BHL, *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, *Vie des Saints*). The name then appears as *Yvor / Ivor* (which is the form that is widely used as a first name today) in Geoffrey (ed. Griscom p. 259 and 534), and it refers there both to a figure from the distant past and also to the somewhat successful an-tagonist of the Saxons and son of King Cadwaladr of Gwynedd (~ North Wales, † around 682).[1358] Finally, there is a literary figure called *Yvorius* in the Lat. *Vita Meriadoci* (p. 346 ed. Bruce, 1900), which according to the editor (p. 339) is probably from the second third of the 13th c., but it is probably only a freely invented story, probably about a non-Celt, which lumps together international

---

1358 But in the other (i.e. genealogical) sources he is called *Idwal Iwrch* 'Idwal the Roebuck'.

narrative motifs and Celtic names; the editor (p. 330 n. 4) notes that *Ivorius* is a straightforward Latinisation of the well-known Celtic name *Ivor*. In the Romance-speaking regions, however, only one real person called *Ivorius* is attested, namely an unremarkable bondsman (*colonus*, *homo sancti Germani*) who has a family which is onomastically also unremarkable and based in Villemeux (Eure-et-Loir); the source is the *Polyptychon Irminonis* 9.9 (around 820, property register of Saint-Germain des Prés).

If the author of the Song of Roland in its surviving form was in fact a Norman cleric, then it is almost certain that he would have known about this name. Thus, we may consider Ive and Ivoře as a pair from the northwest.

It is unlikely that the name *Ivoře* has a different etymology. In Old French epics (e.g. in the *Chevalerie Ogier* 3995, 9109, 9128 ed. Eusebi) and probably also in OF everyday usage, the Piedmontese city of Ivrea (Lat. *Eporedia*, today Fr. *Ivrée*), an important staging post on the *Via francigena*, was called *Ivoře* (with the stress on the *-i-*), is therefore only a homograph of the personal name. According to Rajna (1889, 20, 28s.) and Rosellini (1958, 259s.), the personal name *Ivorinus* is prevalent in and around Ivrea, just as *Tervisius* occurs around Treviso and *Patavinus* and *Paduanus* around Padua. However, this *Ivorinus* can be wholly (that is to say including the *-inus*, cf. *Patav-inus*) explained from the city name and so tells us nothing about the epic.[1359] Moreover, the *Chevalerie Ogier* mentions both the city name *Ivoře* and the personal name *Yvoře* (this time with the stress on the *-o-*, v. 4119 ed. Eusebi): *Par Saint Yvoře dont je voi le cloquer*, which also suggests that there is no connection.[1360]

The PT, which may not have been aware of the British name, may have associated its *Ivorius* with Ivrea as a secondary interpretation when it has him buried in Arles with the men from the southern part of France.

C.7.4.3.7 *Astors* or *Sansun / Sanson*

Astors / Sansun: In v. 79, as we saw above (C.7.4.1), O has a clearly incorrect *Astors* instead of the *Sanson* in nKV4T, and this helps to create another assonating pair Astors and Ansëis; but he does not carry this idea on throughout the Song. For in all other passages (such as v. 105, and again 1275, [1531]=1574, [1537]= 1580, 2188 and 2408) O has *Sansun* with minor variants in the β (*-un/*-

---

[1359] This would even hold true if the Germ. name *Eburinus* had merged into this *Ivorinus*.
[1360] The quoted statement is uttered by Bertrand in Pavia. Eusebi comments in the index: "S [anctus]Ebureus, festeggiato il 23 aprile", but this is probably just taken from Mas-Latrie since no evidence is provided for his veneration in France or Italy.

on, *-ns-/-ms-/-mps-*, also a rectus *Sanse* V4T, *Sanses* CV7). The *Carmen* (v. 267 etc.) also has *Samson/ Sampson*.

In O *Astor-s* is probably < *Astorc-s following the three-consonant rule. We shall discuss below (C.8.4) the name MLat. *Austorgius / Astorgius / Eustorgius*, which in the form *Austorje* in v. [1582]=1625 refers to a Duke of Valence. The name sometimes appears in a variant without the *-i-*, as in *Astorgus* in the year 894 in Brioude, *Austorgus* in 1062 in Marseille (Morlet 1972 s. v. *Eustorgius*), in the two men called *Austorgus*, father and brother of Bishop Aldebert of Mende, who founded the Priory of Chirac the Gévaudan region in 1062 with this same brother (Bouquet 14.107s.), in the *Austorg / Austorc / Auztorc / Austorx* in the period between about 1109 and 1182, who, according to Aebischer (1970b, 439) are to be found in Brunel's Occitan deeds, and finally in the name of the troubadours Austorc d'Aurillac, de Galhac, d'Alboi (or del Boi) and de Segret – which also correspon to our text.[1361] As Aebischer no doubt correctly supposes, the writer of O or his predecessor must have been thinking of Duke *Austorje* when he wrote about his *Astor*s; Hilka/Pfister also make this identification in their index.

This brings us to *Sansun*! The biblical Samson had a very prominent place in cathedral statuary in Romance-speaking areas (LCI and LM, s. v.), and another Saint Samson, who founded the Diocese of Dol in the 6th c., was venerated in Brittany, Normandy and around 1100 also even in the Beauvaisis region; Archbishop Samson of Reims (1140–1161) who came from the Vexin was probably named after him. But the Song describes *Sansun* as a *duc* (v. 105, 1275, 2408), *riche duc* (v. [1531] =1574), and besides Gefreid of Anjou, Oedun of Brittany and Richard of Normandy (as well as implicitly Roland in Le Mans, we assume) it is not obvious where in the (north-) west there would be room for another duke. I was not able to find any other Samson from the higher nobility in France; but of the more than 20 references in Morlet (1972, s. v., the forms *Samson / Sanson / Sanso*) the majority come from the southeast, as indeed by far the majority of Saints' names were pushing up from the southeast at that time. The PT calls Samson *dux Burgundionum* and also has him buried in Arles; the *Gui de Bourgogne* (where he is the father of the eponymous hero) and the *Gaydon*[1362] take up this

---

1361 The variant with /a/ and with /g/ (> Old Occ. /-k/ at the end of a word) is possibly influenced by the name *Asturicus*, which Solin/Salomies (1994, 296) found attested in Juvenal 3.212. Sometimes in Old Occ. the *-c* was dropped; Aebischer (1970b, 439) finds an *Austor* in Brunel from the year 1186, and Chabaneau/Anglade (1916, s. v.) have an *Austorc* as well as an *Austor* and an *Austoret*.

1362 As does the Roland L ms.; T makes him a Duke of Metz and Dijon, but this is simply amplification.

localisation. The Roland poet is probably thinking of the *riche duc Sansun* as a Burgundian too.[1363]

C.7.4.3.8 *Anseïs*

Anseïs (v. 105, 796, 1281, 1599, 2188, 2408): This form of the name is confirmed for the archetype by OKV4CV7PTL; only the Norse, Dutch and Welsh translations misunderstand the name. The *Carmen* (v. 317) also displays unfamiliarity with the name through its use of the form *Ansēum* (acc. sg.). Morlet (1971, s. v.) offers 25 references for MLat. *Ansigisus* (< Germ. *Ans-+-gis*), 18 from the eastern half of France and 7 from the western half, as well as four references for the variant *Ansigisilus* of this name.

   Ansegisel was the great-great-grandfather of Charlemagne, solely on the father's side (middle of the 7th c.), son of Saint Arnulf of Metz. He unified the power complex of the Arnulfingers around Metz through his marriage to Begga, the daughter of Pippin the Elder, with the still more important power complex of the Pippinids around Liège-Landen, and in so doing he founded the large Maas-Mosel domain which provided the resources to help his son Pippin the Middle make his way up to his high position as mayor of the whole of the Frankish empire. The name of this person *Ansegisel* was soon replaced by the more common *Ans(e)gis(us)* or even made to resemble the classical name *Anchises*;[1364] the genealogies of the Carolingians and the Frankish kings that begin to appear just before 800 (MGH SS. 13.245–249; cf. now Settipani 1993, 139–146) only have *An(s)chisus*, *Ans(i)gisus*, and Thegan (cap. 1, MGH SS.schol. 64, 176) has *Ansgisus* (var. *Ansigisus*, *Anschisus*); the Chronicles follow suit, so that – to pick out only two examples from the period around 1100 – Sigebert of Gembloux († 1112, for the years 650, 685, 692) has *Ansigisus*, and Hugo of Flavigny († around 1114, MGH SS. 8.332) has *Anchises qui et Ansegisus*. Since it is understandable that people would tend to think that the ancestors of the Carolingian kings were also kings, there are likely to be vague recollections of this *Ansegis(el)* when in the Lorraine epics (from the region around Metz!) *Garin le Loherain* (late 12th c.) and *Hervis de Mes* (before 1215) an Anseïs appears, now promoted to the position of King of Cologne, father-in-law of Hervis of Metz. After this, in the *Anseïs de Mes* (early

---

1363 Boissonnade (1923, 406s.) is perhaps right to remind us of the Salian Frank Samson († after 932), Count of Pavia and Bergamo and Count Palatine under King Rudolf of Italy (922–926) and Upper *Burgundy* (912–937), then under King Hugo of Italy (925–945) and Lower *Burgundy* (924–933).

1364 This last option is found explicitly in Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* 6.24: *Anschis* (sic, var. *Ansechis*, *Ansegissus* etc.) *Arnulfi filius, qui de nomine Anschise* (sic, var. *Anchise*) *quondam Troiani creditur appellatus.*

13th c.), Hervis' grandson Ansëis becomes the eponymous hero of his own epic, and in the *Aspremont* and the *Folque de Candie*, Ansëis is a former King of France, just as in the *Saisnes*, where he is (like the historical Charles Martel) the illegitimately-born grandfather of Charlemagne who obtains the French crown by fighting in single combat, and in *Simon de Pouille*, in the *Chevalier au Cygne* and in the *Enfances Doon de Maience* the expression 'since the time of Ansëis' just means 'since time immemorial' (cf. Moisan s. v.).

Among the secular higher nobility, I can only find one possible Count *Ansigisulus* of Verdun in the year 701 in the circle around Pippin the Middle (probably a close relative).[1365] A monk Ansegis († 833) served as a successful royal messenger under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious and was rewarded with the leadership of monasteries in Reims, Châlons, in the Beauvaisis region, Luxueil and above all in Saint-Wandrille – making him extremely powerful, which no doubt indicates that he belonged to the upper nobility – and he left a collection of capitularies behind; he was venerated as a saint in Saint-Wandrille (LM s. v. *Ansegis* 1, AA.SS. relating to the 20th July). There were other high-ranking clerics who bore this name: Archbishop Ansegis of Sens (871–883), an opponent of Hincmar and for a time Papal Vicar for the whole of France, who in the year 879 in Sens crowned Charles the Bald's grandsons Louis and Carloman (LM s. v. *Ansegis* 2); Bishop *Ansegis* of Geneva, attested in the year 877, is said to have been a bishop for 32 years; and finally there is the chancellor of the

---

1365 The old, now discredited MGH edition of the Merovingian charters by G. H. Pertz Jun. (Hannover, Hahn, 1872) also contains the charters of the early Carolingian mayors of the palace, on p. 92s. the charter of Pippin the Middle and Plektrud of 20.01.702, which only survives as a copy, regarding an exchange of goods between Bishop Armonius of Verdun and the Monastery of Saint-Vanne in that location; the first witness is (*Signum*) *Ansigisubo comite*, which obviously should be read as *Ansigisulo*. In the new MGH edition by Ingrid Heidrich (2011, no. 3) the charter is now dated to the 20.1.701 and deemed to be genuine. The variants are here *Angibuso* C1, C2, E, *Ansigisubo* C4, *Angebusi* D, *Antigisubo* Calmet. According to Heidrich, all of the surviving texts lead back to the cartulary of Saint-Vanne (C, 12th c.) which was lost after 1784. Calmet (1728) claims to have edited the text directly from theoriginal and may have misread *nſ* as *nt*. Since C1 and C2 are copies made by the same hand in the 15th/16th c., they should be considered as a single source. According to Heidrich, not only D, but also C4 (18th c., Collection Bréquigny) are based on C2. It is difficult to accept this last theory, not just because C2 has errors in lines 8, 9 and 13 which are not carried over into C4 (cf. Heidrich's textual apparatus), but because in particular there is no explanation for *Angibuso* (and *Angebusi*), other than that it arises from incorrect spellings of *Ansigibuso* < *Ansigisubo* (= C4 + Calmet's source C) < *Ansigisulo*. The Collection Bréquigny, made up of mostly charters that were kept in England until after 1764, could here represent an independent and better strand of the manuscript tradition.

French King Raoul, Bishop Ansegis of Troyes (914–970 [sic]), who fought bravely with his vassals on the Burgundian side against the Loire-Normans and was gravely wounded in 925 at the Battle of Chalmont in the Gâtinais region, all of which persuaded Boissonnade (1923, 356s.) that he was the most likely one to have given his name to the epic Ansëis. I prefer a more general assessment: since almost all of the sources point to the name being prevalent in the eastern part of the French-speaking area, it would probably have sounded somewhat eastern to the Roland poet. Sansun and Ansëis are thus probably an eastern pair, from Burgundy-Lorraine. There is no Anse(g)is in the PT.

Just as *Sansun* and *Anseïs* belong together in the surviving Song of Roland, so they also appear together in the *Carmen* (v. 315–318) as *Sampson* and *Ansēus* (in the acc. form *Ansēum*). But *Anseus* is entirely unknown anywhere else as a name form, or a name in its own right, and neither is it very likely to have been an unattested stage in the development of *Ansegis(el)*. What happened, then? It is very likely that the author of the *Carmen* did not know, or did not recognise, the name and thought that the *-is* in the vernacular form *Anseīs* from his source was an inflective element, and so he Latinised what he thought was the remaining word stem *Anse-* in the simplest possible fashion by adding the ending *-us*. This indicates that he was not the creator of the material – and that his Latin *Carmen* was not at all the main source of the Song of Roland – as Gicquel (2003, passim) believes. For it is rather unlikely that the author of the *Carmen* would have given a hitherto non-existent name with no prestige to a Frankish character he had himself invented; it is also unlikely that the Roland author would have managed with a *coup de pouce* to turn this name into a good one, full of Lorraine regional prestige; and finally, it is also unlikely that this would have "by chance" brought into being a geographically neighbouring pair of friends, that is to say men from Burgundy and Lorraine respectively. The majority view in French studies until now is much more likely: that the ambition of the author of the *Carmen* was to make a Latin epic out of the vernacular Song of Roland or, more precisely, out of an edited form of this Song, which was quite close to the surviving form we see today. This edited version had (like the PT) no Baligant section, and instead of the Blancandrin section, it had the scene with Ganelon's lonely and fearful ride to Saragossa, which means that in terms of the stemma it is older than the surviving Song of Roland. This does not necessarily mean, however, that it is older in terms of the absolute chronology. For the surviving form of the Song that we have today did not suppress overnight all the other vernacular versions of the material.

C.7.4.3.9 *Gaifier* or *Engel(i)er* the Gascon

Gaifier / Engel(i)er: In the first passage (v. 798), as we saw above (C.7.4.1), O has replaced the *gascon* (nCV7T) *Engelers* (nKV4CV7T) in β with the *riche duc Gaifier* (*de Bordele* in other Old French epics) but he does not continue with this name in the rest of the work. In all the following passages (v. 1289, 1389, [1494]= 1537, [1503]=1546, 2407) the name *Engelier* is confirmed by OnK, with small dialectal discrepancies also by V4 (*Enç-/Inc-*, with northern Ital. /(d)z/), CV7 (*Eng-/Enz-*, the latter northern Ital.) and PTL (*Ang-*). The Carmen (v. 305) also only has *Engĕlĩẽrum*.

Gaifier, in other epics *de Bordele* 'of Bordeaux', in the PT *Gayferus, rex Burde-galensis*, is of course the historical Waifar, Duke of Aquitaine and overlord or loyal ally of the Gascons as well as Lord of Bordeaux, enemy of King Pippin and Pippin's young son Charles who accompanied his father in those campaigns, later to be Charlemagne. So, Waifar took the main negative role in the Fredegar continuations (cap. 35 and 41–52, MGH SS.mer. 2.183 and 186–192), in the Royal Annals for the years 748, 760, 761, 764, 766 and 768 and in the later texts which copy out parts of them, including the work of Sigebert, as well as in the smaller annals and in Einhart's *Vita Karoli* (cap. 3 and 5). For more detail on this man as a figure in the Old French epic tradition (and in Spanish romance poetry), and on his "pro-Carolingianisation" cf. Beckmann (2010, 53–90).[1366]

Engelier: Morlet (1971, s. v. *Ingelharius*, < Germ. *Ingel-+-hari*, where *Ingel-* is an expansion of *Ing-*) supplies 12 Medieval Latin references for the OF *Engelier*. But I am not aware of anyone bearing this name among the higher nobility in the Bordelais region or Gascony. Boissonnade (1923, 361–363) cannot find any either and instead suggests unsuitable ordinary knights (the most southerly of which is from the Limousin region), but then opts for the oldest known ancestor of the Count of Anjou *Ingelger* († 888), whom the Angevin regional historians could still recall more than 200 years later (cf. Halphen/Poupardin 1913, Index s. v. *Enjuger, fils de Tertulle*). In fact, a dissimilation through loss of the second /dž/, that is to say, *Ingelgerius* > *Ingelerius* is almost to be expected, and Boissonnade's observations that Ingelger's descendant Geoffroy II Martel (I) lays claim to and at one point even occupies Bordeaux and that Geoffroy IV Martel (II) in 1104 tries to revive these aspirations, mean that in absence of any better candidate, this Ingelger is barely acceptable. Let us remember that the Song also portrays the

---

1366 We must also reject outright (not just for phonological reasons) his identification as the well-known knightly participant in the First Crusade, Gouffier de Lastours (*Golferius*, *Gulferius de Turribus*, < Germ. *Wulf-+hari*!) in Boissonnade (1923, 360).

members of the house of Anjou, Gefreid d'Anjou and his brother Tierri, with clear sympathy.

Engelier is called *Engelerus dux Aquitaniae, genere guasconus* in the PT, and he is laid to rest, as we might expect, in Bordeaux.[1367]

C.7.4.3.10 *Gerart de Rossillon*

In the case of *Gerart de Rossillon* (v. 797, 1896, 2189, 2409) this full name was already a given for the Roland poet because Gerart, apart from Roland and Olivier, is the only figure in the list of peers who can be *definitely* confirmed as a pre-existing figure. Outside the Rol., the epic Girart de Roussillon (just like his prefiguration, the historical Count Girart of Vienne) spent most of his life fighting against a King Charles (in history Charles the Bald, in the *Girart de Roussillon* epic *Carles Martels*, also called *Carles li Caus*, and otherwise Charlemagne), but he does not die in these battles. From time to time, he even helps Charles to fight the Saracens, and eventually makes peace with him; this is enough to make him eligible for a hero's death at Roncevaux.

Here we have to guard against a false conclusion and at the same time take note of an important, and as far as I know hitherto unrecognised[1368] detail in the development of the Girart material. The young son of a count from the Roussillon area, normally just called "Girard I", who took part in the First Crusade (becoming in 1102 himself Count of Roussillon, murdered as a middle-aged man in 1113/1115) was originally called *Guinard* (< Germ. *Wine-hard*, cf. Morlet s. v.) and only gradually took on the name *Gui-rard / Girard*, a process that was made very much easier by the fact that in Occ. the Germ. *Ger-* names have double forms with /g-/ (written as *gu*-) and with /dž-/. Here are a few references from charters relating to this person: Marca 1688 (col. 473, 476, 477/ 478, 480 [2x], 1219/1220) in 1097 *Guinardus*, 1100 *Guinardus*, but then in 1102 *Guirardus*,[1369] in 1109 *Girardus*, in 1110 *Guirardus*; LFM II (no. 702, 706, 713, 728s., 743, 786) in 1105 *Girardus, Guinardus*, in 1109 in the heading *Guinardus* (2x), in the text *Girardus* (2x), in 1110 *Guinardus, Guirardus*, but then in 1102–1115 *Guirardus* (2x), *Girardus*, in 1121 *Guirardus*, in 1154 *Gerardus*;

1367 In the PT, he is said to have lived in the city of *Aquitania* which was located within the Limoges-Poitiers-Bourges triangle and disappeared after his death. The legend concerning this city is not an invention of the PT, but it may not have been linked with Engelier before it was mentioned in the PT.

1368 In particular, this was not recognised by René Louis (1946–1947, 3.278).

1369 According to fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/CATALAN NOBILITY.htm#_Toc23531387 (last access 31.03.2022) the charter from 15 September 1102 has *Guitardus* (2x); but this could be a misreading of *Guirardus*, because in the Carolingian (and Visigothic) minuscule, the *-t-* does not go above its cross stroke, which makes confusion of *-t-* with *-r-* more likely.

original testament in 1107 (R. Louis 1946–1947, 3.278) *Guirardus*; the crusade historians (Albert of Aachen, William of Tyre, Matthaeus Parisiensis) *Gerardus, Girardus*. Similarly, there are references to his grandson († 1172): Languedoc-HgL V (col. 1035, 1102) in 1139 *Guinardus*, but then in 1148 *Girardus*; Temple 349 (for the Templars of Mas-Deu) in 1149 *Guinardus, Girardis* (sic, gen.). This leads us to only one conclusion: the historical and epic Girart de Vienne was not renamed Girart de Roussillon because of the influence of the historical *Guinart / G(u)irart* I of Roussillon (or of the *county* name as such),[1370] but in fact the opposite happened. Girart de Roussillon was already an epic hero (although the epithet referred, initially at least, to Roussillon Castle on the banks of the Rhône, 20 km south of Vienne[1371]), and the French-speaking participants in the crusades made the young *Guinard* I of Roussillon (probably via an intermediate form Guirard) into a *Girard* de Roussillon; the resistance of the countal family against the flattering new name was at best mediocre in that generation, and it was practically zero two generations later. There is therefore no justification for seeing the *Gerart de Rossillon li veillz* in the Rol. as anything other than the epic hero whose fame had already reached as far as north-western France, albeit probably in a more rudimentary form than it assumed decades later in the grandiose *Girart de Roussillon* epic. The historical Count Girart was a Burgundian both in his Latin *Vita* (§ 102 ed. Billings Ham) and in the two *Girart de Roussillon* epics of the 12th and 14th c. (although under the influence of the monasteries of Pothières and Vézelay which he had founded, his centre of power shifted from the Kingdom of Burgundy into the Duchy of Burgundy). Max Pfister (1970, passim) argued, in my opinion convincingly, that the *Girart de Roussillon* of the 12th c. belongs linguistically in the border area between southern Franco-Provençal and Occitan, that is to say in the area around Vienne, which brings it into the Kingdom of Burgundy. Furthermore, in the third epic devoted to this figure, the *Girart de Vienne*, and in the KMS I (ed. Unger cap. 38–42, ed. Loth cap. A 35–39, B 35–38), Girart remains exactly as he was in history, Count of Vienne. Finally, as Girart de Fraite in the *Aspremont* he is named after a 9th/10th c. castle near Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, that is to say in the south of the Kingdom of Burgundy,[1372] although even in that text he continues to reside in Vienne (v. 1081, 3478, 4152, 5032 ed. Brandin). In view of all these references, the Roland poet must certainly have thought of him as a Burgundian (in the broader sense of that word).

1370 As Coll i Alentorn (1956, passim) believed.

1371 With a historian's critical eye, F. Lot (1926, 280–282, reprint 1958, 92–94) noticed this.

1372 Cf. Lot (1958, 88 n. 3) with the literature cited there!

We can formulate this more categorically: the fact that none of these many texts ever moves Girart from Burgundy into the county of Roussillon, shows that it must in principle be incorrect to assume that there was a phase in the history or pre-history of the Girart epic which was determined by events in the county.

C.7.5 Review of the twelve peers

The meaning of the 'peers' concept in the Old French epic tradition (but, apart from Roland, not its onomastic content) derives from the *aulici* who were slain in the year 778. The fact that there are twelve peers to a certain extent mimics the number of the disciples of Christ, but it is also just a *topos*, that is to say, it is modelled on the large number of positively valued groups of twelve men already in existence.

The specific individuals who make up the number twelve before and after the Rol. vary enormously, apart from the two constant figures Roland and Olivier. The (partial) list of peers in the *Nota Emilianense* and the probably next-oldest list of peers in the *Pèlerinage* do not tell us who the '12 most respected casualties of Roncevaux' are, but instead, it tells us who 'Charlemagne's 12 greatest warriors' are, with the result that Aimerids and some others are included at that point. The Roland poet can eliminate these because most of the Aimerid cycle now unfolds under the leadership of Louis. He has made Ogier and Naimes into courtiers from the circle immediately around Charlemagne, but they are not part of the group of twelve. Turpin is no longer a peer either, because he is a cleric; nevertheless, he dies with the peers at Roncevaux, because the poet is obviously keen to demonstrate the feasibility of combining his spiritual duties on the one hand with bearing arms on the other in a fight against the 'heathen', complete with martyrdom on the battlefield.

The poet gives a firm structure to the number twelve by ordering the men into pairs, and two of these pairs show signs of his creativity in onomastic choices: Gerin and Gerer, Ive and Ivoře. He places two heavyweights at the beginning, namely Roland and Olivier, and two at the end, Engelier of Gascony (or *Aquitania*?) and Girart de Roussillon, but in between he has *homines novi*, young men whose fiefdom is not named, so that altogether the tragedy of Roncevaux – and one of the main reasons why it is such a major blow – lies in the fact that it befalls not the veteran worthies in the circle around Charlemagne, but the elite younger men, who carry the hopes of the Empire.

If we dare to explore the poet's views on the respective homes of the peers by analysing the varying levels of popularity of their names across different regions, we find that he intended the group to be spread across (almost) the

whole of France: in the north-west Ive (Amiens to Le Mans?) and his neighbour Ivorĭe as well as Roland (Le Mans to Angers?), in the mid-southwest Gerin and Gerier (north or east of Bordeaux?), in the far southwest Engelier (Bordeaux to Gascony?), in the far south Aton (Albi-Béziers?), somewhere in the south near the Mediterranean also Berengier, in the far southeast Girart (~ Vienne) and Olivier (~ middle Rhône valley, Geneva?), in the southeast to east Sanson (Duchy of Burgundy?), in the east Ansëis (Metz). There is no-one from the Capetian domain (shortly after 1100 from Bourges to Péronne, Montreuil) or from the northeast – a phenomenon that we will find again when we study the fiefdoms of the other figures, and we will analyse its causes there.

Finally, the concept of the peers inspired the poet to give a certain structure to the whole first act of the Battle of Roncevaux with the invention of the 12 anti-peers.

C.8 The minor characters

Now that we have examined, on the Christian side, the leaders of the ten *eschieles* in the Baligant section and the twelve peers in the Marsilĭe section, which make up the two large groups of people, it is time to look at the minor characters, and we shall do this in alphabetical order.

C.8.1 *Acelin* of Gascony

E de Gascuigne li proz quens Acelin O 172, *Wido von Waskonie* K, *Gui de Gascoigne* CV7: In terms of the stemma, *Acelin* in α and *Gui* in β are equally valid; but β presumably perceived *Acelin* as a negatively loaded name (cf. below) and replaced it with a neutral name, which at the same time alliterated with *G(u)ascoigne*. The second passage, however, is much clearer in terms of the stemma:

Li quens Acelin O 2882, the same in B (the London fragment), *Encilin* V4, *Yoscelin* P: β has given up resistance against the name *Acelin*, but P substitutes a name that is not negatively loaded, V4 contaminates *Acelin* with *Ençeler/Inciler*, its forms of the name *Engelier*. OB confirm the archetype.

Acelin (< Germ. *Azzo-lin*, almost 30 Medieval Latin references from France in Morlet s. v. *Adsilinus*) is in most of the French-speaking area a hypocoristic form of *Ace* (< Germ. *Azzo*, over 25 Medieval Latin references in Morlet s. v. *Adzo*), which in turn can be a hypocoristic form of a full name with a *A-* + dental, as in the case of Bishop *Adal*bero-A(s)celin of Laon, who in 991 betrayed Charles of Lorraine, the last Carolingian pretender, to Hugh Capet. Occasional

forms with umlaut are attested far into the Romance-speaking area (such as in Morlet a female *Ezelina* in 1027 in Bèze, a *Hescelinus* before 1032 near Tours).

The situation is different in Gascony, however. In that region (and in the whole of the Pyrenean area) there is a name *Aizo / Aizi / Eizi / Etzi(us)*: La Réole 108 in the year 990? and 111 in 1030 (2x) *Aizo*, 113 in 1026–1030 *Azio*, 128 in 1100? *Guilhelmus Ezius*; Saint-Sever 150 in 997–1009 *S[ignum] Aezi*, 198, 204, 208 all in 1028–1072 *Eitius / Eicius*; Lézat according to the index from the 10ᵗʰ c. onwards several *E(i)ci(us, -o) / Eiz*; S.Jean-Ordre 413 in 1100–1110 *Eitius de Mazerolis* (charter for Count Sancho of Astarac). In the family of Lords of Labrit (Landes), Fr. (*d’)Albret*, ancestors on the mother's side of Henry IV of France, the first *Bernard Aiz de Lebret* appears in 1085 as the sponsor of Grande Sauve Abbey; his son Amanieu signs a charter for Saint-Sever in 1125 as *filius Bernardeizii*; a second *Bernard Aiz* of Labrit is attested in the year 1140; the name *Bernard Aiz / Ezi* can be found among the Albret family until at least the late 14ᵗʰ c.;[1373] *Aiz* seems here to be a second name, not a patronymic.[1374] Navarrese-Aragonese references are to be found in M. Álvar (1973–1978, Index s. v. *Aiça / Eiz / Eiça, -o*), Catalan in Becker (2009, 131), who thinks the name is a late successor of Lat. *Aëtius*. In my view, it looks more like the Germ. *Aizo*, a hypocoristic form of the Germ. *Aid-* names (cf. Förstemann s. v. *Aid-*). A Visigoth called Aizo (not mentioned by Becker) instigated the great anti-Frankish rebellion in the Marca Hispanica in 826/827 (Royal Annals for the years 826 and 827, *Vita Hludovici* by Anonymous cap. 40s.); the name seems to be unknown in the rest of France (cf. Morlet 26b bottom of the page).[1375]

Secondly, in Gascony there was a name *Akelinus/Achelinus/Aquelinus*, which was evidently pronounced with /k/, and this differentiates it from the previous name (cf. on this name Becker 2009, 185, and Morlet 1972 s. v. *Aquilinus*): Saint-Sever 1.70 (n. 316) in the year 988 *S[ignum] Aquelini Atilii* and in the interpolated or forged charters Saint-Sever 120 "in the year 988" *Achelinus*, 122 (the same charter) *S[ignum] Aquelini Atilii*, 140 and 144 "in 997–1009" *Achelinus*, 234 before 1072 *Aquelini Atilii* and in the genuine charter 654 in 1330 *Aquilinus de Sancto*

1373 These references are from fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/gascatlan.htm#_Toc493834535; last access 21.04.2022. Marquette (1975, passim) is still essential reading on the early history of the Albret family.

1374 Jaurgain (1898–1902, 1.180, 285s., 329, and 2.127) also sees this name in an *Eneci* (< *En Eci*) from the year 920 and in a *Vicecomitis Exii* (gen.), from the year 977, who was a witness at the (re-) foundation of La Reole; in his opinion, this refers to the ancestor, or ancestors (or even the very first) of the Viscounts of Marsan.

1375 Förstemann s. v. *Aizo* mentions the Visigoth reference and also supplies a few references from the Saxon tribal area, but the latter are not relevant for us.

Iuliano. In the year 1080 *Achelinus de Marsan*, son of the local Viscount Lupus Aner, entered the monastery at Grand Sauve because he had lost his sight.[1376]

Thirdly, the form *Acelinus* appears occasionally – as a modification of the second name listed here, or as a hypocoristic form of the first one – as in Saint-Sever 124 in 988–996 *Acelinus Atilio* (the above-mentioned individual). It probably arose through attraction from the (genetically unrelated) common Gallorom. *Acelinus < Azzo.*

The poet must have encountered one of these forms, perhaps the last one, referring to a Gascon, and he would have thought that it was a form of the Gallorom. name *Ace, Acelin* which he would have known already. It is unlikely that he would simply have thought of the name Acelin spontaneously, because this name belongs to a positive character in the Song, while in the French-speaking area, a negative aura had been attached to it because of the bishop who betrayed the last Carolingian; this also explains why the only other *Acelin* in the early epics is the traitor in the *Couronnement de Louis* who tries to seize the French crown for himself (v. 1380–2222).[1377]

C.8.2 *Alde*

Alde O 1720, 3708, 3717, 3723, the same also in V4, *Auda* n, *Alda* (in the gen. once the upper Ger. form[1378] *Alten*) K, *Aude* CV7PT: because of OKV4, *Alde* is also in the archetype.

The name *Alde* (< Germ. *Alda*, in Morlet s. v. eight references) had been on my search list from the start. It is well attested in the (8th and) 9th c. in the north of Galloromania. *Alda* was the name of the mother of William of Toulouse, in the

---

1376 Jaurgain (1898–1902, 2.128).

1377 Boissonnade (1923, 363) is not correct in his suggestion that the poet could have transferred the name *Asseline* from the wife of Count Gerhard II of Armagnac (around 1085) to her husband in the masculine form; in the documentation available to me (https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/gasccent.htm#_Toc493834599; last access 31.03.2022) this lady is actually called *Azivella* (2x) / *Azivera* (< *Aci-bella*, Gasc. > *-bera*).

1378 Förstemann s. v. *Alda* supplies a few references for this form too.

epics called *al curb nes*.[1379] She came from the high Frankish aristocracy and was probably even a daughter of Charles Martel.[1380]

The narrowly regional cult of a certain Saint Alda may well also go back into the Merovingian period, though her name first appears in the name of her home town Sainte-Aulde between Meaux and Château-Thierry, and not until 1109 as *Sancta Auda*, in 1184 as *Sancta Alda* (DT Seine-et-Marne);[1381] Morlet suggests from the *Polyptychon Irminonis* (in or around Paris, about 820) *Alda* 9.33 and *Halda* 22.75, from the *Polyptychon Sancti Remigii* (Reims, about 850) *Halda* 3.7; but *Alda* appears in the *Polyptychon Irminonis* also at 9.52, 11.13, 12.3 (and 12.4), 17.46, 19.12 and 21.63, evidently referring to different individuals each time.

Then the name appears to be almost completely unattested north of Burgundy until after the start of the 11th c.; a solitary *Alda* in Stavelot in 947 can hardly count because this place is very close to the German-speaking area.

The situation is quite different from the level of Cluny southwards. Morlet (s. v.) suggests four references: from Marseille in about 814, Beaulieu (Limousin

---

1379 In the copied versions of his last will and testament, and in the *Vita Sancti Willelmi* (cap. 3, MGH SS. 15.212), documents from Aniane and Gellone (both in Hérault), she is called *Aldana*. In fact, the further south you go in medieval France, the more quickly the Late Latin type of feminine declension *Alda-Aldáne* (> OF *Alde-Aldain*) begins to diminish; classical Occ. has only preserved *puta-pután*. In the other cases, the development was *Aldáne > Aldána* to make the feminisation more obvious. There are similar references in Occ., such as Languedoc-HgL 2.333 (Montolieu near Carcassonne) in 862 *Aldana*, Beaulieu (Limousin region) 203 in 916 two instances of *Aldana*, Languedoc-HgL 4.113 in 1021–1035 (a family tree formulated in modern French) *Roger II* [. . .] *de Comminges* [. . .] *épousa Aldane*, but also from the southern *langue d'oïl*: Cormery 56 (Diocese of Tours) in 868 *Aledanae* (gen.), Bourgogne-Garnier 120 in 878 (for Saint-Bénigne de Dijon) and Cluny 3.283 in 1049–1109 *Aldanae* (gen.).

1380 Settipani (1993, 173–176) argues this *contra* Hlawitschka, convincingly in my opinion. In this instance, *Alda* could be a hypocoristic form of *Alpheid*, her grandmother's name.

1381 According to tradition, Alda was a companion of Saint Geneviève of Paris († around 502), although the two older *Vitae* of this saint (BHL 3334, 3336, AA.SS. for the 3rd of January; the oldest probably late 8th c. MGH SS.mer. 3.204ss.) do not mention Alda. The church of Sainte-Geneviève in Paris kept Alda's bones; her shrine was mentioned in a charter when in 1239 it was taken on a procession to meet Louis IX as he made his way home from his crusade. The Breton church also claims this Alda, identifying her with the historical virgin sainte *Eode (z) / Aode* of Trémazan (Parish of Landunvez, Finistère), murdered around 540; allegedly, for fear of the Normans her bones were taken to Sainte-Geneviève in Paris, whose clerics then would have made her out to be Geneviève's companion. If this version were true, then it would be entirely natural that in Paris her Bret. name would have been turned into the pre-existing Gallorom. *Alda / Alde*. Finally, La Chapelaude (10 km northwest of Montluçon), founded as a Priory in the middle of the 11th c. by Saint-Denis has nothing to do with the saint, and was only later named after the neighbouring town Audes *Capella de Aldis / de Alda*, *La Chapelle-Aude*, and eventually *La Chapelaude* (cf. van de Kieft 1960, passim).

region) in 893, Cluny in 926 and Poitiers-S.Cyprien in 990. I can add from my
own material: Saint-Jean-d'Angély 2.17 and 68 in 969 and around 1009 *Alda,
uxor Adalgardi*; Vienne-S.André-Bas 71 in 975–993 *Signum Winisi et uxoris eius
Alda*; Domène 61 a. 1049–1109 *Alda*, daughter of *Aldemannus*, sister of *Alberga*
and *Aldiarda*; Lérins 166 in 1092 *Alda*, and especially from early Cluny (all from
the area around Mâcon-Vienne) 1.161 in 910–927 *Alda*, wife of Leotald; 1.316 in
927–942 *Alda*, wife of Engilbert; 2.99 in 956 *Alda*, wife of *Aiglald*; 2.201 in 961
Alda, wife of Emmo; 2.300 a. 966 *Alda*, wife of Ascherius; 2.365 in 970 *Alda*,
widow of *Igalt / Aigald* (=2.99?); 2.418 in 973–974 *terra Aldane et filiis eius*;
2.437 in 974 *Alda*, wife of Constabulus; 2.526 in 979 *Alda*, mother of Girbald.[1382]
Even if we take account of the fact that the number of charters in Cluny is very
large, this still shows a remarkable concentration of this name in the 10th c.

   In the 11th and early 12th c., the name gradually advances in a northerly di-
rection again: Dijon 9 in 990–1007 *Alda*, frequent sponsor of Saint-Bénigne (cf.
on this person also Lot 1891, 332 n. 5); *Miracula S. Firmini Flaviniacensia* 2.6
(MGH SS. 15.808, Flavigny-sur-Moselle, Diocese of Toul) early 11th c. *Alda*, sis-
ter-in-law of Count Folmarus; Remiremont 39ř I middle of the 10th c. *Alda* and
51v̊ VI last third of the 11th c. *Alda*, bondswoman; Saint-Maixent (Diocese of
Poitiers) 1.107 in 1027–1030 *Alda*; Pontoise 30 in 1099 *Alda*, wife of Lecelin of
Belle-Église (near Beauvais); Flandre-Comtes 289 in 1119–1127 *Aldę matris suae*
(scil. of Baudouin of Coucy); Luchaire 1890, 255 in 1135 (charter for Louis VI)
Alda, daughter of Aloud of Soissons; Saint-Leu (Diocese of Beauvais) 40 in 1136
Auda, wife of Eudes de Breuil. Morlet (s. v. *Alda*) has also in Saint-Hubert (Ard-
ennes) a single *Olda* in 1087, although the *O-* appears out of place in Galloroma-
nia (Flemish influence, perhaps?).[1383]

   In societies where the continuity of the family is mainly decided through
the male line – as has been the case in Western Europe since the rise of the

---

1382 We can also count the five references for *Aldana*; cf. n. 1379 above!

1383 For the sake of completeness, we should add that at first *Alda* only rarely appears to
come into contact with *Ádela*. Aubri de Troisfontaines (13th c.) mentions (for about 1030) a
daughter of Robert II of France, wife of Baldwin V of Flanders, who is otherwise called *Adela
/Ala*, first as *Alda*, then soon after that *Adela* (MGH SS. 23.784, 792), and in charter texts in
Vermandois-Colliette 1.693 and 695 the wife and daughter of Herbert IV of Vermandois (11th c.)
are called *Alida*, although they are called *Adela / Adala / Adelis* in other places. Secondly, in a
few instances, *Alda* possibly is connected with the old *Hilda* (> *Ẹlda*), because Ademar of Cha-
bannes (2.5s.) calls Charlemagne's wife Hildegard(is) *Aldeardis* (which appears to point to an
oral tradition; also, according to K. F. Werner (1967, 459) the second wife of King Hugh of Vi-
enne (∞ before 926) was called *Alda / Hilda*. However, all of this does not justify Boisson-
nade's (1923, 412s.) strategy of listing all instances of *Ada* in such a way that they seem to be
called *Alda* or *Auda*.

nobility in the 9th c. – there is usually more freedom in the choice of women's names than of men's names, and a greater likelihood of small trends and fashions in women's names, whose causes lie beyond the scope of our investigations (cf. e.g. on northern Italy in the 12th and 13th c. Fassanelli 2014, 242). It would therefore be risky to take the regional popularity of a name as an indication of its epic status. Conversely, however, it is likely that a name would be taken into epic writings in those regions where it was already quite well known. Since it is obviously Alde's literary *raison d'être*, as Olivier's sister and Roland's fiancée, to strengthen the comrade-in-arms relationship between the two through a family bond, she cannot very well have been an epic figure before Olivier was; but since an epic Olivier never existed without an epic Roland, and he either already was his comrade-in-arms (as in the Song of Roland), or took on this role by the end of an epic at the latest (as in *Girart de Vienne*), it is likely that she is exactly as old as Olivier.

We may even go a little further, perhaps. The first parts of the names *Al*-de and *Ol*-ivier are indeed similar. Let us assume for a moment that a poet would be looking for a female name for Olivier's sister which started with the same sound. If we ignore hapax formations, the only name with *Ol-* in Galloromania according to Morlet's two volumes is *Oliva*, but Morlet lists only two references from the 9th and one from the 10th c.; the name seems to have been rare, therefore. Also, in Septimania (and in a small border area to the north), *Oliba* (occasionally *Oliva*) was a man's name. If this poet knew it as a man's name (and he would not have to be from Septimania to know this), then he may have wanted to avoid the (completely, or almost completely) homonymic women's name for this very reason. In that case, *Alde* would have been an obvious choice.[1384]

C.8.3 *Antelme de Maience*

Antelme de Maience has already been discussed above in C.4.8 'The four corners'.

1384 Morlet's single-stemmed forms with *Al-* + labial (*Alba*, *Albana*, *Albina*, *Alfasia*, *Alfia*, *Alvia*) are all hapax formations. – I am not convinced by the theory advanced by Kahane/Kahane (1959, 229) that there is some kind of subtle demonological link between Alde and the Hulda / Frau Holle of Germanic folklore.

C.8.4 *Duke Austorje of Valence*

Un riche duc Austorje O [1582]=1625, *Ankore* n (*Anchora* Bb), *Antoir* K, *Austoine*
V4, *Antoine* CV7T, *Anthiaume* P, *Anselme* L, *Astorius* w: Segre interprets *austorie*
in O as *Austorje* and not as, e.g. Hilka/Pfister would have it, as *Austorĭe*, because
the name *Eustorgius* with its well-attested variants *Austorgius / Astorgius* is
meant here,[1385] and this must lead to a semi-erudite Old French form ending in
/džǝ/; KV4CV7T are based on a reading with /ĭ/ instead of /dž/, but this tells us
nothing about the archetype, because they obviously do not recognise the name.
As *Astor-* existed besides *Austor-* the name has been *de facto* retained in w, and
since according to Segre's stemma, w is part of the β set of versions, this confirms
that the name belongs in the archetype (although the question of *Au-* or *A-* re-
mains). If, however, there is any doubt about the logic of this, due to the com-
mon provenance of O and w in Britain, the following also pertains. OV4 confirm
Austoi[.]e or the older form *Austo[. . .]je*, which we would expect to find in the
archetype; the meaningless form *Austoine* in γ (attested by V4) is then (with a
silent *-s-* followed by a misreading of *-u-* ~ *-n-*) infused with a secondary meaning
as *Antoine* 'Antonius' in CV7T[1386] or as *Anthelme* 'Anthelm' in P (we might think
of *Antelme de Maience* in v. 3008), from which L finally makes the more common
name *Anselme* 'Ans(h)elm'. *Austorje* therefore belongs in the archetype.

C.8.4.1 This character in the Song

We are immediately told that this is the Count *Ki tint Vale[nce] e Envers sur le
Rosne* – according to Segre [1583]=1626, *Valeri* O, *Valenta* n (*Valencia* Bb), *Val-
tia* 'enclosed by the Rhône' K, *Valença* 'and the fiefdom that goes with it' V4,
Valence 'and the cliffs all around it' CV7L, *Valence* 'and the land all around it'
P: As Segre correctly concluded, the Rhône (confirmed by OK), proves that the
Valence in β belongs in the archetype. O misread the *-n-* as *-ri* and may then
have been thinking of a place like Valéry near Maubeuge, Vallery (Yonne) or
even (with unusual suppression of the *Saint*) the geographically closer Saint-
Valery-en-Caux and -sur-Somme even though all of these spoil the metre.[1387]

1385 Aebischer ([1968] 1975, 249s.; 1970b, 438s.) realised this too.

1386 From which, as Aebischer ([1968] 1975, 243–245) has shown, in the *Aye d'Avignon* Aye's
father Antoine of Valence and Avignon was developed.

1387 Jenkins thought *Valeri* was the primary form, and following Boissonnade (1923, 373)
suggested the valley area of La Valloire (Drôme), along with Saint-Vallier which is located
within it. However, his supposition that *La Valloire* goes back to an older *La Valleire* (as an
intermediary stage on the way to *Valeri*) is incorrect because it is clearly a *Vallis aurea* (accord-
ing to the three oldest references in the DT Drôme!); also, (*Saint-*) *Vallier* > *Valeri* does not fit

Stengel put the *el(l') onor* of V4 into the text instead of the *envers* in O. Following Bédier, editors have put *Envers* with a capital letter into the text, thinking it is the name of a town; Bédier translated it as "Envers [?]", Segre has in his index "Città sul Rodano", Jenkins (ad. loc.) interprets it as *Viviers* (as do Hilka/Pfister with some hesitation).

But there is a simpler solution: throughout the whole of the east and southeast of Galloromania, at least from the Dép. Vosges and Nièvre in the north, to Savoy, Hautes-Alpes, Gard and Cantal in the south, *envers* in the sg. and in the pl. is often used as a toponym, in more than fifty places altogether.[1388] It is based on the Old French meaning 'back (of a hand, a fabric etc.)'; Vincent (1937, § 517) explains its toponymic meaning: "côté le moins beau, versant tourné vers le nord".[1389] In a few of these cases, the inclusion of the reference point is optional; thus the place we know today as *L'Envers-de-Gleysin* was simply called *Lenvers* (DT Isère) in the 13th c. In at least half of them, however, inclusion of the reference point seems to be the rule, as for example in the Dép. Vosges in 1593 *à l'envers de Clurye* (= Cleurie) or in 1670 *à l'envers de Longemer* (DT Vosges). The ordering of the parts is the reverse of that used in *Valence e Envers*, but the same logic applies. Today, this toponym is used only for small places; but before it became fixed in this way, there must have been a phase when it was freely used, and when the 'back' or 'northern side' still could have signified a very wide range of different sizes. This interpretation of *envers* is confirmed by the fact none of KV4CV7LP have interpreted it as the name of a town, but instead, they all have some version of 'all around ~ surrounding area'.

Valence lies on the Rhône route and has always been very well known. It was a diocesan town from at least the 4th c. and in the Middle Ages, its bishops were also its secular rulers; however, as we see from the example of Reims, the Roland poet does not recognise any secular rule for the bishop, as indeed is correct for the time of Charlemagne. The territory around Valence formed the county of Valentinois in the Middle Ages, and its Count was *Valentinus* (rather than *Valentinensis*) *comes* for short, one of the big allodial complexes in the south-eastern French region, which had grown out of various castellanies, with the consequence that it was not very coherent in geographical terms, but precisely because of this, it extended from parts of the Massif Central to the foothills of the Vercors

---

the metre, quite apart from the suppression of the *Saint*. Moreover, both of these places are too small to be the main fief of a *riche duc*, and they are by no means "almost in sight of Viviers" (if the latter is the meaning of *envers*), since it is almost 100 km away from there.

1388 Cf. FEW 4.791b, Nègre (1990–1998, no. 22370–22375) and the relevant DTs.

1389 A few are constructed with the diminutive *-in*: *Enversin(s)*; Vincent rightly subsumes them under *Envers* without comment.

(LM s. v. *Valence*). This may have been what prompted the poet to mention the 'area behind' Valence.

Now back to the personal name *Austorje*! Since *-eu-* only had a marginal place in genuine Lat. (*ceu, heu!, neu, neuter, seu*), and VLat. did not have an equivalent of the Gk. or the Germ. *-eu-*, substitutions were used in the Romance languages. In northern France it is mostly *-ie-* (often > *-e-*); in southern France, however, we often find *-au-,* sometimes reduced to *-a-,* as in Old Occ. *laupart* < *leopardus*, *Laugier* < *Leod(e)garius*, *Launart* < (Rom.-Germ. hybrid) *Leon-hardus*, *Daudé* < *Deusdedit*. Morlet (1972) is therefore quite correct when she lists together s. v. *Eustorgius* five instances of *Eustorgius*, one *Heustorgius*, three *Austorgius*, two *Estorgius* and one each of *Austorgus*, *Astorgus* and *Esturgis*.[1390] *Eustorgius* (from Gk. στέργω 'am patient, contented') was, according to the *Martyrologium Usuardi* (11th April), the name of a little-known priest and martyr, probably from Nicomedia in Bithynia, after whom the Saint Bishop Eustorgius I of Milan (shortly after 343 until just before 355) was probably named; for he was said to have been born a Greek, sent by the Emperor in Constantinople on a mission to Milan, which at that time was the cultural centre of the whole of the west, elected bishop of that place, and remained to the end a staunch Athanasian. He was laid to rest in the church which was dedicated to him soon after burial. His name was passed on to other bishops, in some cases in a distorted form: another Saint, Eustorgius II of Milan (around 510/511), an Eustorgius from a diocese somewhere in the northern half of France in the year 652 (Pardessus 1843–1849, 2.96), Eustorgius of Toulon in 879, 882, Eustorgius of Sisteron around 881 (for 44 years, according to Gams 631), *Eustorgius/Austorgius*[1391] of Limoges from around 1106 until around 1137 and (according to Gams 552, though the existence of both of these figures is disputed) Astorgius I and II. of Gap around 960 or 1027 to around 1035. Other senior clerics: *Astorgius*, Abbot, probably in the Diocese of Clermont in 905 (GC 2.131, Instr. Saint-Flour), *Eustorgius*, Prior of Savigny in 1126 (Bourbonnais-Cat. 231). There are also some historical figures from the nobility: in particular the family of Vicomtes of Clermont/Auvergne (including a side branch, the Lords of Brezons), where we can trace the name *Eustorgius / Heustorgius / Austorgius / Astorgius / Ostorgius*[1392] (all of these spellings are attested for this family!) from around 900 until after 1030 over four (and in the side branch even six)

1390 On the other hand, the Lat. names *Ostorius* and *Asturius* do not appear to have reached as far as Galloromania, while the Gk.-Lat. *Asterius* certainly did (Morlet 1972, s. v.), although the different stressed vowels ensured that there was no confusion with *Eu-/A(u)storgius*.

1391 Aebischer cites references for both forms of the name ([1968] 1975, 250s.).

1392 The substitution of *O-* instead of *Eu-* is also to be found in other names, cf. *Offrasia* and *Osebia* in Morlet (1972).

generations with, if my calculations are correct, 12 persons bearing this name;[1393] we can find also *Eustorgius* of Mercœur, brother of Abbot Odilo of Cluny,[1394] two *Astorgius / Eustorgius* of Mainsac, father and brother of a Robert who traded with the Monastery of Saint-Lomer de Mainsac at the end of the 11th c. (Bouquet 14.107s.); finally, as Boissonnade (1923, 373s.) notes, an *Astorgius* of Pervin-quières in the Rouergue, participant in the First Crusade and brother of Bishop Bernard of Lodève, and two persons called Guillaume, who were both sons of an *Austorgius / Astorgius* in around 1100, one of whom made a donation to the church of Romans-sur-Isère (almost 20 km northeast of Valence), while the other lived in Tournon-sur-Rhône (almost 20 km north of Valence), and was able to lend his future father-in-law 4600 gold solidi to pay for his participation in the First Crusade.[1395] There are also the twelve above-mentioned individuals s. v. *Astors* (C.7.4.3.7) called *Astorc* or *Astorgus*.

Morlet states that the name is only attested in the south of Galloromania; likewise, I cannot find any references before 1150 north of a line running from Saint-Jean-d'Angély–Auxerre. Once again it is evident in the case of *Austorje* – and even more so with *Envers* – that the Roland poet is very aware of the re-gionality of names.

C.8.4.2 The historical person

We examined above only the undisputed forms of *Eustorgius*, that is to say, those ending in *-orgius*, *-orgus* and *-or(c)*. From time to time, however, forms occur ending in *-icus*. This is the name of the Bishop of Grenoble in about 740 mentioned in Duchesne (1894–1915, 1.228) and Förstemann (col. 216) *Austori-cus*, in Gams 556 *Eustorgius / Austoricus*; he is not mentioned in Morlet's two volumes. Again, in the first half of the 8th c., there is a Bishop of Langres in Gams 557, in the catalogue MGH SS. 13.380, in Duchesne (1894–1915, 2.188) and Morlet 43a called *Astoricus*, but in Förstemann (col. 151) also called *Astorgius*, although Wikipedia's apparently meticulous *Liste des évêques de Langres*[1396] complete with footnotes, only lists *Eustorge*. There is nothing strange about /-stǫrdžǝ/ being written as *-storicus*; for Gallorom. /-džǝ/ quite often goes back

---

1393 Cf. Settipani 2004, 314s., 325s., and https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/AUVERGNE. htm#_Toc55890150 (last access 31.03.2022).
1394 Cf. Settipani 2004, 330, 332, and https://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/AUVERGNE.htm#_ Toc55890158 (last access 31.03.2022).
1395 Several little-known individuals called *Austorgius* from the Limousin area are also listed in Aebischer ([1968] 1975, 250).
1396 Last access 23.02.2022.

to VLat. *-icu* after a dental (OF *-age*, *siege*, *Saintonge* and dialectically over a wide area *herege*, *m(i)ège*, Old Occ. *-atge*, *herege*, *metge*, *monge*).

As we might expect, there are also a few instances of *Austoricus* without the accompanying *-gius*, as for example in Förstemann (col. 216) one each from Lyon, the Languedoc[1397] and a monastery that is difficult to identify, probably Novalesa Abbey,[1398] and in Morlet 47a one more from the area that is now in the Département Yonne. Both scholars interpret them as the Germ. name *Austr-*+*-rīk*. But since they belong in the same region as Eustorgius, I prefer to explain them as versions of *Eu-* or *Au-storgius*.

If we agree with this assessment, a surprising perspective is gained on the 'Duke' *Austorje*, who in the words of the poet, ruled in Valence 'and the surrounding area'. To be sure, during the lifetime of Charlemagne and even of Louis the Pious, this could not have been a duchy in the literal, constitutional sense, because the old duchies had been abolished, and new ones had not yet been created; but it was an honour for a count to be granted temporary authority over his equals through the office of *missus*, that is to say a supervisor and appeal body, generally overseeing lands that that he would have been to some extent familiar with, perhaps because his own county was part of it, or shared a border with it. Conversely, around 1100, above the counts there were no more *missi*, but quite a few dukes. Our poet might thus be tempted to call a historical *missus* a duke.

According to the charter Cluny 1.6, in 814 the *missus* of the Emperor, *Ostoricus comes* held a meeting at Tournon-sur-Rhône (just about 20 km north of Valence, 'opposite' this place, i.e. on the other side of the Rhône).

Counts with names derived from Latin are to be found now and then in the 9th c., especially in the southern part of the empire: Amadeus of Savoy in 814,

---

1397 The details of the sources in Förstemann and Morlet (with dates of 934 and 931) are in my opinion inaccurate or incomplete; the correct source is probably Languedoc-HgL 3.408 (*preuve* 9) in 931 *S. Austoric levita*.

1398 Morlet and the MGH edition by Autenrieth et al. (L.mem.n.s. 1, facs. 9 B 37) subsume the column *Austoricus* under the preceding heading *Fratrum de Sancto Maximo* (facs. 8 CD), which Morlet thinks is St. Maximin of Trier, the MGH-Editions by Autenrieth et al. (in the index of place names) and Piper (p. 165 n.) think is the St.-Maximus monastery in Speyer. But Piper was probably correct when he placed his columns 39–41 under a different heading than the heading for columns 37–38, ordering them instead under the Novalesa, because of the persons named in that section. This would also fit the linguistic details: *Flodbertus* (2x) and probably also *Gauso* (2x) and *Gausemaris* point to Galloromania, *Teufre* points to the south of Galloromania; taken together with the tenues in *Anscausus* and several *-pertus*, *-prandus*, *-paldus* they point towards the Frankish-Lombardic (= Galloromanian-Italian) border area, and they do not fit with Trier, nor with Speyer.

Apollonius in Septimania in 859, Bonifatius in Tuscany in 812 and 838, Burrellus in the Spanish March in 798 and 809, Donatus of Melun in 816, Macarius of Condroz in 874, Manassès of Dijon around 891, Stephen of Bourges in 862, Turpio of Angoulême up to 863, Vivianus of Tours up to 851 (cf. on most of these e.g. Kienast 1990, Index), and so a Count *Austorgius,* possibly spelt *Ostoricus*, of Valence would not be unexpected. The probability that our *Austorje* and the *Ostoricus* of 814 refer to the same person is therefore quite high. There may have been a longstanding regional tradition that only needed to remember the name of the man and then had the good fortune to be included in the Roland material.

C.8.5 *Baldewin* and *Guinemer*

It makes sense to examine Ganelon's son *Baldewin* and Ganelon's uncle *Guinemer* together.

C.8.5.1 Baldewin

Baldewin O [296]=314, the same K, *Baldoyn* V4, *Baudoin* CV7, *Bawtwin* w; also **Baldewin O** 363, the same K, *Baldvin* n, *Baldoin* V4, *Balduin* C, *Bauduin* V7, *Bawtwin* w: -*au*- or (in w) -*aw*- is what would be expected as a later form. Moreover, in both passages *Baldewin* in O and K (along with the single *Baldvin* in n) contrasts with *Baldoïn* in γ; the editors therefore put *Baldewin*, and not *Baldoïn* into the text.

The difference between the two variants is dialectologically interesting. The w- in the second part of Germanic names (-*win*, -*ward*, -*widi*) usually turned into a syllable in its own right in OF, namely -*o(u)*- in order to avoid the unfamiliar consonant. Latinised forms of names show that this development goes back to the Merovingian period, and was certainly established before the year 1000: (*Ebur-wine* >) *Ebroinus* (> Song of Leodegar *Ewruin(s)* v. 11 etc., always trisyllabic, OF *Evroïn*) and (*Hard-wine* >) *Chardoinus* (> OF *Hardouin*) are already present in the 7th c., *Baldoinus* (> OF *Baldoïn, Baudouïn*), *Giboinus* (> OF *Gebuïn, Gebouïn*), (*Heil-widi* >) *Heluidis* (not *Heluuidis = *Helwidis!; > OF *Heloïs*, finally more clearly feminised to *Héloïse*), (*Erl-win* >) *Herloinus* (> OF *Herloïn/Hellouïn*), *Ragnoardus* (> normal OF *Rainouart*) and *Aimoinus* are in about 820/850 the normal forms; *Geboardus* (> OF *Giboart*) and *Gozuinus* (> OF *Gossouïn*) appear finally in the 9th/10th century (cf. Morlet for each of these). Conversely, the only comparable occurrences of the type *Baldewin* in Morlet's material from Galloromania are *Baldawinus* (in 1006 Saint-Mihiel, Lorraine), *Baldewinus* (in 1096 Liège, Wallonia), *Ragnawardu*s (around 850 Amiens, Picardy), *Regnewardus* (9th/10th c.

Reims, Champagne) and perhaps *Everuinus/-winus* (in 839, 876 Saint-Bertin, Picardy) – forms from northern and eastern dialectal areas; from further north we can add Dutch *Boudewijn* (with dialectal variants). However, we see from *Baldewin* and *Reneward* (as well as the somewhat later form *Lowis < Loëwis*) in the *Chanson de Guillaume*, and from *Baldewin* and *Loëwis* in the Roland O version, that Anglo-Norman follows the northern trend here (as it quite often did); moreover, Forssner (1916, 41s.) cites, along with other spellings, 14 references from England dating from the late 11th to the early 13th c. for *Baldewin(us)*. OnKw therefore all point back to Anglo-Norman.

The name *Balduin* (Germ. *Bald-wini*) itself, leaving aside the phonological details, was at first found across the whole of Galloromania, but in the early 11th c., it retreated mainly to the north (Morlet s. v.). In the higher nobility, it is from the start almost only found in the north, and its heyday in that area is largely due to the efforts of one family: Balduin I of Flanders († 879) became a Count when he kidnapped Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald, took her back to his Flemish homeland and then married her in 863, whereupon his father-in-law backed down and awarded him a fiefdom. Before 1150, he was succeeded by Balduin II (879–918), III (who never ruled, † 962), IV (987–1035), V (1035–1067), VI (1067–1070) and VII. (1111–1119). From the first third of the 10th c. onwards, this domain included some important Francophone areas (above all Arras, Lille, Douai, Béthune), and from the early 11th c. onwards increasingly also imperial fiefdoms (Aalst, Four Districts). The line of Counts of Boulogne branches off with Balduin II, and then through a further Balduin (around 988) leads to Balduin I, King of Jerusalem (1100–1118). Balduin V of Flanders became simultaneously Count Balduin I of Hainaut through marriage, and with him the line branches off and produces the Balduins of Hainaut II (1071–1098), III (1098–1120) and IV (1120–1171). As we might expect, a name like this also diffused through the regional nobility: *Balduin* is the name of a lord of Tournai (in 981), two advocates of Saint-Peter of Ghent (in 962, around 1082) and a castellan of Ghent in the 12th century, a Count of Guines († shortly before 1097), a son of the Lord of Béthune (in 1113), a lord of Saint-Omer († before 1128), and two lords of Aalst (in 1093 † before 1128).[1399]

Further south, the name is rare. There are Baudouin du Bourg, son of Count Hugo of Rethel, who succeeded his homonymous cousin from Boulogne as Balduin II King of Jerusalem from 1118–1131, and his grandson Balduin III, King of

---

1399 Tournai: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/HAINAUT.htm#_Toc77845366; Ghent: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/FLEMISH NOBILITY.htm#_Toc59294220; Guines: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/NORTHERN FRANCE.htm#_Toc43878018; Béthune: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/nfranord.htm#_Toc62819700; Saint-Omer: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/NORTHERN FRANCE.htm#_Toc43878016; Aalst: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/FLEMISH NOBILITY.htm; last access 31.03.2022.

Jerusalem from 1144–1162. There are, somewhere in the 11th century, two scantily documented Baudouins, brother of Renaud II of Clermont-en-Beauvaisis, Baudouin I to V, Lords of Donjon near Corbeil between about 1070 and 1150.[1400] I could find no-one called Balduin among the higher nobility further south.[1401]

C.8.5.2 Guinemer

We turn now to *Guinemer* O 348, *Guinimus* n, *Wyneman* K, *Guinemans* V7, *Faviens* C: the reviser of β did not know or did not recognise the name *Guinemer* which appears only once in the Song, and so he replaced it with *Guineman*, which was a big mistake. We cannot agree that Ganelon's uncle is the same person as the Guineman in the Baligant section, leader of a team of young men, and not only because of the age difference; it would have been mightily inappropriate if Charlemagne, when looking for two men to replace Roland and Olivier (v. 3016), had selected a relative of Ganelon, whose treachery had just been found out. C may well have realised this and therefore decided to change the unacceptable name *Guineman*. n has probably finished off an incomplete *Guinim'* with an incorrect ending. The *Guinemer* in O therefore belongs in the text, simply because there is no other suitable candidate.

The strongest argument in its favour is the fact that, at first, *Guinemer* was widely distributed (Morlet s. v. *Winemarus* has eleven references including one each from southern and eastern France in the 11th c.), but in the higher nobility the name is even more confined to the north than *Bauduin* was. In the year 900, a certain *Winemarus*, vassal of Balduin of Flanders, killed Archbishop Fulk of Reims in a fit of rage (*Ann. Vedastini* for the year 899, Regino for the year 903, Flodoard *Hist. Rem. Eccl.* 4.10). *Winemarus* was also the name of an advocate of Saint-Peter of Ghent in 918–945, with homonymous relatives in 991 and 1031, and from the same family the name of a Castellan of Ghent from before 1088–after 1118 and one of his sons in 1135 (another son being called Balduin!); also, there was a Lord of Lillers (Pas-de-Calais) in 1043 and a Castellan of Bergues (Nord) in 1095, both vassals of the Flanders Balduin dynasty.[1402] The name also appears in the Domesday Book, probably referring to several

---

1400 Clermont-en.Beauvaisis: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/parclerdam.htm#_Toc40250995; Donjon de Corbeil: fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/parcorroc.htm#_Toc40424714; last access 31.03.2022.

1401 In Old French epic literature, the son of Ogier and the daughter of the Castellan of Saint-Omer is called *Balduin,* and a *Balduin de Flandres* or *le Flamant* appears as a minor character in a number of epics (cf. Moisan).

1402 On these individuals cf. fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/NORTHERN FRANCE.htm#_Toc43878009 and fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/nfranord.htm; last access 31.03.2022.

Flemish individuals who had taken part in the Norman Conquest of England; a *Winemarus Flandrensis* is in 1086 tenant-in-chief in Northamptonshire and therefore cited dozens of times in the relevant section of Domesday Book. The southernmost bearers of this name on the continent, as far as I am aware, are a *Vinemarus Laudunensis*, witness at the foundation of Ribemont Abbey (Belgique-Miraeus 1.358 in the year 1084) and a *Guinimarus,* Castellan of the Bishop of Laon in 1097 according to de Sars (1924–1934, 2.217). There is also a toponymic trace: *Vinnemerville* (in about 1040 *Winemervilla*, Adigard des Gautries 1959, 280) in northern Normandy, 3 km from the coast, 15 km northeast of Fécamp; the name may well go back to pre-Norman times.

The most famous bearer of this name, however, is Guinemer of Boulogne, a pirate who at the start of the First Crusade realised that by helping the crusaders, he could transform himself from an outlaw into a hero. He turned up with a rather large Flemish-Frisian-Danish fleet at Tarsus, which at the time was occupied by Balduin, the son of the Count of his home town, and was only too eagerly welcomed by him. When Balduin moved on, Guinemer offered his services to Tancred and helped him with the conquest of Alexandrette. Later, he appears to have captured Laodicea for a short time (Setton 1969a, 300–303, 325).

This narrowly provincial character of the name *Guinemer* explains why β did not recognise it.

In the light of all these facts, the poet could not have used the name *Balduin* in his work, and even more definitely not the name *Guinemer,* without knowing that these names had connotations of the north. Nevertheless, there is one big difference between the two.

Because *Guinemer* only appears in a single line of the song (which V4 omits without harming the flow of the text) this figure is likely to originate in the surviving version of the song, and not in a previous stage. The poet has selected this name, as he did many others, because of the alliteration, in this case with *Guenes / Guenelun*, the name of his nephew. Morlet cites more than 50 references from Galloromania for other Germanic *Wan-* or *Guen-* names but only 1 or 2 of them are from the time after 1050, and both are hapax legomena: *Wannalgaudus* and *Vuenisius*.[1403] Evidently the poet knew no *Guen-* names other than *Guenes / Guenelun* and so he turned to *Guin(e)-* names, choosing *Guinemer*, not just because

---

1403 There may even be some doubt about their belonging to the Germ. *Wan-* group. *Wannalgaudus* would be the only *Wan-* name with an *al-* or *el-* extension. On the other hand, *Wandel-* names are popular in Galloromania: Morlet cites over 90 references, including four instances of *Wandalgaudus*; is not *Wannalgaudus* just a variant of this? Morlet groups three instances of *Winisus/Vuinisus* under *Wini-*; couldn't *Vuenisius* belong here with a dissimilation of the kind we see in *vicinus > vezin/veisin*?

of the alliteration and because its northern character complemented Balduin, but probably because the name of the archbishop's murderer and the former pirate had shady connotations which were quite welcome to him.

C.8.5.3 Balduin as a pre-existing figure

The figure of Balduin, on the other hand, has a good chance of being older than the Rol.

According to the Rol., even before Charlemagne's Spanish campaign there was a Saxon war in which Roland also fought (v. 2330) – as in the PT (cap. 33) and KMS V; now the subjugated Saxons are allowed to take part in the trial of Ganelon (v. 3700, 3793); but, as Charlemagne predicts, they will rebel again (v. 2921).[1404] In other words, an epic hero who won his fame fighting the Saxons may have done so at the same time as Roland or after his death or even both. The no. 1 hero of Old French epic poetry about Charlemagne's Saxon wars is Balduin.

In the Rol., Balduin, son of Ganelon and, in second marriage, Charlemagne's (unnamed) sister, never appears in person – evidently because he is still too young to serve in the army –, but he is mentioned twice by Ganelon in his farewell speeches immediately before he leaves for Saragossa: towards Charles and his court, he declares Balduin, "un filz ja plus bel n'en estuet" and "qui ert prozdoem", to be his heir (v. 313–315); then, he urges his liegemen that on their return to France, they should on his behalf greet his wife, his friend Pinabel and his son Balduin "whom you shall support and acknowledge as your Lord".

Here, the mention of Pinabel is a narrative device, as it points forward to a later point in the Song itself; but the poet's clear insistence on Balduin does not. Since in the Rol. this insistence can hardly be functionless, there is only one possibility left: it shall remind the public of a Balduin they know from outside the Song, that is, a Balduin after Roncevaux.

Rol. (including n=KMS VIII, cap. 6) Balduin is Roland's half-brother. But the PT (cap. 11) refers to Balduin (who survives Roncevaux) briefly as *frater Rotolandi*, and not as Ganelon's son, and in view of its otherwise consistent emphasis on clarity, or even pedantry, this is astonishing. This is repeated, again very clearly, in KMS V, the Saxon war before Roncevaux: when Roland is wounded, Balduin 'his brother' (in cap. 28, also 35, 41, 44, 51) comes to him from his homeland and both acquit themselves gloriously in battle; finally, Guiteclin surrenders to Balduin, instead of fighting with him in single combat. And

---

1404 Just as in history: Charles fought the Saxons before and long after his Spanish adventure. On this interesting quasi-simultaneity of the Saxon war and the Spanish war cf. Beckmann (2008, 164 with n. 223).

also (around 1200) in Bodel's *Chanson des Saisnes*, all of which takes place after Roland's death, Balduin is Roland's brother and thus the second beloved nephew of Charlemagne, whom he fears losing, just as he did Roland (and ultimately does lose in the sequel, where he is killed by Guiteclin's son); if he had been Ganelon's son, it would be most astonishing for the poet to have retrospectively referred to Ganelon three times (v. 426/416, 1051/6859, 1083/ 6892 ed. Brasseur) as the 'evil traitor' who had been put to death, without mentioning the fact (and if possible making some excuse), that he was the biological father of the main hero.

Finally, shortly after 1300, Girard d'Amiens in his *Charlemagne* says that both Balduin and Roland were sons of Milon and Charlemagne's sister (Moisan s. v. *Bauduin 1*). This overlap in all four texts cannot be a coincidence. It seems that very early in the poetry about the Saxon wars – and possibly right from its beginnings – Balduin was, like Roland, Charlemagne's nephew, but not Ganelon's son. If so, the introduction of the step relation between Roland and Ganelon was a stroke of genius on the part of the Rol. poet.[1405]

And it also shows that the name *Balduin* is not chosen especially for the Rol. but goes back to the early Saxon epic, and it makes a lot of sense there: the Saxon epic originated in the north-eastern part of the Francophone area, and up there *Balduin* was a very famous name, especially in the Francophone part of Flanders and in the Hainaut area.

C.8.5.4 The *Balduinus / Tedricus* rivalry in the PT

In the PT – which for lack of any clear indications to the contrary we shall regard as essentially the same age as the surviving Rol. and as a parallel stage in the development of the Roland material – the relative ages of the characters are altered: *Balduinus frater Rotolandi* is mentioned in cap. 11 in the long list of *pugnatores maiores*, not together with Roland, but much later between *Salomon, socius Estulti*, that is to say the friend of *Estolz de Langres*, whom we should regard as likewise coming from somewhere near Langres, and *Gandelbodus rex Frisiae*. This appears to indicate that the PT sees Balduinus as already holding a fiefdom in the northeast. In cap. 21, the PT informs us that the Roncevaux warriors – and for this author that includes all the *pugnatores maiores* – have now fallen: *nec unusquidem e viginti milibus evasit*. Yet he goes on to list

---

1405 Toward the end of the drama, we learn that the enmity between Roland and Ganelon is even older than Roland's provocative *mis parastre* (v. 277) and that Roland may have been the active part in it (v. 3758): *Rollant me forfist en or e en aveir*, which Tierri does not deny (v. 3827): *Que que Rollant Guenelun forsfesist [. . .]*.

the exceptions: the *pugnatores maiores* Turpinus and Ganalonus are still alive, because they are with Charlemagne; he also keeps Roland alive at that point; moreover, the PT continues, (the *pugnator maior*) Balduinus and Tedricus (the man who avenges Roland later, and who appears here for the first time without further identification) are at that time hiding in the woods and will escape later. In cap. 22 these claims are repeated, with reference to a slightly later point in time, when Roland drags himself to the spot where he will die and addresses his sword. In cap. 23, Balduinus comes upon Roland, and is asked by him to bring a drink of water, but he cannot find any, blesses the dying Roland and rides off towards Charlemagne's army because he is afraid of falling into the hands of the Saracens. Shortly after that, Tedricus comes upon Roland, starts lamenting him and reminds him to make his last *confessio* – this then takes up the equivalent of two whole pages of printed text; but he does not leave Roland until literally the moment when his soul leaves his body and goes up to the heavens, after which Tedricus also rides off to follow Charlemagne.

Balduinus, previously introduced as a *frater Rolandi* and *pugnator maior*, appears clearly as a narrative doubling of Tedricus here, in a role that is rather inglorious, although not entirely dishonourable. Tedricus on the other hand, about whom the PT forgets to give any detail – he will be Roland's future avenger, in the Song a remote relative of Roland, called *Tierri* – turns out to be worthier than the brother. If the PT had invented this figure, or even just this scene, the author would not have forgotten to identify who he was; he forgets to do this because he subconsciously counts on his readers recognising him. Be that as it may – why is there a narrative doubling of this scene?

One of the characteristic features of the Frankish defeat of the year 778 was the fact that there were literally no survivors among the part of the army that was attacked, the rear guard; the author of the surviving version of the Song preserved this feature. But even before him, in the 11th c., people heard more and more about Roncevaux from the *jongleurs*, including all that Roland and Olivier had said and done. At that time, most ordinary people without poetic ambitions did not yet accept the legitimacy of fiction; any one of them could bring the emotions of the audience down to earth by asking the *jongleur* one simple question: 'If nobody survived – how do you know all this?' The poet of the surviving Song, thanks to his magnificent and cohesive composition, was able to ignore this question and just leave a few (justifiably!) vague pointers to a *geste*; it was not so easy for the ordinary *jongleur.* But fortunately, the art of narrative has an antidote to this poisonous question: 'One of them survived.' This survivor could be an insignificant figure; but the closer he was to the leader of the men who fell, the more authentic his report would be, and the stronger his (voiced or mute) demand for revenge. If we follow this logic, there were two leading candidates for

the role: Roland's brother, and his remoter relative, but future avenger. There was a *jongleur* willing to build each of these into his narrative. The PT, whose author claimed to have taken part in the campaign, felt obliged to provide the greatest possible amount of evidence. Thus – probably on his travels along France's pilgrimage routes – he gathered as much narrative material as he could and put it all into his version, avoiding as far as possible any contradictions. In this case, however, the two versions did contradict each other, because only one survivor of Roncevaux could risk his life in the single combat that was to follow later; in the end, this meant that the role of the other would almost certainly have to fall away.

C.8.6 *Basan(t)* and *Basilĭe*

These two are brothers and so they are examined together.

Basan O 206, the same in n, *Basans* V4, *Basins* C, *Basin* V7w;

Basant O 330 (:ã, mostly -*ant*),[1406] *Basan* n, *Pasanzi* K (*Bazanza* A, *Basanzi* S), *Baxant* V4, *Basant* C, *Basin* V7w;

Basan O 490, the same in n, *Baxans* V4, *Basin* CV7w: In K the *P*- is Bavarian, the -*zi* comes from the Lat. hybrid stage **Basantius* that Konrad has made. In V4 <x> is the northern Italian written form of /z/. (C)V7w are the first to introduce the well-known name *Basin* (probably from the now lost Fr. version of the Basin epic).[1407] OnV4 confirm *Basan* or (v. 330) *Basant* for the archetype.

His brother is *Basilĭes* O 208, *Basilie* n, *Bassilia* V4, *Basie* CV7, *Basil* w; *Basilĭes* O 330, *Basili* n, *Basilie* K, *Baxilio* V4, *Basille* C, *Basil* w; *Basilĭe* O 490, *Basilius* n, *Baxilie* V4, *Basie* CV7, *Basil* w: In (C)V7 early /lj/ > northern Ital. /j/ has merged into the /i/ next to it; w has (with loss of the -*e*) the late Anglo-Norman form of the name which then also prevailed in English. The archetype had *Basilĭes* or -*ĭe*.

In Merovingian times there was a fairly common name *Basin(us)* which started to occur less frequently from about 850 onwards at the latest, and it had a well attested variant *Basen(us)* (Morlet s. v. *Badu-*)[1408] as well as, very rarely,

---

1406 On the proliferation of -*ant* in OF epics, cf. n. 234.

1407 For detailed information on the *chanson de geste* about the famous thief Basin, on its widespread popularity and on the name *Basin* see Beckmann (2008a, 7–23, 71–73 and index); in that study I overlooked one bearer of this name in the Carolingian nobility, Count *Basinus qui et Tancradus* (MGH DD.kar. Lo I no. 68 a. 842).

1408 Morlet did not find the earliest reference: a *Basenus grafio* of the 7th c. seemingly at the court of Chlothar III (now MGH DD.mer. no. 88 ed. Kölzer, original on papyrus); -*enus* rather

but in a very interesting place, also *Basan*;[1409] the poet may have used the latter form in order to avoid possible identification as the famous thief Basin.

Basilius is fairly common as a Christian name in very late antiquity (after the Cappadocian saint) but is only thinly spread when it passes on to Galloromania (Morlet 1972 s. v.), although after 1050 it very gradually gains in popularity again.[1410]

I recently explained the onomastic and narrative reasons why I think this pair of brothers in the Rol. are not pre-existing figures, but rather the poet's own invention, devised as part of his preparation for the forthcoming Blancandrin scene (Beckmann 2008a, 185–187, 2008b, 134s.).

C.8.7 *Basbrun* and *Besgun*

Basbrun (v. 3952),[1411] one of Charlemagne's bailiffs, who with his *serjanz* is charged with the execution of Ganelon's thirty bondsmen, and *Besgun* (v. 1818),[1412]

---

than -*inus* is typical Merovingian Latin (-*lenus* < -*lin* cp. also *Herveus* < *Herwig*, *Chlodoveus* < *Chlodwig*). This form can be found in epic literature in the minor character *Bazen* (*Girart de Roussillon* v. 1946).

1409 That is to say in the monk Eadwi *cognomento Basan* (added note in the scribe's own hand to the so-called Hanover Gospels, Hannover, Kestner-Museum Ms. WM XXI a 36!), a famous calligrapher (and competent forger!) in about 1010–1030 in Christ Church, Canterbury, who had apparently not been forgotten in the following century (Gibson 1978, 231, and 1992, 85s.; Pfaff 1992 passim); Pfaff (1992, 280) considers this nickname as essentially unexplained. I have unfortunately not had the time to follow up current scholarship on this individual. – It is not clear why Mireaux (1943, 184) thinks that *Byzantius* is behind the name *Basan*.

1410 One example: in Anjou, which is quite receptive to Mediterranean saints' names from about 1050 onwards, the abundant charters of Saint-Aubin d'Angers between 1050 and 1150 mention three to five individuals bearing this name.

1411 This character is almost without a name because *Basbrun* is only a nickname. *Bas* meaning 'stocking' is first attested in MF, although with the meaning 'lower hem of a garment' it comes from around 1200 (cf. Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v.); brown would then be chosen as a nondescript colour. But *bas* here could possibly mean, as it so often does, 'of low social status', and so *Basbrun* could mean 'the ordinary guy from the lower class'.

1412 *Besgun* O, *Begon* V4, *Bovon* CV7. The -*s*-, which in the 11th c. had already been lost before a voiced cons. is hypercorrect in O. From OV4 we have *Begun / Begon* for the archetype. The Germ. name *Beg(g)o* (etc., Morlet 51b) was borne by a Margrave, son-in-law of Louis the Pious and an older relative of Girart of Vienne (cf. Kienast 1990, 235), but to my knowledge no other member of the higher nobility bore this name after him. As a single-stem name which did not sound like any two-stem name, it must have been rather bland and lacking in connotations around 1100, and this made it a suitable name for a senior servant. The northern Italian source behind CV7 appears not to have recognised him, and replaces him with the similar-sounding

Charlemagne's head chef, who with his people – *des mielz e des pejurs* – is responsible for guarding Ganelon and does this in a way that modern readers will find quite terrifying, are the only two named persons who are below the bottom of the fiefdom pyramid and therefore necessarily appear without any indication of a fiefdom.

C.8.8 *Bevon de Belne e de Digun*

Bevon [. . .] de Belne e de Digun O 1891s., *Begun* n (*Gesson* of *Blasma* and *Begon* B,b), *Pegonem, uon Pilme Degionem* K, *Begon de Belne e de Donion* V4, *Hugon de Balne e de Digon* C, *Hugon de Balene e de Dijon* V7, *Buevon de Biausne soz Dijon* P, *Buevon* L, *Legon [. . .] de Mez e Dyjon* T, *Straelberrengier* h(V): The name of the fiefdom in the archetype was *Belne* 'Beaune' following OV4(CP) and *Digun/ Digon* (with ~ /dž/, because < Lat. *Divione*) 'Dijon' following O(K)C (V7PT). V4 has misinterpreted *Dijon* as *donjon*, and T has replaced the rather small place Beaune with Metz. The personal names *Hugon* in CV7 (more on this below) and *Legon* in T (the latter through a misreading *b ~ l*) are linked with *Begon* in nKV4. For reasons related to the stemma, PL could not therefore have taken their *Buevon* from O, but rather they have replaced the name *Begon* in their source with the better-known (e.g. from the *Beuve de Hantone*) *Buevon*. Thus *Bevon* O and *Begon* β compete for inclusion in the archetype; the editors including Stengel prefer the former, not just because they are following the principle *In dubio pro O*, but also because this avoids the double use of the name *Be(s)g(u/o)n*.

From the early 11th c. onwards, Dijon was the main residence of the Dukes of Burgundy (LM s. v. *Dijon*). Beaune, Lat. *Belna*, 40 km southwest of Dijon, attested from the 6th c. onwards as a *castrum*, belonged to the Capetian Otto, Duke of Burgundy († 965) in the 10th c.; another Capetian (quasi-) Burgundian Duke Henry I († 1066)[1413] retained the title of Count of Beaune, but gave the Viscount title to his illegitimate son Odo, whose descendants held it until the early 12th c. (LM s. v. *Beaune*). For the audience of the Rol., 'Beaune and Dijon' therefore meant more or less 'the Duchy of Burgundy'. Since there were five Dukes

---

Bovon, which at that time, e.g. through the *Beuve* (acc. *Bovon*) *de Hantone* had become very well known.

1413 The only reason why he did not become Duke of Burgundy is the fact that he died young; this title went from his father Robert, brother of King Henry I of France straight to his legitimate sons Hugo, and then Odo.

of Burgundy called Hugo between 1075 and 1315, CV7 replace the semantically empty and relatively rare *Begon* with *Hugon*.

Bevon is probably dissimilated from *Bovon*,[1414] and therefore is more likely to come from Germ. *Bobo* than from the very rare Germ. *Bibo* (cf. Morlet on both names). There does not seem to be any historical Bovon, Bevon or Begon who has a link with Beaune or Dijon; the poet may well have chosen *Bevon* for the sake of its alliteration with *Belne*.

C.8.9 *Droün* and his nephew *Gualter del Hum*

I examined these two figures in some detail in the first third of a monograph recently (Beckmann 2010, 1–52). Within the economy of the Song, Gualter is the only second-level liege man, and as Roland's vassal, his important role is to show that Roland is not just a stern and demanding ruler, but that he can also in the longer term be a trustworthy leader who inspires loyalty in others. The historical substratum of Gualter and Droün is interesting: the poet finds inspiration for these two in the French Vexin dynasty of Counts who were often called Walter and Drogo. These were counts who as liege man of the Dukes of Francia, that is to say in the 11th c. of the Capetian kings, generally belonged to France in the narrower meaning of that word, but at that time they were also within the area influenced by the Norman dukes, which meant that for the poet they were the most typical second-level liegemen in the north-western part of France. The fact that Walter in the Song is Roland's liege man shows also that in the mind of the Roland poet, Roland, too, would implicitly have his fiefdom in the northwest. And just as in history a member of this family of counts, thanks to its links with the Norman dukes, under their relative Edward the Confessor led the war against the Welsh in Britain and became the founder of the Welsh march, so in the Song, Roland had assisted in the subjugation of Britain by defeating the Welshman Maëlgut (an adaptation the historical Welsh 'national hero' Maelgwn). I refer to the monograph for further details on this name, including the epithet *del Hum*.

1414 Like r*eont*, *reoignier*, *seror* and *serorge* all from Chrétien; *secorre* Wace, E*neas*, *Ch. de Guill.*, Chrétien; *secors* Chrétien; *sejor* Beneeit *CDN*, Chrétien; *sejorner Cour. Louis*, *Ch. de Guill.*, Chrétien; *enor Charroi*, *Rou*, Chrétien; *semondre* Chrétien.

C.8.10 *Guiun de Seint Antonĭe*

E Guiun de Seint Antonĭe O [1581]=1624 (:ǫ-ə, +1), the Count of *Sanitun* [in appo-
sition to the preceding *Bæringr*] n (*Sant Anternie* B,b), *Guimuten* (Ger. acc.) K, *et
Guion et Anthonie* V4, *de Gascoigne* [belongs to the preceding *Berenge*r] *et
Guion* CV7T, *le Gascon* [or similar] *et Guion* L, *et Guion le Gascoing* P, *Gwimwnt*
o *Saxonia* w: the similarity between the personal name in K and w with the
added *-m-* is presumably due to their use of the same Anglo-Norman source;
Guimundus was the name e.g. of a Chaplain to Henry I, then Prior of St. Frides-
wide in Oxford († around 1139; cf. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta* cap. 178 and
Miracula no. 14). *Guiun / Guion* is confirmed by OV4CV7PTL for the archetype.
In the fief name a certain *⁎S[aint] Antonie* in β (on simple *S* abbreviations for
sanctus cf. Cappelli 1961, 336, Stiennon 1973, 125, Bischoff 2009, 223) is misin-
terpreted in w as *Saxonia*, in n as *Sanitun* (but in B,b corrected to *Sant Ante-
rnie*); V4 also did not know, or did not recognise a place called *S[aint]- Antoine*
and therefore removed the *S[aint]* and turned *Anthonie* into a knight (which
meant that in terms of both content and metre, the second *et* was needed). It
was not until δ that the place name was replaced with 'Gascony' in the alliterat-
ing form *⁎de Gascoigne Guion* (:ō),[1415] after which the qualification as a Gascon
in V7 and LT is understandably applied to the preceding Berenger. According
to OV4CV7TL *Guiun* belongs in the archetype, according to O(B,b)V4 *Ant(h)onĭe*
does too, and finally according to O(n with B,b; w) *Seint* also belongs there; this
is therefore retained in O.

The hypermetry in O is easily fixed by removing the *e(t)* (as do Jenkins,
Hilka/Pfister).[1416] Jenkins is suspicious of the reading *Antonĭe*, because (class.)
Lat. *Antonius* has an *-ō-*; but *Antonĭe* is (semi-) erudite and that is why it has *-ǫ-*
just as the Song, as the assonance shows, has also *Grandǫnĭe* and even *Jerichǫ*,

---

1415 A *Gui de Gascogne* appears in β in the additional verses after v. 105 (V4CV7 and partially
K) and 171 (KCV7).
1416 Just as even Segre must athetise *e(t)* in v. 128, 170, 399, 608, 1140, 1359, 2075, 2186, 2210,
2515, 2963 (2), 3126, 3229, 3245, 3259, 3659, 3722, 3885, showing that O has a clear tendency to
add a superfluous *e(t)*. The resulting asyndeton in this place is acceptable because (logically,
although not grammatically) *Austorje* follows next in the list. According to Segre, Gautier (2nd
–8th edition) and Stengel read *Gui* and not *Guion*, even though it is guaranteed by V4. Th.
Müller, Gautier (éd. classique, 1887) and Bertoni on the other hand read *e(t) Guion e(t) Anto-
nie*; however, the preceding figures in the text, Gerin, Gerer and Berenger were all introduced
as peers before, while Guion and Antonie are just names, and the poet does not do this in
other places; moreover, this reading must assume that the existence of the historical figure
Guigo of Saint-Antoine (more on him in the main text below) is a coincidence.

in accordance with the very same Medieval Latin or ecclesiastical Latin pronunciation convention which is still followed in Ital. *Antǫnio*.[1417]

Jenkins and Roncaglia suspect that originally there was *e Guion de Saintonje* – but this is not correct. For first of all, it would be at least strange if the name of a very well-known French territory (thanks to the pilgrimage routes) had not been preserved in a single textual source. Secondly, as Th. Müller and Segre note, *Saintonge* (< *Sanctŏnica*), which is a popular (~non-erudite) name, has (before a nasal) regular *ǫ-* > *-ǫ-* (as e.g. in v. 925, 1755, 3255 *lunge* /lǫndžə/ < *longa* each time in ǫ assonance). Thirdly, we can hardly assume – quite apart from the case of B,b – that O and V4 would, independently of each other, have gone from *Saintonje* to *Ant(h)onie*; instead, *Antonïe* must have been in the archetype, and the assumption that there are errors in the archetype would only be admissible if the latter were intrinsically suspicious. But fourthly, it is not suspicious here since *Guion de Saint-Antonïe* was a real person. And fifthly, Saint-Antoine (Isère) fits with the following Valence much better than Saintonge does.

We turn now to the person himself. Tavernier (1912, 125) introduced him to Romance Studies, and Boissonnade (1923, 376–379) agreed; but both accounts of this difficult material are in need of a few corrections and more detail using the benefit of modern research, including especially the work of Noordeloos (1942), Mischlewski (1976) and Schilling (2006). Around, or just before 1200, the *Translatio sanctissimi Antonii a Constantinopoli in Viennam* emerged, and it is preserved in two mss. of the 13th c. as well as other places.[1418] It tells how in the late 11th c. a knight from the Dauphiné region by the name of *Guigo Desiderii* [scil. *filius*] always carried relics with him, even on feuds. He had inherited these relics, and they were thought to be the remains of St. Anthony the Great († 356), the main founder of Egyptian anchorite monasticism (and therefore also of all Christian monasticism).[1419]

1417 Cf. n. 97 above.

1418 Cf. the (only one usable by scholars!) edition of the *Translatio* by Noordeloos (1942) with its detailed commentary.

1419 According to the contemporaneous *Vita Antonii* by Athanasius (around 360, translated into Latin by Evagrius of Antioch by 373) Anthony had instructed his people to make his grave unrecognisable in order to forestall certain practices based on popular superstitions. But in the 6th c. it was supposedly found and the remains in it were brought to Alexandria; this is reported by the North African Bishop Victor of Tunnuna († 570, MGH AA. 11.205 for the year 561) and later authors (Isidore, Bede, the martyrologies). According to the *Translatio*, in Guigo's family it was said that the remains were taken from there to Constantinople around the time of the Muslim conquest of Egypt (and there are a few facts to support this: 1) in Lézat south of Toulouse people also believed that the relic of Anthony in that place had come from Constantinople, and 2) in 1231 while the Latin Empire was still in control of Constantinople,

When the Pope found out about this, he instructed Guigo to donate them at once to the monastery of his choice. He opted for Montmajour near Arles, but in order to keep the relics close to him, he founded a priory in his home town La Motte (from that time forwards called Saint-Antoine, today Saint-Antoine-l'Abbaye in the Dép. Isère), and also – at least according to this source – founded a hospital especially for people suffering from the condition called St. Anthony's fire. These events reported in the *Translatio* are partly substantiated by two charters from around 1083: the last will and testament of Desiderius Mallen, Guigo's father, in which he, with Guigo's agreement, donates among other things his own church *sancti Anthonii* and a neighbouring village to the Monastery of Montmajour, where *monasterium construatur* (subjunctive!), and a simultaneous charter with essentially the same content (saying that among other things this same church with its r*eliquiae tanti patroni* passes from secular ownership to Montmajour) by Bishop Gontard of Valence who at that time was administrator (from 1082–1084) of the (Arch-) diocese of Vienne, where Guigo's property was situated.[1420] Thereafter, the Montmajour Monastery is confirmed as owning the *ecclesia S. Antonii* by Paschal II on 22. 10. 1114, by Gelasius II in 1118/1119 and – now more specifically with ownership of the *ecclesia S. Antonii de Mota* – by Calixtus II on 9. 4. 1123 (Jaffé/Löwenfeld no. 6402, 6675, 7060; Schilling 2006, 247, 249). On the 20. 3. 1119, barely two months after his election at Cluny, Calixtus, who at that time was still living in his previous Archdiocese of Vienne, had consecrated the new Priory church.

---

an arm relic of Anthony was transferred from Constantinople to Bruges); in Guigo's family it was also rumoured that *Jacelinus*, more accurately *Jocelinus*, i.e. Gauzlinus (>*Josselin*) / Gaucelmus († 834), the son of a *sanctus Guillelmus*, who was also a *pugnator* (and taken together this can only mean the epic William of Toulouse), had inherited the remains as his personal property and had brought them from Constantinople to Provence on his way back from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. (There is absolutely no doubt about the identification of Gaucelm and William, contrary to almost all previous research, including most recently Schilling 2006, 245!) This is actually not improbable; in the 11th c. Gaucelm was no longer a famous person, and would not have been linked with a legend, but under Louis the Pious he was a Count of the Spanish March and as such gathered experience with Islam, and as William's son he may even have been a friend of Louis, who at some later time could well have sent him with the periodic Frankish donations to the Holy Sepulchre, and/or had him go as an emissary to Constantinople. Cf. on Gaucelm Calmette (1906, passim) and e.g. fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/ FRANKISH NOBILITY.htm#_Toc371156061; last access 21.04.2022; on the Anthony relics in principle AA.SS. for the 9th of January, which, as always, must be read with the benefit of modern knowledge.

1420 Text of the first one e.g. in (1942, 70 n. 6), the second one e.g. in Maillet-Guy (1907, 94 n. 2). On both charters more recently Schilling (2006, 245).

The Papal Bull for that occasion (Jaffé/Löwenfeld no. 6684, Robert 1891 no. 3), which also warns *Guigonem Desiderium cum filiis* against misappropriating any of what was now the Church's property, is understandably not yet prepared to the chancery standard[1421] and it even has two short additions which are clearly forged,[1422] but it fits with Calixtus' itinerary and names as witnesses Lambert Bishop of Ostia and John of Crema, Cardinal priest of San Chrisogono, who at that time really were members of the Pope's retinue; these details show that this is a credible report (Schilling 2006, 247–249). Guigo Desiderii and his sons also appear in 1104 and 1116 as witnesses for the Carthusian monastery Les Écouges (*Excubiae*), 25 km east of Saint-Antoine (cf. Maillet-Guy 1907, 181s.), and his sons on their own, *Franco et Mallenus, filii Guigonis Desiderii*, make a donation to this monastery in 1139 (GC 16.88s.). Guigo's father was therefore on record in 1083, Guigo himself from 1083–1119 and his sons from 1104–1139. All in all, therefore, there is no doubt that in the early history of Saint-Antoine, Guigo very soon became more illustrious than his father thanks to his much more active role in public life.

1421 Of the Bulls issued by Calixtus, the one dated 7. 4. 1119 (Jaffé/Löwenfeld no. 6685, Robert 1891, no.4) is the first of his prepared by the chancellor Cardinal Grisogonus (who had also been employed in this role by Calixtus' predecessor Gelasius II) and thus the first one complying with chancery standard.

1422 After the word *monachi* (here: the monks of the Priory who had come from Montmajour) the words *et clerici* are inserted in two places, and this is intended to signify those who actually ran the hospital, that is to say the Brothers of St. Anthony. But in terms of ecclesiastical law, these were only a brotherhood of laymen, and the *monachi* had still not granted them their own *oratorium* by 1181, although they had to do this in 1207 after the brothers had elected a priest to the position of Superior, and one of them even became Bishop of Viviers in 1205; in 1232 the Brothers enacted stricter statutes for themselves, but it was not until 1247, when they accepted the Rule of Saint Augustine, that they became *clerici*; it was only in 1298 that Saint-Antoine was declared to be their Abbey, at which point their emancipation from Montmajour was complete (Mischlewski 1976, 41–48). Their longstanding status as laymen also explains why the hospital is not mentioned in any of the above-mentioned charters, even though there can hardly be any doubt that it existed from about 1096 onwards. For according to Sigebert's chronicle, in the *annus pestilens* 1089, especially in western Lorraine, there was an outbreak of *sacer ignis* (*Ergotismus gangraenosus*, plague-like ergot poisoning), which soon became a scourge of the Middle Ages, and in the course of the 12th c. it was commonly known as Saint Anthony's fire; in 1123, the Brothers of Saint Anthony were given two more hospitals in Gap and, at around the same time, one in Chambéry and another in Besançon (Mischlewski 1976, 22–26, 29, 349). But as the order grew, and because of disputes with the Benedictines from Montmajour, they increasingly tended to misrepresent their own past as that of a fully clerical order from the start (which explains the *et clerici* mentioned above). To this day, this tendency has caused scholars to doubt the accuracy of the historian of the Brothers of Saint Anthony, Aymar Falconis (*Antonianae historiae compendium*, Lyon, 1534).

Wigo, *Guigo* had at that time become a very common name in the Dauphiné, especially because between the 10th and 12th c. this was the name of at least seven successive Lords (from 1030 onwards Counts) of Vion, from 1079 Counts of Albon, who from 1110 onwards were also called Delphini. Their territory, which was soon named Dauphiné after them, stretched at that time from west of the Rhône to the other side of the important Montgenèvre Pass over the Alps (LM s. v. *Albon*).[1423] The phonology of the name *Guigo* goes to Fr. *Gui* (thus merging with the French form *Wido*).[1424] Since Saint Anthony the Great had long been fervently venerated in the western Church as well, the forced immobilisation of his relics in about 1083, followed by founding of the hospital probably in about 1096,[1425] and certainly the consecration of the new Church of Saint Anthony in 1119 by Pope Calixtus, must surely have attracted attention across the whole of France. On the other hand, this place is not reliable evidence that Bishop Turold made his way along the Rhône in 1106, although Tavernier argued this point.

However, there is another possibility besides the one suggested by Tavernier, and it is perhaps preferable: if the poet who was in the north of France at that time had only heard about Saint-Antoine, but not about Guigo Desiderii, he might have understood *Gui* to mean simply the lord of the whole region, that is to say the Guigo Count of Albon.[1426] If this is true, then there is no need to acknowledge an ordinary castellan from southern Burgundy who is roughly contemporaneous with the poet as the putative provider of this name.[1427]

Be that as it may – as far as the Carolingianisation, i.e. the shift back into the time of Charlemagne, is concerned, we must recall the basic principle noted above in the section on 'Apparent Anachronisms' (C.5.1): the poet lives in a

---

1423 Guigo I –996, II –1009, III (Vetus, le Vieux) –1074/75, IV (Pinguis, le Gras) –1106, V –1125, VI –1142, VII –1162. In the handbooks we find some deviations from this list that are not important for our purposes, mainly because sometimes this or that charter was not consulted, and the use of the same name by multiple members of the family makes it difficult to distinguish the generations, and also because the first of them to have the title of Count is sometimes called Guigo I (instead of III).

1424 The *Guigues* we often find in French scholarship is a semi-erudite form and relates to *Gui* exactly as e.g. *Hugues* relates to *Hue*.

1425 Cf. n. 1422 above.

1426 We might also mention in this connection that K in the introduction to the first council scene in the additional lines after O 171 also lists a *Iuo uone Albonie* (K v. 1181).

1427 Moreover, the family of castellans could have been related to the Albon family. Bishop Humbert of Grenoble (*sedit* from around 990 until after 1030), brother of Guigo II of Albon was succeeded by Mallenus, his nephew on his sister's side (until 1036); cf. fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/burgkvien.htm#_Toc31798779; last access 21.04.2022. In Mallenus' family, then, from this generation forwards, the names *Guigo* and *Mallenus* are to be expected, and this is what happens in the castellan family.

world where fiefdoms are inherited, where people are mostly named after others in the family, and where long-term territorial, social or onomastic changes are insufficiently perceived. If a *Gui de Saint-Antoine* now exists or recently existed, why then would there not have been someone of the same name and standing during Charlemagne's lifetime?

C.8.11 *Henri*, nephew of Duke *Richard* of Normandy

E sun neüld Henri (scil. of *Richard li velz*; *-uld* erased but still legible) O 171, *Heinrich uon Garmes* K, *et ses freres Terris* (scil. *des Sanses li dus*) CV7: The *Henri* that is in OK belongs in the archetype, not the *T(i)erri* in CV7.[1428] The Anglo-Norman source of K had *(et?) de Garmes(e?)* (< *Garmaise*) *Henri*'[1429] where K did not recognise *Garmes(e)* as the French equivalent of MHG *Worme3*. Stengel did not recognise it either, but "emended" it to *Galne* and puts *de Galne Henris* into the text, but this is incorrect, because *Galne* in O 662, its only occurrence, is only a corruption of *Valterne*, and because the context in that passage shows that this town is in Spain, whereas in the whole of the Song, Charlemagne has not given out any fiefdoms in Spain. But *de Garmaise* does not belong in the archetype either, because *e sun neüld* in O or *e ses freres* in CV7 go together, and one or other of them was in the archetype, which means there was no room for the name of a fiefdom. O is the only unproblematic option, and so it determines what goes into the archetype.

Worms was the Salian imperial dynasty's centre of power; this is why the emperors Henry III to V (1039–1125) were known as 'Henry of Worms'. Since the relationship between Henry V and Henry I of England was particularly good – in 1114 the emperor became the king's son-in-law, and in 1124 a joint campaign against France was cancelled only at the last minute – *(et?) de Garmes(e?) Henri* is a logical reading for the Anglo-Norman source of K. But O is even better, where 'Henry' belongs to the family of Richard the Old, that is to say the Norman dukes, and thus hints at Henry I himself, the third and last son of William the Conqueror. Born in 1068, he was paid off with a huge sum of money on the death of his father

---

1428 In K (v. 1183–1185), however, the context is as follows: *Ritschart uon Tortune, Diebalt von Remis* (in O two lines later), *Heinrich von Garmes*, and so Henry is not depicted as a relative of Richard, and Richard is not a Norman ruler; but I agree with Segre and think that the overlap between O and K cannot be a coincidence.

1429 I am not sure how to handle this: delete the *et*, Anglo-Norman hypermetry, Anglo-Norman loss of the *-e* or perhaps silent *h* (with slurring of the *-e*). If we wanted to put this reading into the text, the only possibility would be the first one: *de G(u)armaise Henri*.

in 1087, but then nevertheless, on the death of his brother William the Red in 1100, he became King of England, and after defeating his brother Robert also Duke of Normandy in 1107; William the Conqueror had named him out of gratitude to his liege lord Henry I of France, because the latter had recognised him as Lord of Normandy when he was a seven-year-old illegitimate orphan and had also provided military support for him in 1047 against rebelling Normans, thereby very probably saving his career. Bédier, Jenkins, Segre, Hilka/Pfister etc. are therefore right to put O into the text.

C.8.12 *Loëwis* 'Louis', Charlemagne's son

Loëwis [. . .] mes filz O 3715s., *dem guten Ludewige* K, the Duke of Normandy V4CV7PLT: Following OK the name 'Louis' belongs in the archetype, although possibly in the continental-Old French form *Loöis* rather than *Loëwis* which Stimming (1899, 220) recognised as Anglo-Norman.[1430]

The two dominant Carolingian kings in the Old French epic are Charlemagne and his son Louis, who was also his successor in history; the poet automatically regards Louis as the Crown Prince, even at the time of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign. If we consider that every monarch in the period around 1100 knew that his choice of bride for the successor to the throne was a question of supreme importance, we can understand how noble Charlemagne's gesture is: he knows now that he must make the highest possible commitment if he hopes to console Alde. The German editor follows the official, especially ecclesiastical, designation of Louis "the Pious" when he describes the successor to the throne as 'good'. The editor of γ takes the opposite approach; he is under the influence of the increasingly popular Louis epic with its very negative depiction of this ruler and so he decides: it is better to have an anonymous Duke of Normandy as a marriage partner than this Louis character.

C.8.13 *Pinabel del castel de Sorence*

Pinabel O 362, the same in nV4CV7: this is in the archetype. Pinabel's name is introduced here in the obliquus case. Later, there are sometimes (in O only in v. 3885) rectus forms ending in *-s*, but the name often remains invariable, as often happens in early OF, especially when names are felt to be of foreign origin. K

1430 Cf. C.8.5.1 above on the parallel form *Baldewin*.

writes *Binabel* because of the German consonant shift, but there are no other phonological variants.

We first encounter Pinabel in the great trial scene as *Pinabel del castel de Sorence* O 3783, *Binabel* K, *Pinabel [. . .] de Sorançe* (*Florence* T), *sire de Besençon* V4T, *Pinabel de Florence* C, *Pinabel de Sorence* V7PL. *Sorence* OV4V7PL belongs in the archetype; *Florence* is obviously a *lectio facilior*, even though C and T seem to have introduced it independently of one another.[1431] *Sire de Besençon* appears at this point only in V4T; but in the line that corresponds with O 3894, Pinabel in CV7PT also promises Besançon to Tierri in the case of his demise. Pinabel is known as the ruler of Besançon at least in the γ stage. It implies that the ẽ-ə laisse in O has been turned into a (rhymed) õ laisse. Since K suppresses *de Sorence* here, the question arises whether this text might also suppress *sire de Besençon*; but in the next few lines *er was michel unt snel, / starh unt chŭne, / redehaft genŭge* which mirrors the text in O: *Ben set parler e dreite raisun rendre, / Vassals est bons por ses armes defendre*, and does this so closely that it is obvious that the author was looking at the ẽ-ə laisse, whereas the content in the γ texts is very different. *Sire de Besençon* cannot then pass beyond γ into β or even the archetype. Only O is unproblematic, and so it represents the archetype.

Sorence is [1] probably Sorrento at the southern end of the Gulf of Naples, but this only becomes clear after a detailed examination of the name *Pinabel*; it is [2] certainly not Sarrance (Pyrénées-Atlantiques) 20 km south of Oloron on the road from there to the Somport Pass and [3] probably not Sorèze (Tarn) between Castres and Castelnaudary; but there may be some benefit [4] in looking at a few places with a similar name near Besançon.

On [1]: When Pinabel's name is mentioned for the first time, Ganelon calls him *mun ami e mun per* and says his people should greet him if, as he fears, he himself does not come back from Saragossa. The *ami* turns out later to be a relative, in fact; but even if he were "only" a friend, among the nobility of that period, friendship always came with a close mingling of interests, and as the term *per* shows, it implied reciprocity at a very high level because Ganelon is the Emperor's brother-in-law. It is also of interest that Pinabel is currently not in the army, having remained in his own homeland, which perhaps casts a slight shadow over his character. At any rate, the audience of the Song is given the impression that this Pinabel will play some part in the story, but probably not

---

1431 In additional verses later, we find C 7890 (*Serençe*), 7925 (*Sorence*) as well as T 5391, 5494 the correct form *Sorence*.

until the army has returned from Spain, which means after Roncevaux. The fact that it only takes a single, well-placed line to make this point demonstrates the economy – and the fact that this simultaneously draws an arc across more than three thousand lines demonstrates the high degree of structuredness – across the whole of the Song.

But there is more: *Pinabel* is the most surprising name in the whole Song. The majority of the Christian warrior names are of Germanic origin, and there are also the Celtic, Greek or Latin names *Ivorĭe*, *Austorje*, *Basilie*, *Lorant* and *Olivier*; but the first four are saints' names, Olivier was originally a metaphorically descriptive name and during the lifetime of the poet doubtless also one that carried a positive symbolic meaning, though by then well integrated into the inventory of "normal" names in general consciousness. *Pinabel* is not like this, but instead it is constructed out of visibly Romance elements, and resembles only *Basbrun* on the Christian side, the name of the man who executed thirty people. Since it was not possible to be baptised with the name *Pinabel*, the audience must have understood it as an epithet and therefore as a reflection of the man's character.

Now in the Middle Ages, at least until the latter part of the 12th c., the element *bel(lus)* 'beautiful' in real *masculine* names is only to be found from around Poitiers and Vienne and places south of there. Very often it is the main element: Morlet (1972, s. v.) lists from that area two instances each of *Bellus* and *Bello*, three of *Bellus-homo* and one each of *Belletus*, *Bellucius* and *Belonus*. Kremer (1972, 315), Piel/Kremer (1976, 100) and especially Becker (2009, 264–271) list a large number of names from Iberoromania based on *bellus* such as (always with minor and insignificant variants) *Bellus*, *Bellushomo, Bellellus*, *Bellitus*, *Bellotus*, *Bellucius*. A similar pattern continues through Italy as far as Dalmatia, where Jireček (1904, 25) lists from Veglia a *Bellus* and a *Belletto* in the late 12th c. In comparison, *Bel(lus)* as the second part of a name is remarkably rare; it seems to have taken root first on the southern edge of Galloromania and there, as in Iberoromania, it seems to be based at least partly on the reinterpretation of a pre-Romance element (cf. Becker 2009, 25, 114s., 258). At any rate we can cite: from Galloromania probably *Olunbellus*, a bishop in Septimania (Bouquet 9.170 from 878), and again *Olimbellus/Odimbel*, Bishop of Lodève in Septimania (Languedoc-HgL 4.288 around 1030);[1432] from Iberoromania e.g. *Sanzobelle* (Albelda 11 a. 921), *dompno Azubeli* (Salazar 86 from 1046), *Enneco Oribel* (San Millán 248 from 1079), *Exabellus* (Catalonia from 1110, Kremer 1972, Index).

Finally, Rajna cites from Italy (1889, 15s. and 66 n. 1) no less than three instances of *Pinabellus*, from the Milanese region one each from 1132 and 1246/

[1432] Unfortunately, Morlet's two volumes are not indexed for the second parts of names.

1251, and from the southern Italian *Catalogus baronum* (mostly from 1150–1152) a holder of a fiefdom from Casaldianni (25 km north of Benevento); Rosellini (1958, 262) added two more instances of *Pinabellus* from Pavia in 1181 and from Tortona in 1191, and finally, de Mandach (1993, 137 n. 17) mentions one in 1239/ 1240 from Circello (8 km north of Casaldianni, probably a descendant of the one cited by Rajna).

So, there is evidence here of some variation in taste according to geography: in northern France a man could certainly be thought of as handsome and well-formed; but it would have sounded strange, and foreign, if his name were to indicate that he was 'beautiful'. Inversely, the epics soon began to form heathen names with -*bel*: the PT already has *Burrabellus* (where admittedly the inclusion of some kind of Arab. *Abū*- name cannot be ruled out), and later epics have *Cladu*-, *Fina*-, *Forti*-, *Justa*-, *Lucabel*, and also *Luciabel*, which was (as a distortion of *Lucifer*) the name of the devil; the element of 'beauty' is of course intentionally deceptive.

Rajna was of the opinion that the North Italian reference from 1132 had already been influenced by the Song of Roland. But if even the way this name was constructed was alien to OF, and there were six bearers of this name from Italy but none at the same time from France,[1433] we must conclude with Hans-Erich Keller (1989, 86, 102) that the name came into the Song from Italy.

But Keller claimed much more for the name than just an Italian origin. Since he obviously only knew one reference of those identified by Rajna and Rosellini, namely the southern Italian one from the middle of the 12th c.,[1434] He was confident in his belief that the poet or one of his informants had first heard of the name when Louis VII returned from the Second Crusade and stayed over at the Norman-Sicilian court, and then this person must have brought the name back to France. This is extremely arbitrary[1435] when the name, as in this case, is

---

1433 To be sure, the Celtic specialist Joseph Loth writes in 1903 (*Romania* 31.393), that the [family] name *Pinabel* is "assez répandu" in the Saint-Malo region, and surprisingly, he is right. For first, judging by the French national telephone book at www.infobel.fr it is present at a low level in every region of France, but it is most frequent by a very long way in Normandy. Secondly, according to www.geneanet. org/nom-de-famille it was present around 1600 in the area of today's Département Manche and it was popular only in that region. It seems then to have been brought from southern Italy via the Norman Rol. to Normandy, and there thanks to the influence of the Song it became an epithet at first, and then later a family name; it provides further evidence of the popularity of the Song precisely here in Normandy.

1434 For this is the only Pinabel mentioned in the by English historian Evelyn Jamison (1938, 71) whom Keller relies upon as his source.

1435 Even riskier is de Mandach's idea (1993, 136s.), which he arrives at without the slightest scrap of historical evidence, that this particular Pinabellus could have taken part in the

attested from one end of Italy to the other. If it was brought to France from southern Italy via the Italo-Norman connection, this could have happened decades earlier, which means that it is *de facto* useless as an indication of the date of the Song; for this connection existed for more than a century, whereas the southern-Italian Capetian connection that Keller refers to lasted only a few weeks.

It is in fact likely that the poet, who was probably a Norman and active in France, first heard of the name when it was brought back by the Normans from Italy. Now, if in the northern half of France Pinabel was recognisable by his name as someone from the Mediterranean, or even an Italian, then the only plausible identification for *Sorence* is Keller's suggestion, Sorrento. The substitution *-o > -e* is to be expected, since it is similar to the likes of *Salerno* > OF *Salerne*, because when southern Romance names are taken into OF the only unstressed final vowel possible is /-ə/. For <t> > <c> Keller suggests a palaeographical misreading (by the author himself or in the archetype); there could also be some attraction from other city names ending in *-enza / -ence*.[1436] Finally, the phoneme boundary /rr/ ≠ /r/ is porous in OF, even after the main stressed syllable, and after an unstressed syllable it is negligible.[1437]

Keller also thought he could use the date of the Norman conquest of Sorrento in 1133 "après une longue et farouche résistance" (1989, 101s.) as the *terminus post quem*. But I cannot agree with this either. Since in the Rol. Charlemagne has subdued *Puille e trestute Calabre* (v. 371) and fears the rebellion of the *Puillain e tuit cil de Palerne* (v. 2923), the rather unsympathetic Pinabel is certainly not seen as a southern Italian Norman, but rather as one of the local Italians who from a Norman perspective acquired a mostly negative image because they did not submit of their own free will. Just as the wealthy trading city of Sorrento managed to free itself from the Duchy of Salerno in 1052, it also managed to escape Normanisation

---

Sorrentinian "rebellion" of 1127–1130 against King Roger II and then been pardoned later. Like Keller, De Mandach is unaware of the northern Italian references.

1436 In southern Italy itself *Cosenza* and *Potenza*, which were already significant places in the Norman period and had to end in *-ence* in OF; in the rest of Italy, we find e.g. *Florence* and *Plaisance* 'Piacenza', in the Song itself *Valence* and *Maience*. With reference to the ending of the word we might also consider OF *Espolice* 'Spoleto'.

1437 There could be some lingering doubt about this identification because Ganelon had said (v. 360–363): *En dulce France [!], seignurs, vos en irez: / De meie part ma muiller salüez, / E Pinabel, mun ami e mun per, / E Baldewin, mun filz que vos savez.* But this means 'after the campaign has ended, you will return to France.' And it could mean: 'then you will meet my wife and my son, and at the next Imperial Diet at the latest (there would not be long to wait for this, in both the 8th and the 12th c.) you will also meet Pinabel.'

in around 1077, and from that time forward it must have been a key object of Norman desire and antipathy.

If Pinabello in the Song is the ruler of Sorrento, it is quite clear why he does not take part in Charlemagne's Spanish campaign. For although Charlemagne has already conquered Italy and Saxony as well (according to v. 2330, 2921), in the Song he does not take any Italians or Saxons with him, very probably because he does not trust them.

Keller's next remark (1989, 86, 102) is more interesting, though it is perhaps in need of a little more explanation: since in southern Italy trees are often feminine, the name *Pinabello* "(homme) beau comme un pin" (which would be a suitable characteristic for the tall figure of Pinabel); but the French audience would then very probably have associated the name (because of the -*a*-) with *la pine* 'membrum virile'. In fact, according to the FEW (s. v. *pinus*) *pine* is formed from *pin* 'fir/pine' following the same pattern as *pirus* 'pear tree' – *pira* 'pear' (so that originally it must have meant 'pine cone' but soon only preserved the figurative meaning; in the literal meaning *la pigne* < Lat. *pinea* remained unrivalled). After an isolated Occitan *la pina* in Giraut de Bornelh (last third of the 12th c., Limousin), French *la pine* is first attested in the Romance of the Rose and remains productive through the centuries up to the present time: alongside *pine* (TLF: 'argot trivial') which is still common, in 1931 *piner* 'coïre' crops up; in view of the almost timeless nature of this term, we should be permitted to extend its usage back in time by about one and a half centuries from the Romance of the Rose to the Rol., since it only rarely finds its way into the written language.[1438] The name is then ambiguous in the Song.

This leaves one question unanswered: was it already ambiguous in Italy? Four of the six references, including the oldest one, come from northern Italy; in that region, tree names are generally not feminine, and the predominant type is *pero* 'pear tree' – *pera* 'pear'. Which type of word formation does Pinabellus belong to, then? According to Rohlfs (1972, § 992s.), in the Occitan and Italian composition type noun + adj., the noun, even if its -*a* is retained in the middle of the word, always has a limitative meaning. Rohlfs cites: from the Occ. *bocadurs* 'hard-

---

[1438] On the other hand, names like *Pinellus* etc. could have harmless connotations ('little fir/pine tree'). *Pinellus* is attested from around the middle of the 11th c. in Anjou (e.g. Angers-S. Aubin 1.337 around 1070 *Hamelinus Pinellus*, an already deceased *miles*) and in Normandy (*Radulfus Pinel*, 1066 in William's army according to Migne PL 149.1283, also in the Domesday Book according to Hildebrand 1884, 341) and probably from there it went to southern Italy (Cod.Cajet. 176 from 1105 *Pinellus*, evidently a Norman, witness in a charter by Richard of Aquila). The foundation charter of Baugerais (Diocese of Tours, GC 14.85 in 1153) even mentions 4 individuals called *Pinonus*, *Pinetus*, *Pinochus* and *Pinotus* respectively.

mouthed', *bocafortz* similar meaning, *coaros* 'the bird with the red tail = redstart', *lenguaforbitz* 'smooth of tongue', and from northern Italian Piedmontese *cuarúss* 'red-tail', Venetian *coaros*s same meaning, Lombard *barbaruss* 'red beard, robin', from southern Italian: Neapolitan *codarusso* 'red-tail', *cannapierto* 'aperto di gola', *voccapierto* 'aperto di bocca, open-mouthed', Calabrian *vuccapiertu* and *vuc-cancatu* similar, *gammalestu* 'agile di gamba, agile of leg', *linguaffrittu* 'afflitto di lingua'; there are no references showing that a different vowel could change into *-a-*. In the whole of Italy, therefore, *Pinabellus* could have been analysed as "beautiful in the *pina,* (man) with a beautiful *pina*". A 'pinecone' in modern Standard Ital. is *pigna* (< Lat. *pinea*); but it was in competition with (originally Tuscan) *pina* until very recent times (Battaglia s. v. *pina*), so that e.g. Boerio (1829, s. v.) believed, Venetian *pigna* could be explained by 'pina' (which he evidently regarded as Standard Italian). But – what is more – even the Florentine Machiavelli uses his native *la pina* also as 'membrum virile',[1439] so that the interpretation of the name *in malam partem* was at the very least possible in parts of Italy, too. And finally, when one considers that the pine tree in ancient times (according to Vergil *Aen.* 9.85, Ovid *met.* 10.103, 14.532ss., Phaedrus 3.17.4, Prudentius *perist.* 10.19.6) was sacred to Cybele and symbolised fertility because of its cones, and that a pine-cone formed the point of the Thyrsos spear carried by Dionysos and his followers,[1440] then we shall hesitate to suggest, in the Mediterranean regions, any geographical limits for the understanding of the metaphor.[1441]

Be that as it may – after all of the evidence outlined above, the name *Pinabel* in the Song very probably comes from the early Norman stage; it is hard to believe that the Angevin poet in the middle of the 11th c. would have had access to a name that in reality can only be attested in Italy. We cannot necessarily conclude from this, however, that the duel scene as a whole was previously missing. It might have been simpler before, perhaps in such a way that Ganelon had to duel for his own life; the Norman poet would then have invented the athletic Pinabel, so that the whole Ganelonid clan would stand guarantor of his bodily strength and so that the duel itself would be more exciting because of the obvious disparity between the two warriors.

1439 Battaglia (s. v. *pina*). – Radtke (1980, 244) cites *pignolo* in modern Italian as a word for 'membrum virile'.

1440 Herder-Lexikon der Symbole s. v. *Pinie*.

1441 I agree with Rajna that *Spinabello*, e.g. in the year 1154 in Este (Rajna 1889, 16), in 1252 in Padua (Fassanelli 2014, 246) is an alternative to *Pinabello* (but unlike Rajna, I think this form seeks to disguise the meaning).

On [2] and [3]: Boissonnade (1923, 135, 341) argued for Sarrance (Pyrénées-At-lantiques) and Jenkins (ad loc.) did too, albeit more reluctantly. But the *Soricinii* in the register of a charter from the year 1088 in Anselme (1726–1733, 2.626) al-most certainly refers to Sorèze Abbey (Tarn). The scholars who are perhaps the most knowledgeable about the history of the French Western Pyrenees (Du-barat/Daranatz in Bayonne-Veillet 1910–1929, 3.1043) vehemently reject Bois-sonnade's suggestion, because in 1343 *Sarrance* was still a place *carens populi copia*, when after the discovery of a sculpture of Mary a Cistercian priory was founded; it certainly cannot have been a *château* (Boissonnade 1923, 341, not clearly explained).

Sorèze Abbey (Tarn), on the other hand, was founded in around 754 or – more probably – around 814/817 and is attested as *Suricinum/Suricinii* in around 814/817, *Soricino* in 961, *Soreze* in 1168. Like many toponyms in this region, its name also found its way into the Pseudo-Philomena, where the editor Schneegans (1898, p. 247 n.) correctly identified *Soricinium*. The intermediate stage /sǫrę(d)znə/ was Frenchified by slotting it into the type of formation ending in *-ence* (like *Valence*, *Maience*). The Celtic Oppidum Verdinius (etc.) situated about 1.2 km south of Sor-èze, has been called (Montagne) Bruniquaut from the Middle Ages until the pres-ent time (*Castellare Brunichellis* 1141, *Brunicheld* 1148), was occupied from late antiquity until the start of the 12th c., and then was evidently abandoned when people moved over to Sorèze in the valley; it has almost constantly been the object of archaeological investigations.[1442] Sorèze would be a possible identification for *Sorence* if any kind of connection could be found with the name Pinabel, which exists only in Italy; but this is not the case.

On [4]: A second-order question remains unanswered: why did the reviser of γ make Pinabel de Sorence ruler of Besançon as well? He obviously identified the name *Sorence* that he found in the Song with one of the similarly named places in the area around Besançon, which included: [a] Soirans (-Fouffrans, Côte-d'Or, *Soorans* 1280, *Sorans* 1313), 60 km west of Besançon, 25 km southeast of Dijon on the road from there to Auxonne and in the Middle Ages onwards via Lausanne and the Great St. Bernard Pass to Italy. It is one of the last places be-fore the Saône, which generally formed the border here between the *regnum Franciae* and the Empire; but Soirans in particular later belonged to the Prévôté of Aussonne, and probably therefore to the Empire before that (cf. Longnon 1912, pl. XI, where it switched over to the Empire in the time around 1032). A noble family is attested owning territory there from 1358, and in 1372 one of its

---

1442 Letter from the Director of the *Archives départementales du Tarn* to myself dated 12. 3. 1970; Lautier (1968 and 1977, passim); Séguier (1990, passim).

members rendered homage to the Duke of Burgundy for the *motte* and *maison forte* of Soirans.[1443] [b] Sorans-lès-Breurey (Haute-Saône, *Sorans* 1184, *Sorens* 1199), only 20 km north of Besançon on the old Roman road from Besançon-Rioz-Vesoul (N 57 = E 23). A noble family from that place is attested from 1184–1324, and a *château* whose foundation date is unknown was destroyed by Louis XI. [c] Sorans-lès-Cordiers (Haute-Saône, *Sorans* 1250), 35 km northeast of Besançon, about 6 km east of the road from Besançon-Rioz-Vesoul, rather out of the way. [d] Sourans (Doubs, *Sorens* 1147), almost 60 km east-northeast of Besançon, 6 km southeast of L'Isle-sur-le-Doubs in the Belfort Gap, just to the south of the Doubs and the A 36 = E 60 Besançon-Belfort-Alsace and directly north of the old D 73 ('La Grande Rue') Besançon-Pont-de-Roide-Western Switzerland.[1444] [e] Sorens (Canton of Fribourg, Switzerland), 100 km as the crow flies southeast of Besançon, according to Longnon (1929, § 812) attested in around 975 as *Sotringi*.[1445] All five of these places are too small to be the primary source in the archetype; but if the reviser of γ asked himself what *Sorence* might be and associated it with one or more of these places, it was logical to promote Pinabel to the position of ruler of Besançon, because he was much more than a just minor nobleman. The fact that Frederick Barbarossa married Beatrix, the heir of Besançon in 1156, thereby binding the French-speaking nobility of the Free County even more closely to the Empire, may have been another painful reason in the minds of the French for incrementally placing this family of traitors in the east.[1446]

1443 Letter from the Director of the *Archives générales du département de la Côte-d'Or et de l'ancienne province de Bourgogne* to myself dated 11. 7. 1969.

1444 I am grateful to the Directors of the *Archives du Département de la Haute-Saône* for historical information about all four places sent to me on 16. 5. 1969. I would like to record my – somewhat belated – thanks to the archives in Albi, Dijon and Vesoul.

1445 The proliferation of such similar names in a single geographical area suggests they share the same etymology. They go back to Germ. settlement names ending in *-ingos*; but the preceding personal name is not easy to define. Gamillscheg (1934–1936, 3.90s. and 146) suggests [a] and [b] are based on a Burgundian *Saudiharjis* (with Burgundian = Gothic *sauþs* 'victim'), [e] on the other hand (for which he ignores the form *Sotringi*) on a Germ. *Saurus*. Because of the *Sotringi* of 975 (and perhaps also the *Soorans* from 1280) I suspect there is in [a] to [e] a Germ. *Sud(a)-hari*, OHG *Sut-heri*, which is once attested as *Sudieri* in the *Liber memorialis* from Remiremont f.25v° (by scribe 13, final quarter of the 9th c., p. 51 of the MGH edition). In this work there are (according to the index in the MGH edition) no fewer than 16 references for Germ. names starting with *Sud-*; Morlet lists 19 references from the whole of Galloromania, mostly from the southeast, where at least the three instances of *Sof(f)redus* (all from Burgundy) show that here the Germ. *-u-* could lead to Gallorom. /ǫ~u/.

1446 The river *Sorence* near Barbastro and the Muslim town of the same name in the *Siège de Barbastre* and *Sorence* castle in Famars (Nord) in the *Perceforest* appear to be imaginary places.

C.8.14 *Willalme de Blaive*

Willalme de Blaive O 3938: On Blaye cf. above C.1.6.6 s. v. *Romanus of Blaye*.
Wilhelm IV of Angoulême († 1028), who had annexed Blaye in the late 10th c.,
bequeathed the County of Angoulême to his oldest surviving son Hilduin (Al-
duin), and the rulership of Blaye to his younger son Gauzfred. This younger son
(† 1048) took over Angoulême too in 1030/32 after the death of his brother; he
bequeathed it to his elder son Fulko, and Blaye to his younger son Gauzfred
(† shortly after 1089), for whom the epithet and simultaneously family name
Rudel is attested for the first time. The family kept this name and their position
as rulers of Blaye until after the start of the 14th c. Gauzfred Rudel was suc-
ceeded by his son William, who was known also by the epithet *Fredelandus* or
Freslandus († after 1095, perhaps even after 1106).[1447] It is possible that the poet
knew his name and used it. But this overlap could also be a coincidence, be-
cause between 916 and 1120 there were five Counts called William of Angou-
lême, including the one who conquered Blaye, and as their liege lords between
927 and 1127 there were seven Dukes called William of Aquitaine; all this con-
tributed to making William a common name in southern France.

Blaye was able to claim ownership of Roland's grave because of its quasi-bor-
der town function between about 980 and 1032 (cf. above C.1.6.6); however, when
Gascony was united with Aquitaine this border position was quickly forgotten. In
answer to the question why Roland was laid to rest in Blaye, the PT can only reply
by making him not only Duke of Le Mans but also ruler of Blaye as well.

There is no need to go as far as that in the Song of Roland. Since Roland is
buried in Blaye (v. 3689), the ruler of Blaye becomes the protector of his earthly
remains and therefore also, to a certain extent, a guarantor of his honour after
death. In this role he cannot have watched the single combat between Pinabel
and Tierri as a disinterested party; it is understandable, then, that at the mo-
ment when Tierri wins the fight, he rushes enthusiastically up to Tierri, with
Charlemagne, Naimes, Ogier and Gefreid d'Anjou (v. 3938).

1447 Cf. LM s. v. *Blaye* (but I see no reason to doubt the fact that the troubadour Jaufré Rudel
is part of this family) and fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/ANGOULEME.htm#_Toc518630911; last
access 21.04.2022. Wilhelm Fredeland was already discussed by Bédier (1926–1929, 177 n.1,
and also in the first edition, 1912).

C.9 The fiefdoms

C.9.1 The explicit fiefdoms

We can now, essentially retrospectively, evaluate how fiefdom (or in a few cases homeland) names are used to characterise the warriors.

The explicit reminder that Charlemagne is the ruler of *France* comes understandably from the mouths of enemies (v. 16, 488, 2658, 3234). But twice this comes from the mouths of Franks: first in Ganelon's words to Marsilĭe (v. 470), where it is part of his calculated and provocative threat, and then secondly in Roland's extremely deliberate, and very definitive answer to Ganelon (v.755). Finally, it comes from the mouth of the poet on two occasions: in v. 94 when Marsilĭe's messengers arrive at Charlemagne's court, where it accentuates the change of place, or, one might say, the crossing over from one world to another, and in v. 3579, when Charlemagne and Baligant have unseated each other from their saddles and now stand facing each other, ready to fight for life or death – not only of themselves, but also of their empires. In other places, that is to say in the vast majority of situations when Charlemagne is named, this geographical explicitness would have been awkward because it would only have detracted from the axiomatic sense of Charlemagne's being on "our" side throughout the whole of the Song.

As we have shown above, the other main characters (Roland, Olivier, Naimes, Ganelon) appear in the Song with no explicit naming of their fiefdoms because the poet wants to prevent his work from being understood in a facile way as a plea for or against any particular region. Others are also cited without naming their fiefdom, namely some warrior pairs (in which one party is defined by his relationship to the other) and some individuals who are just there to support a more important person, here with the implication that the fiefdom of the supporting person will be located next to that of the more important person (e.g. *Milun sun cusin*, that is to say of *Tedbald de Reins*). The heir to the throne Loëwis does not have a fiefdom yet; the head chef Besgun and the bailiff Basbrun are outside, or in fact below the bottom of, the pyramid of fiefdoms.

The remaining individuals appear with information about where their feudal home is. In only a few cases this is outside the French-Occitan language continuum: *Frise*, *Maience* and *Sorence*, if it is Sorrento. *Denemarche*, which only had to send Ogier as a hostage, and *Galice* as the home of Hamon who came to Charlemagne of his own accord are probably outside Charlemagne's empire as far as the poet is concerned.

Inside the French-Occitan language continuum we therefore have (if we use + to put together the fiefdoms belonging to one and the same person):

Anjou, *seint Antonĭe*, *Argone*, *Belne + Digun*, *Blaive*, *Bretaigne*, *Burdele + Guas-cuigne*, *Guascuigne* on its own, *Normendie*, *Provence*, *Reins*, *Runers* (*val de*), *Rossillon* (south of Vienne) and *Valence*. We must also remember that *Nerbone* and probably also *Carcasonĭe* cannot be included in this list because they are still within the current campaign's battle zone. The key concern of the poet is obviously to represent the French-Occitan language continuum more or less as evenly as he can. If we take a closer look, however, we find one noticeable limitation.

C.9.2 A basic fact of epic geography: the Capetian barrier

The lands belonging to the Capetian crown are excluded. Just after 1100 they stretched from Bourges via Orléans and Paris as far as Péronne and to the small exclave of Montreuil-sur-Mer.[1448] But with them the whole of the north and northeast of the French-speaking territories are excluded. We are faced with a basic fact that underpins the geography of names as a whole: it turns out that the key epic names *Olivier*, *Turpin* and (to a lesser extent) *Naimes*, the trend to-wards pairs of brothers Olivier/Roland or Roland/Olivier, and the increase in frequency of the name *Roland* and with it the prehistory of the Roland epic as a whole, expanded widely over the south and west for many decades, but this all came to a sudden stop at the border of this region – the Capetian-dominated area plus the north and northeast – as if a barrier stood in their way; moreover, the distribution of the name *Vivien* suggests that the situation was not much different in the William and Aimerid epics.

Let us therefore examine the causes of this through a sufficiently in-depth examination of the background.

The replacement of the Carolingian dynasty by the Capetian dynasty in the years from 888–987 was one of the longest, most painful and eventful in history; a large country paralysed itself for a century, and it was also weakened by the need to defend itself against external enemies. And in 987 no one could have imagined that Hugh Capet was about to take over the French crown, and that his family would go on to retain it (apart from two transfers to a side-branch) for eight centuries. The previous Capetian reigns of Odo, Robert I and Radulf looked like unimpressive inter-regna periods in comparison with the vi-olent Carolingian reigns of Charles III, the (definitely not) Simple, his son Louis

---

1448 As is customary, I do not count the Duchy of Burgundy as part of the crown territories, because the side branch of the Capetians there was at that time already in its third and fourth generation, and it was more or less striking out on its own.

IV d'Outremer, and his grandson Lothar. It was not until 991 that the Carolingian pretender Charles was betrayed to Hugh, and not until around 1012 that Charles' son Otto died as the Duke of Lorraine under the suzerainty of the Ottonians. The *Historia Francorum Senonensis* was written between 1015 and 1030 and portrays the change of dynasties as nothing more than a treacherous rebellion by the Capetian faction, an attitude which in mitigated form lasted until the start of the 12th c. (Hugo of Fleury, Ordericus Vitalis); Ademar of Chabannes († around 1034) and Sigebert of Gembloux (*scripsit* from 1100–1105) also show a certain amount of anti-Capetian bias.[1449]

As late as in 1035, Viscount Roger of Béziers dated a charter (Languedoc-HgL 5.435) not with reference to the Capetians, but to Charles' younger son Louis (who died on an unknown date after 993).[1450] In around 1050, in two chronicles from Anjou and Vendômois we find the sharpest, most derisive attacks on the Capetian *pseudoreges*, *reguli*, *tiranni*, on kings who until that point *solo nomine regnaverunt*.[1451] Indeed, at any suitable opportunity in later times, similar mockery of the Capetians could flare up: thus in 1096, Count Foulque le Réchin of Anjou, four years after King Philip had kidnapped his wife, proudly emphasised in the surviving fragment of *Historia Andegavensis* how his ancestor Ingelgerius had received his Angevin fiefdom from a French king *non a genere impii Philippi, sed a prole Caroli Calvi qui fuit filius Hludovici filii Caroli Magni*.[1452] Such remarks did not spring from any real attachment to the Carolingians, but rather from a centrifugal, particularistic attitude. They show how easily pro-Carolingian ideas could be instrumentalised against the Capetians in this period. At that time, anyone in the Capetian territories who praised Charlemagne too loudly would at the very least have been viewed with suspicion – and the Rol. is one big hymn in praise of Charlemagne, just as the William epics are, more indirectly.

The Capetians did not manage to achieve a minimum level of security as a dynasty until 1060, when the crown passed from Henry I to Philip I, this being the first succession carried out according to the principle of primogeniture and without tumultuous background events. Philip I then, figuratively speaking, threw on the broad mantle of the Carolingians when, probably at the end of 1081, he gave his oldest son the Carolingian name Louis – just as in 778 Charlemagne had for the first time given Merovingian names, to his new-born twin

---

1449 Cf. K. F. Werner (1952, 208–211, and 1965, 5 n. 2).

1450 Reference to the charter in Dhondt (1948, 80).

1451 Halphen (1903, 57). Rightly emphasised by Bender (1967, 40).

1452 Cf. the edition in Halphen/Poupardin (1913, 232s.); and in the same place p. 233 n. on the date of this statement and p. LXXXIXs. on the authenticity of the authorship.

sons Louis (*Ludwig < Chlodwig*) and Lotha(i)r (< *Chlothar*).[1453] But when Louis in around 1110 twice had to launch a campaign against the one castle Le Puiset, and when in 1119 he suffered a heavy military defeat against Henry I of England near Brémule, any fulsome praise of the Carolingians would still have sounded like an implicit criticism, almost derision, directed at the Capetians. It was only from 1122 onwards, when Suger started to guide Louis' politics that we begin to see the Capetians achieve a France-wide reach, though still not on a Carolingian scale, and it was only in 1130 with the death of Thomas de Marle that the small, regional anti-Capetian rebellions ceased.

Thanks to this deeply un-epic, locally focussed attitude in the Capetian-dominated areas, the north and the northeast behind them were sheltered from the influence of the Roland, and the William and Aimerid epics. Conversely: these areas did not bring any regional figures into those epics – even though presumably by then the east and the north had begun to develop their own epics: the Lorrain epics, those on the Saxon war, and isolated themes such as *Gormont und Isembart* followed a little later by the *Quatre fils Aymon* and *Raoul de Cambrai*.

1453 Ordericus Vitalis (ed. Le Prévost 1.187) calls Louis VI on the occasion of his inauguration in 1106 *Ludovicus Tedbaldus*. If he is right, then *Tedbaldus* may have been the name the prince normally used, while it was hoped that now for the young king the history-laden name *Ludovicus* would become popular. If he is wrong, then *Tedbaldus* should probably be seen as a trivialising addition made by the western French detractors of the Capetians, but even this is still a significant statement.

The main characters

C.10 Ganelon

He is mentioned in O 178 and passim 85 times altogether: *Guenes* (metrically incorrect *Guens* 844, *Guen* 647) mostly rectus / *Guenelun* (rarely -*lon*) mostly obliquus, *Guinelun* n, *Genelun* (sometimes with the German case endings -*e*, -*en*, -*es*, in the rhyme also with paragogic -*e*) K, *Gaino*, *Gaine(s)* / *Gainelon* (occasionally -*ay*-, 1x -*a*- instead of -*ai*-, -*ll*- instead of -*l*-) V4, *Guene(s)* (occasionally *Guenellons*) / *Guenellon* CV7, *Ganes* / *Ganelons* (only 1x) P, *Guenellon* T, *Gwen(n)lwyd* (occasionally *W*- instead of *Gw*-, a few times -*wl*- instead of -*lw*-) w, *Gwynylon* e, *Guelloen* h(R), *Guweloen* h(V): The -*d* in Welsh comes from a merging with *Glewlwyd* (apparently attested before 1100), the famous gatekeeper in Celtic mythology (on him Maier 1994, s. v.).[1454]

The name is based on Germ. *Wanilo*, *Wenilo* (n-stem, hypocoristic form of *Wano* which is also attested), the -*e*- variant of which is attested in Upper German in the late 8th c.,[1455] and in the French-speaking regions before the middle of the 9th c. (Förstemann, Morlet s. v.). According to *Duchesne* (1894–1915, 3.140, 2.210 and 2.417) the *e*-variant to be preferred, not yet for the Bishop of Laon (800–about 813),[1456] but clearly – and now also e.g. according to the *Concilia* volumes of the MGH – for the two Archbishops bearing this name, of Sens (837/838–865) and of Rouen (attested 858–869). Since in the initial syllable, the -*i*- in n, and the -*y*- in w and e can only have come from -*e*-, and not from -*a*-, the *e*- variant is in OnKTweh and therefore also in the archetype, whereas the *a*- variant is on the one hand in V4 (with generalisation of the originally stressed OF -*ain*[- < -*an*[-), on the other hand in P and (according to G. Paris 1882b, 486) in some later epics and (according to Flutre s. v.) in a few romances (with generalisation of the originally unstressed -*an*-). The archetype of the Song (and broadly speaking also O) is, judging by the metre, characterised by its almost clean separation of the two case forms, albeit with non-organic -*s* in the rectus, as in *Guenes* / *Guenelun*; the incorrect case is used, as one can easily

---

1454 I am grateful to Annalee C. Rejhon for this explanation (e-mail dated 25.09.08).

1455 Since it is based on OHG *wân* (something like 'hopeful faith'), but the umlaut *â > æ* only happened in the 11th/12th c., we must probably assume there was an early shortening in the third-last syllable; the umlaut *ă > e* already happened in the 8th/ early 9th c.

1456 I agree with Martinet/Merlette (1982, 68s.) that there was only one such Bishop, and not two, one following after the other. However, the other information that these two authors provide about him is not relevant to our context.

see in Segre's index, in fewer than 7 % of the occurrences.[1457] Since the un-stressed vowel *before* the stressed vowel remains somewhat stronger than *after* the stressed vowel, in the obliquus *Guenelun* it could remain as *ə < ę < ĭ* . In the rectus there had to be *Guenle(s)*, which (as G. Paris 1882b, 486 pointed out) is retained more than twenty times in Philippe Mousket (and occasionally e.g. in the *Ogier* tradition), since many northern dialects tolerated *-nl-* and similar con-sonant groups (cf. Pope 1952, N. § XIII). In the remaining areas, the *-l-* was lost, and in fact this happened very early, as the *Guenes* in the only surviving copy of the Song of Leodegar shows, even though the name only appears there be-cause of a translation or even copying error. In V4 the *-s* is still sometimes miss-ing; this historically more correct rectus was then (mostly with reversal of the FR *-ain-*[1458] to the Ital. *-an-*) generalised into Ital. *Gano.* – The PT has, in the *Codex Calixtinus* and the majority of manuscripts as well as evidently in the ar-chetype, *Ganalonus*, which is the *a* variant, but in the course of Romanisation it turned the new imparisyllabic forms back into parisyllabic forms built on the obliquus. Aubri de Troisfontaines copies it out and uses it in his own state-ments, too (MGH SS. 23.724s.); the PT may have at least partly contributed to the final triumph of the form *Ganelon* that is usual in modern Fr. (Eng. Ger.). The *Carmen* on the other hand (v. 1 etc.) has retained the imparisyllabic form, but with generalisation of the (*l*-less) rectus stem: *Guēno / Gu̯ēno, Gu̯ĕnōnis*.

In the prehistory of the Rol. there is nothing less certain, and hardly any-thing in the research on this work over the last half a century, that has been as controversial as the age of the Ganelon character. Let us first recall a fixed, albeit modest, *terminus ante quem*. In the inscription in the wall of the Cathedral of Nepi (about 40 km north of Rome) dated 1131, the knights and consuls of the city record the founding of their sworn covenant and threaten to punish any traitors with the same ignominious fate that befell Judas, Caiaphas and Pilate *ut Galelo-nem qui suos tradidit socios.*[1459] The inscription shows that Ganelon was known at that time in a small town in central Italy on the *via Francigena* – and this is neither in the Northern region near France, nor in the Norman southern region – and that he could be mentioned in the same breath as Judas, Caiaphas and

---

1457 On the later blurring of the difference between cases in the French naming tradition out-side the Rol. cf. G. Paris (1882b, 486s.).

1458 The Germ. name *Wano*, that is to say the stem name of the hypocoristic *Wanilo, Wenilo*.

1459 The first thorough and scholarly description is in Rajna (1886 and 1886–1887 passim). The inscription is guaranteed to be authentic and contemporaneous because the dating of 'July 1131' has not only the correct indiction VIIII, but also the formula *temporibus Anacleti II pape*; for this is the antipope who held this position from 1130 until 1138, and no one would refer back to an antipope at a later date, especially not calling him simply *papa*.

Pilate. There appears not even to have been a need for an Italian translation of the Song; but we can assume that a decade or more must have passed since the creation of a French Song of Roland complete with the Ganelon plot line. This guarantees that a French Ganelon character existed in around 1115–1120, or in any case it makes a very late dating impossible.

Some time ago, following the footsteps of illustrious predecessors such as Pio Rajna and Rita Lejeune I started a new search of charters from 778–1150 looking for "epic" names – only this time aiming to cover the whole tradition as far as this is possible – and of course I included the name Ganelon and its variants in my search. I did this with expectations that were the opposite of those that I had in relation to Olivier and Roland, that is to say, the basic question was: how does people's usage of the name as a normal name fade over time? However, the search led to a surprising result; because it turns out that it was not the chronological dimension that was important, but rather the geographical one. Because of this, in the following discussion I must exclude a strip in the centre-west of the French-speaking area for the whole of the period in question from 778 until 1150. This strip is about 180 km long and stretches from the Chartrain over the Dunois and the Vendômois through the main area of Tours and as far as the southern Touraine, but it includes also smaller areas radiating into the whole of Maine as far as Angers, the north-western tip of Poitou (Moncontour, Mirebeau) and the whole of Blésois. Moreover, I skip double names of the type *X + Ganelon* and discuss these at the end.

C.10.1 The name outside the centre-western strip

We shall examine the rest of Galloromania first. Of Morlet's altogether 16 cases belonging to Galloromania,[1460] seven of them, including the three who are bishops, are from the period between about 800 to 900. We must add from my material:[1461] in around 830 a *Uuanilo* in Corbie (MGH LC. 2.452.35) and a *Ganilo*

1460 The one located by her at "Marmoutier" does not belong to Marmoutier in Tours, but to Maursmünster/Marmoutier in Alsace, that is to say within the area that was German-speaking at that time.

1461 I have not included new references for persons already documented as certain or probable in Morlet, such as e.g. for a *presbyter Wanilo* in Langres in around 830 (MGH LC. 1.46.47) a vaguely contemporaneous canon *Wanilo* in Langres (MGH LC. 2.549.29). This applies all the more to the bishops, where I suspect that the *Wanilo presbyter*, who signed the documents of the Council of Langres in 830 along with many other *presbyteri* (MGH Conc.kar. 2.682), was the very one who was then promoted to Archbishop of Sens in 837.

a. 791, lay assessor in the area around Narbonne-Caunes (Languedoc-HgL 2.57), only acceptable with reservations, because only a copy of the charter survives, and the original may have had *Wanilo* or *Guanilo*. There are also some doubts about a *Wenilo* in Saint-Denis or Poitiers and another one in Lyon (MGH LC. 2.357.12, 364.22) between the 9^(th) and 10^(th) c.; if we count one of the two for each century, we have 9–10 bearers of this name before 900.

In Morlet there are 7–8 between 900 and 1000,[1462] and I have two to add to them (apart from the one just allocated): *Uuanilo*, canon in Paris (MGH LC. 2.156.11), and probably also *Uuanilo*, monk in Manlieu (Diocese of Clermont, MGH LC. 2.153.27) – which makes altogether 9–11.[1463]

We are left with the period from 1000 until 1150: Morlet's only reference s. v. *Wanilo* (from the period 1026–1047) belongs in the strip of territory mentioned above and is therefore excluded for now. But under the rare, somewhat dubious name stem *Gan-* (in which Morlet incorrectly sees the infinitive of Germ. *gân* 'to go') there is a *Ganilo* from the Dauphiné (Saint-Chaffre 50), which the editor at first dated to 1034 or 1134, but then according to a remark in the preface (p. XL) changed to 1134; by then in the south the development /gw-/ > /g-/ has already taken place, which means our name is present here. I can add from my own material: Poitiers-S.Cyprien 87 a. 1068 *Ganelenus*, son of the benefactor (probably a misreading of *-onus*); Nogent-le-Rotrou p. CXXXVI (= Cluny 4.701 around 1080 and 744 a. 1081–1088) *Genelo* (near Nogent-le-Rotrou) and obviously the same person 91 and 174 around 1100 *Gano de la Mot(t)a* (+ dat. *Genoloni de Motta*, La Motte, 7 km southeast of Nogent-le-Rotrou); Saint-Jean d'Angély 1.326 a. 1091 *Vualeno* (var. *Guanelo*) *Vuilelmus de Germiniaco* (Germignac, Charente-Maritime); Montbéliard 28 (= Lorraine-Calmet II instr. 350) around 1093 *Wehelo*, chaplain (obvious misreading of *-h-* instead of *-n-*); Saint-Jean-d'Angély around 1099 *Gainonus de Mauritania* (Mortagne near Saintes); Baigne (Saintonge) 22 end of the 11^(th) c. *Ganelo*, brother of a monk; Tardif 193 around 1100 *Guanilo cementarius*, citizen of Pierrefonds; Poitou-S.Florent 37 a. 1120–1145 *Ganilo*, son of the female benefactor. And finally: Rodulfus Tortarius who died shortly after 1122 writes in his poetic epistle VII (v. 259 and 270, cf. 274), without any kind of negative connotations, that during Bohemund's Balkan adventure of 1108 a pair of French brothers called *Guanelo* and *Corilus* ('coudrier, hazelnut tree') were killed, and so we are entitled to believe, despite the disquieting (nick-?) name *Corilus,* that

---

1462 Because one of them is "Xe–XIe siècle".

1463 I assume that the *terra Ganeloni* (Poitiers-S.Cyprien 91 "vers 970?") belongs to the same person who signs a charter some 20 years later (*S. Wanelonis*, Poitiers-S.Cyprien 81 [sic] a. 987–996) and Morlet is also aware of him.

he is talking about real people. The century and a half from 1000 to 1150 give us therefore another ten occurrences.

The total number of surviving charters – and therefore also of opportunities for documenting the name – increased from the 9th to the 10th and again from the 10th to the 11th c. The sequence of 9–10 cases between 800 and 900, 9–11 cases between 900 and 1000, and 10 cases between 1000 and 1150 should therefore be interpreted as a steady but slow decline in the use of the name. The main reasons for this are that it is a Germanic name in Galloromania, where for the vast majority of speakers its semantics would be opaque, and the simple fact that it was not kept alive by any great family or positive figure: Germanic names without this kind of support slowly converge towards extinction. In any case there is no detectable downwards trend just before 880, or by 900 at the latest, as we might expect if people's outrage at the betrayal of Charles the Bald by Archbishop Wenilo of Sens (September 858, reconciled in 859) had had any significant onomastic effect. This does not support the theory that he was the person who gave his name, but for reasons that will become clear below (at the end of C.10.2), neither is it a convincing argument against this theory.

A stronger argument against him is the fact that what he did had no major consequences. The factor that caused a stir at the time was mainly Wenilo's clerical rank: he was, as Charles stresses in his written complaint (MGH Conc. 3.464–467), the only bishop who openly supported Louis the German; for Charles himself there was the additional fact that someone who had been his protégé until that point had betrayed him. The rest of the bishops under Hincmar's leadership had at first used delaying tactics to gain time while Louis was still in the area; Charles was victorious in January 859 and at the Synod of Savonnières on the 14th of June of that year, he submitted a complaint against Wenilo; the bishops summoned Wenilo to appear within four weeks, but in order to protect the Church from scandal, they insisted that Wenilo and Charles should be reconciled; the planned hearing against Wenilo seems not to have taken place after all, and by the end of the year at the latest, their reconciliation was complete. Unlike most of the episcopacy, almost all of Charles' secular noblemen, excepting only his Guelph cousins Conrad of Auxerre and Hugh "Abbas", had taken part in the rebellion against Charles, including Robert the Strong, who later became France's national hero when he died heroically for his country. Given these circumstances, it is difficult to imagine that the majority of the population would have spontaneously been outraged about the archbishop in particular. René Louis (1956, 459) correctly thinks that like the name *Ganelon*, the names *Acelin* (albeit excepting the Acelin in the Rol!) *Grifon*, *Haguenon* and *Hardré* in the Old French epic indicate negative characters (cf. Moisan s. vv.), who have nothing except their name in common with their equally negatively viewed historical homonyms.

But these parallels do not apply here because the cases presented for comparison are of a very different calibre: the episode of 858/859 had no serious consequences for Wenilo or Charles, and things returned to the *status quo ante*, whereas Grifo and Hardrad's almost successful anti-Carolingian conspiracies – the former carrying them on for a decade and the latter secretly, but over a very broad network, led to them losing their lives in dramatic circumstances. Because of Hagano, Charles the Simple lost his throne, and because of Adalbero-Azzelin the Carolingians lost their throne for ever.

The *Guenes* in the copy of the Song of Leodegar seems to fit into the unspectacular circumstances surrounding the name *Ganelon*.[1464] The second-oldest *Passio Leodegarii* by Ursinus of Ligugé, on which the vernacular work is based (cap. 15, MGH SS.mer. 5.336s.), states that Leodegar, who had already been tortured, having had his tongue and lips removed, was sent by his arch-enemy Ebroin into the *custodia* of a certain *Waningus* who has not been mentioned before, in the cynical but premature expectation that he would soon succumb to his injuries there; Waning took him to the nunnery that he had founded at Fécamp and held him there *sub custodia*, but for a long time he was widely admired because by a miracle he regained the power of speech; in the end he was put to death – with no mention of Waning this time – not in Fécamp, but in a forest in Artois, some 200 km from there. Waning was one of Ebroin's trusted friends, and so the author of the Song may have seen him as a negative character.[1465] But since this poet was writing about 300 years after the event, as has hitherto rightly been emphasised (Pellegrini 1964, 108s.), other names from the Latin text have also been distorted: King *Childericus* became King *Chielperics*, Queen *Baldechilde* became *Baldequi* (: *di* 'diem'), *Hrodbertus* (var. *Ruodbertus*, *Delbertus*) became *Laudebert*, and it is difficult to work out, though it is irrelevant to our context, how much of this goes back to the copyist (of the Latin work or the later vernacular one). We cannot therefore exclude the possibility that *Guanẽs* (= *Guanens* < *Guanencs* < *Waningus*) through loss of the tilde was read as *Guanes; and since in the only surviving copy of the song, no matter where the language originates from, the sound shift *á[* > *ē* is frequently attested (v. 1, 2, 15 etc.), a copyist could have replaced *Guanes with a real name that was familiar to him, i.e. the as yet un-epic name form *Guenes* (< *Wenilo* + -*s*). This may still be a strange coincidence in

---

1464 The Song is generally thought to have been written in the 10th c., and the copy comes from the beginning of the 11th c.; cf. especially Heitmann (2002, 781s., 786), also on the source and its age (784 with n. 17) and on the problem of where the language comes from (786s. with n. 23–29).

1465 Especially if the *en castres* (v. 176) as thought by G. Paris and later scholars is to be understood as *en cartres*.

relation to the Song of Roland; but if the archbishop is not the person who gave his name, this is the only remaining indication of a Ganelon figure in a previous, undocumented Rol. around 1000 (*contra* Menéndez Pidal 1960, 324) and not reliable – at any rate not reliable enough to make further research on the name *a priori* redundant.

C.10.2 The name inside the centre-western strip

The name developed in a strikingly opposite way within the centre-western strip of land around Tours that we defined above: its frequency increased so much that even in 1874 Émile Mabille, when he was editing the (partial) Marmoutier cartulary (that is to say from the large monastery on the right bank of the Loire opposite the central city of Tours, which emerged out of the place where Saint Martin spent the last stage of his life) for the Dunois area (that is to say for the territory around Châteaudun) devoted a long section of his introduction to the task of bringing some clarity into the confusing network of approximately 12 Ganelons he found in 11th c., including one in particular which stood out from the rest (Dunois-Marmoutier p. XVIII–XLVI). Some historical depth for the family of this distinctive Ganelon, going back to the middle of the 9th c. was then provided by Karl Ferdinand Werner (1959, 150, 153, 173–176). More insights followed from three articles by Jacques Boussard (1961; 1962a; 1963) and the work of Guillot (1972).[1466] I draw on all of these in the following discussion, and add my own contributions in [ ].

The following picture emerges from all of this. A certain *Wanilo* (I) appears as a witness in 846 in a charter by Count Odo of Châteaudun for Saint-Martin de Tours (that is to say for the great canonical monastery on the left bank of the Loire which housed the bones of St. Martin). He [at about the same time put pressure on the monastery of Saint-Maur-sur-le-Loir near Châteaudun (MGH SS. 15.471) and] was in 865 once again a witness for an exchange of goods between the Count of Angers-Tours-Blois Robert the Strong and the Archbishop of Tours, whereby one of the items exchanged immediately went to Saint-Martin as a donation; he is perhaps the same person as, or very probably a relation of, the *Wanilo* who possibly in 854, certainly in 878 and 887 was likewise attested in connection with the city of Tours. [We can probably add to this: Tours-S.Martin-privés a. 900 *Guanilo subscripsit*.]

1466 I have also drawn upon information at fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/cfrachacha.htm#_ Toc4799317351 (where however most of the recent research has not been used and therefore the count of the Ganelons is different) and at fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/anjounob.htm#_ Toc492564517; last access 21.04.2022.

In six charters over the years between 941 and 957 we find a *Wanilo* (II) as *vicarius* of the city of Tours. [In Bouquet 9.723 he appears in the year 939 in a charter for Saint-Julien de Tours. I can add from the 10th c. in the centre-western strip also: Chartres-S.Père 1.42 (undated) *Wenilo canonicus* and 1.60 a. 974 *Wenilo presbyter* (since the treasurer Guanilo III of Tours undertakes the restoration of the small monastery of Saint-Avit in Chartres at a later time, I think that this charter shows there is probably a connection with his clan) and in Angers-S. Aubin 1.57 a. 993 *Guanilonus*, a monk from that place (cf. Halphen 1906, 106 n. 4).]

Finally, in around 990/1000 a *Gualterius miles*, *provisor* of the city of Tours, donates with his son Guanilo (III) a few bondsmen to Marmoutier, and thereafter father and son appear several times together until 1024. (K. F. Werner then retrospectively examined these 'Walter' names and worked out from the chronological intervals between the 'Wanilo' figures that there was obviously a family featuring these two names).

Guanilo III is the one who is of most interest to us. He appears to have been a layman all his life, and yet by the end of 1023 he was treasurer (*claviger*) and *prepositus* of the Cathedral of Saint-Maurice[1467] in Tours. In 1024 he followed his father and became intendant of the domains belonging to the Counts of Blois (-Tours) in the Touraine, and as such he carried out a role in Tours (where there was no viscount) which was very similar to that of a viscount. In around 1027 he became treasurer of Saint-Martin as well, which meant that he acquired the almost permanent epithet *(Guanilo) thesaurarius*. In around 1030 he inherited Montigny castle in the Dunois (to this day named after him as Montigny-le-Gannelon),[1468] and also the feudal lordship over a few sub-fiefdoms in the Touraine. Between 1032 and 1037 he signed almost all the charters of the Theobaldine Count Odo of Blois (-Tours) and Champagne; at around the same time, his wife Agnes donated a few vineyards to Marmoutier. In 1042/1043 he founded the Saint-Hilaire-sur-Yerre Priory near Montigny for Marmoutier, as a kind of monastery for his own family. At that time, he was at the zenith of his power.

The office of treasurer of Saint-Martin requires a little introduction. Shortly after Saint Martin died, he was elevated to the position of patron saint of the

---

1467 It was not until the 14th c. that it was re-dedicated to Saint-Gatien, the first Bishop of Tours (Martin was the third).

1468 The second French place with a name structured like this is Sougé-le-Ganelon about 50 km north-northwest of Le Mans, only just still inside the centre-western strip. There is thought to have been a Priory of Saint-Martin nearby, while Saint-Paul-le-Gaultier and Saint-Georges-le-Gaultier are about 6 km from there. This, too, points to the family of treasurers; however, I have not managed to find historical information about this complex.

whole of Gaul, and then of the Merovingian kings, who reputedly took the *cappa* of the Saint with them when they went into battle – almost like France's national banner *avant la lettre*; some places benefited from the fame that Martin enjoyed, including his home in later life, Marmoutier, and the Cathedral of Tours, but thanks to the customary medieval veneration of relics, his resting place was particularly popular, which was the canonical Monastery of Saint-Martin. The benevolence of the Merovingians was continued by the Carolingians: Boussard (1961, 67s., n.4) counts more than 25 donations or privileges – including the privilege of immunity – on the part of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald. The canons had enjoyed the right to mint coins under the Merovingians, and this was renewed by the kings in the 10th c., and apparently grew so important that from the 13th c. onwards their coins, including their *denier* and later even more so their *gros Tournois*, were France's most respected coins, valid far beyond its own borders.[1469] But in Saint-Martin itself the distribution of power was unusual: Charles the Bald had given the position of abbot of the monastery to the layman Robert the Strong; his descendants retained this position even when they were kings throughout the whole of the Middle Ages. The spiritual leader of the canons was *de facto* the dean, and the next in line was the treasurer. Other monasteries had one or more laymen as bailiffs; this position is nowhere to be found in Saint-Martin from the year 900 onwards (Boussard 1961, 70, 74), and so we can assume that the treasurer also took on the tasks of a bailiff in the name of the absent King. It is also said of

---

1469 Scholars – especially specialists in French – should remember from time to time that the replacement of Saint Martin by Saint Dionysius as the patron saint of France was a very slow process. Dagobert and Pippin the Short arranged for themselves to be buried in St.-Denis, but Charlemagne and Louis the Pious did not. Monks of Saint-Denis took the body of Charles the Bald out of the grave near Nantua and transported it back to their place; but most of the later Carolingians – Louis the Stammerer, Charles the Simple, Louis IV, Lothar and Louis V – as well as King Raoul were laid to rest elsewhere. Even among the Capetians, Philip I († 1106), in accordance with his own personal preference, was laid to rest in Fleury. And before Suger's *Gesta Ludovici Regis cognomento Grossi* Saint-Denis contributed almost nothing to French historiography, because in Carolingian times this was the role of the court, and then the bishops Prudentius of Troyes and Hincmar of Reims, while in the 10th c. it passed to the Church of Reims, and from about 1000 to Fleury. The reason why Dionysius grew in importance has to do with the fact that during the lifetime of Louis the Pious, Abbot Hilduin, in a move that ran counter to history, equated the Parisian martyr of the 3rd c. with the New Testament Areopagite (and supposed author of the pseudo-Areopagite writings); this meant that the saint who was the founder of the Gaulish church and of the monastery which is its mother church now also acquired an apostolic status that was above all others. When Gregory VII installed the Archbishop of Lyon as Primate of France, however, he consciously undermined the Saint-Denis construct. Suger was the first person to make Saint-Denis part of the political ideology of the monarchy.

him (Boussard 1961, 77): "Il semble que ce soit l'administrateur des biens de la communauté et qu'aucune opération touchant au temporel ne se fasse sans son intervention". Indeed, the treasurer (*trésorier*), was *de facto* in charge of the chapter and he was responsible for the mint; he was also the lord of Châteauneuf (LM s. v. Tours), [i.e. the castle already attested in 918 in the special quarter that had sprung up around Saint-Martin G.A.B.]

All in all, therefore, Guanilo, was the most powerful man in the Touraine region, despite never having taken up a spiritual career and never having achieved any fame through military exploits, even though technically he ruled in the name of others, and his key position was mainly in the area of finances. This may have tempted him to improve his own financial position, but at any rate it enabled him to act as the money and service provider *par excellence*, which must have sparked a good deal of envy and hostility on the part of both clerical and secular people around him. In 1034/1037, for examples, even the monks of Marmoutier successfully petitioned Count Odo of Blois (-Tours) regarding the unfair taxes raised by Guanilo (K. F. Werner, 1959, 174 n. 109). It would soon become clear what the canons of Saint-Martin thought of him.

Ever since the late 10th c., the Counts of Anjou had systematically recruited potential allies against the Counts of Blois (-Tours) through a complex network of fiefdoms so that in the end the whole of the nobility in Touraine was caught up in a face-off between the two factions. Several ancestors of Guanilo by the name of Gaulterius had been treasurers of Saint-Martin, but his two immediate predecessors Hervé (II) of Buzançay (1001–1012) and Hervé's nephew Sulpice of Amboise (1012–1027), belonged to the Angevin camp (Boussard 1961, 78s.), while Guanilo was on Odo's side, and after that, the side of his son Thibaut III of Blois (-Tours) – and this was reason enough for Geoffroy Martel of Angers to hate him. In 1043 the rivalry between the two families of counts escalated into open warfare. Geoffroy besieged the city for a whole year; we might wonder if it was Guanilo who organised its defence. Finally, when Thibaut and his brother approached with an army intending to relieve the city, Geoffroy, according to Raoul Glaber (*Hist*. 5.2), swore to give back to Saint Martin whatever he might have stolen from him, upon which the canons of Saint-Martin sent him a banner (*sigillum* 'identifying sign', evidently the monastery's banner), which he fastened to his lance! They had shifted allegiance to Guanilo's enemies even before the city had fallen, and this shows what they thought of Guanilo. After this, Geoffroy (a. 1044) defeated Thibaut III, and was able to take him prisoner, occupy the city, and force him to give up the whole of the Touraine region. According to Glaber, no one doubts that this occurred through the intercession of Saint Martin; for when the enemy attacked the Theobaldine troops, they were terrified and stood there 'as if in chains', and the few who still managed to flee

reported that Geoffroy's whole army, those on horseback as well as those on foot, had appeared to them 'as if in shining white clothing'. Raoul Glaber concludes that "this is how the Theobaldines were punished, who had used money they had robbed from the *pauperes* of St. Martin[1470] to pay their own people".

It had long been the custom by this period that whenever there was a change of ruler (even if this happened after a war) at the level of a count or a duke, any vassals who were affected by the handover were allowed to keep their possessions, and they were only required to transfer their oath of fealty over to their new lord;[1471] this was, as one might expect, a prerequisite of the *de facto* system of inheritance, which had by then reached the middle-sized and smaller fiefdoms. But in a "spoliation brutale" (Boussard 1963, 142), Geoffroy caused quite an uproar when he took over all of the fiefdoms belonging to the other side and gave them to his own people. Now the monks of Marmoutier also revealed which side they had been on, when they commented on this change of ownership with the words *Deo cuique iusta tribuente* (cf. Halphen 1906, 49 n. 2). Guanilo lost all the fiefdoms and offices in the Touraine region that he had received from the Theobaldines, and in fact they went to a certain Airard, who from then on was Geoffroy's governor (*prévot*) in Tours. But Guanilo appears to have retained the office of treasurer of Saint-Martin, which of course was not a Theobaldine fiefdom, even until he died, probably thanks to the intervention of the King as the nominal Abbot (Guillot 1972, 1.88), but he does not seem to have actively carried out the role. For "Ganelon se retira alors dans ses terres de mouvance blésoise et ne semble pas avoir reparu en Touraine" (Boussard 1963, 145). At any rate Geoffroy now took over the right to act as *garde* over the monastery of Saint-Martin, and a period of building and reform then followed, ushering in a time of progress (LM s. v. *Tours*). In 1045, Guanilo was still assisting with the renovation of the small Abbey of Saint-Avit of Chartres, and a few years later he allowed his remaining vassals to found the Priory of Villeberfol (20 km north of Blois) and endow the Church of Saint-Lubin de Morée (20 km northeast of Vendôme), both for the benefit of Marmoutier; he died – probably in around 1056 – without sons. We can see that these events were much more than just a regional *fait divers* for his contemporaries because at the other end of the French-speaking world, in

---

1470 'The poor of St. Martin' include at least the Benedictine monks of Marmoutier since their vows included that of poverty. The canons were also obliged to live in a community, but they did not have to give up all of their private possessions; I leave it open whether Glaber subsumes them in this category or not.

1471 Even when Philippe Auguste had conquered Normandy, the one thing he did not allow was that anyone should keep a double territory covering both sides of the channel. He could not tolerate any more divided loyalty.

Burgundy, Raoul Glaber devoted the whole second chapter of his fifth book to them, where he portrayed Geoffroy's victory as a miracle of St. Martin. Since the victor Geoffroy dominated public opinion in his own homeland at least as much as he did in faraway Burgundy, the Guanilo who was not named by Glaber must have also been regarded in Anjou as a greedy scoundrel punished by God, and since the acquisition of Tours turned out to be the most successful military exploit of Geoffroy Martel's life, these events would have remained very much in the forefront of everyone's memory even decades later.

Let us return to Mabille's list of Ganelons (as they will be called from now on for the sake of simplicity). Two of the treasurer's nephews on his sisters' side were also called Ganelon, in families where the name does not appear to have occurred previously (which is an excellent demonstration of the way in which the name of a powerful relative increased in popularity at that time!). One of them is attested in 1032, and he took over Montigny shortly after the death of his uncle, before dying in 1070/1072;[1472] the other one, brother of a man called Cleopas, was from 1035 at the latest lord of the castle at Nouâtre and appears to have been careful to avoid giving the Angevins any cause to see him as an enemy. Another Ganelon was the son of Thise de la Roche [according to Mabille, *Thies/Theacus de Rupibus*, G.A.B.], a *viguier* 'magistrate' in the treasurer's family for the North-Touraine area; he, too, probably owes his name to this family. Two Ganelons, father and son, were lords of the castle of Châtillon [-sur-Indre], 60 km southeast of Tours. [A *Ganillus de Castellione* (probably with a lost tilde on the western -u- just as in O) is in 1007 a witness for a donation by Foulques Nerra to Beaulieu near Loches (Halphen 1906, 352 n. 5). Furthermore, we see by chance in the charter of Noyers 431 a.1113 in a retrospective comment that there was once a *Ganilo de Castellione* who was the vassal of a treasurer Walter of Saint-Martin, G.A.B.] Four more Ganelons are minor noblemen in the region, but nothing more is known about them; we can assume that their name diffused into their families 'from above' more or less directly from the family of treasurers. Finally, two Ganelons are monks at Marmoutier, and so we do not know anything about their family connections: one of them, leader of two priories on the south-

---

1472 His heir was his apparently only daughter, who (after a few interludes) took the castle into the family of her second husband Eudes de Vallière: according to http://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/cfrachacha.htm#_Toc479931735; last access 21.04.2022, in the following four generations that are listed there, the name Ganelon never occurs again. (One person who does not fit into this family is an impoverished knight by the name of Gales/Galon de Montigny, who proudly carried Philip Augustus' banner at Bouvines in 1214. The only mention of his homeland is by Anonymous of Béthune: he comes from the Vermandois area – that is to say probably from Montigny-le-Crécy 25 km southeast of Saint-Quentin.)

eastern edge of the Touraine region, has the title *Domnus Guanilo*; the other is familiar in the history of theology and philosophy as the man, much admired by Hegel, who (according to Mabille after 1070, but according to later Anselm research nearer to 1080) contradicted Anselm's famous proof of God in his *Proslogion*. He is unfortunately listed in the handbooks to this day under the misreading *Gaunilo(n)* (and also in the relevant article in the LM).

I can add from the 11th c. inside the centre-western strip (avoiding overlaps with the people cited by Mabille, as far as I am aware): Blésois-Marmoutier 33 after 1044 *Guano* of Chaumont-sur-Loire (40 km upstream of Tours on the Loire), 53 around 1050 *Guanilo*, Son of Hugo Balbus; Vendôme-Trinité 1.177 a. 1053 *Wanilo de Guirscia* (a person from La Guerche); Tours-S.Julien 1.36 a. 1058 *Guanilo*, nephew of Hardouin de Rochecorbon (7 km northeast of Tours); Noyers 28 a. 1061 *Galino*, son of Hugo and Amabia (metathetical misspelling); Solesmes (about 50 km west-southwest of Le Mans) 26 a. 1076 *Guanilo monachus*; Noyers (southern Touraine) 205 around 1089 *Ganilo*, son of Petrus de la Rajace, 207 around 1089 *Ganilo Senon*; Indre 233 a. 1092 *Guanilo* of Saint-Aignan (60 km east-southeast of Tours), makes a donation to Marmoutier on his deathbed; Blésois-Marmoutier 75 a. 1093–1094 *Ganelinus, miles* (spelling error or hypocoristic form); Vendôme 2.109 a. 1098 *Guanilo infans*.

Even in the remaining period of our research, 1100–1150, the name does not reduce very much in frequency. The Châtillon and Rochecorbon families retain their naming tradition: Noyers 451, 469, 476 up to 1121 (and other sources) continue with *G(u)anilo* (also *Guenno*) of Châtillon, 626 s. a. *Ganiloni juniori* of Châtillon; Touraine-Marmoutier 53 a. 1108 *Guanilo* son of Robert I of Rochecorbon in one of his father's charters. Other references: Noyers 324 a. 1102 *Gano de Azai* (one of the Azay family in the Touraine region); Blésois-Marmoutiers 1.117 a. 1104 (and also Vendôme 2.237 a. 1124) *G(u)anilo*, vassal of Raoul de Beaugency; Anjou-Chartrou 323 a. 1108 (for Bourgueil, West-Touraine) *Gano Papot de Lungue* (Longué-Jumelles 25 km northwest of Bourgueil); Tours-Archevêché 1.97 a. 1118–1124 (testis*) Guano de Montbason* (Montbazon, 15 km south of Tours); GC 8.504 a. 1126 *Gano* in a charter by the Bishop of Orléans for Beaugency; GC 14.145 a. 1132 and also 1150 (additionally in other sources passim) *G(u)ano*, *Gueno*, *Ganilo* Dean of Saint-Maurice de Tours (in Louis VII-Luchaire 137 a. 1143 *Galunon*, the same person); Touraine-PU 114 a. 1136 (for Fontevrault) *Ganus*, brother of the Lord of Mirebeau; Poitiers-S.Cyprien 88 a. 1142–1150 *Ganelo Defous* (near Moncontour, Vienne).[1473]

1473 Since in this charter the name *Ganelon* appears along with the uncommon name *Cleopas* as with the Lords of Nouâtre, I suspect they are related.

In 1131, therefore, the Ganelon of the Rol. was familiar in a small town in central Italy as the prototype of a traitor, while his name in the French centre-western strip was still very popular as an ordinary personal name. This is only an apparent paradox. If one half of a percent of all parents gave a son the new name Olivier – at first mostly younger sons, for whom there was no established naming pattern, in later generations this would automatically pass on to first-born sons – then this certainly stands out in our statistics, looking like a new appearance of this name. But if in the families which favoured the key name Ganelon five percent of parents consciously avoided it because of its negative associations – so that for example we would find only 19 references instead of 20 –, this would be below the significance threshold.

C.10.3 The name type *X* + *Ganelon*

Does this mean that the statistics of a negative name are of no use when re-searching the epic tradition? Not entirely: we have still to consider names of the type *X + Ganelon*. Admittedly, they only start to occur after 1050 and they remain very uncommon until 1150, because what the charters in the centre-western strip in particular mainly reflect is not an urban bourgeoisie (which due to the density of the population would have necessitated the use of distin-guishing epithets), but rather the landed gentry of higher and lower status, who were increasingly recorded by the scribes using the type *X + de +* toponym. But even the small group of names consisting of *X + Ganelon* quickly starts to diminish. For if the type *X + Ganelon*, the second element, but not the first, is in the genitive, this gives us simply a father's name: as in for example Noyers 699 a. 1069 and again 494 a. 1128 (presumably a grandson) *Boso G(u)anilonis*.[1474] If both elements are in the same case, we can have either a father's name or an epithet: in Noyers 51s. around 1065 *Gofredo Guanilone* shows probably a fa-ther's name, because in the same charter there is a previous mention of *Guanilo de Castellono*; but if we only had Noyers 70 around 1069 *terra Gaufredi Guanilo-nis*, we would not be sure – as in Vendôme 1.177 a. 1053 *Fulgerius Wanilo*, Noyers 26 around 1061 *Signum Effredi Guanilonis*, 491 around 1127 *Brochardus*

1474 In the reverse type *Ganelon + X* the patronymic interpretation of X as opposed to the interpretation of *Ganelon* as an epithet is so obviously more likely that we can pass over the latter possibility. I have included the few references of this kind without comment in the list of simple occurrences of *Ganelon*.

Gano. Even in Poitiers-S.Cyprien 330 around 1120 *Willelmus Guaneluns* it is impossible to decide: the same *Willelmus Guanelluns* appears in Poitiers-S.Cyprien 328 around 1140 (he is becoming a monk now) with *Petrus eque* [= *aeque* 'as well as'] *Guaneluns filius eius*, showing that in this case, the name *Guanelun* has already become "immobilised" as a family name; but family names derive from fathers' names as well as from nicknames.

Similarly, in Saintes 44 before 1134 [retrospective reference] *Aimarus Ganelos* (with loss of the tilde) both interpretations are possible; nevertheless, in this region the fact that *Ganelon* is rare as the name of a real person (cf. above C.10.1) increases the chances that it is an epithet here. A clearly probative case is Le Mans-S.Vincent 171 a. 1080–1100 *Herbertus Wenes*, son of Bencelinus. And despite an evident misreading, I also find evidence of this in Noyers 109 a. 1081 *Bernardus de Azaico, cognomento Gaulois*. This cartulary was lost in the Revolution and is edited from an 18th c. copy. But *-au-* does not appear in *gaulois*, *Gaule* until the 17th c. (before that it is always *gal-/gall-;* even Wace's Brut, ed. Arnold v. 9905, has *Galle* in all mss.!), in the unrelated *galeis > galois* 'galant, bonvivant' it appears even later through a simple merging with the former, and in *gallois* 'Welshman, Welsh' it never occurs (cf. on these TLF s. v. *Gaulois* and FEW s. v. **walhisk*); moreover, none of the three in Touraine in the late 11th c. can have *-ois* instead of *-eis*. This is certainly a misreading, therefore, of both syllables with a consequent misinterpretation. Fortunately, we have the above-mentioned (C.10.2) charter Noyers 324 around 1102 with its *Gano de Azai*; in this case the epithet has obviously turned into the only name that is generally used by that person, so that instead of *Gaulois* the reading should have been **Gan(e)lõs* or similar.

Whenever someone was given the epithet 'Ganelon', people around him must have had some idea what that meant, and at this time they surely must have been thinking about the traitor. In reality, this must have happened more frequently than the last two examples above suggest. For first, some of the ambiguous references will contain an epithet and not a father's name; secondly, quite often the individual in question will have objected to the recording of this epithet in the charter, or the scribe will have taken it upon himself to suppress it out of decency. We should not therefore, dismiss the two clear incidences as statistically irrelevant.

Moreover, we can assume that the bearer of such a name must have had it for a number of years, for it not to be dismissed as a fleeting joke, but to be felt necessary in order to identify him after decades have passed. And before that, given the conditions under which a song spread out in those days, it would take a couple of years for the name of one of its main characters to become

popular enough to be usable as a nickname. This means that a Rol., complete with Ganelon figure and the traitor plot line,[1475] is likely to have existed by around 1060 at the latest.[1476]

This *terminus ante quem* is in principle separate from the question of why the traitor in the Song is called precisely *Ganelon*, and it is still valid even if the answer that follows is incorrect. Let us ask the question, therefore: where in France, and based on what factors, is a poet writing in the middle of the 11th c., and looking for a negative name for the traitor he has invented, most likely to have hit upon *Ganelon* (or *Guenes/Guenelun*)? In the light of our discussion above (C.10.2), the answer is clear: in the Anjou region, with reference to the treasurer Ganelon[1477] who was

---

1475 Burger's unfortunate attempt (1948–1949, 443–445), to argue for a previous stage of the Rol. in which Ganelon was present but not a traitor was, in my opinion, conclusively refuted by Rychner (*Romania* 72, 1951, 243s.).

1476 The fact that this is not mentioned in the *Nota Emilianense* seems to be sufficiently explained by that text's intention: the *Nota* is interested in Charlemagne and Roland, but not sympathetic to them. Its tenor is something like this: A Spaniard only needed to know that Charlemagne failed in his attempt to conquer Saragossa, and that when he was retreating, his rear guard led by Roland was destroyed, and that is all. This can also imply: What did Charlemagne do for the *reconquista*? Nothing. In San Millán de la Cogolla around 1075, people would certainly have been interested in the French, not least because of its location near to the Way of St. James, but this by no means requires the monks to be happy that French influence was spreading across the whole area. We must not forget that the *Nota* is written in Visigothic script, and was not influenced by the Carolingian minuscule, and even more importantly, only a few decades later even harsher judgement is to be found in the *Historia Silense / Seminense* (Menéndez Pidal 1960, 147–149)! – In Italy Rajna (1889, 4s.) found an isolated *signum manum Uuanelloni* from the year 1040 from Sangano near Turin and hesitated to present this case ("Ancorchè in certo qual modo mi ripugni, m'indurrò comunque a rammentarlo"); this may have been a remnant of the normal distribution of the name. The few additional references brought forward by him, and later by Rosellini (1958, 259), beginning with an *Orlandinus de Gano* from the year 1125 and a *Ganelus* from 1138 fit very well with the chronology of our account. *Gano* in Italy cannot autochthonously have come from *Guanilo*, and so it can count as evidence for the Song; but since for precisely this reason no one was baptised with this name, it can only be considered as an epithet, which could be given to an adult (and even a father). Therefore, even the 1125 case cannot tell us much more than the inscription of 1131. In fact, it is very instructive that a negative name like this, which has few onomastic references, can only take root once the literary figure has become widely known; this reflects retrospectively on the two epithet references from France as well.

1477 In the interests of fairness, we should remember that Boissonnade (1923, 329), in the midst of a lot of irrelevant and thin material, also mentions with a "peut-être" that the Ganelon figure in the Song may have something to do with the treasurer; because the poet "semble avoir eu quelque prédilection pour les Angevins".

active in the neighbouring Touraine region.[1478] The name arises therefore from a family feud: it sounded vaguely unsympathetic, not exactly 'foreign' but even less

---

1478 A radical traditionalist would no doubt find my choice of the treasurer too timid. He or she could make a case for Galindo Belascotenes as the prototype for Ganelon. Before the second most important man in Al-Andalus in a. 777, Ibn al-Arabi (on him cf. above n. 734), made his way in person, along with a few allies, to meet Charlemagne in Paderborn (Royal Annals, *Mettenses priores*, Regino for the year 777), there of course had to be a preparatory communication between the two sides at a lower level. The Christian forces who had remained on the southern side of the Pyrenees were suitable mediators. But when Charlemagne was unsuccessful outside Saragossa, he took Ibn al-Arabi prisoner (*Ann. Petaviani*), intending to take him back with him to France, which meant that Charlemagne felt he had been betrayed by him. This accusation of betrayal could easily have applied to the mediator or mediators as well: a key indicator of Charlemagne's state of mind at this point is that on his way home he destroyed the fortress at Pamplona, which was under Islamic control, but a considerable number of its people were practising Christians; we cannot count on Charlemagne's army having the ability to make finer distinctions than the king, especially after the annihilation of the rear guard. Are we able to find out who one of these supposed mediators was? About three years after Charlemagne's Spanish adventure, in 780–783, ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān I. of Córdoba led one or two extended campaigns to the Upper Military Border and forced not only Saragossa, but also the neighbouring areas south of the Pyrenean range back into the overall control of Córdoba, namely according to *Akhbār madžmūʿa* (Lafuente y Alcántara 1867/1984, 104s., James 2012, 108): Pamplona, Collioure (as stated very hesitantly by Lafuente; here probably Ibn al-Athīr is better: Calahorra and Viguera), and, turning himself around, 'the Basques', Cerdanya and the land belonging to Ibn Balaskūṭ (Belaskut); he took Ibn Balaskūṭ's son hostage and made the father pay the capitation tax, which means Ibn Balaskūṭ was a Christian. Earlier researchers located his territory almost anywhere from Cerdanya in the east to Álava in the west. However, there is evidence (according to Lacarra 1945, 210 in particular) for (High) Aragón, that is to say the area approximately opposite Huesca and Zaragoza; at the same time, however, the family probably had old connections with Pamplona (cf. more recently Settipani 2004, 88). Ibn Belaskut is almost certainly one and the same person as Galindo Belascotenes, the husband of a certain Fakilo, in the genealogies of Roda (ed. Lacarra 1945, § 19). (The name *Galindo* is Visigothic, occurring most frequently south of the western Pyrenees, but it also radiates out into the Toulouse area. *Belascoten-* is according to Balparda 1924–1934, 1.291 n. 138, Basque: *bela / bele* 'raven' + hypocoristic *-sko-/-skot-* + genitive/patronymic *-en-*; added to it is pleonastic Lat./Rom. genitive/patronymic *-es < -is*; Becker, 2009, 258, 262s., does not mention this reference, but locates a related *Belascutti* mainly south of the eastern Pyrenees. *Fakilo* is Visigothic, also attested as far as the Bigorre, Lacarra 1945, 211 and § 19.) Their son García el Malo – according to the genealogies – married a daughter of the first (clearly Carolingian) Count Aznar I Galíndez of (High) Aragón, but in Bellosta (according to Lacarra probably Las Bellostas, 40 km northeast of Huesca) had an argument with his wife's family, killing one of them and then repudiating his wife in favour of a daughter of one of the Carolingians' enemies, Íñigo Arista of Pamplona, after which he allied himself with him *et cum mauros* (!) and drove out his father-in-law, who received Cerdanya and Urgell from the emperor as compensation; García el Malo very probably died before 833 (Settipani 2004, 88 with lit.; at any rate the reservations expressed by d'Abadal, 1950–1955, 3/1, 74, regarding the identification of Ibn Belaskut as Galindo Belascotenes are based on a chronological error). Since political

'one of ours' – and this is exactly how it was intended to sound, because after all, the betrayal in the Song also arises out of a family feud.[1479]

We should remember at this point that Anjou in this period came to our notice once before when we were wondering when and where in the South of France the name *Marsilius* started to become a heathen name (cf. section A.8.3). This will not be the last time we are drawn to this particular time and place.

---

conditions during the lifetime of the father and the son were roughly the same, we can surmise that father and son probably held similar political views, which would make this Galindo an ideal prototype for Ganelon. An important factor in the further development of the name (Kremer 1972, 120, and especially Piel/Kremer 1976, 143s.): in the Latin charters *Galindo, -onis*, especially the formal obliquus *Galindone(m),* occurs more frequently between the 9th c. and 1000 or later than *Galindus, -i*; moreover, we occasionally find from 900 onwards, frequently from 1000 onwards, the assimilation *-nd- > -nn-* (less frequently *-n-*), e.g. we already have *Galinnus* in 897/898 in King Odo's original charter for Montredon near Narbonne (Bouquet 9.466). Here are a few references where both developments appear together: d'Abadal 3.341 a. 908 (with additions to the 11th c.), *Signum Galinnone de Orrido, Signum Galinnoni Mabaissonis*, Obarra 6 a. 1004, copy from the 11th c., *nostro Galinoni abate*, San Juan de la Peña 2.156 a. 1057 *Banco Galinnonis*, 2.157 a. 1057 *Lope Galinnonis*; especially in the Aragonese royal charters: Ramiro 31 a. 1040 *S. Galinoni monachi*, 161 a. 1045 *filiis vestris Galinnone* [. . .], 221 a. 1045 *Gartia Galinnonis*, 121 a. 1055 S. *Atto Galinnonis*, Sancho Ramírez 2.23 a. 1065 *Balla Galinnones, Sancio Galinnones*. Although these references mainly relate to High Aragón, it is well known that *-nd- > -n-* is also a regular development in Catalan and Gascon phonology. Moreover, we must also consider the special development which occurred in some small areas, namely the fact that *-nd- > -nn-* was still drawn into the development of Lat. *-nn- > -ñ-* (Kremer 1972, 120 n. 600; M. Álvar 1973–1978, 1.85s.; Ravier 1991, 87 with lit.). The resulting *Galinon / Galiñon* differed from *G(u)anilon* almost only in one metathesis, when in the latter *gua- > ga-* occurred; this was the case before recorded history in southern Galloromania, cf. the hypercorrect *Gualindus* from 984 and 1028 in Kremer (1972, 120). Thus, at some point between around 1000 and 1060 in the main Galloromanian area, an unusual *Galinón / Galiñon* might well have been "corrected" to *Ganelon*, e.g. by our Angevin poet who also had the treasurer in the back of his mind. This would also explain why no traces of an epic Ganelon are to be found before 1060, even though within the Roland plot the idea of a betrayal was somehow 'in the air' – and this applies to the general public in a social/psychological sense as well as to a storyteller in a narrative sense.

1479 I hardly need add that von Richthofen's (1970, 149ss.) theory is illusory: he argued that the Ganelon figure in the Rol. is modelled on García Ordoñez de Grañon, the enemy of the Cid and supporter of Alfons VI. The idea that the fiefdom name *Grañon* might have suggested the personal name *Ganelon* – or rather *Guenes/Guenelun*! – is purely random. The other parallel factors are very general. By the way, the historical García Ordóñez was never at any point in his life a traitor, but in fact he was quite the opposite in so far as he respected treaties even with the "enemy", which shows an understanding of justice that is closer to our own than that of the Cid, and finally, he died an honourable death for his king in a battle against Islam, alongside the crown prince who was entrusted to his care.

C.10.4 The question of Ganelon's home fiefdom

We return now to the hypothetical Angevin Roland poet: he invented the Ganelon character but probably even he did not give him a particular fiefdom in France; for Ganelon does not have one in the PT either. The poet of the Song in its surviving form, at any rate avoids any explicit statement, exactly as he does with Roland, Olivier and Naimes; all of these characters are presented in this way so that no one in the audience should boast – since this would run counter to the Song's portrayal of a unified France – about his or her fellow countryman, and so similarly with Ganelon, no one should feel bad because he was from their homeland.

At best, the names *Baldewin* and *Guinemer* (cf. on these C.8.5.1, C.8.5.2 above) might suggest that the poet imagined Ganelon's homeland to be somewhere in the north or northeast, that is to say, close to the Germanic-speaking area. If this is true, then he would be the first to push the traitor to the very edge of the *regnum Franciae* of his lifetime, an entirely logical decision, and in particular to the border with the Empire.[1480]

In this sense, then, Ganelon is based, as far as V4CV7 are concerned, in Mâcon (inside the *regnum Franciae*), because his relative Pinabel (based on the reinterpretation of *Sorence*) has become the ruler of Besançon (inside the Empire) – traitors, then, who work together from their positions right next to each other on either side of the border (as it was at that time).[1481]

But there is also an opposite tendency to leave Ganelon *grosso modo* in the east, but to bring him closer to Paris which was the centre of the *regnum Franciae* at that time, as befits the brother-in-law of the emperor and also allows him, so to speak, to deliver the fatal blow from closer at hand. In the KMS I (ed. Unger cap. 26 and 54, ed. Loth cap. A 25/B 26 and A 51) Ganelon comes from Château-Landon and when he marries Charlemagne's sister, he becomes Count

---

1480 Lejeune (1959, passim) wants to read in v. 275 *Car m'eslisez un baron de ma marche* the word *marche* with its narrower meaning, that is to say 'march, border land', and interpret it as the *marche d'Espagne*, so that Ganelon would be "une sorte de Goth, voire de Gascon", and someone whom Charlemagne would consider better able to negotiate with the Muslims – an alluring thought, but there is no support for this in the surviving form of the Rol. (although for comments on a possible earlier stage, cf. n. 1478 above). Imbs in the discussion that follows (p. 273s.) reminded us of Lat. *fines* 'borders' > 'area'; in v. 190 and 3716, too, the plural *marches* at least simply means 'area'. Moreover, in v. 360 s. Ganelon's people are instructed to greet his wife *en dulce France*, which would be a strange way to describe a place that is almost a border area.
1481 At the same time, the window onto the past opens to a quite ridiculous extent: according to V4CV7 Ganelon's ancestors were responsible for murdering Caesar, and according to V7 Alexander as well.

of Corbeil; from around the time of the *Fierabras* onwards, he is the son of Grifon d'Autefeuille, and in case anyone is thinking of Hautefeuille (50 km southeast of Paris, 100 km northwest of Troyes), we are told in *Gaufrey* that in fact this Autefeuille is a castle built by Grifon near Troyes; for Aubri de Troisfontaines (MGH SS. 23.723 and 775) Ganelon comes from Ramerupt and is the ancestor of the Count of Arcis and Ramerupt (as the crow flies, about 30 km north of Troyes); on the other hand, for Roger of Wendover (MGH SS. 28.50, for the year 1216) he is ancestor of Hervé of Donzy and Gien, who had managed by violent means to make himself Count of Nevers and was favourably regarded by Philip II Augustus.

This tendency reached its peak when in the *Girart de Vienne* Grifon d'Autefeuille is elevated to the position of son of Doon de Maience. Thus, a situation arises, whereby almost every traitor is included in the *geste* about Doon de Maience or, if the figure is invented, is added to the list.

A few references locate the fiefdom more towards the west, so that in the late 13th c. Thibaut le Tricheur (Bouquet 9.76, contesting this idea) and Mathilde of Bellême (Bouquet 11.323) are considered Ganelonids.

For the sake of curiosity, an apparently quite late tradition merits some consideration. In the posthumously published 1905 revised new edition (p. 523) of his *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne* Gaston Paris was able to include a note published in 1902 in the press by a certain E. Maison, stating that when he was a child, that is to say in about 1850, schoolchildren in Montigny-le-Gannelon used to be teased with the saying: "Gens de Montigny-le-Gannelon, où fut faite la première trahison". Paul Meyer cautiously added that Montigny-le-Gannelon was named after the treasurer of Saint-Martin, and so this tradition appears to be based on a misunderstanding. One is tempted to reply: maybe not!

C.10.5 Review of Ganelon

The name *Ganelon* or *Guenes/Guenelun* was probably given to the traitor in the Roland story in about 1045–1070 in the Anjou region because of a family feud involving the Theobaldine governor in the contested Touraine region, the treasurer of Saint-Martin in Tours, who was accused of making himself rich without demonstrating any military achievements. No hard evidence has been found of an epic Ganelon before this time.

C.11 Turpin

He is mentioned in O 170 and passim 14 times altogether: *Turpin* 6x *rectus*, 4x *obliquus* / *Turpins* 3x *rectus*, 1x *obliquus* (cf. Segre, Index), *Turpin* nKw, *Trepin(s)*, only 3x *Turpin* V4, *Turpin(s)* CV7, *Torpin(s)* P and T, *Tulpijn* h(H), *Turpinus* also the PT, *Turpīnus* the *Carmen* (v. 267 etc.): The archetype evidently had *Turpin(s)* like OnKwCV7.

The Middle Ages took the name as a derivative of Lat. *turpis* 'ugly, opprobri-ous', i.e. as a Christian humility name (like *Simplicius*, *Injuriosus* etc.). By the etymological method of *lucus a non lucendo* this could, like other humility names, be given a positive meaning; in the PT the pseudo-Calixtine appendix A explains: *Turpinus interpretatur pulcherrimus sive non turpis.*

Lat. *turpis* has a short *u*; if the stem had lived on into spoken French, the name would be *Torpin*, later *Tourpin*, and indeed forms of that type do occur, not only in P and T, but also in the *Nota Emilianense* (*episcopo domini Torpini*), in the Brindisi mosaic (Lejeune/Stiennon 1966, 1.109, a sketch of it is also in Jenkins 1923, p. XXXI) and in a few epics (such as in the *Aspremont* ed. Brandin alternating with *Turpin*). There are also real people called *Torpinus*.[1482] Further-more, the *Trep-* in V4 and later in the Franco-Italian *Prise de Pampelune* differs only by a metathesis from *Terpinus,* the name of a person at Bassano near Vice-nza as early as 1175 (Rajna 1889, 16); *Terpinus* in turn seems to emerge from *Torpinus* by a partial assimilation to the stressed vowel.

However, since *turpis* was mostly recognised as a Latinism, the /tyrp-/ pro-nunciation generally prevailed. On *Tulp-* in h(H) cf. below.

The historical bishop of Reims in 778 was called *Tilpinus*. He was a *vir valde religiosus* and had previously been *praepositus* of Saint-Denis – according to his third successor, Hincmar (MGH Ep.mer.&kar. 8.1, ep. 160.8, cf. also Flodoard, *Hist. Rem. Eccl.* 2.17). He had taken on the office of bishop in 748/749;[1483] contemporary evidence from the period before 778 exists at any rate in the fact that he was pres-ent at the Council of Rome in 769: MGH Conc. 2.1.75 *Tilpinus episcopus civitate Re-mensis.* It is quite likely that he took part in Charlemagne's Spanish campaign because Charlemagne generally insisted that the bishops should personally lead

---

[1482] A few references for *Torpinus*: Obituary from Saint-Claude (Jura, probably '9th–11th c.', but in a ms. from around 1395, Morlet 1972 s. v.), Bouquet 15.209D a.1111 (Saint-Vanne in Ver-dun), Angers-S.Aubin 2.276 around 1115, Fucecchio near Florence on the *strada francesca* a. 1144 (this one from Rajna 1889, 16 n. 4), Padua a. 1252 (Fassanelli 2014, 247), and also four *Tourpin* in the Parisian *rôles de taille* of 1292 (Michaëlsson 1927–1936, 1.97). With additional metathesis: *Tropinus* in 1275 in Padua (Fassanelli 2014, 248).

[1483] Evidence in Duchesne (1894–1915, 3.86).

the warriors from their immunity districts to his main army.[1484] But he lived for a long time after this campaign, since Hincmar attests in his epitaph (in Flodoard *Hist. Rem. Eccl.* 2.17, also MGH PLAeC. 3.409s.) that he served as a bishop for more than forty years. The year of his elevation from bishop to archbishop, which was granted by Pope Hadrian (772–795) at Charlemagne's request, is unclear, but it was before 780; for Hadrian's letter to Tilpin (text in Flodoard *Hist. Rem. Eccl.* 2.18) instructs him, along with his colleagues Weomad (of Trier) and Possessor (probably from Tarentaise) to encourage Bishop Lull of Mainz to write down and send him his profession of faith so that Hadrian could send him the pallium, and a prerequisite of this is evidently that Tilpin himself would already have possessed the pallium. This must have been written shortly before 780, because that is the year in which Lull sent his profession of faith, dated by himself, along with an accompanying letter to Hadrian, in which *Viemadus, Tilpinus, Possessor pontifices*, the men who had helped him to write it, are obviously assumed to be still alive (MGH Conc.mer.&kar. 2, Suppl. 2.24). He probably died in 794;[1485] the earliest possible date of his death is 788/789.[1486] He was possibly a personal friend of Charlemagne's, because the emperor had contacted the Pope to ensure that he would receive the pallium, and because Charlemagne did not make a decision about a new Archbishop of Reims until some nine years after Tilpin's death (Duchesne 1894–1915, 3.87).

The form of the name *Tilpinus* is absolutely certain and remains without variants outside the epic tradition until after 1100.[1487] It is the same in the Reims catalogues of bishops in the 12th and 13th c. (Duchesne 1894–1915, 77s.,

---

1484 Prinz (1971, 72): Charlemagne had no compunctions about ordering the highest clerics in the empire to carry out tasks, specifically including military service; p 73ss.: on clerical military and state services from the time of Charlemagne onwards, Charlemagne had i n s t i t u t i o n a l i s e d [spacing emphasis by Prinz.] this military and state service for clerics; he gives on p. 74 and 80 two illustrative examples: Charlemagne's 'conscription orders' to Abbot Fulrad of Saint-Quentin and his knights ("*venire debeas*"); and he ordered the elderly Abbot Sturmi of Fulda, along with his people, to participate in such a campaign and provide military protection for the Eresburg; p. 77, bishops and abbots were called upon not only to provide services, but also to accompany the army in person as it moved around, bringing their armed men with them; p. 82ss.: the h i g h clerics were now implicitly but systematically released from the prohibition of homicide; p. 104 and 110: Bishops Angilram of Metz and Sintpert of Regensburg perish in 791 when participating in the campaign against the Avars.

1485 Duchesne argues for this and explains why (1894–1915, 3. 86 n.7).

1486 Stated in supplement to the best ms. of the *Ann. Bertiniani* (Saint-Omer 706, 10th c.) and Lambert of Saint-Omer, *Liber floridus*, ed. Derolez, f. 41r°.

1487 Lull, Hincmar and Flodoard (including the letter from Hadrian) in all the passages quoted above, as well as Hincmar in his *Vita Remigii* (MGH SS.mer. 3.250 and 352) and Flodoard *Hist. Rem. Eccl.* 1.4, 2.16, 2.18, 3.20. In the *Vita Rigoberti* (written at the end of the 9th c.,

cf. also MGH SS. 13.381); only the catalogue of Mont-Saint-Michel (which is out-side the Archdiocese, after 1176) has *Turpinus* due to being influenced by the epic (Duchesne 1894–1915, 77s.) or *Turpinius* (MGH SS. 13.750). We also read in the forgery of Saint-Remi from Reims in the name of Charlemagne (12th c. MGH DD.kar. 1, no. 284), as we might expect in Tilpin's diocese, *Thilpinus*. Since Til-pin had been a monk in Saint-Denis before he became a bishop, some people remembered him there: we find a correct *Tilpinus* in the *Descriptio*, but *Turpinus* in the two forgeries of the late 12th century (probably made by the same monk) in the name of Charlemagne (MGH DD.kar.1, no.. 282 and 286), the first of which contains significant other epic elements (mention of the epic William), and the second of which is very vague in terms of its content. Moreover, *Tilpi-nus* is also written by Lambert of Saint-Omer (which belongs to the Archdiocese of Reims) in the *Liber floridus* (ed. Derolez, f. 41r° and 240v°) and by Balduin of Hainaut in his letter to Barbarossa accompanying his delivery of a partial ms. of the *Codex Calixtinus* (including the PT, Smyser 1937, 7 and 110). The hybrid form *Tulpinus*, corresponding to the *Tulpijn* in the Dutch *Roelantslied*, is found in the PT ms. Paris Lat. 17656 (written shortly after 1179, ed. Smyser, less precise in ed. Meredith-Jones, there as A1), but the scribe ceased in his efforts to im-prove the text at chapter 25. It is consistently carried through the whole of the *Vita Karoli* of 1165 where the Vita is based on the PT (that is to say, in its cap. 1–7); the author of the Vita explains that he has obtained the text from Saint-Denis (ed. Rauschen 1890, 67–74). The late appearance of *Tulpinus* is sufficient evidence to show that it is a hybrid form of *Tilpinus* and *Turpinus*, and not a temporary form on the way from *Tilpinus* to *Turpinus*.[1488]

Finally, we have a 13th c. case that mixes elements of these different tradi-tions: Aubri de Troisfontaines (SS. 23.712, 719, 721, 725) introduces the bishop in 766 as *Tylpinus vir nobilis qui et Turpinus dicitur*, then cites him in his own text and in the PT quotations as *Turpinus,* then quotes another source which is a catalogue-like text and evidently from Reims, with the dative *Tulpino*, and fi-nally in his own wording calls him *Tilpinus* again.[1489]

SS.mer. 7.60 and 70) only ms. C2 (12th c. from Vaucler near Laon) has *Turpinus* instead of *Tilpi-nus*, evidently due to the influence of the epics.

1488 For the sake of completeness, we should note the form *Tolopinus*, which appears once in Angers in the year 1140 for a *Turpinus* of a. 1141 and 1151 (cf. the list of references below in C.11.1), probably a somewhat precious spelling of *Tulpinus* /toʉpĩN/.

1489 As in ms. 1, at any rate, and its readings are doubtless correctly put into the text by the editor Scheffer-Boichorst; ms. 2 has generalised it to *Turpinus*, even in the quotation from Reims.

Tilpin(us) was apparently an unusual name; at any rate, no other person bearing this name has ever been found. In origin, it may well be a childish form of the name with the usual hypocoristic ending *-in*, e.g. for a *Theod-/Thiod-leib* or *-wulf* (with the characteristic early childhood replacement of the fricative with a stop).[1490] This extreme rarity, and perhaps also the element of childishness, may have assisted its transformation into *Turpin(us)* but they do not explain the phonology of the resulting form.

The Christian modesty name *Turpinus* is attested a few times before 900, which is early enough to be sure that the epic figure cannot have influenced it. These references are according to Morlet (1972 s. v.) once in the *Polyptychon Irminonis* (about 820) for a bondsman of Saint-Germain des Prés in Villeneuve-Saint-Georges and three times in MGH LC. (2.25.2, 171.2, 541.34, all in the 9th c.), for a monk in Reichenau, in Murbach (*Turpino*) and in Molosme (6 km east of Tonnerre) respectively. From my own material we have the following additional references, all likewise from the 9th c.: once in the *Miracula Sancti Dionysii* 1.4 for a peasant,[1491] three times in the MGH L.mem. (1.26v° 7, 49r° 6 and 58v° 1) for a monk in Prüm(?), Saint-Germain des Prés and Remiremont respectively, and finally once in MGH L.mem.n.s. (4.7r° A2), written in San Salvatore di Brescia, for a monk of unknown origins. Morlet also cites a monk *Torpinus* of Saint-Claude (Jura) from the obituary of the monastery there, which she dates vaguely to the '9th–11th c.'. The editor Georges Guigue actually suspects that the obituary contains mainly names from the 10th and 11th c.; it was not written, however, until about 1395, and there is no obvious reason why there would be any need to go to the effort of making a copy, when there had been no, or almost no new entries for centuries.

In sum, then, only 5–6 persons are attested in Galloromania, and none of them stand out for any reason; rather, the name seems to have almost died out in the course of the 10th c.[1492] This is not nearly enough to attract the name *Tilpinus*.

1490 Morlet and Förstemann have simply overlooked this name. In my own search for "epic" names I looked for *Turpinus*, and initially not for *Tilpinus*, but I think it is quite likely I would have noticed it, if it had appeared. Names ending in *-in(us)* can be of both Latin and Germanic origin; cf. on the one hand *Anton-inus*, *August-inus* etc., on the other hand *Bas-inus*, *G(a)er-inus*, *Pip(p)-inus* etc. But while the Latin names are generally transparent, in the Germanic ones, there is often an early childhood simplification of the name; the best example is *Pipp-in*.
1491 Cited from a Reims ms. of the 10th c. in Luchaire (1899, 94).
1492 When Morlet (1972, s. v., that is to say in the case of names from Latin) compares *Turpinus* and *Turpio* with *turpis* and interprets this as a Christian humility name (like *Injuriosus*, *Simplicius* etc.), she is correct at least in terms of their synchronicity. However, if we try to put the name into a historical context with other related names, two other issues arise. On the one hand, there are in France at that time a few instances of *Turp-ricus*, *Turp-(w)aldus*, *Turpingus/Turpengus*,

Bédier (1926–1929, 3.381 n.1) suggested what is probably the correct explanation: it was influenced by the name *Turpio*, "nom porté par les comtes d'Angoulême entre autres".

Let us take a closer look at the events! According to Ademar of Chabannes (γ 3.16s.), shortly after the death of his son Pippin (in 838) Louis the Pious had appointed Turpio as Count of Angoulême as part of a larger restructuring.[1493] In 844, Lupus of Ferrières reports that he has just escaped certain death during the Aquitaine rebellions thanks solely to Turpio's help (MGH Ep.mer.&kar. 4.81). In 863, *Turpio* and a Norman leader both die in a single combat with each other; Ademar (αβγ 3.19) writes a brief and factual report: *Turpio vero [. . .] cum Normannis congressus, occidens eorum regem nomine Maurum, ab eo ipse occiditur.* But the *Ann. Engolismenses* (MGH SS. 16.486) mention the day of his death, the 4.11.863, and go on to commemorate him with great warmth: *Turpio comes, miles fortissimus defensorque optimus, vir magnificus, amator clericorum, ecclesiarum aedificator pauperumque recreator, cum Normannis congreditur, et occiso Mauro, ab illo occiditur.* Even in 1160 the *Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium*

---

which Morlet 1971 s. vv. lists with the Germanic names, although she regards them as hybrid names (where *Turp-* is taken from *Turpinus* and *Turpio*) and *Turp-uinus/Torp-uinus* (Bourgogne-Pérard 15 a. 817, 62 around 913), also, at the same time in Germany a few phonologically corresponding instances *of Dorfo/Durfo*, *Dor(p)funi*, *Dorfwin* (Förstemann s. v.); this allows us to posit Germ. *þorp* 'built-up land, farmstead, village, gathering (of people or animals)' as the first stem of personal names (according to Bruckner, Kalbow, Gamillscheg, Dauzat, Geuenich). On the other hand, the Lat. family names beginning with Etruscan *Turpli* include *Turpilius* and *Turpio*, occasionally also *Turp-edius*, *-enus*, *-idius*, *-ilianus*, *-ilienus*, *-ilinus*, *-ilio*, *-illus*, *-leius* and *Turpo* (cf. now Solin/Salomies 1994, 192, 414s.), where *Turpio* was probably already in the name of the stage actor Ambivius Turpio in the time of Terence, and certainly in late antiquity in Marius Mercator (cf. DuCange s. v.) as an appellative meaning 'dimwit'; a hypocoristic *Turp-inus* can easily be based on these. A *Turpenay* in the southwest of the Touraine region (parish of Saint-Benoît-la -Forêt) may go back to this, or to a *Turpenus*, and this is where in 1127 Foulques V of Anjou-Touraine founded a monastery called *Turpiniacum* (GC 14.295ss.); since *-(i)acum* had by that time not been productive for several centuries, it cannot very well have been named after one of the contemporary Turpins. Cf. on *Turpio* also n. 1493 below! But even if the Germ. or Etruscan-Lat. *Turp-* strand were to have been continuously linked with the name that we are interested in, it would be irrelevant. – In the 13th c. *turpin* is attested twice meaning 'warrior', and there is one instance of *turpineis* 'fight, battle', along with one each of *tupinel* 'warrior' and *tupinëiz* 'fight, battle' (Tobler/Lommatzsch s. vv.). The forms with *-r-* at least are influenced by the epic; but even if they are the primary forms, they tell us nothing new about the name.

1493 Since in southern France a *vir tribunicius* by the name of *Turpio* is mentioned by Apollinaris Sidonius (MGH AA. 8.74s.), a *Turpio presbyter* is a signatory in the year 529 at the Council of Vaison (although his name is only in one ms. from the 7th c., MGH Conc.1.58) and finally a *Torpio* appears around 752 as the Bishop of Le Puy, the family of counts is presumably a long-established one from southern France.

(p. 6 ed. Boussard) gives us a particularly vivid account of the single combat: *Currentibus enim caballis, ambo in pectoribus sibi lanceas configunt et vitam relinquunt.* This is obviously a man whose memory has been kept alive in this region for a long time, not just because of his achievements, but even more because of his heroic death.

Between 898 and 944 we find a Bishop Turpio in Limoges (Duchesne 1894–1915, 2.54), probably a relative of the count. He made his mark during his lifetime and after it, through his long term of office, as the builder of St. Stephen's Castle and especially through his admiration for Cluny, which was still in its infancy: *castellum Sancti Stephani Lemovicae sedis quod Turpio episcopus [. . .] magna ex parte a solo construxerat* (Ademar βγ 3.25), *Turpio, genere clarissimo, avunculus Rotberti vicecomitis Albucensis, in rebus Dei magnificus fuit et Odonem abbatem Cluniacensis coenobii summo excoluit* (also in Ademar βγ 3.25). The *Ann. Lemovicenses* (MGH SS. 2.251 for the year 944) still refer to him respectfully after more than a century as *Domnus Turpio*, while other bishops in this text (such as Geraldus of Limoges, † 1020) have to do without the *dominus*. In later years, there seems to have been some confusion about these two individuals called *Turpio*. Thus, we read in a forgery from the 11th or early 12th c. for Solignac (10 km south of Limoges) in the name of Charles the Bald, that purports to have been written in 872, *adstante et concedente Turpione episcopo* (Charles-le Chauve, 2.646ss.).

The following instances showing interference from *Turpio* on *Turpin(us)* are more interesting for our explanation. Bédier (1926–1929, 3.381 n.1) already identified one of them: it is the *domno Turpione* in the forgery for Saint-Yrieix (40 km south of Limoges on the second Way of St. James), which purports to have been written on Charlemagne's journey down to Spain, and which certainly refers to the epic figure. Two others work in the opposite direction: while in the *Historia Monasterii Usercensis* (after 1148, perhaps even as late as 13th c.) Bishop Turpio of Limoges is described as an enemy of Uzerche Monastery (50 km south-southeast of Limoges), the name of the same man in the similarly formulated introduction to the Uzerche cartulary is *Turpinus* (Uzerche 14–20, both texts printed in parallel). And in the foundation charter of Déols monastery (about 125 km north-northeast of Limoges, Diocese of Bourges) a witness signs (as the guest of the bishop, invited from a neighbouring diocese, as often happened at the foundation of monasteries) also as *Turpinus, episcopus Lemovicensis* (Indre 110 a. 917). This charter was carved in wood and kept in the parlour of the Abbey, but it no longer exists; however, there are surviving copies from the 15th and 16th c. *Salvo errore* the lost carving cannot be dated; it – and with it the confusion – could therefore be centuries later than the foundation of the monastery in 917.

Anyone who travelled to Spain from the French-speaking area in the 11th c. as a pilgrim going to Compostela, or in a military role – e.g. with campaigns

led by Geoffrey Martel, as far as the Saintonge region or even to Bordeaux – would therefore have had an opportunity along the way to hear about a Bishop *Turp(ion)*, and about a *Turp(ion)*, who died heroically in a battle against the heathen. If, on the other hand, he or she heard about a bishop by the name of *Tilpin* – a name that no one else had ever had and that did not sound at all like a priest's name – this could have led to a mixing of the two names; we will look again in more detail at the circumstances surrounding this crossing of the two names.

Be that as it may, in the later 11th c., the name *Turpinus* resurfaced with re-newed vigour, and in fact the geography is important, exactly as it was in the case of Marsilĭe and especially Ganelon. The location is a centre-western French area very similar to the one relating to Ganelon, that is to say from the Chartrain area to the Anjou area, only with a somewhat broader reach towards the north-west and into the Mayenne area.

C.11.1 The name inside the centre-western strip

Morlet (1972 s. v.) offers only a single *Turpinus*, in a necrology from Vendôme, that can only be vaguely dated to the 12th c. I have the following material, in which I omit multiple references to the same person unless they are of special interest: An-gers-S.Serge 124 a. 1055–1081 *Turpinus*, child; Vendôme 2.30 a. 1066–1085 and 2.40 a. 1086 *Frotmundus cognomento / cognomine Turpinus*, 2.43 a. 1086 *Fromun-dus Turpinus*, 2.144 around 1100 *Guillelmus Turpinus* (Fromund's brother), 2.155 a. 1100 *Paganus Turpinus*, 2.155 a. 1100 *Turpinus*, 2.194 and 195 a. 1110 *Fromundus Turpinus, Guido Turpinus eius frater*,[1494] 2.96 and 100 a. 1097 *Turpinus de la Mota, praepositus*, 2.102 a. 1097 *Turpinus de Durnillo*; Mont-Saint-Michel 176 and 170 around 1100 and before 1139 *Turpinus praepositus / prefectus monachorum* in the Priory of Gohory (almost 15 km northwest of Châteaudun); Craon 57 a. 1105 *Wido Turpinus, homo Mauricii* [*de Craon*], 59 a. 1102–1116 *Turpinus* of Saint-Amadour (7 km east of Craon); Angers-S.Aubin 2.276 around 1115 *Torpinus de la Praella*, 1.227 a. 1116 *Turpinus*, monk; Noyers 457 around 1117 *Turpinus de Sancto-Spano*;

1494 This family was based in the castle named after them *La Roche-Turpin* (almost 30 km west of Vendôme) which was destroyed in the 16th c. According to Clément (1899, 103–108) we know of the grandfather Otrad and the father of the brothers, Salomon; but they are not yet using the name Turpin, which was transferred in the brothers' generation from one to the other, in the process becoming a family name (the one who is called only *Turpin* in 1100 is, according to Clément, Fromund). This family can be traced as the owners of the castle until shortly after 1300.

Angers-Ronceray 255 around 1120 *Turpinus villicus*, 54 around 1120, 90 around 1126, 63 and 126 around 1145, 122 around 1150 *Turpinus*, 143 around 1130 *Turpinus de Asesa*, 24 around 1140 *Tolopinus de Super Pontem* (the same person as 67 a. 1151 *Turpinus de Super Ponte* and Angers-S.Nicolas 2.74 around 1141 *Turpinus de Super Pontem*), 183 around 1143, 24 and passim around 1145 *Turpinus vicarius*, 65 around 1145 *Turpinus praetor*; Tiron (today Thiron-Gardais 40 km west-southwest of Chartres) 2.44 around 1145 *Turpinus, avunculus Geroii de Lunviler*; Anjou-Chartrou 366 a. 1127 [Fulco of Anjou for Saint-Florent de Saumur 50 km southeast of Angers] *Turpinus* [as the only witness out of five to have no epithet]; Angers-Cath. 265 a. 1125–1136 *Turpinus et uxor eius*, 228 a. 1136–1140 *Turpinus Halenotus*, 229 a. 1140, 299 a. 1140–1145, 309 a. 1136–1148, 312 a. 1136–1140 *Turpinus*, 335 before 1149 *Turpinus de Ramoforti*; Blésois-Marmoutier 151 a. 1139 *Turpinus*, cook for Urs (i)on de Fréteval (25 km south-southwest of Châteaudun), 152 a. 1139 *Turpinus*, monk of Marmoutier.

C.11.2 The name in the rest of Galloromania

The *Aegidius Turpinus* from the Ostrevant or Hainaut area, who according to Belgique-Miraeus 2.1145 a. 1096 had taken part in the solemn inauguration of the Monastery of Anchin (12 km east of Douai), is, along with the whole inauguration, the product of a 17th c. forgery (cf. Gerzaguet 2005, 106–110). The remaining references are therefore: Bouquet 15.209D a. 1111 *Torpinus pictor* in Verdun; Toulouse-S.Sernin 171 and 246 a. 1100–1150 *Willelmus Turpinus*; Aureil (12 km east-southeast of Limoges) 5 around 1150 *Turpinus*, brother of Ademarus Salvajus of (Saint-Léonard-de-) Noblat.

Here are a few notes, with no claim of completeness, on the name *Turpin* outside Galloromania, including some after 1150. Rajna (1889, 16 n.4) reports from Italy for the year 1144 a *Torpinus*, son of a deceased *Rollandus*, in Fucecchio near Florence on the *strada francesca*, and two later Turpins from 1175 and 1214; Rosellini (1958, 263) added six more between 1160 and 1196. In the Holy Land we have at least one *Bernardus Turpin* in the year 1155 in Acre/Akko (Röhricht 1989, 80). In Aragón between 1150 and 1158 a *Turpin* is lord of Cascante near Tudela; he or his father may have been among the French people who assisted Alfonso el Batallador (Boissonnade 1923, 64 n. 6, 325 n. 3). And finally, in the Estremadura of that time, which was part of the Kingdom of León, but is now just inside Portugal, we find at some point between 1161 and 1183 a "Turpín, que será probablemente un franco e indudable repoblador de Villar Turpín," *recte*: Vilar Torpim near Figueira de Castelo Rodrigo (González 1943, 227, cf. 238).

Altogether, the appearance of the name is just as surprising as it is interesting. Between 900 and 1075 we could find only one reference (in the obituary of Saint-Claude), but immediately after 1075 there is a veritable explosion of this name in one region, and this certainly demands an explanation. There is only one explanation: what we see here reflects the Turpin figure in the Roland material. At the same time, the chronological specificity of the name's appearance stands out; it leads us to conclude that the event which caused this explosion must have happened very recently. I cannot imagine that a Latin text could have "caught fire" so suddenly and thoroughly, only to have disappeared later, nor indeed, a vernacular, almost amorphous prose narrative. Let us take the plunge, then, and dare to utter this sentence: the name reflects an Old French Song of Roland. The oldest of the Turpinus brothers, who came of age in 1085, must have acquired his nickname by 1080 at the latest; the child Turpin can hardly have been born after 1075; the Provost of a Priory of Mont-Saint-Michel in the Dunois area must have been at least 30 years of age, probably born around 1070. If the figure in the Song started to have an effect on onomastics in about 1070, then it must have been created in about 1045–1060.

The spatial distribution of this name is similar to that of the name *Ganelon*, but it is not the same. In the latter case, the majority of instances were found in the Touraine area, and it only marginally entered the Anjou region; in the present case, however, the majority of instances are in the Anjou area (with a smaller, easily explainable[1495] focus on the Vendômois area), while it only marginally entered the Touraine area. And in this case, too, the pattern is not surprising: in the case of *Ganelon*, the name came from a family feud in a neighbouring region, whereas with *Turpin* the name is creation of an Angevin poet seeking to make this character 'one of ours'.

In 8 of the 14 occurrences of this name, the poet of the surviving Song adds the title *l'arcevesque* to it; in marked contrast to his treatment of the other main characters, the poet also names Turpin's official home: *de Reins* (O 264, 2077, 2083; the same in CV7 and therefore in the archetype, *Raines* K, *Raina* and 1x *Raine*, *Reine*, *Reins* V4, *Rains* P and T respectively, *Riemen* h(H)); an archbishop without a diocese would probably have been too abstract. But why in the Angevin

---

1495 From the time before 990, when Elisabeth of Vendôme, daughter of Bouchard ("IV") le Vénérable, had married Count Foulques Nerra of Anjou, the Vendômois region became increasingly dependent on Anjou. From 1032 until 1056 Geoffroy Martel (initially heir, but from 1040 ruler of the County of Anjou) was simultaneously ruler of the Vendômois region, where he founded the Trinité de Vendôme; when he was forced by King Henry finally to grant it to his nephew Foulques l'Oison in 1056, he seems to have moved to a position between the latter and the King in the pyramid of fiefdoms.

Song did the Archbishop of Reims play such an important role – and not e.g. the one from Tours or from Rouen? The answer is to be found quite simply in the unique position that the Archdiocese of Reims had attained in French history, and especially in its link with the Carolingian dynasty. Bishop Remigius of Reims had baptised Clovis in the early days, and it was thought that this happened in his cathedral. When Hincmar had the grave of Remigius opened, two small vials were found, which still exuded a wonderful fragrance. Hincmar repurposed a popular legend in his *Vita Remigii*, claiming that Clovis had been baptised with oil that had been brought down from heaven by a dove in one of these vials.[1496] This appeared to show that France's kings should be anointed using this vial by whichever Archbishop of Reims was in office at the time (which meant then, that in France, unlike Germany, the anointing and not the coronation became the central act in the consecration of the ruler).

Admittedly, there was a long way to go before this personal entitlement could be enforced, and it required constant political intervention on the part of Hincmar and his successors.[1497] From 859 onwards, Hincmar himself was the spiritual leader of the West Frankish episcopacy and an altogether loyal and politically astute advisor to Charles the Bald and his successors. When Charles the Fat was deposed in 888, Archbishop Fulk wanted the Carolingian Arnulf to be king, but the powerful figures in the Western Empire decided in favour of the Capetian Odo. After this, in 893 in Reims, Fulk consecrated the Carolingian Charles the Simple, who then pursued his objectives through a civil war. In 918, Archbishop Hervé was almost the only person to offer military support to Charles against the Hungarians, and in 920 he was out in front leading his troops when they liberated Charles from the Capetians. At almost the same time as Hervé's death in 922, his adversary Gautier of Sens consecrated the Capetian Robert and in the following year, his son Raoul. Archbishop Artaud of Reims, too, was for a time unable to withstand unworthy competition from the under-aged Hugh of Vermandois who was a supporter of the Capetians; but in 936 he consecrated Louis IV "d'Outremer", quickly became his chancellor, and perhaps at that time also was given the powers of a count in Reims (which Archbishop Ebalus was finally able to secure once and for all in 1023); between 940 and 946 he had to relinquish his position to Hugh once again; but then Louis reinstated him with the support of Otto the Great; in 954 he consecrated Lothar. Archbishop Adalbero was a reliable supporter of Lothar between 969 and 984, but he changed sides when Lothar wanted to usurp the inheritance of his nephew Otto of Lotharingia, and consecrated Hugh

---

1496 Marc Bloch (1983, 225–227; originally 1924); Oppenheimer (1953, passim).
1497 The next section relies on Dumas (1944, passim) in particular.

Capet in 987. But in 989 Lothar's son Arnulf was elected as Archbishop of Reims and shortly after this he passed the city over to his uncle, the pretender Charles. He and Charles were captured in Laon in 991 by his suffragan Adalbero-Azzelin, delivered to King Hugh Capet and deposed. When his successor Gerbert became Pope in 999, he reinstated Arnulf and expressly declared that the Archbishops of Reims had the right to consecrate the kings of France. Apart from the understandable exception in 987, the archbishops had carried out their role with faultless loyalty to the Carolingians, and yet also retained the right to consecrate kings into the Capetian period. Indeed, they even consolidated it: Fulk, Hervé, Artaud, Adalbero and Gerbert also held the position of Chancellor; this is why as late as in 1060 William (of Bellême/La Roche Guyon) as Archbishop of Reims succeeded in claiming this position. But in the eyes of the people, it was the consecration of kings that brought the Archbishop of Reims close to the throne and guaranteed his unique position as a *primus inter pares*: if a poet projects these circumstances back into the time of Charlemagne, there is no need to look for any other explanation.

We have covered the most important poetic factors. The question remains: how could the Angevin poet have known who had been the Archbishop of Reims during Charlemagne's reign, and specifically at the time of his Spanish campaign? A cleric in the Archdiocese of Tours at that time would not have easy access to a catalogue of bishops from the Archdiocese of Reims. However, we cannot rule out the likelihood that the historic Tilpin lived on to a certain degree in the oral or semi-oral tradition across large parts of France for two and a half centuries.[1498] Roncaglia (1946–1947, 120s.) used the *cui bono* principle to develop the hypothesis that the figure of Archbishop Turpin was in fact brought into the epic tradition by the 11th c. Reims Archbishops from the Roucy family, that is to say Ebalus (1021/1023–1033) and Manasses I (1069–1081). But Ebalus is a rather negative character,[1499] Manasses is too late, and the other Reims Archbishops cannot be considered key promoters of the epic figure; for if they had been, the fashion for the Turpin name would not have broken out in Anjou, the epic figure would have been called *Tilpin*, and his grave would not

---

1498 Cf. e.g. the forgery (created after 950) for Fleury in Charles-le-Chauve 2.599 (no. 480), purporting to be from Compiègne 29.05.860, and therefore in the name of Charles the Bald, and apparently signed by *Einardus [!] notarius ad vicem Tilpini summi cancellarii*. The forger confuses the world of Charlemagne with that of Charles the Bald, but by *Tilpinus* he can only mean the Archbishop of Reims, who for him is automatically also the Chancellor.

1499 Roncaglia initially emphasises the steadfast loyalty of the Roucy family to the Carolingian King Lothar, but then notes the fact that a little later, Ebalus of Roucy was secretary to Adalbero-Azzelins of Laon (that is to say to the most notorious person who betrayed the Carolingians!) and *suae calliditatis conscius* (MGH SS.7.473), and after that, he was manoeuvred into the position of Archbishop of Reims.

have been in Blaye or Vienne, but in Reims itself; after all, Tilpin's grave was visible in Reims Cathedral, complete with the epitaph written by Hincmar, so that Mabillon was still able to read it *in situ*.[1500] But, as we have already said, no special cause is needed here. This is roughly the same period as the early phase of the Charlemagne legend as a whole, when – probably still in the first third of the 11th c., at any rate in the first half – in Fleury (Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire), that is to say about half way between Reims and Angers, the scribe of Ms. Paris BN lat. 5354 formulated a final remark about what he missed in Einhart's *Vita Karoli*, namely the *reliqua actuum eius [scil. Karoli gloriosissimi imperatoris] gesta seu et que [= quae] in carminibus vulgo canuntur de eo*.[1501]

Be that as it may, the Archbishop owes his status in the Rol. and the epic form of his name to the Angevin poet. Some doubt remains about the question of whether his Turpin was already a military man. We might initially hesitate before suggesting that this kind of pre-crusading spirit was present in Anjou around 1050. On the other hand: would someone who was only a priest – e.g. the narrator figure in the PT, irreproachable but colourless – have unleashed the excitement that we find in the fashionable popularity of this name? What could such a man offer that was new, all of a sudden? And would then so many people bear this name, most of whom had probably never been destined for a clerical career?[1502]

1500 Pierre David (1948, 75) also recognised that the epic-legendary graves do not support Reims. However, he thought that the epic Turpin had therefore started in Saint-Denis, where Tilpin had previously been a monk – to which we can only reply, that even the very pro-Saint-Denis PT does not mention the fact that Tilpin was a monk there, nor does it use the correct form of his name.

1501 There is more detail on this in Beckmann (2009a, 487–492).

1502 At this point I reviewed the material that Erdmann (1935), Hildesheimer (1936) and most systematically Prinz (1971), all passim, gathered on the topic of 'clerics as warriors'. In the case of Turpin, the issue is not the fact that a cleric organised the defence of his homeland, brought the troops from his districts of immunity to the battlefield, offered spiritual support to the army, led large or small offensive operations, or processed into battle with crosses, church banners or relics, but it is all about the fact that he personally wielded a sword and lance, albeit only against unbelievers. To the extent that this case comes clearly enough into view from the time of Charlemagne until around 1100 – and this happens rarely enough – the laconic legal answer appears in Charlemagne's capitulary of 769 (MGH Capit.r.F. 1.45): *Ut sacerdotes neque christianorum neque paganorum sanguinem fundant*, and in Gratian globally (2.23.8.6 II, col. 954 ed. Friedberg): *Sacerdotes propria manu arma arripere non debent*. But this principle could not be enforced until the period of Gregorianism in the late 11th c. What was the position before this time in specific cases? Whereas e.g. Hincmar († 882) still condemns any use of weapons in such cases, Abbo of Saint-Germain before 897 in his *Bella Parisiacae urbis* (e.g. 1.243ss., 1.320ss., 1.601ss.) has Bishop Gozlin and Abbot Ebalus physically fighting with the heathen enemy. In the 11th c., then, even with full knowledge of the principle of ecclesiastical law, authors are almost always – and sometimes even, if the battle is solely against

C.11.3 Review of Turpin – and of Ganelon and Marsilĩe; the Angevin core Song of Roland from 1045–1055

We have now arrived at one of the most important points in our investigation. In the Anjou/Touraine area and around the middle of the 11th c., the southern French name *Marsilius* seems to have been turned into a Saracen name, its meaning having been influenced by *(al-)Manṣūr* and/or *Mundhir* /mondzír/. In Anjou around the middle of the century, *Guanilo* changed from being the name of someone involved in a regional feud into the name of the traitor in the Rol.; there are no indications of a betrayal in the Roland material before this happened; we may assume, therefore, that the betrayal theme came into the Roland material along with the name. Then again, in Anjou in the middle of the century, Archbishop Turpin makes his appearance in the Roland material, probably complete with his warrior role. Such close proximity in time and space between three different motifs which are independent of each other in the plot show that the poet was working very deliberately to make his own mark on the story. The Song we have before us in its bare outlines – though not in the actual words – is already what I would like to call the core Song of Roland. That is to say, it is the Song we see in outline if we extract from the Oxford

---

'bad Christians' – accompanied with an apology or even with an explicit commendation. This shows how far public opinion was from the norms of theoretical-ecclesiastical law. Since we are concerned with Anjou, Bernard of Angers is very instructive. He wrote his *Liber miraculorum Sancte Fidis* around 1020 (!); Erdmann (1935, 69s.) paraphrases Bernard better than I can, saying that Bernard describes a prior at Conques, who regularly went into battle personally against all attackers and disturbers of the peace, even leading his own people, and who always kept his weapons with him in his cell, repudiated all kinds of cowardice and declared it his duty to go into battle against bad Christians. Bernard writes about this figure in great detail and admits that it was actually not permitted for a prior to take a leading part in armed conflict, but then he declares that in this case it is a virtue rather than a breach of the rules. For the prior exhibited only a zeal for God and fought to defend the good and protect his monastery. Fighting against evil people was not a crime for all servants of God, no matter what their rank was, and if a monk killed any people in such a war, he needed do no more penance than David did when he slew the Philistine (*Liber miraculorum Sancte Fidis* 1.26 [now p. 128–131 ed. Robertini]). Bernard is therefore quite happy to praise the prior's military conduct, and he describes how God himself fought through the prior's hands, often helped him with miracles, and also made him into a guardian angel. (So far Erdmann 1935, loc.cit.) Here, we clearly see the start of the long process of gradual convergence of Church and the Military which would culminate in the First Crusade. It is easy to imagine that how any scruples would be further diminished if this prior had already fought against the 'heathen' (Conques was just about to switch to this position!), and all the prerequisites for the Turpin figure would be in place; all that was required to articulate them, was a poet.

Roland the parts which in a careful, synchronic analysis turn out not to be central.[1503] Instead of the Blancandrin section with its superbly intricate psychology and narrative structure culminating in the discussion between Blancandrin and Ganelon, there was a simpler train of events, more like the one we see in the PT. The Baligant section was not yet there, as in the PT; Baligant was either Marsiliĕ's less important brother, as in the PT, or not yet in existence. Ganelon's trial was not yet the great act of empire with its deep sense of disillusionment, but probably a kind of court martial, an abbreviated trial, as it is in the PT. Bramimonde's conversion was not yet there, as in the PT. And since *Turold* is a purely Norman name, and the poet was an Angevin, he did not sign the work as *Turoldus*, but presumably did not sign it at all. We might therefore expect that a poet with such powers of invention might consider the unusual name Tilpin strange or childish, and in memory of *Turpio* turn it into *Turpin*.

But such a Song could very quickly have spread to Normandy. Immediately before the Battle of Hastings, a *jongleur* could have performed one or two scenes, and perhaps – why not? – he enhanced his steady delivery at appropriate places, e.g. by raising or modulating his voice a little so that the army could reply: AOI, as a kind of military *sursum corda*.[1504]

C.12 Naimes

C.12.1 The forms of the name

He is named in O 230 and passim 29 times altogether: *Naimes* (15), *Neimes* (10) rectus / *Naimun* (2), *Naimon* (2) obliquus O *Nemes*, *Nai-*, *Naymes* n, *Naimes* K (*Neimes* Schwerin fragment, *Naymis* Stricker, *Names* the *Karlmeinet*), *Naimes* (less common *Naime*, *Naimo,* sporadically *Naim*, *Names*) / *Naimon* (rarely *-un*), both cases with *-ay-* instead of *-ai-*, and 2x hypocoristic *Naimin* V4, only insignificant deviations from O in CV7PTb, *Naim*, *Naym* w: In O <ai> and <ei> stand for the same phoneme before the nasal. The readings from O belong in the archetype.

Outside the Roland tradition we find some forms that are different:

1. The PT has *Naaman*, which is an Old Testament name (2 *Reg* 5). Elsewhere the author does not have a tendency to make any other personal names more biblical or antiquated; but here he had obviously never seen /naimon/

1503 I recently tried – as many others have – to explain this in *en détail* (Beckmann 2008b, passim).

1504 Cf. Beckmann (2008c, passim, especially 211 with n. 48).

written, and looking for the most similar Latin name, he hit upon biblical *Naaman*.

2. In the north-eastern part of the French-speaking area, where the *-ml-* nexus is tolerated, there are still forms with *-l-*: *Namles*, sporadically *Namelons / Namlon*, less common *Namelon* in the *Saisnes* A (over 50 *-l-* forms; but *Naymes / Naymon* L, mostly R too); *Namles / Namlun* passim, *Naime(s) / Naimon* only 6x in the *Aspremont* (ed. Brandin);[1505] *Namlun* KMS I (Belgo-Romance base) Aa, *Naflun* (with /v/) KMS I Bb;[1506] from this through assimilation: *Nales / Nalon* in the *Huon de Bordeaux*.[1507] Are these *-l-* forms archaic-lateral, that is to say the original ones, or do they come from an analogical *Guenes* (northern: *Guenles*) / *Ganelon*? If they are the original ones, the only possible etymology – since no *Namilo* or similar is attested anywhere – would be the names *Amalo* and *Amalung(us)*, which become merged in Galloromania from the 9th c. onwards.[1508] But the *N-* does not fit geographically, because then it would have to be interpreted as an agglutinated Occ. *N·* (< *dominus*). This would make it a Germ. name which received its epic form in southern France and was preserved unchanged only in the northeast, all of which amounts to a complicated and scarcely credible history.[1509]

3. In the Occitan and the Spanish-speaking area, on the other hand, there are forms without this *N·*, although some of them have a preceding *dominus* title: *dominus Aymo de Bayveria* in the *Gesta Karoli Magni apud Carcassonam et Narbonam* (early 13th c.),[1510] *Aimon le Marquis* in the Occitan version (around 1300) of the *Vita Porcarii* (Jeanroy 1897, 178), *don Aymes de Bayuera* in the Spanish *Cuento del Emperador Carlos Maynes e de la Emperatris Seuilla* (14th c., van Waard 1937, 89) and perhaps *Aymon* in the *Roncesvalles* v. 97

1505 The northern *-l-* forms also turned into Dutch and German derivatives (cf. Moisan).

1506 *Naflun* stands out, because the changes made in Bb are mostly quite obvious later corrections, or at any rate they were introduced very deliberately.

1507 I have to leave it open whether *le bon duc Amelon* in the *Aspremont* 1641, 2891 is the same person; Brandin's index makes them two different people. Cf. also *Emelon*, Duke of Bavaria (albeit in Merovingian times!), in the Old French *Floovent* (> *Hemelyoen* in the Dutch *Flovent*).

1508 For the sake of completeness, we should note that in a Regensburg gloss of the 12th c. the name *Amelunge*, in fact the name of the Ostrogoth royal family, is explained as 'Bavarian'; cf. Gillespie 1973 s. v. *Amelunc*.

1509 When I followed up (Beckmann 2008a, 40 n.6) the work of Gaston Paris (*Romania* 15.150s.) a few years ago, I conceded better chances for this etymology of *Amalungus*, than I would now, having since examined all of the information available on this name.

1510 Moldenhauer (1922, 145) notes that the *Gesta* give the title *dominus* only to "Aymo", which suggests it is just the author's own etymological interpretation.

(de Riquer, 1958/59, passim). Because of their later dates, these texts do not constitute evidence that *Aimes / Aimon* was the original form of the name, but they do show the fluctuation in the way such names are interpreted, including the almost interchangeable nature of the forms with and without *N-* in the south.

4. A single *Dunaimes* in Roland ms. T and similar forms in late Dutch, German and Italian derivatives (cf. Moisan s. v.) are based on contraction of *du(c) Naimes*; in the *Chevalerie Ogier* 641 ed. Eusebi, too, *du Naimon* means *duc Naimon*.

C.12.2 Naimes, the character in the Song

Naimes is the confidant, even friend of the emperor: Charlemagne calls him *Bel sire Naimes* at a time when Naimes is badly wounded and in need of spiritual support (v. 3455). Looking at him from a modern perspective, he is the only proper statesman at Charlemagne's court. He is able to consider things carefully, and so in the first council scene, he can neither reject Marsilĭe's offer unconditionally as Roland does, nor accept it unconditionally as Ganelon does. Since he thinks further clarification is required, through a counter-delegation to be sent back to Marsilĭe, he is prepared to take on this responsibility himself; but Charlemagne thinks he needs to keep Naimes close by as his adviser. In the second council scene, Naimes realises that Ganelon's suggestion, although inspired by malice, is appropriate not only because as far as anyone can tell, Roland is the man most likely to accomplish this task successfully, but also because once this suggestion has been made, Charlemagne has no alternative: if he nominates another man to do it, he opens himself in front of the whole court to the suspicion that he is protecting his own flesh and blood at the expense of another man. It would be wrong, therefore, to oppose Ganelon in this matter. It is only when Naimes realises this, that he thinks of the only way out: Charlemagne must send an exceptionally strong troop with Roland: *Si li truvez ki trés bien li ajut!* This advice is welcomed by everyone – except Roland himself. Not only is Charlemagne stunned by his pride, but following his example, so is clever Naimes.

But when they are riding over the pass on the way home and Charlemagne tells Naimes about his warning dream, Naimes has a better memory of the second council scene than the others; for him only one thing more is needed to make Ganelon's betrayal manifest. This is why he is the one who reacts when Ganelon tries to prevent Charlemagne from responding to the call of Roland's trumpet.

When Charlemagne collapses at the sight of Roland's body, Naimes keeps a clear head and advises him to do the only thing he can now: the enemy is not yet far away, and so Charlemagne should take his revenge on them. An adviser of this calibre is also able to organise things: thus, Charlemagne charges him and Joceran with the task of deploying the army against Baligant. However, unlike Joceran, he will not lead one of the *eschieles*, he will naturally stay within reach of the emperor, evidently because this is what Charlemagne wants him to do.

In the description of the battle, the poet wants to highlight this relationship of trust between them once more, and so he lets it culminate in complementary actions: when Baligant's son causes *grant damage* among the Franks, Naimes cuts him down, but in return he is wounded by Baligant's brother, and he would have died from the next stroke of this man's sword if Charlemagne had not saved his life. Charlemagne fulfils a liege *lord*'s most noble obligation of all, the duty to protect his men; shortly after that, when Charlemagne has killed Baligant but is himself thrown out of his saddle and wounded, Naimes stands ready with Charlemagne's horse and serves him in the way that was symbolic of the liege *man*'s duty in this period: he holds his stirrup for him.

In the surviving Song, then, Naimes is a coherent character, seemingly cast from a single mould. But outside the Baligant section (which cannot have had any impact on onomastics before 1150) he is notable only for his intelligence and is therefore not like the usual cliché of a hero, and furthermore, he is elderly; it would even be possible to tell the gist of the story of the surviving Song without mentioning him. This explains why we should expect him to have very little impact on onomastics, if any at all. Let us divide the problem into two parts: the question of the form of the name and its prehistory, and the question of his official home. I believe I can answer the first part definitively but not the second.

C.12.3 Real people and the prehistory of the name

No real persons by the name of *Naime(s)/Naimon* or MLat. *Na(i)mo* from Galloromania have been found until now; Morlet does not know the name either. In Italy, Rajna (1889, 19) found for the year 1183 a *Signum Johannis Nami* and from the middle of the 13th c. an uncertain *Naimino*, Rosellini (1958, 260) for the year 1215 a *Naimus* – all reflecting the epic but, as we might expect, thinly spread, and also chronologically not of interest to us. Förstemann only has a single *Namo* from Germania to offer, the twenty-first out of 27 witnesses in a donation dated 798 from the Wormsgau to Fulda, a very unprepossessing reference with

no particular significance; it could not seriously be suggested as the key witness proving the "existence" of the name.[1511]

I included this name in my search list from the very start, and so I combed through the Galloromance charter tradition from 778–1150 looking for him. The results are meagre, but not absolutely zero: four individuals bearing this name were found, and the two oldest were Normans.

The oldest reference is Normandie-Ducs 272 (no. 111), according to the editor from the years 1035–1048, *recte* 1035–1042: *Hunfredus Namo*, witness of a charter by the young William who was later to become the Conqueror. In an original charter by William's father Robert, in which he had donated half of the island of Guernsey to the Mont-Saint-Michel (Normandie-Ducs 211s. a. 1027–1035, no. 73), one of William's charters is inserted, in which he exchanges the donation made by his father for the islands of Sercq/Sark and Aurigny/Alderney instead. The text of the new charter was squeezed in under the text of the old one, but over the old list of witnesses, and then the new list of witnesses was added below the old list. *Hunfredus Namo* is the fifth of ten witnesses; before him we find only: the Bishop in who is responsible, namely Hugh of Avranches (since clerics generally come before all secular witnesses), *Willelmus filius Villelmi* (William 'Busac', count of Eu, a great-uncle of the young duke, cf. index of the edition, p. 558a, and Douglas 1995, 34; as a member of the duke's family he comes before the other secular witnesses) the viscount who is responsible, namely *Niellus iuvenis* of *Cotentin* (= *Nigellus*, modern Eng. *Nigel*; 'junior' to distinguish him from his father and predecessor of the same name) as well as *Haduaiardus rex* (pronounced: /adu̯e̯ardus/), the Edward who at

---

1511 Nevertheless, this has been attempted, and in fact in two different ways. First, it has been suggested (von Riezler 1892 1892, 730 n. 2), that *Namo* should be interpreted as an otherwise unattested 'taker, grasper, tearaway' (from *nëman* 'to take etc.'); this is problematic even in terms of the form, because the *nomina agentis* of this type usually have the vowel from the zero grade or (more rarely) from the present tense, so that we would expect **Numo* or **Nëmo* (cf. for example Krahe/Meid 1969, § 91.3). One could look at this name in parallel with *Grifo*, which can likewise be understood to mean 'grasper' (albeit only in a secondary sense, though quite acceptable in terms of the form). It was only a small step from there to the hypothesis that *Namo* could be a poetic alias for *Grifo*; von Riezler formulated this hyphothesis but was unwilling to rely on it as unless analogous cases of pseudonyms could be found in French heroic poetry. Secondly, Settegast (1904, 335, following Uhland) saw *Namo* as a hypocoristic form of *Nantwin* (that is to say with an infantile -*m*- < -*n[t]w*-), because in the Song of the Nibelungs (around 1200) there is a King *Nantwin*, and in the *Biterolf* (which modern scholarship dates to 1260) even a *Nantwin* of Regensburg, Duke of Bavaria. But this Nantwin is not a real historical person, and there is no reason to believe that a non-historic figure from German poetry, first attested in around 1200, could be the source of an older Romance figure, unless there are other arguments to consider as well; Settegast is also making a judgement here along Germanomaniac lines.

that time was still in Norman exile, but later became Edward the Confessor (Old Eng. *Eadweard*); another viscount signs after Hunfridus Namo, as well as other people. *Hunfredus Namo* must therefore have been a person of high status.[1512] The authenticity of the inserted charter has been disputed a few times;[1513] but the editor declares it is genuine – quite correctly as far as the content, but not the form, is concerned – because Edward as an *exulant* was in Norman eyes the rightful heir to the throne, he was called *rex* in an even older Norman charter, and because in 1048 there is evidence to show that the Mont-Saint-Michel no longer had any rights over Guernsey, which proves that the exchange had actually taken place. However, the date must be more narrowly defined as 1035–1042 (according to Keats-Rohan in Mont-Saint-Michel 86), because Edward went to England in 1042 and was crowned there in 1043.

But the charter cannot be regarded as original because of the form in which it was handed down. For example, it may have been copied two or three decades after the event from an original which is now lost, or even – in those days with almost no sense of wrongdoing – freely formulated by someone who remembered the event and wanted to make sure it was recorded in a charter. It even seems at one point to offer an incorrect reading (*Losfredus vicecomes*, with a name that is not attested anywhere else), whereas the copy in the Mont-Saint-Michel cartulary

---

1512 The seventh witness, who signs after *Hunfridus Namo* separated by one witness, is *Rogerius filius Hunfridi*. This person would appear to be Roger of Beaumont, son of Hunfrid of Vieilles; Roger († 1094) features regularly in William's charters, and in no. 128 and 129 is listed only as Hunfrid's son, so that we recognise him there only from this information; the editor makes a link from the one to the other in the index (p. 536a, 535b). Our *Hunfridus Namo* could therefore be Hunfrid of Vieilles. His father Turold of Pont-Audemer was, according to William of Jumièges (2.7), murdered when he was the orphan William's teacher (*teneri ducis paedagogus*). Hunfrid of Vieilles himself died, according to the editor (p. 334) in about 1050, according to Douglas (1995, 94) before 1047, according to the Foundations of Medieval Genealogy which uses a later source, not until after 1053 (fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/normacre.htm#_Toc87169557; last access 22.04.2022). He was apparently a follower of Richard II and III (Normandie-Ducs 117 and 122, before 1027), certainly a follower of Robert I (Normandie-Ducs 226 from 1031–1035, during which time he was already called *Unfredus vetulus*!), and (according to Douglas 1995, 94) before or around 1035 he founded the Monastery of Saint-Pierre in Préaux near Pont-Audemer, which he entered just before he died, as well as the Saint-Léger nunnery. At the time of our charter, he was one of the oldest followers of the young Duke William; if he is this person, this explains his honoured status in the list of witnesses in our charter, not only ahead of his son, but also of a viscount. In relation to the young duke, would he not be an experienced adviser *par excellence*, and thus a veritable Naimes? His epithet must then have come from the south, or at any rate have reached Normandy before 1050. If he is not this person, the timeline is later.
1513 Cf. e.g. Douglas (1995, 166).

has what is presumably the correct one (*Joffredus vicecomes*);[1514] this evidence is a strong argument against the idea that it was written down at the time when the donation was made. This means that the presence of this or that person as a witness is uncertain, but it does not affect their actual existence or their social rank. Because *Hunfridus* (> modern Eng. *Humphrey*) was a rather common name in Normandy, the previously unattested *Namo* in the nominative is more likely to be an epithet than a father's name, and as such it could have been attached to Hunfridus after the official donation, but before the copy was made. As far as the written form of the name is concerned, it seems reasonable that the scribe, who was constantly confronted with correlations such as OF *faim*, *aime* etc. ~ Lat. *famem*, *amat* etc. would have written /nãimə/ as *Namo*. This means that we actually have the name *Naime(s)* here; the fact that it appears first as an epithet, but without any appellative meaning, may be taken as an indication that it could be an epic name. At the same time, it is clear that the name even at this early date had no -*l*-; this excludes the above-mentioned etymology *Amelung*, and the only interpretation of the name that remains is *N·Aimes / N·Aimon*.[1515]

Much less commentary is required for the second reference, Delisle-Rouleaux 220, before 1113: a *Titulus Sancti Michaelis archangeli de periculo maris* includes among the dead a *Naymo monachus*. He can hardly have been born after 1090. This reference is very welcome because it protects the earlier reference from the suspicion that it might be some kind of useless Hapax. In the meantime, people had become accustomed to the name, to the extent that it was acceptable as a person's only name.

After this we find: Laon-évêques 362 a. 1144/45 *Naimo*, younger son of *Rainaldus Escossars* in Bray-en-Thiérache.

Finally, the latest reference: Fontevraud 2.610 a. 1149–1155 *Nemo, prior Laudunii* (Loudun, 20 km south of Fontevraud). The scribe who probably pronounced /nẹmə/ in the rectus can hardly have overlooked the homography with Lat. *nemo* 'no one', but he would have accepted it as a little automatic joke. The alternative would be that, without any linkage to epic names, the monks used Latin *nemo* as a nickname for their superior: 'His Nullity, our prior', but then it would be impossible to put that name into an official charter.

1514 The charter itself was destroyed in 1944, but there are several printed versions of it, as well as manuscript copies, which between them do not have any variants of the names; the oldest surviving copy is the one in the Mont-Saint-Michel, cartulary no. 7, written down in 1149–1150; cf. the Keats-Rohan edition p. 86 (and commentary p. 211!).

1515 This fact does not entitle us, however, to equate the Naimes in the Song with Hamun de Galice, as Tavernier (1914, 87s.) does, before he goes on to suspect that Raymond of Saint-Gilles is behind this name.

It is significant that three of the four bearers of this name are to be found in the epic-loving west between Anjou and Normandy. The fact that on this occasion the Normans come before the Angevins in time should be regarded as a coincidence because the numbers are so small, and all the more so because the agglutinated N· shows that it must have come from somewhere further south than Anjou.

But at this point we might ask the more general question of whether the whole development of this name could have been in the opposite direction: if *Naimon* was also known in the French-speaking area – at least in Normandy – as an unusual name, but still without any epic connotations, couldn't a poet who was looking for a name for his duke then simply have hit upon this one? The answer is no, because agglutinated *N·* (< *dominus*) was only brought from the Occitan-speaking area into the French-speaking area in names that were familiar from the epic tradition, although this does require a more detailed explanation.

It is well known that in Occitan, just as *En* can be put before any masculine name beginning with a consonant, *N·* can go before one beginning with a vowel, as a particle indicating respect: *N·Eblun* 'Sir Eble', *N·Odelon* 'Sir Odilo', *N·Antoni* 'Sir Antony'. This can lead to agglutination and occasionally even to misunderstandings, particularly in the spoken language; since medieval mss. generally do not have a way of marking the enclisis and we cannot rely upon the use of capital letters either, it is sometimes not clear, even in written Occitan, whether e.g. *nantelme* is intended to represent *N·Antelme* or *Nantelme*.[1516] Thus O. Schultz [-Gora] (1894, passim) helped to reveal that the troubadour name was *N·At de Mons* ('Sir Atto / Hatto') and not *Nat de Mons*. Since the Old French William epic (at least: also) has Occitan roots, its mss. (and their Italian derivatives) very often have *Naimeri* instead of *Aimeri* (< *Haimericus*), which is here and there even confirmed through the metre, and *Naïmer* rather than *Aïmer* (< *Hadamarus*), in both cases complete with the usual spelling and phonological variants; Gaston Paris gathered a large number of examples in a special article devoted to this material (1902b, passim).[1517]

1516 Gaston Paris, *Romania* 23 (1894), 612 cites a few Occitan examples of what he considers to be complete agglutinations, including *Nesteve*, *Narnaut* – The opposite is also possible in names beginning with *N·*: thus, Charlemagne's historical counterpart on the Byzantine imperial throne, Νικηφόρος, at that time already pronounced /nikifóros/, through Occitan interpretation became **N·Iki fors* and ended up in the phonologically similar group name + adj. as **N·Uc (lo) fors* or OF *Hugue li forz*, the Byzantine emperor in the *Pèlerinage*, (Beckmann 1971, passim). The Occitan and Spanish cases (listed above in C.12.1 under 3) of *Aymes* etc. rather than *Naymes* are almost certainly not archaisms, but back-formations.

1517 *Anthelme* and *Nanthelme* are two pre-existing Germanic names. In addition to the cases mentioned by Paris (according to Moisan s. vv.) we find *Naimeri* etc. in a supplemental verse

These forms are also to be found outside the epic tradition wherever its characters are mentioned, e.g. *Historia Walciodorensis* (probably middle of the 12th c., MGH SS. 14.505) *inclitus nobilissimusque comes Nammericus Narbonensis* 'the epic Aimeri de Narbonne', Aubri de Troisfontaines (MGH SS. 23.716, 723, 731) *Nemericus* 'id.'[1518] In the French-speaking and Italian-speaking areas, the N-forms of this name are occasionally also found referring to real people. Probably the first of these are the man named by Wace (*Rou* 3.6365 etc.), *Naimeri*, the Viscount Aimeri IV of Thouars, who fought at the Battle of Hastings, and Bishop Ademar of Le Puy, the commander of the First Crusade: Ordericus has *N'Aimarus* four times (3. 469. 485, 502, 555, 574 ed. Le Prévost), later *Haimarus* once (4.142), all in the original ms. from Saint-Évroult, whereas in Albert of Aachen only *Naimerus* appears (RHC Occ. 4.316, 328, 357), and then later in Aubri de Troisfontaines *Naimerus*, *Naymerus* (MGH SS. 23.824, 828). From my own material we can add Vendômois-Métais 101 around 1130 a *Naimarus*. The Doge of Venice elected in 1130, Petrus Polanus, had a son *Naymerius / Neimerius comes* (*Historia Ducum Venetorum* 3, MGH SS. 14.74; Rahewin, *Gesta Friderici* 4.84, MGH SS.schol. 46.341), several Ital. *Naimerius* are to be found from 1169 onwards (Rajna 1889, 51s.). In Lorraine, in the year 1214 a *Nainmeris*, and in 1251 a *Neymeri* are attested (K. Hofmann 1883, 429), in Arras in the 13th c. a *Wautier* had the epithet *Naimeri* (G. Paris 1902b, passim).

---

in the Roland mss. CV7P, in the *Enfances Vivien*, in manuscript branches of the *Narbonnais* and the *Siège de Barbastre* as well as in the Franco-Italian *Mort Charlemagne*; *Naïmer* etc. appears in the Anglo-Norman translation of the crusade report by Baudri de Bourgueil and again in Italy in the *Mort Charlemagne*, in the *Fioravante* (ed. Rajna) and in the *Nerbonesi*; in the *Folque de Candie*, *Naïmer* and *Naimeri* are more widely distributed than Paris thought (ed. Schultz-Gora, 3.403 and 437). One case, which Paris could not yet know, is particularly interesting: the *Aimeris / Aemeris* in the *Chanson de Guillaume* I 298, 1438 is the same person as the *Neimeri* (2x) / *Nemeri / Neemeri / Naimeri* in the *Chanson de Guillaume* II 2553, 2557, 2626, 2932, 3167.

1518 As far the two characters, the Duke Naimes/Naimon and the Duke (H)Aimon, father of the Haimon children, are concerned, Aubri de Troisfontaines warns against confusing them with the words (MGH SS. 23.723): *Naaman, dux Bawarie cum 10000* [from the PT]. *Non est iste dux Haymo, qui quattuor habuit filios, Renaldum, Alardum, Richardum et Guichardum* [. . .] (reference to this in van Waard, 1937, 91.) There are a few good reasons why Aubri explains; for (and van Waard also points this out) in pseudo-Benedict of Peterborough, *Gesta* (2.115 ed. Stubbs; shortly after 1200), the *filii Neimundi* are clearly the children of Haimon; moreover, according to Moisan (s. v.) *Naime de Dordone* is to be found in the *Aquilon de Bavière* and *Nauim aff Darden* is in the Danish *Kong Olger Danskes Krønike* (16th c.). Moreover, in V4 and CV7 of the Rol., *Hamun (de Galice)* – as in O, similarly in K and P – is confused with *Naimes* and becomes *Naimon* or *Nemon*. But both cases show a confusion of two epic figures, not the emergence of an N-form without any epic assistance.

But what did not exist – and this is what matters – were forms in the French-speaking area such as **Nodon* (or even just: **N·Odon*), **Nalbert*, **Nevrar*t etc., because there was no assistance from the epic tradition. It is therefore also improbable that in the middle of the 11th c. a *Naimon < N·Aimon* from further south would have found its way into Normandy, unless it had some kind of epic associations attached to it. And the only conceivable epic association from this early period is precisely Naimes' position as a duke and as Charlemagne's faithful adviser.

C.12.4 Naimes' Duchy

In twenty of the 28 instances of this name, the poet includes the title of Duke. The question of where Duke Naimes' fiefdom was located remains unresolved. The poet withholds this information from us, as he does in the cases of Roland, Olivier and Ganelon. But just as in reality there could not have been a duke if there was no duchy, so it must surely have been for the original Naimes. The PT, which we have come to recognise as a textual witness of similar worth in the genesis of the Roland material, introduces a new problem: the majority of the mss. call him *dux Baioarie* 'of Bavaria',[1519] but in a few of the mss. (in at least one of two places in the text) *dux Baione* 'of Bayonne';[1520] evidently the similarity between *-ri-* and *-n-* has played a role in this. It is debatable which of the two belongs in the archetype.[1521] And finally, in a legendary episode (MGH SS. 9.400) in what was once called the *Abbreviatio gestorum Franciae regum* by Dom Brial (in Bouquet 17, 432–434) and sometimes still is referred to as such, later renamed by Waitz, the editor of the MGH *Historia regum Francorum monasterii sancti Dionysii*, which deals with material relating to approximately a decade after 1108, but may have been written several decades later, Duke Naimo is referred to as *primicerius*

1519 According to Moisan (s. v. *Naimes*) this was carried over into most translations of the PT and into Aubri de Troisfontaines, Vincent de Beauvais, Jan de Klerk and Jacopo d'Acqui.

1520 According to Moisan (s. v. *Naimes*) this was carried over as *Raaman* [sic], Duke of *Baiona*, into the Gallegan translation of the PT as *Naaman, dux Boyonie*, into the Latin summary of the *Roman d'Arles* and as *Naagra* [sic], *le dux de Baiona*, into the Occitan *Roman de Saint-Trophime*.

1521 A posthumous article by Adalbert Hämel (1955, passim) made ready for publication by Hans Rheinfelder attempted to show that in the PT, *dux Baione* is the original title. But as H.-W. Klein (1986, 148, and 1987, 176) realised, Hämel's data on the readings of the mss. are partially incorrect. I recently tried, in a very technical discussion that I will not repeat here, to show that *Naimes* was more likely to have been *dux Baioarie* in the archetype of the PT (Beckmann 2011, 38–44).

Wasconumque dux under Charlemagne.[1522] Until further information is available, then, we must keep both possibilities, Bayonne and Bavaria, in mind.

One possibility is that Naimes was Duke of the Basque country from the very beginning. This would mean that his character was invented in the Basque country itself, probably around 1020–1030, when public interest in Charlemagne began to increase significantly and when growing numbers of pilgrims on their way to Compostela were talking about him and his Spanish campaign. The local people wanted to position themselves as being on Charlemagne's side, and so a fictitious Basque Duke N·Aimes was inserted into Charlemagne's court.

The other possibility is that Naimes was Duke of Bavaria from the very beginning. Invented in the southern half of France – and yet Duke of Bavaria? If we confine ourselves to 11th c. parameters, and therefore also to the range of options that could lead to a consensus, there is only **one** catalyst for such an occurrence, and that is a diplomatic stroke of genius on the part of a man we have met before: Geoffroy Martel of Anjou. Through his marriage to Agnes, the widow of William V of Aquitaine-Poitou, he could act in large areas of the southwest as the *de facto* ruler; as such he founded, together with his wife, the nunnery of Notre-Dame de Saintes in 1047, for example. But his ambition went even further: in 1043 he married his stepdaughter Agnes of Poitou and Aquitaine to the German Henry III, who was co-regent with his father from 1028, sole ruler from 1039, and emperor from 1046; the marriage enhanced the position of both parties in the eyes of King Henry I of France, against whom (even though Henry was his supreme feudal lord) Geoffrey took up arms as an ally of the emperor in 1049. Henry III was from 1027–1042, that is to say, for fifteen years until just before his marriage, Duke of Bavaria, and he again had this title (alongside his title as emperor) in 1047–1049; from 1053–1055 the title of duke nominally belonged to Henry and Konrad, the sons of Henry and Agnes; and finally Agnes, who had already been Duchess of Bavaria between 1047–1049 through her husband, even

---

1522 This legend was also discussed by Hämel (1955, 4ss.). I would like to raise an important and thus far undiscovered circumstance relating to this. Only two of the mss. of this *Abbreviatio/Historia* (cf. MGH SS. 9.341, 343, 349) are from the 12th c.: Leiden BPL 20 (not used by Waitz) and Bern Burgerbibliothek (Bongarsiana) 90 (used by Waitz and labelled "2"). The Leiden ms. was written by about 1139 (at the latest cf. *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, ed. van Houts (1992–1995, I, p. CIXs.) "c. 1139"; Dr. van Houts confirmed this dating to me in an email of the 15. 03. 2010, and I would like to express my thanks here once again for her precision. But I discovered to my surprise when examining a copy of the whole ms., the episode in question is missing (it would have been expected to appear in f. 55v° b, lower third – f. 56r° a, upper half). Since the episode appears to be stylistically very different from the surrounding text (and not in a good way) I think it has been inserted into the *Historia*. Admittedly, this still tells us nothing from the 12th c. about the age of the Bern ms., which it contains in f. 134v°.

took control of the Duchy after his death in 1056 as imperial administrator – and this certainly would have been admired and seen as a good thing in France, at least in Agnes' homeland of Aquitaine. The Charlemagne epic had no need of a German king nor especially emperor, but a Duke of Bavaria would have been very welcome;[1523] he could not be called *Henri* because that was the name of King Henry I of France; it is probable, therefore, that someone from Aquitaine randomly,[1524] but giving him the respect that was his due, named him *N·Aimes /* *N·Aimon* 'dominus Haimo'.

[1523] We must always beware of the idea that after the empire was divided in 840, Bavaria would have more or less dropped out of view for people in Galloromania. For example, King Lothar of France forged an alliance with Duke Henry 'the Quarrelsome' of Bavaria against Emperor Otto III in 984–985 (cf. Uhlirz 1954, 12ss., 27s., 52s.). In Ademar of Chabannes († 1034) we read that [in 877] after the death of Charles the Bald [sic] the *Baioarii* and Alemanni had elected *Oto* as their king [a. 939], who then defeated the Lombards, and after his *Baioarii* achieved a major victory over the *Romani* he was crowned as emperor by the Pope (version α 1 and 63, βγ 3.20, 3.22); furthermore, that this *Oto* had also provided support to Charles [the Simple, deposed in 923, † 929], so that an army from *Francia* and *Baioaria* was able to kill Robert [I of France] (α 73); moreover, Ademar's *sanctus Bruno de Osburg civitate que est in Bavaria* (βγ 3.22) is a composite figure made from Bishop Bruno of Augsburg (1006–1029) and Saint Bruno, missionary bishop and martyr in the land of the Prussians († 1009). Ademar is of course more reliable when it comes to events he has experienced himself, as when he reports that Count William [IV Taillefer] of Angoulême [in the year 1026] went to Jerusalem *per Baioariam* and Hungary (α 326, βγ 3.65), which was quite unusual at that time, because Hungary had been Christianised just a few decades before. Raoul Glaber († around 1047) on the other hand, believes that the best remedy for the burning disease (soon to be called St. Anthony's Fire) was to call upon Saint Martin of Tours, Saint *Odolricus* (Ulrich) *Bajoariorum* and Saint Maiolus of Cluny (*hist.* 2.7.14), and that 'in the year 1000 after the passion of Christ' the Lutici had completely devastated the *provintias Saxonum ac Baioariorum*, until the emperor, even though he lost some of his own men, defeated them (*hist.* 4.8.23).

[1524] A radical traditionalist would not be satisfied with this explanation, however. During Charles Martel's lifetime, there was an Alemannic Duke *Hnabi*, usually called *Nabi* (in Ger. in the late 8th c. > *Nebi*, Frankish and Low Ger. with *-v-*, cf. Förstemann s. v.). He maintained friendly relations with Charles Martel; when just before 720 the young St. Gall was threatened by local forces, he sent Abbot Otmar to Charlemagne so that he could take St. Gall into his immediate protection (recounted in Walahfrid's *Vita Sancti Galli* 2.10, MGH SS.mer. 4.319), in 724 he facilitated the founding of Reichenau through Pirmin from Burgundy by sending him to Charlemagne too (accounted in the *Chronicon* by Herimann of Reichenau for the year 724, MGH SS. 5.98). after Nabi there were other dukes who were hostile to the Franks, until 744 Carloman and Pippin integrated Alemannia into the Frankish empire. Nabi's daughter Imma married the Frankish Count Rotbert who was installed in Alemannia; their children were Charlemagne's wife Hildegard and her brother Gerold, whom Charlemagne made Prefect of Bavaria when in 788 he deposed Thassilo Duke of Bavaria, and Gerold kept this Duke-like office until he died in battle against the Avars in 799. Gerold was also related to the Bavarian Duke's family through the Alemannic Duke's family, and this certainly made him more acceptable to the

He could have come into the Angevin core Rol. in the years from 1045–1055 alongside Marsilĭe, Ganelon and Turpin either as a Basque or as a Bavarian.

C.12.5 Review of Naimes

The figure of Charlemagne's adviser Naimes (< *N·Aimes*) was created before or around 1050 in southern France, and in fact in Gascony, if Naimes was a Basque duke from the very beginning, or alternatively in Aquitaine, if he was a Bavarian duke from the very beginning; this character probably became a part of the Angevin core Rol. in around 1045–1055.

C.13 Olivier and Roland: the pair of names

Since pairs of names, mostly names of brothers, present a stronger argument than the occurrence of single names, they will be discussed first.

We shall start with a word about the literary foundations. It was Curtius (1938, passim) who rightly recognised that Roland and Olivier embody the very ancient contrast between *fortitudo* and *sapientia*. But one detail should not be lost (it seems somewhat inadequately appreciated e.g. in Delbouille's critical reference to Curtius, 1954, 103–105): if we exclude from the large number of references for this *topos* those dealing with the two virtues abstractly and without a surrounding narrative, and secondly those attributing both virtues to the same person, often in a facile, adulatory fashion, then all that remains, with one notable exception that we

---

Bavarians. The pair of friends Charles [Martel] – Nabi, Duke of Alemannia, therefore corresponded to the pair of Charlemagne – Gerold, quasi-Duke of Bavaria, and as quite often happens in the Old French epic tradition (we can think of Raimbalt de Frise or Morant de Riviers), a constellation around Charles Martel could be transplanted into the time of Charlemagne, except that Bavaria took the place of Alemannia when that happened. This results in a pair of friends Charlemagne – *Nabi, Duke of Bavaria. In MLat., Germanic names ending in *-i* could be Latinised with an *-io* ending; e.g. Abbot Sturmi of Fulda is in Charlemagne's original diploma (MGH DK 1.163 no 116 a. 777) twice in the nominative *Sturmio abba*, then in the dat. *Sturmioni abbati*. Therefore, we would have (with Frankish *-v-*) *Navio / Navionem*. In OF at that time there was no longer a labial + /j/ > /dž/ (like *diluvium > deluge* etc.) in late borrowings, but the /j/ bypassed the labial (as in *fluvium* > OF *fluive > flueve*, *graphion* > OF *graife > greffe*). Therefore: *Naive(s)/ Naivon*. Since these forms did not appear as real names, and they were etymologically completely isolated, in the Galloromanian south they were attracted by (or reinterpreted as) *N·Aime(s)/N·Aimon*. Everything else is as above. This hypothesis would have the advantage that the name is historical and not freely invented.

will outline below, are just episodes and not epics. In the Rol. however, this contrast is structurally important: the way Roland behaves at Roncevaux determines the fate of the twenty thousand men under his command. If there had only been *sapientes* like Olivier, Roncevaux would not have happened, and the Song would never have existed either. The poet could not have known about the single exception to the rule: the *Iliad* – and even here, the Rol. is different in one important respect. In the *Iliad*, the contrast between Achilles and Agamemnon (or Odysseus) is very nearly obscured by all the riches of the poem's narrative; over long passages, the relationship between the two enemies, Achilles and Hector, carries more human emotion and is more poetically productive. In the core part of the Rol., on the other hand, the contrast between the pair is very clearly carved out as a polar decision between death and life until it is finally and all the more convincingly "set aside" when the two heroes are reconciled. And precisely this reconciliation was the precondition that allowed parents to name a pair of sons after *both* of them.

This brings us to the pairs of names! I have consciously refrained from presenting a preliminary research report here, because it would have to bring up a great amount of material that resolves itself in the following analysis, and it would complicate the most important thing, which is the chronological order of references in the 11th/12th c. Instead, I list the references in this chronological order (in such a way that when dates can only be established across a range, I date them in the middle), and I cite only the person who discovered each reference. An asterisk * before the order number of a reference means it is probably (or certainly) not recognisable as a pair of brothers, and a circle ° means it is accepted with some kind of qualification.

C.13.1 The pairs 1–7

*1 Brioude 307 a. 1011–1031 witnesses S. *Bonpar*, *S. Oliverii*, S. *Rodlandi* (Lejeune 1950b, 377 with n.2.). Time parameters: King Robert I 999–1031, Abbacy of *Eurardus* (or *Curardus*?) from 1011 onwards. Donation by Abbot Eurardus for the salvation of his soul, and that of his son *Curardus* (or *Eurardus*) and that of *Biliardis*. Lejeune thinks Curardus and Biliardis are deceased, and so the witnesses would be their surviving relatives (and Oliverius and Rodlandus were most likely brothers). Lecoy (163, 117s.) largely undermined this logic: in charter no. 106 (p. 123) in the same cartulary, the same abbot makes another donation, but the witnesses are *Bompar* (obviously the same person as the one mentioned above), *Poncius* and *Stephanus*. A benefactor occasionally calls upon witnesses

who include a pair of brothers not related to himself,[1525] but it is of course many times more common for two witnesses standing next to each other not to be brothers. This is far more likely in this case, too. Therefore, the reference attests the co-existence of the two names in the same space and time, but we cannot use it as evidence of a pair of brothers.[1526]

*2 Lérins 1.70 a.1038–1062 *Rollanus Truannus firmavit, Dodonus firmavit, Oliverius firmavit.* (Lejeune 1950b, 377 with n. 1.) Lejeune's dating range of 1026–1069 was narrowed down by Aebischer (1952a, 671s.) to 1038–1062, with the suggestion that the date is actually nearer to 1062. Lejeune believed that the three witnesses were members of the benefactor's family "car ils garantissent le legs". But the last sentence immediately before the signatures reads only: *Et ut hoc testamentum nostre auctoritatis firmum ac stabile in perpetuum maneat, manibus propriis firmo et testibus roborandum trado.* Here, as elsewhere, the 'witnesses' only 'affirm' the reality and the content of the legal act through their signature or its equivalent and undertake to bear witness accordingly in the future; they do not undertake to guarantee that the content will be followed or the instructions carried out. The conclusion that they are related to the benefactor is therefore not justified. Aebischer rightly emphasises the fact that Roland *Truannus* is also attested elsewhere, namely with his brothers *Isnardus* and *Petrus*, but there are no traces elsewhere of an Olivier in the family. This reference, like the last one, provides useful proof that the two names coexisted, but because of the *Dodonus* sandwiched between them, it is even less likely to signify a pair of brothers than the previous reference.

3 Marseille 1.510s. (no. 515), undated, possibly not until around 1079–1085: benefactor family *Poncius Mairastra et filii ejus Bertrannus et Isnardus, Rollannus, Olivers.* (Dated by editor Guérard as 'circa 1055'; there is more on this below. Cited by Boissonnade 1923, 371 for a different purpose, recognised as relevant by Mireaux 1943, 113s., rejected with superficial argumentation by Burger 1948–1949, 433, also mentioned by Lejeune 1950b, 373.) This document in the large cartulary of Saint-Victor de Marseille was discussed in an article in the Marseille journal *Vérité* of the 11.10. 1946 entitled *Marseille et la Chanson de*

1525 Cf. below the pairs of brothers from Saint-Pé (a. 1096) and Jerusalem (a. 1138).
1526 Aebischer initially expressed serious reservations about this reference (1952a, 675, 1952b, 326), but he later accepted it without hesitation (1955, 223ss., and [1966] 1967, 153s.), because by then the Olivier-Roland order fitted in with his ideas. We must reject this conclusion because there are only two possible ways of ordering the names, and so even in the case of unrelated individuals, the chance of either order being used is 50%, which is unacceptably high.

Roland and written by local historian Eugène-H. Duprat. In this article, and later in a letter to McMillan, the author characterised it as *faux éhonté*, a judgement that was uncritically accepted – along the lines of the maxim *Massilia locuta, causa finita* – by McMillan (1952, passim), Delbouille (1954, 115s.) and Lecoy (1963, 117), whereas Aebischer hesitated for a time (1952a, 672ss.) before finally ([1960b] 1967, [1966] 65s., 155s.) casting the reference aside, not so much because of the question surrounding its authenticity, but rather because he thought there were uncertainties around the dating of it. In view of the accusation of forgery, we will have to subject the document to a very careful examination.

Let us begin with something that looks like a side issue: when was the charter actually put into the cartulary? According to the editor Guérard (1857) the cartulary came into being around the turn of the 11th to 12th c., according to de Manteyer (1899–1904, 2.485) after 1099, perhaps after 1110, perhaps even after 1155, according to Duprat at the end of the 12th c. (as he claims in 1941a, 178 n. 44), or after 1119 (as he claims in 1945–1946, 32 n. 7), or possibly after 1150, at any rate after 1119 (as he claims in 1946 in the *Vérité*).

Fortunately, we now have a much more precise and reliable answer thanks to the research carried out by Monique Zerner, a student of Georges Duby, and (now Emeritus) Professor of Medieval History (especially of southern France) at the University of Nice; she followed the principle *Retour aux manuscrits!* in her three long articles about the cartulary (Zerner 1993, 2006 and 2009). In the first article (1993, 216s. with n. 4) she points out that almost 150 charters in the cartulary can be compared with their surviving originals, and that the cartulary is "particulièrement précieux pour les historiens de la Provence" because it comes out well after this comparison; with the possible exception of the celebratory introductory charters, contained in the first five folios (on these among others Zerner 1999, 524s. and 532–538; 2006, 188–201; 2009, 309–322), there is no sign of the systematic forgeries or fraudulent alterations that Duprat claimed to have identified (cf. below for more on this). The cartulary in its original form (that is to say with the exception of those few items that have visibly been copied into it later) incontrovertibly came into being between 1080 and 1100 (Zerner 1993, 219 and passim; cf. also 1999, 523, 526; 2006, 165, 171–173; 2009, 302–305; since then Magnani 1999, 266–268, and Mazel 2002, 170–174, argue even for a slightly earlier creation date between 1070 and 1100). The layers numbered 15–17, which relate to possessions of the Marseilles monastery in the Diocese of Fréjus, are not all written by one and the same hand, but no change of hand coincides with a change of layers, which suggests that they were written "complètement et jusqu'au bout d'origine", that is to say at the time when the cartulary was first put together; in particular, layer no. 15 which is relevant to us contains 47 items, but none of them have been added later (Zerner 1993, 224s., 242).

I also contacted Professor Zerner by email in order to make sure that my understanding of these details, some of which are very technical, was indeed correct. Her reply of 06. 09. 2008, for which I am most grateful, stated among other things: "Donc, je confirme plus fermement encore que jadis que le premier cahier de Fréjus où se trouve votre acte (n°515) a très probablement été copié entre 1079 et 1085. [L'acte] ne fait en aucun cas partie de ces actes qui ont été copiés après coup, probablement à partir de 1095 [. . .]". She also informs me that she does not understand why Duprat, "dont l'hypercriticisme a fait d'autres dégâts" believed our document was a forgery.

We must hold on to this interim conclusion: whether the contents of the document are genuine or a forgery, it was put into the cartulary in the late 11th c. – and in fact probably shortly before 1085. Since the following references to pairs of brothers no. 4–6 are preserved only as copies, this leaf from the cartulary of Saint-Victor is actually the oldest piece of parchment in the world with a mention of the pair of brothers Roland and Olivier, the order of names here being RO.

Let us turn to the contents! It is an undated document in two parts. The first part is a charter in which a married couple hands over a piece of land in Salernes (Département Var, Diocese of Fréjus, as the crow flies, about 75 km east-northeast of Marseille), in return for services rendered and a mule, to Lautardus Mairastra *et filiis suis et filias* [sic]. As Aebischer (1952a, 672ss.) clearly demonstrated, this legal transaction took place before 1050. The second part reads:

> *Istam kartam et terram quę in ea scripta est donavit et vendidit Poncius Mairastra et filii ejus Bertrannus et Isnardus, Rollannus, Olivers ab integro ad sanctam Mariam sanctumque Victorem et ad monachos ejus. Dedit eis in precio Willelmus, prior qui fuit de Belveder, unum semodium de annona et unum feltrum, et ipsi dederunt omnia quę in ea terra sunt, quę modo sunt vineę, decimum, gardia, obedimentum.*
>
> *Poncius Massilius firmat. Poncius, Feraldus, Disderius, Geraldus firmaverunt, et Ugo firmat, et ipsi firmaverunt et firmant.*

Poncius Mairastra (who is not the same person as Poncius Massilius) and his sons therefore transfer, along with the piece of land, *istam kartam* 'the charter cited in the text above' (the donation to Lautardus Mairastra), so that the monastery can always prove that the Mairastra family making the donation had come into possession of the land legally. *De facto* it is now a donation from Poncius and his sons to the monastery; but since in the Middle Ages an exchange, or mutual gifting between two people was considered more difficult to challenge than a one-sided handover, it was possible to characterise a donation formally as an exchange through the giving of some small gifts in return; once these had been accepted, the transaction became legally binding. In this case,

therefore, Poncius along with his sons *donavit* (as far as the content was concerned) *et vendidit* (as far as the formal procedure was concerned) the piece of land, and the Prior gave them *in pretio* half a bushel of corn (a little over four litres) and a felt blanket.

Poncius is therefore the heir of Lautardus, and since Lautardus can hardly have outlived all of his *filii et filiae*, Poncius is not a lateral relative, but a descendant. This also explains why the passing down of the land from Lautardus to Poncius is not mentioned: it was self-evidently legitimate. Poncius Mairastra also appears in charters no. 493, 495, 500, 502 (this charter is a. 1054 with the correct indiction VII), 505, 506, 507 (Poncius with two brothers and son Bertrannus together donate a piece of land for the monastery), 511 (Poncius and son Bertrannus exchange a piece of land with the monastery, dated 1055 with the correct indiction VIII), 512 (Poncius exchanges a piece of land with the monastery), 516 (Poncius and one of his brothers each exchange a piece of land with the monastery, whereby upon their respective deaths, however, the exchange becomes a donation to the monastery) and 521 (Poncius and his son Bertrannus, who apparently on this occasion enters Saint-Victor as a novice or as a monk,[1527] pass a piece of land, which Poncius has just received in return for good service to his lord, to the monastery as a gift, but retain the use of it until the death of either one of them, whichever comes first).[1528] Judging by the relatively short period between the two dated charters by Lautardus, Poncius is probably his son, and not his grandson, especially since he already has an adult son Bertrannus.[1529] But in the charter of 1055 there is not yet any indication that Bertrannus has a special relationship with the monastery, as we might expect, if he was already a novice or a monk there; he may well have been e.g. between 15 and 18 years old in 1055.

The editor Guérard estimates that the undated charters in this group should be dated 'around 1055', although we should be aware that in the cartulary as a whole, the charters are geographically ordered, but within the geographical

---

1527 "Et ego Bertrannus supradictus dono anima mea [sic] et corpus meum Domino Deo et sanctę Marię sanctoque Victori martiri in manu supradicti prioris (*scil.* Willelmi)." This cannot be referring to his entry into a feudal dependency or personal bondage, because neither of these include the person's soul. It must mean that Bertrannus enters Saint-Victor or its priory, either as a novice or already as a monk.

1528 In the charters for which I give no indication of the content, Poncius is either a witness or the owner of a neighbouring piece of land mentioned only because it marks the boundary of the piece of land that is being donated; if I do not supply a date, the charter is undated.

1529 This last factor in particular makes Aebischer's assumption ([1966] 1967, 156) unlikely, that Poncius could be his grandson, and that the document would therefore have to be dated much later.

categories they are not even in vaguely chronological order; since there are twelve charters altogether with the name of Poncius Mairastra in them, their distribution in time could be much broader than this. Bertrannus appears three times as the only son (including once in 1055), but in our charter he is the first of four. If our charter is genuine, then he is probably the eldest, and at the time of the three other charters, his brothers would not have been adults, or perhaps they would not yet have been born. Male sexual reproduction in the Middle Ages quite often continued for thirty years or more, and since many women died in childbirth, second marriages by men were very common.[1530] If Bertrannus was born in around 1040, then Rollannus and Olivers could have been born – probably from a second marriage – in around 1065–1070; it is impossible to tell whether Isnardus was born from the first or the second marriage, and when exactly he was born. The text of our charter could have been written in around 1080–1085, that is to say it could virtually have coincided with the creation of the cartulary. In particular, the noticeable change in tense between *firmaverunt* and *firmat* in relation to the monastic witnesses and the even more noticeable change in *ipsi firmaverunt et firmant* in relation to the benefactors may not have been coincidental; it may imply that the event described in it had been legally enacted in two stages at two different times, e.g. in such a way that some of the benefactors or potential objectors would only have reached the age of majority at a later date (e.g. shortly before the charter was put into the cartulary) and would now retroactively assert their agreement; in the meantime, the Prior Willelmus had died (*qui fuit*). This would explain the strange position of the *et* in one of two ways. Either Isnardus comes from the second marriage, and the *et* separates 'child from the first marriage' from 'children from the second marriage' (these three would then be in asyndeton). Or alternatively, the original charter applied initially only to Bertrannus and Isnardus from the first marriage, and later – perhaps not until shortly before it was copied into the cartulary – the agreement of the two other children was obtained, both of whom

---

1530 I repeat here something I noted elsewhere (2010, 158 n. 3): for example, Charlemagne (* more likely in 747 than 742) fathered a child in 770 and again in 807, Louis the Pious (* 778) in 794 and in 823, Lothar I. (* 795) in 825 and again in 853, Charles the Bald (* 823) in 844 and again in 876, cf. K. F. Werner 1967, especially the fold-out table at the end of the book. There is no reason to assume that the Carolingian royal family enjoyed exceptional reproductive powers; but in this family we have a particularly large amount of documentation, whereas birth dates in other families are not as accurately documented, we often cannot work out the exact dates, and lists of children are perhaps incomplete. – We know that second marriages by men were frequent from the large number of genealogies maintained by the nobility; cf. the Foundation for Medieval Genealogy, Medieval Lands www.fmg.ac passim.

came from the second marriage, and whose names *Rollannus, Olivers* were added asyndetically.

We turn now to Duprat's forgery hypothesis! In his letter to McMillan, Duprat provided no justification for his claim, but only referred to his article in the *Vérité* and other work he had done. I doubt that any of the French specialists has ever read them. I read them (and a few more works by Duprat) and quickly grew more and more sceptical;[1531] only the *Histoire de l'Église de Marseille de 780 à 1053*, which at that time was supposed to be *sous presse*, was never published. In the article in the *Vérité* it is immediately obvious that Duprat approaches the question of authenticity, not as a historian *tout court*, but looking at Romance philological studies, and in so doing he builds a circular argument: he implicitly interprets Boissonnade's dating of the Rol. to 1118 as if there had never been any notable Roncevaux legend before that time; from there, he attempts above all to show that the charter was written after this date; if so, it draws upon the Song and is a *faux éhonté*. But if the forger had just learned from the Song that Roland and Olivier were persons of Charlemagne's time, what did he gain by placing them (or a homonymous pair) in Poncius Mairastra's family? Duprat seems never to have asked himself this obvious question.

His main theme is the fact that the bishops of Marseille along with the canons of their Cathedral of St. Marie took refuge in the Monastery of Saint-Victor during troubled times in the 9th and 10th c., and the bishops became simultaneously abbots of the monastery, but afterwards, when the two institutions were separated again in the 11th c., the monks retained not only the double patronage of St. Marie and St. Victor, but also the joint archive and with it the

---

1531 In connection with our case I looked through the following publications by Duprat, Eugène-H.: *Étude de la charte marseillaise de 1040, relative à la consécration de l'église Saint-Victor de Marseille*, Bulletin philologique et historique (à 1610) du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques 1922–1923, 27–33; *Le Haut Moyen Âge (406–1113)*, in: *Les Bouches-du-Rhône, Encyclopédie départementale*, ed. Paul Masson, vol. 2, Paris, Champion, 1924, 105–302, especially 209ss.; *L'Église de Marseille et l'abbaye de Saint-Victor à l'époque carolingienne (Réponse provisoire à M. L.-H. Labande)*, Mémoires de l'Institut Historique de Provence 4 (1927), 87–93 (where Duprat in p. 93 n. 1 describes himself as *un soldat sans grade de l'humble armée des chercheurs*); *Un évêque inconnu du Xe siècle*, Revue historique de l'Église de France 1941, 165ss. (=1941a); *Les Aliscamps*, Mémoires de l'Institut Historique de Provence 18 (1941), 87–157 (=1941b); *La légende de Saint-Victor*, Mémoires de l'Institut Historique de Provence 20 (1943–-1944), 66–94, 21 (1945–1946), 3–40; finally also O. de Guymove (according to the library catalogue a pseudonym for Eugène-H. Duprat), *Tauroentum: Le Brusq-Six-Fours ou l'abbé Saglietto déchaîné*, Marseille, "chez l'auteur", 1938, an extremely unedifying (and in spirit extremely un-French) polemic: his opponent is asked whether he had the Church's *imprimatur,* whether he was a naturalised Frenchman etc.

opportunity to alter charters which benefitted the Cathedral or the conjoined institutions, by inserting a small supplement in such a way that they would now benefit the monastery.

As it happens, in our charter the donation does go *ad sanctam Mariam sanctumque Victorem et ad monachos ejus*; but even if *et ad monachos eius* were a forged insertion here, according to the accepted principles of research in this field, this would not suffice to call the whole charter into question; quite the opposite, in fact: precisely if this phrase were added in, it would give the monks every reason to copy the rest of the text accurately, in order to ensure that it would still look authentic from that time onwards.[1532]

But Duprat did not stop there: he went on to carry out what can only be described as an act of violence: he simply declared in the *Vérité* that another few dozen charters were suspect because he could not match the people named in them with family trees; he claimed that some people bore *des noms fantaisistes*. But it is an everyday occurrence in charter research to find it impossible to put together a family tree, first because members can be missing, and secondly, because the principle of naming people after others in the family makes it difficult to tell the generations apart, or sometimes even cousins! Putting *noms fantaisistes* into a charter would be a very dangerous thing to do, because at the time of the forgery (which with the benefit of modern scholarship we can put at 1085 at the latest) there would still have been older people who remembered the family relationships that were in place around the time of Poncius' legal acts (very probably around 1055 at the earliest). On the other hand, we must count the possibility that Rollanus and Olivers were born around 1065–1070. If this is correct, then this evidence is not much older than the following one (no.4), and so it does not affect the chronology very much; however, the RO order is interesting.

4 Béziers 119 a. 1091 *Olivarius et Rodlandus*, brothers. (Lejeune 1950b, 376; generally accepted, as are the following references.)

5 Angers-S.Aubin 1.350 a. 1082–1106 *Oliverius et Rolandus*, sons of *Girardus de Monte Alivo* (Montalais, 30 km east-northeast of Angers) agree to a donation on the part of their father to the Priory of Gouis belonging to Saint-Aubin of Angers (Jenkins [2]1928, p. LXXXVI.)

[1532] Menéndez Pidal (1960, 356) looked at this case and came to this same conclusion, but as a result was accused by Lecoy (1963, 117) of being uninformed. However, in this case, even the *et ad monachos ejus* is not suspicious; because the 'Prior' and his priory can only belong to the monastery, and the willingness of the family to make donations was obviously directed at the nearby monastic priory rather than to the distant cathedral, which belonged to a different diocese.

6 Béarn 356 a. 1096 *Oliuer de Arborcaue, Rodlan, son frere*, in Saint-Pé-de-Bigorre alias -de-Genérès (Hautes-Pyrénées, 10 km west of Lourdes). (Boissonnade 1923, 318 n. 2 and 336; its relevance was first recognised by Lot 1928, 372, 379.)

7 Bretagne-Évêchés 4.390s. a. 1108 *Gaufredus*,[1533] Lord of Dinan, and his evidently oldest son *Oliverius*, with the agreement of Gaufredus' other sons *Wilhelmus, Rollandus, Goscelin*, contribute to a donation made by Bishop *Benedictus* of Alet for the Marmoutier of Tours. (Discovered by the Celtic specialist Francis Gourvil, and publicised by Aebischer 1955, 228.)

C.13.2 The names *Riuallon/Ruuallon/Rualent* etc., *Roland* and *Olivier* especially in the Dinan dynasty

I am afraid the relationship between the name forms *Riuallon/Ruuallon/Rualent* etc. on the one hand and *Roland* on the other, especially in the family of Lords of Dinan require a more detailed investigation, especially with reference to pairs of names. For if these name forms had been regarded as variants of the name *Roland* in the middle of the 11th c., then there would be a pair of brothers named Olivier and Roland in Brittany, whose elder brother would have to have been born before 1056, making this possibly the oldest reference to such a pair.

Boissonnade (1923, 318s.) famously thought that even outside this family, the many instances of *Rualend, Rual(l)en, Ruel(l)enn* (found frequently in the cartulary of the Mont-Saint-Michel) were *les formes françaises* (not even *bretonnes!)* of the Germ. name *Hruolandus* (or rather *Hruodlandus*), i.e. of the name *Roland*. With this amount of generalisation and with such an explanation, this is obviously absurd; in fact, *Riuallon/Rualent* etc. is a widely used and genuinely Celtic name. Instances are found in Wales: such as the British king from before recorded history (Lat.) *Rivallo*, son of *Cunedagius*, in Geoffrey of Monmouth, and also a *Rhiwallon*, son of Urien, who (according to J. Loth 1910, 110) was venerated as a saint in Wales, and two people called *Riwallawn* in the Mabinogion (J. Loth 1913, vol. 2, index); in Brittany the name appears first belonging to two historical men called *Riuallonus*, father and son of King Salomon (*Chronique de Nantes*, ed. Merlet for the year 857), a *Rivelen*, who was perhaps Salomon's brother (Chédeville/Guillotel 1984, index), and (according to J. Loth, 1910, 110) a *Saint Rivalain*,

---

1533 Aebischer accidentally writes *Gemfredus*, which, as far as I am aware, does not exist as a name.

venerated in Melraud (Morbihan);[1534] it soon became one of the most common Breton names.[1535] In a kind and detailed letter of the 18. 08. 1966, Canon François Falc'hun, Professor of Celtic Studies at the University of Rennes, who died in 1991, explained the phonetic development of this name to me. In Breton, the development *iw > ü* or *u* occurs in other words, e.g.: *riv(us) > ru*, *diwall > dual*. Secondly, the vocalisation of the unstressed final syllable *-on* is exceptionally unstable, so that in the cartulary of Redon the name *Wigo(n)* appears as *Guigon*, *Guegon*, *Guegant*, *Guegandus*, *Gueguentus* etc. Thirdly, at the end of a word there is an obvious "tendance à confondre /nt/ ou /nd/ avec *-nn* (ou *-n* après voyelle non accentuée)" which Falc'hun had already discussed on a previous occasion (1951, 77, 3) and which explains the unetymological stop in *Guenguent(us),* and so also in *Rualent*. Finally, the *-ue-* in the first syllable, which Falc'hun does not mention, is well attested as a variant of *-ua-* at least from the late 11th c. onwards.[1536]

This shows that the two names have an entirely separate prehistory. At least for the most part, and probably even without exception, their separation persisted; I searched in vain for a person who is cited using both names in the Bretagne-Évêchés and Bretagne-Morice collections as well as in the cartularies of Saint-Georges of Rennes, Tiron, Saint-Vincent of Le Mans, La Roë, Angers (*Cartulaire noir*) and Saint-Florent of Saumur, all of which contain references to both names; in the cartulary of the Mont-Saint-Michel, too, a certain *Riuallo(nus) / Rual(l)en(dus, -th) / Ruellen Calcebof* is frequently found and about ten other *Riuallonus, Rual(l)en,* or *Ruellem*, but there is never a *Ro(d/t)landus.*

Next, we must consider the family from Dinan! They already appeared in research about the epic even before Aebischer pointed out the pair of brothers from the year 1108: Boissonnade (1923, 319, 337) found one Olivier from 'about 1064' (that is to say, Olivier I, Lord of Dinan, cf. below!), another Olivier from between 1110 and 1137 (that is to say the one from 1108) and supposedly a "Roland ou Rualon" (in Ordericus Vitalis 4.255ss. ed. Le Prévost only: *Riuallo de Dinam*), who in 1120 was captured by the Muslims and kept prisoner in the

---

1534 According to Chédeville/Guillotel (1984, 77s.) the cartularies of Landévennec, Quimper and Quimperlé mention two *Rivelen* who were said to have been the first Princes of Cornwall.

1535 As far as the literary name forms are concerned, Bédier (1905, 122) insists, without properly explaining why, though probably correctly, that "Rivalen ou Rivalin", in Eilhart of Oberge and Gottfried von Straßburg (and in Bédier's opinion even in Thomas) the name of Tristan's father is a Breton form; the same could be said for *Ruvalen*, in the French prose *Tristan*, the brother of Isolde of the White Hands.

1536 For example: Sées 51v° a. 1089 *Ruellenus Curteomer*; Rennes-S.Georges 290 after 1100 *Ruellanus*, 285 after 1127 *Ruellono, Ruellanus archidiaconus* etc. The *-ue-* may already be a substitution of the Old French diphthong (albeit in an unusual unstressed position) for the Breton *-ua-* which did not exist in OF at that time.

Holy Land for three years, and Rita Lejeune (1950b, 376) had pointed out a pair of cousins Roland and Olivier, son of an Olivier, in Robert de Torigni for the year 1168: *Oliverius, filius Oliverii de Dinan, et Rollandus consobrinus ejus.*

We must proceed more systematically here. In this family, an early *Riuallon/Rualent* († 1065/1066) is attested:

Tours-S.Julien 21 a. 1037 (original!) *S. Rualenti domini Doli*; Redon a. 1029–1037 *Haimo* [II] *vicecomes* [of Alet], *Goscelinus* [Lord of Dinan], *Riuallo* [Lord of Dol, more accurately, *advocatus* of the Archbishop of Dol], all brothers of Archbishop *Gingueneus* [~ *Jungeneus*] of Dol (1010 – around 1040); Bretagne-Morice 426 before 1065 *Riuallonus de Dolo*, brother of *Goscelinus* of Dinan; finally Mont-Saint-Michel 100 (and commentary 219s.!) a. 1065–1066 eleven days after Riuallon's death *in castro Dolensi in domo eiusdem Riualloni*, his sons give a piece of land back to the Abbey. (We should note that no one has ever claimed that this *Riuallon* referred to himself, or other people referred to him, as *Roland*.[1537]) The date on which his above-mentioned brother Gosecelin of Dinan died is not known; his son was then Olivier I of Dinan:[1538]

Bretagne-Morice 477 a. 1062–1076[1539] [= Boissonnade's 'about 1064'] *Olivarius de Dinan*; Bretagne-Morice 433 a. 1076–1081[1540] *Olivarius de Dinanno*.

This Olivier I had a younger brother, who according to the Wikipedia article entitled *Maison de Dinan*[1541] was "Roland (ou Ruellan ou Riwallon) de Dinan, dit le Roux († après 1115), seigneur de Plouër" (10 km north of Dinan). He, the uncle of the benefactor Gauzfredus of 1108, appears in Gauzfred's charter too, as the second secular witness, *Riuallonus Rufus*;[1542] and so he remains onomastically quite

---

1537 We can see that the scribe of Saint-Julien de Tours, who is writing quite some distance from the Breton language area, writes this name as he hears it: *Rualent*, whereas the others retain the classical form of the name: *Riuallonus*.

1538 He is Boissonnade's Olivier from 'about 1064' and the father of the G*auzfredus* (full form of *Goscelin*), who succeeded him in about 1081–1085 as Lord of Dinan (Guillotel 1988, 213) and is known to us as such in the charter of the year 1108.

1539 After 1062, because Abbot Frederick of Saint-Florent, who is said to have given away a fief 'more than forty years ago', took on this role from the year 1022 at the earliest; before 1076, because Bishop Mainus of Rennes died in this year and Archbishop Judhael/Juhel of Dol was finally replaced.

1540 Under Archbishop Even of Dol.

1541 Online at: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maison_de_Dinan (last access 22.04.2022).

1542 Bretagne-Morice 1.439 a. 1070–1118 appears to confirm that these are the same person. However, I would not like to exclude the possibility that *Riuallonus Rufus* († 1114) belongs to the following generation and is a brother, and not an uncle, of the benefactor Gauzfred in the year 1108, which would make him an uncle, and not a great-uncle of *Rollandus*; because the Foundation for Medieval Genealogy fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/brittcope.htm#_ftnref692 (last access 22.04.22) cites (under n. 692) from a publication of 1707 extracts from an undated charter, in which the

clearly separate from his great-nephew *Rollandus*. One of the best-known experts in Breton history, Hubert Guillotel, wrote two seminal articles about this, the first of which is also cited by the author of the Wikipedia article, and he refers to him only as *Rivallon le Roux* (1988, 214, 1997, 272). Given these circumstances, I cannot count him as a Roland. Even if another charter did turn up one day, in which he appears unequivocally as *Rol(l)andus*, we would have to assume that he was named after his uncle and baptised with the Breton name, and that it is only later that people would have reinterpreted his name as *Roland*. I do not see any reason, therefore, why on his account we should push back in time the start of the fashion for naming pairs of brothers.

The situation is not much different when it comes to the *Riuallo de Dinam* of the year 1123 who was mentioned by Ordericus. Because he was out in the Holy Land and there is no connection back to his family of origin, he is very difficult to classify. He might be the younger brother of Gauzfred of Dinan, whom Meazey (1997, 42) and the Wikipedia article mention, and he may have been missing from the charter of 1108 because he was already in the Holy Land by that time. There does not appear to be any evidence suggesting that he is the same person as Gauzfred's son *Rollandus* attested in the year 1108. Unless such evidence appears, we cannot assume that the two names ever refer to the same person, even within the Dinan family and in this time frame.

On the other hand, however, the document of 1108 indicates through the juxtaposition of the aged Riuallonus and the young Rollandus that the family of Dinan, having already adopted the name *Olivier* in the 11th century, is about to change from the ancestral *Rivallon/Ruallent* to the similarly sounding *Rol(l) and* – of course under the effect of the epic; see below cases [*]23, 24, 25.

C.13.3 Pairs of names 8–11

°8 Angers-S.Nicolas 2.21s. a. 1105–1116[1543] Maurice [I] of Craon does not contest a donation made by his deceased father-in-law Hugues de Champtocé to Saint-Nicolas of Angers, *istis testibus: Raginoldo monacho, Olivero, Rotland militibus, Joanne famulo.* (The present author, new). As is often the case, the same number of witnesses is produced for each side: the monk is named first, as all

---

benefactor is named as *Riuallonus Rufus frater Goffredi de Dinan*. Meazey (1997, 32) also calls him *Rivallon le Roux* based on the undated foundation charter of the Priory of Sainte-Magdeleine in Dinan, but additionally claims (p. 40s.) that he is the same person as Ordericus' *Rivallo* of 1123! The later he is dated, the less relevant it is for us whether this man was ever called *Rollandus*.
1543 Undated; chronological parameters according to de Broussillon, Craon 59 n.2.

clerics usually are; the two knights from Maurice's retinue come next; the *famulus* belongs to the monastery but as a non-monk, or not-yet monk. Unlike the charter from Brioude dating from 1011–1031 (no. *1 above), in Anjou of the early 12th c., it is rare for knights like Olivier and Roland to be mentioned just with their (only!) names, and with no indication of their fiefs; but here they are grouped as a duo through the designation *militibus,* and: in the retinue of the lord (not Count!) of Craon, that is to say in a very small circle, they define each other, and in this context they are quasi-brothers of the OR type. Even if they were not related to each other, we can assume that by this time we have here, unlike in Brioude, an allusion to the Song, that is to say, another attestation of the form OR.

9 Talmont 245 around 1115 *Olivarius* becomes a monk in Talmont (Vendée) and makes a donation with the agreement of his brothers *Petrus* and *Rolandus.* (Lejeune 1950b, 376.) The chronology of their ages is not clear.[1544]

10 Fontevraud 2.692 a. 1115–1129 *Oliverius de Maisnilo* and his brother *Rollandus.* (New.)

The following double reference has a slightly later averaged dating than the one above:

11a Liré 21–23 a. 1118 (original, dated) *domnus Rollannus*, Lord of Liré (50 km west-southwest of Angers on the southern bank of the Loire) and *defensor* 'bailiff' of the Marmoutier Priory there, and *Oliverius, frater ejus*, in a legal dispute between the Priory and a third party. (New). And also the same people:

11b Liré 25–27 a. 1124–1137 (original)[1545] *Ego Rollandus, dominus Liriaci [. . .] et uxor Matildis, duo quoque fratres mei Oliverius et Gestinus* make a donation to the priory. (New).

1544 Aebischer ([1960b] 1967, 66) points out that since Olivarius is a cleric, he was presumably not the firstborn son; but since Petrus appears to be the firstborn, it is still not clear in which order the ages of the other two then follow.

1545 Dating: Abbacy of Odo of Marmoutier. Mabille (Touraine-Cat. 156) estimates the charter's date as "vers 1130", but he clearly contradicts the original (which was published later) by mistakenly describing Olivier and Gestin as Roland's sons.

C.13.4 Interim summary of the pairs of brothers

With the pair from Liré, a compact series of pairs of names begins with the RO order (including a few unclear cases) and continues until the year 1150. For this reason, we will draw up a short summary of the early phase treated above, which had one RO and (if we reject no. 1 and 2) six or perhaps seven pairs with the OR order.

In a game of chance with the option 'red or black', the probability that by pure chance from any given moment in time only one of the next seven attempts will be 'red' (=RO) and all others 'black' (=OR), is small (1/64 or 1/128). In other words, the complementary case, that the ordering principle OR is behind them, has an overwhelming chance of more than 98%.

The document from Marseille/Salernes could indicate birth dates between 1065–1070, and the three references from 1091, around 1094 (mid-way between 1082–1106) and 1096 indicate birth dates from the 1070s at the latest. In the light of all these references, we can identify a fairly sharply defined starting point for the series of name pairs: the fashion for giving brothers these two epic names does not start until 1065–1070, and it is evident that people thought these two names were inseparable.

How can we explain the OR order? Paul Aebischer (implicitly 1955, 231, more clearly [1960b], 1967, 74ss., and [1966] 1967, 157–163) famously believed that the Olivier character (and his juxtaposition with Roland) emerged in an early *Girart de Vienne* sometime around the turn of the millennium (!), and secondly, that the OR order reflects this *Girart*. I more or less agree with the first part (more detail on this below in C.14.9), but I have some difficulty with the second.

I do not see why the effect of this *Girart* would start so late, but then become established so clearly and remain very evident for about thirty years. The chronology fits better with the Angevin Song of Roland, for which we have postulated the years 1045–1055 on the basis of our findings relating to the names *Marsilĭe*, *Ganelon*, *Turpin* and *Naimes*.

There is also the general mindset of the people at this time in history: the Peace of God movement had already passed its peak by 1054; the second half of the 11th c., on the other hand, was influenced by the Cluniacs and the reforming Papacy, and the spiritual atmosphere of the entire West Christian world was gradually moving towards the First Crusade, as Carl Erdmann's classic work on the origin of the idea of the crusades has demonstrated. For France especially, this half-century is characterised by growing numbers of people participating in the Reconquista, from the adventures of Roger de Tosny and his people in Spain sometime between 1018 and 1035, to the first 'Pre-Crusade' of 1064–1065, the second, larger-scale one of 1087 and then to continuous French engagement

in Aragón and in Galicia (-Portugal). On the other hand, this period is charac-
terised – often in ways that are linked with this last trend – by a sharp increase
in the number of people going on a pilgrimage to Santiago assisted by, among
other things, the establishment of the definitive Way of St. James and the open-
ing up of Spain to the Cluniacs by Sancho el Mayor († 1035), as well as the
building of the new Cathedral of Santiago under Alfons VI from about 1078.
More and more French people crossed over the Pyrenees, many of them via
Roncevaux; the *cantilena Rollandi*, which according to William of Malmesbury
was heard in 1066 in Hastings, can only have been about Roncevaux, and not
Vienne. It would be astonishing if the peace movement in south-eastern France
had fascinated French parents more than the events at Roncevaux.

For last, but not least, the poet of the early *Girart de Vienne* may well have
ended his song by recounting the new brotherly relationship between Olivier
and Roland, and he may even have pointed out that they died together in the
Pyrenean battle against the 'infidel'; but – as Favati (1962, 16) realised – he
could not have described their death *in a narrative way*, as a slowly developing
and complex story emerging inexorably from the character of the two friends, a
song of praise for this friendship that suffered a terrible crisis but managed to
prevail, ultimately leading them to their heroic death. This transformation,
which transposes the pair from a peace-loving, south-eastern French context to
a tragic and deeply moving all-French, or even all-Western context, seems to
have been the work of the Angevin.[1546] And it was *this* central idea, of two
brothers-in-arms overcoming their immediate differences and remaining loyal
to each other even to the point of death, that parents were able to transfer onto
real brothers. Even if my dating of the reference from Salernes were too late
and/or if there turned out unexpectedly to be a song about Roland and Olivier
in Roncevaux in existence some time before the Angevin poet wrote his Song,
the fashion for the pair of brothers still starts in around 1070, and it points to
the Angevin poet, which means that we must credit him with giving the story a
considerable quality enhancement as compared with all previous versions.

I tend therefore towards a different explanation of the OR order than the one
suggested by Aebischer. In the *Girart* section of the KMS I (ed. Unger cap. 38, ed.
Loth cap. AB 35) when Roland sets off to help his uncle against Girart, he has to
be knighted first, and at that point he was 'so young and so small' that they had
to hang his sword from his neck instead of putting it at his hip. There is no such

---

1546 We should remember that Delbouille (1954, 163) with admirable intuition located "ce
premier poème [qui] chantait le sacrifice de Roland et d'Olivier trahis par Ganelon et tués par
les Sarrasins d'Espagne, à Roncevaux" in Anjou; he dated it "au début du XIe siècle", how-
ever, and I cannot find any onomastic evidence to support this early estimate.

tale about Olivier; on the contrary, he is mature enough for Girart to entrust him with the task of bringing a very important message to Charlemagne (cap. 41 and 38). The KMS I and the lost *Vie de Charlemagne* on which it is based can be regarded as a collection of Old French epic pieces, and apart from linking passages and some small, non-narrative additions, it does not contain any original invention (Beckmann 2008a, passim, especially 195–197), and so we can assume[1547] that Roland was younger than Olivier in the lost early *Girart* too, since Olivier's name already marked him out as the peace-loving one (cf. C.14.4 below).

The Angevin poet may well have taken this age difference from the early *Girart*, and he then develops it in his own work when Olivier reveals himself at Roncevaux to be the more mature and cautious of the two; for this, too, seems to be picked up in a work that is based on the Angevin Song, that is to say in the PT. There (cap. 11), Roland is introduced as *Rotholandus dux exercituum, comes Cenomannensis et Blavii dominus, nepos Karoli, filius ducis Milonis de Angleris, natus Bertae sororis Karoli*, with no mention of any previous fighting experience, whereas immediately after this, Olivier is introduced as *Oliverus, dux exercituum, miles acerrimus, bello doctissimus [!], brachio et mucrone potentissimus, comes scilicet Gebennensis, filius Raineri comitis*. And Charlemagne gives the command of the rear guard here, not to Roland, but to *carissimis suis* Roland and Olivier (cap. 21).

If Olivier was clearly described as the elder of the two somewhere in the Song of Roland of 1045–1055, then it makes sense that between approximately 1065 and 1100 most parents (as in Béziers, Montalais near Angers, Saint-Pé-de-Bigorre, Dinan and the area close to Fontevraud, perhaps also in Craon and Talmont) took note of this information and retained the OR order, whereas a few (as in Salernes) may already have started to show a preference for Roland's bravado.

The OR series lasts until at least 1115 and then from 1118 the RO order starts with no. 11a. We should therefore look for the cause of this change to the order of the names between about 1095 and 1100, and the answer is obvious: it is related to the mentality of the First Crusade. For when Pope Urban issued his call to arms in 1095, a strong consensus was formed, in words at least, that what was now required above all else was a readiness for martyrdom, and not a pragmatic balance between spiritual and secular ideals, including military and tactical experience which in some concrete situations might make people afraid to go into battle.

1547 R. Louis (1946–1947, 2.134s.), and then Aebischer following him, have already emphasised that the *Girart-de-Vienne* story in the KMS I in its genesis [if not strictly speaking in its chronology, G.A.B.] represents an older stage than the surviving *Girart de Vienne*.

Against this background, Roland gained the moral superiority that he has in Turold's work, and this made the question of the relative age of the two simply meaningless. Turold is an accomplished poet who is able to ensure that on a factual level, Olivier behaves in a just and proper manner: in three laisses (LXXXIII–LXXXV) he makes a correct and sensible assessment of the situation and urgently calls upon Roland to blow his horn; and later (in laisse CXXX) he even draws a devastatingly accurate conclusion: *Vostre proëcce, Rollant, mar la ve<i>mes [. . .] Vos i murrez e France en ert hunie.* But on the superior ideological level, the poet has even higher praise for Roland: he is the only man who is not killed by an enemy weapon, and he dies with the Christian's *mea culpa* on his lips, making no mention of his misjudgement, and God validates his behaviour by ceremoniously taking him up to heaven. The difference in ages between the two heroes is not even worth mentioning at this point; if people intuitively see Roland as the elder, that is probably because he holds the formal position as commander, and because of the many conquests that are now attributed to him in two separate lists (v. 198–200, 2322–2332).

C.13.5 Pairs of names 12–33

12 Molesmes (Diocese of Langres, 75 km west of there) 2.598 a. 1123 *Rollanus* and *Oliverius* are in a list of brothers. (Lejeune 1950b, 376.)

13 Scafati (near Pompei) a. 1131 *Rollandus et Uliverius*, brothers. (Aebischer 1936, passim.) The first Italian reference, obviously brought there by the Normans (Scafati was part of the Principality of Salerno, which was Norman from 1078), but RO from the start, only thirteen years later than in France.

Since we have now reached the point where the birth years are 1112–1118, we should remember that in these same years Raoul de Caen in his account of the First Crusade (cap. 29 *in fine*) commemorated the brave warrior Counts Robert of Flanders and Hugh Magnus with these words of praise: *Rolandum dicas Oliveriumque renatos*, a clear allusion to the Rol. and at the same time another reference for the RO order.

14 Fontevraud 1.328 = 2.836 a. 1135 *Rollandus, Oliverius*, sons of Abbo of Briollay (11 km north-northeast of Angers). (New. I can find no evidence indicating that this is the same as 10.)

15 Saintes 65 a. 1137 *Girvasius* makes a donation to the Cathedral of Saintes with the agreement of his wife *Lucia* and his four sons *Willelmus*, *Girvasius*, *Rothlandus*, *Oliverius*. (Lejeune 1950b, 376.)

16 MGH DD.lat.K.Jer. 1.321 a. 1138 (= Jerusalem-S.Sépulcre 63 a. 1138) *Rollandus Gunterius*, *Olivarus, frater ejus*, secular witnesses of a charter by King Fulk. (New.) Two secular witnesses *Rollandus* and *Gunterius* without any epithets would not fit with the style of a witness list; but *Gunterius* is obviously a patronymic (and the editors agree).

°17 Morlaàs 38 a. 1123–1154[1548] a donation *cum consilio et laudamento proborum vicinorum Anerii de Espui, Petri Aldeberti, Galaciani fratris ejus, Oliverii Rodlandi fratris ejus, Johannis Pelicerii et aliorum multorum*. (New.) If we agree with the editor's positioning of the comma, Oliverius is the son of a man called Roland (and as such still of interest to us), and therefore only a half-brother of Petrus Aldeberti (and more likely a half-brother than a brother of Galacianus). We should not exclude the possibility, however, that there should be a comma after Oliverii which would mean that Oliverius and Rodlandus define one another as a pair of brothers (although of the type OR).

18 Angers-Cath. 297 a. 1140 *Abbo de Rocaforti* (Rochefort-sur-Loire, 20 km south-southwest of Angers) with his wife *Agnes* and his eldest son Petrus donated the small Monastery of Saint-Pierre in the outskirts of Angers to the Cathedral in Angers, with the agreement of his other children *Abbo*, *Agnes*, *Gaufridus* ('Abbot' of Saint-Pierre), *Rollandus* and *Oliverius*; a special ceremony is arranged for the previously appointed 'Abbot' Gaufridus' to take his oath of obedience. (New.)[1549]

1548 The time parameters are from the editor. They are no doubt based on the fact that from 1123 a Prior Arnald is attested, and up to 1154 a Pierre Audebert (ed. p. XIX, XXs.).

1549 This very large charter is also interesting for multiple reasons related to onomastics: it illustrates how in Anjou from the 11th c. onwards, the popularity of Mediterranean saints' names as Christian names had grown (*Agnes*, *Petrus*, *Andreas*, *Mauricius*), and how epithets could become the only name commonly used by their bearers (*Paganus*, *Normannus*, *Vaslotus*); how tolerant people were to the meaning of the names taken on in this way, so that a canon can be called *Gaufridus Bibevinum* or an archpriest *Paganus*; how contemporary history affects the choice of names (*Boamundus*, Archdeacon), and now not only the pair of brothers *Rolandus* and *Oliverus*, but also a *Turpinus* and probably a *Pipinus* have names taken from epic literature. It is not a coincidence that the charter comes from Anjou!

Since the discussion now centres on birth years in the time around 1127, we should remember a poetic statement which Rajna (1897, 48) noticed some time ago. The *Liber Maiolichinus*, which was probably written before 1127, recounts the great Pisan campaign of 1114–1115 against Muslim Mallorca (v. 3293–3296 ed. Scalia): *Aestuat interea castris Pisana iuventus, / Protinus incipiunt pugnam Brunicardia proles, / Promptus Oliverius, Vada quem misistis ad arma, / Rolandusque valens, Rodulpho patre creatus.* Here we find two men 'pushing for a fight', namely Oliviero Brunicardi from Vada, which belonged to Pisa, and the 'bold' Orlando Rodolfi, a young adult, though the two were probably not related;[1550] the poet is the first person to see them as an onomastic pair, and so this only counts for the time in which he wrote the poem. Olivier is cited first, presumably because the social order required it. The reference is not just a simple juxtaposition as in Brioude a. 1011–1031, not only because at the time of writing the pair of brothers from Scafati (no. 12) had long since been born, and so the Rol. was well known in Italy, but also because of the plot: here, as in the Rol., a campaign is in progress against Spanish Muslims, and the poet also shows his interest in the Charlemagne legend in other places (Rajna 1897, 47s.). The allusion to the Rol. is therefore quite clear.

19 Pavia (Monastery of San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro) March 1145 (original) *Rolandus et Olliverus*, brothers. (Rajna 1889, 18 with n. 4; however, Rosellini could not find the charter mentioned in Aebischer 1954/1955, cf. Aebischer 1955, 224s.).

20 Sant Cugat del Vallés (15 km northwest of Barcelona) 3. 143 a. 1145 *Rodlandus Oliverius* and his brother *Olivarius presbyter*. (Aebischer 1953, passim.) It is interesting that the father was called Olivier too.

21 Genoa a. 1150 *Rollandus; Oliverius*, brothers. (Aebischer 1958, 59s.) In each of two donations made by the same father in June 1150, one of his sons is the recipient, and the other is a witness. The ordering of the names is therefore unclear.

1550 More about them in Martínez (1975, 284 n. 28; a reference to them in Álvar 2014b, 19). In one of the three mss. v. 3294–3296 are missing, but Scalia (1956, 285ss.) provides convincing evidence that they belong in the urtext.

°22 Calvados 2.94 undated witness *Guillaume Avenel*;[1551] 2. 95 a. 1142–1164:[1552] on the same occasion witness *Olivier Avenel*; 2.240 undated *Roland Avenel*, son of *Guillaume Avenel*. (New.) A brother relationship is only speculative, order unclear.

*23; 24, 25 Dinan a. 1168 already mentioned above in C.13.2., identified by Rita Lejeune (1950b, 376) in Robert de Torigni, a pair of cousins O*liverius, filius Oliverii de Dinan, et Rollandus consobrinus ejus*. These paired names are not a coincidence because we found a previous pair of brothers in this family in 1108. We can explain this more clearly now: the father Oliverius of the year 1168 is the same person as the young Oliverius of the year 1108, † 1150 as Olivier II of Dinan, founder of the "branche de Dinan-Nord", owner of Dinan castle; his son of the same name Olivier († 1189), also named in 1168 but not as the first son, was the founder of the "branche de Dinham" in England (from the 13th c. onwards Lords Dinham of Ludlow, where the Eng. *Dinham* < Fr. *Dinan* is related through folk etymology to Old Eng. *-hām* '-home', and today is part of Ludlow, Shropshire);[1553] the brother of Olivier II who was probably the youngest, since he was not mentioned in 1108, *Alanus* († 1157), is the founder of the so-called "branche de Dinan-Sud", owner of Bécherel castle (20 km south-southeast of Dinan) and father of his successor mentioned in 1168 *Rolandus* († 1186).[1554] This completes our commentary on Robert de Torigni.

But Olivier II of Dinan († 1150), in addition to his son *Olivier* who is attested in 1168 but was not the eldest, also had an even younger son *Roland*; furthermore, the eldest surviving son of Olivier II, Geoffroy II of Dinan († 1179), also had sons called *Olivier* (III) and *Roland*.[1555] It is quite a surprise, therefore, to find two pairs of brothers born before 1150 and before 1179 of the type OR! (New.) The explanation is immediately clear however: since Olivier II only had

---

1551 The source only gives modern French forms in a summarising style. – *Guillaume Avenel* seems to be the same person as the *Willelmus Avenel*, who in around 1145 in the region of Chichester (England) served as witness for a donation to the Templars (Temple 238), which at least provides chronological parameters for him.
1552 Dating: episcopacy of Philip of Bayeux.
1553 On this branch Michael Jones (1987, passim). It retains only the name Olivier, but according to Jones (p. 42 and 50) this persists until 1500. The last Lord Dinham reached the position of Treasurer of England in 1486 but when he died in 1501, he left behind only one illegitimate son, who continued the Dinham family at a more modest level (p. 40–42).
1554 Cf. the table in Meazey (1997, 42).
1555 According to the Wikipedia article *Maison de Dinan* and Meazey (1997, 40, 45, 47); cf. also Guillotel (1988, 213). With Olivier III († 1209) the Dinan-Nord branch stops using this name; in a side-branch, that of the Dinan-Montafilant, the name *Roland* persists until 1419.

an Olivier as a direct ancestor, his branch continued with *Olivier* as its first choice of name, while *Roland* was only its second choice.

This case is interesting methodologically; it shows that the Song first caused the pair of names to come into this family, but then subsequently the traditional practice of naming children after other members within the family resumed. It is quite obvious that analogous cases will very soon become more frequent as time passes: more and more new-born children would be named after Rolands and Olivers who were already in the family, and so the names would not so frequently be given directly because of the Song. This explains why the reason behind this or that ordering of the two names will often not be obvious, or not worth the time it would take to investigate it fully. Since the first of these anomalous cases, where naming is evidently influenced by the family history, occurs before 1150, I decided here, as in other areas of this study, to carry out an exhaustive study of the pair of names until 1150 and no later. The cases from no. 22 onwards are therefore just random additional findings.

On the other hand, the cases from no. 11–20, leaving aside no. 17, have the order RO; the probability that from any given date onwards in the red-or-black game only one case out of ten will turn out to be black is obviously very small (1/512rr). There must be a reason for this result, and the only obvious reason is the Song, with its increasingly obvious portrayal of the two main characters in the spirit of the First Crusade.

26 Sant'Olcese (15 km north of Genoa) a. 1172 *Oliverius et Rolandus*, brothers. (Aebischer 1952b, 330s.) Another "anomalous case".

Since we have now reached pairs which can hardly have been born after 1152, it is apposite to consider a literary reference (cited by Carlos Álvar 2014b, 19s.) from the decade 1147–1157. The *Poema de Almería* is about the conquest of Almería in the year 1147 by Alfons VII († 1157) and it was written while he was still alive. It celebrates the courage of Álvaro, grandson of Álvar Fáñez: if he had been a third member in the band alongside Roland and Olivier, the Muslims would have been defeated, and these two would not have had to die (v. 215–218): *Tempore Roldani si tertius Alvarus esset / Post Oliverum, fateor sine crimine verum, / Sub iuga Francorum fuerat gens agarenorum, / Nec socii chari iacuissent morte perempti.*

27 Mulazzano (25 km south of Parma) a. 1174 *Rolandus et Uliverius*, brothers. (Aebischer 1952b, 328–330.)

28 Ferrara a. 1176 *Orlando et Olivero*, brothers. (Rosellini 1958, 57s.)

°29 GC 14.862 a. 1175 and 1177 Bishop Robert II of Nantes confirms for the Cistercian Abbey of Buzay (25 km west of Nantes) a donation by *Olivarius de Begon*, and then donations by *Sylvester*, a son of *Rotlandus de Begon*. (New.) Brother relationship uncertain; if they are brothers, then the order is probably RO.

30 Monselice (almost 25 km south-southwest of Padua) a. 1183 *Rolandus*, brother of a priest called *Oliverius*. (Aebischer 1955, 225.) Order unclear, but more likely to be RO (since only a younger son was likely to become a priest).

31 Stainton-by-Waddingham (Lincolnshire) a. 1185 *Rollant pro .I. tofto de dono Oliverii fratris eius .XII. den.* (Douglas 1960, 107.)

32 La Roë (12 km northwest of Craon) f.100v around 1180 until around 1190[1556] *Rollandus de Meral et Oliverius frater ejus.* (New; Méral, 13 km north of Craon.) Identity with *8 improbable for reasons of age.

*33 La Roë second half of the 12th c.: This case (new) appears to be an optical illusion: in the cartulary of La Roë there is in f.79v° a *Rollandus de Buche Usure*, 87v °, 98v°, 99v° an *Oliverius de Buche Usure* and 79r° a *Turpin de Buche Usure*,[1557] all in undated charters from the second half of the 12th c., but before 1190. This would be, of all the families we have noted so far, the one that is most open to influences from epic literature, were it not for the fact that when we compare these charters, we see that Oliverius had only married into this family; in view of the late date of this case, I refrain from further comment.

There is just one more literary reference from before 1200 that is relevant to our investigation. Shortly before 1190, Gottfried of Viterbo twice mentions Roland and Olivier in his *Pantheon* (23.3 and 17, MGH SS. 22.211.25s. and 223.1–3). On the first occasion, he asserts that they took part in Charlemagne's siege of Pavia. The second passage is more interesting: when Charlemagne was returning from Jerusalem via Sicily, these two men named mountains after themselves: *Mons ibi stat magnus, qui dicitur esse Rollandus, / Alter Oliverius, simili ratione vocandus, / Hec memoranda truces constituere duces.*[1558] Rajna (1897,

---

1556 Undated; approximate dating can be deduced from: Abbot Gautier I around 1180, Abbot Gautier II around 1190.

1557 Bouche d'Usure, 3.5 km south-southwest of Craon, at the mouth of the small River Usure in the Oudon.

1558 Roland is mentioned on his own one more time on Charlemagne's Spanish campaign, Pantheon 23.18, p. 224.

51s.) noted the importance of these passages for French literature; they are two genuine foothills. Mireaux (1943, 111s.) maintained without justification that that their naming must have occurred in connection with the Norman conquest in the 11th c. Li Gotti (1956, 11s.) correctly argued otherwise: these are two foothills, one about 20 km west and the other about 20 km east of Cape Calavà (65 km west of Messina); back in the time of the Arabs, there was a castle and a fishing port there called *Oliveri* (and this is still what it is called today, named after a nearby olive grove); this name was evidently transferred onto the foothills by seafarers, which would then explain why the second foothill would be called Roland; apart from Gottfried, the name (still used today) *Capo d'Orlando* is not attested until the end of the 13th c.

Finally, it should be noted that the fashion for pairs of names (and the change in the order of these names through the generations within the same families) reached its peak in Italy in this period just after 1200. Fassanelli (2014, 239–241) carried out a longitudinal study from 1146 until 1275 for Padua and its immediate surroundings and identified several other cases, concluding that: "Il binomio 'Rolando e Oliviero' compare spesso [!] tra i Guarnerini e nella parentela del dominus Aldrigetto, richissimo proprietario fondiario [. . .]"

Let us review the developments since 1118!

Italy starts immediately with the type RO, only 13 years later than France. It has a respectable total of six pairs, which should not be surprising to anyone who is aware of Rajna's ground-breaking investigation into the onomastic influence of French epic literature on Italy. Epic names from France largely travelled over the Alps to northern Italy; this is the only place where a Franco-Italian epic literature emerged. Nevertheless, this trend also seems to have reached Norman southern Italy because there is one reference from there (no. 13).

Inside France, however, Normandy is strictly speaking only represented by the uncertain and rather late pair °22 (around 1150); for the House of Dinan was Breton, even though during the time of Robert de Torigni it was very well integrated into the Greater Norman Empire on both sides of the Channel. Despite all of this we can safely conclude: the pair Roland and Olivier as such is not an invention of Turold's, but in fact it is much older than the period in which this Norman author, who shared his countrymen's taste for adapting and building on other cultural artefacts, turned the material into its most perfect form.

There are no pairs at all in the Capetian domain and anywhere northeast of there. This forms just a part of the negative findings that we described above in section C.9.2 'A basic fact of epic geography: the Capetian barrier'.

We turn now from geography to chronology: Lejeune's two oldest references did not stand up to scrutiny, as scholarly reactions immediately after their

publication soon made clear. The third reference, from Salernes, has remained valid, albeit within shortened chronological parameters. I was able to add six certain and six probable or debatable pairs of brothers to the list thus far, but they are all from the 12th c., and their greater density shows the growing the importance of this phenomenon. Conversely, however, this means there is now very little hope of ever finding any new references from the 11th c.

C.13.6 Review of the pairs of names

The Angevin Song of 1045–1055 appears to be the first to depict Roland and Olivier together in Roncevaux and also dying there together. In approximately 1065 it must have been the inspiration for the fashion of naming pairs of brothers. The fact that in the early phase until about 1100 the most common order was Olivier-Roland can be most easily explained with the assumption that the Angevin Song not only regarded Olivier as the more sensible of the two, but also depicted him as several years older than Roland; however, thanks to the atmosphere generated by the First Crusade, the higher status of Roland gradually came to prominence. In around 1150 the order of names in the pairs of brothers became irregular again, because within families, existing Rolands or Oliviers carried on the custom of naming children after their parents or ancestors.[1559]

C.14 Olivier and his Family

The name (in O 104 and passim *Oliver*; the same in V4CV7, *Olivier* PTL and the fragments, but all β with small deviations occasionally) is mentioned 69 times in the Song and is according to Segre (who follows O in this matter) indeclinable (whereas all of the β mss. apart from the fragments, albeit in very different amounts, also have some -*s*- forms). The *Carmen* (v. 225 etc.) has *Ŏlĭvērus*.

1559 Curiously, there is another echo of the fashion for pairs of brothers in Hungary. According to Szabolcs de Vajay (1962, passim) sources from about 1275 and later, which are credible nonetheless, say that in 1097 the brothers Olivier and Ratold came to Hungary from the southern Italian family of Counts of Caserta with the daughter of Roger I of Sicily when she married King Coloman, and they founded the *Rátót* (< OF *Ratout*) family there. After 1250 and again in around 1336 there is a pair of brothers Roland and Olivier in this family, as well as other single Rolands and Oliviers until the start of the 15th c.; the first Hungarian Roland, *grand officier du roi Géza II* (1141–1161), was *sans doute* a Rátót.

Olivier has the title of Count a few times in O and in the archetype (v. 255, 2403, 2702); V4 promotes him several times to *dux*, once to *marchis* (cf. the index by the Ed. [Duggan-]Cook), T once (corresponding to O 2702) to *duc*. He is addressed by Turpin in his sworn plea v. 1740 (as is Roland) as *Sire Oliver*; Roland on the other hand adds to the name of his friend: *bels cumpainz* (v. 2207), *frere* (v. 1395, 1698, 1866) or even *compaign frere* (v. 1456) except in his plea *Tais, Oliver!* (v. 1026).

C.14.1 The distribution of the name *Olivier* until 1060

Whereas Lejeune (1950b, 380) could only find five instances of Olivier in the period before 1060, in my own material there are at least 15 individuals bearing this name, scattered over more than 20 references. (From before 1100, my material contains about a hundred references, and there are 130 more for the time between 1100 and 1150; however, with increasing numbers of references it becomes all the more difficult to determine the number of individuals they are referring to.) As we shall see below, for the purposes of our investigation into the origins and early history of the name, it will suffice to trace its distribution with all the references up to year 1060; this allows us to evaluate Lejeune's conclusions, and the objections to them – most of which were raised before 1970 and take issue with particular small points – in our case with a sufficiently broad collection of data.

Where it has not been possible to clearly separate individuals, or when I have not been able to detect a sound argument behind the editors' dating of charters, I have selected the most minimal solution, or the latest one. In the references which follow, I have once again selected the middle date when only a range of dates is available; however, I have sometimes departed from the chronological order so that related material can be examined together in the same section. References which are of limited use are once again listed with a °, those which are of no use are listed with a *.

C.14.1.1 The south

1 Savigny (Diocese of Lyon) 219 (no. 388) "a. 1000 circa" *S[ignum] Oliverii*. (Noted by Rajna 1889, 7 n. 5.) Refers to the place called Bibost, 25 km west-northwest of Lyon, 40 km northwest of Vienne. Aebischer ([1960b] 1967, 77s.) confirms that the editor's dating is reliable: the benefactor *Adalardus presbiter* is attested around 970 and around 1000, the witness *Andreas monachus* a. 1001 and at some indeterminate point between 993 and 1032, the scribe *Uualterius*

monachus three times between 990 and 994. (If we give each of these dates equal weight, the middle date is 994/995.)

Lejeune overlooked this reference in the cartulary she consulted. It contradicts her idea (1950b, 380), that over a period of almost half a century the name *Olivier* could only be found in the three references that she categorised as pairs of brothers (these are discussed above in the section on pairs of brothers as no. *1, *2 and 3). If that idea were correct, the name *Olivier* would almost certainly have been invented by an early Roland poet. Unfortunately, the situation is much more complicated; we must now consider the question of whether the name was invented by a poet, and if so, in which narrative context this occurred (cf. C.14.3–C.14.6, C.14.9–C.14.10).

2 Sauxillanges (115 km west of Vienne) 365 (no. 477) a. 990–1049 *Sig. Oliverii*. Dating: Abbacy of Odilo of Cluny.[1560]

3 Brioude (120 km west-southwest of Vienne) 307 a. 1011–1031 *S.Oliverii*. The (pseudo-) brother pair reference no. *1.

°4 Chamalières (150 km west-northwest of Vienne) 140 a. 1021–1028 or 1037–1038 *Stephanus Oliverii* [scil. *filius*!]. The editor's dating seems to be based on the fact that the female benefactor Benaia appears in another charter (p. 114) together with a Prior Petrus who could be either Petrus I or II; the dating is therefore only approximate.

5 Chamalières 97 according to the editor "vers 1050?" *Wilhelmus Achardi, donator; filii sui Ugo, Olivarius, Petrus, Arbertus* give their agreement. (Widest chronological parameters: a. 1038–1082, Prior Beraudus, cf. p. IV of the edition.)

Despite their rather vague dating, these five references can be treated as a group. The oldest reference concerns a place that is directly under the influence of Lyon and Vienne, that is to say, a place in of the area of the big Rhône Bend at the influence of the Saône (from now on called the Rhône Bend for short). The regions further to the west, that is to say the uppermost Loire Valley and the neighbouring regions in the French Massif Central had from time immemorial been culturally oriented towards the Rhône Valley; it was from there that all innovations were expected and adopted: first Greek influence, then Roman

---

[1560] In the same cartulary the *S. Oliverii* p. 251 (no. 313) could be even older; however, I can find nothing in the charter to help identify its date.

culture and language, then Christianisation, and the same is now true of the name *Olivier*. It is possible therefore to see a meaningful development in time and space in these references: the fact that the first attested Olivier was to be found near the Rhône Bend is probably not a coincidence, but points to the region where the name originated.

There is a difference of only 25 years between the oldest reference in this coherent group of five and the oldest reference in the next, equally coherent group which stretches over Septimania and Catalonia as far as the Catalan-Aragonese border area:

6 Carcassonne 1.196 a. 1025 *Amelio Adalberto, et Mefredo Aigfredo, Derico, Bernardo, Amelio, Olivario, Radulfo, Benedicto praesbitero, Arnallo Aigfredo, Stephano praesbitero*. This is the only source, BN Paris, Coll. Doat 69–70, 82–83, in a charter from the Abbey of Montolieu (15 km northwest of Carcassonne). The editor suppresses the comma before *Oliuario* in his source, which means that *Olivario* would probably be understood as a patronymic; but there is no justification for this change, because the uneven number of names makes it impossible to read them as double names without having one left over. Moreover, the editor dates the charter incorrectly in the third rather than the thirtieth (*tricesimo*) year of King Robert II.

7a Obarra (between Veracruz/Beranuy and Calvera, Prov. Huesca; historically the western part of the County of Ribagorza) 81 a. 1020–1045 *Oliverius*, seller of a piece of land. The editor dates it as about 1020; however, the facts cited in his introduction only confirm that the date is sometime before 1045; the surviving copy in the *rotulus* orginated, according to p. XVII, in the middle of the 11th c. There is also 7b Ribagorza 449 a. 1038 (=Alaón 235 a. 1039) *Oliver*, witness in the retinue of Count Raymond (III of Lower Pallars and the remaining part of Ribagorza) in a matter concerning Castanesa (15 km as the crow flies north-northeast of Obarra, also today in the Province of Huesca, at that time the western part of the County of Ribagorza). I suspect that this person is identical to the one in no. 7a, but I must leave the decision to the specialists.

8 Delisle-Rouleaux 52 a. 1050–1051 *Olivarius cum omnibus parentibus suis*. Monastery of Mont Canigou, Roussillon; Dating: death of Count Guifré of Cerdanya.

9 Montjuich 417 a. 1057 *Oliver Mir*.

According to Coll i Alentorn (1956, 145) this reference followed by a series of 15 from 11th c. Catalonia.[1561]

Though our second group of references begins only 25 years after the first one, the lag is probably not a coincidence. This means that another of Lejeune's hypotheses is rather improbable, namely the idea that the name *Olivier* originated as a reshaping of the (equally male) name *Oliba*, occasionally through secondary interpretation also *Oliva* (cf. especially her table of references in two columns, 1950b, 380). A man's name ending in *-a* would only have been able to spread in a place where there had been a Gothic upper class for centuries, because in Gothic the many masculine *n*-stem names ended in *-a(n)*, and not in *-o(n)* as in continental West Germ. and Latin-Romance; we only need to think of the Visigothic kings' names *Agila*, *Chintila*, *Egica*, *Liuva*, *Tulga*, *Walja*, *Wamba* and *Witiza*.[1562] North of the Pyrenees, Gothic rule lasted for several hundred years only in Septimania, including Carcassonne, where in the 9th c. there were two Counts by the name of Oliba. The name diffused lightly into the neighbouring areas to the northwest, because the culture of the Visigothic Kingdom was superior to that of the Frankish realm; this explains why in Lejeune beside a majority of Catalan and Septimanian instances of *Oliba* / *Oliva*, there is one each from Lézat, Albi and Conques;[1563] there is also one outlying *Oliba*, Bishop of Angoulême in around 892. However, the name does not seem to have travelled to the northeast as far as the middle Rhône Valley around Vienne-Lyon. In other words: the area where this name occurs and the area where the name *Olivier* probably originated do not overlap.[1564]

But at least one part of Lejeune's hypothesis stands firm. For although the name *Olivier* did not originate in the area that was once controlled by the Visigoths, it did appear there, as we can clearly see, surprisingly early, and in the

---

[1561] However, the name only penetrated the rest of the Pyrenean Peninsula to a limited extent, even in literary texts, and it is only found as a real name rarely and at a later date (Álvar 2014b, passim).

[1562] There is only one reference of note from the Visigothic Kingdom itself: *Olipa*, who as Bishop of Segobri(g)a in a. 683 and 684 signed the decrees of the 13th and 14th Council of Toledo (Vives 1963, 433, 447). This confirms that the in *Oliba* was a 'fixed' /b/, which was the phoneme following on from Lat. intervocalic *-p-*, and that *Oliva* was probably influenced by *oliva* or the etymologically identical women's name *Oliva*. An isolated *Olipa* Alaón 182 a. 987 could be an archaism, but it may by chance be a correct (perhaps only written) backformation. *Olipa* seems to have originated from Visigothic *Opila* through metathesis (Becker 2009, 783, following Dieter Kremer).

[1563] The second one from Conques actually refers to a place in Septimania.

[1564] Even if this hypothesis did unexpectedly turn out to be true, it still would not prove that one of the two Counts called Oliva/Oliba was a (proto-) epic character.

11th c. also in considerable numbers; in fact, it may well have been welcome as a modern replacement for the name *Oliba* because the system of having men's names ending in -*a* (and even more so, women's names ending in -*o*) had started to be archaic there, now that the High Carolingian period brought in the opposite system from Galloromania, which then received added support from the appellatives.[1565]

The diffusion of the name took place somewhat more slowly in – thirdly – the south-southeastern coastal area:

10a Lérins 1.73 a. 1026–1066 *Olivers*, 10b Lérins 1.70 a. 1038–1062 *Oliverius firmavit* (the pseudo-brother pair reference no. *2), 10c Lérins 90 a. 1056 *Oliverius firmavit* – probably one and the same person.

At this point we must bring Italy into the discussion. Rosellini (1958, 260) found an astonishingly early reference:

11 Cavanna near Romagnano Sesia (then in easternmost Piedmont, today in northern Novara) a. 1040 ("Hanno ab incarnatione domini nostri yesu cristi. Millesimo quadragesimo. terciodecimo kalendas nouembris. Jndictione nona", edited by Ferdinando Gabotto from the oldest surviving copy, 15th c.) "Jn cauanna, benedicta uxor(e) oliuairij, Albertus et Gisla et sanbo", serfs given by the Marchese Odolricus of Romagnano to the Monastery of San Silano. It seems, then, that the name must have entered Italy along the *strade francesche* via these roads, and not by sea along the coastline. The next reference to come from Italy is then much later, an *Olivierus* from 1085, from the area around Treviso, (Rajna 1889, 9s.), or even from the County of Tarvisio (cf. Rajna's reference back to 1889, 4 n. 2!). However, Jireček (1902, 49) points to an *Oliverius* in the year 1080 near Split/Spalato! The name must therefore have already travelled across the whole of Upper Italy, and it must have passed from Venice to the Dalmatian port.

1565 This fits with the fact that (apart from two late references in 1077 and the end of the 11th c.) *Oliba / Oliva* drops off from Lejeune's list in about 1050. For Sant Cugat, however, Aebischer (1951, 198–201) found considerably later dates and longer transitional periods: from 1070, *Oliva / Oliba* is as frequent there as a patronymic, as it is as first name, and from 1090, it is even more common; the last reference as a first name is attested in 1116, as a patronymic in 1143. According to Coromines (1952, 50 n. 47) the name can still be found – evidently rarely – even as late as the end of the 13th c. Moreover, Aebischer (1951, 203), shows that it is quite probable that *Oliva / Oliba* and *Olivarius* were interchangeable in the case of one person in 1075 as a first name, in the case of two individuals of the 12th c. as a patronymic. But Aebischer is also of the opinion that *Olivarius* originated in non-Septimanian southern Galloromania, where it could build on the appellative *olivarius*.

Rajna cites more than fifteen references for the time before 1150 from Italy, Rosellini has about thirty references for the 12th c., and now Fassanelli (2014, 248) has sixteen from Padua and the area immediately around it in her longitudinal study from 1146 to 1275. Occasionally, there are some fully dialectal forms such as in the year 1141 the Lombard *Oriverus* (Rajna 1889, 9 n. 2). The unstressed *O-* shows the two complementary regional developments, on the one hand to *U-* (as in *ulivo* etc.) in northern and central Italy: *Uliverius* a. 1126 in Padua (Rajna 1889, 9), then very frequently in Italian literature, probably first in the *Fierabraccia ed Ulivieri*; and on the other hand to *A-* in the Mezzogiorno: ALVIER a. 1178 in the precisely datable mosaic in Brindisi Cathedral (on both developments Rohlfs 1972, § 131).

C.14.1.2 The west

Unfortunately, the first references in the west present a few chronological difficulties; we can estimate that the name was first documented there in around 1035. The details are as follows:

*12 Rennes-S.Georges 253 according to the editor a. 1037, but in my opinion more likely to be around 1085 *Oliverius pretor [S. Georgii]*, witness. The editor identifies Duke Alanus and his sister Adela, Abbess of Saint-Georges, as Alain III and Adele I. But half a century later, the same constellation appears again with Alain Fergant and his sister Adela II; the latter is more likely because here and in Rennes-S.Georges 263 a. 1085 we find seneschal Mainfinidus and witnesses Thehellus and *Oliverius*.

13a Vendôme-Trinité 1.52 before 1040: benefactors *Thescenda, femina Rainaldi Olivardi*, and their sons *Raherius* and *Herbertus*. We cannot dismiss *Olivardus* here as a spelling or printing error because there is mention in 13b Vendômois-Marmoutier 223 a. 1040–1070 of two parcels of land *Burchardi et Olivardi*. But because *Oliv-* in masculine forms is generally not productive as a base for names, and there was for example no **Oliv(e)bertus* etc., *Olivardus* cannot be understood as a name in its own right, but rather as a (comical, slightly coarse) reformulation of *Olivarius*,¹⁵⁶⁶ which of course requires previous knowledge of that name; its

---

1566 This is like a case where, amidst many instances of *Vivianus*, for no apparent reason a *Vivardus* appears (Mans-S.Vincent 386 beginning of the 12th c.) or where the Chronicler Robert de Clari is called *Robillard* by the people in his surrounding area (cf. ed. Lauer p. VI). – In contrast to the *Olivardus / Olivarius* above, I have rejected Normandie-Ducs 265 a. 1046–1058 *Osbernus Olifardus* because in the confirmation of this donation in Normandie-Ducs 451 a. 1082–1087, he is called *Osbernus Olifantus* 'O. the elephant' or 'O. with the olifant'.

coarsening effect means that it is hardly likely to be a father's name, but is proba-
bly a recently acquired epithet. What becomes of the two sons *Raherius* and *Her-
bertus*? The elder son appears in 13c Vendôme-Trinité 1.270 a. 1062 as *Raherius
Olivarius*, where *Olivarius* is now obviously the father's name, so that the father
Olivardus now can be seen with his name in its unadulterated form. The younger
son, *Herbertus*, is nowhere to be found under this name; instead, we find in 13d
Vendôme-Trinité 1.137 a. 1047 an *Olivarius frater Racherii*, no trace of whom ex-
ists before 1040. This suggests that *Herbertus* has been turned into the newly
fashionable *Olivarius*.

14 S. Jouin (-de Marnes, Deux-Sèvres, 75 km south-southeast of Angers) 9
around 1040 (we cannot entirely exclude the possibility: up to the year 1090) *S.
Oliverii*. The editor dates this to around 1040, because the witnesses Cadelo,
son of Eblo, Basilius and Radulf already appear in p. 3 a. 1038; on the other
hand, however, (according to p. 3s. and 25) Abbot Simon, the monk Radulf and
a man called Dodelinus still appear to be alive in 1092.

15a Rennes-S.Georges 264 around 1050 *Olivarius*, brother of Goffredus and Ca-
moal, in the immediate circle around *Odo de Apigneio*. The editor does not give
reasons for his dating of this undated charter, which could arouse suspicion.
Then in 15b Rennes-S.Georges 269 a. 1096 an *Oliverius*, nephew of a *Hugo de
Apigneio* is attested, and in 15c Bretagne-Morice 1.584 a. 1141 another *Oliverius de
Apigneio*, which suggests that the *Olivarius* from around 1050 belongs to the
House of Apigné (5 km west of Rennes). Sure enough, there is in charter 15d Ren-
nes-S.Georges 275, according to the editor from about 1060, a *Hugo filius Oliverii*,
who appears with his father *Olivarius* in 15e Rennes-S.Georges 263 a. 1085, and
without him in 15f Rennes-S.Georges 293 around 1100 and 15g Rennes-S.Georges
292 early 12th c. If a son of an Olivier is probably attested from 1060 onwards, and
at the latest from 1085, then it seems entirely possible that the father would have
lived between about 1050 and 1096.

16 Blésois-Marmoutier § 24 a. 1040–1070 *Olivardus*. Is to be treated in the same
way as no. 13, and the possibility that these are one and the same person can-
not be ruled out entirely; however, we cannot confirm this because there is no
related *Oliverius* here.

17a Angers-S.Aubin 2.422 probably not before 1051–1060 (not a. 1033–1036, cf.
below) *Olivarius*, son of Guillaume II Talvas of Bellême from a second relationship

which was widely regarded as uncanonical (gives his agreement to a donation by his uncle Ivo of Bellême, Bishop of Sées [*sedit* "vers 1035 – vers 1070"], to Saint-Aubin, listed after his father Guillaume as the first of three nephews of the bishop); he is possibly the same person as the *Oliverius* in 17b Angers-S. Aubin 1.50 a. 1056. He is clearly the same person as in 17c Martène/Durand 1.420 around 1050 *Oliverius*, (half-) nephew also of Bishop Gervasius of Le Mans (whose mother was a Bellême); he certainly appears also in 17d–f Le Mans-S. Vincent 1.313 a. 1040–1065 (once again giving his agreement to something done by his uncle, Bishop Ivo), 1.316 a. 1050–1060 (where he is expressly described as Guillaume's son), 1.337 a. 1076 (an *Olivarius bastardus*, in the castle of Bellême in the circle around his half-sister *Mabille*, and so it can hardly be anyone else), also 17g–k Sées 6, 8, 9, 10v°, 12v° all a. 1059–1070, probably even 17l–p Sées 15v°, 22r°, 22v°, 63r°, 70v° a. 1073/1089 until around 1100, in which *Olivarius* is *clericus*, and then *sacerdos*. He is the same person as Olivier of Le Mêle (about 20 km north-west of Bellême): 17q Jumièges 1.112 a.1086 *domnus Olivarius de Merlo*, 17r Sées 51r° a. 1094 *Hugo clericus filius Oliverii de Merula [. . .] Oliverio patre suo iam monacho*, 17s Sées 57v° a. 1104 *Oliverius de Merlo*. There are also charters by his second son Robert: 17t Normandie-Ducs before 1066 *ego Robertus Oison, filius Olivarii de Merula*, 17u Sées 50r° around 1090 *ego Robertus Oisons Oliverii de Merula filius*. Ordericus Vitalis mentions him in his additions to the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* by William of Jumièges (7.12, ed. van Houts 2.112), saying that after an honourable secular life, *Olivarus*, the son of Guillaume II Talvas, as a *senex* entered the Monastery of Le Bec under Abbot Anselm, which means before 1093, and so he must have been born in about 1033 at the latest, and yet under Abbot William (1093–1124) he remained a monk *multis annis*, and cannot therefore have been born much before 1033; on the other hand, since his son Robert reached the age of majority before 1066, we can estimate his date of birth as around 1025–1030. Because of the length of his life, we cannot agree with the editor Bertrand de Broussillon of the above-mentioned charter no.17a, nor following him Latouche (in Maine-Latouche 143), who interpret *Gausfredus comes* and *Herbertus Cenomannensis comes* as Geoffroy I of Le Perche and Herbert I. of Le Mans (which leads to a. 1033–1036). Instead, we identify these as Geoffroy Martel and Herbert II of Le Mans (which leads to the date given above of 1051–1060). Also, in this charter the nephews of the bishop who give their agreement do not include Arnulf, son of Guillaume II Talvas from his first marriage, who was murdered shortly before 1049 (cf. ed. van Houts, 2.112 n. 2); he would have to have appeared before Olivier in the list, and if he is missing, this means that the charter must have been written after his death.

For the sake of completeness we must also mention: *18 Paris-S.Magloire 95, according to the editors "[1047–1071] ou [1104–1117]" (depending on whether

the Abbot issuing the charter was Ulricus I or II at the Abbey of Saint-Magloire) *Oliverus grafium [sic] de Corsolt* (Corseul about 15 km southwest of Saint-Malo), one of the group of Breton monks who were taken into prayer fellowship with Saint-Magloire of Paris. (Saint-Magloire was originally a Breton monastery; its monks saved the relics of Maglorius from the Normans and brought them to Paris, where a Saint-Barthélemy was turned into the new Saint-Magloire, and as we see here, it kept in touch with their old homeland).

Our attention has already been drawn several times to 11th c. Anjou. It was ruled by the touchy and aggressive Gauzfrids (~ Fulk family) and its cultural influence spread into the Vendômois region and Brittany, bringing a love of onomastic and proto-epic innovation into these areas. The early reception of the name Olivier fits this situation very well. As to Bellême in the western Perche, i.e. in the transition area to Normandy, its isolated early Olivier is probably an outlying case: if he was not from a canonical marriage, there was no need to take account of the names of his relatives, and he could be given a 'modern' name.

C.14.1.3 The north

We must just correct one error here. In S.Quentin-Charles 89 it is claimed that an Olivier of Rouvroy donates Harly to the monastery of Homblières in the year 1060 (all three places are directly to the east of Saint-Quentin); however, the donation was actually made in the 12th c.: S.Quentin-Héméré 40 a. 1130 and 42 a. 1144 ($\equiv$ Vermandois-Colliette 2.276 and 277) *Oliverius miles* has made donations to Homblières in *Ruuereo et Harleio*.

Apart from this, there are no references from the north from before the year 1060.

C.14.2 Summary of the early period, further dissemination

The picture of the first 60 years (1000–1060) of the name *Olivier* that we now have before us can be summed up in a few sentences. The name *Olivier* first appears around or shortly before 1000 in the middle Rhône area just to the west of Vienne-Lyon and quickly spreads further to the west into the French Massif Central around Brioude. But we also find it in Septimania from around 1025, and not long after that, deep inside the Marca Hispanica. This is too late to explain the whole name as an offspring of the regional name *Oliba / Oliva* that is to be found almost exclusively in that area, and yet it is early enough to suspect that in this area, *Olivier* was indeed interpreted as a modernisation of that local name and adopted there. A little later, it spreads from the middle

Rhône area further into the southeast and appears in 1040 on the other side of the Alps in Upper Italy, which it manages to cross in just under forty years. It also appeared around 1035 in the proto-epic loving west (Anjou), and indeed early enough to appear at Roland's side – and also alongside Marsilĭe, Ganelon, Turpin and Naimes – in the Angevin Song from between 1045–1055; through the influence of the Angevins, in about 1050 or shortly after that, it passed on into French-speaking eastern Brittany, and at that time atypically, we find it as the name of only one person in the Perche near the Norman border.

For a new name which is linked with neither a high-ranking real person nor with a saint, this is at first a quantitatively thin expansion, but by medieval standards, it is notable for its speed and obvious direction – within a wide but nevertheless clearly defined area. The name's popularity continued in all the areas it had reached by 1060, and until 1150, the end of the period covered by my investigation, it remained densely represented there; references are so easy to find that there is no need to present the evidence. The other side of this picture is also instructive, that is to say the fact that after at least 60 years of documentary evidence relating to this name, there is still no trace of it in the *Duchy* of Burgundy (in the *regnum Franciae*). The further spread of the name is of less interest to us; however, I give an illustrative indication of it with the following early references from my collection of materials, arranged region by region.

Duchy of Burgundy: Cluny 4.497 a. 1063 (and Nevers 142 a. 1011–1065) *Oliverius miles*, owner of a church in the Diocese of Nevers; Molesmes 22 a. 1076 (or shortly after this date) *Oliverius*, witness; RHC Occ. 4.317 and 494 Olivier of Château-Jussey (Haute-Saône), participant in the First Crusade.

In the southwest, the name seems partly to have come from the area around Anjou: Poitou-S.Florent 104 a. 1059–1070 *vidente Oliverio, postea monacho*, presumably the same person as the Olivier from the family of Viscounts of Castillon-sur-Dordogne (GC 2.324 around 1079, Périgord-S.Florent 36 a. 1081, cf. also A. Richard 1903, 2.208), who in about 1080 became a monk in Saint-Florent-de-Saumur (Périgord-S.Florent 37 a.1081, Bordelais-S.Florent 15 and 17 a. 1080, 12 a. 1082); also Poitiers-S.Cyprien 260 "v. 1060- v. 1110" and 34 a. "1073–1100, vers 1090" *Oliverius* of Château-Larcher near Vivonne (Vienne), 30 a. 1088–1091 *Olivarius*, a different person. In the far southwest, on the other hand, it is unclear whether the name came from the Anjou area via Poitou, or alternatively from the middle Rhône area westwards through the mountains: Lézat 1.233 "vers 1072–1081" *Oliverius de Ladmunt*, 1.225 a. 1084 *Oliverius de Chinval*; Saint-Sever 237 a. 1072 *Oliverius de Montbeo*; Bouquet 12.401 a. 1080 *Olivarius de Turre*, cofounder of La Sauve-Majeure near Bordeaux; GC 1.188 a. 1087 *S. Oliverii monachi*

(Diocese of Bazas); Béarn-Marca 356 a. 1096 *Oliuer de Arborcaue* (the one in the pair of brothers no. 6, cf. C.13.1 above).

From Anjou and eastern Brittany into Normandy: Here, after the forerunner examined above (as no. 17), the son of Guillaume II Talvas of Bellême, are the references up to the year 1120. According to Hildebrand (1884, 340) the parts of the original mss. of the *Domesday Book* dating from 1086–1087 contain eight references for the name *Oliuer*, three in the *Exchequer Domesday* (all vol. 1, 115 d), and five in the *Exon Domesday* (vol. 4, 62, 380 [2], 381 [2]); however, they all seem to be referring to one and the same landowner in Devon. Further references: Cormery 101 a. 1070–1087 *Olivarius*, deceased son of Roger d'Aubigny (Diocese of Coutances); Sées 14v° a. 1094, 16v° a. 1096 *Oliverius*, son of Gérard de Saint-Hilaire (25 km southeast of Avranches); Sées 16v° a. 1096 *Oliverius de Guaio*; Normandie-Saint-Florent 44 around 1096 *Oliverius de Saceo*; Normandie-Saint-Florent 43 around 1096, 46 a. 1097, 45 after 1100 *Oliverius*, cleric, son of *Herbertus presbiter*, not the same person as the previous one; Ordericus Vitalis (ed. Le Prévost) 4.180 a. 1103 *Oliverius de Fresnai*; Bouquet 13.69 around 1107 *Oliverius de Merlymond*, supporter of Henry I of England; Sées 24v° a. 1117 *Oliverius de Monmaie*. The name *Oliverius* first became popular as a Christian name in the time around 1064–1066, when William forged an alliance between himself and some of the Bretons against the other Bretons, and then gladly relied on the help of many Bretons during his conquest of England, after which he rewarded them appropriately, and this led to the two sets of nobility maintaining contact with each other. The influence of French-speaking eastern Brittany may therefore have encouraged the reception of the name *Olivier* in Normandy more strongly than the diffuse influence from further south.

The name *Olivier* was not present in Normandy as early as it was in Anjou, Eastern Brittany or the Vendômois region, and this is not just due to the vagaries of manuscript preservation. This can be seen in two negative and quantitively relevant sources. In Fauroux's edition of the charters of the Norman dukes (up to the year 1066; 233 charters) there is no second Olivier to be found, and not a single Roland either. Chalandon's history of the southern Italian Normans (1907) counts in the index 65 Guillaume, 65 Robert, 50 Roger, 41 Richard, 36 Geoffroy, 15 Gautier – but no Olivier and no Roland; since modern scholarship (Tramontana 1980, 189) confirms that the migration of Normans from France to southern Italy came *quasi totalmente* to a stop in 1066, because better opportunities had become available in newly conquered England, Chalandon indirectly collects material from Normandy up to the year 1066. I emphasise this point because I would like to highlight my conviction once again that the Normans sang the Song of Roland in the year 1066, and that sometime later the Norman poet Turold turned the material into a masterpiece of world literature,

but the version that already existed for him, dating from around the middle of the 11th c. – already featuring the illustrious pair Roland and Olivier, and including Ganelon, Turpin, Naimes and Marsilĭe – was Angevin, and not yet Norman.

North-western Alps, Franche-Comté, French Switzerland: Romainmôtier 473 undated (= Schweiz-Hidber 1.386 "a. 1085?") *Oliverius* of Bannens, son of the benefactor; Domène 45 around 1110 *Olivarius Engelbertus*; Basel 1.265 a. 1136 *Oliverius* of Dampjoux near Montbéliard.

Area around Paris: Longpont (Diocese of Paris) 258 around 1108 G*odefredus, cognomento Oliverius de Fertada*; Paris-S.Germain 1.168 a. 1146–1152 *Goffredus filius Oliverii*.

Lorraine, Champagne, Ardennes: Ramerupt 451 after 1082 and MGH SS. 13.254 (*Genealogia regum Francorum tertiae stirpis*) *Oliverius*, son of Count André of Ramerupt (on the dating: Olivier's father died after 1118, his brother Eble, Bishop of Châlons from 1122, died in 1126, his sister Alix after 1143); Remiremont 29v°XC first half of the 12th c. (probably a. 1124–1143) *pueros suos [. . .], Oliverum, Boemundum* (M *Amelina*, B *Bencelinus*, *Teobaldus*, S *Haduidis*, *Belisma*) in Saint-Nicolas (Meurthe-et-Moselle); Champagne-d'Arbois 3.429 a. 1142 *Oliverius de Droennaio*.

Flanders: MGH SS. 25.442 a. 1127 (*Chron. Hanoniense quod dicitur Balduini Avennensis*) *Ylias li nies Olivier* and *Fromons fius Olivier*, probably related to each other, who assisted the murderers of Charles of Flanders; Temple 2 around 1125 *Gunmerus de Chery et Oliverus filius ejus*; S.Bertin-Haigneré 158 a. 1125 (and frequently until 1147) *Olivarius de Arkas*; Douai-Brassart 408 a. 1129 *Oliverus de Bunduis* (Bondues 10 km north of Lille).

German Lower Rhine: Niederrhein 167 around 1100 (probably 1100–1102) *Olifier* (Archbishopric of Cologne or County of Berg), but this is the only reference. Socin in his MHG book of names (1903, 75) can only find one *Oliverus*, a teacher in the Cathedral school in Cologne in 1201, and another *Oliverus*, a knight from Alsace, in 1226, and even these are only from areas affected by a strong French influence.

In Galloromania, the further dissemination of the name after 1060 was, as we might expect, mostly from south to north.

C.14.3 Could the name *Olivier* be derived from another name?

For a long time, there was a certain aversion against the idea that the name *Olivier* could be derived etymologically from *oliva* 'olive tree' + the onomastic element *-erius* or simply from the late Latin *olivarius* 'olive tree' because it would be too simple, almost automatic. And precisely because alternative explanations are so persistent, I cannot pass over the following cases without comment:

[1] *Oliba*: We have already examined Lejune's view that *Olivier* is an extension of the regional name *Oliba* and concluded that this is not very likely.

[2] *Olitguarius*: Léon Gautier (1899, 533) came across the charter Beaulieu 132s. a. 888 containing a witness called *Olitguarius,* and on the basis of this find, he believed that the name *Olivarius* was of Germanic origins. *Olitguarius* < Germ. *ald-* (or *halid-*) + *-wari*; for Germ. *ald-* goes to *old-* not only occasionally in the north-eastern part of Galloromania, but also rarely in the south: Saint Olegarius is called in Dauphiné 528 a. 1111 *Ollegarius*, 530 a. 1112/1113 *Oldegarius* as Abbot of Saint-Ruf (Diocese of Valence), 537 a. 1116 both *Oldegarius* and *Aldegarius* as Bishop of Barcelona, and finally in Cluny 5.360 a. 1130 *Aldegerius* as Archbishop of Tarragona (showing unequivocally that we have here Germ. *ald-* + *-gari*); a simultaneous analysis of *ald-* > *old-* as disyllabic can be found in relation to the same name in Ribagorza 442 a. 1015 *Uuifredo filio Olodigero*. But the *Olitguarius* from Beaulieu remains quite isolated; for this reason, quite apart from the phonological problems, I cannot accept this as the source of the name, nor as the first reference to it. My view is that this case – which is separated in space and time by over 200 km as the crow flies and more than a century from the oldest unequivocal reference – shows only coincidental similarity.[1567]

1567 Schmittlein (1966, 301–303) and Coromines (1952, 50 n.50) have picked up Gautier's theory again. Schmittlein analyses *Olitguarius* in principle correctly as *Altwar*, but then incorrectly concludes that *Olivier* can be explained as coming from a non-existent form **Alt-var* instead of *-war*, which is not the same thing in terms of the phonemes and disguises another difficulty; it is entirely inadmissible to then conflate this with the name *Alitgar* (Halitgarius, Bishop of Cambrai 817–841), which is clearly a *-gar* name. Coromines views *Olitguarius* – in my view incorrectly – as the oldest reference for *Olivarius*, seeing it not as a Germanic name, but as the fem. saint's name *Oliva* + *-arius/-erius,* thus coming a little closer to the correct etymology. He regards the two masc. names *Oliba / Oliva* and *Olivarius*, again correctly, as not related to each other, but occasionally being identified with each other through secondary interpretation (cf. on this n. 1565 above).

[3] *Aldigarius*: The Germ. *Aldigarius* is even more obviously not an earlier stage of the name *Olivarius* (Kalbow 1913, 158s.); because this would not answer the question of how a /v/ could ever have come from /g/ or even /dž/.[1568]

[4] Old Norse "*Olleifr*": Jenkins (in his edition's index of names) was thinking of "Norse *Olleifr*"[1569] and apparently did not realise that the *-r* here is only a nominative ending; there is not the slightest indication to show how an Old Norse name could have reached the Rhône Bend before 1000, and why this name, which at that time was still only pagan, would have been given to a Christian.

[5] Old Norse *álfr*: Kahane/Kahane (1959, 227–229) point out that from the early 13th c. onwards, in the Rhine-Flemish area, a kindly servant demon was called *Oliverus*, and that Old French during this same period (and even in some places still in modern French) had a saying *avoir son Olivier courant* 'faire ce qu'on veut' (or in my opinion more accurately: 'to cope well') which probably refers to this demon. But the chronology does not support this attempt to trace the origins of the epic Olivier back to a demonological source which comes more than two centuries later! Moreover, I think that the demon's name is simply there to suggest 'faithfulness, reliability'. It therefore seems random to me in terms of the meaning to derive the name from Old Norse *álfr* (or a less common Middle Low German-Middle Dutch *alf*) 'the Elf, the Elbe' + *-arius*.

[6] Old Danish/Old Swedish *álfihari*, *álfiher*: From a footnote in Álvar (2014b, 9 n. 3) I became aware of García Gallarín (2014 s. v. *Oliverio*, *Oliver*, *Oliveros*), who suggests the name comes from a folk-etymological alignment with Lat. *olivarius* so that it ultimately "podría venir de Oliver en antiguo danés y sueco, o bien de Alfihari, Alfiher 'el ejército de los elfos'". But the Old Danish or Old Swedish *Oliver* can only be the epic name itself, since in the late Middle Ages it came to the north via the KMS and other Old Danish and Old Swedish texts that

---

1568 By way of pre-emptive remark, I note at this point that *Odolgerius* is even less valid as a previous stage of *Oliverius* than *Olitguarius* or *Aldigarius* – this is pre-emptive with regard to Bourgogne-Garnier 144 a. 953 (for Saint-Étienne de Dijon) *servum unum nomine Anscherio, cum uxore sua et infantibus illorum Otolgerio et Rotlanno*, but also e.g. Flavigny 85 a. 942, 99 a. 1000 and 121 a. 1034 *Od(o/u)lg(e/a)rius* (in the region around Autun/Flavigny).
1569 Jenkins does not give a source for this form of the name (with *-ll-*). He obviously means the name that is usually cited in its late form, Old Norse *Óláfr* or *Ólafr* (for King Olaf, who Christianised Norway), but who is also attested with the older forms as *Óleifr* or even (skaldic) *Áleifr* (Heusler 1967, § 117.8).

were derived from it, which means we have a *petitio principii* here. Nor do we need to look for the compound made from Germ. *alƀi* + *-hari* in the north (and in an appellative) because it is also attested in Galloromania: Morlet (s. v. *Albharius*) cites, alongside OHG *Alpharius* (with [p] + [h], not /f/!) and a Flemish *Alfheri*, also one *Albarus* (Marca Hispanica a. 878, cf. Spanish *Álvar*), one *Alparius* (Langres 9. Jh.) and one *Alperius* (Reims a. 1075), all referring to very ordinary individuals. But the changes *a-* > *o-* and *-b-* (or even *-p-*) > *-v-* as well as the middle *-i-* must then all be attributed to the influence of *olivarius*, which means there is no reason why there should ever be an earlier etymological stage before *olivarius* – apart from the *a priori* conviction that a name must always go back to another name.

[7] A Saint Oliveria: Pauphilet (1933, 176 n. 2) brought a Saint *Oliveria* into the debate. She was venerated in the 11th c. in Chaumont-Porcien, and so although Pauphilet does not expressly state this, a suggestion is made that *Oliverius* could be emulating her name. Not at all! We read in the entries about her in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Feb I 365s., relating to 3rd of February and Jun III 100, for the 16th of June) that the Saint is supposed to have lived as a hermit near Chaumont with her sister Liberata / Libertas in the year 500, following the advice given to her by two other saints local to that area, Bertaldus and Amandus, but the oldest reliably datable text about her is the note made by Bishop Guido of Soissons regarding the reburial of her relics in the year 1248 in a new shrine; another equally old source could well be a Vita of Bertaldus, printed in 1634 (BHL 0326), which the Bollandists estimate could have been written in *seculo XI vel XII aut forte serius*. However: in both texts, the saint is called not *Oliveria*, but *Oliva* and she is called *Olive* to this day in the place where she is venerated, as R. Louis (1964, 463) confirmed. The name *Oliveria* appears only to be found in the writings of three people who are not from that place, namely the hagiographer Molanus († 1585) in his *Natales Sanctorum Belgii* (1595, 1616) and two of the authors who copied his works, Ferrarius (1625) and Saussaius (1638), where in my opinion it could be either a short-lived variant, or even an error on the part of Molanus. Given these circumstances, there is no justification for the opinion held by R. Louis (1964, 462s.) that *Olivière* is older than *Olive*, and even goes back to an unattested *Livière/*Livaria, simply so that there would be a similar-sounding pair of names, *Livaria* and *Liberata*, from the very start. If the similarity in the sounds were so important, we would expect that over time, the names would become more like each other, rather than less. Above all, however: how could someone before the year 1000 at the Rhône Bend, some 400 km away, have heard of this strictly local saint?

[8] Saint Livarius: the situation is not much better when it comes to the candidate suggested by René Louis (1964, passim), namely Saint Livarius.[1570] He is said to have launched himself at the Huns when they were persecuting Christians and so he was beheaded by them near Marsal (50 km south-southwest of Metz). This is reported in his Passio in the *Petit Cartulaire de Saint-Arnould*, edited in the MGH SS. 24.530–531 from a copy made in about 1400 and destroyed in 1944, but since then reedited by Gaillard (2006, passim, the Passio p. 24–27) from an earlier copy made in 1300. According to van der Straeten (1968, 375) the *Petit Cartulaire* itself was made in the late 13th c. but partly based on material from the 10th c. The oldest credible information about Livarius refers to the translation of his remains from Marsal to what was then the Polyeuctus Church of Metz, by Bishop Dietrich I of Metz (965–984),[1571] and it is credible because at the end of the 11th c., people called upon Saint Livarius among others during a procession in this church, in the 12th c., people commemorated him in the Cathedral on the 25th November, and because apparently in the 11th c. (Gauthier 1986, 50), or at least before 1190, the Polyeuctus Church became a Livarius Church; also, in about 1174 a Livarius chapel was built in the women's Abbey of Saint-Maur of Verdun because the Abbess Elisabeth held this particular saint in high esteem (van der Straeten 1968, 374–376). But the veneration of Livarius never spread further than Marsal, Metz and this one nunnery in Verdun, and before 1200 Livarius is not a specifically military saint.

Then things took an unexpected turn. A French ms. of the 15th c. (Bibl. de la Ville de Metz 855 [105], f. 197r°–240v°) contains a lengthy romance of Saint Livier. Both Auguste Prost (1885, especially 334–338) and Charles Bruneau (1928, passim) saw it as the prosification of a *chanson de geste* from the 13th c., "plus récente que la *Geste des Lorrains*". The key elements of the plot are as follows (based on the detailed information on the contents in Bruneau and in Louis, 1964, 454s.): In Metz which was once founded by three noble Trojans [borrowing from the Trojan legend which by that time was familiar across the whole of Europe], and which had recently triumphantly overcome an invasion by the *Wandres* 'Vandals' with the help of the Emperor of Cologne [borrowing from

---

1570 His insignificance is such that the authors of the *Acta Sanctorum* overlooked him; this omission was not rectified until the article by Joseph van der Straeten was published in the *Analecta Bollandiana* 86 (1968, 373–389).

1571 Since there is no trace of any veneration of this saint in the intervening 500 years, it has also been suggested (e.g. in the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* s. v. *Livarius*) that Livarius may well have been a victim of the Hungarians. In those days, they were often taken for returning Huns, and that is why they were called Huns for short (cf. the collected references from the 10th to 13th c. in Beckmann 2010, 36 n. 150).

the Lorraine epics], there lived a young man called Livier. He was from the Gournay family on his mother's side [according to Bruneau a family from the city of Metz in those days!]. He came with a delegation to the court of King Ban of Benis [modelled on the *Ban de Benoïc* who is in several Arthurian romances]; this king is about to be besieged by the pagan kings of Armenia and Cyprus, but with Livier's help, they are defeated and converted [the Kingdom of (Little-) Armenia was influenced by the French from 1198 onwards, and had promised to submit to the Roman Church; Cyprus was from 1192 onwards a French-speaking kingdom ruled by the Lusignan family, with a Roman Catholic dynasty and military class]. Livier travels with the newly converted kings to Jerusalem [since visiting the Holy Land is a sacred duty for pious heroes], becomes engaged to *Genouyre* [name modelled on that of Arthur's wife Guinevere], the King of Armenia's niece [probably influenced by the *Boeve de Hantone*], but when he goes to Metz to obtain his father's permission to marry her, he runs into another invasion by the *Sarasins*, *Hongrois* and *Wandres* [again taken from the Lorraine epics]; this time, the *Wandres* have women with superhuman strength and extra-long breasts which they hang over their shoulders [borrowed from the medieval geography of monsters], who throw boulders and help to defeat the people from Metz by striking them with heavy anvils. At this point the *geste* develops into a Passio: Livier launches himself with great courage towards the enemy but is captured and beheaded near Marsal.

René Louis unfortunately overlooks the reference to the Gournay family of Metz and, in my view, this is why he fundamentally misunderstands the circumstances under which this *chanson* originated. I think the work was commissioned by the Gournay family: Nicolas le Gronnais from Metz – this is the original form of the family name – was in 1230 the leader of the Metz assessors, had business dealings with the Duke of Lorraine in 1243, and obtained a money-changer's licence in 1245; between about 1250 and 1350 his family were "les banquiers les plus puissants" in the city (J. Schneider 1950, 275–279, with much more detail Pundt 1996, passim); in 1350 Tiébaut le Gronnais (according to Pundt 1996, 179) became a vassal of the Count of Bar, and this marked the start of the family's second career, leading to their entry into the nobility and ultimately in the 17th c. their elevation to the status of Count, all of which is most easily ascertained by reading their burial monuments (on the detail of these, Ph.-É. Wagner 2004 passim). They must surely have paid for a wordsmith, probably in the second half of the 13th c., to rework this saint's legend into a family saga by borrowing whatever material seemed most suitable.[1572]

1572 In his list of contents, Bruneau uses *Gournay*, the later name of the family, instead of *(le) Gronnais*, possibly contradicting his source in order to make the identity of the family

René Louis (1964, 448–451) did, however, discover something else about this *geste*: already in the *Petit Cartulaire,* that is to say in the late 13th c., the title of the Passio does not completely match its content, but is more suitable for a *geste,* because it reads: *De quodam milite (!) Livario, nobili et strenuo viro, qui, acceptis militaribus armis (!), se inter profanos intrepidus audacter tanquam leo immersit.* But even this could be due to the fact that the Gournay family commissioned the work: the scribe of the cartulary knew this and did not want to omit the mention of Livarius' knighthood and battle experience from his title, although it is interesting that he did not include any more details than this.

Be that as it may, this clearly provincial saint from Lorraine, whether in his humble early form, or in his "militarisation" in the late 13th c., does not allow us to conclude anything about the middle Rhône area before the year 1000. It is almost redundant to point out that Livier is never called Olivier, just as conversely, in the middle Rhône area there is no Livier to be found before or beside Olivier. Louis' view that Livier gave his name to the epic Olivier is therefore untenable.[1573]

C.14.4 The symbolism behind the name

Now that we have refuted all attempts to derive the name *Olivier* from some other pre-existing name, it is high time to consider a different approach: the name is an entirely new creation, specifically because the man who invented it – whether he was the poet or not – did not want to evoke a hero or other person 'like others before him', but instead wanted him to represent a new type of person, a new ideal. I would like to demonstrate this in three steps: first, I aim to show that the symbolic content of the name – with its classical as well as Christian roots – was simply impossible to miss for a person living in the time around 1000; secondly, I would like to explain how the name was not

---

more obvious. Judging by the way the name is cited in the secondary literature (especially Ph.-É Wagner 2004), the form *le Gournai*s appears in about 1450, *de Gournai*s in about 1500, *de Gournay* in the middle of the 16th c.; there is no doubt at all that this refers to the same family. At some point, the Gournay family committed a second act of deception, in addition to the *Chanson de Livier*: they claimed that their ancestors had been Lords of Gournay in Normandy over a period of three generations, and not only that, were related to a side-branch of the Capetians (!) before they returned to Metz – and unfortunately Dom Calmet (in Lorraine-Calmet, V, p. CC-CCII) took this at face value.

1573 The situation was very different in Italy, where a Saint Liberius, *San(to) Liverio* (who is not historical and probably an invention of the 13th c., cf. AA.SS. for the 27th of May) was commonly known as *Sant'Oliverio* because of the obvious influence of the name *Oliverius*; this relates to the subsequent note added by René Louis (1966, 705 n. 36).

exceptional in terms of the way it was formed, but only in terms of its huge success; and thirdly, I embed the name in the most powerful spiritual and social current of its time.

For the first step, I have a precursor, the perceptive Leo Spitzer (1943, 589–591): he was well aware of the symbolic content of the name but simplified things somewhat by quoting the *Distinctiones* by Alanus ab Insulis (written about a half a century after the surviving Rol.) where the biblical symbolism of the *oliva* – the *sapientia divina*, the *justus* and the *Ecclesia* – are each cited with an example, and a quotation from the Psalms is explained in more detail. I propose to explain the symbolism with reference to a somewhat broader foundation.[1574]

When Augustus had put an end to the Roman civil wars, he instituted a great cult of peace personified: the divine Pax. In this environment, the olive tree and olive branch soon flourished as a "symbol of existing, desired or personified peace" (PW s. v. *Ölbaum*, col. 2020s., where the following references are also to be found): the *oliva* is in Vergil's *Georg*. 2.425 *placita Paci* 'cherished and valued by the goddess of peace' (and Servius explains that the *oliva* is *pacis insigne* 'the sign of peace'); in the nekyia, *Aen*. 6.808–812, the peaceful bringer of the law Numa appears *ramis insignis olivae* 'richly adorned with olive branches'; when Aeneas, sailing up the Tiber with his Trojans, hears someone from the bank asking who they are and what their purpose is, he makes himself known and (*Aen*. 8.116) immediately *pacificae [. . .] ramum praetendit olivae*, holds out 'a branch of the peace-bringing olive tree'; in Ovid, *met*. 6.101, when Pallas Athene is in competition with Arachne she finishes her weaving *oleis pacalibus* 'with (an image of) olive branches of peace' which is her sacred tree. And finally, an example with a more obvious political meaning: if *pacatae ramus olivae* brings salvation even in war, can the same gesture be in vain for someone begging his lord for mercy), if that lord is the bringer of universal peace himself? asks Ovid in a coquettish and wistful way in his *ex Ponto* 1.1.31. Isidore spells this symbolism out for the whole of the Middle Ages when, following Servius, he says of the *olea* that it is *arbor pacis insignis* (*et*. 17.7.62), while Rabanus (*De univ*. 19.6, PL 111.522) and later Vincent of Beauvais (*spec. nat*. 13.28, ed. Douai 1.965) echo the whole passage word for word.

Also, according to PW (s. v. *Ölbaum*, col. 2021) it is only a special case – but, we might add, by far the most important one – that messengers, including especially those who are coming to offer or ask for peace, bring an olive branch with them; a *ramum [. . .] popularis olivae* 'a branch [from its homeland Athens

---

[1574] In my view, there is no need to make a distinction between an olive tree and an olive branch.

because it was sacred to Athene] of an olive tree' is carried by the messenger Cephalus, when he goes to Aeacus from Aegina to ask him for help against Minos (Ovid *met.* 7.498). For the popularity of this symbol, it was important that Vergil and Statius in particular loved it: Aeneas sends a hundred messengers to the Latins *ramis velatos Palladis omnīs* 'all wrapped round with the [olive] branches sacred to Athene' (*Aen.* 7.154); Latin messengers similarly carried an olive branch, when for example (*Aen.* 11.101) they asked for the bodies of those killed in battle or when (*Aen.* 11.332) they had to take an offer of peace to the Trojans; even the word *rami* on its own could in such a context mean 'olive branch', e.g. *Aen.* 8.128 where Servius adds by way of explanation the pseudo-etymological reference ἐλαία 'oliva'~ ἔλεος 'misericordia, pacis signum'; similarly, Statius (*Theb.* 2.389, 2.478, 5.417s., 7.476, 12.468, 12.492; cf. also 7.476, 8.89, 12.682). Blancandrin knows this custom of the *ius gentium* and abuses it (v. 72s.): *Branches d'olive en voz mains porterez: / Ço senefiet pais e humilitét*; Jenkins makes reference to *Thèbes* 1243s. and *Eneas* 4687s.

This strand of tradition from classical antiquity then merged with biblical tradition at the end of the classical period. Since in the Old Testament the olive tree and olive branch were already present in many contexts, including similes, they necessarily became an extremely polysemic symbol for the essentials of Christian faith. But no biblical passage appears to have moved people in late antiquity and on into the Middle Ages as much as *Gen* 8.11: the dove returning to the ark with the olive branch. Just as the ark prefigured the *ecclesia* as a place of saving refuge, so God's messenger of peace prefigured the confirmation of God's peace that follows from baptism. Sometimes she appears carved in touchingly rough outlines, holding something in her beak that only a specialist would be able to identify as an olive branch, but often she also appears more clearly on early Christian coffins and other artworks: "Nous pourrions citer des centaines de monuments, épitaphes, bas-reliefs, fresques, etc., sur lesquels l'olivier est figuré, sans parler de la colombe qui regagne l'arche avec le rameau dans son bec ou entre ses pattes", writes Henri Leclercq in the Art. *Olivier* in DACL (with two typical illustrations). With this in mind, Tertullian also states (*De baptismo* 8.4): *quemadmodum [. . .] pacem [. . .] columba terris adnuntiavit [. . .] cum olea reversa – quod signum etiam ad nationes pacis praetenditur – eadem dispositione [. . .] carni nostrae emergenti de lavacro [. . .] columba sancti spiritus advolat pacem Dei adferens, emissa de caelis, ubi ecclesia est arcae figura.* Augustine expresses this more simply (*De doctr. Christ.* 2.16.43s.): *facile est intellegere pacem perpetuam significari oleae ramulo (var. ramusculo), quem rediens ad arcam columba protulit.* Similarly (according to TLL s. v. *oliva*) in the 7th c. the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* 77.7: *columba demonstrans per olivae ramum pacem terris redditam.* In Christian poetry, the *olea / oliva* (according to the TLL s. vv.) is also clearly a

symbol of peace, e.g. in Ausonius (*Ordo urbium nobilium* 88), Prudentius (*Perist.* 4.54–56, *Psych.* 687), Apollinaris Sidonius (*Carm.* 14.5), and Arator (1.27s.). When in the year 1046 Bishop Oliva of Vic died, the Cathedral clerics of Girona wrote in their letter of condolence: *Quam de quo loquimur patrem bene decebat pacificum nomen Oliva!* (Esp.sagr. 43.440). At the God's Peace Council of Narbonne in 1054, olive groves were declared to be sacrosanct, because this plant was a sign of peace after the flood (H. Hoffmann 1964, 95s.). And to give two examples from the time of the Rol. (according to NGML s. v. *oliva*): Rupert of Deutz (*De vict. Verbi* 5.6): *ramum olive constabat gentilibus [. . .] signum pacis esse*; and Reimbald of Liège, epitaph (*Chron.*, *epitaph.* 2): *clauditur hac tumba simplex sine felle columba / que nobis vivam referebat pacis olivam.*

The olive tree is unequivocally a symbol of rediscovered peace with God even in the oldest surviving (fragmentary) Old French epic (*Gormont et Isembart* v. 656): repenting of his misdeeds and dying as a martyr, Isembart drags himself with the last of his strength to an *olliver fuilli*, and then he says his *Mea culpa* under its branches; the symbolism here is all the more obvious when we remember that no olive trees ever grew in northern France. Similarly, William and Guiot find the dying Vivien under an olive tree (*Ch. de Guill.* 1988–1993).

Another Old Testament saying that attracted the attention of Christians at an early date is *Ps* 52.10: *Ego autem sicut oliva fructifera in domo Dei; speravi in misericordia Dei, in aeternum et in saeculum saeculi.* Eucherius of Lyon († um 450) explains it in his *Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae*, an early lexicon of biblical symbols (cap. 3): *Oliva: sanctus misericordiae abundans fructibus.* The righteous person in the Bible text was not in fact rich from the fruits of his own mercy, but from the fruits which God's mercy had given him, and so Eucherius' statement is somewhat ambiguous. The reference to a person's own actions is clearer in Rabanus (*Allegoriae in universam sacram scripturam*, PL 112.1011): *Oliva: opera iustorum, ut in Psalmis "Ego autem sicut oliva fructifera," id est ad instar praecedentium justorum vixi.* Why does the olive tree now signify the 'works of the righteous' themselves, that is to say their own *misericordia*? The answer can be found in the short formulation, already cited by Spitzer but in my view not yet fully explained, from Alanus (*Distinctiones dictionum theologicalium*, PL 210.881) with the key word 'David': *Oliva: [. . .] dicitur 'justus', unde David: Quasi oliva fructifera.* Since in the Middle Ages David was thought to have been the author of the Psalms, he is the one who is led by divine inspiration to call himself the righteous one, the *oliva fructifera*. In the process, this 'righteousness' (or in the Bible text *misericordia*) takes on a dual meaning all of its own: David's righteousness in the name of God was peaceful within Israel, especially towards Saul, but it was extremely violent when directed outwards, against those who did not follow Yahweh. From the Carolingian period onwards, if not earlier, this kind of life would be understood through the metaphor

of the olive tree.[1575] Thus, there is no inherent contradiction when the PT first introduces Olivier (cap. 11) *as miles acerrimus, bello doctissimus, brachio et mucrone potentissimus*, but then in the final chapter, which he ascribes to *Calixtus papa,* etymologises his name (and in so doing seeks to show his nature): *Oliverus interpretatur heros misericordiae, quia clemens et misericors super omnes extitit.* The association of *misericordia* with *oliv(a)* shows that he had the passage from the Psalm in mind; the important thing for us is the fact that in his opinion, this *misericordia* did not preclude the destruction of 'God's enemies', but specifically included it.

For people who knew their Bible well, these meanings were surrounded by other, mostly very positive meanings of the polysemic symbol of the *oliva*. We only need to list them as Rabanus does, to see that they formed an aura of overlapping religious values without clear external borders, centred around the old, central notion of 'peace with God'; the *oliva* also signifies: the (old and now new) house of Israel (in Paul, *Rom* 11), the *Ecclesia, Christus in Ecclesia*, the *spiritus sanctus* (*De univ.* and *Allegoriae*, PL 112.1011);[1576] similarly, the *oleum* relates to *gratia* (or *praesentia*) *spiritus sancti* or *interna gratia*, the *fama divinae laudis*, *caritas*, *misericordia* or the *opera misericordiae*, *consolatio*, the *devotio mentis*, a t*estimonium conscientiae bonae* or *testimonium cordis*.[1577]

1575 We should note here that the name *David* in Morlet 1972 (s. v.) has 30 Galloromanic references from the 8th–11th c., which shows remarkable frequency and continuity.

1576 In the New Testament, the olive, instead of giving rise to further metaphors, is present in the literal sense. Among other things, there is the *Mons Oliveti /Mons Olivarum*, from where Jesus 'meekly' (*Mt* 21.5) began his entry into Jerusalem (*Mc* 11.1, early OF 17.2 *mont Oliver*), where he predicted the destruction of the temple (*Mc* 13.3) and where the garden of Gethsemane was (*Lc* 22.39); in memory of the entry into Jerusalem some parts of Christianity practise the custom of taking olive branches along with or instead of palm branches during their Palm Sunday procession (regional Italian d*omenica d'uliva* instead of *domenica delle palme*, FEW s. v. *ŏlīva* n. 2). Finally, on the basis of the Bible's many and very positive connotations, medieval authors occasionally used the *oliva* in metaphors of their own, e.g. for great saints such as John, Peter or Paul, relics from the Holy Land etc., cf. the references in the NGML s. v. *oliva* I) B, V) B and V) C.

1577 Here however, we have to remove an objection. As Steinmeyer (1963, 126) correctly noted, for Rabanus, *oliva* and *oleum* had a negative meaning in a few Bible passages, essentially when the context shows that someone is only pretending to hold one of these values. Steinmeyer further notes that according to Rabanus the pine tree in *Is* 60.13 symbolises the *veritas fidei* because of its height, strength and evergreen nature. And he shows that the Roland poet links, as accessories of the story, the olive tree with the enemy, and the pine tree with Charles. Doesn't that contradict any symbolic relationship between the olive and the name *Olivier*? No. First, since in the Middle Ages no one seemed to be bothered when polyvalence in symbols even went as far as contradiction – the lion could symbolise Christ, but also the devil etc. –, the poet of the surviving Rol., more than a century after the appearance of the

Moreover the *oleum* – not allegorically now, nor in a simile, but physically – was the oil which anointed Old Testament kings, priests and prophets, and was later part of Christian baptism, confirmation, the consecration of priests and bishops, and in the 'last anointing' (today called the 'last rites'); thus, it became the great symbol of a sacred pact (in each case a different one), and at the same time a personal pact of peace between God and a human being. These manifestations of oil were also filled with Christological symbolism in the liturgy, and they were apparent to believers when they participated in the sacraments. We see this laid out e.g. *in extenso* by the pseudo-Areopagite (cf. Ladner 1996, 216–217), which was available in the Latin translations by Hilduin of Saint-Denis (832) and John Scotus Eriugena (867).

All of this shows – as the first step in our argument – that the name *Olivier* rests on a semantic foundation that had overwhelming cultural power; I therefore think it is misleading to describe it as Aebischer ([1966] 1967, 170) does, as "un nom tout quelconque".

---

name Olivier, could very well have used these trees as accessories with a symbolism different from that of the name; it is remarkable that he calls the accessory an *olive*, never an *olivier*. Secondly, an accessory may carry stronger geographical than religious associations. There were no olive trees in Northern or Central France, and so for the poet as well as for Charlemagne the olive was still the Mediterranean tree *par excellence*, suggesting Spain or Italy no less than Israel. On the other hand, OF *pin*, just as Modern French *pin* and English *pine*, included not only the Mediterranean pine (*pinus pinea*; *Pinie* in German), but also all related species of the family *pinaceae* in Western and Central Europe, from the *Scots pine* to the widespread *pinus sylvestre* or *common pine* (*Kiefer* in German). It is very interesting to look at the beautiful double image (v. 114), in which Charlemagne first appears in the Song: he sits *desuz un pin, desuz un eglenter* 'under a pine tree and under a wild rose (dog rose, rosehip) bush (*rosa canina*)'. Unlike the olive tree and the pine, this bush does not occur in the Bible and so it is not part of any biblical symbolism. But let us remember, the bush grows to a height of 3 m, occasionally even 4 m, and so it was entirely feasible for someone to sit 'under' it. Like the pine, it grows in Spain, too, but it is much more typical of France, especially of the west, which is where the beautiful subspecies *rosa canina Andegavensis* comes from, the so-called 'Anjou rose'. The verse then does not aim at a double moral characterisation but improvises a momentary *locus amoenus* of two elements: the great emperor has chosen to sit under a 'sublime' tree which protects him from the Spanish sun, and at the same time amid a beautiful little corner that could remind him of home. (CV7 found the *eglenter* prosaic and changed it into *oliver*. But *eglenter* belongs in the archetype because of K: for there, v. 658, the word *adelaren* 'eagle', as Karl Bartsch recognised in his edition of 1874, is due to a misunderstanding of *aigle* instead of *aiglentier*, the attested variant spelling of *églantier*; in terms of the stemma, therefore, K supports O.)

C.14.5 This name-type and its productivity in Galloromania

We turn now from semantics to onomastics! It is phonologically irrelevant whether, as Spitzer (1948, 589ss.) argues, *oliva* 'olive tree' acquired the onomastic suffix *-erius*, which judging by the *Delecterius* cited by him already produced analogical forms based on Latin (a process much encouraged by the Germ. *-heri* names), or whether in the early 11th c, the word form *olivarius* 'olive tree'[1578] was turned into a name, because *-arius* and *-erius* became merged in Galloromania before recorded history; in both cases, *Olivier* is clearly a conceptual name.

Conceptual names are widely recognised as having held an important place in Christian onomastics from the very beginning. To name but a few based on Latin: Clemens, Pius, Innocentius, Bonifatius, Coelestinus, Hilarius, Simplicius were all names of Popes from the period before 500, and with the help of a large lexicon of saints, the list of such names could be extended almost *ad libitum*. Not much attention has been paid, however, to the fact that names of this type continued to be invented in Galloromania until the turn of the millennium and beyond. In the next section, I cite only names for which Morlet (1971 and s. vv.) could not find references before the stated century, and only names from within Galloromania.[1579] The locations should be regarded as approximate.

8th c.: *Bonevalus* (Grenoble; from *valere*, cf. *Valens* 'combative', also in the spiritual-Christian sense), *Deodonatus* (Gorze, later Reims and Marseille; re-newal/ popularising form of *Deodatus*, *Adeodatus*, *Deusdedit*), *Hamedeus* (Gorze; variant of *Amadeus*, which appears in the early 9th c. in Paris and then else-where soon after that; it survives into modern French as *Amédée* mainly

---

1578 For the type *olivarius* meaning 'olive tree' Aebischer (1951, 203s.) cites three references from before 1050 from Marseille and Catalonia. In Old Occitan as a whole, the word competes with the then more frequent *oliu* (as in Ital. Span. *olivo* <*olivus*). It is attested in the *Pèlerinage* (v. 7) for the Île-de-France, in the *Gormont* (v. 656, almost certainly late 11th c.) and with Henri de Valenciennes (shortly after 1200) for the Galloromanian north. It pushed its way into promi-nence at the expense of *olif* (<*olivus*) and *olive*, which as the FEW states, should be seen as a direct continuation of Lat. *oliva* 'olive tree'; the surviving Rol. only has this last form.

1579 I checked that they were not listed in Solin/Salomies (1994). All names which have a Germanic element as their second part (excepting *-erius* ~ *-heri*) are excluded from the list, that is to say e.g. *Bone-sindus*, *Christ-olfus*, *Elect-elmus*, *Sancte-bertus* etc.; Morlet (1971, passim) lists about a hundred of these (including one female *Oliv-eldis*, Haute-Marne 182 a. 909).They are not suitable for comparison; because around 1000 a normal speaker would no longer have understood the *-ier* in *Olivier* as one of two equally important parts of the name, but – because of the phonological mingling with countless appellative forms ending in *-arius* – it would have been seen as just a suffix by then.

because *Amedeus* [sic] was from 1000 onwards the preferred name of the Counts of Maurienne, later Savoy).

9ᵗʰ c.: The list is long now mainly because of the polyptychs: *Adorellus* (Mâcon, from *adorare*), *Benecristus* (Paris), *Bethleem* (Tours), *Christidonus* (Marseille), *Creatus* (Paris; spiritually 'God's creation'), *Cristiommus* (Reims; ~ *Christi homo* 'Christ's bondsman'), *Cristorgius* (Reims; *-orgius* as in *Georgius / Eustorgius*), *Cristorius* (Paris; *-orius* as in *Gregorius / Honorius*), *Deidonatus* (Nîmes, later Marseille), *Deidonus* (Marseille and soon elsewhere), *Deodonus* (Beaulieu, Diocese of Limoges; later also Tours), *Deonatus* (Paris), *Deusadjuva* (Paris), *Durandus* (widespread across the whole of France, the majority of instances in the middle Rhône area, cf. above n. 943; 'destined or able to persevere; may a long or eternal life be granted him'), *Gedeorus* (Beaulieu; *Gedeo*n + *-orus* as in *Theodorus*), *Homodei (*Marseille, later Moissac), *Josualis* (Paris; adaptation of *Iosue*), *Justadus* (Paris; 'tested and found righteous'), *Natalifius* (Paris, around 820; adaptation of the name *Natalis*, may already mean 'born at Christmas'), Nodelevius (Reims, around 850; the same), *Olifius* (Canon in Langres;[1580] from *oliva*), *Praesagiu*s (Fleury; 'gifted with the spirit of prophecy'), *Provasius* (Languedoc, later Toul; probably as Morlet states *Probus* + *-asius* as in *Protasiu*s / *Gervasius* / *Paschasius*), *Restaurius* (Reims, later Poitiers; from *restaurare* referring to Christ's making good the Fall of Adam); *Rosianno* (Reims; from about 200 A.D. the *rosa* was the flower of Paradise and a symbol of martyrs' blood, cf. the LCI s. v. *Rose*; crossed with *Hosianna*, and then masculinised), *Seraphim* (Reims, Bèze) or *Seraphin* (Beaulieu; on its singularisation and on *-im* > *-in* cf. above s. v. *Cherubin*, C.1.3.3), *Sion* (Marca Hispanica, later Tours), *Susannus* (Tours; cf. *Susanna*, deutero-canonical book of the Old Testament and *Lc* 8.3), *Timorius* (Reims, 9ᵗʰ–10ᵗʰ c.; 'god-fearing').

10ᵗʰ c.: *Beneventus* (Cluny and soon elsewhere; synonym for VLat. *Benevenutus* > Ital. *Benvenuto*), *Confortus* (Cluny; from *confortare* 'to strengthen someone spiritually/mentally', important Bible passage *Lc* 22.43), *Felicitus* (Cluny; masc. equivalent of the older fem. name *Felicita* and *Felicitas* 'happiness'), *Provizius* (Marca Hispanica; probably as Morlet states from *Probus*, + *-icius* as in *Sulpicius / Agritius* or in appellatives), *Sufficianus* (Brioude; 'sufficient', important Bible passage *2 Cor* 12.9).

1580 He is not only attested in MGH LC. 1.46.12 and 2.549.19, where the *-f-* can perhaps be attributed to the Upper German scribe, but also in Bourgogne-Garnier 102 a. 847. There are two other similar names, but they are only sparsely attested: an early Christian hapax *Olibio* (= *Olivio) in Kajanto (1965, 334s.) and *Olibus* (= *Olivus), the name of the Sicilian father of Pope Stephen III (a. 768–772) according to the *Liber Pontificalis*.

11th c.: *Jaudatus* (Marseille; according to Morlet from *gaudium*, acceptable because of the wide distribution of Occ. *joi, joia* along with *gaug*), *Laetatus* (Saint-Hubert-en-Ardenne; from *laetari*, perhaps also 'born on Laetare Sunday').

There are also cases not found in Morlet from the obituaries of Moissac and Saint-Claude: *Credo*, *Restabilis* ('the one who persists to the end is blessed') and *Sancilius*.

We see in *Ador-ellus*, *Clar-erius (!)*, *Crist-iommus/-orgius/-orius*, *Gede-orus*, *Jo-sualis*, *Just-adus*, *Natal-/Nodel-ivius/-evius*, *Prov-asius/-izius*, *Ros-ianno*, *Sanc-ilius*, *Suffic-ianus* that there was an astonishing degree of freedom in the formation of the second part of the name, which indicates that in this company, *Oliv-erius* does not stand out in any way.[1581] *Olifius* illustrates how trees with a Christian or Christianised aura could inspire names even in regions where they did not appear in nature. The same is true, incidentally, of the name *Cedrus* attested in Saint-Claude (in the Old Testament mostly the epitome of steadiness, strength and beauty, as especially in *Ps* 92 (91).13 compared to the righteous, reinterpreted by the Church Fathers as Christ, the Church, the wood of the cross, cf. LCI s. v. *Zeder*), except that this is already attested in late Latin (Solin/Salomies 1994, 312, cf. also 52).

In short: judging by its type of formation, *Olivier* could well belong to this category of names.

C.14.6 This name and the Peace of God movement

Only three of the names listed above, *Amadeus*, *Durandus* and to a lesser extent *Deodonatus* (as *Dieudonné*), all of which are semantically self-explanatory, survived past the early phase. The name *Olivier* emerged almost two hundred years later than *Durandus*. Its spread was at first quantitively weak, but geographically clear from the beginning, and then between 1060 and 1150 quantitatively stronger since I have gathered over 230 references altogether. The powerful associations that adhere to the name (C.14.4), help it to expand, but they do not explain e.g. why this expansion did not begin a hundred years earlier or later.

Could we perhaps say that in one particular sense, the name *Olivier* appeared at exactly the right time? As far as I am aware, this question has never been asked before, and yet the answer is obvious: the affinity that this name

---

1581 Aebischer ([1966] 1967, 170, with a reference back to 1923, 45) cites names from French-speaking Switzerland such as *Jordan-erius*, *Stephan-erius*, *Anthon-erius* but they all appear after the period that is of interest to us.

has with the Peace of God movement.[1582] Here, too, it will suffice to examine the circumstances that prevailed up to the year 1060, since the movement reached its peak with the Council of Narbonne in 1054.

About 25 years before our earliest reference and only 100 km away from its location Bibost, the Bishop of Le Puy, Wido of Anjou († around 995), true son of a family that was never squeamish, and now backed by the persuasive power of troops belonging to two of his nephews, held a diocesan conference in Saint-Germain-Laprade (5 km east of Le Puy). At this meeting he forced the knights and peasants in his diocese to swear an oath of peace which protected the property of the Church and the possessions of the *pauperes* and ordered them to return stolen goods; by way of guarantee, he immediately took a few hostages.[1583] This marked the start of a powerful movement which went on to develop ever greater and more clearly defined aims over the next eighty years.

In 994, only monks, peasants and merchants were protected, but the oath was soon extended to include women and their unarmed attendants, pilgrims, hunters, mariners, etc. At certain times of the year, it applied to everyone, and in around 1020 these times included the period of Lent, soon after that – now called the *treuga Dei* – also from noon every Saturday until Monday morning; from 1033 the Church holidays were added, which means from Advent to the Octave of Epiphany, the Saturday before Ash Wednesday to the Octave of Easter, Rogation days to the Octave of Pentecost, Quatember fasts, the Apostolic and Marian feast days and the feast days of local patrons; and finally from 1040 it applied from every Wednesday evening until Monday morning, so that all in all, feuds were only allowed on about 80 days of the year. Over and above these measures, the list of offences was expanded; after the Council of Narbonne (1054) these included e.g. starting to build a fortress, disputes over debts and bonds and the destruction of crops.

1582 Waltz (1965, 112–118) explores the Peace of God movement as a backdrop for the Rol., but with no special reference to the name *Olivier*, or the exact chronological order of events.

1583 This and the following section rely on LM s. v. *Gottesfrieden*, HdR s. v. *Gottesfrieden*, Hoffmann (1964, passim), Lauranson-Rosaz (1992, passim) and Soria-Audebert/Treffort (2008, 113–120). Like all great movements, this one had some immediate predecessors: Bishop Stephan II of Clermont called a general meeting in the year 958, at which he urged especially the noblemen who were present to take seriously their obligation to maintain peace, and in 972 he called another meeting for the southern part of his diocese, at which he emphasised the need to protect Church property, saying that no-one would see the Lord unless there was peace, and encouraging the nobility to meet annually near Aurillac to resolve their outstanding difficulties amicably. But there is no mention of any obligations that were accepted by the participants, or of any other consequences following on from these events, and exactly this kind of obligation is the necessary and defining feature of the Peace of God movement.

The geographical expansion of the movement is of more interest to us. First of all, here is a list of the regional councils or synods and other peace treaties in chronological order:[1584] 989 Charroux, around 990 Narbonne, 994 Saint-Paulien (about 12 km north of Le Puy, again organised by Bishop Wido for his diocese, but this time the participants also included the Bishops of Elne, Toulouse, Rodez, Clermont, Lodève, Viviers, Valence and Glandève, which means that large parts of today's South of France from the Roussillon area to the Alps were represented), in the same year also Limoges and Anse (near Lyon, initiated by the Abbot of Cluny), 1000 and 1014 Poitiers, first third of the 11th c. Vienne, 1019/1021 Verdun-sur-le-Doubs, 1023 Beauvais and Soissons, 1024 Héry (near Auxerre), 1025 again Anse, 1027 Toulouges (near Perpignan, for the Diocese of Elne), 1027/1028 again Charroux, around 1031 again Limoges, 1031 Bourges, 1033 Vic (Catalonia), around 1036 Douai and again Le Puy, 1036 again Poitiers, before 1037 *Mons Rotundus* (near Lausanne), 1037/1041 Arles, 1040 Marseille, 1041 Saint-Gilles, Nice and Lausanne, 1047 Caen, 1054 again Narbonne.

Let us turn to the relationship between the name and the movement through space and time! The name *Olivier* first appears just west of the Rhône Bend; in the first phase – if we count Catalonia as still part of the *regnum Franciae*, to which it of course legally belonged – it remained a purely southern French phenomenon for about 35 years, and after about 60 years it had conquered the whole of the south, from Catalonia to Lérins near Cannes. The Peace of God movement began 25 years before the name *Olivier* became visible, and 100 km further south, in the neighbouring diocese; its first phase lasted 40 years, that is to say until after 1015, and during that time it was a purely southern French phenomenon, until after almost 70 years it had conquered the south from Catalonia to Nice. During the first phase, which was the most important for the success of the name, the spread of the movement looks very similar, and the documentation of the name followed the movement after some delay, which can be explained by the fact that the charters document legally competent adults, and not the act of name-giving.

Admittedly, there are some small geographical differences. The southwest with the exception of Gascony was reached by the movement earlier than by the name, because in 994 so many south-western bishops had followed Bishop Wido's invitation to Saint-Paulien. Inversely, the name arrived in Gascony rather late, but the Peace of God movement never got that far. Gascony welcomed the name as soon as it was firmly integrated into the Rol. because pilgrims and

---

1584 I have not commented on small differences in the handbooks and monograph accounts, most of which are attributable to the vagueness of the sources.

soldiers travelling through their country to Spain had it on their lips; it was less willing, however, to open itself up to any new ideas about feudal obligations.

In the second phase, both trends spread out in a northerly direction as far as the latitude of the Lower Loire and northern Burgundy; but now the differences become more obvious. While in Anjou and the large area under its influence the name *Olivier*, along with other proto-epic elements, was well received, both Anjou and Blésois closed themselves wholly to the Peace of God idea; for both ruling Count families the Gauzfrids (~ Fulk family) and the Tetbaldines ran such a tight ship, that there could be no talk of incipient anarchy, and the Peace of God movement was able to interfere at best within their own power structures. In Chartres, moreover, Bishop Fulbert appears to have been at best ambivalent about the Peace of God movement, and he probably mistrusted it (on him Hoffmann 1964, 68s.). North of that area, however, in Normandy, the young Duke William, who had recently struggled to subjugate his own viscounts, was only too happy to join with the Archbishop of Rouen and the Abbot of Saint-Ouen, both of whom were related to him, and align himself with this ecclesiastical movement (Douglas 1995, 53, 59s.); it is typical of this still deeply divided land that at first the name only slowly gained acceptance.

In the Duchy of Burgundy and the Franche-Comté, areas where in the early 11th c. central power was sometimes weak, and sometimes unstable, the movement took hold much faster than the name, above all because Archbishop Bouchard of Lyon, whose residence was in the *Kingdom* of Burgundy, in 1019/ 1021 at the Synod in the border town of Verdun-sur-le-Doubs exerted influence upon his Suffragans of Mâcon, Chalon-sur-Saône, Autun and Langres which belonged to the *Duchy* of Burgundy and therefore to the *regnum Franciae*. But to the north of that area, the Dioceses of Meaux, Troyes, Châlons and Reims did not join the movement,[1585] not to mention Laon, where Bishop Adalbero († 1030) was an enemy of the Cluniacs and presumably also of the Peace of God movement, which he possibly included in his satire of Cluny; on the other hand, the name reached these areas – and also the royal domain – late and to a rather small extent, because it had only managed to spread slowly across the Duchy of Burgundy. Finally, the Capetians: they were sympathetic to the movement, as long as it did not affect their royal domain or did so only peripherally. Robert II the Pious appears to have sent Bishop Berold of Soisssons as his representative to the Synod of Verdun-sur-le-Doubs in 1019/1021; the bishop returned convinced

---

1585 Cf. Hoffmann (1964, 87s.) who notes in relation to the year 1140 that especially the sons of Odo II of Champagne did not wish to bow to a spiritual authority, and their evil example set a precedent, so that even Richard of St.-Vanne could not stand against it.

and also persuaded his fellow bishop, Warin of Beauvais to introduce the Peace of God movement into both dioceses in 1023, making them into a northern exclave, but as we might expect, this had no effect on the name. Nothing of this sort was reported in the royal domain, and in particular, nothing from the Diocese of Paris, presumably because Robert was too reliant on the regional nobility to help guarantee the succession of his son Hugh and after Hugh's death, of his son Henry; the name was also taken up here rather late.

Summa summarum, we cannot attribute the similarities in time and place between the spread of the name on the one hand, and of the movement on the other, to chance. Since the movement was a much more important historical factor than the name, it was the name that profited from the movement, and not the other way round. We can even say that the name is a product of the movement because the symbolism of 'olive' ~ 'peace' is such a striking match: the person who invented the name captured the spirit of the whole epoch in it.

It would be easy to fall into the trap of assuming that the name *Olivier*, in the first seventy years or so of its existence – that is to say from its invention around 980 until its inclusion in the (in my opinion Angevin) Song of Roland in around the middle of the 11th century – did not yet have any connection with epic poetry at all, but was only a hallmark of the Peace of God movement; the Angevin poet of the middle of the century would have recognised that such an exemplarily peaceful and loyal individual as the name suggested, could at the same time be a hardened warrior fighting against 'enemies of the faith', and that he would be an ideal complement to the impetuous Roland on the Christian side. Tempting as this possibility might seem, several counter arguments will make it highly unlikely.

One of these – though not the decisive one yet – was advanced by Favati (1962, 7): the area near the Rhône Bend is where the name *Olivier* first appears as a normal man's name and is also more or less where the epic Olivier and his whole epic family are said to come from. That makes it indeed a lot more probable that the figure of Olivier was invented from the outset as 'a countryman of ours', i.e. not as an Angevin.

The details are rather tricky, however, because the evidence from the surviving Rol. – essentially the one toponym *Runers* or similar, name of the fiefdom of Olivier's deceased father – can provide an unequivocal interpretation only when it is considered alongside all of the other evidence available. I have therefore opted for a different chronological order: I describe Olivier's family as it appears to us in or shortly after 1200 in the *Girart de Vienne* and in the roughly contemporaneous and later sources; I then check how far the sources from the time before 1200, excepting the Rol., match this later form; and finally, I discuss the Roland passage in the same sense.

C.14.7 Olivier's epic family

C.14.7.1 Olivier's epic family around and shortly after 1200

In the *Girart de Vienne* by Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube we find: Olivier and his sister Aude; their father Renier de Genvres 'Geneva',[1586] and Renier's brothers Girart de Vienne (with his two sons *Buevon* and *Savarïet* who are minor characters because they are too young to bear arms), Hernaut de Biaulande (Nice, with his son Aimerïet, the future Aimeri de Narbonne) and Milon de P(o)uille; there is also the father of these four brothers, Garin de Monglane.[1587] But structurally, the following impressions are given: that father Garin's only purpose is to keep the four brothers together as a group, that although all four brothers take part in the action, Hernaut's only reason for being there is to provide a genealogical link to the whole Aimerid and therefore also William epic; that Milon is a bland character and even Renier, despite appearing often, is nothing more than a stereotype throughout. Girart and very quickly also his nephew Olivier are the heavyweights on the one side, while Charlemagne and his nephew Roland are very quickly the same on the other; the plot, which of course takes place in or just outside Vienne as it is being besieged, leads towards the duel between Olivier and Roland, which lasts a long time with neither able to win, until finally, it would have ended in the death of both, had there not been a *deus ex machina* leading to reconciliation, engagement, brotherhood-in-arms and the two setting off to fight against the unbelievers.

1586 On the form of the name cf. Favati (1962, 2; also the van Emden edition or following it, Moisan s. v.). Renier's fiefdom is called *Genves* in the *Ansëis de Cartage*, *Genvenes* in the *Aspremont*, *Genevois* in the *Ogier* and *Gaufrey, Geneve en Bourgoigne* in David Aubert, *Zenevre* in the *Fatti di Spagna*, *Geneven* in the Dutch *Malegijs*, *Genf* in the German *Malegis*; in Mousket *Genves* is Olivier's battle cry (cf. Moisan s. v.). But since *Gennes/Genes*, sometimes also *Genevois* and it seems occasionally even *Genvres, Gevenes* in OF can refer not just to 'Geneva' but also to 'Genoa' (it is often impossible to distinguish author errors from scribal copying errors), individual authors (and especially scribes and audiences) could have been thinking of Genoa instead of Geneva, and Renier's brother Milon de Pouille could encourage this supposition. But I think it is very unlikely that Genoa was the primary meaning, not just because the PT with its *Genf* is the earliest source (cf. for more detail below, C.14.7.2!), but because Olivier's fiefdom needed a location in a very early phase of Old French epic literature, at a time when all its heroes were based in Galloromania. But even an Olivier of Genoa would still be a man from the southeast and thus a polar opposite of Roland. – On Geneva cf. n. 1595 below!

1587 Later in the 13th c., direct descendants or ancestors added: as the eponymous hero of his own epic, Olivier's illegitimate son Galïen, who dies a hero's death shortly after his father at Roncevaux, leaving no descendants, and in the *Enfances Garin* the father of Garin de Monglane who is called Savari d'Aquitaine.

We should also note the following details in the *Girart-de-Vienne* chapters of the KMS I: Hernaut and the Aimerids do not appear, and neither do Girart's sons (who are minor figures even in the *Girart de Vienne*) so that Olivier automatically appears as Girart's heir; Renier is Aude's (and therefore also Olivier's) father, but does not take any part in the action.[1588] All of this shows that the most important element is not Renier, but rather the uncle-nephew relationship between Girart and Olivier, and that alone. Following this lead, in later versions of the Roland story, that is to say in the supplementary parts of CV7 (such as immediately after O 2379), Aude is not so much 'Renier's daughter' as the niece of *Girart de Viane la grant*.[1589] Since among all the members of this family only Girart is a historical person, that is to say identifiable as Count Girart of Vienne († probably in 879), therefore Vienne, and not Geneva, is confirmed as the fixed point, the ideal centre of the whole family, and this is all the more relevant because the great war takes place in the form of a siege of Vienne. The impression is even given that Geneva was already in an early stage of the story's invention but was only chosen so that Renier could also have a large fiefdom not too far away from Girart's fiefdom in the middle Rhône area. Olivier, however, because he appeared more often as his uncle's heir than his father's, is sometimes named Olivier 'of Vienne'.

1588 Olivier is first described as Girart's *systr son* in ed. Unger cap. 40 (but only in ms. A), ed. Loth A 37, then in Unger 41 (in all mss.), Loth A 38, B 38. Importantly, Aude is Olivier's sister in the KMS I too (explicitly so in ed. Unger cap. 42, ed. Loth cap. A 39, B 38), although Favati (1962, 13 with n. 3) doubted this with no knowledge of the original text (which means his argument on p. 14s. is not supported by any text). Aude's (and therefore also Olivier's) father is called in A something like *Reinalld*, but B corrects it, as often happens, by referring to the French text, resulting in *Reinar* (ed. Unger cap. 42, ed. Loth A 39, B 38). It is difficult, however, to emend his fiefdom in the KMS: *Laramel* in A, *Kaliber* in B; we could imagine a *la riber / riuer*. – Aebischer ([1966], 1967, 159–165) treats the KMS I in this instance as if it were unequivocally older than the *Girart de Vienne*. I willingly concede that its depiction of the war between Charlemagne and Girart cannot be convincingly drawn from the *Girart de Vienne*, and that therefore in terms of the stemma it can be regarded as the earlier of the two. I would not, however, like to rely on the notion that it is earlier in absolute terms, because in my view the Old French source of the whole KMS I was not written down until after 1200, and probably not until shortly after 1220 (cf. Beckmann 2008a, especially 29s., 48, 126s., 173); these circumstances mean that for our comparison purposes, it can only be accepted as evidence from the time around and after 1200.

1589 In the whole CV7 text (not just in the supplementary parts) the name *Olivier* appears 151 times, *Aude* 96 times, *Girart (de Vienne)* 55 times, and *Renier* 5 times. – In the *Aspremont* however (and following on from it in the KMS IVb) Rainier has become the son instead of the brother of G*irart de Fra(i)te*; the children *Aude* and *Olivier* who are only mentioned in passing, are his children here as well, but this means they are Girart's grandchildren. This is no doubt a secondary interpretation; the *Girart-de-Fra(i)te* plotline, which we only know from the *Aspremont* can be regarded in other respects too as a coarser side-branch of the *Girart de Vienne* story.

According to Moisan (s.v.) this is what happens on occasion in the *Gui de Bour-gogne*, *Galïen*, *Jehan de Lanson*, *Renaut de Montauban* and the *Prise de Pampe-lune*, in a few derivative English and German texts, and especially in Italy: in *Fierabraccia ed Ulivieri*, the *Spagna in rima*, the *Fatti di Spagna*, the *Nerbonesi* and in *cantari* about *Rinaldo*. Finally, in Guilhem de Berguedán (before 1185) and in the Occitan *Ronsasvals* Olivier is 'of Lausanne', as is his father Renier in the *Chron-ique dite Saintongeaise*, the Franco-Italian or Anglo-Norman *Aspremont* (ed. de Mandach) and the *Gesta Caroli Magni apud Carcassonam* ('pseudo-Philomena'), which we can interpret as a variant on 'of Geneva'.[1590] Whether from Vienne, Ge-neva or Lausanne, Olivier belongs in this middle part of the Rhône Valley.[1591]

C.14.7.2 Olivier's epic family before 1200 (excluding the Song of Roland)

Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube himself says at the start of the *Girart de Vienne*, that others went before him, although none of them were perfect (v. 81–89 ed. van Emden): *Del duc Girart avez sovant [!] oï, / cil de Vïanne au coraje hardi, / et d'Er-menjart, et del conte Aimeri; / mes del meillor vos ont mis en obli / cil chanteor qui vos en ont servi, / car il ne sevent l'estoire que ge di: / la commençaille dont la*

1590 Lausanne may have intruded instead of Geneva here and there, because in the Middle Ages people travelling from (northern) France to Italy more often passed through Lausanne (-Martigny – Great St. Bernard – Aosta) than through Geneva. – It is not certain whether our Olivier is the same character as Olivier of Verdu(n) mentioned in the *ensenhamen* by Guerau de Cabreira (v. 156), in the Occitan *Flamenca* (after 1234, probably last third of the 13th c.), in the *Roman d'Arles* (a. 1373–1375) and perhaps – if we allow emendations – in the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* (v. 406) and in *De castri stabilimento* (Spain, probably 14th c.); it is also interest-ing in this connection that there is a real person called Oliver de Verdun already in 1157 in Genoa (HPM t. 7, chartarum t. 2, col. 395; reference to this charter in Aebischer 1960a, 155). Pirot (1969, 255–265) argues that this is not the same person as our Olivier. If they actually are the same person, then we could probably, as Favati (1962, 7) suggests, see *Verdu(n)* only as *Verdun-sur-le-Doubs* (at the same time *-sur-Saône*!). This possibility has in its favour the fact that it is situated in the Duchy of Burgundy (and therefore in the *regnum Franciae*) close to the border with the Franche Comté (inside the Kingdom of Burgundy), where it would become widely known through the Council of Verdun-sur-le-Doubs (a. 1019–1021), which as we noted above (C.14.6) was an important milestone in the Peace of God movement; it would therefore be regarded as a symbol of 'the whole of Burgundy' – just as indeed the historical Count Girart of Vienne was for many years *de facto* ruler of the Kingdom of Burgundy, and at the same time founder of the Monasteries of Vézelay and Pothières in the Duchy of Burgundy. In this sense, we might also regard Verdun-sur-le-Doubs as a variant of Vienne-Geneva-Lausanne; in all cases, Olivier would still be a man from the southeast.

1591 This means we can reject outright Jenkins' suggestions (1928, p. LXXXVII), that *Gennes* is the Gennes on the border between Anjou and Blésois, that *Runers/Riviers* is Vihiers in the Poitou area, and that Vienne is the place of that same name in the outskirts of Blois.

chanson oisi, / qui fu Girart ne ses peres ausin; / mes geu dirai, que bien le sai de fi. The audience had therefore 'often' heard about Girart de Vienne 'the bold' before, which obviously presumes that there was a specific set of material devoted to Girart and not just minor roles in an odd epic here and there. Similarly, but separately, the audience had heard of Aimeri and Ermenjart; for at that time both were already the ancestors of the Aimerid dynasty and therefore also of *Willelme al curb nes*. The audience had not heard of the *commençaille* that Girart and Aimeri shared, out of which the later story grew. Girart's father was also part of this *commençaille* as (*ses peres ausin*); because – in Bertrand's work he is Garin de Monglane – Bertrand presents him as being also the father of Hernaut de Biaulande and therefore grandfather of the young Aimeri(et). Bertrand praises these relationships as 'the best thing' about the whole story, because he hopes that audience will have a permanent 'Aha!' experience, when they listen to the first part of the work and learn about the shared background from which the boldness in each of the two families emerged. Bertrand does not dare admit that he has invented this part, but rather he goes on to maintain a little later (v. 102–109) that in Bar-sur-Aube on a day in May, he had listened to a pilgrim who had visited Santiago and Rome and who somewhere on his way home – that is to say evidently near Vienne – had heard the substance of the story in a reliable form; but even in those days that will have made some of his audience smile because they had seen through this little tale as a stylistic device entirely appropriate to his art. Nevertheless, Bertrand's words are notable for the way in which the novelty value is claimed only for this *commençaille*, but not for the actual *chanson* which *oissi* from it, i.e. the later and from our perspective more important plotline around the constellation of Charlemagne-Roland-Alde-Olivier-Girart; thus, he recognises these as being pre-existent. All in all, therefore, he takes an old epic and rejuvenates it with his own supplementary material.

Aebischer ([1966] 1967, 160) also highlighted the *Quinze joies du mariage* in verse, which have been dated as 'still 12th c.'; there it is stated (v. 967–969 ed. Aebischer): *Plus volentiers orreit chanter / Comme Rollant ala juster / E Oliver son compainnon*. Certainly *juster* 'to compete in single combat' in Rol. (v. 1191, 3169, 3287, 3360) and in other epics often refers to battles with enemies of the faith, because these are often represented in the form of single combats; we therefore cannot rule out the possibility that the poet is quite simply talking about the Rol., since Olivier is already Roland's *compainnon*. But because the verb is placed between *Rollant* and *Oliver*, a reference to the *Girart-de-Vienne* plotline, as Aebischer argues, with *compainnon* as a kind of logical anticipation is at least as likely.

According to Lejeune/Stiennon (1966, 1.160ss.) the Monument of Meaux was built in 1186. It bears an inscription relating to Olivier: *Audae coniugium*

tibi do, Rolande, sororis / Perpetuumque mei socialis foedus amoris. This is a kind of snapshot of the *Girart de Vienne*, albeit anticipating the surviving text by about twenty years; it is unlikely that *this* perspective was distilled out of the Song of Roland. Lejeune/Stiennon (1966, 1.163) also opt for the *Girart-de-Vienne* plotline as the source of this.

Furthermore, they highlight (1966, 1.165 n. 22) a parallel reference. Alexander Neckam († 1217) lived for six years next to the Petit Pont in Paris, some of that time working as a university lecturer, before he returned to England, by 1186 at the latest. Most of what he knew about French epic literature must have come either from his time in France, or from his youth in England. This means his verses in *De laudibus divinae sapientiae* (ed. Th. Wright, London 1868, Distinctio tertia, v. 735ss.) are of interest to us: *Influit et Rhodanus praeclarae rura Viennae, / Quam anxit Karolus obsidione diu. / Sed famae titulis majores inde Girardi, / Inde nepos Karoli, sed probitate pares / Experti vires dextras iunxere, nec unquam / In paribus potuit certior esse fides*. Once again, this is the essence of the *Girart-de-Vienne* plotline, pressed into a just a few lines.

No one seems to date the *Girart de Roussillon* later than 1180. In this text, *Peire de Mont Rabei / Rabel / Rabeih / Rabet / Rabeil* (v. 3756, 3847, 4327, 4541, 7055) owns some spectacularly expensive weapons, which Olivier had once given him (v. 3921, 3955, 5190); obviously, therefore, Olivier must have made him one of his knights.[1592] Peire's fiefdom is considered unidentifiable; but recently, I found out that it is Mont Rabeau (today within Nice). Be that as it may, Peire's father *Gauter de Mont Rabei* (v. 3808 etc.) is at the same time *de Mont Senis* (v. 4545). Olivier, too, as his feudal lord, would have to be a man from the area that is today the southeast of France.

In the *Fierabras* (around 1170) Renier is Lord of *Gennes / Genne / Gennles / Jenes / Genevois / Geneves* (on the distribution of these forms, Favati 1962, 2).

Aebischer ([1960b] 1967, 70) highlighted a passage in the *Chanson de Guillaume*. Even if we accept in principle McMillan's late dating, we can hardly date it later than 1170, and most of the research indicates that its first part incorporates a song that is even older. In this first part we read (v. 1268s.), William's *jongleur* was able to sing, among other things: *E de Charlemagne e de Rollant, sun nevou, / De Girard de Viane e de Oliver, qui fu tant prouz*. This couplet is metrically irregular, but so are many other verses throughout the song; nobody would

---

1592 The plot of this epic is set in the reign of *Carle Martel* (v. 29 and passim), although the poet writes at the end of the work (v. 9467), that he will go down in history as *Carles li Caus*, i.e. Charles the Bald; the historical substratum of the plot occurs in the reign of Charles the Bald. Olivier could therefore "once" have given weapons to Peire.

say that they are the work of a copier just because of that.[1593] And it presents a summary of the plotline we encounter later in the *Girart de Vienne* which is so perfect that there can be no doubt: the *Girart de Vienne* is nothing more than a modernisation of a *chanson de geste* which the author already knew.[1594]

Finally, in the PT, which we have come to recognise as being at least as informative about the earlier stages of the Roland material as the Rol., Olivier (in cap. 11) is *comes Gebennensis* 'Count of Geneva'[1595] *filius Raineri comitis*; on the other hand, Roland is *comes Cenomannensis* 'Count of Le Mans' and *Blavii dominus* 'Lord of Blaye' – the latter probably only because the PT was trying to explain his burial in Blaye. The PT does not explicitly mention the *compagnon-nage* of the two characters, nor does it mention Alde, who is a further tie binding the two together. However, we can put this down to its narrative style; after all, the narrator is not supposed to be a poet, but rather an archbishop taking on the role of a historian. But the PT gives the title *dux exercituum* only to Roland and Olivier (and to Roland's father Milo de Angleris but he is killed very early in the story), and when Charlemagne gives both of them together (in cap. 21) the command of the rear guard, he sees only these two as *carissimi sui*, and this would hardly be possible unless they were also *carissimi* in relation to each other. Thus, it is important that the two men come from opposite parts of Gaul; for this means that the emergence of their friendship is not just a natural one, so to speak, but rather it arises out of some kind of previous history, and there must be a story behind it. This story is not told in the PT; however, it is noticeable that (in cap. 11) among Charlemagne's thirty-three *pugnatores maiores* there is one called *Lambertus, princeps Bituricensis*. Lambert of Bourges is a minor character in a few epics, and he has quite a small role to play in the late *Maugis d'Aigremont*, but he plays a larger part only in the *Girart de Vienne*, and

---

1593 Suchier emended this in his regularising edition (1911): d*e Charle Maigne, de Rollant sun nevou, / e de Girart e d'Oliver le prou.*

1594 The *Oliver le Gascun* (v. 2361, that is to say in the second part which rests on an earlier stage) is not a counter argument, since it is explained by the fact that according to the PT, Olivier was buried in Belin.

1595 In all editions of the PT and its manuscripts (or manuscript branches) *Gebenennsis* is confirmed from the beginning, and so there is no reason to doubt it, or to reinterpret it (and especially not to read it as *⃰Agennensis* 'of Agen', because in cap. 9 *Agennum* appears several times with no variants). The metathesis inherent in *Gebenna* (instead of classical Lat. *Genava*, late Lat. also *Geneva, Ianuba* etc.) appears first in the *civitas Gavanensium* of the oldest surviving ms. A (7th c.) of the *Notitia Galliarum* (11.4, as opposed to the *Genavensium* in the critical edition). In any case, *Gebenna* (according to LM s. v. *Genf*) is also attested elsewhere in the 12th –17th c. Cf. also KMS IV 11 *Gibben* A, *Gebenens* B.

especially in the *Girart-de-Vienne* plotline of the KMS I:[1596] there, he was a supporter of Charlemagne, but he was taken prisoner by Olivier, and he had the bright idea that peace could be achieved by bringing together Girart's niece Alde and Charlemagne's nephew Roland. In the absence of any other convincing reason for the presence of Lambert in the list, we may assume that that the author of the PT knew about this particular role that Lambert played.

Let us sum up the situation so far: even if we disregard the Rol. itself for the time being, the core of Olivier's epic family – Olivier, Alde, their uncle Girart de Vienne and their father Renier (as Girart's brother-in-law or brother) – along with the epic story of Charlemagne's war against Girart, the interrupted duel between the nephews of both Charlemagne and Girart, and the reconciliation through Alde, appears to be surprisingly old, possibly older than the surviving Rol. From the very start, this family's home was the middle Rhône area, between Vienne, Geneva and Lausanne, and the story was focused on Vienne. And now we turn to the Song of Roland!

C.14.7.3 Olivier's epic family in the Song of Roland

The Song's author tells us that Alde is Olivier's sister and Roland's fiancée, which is bound to make us curious about their previous history, but he does not tell us about Roland's and Olivier's fiefdoms (nor about those of Ganelon or Naimes) – because as I hope I have already shown, his intention is to prevent anyone from interpreting the Song along locally patriotic lines. But we can conclude that he knows Roland is from the northwest from some details at the beginning of his list of conquests (v. 2322ss.), from the figure called *Gualter del Hum* and from the essentially Norman name of *Rabel*, who is suggested as his replacement in the Baligant battle. In complimentary fashion, Olivier's successor has the eastern, perhaps south-eastern-sounding name *Guineman*.

In the light of these insights, we now take a look at the last, seemingly enigmatic detail relating to Olivier's roots: the evocation of his father, the *<riche> duc Reiner, / Ki tint la marche de l<a> val de Runers* (v. 2208s.) – according to Segre; but since in the Song *val* is usually masc. (confirmed by the metre v. 814, 1018, 1084, 3065), the *de <ce>l val de Runers* in Hilka/Pfister is probably preferable. However, the last half line in V4 reads *de Çenevra sor la mer* (+1), in T *et le val Dernir* (–1), while nKCV7PL give no geographical indications. In the mouth of a (northern) Italian, *Çenevra*, today Ital. *Ginevra* (here with Old northern

---

1596 There he is called *Lambert af Berin* 'de Berry' and *Lambert Berfer*, with Old Norse ~ /v/, here with a misreading of the vocalic u> in *(le) Beruer* (< *Beruier*) 'Lambert le Berruyer' in the Old French source as a consonantal <u (cf. Beckmann 2008a, 146s.).

Ital. /dz/, today dialectally /z/), of course means 'Geneva',[1597] but this is clearly a secondary interpretation here because of the match between *de Runers* in O and *dernir* in T against V4. The archetype therefore must have (if we take account of the metre and the *-ie* assonance) *de Runier(s?)*.

Two possibilities arise here. The first is that we stick with *Runiers*; this means we can only be thinking of the Rhône. Keller (1990, 378s.) thought it was a cross between OF *Rosne* (v. 1626) and Franco-Prov. *Rózer*; but even if we imagine that the stress shifted so that *Rózer* would turn into *Rozér* on its journey northwards (even though *Sízer* did not turn into *Sizér*!), the assonance vowel *-ie-* remains unexplained, and there is no reason why both *Rosne* (v. 1626 [1583]) and *Runiers* v. 1626 [1583]) plus *Runiers* (v. 2209) should be in the text with the same meaning. But since in the Song *-s-* before a voiced consonant is already silent, and since before a nasal at least, the unstressed original /o/ has merged with /ọ/ into /ọ/ (O always writes *hunir*, *huntage* etc.), we could interpret *Run(i)ers* as **Rhodanarii* 'Rhône resident, inhabitant of the Rhône area', even though there are no other river name derivations in France ending in *-arius*.[1598]

If we reject this argument, then Stengel's emendation into *Riviers* is practically inevitable, first, because O would only have grouped four strokes incorrectly (at that time still without any dots above the i!) i.e. *-iui-* > *-un-*, and this would have seemed natural because the scribe himself wrote *-e-* more often than *-ie,* and so would probably not have expected *-ie-* here; secondly, because *Riviers* usually appears in the nexus *val de Riviers*.

Admittedly, we have to be all the more careful about interpreting what is meant by this. For elsewhere in OF, *val de Rivier(s)* means roughly the Walloon Meuse Valley; in the *Raoul de Cambrai* the context clearly makes this meaning look likely, and in the *Aye d'Avignon* (which in spite of its title originated in the Île-de-France or Picardy) there is a *Girart de Rivier / Rivers* Lord of Huy, Namur and Dinant. But although the name *Renier* was very common there,[1599] the Meuse Valley is not at all suitable as the home of Olivier, not just because it

---

1597 Lake Geneva is called *Rhodani mare* e.g. when the empire is divided up in 839 (*Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 839). Vulgate and late Latin references for *mare* 'lake' in Favati (1962, 3 n. 3). In Old French epic literature *sor mer* is occasionally just an empty phrase, if e.g. *Gironde* 'Girona', *Porpaillart* 'portus (or pagus) Palliarensis' or *Luiserne* 'Lucena' are said to lie *sor mer*.

1598 The only ethnic term formed from Lat. *-arius* in OF appears to be *Pohier* from the old place *Poix-de-Picardie*; even the contemporary *Aisniers* refers to the residents in the Département and not to the people living by the river, although they are also *Rhodaniens* (Wolf 1964, 63s., 37).

1599 We only have to think of the Reginar and Gislebert family which was the most powerful family in Lower Lorraine in the late 9th and the 10th c. and held the title of Duke until it was forced to go back to the Hainaut region.

does not fit into the Vienne-Geneva-Lausanne area, but also because the name *Olivier* did not reach the northeast of the French-speaking area until more than a century after it first appeared.

But this opens up a new avenue that has never been tried before. In OF the masc. *rivier* (just like the fem. *riviere*, from the Lat. adj. *rīpārius*) is initially an appellative 'rivage, bord d'une rivière, contrée située sur le bord d'une rivière', so that *val de Riviers* is just an appropriate usage of this appellative, referring in the cases cited above to the Meuse Valley.[1600] If the psychological prerequisites for this meaningful use were present there, we should not be surprised if they are also present somewhere else.[1601]

It is useful at this point to look briefly back to late antiquity. At that time, starting with Diocletian, when the empire was being restructured and many previous provinces were being broken down into smaller provinces, a few of them were given the differentiating addition *ripensis* ('located on the bank of the river') or *ripariensis* (originally: 'containing the *riparii*, that is to say, the

1600 However, Paul Meyer and Auguste Longnon suspected (in the index of their edition of the *Raoul de Cambrai*), and Flutre (s. v.) then was sure that *(val de) Riviers* was etymologically 'Ripuaria'. But when researching this question, we should not start with the outdated belief that Salian and Ripuarian Franks constituted the two main sections of the Franks, each of roughly equal importance, but instead we should start with the contemporary perspective which holds that the name *Riboaria, Riboarii* (this is the oldest form, *rib-* < Lat. *rīpa* '(river) bank', here: 'bank of the Rhine', + Germ. *-wari* 'inhabitant') does not appear until the 8th c. and (with a few isolated exceptions, around 870) it always referred to a smaller area, that is to say, the *civitas* of Cologne or the Rhine Valley, at most from Andernach to Nijmegen (cf. e.g. LM s. v. with literature, especially Ewig 1954, passim); Huy, Namur or even Dinant were therefore not in Ripuaria. If I then understand the OF expression *(val de) Rivier(s)* not as a borrowing from the Ger. but as a meaningful usage of OF *rivier*, m., referring to the Meuse Valley or its inhabitants, this does not mean that I am denying the fact that when on occasion the German name *Ripuarien* had to be translated into OF, sometimes *Rivier(s)* also was used, because of the nature of the respective situations, and the partial similarity in the way the words were formed; we see this in a Charter belonging to King Zwentibold from the year 898 (MGH DD.kar. 4.64), where a Romance scribe (and Ewig 1954, 118ss. agrees) translates 'in the area of Ripuaria' as *in pago Riuuerense* [sic], or in the forgery from the 11th c. at the latest for Gembloux of Otto I purporting to be from 946 (MGH DD.dt.KK. 1.162), where the monastery's ownership is confirmed of a vineyard *in comitatu vero Reuuers*.

1601 Today, near the middle Rhône area (Départements Loire, Haute-Loire, Isère, Drôme, Savoie, Hautes-Alpes), but apparently nowhere else, there are about a dozen very small places, most not even with the status of a *commune,* called *Rivier*, *Riviers*, *Ribiers*, which are simply showing continuity from *riparium / riparios*. None of them were significant enough to be mentioned in the Rol., or even to have been considered as the fiefdom of some epic figure or other; but they show that precisely in this area, the masc. was common and tended to be used, here at least locally, with a practical meaning.

people who live on the river bank' but factually the same as *ripensis*): so we have according to the *Notitia Dignitatum* (originating sometime between 395 and 430, cap. occ. 32s., 42) on the Danube *Dacia ripensis*, *Valeria ripensis* (western Hungary, Croatia), *Pannonia secunda ripariensis et Savia* (on the Danube and Sava, south-eastern Austria, Slovenia), *Noricum ripense* – and so in Gaul *Gallia ripar(i?)ensis*, which is more or less synonymous with *Gallia Viennensis*. *Gallia ripar(i?)ensis* included the Rhône Valley, and stretched upriver at least as far as Lake Geneva, including the land around it which is not easy to define accurately, but was not very big: the *Notitia* lists the troops from this province and the first group mentioned is the Rhône fleet of Vienne and Arles, followed by a fleet in Lake Geneva, and the third group is the Garrison of Marseille. In about 550 the name of its inhabitants appears to crop up once again, when in Jordanes (*Getica*, cap. 36) the *Ripari*[1602] are among the auxiliaries brought by Aëtius to the great battle against Attila. Earlier research saw this as the first reference to the name of the Ripuarians; but Eugen Ewig (1954, 481s.) argued quite successfully that it was referring to troops from *Gallia ripar(i)ensis*. If he is correct, there is a gap between this reference and the Rol. of more than five and a half centuries; if he is wrong, then the chronological distance from the *Notitia* is fully seven hundred years. But names of countries are often very difficult to track through the early to high Middle Ages when they do not apply to a political entity, and here, for example, the term *Burgundia* could have covered up a regional usage. Thus, it seems to me that despite the chronological hiatus, the similarity between *Gallia ripar(i)ensis* and *val de Riviers* in both the meaning and the core phonological element is too specific to be attributable to chance.

I see this confirmed in the fact that among the figures who have the name type *X de Riviers* – apart from the above-mentioned *Girart*, Lord of the Meuse Valley, and a few minor characters who offer no indication as to the location of *Riviers* – two are *Rhodaniens*. *Achart* (var. *Guichart*) *de Riviers* in the *Garin le Loherain*, as Ferdinand Lot (1896, 215 n.4) recognised, a *Méridional* – or more precisely: someone who lived by the Rhône – because he is twice mentioned between the Lords of Pierrelatte (Drôme, near Montélimar) and of Avignon, that is to say two men who lived by the Rhône; a few scribes could not work out a suitable meaning for *Riviers* and so they changed it to *Viviers* or even *Nevers*. This same *Achart de la val de Rivier* is in the *Girart de Vienne* (v. 3961–3963) the father of Olivier's squire, and therefore obviously from the Rhône region. *Morant de Riviers* is a much more

---

1602 A less probable form: *Riparioli*. Because after the *Ripari* come the essentially unidentified *Olibriones*, and one ms. writes the name as one word: *Ripariolibriones*, while a few others separate the parts as *Riparioli Briones*.

important figure: in the *Gaydon* and in the *Ansëis de Cartage* he always appears alongside *Hugon d'Auvergne*, in the *Gaufrey* he is the father of the Duke *Raimon de Saint-Gilles*; he even has a *Rhodanien* as a historical model (cf. C.14.8 immediately below).

Riviers in these men's epithet denotes the Rhône Valley, and if it occurs in the Rol., there is absolutely no reason why it should mean something different there.[1603] In in the Rol., too, Olivier comes from the Rhône Valley – and this confirms our impression that his family and the *Girart de Vienne* plotline are older than the surviving Old French epic.

C.14.8 Digression: Morant de Riviers

The name *Morant* and the figure of Morant de Riviers merit an investigation of their own; here is a summary of the most important points. It is based on the late and MLat. name *Maurontus*, for which Morlet (1972, s. v. *Maurondus*) offers twelve references from Galloromania in the 8th – 11th c., most of them with *-nt-*. Since *-ont* is a very rare ending for nouns, the ubiquitous *-ant* crept in, and dissimilation from the preceding *-o-* < *-au-* may also have played a role: in Morlet (1972, s. v. *Maurantus*) there are from the 9th c. onwards, six references ending in *-antus*, *-andus*, most of them already with *Mor-* instead of *Maur-*.

There are three historical Saints called *Maurontus*, that is to say an Abbot of Bruel (today, Merville, Dép. Nord), son of Saint Rictrud (AA.SS. for the 5th of May.), an Abbot of Saint-Florent-le-Vieil (Dép. Maine-et-Loire, AA.SS. for the 8th of January), both around 700, and a Bishop of Marseille, who was at the

---

1603 Ph.Aug. Becker (1939, 57 n. 3) has a different view – unfortunately without the slightest trace of historical evidence – when he interprets the *marche des val de Riviers* as 'Valley of the Dora Riparia', i.e. as the Margravate of Susa. Olivier's father would then not literally be a *Rhodanien*, but with his lands upstream he would have had to protect the Rhône Basin. I do not wish to exclude Becker's solution out of hand – when no proof is even attempted, there is no way to refute it – but as a precaution, I would like to reject two other possible interpretations: 1) The Revermont (according to DT Ain a. 974 *pagus Reversimontis*), the territory around Lons-le-Saunier in the old Free County of Burgundy is out of the question, because the /ę/ (in closed syllable) does not fit with the assonance and because in all the references to the territory, the *-mont* is never omitted. 2) The (always feminine!) term for the Mediterranean coast between Toulon and Genoa, Fr. *la Rivière*, Occ. *la Rib(i)e(i)ra*, Ital. *la Riviera* seems to have appeared for the first time in Occ. in Raimon Feraud (around 1300), and according to the FEW (s. v. **rīpāria*) in Fr. in Froissart, while Ital. *riviera* is borrowed from the Fr. But even if one of the three possibilities did unexpectedly turn out to be the correct interpretation of the epic *Riviers*, Olivier would still be a man from the southeast.

same time Abbot of Saint-Victor (AA.SS. for the 21st of November.), around 780/ 786. Some vague awareness of them may well have given rise to the fact that in epic literature, minor clerical characters were often called Morant (*Raoul de Cambrai*, *Girart de Vienne* [2], *Aimeri de Narbonne* [2], *Narbonnais* [2], *Beuve de Hantone* [3], *Folque de Candie*).

The only non-clerical person in history called Maurontus (in Ademar of Chabannes βγ 1.54 written as *Maurantus*), is a *dux* in the *Provincia*, who was presumably embittered by Charles Martel's punitive interventions in Lyon, Marseille and Arles, and betrayed Avignon to the Saracens in 737;[1604] Charles took it back, but soon had to conquer Avignon and Marseille once again, and only then managed to chase Maurontus into the mountains, which were inaccessible to Charles (*Fred. cont.* 20s., MGH SS.mer. 2.177s.; *Ann. Mett. Priores*, MGH SS.schol. 10.29s.; *Ann. Laur. Min.*, MGH SS.1.115). There is no information on what happened to Maurontus after that; but the Bishop of Marseille who bore the same name almost fifty years later was obviously a younger relative of his, and so we can assume that the family survived the crisis as part of the Provençal upper class.

The epic Morant de Riviers played his most important role in the parts of the *Mainet* plotline that were not preserved in the Old French original; but as Gaston Paris (1865a, 230–246, 388, 473–478) demonstrated, we can still reconstruct the main features of this role from the Franco-Italian compilation in V13 (where he is called *Morand de Rivière*), the *Charlemagne* by Girard d'Amiens (*Morant*), the *Primera Crónica General* (Count *Morante*), the *Reali di Francia* (*Morando di Riviera*) and the Ripuarian verse tales *Karl und Galîe* and *Morant und Galîe*, only preserved integrated within the *Karlmeinet* (*Morant von Rivire / Riviere*). (The fact that the compiler of the *Karlmeinet* thought that the Morant character appearing in his two sources was actually two different individuals is irrelevant for the history of the story. In all of them, Morant is Charlemagne's loyal and indispensable assistant during his exile as a youth in Saracen Toledo. The fact that V13 and the *Reali* depict him as a Frank who has come with Charlemagne, while Girard d'Amiens and probably also the *Crónica* show him as a sympathiser with the Saracens, makes the question of which side he "inherently" belongs to rather difficult to pin down. In all versions (as long as we regard the two Ripuarians as one and the same) Morant, as well as Charlemagne and Galienne, returns to France and is royally rewarded by Charlemagne. Girard and the *Reali* overload their return with obviously secondary delays which have no psychological justification, but the *Crónica* offers a clear and very striking sequence of events: when Charlemagne realises that his personal freedom

---

1604 We can overlook the fact that the dating of these events varies by one or two years.

is in danger, he sets off for France alone – in this instance not exactly an example of heroic behaviour – and commands Morant to follow on after, bringing Galiana with him; on their way back, Galiana is briefly captured by Saracens who are pursuing them, but Morant frees her, and the two of them keep away from all inhabited settlements for the next seven days; they finally catch up with Charlemagne near Paris. This sequence of events contrasts markedly with Charlemagne's usual character, but its meaning becomes clear if we understand how it relates to the continuation of the story in the Ripuarian *Morant und Galîe*. In this narrative, Morant is highly honoured at Charlemagne's court, but he is accused by a man disguised as a pilgrim of having had an illicit relationship with Galîe on the journey back; he is finally able to prove his innocence, however, and that of the queen, through single combat. Charlemagne's hasty flight and the long isolation together of Morant and Galiana in the *Crónica* therefore do have a purpose, which is to make this accusation seem plausible. It is clear that the flight and the accusation must have been depicted in one and the same Old French epic, which the Spanish and Ripuarian authors then drew upon (each adding certain variations of their own). The epic and the historical Morant have several features in common: the name, the homeland or fiefdom (Avignon/Marseille or *Riviers* 'Rhône Valley'), the positive relationship with Spanish Saracens (which was either temporary or a result of his heritage) and the relationship with 'Charlemagne'; however, this enmity/disloyalty in reality has turned into friendship/loyalty through the instructive – and narratively fruitful – idea that the accusation of disloyalty can only be a slander. We have seen this polar reversal before, from a crassly anti-Charlemagne figure in reality to a friend of Charlemagne in epic literature: we find it in the Roland ms. O (and in the PT) with Gaifier (on this Beckmann 2010, 54–59) and even in the archetype of the Song with Ogier (more detail on this in Beckmann 2004d, 441–452), Girart de Roussillon (C.7.4.3.10) and Rembalt de Frise (C.6.3.8). In principle, we can assume that these characters lived on as anti-Charlemagne figures in the (mostly regional) memory of the people at first, until in the 11th c. the steadily growing (retrospective!) admiration of Charlemagne prompted people to reinterpret those who once were enemies now as friends, almost because this was felt to be a *conditio sine qua non* for their continuing inclusion in the story. With Morant, this polar reversal was made easier by something else: perhaps the main theme of the *Mainet* narrative, a temporarily pro-Saracen Charlemagne with a wife who has a Saracen heritage, came into being after the exile of Alfons VI as a youth in Islamic Toledo (until 1072), or else after Zaida's flight to him (1091) or their likely marriage (1099); this made it easy to depict the temporarily pro-Saracen Morant as Charlemagne's best friend during the time when they were both pro-Saracens together. Becker (2009, 532) offers only

one reference from Catalonia from 1158 and one from Saragossa from 1193 for the name *Galiana*. But I have made a remarkable chance find: the surviving original will of the Catalan Guillem Seguer de Montagut dating from 2. 11. 1135 includes his daughter *Galiena* among his heirs (photo of the Old Catalan original plus summary in modern Catalan: http://www.bnc.cat/pergamins/detall?registre=9964, last access 25.05.2022). This is clear evidence of the existence of the *Mainet* fable, and because it has *-ie-*, and not *-ia-*, it is almost certainly even evidence of an Old French, and not 'just' Spanish or Occitan *Mainet* epic.[1605] (The fact that Morant is later "used" in a few other epics and finally slotted in as the son of Doon de Maience is in line with the usual pattern of development in Old French epic literature.) Gaston Paris' theory that the partially surviving *Maine*t dating from around 1200 is a reworking of an older epic from the early 12th c. is therefore fundamentally correct.

C.14.9 Back to the prehistory of the name Olivier – and some facts of Burgundian history

To conclude the subject of Olivier, we must briefly sum up our results. We have established (1) that as a normal men's name, *Olivier* shows up slightly before the turn of the millennium near the Rhône Bend, (2) that even when the Old French epic first started to be written down, Olivier's home as an epic character is practically the same as the place where his name is first documented as a normal man's name, close to the Rhône Bend; this makes it probable that as an epic character he was from the beginning conceived of as "one of our own", (3) that the symbolism of his name shows he was from the very beginning a different type of warrior than Roland, was intended to complement him, and this is the role he continued to play, and (4) that his epic home was from the very start anchored to a particular family, in which he was not 'the son' but 'the nephew', the family of *Girart de Vienne*.

These circumstances lead us to a particular conclusion in terms of the narrative logic. If Olivier is fundamentally "one of our own", that is to say created out of pride in a regional culture, then this probably happened in a narrative context where this "being one of our own" was not just mentioned in passing,

---

1605 The claim that the *Palais Galienne*, still officially called *Palais Gallien*, in Bordeaux along with its homonym in Poitiers was built by Emperor Gallienus is an erudite invention of the 16th/17th c. It sought to replace the *Mainet* fable, which by then was known to be fictitious, with something more serious; cf. Bédier 1926–1929, 3.169–172. The *-ie-* in *Gallienus* cannot, therefore, explain the *-ie-* in the name of the Catalonian woman.

as in a Song of Roland, but where it constantly played a role in the story, in other words, in a *Girart de Vienne*. The high status of this work is clear in the way its message was to illustrate the message of the Peace of God movement and with it, the whole tenor of its age: before Galloromania (~ the Carolingian Empire) can defend itself successfully against outsiders, or even engage in aggressive re-Christianisation, it must first find its own inner peace; this is the most urgent, and also most difficult task. No other Medieval Latin poet was able to express the key idea of his age with such aplomb! It should be emphasised that the other determinants of this *Girart de Vienne* were already *en place* in about 980.

First, it is extremely unlikely that the historical Girart of Vienne († probably in 879) had already faded from memory in 980 in the area around Vienne. For during his time as *dux* of Vienne and Lyon in 843/844–870 he had long been the first to realise a Burgundian ideal which was permanent. At this point we must once again step out of the usual chronological order.

Vienne and Lyon were Romanised later than Marseille. But the Romans were only mediocre seafarers, while they were probably the greatest road-building civilisation in the history of the world, and so Lyon, much more than Marseille, became a centre for the spread of Latinisation. This happened, at the latest, during the reign of Augustus, when the civil administration of Gaul was finally established, and when Lyon became a part of the *Tres Galliae* and the capital city of the largest of them, named Lugdunensis; the first great Christian of Gaul, Irenaeus of Lyon, was Bishop in Lyon, not in Marseille, from 177/ 178. Thus, Lyon was for about four hundred years in all, the greatest mediator of global culture – Roman, Christian and the many Greek and Oriental cultures that stood behind them – helping them to spread across most of Galloromania. These long centuries built up a strong and lasting regional pride. The Lyon-Vienne region came though Gaul's most terrible period, between around 400 and 460, suffering very little harm, and it prospered even more during the period of Burgundian rule between 460 and 534.

But then began the interminable, forced incorporation into the Frankish realm, binding them to these half-barbarians from the north, whose culture they considered inferior – rightly so in the 6th c., and in some respects still in the 9th and 10th c. In the mostly decentralised Merovingian realm, it was generally quite bearable; there were even times when the Burgundians had the upper hand, as for example under Guntram and under Brunichild; this period (657–675) is also the time when Bishop Leodgar of Autun played a long and successful role maintaining Burgundian autonomy in the face of Neustrian centralising ambitions, although he did in the end suffer martyrdom (in 675–677) for his trouble. The Carolingian intervention from Austrasia, the least Mediterranean, only partly

Romance-speaking, and culturally the youngest of the three subkingdoms was very different: it was brutal under Charles Martel, gentler but still committed to centralisation under Pippin, Charlemagne and Louis.

It was not until the partition of the Carolingian empire that the Lyon-Vienne area suddenly had an opportunity to realise its Burgundian ideal of nominal incorporation into the Carolingian empire with *de facto* almost complete autonomy, and Girart took full advantage of it: between 843/844 and 855 under a distant emperor Lothar I, who apart from his brief Aquitaine adventure of 854 never appeared anywhere west of the Alps; between 855 and 863 Girart was even more independent as *parens*, *nutritor* and *magister*[1606] of Lothar's son Charles "of Provence" who was barely capable of taking the throne because of his epilepsy, and Girart successfully repelled a Norman attack in 860, and even more importantly intervened successfully in 861 to thwart Charles the Bald's attempt to disinherit his nephew; finally, after the early death in 863 of the epileptic King, until 869 under his heir and brother Lothar II, who appeared briefly in Lyon, Girart was confirmed in his position, and from then was fully occupied with his unhappy marriage situation, and only left his northern Alpine estates to undertake one trip to Italy. His death in 870 resulted in the partition of the empire at Meerssen, which gave the Lyon-Vienne area to Girart's old arch-enemy Charles the Bald, and this brought an abrupt end to Girart's role there.

After this eventful life, Girart's spirit lived on in that area. In 879, not even ten years after Charles the Bald took over Vienne, one man declared himself to be the first non-Carolingian king, specifically of (Lower) Burgundy with his capital in Vienne. He was none other than the administrator whom Charles had appointed to govern the new southeast of his realm, his brother-in-law Boso. Only nine years later, another non-Carolingian relative followed in his footsteps by founding a second kingdom, also called Burgundy (more precisely Upper Burgundy). He was the Welf Rudolph I, and his kingdom was around Geneva and Lausanne. Thanks to support from the region around Vienne, King Boso († 887) was never completely defeated by the Carolingians. His son, King (and due to a short and unfortunate Italian adventure even Emperor) Louis the Blind (i.e. blinded, † around 928) nevertheless managed to retain the whole Burgundian realm; his son Charles-Constantine († around 962) had to be content with the role of Count of Vienne, but only because after a few, sometimes pro-West-Frankish vicissitudes, the title of King in Boso's realm had been handed over to the other Burgundian kingdom in about 942 thanks to the support of the Ottonians. Its king, Conrad († 993), ruled for fifty quite uneventful years over a

---

1606 These are Charles' own words referring to Girart (cf. R. Louis 1946–1947, 1.53).

Burgundy which now included Lyon-Vienne-Arles and also Geneva-Lausanne, and he selected Saint-André-le-Bas in Vienne as his burial place, which shows that he saw Vienne – since the death of Charles-Constantine at least – as the centre of his realm. The last decades of his rule can be regarded as the peak years of the unified Burgundian kingdom. He was succeeded only by his son, Rudolph III (993–1032), who had a closer but not entirely willing connection with the German emperor which finally led to a contract of inheritance, and after his death, the annexation of the Kingdom of Burgundy by the empire took place. The Burgundian individualism which had first been realised by Girart in the Carolingian period had therefore survived undiminished until the early 11th c.; it is the soil that nurtured the legends concerning Girart, and they flourished there especially around 980 when the tales coalesced into the first fully rounded story, the *Girart de Vienne*.[1607]

1607 The fact that the Bosonids and the Rudolphines ruled with the same spirit as Girart, even though they were not related to him, may explain why the ruling houses did not exert any corrective influence on the formation of the legend, and it was allowed to flourish in any direction. Since it developed into three different epic strings (comprising four epics), we shall briefly differentiate them against each other here. 1)a) The (anonymous) *Girart de Roussillon* in decasyllables originated before 1180 as the work of a highly talented poet from the area around Vienne (cf. Pfister 1970, passim, summed up in 91s. and 798). While the poet is almost arbitrary in his choice of secondary characters, for the plot itself he largely sticks to the *Vita nobilissimi comitis Girardi de Rossellon*, written around 1100 or in the early 12th c. in the monastery of Pothières which Girart had founded on his north (!) Burgundian allodial (!) estate, and where he and his wife were laid to rest. Into their Vita, the monks of Pothières had gladly integrated the many anonymous legends circulating about their founder Girart, though most of them described Girart more as the combative Count/Duke of Vienne and a certain Roussillon (almost certainly the one on the Rhône 20 km south of Vienne, today a ruin) than as the pious founder of their monastery. (The monks wrongly identified Roussillon with the pre-Roman ruins on their nearby Mont Lassois.) 1)b) Shortly before 1350, a monk of Pothières modernized this *Girart* into a *Girart de Roussillon* in dodecasyllables (~ alexandrines). 2) The *Girart de Vienne* by Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube (around 1200) as the culmination of a string preserving and intensifying the idea of one big family of heroes; cp. above the main text. 3) There is a third plotline, usually called the *Girart de Fra(i)te* plotline, which we only know about because it has become part of the *Aspremont* (shortly before 1194): for a long time, Girart is quite headstrong in his dealings with Charlemagne, but finally helps him by bringing his troops to join the battle against the Muslims near the Aspromonte in Calabria. The poet's indications about Girart's possessions and relatives sound arbitrary. *Fra(i)te* is the Medieval name of (part of?) the imposing Celtic, Greek and Roman ruins of Glanum near Saint-Rémy-de-Provence 25 km south of Avignon. I regard as reliable the statement in the *Vita Girardi* from Pothières, that Girart died in Avignon and in accordance with his wishes, his corpse was brought to the monastery he had founded, just as his wife was, because this is a matter which directly concerned the monks of Pothières. In fact, when in 870 Vienne in the Treaty of Meerssen was handed over to his life-long enemy Charles the Bald, it would have been the most natural option for

Secondly: the name *Roland* was in the 10th c. astonishingly popular in the area which is now south-eastern France near the Rhône Bend (cf. C.15.7.3 below).

And *thirdly*: the section on 'Alde' above (C.8.2) shows how in 980 the name 'Alde' was well known, precisely in the area around Cluny-Vienne and for an author looking for a name for Olivier's sister, there were good reasons for choosing this one rather than any other.

It is, *fourthly*, perhaps of interest to note at this point that the name *Durandus,* in my opinion the point of origin of the sword name *Durendart / Durendal*, appears also to have reached its peak of popularity around the year 1000 near the Rhône Bend in the Savigny-Cluny region (cf. n. 943).

Our decision in favour of an Olivier who came into being not in a Song of Roland but shortly before 1000 near the Rhône Bend in a *Girart de Vienne* as someone who was "one of our own" means that we have reached a position that has been held before, by Aebischer (hinting at this 1955, 231, more clearly [1960b] 1967, 70ss., definitely [1966] 1967, 157–163. Favati (1962, passim) agreed with the main argument. I acknowledge Aebischer's achievement in being the first to notice this and admire this well-deserved fruit of decades of intensive work on the Old French epic, as well as his intellectual courage, but I must also emphasise that I reached the same conclusion through a very different logical process. Postulating an *a priori* a folksiness/simplicity in Old French epic literature, Aebischer denied that the name *Olivier* had any symbolic value, and did not consider the Peace of God movement, which in my opinion means that he excluded the single most important reason behind the contrast between Roland and Olivier; he dismissed the RO reference from Salernes with facile arguments, and regarded the OR order as a definitive piece of evidence, although in my opinion it cannot be regarded as such for chronological reasons; since he did not explain the *Runers* in the Rol. and did not notice the *Lambertus Bituricensis* in the PT nor the passage in Alexander Neckam, he had to make the KMS I bear a heavy burden of proof, over a chronological chasm, so to speak. For my part, however, I have made every effort to use, among other things, onomastic-statistical means and also the history of mentalities to strengthen and tighten the argument. The fact that we have arrived at the same conclusion by following different paths

---

Girart to go down the River Rhône into the realm of Emperor Louis II, the only surviving brother of Girart's deceased sovereigns, Charles the Epileptic and Lothar II (all three of them sons of Girart's first sovereign Lothar I, brother of Charles the Bald). If Girart lived in Avignon for eight or nine years, and was perhaps even active there, this could explain *Fra(i)te* as the third 'home' of Girart. – The string of the *Girart* legend that is of interest to us is the one that gives most information about his epical family and therefore about Oliver's epical home, i.e. the one represented by the *Girart de Vienne* of Bertrand of Bar-sur-Aube and the KMS I.

makes the result all the more trustworthy, especially with respect to chronological factors. The chronology may look quite bold, even today; but we should remember one important fact: Bédier's core hypothesis (1926–1929, 4.477) was that *les chansons de geste sont nées au XIe siècle seulement*, but not *à la fin du XIe siècle*; thus far we have, *grosso modo*, kept within these boundaries.

The early *Girart de Vienne* leaves us one last question to answer. Its author found Charlemagne and Girart already in existence; but was he the first to make Roland into Charlemagne's nephew, just as he made Olivier into Girart's nephew? If he did, then this "nephew" motif in his constellation of four would have been his invention. Or did he find Roland along with Charlemagne, already as his nephew – which *de facto* means: did he find a rudimentary Roncevaux Song in existence, since of course from the very beginning Roland cannot be separated from Roncevaux? In that case, his bright idea would be to expand the central concept of a nephew relationship into a mirrored constellation of four. Aebischer ([1966] 1967, 170) opted for the second possibility when he described the origin *Girart de Vienne* thus: "deux acteurs entraient forcément en scène, Girard lui-même, et Charlemagne, son suzerain et son adversaire. Mais comme ce dernier *était depuis longtemps accompagné par son neveu Roland*, il fallait donc, par symétrie, que Girard disposât lui aussi d'un neveu qui le soutînt [. . .]" (italics added by me.) I think he is right; but once again, this can only be demonstrated using a very complicated argument.

C.14.10 Review of Olivier

The name *Olivier* originated in about 980 near the Rhône Bend as a symbolic name, and it expressed the same longing for peace in Christian society that fed the Peace of God movement which arose at the same time and in almost the same region. The name was possibly even created by the author of the first Song about Roland and Olivier, that is to say an ur-*Girart de Vienne*; it is also possible that this author, shortly after the emergence of the name, used it in a stroke of ingenuity for a character whom he invented, the nephew of Girart de Vienne, created to be the (probably more mature) counterpart, and ultimately comrade-in-arms as well as prospective brother-in-law of a young Roland, whose status as nephew of Charlemagne this poet was probably not the first to mention. The plot probably ended like that of the surviving *Girart de Vienne*, in a brief outlook on the death of the two nephews together at Roncevaux.

C.15 Roland

This name appears in O 104 and then 187 times altogether, in O mostly short-
ened to *Roll* (as it is in the first appearance, and also in 16 of the 21 cases in
assonance), sometimes written out in full as *Rollant* (as it is in the second appear-
ance, v. 175, and in 5 cases in assonance), never as **Rollanz*; V4CV7 and the b
[Bogdanow] fragment also have, like O, an invariable *Rollant* as the norm, T has
Roullant apart from a few isolated small deviations (including 1x *-ans*), and so
Segre correctly uses an invariable *Rollant*. *Rollant* is also maintained as the norm
in n, *Rolant* in w. On the other hand, the majority of the Konrad tradition (re)Ger-
manises the stressed vowel to <ŏ> or <ů>, both for /úo/, and the Dutch tradition
to <oe> for /ō/ (not yet /u/!). PL and the l [Lavergne] and f [Michelant] fragments
maintain the two-case inflection fairly well, and so they have besides the obli-
quus *Rol(l)ant* the rectus *Rol(l)ans* (Pfl) or *Rollanz* (L), so that Stengel, who did
not believe in Th. Müller's binary genealogical stem (later supported by Bédier
and Segre especially), maintained the two-case inflection throughout the whole
edition.

 The Carmen (v. 21 etc.) has *Rollandus*, the *Codex Calixtinus* on the other hand,
both in the PT and in the *Guide for Pilgrims* has *Rotolandus / Rotholandus,* which
as shown e.g. by the edd. Meredith-Jones and H.W. Klein is diffused through al-
most all branches of the PT manuscript tradition (Hämel-A, Meredith-Jones A6,
B3, C3) and therefore certainly can be put into the archetype of the PT. Since clas-
sical Latin does not have *-tl-* in its indigenous vocabulary, this is a Latinising 'en-
nobling' form. In contrast to the whole manuscript tradition of the Rol. (and of the
Carmen) it indicates contact with the type /rotlant/, that is to say (around 1145!)
neither with the northern (at that time probably including at least the Mayenne
region) type /rolant/ nor with the southern (apparently embracing the area near
Saint-Jean-d'Angély) type /rotlan/; it is therefore one of the indications that the
author of the PT comes from the area in between, and so it fits very well with the
hypothesis advanced by Bédier and André Moisan, which I also favour, surmising
that the *Codex Calixtinus* and also the PT in it goes back to the Poitevin author
Aimericus from Parthenay-le-Vieux in the Poitou region.

C.15.1 The relevance of the defeat in 778

In order to see the figure of Roland in the right scale, we cannot avoid answering
a basic question about the defeat in 778. I call this the question of relevance: if
someone in the 12th c. had learned almost all they knew about Charlemagne from
the Rol., would he or she have known something relevant about the emperor, or

just something arbitrary or peripheral? Famously, in Romance studies, both yes and no answers to this question have been given.

René Louis surmised that on that day Charlemagne's life was in danger.[1608] But there is no evidence of this in the texts, and it would even diminish the relevance of the Song to a grotesque extent; for if this were true, its main message would be historically wrong, that is to say its claim that only the rear guard was in danger, and only the rear guard was annihilated. This extreme answer goes against the default position of its – if buzzwords must be used – 'neo-traditionalist' author.

Bédier on the other hand (1927, 6) emphasised that from a late 11th or early 12th century perspective the defeat was a *fait divers indifférent*. And indeed: if in the time around 1100 someone had written a *Karolis*, some few thousand lines long and based on the written evidence, the defeat of 778 would have been a small episode, or it might have been omitted entirely; but in fact, this indicates

---

1608 R. Louis (195, 403): "Le roi lui-même ne se fraye un chemin qu'à grand peine; on pressent que certains sont morts pour couvrir sa retraite." No. The clearest account is in the *Vita Karoli* (cap. 9): the *Wascones* attacked only *extremam impedimentorum partem et eos qui novissimi agminis incedentes subsidio praecedentes tuebantur* 'the last part of the baggage train and the rear-guard troops who were protecting it'. The Astronomus (cap. 2) agrees: the event consisted only of the fact that *extremi quidam in eodem monte regii caesi sunt agminis*. The longer revision of the Royal Annals (which is the only one to mention the defeat) states that the *Wascones [. . .] extremum agmen adorti totum exercitum magno tumultu perturbant [. . .]*, and so this also indicates: they only attacked the rear guard, but in so doing they caused a commotion throughout the whole army. For as soon as it was evident that the *Wascones* had isolated the baggage train, or the part of it being defended by the rear guard, by driving a wedge of attackers between it and the main army, it must have been obvious to everyone that the very existence of this part of the army was in jeopardy; news of the attack spread as fast it possibly could through the whole army, and the unit leaders either lost valuable time waiting for an order from the top, or gave uncoordinated commands to turn back immediately; but they were not able to break through the separating wedge and experienced at least acoustically the death of the rear guard from the noise of the battle; the king was certainly alerted to this and he was called upon to come back. The king was visibly in a state of powerlessness and perhaps also bafflement and shock; and in the end they had to retrieve the bodies of their own warriors, identify them and bury them – all of this is more than enough to cause commotion and keep the army in a state of confusion. This would be *a fortiori* the case, if Charlemagne in his hurry had made the mistake of travelling, alone or with the most mobile parts of his army, not along the Roman road over the mountains, but along the road through the valley (where the modern main road runs) from Ibañeta down towards *Vallis Karoli* 'Valcarlos', as the PT and the *Guide for Pilgrims* (which were familiar with the region!) suggest. Before the 19th c., this road was said to have been in places not passable by two people at the same time; but are we sure that this would have made Charlemagne afraid to go through these narrow places with his horse?

that the Roland fable did not originate at this time, and it was not based on written sources. Bédier's extreme statement, too, turns against the default position of its 'individualistic' author. To use a modern image: an own goal on both sides. In my discussion, therefore, I am not looking for a simplistic formula, but rather I assemble together four objectively provable and unique features of the battle as a traumatic experience, and I try to formulate the relevance of each, both for contemporaries and for the Song itself.[1609]

First: the defeat in 778 was the only one that Charlemagne ever experienced as leader of the troops.

Charlemagne's army suffered other heavy defeats, as in 782 in the Saxon war at the Süntel and in 793 when it was travelling through the still Frisian Rüstringen area. William's defensive battle, also in 793, cost many lives and was a stalemate, only in so far as the enemy did not press any further forwards;[1610] but instead they went on to ransack Narbonne without a struggle and gather plenty of loot; the Royal Annals even state that *victores ad sua regressi sunt sagen*. But when all these defeats took place, Charlemagne was many hundreds of kilometres away. He could not even be accused of having sent too few troops to these two theatres of war; for at the Süntel one part of the army went into battle too early because its leaders were too eager for glory, in Rüstringen the Franks were betrayed by Saxon auxiliaries, and the raid in Septimania was a surprise attack from the sea when the enemy knew very well that most of Charlemagne's forces were tied up in the war with the Avars.

778 was different: if the Commander-in-Chief sets off in the morning for an obviously dangerous day's march and does not allocate enough troops to guard the baggage train in the rear guard, then the question arises, how far he is responsible for the consequences. No one dared speak about his 'guilt' in the matter, but nevertheless there certainly was 'a tragic miscalculation'. A well-educated and clever observer such as Einhart points out the heavy weaponry of the Franks and the difficult terrain; but this heavy weaponry had brought the Franks victory in all other theatres of war, at the same time reducing their losses there, and in the two hundred years after the defeat, only relatively few Franks ever saw the place where the battle occurred. It must then have been

---

1609 My concern in the following analysis is partially the same as that of Ilse Nolting-Hauff in her excellent article *Zur Psychoanalyse der Heldendichtung: das Rolandslied und die einfache Form 'Sage'* (1978). But my mode of expression and some parts of my argument are different.
1610 Since it was widely believed in the Middle Ages that the one who held on to the battlefield was the victor, even if there had been horrendous losses (cf. Rol. 2182!), epic literature could quite easily depict the battle of 793 as a victory for William.

increasingly natural to see Charlemagne's miscalculation in quantitative terms: why had the king not made the rear guard stronger, strong enough to make it appear as unassailable as the main army was? And the leader of the rear guard, who had given his life for it, would have remained free of any 'guilt', because it was probably evident from the battlefield that the rear guard had defended itself heroically to their very last breath. But – the question was too obvious to be left unasked – had he, too, perhaps been the victim of a brief, but fateful miscalculation, when he had not, as soon as the attack began, used his horn to alert the main army and call them back? The surviving Song has fully retained these tragic miscalculations, both by the king and by the leader of the rear guard, but it also brought them into a new, much more complicated context, and managed to balance them perfectly. For in the meantime, a poet had found a more brilliant solution, which even satisfied the audience's dark desire for vindication: the traitor who conspired with the enemy. This made it possible that both Charlemagne and Roland only just succumbed to their miscalculation, and they did so because of the noblest characteristic that great characters possess, namely their trust: both recognised Ganelon's hate, but they trusted him at the most crucial moment – Charlemagne when he appointed the rear guard, Roland at that point and again when the first enemy hordes appeared – and they did not think him capable of ultimate step of conspiring with the enemy.

Secondly: the defeat in 778 was the only defeat in the whole of Charlemagne's lifetime that remained unavenged. After the Frankish defeat at the Süntel, Charlemagne immediately went to Saxony and according to the Royal Annals, had 4,500 Saxons put to death; two years after the Frankish defeat in Rüstringen he subjected the Saxons to another heavy defeat and only after their land had been laid waste – *eorumque terrā vastatā* – did he return to Gaul; another nine years after that, even the very last Saxon's spirit of resistance was broken. In Septimania, the Franks managed to transition into an offensive phase of the war four years after they had suffered such heavy losses in the defensive battle of 793, and long before Charlemagne's death this led to the final conquest of Girona and Barcelona.

On the other hand, Einhart (*Vita Karoli* 9), writes that Charlemagne's defeat in the Western Pyrenees could not be avenged there and then, because the enemy had very quickly dispersed in all directions. In reality, the shock was much greater: Charlemagne feared that because of this defeat, a rebellion could break out in the whole of Aquitaine as soon as he had retreated with his army to the north. In order to prevent this, he carried out – and according to the Louis Vita by Astronomus (cap. 3), even before he left Aquitaine – a reorganisation

more thorough than any other during his reign: he appointed new counts not only in Bourges, Poitiers, Périgueux, the Auvergne, the Velay, in Toulouse, Bordeaux, Albi and Limoges and (in an unspecified amount) new abbots (!), and not content with that, he also appointed a layer of many *vassi* below the Counts, that is to say men who had personally pledged themselves ('commended') over and above the ordinary duties of a subject. But the most important thing he did (and likewise uniquely in his lifetime): he made sure that all these counts, abbots and *vassi* were expressly *ex gente Francorum*, men 'against whose prudence and bravery no deceit nor violence would remain unpunished'. *Franci* can only mean here: non-Aquitanians, people from the north, while deceit and violence can only refer to the Aquitanian insurrections he feared so much.

Menéndez Pidal (1960, 217) reminds us of two more events, the first showing how the shock of 778 was still felt in 813, and the second showing how in 825 the old memory was painfully revived. In the year 806 a group, which judging by their name was pro-Frankish, had come to power in Pamplona, and formally brought Navarre under Charlemagne's control. When in 812/813 Louis the Pious as King of Aquitaine had once again quashed a Gascon Basque uprising, he thought it necessary to appear in Pamplona with an army, presumably because he sensed that the Navarrese would come to the aid of the Gascons. He took care of everything in Pamplona, as the Astronomus reports rather vaguely in his Louis Vita (cap. 17), and set off on his way home again; he then discovered signs of a planned attack in the passes, in other words, a repeat performance of the events of 778. Then *prudenti astutiā* 'through clever deceit' almost all of the suspects' wives or sons were *erepti* 'torn from them' and carried off as hostages, until Louis and the army were safe. We have to imagine what this meant in concrete terms: the marching distance from Pamplona to the Pyrenean range is at least 50 km, which for an army in those days meant a two days' march, in the course of which they would have to be ready for a Basque attack to free the hostages at any moment; because of this, the hostages had to be so closely guarded round the clock, that they could be killed in a matter of moments if necessary. If the Astronomus writes in a way that praises Louis, describing this not as a cowardly deed, but as a mark of cleverness, then the audience must have still been so aware of the shock of 778 that they considered it justifiable to use any means against the Navarrese.[1611] According to the Royal

---

[1611] The fact that Louis suspected the Navarrese is, incidentally, an argument supporting the idea that back in 778 the attackers were Navarrese, and not Gascons. Here are two more arguments that are at least as convincing: (1) Since these attackers only targeted Charlemagne's baggage train and rear guard, they knew that his main army would remain unharmed and go on to march through Gascony. King Pippin had already shown, between 760 and 768 in

Annals things were even worse in 825: a Carolingian army under two counts appeared once again in Pamplona; they were attacked on their way back through the passes, whereupon one of the counts was spared because he was of Gascon blood, and sent on his way home, but the other was packed off as a gift to Córdoba – and although this did not endanger the Frankish realm, it was an insidious reminder of Navarrese power and so, for the Frankish side, instead of delivering the compensation for 778 that they hoped for, this turn of events reopened an old wound.

And finally, shortly after 840 the Astronomus wrote this much-debated sentence about the victims of the attack of 778 (cap. 2): *Quorum, quia vulgata sunt, nomina dicere supersedi.* Thus far, the discussion has revolved around the question: what is he referring to, the *Vita Karoli* or early epic songs? The Astronomus is very probably familiar with the *Vita Karoli*; this is evidence enough for us to conclude that he very probably wants this sentence to be understood at least mainly as a reference to the *Vita Karoli*; it is not possible to determine from this statement alone if there is more behind it than that. But the question is posed too narrowly; historians and literary historians must investigate not only the meaning of the words and the source of a statement, but also the intention behind it. If we do this, the picture looks quite different. The Astronomus is writing a biography of Louis the Pious; this requires him, of course to provide the man's date of birth. He does this at the beginning of his third chapter using the familiar format 'in the year 778 after the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ'. But in those days, the calculation of time after the incarnation of Christ was being taken from the Annals into other forms of historical writing; no doubt most of the audience would not yet count their own life experiences in terms of years after the Incarnation but would instead think of them in relation to this or that memorable event. The Astronomus thought he needed to document Louis' birth in this way, too, and only one such memorable event came to mind: Charlemagne's Spanish campaign. This is why in the first chapter of his work – after the obligatory prologue – he provided a short summary of the first decade of Charlemagne's reign, where it is noticeable that the conquest of Italy is missing, but the chapter finishes with the pacification of Aquitaine; the second chapter is

---

neighbouring Aquitaine, just how capable the Carolingian army was of carrying out a scorched earth policy, (partly assisted by Prince Charles, as he was then) leaving the land *vastando et desertando* (Royal Annals for the year 761). Would you attack a rear guard if the main army could then destroy your land afterwards? And (2): on the return journey, a few days before the attack, Charlemagne had destroyed the walls of Pamplona *ad solum usque* (Royal Annals up to 829, for the year 778; similarly in the version up to 803, the *Ann. Mettenses priores* and *posteriores*, Regino, Poeta Saxo). Who had grounds for revenge there, the Navarrese or the Gascons?

then entirely devoted to the Spanish campaign. However, the Astronomus encountered some difficulties in the presentation of his material; for if shortly after 800 anyone looked back on Louis' life and compared it with the life of Charlemagne, he or she would surely wonder whether Louis had been born "under an unlucky star". As Louis' biographer, the Astronomus was especially concerned to claim the opposite: no, at the very time when Louis first came into the world, his father was doing great things, demonstrably by the grace of God. At the end of Charlemagne's Spanish campaign, it would have been genuinely difficult to make this claim. Writing about the middle phase, the Astronomus says by way of introduction that the true purpose of the campaign was to assist the Spanish Christians; but in the middle of the chapter he says meekly *Dum enim quae agi potuerunt in Hyspania peracta essent* 'when in Spain everything had been done that could be done', or more plainly: nothing much or rather: nothing that would last; for after 840 it was obvious that a Frankish ruler's word had not the slightest effect even in Pamplona, far less in Saragossa.

The last remaining task was to describe the march through the Pyrenees in a highly stylised fashion: *Qui mons cum altitudine caelum pẹne contingat, asperitate cautium horreat, opacitate silvarum tenebrescat, angustia viae vel potius semitẹ commeatum non modo tanto exercitui, sed paucis admodum pẹne intercludat, Christo tamen favente prospero emensus est itinere. Neque enim regis animus Deo nobilitante generosissimus vel impar Pompeio vel segnior esse curabat Hannibale, qui cum magna sui suorumque fatigatione et perditione iniquitatem huius loci olim evincere curarunt.* A comparison with Einhart (*Vita Karoli* 9) is useful here; Einhart did not use sixty-four words to describe the march into the mountains, but only needed three: s*altuque Pyrinei superato*, and later, when Charlemagne turns back, Einhart describes the attack accurately, but soberly, including especially the *opacitas silvarum* which made the ambush possible, the *loci iniquitas*, through which the Franks were chased downhill, and the fact that their *armorum gravitas* hindered their progress. Now we suddenly understand why the Astronomus omitted the conquest of Italy in his first chapter: the crossing of the Alps would have made the crossing of the Pyrenees look pale in comparison, and there would have been no glorious deed left to report in the year of Louis' birth. It is not clear why Hannibal and Pompey were said to have suffered losses; according to Livy (21.23s.) Hannibal managed to cross over the Pyrenees without any problems, according to Pliny (*n.h.* 3.18, 7.96, KPauly s. v. *Pompeius*) Pompey even erected a great victory marker on a high ridge when he crossed the Pyrenees, because he had subdued the whole of Spain; the *magna perditio* suffered by both of them is therefore an invention by the Astronomus. All in all, this highly stylised account of Charlemagne's march into the Pyrenees only makes sense if its purpose is to overcompensate for his march back. This march back could therefore not be forgotten

even after Charlemagne's glorious, 45-year-long reign, and it sets the tone whenever Charlemagne's Spanish campaign is mentioned.

When he is describing how Charlemagne turns back, the Austronomus starts with the *infidus incertusque fortunę ac vertibilis successus* – using three adjectives at once; because the strong personal values that have characterised Charlemagne thus far ('Charlemagne's higher purpose') must suddenly be replaced by a value-free and impersonal concept ('luck/misfortune'). Then the event itself: *Dum [. . .] prospero itinere reditum esset, infortunio obviante extremi quidam in eodem monte regii caesi sunt agminis. Quorum, quia vulgata sunt, nomina dicere supersedi.* The return journey also passed 'happily' until 'misfortune demanded otherwise . . . ' Then we hear the most important statement of all, the 'confession', made as short as possible and therefore without an agent: *caesi* – by whom then actually? The most interesting statement in psychological terms, however, is the closing sentence, taking almost as many words as the mention of two or three names would have done.

Why is this last sentence even necessary? If an author takes almost as many words to tell us that he is not going to say something, as he would have done if he had said it outright, then it must be because he is trying to avoid going down a temptingly obvious track, to explicitly deflect a particular expectation. If the memory of 778 was fading fast, since more than sixty years had passed – why would the focus turn from the event to the names, and from there to the fate of individuals? If people today think of Stalingrad, or of the Korean or Vietnam War, does anyone list the high-ranking people who were killed? The defeat is therefore not forgotten, even after sixty years, but on the contrary, it continues to cause enough empathy to be evoked through the fate of individuals who were there.

A defeat like this leaves a burning resentment. The collective consciousness exerts pressure not just to explain what happened, but to avenge it, and finally – as long as contemporary reality does not disavow it completely – to over-avenge it. Here, too the path from principle to final execution was long: to the annihilation of at least the enemies from Roncevaux who survived, to the sun miracle that followed, to the capture of Saragossa; then – carried along by the feeling of victory after the First Crusade and again after the recapture of Saragossa – to excessive vengeance, first on the external enemy, that is to say the destruction of the much bigger enemy army, which came unexpectedly from overseas (although logically they were not responsible for Roncevaux), and then secondly the excessive vengeance on the traitor, that is to say the trial against Ganelon with the 'last extraordinary moment' of collective cowardice which was overcome only through the courage of one person and God's help, these being the only reasons why the annihilation of a whole family was allowed. Most of this excessive revenge – that is to say at least the Baligant

section – is probably the work of the last poet, who in my opinion signed his work as *Turoldus*; it is commendable that once he has so powerfully imbued the work with the spirit of his age, he relativises its triumphalism in the closing lines with the mention of *Bire* and *Imphe,* leaving the work open-ended, as befits all human history.

Parallel to the chronologically forward-looking need for (excessive) revenge, there is also a backwards-looking need: the defeat can better be borne if great victories had been won beforehand, *set anz tuz pleins* and *tresqu'en la mer.* In the surviving Song, they are just briefly alluded to, so as not to impinge upon the concise drama of the story, but outside of it, they accumulated steadily, from Roland's first feat of arms to the capture of Nobles.

We can see it now: almost every aspect of the Song that deviates from history, or rather, every time it enhances history, the reason is this fundamental collective need – even if every detail was invented by a poet. Collective needs exert pressure, but they do not yet create anything.

Thirdly: According to the Vita Karoli (cap. 9) only one precisely definable part of the army was attacked – the last part of the baggage train and the rear guard protecting it – and everyone was killed, down to the last man. We must consider this, too, in very concrete terms. On the morning of the 15th of August 778, south of the Pyrenean pass, there was a moment when the main army and the rear guard blithely made their preparations for departure: that very same evening they would be in Gascony, *la tere lur seignur*, and most of the stress of the military campaign would be behind them. There was, however, an invisible, dividing wall between them in that space: anyone on the other side of it would not live to see the evening. No other defeats are described in this way in contemporary texts: at the Süntel *paene omnes* of the over-eager combatants were killed, but a few managed to escape into the Commander-in-Chief's section of the army; in Rüstringen the Frankish troops were *deletae*, but this does not necessarily mean all down to the last man; in the south at any rate – to name a circumstance that was either banal or sublime, depending on your perspective – the Commander-in-Chief survived: *n'en fuit mie Willame, ainz s'en vait*; it was well known that he died as a monk thirteen years later.

The fact that literally not a single member of the rear guard survived at Roncevaux, and the associated aura of inevitability from the moment when the first wrong decisions were made, always formed the central core of the story;[1612]

[1612] On the functionally justified double exception to this in the PT cf. section C.8.5.4 above: 'The *Balduinus / Tedricus* rivalry in the PT'.

and after what was probably another long development, the surviving Song also made brilliant use of it: from the painfully slow (and artistically varied!) melting away of the troops, with the intermittent quarrel of the leaders over the horn sounding (a motif marvellously suited to the Pyrenees!), the death of Olivier, the perseverance of the last three warriors, the death of Gualter, then Turpin, up to Roland's great death scene which was constructed following no different model than the latent example of the Passion of the Lord. This vast sequence of events is brought to a sudden close by the tragic irony of Charlemagne's arrival only a short time later: the two sentences *Morz est Rollant, Deus en ad l'anme es cels* and *Li emperere en Rencesvals parvient* are right next to each other, and even part of the same laisse.

Thus, the third specific of the defeat of 778 has borne manifold poetic fruit.

And its influence carried far beyond the Oxford Roland. The motifs of revenge and excessive revenge had to lead to an outcome where the principle of good was victorious, but not at the cost of the traumatic core: none of the post-Oxford authors who rewrote the work ever considered having Charlemagne arrive early enough to find some men alive and save them. Traditional poetry *vive en variantes*, but it also upholds the principle of consistency when it comes to the core of the story.

Fourthly: According to the Royal Annals up to 829, plerique aulicorum, quos rex copiis praefecerat were killed. Lat. *plerique* hovers between '(rather) a lot of' and 'most of'; since even this version of the Annals, in contrast to the previous version that was written during Charlemagne's lifetime, admits the disaster, but presumably still plays it down somewhat, the meaning is probably 'most of' the men. *Copiae* in military contexts has two meanings: 'supplies, baggage train' or 'troops'; since only the baggage train and the rear guard were attacked, and not the whole army, the second meaning 'troops' does not fit – quite apart from the fact that it is not at all obvious why on this occasion Charlemagne should not have left these units under their customary leaders. Moreover, the relative clause here cannot be a 'necessary / constraining' one (most of those *aulici*, whom . . .), because in this part of the army all of them were killed, down to the last man, and not most of them; therefore, it is an 'illustrating' clause ('most of his *aulici*; for it was they whom he had . . . ' The *aulici* are *per definitionem* the men who were living in daily communion with Charlemagne, and they included among them the highest-ranking office bearers of the empire, such as the Seneschal (*regiae mensae praepositus*; *regi summus in aula fuit*, MGH PLAeC. 1.109) and Count Palatinate (*comes palatii*). A monarch of Charlemagne's status, at least after ruling for ten years, would have only tolerated people around him whom he liked and trusted, and they would include – to the

extent that a sovereign could afford to have any – his friends. This is why the defeat also affected him as a human being; although Einhart (cap. 19) praises his *summa in qualicumque et prospero et adverso eventu constantia* in other circumstances, the Annals for the year 778 report: *Cuius vulneris acceptio magnam partem rerum feliciter in Hispania gestarum in corde regis obnubilavit*. None of the reports on other defeats mention *aulici*, far less the heart of the king;[1613] the term *obnubilare* 'to cloud over, to darken' is also uniquely expressive.

The Annals report that 'many' or 'most' of the *aulici* were killed, while according to Einhart, all members of the rear guard were killed. As discussed at length above in the section 'From the *aulici* to the *pers*' (C.7.1), the epic has added these two statements together; all of the *aulici* were killed, because they were all in the rear guard. At the same time, it has turned the *aulici* into the peers, a covenant of (mostly) young warriors, because the epic needs warriors. But if only because their *primus inter pares,* Roland, is now Charlemagne's nephew, the King continues to love them: even Ganelon (v. 547, 560) says *Les . XII. pers, que Carles ad tant chers,* and *Li .XII. per, que Carles aimet tant* when he informs Blancandrin about the balance of power at Charlemagne's court. And when Charlemagne arrives at Roncevaux, his first words, his cry of *U est,* include all twelve of them by name (v. 2402–2410); if *Ive et Ivor̆ie*, who have not distinguished themselves from the other ten, are rewarded with an additional *que jo aveie tant chers*, this is little more than a question of the metre, and the meaning applies to all the others, too. There is only one utterance still more intense than this, and that is Charlemagne's great lament for his nephew: *Ami Rollant* (v. 2887–2942).

Let us summarise, then: Charlemagne's defeat in the Pyrenees has four distinctive features. We first examined their effect using contemporaneous material for comparison, and in so doing we took account of the perspective and the emotional categories of the late 8th and early 9th century. Given this perspective, can we seriously doubt the relevance of the defeat? Then we followed its effects into the Song in its surviving form. In the process – and I think this is methodologically indispensable – we have not understood history simply as something that may or may not be preserved in the Song, but rather as something that is capable

---

1613 The one that comes closest is the defeat at the Süntel, where (apart from four counts not mentioned by name and various other dignitaries) two *legati* 'emissaries' who had just been sent there by Charles were killed, namely his chamberlain Adelgis and his Marshall Geilo; but we do not hear anything about an emotional reaction on Charlemagne's part. Einhart does depict (cap. 19) Charlemagne shedding tears on the death of his sons, and a daughter, and Pope Hadrian.

of inspiring the poet make variations, enhancements, and corrections. In the light of this, can we seriously doubt its relevance in the surviving Song? And does this not all indicate that this second type of relevance developed consistently and organically out of the first? Therefore: *En el principio era la historia*.

But let us not forget a fifth, ideological factor, which constitutes the necessary foundation for the effectiveness of the four others. An epic memory can only survive through the ages if the core values on which it is built spontaneously remain core values for the society that is doing the remembering;[1614] in the case of a tragic story, the sacrifice must be made for the sake of these core values and if this is so, it will remain meaningful to an extent which transcends merely utilitarian thinking or criticism of specific details, no matter how reasonable these may be. Charlemagne's Spanish campaign was not just for France, it was for the whole of Christendom – this is how contemporaries saw it. From a modern perspective, the fact that, for Charlemagne, the latter was unthinkable without the former is a disconcerting limitation of his. For the Franks, and then the French, it was a happy accident – and the surviving Song demonstrates this very clearly. The Frankish Empire, then the Kingdom of France, and inseparably from them, the Christian faith had been throughout the centuries from Charlemagne to Turold the key ideal that had always brought the people of France together – at least as a "principle of hope" even in the deepest depths of the late 9th and the 10th centuries. Roland died on a campaign that was waged for king and people, and even more than that, for Christ. Regardless of one's thoughts in the early phases of the story about the identity of the attackers and their motives, or about Roland's mistake through all phases of the story's development – the meaning of the campaign gave his death an indestructible dignity and sublimity as the ultimate example of approval and acceptance in God. And, as the First Crusade drew nearer, the theology of the Church grew ever clearer: a martyrdom for Christ would extinguish all previous sins. It was an ideal that could also appeal to the ordinary Christian, a flame that never quite went out, so that it was able to flare into life again in the course of the 11th c. And had God not given this sacrificial death its meaning? – not in the way that humans tend to think, using short-term cause-and-effect thinking, but rather following the higher logic of his plan for salvation. Had he not confirmed it in this world, by giving the Frankish people the whole glory of Charlemagne's empire? This 'relevance' of the defeat in the year

---

1614 The word 'spontaneously' is crucial here. Epic literature can presumably live on indefinitely in a non-spontaneous fashion, by way of literary appreciation: we can even appreciate the greatness of Hagen in the Song of Nibelungs, if we step into his world view temporarily, so to speak, although this certainly is not the same as our own world view.

778 was the soil that nourished literary creativity for more than three hundred years. But it is important to remember: the ground nourishes, but it does not guarantee that anything will thrive, since nothing happens automatically. Only gifted authors can create works of literature. In the literary epic tradition, there are on the one hand quite a few such authors, relatively speaking, who create more and more new variations, as long as the epic is a living genre – *una poesía que vive en variantes*. But in the end, they are not able to define how the material develops, since only a very few can manage this, and these are the ones who imprint major mutations onto the material. We can say that we have identified three such especially gifted authors: the Norman Turold in the first half of the 12th c.; the anonymous Angevin poet in the middle of the 11th c., whose main characters, with the exception of Baligant and Bramimonde, behave in his Song just as they will in Turold's version, and finally the anonymous Viennois poet who between 970 and shortly after 1000, probably within the context of a version of the *Girart de Vienne* story, invented Olivier to go with Roland, and in so doing brought a polarity within the Christian side into being, without which it would have been much diminished. Roland existed already, and was probably already Charlemagne's nephew, while the enemy were – and we can even regard this as certain – no longer Basques who were being directed by Muslims, but actual Muslims.

Will it be possible to identify a fourth great creator here, in the early history of the material?

C.15.2 The historicity of Roland

There was a development, erroneous in my view, in Romance Studies which started in the 1960s and has continued to be influential up to the present time, based on the work of especially Paul Aebischer and André de Mandach, but also Jean Dufournet, Hans-Wilhelm Klein and most recently Bernard Gicquel.[1615] The

---

1615 Aebischer ([1965] 1967, passim, [1966] 1967, 146–150, [1969] 1975, 41–48 and 62–66, 1972, 93–145), de Mandach (BBSS 2 [1959–1960], 94, partly also 1961, passim, and 1982, passim), Dufournet (1972, 23s.), Klein (1986, 147), Gicquel (2003, 30–37). In the case of Aebischer, the great scholar's intellectually respectable, nagging doubt about Roland's existence is still in evidence, but de Mandach makes incorrect statements about the readings in several mss.; Klein writes in a matter-of-fact tone, as if there was consensus among scholars on the subject. Finally, in Gicquel's work the whole issue almost turns into a caricature: he assigns to the *verbum rotulare* a meaning that is attested nowhere 'to put into the *rotulum*, the file/record', and assumes that Louis the Pious, or one of his notaries, has added a marginal note against the two names in the revised version B: *rotulandus praefectus britannici limitis* 'here the Warden of the Breton March should be added' (by which he meant Wido, the holder of this office in

manuscript history of the *Vita Karoli* was used to cast doubt upon, or even deny outright, the very existence of Roland. Others, including Rita Lejeune (1979, passim) argued against this idea, but apparently without much success, and it seemed also not to matter that no historians ever joined the agnostics. In the following section I shall present my own understanding, taking account of important results from more recent historical research.

C.15.2.1 Roland in Charlemagne's charter from the year 772

Charlemagne's charter no. 65 (MGH DD.kar. 1, 94s.) [undated, but from around the 29th of March (Easter) 772], states that while he is holding court in Herstal *una cum fidelibus nostris Hagino, Rothlando, Wichingo, Frodegario comitibus* (along with a few *vassi* mentioned by name), at the request of Gundeland Abbot of Lorsch, he rejects the claim made by Heimerich [Count of Upper Rheingau] that the Lorsch monastery belongs by right to Heimerich's family. The charter is only preserved in the copy of the *Codex Laureshamensis* (2nd half of the 12th c. f.1'b, ed. Glöckner p. 273). We know that its substance is genuine because of charter no. 67 (MGH DD.kar. 1, 97s.) written only two months later, in which Charlemagne even grants Lorsch immunity, and because of the whole history of Lorsch from that time forwards; even its literal wording has never been in doubt either,[1616] and Aebischer ([1965] 1967, 120s.) accepted it. But Aebischer wonders whether "nous n'avons pas en Rothlandus un nom mal lu ou interprêté à sa façon par le copiste, ou bien un nom ajouté par lui à la liste primitive". Aebischer deserves a more nuanced reply than the one afforded him by Lejeune (1979, 159s.).

It goes without saying that in the second half of the 12th c., in a highly civilised place such as Lorsch, not quite 200 km from the French-speaking regions, people knew of the epic Count/Margrave Roland, Charlemagne's nephew and the best commander of his troops, who was killed at Roncevaux through treachery. Even if they had not yet encountered the German Rol. by Konrad the priest, and if the name *Roland* was not yet reflected in German onomastics at that time, they

---

the year 799!), and then the marginal note was supposedly incorporated into the main text by accident.

1616 Apart from the minor detail that Charlemagne is called a *vir illustris*, whereas judging from approximately contemporaneous originals, the usual formulation was *vir inluster*. However, in charters no. 63, 76, 86 and 91 (a. 771–775) the 12th c. copyists always write *vir illustris*. In the 12th c. the assimilated forms obviously prevailed, and in some circles, *illustris* (sic) *-is*, *-e* (like *fortis*, *-is*, *-e*) was taught. Fluctuations between forms to this extent are so absolutely normal in medieval copies that they are of no practical use for investigations into the authenticity of documents. (After the year 775 this formulation disappears from Charlemagne's title.)

still knew about Roland because of the spread of French culture across Europe, and certainly since the First Crusade. But there is also another circumstance, which makes it likely that the Lorsch copyist in particular not only knew the epic Roland, but also *recognised* him in his source. As Mühlbacher, the editor of the MGH correctly observed, our charter was drawn up around Easter 772; because first of all, Charlemagne did not own Lorsch before the death of his brother Carloman (4.12.771), and secondly, the Thionville immunity charter of May 772 is the *terminus ante quem*, and in the period between these dates, Charlemagne celebrated Easter in Herstal. The charter does not mention a date, but the copyist provides the (wrong!) date of 776 in his introductory paragraph (ed. Glöckner p. 272).[1617] How did he work that out? The answer is very simple: he – or his brethren in the monastery before him – had also read (or read out to each other) the Royal Annals and the *Vita Karoli*. Let us not forget: the most magnificent ms. of the Royal Annals or *Ann. Laurissenses* ('of Lorsch'!) *maiores*, labelled A1 by the editors, today lost, accessible only through the early print of a direct copy (cf. MGH Ed. Kurze p. IX), came from Lorsch; and from the middle of the 10th c., Lorsch owned ms. C2 of Einhart's *Vita Karoli* (today Vaticanus Palatinus lat. 243) which was written in the late 9th c. and mentions Roland, and which was first correctly dated and properly evaluated by Bernhard Bischoff (1989, 60). The copyist knew from these documents that Charlemagne had undertaken his only Spanish campaign in the year 778 – and that Roland was killed in the Pyrenees on the way back – and he also knew that Charlemagne very often stayed in Herstal, and that the last time he did this before he left for his Spanish campaign was at Christmas 776. Thanks to a probably universal human tendency to make tragic events as dramatic as possible, the copyist then consciously or unconsciously picked the latest possible of all the Herstal dates: there was already an invisible shadow of death over the young Count, who was sitting there next to his uncle, dispensing justice, and doing so in a sympathetic way that benefited Lorsch.

And now to Aebischer's suspicions! Has the copyist surreptitiously slipped the name of Roland in, or through a conscious *coup de pouce* distorted another name to turn it into Roland? No; for if he had done so, then he would certainly have moved Charlemagne's nephew and best military commander to the top of the list of counts, and he would not have left an insignificant one called Haginus in that prime position.[1618] The fact that he does not do this shows that he is acting *bona fide*. Finally, the last of Aebischer's three suspicions – that the

---

1617 When he adds: *regni vero Karoli regis et postea imperatoris anno VIIIº*, this means of course: 'in the eighth year of the reign as king of the Charles who later became Emperor'.

1618 Because – to forestall this misconception too – even simpler souls than the monks of Lorsch knew that the Song of the Nibelungs describes a much earlier period than that of

copyist mistook a different name for that of Roland – is perfectly arbitrary, and when nothing speaks in favour of a suspicion, that also means, you have nothing to disprove it.[1619]

A few words remain to be said about the spelling *Rothlandus*, which is very different from the *Hruodlandus* in the critical edition of the *Vita Karoli*. If we compare the spelling of all Germanic names in the charters of Pippin, Carloman and Charlemagne on the one hand, and in Einhart, most of the necrologies, memorial books and local charters on the other, there is a considerable and thus far, little-researched difference between the two. The latter group mimic the spoken language relatively well, and Einhart does so on principle – he was an excellent observer not only of the Latin style of his role models, but also of his Old High German (Rhine-Franconian) native language – and the others in this group do so because the scribes had almost no previous tradition to rely on for most of the names. The royal charters, on the other hand, were produced by what was after all one of the best chancelleries of the age, and the names are much closer to the Latin spelling system, and they follow Latin conventions for combining graphemes, presumably because the scribes working on them were Romance native speakers or fully bilingual.

This applies to the name element /*hruod*/ that is of interest to us. The royal chancellery wrote in an original charter of Pippin from the year 759 for Saint-Denis (MGH DD.kar. 1.17s., no. 12) *Rodegarius/Rotgarius, Rothardus*, and in an original charter of Charlemagne from the year 812 (MGH DD.kar. 1.289s., no. 216) *Rotbertus comes*. First, the Germanic sequence <hr> did not exist in Lat., and the Romance speakers only pronounced this as /r-/; secondly, Romance speakers knew the diphthong <uo> if at all, then only in syllables that were stressed (according to their own stress rules). Thirdly, in Frankish, final devoicing took place not only at the end of words, but also at the end of syllables, so /hruod/ came to be pronounced /hruot/. On the other hand, Germ. /θ/as in /θiud-rīk/ was latinised as <th> (Theodericus), following the example of the Latinisation of Greek

---

Charlemagne and that the Hagen who died in the land of the Huns could not have been a count at Charlemagne's court.

1619 Aebischer tries to make his third suspicion look vaguely plausible (p. 120s.) by discussing it immediately after his analysis (up to p. 119) of the forged version (D) of Fulrad's will, in which the forger, who was active from around 900 to 950, replaces a *Raulcone comite* in his source's list of witnesses (namely version C, which is from essentially the same time as Fulrad) with *Rotlani comitis*. But the two cases are not comparable! The forger produces his text with a criminal motive, that is to say with a view to changing the historical ownership of a property, and in order to enhance the "authenticity" of his work, he *deliberately* (not through misinterpretation of the phonology) replaces a faded count's name with a very different one that still has resonance.

words, but pronounced as /t/ and in the vernacular often even spelt <t> (*Tierri, Thierry*); so <th> became available (as a 'noble' writing) of syllable-final /t/</d/: *Rod-* or *Rot-* or *Roth-*. All in all, therefore, there is nothing suspicious about the spelling of *Rothlandus.*

The charter of 772 must then be accepted as authentic and the count named in it is in all probability the same person as the margrave from the year 778.[1620]

C.15.2.2 The dinars with the names of Roland and Charlemagne[1621]

In the year 1857 in Imphy, 10 km southeast of Nevers, in a hoard containing about 100 Carolingian silver dinars, among other things, the following items were found: one dinar, the ownership of which is currently unknown, but which is accessible in the form of an illustration[1622] with the inscription obv: [= obverse,

---

1620 'Margrave' was not yet a title; the *de facto* margrave was at that time just a normal count, who as *primus inter pares* was only given authority over the other counts in order to guarantee that there would be a unified and speedy response in any emergency. André de Mandach (1961, 22) writes "Il suffit que n'importe quel 'Roland' du règne de Charlemagne ait signé comme témoin l'une des innombrables chartes de l'empereur, pour que, selon d'aucuns, la réalité historique d'un Roland mort dans les Pyrénées, le 15 août 778, soit attestée." But at once several different methodological objections present themselves: 1) Charlemagne reigned for 45 years (and approximately three and a half months). When he suffered the defeat in the western Pyrenees, only 10 years of that time (minus two months) had passed, and he still had 35 years (and about five months) before him. If Roland had been attested after (or before and after) 778 the game had been lost; but against probability, he is attested only before 778. 2) This is not about "n'importe quel Roland", but about one particular *Count* Roland; and he did not sign the charter as a witness but sat with the judges in the royal court. In those days doubtless not even one in a thousand of the adult males in the population bore the title of count. Or to express this in a different way: the number of names existing simultaneously in Charlemagne's kingdom probably numbered in the thousands (as we could easily demonstrate if we added up the names in Förstemann or Morlet); but in the charters from Charlemagne's first ten years (MGH DD.kar. 1, no. 55–119) only 20 counts in total (and the Count Palatine Anselmus) are mentioned by name: Aginhardus, Agmo ('Heimo'), Albuinus, Berngarius, Bern(eh)ardus (Charlemagne's uncle; the only one mentioned twice), Ermenaldus, Fredegarius, Ghaerardus, Hagino, Hebroinus ('Ebroin'), Hilderadus, Odrigus ('Aud-rik'), Radulfus, Rothlandus, Theodericus, Theudbaldus, Wichingus, Widrigus ('Widu-rik'), Wiggerus. Even the *a priori* probability that there would be a Roland among these 20, was therefore very small. Given these circumstances, anyone who wants to argue that there was a second Count Roland can quite reasonably be held responsible for finding the evidence for that.
1621 In this section I mostly do not take note of the non-alphabetical elements of the inscriptions on these coins (such as period, groups of periods etc.), insignificant discrepancies in the formation of the letters such as ◊ "lozenge" for O and breaks between lines; I refer to the primary sources cited in each case for more detail on these aspects
1622 Gariel (1883–1884, 2.132 and plate 9 no. 114).

also in the following instances] KRx·F· (with a bar above it), rev: [= reverse] RODLAN,[1623] and another one, located currently in Berlin with V: CARºLVS, R: RODLAN (the latter with a bar above it).[1624] Moreover, in 1904 in the Grisons, during the construction of the road from Ilanz/Glion to Ruschein (5 km by road to the northwest of there) a hoard was found containing (according to RGA s. v. *Ilanz*) 83 gold tremisses (43 from Lombardy, 40 Charlemagne's), 47 silver dinars (9 Pippin's, 38 Charlemagne's), 3 Anglo-Saxon and 2 Muslim coins plus a silver dinar currently located in the Rätisches Museum in Chur, with the lettering obv: CARºLVS and rev: RODLAN.[1625]

The Ilanz hoard has been guarded by the Swiss authorities from the moment of its discovery and so no counterfeiters have had the opportunity (or even the financial incentive) to augment it with their own fabrications (Grierson 1953, 47; accepted by Aebischer [1965] 1967, 125); the authenticity of the Ilanz dinar thus retrospectively authenticates the Imphy dinar which is of the same type.[1626] There are no concrete reasons to doubt the other Imphy dinar either, but it is not important in our context. Furthermore, because of the composition of the hoards, there can be no doubt that the 'Charles' here is Charlemagne. We can only roughly estimate that the Imphy hoard was buried 'in about 775'[1627] but 793/794 is a very firm *terminus ante quem*, because the burial of the Ilanz hoard can be dated with certainty as between 790 and 794,[1628] and because in 793/794 Charlemagne implemented a reform of the coinage, and from that time forwards, the coins minted in his realm look very different: on the obverse side there is a monogram of his name and on the reverse a cross, both of them ringed by the lettering, on the obverse this is the name of the king, usually in the form CARLUSREXFR, and on the reverse usually the place where the coin was minted. In the period before this, Charlemagne only insisted on the obverse side having his name on it, and from 771 onwards, mostly, but certainly not always,[1629] CARº/LVS written in two lines, and so at least the two surviving

---

1623 Gariel (as previous n.) notes with reference to the RODLAN on the reverse side, that the letters stand *sans beaucoup d'ordre dans le champ*, but Völckers (1965, 127, no. I 45) describes this reading more precisely as (R)-D-L-A-N in a ring around a diamond-shaped O. (A diamond-shaped ◊, "O lozenge" is very common on coins.)

1624 Gariel (1883–1884, 2.132 and plate 9 no. 113), Völckers (1965, 127, no. I 44).

1625 Völckers (1965, 162, no. XXIV 22).

1626 However, a few rather poor-quality counterfeit coins have been made, modelled on the Imphy example (Grierson 1958, 309, 311s. and plate 19 no. 4).

1627 Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 203).

1628 Grierson (1953, passim).

1629 On the exceptions, cf. for example Metcalf (1966, 381s.).

Rodlan dinars fit into the timeframe of 771–793/794.[1630] And finally: a more or less random abbreviation of proper names (partially excepting the names of current sovereigns) is perfectly normal on coins of this period; it is undisputed and, in the absence of an alternative, indisputable that *Rodlan* should be interpreted as *Rodlandus*.

The only point left for discussion is, and can only be, whether this Rodlandus was one of Charlemagne's dignitaries, in which case probably the one who later became the epic hero, or whether he was a coinsmith.[1631] It must first be emphasised that the location of both discoveries somewhat to the east is not an argument against the epic hero because only three relatively large hoards from Charlemagne's reign before 793/794 have ever been found in eastern Francia (Imphy, Lausanne, Jura) and six more from the eastern border areas (Holstein, Friesland, Geldern, Ilanz, Ligurien, Vercelli), but none from western Francia or Brittany.[1632] And the burial date of 790–794 for the Ilanz hoard is not an indication that Roland dinars continued to be struck after 778; for over forty of the coins found there are from the Lombard period, that is to say from before 774.

But let us turn to the main argument. The coinsmith's name hypothesis looks plausible at first, because it is unspectacular and only requires a weak afterlife of Merovingian conditions into the Carolingian period. It is only when we examine this hypothesis more closely that its plausibility falls away.

In the late Merovingian period, from about 670 onwards, the kings did not exercise their sovereign right to issue coins, and often did not even control the issue of actual coins; the silver dinars, which at that time were the standard coin, only bore a king's name in one exceptional case, that of Childeric II (662–675), whereas by far the majority bore the name of the coinsmith and the place of the mint (Grierson/ Blackburn 2006, 99–101, 139). Blanchet (1912, 249–336) lists over 2000 coinsmiths' names from the Merovingian period (that

---

1630 The most thorough discussion of this: Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 194–203 and especially 207–210).
1631 According to Stiennon (1965, 90) the following scholars opted for the man who would later become the epic hero (regarding this as certain or probable): Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 1.211), A. de Barthélemy in the *Revue numismatique*, 3. sér. 12 (1895), 80, Kleinclausz in Lavisse (1911, 341), Luschin von Ebengreuth (1926, 100s.), Joos (1956, 125), Suhle (1955, 25); those who opt for a coinsmith: Longpérier (1858a, 203–225), Prou (1896, p. XLVII), Blanchet (1912, 350). [As well as more recently in favour of the epic hero (with no claim to completeness): Grierson (1966, 512), Völckers (1965, 35), Stiennon 1965 by himself, Lejeune/Stiennon (1966, 9), Lejeune (1979, 156–158), Grierson (2006, 202, 207, here qualified with "more doubtfully" and a reference to Aebischer), Coupland (2007, I/213); favouring a coinsmith: Aebischer ([1965] 1967, 124–134).]
1632 Grierson (1966, 503s.), Metcalf (1965, 24), Morrison/Grunthal (1966, 339–343).

is to say in a timeframe of two and a half centuries at the most). However, there are quite a few exceptions; the following individuals had coins printed in their own name: the famous, or rather infamous, Majordomus Ebroin, the *patricii* (regional rulers) Antenor I, *Ansedert*,[1633] Nemfidius and Antenor II of Marseille (late 7th and early 8th c.), bishops such as Lambertus (678–684) and another Bishop of Lyon, Bishops Nordobertus, Bubus and Proculus of Clermont-Ferrand (early 8th c.), and finally (with no bishop's or abbot's name) major churches such as Poitiers, Rouen, Sens or Troyes and large monasteries such as Saint-Martin de Tours (Prou 1894, p. CIX, Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 93s., 98, 100s., 139, 141–149).

Under the rule of the Carolingian kings, in the period from 771 to 793/794 there were at least one hundred mints (Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 207). If these kings had just allowed the Merovingian system to continue, then in the time between 751 and 793/794 alone, in proportion to Blanchet's 2000 names, we would expect about 175 names of non-Carolingians who would be issuing coins. Instead, we now find it is the norm to have the king's name on the obverse side, in full, or in a shorter but still legible monogram form, and only an abbreviated mint location on the reverse. But we also find on a very small fraction of the coins, at the most 17 (real or supposed) personal names of non-Carolingians, that is to say, two or three under Pippin's rule, one under Carloman or Charlemagne, eleven under Charlemagne and one or two coins previously thought to be Carolingian, but with no sovereign's name on them. The very big drop in the numbers is noticeable here, and also the sharp cut-off point in time. This evidence has only one possible explanation, and that is the assumption that not long after Pippin was crowned, he issued an edict saying that coins had to bear the name (or the definitive monogram) of the sovereign on them, and instead of the name of the coinsmith, the reverse side should have the name of the place where the coin was minted. In 754/755 he issued a further decree, saying that from one pound of silver, no more than 22 Solidi (that is to say 264 dinars) could be minted.[1634] The reasoning behind this is clear: Pippin had rediscovered the old imperial and royal right to issue coins that had prevailed in the Roman and early post-Roman period, and had understood its political-economic importance and so began to take an interest in the quality of the coins, but he did not accept the idea that on his coins, alongside his own name, the name of a non-royal artisan should stand almost as prominently. From this time onwards, no coinsmith would dare to

---

1633 Since *-dert* is not a name-forming element, I suspect ANSEBERT with a mistake in the minting or a misreading of a B as a D; the name *Ansebertus* is also attested in Marseille in the *Polyptychon Wadaldi* (early 9th c. H 71).

1634 MGH Capit.r.F. 1.32 § 5. Also Lafaurie (1980, 486s.), Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 204).

disobey the decree outright and put his own name on the coins he made, because these coins could have easily been traced back to their maker, and the Carolingians were not inclined to show mercy towards open insubordination against a royal edict – in this case all the more so because there was so obviously no lack of (albeit only mediocre) coinsmiths active at this time. The phenomenon of a few coins with non-Carolingian personal names on them continued from Pippin's time into the epoch of standardised coins with *Car⁰lus* on the obverse (771–793/794)– apparently especially during the reign of Charlemagne – and these coins are in no way especially well made, and so we cannot very well assume that a small number of experienced coinsmiths were permitted to carry on putting their own names on their coins; if that were the case, it would be the only example of public recognition of non-noble individuals in the whole of the High Carolingian century. In other words, there is no evidence to support the theory that these are the names of coinsmiths. This theory is dangerous because it is so simple: any name at all could be interpreted as the name of a coinsmith who is not attested anywhere else.

Sources from the 9th c. tell us that in those days the relevant count was responsible for each of the mints (Lafaurie 1978, passim, especially 491, 495). In the 8th c., after Pippin's reform, this must also have been the case (Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 196), because the Carolingian state had no other institutional network to enforce royal instructions, apart from the quite numerous large churches and monasteries, and there is evidence that they, too, continued to issue coins (Lafaurie 1980, 488, Coupland 2007, I/213s.).

In the light of this, here is the "longest possible" list[1635] of real or supposed personal names (the forms of the names are standardised to start with, as far as possible): Adradis, Ardis, Arfiuf/Fiufar, Autramnus, Gaddo, Gervasius, Grimwald, Had, Lambert, Leutbrand, Maurinus, Milo, Novinus, Roland, Stephan, Udalrich, Walacarius. The reason for the uncertainty around the inclusion of these names is partly the fact that no one has ever tried to construct a thoroughly researched and complete account of them all. Researchers have only ever discussed a few names, and they tend to be mentioned when the respective author has something particular to say about a particular name. A systematic analysis shows, however, that eight of the seventeen names are certainly or probably place names.

1635 Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 1.203–210), Prou (1896, p. XLVII) and Blanchet (1912, 396) offer almost complete, not entirely overlapping lists; three additional names from Grierson (1966, 508s., 512s.) are included.

Let us consider an especially informative case first of all! Carolingian sub-kings generally did not mint their own coins. Charlemagne made an exception, when in the year 781 he sent his three-year-old son Louis to Aquitaine to be the (sub-)king there. His intention was to make Carolingian sovereignty over Aquitaine more acceptable to the people by giving them their own king; and that is why he even gave instructions that the young Louis should wear Gascon clothes (Astronomus, *Vita Hludovici* cap. 4). With the same purpose in mind, he set up a mint in Louis's name (Grierson 1966, 508, cf. also Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 195, 207, and Coupland 2007, I/214): obv: hLVDVh 'Hludv(i)h, Louis', rev: STEFANI (although in monogram form and therefore very difficult to read); Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 461).[1636] Because in this case Charlemagne himself undoubtedly controlled the mint, we would not expect a coinsmith's name to be used. But among Louis' dignitaries, the nine most important of which the Astronomus (cap. 3) mentions, there is no Stefan. Grierson makes a useful suggestion: the location of the mint is the Church of St. Steven, which could have been Saint-Étienne de Bordeaux (the oldest large church there, outside the walls, where Merovingian tremisses had already been struck; Grierson argues this 1966, 508, and Engel/Serrure 1891–1905, 1.232 considered it a possibility), or alternatively, it could have been the Cathedral of Saint-Étienne de Bourges (argued by Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 207).[1637] Since coin inscriptions have to be short, the *Sanctus,* normally obligatory in medieval times, was omitted.

We find an analogous case in the dinar with obv: CARLUS, rev: GERVASI (with the S facing left; Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 257, Gariel 1883–18: 84, plate 7 no. 54). It may well have come from one of the Saint-Gervais-et-Saint-Protais churches of the time, perhaps Soissons Cathedral or (in keeping with the patrocinium of the time) Sées cathedral.[1638]

1636 Coins with a full SCI (and a bar over it) STEPHANI MONE(ta) are attested from the later years of Charlemagne's reign (Prou 1896, no. 962).

1637 Cf. on this question also Metcalf (1966, 381 n. 12).

1638 According to Gregory of Tours (*glor.mart.* 46), immediately after the discovery and elevation of these two saints by Ambrosius in Milan, small cloths holding their blood were distributed across the whole of Italy and Gaul, Victricius took relics to Rouen, and Martin took some to Tours (LM s. v. *Gervasius und Protasius*). – At this point we should note: if according to the RGA s. v. *Ilanz* among the Ilanz Charlemagne dinars [and also those from Imphy, G.A.B.] one of them originates from an 'uncertain' mint and has an unexplained inscription on the reverse side SCA/MAR, this of course refers to *Sancta Maria* – and so we have the choice of many episcopal towns with a Cathedral of St. Mary; Morrison/Grunthal (1967, no. 286–287, cf. no. 13) suggest Laon. (On SC- = *Sanct-* and especially SCA = *Sancta* cf. e.g. Cappelli 1961, p.XXI and 343.)

Gariel (1883–1884, 2.66s. and plate 3 no. 49) describes a dinar with obv: RP 'Rex Pippinus', rev: NOVINOMO (the middle N turned to the left, according to Gariel; or NOVIMOMO, according to Engel/Serrure 1891–1905, 1.203, and Morrison/Grünthal 1967, Nr.14). Before Gariel it was thought that MO was an abbreviation for *monetarius*; this is why a *Novino*, simply turned into a nominative without comment, is cited in 1858 in Longpérier, which then in Prou (1896, p. XLVII) turns into the Carolingian coinsmith Novinus (who is then even accepted by Völckers 1965, 37). Gariel had already found the correct solution, however, when he attributed the coin to Noyon, although he provided no explanation. It is easy to remedy this omission: if we imagine the controversial middle part of the quasi -N or -M as a horizontal stroke, then we have NOVIHOMO, which then gives us NOVIOMO, if we ignore the silent -*H*-, and this is a normal graphy for the episcopal town of *Noviómagus > Noviómo > Noyon*.[1639]

A dinar found especially in Avignon, Béziers, Marseille and Narbonne (Grierson 1954, 309), but also in Imphy, Ilanz and Vercelli (Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 237–238, Prou 1896, no. 887–890, Gariel 1883–1884, plate 5 no. 10) has obv: CAR°LVS, rev: ARDIS (again with abbreviation stroke above the AR). Longpérier (1858a, 259–251) thinks that *Ardis* is the name of a coinsmith, but Grierson (1954, 308) rightly considers this "extrêmement invraisemblable"; in fact, *Ardis* is not attested as a personal name, and it does not look as if it belongs to any personal name type. Because of the concentration of the finds in southern France, Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 1.206) were probably correct when they interpreted ARDIS as an abbreviated VLat. *Ár(ela)dis* (< classical Lat. *Arelate* + the -*s* ending normally used for city names) 'Arles'. Grierson/Blackburn (2006, plate 33 no. 1.722) also indicate that the location of the mint is "Arles?" whereas Grierson (1954, 308) had thought that unlikely. I do not see why; abbreviation by contraction (here first syllable + what was at that time last syllable) is

---

[1639] In town or city names ending in Celtic -*măgus* such as *Noviomăgus*, *Rotomăgus*, *Cadomăgus* the /ɣ/ (<-*g*-) is dropped very early before a dark vowel (as in *Rotomaus* in Gregory of Tours), and the resulting /au/ or /ao̯/ is contracted quite early to /o̯/ (as in *Rothomo* in Fredegar), and then turns into the phonologically similar inflection /o̯/ (after which it finally disappears along with the inflection): *Noyon*, *Rouen*, *Caen* (cf. Pope 1952, § 341). Parallel to Fredegar's *Rothomo* we would therefore expect *Noviomo*, which is indeed attested on Merovingian and Carolingiaan coins (Blanchet 1912, 208, 390); one of Charles the Bald's coins has *Noviom* with an abbreviation stroke (Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 802). It is even likely that the silent -*H*- could be understood as a separating -*h*: since normally /vj/ > /vdž/ (> /dž/ > /ž/) as in (*diluvium > deluge*, *servientem > serjant*, *Divionem > Dijon*), whereby in this case the -*H*- prevents this pronunciation. – We cannot definitively exclude Noyen-sur-Sarthe instead of Noyon (cf. Prou 1894, 107s.).

common throughout the whole of the Middle Ages), as it is in the work of Grierson/Blackburn themselves on the coin that follows immediately after this one in plate 33 (no. 1.723): CLS (with a bar above it) 'Clusis' (according to Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 635, probably the Carolingian port of Sluys on the Channel coast).[1640] But be that as it may, the option of Ardis as a coinsmith name seems hopeless.

On one of Charlemagne's dinars (Gariel 1883–1884, plate 5 no. 14), Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 1.210) and Blanchet (1912, 382) interpreted the ADRADIS on the reverse side as a man's name, but without further commentary; Prou (1896, no. 214), Gysseling (1960, s. v. *Arra*s) and Morrison/Grunthal (1967, no. 123) correctly saw that it was 'Arras'. In historical linguistics terms we have here the middle step of a regular development: *Atrabatis* (around 400) > *Adradis* / aðrats/ (8th c.) > *Arraz* (1177 approximately).

Only one dinar, which survives as an isolated, very badly worn coin has obv: KRL.Rx.F (Rx in ligature), rev: ARFIVF (suggested by Prou 1896, p. XLVII and no. 6, and Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 239) or FIVFAR (suggested by Longpérier 1858b, 331ss., Engel/Serrure 1891–1905, 1.210, Blanchet 1912, 396, and Stiennon 1965, 91); for the lettering is circular, according to Prou "autour d'un annelet auquel les lettres se rattachent par le pied" and this explains why in my opinion the second F could just as easily be read as E. Moreover, almost nothing of the first F has survived; Metcalf (1966, 382) reads it as "a square C" and provides what is probably the correct interpretation, with some minor discrepancies.[1641] He uses a stylistic argument to show that the coin could very

---

1640 Grierson (1954, 306, in comparison with 300) suggested that a pseudo-Charlemagne gold dinar, which probably was made in the 10th c. or later in Provence (so that a pious donation of gold or similar could be made in this form), and which bears the (uninterpretable!) inscription AURODIS on the reverse side, but the idea that this could tell us anything about the *ARDIS* on a coin that is two hundred years older is anything but compelling.

1641 Longpérier thought he recognised in *Fiufar* the M.Lat. name *Fefrus*, a Latinisation of the Irish Saint Fiachra (otherwise mostly M.Lat. *Fiacrius*, Fr. Saint-Fiacre), who died in about 650 as a hermit in Meaux; no commentary is necessary. Stiennon (1965, 91) thought the lettering referred to the Archbishop Wulfarius of Reims, which is also unlikely. Wulfarius did not take up the Reims Bishop's seat until after the year 800; even if Charlemagne, contrary to what we might expect at this late date, in which (since the reform of 793/794) both obverse and reverse sides of his coins had long been standardised, had permitted one of his dignitaries to use his own name on the reverse side of coins issued in his local area, one would expect the obverse side to have retained the standardised form used across the whole of the empire, and not to have reverted to the more primitive form. Also, graphically and phonically, the interpretation of FIVFAR as 'Wulfar(ius)' is somewhat problematic; Stiennon offers nothing by way of justification for this. The same reasoning would also speak against Wulfarius of Vienne (about 797–810), whom Steinnon does not mention.

well have come from Strasbourg and interprets the lettering as an abbreviation of *Argentoratum civitas*: my suggestions are very slightly different: I would start with *Argentina civitas*, which was the norm on coins of that period (Morrison/Grunthal 1966, no. 1346, 1350s. and 1552–1554), and I would read it as AR/CIVE. *Civitas* is a very common addition to other town and city names (which is obvious if you take even a quick look at Morrison/Grunthal, 1966, p. 448–461); CIVE is quite often used as one of its abbreviations.[1642]

In the case of the dinar type with obv: CAR°LVS, rev: WALACARI° (Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 300, Gariel 1883–1884, plate 11 no. 152) the toponym Walcheren has rightly been suggested (most recently as a possibility by Coupland 2007, I/213).[1643] From late antiquity onwards there was a small community actively trading with England, located on the island of Walcheren, near Domburg at the mouth of the Westerchelde. In the Middle Ages, it was 216 km^2 in size and separated from the mainland by a small strait. Shortly after 695 the Apostle to the Frisians, the Anglo-Saxon Willibrord, according to the Willibrord Vita written by his countryman Alcuin (cap. 14, MGH SS.mer. 7.128) came from his bishop's seat in Utrecht *ad quandam villam Walichrum* (later mss. replace *villam* with *insulam*) and destroyed a heathen *idolum*; this is (apart from Utrecht, which was originally Frisian) the only place in Frisia of that time mentioned by the Vita, and also the only single *idolum* or *fanum*. Archaeological evidence shows that the trading community extended for 1000 m along the coast in the Merovingian and Carolingian periods. Even though it is not mentioned in other sources before 800, it was almost as important as Dorestad or Quentovic (where quite large numbers

---

1642 Cf. Prou 1894, no. 685, 1072, 1108, 1220, 1729, 1744, 1901, Morrison/Grunthal, 1966, no. 1086 and 1091. A Strasbourg Charlemagne dinar from before 781 with CIVI ARGE is to be found in Prou (1896, no. 42). – We cannot entirely exclude *ARvernorum/CIVE* 'Clermont-Ferrand' instead of Strasbourg (cf. the *AR* in Prou 1896, no. 762).

1643 Stiennon (1965, 91) suggested Archbishop Wilcharius of Sens instead, who is attested in this role at least from 769 until about 785. He was appointed by the Pope, not long after the death of Chrodegang (in the year 766), replacing him as the only Archbishop in France, *archiepiscopus Galliarum* and *missus sancti Petri,* and he was not joined by fellow archbishops in Reims, Trier etc. until some time later (cf. section C.11 'Turpin' above). But the name branches *Wil(i)-* and *Wala(h)-* are independent of each other, and only the former is attested for the archbishop. By far the best evidence is for the spelling *Wilcharius*, and it is found in the letters from Pope Hadrian (MGH Ep.mer.&kar. 1. 571, 593, 637, 644) and in the better mss. and therefore the MGH editions of the Royal Annals for the year 771. The other spelling variations (such as for example *Wili-*, *Uuilli-* etc, -*c*- or -*h*- statt -*ch*-) are insignificant, apart from the fact that there is also a Bishop of Nomentum called *Wicharius*, who is probably the same person (MGH Ep.mer.&kar. 1.507).

of Merovingian and Carolingian coins were struck, Grierson/Blackwell 1966, Index s. vv., Coupland 2002, passim) and it was most successful between 750 and the early 9th c. (LM s. v. *Domburg*). The vernacular form of the name, which the Anglo-Saxon Alcuin probably took from the oral tradition, appears again in the *Walicrum* in the *Ann. Xantenses* for the year 837 and leads eventually to the modern Dutch *Walcheren*, although it was layered with more elaborate Latinisms in the written tradition for three hundred years, that is to say in the *Ann. Elnonenses* for the year 839 as (*in*) *Walacris* (which at least imitates the vernacular dat.-loc. plural) and in the standard tradition *Walacria* (from shortly before 1000 also *Walacra*), first attested in the Annals of Prudentius of Troyes for the year 856/857 (Gysseling 1960, s. v. *Walcheren*). We cannot exclude the possibility that this Latinising tendency started even before 800 and, because it is arbitrary, it would have varied somewhat, especially in the beginning, which would make an early *Walacario* acceptable.

The last probable place name is of central importance. An especially large number of one particular dinar has been found including some struck during Pippin's reign (Blanchet 1912, 341), and also some in Charlemagne's reign until the period 771–793/794 (Morrison/Grunthal 1966, no. 234, Blanchet 1912, 396, Gariel 1883–1884, plate 5 no. 8). It is the so-called *Autramnus* dinar, of which there were twenty in Imphy alone, seven in Ilanz and one in Wijk-bij-Duurstede (Dorestad), (Völckers 1965, 120, 137, 160). The inscription on the reverse side therefore varies considerably, and so if we add together the readings by Gariel (1883–1884, 1.54), Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 1.200, 1.206), Prou (1896, Nr. 2–4), Blanchet and Völckers (both as above) we find: ANTTRANO, AVTTRANO, AITTRANO, ATTRANO, AVTRAMNO, HTTRANO, INTTRANO, MTRANO and NTTRANO. To be precise, the middle syllable A appears mostly as Δ and usually has a bar above it (to indicate an abbreviation); less frequently, the first A is also a Δ.[1644] The variation is partly due to different readings between numismatic specialists, but at least as much to the way in which coinsmiths made copies of coins without understanding their meaning. The combination of these two things does not cast any doubt on the consistency of the intended meaning, but it makes it impossible to use historical linguistics methods to reduce the name to its basic form.

In his first description of the find at Imphy, Longpérier (1858a, 226–229) opted for a coinsmith called *Aut(t)ramnus*; Prou (1896, p. XLVII) agreed. But

---

[1644] There are also some degenerated variants, in which single letters are turned into nonletters; the gradual degeneration is clearly visible across the 16 examples of the coin which are illustrated in Metcalf (1965, 27).

Gariel (1883–1884, 2.42–44, 98) deduced from the degeneration that these were not made by a coinsmith using his own name. According to Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 203) there were still, in the Carolingian period, some coinsmiths who were illiterate; but even such a person would tend to be all the more faithful in his work. If this is a personal name, then the final -o that is consistently used in the 8th c. could be intended as a possessive obliquus. This points to Carolingian counts, then, starting with probably the oldest count of all from Carolingian times: a Neustrian dignitary by the name of *Audoramnus* switched sides in the year 686, which is one year before the Battle of Tetry, from his Mayor Bercharius to Pippin the Middle (Fredegar cap. 3, MGH SS.mer. 2.171) and was evidently richly rewarded by him: in 694, *Audramnus* is his *comes palatii* (MGH DD.mer. 1.356s., no. 141 ed. Kölzer).[1645] Then we find an *Auteranus*[1646] as Count of Bergamo († before 816) and an *Autramnus*, who in 826 at the imperial palace (!) of Gondreville (near Toul, Lorraine)[1647] transferred to his bride Adelburga in accordance with Salian-Frankish (!) law a dowry of a *curtis* with thirty houses in Vercelli in Italy, mentioned in 846/847 in Emperor Lothar's *Capitulare de expeditione contra Sarracenos facienda* (MGH. Capit.r.F. 2.68, no. 203) as *comes* and *signifer* of the second *scara*, referred to in 848 in a private charter with the title *gloriosus comis* and appearing in another charter from the same date as *comes* of Cittanova 6 km west of Modena, which means *de facto* of Modena; in 854, his wife Adelburga leased out land in Marzaglia right next to Cittanova and appears as a widow in 874 in a charter by Bishop Leodoinus of Modena.

1645 This is based on Ebling (1974, 68), the following on Hlawitschka (1960, 144–146) and (having checked most of the primary sources) on http://www.manfred-hiebl.de/genealogie-mittelalter/hlawitschka_franken_alemannen/amtstraeger/autramnus.htm (last access 01.05.22) although some reservations about political bias on this website are on record.

1646 The name is etymologically Germ. *aud(o/a)-* + *hraban* (in names very early > *-hramn*), both very common name elements. If Romanisation/Latinisation occurs early, the *-h-* disappears sooner than the linking vowel *-o-*: *Audoram* > *Audram* (as with the 7th c. Neustrian). If contact with Germanic is longer or later, the linking vowel disappears, and the *-d-* undergoes assimilative de-voicing because of the still detectable *-h-* (just as in *Walda-hari* > Fr. *Gautier*, not **Gaudier*): and thus, we have *Aut-hramn* > *Autramnus*. The *-mn(-)* goes to *-m(-)*, in some parts of France, to *-n(-)* in other parts, and to *-m* in Ger. (for comparison: *Wolfram*, *Bertram*). The variant *Auteranus* with a single *-n-* in Italy is due to the fact that when the Fr. *Autran* is heard, it is Latinised once again.

1647 I do not see why this event would have taken place in the palace, when neither Louis the Pious nor Lothar were present. Louis visited the Gondreville palace sometime between 825 and 830, as we can see in letters 6 and 9 by Bishop Frothar of Toul (MGH Ep.mer.&kar. 3.280, 282s.); it is customary, however, to accept the date as autumn 828. We know that Lothar was north of the Alps in 825–829, but there is no way of telling what his itinerary was, even in broad terms.

Since this family lived according to Salian-Frankish law, and therefore the male line came from France, it would not be surprising if they were descendants of the first Count Palatinate Audram, and if there had been a member of the family with the same name who was a count under Pippin and Charlemagne in France. This would still not explain the very large number of coins, however.

Gariel (1883–1884, 2.42–44, 98) opted instead for Entrains (-sur-Nohains), only about 70 km north of Imphy in the same Département Nièvre, an urban location situated in Roman times at a crossroads, with its own theatre, an *inter ambes / amnes* (Gallic *ambis* ~ Lat. *amnis* 'river, stream'), but which in this case (according to DT Nièvre s. v.) is attested not just as a type of plural, but also even before 800 as neuter *Interamnum*, *Interanum*. The logic of this theory was convincing, as long as it concerned only the twenty dinars from Imphy, and so Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 1.200, 1.206) agreed; it experienced a setback, however, when the seven examples of this coin turned up in Ilanz, almost 500 km away, and so Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 634) regard the theory as "not conclusive".[1648] I cannot agree with the theory, simply because by far the majority of the Autramnus coins have an initial *A*- (or *Δ*-), but the (in any case only partly Old French) /ẽ/ > /ã/ shift took place in the early 11th c. at the earliest (Pope 1952, § 448).

A toponymic interpretation suggested "very tentatively" by Metcalf (1965, passim, especially 21) was considered by Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 634) as "wholly fanciful", but it appears to me, with one small modification, to be quite promising: instead of *ANTisTitio Regio ΔioNysiacO*, I suggest *ANTisTite Regni Δio-NysiO*, both meaning 'Saint-Denis'. *Antistes* 'spiritual superior' is very common (especially referring to bishops and also saints) from early Christian literature onwards (more than 700 references from before the year 735 in Brepols' electronic *Library of Latin Texts*); *antistitium* 'seat of such a superior', on the other hand, is not attested before the 10th c., and even then, it remains very rare (5 references in total in Brepols' list). But elsewhere in medieval-monastic language we sometimes find, instead of the monastery, the saint (it is officially he, and not the monastery, who receives the tax, the donation etc.). The capital delta Δ in Charlemagne's realm is a key feature of coins made in Saint-Denis (and almost only there) apparently even from the late Merovingian period onwards, at any rate in the Carolingian period until the beginning of the 10th c. (Metcalf 1965, 19, Morrison/Grunthal 1966, no. 840–847, 1286–1288, 1396, 1586–1588, Prou 1896, no. 342–357), imitating the ubiquitous (often with the same kind of bar above it) *nomina sacra* IHC or

---

[1648] They make the mistake of saying that Gariels location is "Antrain (Ille-et-Vilaine, arr. Fougères), not far from Imphy", which makes no sense (the distance is 400 km!).

IHS (also *Ihesus* in full) and XP (modelled on the writing of IHCOYC and XPIC-
TOC). From 635/636 onwards, Saint-Denis was a royally approved trading centre,
and this explains the high frequency of finds of this type, and as far as it is feasi-
ble to work it out, also the spread of finds over the different sites.[1649] And finally:
if we do not accept this location, we would have no Carolingian coins from before
793/794 from Saint-Denis and almost none from Paris.

The nine remaining names are personal names. Let us examine the first
two of them: Grimoald and Udalrich.

Obv: CARLUSRX, rev: GRIMOAL (Grierson 1966, 509). As *rex Langobardorum*
Charlemagne also had a claim on Benevento, but he allowed the indigenous
family of counts to rule there. However, in 787 after the death of Arichis, and
before the succession of his son Grimoald, who was at that time with Charle-
magne as a hostage, he required that Grimoald *cartas vero nummosque sui [scil.
Caroli] caracteribus superscribi semper iuberet* – as Erchempert writes in his
Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum (around 900, cap. 4, MGH SS.Lang.
236). This coin shows that Grimoald kept his word for a time.[1650]

Referring to the dinar type obv: CARᵒLVS; R: OδALRICVS (Morrison/Grunthal
1967, no. 272, Prou 1896, no. 7, Gariel 1883–1884, plate 9 no. 102) and Engel/Ser-
rure (1891–1905, 1.211) realised that it relates to Charlemagne's brother-in-law U
(o)dalrich, the brother of Queen Hildegard. According to Notker's *Gesta Karoli*
(cap. 13, MGH SS.n.s. 12.17 ed. Haefele), Charlemagne departed from his usual
practice and gave him more than one county; after Hildegard's death, he took it
back from him because of some kind of misdemeanour, but he returned it to him
a little later in a fit of remorse. We find Udalrich's family, the Udalrichinger,
holding the title of count in the Alp-, Breis-, Thur-, Argen-, Linz- and Hegau, in
other words all around Lake Constance. The visionary Wetti on the island of
Reichenau saw an image of Count *Odalrih* sent to purgatory for greed – as he did
of Charlemagne for sexual excess – (MGH PLAeC. 2.317s., the names are in the
acrostic), but he saw his brother Count Gerold sent to Paradise because he was a
benefactor to Reichenau and a martyr for Christ (MGH PLAeC. 2.329s.). We must

1649 Saint-Denis is 267 km by road from Imphy, 789 from Ilanz, that is to say almost three
times as far away; 7 dinars were found in Ilanz, 20 in Imphy, which is almost three times as
many. The 7 dinars in Ilanz reflect the flow of money from Saint-Denis towards Italy and the
Orient, the single dinar in Dorestad, 475 km by road from Saint-Denis, reflects the more modest
volume of trade with north-western and northern Europe.
1650 On his later coins cf. Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 195, 210 and plate 51 no. 1098–1101).

understand Charlemagne's generosity against the background of the wider political context. Hildegard and her brothers were the children of a Frankish Count Robert, but on their mother's side they were the grandchildren of Hnabi, Duke of Alemannia, who was a good ally of Charles Martel; in the next generation, however, Pippin and Carloman brought a bloody end to the hereditary Alemannian Dukedom. Nevertheless, from the very start, Charlemagne pursued a policy of keeping the Alemannians peaceful and amalgamating his people with them, aiming to make them every bit as loyal supporters of his realm as the Franks were; the success of this policy is clearly visible in the extent to which he relied up on the Alemannians to assist in his advance into Italy (Hlawitschka 1960, 23–52, especially the map on p. 40s.). Hildegard's family represented not only the successful amalgamation of Franks and Alemannians in the previous generation, but also all that was left of the family of dukes. This is why Charlemagne bound them to him through his marriage and also through his appointment of Gerold, after Thassilo's removal, to the position of *praefectus Baioariae* with a status almost as high as that of a duke, and why he gave Udalrich an endowment that must have been reminiscent of the Alemannian dukedom; the honour of being represented on the back of coins may well have been part of this arrangement.

These two cases give us some idea of the probabilities in these matters. If we add together some of the numbers in Morlet, we can see that in Charlemagne's realm there must have been several thousand men's names in use (*types*, not *tokens*!). If the personal names on the coins belonged to exceptionally deserving coinsmiths, we would expect a random distribution across this very large number. Individuals with a status similar to that of Grimoald or Udalrich always represent a vanishing minority in comparison. Under these circumstances, it is therefore very unlikely that the name of a coinsmith should also 'randomly' be part of this vanishingly small group. We can therefore assume that the opposite is more likely to be true: there were at least a few dignitaries who were allowed to put their own name on the reverse side of coins. As soon as this happens in the case of a few individuals, the situation changes for the others *per analogiam* as well: if we know that the name on a coin is identical to that of a high-ranking person, we can assume that this is the person who is meant on the coin. This then also applies to the RODLAN dinar. It would not be a *petitio principii*, even if the two other pieces of evidence showing the existence of a Margrave Roland were considered uncertain. For even if this were so, the dinars and the other pieces of evidence would enhance each other's probable validity; if the existence of a Margrave Roland is accepted, we have explained all three following the principle of economy of thought and we would

not need to look for three individual solutions that are at least as plausible: *simplex sigillum veri*.[1651]

Two more cases can be considered next. The only known example of the dinar type obv: CARºLVS, R: MAVRINſ (Nſ in ligature; Morrison/Grünthal 1967, no. 266, Gariel 1883–1884, plate 9 no. 98) was found near Le Bréau-sans-Nappe (Yvelines), only 25 km west of Morigny (-Champigny, Essonne). Because of this location, Gariel (1883–1884, 2.125s.), who interpreted the ligature more as a monogram-like NIACI, thought the inscription referred to *Mauriniacus* 'Morigny', and this reading cannot be entirely excluded.[1652] But before the Benedictine monastery was founded there in around 1090, Morigny was a very insignificant place. I therefore think a more plausible interpretation is the personal name *Maurinus* (as suggested by Engel/Serrure 1891–1905, 1.210, Prou 1896, p. XLVII). I note that there were several bishops by the name of Maurinus in Évreux (a. 762/ 765–775) which is only 80 km away, and in Auxerre (approximately a. 772–800) which is 150 km away. As we saw above, in the Merovingian 7th and early 8th c. several bishops had coins stamped with their name, and so initially the Carolingians could have allowed this practice to continue, or at least tolerated it without saying anything.[1653]

1651 At this point we must be wary of a possible misunderstanding. According to Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 1.141), Prou (1892, 176, and plate 13 no. 17), de Belfort (1892–1895, vol. 5, no. 3809) and Blanchet (1912, 336) a Merovingian coin exists with obv: ROLEN DEO, rev: no inscription. But *Rolen* cannot be accepted as a form of *Hruodland/Rollant* at that time, and *Deo* would not fit stylistically. However, the lettering is in a ring; it should be read, as Felder states (2003, 457, no. 799), as *Deorolen*, an apparently otherwise unattested, but completely regularly formed Germ. name *Deor(ja)-* 'dear' (Förstemann col. 408s., for Galloromania Morlet s. v.) + common Merovingian Lat. *-len(us)* < Germ. unstressed *-lĭn* < *-līn*, diminutive ending.

1652 Morigny (Manche) and Mauregny-en-Haye (Aisne) are much too insignificant to be considered as possibilities.

1653 Coupland (2007, I/213) highlighted Count Mauringus of Brescia. And in fact, this man was appointed in 823, along with the Count Palatine Adalhard, by Emperor Louis to administer justice in the *regnum Italiae* and he was the designated Duke of Spoleto († 824, Royal Annals for the years 823 and 824). There was also a Count Palatine Maurinus, who is attested from 835, and who carried out this role in Lucca in 840 and was present at the coronation of Louis II in Rome in 844 († around 850). Both men probably belonged to the Salian-Frankish Supponids, which means that the male line came from France (Hlawitschka 1960, 236s., 299–309, LM s. v. *Supponiden*). Since the principle of naming people after their ancestors in families of counts was absolutely normal in those days, there could have been older relatives in the 8th c. who were counts in France, and again a century before that, in around 640/650, an Aquitanian Count Maurinus, probably from Périgueux, is attested (Ebling 1974, s. v.). However, I prefer two attested bishops to one unattested count. – The Abbey of Saint-Maurin, Lot-et-Garonne, is according to Cottineau s. v. not attested until the middle of the 11th c., and this late date rules it out for our purposes. It should also be noted that the name *Maurinus* can be

A similar explanation applies to one of Pippin's dinar types: it has obv: PIP 'Pippin', and immediately below it a small hĀδ; R: RP 'Rex Pippinus' (Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no, 29) or RF or RxF 'Rex Francorum' (Gariel 1883–1884, plate 2 no. 29; Engel/Serrure 1891–1905, 1.200). *Hado* was the name of a Bishop of Chartres in the late 8th c., though it is impossible to date him precisely, and *Heddo* (< *Haddio*) was a Bishop of Strasbourg from 734 until after 763.[1654]

There are two kinds of dinar with the inscription *Milo*. The first type (Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 62, Gariel 1883–1884, plate 2 no. 43) has MILO on one side; the three letters on the other side have long been read as PRE (with a bar on top, with a left-facing P) and interpreted as *P(ippinus) RE(x)* – in which case this would be the obverse side; according to Prou (1896, 115s., and also Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 643) this should be read as TRE[1655] – which would mean this is the reverse side. The second type has a cross on both obv and rev, and

---

found on quite a few Merovingian coins (Blanchet 1912, 258–336, several instances). But this apparently itinerant coinsmith struck a gold coin (476 with plate 21 no 420; they have *IMAURINO*, but the *I-* cannot be part of the name) and also a silver dinar which the authors (Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 102) regard as one of the oldest silver dinars in existence. The date of the change from gold to silver currency is around 670. There is therefore a large safety margin between then and Charlemagne's accession in the year 768.

1654 Stiennon (1965, 91) wanted to attribute this dinar to Had, the emissary of Charlemagne who was killed in the year 798 in Nordalbingia (MGH Ep.mer.&kar. 5.301). Unfortunately, this is unacceptable! It is just about possible that an emissary could be a count for more than thirty years; but Morlet is not aware of any *Had*, Förstemann (s. v.) finds evidence of it only in the Corvey tradition (seven times there), and so it must be considered as Saxon. It is hard to believe that a Saxon would be a count back in Pippin's time; it is even harder to imagine where he could have administered 'a place worthy of issuing coins'. In Charlemagne's time (according to Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 196) there is still no known town issuing coins east of the Rhine, nor in Louis the Pious' time, apart from Regensburg. (The two Charlemagne dinars Morrison/Grunthal no. 94 and 95 from after 793/794 indicating their place of origin as SENNES, and which researchers believe are from "East Francia" or according to Prou 1896, 7, from the "région rhénane" may well have been from *Senŏnes* 'Sens'.) Gariel (1883–1884, 1.55) on the other hand, interpreted HAD as "Had ou Haddo ou plutôt Hadalardus". But Adalhard, Pippin's nephew through his half-brother was only born in 750, and so before 768 he can hardly have been old enough to carry out the role of a count. – We should mention nevertheless that the St. Gallen confraternity book (ed. Piper, MGH LC. 1.11.1) has an entry where a HADDO LAIC. stands in very obvious capital letters right next to Charlemagne.

1655 About half-way up the letter T, on the left of the perpendicular main stroke, there is a semi-circle going in a clockwise direction and passing over the cross stroke, and this is common in many pre-Caroline scripts, not only Visigothic and Beneventan, but also in the Frankish realm of the 8th c., e.g. in the Luxeuil type and the *ab*-type from Corbie (Bischoff 2009, 133, 143, 153).

inside the four spaces created by the cross we find obv: M-I-L-O, rev: N-R-B-O 'Narbonne' (Prou 1896, no. 834, Blanchet 1912, 350, fig. 245). The two types are not stylistically related in any way.

The Milo family (also called the Lambertiner, or most often Widones) come from the Central Moselle area around Trier and they were some of the most trusted allies of the Carolingians from the early days of Charles Martel until after the death of Charlemagne; after the partition of the empire, they worked closely with Emperors Lothar and Louis II in Italy, where finally at the end of the 9th c. they even accepted the emperor title.[1656] The first of the three famous 8th c. men called Milo was one of the oldest supporters of Charles Martel whose name is recorded. From at least 722/723 until 744 he was simultaneously Bishop of Trier and Reims, and he retained Trier until his death in 761/762. He squandered Church resources and Boniface in 751 considered him the soul of the group who resisted reform (*Milo et eiusmodi similes* in a letter from Pope Zachary replying to Boniface from the end of 751, MGH Ep.mer.& kar. 1.371; cf. also LM s. v. *Milo 1*). The second Milo is attested from 752 until 759 as a count (though where his seat was, is unknown) and a member of the royal court, and in 752 and 753 (MGH DD.kar. 1, no. 1 and 6) the principal member, so he played an important role at that time. The third Milo appears as Count of Narbonne in 782, and together with the Archbishop of Narbonne he founded the Abbey of Caunes (45 km west-northwest of Narbonne)[1657] and he died before 791 (Amardel 1902, 1–3).

The first coin type only survives in a single example. Prou (1896, 115s.) realised that because of its style, technique, and weight of (today) only 1.15 g, it fits best into the Merovingian period. For that reason, I would like to attribute it with its TRE '*Treviris*, Trier' to Bishop Milo of Trier and to the time before Pippin's coin reform; TRE for the mint located in Trier is still attested under Charlemagne (Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 114, actually found in Trier).[1658] Even if we

---

1656 For an introduction to the history of this family, which can be seen as more prototypical than any other of the high aristocracy under the Carolingians, cf. the article on the *Widonen* in the LM by Eduard Hlawitschka.

1657 Cottineau (1937, s. v.) states 780, Amardel (1902, 3) "vers 790". The third Milo cannot be more precisely placed in the Milo family tree (and is not mentioned in the article on the *Widonen* in the LM), but with this name and possessing one of the most important count positions, he can hardly have been unrelated to this family; after the conquest (or during the Frankisation) of Septimania, the Carolingians, were practically forced to give part of their plunder away, some of it to this family who were among their staunchest supporters.

1658 Felder (2003, 264 and 465) attributes a Merovingian dinar to Bishop Milo, which has MILO on one side, and something like TREVERIS (or TREVERVS with S turned 90° to the left); if I understand his referencing system correctly, this coin was purchased by the Bibliothèque

are unsure about the idea of PRE 'Pippinus Rex', we can attribute this type to the same Milo (or to the second Milo) and to the time around, or shortly after, Pippin's coin reform.

The case of this second type is complicated by the fact that counterfeit versions were around even in 1867; in 1959, for example, Grierson was shown a total of ten (!) examples of this type by a coin dealer, of which he bought one, before later realising it was probably counterfeit (Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 207, 643s., Nr. 1497). One point in its favour, however, is the fact that in around 1850 one example of this type was already in a private collection, and (according to Amardel 1902, 12) presumably early enough in time to be in a period when the counterfeiting of West European medieval coins (unlike those from antiquity and the Orient) was still not very lucrative; it was then bought by the Bibliothèque nationale, and Prou thought it was authentic at that point. The discussion below is based on the assumption that at least one example of this type is genuine.

The name *Milo* is Frankish; the corresponding Visigothic name would be *Mila*, but it is not attested. Before Narbonne was captured by the Muslims (in about 719) it was never Frankish, but had been Visigothic for centuries; in 733 it was unsuccessfully besieged by Charles Martel (which means the town was well fortified), and not captured until 759 under Pippin, when the town's Gothic citizens, having received assurances from the besieging Franks that the Visigothic laws and privileges would be respected, massacred the Arab garrison (*Chronicon Moissiacense* for the year 759, Sénac 2002, 38s.). The Carolingian king's name is missing on this type of coin, and since the middle of the 19th c. the explanation for this (with some variations) has been the suggestion that it has something to do with this Frankish-Gothic agreement, allowing the Count of Narbonne to feature on the coin as once the Visigothic kings did (or in the early 8th c, the *patricii* of Provence), which would have allowed the Narbonnais to retain the appearance of having coinage issuing rights. The kings of the Franks may well have left this privilege in place even when, soon after the capture of the town, Pippin had to send in a Frankish garrison under two counts, to defend it not only against the Muslims, but also against an Aquitanian-Gascon attempt to capture it (*Fred. cont.* 44, MGH SS.mer. 2.188). This could also be the case later when he, or perhaps Charlemagne after him, installed the Frank Milo as Count of Narbonne – this is the theory suggested by numismatics experts such as Fillon, Longpérier, Poey d'Avant, de Barthélemy and Amardel

---

nationale after the publication of Prou's Merovingian Catalogue (1892). If this coin is not the same one as the above-mentioned MILO coin, it supports their attribution to the bishop.

(who in 1902, passim, reviews the prehistory), and it was considered acceptable by Grierson/Blackburn (2006, 207). As Amardel emphasised, this type is stylistically similar to a late Visigothic king's coin (it is in fact comparable with e.g. Grierson/Blackburn 2006, no. 279 and 280), and furthermore, its NRBO reverse side is retained in an unsuspicious CAR°LVS coin from (probably not much) before 793/794 (that is to say Gariel 1883–1884, plate 9 no. 101, Morrison/Grunthal 1966, no. 184).[1659] After Milo's death, at the latest, Charlemagne dropped the coinage arrangement.

Since *Lambert* is another of the main names in the Milo family (explaining why they were also sometimes called Lambertiner) another dinar probably leads back to them, with obv: LAbI (with a bar over it), and rev: REM for *Remis* 'Reims',[1660] which is where it was found (Grierson 1966, 512, Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 15, Gariel 1883–1884, plate 3 no. 56). Grierson at any rate attributes it, unfortunately without further explanation, to a "Duke Lambert". This coin may well also come from before Pippin's reform,[1661] and the "Duke" may equally well have been a count. In actual fact, Bishop Milo of Trier and Reims had a son or nephew called Count Lambert, the location of whose seat is unknown (LM s. v. *Widonen* by Eduard Hlawitschka); he could have been meant in this case.[1662]

Seven of the nine personal names of 8th c. Frankish dignitaries have now been allocated. The only two left without an explanation are the men's names *Gaddo* and *Leutbrand*. They relate to the dinar type with obv: RP(i?) 'Rex Pippinus', rev: GADDO (Prou 1896, no. 5, Morrison/Grunthal 1966, no. 55, Gariel 1883–1884,

---

1659 However, Amardel himself constructs an absurd argument because he does not know that *Milo* (with a very firmly attested *-o*) can only be a Frankish name, and not a Visigothic one, and that the Milo family was one of the most famous of all in the Carolingian period. His excess of ingenuity leads to the conclusion that Milo, before he resigned himself to becoming a Frankish count, was the last Gothic ruler, who had issued the first Milo coin type while he held this position, and had done this in *TREncianum*, today Trausse (Aude), which is attested in the year 866 as *villa Trenciani* (DT Aude s. v.).

1660 There are other coins with REM 'Reims' in existence from the Merovingian period and from Charlemagne's reign before the year 781 (Prou 1894, no. 1030, 1896, no. 291s.).

1661 Its weight of 1.29 g (Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 15) is absolutely compatible with the Merovingian period in the northern half of France (Grierson/Blackburn 2006, 108, after Lafaurie).

1662 After the death of the last Dux of Champagne known by name, who had his seat in Reims, Drogo († 708), son of Pippin the Middle, we do not know who the secular *duces* or *comites* of Reims were throughout the rest of the 8th c. At some point in this period, probably rather early, the Dukedom was abolished in favour of the single position of Count (as happened in about 740 when Pippin and Carloman also brought the Duchy of Alsace to an end).

plate 2 no. 28);[1663] and the dinar type with obv: CARL° (monogrammatic) or CAR°, with a bar on top of it, rev: LEVTBRA (Gariel 1883–1884, plate 4 no. 5, Völckers 1965, 125), which is usually attributed to King Carloman (a. 768–771), (Engel/ Serrure 1891–1905, 1.205, Blanchet 1912, 396, Morrison/Grunthal 1967, no. 85), although Lafaurie (1974, 39s.) attributes it to Charlemagne.[1664]

Experts in the field will not be surprised if out of nine early Carolingian dignitaries, two remain unidentified. On the other hand, it would be extremely unlikely to find that out of thousands of names (since this is how many coinsmiths were at work) a purely random selection would produce seven which happen to match the names of early Carolingian dignitaries. The interpretation of the name RODLAN as an early Carolingian dignitary is therefore preferable to its identification as a coinsmith. This dignitary – like e.g. Charlemagne's brother-in-law Udalrich – would have been "worthy" of having his name on a coin from 771–793/794 at most; if the estimated dating of the burial of the Imphy hoard to 'about 775' is correct, this period reduces even further to between 771 and about 775, which is the very time when the charter of 772 was drawn up.

C.15.2.3 Roland in Einhart's *Vita Karoli*

Doubts about the originality of the name in the charter of 772 or about the relationship between the dinars and the Margrave can be considered hypercritical, but the problems surrounding the mention (or non-mention) of Roland in Einhart's *Vita*

1663 In the early Carolingian period, the name *Gaddo* is attested mainly in the area around Weissenburg-Worms-Mainz where there were landowning donors, some giving to Fulda as well; but before 900 the family seems not to have been at the level of count. It is not until from 902 to 923 that we find a Viscount *Gariardus seo Gaddo* of Fontaneto in Piedmont, retrospectively called *comes* in 945, but nothing is known about his ancestors (Hlawitschka 1960, 183s.), and so we cannot draw any conclusions.

1664 Coupland (2007, I/213) wants to locate this coin type in Italy, because the name *Liutprand* points to "the line of the Lombard kings and dukes of Benevento". But only *one* Lombard king (712–744) and only *one* Duke of Benevento (751–758, until 756 under the guardianship of his mother) bore this name, and neither of them fits chronologically. King Liutprand maintained friendly terms with his relatives and with Charles Martel, but there is no Liutprand to be found in their circle, or that of their successors. On the other hand, the name is attested in France even before that time (Morlet s. v.): according to the *Gesta Abbatum Fontanellensium* (MGH.schol. 28.19), for example, a liegeman of Childebert IV (*de facto*, therefore of Pippin the Middle) bore this name, and in 705 he donated part of a village in the region of Évreux to Saint-Wandrille. – Counterfeit versions of this dinar type exist (Grierson 1958, 305, 307–311 and plate 19 no. 2 and 2c). But the example from Imphy (1857) is genuine, and especially the example from the Lorenzberg near Epfach on the River Lech (unsuspicious lone find from 1957, immediately donated to the Archäologische Staatssammlung Munich, cf. on this Morrison/Grunthal 1967, 391).

Karoli look more complex. The impression that no solution seemed to be in sight here may have led sceptics to their negative 'overall solution', that is, to reject the charter and the dinars as well.

I am still not aware of any overall and sufficiently convincing solution in the scholarly literature to the problems surrounding the passage about Roland in the *Vita*, but I believe that a surprisingly simple and convincing one can be found if we combine two or three contributions from respected historians which have thus far remained separate from each other through an unhappy coincidence. Simply referring to them would not suffice to provide a logically coherent coverage of the whole problem, and so this is what we shall attempt to do now.

The MGH-Ed. Waitz (1880), divided the mss. of the *Vita Karoli* into three categories, A, B and C, and this approach was continued by Holder-Egger in the sixth and thus-far last print of this edition (1911) and by Halphen in all prints of his edition (1923, most recently ³1947). Cap. 9 of the *Vita Karoli* reports on Charlemagne's Spanish campaign including the defeat on the way back over the Pyrenees. The sentence with the mention of Roland reads in Holder-Egger's edition: *In quo proelio Eggihardus regiae mensae praepositus, Anshelmus comes palatii, [et Hruodlandus Brittannici limitis praefectus] cum aliis compluribus interficiuntur.* The square brackets are explained: *Uncis inclusa desunt B.* The part that mentions Roland – and only these exactly fourteen syllables – is therefore missing in B.

For the sake of completeness, another circumstance should be added from Holder-Egger's introduction p. XIX (with n. 3 and 4), namely that in ms. A 1* (Vienna ÖNB 510) [according to modern research this ms. dates from the last quarter of the 10th c.], both f.1 (which is irrelevant to us) and f.37, where Roland would have been mentioned, are rewritten by a hand from the late 12th c. (which is even at first glance very obviously different from the codex's main hand) following a ms. from the B category, that is to say without Roland's name.[1665] It is

---

[1665] At this point I am compelled to mention a few fundamentally incorrect claims made by André de Mandach in the years 1959–1961, and first corrected by Tischler (2001, 80 n. 7). For reasons that are not clear to me, de Mandach claimed at the *Table ronde* of the Premier Congrès de la Société Rencesvals (23. 07. 1959 in Poitiers) exactly the opposite of what I have outlined above, in other words, he said that in the 12th c., the rewriting of f.37 introduced the mention of Roland into the ms. as a new element; he went on to draw an extraordinarily excessive conclusion, that something similar could have led to all other mentions of Roland, so that "nous n'avons aucune preuve de l'historicité de ce personnage". The only member of the illustrious participants to express doubts about this was Élie Lambert: "est-ce que vous avez vu le manuscrit?" I simply do not understand the reply: "Non, mais j'ai vu des photographies." The whole session, which at the time was considered "la manifestation la plus brillante" of the whole conference was recorded on audio tape (an innovation in those days!) and most of it was transcribed and printed in the BBRS 2 (1959/1960), 91–122 (on the above-mentioned issue

methodologically correct to conclude that these two folios do not belong to the ms., that the ms. is therefore to be regarded as fragmentary, and then to sum up the problem as follows: Roland's name appears in the A and C categories, but not in B.

Nevertheless, it is still worthwhile to examine this particular ms. more closely. The original f.1 had fallen off or had at least been damaged. But why did f.37 have to be replaced? On the new folio the last words *quę filia* are underlined, which here, as so often in the Middle Ages (Bischoff 2009, 227), is the equivalent of our modern crossing out; for the first words of the old f.38 are also *quae filia*. The new scribe has therefore finished his text four syllables too soon, but he simply added these four in, and then crossed them out again; he must have thought this was less noticeable than just leaving a space there (and, if there had to be a culprit, the writer of the old f.38 might have written *quae filia* for the second time). However, the B text (without Roland's mention) is not four, but in fact fourteen syllables shorter than the A text, which equates to about half of a line. In other words, the scribe had to proceed even more cautiously when he tried to reach a common end for the text and the folio. Under these circumstances, a miscalculation of the space of four syllables instead of a possible fourteen is still a remarkably good effort. In this case, therefore, text A has been *deliberately* replaced by text B, and since the mention or non-mention of Roland is the only important difference on f.37, this means: in the late 12th c. a monastic librarian considered that it was not enough to erase Roland's name by striking it out, but the erasure was important enough to require the rewriting of a whole folio. What could possibly be the reason for his eagerness? Here is a simple explanation: the librarians in two monasteries were agreed in their condemnation of the *jongleurs* and their 'lies'; but one of them mitigated this by reminding his colleague that at least the key character Roland was a historical person. The other disagreed vehemently, and they compared their two *Vitae Karoli*. And something remarkable happened: doubt prevailed. The fear *d'être dupe* was so deeply entrenched in the human psyche, that people at that time even took upon themselves the risk of erasing the memory of a martyr for Christ.

Let us now return to the stemma! If this had three branches at the start (A, B, C), then following the principle that two scribes would not be likely to make the same mistake, the mention of Roland in AC would be put into the critical

---

of the inclusion of Roland, p. 91, 94, 96). In a footnote (p. 95 n. 1) added shortly before publication, de Mandach claimed again with no justification, that the mss. Holder-Egger A2 (Vat. Reg. lat. 339) and A2a (Leiden lat. 20) did not contain Roland's name. He was still making similar claims in 1961 (23, 27, 52s.).

edition. Unfortunately, however, there is no doubt: C is a sub-group of A, but Waitz and Holder-Egger (against their predecessor Pertz) erroneously made it a category of its own, because besides the overlaps with A, it has a distinctive innovation (in cap. 18).[1666] If we replace the designations C1, C2 etc. for a moment with A(C)1, A(C)2 etc., we can say: the stemma has two branches at the start: Roland is mentioned in A, but not in B. We have then described the problem accurately, but all hope of finding a solution through the stemma is lost.

Which other aspects could possibly help us to change this undesirable equilibrium?

The first possibility is the distribution of the oldest mss. across the two categories. We have the incomparably thorough investigation by Tischler (2001) into the manuscript history and reception of the *Vita Karoli*, and for the reader who has the time to engage with its almost 1900 pages, it is both lucid and well-organised, incorporating some very important 'discreet and partly hidden' results from Bernhard Bischoff's research. According to this research, of the 123 surviving mss. and ms. fragments of the *Vita Karoli*, only four are from the 9th c., namely Holder-Egger A2 (*Hruodlandu*s) = Vatican Reg. lat. 339, written in the year 867 (?) by a Regensburg scribe from the circle around Grimalt, the East Frankish chancellor, for St. Gallen, where Grimalt was abbot at the time; Holder-Egger B1* (no 'Roland') = Halphen B2 = Vienna ÖNB 473, written in the year 859 (?) in Saint-Amand for Worms; Holder-Egger C1 (*Hruodlandus*) = Halphen C = Paris BN lat. 10758, written in Saint-Remi de Reims in the last quarter of the 9th c., 877 at the earliest; and Holder-Egger C2 (*Rotlandus*) = Vaticanus Palatinus lat. 243, written in northeastern France in the last quarter of the 9th c. (Tischler 2001, 20–44). This produces a ratio of 3:1 in Roland's favour.[1667]

Can the syntax tell us anything? If you cancel the *et Hruodlandus* text in the brackets, the result is an asyndeton *a,b*. Apart from formulae (such as *XY consulibus*, *serius ocius* etc.), asyndeta in Latin give the impression of a conscious, Tacitean breviloquence, which is absolutely not Einhart's ideal. So this would be an argument in favour of *Hruodlandus*? Only, if you decide that the

---

1666 On this decidedly 'unfortunate' categorisation, cf. especially Tischler (2001, 1322 n. 16).

1667 If we add those mss. which are *certainly* from before 1000, the ratio changes to 6:3 in favour of Roland: Holder-Egger A1 (*Hruodlandus*) = Halphen A2 = Vienna ÖNB 529, written in the middle of the 10th c., perhaps in the year 948, in Reims/Trier; Holder-Egger A1* (f. 37 with a replacement from B cf. above) = Halphen A2 = Vienna ÖNB 510, written in the 4th quarter of the 10th c. [sic] in Lorsch; Holder-Egger A3 (*Hruodlandus*) = St. Petersburg BP Salt.-Šč. F.v.IV.4, written in the first third of the 10th c. Saint-Cybard d'Angoulême; Holder-Egger B1 (no 'Roland') = Montpellier Éc.Méd. 360, written in the first half of the 10th c. in Saint-Germain d'Auxerre; Pertz B6 (not in Holder-Egger, no 'Roland') = Einsiedeln 323, written at the turn of the 9th to the 10th c. or in the first quarter of the 10th c. in St. Gallen.

final *cum aliis compluribus* (on account of its *cum*, not *et* or zero) cannot belong to the enumeration.

Does the term *Brittannici limitis praefectus* 'Margrave of the Breton March' hold up meaning-wise, and stylistically? In terms of its meaning, yes, and stylistically in a very striking way. Recent scholarship has found that the Marche de Bretagne was "vraisemblablement aménagée ou plutôt réaménagée dès 753" immediately after the defeat of the Bretons and the (re-)capture of Vannes by Pippin (*Ann. Mettenses priores* for the year 753; Brunterc'h 1989, 46). On the other hand, according to the Royal Annals (even in the version up to 803, more precisely in the one up to 829) in the year 786 Charlemagne sent an army under his seneschal Audulf into Brittany, where it speedily collected the outstanding tribute, taking hostages and other high-ranking prisoners with them in the process. But this only has to mean that Charlemagne was not sure that the Margrave over there was able to handle the situation. To assume just because of this intervention that in 786, and therefore also in 778, the Breton March did not yet exist, and that Einhart gave Roland an arbitrary title, is to doubt too much. Louis the Pious in 818 and 824 personally led campaigns into Brittany, and this had no effect whatsoever on the organisation of the March. In the year 799 we even read: *Wido comes qui in marca Brittaniae praesidebat* (Annals up to 803) or *Wido comes ac praefectus Brittanici limitis* (Annals up to 829) has *cum sociis comitibus* reached the western tip of Brittany for the first time in the Frankish period, and in so doing accepted the capitulation of the individual leaders; but Brittany is not the March of Brittany, and in fact Wido was already in charge of the March before he started his campaign.[1668]

Could the spelling *Hruodlandus* indicate the involvement of Einhart? In the *Vita Karoli* itself (cap. 8 and 18) *Hruodgausus*, *Hruodtrudis* and *Hruodhaidis* are not entirely variant-free, but in terms of the stemma they are confirmed forms, even at the level of the spelling, and there are no counter-references;[1669] this shows that *Hruod-* is typical of Einhart. But what about the whole name *Hruodlandus*? This spelling seems to occur only in Einhart's writings, although no-one has pointed this out before. Morlet (s. v.) provides references for 19 different spellings of the name *Roland*; *Hruodlandus* is not among them, because she did not extract any references from the *scriptores* of the MGH, and neglects narrative sources

---

1668 *Praefectus* in the *Vita Karoli* always means the title immediately above Count: in the late Merovingian period, *praefectus aulae* or *palatii* is the Mayor of the Palace (cap. 1 and 3), Hruodgausus is the *Foriuliani ducatus praefectus* (cap. 6) who is dismissed in 776, Gerold is the *praefectus Baioariae* (cap. 13); moreover, in cap. 13 the *praefecti provinciarum* are listed before the *comites*.

1669 *Hroccolfus* (cap. 33) does not contain **hrōd-*, but **hrŏc(c)-* (+ -*wulfus*).

entirely. Förstemann (s. v.) provides references for 27 ways of spelling the name including *Hruodland(us)*,[1670] but cites only the *Vita Karoli*. This spelling is therefore unexpectedly distinctive. I am fortunate to know another text which was written at almost the same time as the *Vita Karoli*, and which in the *editio citanda* spells the name as *Hruodlandus*: it is Einhart's *Translatio et miracula Sanctorum Marcellini et Petri* (MGH SS. 15.238–264, the passage is in lib. 1, cap. 11, p. 244). In this passage a dream or vision was experiences by *cuidam ex pueris nostris nomine Hruodlando* – as the critical edition by Wilhelm Arndt states. I must add, that of the two codices used by Arndt, only the one he considered the better one, the then Metensis E 99,[1671] *diligentissime et elegantissime scriptus* (Arndt p. 238) in the 10th c. in Saint Arnulf of Metz contains this spelling; the other, Vat. Reg. lat. 318 from Fleury, from the 9th c., was written according to Arndt, although older, *minus diligenter* and has *Hrothlandus* – where we should understand the <o> instead of <uo> as a Romance and MLat. simplification, and also the <th> as an un-Einhart-like MLat. (pseudo-) refinement (cf. the discussion in C.15.2.1 above on the charter of 772). We must agree with Arndt's decision, therefore, to put *Hruodlandus* in the critical text.

One circumstance seems to go against these indications, however. Two of the oldest readers of the *Vita Karoli* whose names are known to us are Louis the Pious' librarian Gerward (certainly before 840, probably from 829/830) and Walahfrid Strabo (between 840 and 849, probably until 842, Tischler 2001, 368s.), both of whom produced B editions for further dissemination. Pertz (following Duchesne; Tischler 2001, 78 n. 1) correctly identified Gerward in his edition of 1829 (MGH SS. 2.437s.) and pointed out that many B mss. – and only these ones – contain three couplets written by him at the end of the *Vita*: *Hos tibi versiculos ad laudem, maxime princeps, / Edidit aeternam memoriamque tuam / Gerwardus supplex famulus qui mente benigna / Egregium extollit nomen ad astra tuum. / Hanc prudens gestam noris tu scribere lector / Einhardum Magni magnificum Karoli.* We must remember – following the work of Thompson (1926, passim), Bischoff and Tischler – that Einhart could not send copies of his work to any friends here and there before he had sent one to the imperial court; this would have been an insult to Louis. It follows, then, that there could have been no other stages in the manuscript history of the work (or in its effect) between Einhart and Gerward.

[1670] Förstemann suppresses the Latinising ending *-us* on principle.
[1671] According to Clavis (1994, 1.345s.) it was later called Metz Bibl. Mun. 306 and was destroyed in the War. Apart from the two mss. used by Arndt, Clavis is also aware of a supposed Mainz ms. which turned up in 1899 at an auction, and a copy in an 18th c. compendium (today Giessen UB 40, p. 60ss.).

It is quite natural that a few B mss. (listed by Tischler 2001, 79 n.2) skipped Gerward's verses (which were obviously not part of the main work). We may nevertheless conclude that the verses must have been in the sub-archetype of *all* B mss., which was the work of Gerward himself, or more precisely: in the version of the work that was sent out from the imperial court to the rest of the world. This means, therefore: *the mention of Roland is missing in all – and only in all! – of the mss. whose early history passes through the library of Louis the Pious*, a fact which, among other things, was clearly evident to Horrent (1972), Lejeune (1979) and of course Tischler (2001) and which should not be allowed to be forgotten again.

The B group have one significant defect which was already noticed by Pertz: they do not have a foreword,[1672] whereas the AC group do (again apart from a few mss., which have evidently omitted it in order to keep costs down). Einhart may possibly have written a different foreword for the emperor than for the majority of his readers, but it is impossible that he sent his copy to the emperor without any foreword. Gerward, or at the latest his successor,[1673] has therefore suppressed this original foreword, probably not before the work was given to Louis (since an imperial librarian would hardly dare to do such a thing)[1674] but very likely after the event, on Louis' orders or using his own initiative. I can see only one possible reason for this: Louis and/or Gerward or Gerward's successor felt that it was too obviously critical of Louis. (The surviving AC foreword does not explicitly criticise Louis, but almost everyone agrees that it is very clearly *e contrario*.) Gerward, or his successor, seems to have removed an important element from the B edition that was felt to be anti-Louis. Whoever removed this could also remove another element. So, we only have to show how the mention of Roland could be read as an anti-Louis element. The defeat

---

1672 Only Pertz B2b = Paris BN lat. 6264 from the 2nd half of the 15th c. includes the foreword from the AC version (cf. the evidence of this late contamination in Tischler 2001, 35).

1673 According to Löwe (1950/1951, 83–99) Gerward had come as a young, gifted cleric to the Palace in 814 at the latest, in 828 he is reliably attested as the palace librarian but appears to have become a monk in Lorsch before 837, but as a Lorsch administrator he seems to have lived for a long time in a small place called Gent (*Gannita*) near Nijmegen, which was probably his original home. Since, as far as I am aware, we do not know the exact date of his departure from his duties in Aachen, I am saying "Gerward or his [immediate] successor" to be on the safe side.

1674 Tischler (2001, 158) writes, however, that unlike Gerward, Louis could not read Einhart's foreword because Gerward had removed it from the dedicatory version. However, this difference in opinion is insignificant in comparison with the elementary fact *that* Gerward [or in my opinion possibly his immediate successor, cf. previous n. and main text below] actually *did* leave out such a text.

of 778 occurred at about the same time as the birth of Louis and to those who believe in omens, it would have seemed like a dark cloud over Louis' life (cf. the discussion above in C.15.1 on the words of the Astronomus) but this would not have been a specific enough justification; for the mention of Egginard and Anselm was not removed. The specific reason must have something to do with Roland's family.

The answers suggested so far are unconvincing. Thompson (1926, passim) insisted only that A is "a revised edition" of B; he thought he could give dates for both editions, but they did not stand up to scrutiny (cf. Tischler 2001, 82, 91s. with n. 41, 102–109 and the lengthy chapter 159–239). For István Frank (1956, 216s.) "l'addition ou la suppression [of the name *Hruodlandus*] put bien n'être pour lui que le sujet d'un instant de rèflexion, et cet instant de réflexion, je suis enclin à l'attribuer au styliste bien plus qu'à l'historien", which reveals an astonishing lack of understanding of the historical seriousness of this particular work. Menéndez Pidal (1960, 289) was convinced that Einhart's version B at first only mentioned courtiers in principle, not including a "simple préfet de la marche de Bretagne"; but then later, in A, he was compelled by the popularity of Roland to mention him as well. Unfortunately, we cannot agree with the premises here: all versions of the *Vita Karoli* (cap. 13) mention *Ericus dux Foroiulianus* who was killed in the war with the Avars; his rank is comparable with that of Roland, and he was certainly not a courtier. Horrent on the other hand (1972, 219) capitulated: "Inattention peut-être ou, plutôt, des raisons inconnues qui voulaient que ce nom ne figurât point dans l'exemplaire de la bibliothèque impériale de Louis le Pieux". Lejeune (1979, 161) agreed. And even Tischler, after a heroic struggle with the material (2001, 80–96), concluded that since there was no reason for any censorship activity on the part of Gerward, the omission could only have been a scribal error.[1675]

I do not share this opinion, but I would like to emphasise that Tischler has created an indispensable condition for finding the reason behind the censoring of the text in so far as he worked out the disputed date of origin of the *Vita Karoli* (between 817 and 836) by establishing that the latest possible date was probably

---

1675 Later (2001, 240–243) he also lists the errors in the sub-archetype of all B mss. These include three omission errors: *nam* is missing on one occasion [although it seems to me that a later addition to AC is not impossible either]; *in* is also missing once [which makes the text difficult but not impossible to understand]; only the last error changes the meaning significantly: *domini DCCCXIIII* is missing, and in the following indiction number the VII has become a VI. This error affects our understanding of Charlemagne's biography much more seriously than the failure to mention Roland; in purely quantitative terms, however, the omission of fourteen syllables is even more noticeable.

828 (2001, 151–239, especially 209s.). He did this by showing that the *Vita Karoli* was Einhart's personal response to a self-critical request on the part of Louis the Pious in the spring of 828 (!) – mainly, but probably not exclusively – to the bishops of the empire, to publicise suggestions for reform, which in particular did not ignore the person of Louis himself. (Since then, this date of 828 has also been supported by Pätzold 2011 and 2013, 193ss., albeit with a different emphasis.) But unless I have overlooked something, Tischler never discusses the question of how long it took to write the *Vita* itself, including the polishing touches and the physical preparation of the dedicatory copy; if the aim is to achieve accuracy to within a year, such details should not be allowed to converge towards zero. I therefore think it is likely that this copy did not reach Aachen until 829, or perhaps even the beginning of 830. This is absolutely compatible with Tischler's plausible conviction that very soon after the "dedicatory version" had been sent off, Einhart sent the "official version" out into the world, i.e. the A version with the foreword that is preserved to this day, so that probably in "around 829/830" (Tischler 2001, 228) Fulda received one of the very first copies because of its central importance, and the young Lupus of Ferrières who had just recently arrived there, read it with great enthusiasm and in all humility started to exchange letters with Einhart.

Let us now examine the important events that were occurring at around the time when the "dedicatory version" was received, and those that happened in the following years! Already in 829 Louis, evidently under the influence of his wife Judith, the mother of his fourth son Charles, had considerably aggravated the crisis in the empire by promising a sub-kingdom in and around Alemannia to Charles. At the same time, he sent his eldest son Lothar, who had been his official co-regent since 825, off to Italy, and he dismissed his adviser Abbot Wala of Corbie. In the spring of 830, disaster struck. In an attempt to distract people from domestic political difficulties, and to force wavering souls to make a public declaration of loyalty in his presence, Louis mobilised the imperial army during Lent, ordering them to undertake an obviously unnecessary campaign against the Bretons. An open rebellion broke out instead, led by the three older sons and a part of the imperial aristocracy. The empress was interned in Poitiers, Lothar came back from Italy and ruled *de facto* most of the empire for a few months. Among the imperial aristocracy, none stoked the rebellion more than the Margrave of the Breton March (which included the three counties of Nantes, Rennes and Vannes) and Count of Nantes, Lantbert/Lambert I of the Wido family.

He had good reason for his anti-Louis attitude. After Wido had gained renown across the whole of the empire for being the first man in Frankish times to subdue the whole of Brittany (cf. C.15.2.3 above), and since he is attested in

802 as the imperial *Missus* for the Touraine region, the Wido family were able to build up an astonishingly powerful position in Brittany. While Wido carried out the duties of the Margrave, his brother Hrodold is attested at the beginning of the 9th c. as the Count of Vannes, and he left this title to his son Wido (813–830/831); the son of the Margrave Wido is attested from 806 as Count, from 818 as Margrave, and he is Lambert I, who rebelled in 830. Louis had already launched personal campaigns against the Bretons in 818 and 824, in order to strengthen his position in front of his own people by achieving victories without taking any real military risk. The second of these at least was an extraordinarily elaborate affair, with three army columns directly under the command of himself and his sons Pippin and Louis, which of course stole the show from the Wido family, reducing their relative prestige in the Breton March. At the time, they made the best of it, but when Louis started making plans for a third campaign of this kind, the Margrave – and he was not alone – reacted by starting a rebellion.

Louis was deprived of all his power, Judith went into a monastery in Laon; while she was there, she was practically kidnapped by Margrave Lambert and Count Warin of Mâcon and compelled to talk Louis into abdicating and becoming a monk; when she failed to achieve this, they took the empress into captivity in Poitiers (von Simson 1874–1876, 1.350). But the victors fell out very quickly; at an Imperial Diet in Nijmegen in October 830 Louis regained his position, Lambert was deposed and replaced in Nantes by a Count Ricuin (who is attested there in 832); we can assume that Lambert was among those who were sentenced to death in 831 at the Imperial Diet in Aachen, after which the emperor immediately commuted their punishment to imprisonment, and in May of the same year at the Imperial Diet in Ingelheim, showed mercy once again, giving them their freedom and probably also returning their private assets to them (*Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 831; Brunterc'h 1989, 51s.). But Lambert's cousin Wido, who had remained loyal to Louis, was moved from Vannes to Maine, and Louis appointed a new Count of Vannes and *missus* in Brittany, who was none other than the Breton Nominoë – a decision which with the benefit of hindsight we can see was very foolish; for Nominoë and his son Erispoë were to become the arch enemies of his son Charles, inflicting upon him the worst defeats of his life, and on the second occasion, forcing him to flee for his life. It is impossible to avoid the impression that even then, Louis thought the Wido family were more dangerous than the Bretons, and this explains why he completely dismantled their whole dynastic power base in the Breton March; for in actual fact the new "système permettait de fragmenter le pouvoir excessif que Lambert avait détenu" (Brunterc'h 1989, 55).

Thanks to the recurring ineptitude of Louis, his three eldest sons rose up against him once more at the start of 833, and in the so-called "Field of Lies" at

Colmar they dissolved almost all of their father's army. Lothar appears to have appointed Lambert as Count of Anjou, and he is attested there in the September of that year (Brunterc'h 1989, 57). But more than that, Lothar imprisoned the empress in Tortona in Italy, ten-year-old Charles in the Monastery at Prüm, and Louis in a monastery at Soissons, where he pressed him once again to become a monk. But yet again, he had overstepped the mark, because Pippin and Louis switched to their father's side. In the full civil war that ensued, Lambert established himself definitively as *fautorum Lotharii maximus* (as stated in the *Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 837, retrospectively on the death of Lambert): when Lothar was getting into difficulty, Lambert and a Count Matfrid quite unexpectedly defeated a strong pro-Louis army in the bloodiest battle of the war near the Breton border. Many of Louis' supporters were killed in that battle including the brother Counts Odo of Orléans and William of Blois, the Count Wido who had remained loyal to Louis, a Count Fulrad, the older Vivianus,[1676] and Louis' chancellor, Abbot Theoto of Tours (*Ann. Bertiniani, Fuldenses, Xantenses* for the year 834, *Anonymi Vita Hludowici* cap. 52, *Nithard* lib. 1, cap. 5, *Chronica Rainaldi* in Marchegay/Mabille 1869, 5).

In the year 834, however, after some dithering, Louis and Lothar were once again prepared to compromise: Lothar retained the co-Emperor title (and the entitlement to the emperor title on the death of Louis) but he and his supporters had to withdraw to Italy. Lambert went with him, so that the Wido family's power base in the Breton March appeared to have been broken up once again; Lambert died in an epidemic in the year 836/837, but his son Wido became Duke of Spoleto soon after that, and this Wido's son Wido and grandson Lambert were even emperors in the years 891–898.[1677]

If Roland were a Wido, he would be the only member of the Wido family mentioned in the *Vita Karoli*. It would be easy to understand why in 830 Louis' librarian, either following his emperor's instructions or using own initiative, would have erased with a stroke of his pen the honourable memory (from the year of Louis' birth, of all years!) of this clan. It would not only be understandable on a human level, but it would even be clever if the name was at that time being uttered in public – in words or even in songs – all too often, so that

---

1676 Cf. n. 1126 above in the section on 'Vivïen' (C.3.2.2).

1677 *Guido* soon became a very common Italian name and remained popular until the recent past, all of which is doubtless due to the importance of the Wido family. It demonstrates the well-known process of gradual diffusion from a family in the high aristocracy to lower and lower classes of society, as occurred in Germany, for example, with the names *Wilhelm* and *Friedrich*. Even if the primary cause – in this case the Italian Wido family – disappears after a few generations, the name can acquire sufficient momentum of its own in the lower classes to guarantee its ongoing popularity down the ages.

the Wido family could even gain political capital from it. Even if the fatal stroke of the pen did not happen until 834, this would still have been early enough. In the intervening years, Einhart would have been able to send A manuscripts from the Odenwald out into the world in whatever quantity he wanted.

Yes, *if* Roland were one of the Wido family . . . But *was* he one of them? Let us ask one of the leading experts in the history of Brittany and its neighbours between about 500 and 1200, Hubert Guillotel (1941–2004), and one of the leading experts in genealogies of the West Frankish nobility, Karl Ferdinand Werner (1924–2008). In the article on *Bretagne* in the LM they wrote the section entitled 'I. Frühmittelalter' together. They explain that the basis of Charlemagne's and Louis the Pious' military interventions was the March they created against the Bretons, rather confusingly called the Breton March, or March of Brittany, consisting of three Frankish counties (Nantes, Rennes and also Vannes, which was conquered in 753). They then report, with cross-references, that the first mention of the Breton March is to be found in Einhart, who records the death in 778 of Hruodlandus (→ Roland), *praefectus* of the Breton March (→ Roncesvalles), followed by the Frankish Royal Annals, which mention his successors Wido and Lambert, *who were his relatives.*[1678] These two experts in their respective fields present here as a fact something that is, strictly speaking, a hypothesis, although it is extremely plausible in itself. Since they did not have the opportunity in the small space of a lexicon article to present their reasoning, I would like to take responsibility for trying fill in the gap. The Merovingian and Carolingian monarchies in no way depended directly on 'the people' (the minor nobility, freemen and bondsmen), but rather on the great noble families who were *grafenbar*, that is, traditionally considered worthy of the title of count. Even in the High Carolingian century from 714 to 814, the art of the monarchs lay not just in leading them from one successful conquest to the next, thereby providing them with 'sustenance', but also in the essential maintenance of a balance of power between them. Sudden and visible power grabs or losses in one leading family, relative to a competing family, could quickly have endangered the monarchy as well (and in fact this is exactly what happened under Louis the Pious in catastrophic fashion). This is why even Charlemagne reserved the right to freely appoint margraves and counts, but whenever a count died, or proved to be incapable, he usually gave the title to the best-qualified member of the same noble family. Whenever a margrave or a count was killed in a heroic battle for the Carolingian

---

1678 Cf. also K. F. Werner (1989), 389 who reports that this March was set up by Pippin [in the year 753, immediately after the conquest of Vannes, G.A.B.] against the Bretons and given to the same noble family from Trier that Milo was part of. He also notes that one of the 'margraves' of this new March was called Roland.

Empire, we can *a fortiori* expect that Charlemagne will follow this honourable (and very clever!) rule.[1679] Moreover, the hypothesis advanced by Guillotel and Werner is supported onomastically: in roughly the same generation as Hruod-land, a Rot-harius is almost certainly from the Wido family;[1680] in the generation immediately after Roland in geographically close proximity to Hruod-land, Count Hrod-old of Vannes is certainly a member of the Wido family, and Wido of Spoleto had a daughter who was called Rot-hilde (LM s. v. *Widonen*); thus, we can say that the names used by the Wido family included the formula *Hruod-* + a variable second part.[1681] Taken on its own, this onomastic argument would certainly not be enough to allow us to declare that Roland was from the Wido family; it does, however, make the Wido hypothesis plausible in onomastic terms. And finally, the geographical reach of the Wido family into the area that is the western part of France today seems to have started in in the first half of the 8th c.: according to Brunterc'h (1989, 46 with n. 95), members of the family are said to have settled in the Maine regions from the year 732 onwards;[1682] at any rate, in the year 738 Wido, probably the former Count Wido, was Abbot of Saint-Wandrille in Normandy.[1683]

1679 This is all more or less generally accepted knowledge among scholars in the field. But I would like to at least acknowledge the importance of two seminal articles by Karl Ferdinand Werner because I admire their conceptual precision and the wide-ranging presentation of their respective bodies of material: on the fundamental role of the nobility there is the article in the LM, especially the sections 'I. Definitionen; Adelsforschung' and 'II. Ursprung; fränkisches Reich'; on Charlemagne's relationship with the higher nobility there is the article on 'Bedeutende Adelsfamilien im Reich Karls des Großen' (Werner 1966), especially the introductory pages (83–86 = 22–25 of the reprint) and the excellent closing section 'III. Karl der Große und der fränkische Reichsadel' (121–128 = 60–67 of the reprint).

1680 It has sometimes been suspected that even Rotrud (< *Hruod-drūd*, † 724), the first wife of Charles Martel and mother of the older Carloman and Pippin, was a member of the Wido family; this would explain the very early and close connection between the Carolingians and the Wido family.

1681 Settipani (1989, 11–13) cites another Wido name beginning with *Hrōd-* "Roubaud", that is to say *Rot-bald*, and a "Rolande", which is his rather questionable way of turning a *Rot-lindis* from Lorsch in the year 767 into French.

1682 He relies on a private charter probably from the year 732, not 684 (*actum [. . .] in anno XI regni domni Teodorici gloriosi regis*) from the *Gesta Aldrici* (ed. Charles/Froger p. 188–191), which Goffart (1966, 260, cf. 256) declared was authentic in his examination of *The Le Mans Forgeries*; however, the onomastic evidence provided by Brunterc'h is very thin.

1683 He is the subject of cap. 11 of the *Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium*: he was a very unspiritual abbot, and as such he used to ride around with his pack of hunting dogs, girded with his *semispatium*. In 739, which was about a year after the start of his term of office and the last year of Charles Martel's life, he was suspected of being part of a *conspiratio* against Charles, and even though he was *propinquus Karoli,* he was executed on the road while on the way to face Charles. This event has been interpreted in very different ways in the scholarly

These arguments may be considered the minimum implicit in Guillotel and Werner's hypothesis, and I would like to add a further argument of my own based on the literature that has been published over the years. When Tischler concluded that Roland's name had been dropped from the B group, he was evidently not aware of the articles by Guillotel and Werner, despite his otherwise admirable command of the literature. Guillotel and Werner, on the other hand, – apart from the fact that their work predates that of Tischler – when they realised that Roland was one of the Wido family, just as evidently, did not ask themselves the question exactly when and why his name was removed from the B edition. These two results were obtained independently of each other. If in spite of this, they fit together like a lock and key, this is the best indication of the quality not just of the lock, but also of the key.[1684]

---

literature (cf. for example, Matthias Werner 1982, 311 n. 593a), but history has shown that it did not affect the good relations between the Carolingians and the Wido family in the first years of Pippin and Carloman's reign. Since towards the end of his life Charles Martel was influenced by his (probably only 'Friedel' or unofficial) wife Swanahild to alter his original will in such a way that his third son Grifo would benefit, I assume that Wido's *conspiratio* had something to do with that, and was possibly directed primarily at Grifo; he was a non-Neustrian foisted upon the monastery by Charles, and so he had plenty of enemies in the monastery who would have been watching him, and reporting any disloyalty back to Charles.

1684 Lejeune (1979, 152–154) established that the very first clearly evidenced bearer of the name 'Roland' is a *Ruatland / Ruadland* who appears in a charter from the monastery of Weissenburg from the year 766 as a witness to a donation in Preuschdorf (15 km southwest of Weissenburg) and in Dannstadt (southwest of Ludwigshafen), and in 765–774 he donates to the monastery 'whatever he possesses in Preuschdorf'. This does not necessarily contradict the findings of Guillotel and Werner. The receiving monastery used to specify exactly what the donation was, if it was only a small one e.g. a vineyard or a piece of land of such and such a size; the formula 'whatever X possesses in Y' indicates a more wealthy landowner who is donating not the whole town, but certainly (e.g. when sharing out his inheritance) a significant fraction of what he possesses. Since there is no mention of a will, nor of the benefactor's entry into the monastery, the benefactor could only donate a relatively small part of his possessions, ideally something geographically on the periphery of his lands. The lands of the Wido family in the 8th c. were in the areas around Alzey and Bingen reaching into the Taunus, even more in the Saargau and the Lorraine Seillegau (where Weissenburg had its most important property from 682 onwards, Glöckner 1939, 13, 20, maps 26s.) and especially around Hornbach (Western Palatinate, 3 km from the Lorraine border, almost 50 km west-northwest of Weissenburg), where they very probably founded a monastery, (in the year 742 for Pirmin), and certainly owned most or all of it in the 8th c. (LM s. v. *Widonen*). Under these circumstances it is simply impossible to estimate how close to Weissenburg the scattered and peripheral properties of any one Wido could be, and these could of course have come through the mother. This is *a fortiori* applicable if this *Wido*, who before 768 gave to the monastery of Saint-Denis the large properties from Ortenau on the right bank of the Rhine via Schlettstadt and Rappoltsweiler as far as Colmar – that is to say land stretching over 45 km – was a member of the Wido family (and given

If Roland was a member of the Wido family, two new perspectives open up for specialists in French literature. I can deal with only the first of these at this point (on the other, cf. sections C.16.3 '*Par anceisurs*' and C.16.4 'Gaydon' below). In the 8th c., Milo was such a prominent Wido name that the Wido family was called the Lambertiner or the Milo family as well.[1685] And in the Pseudo-Turpin (cap. 6, 8, 11) *Milo de Angleris* is Roland's natural father (*genitor*);[1686] the PT harmonises its sources when required, but the author does not invent details like this. This could therefore reflect a dim memory of Milo as a Wido name. If this statement did happen to be true in a literal sense, then the likely identity of this person could be the Count Milo who held a prominent position under Pippin in 752–759, though the location of his seat is unknown.

Be that as it may: the mention of Roland in the *Vita Karoli* is typical of Einhart, and the reason why it is left out in the B family of manuscripts is clear.

C.15.3 Review of the historicity of Roland

The mention of Roland in the charter of 772 is authentic, the Roland dinars are genuine and refer to the Margrave, the mention of Roland in the *Vita Karoli* is typical of Einhart, and there is no sensible reason to doubt that Roland, Margrave of the Breton March, existed and was killed in 778 during the ambush in the western Pyrenees.

C.15.4 Why not Eggihard or Anselm?

The fact that we can now regard the mention of Roland as an original element in the *Vita Karoli* has some bearing on another problem.

The *Vita* names Eggihard, Anselm and Roland as high-ranking fallen warriors, but only Roland went on to become an epic hero. Both 'individualists' and 'traditionalists' can live with this fact. The former see in it the confirmation

---

the size of the donation, it would be difficult to assume he was not; when a donation was given, which is a private legal act, the count title would not be mentioned). Some scholars (Büttner, Sprandel, probably also Tellenbach) saw the founding family at Weissenburg as having a close genealogical relationship with the Wido family (although Matthias Werner 1982, especially 16 n. 27 and 49–60 is critical of this view).

1685 Cf. the three men called Milo in the 8th c. who are introduced in section (C.15.2.2) above 'The dinars with the names of Roland and Charlemagne' *à propos* the Milo coins.

1686 There is more detail on this above in n. 1179.

that epic literature is fundamentally not much concerned about history. For the latter, it seems to prove that epic literature is not influenced by *histoire écrite*; because if it were, then Eggihard and Anselm would be the glorious heroes.

In my view, even after about 180 years of debates surrounding the written sources, they are still implicitly misunderstood in one particular way.

The ambush affected mainly the baggage train that was travelling with the rear guard; because this is where Saragossa's tribute of gold was, and the prisoner Ibn al-Arabi. No matter whether both were being transported on pack horses or in carts, in this particular case, they were part of the baggage train. But what else was in the baggage train, and what did a baggage train normally consist of in those days?[1687] The answer is mostly disappointing: many things that we see in the images of later armies – like those of the late Middle Ages or Early Modern period – and intuitively associate with the term baggage train, were in Charlemagne's time, if they even existed back then, treated as part of the individual units of regular troops. We can see this, e.g. from the chance survival of a 'conscription order' sent by Charlemagne in 804–811 (probably 806) to Abbot Fulrad of Saint-Quentin and his people (MGH Capit.r.F. 1.168s., no. 75) and in the *Capitulare Aquisgranense* of 801–813 (MGH Capit.r.F. 1.170ss., no. 77, cap. 9s.). These documents tell us that Fulrad's unit, like every other unit,

---

1687 The most useful research on the time of Charlemagne includes the classic accounts of medieval warfare such as Baltzer (1877, which according to the title starts with the last of the Carolingians), Delbrück (1907), Daniels (1910), Erben (1929), Schmitthenner (1930), Lot (1946), Verbruggen (1954), Rasin (Ger. 1960), Beeler (1972), Wise (1976), Koch (1978) and Contamine (1980) and even specialist articles such as those by Verbruggen (1966, 1979–1980) and Ganshof (1968) but they offer almost nothing about the 'baggage train'; even Oman (²1924) and Frauenholz (1935) consider only the isolated ideas mentioned in the main text. Scherer (1910, 16–21) makes a few good, essentially sobering remarks on the subject of 'war machines' during the time of Charlemagne, but Oman (²1924) offers very little, and the others offer nothing at all, even in specialist studies such as Rathgen (1928 or 1987, over 700 p.!), Sander (1942), Warner (1968, does not even mention Charlemagne's name!), Finó (1972) and Canestrini (1974, edits and discusses only sources from the 15th c!), and there is evidently a good reason for their omission. Things are changing, however, in the later 9th c. (Finó 1972, 27s.): in 873 Charles the Bald used *nova et exquisita machinamentorum genera* when he besieged Angers, which was being held by the Normans, but they did not produce the desired outcome (Regino for the year 873, MGH SS.schol. 50.106); in 886 the defenders of Paris deployed *mangana* 'mangonneaux, catapults', which launched effective *saxa ingentia* onto the attackers (Abbo lib. 1, v. 363–366, MGH PLAeC. 4.96), but the attackers also used several large battering rams and other subtle attacking techniques (Oman 1924, 143–148). But even in these two theatres of war, these machines were built on the spot, and so they were not transported there from a distance in the baggage train; Finó even believes that Charles the Bald had summoned Byzantine engineers for this purpose.

evidently had to bring its own rations to last three months,[1688] its *vestimenta* (which would certainly have included footwear) and all their weapons, including arrows (!) to last for six months, as well as *in carris vestris* necessary tools for carpentry and excavation, perhaps also (although Schneider 1910, 19, disputes this) for masonry work (*cuniada et dolaturia, tarratros, assias, fosorios, palas ferreas et cetera utensilia que in hostem sunt necessaria*); the *Capitulare Aquisgranense*, which is addressed to all of the counts, among others, lists (c. 10) also *fundibulas, et illos homines qui exinde bene sciant iactare* as well as *pontes bonos, naves bonas*. Since the unit led by each *comes* had to bring its own *fundibulae,* they were perhaps only hand slings (as suggested by Schneider 1910, 20), and if not, relatively simple torsion catapults that could launch rocks e.g. into a town during a siege, rather than the heavy *ca(d)ables*, which were more often used from the First Crusade onwards to bring down fortress walls, as the surviving Song tells us (v. 98, 237). For the same reason, the *naves* and *pontes* may well have been simple boats and makeshift bridges that could be transported on carts; Oman (1924, 81) understands a passage with a similar theme in the *Capitulare de villis* (MGH Capit.r.F. 1.89, § 64) to mean that the leather covers on or in the carts could be used to convert these carts into a kind of

---

[1688] In the Boulogne capitulary of 811 (MGH Capit.r.F. 1.166s., no. 74, § 8) this three-month period is described as *de marca* 'starting at the border' as *antiqua consuetudo*, but the document specifies what counts as 'the border': for those who live between the Rhine and the Loire, it means these rivers, for those to the right bank of the Rhine, it is the Elbe [for campaigns against Danes or Slavs], for those south of the Loire, for campaigns into Spain, it means the Pyrenees. It is quite instructive to apply these directions to the campaign of 778. Charlemagne celebrated Easter (19th of April) when he was still in Chasseneuil, just north of Poitiers, about 90 km south of the Loire near Tours. We can assume that a large part, perhaps even by far the largest part, of the army column under his direct leadership would have come from the area between the Rhine and the Loire. It would have taken two to three days for them to march there from the Loire; we would have to add at least Easter Sunday, even if Charlemagne set off on Easter Monday. From the 16th/17th of July onwards, therefore, this part of the army would have had to live off the occupied land around Saragossa, and in the weeks after that, the three-month period would have run out, even for those who came from the southern part of France. Even though the *vega* around Saragossa was fertile, and its inhabitants were probably able to save very little of their produce from confiscation, this army which was so huge by the standards of those days would only have been able to feed itself for one or two weeks at best, which means until the end of the month. The ambush in the western Pyrenees took place on the 15th of August. The modern road from Saragossa to Roncevalles via Pamplona is 223 km long. Taking account of the razing of the walls of Pamplona, the march must have taken almost ten days. Charlemagne must have left Saragossa by the 5th of August at the latest. Now suddenly the *Nota Emilianense* sounds very true to life: *Post aliquantulum temporis, suis [= sui, 'los suyos'] dederunt consilium ut munera acciperet multa, ne a ffamis periret exercitum, sed ad propriam rediret. Quod factum est.*

pontoon bridge that would be deployed when crossing rivers. During the campaign, each person carried his own weapons, of course; it is obvious that rations were not distributed from a central point and shared out every day, because it would take far too much time to organise that.[1689] The larger equipment, however, consisted of items that were expected to last longer than a single campaign, and they would therefore have had identifiable owners. It is not known whether the carts transporting these items remained with the fighting units, or whether they were grouped together as part of the baggage train; Frauenholz (1935, 35s., 79) suspects that they would have remained with the units when inside the empire, but when in enemy territory, to ensure they did not hinder the manoeuvrability of the fighting troops, they would be gathered together in the baggage train. There is nothing on record about larger or more specific war machines in any of Charlemagne's campaigns; *e contrario* it is quite striking that Pavia and Barcelona were not overrun, but they had to be starved out, whereas there was not enough time for this in the case of Saragossa. The razing of the walls of Pamplona was not possible without the simplest of all war machines, the battering ram; we know that the main components of each machine, the largest possible single tree trunk and beams for the frame that carried it, were obtained from the area surrounding the place where it was needed, because every unit had to take its own axes, carpenter's planes and drills (as Schneider 1910 rightly pointed out).[1690]

If we subtract all of this, then the baggage train still has to transport the many requirements of the court (including the personal escorts of the King) along with their provisions; and these were very substantial, one reason being that medieval kings used to spend considerable amounts of their time on campaigns, another that it was important to maintain the standards of the court in a culture that was steeped in symbolism. This means for a holder of a court office that during the march he had to do pretty much what he did on any other day, namely look after his part of the 'baggage'.

1689 Ph. Contamine (LM s. v. *Heer, Heerwesen*) explains that when Charlemagne gathered together his entire army, he was in charge of several tens of thousands of men on horseback and an even larger number of combatants on foot – and in 778 specifically *Hispaniam quam maximo poterat belli apparatu adgreditur* (Einhart).

1690 These battering rams are also, if I am not mistaken, the only siege machines mentioned in the Merovingian period. They are first mentioned in connection with the siege of Convenae (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges) by Guntram's army in the year 585 "battering rams mounted on wagons covered with sheds to protect the attackers" (Bachrach 1972, 59); they were, as the context shows, obviously built on the spot, but they were not successful. The second mention of them is in relation to Charles Martel's conquest of Avignon in 737, but on this occasion his "battering rams" were used to good effect (Bachrach, 1972, 105).

This is what they were doing on the day the ambush happened: Charlemagne had ridden ahead with most of the army and had asked his courtiers to stay with the baggage train, and not go with him. He did not need to put some specially convened troop under the command of each of them for this particular day; he just ordered a large unit to protect the whole baggage train: Roland and his people. Precisely because the *Brittannici limitis praefectus* and his troops have nothing to do with the court, there is only one explanation for their presence: they were the troop set aside to guard the baggage train, the arrière-*garde* in the narrow sense of that term. It was not a bad decision, in principle: the troops from the Breton March were not Breton auxiliaries drawn from the local people, but in fact they were Frankish border troops, whose permanent job was to guard the border against Breton attacks. This means they were a well-trained unit, equipped to fight on fairly flat terrain, probably with a larger proportion of *jeunes* in the sense that Duby used this term, that is to say unmarried and daring young men, than was in the imperial army as a whole. Charlemagne was hurrying ahead with the main army, partly because of the extremely critical shortage of rations, and partly because he already knew about the Saxon rebellion.[1691] His tactical error was that because of these pressing factors he did not take the very valuable but cumbersome baggage train with him in the middle of the main army, nor did he allocate an exceptionally strong rear guard to look after it. On the 15th of August, the weather tends to be hot in the Pyrenees; presumably the courtiers were on horseback, but because they did not have a military role, strictly speaking, they would not have had a coat of mail, shield and lance. They would have been riding up and down the length of the baggage train, girded by their sword, making sure that the train was moving as fast as possible. When the calamitous attack descended upon them, their lance and shield would probably not even have been within reach, and there would have been absolutely no time to even think of a coat of mail; even if they were able to draw their sword, they would be killed by the first thrust of a lance. Their death was tragic, but objectively speaking, their contribution to the battle must have been negligible. Roland and his troop, on the other hand, would have been armed and ready to fight, poised to carry out the orders they had been given, otherwise Einhart's remarks about their *armorum gravitas* would not have made sense. They must have held out considerably longer, and they would have killed quite a few of the attackers. But the enemy had local knowledge and was strong enough to drive them off the road and into the steep surrounding terrain, where indeed the *loci iniquitas* really did compound the *armorum gravitas,* and this sealed their fate.

1691 On the former, cf. n. 1688, on the latter, n. 553.

When Charlemagne and the main army reached the place where the catastrophe had occurred, it was littered with corpses, and they recognised the courtiers on the one hand, and Roland with his troops on the other. Even at that point, they must have been seen as two distinct groups: the first group were mown down on the road itself and the second group driven off the road, but still wearing their armour showing traces of their struggle, because the enemy had not had any time to gather loot. But even if it were not possible to distinguish the two groups just by looking at them, everyone would have known the difference between their respective functions: the courtiers had been killed quickly, whereas Roland and his troop had gradually lost the battle – and they had died fighting. Whenever anyone tried to understand the feat and explain why it happened – and the collective consciousness urged people to understand it – the reason could not have been the actions of the courtiers, but it had to be the actions of Roland, apart from the initial decision of the King. From this perspective, the battle was, and remained afterwards simply 'the battle where, on Charlemagne's way home from Spain, Roland and his whole troop died fighting'.

The death of the courtiers not only 'clouded over Charlemagne's heart', as the Royal Annals up to the year 829 put it, but it had an impact on all of the upper class, which was so accustomed to victory. The names of those they had lost, their Eggihards and Anselms, were still on everyone's lips in 840, not least because of the strength of family ties among those directly affected. But the situation soon changed: between 840 and the 11th c., there was such a seismic shift in power structures within France because of the huge number of feuds between emerging principalities, that even in noble families, knowledge about their respective ancestors in the time of Charlemagne began to fade almost to nothing.[1692] As part of this process, the names of the individual warriors who fell at Roncevalles also faded from memory. With the exception of Roland, who is a special case, probably none of the names of the actual warriors who were killed in 778 made it into the surviving song. What did remain fixed in people's minds, however, and probably regardless of social status, was the overall memory of the unusually high death toll, which particularly 'the courtiers' had

---

[1692] Even in cases where today we manage to prove genealogical continuity, this usually happens by way of marriages and unpredictable inheritances to sub-branches. The one exception is the Vermandois family, which is the only one to have a direct male line of Charlemagne's descendants surviving into the late 11th c. But there is a twist in the tale, in so far as King Bernhard's probably illegitimate son Pippin was demoted to the rank of a count somewhere north of Paris; from that time forwards, we do not hear about any pride in their Carolingian heritage, but we do hear about the rather unscrupulous exploitation of shifting alliances.

suffered; it grew into the idea of a closed circle of twelve who were courtiers at first but then – through the very nature of the epic itself – became a circle of twelve warriors who were close to the King (cf. section C.7.1 above 'From the *aulici* to the *pers*').

But let us return to the perspective of 778 and the time immediately after that.

C.15.5 Was Roland related to the Carolingians?

Sometime around the turn of the millennium, a poet from the middle Rhône area invented a figure called Olivier to be the nephew of his regional hero Girart de Vienne, as a counterpart to Charlemagne and his nephew Roland on the other side. The idea that Roland was Charlemagne's nephew – if we assume that the relationship was not historical – was invented by this poet, then, if not before;[1693] but unless we credit this poet with astonishing creativity, this motif on Charlemagne's side is older.

1693 Lena Löfstedt (1990, passim) considered the *duodecim neptis* in the *Nota Emilianense* and the fact that Irish *nia* means both 'sister's son' and 'warrior, champion' and wondered whether it might be possible that even in the surviving Rol., Roland should be seen not as the nephew of the emperor, but only as a member "d'un groupe privilégié" [around the emperor], whereby his membership would be due to the fact that on the death of his father Milon d'Angliers he was a minor and in need of Charlemagne's protection. But quite apart from the fact that this is a rather thin explanation for his membership of this group, we cannot take something from the Medieval Latin usage of one Spanish speaker and from Old Irish and just make it apply to Old French. Furthermore: since according to Löfsted, after Milon's death, Ganelon apparently married his widow and thus became Roland's stepfather (in the Song they expressly call each other *parastre* and *fillastre*), but is now married to Charlemagne's sister (*si ai jo vostre soer*, v. 312), Ganelon would have married twice in quick succession, although no reason is given for the duplication; in a sense, after the death of Ganelon's first wife, Roland's natural mother, Charlemagne would have given Ganelon his sister in marriage purely by chance. Why would one make it so much harder to understand a given circumstance in the poem, just so that a much more peripheral circumstance (the *duodecim neptis*) would have an explanation (although there is already a second explanation that has not been disproved)? In the Middle Ages, a strong belief in heredity meant that only a biological nephew could carry the huge emotional value that we see in literary uncle-nephew relationships; but the idea that a mere adoptive nephew relationship, or even just membership of a *groupe privilégié* would cause such a strong connection, requires more evidence than Löfstedt provides. Similarly, even long before the surviving Rol., the invention of Olivier as a nephew figure to match Roland (as we see retained in the surviving *Girart de Vienne* acting as an axis to carry the structure of the poem) reflecting a physical nephew relationship on both sides presumes more than just the position of two *privilégiés* in relation to their respective liege lords. And when it is proposed that Girart's niece Alde should marry Charlemagne's nephew Roland, Girart and

This motif was most evident in the Roncevaux scene: it elevated the protagonist from his position as a hitherto provincial margrave with military responsibilities to someone socially superior to the other warriors who died on that day, and above all, it intensified Charlemagne's suffering. This makes it the oldest example in Old French epic literature of a family relationship being postulated to enhance literary connections, a technique that then became fundamental to the William and Aimerid epics, and in around 1200 reached its peak in the claim that only three *gestes* ever existed.

The uncle-nephew motif drew support from the well-known fact in the ethnology of the family that in patriarchal cultures especially, where the relationship of a father with his son was defined by a decidedly cool or even strict attitude – the boy should grow up to be 'a real man' – as a kind of counterbalance, the relationship with a sister's son tended to be warmer: he should also retain an emotional inheritance from his mother's family, and he should continue to feel a grateful attachment to them. Tacitus famously emphasises the importance, even the sanctity of this relationship for the Germanic peoples especially;[1694] among the Celts, it appears to have been just as close, but perhaps more ambivalent.[1695] In medieval Western Europe, it contributed to the emergence of great literature in various, nuanced ways: Charlemagne and Roland, William and Vivien, Mark and Tristan, Arthur and Gawain, Arthur and Mordred.[1696]

In so far as this kind of literary motif needs any explanation, this is surely sufficient. And yet we might usefully ask ourselves the question, how far in this special case it might have rested on a historical relationship. The historian Gerd Tellenbach assembled (1939, 43–55) the 111 most important men in the Carolingian Empire from the late 8th c. until the start of the 10th c. into an "imperial aristocracy"; he established (1939, 56), that 52 of them, that is to say 47 %, or almost half of them were "related to the Carolingian dynasty, or had married

---

Charlemagne surely intend to guarantee peace between them, and not just to enter into a marriage treaty with some mere *privilégiés* on both sides in the next generation (which is as yet unmarried and therefore 'available').

1694 *Germ.* 20.4: *Sororum filiis idem apud avunculum qui apud patrem honor. Quidam sanctiorem artioremque hunc nexum sanguinis arbitrantur et in accipiendis obsidibus magis exigunt, tamquam et animum firmius et domum latius teneant.* On the Germanic epic, cf. Bell (1922, passim), on English, Scottish (and comparing them with Scandinavian) ballads, Gummere (1911, passim), both still useful as collections of material, minus the ideas about 'matriarchy', especially Bell.

1695 On older Irish literature, and specifically the importance of this relationship, as well as the possibility of it turning into something destructive, Ó Cathasaigh (1986, passim).

1696 More examples and older research in Curtius (1954, 175s.).

into it". Since nobility to a large extent was based on biology, and only inheritable through biology, no one saw it as nepotism in a negative sense; as Marc Bloch would say, almost only an *ami charnel* was a truly reliable *ami*. For us, this means that the *a priori* probability of Roland being related to Charles biologically or through marriage was almost 50 %. At the very least, therefore, when sometime before 1000 Roland was promoted to the role of Charlemagne's nephew, the audience would not have thought that something improbable or far beyond the realms of reality was being claimed.[1697]

But if the probability is almost 50 %, the detail of the case should be examined as far as is humanly possible. On Roland's father's side, we have already done this: he was probably one of the Wido family. But what about his mother's side? Einhart (*Vita Karoli* 18) writes about Charlemagne: *Erat ei unica soror nomine Gisla, a puellaribus annis religiosae conversationi mancipata, quam similiter ut matrem magna coluit pietate. Quae etiam paucis ante obitum illius annis in eo, quo conversata est, monasterio decessit.* Leaving the unfortunate hypothesis of incest with his sister aside, researchers in French literature have until now concluded from Einhart's statement that Roland cannot be Charlemagne's sister's son. But Einhart's statement is at the very least misleading; because Charlemagne had two more sisters or half-sisters, Rotheid and Adelheid. When Paul the Deacon was living in France (from 782 until 787 at the latest), he wrote epitaphs at Charlemagne's request for the members of the Carolingian family who were buried in St. Arnulf of Metz, including epitaphs for these two sisters. The originals *in situ* have not survived, but Paul copied the texts into his *Gesta Episcoporum Mettensium* (MGH PLAeC. 1.257s.), which he was writing at the same time. This is Adelheid's epitaph:

> *Perpetualis amor capiendae et causa salutis,*
> *Pectore quem vigili huc properare facit,*
> *Nosse cupis cur busta sacer numerosa retentet*
> *Hic locus, astrigeri qua patet aula poli?*

1697 The fact that the 'nephew of Charlemagne' motif then began to spread exponentially illustrates its believability for medieval people; other 'nephews of Charlemagne' in epic literature include: Balduin in the Rol. and the Saxon epic, the eponymous heroes in the *Gui de Bourgogne* and in the *Ansëis de Cartage*, Bertolai in the *Renaut de Montauban*, Beton in the *Daurel et Beton,* the four children of Haimon in Aubri de Troisfontaines (MGH SS. 23.723) and the *Dutch Renout van Montalbaen*, and also Samsonet in Aubri (p. 720) the son of the traitor Arnëis of Orléans from the *Couronnement de Louis*. Similarly in monastic history and hagiography: the abbot Theodemir is Charlemagne's nephew in a forgery of the 10th, or more likely 11th c. from Psalmodi (MGH. DD.kar. 1, no. 303), as is the Abbot Fulrad in forgeries from Saint-Denis in the 12th or more likely 13th c. (MGH. DD.kar. 1, no. 236. 248, 262), as well as the eponymous Bishop of Nice in the admittedly late *Vita Siacrii* (Syagrii) (BHL 7696, AA.SS. for the 23rd of May) who had supposedly been the Count of Brie before that . . . .

> Iste sacer domini qui post servavit ovile
> Legitimi fuerat germinis ante pater;
> Cuius posteritas atavo confisa patrono,
> Hoc cupit in sancto ponere membra loco.
> Pippini hic proles Adheleid pia virgo quiescit,
> Quam simul et reliquas, sancte, tuere, pater.

Rotheid's epitaph is written immediately before it, and so Rotheid was presumably the elder of the two:

> Hic ego quae iaceo Rothaid de nomine dicor,
> Quae genus excelso nimium de germine duco.
> Nam mihi germanus, gentes qui subdidit armis
> Ausonias, fretus Karolus virtute tonantis;
> Pippinus pater est, Karolo de principe cretus,
> Aggarenum stravit magna qui caede tyrannum.
> Pippinus proavus, quo non audacior ullus,
> Ast abavus Anschisa potens, qui ducit ab illo
> Troiano Anschisa longo post tempore nomen.
> Hunc genuit pater iste sacer presulque beatus
> Arnulfus, miris gestis qui fulgit ubique,
> Hic me spe cuius freti posuere parentes.

Paul is certain that Adelheid died as a *virgo*, but he does not say this about Rotheid – is this just by accident? Oelsner (1871, 25 n. 3) once made the strange suggestion that Rotheid had probably died in infancy, but if that had been the case, Paul would surely have constructed a line something like "her soul returned to the Lord so soon". The question should be whether Paul had to forego the *virgo* distinction because Rotheid had been a mother. And while Adelheid is only described in relation to her ancestor and her father, Rotheid's Carolingian blood is evoked at length through a list of ancestors, and even before these ancestors are mentioned, her brother pushes his way in as conqueror of Italy. This difference appears only to be justified if Rotheid's life had been connected with Charlemagne for a considerably longer time than Adelheid's. The difference seems quite natural, and indeed necessary, if Rotheid lived long enough to see the conquest of Italy in 774, which means she would have survived her father, who died in 768.

On the other hand, Charlemagne is Rotheid's *germanus*; the word can mean a full brother (*frater*), and also a half-brother on the father's side – is this another coincidence? If these two women are Charlemagne's half-sisters, in other words illegitimate daughters of Pippin, this explains both Einhart's silence, and the noticeable fact that there is no mention of a mother in either of the epitaphs, even though Charlemagne famously loved his mother *cum summa reverentia* (*Vita Karoli* 18).

In the case of Rotheid, everything depends on the meaning of the word *parentes*. If the primary meaning 'parents' (from *parĕre*) is intended here, then Roland cannot be Charlemagne's nephew. For if this were so, Rotheid could not be illegitimate, because if she had been, her mother would not have been able to (co-) authorise her daughter's burial in the Carolingian family vault. But neither could she be legitimate because Pippin was married in 744 (not 749), and so even according to Carolingian customs, she could not have become a mother before 758/759 at the earliest; at any rate, her son could not have been Count in the year 772, and he would probably not yet have been able to hold the more responsible position of Margrave in 778.

But *parentes* is found with the extended meaning 'relatives' (*cognati* and even *agnati*) even in the first century A.D., and not just in prose writers such as Curtius, Pliny the Younger and Mela, but occasionally also in the more elevated style of Seneca, who describes as *parentes* in *Herc*. 215 a brother and father, and in *Thy*. 28 even a brother-in-law and nephew. This extended usage is common among Christian prose writers from the very beginning, in Tertullian for example;[1698] and even among the poets, Ausonius, for example, refers to his *avunculus* as *parens* in a verse epistle (*comm.prof.Burd*. 16.5). The MGH editor (MGH AA. 4.1) even notes in the index, in relation to Venantius Fortunatus: "*parens* i.q. *cognatus* passim, [. . .] *parentes* sic passim" and refers especially to *De excidio Thoringiae* v. 84 (cf. also v. 50, 58, 79, all p. 272s.), where Radegundis addresses her youthful companion and son of her father's brother, the Thuringian Crown Prince Amalfrid, as *parens*; for the plural, cf. e.g. in the same text, v. 179 (p. 275) *tunc, pater ac genetrix et avunculus atque parentes*, where the context shows that these can only be individuals born in Radegundis' own generation, or that of her parents, and not more distant 'ancestors'. And even in later times, *parentes* meaning 'relatives' is perfectly normal.[1699] Under these circumstances, we cannot exclude the possibility that Paul's usage of the word *parentes* here means 'relatives', which includes various members of the Carolingian royal family. This means that Rotheid could have been an illegitimate child.

1698 One of the last writers to realise that there was a stylistic distinction to be made was Jerome: in *adv.Ruf*. 2.2 he says that this extended usage should be seen as belonging to *militari vulgarique sermone*.

1699 Six references from the 6th–8th c. in the MLLM, more in DuCange s. v. and also in almost exemplary fashion, in the will of William of Toulouse with *parentes* 'relatives', *genitores* 'parents' (e.g. Gellone 144s.). Cf. from poetic works in the Carolingian period: MGH PLAeC. 2.629.16, 3.80.276, 4.853.10; we find also in the PLAeC the meaning 'brothers' (in a clerical context) and 'members of [our] people, or tribe' both derived from the 'relatives' usage.

Discussing this possibility in no way tarnishes Pippin's honour. First, the Carolingians were hardly able to restrain themselves in this respect: King Pippin's grandfather of the same name had Count Hildebrand (who oversaw the 2nd continuation of the "Fredegar") with a concubine, left his wife Plektrud and 'married' Alpheid, had a son Charles Martel with her, then went back repentant to Plektrud and tried on his deathbed to cut Charles out of the succession, evidently now on the grounds of illegitimacy. Charles Martel himself, if we count Grifo as legitimate, had several additional illegitimate sons: Bernhard (highly honoured by Charlemagne as a military commander), Remigius (Bishop of Rouen) and Hieronymus.[1700] King Pippin's son Charlemagne had his eldest son Pippin at the age of 23 at the most,[1701] and he gave this son the classic family name, that of his grandfather on his father's side, but he later declared him illegitimate, perhaps only after he was injured in infancy and from then onwards was called *Pippinus Gibbosus*.[1702] He also had more illegitimate children: Rotheid, Rothild (Abbess of Faremoutiers), Adaltrud, Drogo (Abbot of Luxeuil, Bishop and then Archbishop of Metz, Arch-chaplain to Louis the Pious), Hugo (Abbot of Saint-Quentin and Saint-Bertin, Arch-Chancellor to Louis the Pious and also to Charles the Bald) and Theoderich. Louis, later named 'the Pious' appears to have fathered his two illegitimate children Alpheid and Arnulf by the age of 16; Alpheid married Bego who became Count of Toulouse and Margrave of Septimania, then Count of Paris,[1703] while Arnulf became Count of Sens. According to the *Ann. Bertiniani*, when Emperor Lothar was a widower, he had several concubines, with one of whom he had a son Carloman, and he also had other sons whose names are not known (K. F. Werner 1966, passim, especially the table at the end of the book). If King Pippin did not have any illegitimate children, he would be the only one in six generations of his family. However, Pippin was born in 714 but did not marry until 744, in other words, at the age of thirty, which was surprisingly late

---

1700 Hlawitschka suspects they were children of a woman called *Ruadheid*, who is listed in the confraternity book of Reichenau in the midst of the Carolingian family immediately after *Ruatrud* who is presumed to be Charles Martel's wife, and *Ruadheid*'s role is benefactress, which means she must have held a very highly respected position (Hlawitschka 1966, passim, especially the table and 79 n. 32); I wonder if *Ruadheid* might perhaps actually have been a daughter of Charles Martel and *Ruadtrud*.

1701 According to K.F. Werner (1973, passim) he was born in 747, not 742.

1702 Pippinus Gibbosus enjoyed such good links with the upper nobility, even long after his demotion, that in 797 he absented himself from the court feigning illness, fomented a rebellion against his father and was punished by being forced to enter the Carolingian family monastery of Prüm.

1703 Setttipani (1993, 200–202) thinks she is Charlemagne's daughter, but this is contradicted by Flodoard and by the fact that Einhart does not include her with the other legitimate or illegitimate daughters of Charlemagne.

for a Carolingian, whereas Charles Martel probably was first married at 16,[1704] Charlemagne at 23, his brother Carloman 19 at the most, King Pippin of Italy and his son Bernhard, both around 18, Louis the Pious 16, Lothar 26, Pippin of Aquitaine about 25, Louis the German about 21, Charles the Bald 19, and Louis the Stammerer 16. Given these circumstances, if Charlemagne's father was sexually inactive until his marriage, he would have been well outside the norm for his family.

A parallel situation with some opposite effects pertained in the case of Charlemagne's daughters. According to Einhart (*Vita Karoli* 19) their father did not allow them to marry as they pleased, but kept them near him until he died, which meant he often had to turn a blind eye or a deaf ear. He pretended that he had personal reasons for this, but in fact his motivation was political: the dynasty had just emerged out of the nobility a generation and a half before, and so questions of succession were not yet formalised; as a result, claims from legitimate sons-in-law and their descendants, at least if there was ever a dispute over the throne, could very quickly represent a threat.[1705] His strict behaviour contributed to, among other things, his daughter Rotrud, at the age of about 25, bearing a son Louis, later Abbot of Saint-Denis and Arch-Chancellor to Charles the Bald for many years, to Rorico, later attested as the Count of Rennes, then of Maine; her sister, according to K. F. Werner (1966, 44a and table) at the early age of 16 had a relationship with Abbot Angilbert of Saint-Riquier, formerly Court Chaplain to her brother Pippin of Italy, and then known as "Homerus", a member of her father's court academy, and she soon bore him two sons Nithard and Hartnid, the former later becoming a count and historian. Very often, even younger women entered into a legitimate marriage: Charlemagne's wife Hildegard was 13, Charles the Bald's wife Ermentrud and Louis the Pious' daughter Alpheid were apparently only 12 years old (K. F. Werner, 1966, plate).[1706] It is quite clear that female Carolingians who were forbidden to marry nevertheless formed loose relationships within the "count-worthy" upper class, and their illegitimate children, along with those of the male Carolingians, fitted right in, so to speak, to this social class.

In the middle of such a *milieu*, it would not be in the least surprising if Pippin, born in 714, were to become the illegitimate father of Rotheid in around 733.

1704 Breysig (1869, 9).

1705 In the long term, he was right: three of the four non-Carolingians who tried to become kings or emperors before 900 invoked their relationship by marriage with the Carolingians: they were King Boso of Lower Burgundy and King Rudolph of Upper Burgundy as well as Emperor Wido in Italy.

1706 The list above is not limited to a few exceptional cases but aims to be exhaustive for six generations of children, starting with the offspring of Pippin the Middle and ending with those of Louis the Pious; there is no way of finding out even approximately the missing details in this account.

Shortly after 747, when his brother Carloman became a monk, Pippin must have decided to become king; for the Royal Annals for 749 already record his famous request to the Pope. From the moment he made this decision onwards, legitimate sons-in-law must have been at least as unwelcome to him as they later were to his son Charlemagne; his legitimate daughter Gisela never married. If Rotheid bore a son in about 749/750, her union would not have been formalised. If the element *Hruod-* in her own name was also to be found in her lover's family, would she not have wanted to give her son a name of the type *Hruod-* + X? She lived her life as an unmarried mother under the protection of her own family and was therefore in due course buried by these 'relatives'. The child would have grown up at the court, perhaps enjoying a close friendship with the two heirs to the throne, who were only two or three years older. When the Crown Prince became King, he would have felt quite comfortable making this trusted young man a count, and soon after that, giving him responsibility for a whole March. Is this a chain of unproven assumptions? Yes, but assumptions for which *a priori* one could never rely on finding contemporary documentation, and which are remarkably well supported by parallels in the surrounding context.

Let us sum up our findings: the probability that Roland was 'somehow' related to the Carolingians is almost 50%; the idea that he was Charlemagne's nephew may not reach this level of probability, but it certainly cannot be ruled out.[1707]

1707 Roncaglia's extreme hypothesis (1984, passim), is that Roland was an incestuous son born in 771/772 to Charlemagne (probably born in 747/748) and his sister Gisela (born in 757), that he was taken at the age of seven with his father on the Spanish campaign and was killed in the baggage train. This theory assumes 1) the rumour about the incest is true, although it seems to have first appeared some 200 years later as an oral side-rumour to the *Vita Aegidii* and was not openly stated until about 400 years later (cf. n. 1012 above). But even if we leave this aside, the difficulties with this hypothesis are insurmountable. 2) There is no explanation for the charter of 772 which cites Roland's name with the title of count. 3) The role of *Brittannici limitis praefectus* is a military command position of the utmost importance; the idea that such a role could have been given to a child during the reign of Charlemagne is anachronistic. 4) Since Roncaglia must rely on the assumption that the memory of Roland survived through an unbroken oral tradition, the transformation of a defenceless child into a heroically fighting leader of the rear guard is not credible; it is just facile to assume that the oral tradition could change everything to this extent; 5) Paschasius Radbertus (*Vita Adalhardi* cap. 7, MGH SS.2.525) easily explains the *inlicitus thorus*, which he charges Charlemagne with, on behalf of Adalard, in a different way: when, for purely political reasons, Charlemagne sent the daughter of Desiderius of Lombardy back to her father after just one year of marriage and married Hildegard, (so that those who had asked Desiderius for the marriage on behalf of Charlemagne were regarded as oath-breakers in retrospect), the young Adalard considered the second marriage as illegal, in keeping with the Gospels and Christian doctrine. He left the court and became a priest. I cannot see the slightest indication of any reason why this passage should have a hidden second meaning.

C.15.6 Arguments on the probability of an early, rudimentary Roland legend in northern France

We shall now examine the possibility that before the year 1000, at least a rudimentary Roland legend existed in the northern half of what is France today. We have to discuss two very complex pieces of evidence.

C.15.6.1 The forged donation by Abbot Fulrad mentioning *Rotlanus comes*

Tangl (1907, passim) provided an excellent description of the will of Abbot Fulrad of Saint-Denis prepared in 776/777, complete with its historical background, its three versions A-C, and the forged version D; Lejeune (1975, passim) published an equally reliable assessment of the different views about this text that have emerged in French literary studies over the years, and so I have assumed in the following account that her work is widely known.

Versions A and B are authentic even by modern standards because they are signed by Fulrad himself. However, the scribe of B has simply retained the name of the scribe of A, as well as the signatures of the two consentient parties, and in the witness list he has replicated at least a few of the crosses. Moreover, B has been slightly shortened in comparison with A (in the listing of previous owners), and a few mainly geographical details have been expanded, although there is no sign of an intention to falsify anything; one name is added to the 17 witnesses in A: *signum † Rotgero*.

Version C is a more or less contemporaneous pseudo-original made by a third scribe also from Saint-Denis, with a few more geographical and stylistic changes (including especially the addition of *monachorum* five times), but still, according to Tangl, with no obvious intention to falsify anything;[1708] the amount of the fine is increased; the signature supposedly of Fulrad and the crosses of the witnesses have been added by the scribe; the first witness *Teudricus* or now *Teodoricus* is given the title of Count [probably justified historically, cf. MGH DD.kar. 1.156, a. 775]; instead of *signum † Rotgero*, there is a duplicated *signum † Raulcone comite* (but as 10th and 14th witness) [a Count Raulco is historical, MGH DD.kar. 1.10,18 and 31s., a. 759 and probably also 753 and 766], and three more witnesses below the level of count have been added.

[1708] Unlike Tangl, however, I believe that this addition of *monachorum* five times reflects the emerging difference in perspective between the Abbot and the Convent on the distribution of the income, which later, in the year 832, was resolved through a contract between the two (Tardif 1866, 84, Nr. 123); to this extent, then, C was written with a particular purpose in mind. Cf. the following n. below!

Version D has a different content than A, B and C: it supposedly documents Fulrad's donation of Andolsheim in Upper Alsace to the Saint-Denis-owned Priory of Leberau/Lièpvre, also in Upper Alsace, which means ultimately to Saint-Denis. D can only be dated palaeographically, but we have the thoroughly justified assessment made by Tangl (1907, 205s.) of "not before the end of the 9th c.", "roughly at this time [scil. around the year 903], the end of the 9th c. or the beginning of the 10th c.". Tangl's view is supported by Philippe Lauer (1944–1945, 382) who edited the charters of Charles the Simple (893–923) and Louis IV (930–954), and whose authority as an expert in West Frankish palaeography of this period is beyond all doubt: "d'une main de la fin du IXe ou plutôt du début du Xe siècle, ainsi que le prouvent les g bouclés au-dessous de la ligne et les panses ondulées des lettres". The forger was aware of A or B because he has in his witness list a *Hainricus*, as in A and B, and not a *Hainradus* as in C; but from C he took the introductory sentence, Fulrad's description of himself in the middle, a few geographical details, and finally the whole closing part beginning with the *actum* formula, including the witness list (with the above-mentioned change, and a few more which we will go on to address now) and the name of the scribe; however, imitating a royal charter, before the *actum* formula, he entered the signature of Charlemagne in the form *Signum Karoli* (followed by Charlemagne's monogram) *gloriosissimi regis*.[1709]

For our purposes, the witness list is very important: apart from small orthographical changes, of the kind that we encounter all the time in this period, D replaces all VLat. obliquus cases in possessive function and ending in *-o/-e* with the correct genitive endings *-i/-is*,[1710] has † *Signum Hainrici* corresponding to † *Signum Hainrico* in A and B as opposed to † *Signum Hainrado* in C and replaces the duplicated †*Signum Raulcone comite* in C (which has no equivalent in A and B) with (just one) †*Signum Rotlani comitis*. And he composed the space for the list of witnesses and Charlemagne's signature very carefully: the list of witnesses is drawn up in four columns, the middle two of which are shorter, leaving enough space for Charlemagne's signature to take pride of place beneath: the quasi-signature of Count *Rotlan*, being the bottom one in the second

---

1709 His use of the formula *semota cuiuspiam abbatis dominatione* shows even more clearly than C that he is not just concerned about the rights of Saint-Denis, but he is especially interested in the rights of the monks as opposed to the abbot; cf. the previous n.!

1710 The people who formulated versions A to C of Fulrad's will would have learned their Latin in approximately 760, when the Carolingian reforms had only just started, whereas the forger of D would presumably have learned his in around 880, when elementary Latin grammar was drilled into learners in school.

column, is the only one placed directly above Charlemagne's autograph mono-
gram, a fact which Lejeune (1975, 200s.) rightly highlights.

How can we explain the addition of Roland? Lauer (1944–1945, 383) was
the first to stress the presence in the witness list of *Anselmus comes palatii*, re-
nowned as the second of the three warriors killed at Roncevaux and mentioned
by Einhart, as well as the witness *Harihardus* (in C *Arihardus*) *comes*, which is
fairly similar to the first of the three names cited by Einhart, *Eggihardus regiae
mensae praepositus* (on his gravestone, MGH PLAeC 1.109s.: *Aggiardus*). This
led later scholars to pose the question: did the forger come to think of Roland,
not because he had heard something remarkable about him, nut because he
had been reading Einhart's mention of Eggihard and Anselm? Has he even re-
constituted Einhart's trio in an effort to give his forged document some extra
support, so to speak? An essentially affirmative answer was given by Horrent
(1951a, 300), Siciliano (1951, 195) and Pellegrini (1964, 109s.).

But it appears to be untenable. If the forger knew about Count Roland only
from the *Vita Karoli*, and if he now were reminded of him by the mention of
Anselm, then we would expect the form of the name to be similar to the form
that Einhart used, especially since the list is supposed to sound authentically
Carolingian. At this point we must draw a clear distinction. Sometimes names
ending in *-landus* (and in fact mostly, but not exclusively in the Occitan and
Franco-Provençal region) in the 9th c. are written as *-lannus*, *-lanus* and *-lan*:
Morlet cites a *Rodlanus* from the year 832 in Limoges, a *Rotlannus* from about
880 in the Languedoc region, a *Rotlan* from 888–898 in Mâcon; from my own
material we can add: *Rotlamnus* [sic] about 830 MGH LC. 2.363.19 (essentially
contemporaneous written record, Saint-Étienne de Lyon), *Hrotlan* Tardif 108
a. 859 (original, from Marœuil, Diocese of Arras, but written for Saint-Maur des
Fossés, Diocese of Paris, concerning an estate in the Telleu and Vimeu region),
Rotlannus Bourgogne-Pérard 153 about 876 (= Bourgogne-Garnier 114 about
869).[1711] But these are all ordinary people, whose names the scribe would have
written in an *ad hoc* way, based on what he heard; conclusions about a literary
text reflecting a written source cannot be drawn from these references. In our
particular case, five of the six mss. of the *Vita Karoli* verifiably dating from be-
fore the year 1000 have the form *Hruodlandus,* the sixth has *Rotlandus* (cf. sec-
tion C.15.2.3 'Roland in Einhart's *Vita Karoli*' above); of the 38 mss. with a name
which Pertz (MGH SS. 2.448) reads as Roland, only his ms. 10c* from the 14th

---

1711 Other names ending in *-landus* are occasionally written as *-lannus* in the whole of east-
ern France (but this seems to die out after a while); Morlet cites (s. vv.) *Gundolannus* Gorze
a. 770, *Berlannus*, *Tetlannus/Teutlannus* in the *Polyptychon Sancti Remigii* (Reims, about 850),
Warlannus Autun a. 865, *Welannus* Gorze a. 894.

c. (!) has *Ruodlannus*, and it is a copy of ms. 10c from the 12th c., which still has *Ruodlandus*. Under these circumstances, the assumption that there was a 9th c. manuscript of the *Vita Karoli*, now lost, with *Rotlanus* seems extremely far-fetched.[1712]

The trio hypothesis arouses some even more serious reservations. An ambitious forger such as this one would surely have arranged the three names so that they appear close together, to encourage the reader to make the desired association; but whereas in C, *Raulcone* was written immediately below *Arihardo*, in the forged text D, *Rotlani*, *Harihardi* and *Anselmi* are written as no. 10, 13 and 17 in different columns, and at different heights – they could hardly have been placed further apart in the list. Apart from these reservations about *Rotlan*, there are also issues with *Harihard*: *Aggiardus/Eggihardus* (> NHG *Eckhard*) and *(H)Arihardus* (> NHG *Erhard*) are two completely different names; *-r-* and *-g-* or even *-gg-* were not similar in sound, nor in written form.

An almost diametrically opposed solution was suggested by Bédier in a distinctly laconic account (1926–1929, 4.424 n. 1 *in fine*): since the name *Raulco* might have 'somehow' embarrassed the forger, he replaced it with the more common name *Roland*. So the forger distrusted the name of a real count and replaced it with that of another real count because he mistook the latter for a non-count name? It is difficult to find anything more arbitrary than this.[1713]

Aebischer ([1965] 1967, 118s.) suggested a more detailed solution than Bédier: "Notre copiste aura reconnu un *r* initial, puis quelques jambages où le *a* pouvait fort bien être pris pour un *o*, puis un *l*, puis un groupe *co* qu'il n'a pu lire du fait qu'il figurait dans une tache du parchemin, enfin un *n*." But the name appears twice in C, and because D replaces it with a single *Rotlani*, he must have noticed the duplication. The *a* cannot be read as an *o* in either of the two places where the name is written; the *quelques jambages* are on both occasions exactly two *jambages* of a clear *u*, which cannot even be confused with *n*; the *co* is on a part of the parchment that is in bad condition in one of the two places, but in the other, it is perfectly legible (cf. the facsimile in Lejeune 1975, 198).

1712 Wilsdorf (1962, 412) accepts that the form *Rotlan(i)* comes from the oral tradition; but he thinks that the forger only hit upon Roland because of the combined effect of *Anselmus comes palatii* and the date of Fulrad's genuine will (between 1st of June and 8th November 777, in other words in the year immediately before the fateful event in 778).

1713 Incidentally, among the names in this list there is one more which, at least within Gaul, is attested only here, and this time the forger seems not in the least disconcerted about it: *Hadtritto (A)/Adtritto (B)/Hattritto (C)/Hadtritao (D)*. The name is Gothic (*Atharidus*, Förstemann s.v. ATHA).

We might ask a slightly different question: would it not be much more logical for the forger to write 'Count Roland' if both he and his audience were able to associate this name with some idea or other? Even Aebischer ([1965] 1967, 119) answers this question in the affirmative, and although he does not believe in the historicity of Roland, he believes that a poet had created him *ex nihilo* quite early – probably in the first half of the 9th c. It seems then, that apart from him, Tangl (1907, 206s.), who enjoyed the privilege of the first, untainted view of the issue, Lauer (1944–145, 383), who likewise judged things as historian, and not as a specialist in French literature, Menéndez Pidal (1960, 303s.), Wilsdorf (1962, 412) and Lejeune (1975, passim) all expressed their opinion that the oral tradition played a role, which means a legend was forming, or the start of an epic. I, too, think this interpretation of the forgery is most likely to be correct. The fact that the form *Rotlan(i)* probably, but not certainly, originates in Occitan or Franco-Provençal is discussed below (C.15.7.4) and the explanation for this is that the early Roland legend was popular in that region.

C.15.6.2 The Roland episode in Dudo of Saint-Quentin

In 1902, a certain Bortolo Faggion published a 12-page article in the Italian magazine *Il Saggiatore* which pointed out the similarity between the scene in which a Frankish standard-bearer dies in *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum* by Dudo of Saint-Quentin on the one hand[1714] and the Rol. on the other; he decided that this scene was a source for the Song. Faggion's core idea came to F. Lot (1904, 469) via Ph.-Aug. Becker (1903, passim), but Lot rejected it – and he was right, at least in terms of the suggested direction of the borrowing. Jenkins (1928, p. LXXXVI) also mentioned this *Francisci agminis signifer Rotlandus*, but immediately commented that he "may have nothing to do with the Roland of Roncesvaux". Lejeune (1950, 393–395) on the other hand, thought the scene was completely unhistorical, believing it was invented by Dudo, as an imitation of a Song of Roland that existed in the time before there was a written record of it. In my view, her hypothesis must be modified in one crucial respect. Unfortunately, this is another situation where very close analysis is required.

[a] Dudo was sent to Richard I of Normandy by his sovereign Albert of Vermandois shortly before the latter's death († 987), (Dudo ed. Lair [in the following, Dudo for short] p. 295, Vopelius-Holtzendorff 1970, 92). Dudo and Richard liked each other, and Dudo maintained their friendship through many visits to Richard

---

1714 The scene is then included in shortened form by Guillaume de Jumièges (2.4[10] ed. van Houts) but restored in Dudo's full form by Robert de Torigni.

(*more frequentativo*) and then to his successor Richard II. In about 994, just two years after the death of Richard I, the second Richard asked him to write the history of the Norman ruling house (Dudo p. 119). Dudo finished his work in 1015 at the earliest, because that is when he became Dean of Saint-Quentin, as he calls himself in the work's dedicatory letter addressed to Adalbero of Laon (on this completion date, Vopelius-Holtzendorff 1970, 94), and by 1026 at the latest, because Richard II is only ever referred to in the work as being alive (Prentout 1916, 14, and Fauroux 1953, passim). Dudo explains that he has acquired his knowledge from Count Raoul d'Ivry, a half-brother of Richard I, whom he even calls *hujus operis relatorem* (Dudo p. 119, 125), and since we can establish that Dudo has quite an expansive knowledge of classical and specifically Christian literature until the late Carolingian period (Vopelius-Holtzendorff 1970, 300–354, 532–533), but not of the Carolingian Annals or any later historical literature, this statement is very probably quite accurate. Dudo's extremely fawning attitude towards the Norman ruling house, which is evident throughout the work, shows us that he had firmly decided not to write down anything that the family would disapprove of – and having the brother of a count as *relator* was therefore the simplest and surest guarantee of this.

[b] The episode of most interest to us (Dudo p. 154–157) is in Book II (cap. 12–15) and is entirely devoted to Rollo. Dudo has described how Rollo and his Normans have been fighting in Friesland and Hainaut and have just taken control of Rouen. Our episode takes place as they then head towards Paris. This whole section of Book II has two weaknesses. First, the Norman army did not take Rouen in the year 876 (as Dudo claims on p. 151), but according to the *Ann. Vedastini* on the 25th July 885; unless there was already a copying error relating to the cumbersome Roman numerals in the archetype (as assumed by Lair, p.58), the error is due to a miscalculation by Count Raoul – of nine years out of about 130 – and this is understandable if Raoul has to calculate backwards in time adding up single phrases of the type "X years later" one by one. Secondly, the Christian historiography of the time (*Ann. Vedastini* for the year 885; Abbo, *Bella Parisiacae urbis* 1.37–2.61 and 2.220) notes that in the battle for Paris that followed, the Normans were not led by Rollo, but by *Sigefridus* and *Sinricus*. Rollo († 927 rather than 917) is not mentioned in Christian sources at all until the year 911, when the agreement with Charles the Simple was made, but at that point he is the only and undisputed leader of the Seine (~ Normandy) Normans. His family will have to fight more than once against rebellious fellow-Normans in the following century and a half, but there is never any sign of a family in competition with the ruling house for control of Normandy; Rollo's dominance, as far as his fellow Normans allowed such a thing, seems to have

been firmly established long before 911.[1715] Under these circumstances, modern assumptions about the year of his arrival in Normandy are necessarily arbitrary, and because Rouen was controlled by Normans throughout the whole period from 886 to 911, we can assume (as Lair does, p.54s.) that the young Rollo was among the conquering army of 886, though he would have played a minor role in their victory; the family tradition, quite understandably, would have expanded his later renown to reach back into his youthful years. These two faults are not specific to our episode, therefore, because they overshadow the whole first part of Book II; if we put them to one side, our episode has a surprisingly large number of individual points which turn out to be historical. Let us examine the details!

[c] According to Dudo (p. 154 top) the Normans proceeded from Rouen upriver along the Seine *ad Archas usque, quae As Dans*[1716] *dicitur* 'as far as Pont-de-l'Arche [on the south bank of the Seine about 20 km south-southeast of Rouen, but on the meandering river the distance is about twice as long; cf. the plural according to DT Eure also in *Pons Archas*, around 1020], and as far as Les Damps [today a suburb of Pont-de-l'Arche, 1 km to the east]'. They erected a fortified camp there (as they usually did on occasions like this, Steenstrup 1877, 1.365 with n. 1); but they left the entrance to this camp extra wide, as a trap for the enemy (Dudo p. 155 bottom). The *Ann. Vedastini* only state that the Normans holed up somewhere on the southern bank of the Seine: *fluvium* [*scil.* the Seine] *transierunt, et sedem sibi firmare non desistunt*. The truth of Dudo's more detailed claim is supported by several factors: 1) Almost 4 km further upriver, the Seine was blocked by the famous fortified Bridge of Pîtres (Lot 1904, 469, 472). 2) Near Les Damps, the Eure comes from the east to within about 200 m of the Seine, before it flows into the Seine west of Pont-de-l'Arche. The Normans did not know whether a Frankish army would come towards them along the Eure from Chartres or along the Seine from Paris; it would not have been clever to have such an army on their flank or at their back. 3) Dudo emphasises (p. 155), that the camp was still visible during his own lifetime. The route passing by that place from Rouen to Paris and to Chartres was very busy once again during his lifetime, not least because of French traders, and so a false claim about the location would quickly have been awkward for him; his statement is

---

1715 This would still be true even if, contrary to our expectation, Guillaume de Jumièges (3.7–8) were correct in his claim that the Normans had chosen Rollo to be their leader by drawing lots (when exactly?).

1716 According to Lair's critical edition, one Dudo ms. has instead the variant *usque Asdan*. Guillaume de Jumièges, judging by van Hout's critical edition, then writes *Hasdans*.

therefore reliable. 4) In fact, the etymology of *As Dans*, today Les Damps, is simply *Ad Danos* (Lot 1904, 472), and so the memory of this camp is retained in the name.[1717] 5) "On a découvert en ce lieu des bracelets et un collier en bronze scandinaves" (Lair p. 154 n. *a*). 6) The idea that the Normans left the entrance temptingly wide is also credible; they were very skilled in tactics, and especially so in military tricks, and they were proud of this (there is a summary that is still worth reading today by Steenstrup, 1877, 22–28 and 363–373).

[d] According to Dudo (p. 154) the Frankish army advanced towards the Normans along the Eure (*Othura*). After a day of waiting and reconnaissance – I will come back to this later – they received Holy Communion there on the following morning, in anticipation of the battle that was to come (which was standard practice, cf. Rol. 1124–1141), and they did this in the church that Lot (1904, 470) identified as the *ecclesia Sancti Germani* (Dudo p. 155s.), which in 1330 became the second parish church in Louviers (DT Eure s. v.); it is situated only 300 m from the Eure and about 9 km from Les Damps. (Incarville, which today is located between the two, was according to the DT Eure later founded by the Normans: in 1026 *Wiscardivilla*.)

Dudo (p. 154) says that the commander of the Frankish army was called *Ragnoldus, princeps totius Franciae*. The exaggeration is understandable: according to the *Ann. Vedastini* (for the year 885), in those days *Ragnoldus dux Cenomannicus* was in command of the whole army of *Neustria atque Burgundia*. After the West Frankish kingdom had lost the original *limes Britannicus* to Brittany, their line of defence now ran from Angers to Le Mans; the *dux* of Le Mans therefore always kept a large number of troop units at the ready during these war years. While Count Odo and Bishop Gauzlin were tied up with their preparations for the defence of Paris, he would have hoped to cut off the Normans as they were heading from Rouen to Paris. The Frankish army did in fact, as Dudo says, come down the Eure and not the Seine, and this means that the taking of Holy Communion in Saint-Germain, at that time on the northern edge of Louviers, is quite plausible. Dudo's geography is therefore perfectly consistent.

1717 The DT Eure s. v. cites among other things: around 1020 *Dans*, *Hasdancs*, a. 1258 *Sanctus Petrus des Dans*, a. 1631 *Lesdans* and even from the year 1814 *Les Dans*; the modern spelling is therefore arbitrary. Mlat. *Dani* was evidently taken into the vernacular in the 9th c. (meaning 'Normans') as *li *Dan*, *les *Dans*. Before recorded history, this was then replaced as part of the appellative vocabulary, though not in place names, by nominalisation of the adjective (*li, les*) *Daneis* (< *Dan-isc-i, -os* 'Dan-ish'), just as *Franc* was replaced by *Franceis*, only more abruptly, probably because **Dan* was less common than *Franc*, and offered less resistance to the change.

[e] According to Dudo (p. 154–156, passim) *Alstingus* was also in the Frankish army, or rather, as he is usually called in the scholarly literature, Hasting,[1718] formerly the leader of the Loire Normans, whose previous raids had been described in sombre terms by Dudo in Book I (after which, *e contrario*, Rollo's deeds were intended to shine all the more brightly). In fact, according to the *Ann. Vedastini* for the year 882, he was welcomed by King Louis the Younger *in amicitiam*. In my view, this cannot mean just a ceasefire or a one-off agreement, but only a relationship forged for the longer term, in this context therefore: the King had accepted him into his service, as a liegeman.[1719] The same source states that in

---

1718 The Lair edition calls him *Alstingus* most of the time, but on p. 166 e.g. (which is the last mention of the name, separated from the penultimate one by more than ten printed pages) *Halstingus*; the mss. are very inconsistent, and apart from these two forms, we also find some with *(H)Anst-* and *(H)Ast-* (which means there is some influence from Lat. *hasta* > OF *haste*, *hanste*). He is also called *Alstingus* in the West Frankish *Ann. Vedastini*, *Astingus* in the likewise West Frankish *Ann. Bertiniani*, *Hastingus* in probably German-speaking Regino and in the post-Dudo Normans, that is to say Guillaume de Jumièges and his editors Ordericus Vitalis and Robert de Torigni, both in the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* 2.4(10) (as well as Ordericus in his *Hist.eccl.* 2.3.2, Robert in his chronicle, his Annals for the year 851 and in his treatise on monastic orders), and in the *Draco Normannicus* (lib. 1, cap. 15s., 19, 22s.), *Hæsten* in the Old English Annals. I note there are some later unique forms such as *Astencus* in Ademar-βγ (3.20), *Alstenius* in an 11th c. sermon from Saint-Quentin (MGH SS. 15.1, 272), *Hastain*, *Hastaim* in Wace (ed. Holden, Index, where the co-occurrence of *-n* and *-m* is irrelevant, because in Wace's phoneme system the nasal consonants in the final syllable have merged), *Hastenc* in Benoît (vv. 5386–5703 ed. Fahlin). *Huasten* in the complex of Angevin chronicles of the 12th c. (ed. Halphen/Poupardin 1913, 21 and 38) is simply corrupted. The Norse form it is based on is disputed (cf. e.g. B. Amory 1979, 265–268), because of, among other things, attempts (also by Amory), to link them with artefacts from the Migration Period or the half-mythical Danish early period. Hasting is without doubt one of the most famous of all the Vikings, but he is also shrouded in many legends. Like other parts of Dudo's writings about him, our episode is copied by Guillaume de Jumièges (in shortened form), Ordericus (in the *Hist.eccl.* severely shortened) and Robert (restoring Dudo's text in full), in the *Draco* and indirectly in Wace and Benoît (all references as above). On other post-Dudo Hasting sagas which are more locally based, cf. Amory (1979, 274–276). As far as the parts of Hasting's biography that are of interest to us are concerned, Amory's article is inadequate, because it tries to please everyone by conflating issues (including stylistic features) and this makes the main points less than clear.

1719 According to Dudo (p. 137) the King bought his services with money, according to Guillaume de Jumièges (1.11) the King gave him the County of Chartres; the award of the title is judged not credible by many scholars, but in the whole of the period in question, no other Count of Chartres is attested. Prentout (1916, 63) is convinced that Guillaume de Jumièges is not trying to exaggerate what Dudo says here, but that both men are relying on an oral tradition that is inconsistent. Be that as it may, if *Hastingus* was to remain in the *amicitia* of the King, the gift of some kind of position within the feudal system was necessary, and it would have to have been quite a generous one.

890 Hasting was still in the western kingdom, and there is no news of any hostile acts on his part; he was therefore probably still *in amicitia* with the crown in 885 (after Louis and Carloman, now Charles the Fat, all of them Carolingians). Given all of this background, it is practically self-evident that in 885 he would have been obliged as a liegeman to provide military service, and so there is no reason to doubt his presence at this time on the Frankish side.

[f] Converts of this type who entered into service arrangements with the Franks almost inevitably found themselves in an ambivalent position: they were valued for their knowledge of Norman affairs including their tactics and the Norse language, and they were useful in certain circumstances as emissaries and lower level negotiators; but they could never be completely free of the suspicion that if a suitable opportunity arose, they would defect to their own people. Thus, we see in one case according to the *Ann. Vedastini* (for the years 883 and 884) the Danish Christian Sigefrid negotiates on behalf of the Franks with the Normans in the Oise region, and after lengthy discussions succeeds in agreeing a ceasefire. On another occasion, however, according to the *Ann. Bertiniani*, the Dane Heriold, whom Emperor Lothar had enfeoffed in the year 841 with Walcheren and the area around it, defected back to his own people. In spite of this, Lothar gave Dorestad 'and other counties' to Heriold's nephew Rorich in 850, but Rorich was a very ambivalent Christian in this place, and his behaviour was such that the inhabitants drove him out before 867. Weland, the Norman who had ordered his fleet out of the Seine in 862 and with his whole family and a few followers had become a Christian and liegeman of Charles the Bald, was accused of treason a year later by two kinsmen and was killed in a judicial single combat with one of them. According to the *Ann. Vedastini*, the Dane Godefried received the *regnum Fresonum* as a fiefdom in 882 from Charles the Fat, and Gisela, the daughter of Charles' deceased cousin Lothar II, in marriage, but in 885, *quia disponebat suam inmutare fidem* 'because he wanted to defect', he was murdered by Duke Henry, Charles' closest confidant, and therefore certainly with Charles' approval (cf. Dümmler 1862–1865, 2.239–241). Similarly, we see Hasting in an ambivalent role, but only after the turn of the year 887/888 (in other words after the time that interests us) after Charles the Fat was deposed which meant that the ruling dynasty that had forged a relationship *in amicitiam* was now no longer in control of Gaul, and at the same time, there was uneasiness among the French nobility because of the new Capetian king: according to the *Ann. Vestadini,* in 890 *Alstingus cum suis* settled in Argœuves-sur-Somme (6 km northwest of Amiens), signed an agreement *per dolum* with the Abbot of Saint-Vaast (near Arras), *ut libere posset ire quo vellet*, and then turned up outside Saint-Vaast and Arras. At this point, the Abbot was afraid

that Hasting and his people would summon a Norman army that was camped at Noyon, and (the text is unfortunately not very clear at this point) *insidias timens – quod etiam Alstingus mandaverat – populum retinuit*. The abbot launched a few superficial attacks which can only have succeeded if Hasting's army were very small, Hasting retreated, and the abbot, *cognita veritate post eorum discessu, multum doluit*, which can only mean that he regretted his lack of faith in Hasting. (This shows both the abbot's ambivalent behaviour towards the 'outsider' and the annalist's inconsistent record of events.[1720]) Shortly after that, Hasting and his people left Gaul once and for all to wage war in England for a few years, before finally disappearing from history.

Let us return to the year 885, to the episode of interest to us, in which Hasting conducts himself blamelessly. On the day before the battle (p. 154) Ragnold asks him for advice, since Hasting is of Norman heritage; Hasting suggests that emissaries should be sent, in order to obtain some kind of answer from the Normans (presumably in response to a demand that they should submit and become incorporated). Ragnold gives this task to Hasting himself. Hasting responds curtly: *Non ibo solus* because he obviously does not want to be accused later of some kind of treachery. Two others who also understand the Norse language are sent with him. Hasting's negotiations with the Normans turn out, as one might expect, to be unsuccessful; I will return to this in a moment. Ragnold then asks Hasting, who has had the chance to take a look at the enemy army, if it would be wise to launch an attack on them (p. 155 middle). Hasting replies that the enemy are strong, armed to the teeth, very well-trained young warriors in their prime, and it would be very dangerous to attack them, – an answer which, on the following day, would turn out to be horribly true. But *quidam Francisci agminis signifer nomine Rotlandus* (single mss. *Rodlandus*, *Rollandus*) blurts out: *Quid huic consulitis? Nunquam lupo lupus nec vulpis vulpe blasphemabitur*. And Hasting, as an outsider under suspicion, can only reply resignedly: *Amodo a me bellum non blasphemabitur*. It is clear that Hasting's clipped responses are appropriate for the situation that the real Hasting found himself in after 882; and the proverb cited by Roland sums up the feelings of the opposing party. When Roland is killed on the following day (p. 156), *Ragnoldus et Alstingus* take flight together;[1721] and with that, Hasting disappears from Dudo's work.

[1720] We should draw the same conclusion when Dudo still attaches very negative epithets to Hasting in Book II, even though he is not up to any tricks there; they are just a lingering echo from Book I.

[1721] They flee *hilares*; this rather unfortunate choice of words clearly means in this context 'happy to have escaped with their lives'. It is syntactically not possible, and quite wrong, to

Hasting is absolutely not a Ganelon-like figure: he will always be an out-sider in his new surroundings because he is a convert, whereas Ganelon is the brother-in-law of the emperor; Hasting is constantly being suspected of treason, while Ganelon may be accused of cowardice by Roland but no one suspects him of collaborating with the enemy until it is too late; Hasting has to insist that he will not meet the enemy without witnesses, while Ganelon achieves his aims solely because he has been allowed to deal with the enemy in the absence of any witnesses; Hasting reports an honest assessment of the danger he saw on his mission, but he does not square up to someone who is ready to fight, while Ganelon falsifies the account of his mission to make the enemy seem harmless and sends those who want to fight into battle to meet their death. In short, there are no grounds for seeing the figure of Hasting as being influenced by the figure of Ganelon, or vice-versa.

There is only one remaining similarity between Dudo's council scene and Turold's council scene that is notable and still requires an explanation: the identical name of the one who objects, which is Roland. It is worth remember-ing, however, that a dispute between someone who favours aggression and someone who favours defence or peace in council scenes has been a familiar *topos* from antiquity onwards. For example, two hundred years before Dudo, Ermoldus Nigellus (lib. 1, vv. 119ss.) reports how the young Louis the Pious asks his advisers for an assessment of the situation: Lupus Sanctio, the Gascon, offspring of a family which has long been hostile to the Franks, advises peace; William is annoyed, demanding that they should conquer Barcelona instead, and he wins the argument.

[g] The episode describing Hasting's mission to the enemy has probably helped to create the impression that Dudo's narrative is fictitious (Dudo p. 154 middle –155 top). The laconic nature of the Christian annals makes it impossible to prove that those who spoke for the two parties were specifically Hasting and Rollo; but the speakers are incidental, while the negotiation itself is the main point. Hasting and his escorts present themselves as royal emissaries within hailing distance of the Normans and ask who these people are, where they have come from, and what their intention is; the answer is that they are Nor-mans and they have come to conquer France. This brazen reply is more than corroborated in the *Ann. Vedastini* (for the year 885): a few months beforehand, these same Normans, who had taken control of Rouen and were now standing

---

make the plural only refer to Hasting and to detect a sarcastic enjoyment in a betrayal that they have 'somehow' managed to pull off (as argued by Amory 1979, 273).

in front of Hasting, had even mocked the troops who had come from the West Frankish kingdom to meet them near Louvain in Belgium: *Ut quid ad nos venistis? Non fuit necesse. Nos scimus, qui estis; et vultis, ut ad vos redeamus; quod faciemus.*[1722]

Hasting asks for the name of their leader. 'There isn't one; because we are all equal, *aequalis potestatis.*' This was indeed how the Norman invaders of the 9th c. saw themselves: none of them had come because of conscription or any obligation to serve; they were in search of fame and even more eager for plunder, and so they had joined up with a leader who would have military command over them for the duration of their adventure – and even then, he would if at all possible consult with the participants, since such a troop would have no chance of success without consultation, but this did not give him any kind of social supremacy over them, even after the event was over. Abbo also tries to explain this (lib. 1, v. 38) in relation to Sigefred, the leader of the Normans: *Solo rex verbo; sociis tamen imperitabat* 'He was king in name only, except that he was [for the duration of their French campaign] their military commander' (whereby even the nominal title of king is doubtful).

The words of the Normans fit very well with the 9th c., and it is difficult to imagine that Dudo or his Rollonid informant invented them. After 911, Rollo and his descendants gradually but resolutely replaced this idea of freedom, even at times by force when it proved necessary, with a feudal hierarchy modelled on that of the French, because they quickly realised that this would make their power more secure, especially through hereditary succession; moreover, their support for Christianity and especially their assistance in rebuilding the Church's hierarchy, through Rollo's son William Longsword, and even more emphatically through William's son Richard I, not only created good prebends for relatives and friends of the dukes, but also brought benefits to themselves, through the doctrine that God had ordained the power of princes (as deduced from *Rom* cap. 13). The Normans now generally accepted the exchange of an old abstract kind of freedom for a new kind of wealth and relative security – apart from occasional outbreaks which were very dangerous for the ducal dynasty. The fact that Raoul openly speaks of these things indicates that they had been passed down through the ages and were still well known across Normandy.

In Dudo's account, Hasting then begins to talk about himself: 'Whose example have you followed to come here? Have you ever heard of a certain Alsting?'

[1722] These words, and the quote from Abbo which follows were of course cited and commented upon by almost every modern historian of the Normans. I am not striving for originality in any way here, but I would like to point out how Dudo's narrative is borne out at every step by the conditions of the late 9th, and not the 11th c.

At this point Guillaume de Jumièges (lib. 2, cap. 10), even though he usually just seems to follow Dudo, has a better linking passage: the Normans ask who this person is, who is talking so skilfully (*facete*) with them; this interest in him as a person, over and above his status as an emissary, evidently comes from the fact that he speaks Norse fluently. The question that Hasting asks next, the very same question that is in Dudo's version, is therefore a counter-question in Guillaume's version, and the context shows that he is clearly introducing himself. It is quite likely, then, that Guillaume (who admits to having lived through events from 1026–1027 as a young man) also knew about this story through the oral tradition.

The Normans again give a brazen answer: yes, they have heard of Alsting; he started out strongly, but *malum finem exitumque sortitum est* 'he came to an ignominious end', evidently when he went over to the Frankish side.[1723] This too, can hardly have been Dudo's own invention. His Norman readers would have easily spotted the parallels with their own time: had not Rollo in similar fashion met an "ignominious end" at a later date? And was the current subjection to the ducal dynasty not even more shameful than that? Hasting's next question, asking if they wanted to *colla submittere* to Charles [the Fat, the correct ruler for the year 885] and receive many fiefdoms in return, receives of course the proud reply *Nunquam cuilibet subjugabimus*, and the emissaries are sent back.

[h] In the end, the inevitable came to pass. The West Frankish army was lined up, ready to block the Normans on their march towards Paris, and it attacked on the morning after the collective Holy Communion. The Normans would have been stupid if they had failed to use the strategic advantage of their camp; they pretended to have only a small number of troops, many of their men lying down close to its broad entrance and covering themselves up with their shields. *Rotlandus, signifer Ragnoldi*, leading a section of the army, stormed the camp; the Normans leapt up and cut them all down *in momento*; when *Ragnoldus et Alstingus* saw that these men had been killed, they fled with the rest of the army. But Rollo turned to his people: 'What have we ever done to harm the Franks? Why did they want to kill us? They were the attackers, *eia,* go after them!'

Finally, Dudo describes quite cursorily how the Normans pressed forward as far as Meulan and conquered it, how Ragnold assembled troops once again, but when the Normans were about to break through, how he fled once more, and how

---

1723 *Sortitus est* in the weaker sense 'he came to be (driven by fate or similar), he was destined to be' is found in classical Latin. Therefore, the Normans do not think Hasting is dead, nor are they *prophesying* – as Amory (1979, 273) erroneously interprets the text – that he will come to a bad end.

when he was escaping, a certain *piscator Sequanae, attributus Rolloni, obviavit teloque transverberatum occidit*. The term *attributus* does not make it clear whether this was a Norman who was sent out by Rollo to go fishing for provisions, or whether he was a Frankish fisherman by trade who had gone over to the Normans. The *Ann. Vedastini* briefly report: *Sed ut congredi debuerunt, contigit ruere Ragnoldum ducem Cinomannicum cum paucis, et hinc rediere omnes ad loca sua cum magna tristitia, nil actum utile.*

As far as the doubling of events in Dudo is concerned (death of the standard-bearer, then death of the army commander Ragnold), as opposed to the single event in the *Ann. Vedastini* (death of the army commander Ragnold), Lair (p. 58) rightly emphasises the fact that Roland's death, from a strategic point of view, was only the introductory episode of the main battle that was about to happen, and as such, we would not expect it to be recounted in Annals at all. For historians *tout court* the problem is resolved; but for literary historians like us, the key question remains unanswered: whether or why the commander of that section of the army was called *Rotlandus*.

In the light of all these points, we cannot categorise most of the details in this narrative as Dudo's own creation, and neither is the intention behind the whole story down to him. First, it would be very strange if the Normans had known so little about Rollo's military experiences that Dudo felt the need to insert an episode like this. Secondly, since the Carolingian Roland fable is always narrated with strong feelings of sympathy around Roland's death, it is difficult to imagine that Dudo would be so crass as to tell it from the opposite perspective – and Pellegrini (1964, 107) rightly argues against Lejeune's hypothesis on this point. Lejeune had tried to forestall this objection with her claim that Dudo "a prêté à Rollon, son héros de prédilection, l'honneur d'avoir vaincu un guerrier renommé". But the only *guerrier renommé* was the older Roland, who was always killed in the Western Pyrenees under Charlemagne, and since Dudo wrote for the Franks almost more than he did for the Normans, he could certainly not assume that his audience would think these two Rolands were the same person, since no one ever dies twice. This brings us to the third, and in my opinion, most important counter argument: if the bare plot of the Roland fable – the commander of a section of the Frankish army, on account of his eagerness to fight, is cornered through enemy treachery and then massacred with all his people before the main army can come to his aid – had impressed Dudo so much that he plagiarised it, then he would surely have changed the name of the commander, just to prevent his French audience from being filled with questions and doubts.

If – *contra* Lejeune – Dudo is not the source of this development, we must nevertheless explain our main finding: the similarity of the basic plot *plus* the

use of the same name, taken together, cannot be due to pure chance. In other words: the story probably retells the historical event itself quite accurately, except that the name of the standard-bearer is taken from the Carolingian Roland fable, and this happened *before* Dudo.

The fact that Dudo, a Christian and non-Norman, does not even have the smallest authorial note of sympathy for Roland or for Ragnold shows that he is not inventing them, but merely retelling what Count Raoul was also retelling, that is to say the Norman legend.[1724] The complete absence of an ethical or empathic dimension, this focus on success alone, is characteristic of the Normans during the invasion period, both in their actions and their stories.

It will suffice to look at just one of their actions. When in 886 a tower went up in flames during the siege of Paris, and its defenders were trapped on a semi-destroyed bridge, "the Danes offered to spare their lives, professing admiration for their gallant defence, but no sooner had they laid down their arms than the treacherous barbarians massacred them one and all, and flung their bodies into the river" (Oman 1924, 144, from Abbo 1.556–564).

And as far as the stories are concerned, we only need remember the two most popular, as Seenstrup explains in his classic work (1877, 22–24s.). The story of the feigned death of a Norman commander, whom his people pretend to bury, before abusing the faith of the enemy to inveigle their way into the besieged city and then massacre the inhabitants, is attested in no less than seven versions: the manoeuvre is attributed to four different Scandinavians, including to the young Hasting, by Dudo (p. 132–153) in connection with the Norman offensive against Luni (on the Ligurian coast), and the story lives on in three versions among the Southern Italian Normans until the time of Frederick II. As for the second story: it is said that five different Scandinavians set a besieged city on fire by sending in sparrows with burning pieces of sponge attached to them.[1725] Neither of the two stories is of Scandinavian origin: the 'feigned burial' *topos* is a modernisation

---

1724 To a certain extent, this must be what Auguste le Prévost (1838–1855, 2.8) meant when he describes Dudo's standard-bearer Rotlandus simply as *un personnage supposé, de l'invention des historiens normands*. Le Prévost had no reason to think that the figure was not historical, unless he, too, wanted to imply that the name was taken from the Rol. Moreover, his plural *les historiens normands* cannot mean Dudo *plus* his successors, since the invention is already fully formed in Dudo; I suspect that was thinking more or less of oral invention through anonymous predecessors – a distinction which hardly needed concern him, since in around 1850 he was editing Ordericus and not Dudo, and he was a historian *tout court*, and not a literary historian.

1725 Snorri Sturluson's *Haralds Saga Harðráða* even attributes both of these tricks to King Harald of Norway (killed in 1066 at Stamford Bridge while attempting to seize the English crown) as well as two more tactics for capturing towns (Steenstrup 1877, 24s.)!

of the 'Trojan horse' *topos*, which from the very beginning also included the abuse of the opposing side's religious faith (Odyssey 8.509s.) and in Latin this same motif of abuse was expanded even more in the Aeneid (2.13–198); the burning sparrows strategy (according to de Vries, 1959, 46–48) also has its origins in the east. The adaptation of foreign stories about successful military trick and their immediate transfer into pro-Norman contexts are therefore common practice in vernacular Norman literature. Generally, these contexts will have a core element that is historical (as in the case of Luni, which really was conquered and almost destroyed by the Normans in the year 860), and then a pre-existing narrative scheme would be bolted on to the central core. If we apply this insight to Normandy in the 10th c., or more precisely of the middle third of that century, we arrive at the following explanation.

The part of the population which was of Scandinavian descent had fond memories of the period of conquest, and they still knew about the battle of 885, at the time of an emperor Charles, and especially about the initial part of it, not least because they would have been reminded by the bulwark at Les Damps which was still visible near the great waterway at the fork of two important land routes; they would also have known the subterfuge used in that conflict, but not the name of the commander of the Frankish unit that was tricked into defeat – quite simply because as a rule, people know or remember fewer details about the enemy side. But the gap almost filled itself: the other, indigenous part of the population had a legend – whether in prose or song form – about a certain Roland who served an emperor called Charles and who with his unit had also been tricked into defeat. It was a very simple legend, with no Olivier character in it, and very probably without a Ganelon either. But it contained the name of the leader, the only element that a Norman might have missed in his own story: *Roland*.

It seems to me this was possible only in this atmosphere of naïve, still uncritical desire to transfer stories, and only at this time when the two cultures were beginning to merge.

In summary, then, the mention of a *Rotlanus comes* in the Saint-Denis forgery of the early 10th c, and the Roland scene in Dudo are both arguments in favour of a rudimentary Roland legend in the 10th c. in northern France.

C.15.7 The distribution of the name *Roland*

In parallel with our examination of the distribution in time and space of the name *Olivier*, a similar examination of the name *Roland* is still outstanding. As

compared with the first attempt at such a study in Lejeune (150, 386s.), the explanations that follow are based on a set of material that is several times larger, and this enables us to obtain a perspective, especially in relation to developments before the year 1000, which is clearer, and I hope also more rigorous.

C.15.7.1 Outside Galloromania

Before we examine Galloromania, it will be useful for comparative purposes if we briefly examine the High German-speaking area and Italy.

C.15.7.1.1 The High German-speaking area

Lejeune (1979, 150–152) established that there was an early, but small focus in Wissembourg in Alsace from about 765 to 824; we can supplement this with a reference from Lorsch (2.230 a. 766 *Rŭtlandus*), with Einhart's *puer noster nomine Hruodlandus* from shortly before the year 830 in the Odenwald area (*Translatio et miracula SS. Marcellini et Petri* cap. 11, MGH SS. 15.244) and a series of references from the 9th and 10th c. in Alsace, Lorraine and the area around Hornbach-Trier-Middle Rhine (and rarely -Fulda), which we do not need to discuss here. They are no doubt due to the effect and later influence of the Wido power base, which ended with the death of Lothar II in the year 869 at the latest,[1726] but at the same time there were close regional contacts with neighbouring Galloromania, which shared broadly the same political fate.

There is also a second area of focus from the year 799 onwards, touched upon only briefly by Lejeune (1979, 150–152), which is apparently independent of the first area, but again small in size, in the region around Reichenau-St. Gallen and a third in the Bavarian-Austrian region, which starts between 785 and 797 with a *Hrodlant/Roodlant abbas* in the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg;[1727] these two strands can only be traced as far as the start of the 10th

1726 As far as the difficult question of the origins of the Salian dynasty is concerned (Kaiser a. 1024–1125), it is certain that the Wido family, along with others, are among their ancestors (LM s. v. *Salier*); the link runs via a Count Werner (< *Warnharius*, a Wido name) from the area around the Worms-, Nahe- and Speyergau region at the end of the 9th c. The Salians have at least the founding of the Monastery at Hornbach as a reminder of their Wido heritage. Two factors that played a more significant role in the rise of the family to a powerful position, and the only ones that are relevant onomastically, are the links they made through marriage with the Conradine and Ottonian families respectively.

1727 Cf. also Fleckenstein in his study of the Court Chapel of the German kings (1959–1966, 1.61, also 1.24 and 1.87) on the Chaplain Rodland who had the St. Martin's Chapel at Linz as a fiefdom, even before the year 799, although his origins and social position were probably only modest.

c. But this amounts to just about all the positive information there is about the name in Germania; all in all, the name seems to have disappeared slowly and almost completely from 850 onwards.

This negative finding is not entirely uninteresting, because it shows the fate of a Germanic name that was not linked to an important noble family, nor to the veneration of a saint, nor supported by any secular legend.

When was the name reintroduced through the Rol. to Germany? The only reference I am aware of from my period of interest up to 1150 (and also Förstemann's only Roland reference after the year 1000 from Germany) is Freising-Meichelbeck I/2.525 (no. 1255, in Freising itself) a. 1096 *Ruodland* (among the *testes nobiles*). Socin, in his *Mhd. Namenbuch* has no German references at all, but merely points out that Pope Alexander III (1159–1181) was previously called *Rollandus* [Rolando Bandinelli, born in Siena in 1100/ 1105, G.A.B.]. French literature specialists Lejeune/Stiennon (1966, 1.111), unfortunately still believed that in about 1120 Archbishop Frederick I of Cologne, who had studied in France, had founded the convent of Rolandseck, or rather Rolandswerth, on the island in the Rhine about 18 km upriver of Bonn, today known as Nonnenwerth. But the convent's foundation charter of 1126, which survives in original form (in the Düsseldorf national archives: Köln-Reg. 1901, 228 = Niederrhein 197s.), calls it *Růleicheswerd*, Emperor Lothar II's original charter of 1134 (MGH DD.dt.KK. Lothar II., 89) has *Růlicheswerde*, Barbarossa's original charter of 1158 (MGH DD.dt.KK. Friedrich I., 1.362) has *Růlechswerde*, which means 'river island once belonging to a certain *Ruo(d)laich* (> *Ruºlich*, *-lech*), where the personal name is a normal, well attested name with Germ. *laik* 'game, dance, song' as its second element (Förstemann s. v. *Hrothi-*, *Rodleich*, Morlet s. v. *Rodolaicus*). Gysseling (1960 s. v. *Rolandswerth*) has 15 references in total for this name, of which the first 13 are etymologically correct, whereas in *Rulingiswerde* and *insula Rulingi*, both from 1225, the *-l(e)ich* element has not been understood, and has been replaced by the suffix *-ling*, which is very common in toponyms; moreover, this *Rulingiswerde* appears in 1209 in one of Count Dietrich of Kleve's charters (Ennen/ Eckertz 1860–1879, 2. 35; reference to it in Floß 1868, 84) and in 1252 as *Rulincswerd* in Jungandreas (1962 s. v.). According to Jungandreas, the references with *-nd-* do not start until 1282.[1728] (To be on the

---

[1728] It is possible that from the 14th century onwards at the latest, Rhenish gutturalization (Schirmunski 1962, 396), suggested that a written *-nd-* may have been lurking behind a presumably dialectal /ŋ/, which would have more easily led to thoughts of Roland. Archbishop Frederick I built a castle opposite the southern point of the monastery of *Růleichswerd* on a steep slope (perhaps on top of an older castle that was already there); for this too, the older

safe side, so to speak, we should note that none of the Roland pillars located in German cities are attested before the 14th c.)

C.15.7.1.2 Italy

There are some early references from Italy in Brattö (1953, 168), Hlawitschka (1960, 327), Capitani (1963, passim) and Aebischer ([1965] 1967, 136). In the Lombard period (i.e. before the year 774) the name is not attested there. This is probably not a gap in the historical record, but rather a true negative result and we know this because of two circumstances in the period immediately after that. First, we see the name in Aebischer's documentation in the year 823 with three references in the Milan area, and then spreading to Cremona (a. 842) and Lucca (a. 844) until the end of the 9th c., when it is on the southern edge of the main area of Frankish influence in Farfa (a. 883) and Viterbo (a. 893), which inevitably prompts us to think of the Wido family in Spoleto, whereas the Beneventan-Capuan south, even though it clearly sees itself as 'Lombardic', does not have any references. Secondly, it is striking that there is such a high proportion of individuals who demonstrably come from North of the Alps: one of Aebischer's three Rolands from the year 823 is an Alemannian, and one is a Frank; Hlawitschka cites three more Franks from the years 879–988. In Italy, therefore, the name has an unbroken, but before the start of the 11th c. unspectacular history (cf. Capitani 1963, passim). It seems at that time to have been passed on through its own momentum, since there are no grounds to assume that it reflects the epic Roland. It is found among the lower nobility and urban citizens, which is very broad section of society in Italy at this time, and without detailed study of individual cases, very little can be said about them.[1729] Until sometime after 950, the name always appears with an unstressed middle vowel (*Rode-/-i-/ -o-*), then as *Ro(l)landus*, which according to Capitani (1963, 70s.) need not be interpreted as a Galloromanian influence, because there is Lat. *spatula* > Ital. *spalla* (> northern Ital. *spala*). From 1011, the form *Orlandus* advances from Middle Italy (the Sabine

---

name *Rulcheseck* is attested before its modern name *Rolandseck*. A single arch from this building remains standing, and it is called the Rolandsbogen today.

1729 I noticed among the higher nobility a *Rolandus vicecomes*, from the year 998, who was a witness in the County of Luni (Muratori, *Antiquitates Estenses* 1.132), an *Azo vir magnificus qui vocor de Orlando* from 1019 in the region around Rome-Farfa, who appears in 1011 as *Azo filius Rolandi* (Capitani 1963, 71), and a *Rodilandus quondam Roccionis comes*, who before 1083 releases lands in Minione and Viterbo to Farfa; bishops such as Roland I and II of Ferrara (around 1031 and before 1040 until after 1063) and Roland of Treviso (around 1083) may belong to this group. After this period, epic names are spread more evenly across society, and Fassanelli (2014, 238ss.) rightly warns against making hasty distinctions.

area) into Tuscany and Romagna. The first clear indication of an influence coming from Old French epic literature is – essentially in parallel to the expansion of the name *Oliverius* – the obvious increase in the name's frequency from the middle of the 11th c. onwards,[1730] because the number of references in the 12th c. becomes *legione* (Rosellini 1958, 54 n. 6); Lejeune/Stiennon (1966, 1.106) provide a similar case study for Padua between 1146 and 1275, cf. now Fassanelli (2014, especially 236, 239–241). Jireček (1904, 42 and 49) pointed out one *Oliverius* from the year 1080 within the area influenced by Venice near Split/Spalato, and we can now add a *Lorandus* < *Rolandus* from the same place in 1086 and agree that these names reflect the epic hero.[1731]

Having covered this background material for comparison, let us turn now to Galloromania!

C.15.7.2 *Galloromania*, 8th and 9th century

If we leave aside the charter of 772 from barely Romanophone Herstal and Roland's home area on the western edge of Galloromania, then Lejeune (1979, 149–151) is absolutely correct when she rejects the uncritical claims of de Mandach,[1732] and insists that there are no references in the whole of Galloromania.

1730 Lejeune's (1950, 386) list of early Rolands from Italy only contains names from 1076 or later, but this is misleading.

1731 For phonological reasons, *Lorandus* cannot be related to *Laurentius*; the only other plausible etymology is then *Rolandus*. The metathetical form passes from the Adriatic into Hungarian; to this day, *Lóránt* is the generally accepted equivalent of the Western European name *Roland* in that country.

1732 A few clarifications are required here. De Mandach (1961, 22) declared that the first person to bear this name was "le puissant Roland, archevêque de Rouen, le Roto-landus de Roto-magum dans les années 720–725". But first, the bishops of Rouen only became archbishops from 744/748, and this qualifies the term *puissant* somewhat. Secondly, the homophony of the first two syllables is of course pure chance, and so the hyphens do not signify anything. But above all, thirdly, what was the man's name? De Mandach did not check before taking his information from Förstemann (1900, 909), who does not provide a source, though he most probably used Gams (1886, 614). But Gams writes "Rollandus (Robertus)" which is another of those terrible 'or/and' types of reference. The *Gallia christiana* (11, 17) only states in relation to him (without specifying any sources), that no date is known for the appointment, nor for the death, of *Radilandus seu Rolandus*, who is also called *Rotolandus*, *Rotlandus* or *Raginlandus*, but he may have held this office in 713 (evidently because this date cannot apply to his predecessor, and even less to his successor); the index of names sums up the situation correctly when it states that nothing at all is known about him. But the only form of the name that is demonstrably correct is *Raginlandus*, a normal name made from *Ragin-* (as in *Raginbaldus* > *Raimbaut*, *Raginfredus* > *Rainfroi*, *Raginhardus* > *Renart* etc.) + *-landus*. This Bishop of Rouen first appears in the

The entire written tradition of the Merovingian period will surely suffice to permit a probability calculation *ex silentio*; the name was therefore presumably an import that did not occur until the Carolingian period.

For the next period, it is advisable to separate north and south, and in fact using a line which leaves Anjou and Touraine in the north, follows the Middle Loire and then runs south of the *Duchy* of Burgundy, excepting its southern tip, that is to say the Chalonnais and Mâconnais areas, which should be counted as belonging to the southern side.

I am aware of 23–24 individuals from the 9th c. Thirteen to fourteen of them are from the northern half: MGH LC. 2.260.8 (Reichenau α) a. 826 *Rotlandus*, Gorze; MGH LC. 2.354.31 (Reichenau α) a. 826 *Hrodlandus*, presumably West

---

Vita Vulframni Episcopi, which was forged shortly before 811, but he appears there not (as Lejeune explains following Mabillon) as *Ragilandus*, but as *Reginlandus* (only ms. 2b still has *Raginlandus*), cf. the critical edition MGH SS.mer. 5.666. After this – from the end of the 9th c. – we have the catalogues of bishops in the ecclesiastical province of Rouen (Duchesne 1894–1915, 2.203s.; *Analecta Bollandiana* 8, 1889, table at the end of the volume); before the end of the 11th c. they all have *Rainlandus*. The *Liber eburneus* from Rouen (shortly after 1068) spells it *Ranilandus/Ramlandus*, the first of which shows that *Rani-* is a misreading of *Rain-* (or the element is wrongly re-Latinised from French *Rain-*), and the second shows a misreading of *-in-* or *-ni-* as *-m-*. According to A. le Prévost in his edition of Ordericus, the *Ann. Uticenses* also read it as *Ranilandus*, Robert de Torigni as *Rani-* or *Rauilandus*, a 12th century catalogue from the Mont-Saint-Michel clearly has *Rauilandus* (with *-n-* being misread as *-u-*); Ordericus himself (2.349 ed. le Prévost) has *Radilandus* (var. still *Ranilandus*), which is another existing name, but here probably showing evidence of being misheard during dictation. According to Sauvage (1889, 419 and table) in the 14th c. there is an ephemeral *Rotrolandus* (< *Rotolandus* x *Rotrou*), in the 16th c. *Rolandus*; finally, the alternative *Robertus* in Gams must surely be an error. I have presented this case by way of example, to show how a supposed plethora of names, or some uncertainty can often be resolved by applying the simple tools of historical phonetics and palaeography, and in the process erroneous interpretations can be avoided. – Lejeune is not correct in her assumption that a *Chrodoland* listed in Förstemann is from the *Polyptychon Sancti Remigii* (middle of the 9th c.), because it is from the famous charter recording the initial foundation of the monastery at Prüm in the year 721 (preserved in the famous copy of the Prüm *Codex Aureus*, 10th c.); this text has *Signum † Chrodolande*, and Lejeune's conclusion that it is a *Chrodolanda*, is possibly correct, because other names taken from the masculine and ending in *-landa* are attested from 732 [not 572] onwards (Brunterc'h 1989, 46 with n. 95; there are four more from the early 9th c. in Förstemann col. 1003). The highly complex connection is disputed among historians, however; Chaume, Calmette, Levillain and Hlawitschka in his revised edition, for example, opted for a woman, but Förstemann, Hlawitschka in his first version and Matthias Werner opted for a man. (Cf. Werner, 1982, Index s. v. *Bertrada* and similar, also with literature review; I did not have time to look for more recent research on this point). If this is a *Chrodolandus,* he is the first bearer of the name – close to the geographical territory of the Trier Wido family and substantively close to the second-most important strand of Charlemagne's ancestry.

Francians;[1733] MGH LC. 2.339.8 (Reichenau β) around 830 *Rotlandus*, Metz; Reims-Pol. 36 around 850 *Hrotlandus ingenuus*, *Villariis* (Diocese of Reims); Reims-Pol. 40 around 850 *Hrotlandus ingenuilis*, Chézy-l'Abbaye near Château-Thierry; Reims-Pol. 43 around 850 *Hrotlandus ingenuus*, Aguilcourt near Laon; Reims-Pol. 45 around 850 *Hrotlandus ingenuus*, a different person; Tardif 108 a. 859 *Hrotlan*, original, written in the abbey at Marœuil (Diocese of Arras), but for Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, concerning properties in the Telleu/Vimeu area; Huy-Gysseling 49 a. 866 *Rotlandus et Veneranda cum filiis suis*; Bourgogne-Garnier 114 a. 869 or 876 *Rotlannus*, from Saint-Bénigne de Dijon; Arras-S.Vaast 286 a. 893 *Rotlandus/Rolandus*, son of the benefactor, charter is very suspicious; Lorraine-Calmet 2.166 a. 898 *Ruotlandus diaconus*, witness for the Bishop of Toul; Remiremont 9v°4 still in the 9th c. *Ruotlandus*; Remiremont 20v°I (scribe 22) around 900 *Rodlandus*.

Ten are from the south: Marseille 2.640 a. 814 *Rodolandus baccalarius*, *mancipium*; MGH LC. 2.363.19 (Reichenau β) around 830 *Rotlamnus*, Lyon; MGH LC. 2.370.1 (Reichenau β) around 830 *Rudlant*, Saint-Rambert (Diocese of Lyon); Limoges 20 a. 832 *Rodlanus*, probably the same person as GC 2.165 a. 833 *Rodlandus*, in the circle around the Bishop of Limoges; from Ep.mer.&kar. 3.586 around a. 852 until *Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 869 a plethora of references for *Rotlandus*, Archbishop of Arles, died in 869 as a prisoner of the Saracens;[1734] Languedoc-HgL 2.322 (= Vabres 89) a. 861 *pro remedium animae avunculi mei Rotlandi*; his nephew of the same name is *Rotlandus*, founder and first Abbot of Vabres-l'Abbaye (25 km southwest of Millau); Languedoc-HgL 5 § 1 around 880 *Rotlannus*; Mâcon 169 a. 888–898 *Rotlan*, lay assessor; Cluny 1.67 a. 895 *terra Rotlant* 'the piece of land (currently) bordering a piece of land belonging to a certain *Rotlant*' district of Chalon-sur-Saône.

The north therefore has slightly more references than the south. It is interesting that no references are to be found west of a line running through Limoges-northern Burgundy-western Champagne-Laon-Le Tréport. The suggestion that older documents in Normandy, and in the coastal areas to the south of there, were mostly destroyed is not credible because there are no references in the Île-de-France either, particularly in the *Polyptychon* of Saint-Germain as compared with the *Polyptychon* of Reims. It seems that the name filled up Austrasia, then

---

1733 The preceding list in the confraternity book refers to Charroux, and the following one to Saint-Denis; since the scribe at least tends to order things in a way that makes sense geographically, we can safely surmise that the list in between also contains Western Franks.

1734 Not in 880, which is the date given for him by Lejeune (1950, 386) – The more significant references are listed in Duchesne (1894–1915, 1.261s.). His successor Rostagnus apparently calls him at least once *Rotlannus* (Languedoc-HgL 5.66 around 880).

headed south thanks to the Carolingian conquests in the years from around 740–781, which were linked with the appointment of many new counts and vassals,[1735] whereas it was not yet popular in the west, because after the battle of Tertry (west of Saint-Quentin), which in 687 made Pippin the Middle into the Majordomus of the whole realm, a huge wave of Carolingian conquests with associated immigration was no longer necessary.

C.15.7.3 Galloromania, 10th century

From the northern half (as defined above in 15.7.2), I am only aware of 13–15 individuals: Gorze 157 a. 903 *Rotlandus*, witness; GC 13. 452s. a. 916 *Rotlandus primicerius, Rotlandus cancellarius*, probably two different monks from Saint-Èvre, Diocese of Toul; Schweiz-Hidber-D.V. 18 a. 916 *Rolandus*, witness for Romainmôtier; Remiremont 53r°a (scribe 25) first quarter of the 10th c. *Rotlanz*; MGH SS. 4.342 and 346 (*Vita Johannis Gorziensis* cap. 20 and 33) *Rotlandus*, choirmaster at the Cathedral of Saint-Étienne in Metz, † shortly before 933; Bourgogne-Garnier 144 a. 953 *Rotlannus*, son of a *servus Anscherius* and brother of an *Otolgerius*;[1736] GC 13.456 around 957 *Rotlandus*, bondsman at Saint-Èvre; Reims-Marlot 2.840 a. 968 *Rotlandus*, witness, for Saint-Remi de Reims; Remiremont 23v°5 (scribe 42) third quarter of the 10th c. *Rolandus*; MGH SS.7.439 n.46 (entry made in the 10th c. or beginning of the 11th c. in the gospel ms. Cambrai no. 309) *Rotlandus* has, with Régnier IV of Hainaut and others (probably in the year 974), set churches on fire; Remiremont 60v°II (scribe 47) last quarter of the 10th c. *Rodlandus*; Montier-en-Der 118 "late 10th century (?)" *S. Rolandi [. . .] Rolandus scripsi et subscripsi*. Finally, an *Orlandus vicecomes Wimnacensis* 'of Vimeu' from the year 980 in Lot (1891, 117), taken from the *Historia relationis corporis S. Walarici* (ms. around 1100, author late 11th c.; *AA.SS. Sancti Benedicti*, saec. 5, 549); I can find no other metathetical forms attested in the northern half of France.[1737] The number of references has stayed roughly the same as it was in the previous century. Once again there are no references from the complex around the Île-de-France, Normandy, Francophone eastern Brittany, Maine-Mayenne and Anjou;[1738] there

---

1735 If it came into the south in 740 with the first wave of Carolingian conquests, then it could have passed into the lower classes by 800 (cf. the first reference).

1736 To avoid false conclusions, cf. n. 1568 above!

1737 I only know of one reference from the southern half, and it is considerably later: Grenoble 144 a. 1110 *Orlannus*; but personal connections are always possible in this area.

1738 Some catalogues of the Archbishops/Bishops of Dol (Bretagne), e.g. on the internet the catalogues at infobretagne.com/eveche_de_Dol and wikipedia.org (both last accessed on 22.05.2022), list not only the two historically attested Roland "II" (1093 until around 1107) and

is not a single reference from this area before the year 1000, and this can hardly be seen as a coincidence.

In the south, a narrow strip in the southeast near the Rhône Bend represents a very clear exception; it stretches roughly from Chalon-sur-Saône via Cluny (40 km further to the south-southwest), Mâcon (20 km to the southeast), Savigny (almost 60 km south-southwest), Lyon (about 20 km east-southeast), Vienne (25 km to the south) as far as Romans-sur-Isère (60 km south-southeast) and is represented by charters from especially Saint-Pierre-et-Paul in Cluny, Saint-Vincent in Mâcon, Saint-Martin in Savigny, Saint-Martin-d'Ainay (today in Lyon city centre), Saint-André-le-Bas in Vienne and Saint-Barnard [sic] in Romans.[1739]

If we leave this strip aside for the moment, we find 13–14 references in the rest of the southern half: Béziers 13 a. 918 *Rotlandus*, witness; Brioude 279 a. 919 *Rolandus*; Nîmes 1.34 and 35 around 921 *Rodlandus* (unclear whether this means two different individuals); Languedoc-HgL 5.1312 a. 924 *Rolandus*, benefactor for Agde; Languedoc-HgL 5.151 a. 925 *Rodlandus*, area around Narbonne; Beaulieu (Diocese of Limoges) 73 a. 926 *de Rotlendo* [sic], judging by the context probably a man's name, not the women's name *Rotlindis/Rotlendis*; Poitiers-S. Cyprien 324 a. 923–936 *Rotlannus*; Conques 101 a. 959 *Rotlandus*, *scriptor*; Brioude 247 a. 936–954 or 986–987 *Rolandus*; Limoges 171 around 968 *Rodlandus*, Son of Ada; Chamalières (just west of Clermont-Ferrand) a. 970 *Rotlandus*; Languedoc-HgL 5.299 "around 984" (= Vabres 160 a. 955–979) *Rotlandus monachus*, Vabres; Poitiers-S.Cyprien 80 a. 987–996 *Rotlandus*; Béziers 59 a. 993

Roland "III" (elected 1177, cardinal, † 1187/1188) but also a "Roland I" who is said to have held this office (from about 922) until his death in around 1004 as a monk at the Mont-Saint-Michel. But the GC 14.1044 (published in 1865) notes with reference to him that the older Breton sources in particular have no record of him; this is why Gams (1886) and the *Trésor de Chronologie* (1889) put a question mark after his name. An even more important factor is that the *Chronique de Dol* from the 11th c, (ed. in Duiné 1916, 38ss.) which was edited later, has no record of him either. Duiné (1921, passim, especially 95 and 97) then made the plausible suggestion that belief in the existence of this prelate arose out of a misunderstood note in a Mont-Saint-Michel obituary which probably referred to Roland "II"; at any rate, there is still "aucune trace sérieuse d'un Roland qui aurait occupé le Siège épiscopal de Dol à la fin du Xe siecle", which renders "Roland Ier ʳ très douteux". This fits with the picture I have described above. A second version of the above-mentioned infobretagne, that is to say infobretagne/dol-eveques-archeveques (also last accessed on 22.05.2022) has a more detailed *Catalogue descriptif* which categorises him as non-existent and subtracts one from the numbering of each of the next two.

1739 The charters which Lejeune (1950, 386) from *après 955* onwards attributes *en masse* to Dauphiné appear in our analysis as charters from Saint-André-le-Bas and Saint-Barnard.

Rodlandus.[1740] In comparison with the 9th c., this is an increase of almost half, but the total numbers are still small; this can be explained mainly by the fact that during the 10th c. in the south, the written tradition, or at least the number of charters surviving until the present day, increased considerably.

We have found less than thirty references from the 10th c. in Galloromania, excluding the narrow middle Rhône strip, but this contrasts very sharply with the number of references from the same period in the monastery of Cluny alone: there are more than a hundred references from this location, on average 3–4 times as many each year as in the whole of Galloromania, 7–8 times as many as in the whole of the south, excepting the middle Rhône strip.[1741] The list of references is summarised here without the word forms; the majority have the spelling *Rot-* (~ 67 %) as opposed to *Rol(l)-* (~ 22 %) and *Rod-*, as well as *-lannus* (~ 70 %) as opposed to *-landus* (~ 16 %), *-lan* (~ 9 %) and *-lant*, with a few aberrant spellings here and there. When the father (F), the mother (M), an uncle (U), a brother (B) the wife (W), a son (S) or a nephew (N) are named, I list them too. I list information in the form *terra R.* and *mansus R.* when the charter only mentions the estate and not the person himself.

Cluny, vol. 1: 139 (F *Aldigrimus*), 151, 172 all a. 910–927; 186 a. 914–915; 210 (= 186, ?=151) a. 920; 230 (*presbiter*; ? = 172), 231 a. 923–936; 266 = 267 a. 926; 274 = 275 (probably monk) around 926; 293 (M *Ildeharde*), 316 (W *Vulberga*) a. 927–942; 357 a. 929; 370 a. 930 (two R. in the same charter); 388 a. 932 (three R.); 400 a. 933–937; 407 a. 934; 458 (*eleemosinarius Arnulfi presbyteri*) a. 937; 494 a. 940; 524 (W *Adaltrud*) a. 941; 555 (=458), 566, 570 a. 942–954; 594 (*terra R.*) a. 943; 619 a. 944–989 (*terra R.*); 650 a. 946–991; 653 a. 947; 701, 708 a.949; 717 a. 950; 762 a. 951; 776, 783 a. 952; 790 a. 952–953; 793 a. 953 (two R.).

Cluny, vol. 2: 3 a. 954 (F *Achimarus*, B *Enestasiu*s, *Ricoadus*; and a second R.); 7 a. 954–985; 13 a. 954–986 (three R.); 65 a. 954–994; 115 a. 956–990 (*terra R.*); 127 a. 957 (*R. scripsit*); 171 a. 959–992 (*levita*, = 127?); 196, 201 (U *Emmo*), 205 (*clericus*) a. 961; 273 a. 965–966; 280 (two R.), 290 a. 966 (B *Durannus*); 302, 305, 305 (*terra R.*), 323 a.967; 332 a. 968–969; 340, 349 a.969; 353 a. 969–970, 357 a. 970; 370 (*terra R.*), 370 (*levita*, = 171) a. 971; 427, 441, 449 a. 974; 468 a. 975; 474 a. 975–976 (F *Manerius*); 492 a. 976–977; 511 a. 978; 528, 530 (*servus*)

1740 Charter Lérins 2.184 a. 954 *Rollandus* is a very clumsy forgery with no genuine source. The *Rotlannus*, *Rolannus* listed by Lejeune (1950, 386) for Lérins a. 996 and a. 997–1031 are not in this cartulary; the oldest references in it are 48 and 340, both a. 1007.

1741 Lejeune (1950, 386–388) appears to have randomly used only vol. 3 of the edited charters from Cluny and so she overlooked more than eighty [sic] references from before 987–994.

a. 972; 570, 583, 584 (deceased, W *Eldeburgis*) a. 980; 623 a. 981–982; 643 a. 982 (*terra R.*); 664 a. 983; 688 a. 983; 688 a. 983–984 (deceased, S *Humbertus*), 693; 706, 716 (*presbiter*); 727 a. 984 (unclear whether *Rotlent* is a man or a woman).

Cluny, vol. 3: 4 a. 987 (*clericus*); 16 a. 987–994; 22 a. 987–996; 36 a. 988; 65 a. 989–990 (unclear whether *Rotlent* is a man or a woman); 69 (B *Oddo*), 74 a. 990; 100 a. 990–991; 120 a. 991–992 (*terra R.*); 145, 147 a. 992; 161 a. 993; 187 a. 993–994; 193 a. 993–996; 372, 374, 378 (*presbiter*), 393 a. 994; 416 a. 995; 433 a. 996 (*clericus*); 486 a. 997 (*scabineus*); 582, 591 (*mansus R.*), 598, 601 around 1000.

Here a few facts which are relevant to the evaluation of this large number of references. Cluny was from the time of its foundation in the year 909 by Duke William I the Pious of Aquitaine, a great-grandson of the 'epic' William,[1742] an exempt reformed monastery (i.e. it was subject only to the Pope). It practised a strict version of the Benedictine Rule, and it was very well run in both spiritual and economic matters. This is evident from the earliest 105 of the monastery's charters: they are from before its foundation. Either the benefactors were obliged to hand over the charter documenting their purchase of the estates that were now being donated to the monastery, if such a charter was available, or alternatively, the people living in the area thought it was safer to have the private documents in their possession passed over to the monastery for safekeeping. The same was true to quite a large extent in later periods. The exemption, on the other hand, protected the monastery from encroachment by bishops and other powerful people in the area and even partly from losses suffered during war (which certainly helped to ensure that the charters survived), and it also afforded the abbots close relationships with Popes, kings and emperors. Above all, thanks to Cluny's exemption and strict adherence to the Rule, donations to this monastery appeared more worthwhile than gifts to other monasteries, and so they very quickly increased in number. For all these reasons, Cluny can

---

1742 At the time when Bédier was writing, it was by no means clear even to historians that Bernard *Plantevelue* was the very same Bernard mentioned by Dhuoda, who was the younger son of Bernard of Septimania, nor that this means Duke William I, the founder of Cluny, was a great-grandson of the famous Saint and epic William. Could they be significant for the early history of the William epic – perhaps because the monastery at Cluny had inherited an anti-Islamic attitude from its founder, in remembrance of his ancestor who bore the same name, and perhaps it did not need to develop this attitude gradually over time? Or perhaps the monks, who doubtless still knew about the family relationship between the two Williams, had developed more sympathy for their founder's ancestor, at least after their Abbot Maiolus was kidnapped by Muslims in the year 973, and a ransom had to be paid, and they passed this sympathy on into early songs or stories?

boast over 2400 charters that have survived from the 10th c. The astonishing number of Roland references is due partly to the excellent preservation of materials, but this by no means explains everything. There is one Roland reference here for every 24 charters, whereas the corresponding ratio for Galloromania outside the middle Rhône strip, though it cannot be precisely quantified, must at least have been one for every several hundred (e.g. the over 800 authentic charters by the French kings between 840 and 987 do not contain even a single Roland!). This cannot be merely a statistical illusion caused by the patchy preservation of manuscripts in this period. (Incidentally: if this were the case, the consequences would be much more radical, almost staggering: the number of Rolands in the whole of Galloromania would have to have increased like a torrent – and why would that happen?) On the other hand, it is interesting that among the more than a hundred charters from before 909 (on almost as many printed pages), none contain a reference to an actual person with this name: they only refer to a *terra Rotlant*, and even these only start in the year 895; the first sign of a *fashion* for the name *Roland* appears therefore in Cluny, sometime around the year 900.

In the 10th c., the references still relate almost exclusively to estates in the districts of Mâcon (where Cluny itself is located, ~ 62 %), Lyon (~ 20 %) and Chalon-sur-Saône (~ 10 %), in other words, inside the middle Rhône strip.[1743] Outside this area, there are only a few estates in the districts of Autun (1.357 a. 929, 1.388 a. 932, 2.427 and 441 a. 974), Forez (2.273 a. 965–966), Auvergne (2.290 a. 966) and Vaison/Gap (3.601 around 1000); we should see this as a reminder that our middle Rhône strip was not hermetically sealed even in the 10th c.

The question of how many distinct individuals were behind the charters was a trivial one in the 9th and 10th c. outside the middle Rhône areas because the ratio was obviously almost 1:1 (with the obvious exception of the Archbishop of Arles). After this time, it is almost never possible to answer the question with any accuracy; a researcher can only hope to be able to spot any major distortions. Even today, it would be unreasonably laborious to check every charter against every other charter to check for relatives or consent-givers, witness lists and especially the toponyms,[1744] and it would still leave quite a few cases unresolved. I carried

---

1743 This would change quite considerably in the 11th c., because the mother monastery at Cluny also held some important charters from areas further afield. In principle, however, the monasteries joined in fellowship with Cluny kept their own charters.

1744 All of the information I have given above about the Cluny charters comes ultimately from my own page-by-page search of the printed edition by Bernard/Bruel, which does not have any kind of index. The excellent *Cartae Cluniacenses electronicae (CCE)* project by the Institut für Frühmittelalterforschung at the University of Münster is now accessible on the internet, and it has enabled me to check my work much more easily; a sister project in

out an experimental checking process on the first twenty Roland references in Cluny (i.e. up to 1.524): it seemed to me that the five individuals marked above with an equals sign were identical, or carried over one to the other, whereas in one charter there were two, and in another three separate Rolands. If we assume that a specialist in Cluny's early charters could eliminate two or three more from the twenty named individuals, leaving 12–13, and then if we calculate this proportionately for Cluny in the whole of the 10th c., this gives us 60–65 actual Rolands instead of a hundred Roland references – but would this change very much?

Saint-Vincent-de-Mâcon is not a monastery, but a bishop's church. It obtained most of its estates in the half-millennium before the 10th c. But in the 10th c. and even beyond this time, it suffered because of competition with Cluny, especially because the life of the canonics made a much smaller impression on donors than the life of the reformed monks. Thus, we find only about 374 charters from this place (chronologically ordered list in the edition, p. CCC-CCCX), about a sixth as many as we find from Cluny. Here are the references: 96 a. 886–927; 166 a. 936–954; 38 ~ a. 947 (*R. Berardi*); 208 a. 954–986 (*vinea R.*); 216 a. 968–971; there are another five undatable charters which, judging by their style, look as if they are most probably from the 10th c.: 97, 158 (W *Berunicia*), 251 (N *Remestagius*), 293=294.[1745] This produces one reference for every 37–75 charters, which is quite a large number, but distinctly lower than the frequency found in Cluny; in Mâcon we are probably close to the eastern edge of the strip in question.

The Abbey of Saint-Martin-de-Savigny was founded in the 9th c. and – after it was destroyed by the Hungarians in about 934 – it enjoyed something of a golden age until about 1200; the abbey could even be called a smaller rival of Cluny. It was not formally a reform abbey, but thanks to the quality of its leadership, it had almost 40 priories by around 1200. These seem to have been founded after the year 1000, however; at any rate the history of the abbey in the 10th c. mostly took place in its home diocese of Lyon. There are 640 surviving charters from this century (chronologically ordered list in the edition, p. 708–733) with a total of 38 Roland references: 79 a. 957; 183, 189 around 960; 160 a. 965; 139 a. 967 (F *Stephanus*); 196, 197 (F *Ingeldricus*, B *Eldevertus*) a. 970; 117, 136, 175, 176 (W *Dominica*) around 970; 161 a. 954–987; 160 a. 955–986 (W *Roteldis*); 136 a. 976; 168 a. 977; 75, 145, 201 a. 980; 147 (deceased), 149, 170, 179, 180 around

---

collaboration with the Centre Georges Chevrier in the Law faculty of the University of Dijon to identify the toponyms is, as far as I know, still in its early stages.

1745 189 a. 968–971 *Rotlenus* is more likely to be a misreading of the name *Roclenus* which according to Morlet s. v. is well attested in this region.

980; 240 a. 988; 242, 248 a. 984–993; 249 a. 994 (S *Pontio* and *Gauzerannus*); 239 a. 1000 (*pręcentor ecclesie Lugdunensis*); 219, 220, 224, 261, 264, 266, 271, 277 (monk), 278, 282 around 1000. With a ratio of one reference for every 14 charters, two observations come to mind. First: evidently as a result of the Hungarian attack, only 60 of the 540 charters are from the period before 950; we would expect four references to come within this period, but there are none. Such a small number is not significant, especially in the case of conclusions drawn *ex silentio*, but it adds to the impression that the fashion for the Roland name did not emerge until the 10th c. Secondly: the frequency of references is higher even than Cluny, and in fact the highest that I am aware of. Let us remind ourselves at this point also, that the oldest reference to the name *Olivier* is to be found in a charter from Savigny! Naturally, these two facts lend considerable mutual support to each other, and they make it difficult to assume that this is all a matter of coincidence.

The Abbey of Saint-André-le-Bas in Vienne was founded in the 6th c. The women's Convent of Saint-André-le-Haut is from about the same period, and the Abbey of Saint-Pierre is about a century older, but none of their cartularies have survived. However, Saint-André-le-Bas was much wealthier in the centuries that interest us than the Cathedral of Saint-Maurice,[1746] and so I base my analysis on Saint-André-le-Bas. Admittedly, this abbey also had to compete with the other three above-mentioned churches in the same city for the favour of all the benefactors, and so its cartulary from the 10th c. contains 'only' 180 charters (chronological list in the edition p. XLVII-XLIX) with eleven Roland references: 101 a.910; 103 a. 938; 8 a. 973? (B *Rainoldus*); 9 (collective ownership with *Girardus*, and so probably ≠ 8), 10 (*terra R.*), 17 a. 977; 5 a. 975–992; 13 a. 975–993 (two R., the first = 8); 118 Î a. 993–997; 121 a. 979–980. The frequency of one reference per 16 charters is not quite as high as Savigny, but higher than that of Cluny.

The sums do not always work out quite as neatly, however. The smaller Ainay Monastery (its location would be in the middle of Lyon today)[1747] nevertheless

---

1746 Their cartulary was lost sometime after 1771. The material that scholars were able to reconstruct on the basis of old notes was summarised by U. Chevalier (1891, passim), but there was no mention of any witnesses, and so it is of no use to us (I searched through the volume). Chevalier (p. 10) was able to establish that the cartulary only contained 79 charters from the 10th c. – as opposed to the 180 from Saint-André-le-Bas. The very few charters that the GC prints from Saint-Maurice include two random references from the 10th c.: GC 16.13 a. 912 *S. Rolanni*; 16.18 a. 997 *Rollannus*, witness for the church of Vienne or the church of Valence.

1747 The second of the abbeys situated in the area that is the city centre of Lyon today, on the Île-Barbe, was, however, one of the oldest monasteries in Gaul, and commensurately wealthy (cf. Le Laboureur 1665, passim). But the *cartulaire-pancarte* contains only 7 charters from the time before 1150, and so it is not surprising if only one Roland is attested here: 2.227 around 978 *Rollannus*.

produced 90 charters from the 10th c. that have survived, which corresponds to a frequency of one reference per 23 charters; we find here 694 a. 937–993 *Rotlan, infans*; 555 a. 996 *Rotlannus*; 595 around 1000 Agno, *filius Rollanni* (which suggests there was a *Rollannus* around 980 or earlier); 599 around 1000 *Rolannus* (W *Raingardis*). From this time onwards, there are references every few years: 577 a. 1002; 666 a. 1005; 584 a. 1008; 664 a. 1013; 585, 657, 690 a. 1015; 587 a. 1018; 697 around 1020 etc.

Finally, in Saint-Barnard of Romans-sur-Isère (60 km south-southeast of Vienne, almost 20 km upriver from the place where the Isère flows into the Rhône) we find ten references, but all of them refer to people who belong to the monastery: 4.17 a. 950, 2.185 a. 940–991, 4.59 a. 937–993, 5.71 a. 938–988 and 5.4 a. 937–993 (all of them *presbyter*); 5.79 a. 937–993 and 4.9 a. 952–993 (*clericus*); 5.109 a. 937–993 = 2.131 a. 952–993 = 5.43 a. 978 (*caput scole*). The worst case is that we only have two individuals here (because a simple *clericus* in the year 952 or later cannot be the same person as a presbyter in 950). We must surely conclude that the middle Rhône strip in the 10th c. had already reached its south(east)ern edge at the level of Romans-sur-Isère.

C.15.7.4 The question of root causes

We have found that the name *Roland* was, until the end of the 10th c. across most of Galloromania, a quantitatively insignificant and fading name. But just before 900, quite a sudden fashion for the name started to appear in a small, more or less north-south strip more precisely defined as running from Chalon-sur-Saône through Mâcon, Cluny, Savigny, Ainay (~ Lyon) and Vienne as far as Romans-sur-Isère. We have examined this trend in as much detail as possible and established that there is no doubt about its existence, not least because of the statistical evidence, and so it requires an explanation. But in about 1000, it had not expanded much beyond this strip of territory. This is precisely the area where in around 1000 the name *Olivier* "took off" as we proved above (C.14.1–C.14.6) by confirming in detail, expanding and slightly modifying earlier research by Lejeune and Aebischer; the very same cartulary from Savigny which contains the highest proportion of references to the name *Roland* (C.15.7.3), also provided the earliest reference for the name *Olivier* (C.14.1.1).

Why did parents in this middle Rhône area want to call their children *Roland* at exactly this time around the year 900? The trend must have been popular, if not with "all of the people" then at least with the social class who owned modest amounts of land but were still able to make donations. This class included not only the minor vassals of regional dignitaries at that time, but in the

south, also a large number of freemen who were allodial owners. It is the same class which at that time was acknowledged as the lowest part of the nobility and which would also go on to carry the main burden of the First Crusade. It is the lowest, but also the broadest class still capable of embracing a great ideology; at lower levels in the social pyramid, the material deprivations and a very basic, almost unthinking piety defined people's lives.

In about 900 there were only two potential models for the name Roland, and therefore two possible root causes of the fashion for this name: the Archbishop of Arles and the hero of Roncevaux. Let us examine each of these possibilities separately.

The dates would fit with the archbishop. In 869 he had a defensive earthwork against the Saracens hastily built on the Camargue, and as the Saracens advanced, he retreated to this place, but more than three hundred of his people were killed and he himself was taken prisoner. He died soon after; but the Saracens kept his death secret and accepted a very large ransom before they handed the body over (*Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 869). If people began to name their new-born sons after him in the decade after his death in 869, it would take until around 900 for this to be clearly visible to us – because by far the majority of the people named in charters are adults, and so it is logical to assume they will be, on average, (at least) twenty years old – and indeed, this is what we find. But apart from this fashion for the name, are there any other indications that he was admired after his death?

Surprisingly, there is almost no evidence to indicate this. The only contemporary witness who expresses an opinion about him is his colleague Hincmar of Reims, who did not like him: in the retelling of his death (*Ann. Bertiniani* for the year 869) Hincmar weaves in the comment that Roland obtained the Abbacy of St. Caesarius in Arles from Emperor Louis II and his spouse Engelberga *non vacua manu*, that is to say through simony, and he adds that when Roland retreated into the defensive earthwork, he acted *satis inconsulte* 'very carelessly'; when these two points are taken together in this particular context, they suggest that his death was God's punishment. He was laid to rest in Arles, no doubt in the crypt[1748] under the main apse of Saint-Honorat, where later in the Middle Ages one of seven tombs was declared to be his. But although we might have expected that a bishop who was martyred in the 9th c. would be the focus of attempts to make him into a saint, there is no sign of this: there is no Vita,

---

[1748] Or, as Le Blant 1878, 1, describes it, based on the probable pre-history of this crypt: in the *catacombes*.

and he is not in any of the great multi-volume lexica of saints, from the *Acta Sanctorum* to the *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, the *Histoire des Saints*, the *Vie des Saints* and the *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*. The only place where he is called *Sanctus Rotlanus* (GCNss 3.7) is in a single list of archbishops of Arles from about 1460, the high point of the extremely uncritical late medieval veneration of saints. It became clear how little substance there was behind this *sanctus* in the 17th c. when at least two authors thought the coffin belonged not to the Archbishop, but to Charlemagne's nephew (Benoît 1935, 35).[1749] I could not find any other indications that the Archbishop was venerated, neither relics nor even a church or chapel that was named after him, not even in his own diocese, far less anything further upstream of the Rhône.

If in spite of this we want to concede that the news of his death may have triggered a certain wave of popularity in his name, there is still no obvious reason why a naming fashion referring only to the archbishop would emerge, not in his own church province, but 300 km to the north. And in particular, there is no obvious reason why this fashion should steadily increase during the long 10th c. and why in around the year 1000, it should seamlessly lead into the appearance of the name *Olivier* in the very same place. In other words, the death of the archbishop cannot explain everything in need of explanation.

How does the Roland of Roncevaux compare with him? We have already seen that he – and not Eggihard or Anselm – was in command of the rear guard at Roncevaux (cf. C.15.4 above) and that this defeat still resonated across the empire after 840 (cf. C.15.1). Even in the northern half of Galloromania, where this was not confirmed by a fashion for his name, he was quite probably the focus of a certain amount of proto-epic attention (cf. C.15.6.1, C.15.6.2 above), and this means that a similar situation is *a fortiori* plausible in the south. We may assume that the rear guard's fierce resistance in 778 must have been evident to the main army when they saw the battlefield, and remained in the memory of the people until just before 870 through unformed prose reminiscences (oral history) and/or through early, *planctus*-like songs.[1750] They certainly were

---

1749 The epic literary tradition first becomes visible in the KMS, which claims that the Roland who fell at Roncevaux was laid to rest in Arles (cf. Bédier 1926–1929, 3.359s., Aebischer 1954a, 236s., Beckmann 2008a, 200). It may be that this connection arose from, or was boosted by, the homonymic archbishop's grave there: no one appears to have noticed this until now.

1750 *À titre de mémoire* and with no claim to originality: in the two centuries between 750 and 950 we can compare the Latin *planctūs* for Duke Eric of Friuli (killed in 799 during the war with the Avars, MGH PLAeC. 1.131–133), for Charlemagne († 814, MGH PLAeC. 1.435s.), for those who were killed at the battle of Fontenoy in the war between the Carolingian brothers

a more congenial subject for a gifted anonymous poet in about 870 than the essentially passive execution of the Archbishop's builders followed by his own miserable death.

Is it conceivable that the death of Archbishop Roland gave a boost to the proto-epic about the Roland who died at Roncevaux? Absolutely. Lejeune (1950, 392s.) floated this idea, and I gratefully acknowledge it; but once again, I am not entirely in agreement with the way in which she expounds her theory, and so would like to set out my own argument as a counter to hers.

The first thing to consider is the name *Roland* that they share. We should take note of this precisely because of the fact that in the 8th, 9th and even in the 10th c., there is no third Roland who is even slightly famous or capable of inspiring an epic. Two of the most scholarly experts in the history of north-western France generally and of the Frankish noble families in particular during these centuries believe that the earlier Roland is a member of the Wido family (cf. C.15.2.3 above). Nothing seems to be known about the family of the later Roland; but it was Emperor Lothar I who had appointed him as archbishop in Arles (probably in 852, by 854 at the latest), this being *de facto* one of the highest positions he was able to bestow, and thanks to many years of crisis in which he depended on the support of the Wido family, Lothar I was throughout

---

(a. 841, MGH PLAeC. 2.138s.), for Charlemagne's illegitimate son, the Arch-chancellor Abbot Hugh (a. 844 killed during a battle for Charles the Bald and against the Aquitanians, MGH PLAeC. 2.139s.), for Lothar I († 855, MGH PLAeC. 4:2/ 3.1074s.), for Archbishop Fulk of Reims (murdered in a. 900, canonised MGH PLAeC. 4:1.174s.) and for William Longsword of Normandy (murdered in a. 942, venerated as a martyr for a long time; ed. Helmerichs 1999–2002). Apart from the two *planctūs* for the Emperors Charlemagne and Lothar, they all refer to individuals who have come to a violent end. If *planctūs* were created for Eric, the victims of Fontenoy and Hugh in particular, there is no reason why they shouldn't have been written for Roland or the others who were killed at Roncevaux. – On the form: with one exception (the neatly metrical *planctus* on Lothar consisting of almost-asclepiads in imitation of Boethius, *De cons.*, I metr. 2; reference to it MGH PLAeC IV 2/3, 1041s.), these *planctūs* are all rhythms with a fixed number of syllables and fixed cadences (e.g. for Eric, Charlemagne and Hugh: 5p+7pp). The two most recent *planctūs* (around and after 900) show (often still facile 1- or 2-syllable) rhymes. The *planctūs* on Fulk contains among its 36 stanzas a few (nos. 3, 19, 26, 27) consisting of three instead of two verses (then with a threefold rhyme); otherwise there is still no sign of an expansion of the (respective) stanzaic form to a laisse The *planctūs* on Hugh has a surplus Adonis at the end of each stanza, the *planctūs* on Charlemagne and William Longsword even a fixed refrain, which can be sung along by the audience (to which one can remotely compare the AOI of the Rol. and perhaps also the *petit verse* of part of the William and Aimerides epics). – On the contents: while the older *planctūs* contain almost exclusively funeral eulogies and expressions of mourning, we find some narrative elements in the *planctūs* for Hugh, more of them in those for Fulk and William Longsword.

the whole of his life the most Wido-friendly of all the emperors. Roland certainly owed his additional title of Abbot of Saint-Césaire d'Arles to the generosity of Lothar's son, Emperor Louis II (*Annales Bertiniani* for the year 869). Under these circumstances, a family relationship between the two Rolands is not at all improbable. If they were related, then observers in around 870 may no longer have been able to specify their precise filiation; but names suggested clans, and people may have known that the later Roland came from the same clan as the earlier one. But even if they were not related in this way, the context around their deaths was quite similar: in both cases there was a surprise attack on the southern border of the empire, although one died heroically while the other died passively as a martyr. This general background could very well have led a poet in the years around 870–880 to reflect on the later Roland and then be reminded also about the earlier one.

We can only make vague suggestions about the precise nature of such a Song, but we do know that the death of the earlier Roland was its main focus. After all, this poet may have introduced three important innovations into the Roncevaux fable. The Roland from 778 died on a military campaign against the Muslim enemy of the faith, killed in an ambush that was mainly carried out by people from Navarre but planned and led by two Muslims; the Muslims of Saragossa were then also the main beneficiaries of the ambush – the groundbreaking exposition of these key points by Menéndez-Pidal (1960, passim) needs no correction. But our poet may well have first, as Lejeune (1950, 393) suspected, replaced the people from Navarre (who for him would have been no threat in terms of their geography) with the Muslims, and in so doing, he would have exchanged a literal, superficial truth for a perspective that would turn out to be, almost justifiably in world-historical terms, the more relevant one, reaching far beyond Turold.

Secondly, he may have made Roland into Charlemagne's nephew, if he was not already (cf. above C.15.5 'Was Roland related to the Carolingians?').

And finally, he would no longer consider his poem as a *planctūs*, but as a historical song, that is to say, he would no longer announce a hero's unexpected death, but commemorate the dead hero in a culture of narrative remembrance, and in doing so, he would possibly end it on a compensating positive note. That would not be difficult given Charlemagne's overall glorious achievements as a monarch; nevertheless, we cannot be certain exactly how far along this path he came.

Summing up, we still have to decide on quintessential points of terminology. Lejeune (1950, 388) speaks of a "premier berceau" of epic poetry and considers "le Midi méditerranéen et pyrénéen" as such. Yes, there was that "premier berceau" but I would like to see the term *pyrénéen* entirely removed and *méditerranéen*

replaced by *Franco-Provençal*. We are talking about the Franco-Provençal proto-epic; for Vienne, Lyon and Savigny lie in the Franco-Provençal area, Cluny and Mâcon were also within it at that time and are only *récemment francisés* with clear Franco-Provençal traces remaining (cf. J.-B.-Martin 1990, 673b–674a), Romans-sur-Isère is only about 10 km outside it. On the question of 'how', I have tried in this volume to reach the very limits of what is knowable. This leaves the question of 'why'. Lejeune (1950, 388–390) was in principle correct in pointing out that the Muslim threat was felt sooner and more strongly in the South than in the North; but here, too, I would like to describe the detail with my own words.

The 9th c. after the death of Charlemagne and the 10th c. were negative centuries for France. But among all the great calamities, only the comparatively smallest ones, the Hungarian invasions, affected North and South in approximately equal measure; they were confined to the time from 899–954 and, from a French perspective, they resolved themselves. Excluding these, the North faced different problems than the South did, especially the coastal South.

In the North, the 9th c. is characterised by the catastrophic vacillations of Louis the Pious, by the incessant wars due to the rivalry between his sons and the lack of discipline that this caused in the higher nobility, and by defeats at the hands of Bretons and Normans. The 10th c. then saw a bitter rivalry between wo dynasties which opened the way for humiliating invasions by the once-defeated Saxons. The Islamic threat played a very small part in people's thinking in the North; even at the end of this period, Hugh Capet cancelled his half-hearted plan to offer military support to Catalonia at the earliest possible opportunity.

The situation was very different in the far South. At the end of the 7th c., the Arabs brought North Africa under their control; in 707/708 they added the Balearic Islands, in 711–718 the whole of the Spanish coast, and from then until almost the year 1000 they fostered anarchy in Corsica and Sardinia through constant attacks. When they started to invade Sicily in 827, they blocked access to the eastern Mediterranean first by the southern route, then by capturing Messina in 843, by the northern route as well. This practically put an end to the sea trade that was the source of wealth for the Galloromanian coastal cities.[1751] On

---

1751 I am aware that Maurice Lombard (1972, 31–46, first published in the *Ann. ESC* 3, 1948, 188–199) took the basic hypothesis of Pirenne's *Mahomet et Charlemagne* and tried to turn it, under the same title, almost into its opposite. But even if in the 9th c. there were still some clandestine trading relationships that we cannot trace any more today (e.g. arms smuggling) as well as trade via the western route Gascony-Navarre-Saragossa-Córdoba as well as via southern Italy, Venice and especially Byzantium, the quantitatively undeniable fact remains that there could not have been significant amounts of trade passing through the Galloromanian port cities on the Mediterranean.

the land front, the Frankish offensive outside Tortosa in the Marca Hispanica had broken down in the last years of Charlemagne's life. In 826 the Frankish forces in the Marca managed to quell the Goth Aizo's pro-Muslim rebellion, but only with great difficulty and after a Muslim army had thoroughly laid waste the area around Barcelona and Girona. From 841 until 871, large areas of the continental southern part of Italy were under Muslim control, and a bridgehead at the Garigliano managed to hold on until 915. At the same time, the raids by Muslim fleets along the whole of the continental coast began to take their toll: in 838 against Marseille, in 842 and 850 against Arles, in 849 against Luni, the Riviera and on into Provence; in 846 a Muslim army laid waste the area around Rome, including the Old Church of St. Peter, in 852 another army did the same to Barcelona, and it was besieged again in 861. The biggest threat lay in the possibility that these raids might lead to permanent settlements in the most favourable places for shipping, which would on the one hand prevent the Christians from maintaining even a modest level of coastal trade, and on the other hand enable kidnapping activities inside these countries. It appears that the chroniclers sometimes could not keep up with events as they occurred; thus, when Hincmar (*Ann. Bert.* for the year 869) is writing about Archbishop Roland's unfortunate defensive earthwork on the Camargue, he notes in an *ad hoc* way that the Saracens 'used to have a harbour there': *in qua portum Saraceni habere solebant*! The robbers' den *par excellence* was created in 888 in the mountain fortress of *Fraxinetum* (La Garde-Freinet, 9 km above the Gulf of Saint-Tropez). It became a thorn in the flesh of the whole of the Southeast, since raiders emanated from there to plunder Vienne, Grenoble, Asti and even the Central Alps until it was destroyed in around 973/975. For the broader European powers, however, the problem of Fraxinetum was not even worthy of a campaign in 962 when King Adalbert of Italy, whom Otto the Great liked to consider a usurper, fled to Fraxinetum and from there made his way back to Central Italy via Corsica. It was not until 972, when Abbot Majolus of Cluny, one of the leading figures in Christianity at that time, was captured at the Great St. Bernard Pass on his way back from Rome and needed rescuing, that Count William of Arles, who called himself Margrave of Provence from then onwards, destroyed the stronghold, apparently with the help of people from Burgundy and Turin. With the benefit of hindsight, we can see that this victory marked the start of the slow but steady Renaissance of France in the eleventh, twelfth and even thirteenth century; but the victory itself was achieved solely by the Southeast. It is clear how pressing the Muslim threat constantly was for the Southeast in the century between 869 and 973/975; but is equally obvious how little resonance it had in the North.

The Song of interest to us is from about a century earlier than the destruction of Fraxinetum. Poetry tends to flourish not so much in places where trouble strikes, but in neighbouring areas, where life continues more or less as normal and there is at least a minimum of ease and relaxation, but where people are affected by the suffering of their neighbours, because the same could happen to them tomorrow. Trouble was rife along the coast of the Mediterranean itself, and people in the middle Rhône area were increasingly worried about it. The fate of the recently deceased Archbishop Roland in itself could only have saddened, or perhaps horrified people. But this changed when people widened their perspective to look at the fate of the other Roland. His death in itself had been similarly meaningless in military terms, and probably just the result of bad decisions; but it took on a deeper meaning the minute it was embedded within the glory of the Carolingian Empire, as one of the inevitable sacrifices that God demanded of his Christians to support every great cause, and for ever would demand. And this recollection of the past greatness of Charlemagne's rule, whether the audience were fully aware of it or not, carried the hope that what was possible once could be possible again. Thus, in the midst of deep humiliation, a highly civilised nation can find in the memory of its own past the seed of its future greatness.

C.15.7.5 Galloromania, 11th century

In the 9th c., and outside the middle Rhône strip even in the 10th c., *Ro(t)lan(d)* was an uncommon name; in the course of the 11th c., its popularity spread out slowly from the middle Rhône strip across large parts of Galloromania, but nowhere as spectacularly as it had in about 900, when it had suddenly appeared in the middle Rhône strip. Looking at the whole picture, this pattern is too similar to the spread of the name *Olivier* to be independent of it. Here, too, we see the name speedily covering the South, including Catalonia. On the one hand, and a little later, it travels along the *strade francesche* to northern Italy (and some time after that it reaches the parts of the southeast of France that are not close to this road). On the other hand, it is clearly welcomed at an early date in the Anjou region, and in the surrounding area under its influence. This is broadly similar to the spread of the name *Olivier* before about 1060; in the last third of the century, this name also travels from the middle Rhône area northwards, through the Duchy of Burgundy, where there are indications that it will carry on to Lorraine and into the Champagne region. It is appropriate, therefore, to present the references in geographical order, just as I did with Olivier, but I have no intention of striving for exact parallels; for there can be minor discrepancies of up to about 25

years in either direction between the two names.[1752] In the other areas, I cannot yet detect any increase in the name in the 11ᵗʰ c.; the name remains more or less as it was before: not very common.

There is no need to provide references for the continuing popularity of the name in the middle Rhône strip. In the southern half of France, its development is most clearly detectable along the whole of the Mediterranean coast: here the burgeoning success of the name is already manifest around the turn of the millennium or shortly after it. Here too, I omit some scattered references from smaller sources,[1753] and concentrate on presenting its development through three informative groups of references.

Far towards the east, Lérins (founded shortly after 400, one of the oldest abbeys in Western Christendom): 48 a. 1007 *Rollannus firmavit* (2x); 340 a. 1007; 118 a. 1038 (B *Petrus*); 126 a. 1030–1046; 94 a. 1041 (*R. de Manuasca*, perhaps = one of the two from p. 48); 70 a. 1038–1062 (*Rollanus Truannus*, cf. above the pair who are probably not brothers no. [2]); 130 a. 1061 (*R. Cabrias*); also 112s. several others only vaguely datable to *saec*. XI.

Similarly, in approximately the middle of Marseille: after the isolated reference from the year 814 the next one is 1.641 (2 documents) a. 1015 *Rothlannus levita scripsit* = 1.642 a. 1019 *Rothlannus sacerdos et monachus scripsit* = 1.618 a. 1037 *Rothlandus scripsit*; 1.207 a. 1017 *Rohtlandus* (sic, F *Leotaldus*, B *Isnardus*); 1.593 a. 1030; 2.118 a. 1040; 2.121 a.1043 *Roltannus* (scribal error); and then on into the second half of the century, from which we will cite only 1.469

1752 I can only offer my suspicion that the reason for these discrepancies might lie in the character of the two names. The name *Roland* was uncommon across most of Galloromania, but it had not been forgotten; it was formed in a way that made it an ordinary name, with two parts, the meaning of which was no longer understood, though the form would have perhaps made sense in comparison with the likes of *Ro(t)-bert* but this would not have been important, because many dozens of names shared this type of structure; parents who now chose this name for their son would have been thinking that they were going back to a "good old name" which now had acquired a new connotation of manliness and heroism (which were fundamentally timeless ideals) – whereas *Olivier* must have appeared modernising, and more subtly, it would have evoked a rational and peace-loving hero. Since there were certainly trendsetters among the local parents, the choice of one or other of these two names could represent a short-term advantage over others.

1753 Nevertheless, we should note the following: because of the early date of the Languedoc-HgL 5.359 a. 1013 *Rodlandus*, lay assessor in Béziers; and because of their high position: in 1063 an Abbot Roland of Saint-André dies in Avignon (Languedoc-HgL 3.342s.), and in 1068 another Roland is Abbot in Montmajour (5 km northeast of Arles, Avignon-Cath. 2.115). Another scattered reference in the above-mentioned sense is the *Rodlandus* in brother pair no. 4 (Béziers 119 a. 1091).

around 1060 *domos que fuerunt de Pontio Rothlando*, because the second name here is either an acquired epithet (in which case obviously after the epic hero) or – more likely – a patronymic, which means it is equivalent to a reference from before 1040.

Similarly, also Catalonia, which still counts as part of Galloromania in these centuries. Here Coll i Alentorn (1956, passim) lists 25 references for the 11th c., behind which there are almost as many individuals. I am grateful for a reminder from Carlos Álvar (email of 13. 02. 2014) – that the reference from 1012 comes from a later cartulary tradition, the one from 1018 is suspected of being a misreading of *Rodullus*, and the one from 1020 (where a *signum Guillelmi Rodlandi* may already be a patronymic) comes from Carcassonne, that is to say from outside the Catalan-speaking area, and along with 1043 and 1059 starts off a chain of references which quickly begins to increase in size. In the case of one interesting reference, a *signum Rollandi Marchesi* from the year 1093, we cannot exclude the possibility that it is imitating the French epic nexus *Rollant le marchis* (cf. e. g. Rol. v. 630).[1754] From my own material we can add: Delisle-Rouleaux 58 a. 1051 *Rodlandus abba*, already deceased, Saint-Genis-des-Fontaines/Sant Genis de Fontanes (Roussillon); Sant Cugat 2.329 no. 665 a. 1068 *ego Rotlandus abbas coenobii Sancti Cucuphatis*; probably also belonging in this group is LFM 1.417 (quoted from Kremer 1972, 153) a. 1095 *Rutilandus*. Occasionally, the name passed from Catalonia into areas on the edge of Aragón: EEMCA 3.515 a. 1078 (charter issued by King Sancho Ramírez) *Rodelan Remon in Laguarres*, magnate in Laguarres (only just inside Prov. Huesca, east of Graus on the Isábena).[1755]

1754 We cannot put it more strongly than this, because *Marches* also appears as a standalone name from Catalonia to Portugal, and in fact too early to be a reference to Roland; I have myself noted the following references, without even trying to carry out a systematic search: Ribagorza 385 a. 986 *Sig†num Egigane filium Marches*, 413 a. 1009 *ego Marches aut uxor mea Matrona*, 489 a. 1026 *Marche*s; S.Juan de la Peña 2.37 a. 1050 *Marches iudex*; Valvanera (Rioja) 154 = 610 a. 1110 *Don Marches, testis*; Portugal-Cortesão 12.121 a. 1068 *Marquizi* and a. 1083 *Marquiz*, second names.

1755 Apart from this instance, the name seems not to have penetrated into Aragón until considerably later: Lacarra cites e. g. Ebro-Lacarra (1946, 520) a. 1129 *Pere Rodlane* = 1.527 a. 1131 *Petrus Rodlandus*; Ebro-Lacarra (1949, 559) a. 1130 *Raimundus Rodlandus*, which are equivalent to Roland references from around 1110, but here *Rodlandus* may have been an immigrant from Galloromania. Quite considerably later the name crops up in the rest of Spain: Álvar (2014, 16 and 25–27) whose study of the history of the name *Roland* is a model of meticulousness, cites as early references *domnus Roldan* a. 1164 and *dominus Roldanus* in 1183 in Burgos, *Roldán* also in 1181 in Hita (Guadalajara) and in 1192 in Sahagún (León), 1199 *Iohannes Roldán*

The name's journey from the middle Rhône westwards into the Massif Central (and then on into Saintonge, the Bordelais area and Gascony) began relatively early. It can be traced by following this chain of references: Brioude 247 a. 1000–1011 *Rolandus*, 307 a. 1011–1031 *Rodlandus* (immediately before *Oliverius*; cf. above the pair who are probably not brothers no. *1); Conques 23 a. 1013 *Rodlandus*, 309 a. 997–1030 *Rotlandus*, 181 a. 997–1031 *Rotlandus*, benefactor, 200 11th c. *Rodlandus*, 27 a. 1078 *Rollandus*, 315 a. 1061–1108 *Rotlandus*, son of a female benefactor; Gellone 10 probably around 1030–1035 *Rothlannus* (undated, comes between charters from the years 1029 and 1027–1048); *Spicilegium* (d'Achery 13.451 = de la Barre 2.586), in the generation after Bishop Hugh of Agen († 1011) *Rotlandus de Sancta Genovefa* (Sainte-Geneviève-sur-Argence, Aveyron); Languedoc-HgL 5.416 around 1035 *Guillelmus Rolandus*, guarantor near Foix; 5.597 around 1073 *Rodlandus*, cofounder of a church in Volvestre (= Lézat 1.180 "vers 1072–1081"); Saint-Jean-d'Angély 234 a. 1040 *Rolannus* (var. *Rodlandus*); Saintonge-S.Florent 51 around 1080 *Rollandinus*, witness; Baigne (Diocese of Saintes) a. 1083–1098 *Rotlandus*, son of Agnes and Odo; La Réole 111 "a. 1030?" (comes between charters from the years 1026 and 1026–1030) *Rotlanus*, but not again until 127 a. 1086 *Rotlandus, fideiussor* for Raymond de Gensac; Talmond 93 a. 1080–1115 *Rolandus de Paludello*.

In Italy, the name *Roland* is clearly understood as an epic name from about 1050 onwards, and so it must have travelled there before that date from the middle Rhône area along the *viae Francigenae*, but it seems, on average, to have reached the areas away from these roads in the mountainous southeastern part of France only over a slightly longer time scale. A certain Count Poncius and his knight *Rotlannus* transferred two churches over to the Cluniacs, probably in the year 1040/1041, but perhaps not until 1062, and they were located in Saint-Jean-d'Hérans, almost 40 km south of Grenoble (Cluny

---

in Montorio (León), but *Rodlán* 1202 in Salamanca as well as (with the northwestern -l- < -ll-) *Rolam* in 1190 in Matilla (western León), *Martinus Rolam* in 1198 in Santiago de Compostela and in 1208 *Petrus Muniz, dictus Rolam* in Toxos Outos (A Coruña), where at the end of the 12th c. a female *Rolana* is also attested (on the spread of the metathetical form with -ld- cf. also Álvar, 2014, 25–27). The metathetical form must have arisen first in Spain (comparable with the Span. *tilde < titulus*, *cabildo < capitulum*, *roldana < *rotulana*, Álvar 2014, n. 22). Álvar (2014, passim) correctly explains that it is not possible to assume with Menéndez Pidal that *Rodlán* was imported from northern (!) France, perhaps even in the 10th c., nor is it plausible that a Span. *Cantar de Rodlane* could be the source of the *Nota*. For the same reasons, I think that Pérez de Urbel (1945, 1060ss.) goes too far when he argues for the existence of a *Don Roldán*, Abbot of Monzón de Campos (13 km north of Palencia), at least for the year 860 or shortly after 866 on the basis of a charter surviving only as a Spanish translation apparently in the 13th c.

4.151 with n. 1).[1756] But – instead of this single case, a more sustainable group can be found too, for example in the cartulary starting from the year 1027 from the Domène monastery. *Monasterium (Beatorum Petri et Pauli) de Domina*, about 8 km east of Grenoble, but 40 km south of the road going from Lyon-Maurienne-Montgenèvre-Turin, with the name starting to appear from the year 1058 onwards, rarely at first: 3 around 1058 *Rotlannus miles* (W *Odda domini Ainardi neptis*) = 9 around 1060 *dominus Rotlannus de Podio Bozonis* = 6 around 1062 *ego Pontius comes fidelisque meus Rotlandus miles strenuus* = 8 around 1080 *Rotlannus de Podio Bozonis*; but now also 7 around 1080 *ego Rotlannus f [ilius] Rotlanni* (confirms the above-mentioned donation to Cluny by his father in Saint-Jean d'Hérans); 9 around 1082 *Rotlannus praepositus* (of a *Petrus Lethaldus*); 144 around 1085–1105, 188 around 1090 *Rotlannus de Tedesio*; 24 around 1090 *Andreas Rotlannus, villicus de Treviis*; also from 80 around 1085 to 191 around 1100–1115 passim *Rotlannus / Rol(l)annus monachus cellerarius*.

Let us turn now from the southern half of France to the northern half, starting – as we did in the case of *Olivier* – with its western part, i.e. with the Anjou area and the surrounding region under its influence, which together also provide an early and compact set of references: Dunois-Marmoutier 98 a. 1039–1040 *Rotlandus ministerialis episcopi*, 24 a. 1042–1044 *Rotlandus de Coldrei*, 146 a. 1097 *Rollandus*; Bretagne-Morice 415 a. 1034–1064/1065 (under the Abbacy of Albert des Marmoutier) *mansuram Rolandi de Acanaiso* (charter issued by Marmoutier; Martigné area, 10 km south of Mayenne); Blésois-Marmoutier 53 a. 1061 *Rolandus bucca*; Angers-S.Aubin 1.247 around 1065 *Rollandus Auduini filius*, 1.350 a. 1082–1106 *Rolandus* (cf. brother pair no. 5), 408s. a. 1098 *Rollandus* (in Le Mans); Saint-Maur-sur-Loire 361 soon after 1066 *Rollandus*, monk, son of the donor Simon Francigena; Le Mans-S.Vincent 160 a. 1082–1102 *Rolandus*, 50 a. 1093–1104 *Rolandus Fradaldus*, 26 a.1081–1082 *Rotlandus mancipium*, 178 a. 1055–1062 *Rotlandus*, 203 end of the 11th c. *Rotbertus Rotlandi filius de Rua Haraldi* ≈ Tours-S.Julien 1.71 a. 1096 *Rotlandus de Rua Haraldi*, *Rotbertus Rolandi* lay witness = Le Mans-Cath. 110 a. 1096 *Robertus Rotlandus*, *Rotlandus de Rua-Haraudi*, lay witness; Quimperlé 192 a. 1069 *Rollant de Leun*, Viscount of Léon; Maine-Marmoutier 2.45 and 2.445 end of the 11th c. *Rollandus de Credone*.

There is also some spread towards the south: Nouaillé 195 a. 1060–1078 *Rotlandus de Vulnol* (Vouneuil-sur-Vienne), 252 a. 1087 *Rothlandus*; Saint-Maixent 1.233 a. 1100 *filius meus Rotlandus* (of Ademar of Chizé, Deux-Sèvres) = Saint-Jean-d'Angély 92 around 1099 *Rotlannus de Casiaco*.

1756 Chevalier (1913–1926, 1.307 and 340) records this donation twice, with different dates.

And what is the situation northeast of the Anjou complex in neighbouring Normandy? Engel/Serrure (1891–1905, 2.381) point out a *RO-LAN*, treasurer for Richard II (996–1026); but this person could have been someone from a different country who made his rather exceptional skills available to further the interests of the ambitious Duke of a young state. In the *Exchequer Domesday* from the year 1086–1087 Hildebrand (1884, 352) found seven references to the name *Rollandus* (vol. 1, 23c, 25a, 25c, 120d, 212c, 227a [2]); they seem to refer back to four individuals (including one who is an archdeacon). After him in the 11th c. only 1.121 a. 1092–1096 *Rollandus episcopus* of Dol in Brittany (1093–1107, GC 14.1047s.) is attested, who apparently died as a monk of the Mont-Saint-Michel (cf. Duiné 1921, 93–95). Lejeune, in her list of Roland names (1950, 386s.) states there is a "large diffusion du nom" in Normandy and then refers only to Boissonnade (1923, 319); but none of Boisssonade's references stand up to scrutiny. We proved this in connection with *Rual-/Ruel-* above (in section C.13.2 'The names *Riuallon/Ruuallon/Rualent* etc., *Roland* and *Olivier* especially in the Dinan dynasty') which were in fact variants of the Celtic name *Riuallon*; moreover, Boissonnade cites many charters from the Mont-Saint-Michel cartulary with incorrect dating: on f. 126 one reference is not from 1155–1172, but from a. 1191, the other not from a. 1124, but from a. 1224; the references on f. 89, 90, 93, 94 and 101 are (according to Ed. Keats-Rohan) not from the second half of the 11th c., but from the period after 1130; a f. 150 (with a reference supposedly from the 11th c.) does not exist (and the supposed *Ruelend Calcebof* is not a Roland and only attested from 1128 onwards). There is no sign that the name *Roland* is popular in Normandy until towards the end of the 11th c., and this supports our similarly late findings for the name *Olivier* and for the pairs of brothers: Normandy is clearly well behind the trend, in comparison with Anjou.

    We turn now to the name's journey from south to north and further to the east! There is an isolated, and probably early reference from the Duchy of Burgundy (apart from the Mâconnais and some of the Chalonnais region), namely Bourgogne-Plancher p. XXVI which is undated (arranged between charters from a. 1006 and 1020) *Rotlanus, presbiter S. Juliani*. However, Marcigny-sur-Loire (Diocese of Autun, 80 km south of there) is more typical of the name's progress from the middle Rhône strip northwards into the Bourbonnais region and the Duchy of Burgundy, or to be precise, typical of the first phase of it; the cartulary starts in the year 1045 and the name does too: 158 around 1045 *sing[num] de Rotlan*; 55 a. 1055–1096 Ermengarde, daughter of a *Rotlan*; 18 a. 1055–1096 *Rotlan* of Roanne; 41= 48 a. 1065–1094 = 48 a. 1094–1096 *Rotlannus* of Pommiers; 51 a. 1088–1094 *Rotlannus* of Sarry; 51 before 1096 *Rotlan du Mont* = (?) 51 before 1096 *Rotlan* of Monceau, son of Arnoul, and about 20 km further to the north-

northeast we find in Paray-le-Monial 27 before 1065 (cf. in this reference p. XIII) a benefactor *Rotlannus Glorious*(!). The rest of the Duchy of Burgundy followed suit in the last third of the century: in north-western Burgundy with Bouquet 11.377c (and 12.306) a. 1085 death of *Rothlannus*, Abbot of Saint-Germain d'Auxerre (from *Gesta abbatum Sancti Germani Autissiodorensis*), the Burgundian northern border with Champagne with the monastery of Molesmes (which was only founded in the year 1075): 61 a. 1076–1099 *Rollannus de Colanno* = 248 a. 1076–1111 *Rollanus de Colanz*; 128 around 1096 *Rollanus prepositus*; 129 a. 1076–1120 *Rollanus iocula-tor, homo Sancte Marie*; 111 a. 1089–1110 *Rolannus miles*.[1757] Remiremont already belongs to the southern part of neighbouring Lorraine. Its references are only par-tially datable by palaeographic means: Cv III "after 1000" *Rodlandus*; 12r°VI and A 1r°III (scribe 51) second half of the 11th c. *Rodlandus*; 64r°IX (scribe 51), second half of the 11th c. *Rotlandus* (F *Rodowicus*, B *Richardus*, *Evrardus*); 66r°V (probably scribe 53) last third of the 11th c. *Rolandus*; 26r°II (scribe 57) around 1100 *Rolandus*. Just across the border with Champagne lies Montier-en-Der 234s. c.1050–c.1085 *Rotlannus, pater domni Odonis*, and *Rotlannus de Fontanis*, Champagne-d'Arbois 1.500 a. 1085 (= GC 12.254 a. 1081) *Rolandus, filius Arduini, miles* of the Count of Troyes.

In the rest of Galloromania, that is to say in the area controlled by the Cape-tians and further north of there, I have only been able to find six or seven indi-viduals in the whole of the 11th c. Apart from Bouquet 11.570c a. 1035 (charter issued by Henry I of France) *Rollandus*, monk, probably in Saint-Riquier, they are all in the second half of the century; I will cite them roughly in south-to-north order: Néronville (near Château-Landon) 306 a. 1085 *Rolandus Brito*; PhilippeI 124 a. 1065–1089 *Rollandus* in Quiers (Seine-et-Marne, 55 km southeast of Paris); Paris-Saint-Martin-des-Champs 27 a. 1061–1065 *Rotlandus* = 32 a. 1067, 23 around 1070 *Rotlannus* = 35 a. 1070 *Rollandus*, Prior of Saint-Martin-des-Champs, per-haps the one who was later Bishop of Senlis; Gams 628 a. 1072–1075 *Rollandus*, Bishop of Senlis;[1758] Ponthieu 18 a. 1100 (= GC 10, instr. 298) a. 1100 *Rodlanus*

1757 Mortier (1939, 145–151) believed that he had found a Roland from before 1089 in the Franche-Comté among the references he had collected for the Montroland 5 km north of the Dôle: a. 1089 *Montis Rolonis*, a. 1107 *Montis Relenis*, a. 1109 *Monte Roolans* (ou *Roolando*), a. 1133 *Montis Roolenis*, a. 1162 id., a. 1190 *Monte Roolino*. Even though the etymological basis of this toponym is difficult to determine (cf. however Morlet and Förstemann on Merovingian Lat. *Hrodo-lenus* < *-lĭn* < *-līn*), it is simply not correct to classify five out of six references as unexplained deviations from the usual spelling of the name *Roland*; it is much more likely that the toponym was only gradu-ally (and certainly not until after 1200) affected by attraction to the name *Roland*.

1758 The list of Bishops of Senlis according to Gams contains here: 1043–1053 *Frotlandus I*, 1058 *sedit Guido III*, 1059–1067 *Frotlandus II*, 1067–1069 *Odo II*, 1072–1075 *Rollandus* [or in fact from 1071 at the latest, cf. Philippe-I 162], 1075 or 1076 *Ingelardus* [. . .]. *Frotlandus* is a regular,

fossarius, one of the *hospites* donated to the newly founded Abbey of Saint-Pierre in Abbeville (Diocese of Amiens) by Acard of Cambron (5 km west of Abbeville); Hasnon 69 *Rotlandus* (= Bouquet 11.110s. *Rothlandus*) a. 1064–1084 first Abbot of Hasnon (Diocese of Arras), was previously a monk in Saint-Amand, *beatus* (Bibl. SS. s. v.). There are also three small toponyms (ultimately of indeterminable age): Paris-Notre-Dame 1.330 around 1006 *Exartum Rotlandi* (near Melun); Vermandois-Colliette 1.685 (= Saint-Quentin-Hémeré Instr. 36) a. 1045 *usque ad Rollandi descensum*; Cambrai-évêques 88 a. 1064 *villa Rotlancurt* (Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai for Saint-Sépulcre de Cambrai) = 110 a. 1071 *de Rolandicorte.*[1759] Even if there are now a few references from the Île-de-France among this group, no-one would claim that there is a fashion for this name in the Capetian domains and the territory north of there; on the contrary, the 'Capetian barrier' was clearly still in force.

One person dominates the end of the 11th c.: Pope Urban II, the initiator of the First Crusade, born as Odo of Châtillon-sur-Marne or probably more precisely of Lagery (15 km further to the north), from the Champagne region, and therefore in the light of France's binary division, an inhabitant of northern France. But when he tried to build support in his homeland for his great plan, he did not make his ardent appeal somewhere in northern France, choosing instead to do it in Clermont-Ferrand, only about 120 km west of Savigny, where the popularity of name *Roland* reached its peak, and where a little later we first encountered the name *Olivier*. The tenor of his speech is reported by the historians of the First Crusade, probably most clearly by Robertus Monachus (RHC occ. 3.727s.): 'You, who have distinguished yourselves through your deeds (*operibus*) as the chosen ones among all the peoples, follow the *gesta praedecessorum vestrorum* and the *probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni regis* and turn all your strength against the enemies of Christ, instead of tearing each other apart!'. This was probably very similar in tone to the closing appeal written a good hundred years before in the *Girart de Vienne*, which originated not far from Savigny and was the first song to tell of Roland-and-Olivier. As overall commander of the Crusade, Urban appointed

---

though rare Germ. name with Goth. *frōth(s)*, OE *frōd*, OHG *frōd*, *fruod* 'clever' (Förstemann 541ss.) and therefore a *lectio difficilior*; there is no reason to change it into *Rotlandus/Rollandus* (and either make a distinction between several bishops called *Rollandus* or combine them all into one). However, this did occasionally happen in older sources, as for example in Bouquet 11.622c a. 1049 (Council of Reims) *Rollandus silvanectensis [episcopus]*.

1759 According to Gysseling s. v. this place is not the same as Rollancourt (Pas-de-Calais, 50 km southeast of Boulogne), since the name (from *Hrodo-lenus*) was affected later by attraction to *Roland*: a. 974 (?) *Rolleni curtem*, 12th c. *Rutlencurt*, around 1120 *Rollaincurt*, but in a. 1123 *Rollandi curia*, a. 1128 *Rodlanni curia*.

Ademar de Monteil (today Montélimar), who was from the Rhône Valley and also Bishop of Le Puy, the very place from where the most important impetus for the Peace of God movement emanated. Urban then travelled northwards through the west of southern France, in a loop via Angers, Le Mans and Vendôme to the Archbishop's See of Tours, which had been part of the Angevin state for over fifty years; he covered almost the entire area that was under Angevin influence, the very same area that gave us the early Olivier and Roland references. It is as if the Pope was following the trail of these two names. From Tours, he returned by a similar route, that is to say via Poitiers, Saint-Maixent, Saint-Jean-d'Angély, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Carcassonne, Nîmes to Vienne and Romans in our middle Rhône strip, and finally, back the way he came, via the Montgenèvre and Asti to Rome (on the entire route cf. Jaffé-Löwenfeld 5569 [4167] – 5669 [4244]). He avoided the Capetian crown domain including Paris and the Archbishop's See of Sens, because he had recently pronounced an interdict on King Philip due to his bigamy (which was also a scandalous breach of feudal rules). Neither did he visit Normandy with its Archbishop's See of Rouen, the whole of the north or even the old coronation centre of Reims, nor anywhere in his homeland which was close by. Does this France, which he was most concerned to meet with, not look astonishingly similar to the epic-loving France that was defined by the names Roland and Olivier in these same years?

Less than three years after Urban's appeal, Ademar died at Antioch, and the most glorious renown from the First Crusade was bestowed, not upon anyone from the southern part of France, but upon the Norman Bohemund. However, when Bohemund was on his way back to France eight years later to recruit for his so-called Crusade against Alexios, he briefly stopped at Saint-Léonard-de-Noblat, feeling that he owed something to this saint, because he was famous for breaking the chains of prisoners, but then Bohemund headed northwards towards Flanders, passing through the Île-de-France, the Chartrain area, Normandy and then southwards to Poitiers. We hear almost nothing about southern France because he had fallen out with the southern French contingent since the First Crusade.[1760] When Pope Urban was looking for human participants to realise the epic dimensions of his great plan, he had consciously or unconsciously turned to the part of France that had maintained an enthusiasm for epic poetry over the previous two centuries; the Norman looked for his support further to the northwest, and epic poetry went with him.

1760 The most precise account of his route is by Yewdale (1924, 106–112).

C.15.8 Review of Roland

The defeat in 778 was the only one that Charlemagne ever experienced as commander of the troops, and therefore to a certain extent, the only one for which he was personally responsible; it was the only defeat in his entire life that was not avenged and could never be forgotten, because it was almost repeated in 813, and essentially repeated in 825. The shock still reverberates after 840 in the words of the Astronomus, and this is clear when we analyse the intention behind what he writes; it was the only Frankish defeat in Charlemagne's lifetime in which a clearly defined section of the army was killed down to the last man; the only defeat in which *plerique aulicorum* 'most of his courtiers', and therefore the people who were living in daily communion with him, were killed, and so it was the only defeat which is reported in the Annals with quite exceptionally emotional language, referring to the 'heart' of the monarch and his spirit being 'clouded over'.

All three of the contemporary sources of evidence for the existence of Roland and his death in 778 are valid (charters, *Vita Karoli*, coins); the idea that he was not killed in 778, or even that he never existed, comes from a hypercritical (and not even profound) basic misconception. Roland was probably a member of the Wido family (which explains why his name was suppressed in the B category of *Vita Karoli* mss.). We can surmise that he, with 50 % probability, was 'somehow' related to Charlemagne because of the social structure of the leading class in the Carolingian realm; it is less probable that he was his nephew, but we cannot categorically rule this out.

Eggihard and Anselm, because of their official roles at the court, were 'predestined' to lead the baggage train; precisely because Roland was not an *aulicus*, his role can only be commander of the section of the army ordered to protect the baggage train, which means that when the battle commenced, he was the effective commander-in-chief. This must have been self-evident to the survivors; it explains why his name was preserved in epic poetry, while the names of the two *aulici* were not.

In the two centuries between 840 and 1040, there are two traces from the North of a probable survival of the memory of Roland. First, in around 900 or a little later in Saint-Denis, the forger of the supplementary charter to Fulrad's will inserted 'Count Roland' as a witness, although this name is not in his source, and wrote the name in a form that he had not taken from the *Vita Karoli*. Secondly, probably during the time the Normans were beginning to merge with the indigenous people – in other words around the middle of the 10th c. – the Normans appear to have taken the name *Roland* from a traditional story told by the indigenous people and slotted it into a similar tale from the time of

their own conquests; the form of the story that came out of this is preserved in Dudo, who probably heard it from his main informant Raoul d'Ivry.

Much greater creativity is evident in these centuries in the South, however, or more precisely, in the Franco-Provençal area near the Rhône Bend. Just before the year 900, a fashion for the name *Roland* appeared there almost like an explosion, and it continued on into the 11th c., and in the first hundred years this marks a sharp contrast with the rest of Galloromania, which is why it needs a reliable explanation. This trend must have started in about 870–880, too soon after the death of Archbishop Roland of Arles in the year 869 to be entirely independent of that event; but on the other hand, neither geographically nor in its steadfast persistence, is it plausible that this event was its cause, because there is no trace of any significant veneration of the archbishop. The only explanation that remains is the assumption that a poet was inspired by the somewhat unheroic death of the archbishop to cast his mind back to the heroic death of the older Roland, and make a poem about him, and this is the very first tangible evidence we have of a Song of Roland. He may have been the one who made Roland into Charlemagne's nephew, and for him, Roland's enemy would simply have been the Muslims. Judging by the strength and long duration of its effect, he must have been the first of a small number of great moulders of the Roland material, before the one from Vienne, the Angevin poet, and Turold. His existence is, of course, hypothetical, and at the very limit of what is knowable; but because an effect that is so specific must have a specific cause, I prefer this hypothesis above the two other options, which are extreme and mutually contradictory: the first option cursorily attributes the first two hundred years of Roland material to the amorphous activity of many individuals, while the second denies its very existence.

C.16 Gefreid d'Anjou and his brother Tierri/Gaydon

C.16.1 Gefreid d'Anjou

There are ten mentions of *Ge(i)frei (-d, -t) d'Anjou*[1761] in the Song, once (v.3806) with the title *dam* just as Olivier and Ogier (v. 1367, 3546) are only mentioned

---

1761 We find *Ge-/Gei-frei (-d, -t)* O, *Çu-/Ço-frei/-froi* V4, *Jofroi* CV7, *Joiffroi* P, *Gieffroy* T (all < *Gauzfrid* with normal OF /ga-/ > /dža-/, continuing only in northern Italy to > /dz/; ultimately from K *Gauta*, a Scand. tribe) but only K has *Gotefrit* (ultimately from *Guta* 'Goth', but with an early change of meaning into 'God'). It was widely believed throughout the Middle Ages that the two names were identical, and this continued even into modern times (e.g. in Tavernier "Gottfried

once with this title. He appears in the first list of Christians in v. 106 in the midst of six others, the only one who is not a peer, but as *le rei gunfanuner*, with a title that already sounds archaic in the Rol. because of the position of the possessive genitive in front. This key function stays with him. Charlemagne's standard-bearer *per definitionem* cannot belong to the rear guard; but in v. 2951 he again plays an important role when Charlemagne, after destroying the surviving Roncevaux enemies, goes back to Roncevaux and has Gefreid blow his horn to tell the whole army to dismount – for Gefreid both carries Charlemagne's sign and passes on his orders; in the Baligant battle, we are told before the fighting begins (v. 3093): *Gefreid d'Anjou portet l'orie flambe*; and in the archetype of the surviving mss., it was he who killed the enemy standard-bearer Amborre in a daring single combat (v. 3545–3549; cf. above, section A.4.3 'Who killed Amborre?'). Gefreid's second function in the Song is his brother relationship with Tierri: in v. 3806 and 3819 the poet mentions him in order to define Tierri as his brother, and of course Gefreid then is one of the four who, along with the monarch, rush to help the exhausted and wounded victor Tierri (v. 3934–3938). The three remaining mentions show Gefreid as one of Charlemagne's close, and above all active, confidants: with his brother and two others, he carries Charlemagne under a fir tree just as the emperor starts to come back to his senses (v. 2881–2884); he even dares (v. 2945–2949) to turn Charlemagne's attention away from his lament and towards the task of preparing an honourable burial for their own casualties; and at the moment when the enemy is threatening to break through towards the end of the Baligant battle, he is one of the four who support Ogier in his request that the emperor should immediately enter the fray personally in a battle of life and death, and they follow him as he does so (v. 3532–3539).

Since Gefreid – at least from the time when he is the standard-bearer – cannot appear in the slaughter of the rear guard in the central part of the Song, most of these mentions occur in parts of the Song which emerge during its last major revision, presumably by a Norman, either added in (like the Baligant section) or extensively reworked (like the introductory part or the trial of Ganelon). Against this background, the Norman absolutely need not have brought the two Angevin warriors into the Song as new elements, but he did at least treat them very sympathetically, and indeed he rated brave young Tierri even more highly than Gefreid himself.

---

von Anjou"). – *D'Anjou* as an epithet of Gefreid is confirmed for the archetype by OCV7PT, n (*Angio* [*Angia* Bb]), K (*Ajûne*), V4 (*Ançoi*, twice *Anjeus*, once *Açor*), even though in many places only some of the manuscripts have the name.

But Anjou and Normandy had mostly been antagonistic to each other for about two centuries; how can we explain the equally positive depiction of the two in the Song? Henry I of England made pacts with Geoffroy IV of Anjou from around 1103 until around 1106. The latter, born in 1073, had revolted against his father Fulk IV le Réchin with the help of the Angevin barons and managed to force a co-regency. He then allied himself with Henry against Henry's brother Robert of Normandy and captured Bayeux, among other places, after he had set it on fire. But when in 1106 he besieged a rebellious Angevin baron, he was killed by a poison arrow, and it was rumoured that his father had instigated this. When, in the course of the following years, it became ever clearer that the tension between the English and French royal houses would be one of the prevailing themes of the 12th c., Henry I, now undisputed King of England and Normandy sought allies against the Capetians. In 1114, he married his daughter Mathilde to Emperor Henry V: in the year 1119, he tried to lay aside the old animosity against Anjou by engaging his only legitimate son William with one of Fulk's daughters and paying a large sum of money to her father. In the following year, however, the bridegroom drowned when the *Blanche Nef* sank in the English Channel. Five years later, Henry found a way to secure a lasting peace with Anjou although this time at a much higher price: when his son-in-law died in May 1125, he called Mathilde back to England, made the barons swear allegiance to her and her future offspring as the only legitimate heirs to the throne and in 1127 arranged Mathilde's engagement, followed by her marriage in 1128, to the Angevin heir Geoffroy V, who had only been born in 1113, knowing full well that his grandson and prospective successor (Henry II, whose birth he lived to see) would be an Angevin on his father's side.

This therefore means that for the surviving Song, with its co-existing pro-Angevin and pro-Norman characteristics, both quite firmly anchored in the narrative, we have 1119 as a fairly certain, 1128 as a more risky *terminus post quem*; the former fits with the equally stable *terminus* of 'after 1118', which we established from Valtierra plus the Baligant battle plus the capture of Saragossa (cf. above A.9.8.2 'Valtierra and the date of the Chanson de Roland').

But why is Gefreid in the Song *le rei gunfanuner*? At this point, *pace* Tavernier (1913, 135, and 1914, 71–73), we cannot avoid examining Angevin history. Gefreid (< Germ. *Gaut-s-frid*), today Geoffroy, was along with *Foulque(s)* (< Germ. *Fulko*) sometimes still Fulk in English, one of the two leading names in this family, that of the Fulks or Gauzfrids, which in Angers from the year 898 held the office first of Viscount, then probably from 909, and certainly from 929 until 1204 the title of Count. There were five Geoffroys and five Foulques, and the Foulques had the longer total ruling period; but little is known about Fulk I le Roux (~ 919–942) and Fulk II le Bon (942–958/960) – and almost nothing about

their military activities – (Halphen/Poupardin 1913, Index s. vv.), whereas the heroic deeds of Geoffroy I Grisegonelle (958–987) are the stuff of legends. Ferdinand Lot in his youth (1890, passim) discussed these legends at length and was at that time convinced that Geoffroy "provoqua un mouvement épique" with "des chants en son honneur", or to be precise, that "de la fin du Xe au XIIe siècle, Geoffroy Grisegonelle a été dans l'Ouest de la France le héros de récits épiques célébrant particulièrement la part qu'il avait prise à la lutte de Lothaire et Hugues Capet contre les Allemands en 978" (1890, 377 and 393). Even if modern research has shown that these were not so much *chants épiques* as prose anecdotes, their reproduction fills 8 printed pages as we see in the chapter entitled *de Goffredo Grisa Tunica* in the *Chronica de gestis consulum* ['counts'] *Andegavorum* (ed. Halphen/Poupardin 1913, 37–44), and indeed its editor shared Lot's assessment (p. XXXVI). This chapter recounts a decisive battle that the French almost lost against *Dani et Flandrenses*[1762] (p. 42), and reports that Geoffroy Grisegonelle *qui suum* [scil. of the king] *detulerat vexillum* turned it into a victory by charging the enemy so recklessly, that he *vexilli regis lingulas in ore Danorum volitare faceret*. Even if this does not yet have to be intended as a permanent standard-bearer position, this Geoffroy is too similar to the *Gefreid d'Anjou le rei gunfanuner* of the Song to be a coincidence, because the latter, instead of using his lance or sword in the critical moment during the Baligant battle, wields the standard itself when he launches his fierce attack on the enemy standard-bearer Amborre (cf. A.4.3 'Who killed Amborre?').

Strictly speaking, however, we have not yet determined the direction of the borrowing. The Angevin *Chronica* originated in the first half of the 12th c., and the history of its production is layered. According to Halphen's seminal analysis (in Halphen/Poupardin 1913, p. V–XCV) it initially covered only the period up to the death of Fulk IV in 1109 and appears to have been drawn up (p. XXXs.) in the name of Abbot Odo (probably of Marmoutier, a. 1121–1137), but only survived (including the *vexillum* episode) in the later reworking by Thomas, notary to the Angevin Count and Prior of Loches (attested in this role from the year 1130 onwards, † 1168; p. XXVI–XXX), and it may be that a few later alterations by a certain Robin have also crept in (p. XXIV–XXVI), although nothing else is known about him. Thomas incidentally mentions another event from the years 1131–1135 (if

---

1762 Since there was no war in the real history of the 10th c. between the French or Angevins and a Norman-Flemish coalition, Lot thinks the story refers to the German invasion of 978. In fact, it is stated a little later in the text: *Rursus a partibus Alemannie bellum novum exortum est*, and this time a Swabian and a Saxon feature in the account. Moreover, Halphen (in Halphen/Poupardin 1913, p. XXXVI) suggests that the war between King Lothar and Richard I of Normandy (um 961–965) could be used to explain this story.

this is not a later interpolation by Robin; p. XXX). The work that survives today was then used in around 1155 by the author of the *Gesta Ambaziensium domino-rum* (p. XXX).[1763]

Chronologically, then, we cannot exclude the possibility that Gefried d'An-jou's *gunfanuner* attribute was freely invented by the Roland poet and then ended up in the form of the *Chronica* that survived to the present time. But most of the legends about Geoffroy were already circulating before the year 1100, because Fulk IV le Réchin († 1109) alludes to them in his account of events in 1096/1097 (edited in Halphen/Poupardin 1913, 232–238, on its authenticity see in that volume p. LXXXIXs.) with these words: *cuius* [scil. Geoffroy Grisego-nelle's] *probitates* ['deeds proving his courage', not 'virtues', cf. MLLM s. v.] *enumerare non possumus* (p. 233). The motif of the *vexillum regis*-bearer fits nicely into the *Chronica*, and there nothing syntactically, and no noticeable em-phasis that would make it look like an interpolation. On the other hand, if an educated, 12th c. interpolator had taken this from the Rol. and transferred it onto the historical Geoffroy of the 10th c., he would have surely represented this as a permanent position, an entitlement of the Angevin Counts, and would not have casually mentioned a battle against *Dani et Flandrenses* which had never happened. In the surviving Song – and possibly in its earlier Angevin version from the middle of the 11th c. – Gefreid's *gunfanuner* attribute probably comes from an Angevin tradition.[1764]

1763 Halphen's explanations superseded a very different theory advanced by Mabille (which still resonates in Lot's article of 1890). I am not sure that my summary above of Halphen's re-sults represents a consensus in modern research but given the very layered history of the document's origins, it may be unreasonable to expect such a consensus ever to emerge; how-ever, I do not see how it would be possible to arrive at a later date than the one given above.

1764 Even if this were a single non-historic detail within this tradition, there is one factor that may have significantly facilitated its emergence. In most of the Merovingian period, the undisputed saint of the realm was St. Martin, not St. Dionysius. The Merovingian kings did not yet have a war banner for their kingdom; instead, they always took the kingdom's most trea-sured relic with them when they went on campaigns, the surviving half of the cape of St. Mar-tin, the *cappa sancti Martini*, which the cleric charged with its safekeeping, the *cap(p)ellanus*, carried before them *ob adiutorium victoriae* – as Walahfrid Strabo writes (MGH Capit.r.F. 2.515). Even when kings in the late Merovingian period kept the *cappa* beside them in Paris and in the early Carolingian period, they took it with them from one temporary palace to the next, always keeping it in small, specially constructed oratories called *capellae* (cf. on this complex the LM s. v. *Hofkapelle*), and its ownership remained according to medieval law with St. Martin; the keepers of his grave and along with it his heirs and administrators were the monks – or rather from 800 onwards canons – of Saint-Martin de Tours. As explained above in the chapter entitled 'Ganelon' in C.10.2, (according to Raoul Glaber 5.2) in the year 1044, Geoff-roy Martel requested and received a flag from Saint-Martin for his war against the house of

There is still an anachronism in the Song: even if the prototype for the epic Gefreid d'Anjou was a historical figure, he was not a contemporary of Charlemagne. But it is quantitatively no greater than the anachronism pertaining to Grisegonelle's contemporary, Richard the Old of Normandy, and in fact it is smaller, because the Angevins were already Charlemagne's subjects during his reign, while the Normans were not; thus the 'apparent anachronisms' described above in section C.5.1 also apply to Gefreid.

C.16.2 *Tierri d'Anjou*

The name *Tierri d'Anjou*, or *Tierri* for short, retains this form consistently in the β manuscripts, but in O there is a careless mistake in the writing of it on the first and third occasion. In the first place, *Gefrei d'Anjou e sun frere [Tier]ri* (v. 2883, as Segre edits it, following V4PTB), it has *Henri*. Besides a certain palaeographical similarity between the two names, it may be relevant here that in the house of Anjou, there was never any Thierry, but there was a Geoffroy V Plantagenêt of Anjou (and, through marriage, of Normandy); he had two sons named Henry (born in 1133, named after his grandfather on his mother's side, Henry I of England) and Geoffroy (born in 1134); they were regarded as future rulers of the expanding realm and probably so often mentioned in the same breath that they lurked together in subconsciousness of the scribe at this point. In the third place, *Ais li devant uns chevalers, <Tierris>, / Frere Gefrei, a un duc angevin* (v. 3818s.), the name is missing entirely in O. This does not create a gap

---

Blois, which he fastened to his lance, and his victory was widely regarded across France as St. Martin's victory. We should be clear about this constellation: Geoffroy (Martel) of Anjou is St. Martin's standard-bearer, and St. Martin was the saint venerated by the state, who had given the realm its first war banner, the *cappa*, and also the right to create other war banners. And then if, at some later date, the poet of the Angevin Rol., who has been in evidence again and again *à propos* Ganelon, Turpin, Naimes and Olivier (and Marsilius), needed a standard-bearer for Charlemagne in his Song, whom would he have chosen, if not an Angevin? This is *a fortiori* likely, if at that time people still knew about Geoffroy Martel's grandfather, Geoffroy Grisegonelle, or if they thought they knew that he had carried the King of France's *vexillum* in a decisive and victorious battle. – We cannot explain Gefrei's *gunfanuner* attribute by referring to the title (which did not appear until sometime in the 12th c., and in the case of France, unlike the Imperium, was absolutely not historical) of a (Grand-) Seneschal of France, which Henry II laid claim to in the second half of the 12th c.; probably in the year 1158, he had a treatise written, entitled *De majoratu et senescalcia Franciae,* which is a very rough and ready falsification of historical facts (edited by Halphen/Poupardin 1913, 239–246; on his character in the same volume, p. XC–XCIII). In reality, the medieval offices of standard-bearer and seneschal have nothing to do with each other.

syntactically, but it ruins the assonance; the β manuscripts differ from each other more markedly, but they all have this name. The context makes it clear that the β group is correct both times.

This means that the source of the problem is the poet: why does he call Tierri an Angevin, which goes against his usual principle of 'regional conformity' (cf. above C.4.8)? Hans-Erich Keller (1989, 43s.) answered this in a way that merits serious consideration: Sibylle of Anjou, the sister of Geoffroy V married Thierry d'Alsace, the Count of Flanders in 1134 (or 1139?); the poet would then be representing the brother-in-law relationship as a brother relationship. The reason for this – we might wish to add – would be that Geoffroy must have welcomed friendly relations with Flanders, especially thinking from the perspective of his son Henry, who would one day be King of England and ruler of Normandy. This makes an appropriate onomastic compliment on the part of the poet quite plausible, even though agnates did not usually affect the naming of children. If Keller's idea is correct, then 1134 must be the *terminus post quem* for the surviving Song of Roland. Like the name *Pinabel*, then, the combined name *Tierri d'Anjou* seems to owe its first appearance to the surviving Song; but as we saw above with *Pinabel*, we need not conclude from this that the duel scene must also be from this late date.

Keller advances his argument one step further, beyond this explanation of the name *Tierri d'Anjou*: he identifies Tierri d'Anjou (in disagreement with the editors Bédier, Jenkins, Segre and Hilka/Pfister, judging by their respective indexes of names) as *Tierri duc d'Argone*, and I find it difficult to accept this.

First, the PT consistently makes a distinction between the two figures called *Tedricus*: one (~ Tierri d'Argone/d'Ardenne) is killed at Roncevaux and is laid to rest in Arles along with the Burgundians including Estolt of Langres; the other (~ Tierri d'Anjou) defeats Pinabel.

Secondly, it would not fit well with the balancing of fiefdoms that is normal in the Rol. if one pair of brothers were to have two Duchies, with no further explanation. In fact, Tierri d'Anjou is mentioned three times (v. 2883, 3806, 3818s.) without a title, and twice simply called *frere Gefrei*s, while in v. 3818 the plain *uns chevalers* only makes sense if he cannot be called *duc*, *comte* or even just *sire de X*. He had been knighted, but he did not yet have a fief, was not yet *chasé*, but belonged to the group which Duby (1964, passim) had so tellingly called the *jeunes*, who were expected to be especially brave because they were not weighed down by thoughts of a wife and children; Duby emphasises the fact that in the 12th c., sons who were not the first-born in their family used to stretch this period of their lives out for several years, because their family would not want to share out their inheritance too soon, and the liege lord would not be in a position to hand out very many fiefdoms. Thus, when Tierri

suggests to the King that he is the right man for the single combat (v. 3825) *Ja savez vos que mult vos ai servit*, this in no way implies that he already has a fiefdom, but only that the King has been impressed by the efforts of this young brother of Gefreid on more than one occasion before. When he was with his brother,[1765] he unexpectedly witnessed Charlemagne's fainting fit at the sight of Roland's body and was one of the four warriors who gathered up the Emperor as he slowly regained consciousness and guided him to a spot under a pine tree; having seen him literally up close and suffering terrible human anguish, he would have been eager to help the Emperor when he saw him once again suffering human anguish.

And thirdly, within the limits of the laws of probability and especially of Old French legal norms, the duel between Tierri and Pinabel acts as a form of divine judgement and imitates the biblical fight between David and Goliath (1 *Sam* 17). Konrad (v. 8847–8849) has his Tirrich say before the fight: *Dauid was uil lutzeler gescaft; got selbe gap ime di craft daz er Golie daz houbit abe slǔc* 'David was very slight in stature; God himself gave him the strength to cut off Goliath's head',[1766] and in so doing makes explicit – as he does in other places – what the great artist before him had only hinted at. Like Goliath, Pinabel is distinctive because of his impressive physical size, his evident power and the experience he has had in battle (v. 3839–3840): *Granz est e forz e vassals e isnel / (Qu'il fiert a colp, de sun tens n'i ad mais)*. Like Goliath, he is the spokesman for an infidel group, in his context the Philistines, while in the Song it is Ganelon's *maisnee*. And just as the people of Israel were intimidated by the mere presence of Goliath, so the presence of Pinabel intimidated the people who were accustomed to identifying themselves with the Israelites, on this occasion the Christian knights of the Carolingian realm, and it reduced them to frightened murmuring among themselves. In the Bible we read: *Num vidistis virum hunc qui ascendit?* Here we read: *Pur Pinabel se cuntienent plus quei; / Dist l'un a l'altre [. . .]/ Mult sereit fols ki [j]a se cumbatreit*. But because the judges are obliged to make their decision known to the presiding judge, they must, unlike the Israelites, make this private cowardice public with the words (v. 3809s.): *Sire, nus vos prium / Que clamez quite le cunte Guenelun*. Just as in the Bible the young David is the only person who dares to accept the challenge, so Tierri takes this role. It is true that David is not described

---

[1765] Since it was customary to have families fight in the same unit so that they would operate more cohesively, he may officially have been allocated to the standard-bearer, his brother, or alternatively – and this amounts to almost the same thing – he may have been with the King's personal guard, which would mean he was part of the royal *mensa*, a privilege that was much sought-after by knights who did not yet have a fiefdom to support them.

[1766] Brault (1978, 324) points this out.

as being small in stature anywhere in the Bible; so Tierri also *n'est gueres granz, ne trop nen est petiz*, and when the poet continues: *Heingre out le cors e graisle e eschewid,* there are connotations of wiriness and a well-proportioned physique. But overall, Tierri appears "unimpressive in appearance, [of] mediocre physique, a puny individual against the giant Pinabel" (Brault 1975, 324).[1767] The onlookers – who were themselves too cowardly to volunteer for the fight and are therefore not counting on God's help, but simply going by the look of things – are overwhelmed by this contrast between the two (v. 3870s.): *Idunc plurerent .C. milie chevalers, / Qui pur Rollant de Tierri unt pitiét.*[1768] Would it not be poetically counterproductive if this Tierri had been commanding the ninth of Charlemagne's ten army units shortly beforehand in the great decisive battle? Would this not unnecessarily reduce the extent of the contrast between him and Pinabel?

1767 If David is *rufus*, but Tierri has *neirs les chevels*, this may mean that the poet wants to protect Tierri from the widely held medieval prejudice against red-haired people; thus, in the slightly later *Couronnement de Louis* the Norman *duc Richart le ros* (as in v. 2108, 2114) is one of the traitors, father of Acelin, who tries to depose Louis.

1768 Tavernier (1914–1917, 423 n. 1) drew a strange idea from this sentence: the Roland poet thought of this sentence because in the *Aeneid* (12.243) the Laurentians and the Latins, in other words Aeneas' enemies, on appraising the situation, have a dark premonition and *Turni sortem miserantur iniquam* at the very thought of a single combat between their man Turnus and Aeneas; Tavernier believes that the roles of Turnus and Tierri are equivalent because they have the lower odds. Quite the opposite! For the higher powers are against Turnus and for Tierri. He goes on to argue that the poet thought of the 'alias' *Tierri* because of Turnus. Apart from the fact that there is not much similarity between the two names, why would Turnus, who is about to be killed by Aeneas, be the Roland poet's inspiration for the name of the victorious Tierri? In his next instalment, Tavernier (1914–1917, 704 n. 2) tells us that when the poet chose the name Tierri, he was probably also thinking of the powerful kings of that name from distant heroic times. But why would it be an 'alias'? The man behind Tierri is supposed to be the, at most, sixteen-year-old, still completely unknown Fulk of Anjou, because he is the brother of Geoffroy IV, and like Tierri, of *statura mediocri*. Tavernier also thought that the fact he was *rufus* while Tierri has *neirs les chevels e alques brun le vis* is a striking similarity, and even that the alias Thierry corresponds to Turnus at least in the number of syllables it has. – Boissonnade (1923, 403s.) suggests an even more outrageous explanation, based on his later dating of the Song (just before 1124/1125), when he turns to the next generation of Angevin counts and suggests Hélie d'Anjou, who was born in 1114 at the earliest, which would make him eleven years old at the most. If we absolutely must see a particular member of the Angevin family of counts in Tierri's outward appearance, then the only person for whom we have at least some objective arguments is Geoffroy Martel († 1060); cf. Gaston Paris (1882a, 408).

C.16.3 *Par anceisurs* – and Angevin history once again

If the name *Tierri* in the duel scene is new, it does not follow that the name *Anjou* is necessarily new as well – on the contrary, in fact.

Although Tierri is the only one to resist the verdict of the others and put himself forward for the single combat, he still feels the need to explain why he has the right to assume this role (v. 3826): *Par anceisurs dei jo tel plait tenir.* Brault (1978, 325) interpreted this statement as a parallel to Roland's fear that his family's reputation would suffer if were to blow his horn (v. 1063 and 1076), arguing along the lines: 'In order to preserve my fearless ancestors' reputation, I must also rise to this legal challenge without fear'. But the analogy is weak; because if Tierri were to do nothing, he would not have had to fear any *male chançun*, nor any damage to his reputation or that of his own people, nor harm to his career. We can interpret the *par* 'through, as a consequence of' (not *pur* 'for the sake of [. . .]'!) *anceisurs* as Konrad does (or even the Anglo-Norman version before him?), so that it means 'because of our common ancestors'. Only this reading leads on to Konrad's statement, which is admittedly an expanded interpretation: *Rûlant hat mich gezogen. / uzer sinim chunne bin ich geboren: / ich bin sin nahister geborn mac* (v. 8823–8825), 'Rûlant has taught me. / I was born from his kin: / I was born as his nearest likeness.' Konrad was not alone in understanding the text he had in front of him in this way, since Gaston Paris (1882a, 408) also interpreted the text we have in front of us in the same way: "et quand Tierri, pour juger Ganelon, invoque un droit héréditaire, on sent clairement une inspiration toute provinciale". Since there is no mention of a family relationship between the two Angevins and the royal house in the French Song, nor in the German version, the relationship with Roland can only be via Roland's father, who is already named by the PT as Milon d'Angliers, where *Angliers* appears to mean either Angers or a place somewhere near Angers.[1769]

If we interpret Tierri's statement in this way, it makes surprisingly good sense; and precisely in the French Song, when there are two possibilities, the more concrete is very often the right one. Let us therefore pose the question more

---

1769 Cf. n. 1179 above! If we leave aside the rumour about incest (on this cf. n. 1012 and 1707 above), almost the only person in all of Old French epic literature thought to be Roland's father is this Milon. The only exception I am aware of is the *Aquin*, the Charlemagne epic from Francophone Brittany: in this work he is a certain *Tiori de Vennes*. The author chose Vannes (Bret. *Guened*, < *Darioritum Venetorum*), to Bretonise Roland on his father's side; he may have taken *Tiori ~ Tierri* from the French Roland material, which means that he, too, found a relationship between Tierri d'Anjou and Roland already present in his sources.

generally: could there ever have been in the early history of the material an indication that the historical house of Anjou and Roland were related to each other?

Karl-Ferdinand Werner maintained that they were related in reality. On the one hand, Werner and Hubert Guillotel advanced the hypothesis that Roland was a member of the Wido family, the same hypothesis that was used above to explain the manuscript context behind the mention of Roland in the *Vita Karoli* (cf. above 'Roland in Einhart's *Vita Karoli*', C.15.2.3). On the other hand, he explained (1958, 265–279, especially 270),[1770] that Fulk I († 942), attested from 898 onwards as Viscount of Anjou, became Count of Nantes in 909, but Nantes fell to the Bretons again, and so as compensation for that he was promoted with the new Count of Anjou title before 929. He married a woman from the Wido family, namely Roscilla, daughter of a certain Warnharius, who ruled over an approximately 60 km long territory in the southern border region of the Touraine from his castles at La Haye-Descartes, Loches and Villentrois. Roscilla' s membership of the Wido family is evident from onomastics: the name *Roscilla* is made from the same component *Hrōd-* (+ diminutive *-icilla*) that we encountered above in the Wido names *Hruodlandus*, *Hrodold*, *Rothilde*, probably also *Rotbald*, perhaps also *Rotlindis* and *Ro(d)trud*;[1771] we have also noted before that *Warnharius* is a Wido name;[1772] and finally, Fulk I had sons named Ingelger, *Wido* and Fulk. Ingelger, the eldest, who was named after his grandfather on his father's side in accordance with the custom that was widespread at that time, died before his father; Fulk II inherited the title of Count, but according to the *Chronica* (Halphen/Poupardin 1913, 33s.), he was the youngest, as indeed the name of the father, if it was passed on, was usually given to the third son. Wido, Canon of Saint-Martin de Tours, and then (approximately 937–973) Wido I, Bishop of Soissons, was therefore the second oldest; his name was taken from his mother's family. In the next generation, too, Fulk II named one of his sons Wido, the later Bishop of Le Puy († about 995), and again in the following generation, Fulk II's daughter (married to Walter of Amiens) had a son, Bishop Wido II of Soissons († 991). From Fulk I and Roscilla, daughter of Warnharius, onwards,

---

1770 Recognised especially by Boussard (1962b, passim) and Guillot (1972, 1.8–11, and LM s. v. *Angers*), defended at length by Settipani (1997, 213–215).

1771 Cf. above the section entitled 'Roland in Einhart's *Vita Karoli*' (C.15.2.3) including n. 1680s.

1772 Cf. n. 1726. Three more individuals named Count *Warnharius* (Garnier) from the 8th and 9th c. are in Settipani (1989, 11–13), and cf. the following n.!

that is to say for three generations, the name Wido was part of the naming tradition of this family. K. F. Werner's chain of evidence takes us this far.[1773]

When we examined the mention of Roland in the *Vita Karoli* (C.15.2.3 above), we traced the Wido family forward to 834, when Lambert I left for Italy. His relatives (probably sons) Warnarius and Lambert II remained at that time in the Breton March, and later allied themselves with the Bretons against Charles the Bald; but when the victorious Erispoë made a treaty with Charles and was given not only the *pagus* of Vannes, which his father Nominoë had received before him, but also the *pagi* of Rennes and Nantes as well as the partial *pagus* of Retz, they lost their territorial base, and in 852 Charles succeeded in killing them both, Lambert through trickery, and Warnarius by execution. At this point the Wido family in the male line disappear once and for all from the foreground of history in the Western Kingdom, that is to say from the dimension that is visible to us in the Annals; the *Bertiniani*, at that time supervised by Bishop Prudentius of Troyes within Charles' area of influence, and therefore reflecting a pro-Charles perspective, consider the pair of brothers retrospectively as *pars vel maxima discordiarum*.

But in the feudal period, if a great family came into an area from afar and wanted to put down roots there, it had to enter into regional agreements, in effect through marriages, including some with the class immediately below themselves. The Wido family had had plenty of time for this over several generations in the western French region bordering with Brittany. Although we cannot reconstruct the connections because of the sparse preservation of documents in this period, the consequences arising from them are clearly visible for instance in Roscilla, the woman from the Wido family married to Fulk I.

The Fulk (later: Geoffrey) family owed their advancement to the Robertians, that is to say the descendants of Robert the Strong. When in 888 Robert's son Odo, Count of Paris was crowned King of France, the Robertians had started off a struggle with the Carolingians for the French crown, sometimes resulting in open warfare, and at other times in more covert activities. From then onwards, their power base in Paris was more important to them, and so after a few years of indecision, as *duces* or even *reges* themselves, they agreed to promote the viscounts in Angers and Tours into counts, and these were precisely the Fulk and Tetbaldine families. Given this situation, it was a good move for the social climber Fulk to carry on the Wido traditions; as K. F. Werner highlighted in

---

1773 The blood of the Wido family may well have flowed in Fulk I as well, and if this were the case, the relationship back to the first clear Wido, the Warnharius who was executed in 852, would have taken place through the involvement of three women, only one of whom, namely Fulk's mother Adelheid is known by name; cf. Settipani (1997, 220–225).

another publication (1966, 116 = 1984, 55) with supporting examples, a noble heritage even if it involved failed dynasties often helped people to improve their family's position in society once again. People thought that nobility was biologically determined, and therefore it could not be destroyed by temporary setbacks; furthermore, in a world where alliances shifted all the time, moral judgements about these alliances were changeable too. And above all, the main concern was property: according to the *Chronica* (ed. Halphen/Poupardin 1913, 33) Fulko obtained two of his father-in-law's castles *postea* (i.e. not at the time of his marriage) *non bona ratione* (i.e. by violent means) and in so doing began his policy of actively infiltrating the Touraine region, which just over a century later was predominantly in the possession of his own or of allied families.

If only because the Fulks were upstarts and probably did not have much of a verbal tradition of their own, they will, to a certain degree, have carried on that of Roscilla, i.e. of the Wido family including at least a vague *On-dit* about the "one of ours" status of Roland.[1774] It may well have contributed to the rapid reception of the name and the Roland and Olivier pair of figures in that area, and it may have helped to inspire the Angevin poet who wrote his great work in the middle of that century. If he mentioned somewhere in his work that Roland was related to the Angevin counts, this may have left some traces in Turold's brief statement, and in the interpretation of these words that we find in Konrad.

I would not like to complete this section without mentioning a hypothesis advanced by the otherwise highly respected expert in Angevin history, Olivier Guillot. He states in the LM s. v. *Angers, Anjou* (in 1980): that the County [of Anjou, G.A.B.] was incorporated into the Breton March. This would make sense strategically: the March would not just have consisted of the *pagi* of Rennes, Vannes and Nantes, which all lay on Breton tribal land (even though some of this area was French-speaking), but it would also have had a massive Frankish military base. It is very risky, however, to build a hypothesis on strategic considerations alone, and I could find no other arguments to support Guillot's view.[1775]

1774 On the other hand, one might ask why such a recollection was not a strong enough reason for the Fulk family to start using this name again. I know of no viscount family in the period before 1050, and no count family in the period before 1150 where epic names were secondarily admitted as real names. For the upper nobility, the need to forge new alliances through marriage and to name children after people from only two generations before on the father's side and on the mother's side was evidently so important that there was hardly any room for other naming reasons.

1775 The only item in the literature cited by Guillot in this article that could possibly add more depth to his claim is Bienvenu (1972) (p. 100) but he also offers no evidence when he writes that the Breton March "englobait Vannes, Rennes, Nantes et, probablement, le Maine et l'Anjou."

More importantly: neither K. F. Werner and Hubert Guillotel in the slightly later article entitled *Bretagne* in the LM, which also discusses the March, nor Brunterc'h (1989, passim) in his extremely precise account of the development of the March, agree with Guillot's assertion. This is why I have not relied upon Guillot's hypothesis at any point in the present study. If my scepticism were to be unwarranted, historical developments would run a little more smoothly than they do in my account here: the Fulk family would not only have managed to bring blood from Roland's family into the house of Angevin counts, but they would also have ruled over Roland's lands; the Angevin poet in the middle of the 11th c. would have extolled the "one of ours" dimension in two ways: not just in the sense of sharing the same blood, but also sharing the same territory; the fact that Roland in the Song captures first and foremost *Anjou e Bretaigne* (v. 2322), would describe almost literally the real extent of his official position; even Roland's epic father Milon d'Angliers would not just bear the Wido name Milo, but his chances of being Count of Angers would be even higher than hitherto assumed . . .

C.16.4 *Gaydon*

According to Subrenat (1973, 17–30, and ed. 2007, 18) the *Gaydon* was written between 1225 and 1240, probably between 1230 and 1234. The story begins shortly after the death of Pinabel and Ganelon. Ganelon's brother Thibaut d'Aspremont and seven relatives[1776] decide to take revenge on those responsible: on Charlemagne and the young Duke Gaydon of Anjou who had witnessed the death of his father Jo(i)ffroi at Roncevaux,[1777] was also present when Roland died, and killed Pinabel in the trial by single combat during the campaign.[1778] They send Charlemagne a poisoned apple as a gift from Gaydon, in the hope that Charlemagne will die and Gaydon be sentenced to death for his murder. But on a whim, Charlemagne gives the apple to a young man who eats it and promptly dies. Charles is deaf to Gaydon's pleas of innocence and so at least

---

1776 As in the PT, the divine trial by single combat, which Pinabel lost, had therefore led to his death and Ganelon's also.

1777 Geoffroy d'Anjou does not appear in the PT, but since according to the PT all *pugnatores maiores* were killed at Roncevaux, the *Gaydon* poet may have concluded that Geoffroy must have died there too.

1778 In both cases just like Tedricus in the PT. The reason why the single combat takes place during the campaign is based on the fact that Charlemagne rewarded Gaydon immediately afterwards inside his tent (v. 423).

half of the plot seems to have succeeded. It is easy to guess what happens next: the story develops into a long war, full of cleverly plotted twists and turns, against Gaydon and his people, a war which Charlemagne is gullible enough to wage on the side of the traitors. When eventually a reconciliation between Charlemagne and Gaydon starts to look likely, the traitors decide to kill Charlemagne before that can happen. But an angel instructs Gaydon to rush with all his people to Charlemagne's aid. Assisted by imperial troops led by Naimes and Ogier, Gaydon succeeds in putting the traitors to flight. Gaydon is handsomely rewarded by Charlemagne; but when his wife dies soon afterwards, he becomes a hermit until the day he dies, and so there is nothing more to say about him. But some of the traitor tribe has escaped and will probably try to ingratiate themselves with Charlemagne again.

This story has a few things in parallel with reality in the second half of the 12th c. These were enumerated by Reimann in his dissertation (1881, passim) and perhaps given too much credence: for him, Gaydon is the son of a Geoffroy d'Anjou, just like Henry II; in the end he becomes Grand Seneschal of France, a title essentially with no basis in history, but which Henry II had demanded for himself from around 1158 onwards; he receives the hand in marriage of the beautiful Duchess Claresme of Gascony, who may well have been inspired by the truly *clarissima* Aliénor 'Eleanor' of Poitou, Aquitaine and Gascony, the wife of Henry II. People would have remembered these historical facts even eighty years later,[1779] and since the Angevins in the *Gaydon* turn out to be loyal

---

1779 Mireaux (1943, 269–274) argued that it was possible to deduce an earlier Angevin version of the surviving *Gaydon* from the years 1154–1158 from these details, as well as an even earlier stage which was supposedly set in Italy. I agree with Subrenat's view (1973, 40–45) that Mireaux' arguments do not stand up, but my argument is different in one important respect. In the surviving *Gaydon*, the main traitor Thibaut, Lord of Hautefoille and Aspremont, says that he was brought up to be a cleric, and in fact (v. 72) according to ms. a by the clerics of *Saint Denis*, and according to the somewhat earlier ms. b by those in *Ravanne* 'Ravenna'; unlike Subrenat, I believe that *Saint-Denis* could very well be a *lectio facilior*. Immediately after this, we find that Thibaut's brother Ganelon fetched him from there to make him into a knight, and in fact (v. 80) in ms. a takes him to *Espolice* 'Spoleto', whereas ms. b does not have a place name here – which means that in each of the two manuscript branches, an Italian city is mentioned once. Since it is not very likely that the two mss. would independently choose Italy, Mireaux is in no way departing from solid philological reasoning when he combines *Ravanne* and *Espolice*, whereas it is a weaker solution when Subrenat rejects this but has no concrete explanation for putting the *Espolice* from ms. a. into his preferred ms. b. But we can only conclude from *Ravanne* plus *Espolice* that the author imagined the family of traitors having lands not just in Hautefeuille but also in Italy; he may have arrived at this idea because he understood Pinabel's fiefdom *Sorence* as Sorrento (probably correctly, cf. section C.8.13 above, 'Pinabel'), or/and because he identified the two as *Aspremont*, which had already been mentioned

supporters of the King of France, as far as he is able to recognise this, the plot fits equally well into Capetian Anjou of the 13th c. In short, it appears to have absorbed the epic climate of the time when it was written down, influenced as it was by the widespread reception of the PT and through the later Roland versions, and it is obviously conceived of as a sequel to them. For these reasons I would like to agree with Subrenat, to whom we owe a thorough study (1974) and the *editio citanda* (2007), and say that it was freely invented by the poet in the time around 1230, were it not for the key problem of the name of the main character.

The fate of *Gaydon qui tant fist a loer* (v. 5) is presented in the introduction as the main theme of the Song. This name, and no other, is used to refer to him fifteen times until Gaydon speaks to Charlemagne about his defeat of Pinabel and says (v. 425–428): *A icelle hore oi je Thierris a non; / Mais por .I. jay m'apelle on Gaydon, / Qui sor mon hiaume s'assist, bien le vit on* – an explanation that should be unnecessary as far as Charlemagne is concerned and is therefore all the more clearly directed at the audience. But this does not affect the narrative in any way: the story continues with the name *Gaydon*. Much later, when the poet is talking about one of the many battles that Gaydon fought, he says that Gaydon drew his sword Halteclere, which the dying Olivier had given him at Roncevaux, he adds, this time in the narrator's voice, that at that time Gaydon was Roland's shield-bearer (v.7351–7358): *Escuiers fu Rollant a icel jor, / Dont l'apelloient Thierri grant et menor; / Mais por .I. gay, ce dient li auctor, / Qui sor son elme s'assist sans nul trestor, / Quant on l'arma por aller en l'estor / Vers Pynabel, le felon traïtor, / Tres puis cel tans, n'en soiez en error, / L'apell'on Gayde, li duc et li contor*. The change of name is mentioned a third time, with no mention of the jay this time, in a single sentence *A icel tans avot Thierris a non* (v. 10137), when Ferraut is trying to talk Charlemagne into making peace and reminds him that only this young *escuiers* had the courage to volunteer for the single combat with Pinabel.

---

in his story, namely the Aspromonte in southern Italy (v.834) which was already famous in epic poetry, and the traditional den of traitors (v. 15 and passim, as well as v. 747 and 912), which is usually identified as Apremont-la-Forêt (Meuse). (When the *Gaydon* was written, Gobert VI of Apremont and Dun was a powerful baron; he had participated on side of the *regnum Franciae* in the Albigensian war and on the side of the Imperium in the crusade led by Frederick II, although he seems to have fallen out with the latter.) But this only leads back to the archetype of the mss. of the surviving epos. It is by no means necessary to deduce from all of this that the whole story was set in Italy in an earlier version, or even that its protagonist was not the Duke of Anjou.

At this point, it is important to ensure that we appreciate the nature of the central problem. The victor over Pinabel has been generally known by the name of Tierri since the surviving Rol. and the PT; by the time the *Gaydon* poet was writing, and about a century later he still was a young hero whose remaining biography was wide open. A poet writing an epic sequel, much like a poet writing an *Enfances* epic, chooses his main character because of the interest that the audience already has in him. However, he can only exploit this bonus effect if the audience immediately recognises the main character, ideally in the title, or if not, in the opening verses where the main theme is presented; if this does not happen, he loses a potential audience who would be interested in Tierri, but do not know that the eponymous hero Gaydon is actually the same person. Since the poet must surely have been aware of this, he must have seen considerable value in the name *Gaydon* in its own right, too, suggesting that part of his audience would have known about him under that name.

The value of the name *Gaydon* does not come from any symbolism in the jay episode. It is true that the jay might suggest someone who will triumph with God's help. But first of all, the jay episode could have been narrated without the change of name, and just using *Tierri* as the protagonist's only name in the whole of the epic; the poet's bonus would be preserved. Secondly, the jay is not an obvious symbol for this episode, or one that might spontaneously suggest itself. If a dove perched on his helmet, people would see which person the Holy Spirit was going to support; if it were a young eagle or a falcon, people would know which man would turn out to be the stronger. But the jay hides from birds of prey, even goshawks, and lives mainly on acorns and beech nuts, and it also steals from nests and occasionally hunts young birds and mice – all very un-heroic. It has a hoarse call, but it can also imitate the call of other birds very cleverly; this is why for Rabanus it symbolised *vel philosophorum vanam loquacitatem vel haereticorum verbositatem noxiam*.[1780] Because of its piebald colouring, Re(n)clus de Mo(i)liens[1781] (predating the *Gaydon* slightly) even thought a jay was an image of Satan, who was very good at arguing; it is not likely that this was Reclus' own idea because even in around 1900 in Brittany, the jay was one of the birds who were said to have been created by the devil.[1782] A bird like this does not symbolise a victor, nor is it a fearless champion of the truth.[1783]

1780 *De universo* 8.6 (PL 111.247), cited also in Subrenat (1973, 200s.).

1781 I.e. from Molliens (Somme), *Roman de Carité* str. 175–179, are 1200; partially cited in Tobler/Lommatzsch s. v. *jai*.

1782 Sébillot (1906, 3.156), cited in Subrenat (1973, 200).

1783 I think the following interpretation of the jay by Simpson (2000, 66 to around 71, reference to it in Subrenat's edition 2007, 699s.) is completely wrong (it is ultimately based on

The jay episode seems to have a literary precedent; Gaston Paris (1865, 323 n. 3) pointed to M. Valerius Corvus: according to Livy 7.26 (similarly Gellius 9.11) a *Gallus [. . .] magnitudine atque armis insignis* challenged any one of the Romans to a single combat; the young M. Valerius defeated him with the help of a raven sent by the gods, which perched on his helmet, and whenever Valerius pressed forward, the raven tore into the Gaul's face with his beak and claws so that he could not see very well and lost his nerve; Livy expressly concludes that Valerius Corvus only acquired the epithet *Corvus* (or *Corvinus* in Gellius) because of this event. The three common elements between Valerius and Gaydon (an impressively strong individual issues a challenge to the side that the audience identifies with, a bird perches on the helmet of the adolescent defender, after the victory, the defender is named after the bird), practically

---

Lacanian ideas): "The jay could be read as a figure of disturbing radicalism set against the interests of the social order. [. . .] Gaydon wants to restore the community by insisting on the truth of Roland's sacrifice. He thinks he is acting for the good of the polis and yet he is actually speaking in terms of the law of desire." But the poet has nothing at all to say about this in the entire epic. His Gaydon was only determined to ensure that the guilty traitors would not escape unpunished after the death of 20,000 Franks – is this supposed to be *disturbing radicalism*? And as a consequence of this one decision, he must constantly fight for this life throughout the whole epic; is this fighting for survival supposed to be his own fault? Since whatever someone strives for (e.g. a social ideal) can never be found (or else it wouldn't be Lacan), and the effort that follows is constituted as desire (we should note Simpson's use of the word!) that is to say guilt, Simpson would have some difficulty finding a positive alternative. But *qu'à cela ne tienne*, there is always the option of a flight into pseudo-religion, an abuse of theology: "In Pauline terms, he [scil. Gaydon] clings to a community of the flesh rather than the spirit." Gaydon would have to demonstrate some *community of the spirit* – but with whom? With the traitors or – to use Pauline language also – *Quae autem conventio Christi ad Belial*? The most alienating thing about it all is the uninhibited and shockingly skewed (and in my opinion perverting and defeatist) application of postmodern categories to an epic adventure, which was merely written to extol Anjou on the basis of knightly ideology. At the end of his story, the author narrates in a total of 23 lines, in other words very obviously in a concise manner, how Gaydon returns to his home in Angers with his new bride Claresme, is widowed in the same year, and then becomes a hermit and dies with the odour of sanctity around him, after which (*puis*) the traitor Gui d'Autefoille lives on and (*n'en douz mie* 'je n'en doute pas') will manage to ingratiate himself and his people once more with Charlemagne, while there is nothing more to be said about Gaydon. The motivation for all of this is a narrative one: the narrator knows very well that he has exhausted the whole Gaydon storyline, but to be fair to his fellow epic poets (or perhaps to himself as well?) he did not want to prevent the composition of further epics about Charlemagne's later life, nor could he do this, even if he had wanted to. But if we try to analyse this in a properly theological way, the result is something entirely different from the musings that Simpson reads into it: God has not promised Christians any lasting sort of victory of good over evil before the Second Coming of Christ; it follows from this that evil will outlast the life of the individual, even the life of any 'hero'.

exclude a coincidence, even if Livy or Gellius can only be considered as indirect sources.[1784]

On the other hand, the jay episode is not only absent from the PT and all Roland versions,[1785] but it is only mentioned in the *Gaydon* when its purpose is to explain the etymology of one of the names. When we look at it in this light, its *raison d'être* is obvious: it is an *aetiological* invention, of the etymological type, like many others so loved by medieval authors. This leads to an important conclusion: the bird did not come first, and the name afterwards, but it was the other way round: the bird was invented to explain why Tierri was also called *Gaydon*, or more precisely: why the same story is told about both Gaydon and Tierri. We can see that this is *genetically* the correct order because the jay is no longer a strikingly crooked symbol, but it is without parallel in a positive sense: neither dove, nor eagle, nor falcon nor any other bird would have a name that sounded like Gaydon!

The poet therefore knew about a tradition – presumably narrowly confined to the Angevin region – which attributed the same feat to someone called Gaydon that the Rol. and the PT attribute to Tierri, i.e. which portrays him as essentially the man who avenges Roland; he believed that both traditions were true, and concluded that the two persons were one and the same. This meant that he had to explain how this individual came by his second name. Since Tierri was more famous than Gaydon, thanks to the Rol. and the PT, he thought that of these two names, Gaydon was the one that was more in need of an explanation. He was a medieval person, and so he looked to etymology for an explanation; after subtracting the *-on*, which was a common suffix in his language, the remaining *gaid-* reminded him of *gai / jai* 'geai, jay';[1786] in answer to the question of how a jay could play an important role in Tierri's fate, he recalled the story about M. Valerius Corvus (or a derivative or analogous version of this, unknown to us).

1784 Another story is a little different, told by Paul the Deacon (6.55): when Hildeprand (a. 736) was being elevated to the throne, a cuckoo landed on his lance, and this was perceived as a bad omen. But the story is instructive, in so far as it shows that it is not just the fact that a bird perches on a man's weapons or armour that constitutes a positive omen, but the species of the bird is what matters.

1785 Even Roland ms. P, which incorporates some elements from the *Gaydon* (Subrenat 1973, 66s.), does not mention the jay motif.

1786 Lat. *Gaius* (used in the 5th c. in Polemius Silvius deonomastically for the bird) leads to Old central Fr. *jai*, Old northern Fr. and Occ. (today southern Occ.) *gai*; but since late OF (and especially in Midde Fr., as in Amyot, Gauchet, Marot, Rabelais) *gai* reaches far beyond the normal spread of the isogloss /g-/≠/(d)ž/ (cf. especially the FEW s. v. *gajus*); moreover, *gai*, does not have to be the poet's own form, but he just has to know that it exists. He could have felt that the *-d* was a hiatus damper; it quite often crops up as such – like *-t-* – in French word formation (cf. Pichon 1942, 28–34).

Reimann (1881, 97) rightly held a similar view, arguing that Gaydon is doubtless the hero of a local Angevin saga, and that his name was carried over to the Thierry in the *Chanson de Roland* through a cleverly invented anecdote. But Reimann's explanation had very little impact, and it is easy to see why: such a vague reference to a local saga that has since been lost – and Reimann has nothing more to add than this – sounds facile.

The only way forward now is a very precise analysis of the history of the name Gaydon.

1) Förstemann (s. v.) derived the name *Gaido(n)* from Lombard *gaida*, OE *gādu* 'a stabbing weapon' (not found in the other Germanic languages!), and his references for the name, about a dozen, all point to Italy; Morlet (s. v.) has only one reference, from Nonantula (northern Italy), and so she has no references from France either.[1787] The name is therefore doubtless of Lombard origin and it was confined to Italy for a very long time; it has a continuous history as the name of real people until the time of our epic[1788] and as a family name until the start of the 19th century.[1789]

2) But from about 1180 onwards, *Gaide(s)* / *Gaidon* was often the name of persons playing small and insignificant roles in Old French epic poetry, occasionally with the spelling *Guedon* or the hypocoristic form *Gaidonet* (cf. Moisan

---

1787 The earliest high-ranking Lombard bearing this name is Gaidus, Duke of Vicenza, who (according to Andreas of Bergamo, end of the 9th c., *Historia* cap. 4) after Desiderius' defeat and Adelgis' flight, battles on successfully for a while, but then submits to Charlemagne and is allowed to keep his position because of his loyalty. (The hypercorrect *-us* instead of *-o* is quite common in this period in Italy, because of overlaps in the nominative between the Lat. *-o* and the vernacular *-o.*) – Förstemann has over 75 references consisting of two-part names with *Gaid-* as the first part, and six sevenths of them come from Italy, a few from the High German area (mainly Reichenau and St. Peter of Salzburg), and a few others which are doubtful; four of Morlet's five references come from Italy (including the one for Cluny), and one from Reichenau. – According to Kaufmann (1968, 131) "perhaps" Saxon *Geddo < Gaido* is also possible; this would not affect our analysis.

1788 E.g. in Treviso near Sondrio (close to the border with Graubünden/Grisons) in the year 1189 we find a charter with the words *ego Gaidonus imperialis notarius* (Graubünden-UB 347). Also, Gaston Paris (1865, 323 n. 4) pointed to a note by Aubri de Troisfontaines for the year 1234 (MGH SS. 22.631): *In Apulia mortuus est hoc anno quidem senex dierum qui dicebat se fuisse armigerum Rolandi Theodoricum, qui dux Gaidonius dictus est.* In fact, "cet étrange imposteur" (G. Paris) makes improper use of our epic material; but in order to do this, he must have at least have legally borne the name *Gaidon*.

1789 Cf. the Art. *Gaidon, Antonio* (about an architect and town planner in Bassano, Veneto) in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 51 (1998).

s. v.).[1790] It could have become current in France at any time: e.g. via pilgrims or traders coming from Rome, but in view of the date, it is perhaps more likely to have come through the literary *mode sicilienne* of the last quarter of the 12th c.;[1791] there was possibly also some influence through neighbourly relationships (including genealogical ones among the nobility) between Savoy and Piedmont,[1792] and through constant contact between the Galloromanian parts of the Imperium and Italy due to the imperial Italian campaigns.

The latter come to mind because chronologically, in the reception of the name, the oldest Lorraine epics come first (*Garin le Loherain*, *Girbert de Metz*), albeit with a strange geographical indifference: we find the name among people from Lorraine,[1793] as well as some from the Bordelais region. A little later, it refers to a crusader (*Chanson d'Antioche*), one of the liegemen of Aimeri de Narbonne (*Aymeri de Narbonne*, *Beuve de Commarchis*) or a liegeman of the King of Bavaria (*Aubry le Bourguignon*), an immigrant in the Lower Limousin region (*Moniage Guillaume II*), a Duke of Brittany (KMS I: *Geddon*), French minor characters (*Girart de Vienne*,[1794] *Folque de Candie*, *Siège de Barbastre*) or alternatively a Saracen minor character (*Elie de Saint-Gilles*); if we accept *Gaidinel* as a hypocoristic version of *Gaidon*, then we also have a knight from Burgundy (*Prise de Pampelune*). The romances take the minor character name from epic poetry (cf. Flutre s. v.); there, it refers to: the Muslim teacher of Floires (*Floire I*), a Saxon king (*Merlin-Sommer*), a Lord of Galloway (south-western Scotland, prose *Lancelot*) and a giant in Brittany (*Melusine*). To sum up: when the *Gaydon* epic emerged, the name *Gaidon* was only half a century old in France, but it had qualified as an all-purpose name for minor characters, like so many others that the epic and courtly romance constantly required: it was easily recognisable as a name, sounded

---

1790 The name usually appears with *G-*, only rarely with *J-*, the latter in the *Chanson d'Antioche* (hapax, ed. Duparc-Quioc), the *Chevalerie Ogier* (twice, ed. Eusebi) and in the mss. D and sometimes B of the *Moniage Guillaume II* (ed. Cloëtta), although the whole episode here may be an interpolation (cf. Ph. Aug. Becker 1939, 160, and Tyssens 1967, 313).
1791 Cf. Lejeune (1958, 331ss.), reference to this in Subrenat (1973, 42).
1792 On this factor, cf. n. 1805 below!
1793 He is the brother of a man called Poince and son of a Tierri; the trio is omitted in the *Chevalerie Ogier* (cf. on this ed. Eusebi 1963, 15).
1794 According to Langlois and Moisan (s. v.) this minor character *Gaidon le viel* (v. 713, hapax), who is mentioned in between *Huidelon le Normant* and *Droon de Vincent* (probably *Wissant*), is one and the same as our Gaydon; however, I agree with W. van Emden (p. 315 of his ed.) that this must be treated with extreme suspicion, since this Gaidon was already 'old' when Girart was still very young, and perhaps even before Roland and Olivier were born. Furthermore, the question is almost irrelevant to our context.

pleasantly unremarkable, was not yet overused, and was unhindered by any spe-cific geographical associations.

It looks at this point as if the name seems rather to contradict the possibil-ity of an older *Gaydon* in the Anjou area.

3) We should remember this: unstressed /ai/ in front of a non-nasal had already become /ẹ/ in western France in the late 11th c.[1795]

The name of our protagonist was therefore, when the epic was written down, /gẹdõN/ (where N represents the nasal consonantal archiphoneme which was later lost). The question then arises: could a second name have been ab-sorbed by this /gẹdõN/?

The only possibility is the name *Wido*, both because of its meaning and its form. A Wido was, as we stablished above (C.15.2.3), the first successor of Ro-land as *praefectus Brittanici limitis* (as stated literally in the Royal Annals for the years to 829, and this is the meaning also in the version up to 803). He was the first Frank to march through the whole of Brittany and force it into submis-sion, and so in Charlemagne's realm he was a top-ranking figure, whose reputa-tion one might expect to be remembered for a long time. There is a space of 21 years between the last evidence of Roland and the first reference to Wido, and so there may have been other less prominent individuals in between; but pre-cisely because they were less prominent, they would have been forgotten after a relatively short time. Whenever people remembered Roland and Wido, they will have thought of Wido as 'the' successor of Roland. This is why from the moment when the treachery motif came into the Roland tradition, this Wido was Roland's natural avenger. And since in the meantime the historic *marche de Bretagne* (Nantes, Vannes, Rennes) was forever lost to Brittany, and even more since the late 9th c. when the region around Anjou-Maine had taken over its function, noth-ing was more natural than to see Wido as the Lord of Anjou. It may even be possi-ble to go a step further: since Wido's family had become the enemies of Louis the Pious, and then even got themselves into a life and death struggle with 'King

---

1795 Pope (1952, § 533) lists among others: *Fresneium* (< *Fraxinetum*) a. 1060, *Plesseio* a. 1075; the *Exchequer Domesday* from 1086–1087 has among the undisputed references *Grentemesnil*, *sesine* and 7 times *sesitus* (Hildebrand 1884, 326, 336). For the Roland poet, as the assonance shows, in the stressed syllable (except when the word ended in /ai/) /ẹ/ < /ai/ is the normal pronunciation (and in O sometimes even the spelling too); laisse 4 in the opening section has *desfere*, *repaire*, *suffraites*: *destre* etc. Similarly, Chrétien has rhymes like *Erec* 791s. *après*: *a eslès* (more examples in Pope 1952, § 529 (I)), so that *a fortiori* in an unstressed syllable we can assume monophthongisation.

Charles' [the Bald],[1796] they doubtless felt unfairly treated by that Charles after their services in relation to the *marche de Bretagne*. The experiences of the historical Wido would therefore make him a good candidate for Gaydon's role.

4) We turn now to the form of the name. The length of the vowel in Germanic names starting with *Wid-* is difficult to quantify, and it sometimes fluctuated even in the name of a single person, because at least two elements competed within it: *wĭdu* 'wood, forest' and *wīd* 'wide' (or OHG *wĭtu* and *wīt*).[1797] Thus, according to Förstemann (s. v.) at the very least the names *Widuh / Widuco, Widulo, Widulin, Witupald, Widubern, Wituchin / Widukind, Widugang, Witugawo / Widugo / Witiko* and *Widuram* come from *wĭdu,* and the single-root short form, at least for these names, should be written as *Wĭdo*.

Conversely, Kaufmann (1968, 396ss.), for example, argues for *Wīdo* because of its normal Old French development into *Gui / Guion*. However, this overlooks the fact that in the Anjou region, the spelling *Widdo* is common. Thus, the cartulary of Saint-Aubin d'Angers (created in about 1175, edited as vol. 1 of Angers-S. Aubin) has within its 392 charters over 80 instances of *Widdo* and over 20 of *Guiddo* (including inflected forms in both cases),[1798] considerably more than the corresponding forms with a single *-d-*. Also, in vol. 2 of the edition, which contains the non-cartulary sources (that is to say, other scattered mss., we find *Widdo* and *Guiddo*, although not quite as frequently;[1799] the *-dd-* is not just an

---

[1796] On the former cf. above C.15.3 'Roland in Einhart's *Vita Karoli*', on the latter C.16.3 'Par anceisurs'.

[1797] Förstemann (s. v.) and Kaufmann (1968, 396ss.) suggest further possibilities, but they are much less probable, and they do not change the structure of the problem; Morlet (s. v.) confines her analysis, in my view correctly, to the two above-mentioned elements.

[1798] Two instances of *Widdo* (and one *Wido*) near the beginning on p. 7 for the year 966, more instances of *Widdo* p. 41, 42, 47, 51 and passim; *Guiddo* p. 76, 127, 133, 134, 136 and passim.

[1799] *Widdo* p. 6 (2 individuals, from 11th c. *pancartes*), 11, 196, 240 and 242 (all from *pancartes* of the 12th c.), 34 (original, a. 1109–1110), 130 (from a cartulary from Brion, 17th c.), 160 (original, a. 1089), 174, 375 and 418 (all from a copy from about 1700); *Guiddo* p. 132 (from a cartulary from Brion), 146 and 155 (both from a copy around 1700), 239 (original, a. 1095), 419 (original, a. 1038–1055). It should also be emphasised that the *-dd-*spellings even in the 12th c. and in the cartulary as well as in the scattered mss. reduce in number only very slowly over time: a monk, eventually prior, is called *Widdo de Matefelone* 2.130 a. 1106, 2.174 a. 1082–1106 and 2.196 s. a., *Guiddo* 1.127 a. 1098, only once *Wido* 2.336 a.1093–1101; a *filius Laurentii* is called *Widdo* 1.171 around 1097, 1.173 a. 1107–1119 and 1.176 around 1140, *Guiddo* 1.172 a. 1107–1120, only once *f* 1.174 a. 1107–1119 etc. Evidently, people thought the two forms of the name were interchangeable (as today we think of *James, Jamie, Jim* or *Catherine, Cathy, Kate*). The same was true until the start of the 12th c. for a toponym derived from *Wid(d)o*: in charter 1.174 a. 1107–1109 a piece of land is called *Widdonaria* in the heading (which may have been

idiosyncrasy of the cartulary scribe. Significantly, members of the dynasty of An-gevin counts also appear more often with -*dd*- than with -*d*-. The son of Count Fulk I is called *Widdo* in his father's charter (1.203 a. 929–930); the *S. Widdonis Suessionensis episcopi* and *S. Widdonis episcopi* in two charters (1.7 a. 966 and 63 a. 966–973) refer to him when he was Bishop of Soissons, although in the text of the latter there is one mention of *hortante quoque Widone episcopo*. His nephew, the son of Count Fulk II, when he is Abbot of Saint-Aubin and other monasteries, is called *Widdo* six times (1.62, 63, 268, 269 [2], 327, all between a. 964 and 973), also in the formulae *ego Widdo* and *Widdo abba subscripsit* as well as in the words of his brother Geoffroy Grisegonelle, and only twice *Wido* (1.5 and 7 a. 966); later, as Bishop of Le Puy, he appears in the cartulary of his home town once more, with the signature *Widdo episcopus subscripsi* (1.42 a. 988).[1800]

This evidence of considerably more than a hundred instances of -*dd*- over three centuries cannot in all conscience be interpreted as ways of writing /ð/ and later even ø. On the contrary, the name evidently has two forms, which go back to the double form even in Germ. based on *Wĭdo* alongside *Wīdo*. Presum-ably *Wīdo* was the predominant form in the Frankish upper class, and thanks to the role of the Wido family across the whole of the kingdom from the middle of the 8th c. onwards, it was borrowed into ordinary OF, where it was involved in the intervocalic development /d/ > /ð/ > ø (> OF *Gui*, written in modern Fr. mostly as *Guy*), and then similarly into Ital. where it remained in the form *Guido*. The *Widdo/Guiddo* spellings show a second, narrowly provincial Romani-sation, this time of *Wĭdo*, probably from the inner circle around the Wido family themselves. Since the short, stressed vowel was no longer imitable in Romance, it was interpreted as a closed syllable instead, which resulted in the name being written down as *Wĭddo*.[1801] In the spoken language, therefore, the /d/ remained

---

written by the cartulary scribe in about 1175), but in the text itself, it is written as *terra Widonis*; in the following charter 1.175 a. 1127–1154 in both the heading and the main text we find *Wid-donaria,* and finally in charter 1.184s. a. 1162–1173 *Guiumneria* (2 mentions), according to the editor today a place called *Guyonnière* in the parish of Brossay (Maine-et-Loire, 45 km south-east of Angers). In this case, the form derived from *Wīdo* has managed to prevail; but in west-ern France, there are also many instances of *Gué- / Guedonnière*; cf. n. 1805 below!

1800 The editor mistakenly writes *Guy, évêque d'Anjou* rather than *du Puy* in his heading for this charter; this error is corrected in the index and in the Errata, vol. 3, p. 211 and 225.

1801 The geminates in Western Romance had by then perhaps stopped being geminates in the phonetic sense, but they still (as in modern Ger.) closed the preceding syllable, as we must

intact;[1802] but Germ. /ĭ/ turned as usual into /ẹ/ (Germ. *hĭlt* > OF *hẹlt* etc.) retaining the short syllable,[1803] which then in the course of the 12th c. regularly turned into /ẹ/: /gẹdõN/.[1804] At this stage, the name merged with *Gaidon* in its pronunciation, which encouraged people to see them as the same name; since the spelling *Gaidon* was already epic language style, the poet based his epic on it.[1805]

How old might this Angevin narrative tradition be? In the cartulary of Saint-Aubin d'Angers a *Widdo Campionus* 'Gueddon the dueller (in the divine trial by single combat)' appears in a charter issued by the Viscount of Thouars, a vassal of the Count of Anjou (1.277 a. 1055–1093). We cannot rule out the possibility that this man was a real dueller. But at that time in Anjou, especially in the case of the more

---

generally assume for OF generally: *(ut) mĭttam* > *(que) jo mẹt(t)e* (not **meite*) > *(que) je mẹt(t)e* etc., also unstressed: *mẹt(t)ons* > *mẹt(t)ons* (not **métons* or **metons*).

1802 Gamillscheg (1970, 373 n. 1) noted that the *-dd-* from before recorded history became *-d-* in later Galloromance, as can be seen e.g. in the personal name *Adda* (for OHG *Atta*) in the *Polytichon Irminonis*, *Ade* in OF epic poetry.

1803 Gamillscheg (1970, 365s.): Germ. *-ĭ-* > Rom. *-ẹ-*, even in words such as *bidil* > *bedel* [. . .], which are among the later Frankish loanwords.

1804 Just like e.g.: *mẹt(t)ons* > *mẹt(t)ons* (not **métons*).

1805 The majority of speakers in the Anjou region do not seem to have gone along with this written reinterpretation, however. We can see this in the later distribution of family names in the *Gaydon / Gaidon / Guedon / Guédon / Guesdon* etc. group in France, as far as this is traceable up to 1500 using the sources indicated in www.geneanet.org/plus/noms-de-famille (last accessed 05. 06. 2022). In around 1500 there were then two clear distribution areas separated by an almost empty zone, each area with many hundreds of attested individuals. The southeastern area has the lowest number of instances and is in today's Rhône-Alpes region (the maximum number being in Haute-Savoie on the border with Italy). The name clearly came to this place through contact with the nearby north-west of Italy; the spellings *Gaydon / Gueydon* (both also with *-i-* instead of *-y-*) represent then as now about 90 % of the references. The western, more prolific distribution area is of more interest to us: it extended in about 1500 across both sides of the Lower Loire, from the Vendée through Mayenne as far as the start of Brittany and the neighbouring parts of Normandy (with early signs of diffusion into the area around Paris); in this area we find, in contrast to the southeast, in about 1500 and continuing until the present time almost only (more than 99%) monophthong spellings such as *Guedon* (today *Guédon*, *Guedon*) and *Guesdon*. It is obvious that the difference between the two areas is statistically significant. There are also toponyms (almost entirely for small farms): in the Rhône-Alpes region I found only one atypical *Guedonnière* near Pouilly-les-Feurs (Loire), but in the west (at least) thirty *Gue- / Gué- / Guesdonnière* in the Départements of Vienne, Deux-Sèvres, Vendée, Sarthe, Mayenne (especially prolific), Ille-et-Vilaine, Orne and Manche, and also marginally a *Gue-* and *Guédonnerie* in Eure and Seine-et-Marne. These are accessible partly through the DTs, partly via www.maps.google.fr The immigrants from northern Italy generally did not found settlements or farms, but the west reveals the picture we would expect when a Germanic name from the upper nobility of the 8th century diffuses into the regional lower nobility who founded settlements and farms in the centuries after that.

common names, epithets were already very often used, and so the editors here think *Campionus* is an epithet; they write it in the text and in the index with a capital letter, which contrasts, for example, with *Widdo aurifaber* (1.156 a. 1060–1081), *Widdo / Guiddo secretarius* (1.156 a. 1060–1081 and 1.353 around 1090), *Widdo rusticus* (1.292 after 1082). If they are right, this is a fairly reliable indication of the existence of a literary figure in the second half of the 11th c. This figure would be older than the time when the names *Tierri* and *Anjou* were combined in the surviving Rol., and he could even have been Roland's avenger in the Angevin song from the middle of the 11th c. The survival of this supposedly merely "local legend" of this *Gueddon* into the early 13th c. to be picked up by the poet of the *Gaydon* would then not be at all surprising: it would be essentially a residual trace of the Angevin Rol. from the middle of the 11th c.

C.17 Charlemagne

The capstone of it all is Charlemagne himself.

C.17.1 The name in medieval dynasties

We turn now to the names *Charles / Karl* and *Magnus* in the various medieval dynasties. In continental Europe before the great emperor, the only ruler named Charles was his grandfather Charles Martel.[1806] The epithet *Magnus* is first

---

1806 There are two competing etymologies for the origin of the name *Charles / Karl*. The older, and until 1965 the only one, which I still support, starts from the fact that the two oldest narrative sources use the form *Carlus* – the *Continuatores Fredegarii* (this part originating under the explicit aegis of Charles Martel's half-brother Childebrand!) uses this form throughout, and the *Liber Historiae Francorum* (written in the year 727, also with Carolingian motivation) uses it at least in its oldest mss. A1, A2. *Carlus/Karlus* is still the regular form of the name in several early annals, such as consistently throughout the *Laurissenses minores* (that is to say for the years 714–814), and in large sections of the *Annales Sancti Amandi* (for 720–741, 768, 796–806), *Laubacenses* (for 720–741, 772–814), *Laureshamenses* (for 766–787, 789–791, end of 796–797) along with *Fragmentum annalium Chesnii* (for 789–790), *Nazariani* (for 718–741) and *Sithienses* (for 741–784, 786–795, 811–814) and also, if we can trust the critical edition by F. Kurze, in the *Annales Fuldenses* (from its first mention for the year 717 until one dated by Kurze as 864, coinciding with a change of author); it appears alongside the fuller form even in Alcuin's *Vita Willibrordi* (MGH PLAeC 1.215, cf. also 207, 208, *contra* 211). But since classical Latin does not have the consonant combination *-rl-* except in compound words, the name *Carlus* is replaced thanks to the Carolingian reform with *Cárŏlus* (where the *-ŏ-*, and not *-ō-* is confirmed passim by the metre, cf. MGH PLAec 1.57, 58, 61, 62 etc.; the *Carmen* v. 3

attested referring to the emperor in around 830 in the lines inserted by Gerward, librarian of Louis the Pious, into his copy of Einhart's *Vita Karoli* (passing from

---

still has *Kărŏlus*). This is how Charlemagne has it written even in his earliest charters, even when there is a reference back to his grandfather; this pattern is also followed by, among others, the *Laurissenses maiores*, i.e. the Royal Annals. (The same reasoning explains why some very early non-Carolingian scribes occasionally wrote *Caralus*, *Carulus*; cf. Förstemann s. v.) The form with *-o-* is by far the dominant one after that. Since the charters by the Arnulf-ing Mayors of the Palace are all only preserved in copies, the form *Carlus* is only preserved in three of their charters (no. 10, 11, 14 ed. Heidrich, although in one ms. of no. 11, a later hand has written in the *-o-* above the name!), while in six others (copies from the 11th c. onwards, no. 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20) and in the three forgeries (no 32, 33, 34) *C/Karolus* prevails. Secondly, this theory is based on the fact that the Fredegar continuation which originated under the leadership of Charles Martel's half-brother, on the occasion of the birth of Charles Martel (MGH SS.mer. 2.172.14s.), states that his father *genuit filium vocavitque nomen eius lingue [= lin-guae] proprietate Carlo [= Carlum]*. The explanation for the name therefore is that it is 'in accor-dance with the characteristics of the language' (at least of the father who gave him the name). This cannot just be referring to some simple spelling or phonological detail in the name – in this period such a minor point would not be worth even a word of explanation, especially in this text which is full of uncontrolled vulgar Latin expressions – but it surely must refer to the name's meaning. It therefore points to the fact that in Pippin's language the name had a meaning, and therefore could be interpreted in an appellative sense. This appellative sense is not difficult to find: it is ur-Germ. **karl(az)* > Old Norse *karl* 'man, male being (generic, opp. 'female being'), husband, also: senior' in a great many compounds *karl(-/a/s)-* 'male, man's' (e.g. *karlsköp* 'the male genitals') [> OE *carl* 'man', *carlcat* 'tomcat' etc.], only gradually with a social upper limit: 'freeman, free peasant, ordinary man'; OHG *charal / charel / charl* '*maritus*, *conjux*, *amator*', occa-sionally: *vir*, *vetulus*', also for animals *charala* '*mares*', early MHG *karl / karle / charle* 'husband, lover'. The word is separated by the simple ablaut from the semantically closely related urGerm. **kerl(az)* > OE. *čeorl* '(common) free man' > ME *cherl / churl* etc. 'countryman, husbandman, free peasant' from about 1300 'bondsman, villain' > modern Eng. *churl* 'rude fellow' Middle Dutch *keerle* '*rusticus* (subst.)' > modern Dutch *Kerel* '(lad, fellow; mostly good-natured), occasionally also: huge, giant-sized person', Middle Low German (also Lower Rhenish [Teuthonista]) *kerle* '*rus-ticus* (subst.)' > early modern Ger. (Central Ger., around 1400) *kerl* a coarse word for 'man' > after about 1500 soon becoming generally modern Ger. *Kerl* 'chap, guy'. The stem of the word, espe-cially in its *-a-* variant at first only indicated maleness, with no reference to social status; only later, by interpretation, did it sink to a lower social level. The meaning of the name *Charles* around 700 must therefore have signified something like 'strapping lad, big boy', when referring to a new-born baby. Since the name of Charlemagne's father and great-grandfather, Pippin after subtracting hypocoristic *-in* ending simply consists of a presumably babyish syllable that defies explanation, and Charlemagne's grandmother's name *Begga* is an equally unpretentious short name, it is clear that the family did not cultivate a high-sounding culture of full names, and that the meaning of *Charles* is not necessarily anything unusual. Furthermore, **karl* or the closely re-lated form **kerl* in the early 6th c. is the name of a King of Mercia, who apparently (like Charles Martel!) was not part of any royal dynasty (Bede *Hist.* 2.14 in the genitive: *Cearli regis Merciorum*), and in the 9th c. the name of an ealdorman (~ *dux*) of Devonshire, who in 850/ 851 scored one of the few victories against the Vikings (the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles: *Ceorl*), which shows that this

there into the B family of its mss.), cf. above C.15.2.3 'Roland in Einhart's *Vita Karoli*'); this is surely supported by the fact that in 877–79 and 881–888 *Karolus Imperator* without *Magnus* referred to Charles the Bald or Charles the Fat.

In the table prepared by K. F. Werner (1967, table) of the over two hundred male descendants of Charlemagne in the seven generations after him, 12 individuals bear the name Charles, all in an unbroken line of legitimate descent, and all but one in an unbroken male line:

- in the first generation after him, his son Charles († 811, i.e. before Charlemagne);
- in the second, Charles the Bald (youngest son of Emperor Louis the Pious, † 877);
- in the third, Charles of Provence (son of Emperor Lothar I, † 863), Charles of Aquitaine (son of Pippin I of Aquitaine, in 849 forced to be a cleric, after fleeing to the eastern kingdom, in 856 Archbishop of Mainz, † 863), Charles the Fat (son of Louis the German, † 888) as well as two sons of Charles the Bald, the elder (sub-) King of Aquitaine († 866, i.e. long before his father), the younger born in 876 († soon after in 877);
- in the fourth, Charles the Simple (grandson of Charles the Bald, son of Louis the Stammerer, deposed in 922, † as a prisoner in 929);
- in the fifth, no one;
- in the sixth, Charles Constantine, Count of Vienne († 962; had Carolingian blood through his grandmother Ermengard, daughter of the son of Lothar, Emperor Louis II of Italy, and their son Louis the Blind of Italy); also, two sons of Louis IV d'Outremer, son of Charles the Simple, the elder born in 945 and dying young, the younger born in 953, Duke of (Lower) Lorraine

---

name was suitable for the upper classes. This etymology of *Charles / Karl* also explains the origins of the name *Carloman* which Charles Martel gave to his oldest son: Old Norse *karlmaðr* (< **karlmannr*, inflected also to *karlmann*) has the same meaning as *karl*, but often with more emphasis 'a man of valour' (Cleasby/Vigfússon s. v.), especially *karlmennska* 'manhood, valour'; cf. also OE *carlman*. – Alternatively, Henning Kaufmann (1965, 213–217, 1968, 78s.) suggested a different etymology for *Charles / Karl*: a west Frankish, or more precisely, a form that arose in the west Frankish-Old French bilingual context, namely *Háriolus* [or more accurately: χ*áriolus*]. But first, Kaufmann does not take account of the earliest and best attested tradition for this name as described above, and secondly, the first sound is worryingly complicated: pre-vocalic χ- > *k*- is supposed to be "west Frankish" although this is only supported by a few name references, and is otherwise at best early Merovingian Galloromance (6th, early 7th c.), but does not fit with the later development of Old French nor of German (cf. Germ. χ*auniþa* > OF *honte*, cf. Ger. *Hohn*, Germ. χ*aribert* > OF., Ger. *Herbert* etc.); neither does it fit with the only reference that exists for the name *Hariolus* itself (Saint-Mihiel on the Meuse a. 942 for someone who is otherwise unknown, Förstemann s. v. *Herili*), where it incontrovertibly stands for /h/; -*iolus* is also according to Kaufmann Romance (cf. *filíolus* > *filiólus* > *filleul*), but the stress is supposed to be Germ. again, so that the syncope leads to Ger. *Karl*, OF *C(h)árles*.

and in 987–991 pretender to the French crown († as a prisoner, on an un-
known date);
– in the seventh, his almost unknown son, born in 989 († at an unknown date).

After the fall of the Carolingians, the Christianiser of Norway, Olaf the Holy, was
the first to baptise his son with the epithet *Magnus*, very probably in remem-
brance of Charlemagne.[1807] The boy would later become Magnús I of Norway and
Denmark († 1047), the first of seven Norwegian and four Swedish Kings bearing
this name.[1808] (After this, *Magnus* gradually becomes a generic, northern Euro-
pean first name, related to the modern Danish first name *Mogens*.)

The name *Charles / Karl* next appears with Charles the Good, born 1080/
1086 as the son of Canute / Knut IV of Denmark and Adela of Flanders (who
had the blood of the Carolingians in her veins through a daughter of Charles
the I who was the wife of Balduin I of Flanders, and then again directly through
the male line); he was Count of Flanders and still childless when he was mur-
dered in 1127. After this, the Capetians picked up the name: Philip I had already
given his eldest son the Carolingian name Louis, but Philip August called an
illegitimate son *Petrus Karlotus* (*Charlot*, born 1205/1209, † 1249 as Bishop of
Noyon); since he only had one son with his wife Isabella of Hainault (from the
house of Flanders-Hainault and therefore of Carolingian blood through the
daughter of Charles the Bald), the heir to his throne, Louis VIII (born in 1187,
whom he was more or less duty bound to name after the child's grandfather),
the name *Charles / Karl* only came into play among the legitimate Capetians a
generation later, but now against the backdrop of a supposedly ancient proph-
ecy about a *reditus regni Francorum ad stirpem Karoli*, referring to the youngest
son of Louis VIII, Charles of Anjou, born in 1225/1227, from 1265 onwards King
of Sicily-Naples (from 1282 only Naples), from 1277 simultaneously (disputed)
King of the remainder of the Kingdom of Jerusalem around Acre († 1285). His
descendants bearing this name include (in addition to several non-kings in
France) two Kings of Naples, and depending on the way they are counted, two
or three Kings of Hungary. At the same time, the house of his brother Louis IX

1807 The Norse sources correctly give this as the explanation for the name; saints bearing the
name *Magnus* (especially Magnus of Füssen, probably 8th c.) are too insignificant to have ex-
erted any influence that would reach as far as northern Europe.
1808 Branch I of the Old Norse KMS came into being when Norway had already had five
kings by the name of *Magnús*. This explains why the young Charles in that work, who was
surrounded by conspirators, chooses *Magnús* as a pseudonym. It was obviously a translation
of the OF *Mainet* which had the same function in the lost Continental source of the KMS I. For
the relationship between this source and the KMS I cf. Beckmann (2008a, passim).

the Saint carried on using the name, and if we count the Capet-Valois-Bourbon house as one dynasty, as is customary, it had seven more Kings of France (until 1830), three Bourbon Kings of Spain (including Juan Carlos, who abdicated in 2014) and one King of Naples-Sicily (1734–1759). The name then spread out from the Capetians in the late 13th c. through a temporary personal union with the Kings of Navarre and in the early 14th c. through a Capetian daughter to the Dukes of Brittany (who were loosely governed by the French). It also passed from King Charles IV of France to his godson, previously called Wenzel, from then on Charles of Luxembourg-Bohemia, later to become Emperor Charles IV; and finally, it passed from Charles the Bold in the Burgundian side-branch of Valois to his grandson Emperor Charles V, and from there to one German member of the Habsburg dynasty, (1711–1740), one Austrian (1916–1918) and one Spanish (1665–1700).

This concludes the history of the name's distribution among kings and emperors of the Middle Ages and its continuation through into modern times through its most significant representatives. In the Middle Ages, then, there is almost always a family justification for the name (in the case of Emperor Charles IV, it is a spiritual relationship).[1809] But it is clear that – from the early 11th c. until the start of the 13th c. – it had to extend very far back in time via the women in these families, and it was therefore a very conscious link with the Carolingian dynasty, including especially Charlemagne himself. As time went on, the genealogical connection grew even more secure. The very high prevalence of the name leads to the suspicion, however, that behind the ever more solid justifications, the idea of the great emperor continued to be a hugely motivating factor; Emperor Charles IV, for instance, was famously a fervent admirer of Charlemagne. One final point completes our sketch of the trajectory of the name adopted by so many great figures in the Middle Ages. It is the fact that in Eastern Europe, the name very soon became an appellative meaning 'king': Church Slavonic *kral'* (> Hung. *király*), Serbo-Croat. *krâlj*, Sloven. *kralj*, Bulgar. *kral*, Russ. *koróľ*, Ukrain. *koróľ*, Belarus. *karóľ* (although in Bulg. and the East Slav. languages it sounded foreign in comparison with *tsar'* [< *Caesar*]), Pol. and Kashub. *król*, Czech. *král*, Slovak. *kráľ*; Lith. *karálius*, Latv. *káralis*.

1809 As far as I am aware, this family connection is lacking only in Sweden, occurring for the first time with Charles / Karl Sverkersson, born in about 1130, King in 1161, † 1167. But it is possible that the example of Magnus in Norway, and especially Charles in Denmark may have exerted some influence on this naming.

C.17.2 The name in the wider population

How widespread is the name in the rest of the population? In France before 1150 it is not at all widespread. There is an amusing example to demonstrate this: Morlet, whose two-volume lexicon of names in Galloromania between the 6th and 12th c. (1971/1972) is based almost entirely on charters and not narrative sources, simply forgot to include the name. I did not have it on my search list, because on its own, it proves nothing about the existence of an Old French epic, but my interest in it was aroused in two specific cases, and I do not think I have overlooked very much. First: Haute-Marne 177 a. 902 *Calemagnus presbiter subscripsit*, 179 a. 904 *Galemagnus levita subscripsit*, 183 a. 909 *Galemagnus presbiter subscripsit* – all in original charters issued by Bishop Argrim of Langres; they obviously refer to the same person.[1810] Even if this man was originally called *Galo / Calo* (Morlet 102a has a reference for the spelling *Kalo* instead of *Galo* precisely for the Diocese of Langres), the addition of *-magnus* makes playful reference to *Carlomagnus*. And secondly: Saint-Sever 232 a. 1065?–1072: (property) *quod tenuerat Karolus et filii ejus in Senas* (parish of Haut-Mauco, Landes), between Mont-de-Marsan and Saint-Sever on the second Way of St. James (according to the numbering system in the PT) from Vézelay to Ostabat, which means that the choice of name was probably influenced by pilgrims on the Way of St. James. It was to be expected that before 991 the name would be *de facto* non-existent outside the royal house, because even in Merovingian times, people who did not have Merovingian blood would generally not dare to use a name taken from the ruling family. The fact that this continued long after 991 may be due to the anti-Carolingian attitude that prevailed in the domain controlled by the Capetians, an attitude which also prevented the emergence of names from Carolingian epic poetry (cf. above C.9.2 'The Capetian barrier'). But even in the epic-loving south and west, the name was almost entirely missing, and this shows that the name must have enjoyed an unusually high level of respect, which could have ranged from a kind of numinous awe to a simple fear of appearing ridiculous.

I did not follow up the diffusion of the name from the dynastic class into the general population from the 12th c. onwards. Seibicke (1996–2007, Art. *Karl*) presents ample material on this for Germany.[1811] According to this account, the

---

[1810] The date of the first charter is not absolutely certain (cf. Haute-Marne 167); this might explain the apparent demotion from *presbyter* to *levita*.

[1811] Although his statement (1996–2007, Art. *Karl*), to the effect that in the 10th c., in a group of 240 participants in a tournament [!] in Ulm, the name Karl only occurs three times, is of course nonsense: his informant (in a newspaper article dating from 1887) took a list of tournaments dating from 938 to 1487 with approximately 8000 names of noblemen from Sebastian Münster's

name is already "in the 12th c." (when exactly?) relatively common in Cologne and it reaches Eastphalia by 1158, in other words before the canonisation of Charlemagne in 1165, but from then until towards the end of the 14th c. it sharply decreases in popularity, before rising again under the influence of Charles IV, which is once again an import from France. Judging by Seibicke's references, Charles V had almost no influence on the name, but Carlo Borromeo († 1584, canonised in 1610) certainly did, albeit only in Catholic Germany of course; it only really took off again in the 19th c. when fashions for medieval Europe and German nationalism were almost inseparable; after the Second World War, the name almost disappeared (in spite of the Charlemagne cult surrounding early efforts to create a European Union), both in West Germany and in East Germany. In 2021, however, the name was the 28th most popular name for boys born in Germany.[1812]

C.17.3 The image of Charlemagne: bipolarity of the character, the title and the name

We turn now to the character of Charlemagne. In our discussion of Roland, we have already distanced ourselves from Brault's (1978) opinion that Roland does not have any weaknesses (cf. above B.1.3 'Why is Roland not allowed to destroy Durendal?). But the poet demonstrates another achievement as least as significant: he knows how to make Charlemagne appear not just as a figure of great majesty, but also as a human being – a man who needs someone to talk to, and who even suffers at an emotional level.

There is no need to provide evidence for his majestic side because it imprints itself from the beginning or, as we might say in the poet's own words (v. 119): *S'est ki· l demandet, ne l'estoet enseigner.*

It is all the more necessary to follow his sensitivity throughout the song, as a constant counterpoint his majesty. Charlemagne is often thoughtful, almost hesitant (v. 138–141): *Baisset sun chief, si cumenceṭ a penser. AOI. // Li empereres en tint sun chef enclin, / De sa parole ne fut mie hastifs; / Sa custume est qu'il paroleṭ a leisir.* And the reason for this is (v. 167) *Par cels de France voelt il*

Kosmographei (1544, 2.1204–1247) at face value, even though it is a typical invention by a Renaissance "historian". On the other hand, Seibicke does not list the bishop-designate of Constance, a certain Karl from Thuringia, sometimes also called Karlmann, (sed. a. 1069, stepped down a. 1070, whose family history is unknown).

1812 According to https://www.beliebte-vornamen.de/62633-2020er-jahre.htm [last access 06. 06. 2022].

del tut errer. The two council scenes prove this: in the first one, he succeeds in guiding the Franks to decide upon the man of his choice, without explicitly saying anything; but in the second scene, this same reserved behaviour leads to his recognition, having been forewarned in a dream, that Ganelon's suggestion is diabolical (although he does not see it yet as an indication of conspiring with the enemy). He only objects with the rather helpless words *E ki serat devant mei en l'ansguarde?* (v. 748) and fails to assert himself against the wishes of the Franks, let alone his nephew's proud defiance. He regrets this immediately when he is crossing the Pyrenees: his soldiers look forward over Gascony, *la tere lur seignur*, and they shed tears of anticipation at the thought of seeing their loved ones again, but Charlemagne's tears come from his concern for his nephew; even though he is reluctant to reveal the cause of these tears to his friend Naimes, this worry is also conveyed to the army. When the sound of Roland's horn is heard, the emperor knows at once that his nephew is fighting with the enemy; but even after the third, long drawn-out blast of the horn, he only manages to utter the strangled realisation that *Cel corn ad lunge aleine* (v. 1789). It is not Charlemagne, but forthright and fearless Naimes who makes the accusation of treason, and Charlemagne then espouses the same view. When Charlemagne arrives at the deathly quiet battlefield, he manages to call the names of his nephew, Turpin and the peers with an anguished *Ubi-sunt*; after that, he faints. Once again, it is Naimes who comes to his aid, and as Charlemagne revives from his swoon, Naimes shows him what he has to do now: take revenge on the enemy who are retreating in the distance. His revenge is accomplished thanks to the sun miracle; but that same night, the exhausted emperor falls asleep in his full armour and is troubled again by a disturbing dream. The next morning, his subtle sense of dignity insists on a very private, personal act of honour, that is to say, he goes to search for his nephew alone; he falls upon the body and loses consciousness once again. He then utters his great lament, calling out four times, *Ami Rollant!* The knowledge that Baligant's army is drawing near gives him his full strength back; he maintains this strength throughout the whole of the battle except for two critical moments: when the enemy is breaking through, Ogier recognises the deadly threat before Charlemagne does and bluntly exhorts him to put his life on the line; and when Baligant wounds him, he has to hear the words of the angel before his fear of death is dispelled. The enforced mass baptism which Charlemagne then decrees – disconcerting for us, but entirely apt for the historical converter of the Saxons – is softened by the decision to let Bramimunde find her own way to salvation. Alde's suffering affects Charlemagne so deeply, that he is prepared to give her the greatest gift a monarch can bestow, the hand of his son in marriage – before he realises that even this will not suffice. At the same time, he wants to make Ganelon's trial in the presence of the Imperial Assembly an *exemplum* of retribution; he achieves

this, even more comprehensively than he had planned, but only after he is shocked by the cowardice of so many in the face of the treachery of the few, and after he had himself been forced to depend on the military prowess of a young man, or rather upon the divine judgement that it represents. Finally, the poet's greatest achievement is shaped by his uncompromising interpretation of God's plan for the salvation of the world: the open ending that comes with Charlemagne's lament: *Deus [. . .] si penuse est ma vie!* Where else in Old French epic poetry is there a ruler with even a fraction of the complexity that he displays?

The bipolarity in the character of Charlemagne also reflects the bipolarity that is in his title and his name. In the Song, Charlemagne appears 107 times as *emperere/-ëur* which characterises him as the universal ruler, responsible for defending Western Christianity not least in his position as "Emperor of Rome"; but just as often – about 180 times, if we include a few borderline cases – he is *rei(s),* with the shorter title he bore throughout most of his life, and the one that was anchored in the consciousness of the French from the earliest times, from the 5th c. right through to the time when the poet was alive. This title was bound to resonate with the people. This same balance between the two titles is also evident in the vocatives: four times he is addressed as *emperere* (v. 308, 766, 2441, 2945), four or five times as *reis* (v. 1697, 2978, 3611, 3824, disputed 3996).

The element *magne(s)* in the Song only ever appears in relation to Charlemagne, not just as part of the name *Charlemagne(s),* but also where it functions as an adjective derived from Lat. *magnus.* But we find alongside the 24 *C(h)/ Karlemagne(s)* and the 8 *C(h)arles li magnes* (as well as the three *reis (li) magnes* and one *emperere magnes* that we can add to them) no fewer than 158 instances of plain *C(h)/Karles/-uns* (hapax)/-e/-un.

Within the last group there are admittedly two cases that are only apparently plain, because in the same line – and this only ever happens here – *reis* and *emperere* are combined. The first is in Baligant's words (v. 2657–2659): *† – Oiez ore, franc chevaler vaillant: / Carles li reis, l'emperere des Francs, / Ne deit manger se jo ne li cumant.* Baligant raises Charlemagne up when he uses this double title, but only because he wants to humiliate him all the more: Baligant thinks he has the power to decide whether even the emperor-and-king of the Christians will live or die.

The other case is to be found in the opening line of the Song. Here, too, *Carles li reis* forms the first hemistich, and *emperere* is in the second hemistich, but the effect is very different. Since the audience at this point is not yet familiar with the term *magnus* in its resurrected form, they hear *Carles [. . .] magnes* just as a tmesis of *Charlemagnes,* in other words, to a certain extent they hear both forms of the name, the shorter form first, which then unexpectedly turns

into the more illustrious one. Into the bracket thus formed, the poet has drawn *reis* and *emperere,* so that both forms of the name and also both titles are heard in one and the same line. And yet – perhaps his most admirable achievement of all – he gives the brilliance of the titles an aura of homely warmth with the little word *nostre*:

> *Carles li reis, nostre emperere magnes.*

D Appendix

D.1 Abbreviations

Books of the Vulgate Cited

Gen	Genesis
Ex	Exodus
Num	Numeri (Numbers)
Deut	Deuteronomium (Deuteronomy)
Ios	Iosue (Joshua)
Iud	Iudices (Judges)
1 Sam	I Samuelis (1 Samuel, formerly: I Regum)
2 Sam	II Samuelis (2 Samuel, formerly: II Regum)
1 Reg	I (formerly: III) Regum (1 Kings)
2 Reg	II (formerly: IV) Regum (2 Kings)
1 Paralip	I Paralipomenon (1 Chronicles)
2 Paralip	II Paralipomenon (2 Chronicles)
Iudith	Judith
Esth	Esther
Iob	Job
Ps	Psalmi (Psalms)
Prov	Proverbia (Proverbs)
Sap	Sapientia (Wisdom of Solomon)
Eccli	Ecclesiasticus (Jesus Sirach)
Is	Isaiah
Ier	Ieremias (Jeremiah)
Ez	Ezechiel (Ezekiel)
Dan	Daniel
Os	Osee (Hosea)
Ion	Ionas (Jonah)
Nah	Nahum
Zach	Zacharias (Zechariah)
Mal	Malachias (Malachi)
1 Macc	I Machabaeorum (1 Maccabees)
2 Macc	II Machabaeorum (2 Maccabees)
Mt	Evangelium secundum Matthaeum (Gospel of Matthew)
Mt [. . .] par	As above, plus parallel places in the other Gospels
Mc	Evangelium secundum Marcum (Gospel of Mark)
Lc	Evangelium secundum Lucam (Gospel of Luke)
Ioh	Evangelium secundum Io(h)annem (Gospel of John)
Act Ap	Actus Apostolorum (Acts of the Apostles)
Rom	Epistola Beati Pauli ad Romanos (Romans)
2 Cor	II Epistola Beati Pauli ad Corinthios (2 Corinthians)

Gal	Epistola Beati Pauli ad Galatas (Galatians)
Phil	Epistola Beati Pauli ad Philippenses (Philippians)
2 Thess	II Epistola Beati Pauli ad Thessalonicenses (2 Thessalonians)
1 Tim	I Epistola Beati Pauli ad Timotheum (1 Timothy)
2 Tim	II Epistola Beati Pauli ad Timotheum (2 Timothy)
1 Petri	I Epistola Beati Petri (1 Peter)
Iudae	Epistola Beati Iudae (Jude)
Apoc	Apocalypsis Beati Io(h)annis (Revelation)

Other Abbreviations

a.	anno (in the year)
abl.	ablative
A.D.	anno domini (after Christ)
adj.	adjective, adjectival
ad loc.	ad locum (at the same place)
acc.	accusative
art.	article
b.	bin (Arab.), son (of)
Bab.	Babylonian
B.C.	before Christ
bet.	between
Bp.	Bishop
BN	Bibliothèque nationale, Paris
Bret.	Breton
Byz.	Byzantine
ca.	circa (approximately)
cap.	caput (chapter)
c.	century
Cat.	Catalan
cf.	confer, compare, see
col.	column
coll.	collection
cons.	consonant, consonantal
cp.	compare
d.	died
dact.	dactylographié, in typed form
dat.	dative
Dép.	Département
Dioc.	Diocese
Du.	Dutch
ed. / edd.	editor / editors
edn.	edition
e.g.	exempli gratia (for example)
Emp.	Emperor

Eng.	English
et al.	et alii (and others)
etc.	et cetera (and so on)
f. / ff.	folium / folia
fasc.	fasciculus, fascicle
fem.	feminine
fl.	floruit (was active)
FrProv.	Franco-Provençal
Fr.	French
Gal.	Galician (Galego)
Gasc.	Gascon
gen.	genitive
Ger.	German
Germ.	Germanic
Gk.	Greek
Hebr.	Hebrew
hist.	history
ibid.	ibidem (in the same place)
i.e.	id est (that means)
ind.	indicative
intervoc.	intervocalic
Ital.	Italian
Jr.	Junior
Kg.	King
km	kilometre(s)
Lat.	Latin
lib.	liber (book)
lit.	(documentation of) secondary literature
loc.	locative
loc. cit.	loco citato (in the place cited)
Lor.	Lorrain
masc.	masculine
ME	Middle English
MF	Middle French
M.Gk.	Middle Greek
MHG	Middle High German
M.Lat.	Middle Latin, Medieval Latin
MLG	Middle Low German
Mod.	modern
ms., mss.	manuscript / manuscripts
n.	nota (note)
NHG	New High German
nom.	nominative
Norm.	Norman
no.	number / numbers
obl.	oblique
obv	obverse (side of a coin)

Occ.	Occitan
OE	Old English
OF	Old French
OHG	Old High German
opp.	opposite
p.	pagina (page)
part.	participle
pl.	plural
p.m.	post meridiem
Port.	Portuguese
prep.	preposition, prepositional
pres.	present
Prov.	Province
Ps.-	Pseudo-
PT	Pseudo-Turpin
r°	recto, front or right side
rev	reverse (side of a coin)
rev.	revised by, reviser
Rol.	Chanson de Roland (Song of Roland)
Ro.	Romanian
Rom.	Romance
s. / ss.	sequens / sequentes (following)
s. a.	sine anno (no date)
s. v.	sub voce (under the heading)
scil.	scilicet (that is to say)
Sem.	Semitic
sg.	singular
St.	Saint
str.	strophe
subst.	substantive, noun
subj.	subjunctive
Tusc.	Tuscan
U.P.	University Press
trans.	translator, translated
v.	verse (line) / von
v°	verso
var.	variants
Ven.	Venetian
VLat.	Vulgar Latin
vol.	volume, volumes
vs.	versus, against
Vulg.	Vulgata (Vulgate)
Wall.	Walloon

In language names final *-ic* and *-ish* are suppressed (e.g., *Arab.*, *Turk.*).

D.2 Literature cited

AA.SS. = *Acta sanctorum*, 67 vol., Antwerpiae et al., 1643–1940.

AA.SS.OSB. = d'Achery [also: Dachery], Luc/ Mabillon, Jean (edd.), *Acta sanctorum ordinis Sancti Benedicti*, 9 vol., Paris 1688–1701.

Abadal i de Vinyals, Ramón d', *Catalunya carolingia*, vol. 1–3/2, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1950–1955.

Achery, Luc d', cf. AA.SS.OSB. and *Spicilegium*.

Adigard des Gautries, Jean, *Les noms de lieux de la Seine-Maritime entre 911 et 1066*, Annales de Normandie 8 (1958), 299–322, 9 (1959), 273–283.

Adrados, Francisco R., *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache. Von den Anfängen bis heute*, transl. from Spanish into German by Hansbert Bertsch, Tübingen, Francke, 2001.

Adso, Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi*, ed. Verhelst, Daniel, Turnhout, Brepols, 1976.

Aebischer, Paul, *Sur l'origine et la formation des noms de famille dans le canton de Fribourg*, Genève, Olschki, 1923.

Aebischer, Paul, *Un écho de la légende de Roland dans l'onomastique napolitaine*, Archivum Romanicum 20 (1936), 285–288.

Aebischer, Paul, *Contribution à la protohistoire des articles «ille» et «ipse» dans les langues romanes*, Cultura Neolatina 8 (1948), 181–203.

Aebischer, Paul, *L'équation Oliba = Olivarius et la fin de la déclinaison gothique en* -a, -anem *et* -o, -onem *en Septimanie*, Cultura Neolatina 11 (1951), 197–211.

Aebischer, Paul, *Les trois mentions plus anciennes du couple Roland et Olivier*, Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 30 (1952), 657–675 (=1952a).

Aebischer, Paul, *Deux cas italiens de frères dénommés Rolandus et Uliverius à la fin du XII*[e] *siècle*, Studi Medievali 18 (1952), 325–331 (=1952b).

Aebischer, Paul, *Un cas du couple Roland-Olivier dans une charte de San Cugat del Vallés*, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 25 (1953), 165–170.

Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana Borealia*, Lausanne, Rouge, 1954 (=1954a).

Aebischer, Paul, *Textes norrois et littérature française du Moyen Âge*, vol. 1, *Recherches sur les traditions épiques antérieures à la Chanson de Roland d'après les données de la première branche de la «Karlamagnus Saga»*, Genève, Droz, 1954 (=1954b).

Aebischer, Paul, *À propos de deux ou trois nouveaux cas italiens du couple Roland et Olivier*, Cultura Neolatina 15 (1955), 223–237.

Aebischer, Paul, *L'entrée de Roland et d'Olivier dans le vocabulaire onomastique de la Marca Hispanica d'après le Liber Feudorum Maior et d'autres recueils de chartes catalanes et françaises*, Estudis romànics 5 (1955–1956), 55–76.

Aebischer, Paul, *«Raimbaud et Hamon». Une source perdue de la Chanson de Roland*, Le Moyen Âge 63 (1957), 23–54, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Genève, Droz, 1967, 35–55.

Aebischer, Paul, *Un nouveau cas génois du couple Roland et Olivier*, Cultura Neolatina 18 (1958), 59–60.

Aebischer, Paul, *Le rôle de Pampelune lors de l'expédition franque de 778 en Espagne d'après l'histoire et l'épique médiévale*, Revue suisse d'histoire 9 (1959), 305–333.

Aebischer, Paul, *Les graphies toponymiques «Sebre» et «Balaguet» de la Chanson de Roland, ms. Digby*, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 28 (1959–1960),

185–209, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Genève, Droz, 1967, 221–241.

Aebischer, Paul, *Études sur Otinel*, Berne, Francke, 1960 (=1960a).

Aebischer, Paul, *La Chanson de Roland dans le «désert littéraire» du XIe siècle*, Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 38 (1960), 718–749, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Genève, Droz, 1967, 56–80 (=1960b).

Aebischer, Paul, *Les derniers vers de la Chanson de Roland*, in: Zamora Vicente, Alonso (ed.), *Studia philologica. Homenaje ofrecido a Dámaso Alonso*, vol. 1, Madrid, Gredos, 1960, 11–33, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Genève, Droz, 1967, 191–210 (=1960c).

Aebischer, Paul, *À propos de quelques noms de lieux de la Chanson de Roland*, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 30 (1963–1964), 39–61, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Genève, Droz, 1967, 242–262.

Aebischer, Paul, *Roland, mythe ou personnage historique?*, Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 43 (1965), 849–901, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Genève, Droz, 1967, 99–138.

Aebischer, Paul, *Trois personnages en quête d'auteurs: Roland, Olivier, Aude*, in: Rudolph, Kurt, et al. (edd.), *Festschrift Walter Baetke*, Weimar, Böhlau, 1966, 17–45, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Genève, Droz, 1967, 141–173.

Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana et Oliveriana*, Recueil d'études sur les chansons de geste, Genève, Droz, 1967.

Aebischer, Paul, *La véritable identité d'Antoine, duc d'Avignon et père d'Aye d'Avignon*, Marche Romane 18 (1968), 147–155, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Des Annales carolingiennes à Doon de Mayence*, Genève, Droz, 1975, 243–252.

Aebischer, Paul, *Arnold de Winkelried, le héros de Sempach, et Roland, le vainqueur de Roncevaux. Observations sur la technique du montage, du lancement et de la mise en orbite de quelques mythes dans le cosmos historico-littéraire*, Revue suisse d'histoire 19 (1969), 1–33, quoted from the reprint in: Aebischer, Paul, *Des Annales carolingiennes à Doon de Mayence*, Genève, Droz, 1975, 41–66.

Aebischer, Paul, *L'état actuel des recherches relatives aux origines de l'anthroponyme «Olivier»*, in: *Mélanges de langue et de littérature du moyen âge et de la Renaissance offerts à Jean Frappier*, vol. 1, Genève, Droz, 1970, 17–34 (= 1970a).

Aebischer, Paul, *Notule rolandienne: Les personnages d'Astor et de Gaifier dans la laisse LXIV du Roland d'Oxford*, Le Moyen Âge 76 (1970), 427–443 (=1970b).

Aebischer, Paul, *Préhistoire et protohistoire du Roland d'Oxford*, Berne, Francke, 1972.

Aebischer, Paul, *Des Annales carolingiennes à Doon de Mayence, Nouveaux recueil d'études sur l'épique française médiévale*, Genève, Droz, 1975.

Afflighem = Marneffe, Edgar de (ed.), *Le cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Afflighem*, Bruxelles, Bureau, 1894 (Reprint Brussel, Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1997).

Agard, Frederick B., *Introduction to The medieval French Roman d'Alexandre*, vol. 5, Princeton NJ, Princeton U.P., 1942.

Agde = Rouquette, Julien (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'Église d'Agde, cartulaire du chapitre*, vol.1:1, Montpellier, 1925.

Aḥmad, Aziz, *A History of Islamic Sicily*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh U.P., 1975.

Ainay, cf. Savigny. *Akhbār madžmūʿa*, cf. James and Lafuente.

Aland, Barbara, et al. (edd. [Greek]), *Das Neue Testament, Griechisch und Deutsch*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/ Stuttgart,Katholische Bibelanstalt, ⁴2003.

Alaón = Corral Lafuente, José Luis (ed.), *Cartulario de Alaón (Huesca)*, Zaragoza, Facsimil, 1984.

Albelda = Ubieto Arteta, Antonio (ed.), *Cartulario de Albelda*, Valencia, Bautista, 1960.

Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. (with Engl. transl.) Susan B. Edgington, Oxford, Clarendon, 2007.

Alföldi, Andreas, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, [3]1980.

Alonso, Dámaso, *La primitiva épica francesa a la luz de una nota Emilianense*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1954.

Althof, Hermann (ed. et comm.), *Waltharii poesis*, 2 vol., Leipzig, Dieterich, 1905.

Álvar, Carlos, *«Roldán», «Rollán» y «Orlando»*, in: Álvarez Jurado, Manuela (ed.), *Studia philologica et linguistica atque traductologica in honorem Miguel A. García Peinado oblata*, Sevilla, Bienza, 2014, 13–32 (=2014a).

Álvar, Carlos, *Oliveros: Auge y ocaso de un héroe*, Summa 4 (Tardor 2014), 7–38 (=2014b).

Álvar, Manuel, *Estudios sobre el dialecto aragonés*, 2 vol., Zaragoza, Institución Fernando el Católico, 1973–1978.

Álvar, Manuel, *Antigua geografía lingüística de Aragón: los peajes de 1436*, Zaragoza, Institución Fernando el Católico, 1992.

Amardel, Gabriel, *Le comte Milon*, Bulletin de la commission archéologique de Narbonne 7 (1902), 1–30.

Amari, Michele (ed.), *Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula*, 2 vol., Torino, Loescher, 1880–1889.

Amari, Michele, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, 3 vol., Catania, Prampolini, [2]1933–1939.

Amory, Frederic, *The Viking Hasting in Franco-Scandinavian Legend*, in: King, Margot H./ Stevens, Wesley M. (edd.), *Saints, Scholars and Heroes: Studies in Medieval Culture in honour of Charles W. Jones*, Collegeville Minn., St. John's Abbey and University, 265–286.

Anderson, Andrew Runni, *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog, and the Inclosed Nations*, Cambridge Mass., Medieval Academy, 1932.

Anderson, cf. Tacitus.

Andolz, Rafael, *Diccionario aragonés (aragonés-castellano, castellano-aragonés)*, Zaragoza, Librería General, 1977.

Andresen, Hugo, *Zum Rolandslied, Vers 198*, Romanische Forschungen 1 (1883), 452.

Angers-Cath. = Urseau, Charles (ed.), *Cartulaire noir de la cathédrale d'Angers*, Paris, Picard, 1908.

Angers-Ronceray = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye du Ronceray d'Angers (1028–1184)*, Paris, Picard, 1900.

Angers-S.Aubin = Bertrand de Broussillon, Arthur (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Aubin d'Angers*, 3 vol., Paris, Picard, 1896–1903.

Angers-S.Nicolas = Le Peletier, Frater Laurentius, *Rerum scitu dignissimarum a prima fundatione Monasterii Sancti Nicolai Andegavensis […] epitome*, Angers, 1635.

Angers-S.Serge = Durville, Georges, *Catalogue de la bibliothèque du musée Thomas Dobrée*, vol. 1, *Manuscrits*, Nantes, Musée Thomas Dobrée, 1904. [Contains register of documents of Saint-Serge on p. 82–153.]

Angoulême = Nanglard, Jean (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'église d'Angoulême*, Angoulême, Chasseignac, 1900.

Anguita Jaén, José María, *La toponimia del Pseudo-Turpin y sus fuentes*, in: Herbers, Klaus (ed.), *El Pseudo-Turpin, Lazo entre el Culto Jacobeo y el Culto de Carlomagno, Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Estudios Jacobeos*, Santiago de Compostela, Xunta de Galicia, 2003, 131–147.

Anjou-Chartrou = Chartrou(-Charbonnel), Josèphe, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151, Foulque de Jérusalem et Geoffroi Plantegenêt*, Paris, P.U.F., 1928.

Anjou-Guillot = Guillot, Olivier, *Le Comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XIᵉ siècle*, 2 vol., Paris, Picard, 1972.

Anselme, le Père, *Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la Maison royale de France*,9 vol., Paris, Compagnie des Libraires, ²1726–1733.

Appel *Chrest*. = Appel, Carl, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie*, Leipzig, Reisland, ⁶1930 (Reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1971).

Apt = Didier, Noël/ Dubled, Henri/ Barruol, Jean (edd.), *Cartulaire de l'église d'Apt (835–1130?)*, Paris, Dalloz, 1967.

Arié, Rachel, *Historia de España*, vol. 3, *España musulmana (siglos VIII-XV)*, Barcelona, Labor, 1982.

Armstrong, Edward, *Old-French Açopart «Ethiopian»*, Modern Philology 38 (1940/1941), 243–250.

Armstrong, Edward (ed.), *The Medieval French Roman d'Alexandre*, vol. 4, Princeton NJ, Princeton U.P., 1942.

Arnould, Ch., *De Petromantalum à Montjoie*, Revue Internationale d'Onomastique 23 (1971), 81–104.

Arras-S.Vaast = Van Drival, Eugène-François (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Vaast d'Arras, rédigé au XIIᵉ siècle par Guimann*, Arras, Sueur-Charrouey, 1875.

Asbridge, Thomas, *Die Kreuzzüge*, transl. from the Engl. by Susanne Held, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, 2010.

Asturias-Floriano = Floriano, Antonio C., *Diplomática Española del período Astur (718–910)*, 2 vol., Oviedo, La Cruz, 1949–1951.

Asturias-Sota = Sota, Fray Francisco, *Crónica de los Príncipes de Asturias y Cantabria*, Madrid, García, 1681 (reprint Orbigo 2008).

Attwood, Katrina, *The poems of [the Old Norse] Ms. [Copenhagen] A.M. 757a 4to, an edition and contextual study*, Leeds, 1996 (Ph.D. thesis).

Auchy = Bétencourt, Dom Pierre-Louis-Joseph de (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Silvin d'Auchy en Artois*, s.l., s. a.

Aureil = Senneville, G. de (ed.), *Cartulaires des prieurés d'Aureil et de l'Artige en Limousin*, Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin 48 (1900).

Avignon-Cath. = Duprat, Eugène (ed.), *Cartulaire du chapitre de Notre-Dame-des-Doms*, vol. 1 [only this one published], *960–1253*, Avignon, Musée Calvet, 1932.

Bachrach, Bernard S., *Merovingian Military Organization 481–751*, Minneapolis, U. of Minnesota Press, 1972.

Baigne = Cholet, P.-Fr.-Ét. (ed.), *Cartulaire de Saint-Étienne de Baigne en Saintonge*, Niort, Clouzot, 1868.

Baist, Gottfried, *Zum Rolandslied v. 198*, Romanische Forschungen 1 (1883), 453.

Baist, Gottfried, *Ein falscher Pair*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 18 (1894), 272–274.

Baist, Gottfried, *Variationen über Rol. 2074, 2156*, in: *Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie. Festgabe für Wendelin Foerster*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1902, 213–222.

Balasque, Jules/ Dulaurens, Ernest, *Études historiques sur la Ville de Bayonne*, 3 vol., Bayonne, Lasserre, 1862–1875.

Baldinger, Kurt, *Graphie und Etymologie. Die Graphien g-, w- und v- als Varianten im Altfranzösischen*, in: Colón, Germán/ Kopp, Robert (edd.), *Mélanges offerts à Carl Theodor Gossen*, Berne (Francke), 1976, vol. 2, 89–104.

Bâle-Trouillat = Trouillat, Joseph (ed.), *Monuments de l'histoire de l'ancien Évêché de Bâle*, 5 vol., Porrentruy, Michel, 1852–1867.

Balparda y de las Herrerías, Gregorio de, *Historia crítica de Vizcaya y de sus Fueros*, 2 vol., Madrid, Artes de la Ilustración, then Bilbao, Mayli, 1924–1934.

Baltzer, Martin, *Zur Geschichte des deutschen Kriegswesens in der Zeit von den letzten Karolingern bis auf Kaiser Friedrich II.*, Leipzig, Hirzel, 1877 (Reprint Marston Gate UK, Amazon, s. a.).

Bancourt, Paul, *Les Musulmans dans les Chansons de geste du Cycle du Roi*, 2 vol., Aix-en-Provence, Université (Thèse), 1982 (=1982a).

Bancourt, Paul, *Réel, imaginaire et senefiance dans la représentation des Musulmans de la Chanson de Roland*, in: *Mélanges Jean Larmat*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1982, 31–40 (=1982b).

Bangert, Friedrich, *Die Tiere im altfranzösischen Epos*, Marburg, Elwert, 1885.

Bar, Francis, *«Montjoie» et «Moultjoie»*, Romania 67 (1942–1943), 240–243.

Barbieri, Alvaro, *Dal viaggio al libro, Studi sul Milione*, Verona, Fiorini, 2004 [Contains on p. 93–127 an edition of the oldest fragment of the Veneto-Emilian version, Ms. 3999 of the Casanatense in Rome].

Barbour, Neville, *The significance of the term «Maurus», with its derivatives «moro» and «moor», and of other terms used by medieval writers in Latin to describe the inhabitants of Muslim Spain*, Actas, IV Congreso de Estudios Árabes e Islâmicos, Coimbra-Lisboa 1 a 8 Setembro de 1968, Leiden, Brill, 1971, 253–266.

Barcelona-LFM = Miquel Rosell, Francisco (ed.), *Liber Feudorum Maior, cartulario real que se conserva en el Archivo de la Corona de Aragón*, 2 vol., Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1945–1947.

Bari-CD = *Codice diplomatico barese*, 14 vol., Bari, Società di Storia Patria per la Puglia, 1897–1938 [continued as *Codice diplomatico pugliese*].

Barlow, cf. Guy, bishop of Amiens.

Basel = Trouillat, Joseph (ed.), *Monuments de l'histoire de l'ancien évêché de Bâle*, 5 vol., Porrentruy, Michel, 1852–1867.

Basset, René, *Hercule et Mahomet*, Journal des Savants, Nouvelle Série 1 (1903), 391–402.

Battaglia = Battaglia, Salvatore, *Grande Dizionario delle Lingua Italiana*, 21 vol., Torino, UTET, 1961–2002.

Baum, Paull [sic] Franklin, *The Mediaeval Legend of Judas Iscariot*, Publications of the Modern Language Association 31 (1916), 481–632 (=1916a).

Baum, Paull [sic] Franklin, *Roland 3220, 3220a*, Romanic Review 7 (1916), 211–220 (=1916b).

Bautier, Robert-Henri, *Une épée médiévale avec inscription*, Bulletin de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France 1978–1979, 106–110.

Bautier, cf. also Eudes.

Bayonne-Veillet = Veillet, René, *Recherches sur la ville et sur l'église de Bayonne*, edd. Dubarat, Victor/ Daranatz, Jean-Baptiste, 3 vol., Bayonne, Lasserre, 1910–1929.

Bearn-Marca = Marca, Pierre de, *Histoire de Béarn*, Paris, Vve. Camusat, 1640.

Beaulieu = Deloche, Maximin (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Beaulieu en Limousin*, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1859.

Becker, Lidia, *Hispano-romanisches Namenbuch*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 2009.

Becker, Philipp August, *Die altfranzösische Wilhelmsage und ihre Beziehungen zu Wilhelm dem Heiligen*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1896.

Becker, Philipp August, *Der südfranzösische Sagenkreis und seine Probleme*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1898.

Becker, Philipp August, revue of Faggion, Bortolo, *Le incursioni de' Normanni in Francia e la Chanson de Roland* (separate print from *Il Saggiatore*, 1902), Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 24 (1903), 249.

Becker, Philipp August, *Streifzüge durch die altfranzösische Heldendichtung*, I, *Rolandslied*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 61 (1938), 1–22, 129–156.

Becker, Philipp August, *Das Werden der Wilhelm- und der Aimerigeste*, Treatises of the Saxon Academy of Sciences in Leipzig, philological-historical class, 44:1 (1939).

Becker, Philipp August, cf. also Helmerichs.

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Trojaroman und Normannenchronik, Die Identität der beiden Benoît und die Chronologie ihrer Werke*, München, Hueber, 1965.

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Das Beispiel Rennewart. Geschichte und Folklore als Inspirationsquellen der altfranzösischen Epik*, Romanistisches Jahrbuch 22 (1971), 53–83 (=1971a).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Hugue li Forz. Zur Genesis einer literarischen Gestalt*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 81 (1971), 289–307 (=1971b).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Maugis d'Aigremont. Zur Genesis einer literarischen Gestalt*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 89 (1973), 148–166 (=1973a).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Zwischen Trier und Aachen. Der geographische Rahmen der altfranzösischen Basinerzählung (Karlamagnussaga I 1–26)*, in: Droege, Georg, et al. (edd.), *Verführung zur Geschichte. Festschrift zum 500. Jahrestag der Eröffnung einer Universität in Trier (1473/1973)*, Trier 1973, 60–70 (=1973b).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *L'identification Nobles = Dax*, Le Moyen Âge 79 (1973), 5–24 (=1973c).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Die erste Branche des Couronnement Louis und die drei Typen epischer «Historizität»*, Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 24 (1974), 385–408.

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, with the collaboration of Erika Timm, *Wieland der Schmied in neuer Perspektive*, *Romanistische Fakten und germanistische Folgerungen*, Frankfurt a. M., Lang, 2004 (=2004a).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Luiserne und der überraschende «historische» Hintergrund der Enfances Vivien*, Romanistische Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte / Cahiers d'Histoire des Littératures Romanes 28 (2004), 251–272 (=2004b).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Le vers, le verset et le contexte: encore le Roland et la Bible*, Romania 122 (2004), 532–542 (=2004c).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Oggero Spatacurta und Ogier le Danois. Zur Komplexität einer epischen Tradition*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 120 (2004), 421–456 (=2004d).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Pierrepont at a Crossroads of Literatures. An Instructive Parallel between the first Branch of the Karlamagnús Saga, the Dutch Renout and the Dutch Flovent*, Neophilologus 89 (2005), 587–603.

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Die Karlamagnús-Saga I und ihre altfranzösische Vorlage*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 2008 (=2008a).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Schwierigkeiten und Triumph einer Überhöhung: Zur Erzählkunst im Rolandslied*, Romanistisches Jahrbuch 59 (2008), 128–156 (=2008b).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *«Aoi» und kein Ende?*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 124 (2008), 313–327 (=2008c).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Les deux Alpais et les toponymes épiques (Avroy-)Auridon-Oridon-Dordon(e)*, Le Moyen Âge 114 (2008), 55–65 (=2008d).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Sind Alpert von Metz und der Pseudo-Alkuin frühe Zeugen der altfranzösischen Epik?*, Romanische Forschungen 121 (2009), 477–495 (=2009a).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Renaut de Montauban and the Pseudo-Turpin's Renaut d'Aubépine: Two names for one person?*, Neophilologus 93 (2009), 393–409 (=2009b).

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Gualter del Hum – Gaiferos – Waltharius*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2010.

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Von Belin, einem Rätsel am Jakobsweg, von der Begräbnisliste des Pseudo-Turpin und von Herzog Naimes*, Ad limina [Compostela] 2:2 (2011), 29–55.

Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *«Malduit», ein Scherzname im Oxforder Roland-Manuskript, und ein Priester namens Baligan*, Romanische Forschungen 124 (2012), 490–504.

Bédier, Joseph (ed.), *Le Roman de Tristan*, vol. 2, *Introduction*, Paris, Didot, 1905 (Reprint New York, Johnson, 1968).

Bédier, Joseph, *Les légendes épiques*, 4 vol., Paris, Champion, [3]1926–1929.

Bédier, Joseph, *La Chanson de Roland commentée*, Paris, Piazza, 1927.

Bédier, Joseph, *De l'édition princeps de la Chanson de Roland aux éditions les plus récentes*, Romania 63 (1937), 433–469, 64 (1938), 145–244, 489–521.

Bédier, Joseph, cf. also *Chanson de Roland*.

Beeler, John, *Warfare in Feudal Europe 730–1200*, Ithaca NY, Cornell U.P., 1972.

Bel, Alfred, *Les Benou Ghânya*, Paris, Leroux, 1903.

Belfort, Auguste de, *Description générale des monnaies mérovingiennes*, 5 vol., Paris, Société française de numismatique, 1892–1895.

Belgique-Wauters = Wauters, Alphonse, et al., *Table chronologique des chartes et diplômes imprimés concernant l'histoire de Belgique*, 11 vol., Bruxelles, Hayez, 1866–1889.

Belgique-Miraeus = Miraeus, Aubertus, *Opera diplomatica et historica*, 4 vol., Bruxellis, Foppens, [2]1723–1748.

Bell, Claire Hayden, *The Sister's Son in the Medieval Germanic Epic*, University of California Publications in Modern Philology 10 (1922), 67–182.

Bellamy, James A., *Arabic Names in the Chanson de Roland: Saracen Gods, Frankish Swords, Roland's Horse, and the Olifant*, Journal of the American Oriental Society 107.2 (1987), 267–277.

Benary, Walter (ed.), *Salomon et Marcolfus*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1914.

Bender, Karl-Heinz, *König und Vasall. Untersuchungen zur Chanson de geste des XII. Jahrhunderts*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1967.

Benedict of Peterborough, Pseudo-, cf. *Gesta*.

Benoît, Fernand, *Les cimetières suburbains d'Arles dans l'antiquité chrétienne et au moyen âge*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1935.

Béraud-Villars, Jean, *Les Touareg au pays du Cid*, Paris, Plon, 1946.

Berchem, Max van, *Titres califiens d'Occident*, Journal asiatique, 10e série, 9 (1907), 245–335.

Bergmeister, Hermann-Josef (ed.), *Die «Historia de preliis Alexandri Magni» (der lateinische Alexanderroman des Mittelalters), synoptische Edition der Rezensionen des Leo Archipresbyter und der interpolierten Fassungen J1, J2, J3 (Buch I und II)*, Meisenheim am Glan, Hain, 1975.

Bergsträßer, Gotthelf, *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, [5]1993.

Bernard, Auguste (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Savigny, suivi du petit cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Ainay*, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1853.

Bernhard, E., *Abstractions médiévales ou critique abstraite?*, Studi Mediolatini e Volgari 9 (1961), 19–70.

Bernhard, Michael, cf. LMLMAe. Bertoni, Giulio, cf. *Chanson de Roland*.

Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube, *Aymeri de Narbonne*, ed. Demaison, Louis, 2 vol., Paris, Didot, 1887.

Béziers = Rouquette, Julien (ed.), *Cartulaire de Béziers (Livre Noir)*, Montpellier, Valat, 1918.

Bezold, Friedrich von, *Das Fortleben der antiken Götter im mittelalterlichen Humanismus*, Bonn, Schröder, 1922 (reprint Aalen, Zeller, 1962).

BHG = Halkin, François, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, 1 vol., 1 suppl., Bruxelles, Socii Bollandiani, 1957, 1984.

BHL = Fros, Henricus (ed.), *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, 2 vol., 2 suppl., Bruxelles, Socii Bollandiani, 1899–1901, 1911, 1986.

Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem, edd. Fischer, Bonifatius/ Gryson, Roger, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelanstalt, [4]1994.

Biddle, Martin, *The Winton Domesday*, in: Besch, Werner, et al. (edd.), *Die Stadt in der europäischen Geschichte, Festschrift Edith Ennen*, Bonn, Röhrscheid, 1972, 36–43.

Bienvenu, Jean-Marc, *Drames et épanouissements du haut Moyen Âge, des invasions à l'an mil*, in: Lebrun, François (ed.), *Histoire des Pays de la Loire*, Toulouse, Privat, 1972, 81–116.

Binjamin of Tudela, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, ed. (with Engl. transl.) Adler, Marcus Nathan, London, Frowde, 1907.

Birkhan, Helmut (ed.), *Leben und Abenteuer des großen Königs Apollonius von Tyrus zu Land und zur See: Ein Abenteuerroman von Heinrich von Neustadt verfasst zu Wien um 1300 nach Gottes Geburt*, Bern, Lang, 2001.

Birnbaum, Henrik, *Noch einmal zu den slavischen Milingen auf der Peloponnes*, in: Olesch, Reinhold/ Rothe, Hans (edd.), *Festschrift für Herbert Bräuer*, Köln, Böhlau, 1986, 15–26.

Bischoff, Bernhard, *Die europäische Verbreitung der Werke Isidors von Sevilla*, in: Díaz y Díaz, Manuel C. (ed.), *Isidoriana*, León, Centro de Estudios San Isidoro, 1961, 317–344.

Bischoff, Bernhard, *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vol., Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1966–1981.

Bischoff, Bernhard, *Die Abtei Lorsch im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften*, Lorsch, Laurissa, [2]1989.

Bischoff, Bernhard, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters*, Berlin, Erich Schmidt, [4]2009.

Blaise, Albert, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1966.

Blaise I = Blaise, Albert, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, Turnhout, Brepols, [2]1967.

Blaise II = Blaise, Albert, *Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi, praesertim ad res ecclesiasticas investigandas pertinens*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1975.

Blanchet, Adrien, *Manuel de numismatique française*, vol. 1, *Monnaies frappées en Gaule depuis les origines jusqu'à Hugues Capet*, Paris, Picard, 1912.

Blésois-Marmoutier = Métais, Charles (ed.), *Marmoutier, Cartulaire blésois*, Chartres, Moreau, 1891.

BLGO = *Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria*, facsimile of the editio princeps (Adolph Rusch, Straßburg 1480/1481), Turnhout, Brepols, 1992.

Bloch, Herbert, *Der Autor der «Graphia aureae urbis Romae»*, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 40 (1984), 55–175.

Bloch, Marc, *Les rois thaumaturges*, Paris, Gallimard, 1924/1983.

Boeles, P.C.J.A., *Friesland tot de elfde eeuw*, 's-Gravenhage, Nijhoff, [2]1951.

Boerio, Giuseppe, *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*, Venezia, Santini, 1829.

Boespflug, François/ Zaluska, Yolanta, *Le dogme trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie en Occident de l'époque carolingienne au IVe Concile de Latran (1215)*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 37 (1994), 181–240.

Bogyay, Thomas von, *Grundzüge der Geschichte Ungarns*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, [4]1990.

Böhmer, Johann Friedrich (ed.), *Acta Imperii Selecta*, Innsbruck, Wagner, 1870 (reprint Aalen, Scientia, 1967).

Boissonnade, Prosper, *Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland*, Paris, Champion, 1923.

Bordeaux = Ducaunès-Duval, A. (ed.), *Cartulaire de Sainte-Croix de Bordeaux*, Archives historiques de la Gironde 27 (1892), I–XXII and 1–292.

Bordelais-S.Florent = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Chartes bordelaises de 1080–1185 tirées des archives du monastère de Saint-Florent près Saumur*, Les Roches-Baritaud (Vendée), 1879.

Bosch Vilá, Jacinto, *Los Almorávides*, Tetuán, 1956.

Bosworth, Clifford Edmund, *The Islamic Dynasties*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh U.P., 1967.

Bouquet = Bouquet, Dom Martin, *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, *nouvelle édition publiée sous la direction de M. Léopold Delisle*, 24 vol., Paris, Imprimerie royale, then V. Palmé, 1840–1904.

Bourbonnais-Cat.= Fazy, Max, *Les Origines du Bourbonnais*, vol. 2, *Catalogue des actes concernant l'histoire du Bourbonnais*, Moulins, Progrès de l'Allier, 1924.

Bourges-Archevêques = Gandilhon, Alfred, *Catalogue des actes des archevêques de Bourges*, Bourges, Desquand, 1927.

Bourgogne-Garnier = Garnier, J. (ed.), *Chartes bourguignonnes inédites des IXe, Xe et XIe siècles*, Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres de l'Institut national de France, 2e série, 2 (1849), 1–168.

Bourgogne-Pérard = Pérard, Estienne (ed.), *Recueil de plusieurs pièces curieuses servant à l'histoire de Bourgogne*, Paris, Cramoisy, 1664.

Bourgogne-Petit = Petit, Ernest, *Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne de la race capétienne*, 9 vol., Dijon, Lamarche, 1885–1905.

Bourgogne-Plancher = Plancher, Urbain, *Histoire générale et particulière de Bourgogne*,4 vol., Dijon, de Fay, 1739–1781 (reprint Farnborough, Greggs, 1968).

Boussard, Jacques, *Le trésorier de Saint-Martin de Tours*, Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France 47 (1961), 67–88.

Boussard, Jacques, *L'origine des familles seigneuriales dans la région de la Loire moyenne*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 5 (1962), 303–322 (=1962a).

Boussard, Jacques, review of Werner, K.F., *Untersuchungen zur Frühzeit des französischen Fürstentums* (Welt als Geschichte 18–20, 1958–1960), in: Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 5 (1962), 364–366 (=1962b).

Boussard, Jacques, *L'éviction des tenants de Thibaut de Blois par Geoffroy Martel, comte d'Anjou, en 1044*, Le Moyen Âge 69 (1963), 141–149.

Bousset, Wilhelm, *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1983).

Brattö, Olof, *Studi di antroponimia fiorentina. Il libro di Montaperti*, Göteborg, Elander, 1953.

Bräuer, Herbert, *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft, Einleitung, Lautlehre*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1961.

Bräuer, Herbert, *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft, Formenlehre*, 2 vol., Berlin, de Gruyter, 1969.

Brault, Gerard Joseph, *Structure et sens de la Chanson de Roland*, French Review 45, Special issue (1971), 1–12.

Brault, Gerard Joseph, *«Truvet li unt le num de Juliane»: Sur le rôle de Bramimonde dans la Chanson de Roland*, in: *Mélanges de langue et littérature médiévales offerts à Pierre le Gentil*, Paris, SEDES, 1973, 134–149.

Brault, Gerard Joseph, *The Song of Roland, an Analytical Edition*, vol. 1, *Introduction and Commentary*, University Park PA, Pennsylvania State U.P., 1978.

Bretagne-Ducs = La Borderie, Artur de (ed.), *Recueil d'actes inédits des ducs et princes de Bretagne (XIe, XIIe, XIIIe siècles)*, Bulletin et mémoires de la Société archéologique du département d'Ille-et-Vilaine 17 (1885) 1–87. 341–436.

Bretagne-Évêchés = Geslin de Bourgogne, Jules-Henri/ Barthélemy, Anatole de, *Anciens Évêchés de Bretagne*, 6 vol., Paris, Dumoulin, 1855–1879.

Bretagne-Morice = Morice, Dom Hyacinthe, *Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne*, vol. 1, Paris, Osmont, 1742.

Brett, Michael, *Ifrīqiya as a Market for Saharan Trade from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century A.D.*, The Journal of African History 10 (1969), 347–364.

Breysig, Theodor, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches: 714–741, die Zeit Karl Martells*, Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1869.

Brice, William C. (ed.), *An Historical Atlas of Islam*, Leiden, Brill, 1981.

Brincken, Anna-Dorothee von den, *«Mappa mundi» und Chronographia. Studien zur «imago mundi» des abendländischen Mittelalters*, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 24 (1968), 118–186.

Brincken, Anna-Dorothee von den, *«…ut describeretur universus orbis». Zur Universalkartographie des Mittelalters*, in: Zimmermann, Albert (ed.), *Methoden in Wissenschaft und Kunst des Mittelalters*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1970, 249–278.

Brincken, Anna-Dorothee von den, *«Fines terrae». Die Enden der Erde und der vierte Kontinent auf mittelalterlichen Weltkarten*, Hannover, Hahn, 1992.

Brincken, Anna-Dorothee von den, cf. also Edson.

Brioude = Doniol, Henri (ed.), *Cartulaire de Saint-Julien de Brioude*, Clermont-Ferrand, Thibaud, 1863.

Broëns, Maurice, *Les noms propres wisigoths dans la Chanson de Roland*, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 31 (1965–1966), 65–71.

Brom(p)ton, John, *Chronicon* [basic text shortly after 1200, revised at least into the 14th c.; Brompton (c. 1436) was probably only the commissioner of a ms.], in: Twysden, Roger (ed.), *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores*, vol. 10, London, Flesher 1652, col. 752–1285.

Brook, Leslie C., *The Concluding Laisses of the Post-Oxford Roland Manuscripts*, Olifant 14 (1989), 19–29.

Brüch, Josef, *Frz. «fard»*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 42 (1922), 226–227.

Brüch, Josef, *Über den Wandel von -d- zu -r- im Französischen*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 55 (1935), 126–154.

Bruckner, Wilhelm, *Die Sprache der Langobarden*, Straßburg, Trübner, 1895 (reprint Berlin, de Gruyter, 1969).

Brummack, Jürgen, *Die Darstellung des Orients in den deutschen Alexandergeschichten des Mittelalters*, Berlin, Erich Schmidt, 1966.

Bruneau, Charles, *Une «geste» messine perdue: la Chanson de Saint Livier*, Les Cahiers Lorrains 7 (1928), 89–91.

Brunterc'h, Jean-Pierre, *Le duché de Maine et la marche de Bretagne*, in: Atsma, Hartmut (ed.), *La Neustrie. Les pays de la Loire de 650 à 850*, Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1989, 29–127.

BSCF = *Biblia sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem*, Città del Vaticano, 1926ss., vol. 8, 1951.

Bugler, G., *À propos de «Montjoie»*, Revue Internationale d'Onomastique 24 (1972), 1–6.

Bur, Michel, *La formation du comté de Champagne*, Nancy, Université, 1977.

Burdy, Philipp, review of Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Onomastik des Rolandsliedes*, Berlin 2017, in: Beiträge zur Namenforschung 54 [2019] 227–237.

Burger, André, *La légende de Roncevaux*, Romania 70 (1948–1949), 433–473.

Burger, André, *Le fief de Margarit*, in: Aebischer, Paul (ed.), *Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hoepffner*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1949 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1974), 163–172.

Burger, André, *Sur la géographie du Roland et sa date*, Romania 74 (1953), 158–171.

Burger, André, review of Aebischer, Paul, *Rolandiana Borealia* (Lausanne, Rouge, 1954) and *Textes norrois et littérature française du Moyen Âge*, vol. 1 (Genève, Droz, 1954), in: Studia Neophilologica 27 (1955), 126–128.

Burger, André, *La question rolandienne. Faits et hypothèses*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 4 (1961), 269–292.

Burger, André, *Oriflamme*, in: Baldinger, Kurt (ed.), *Festschrift für Walther von Wartburg*, vol. 2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1968, 357–362.

Burger, André, *Turold, poète de la fidélité*, Genève, Droz, 1977.

Burger, André, *La «Tere certeine»*, in: Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, et al. (edd.), *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien*, *Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 1, Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay, Musée archéologique régional, 1982, 498–500.

Burger, André, *Contribution à la critique du Roland d'Oxford*, in: Álvar, Carlos (ed.), *Studia in honorem prof. M. de Riquer*, vol. 2, Barcelona, Cuaderns Crema, 1987, 533–546.

Burnam, John M. (ed.), *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, Paris, Picard, 1910 [probably by Remigius of Auxerre].

Buschinger, Danielle, *La prière dans le Rolandslied de Konrad*, in: *La Prière au Moyen Âge (littérature et civilisation)*, Aix-en-Provence, Presses universitaires de Provence (CUER- MA), 1981, 45–65.

Caen-G&M = Musset, Lucien (ed.), *Les Actes de Guillaume le Conquérant et de la Reine Mathilde pour les abbayes caennaises*, Caen, Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 1967.

Caflisch-Einicher, Emma, *Die lateinischen Elemente in der mittelhochdeutschen Epik des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Reichenberg, Kraus, 1936 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1974).

Cahen, Claude, *La campagne de Mantzikert d'après les sources musulmanes*, Byzantion 9 (1934), 613–642.

Cahen, Claude, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche*, Paris, Geuthner, 1940.

Cahen, Claude, *La première pénétration turque en Asie mineure (seconde moitié du XIe siècle)*, Byzantion 18–19 (1946–1948), 1–67.

Calisse, Carlo (ed.), *Liber Maiolichinus de gestis Pisanorum illustribus*, Roma, Tipografi del Senato, 1904 (reprint Torino, Bottega d'Erasmo, 1966).

Calmette, Joseph, *Gaucelme, marquis de Gothie sous Louis le Pieux*, Annales du Midi 18 (1906), 166–171.

Caluwé, Jacques de, *La prière épique dans la tradition manuscrite de la Chanson de Roland*, in: *La Prière au Moyen Âge* (*littérature et civilisation*), Aix-en-Provence, Presses universitaires de Provence (CUER-MA), 1981, 147–155.

Calvados = Léchaudé d'Anisy, Amédée Louis, *Extraits des chartes et autres actes normands et anglo-normands qui se trouvent dans les Archives du Calvados*, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie 7 and 8 (both 1834).

Cambrai-évêques = Van Mingroot, Erik (ed.), *Les chartes de Gérard Ier*, *Liébert et Gérard II, évêques de Cambrai et d'Arras, comtes du Cambrésis, 1012–1093*, Leuven, Leuven U.P., 2005.

Canestrini, Giovanni, *Arte militare meccanica medievale*, Bologna, Calderini, 1974.

Cantera Burgos, Francisco (ed.), *Fuero de Miranda de Ebro*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1945.

Capitani, Liana, *Da «Hrodland» a «Orlando»*, Studi medeolatini e volgari 11 (1963), 69–74.

Cappelli, Adriano, *Lexicon abbreviaturarum, Dizionario di abbreviature latine ed italiane*, Milano, Hoepli, ⁶1961 (reprint ibid. 2006).

Caracausi, Girolamo, *Dizionario onomastico della Sicilia. Repertorio storico-etimologico di nomi di famiglia e di luogo*, 2 vol., Palermo, Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Italiani, 1993.

Carcassonne = Mahul, Alphonse Jacques (ed.), *Cartulaire et archives des Communes de l'ancien diocèse et de l'arrondissement administratif de Carcassonne*, 7 vol. and index, Paris, Didron, 1857–1885.

Cardona, Giorgio Raimondo, *Il nome di Baγdād e le sue irradiazioni nell'italiano antico*, in: *Miscellanea di studi in onore di Aurelio Roncaglia a cinquant'anni dalla sua laurea*, vol. 1, Modena, Mucchi, 1989, 335–350.

Carile, Antonio, *La Cronachistica Veneziana (secoli XIII–XVI) di fronte alla spartizione della Romania nel 1204*, Firenze, Olschki, 1969.

Carloman II, cf. Louis le Bègue etc.

Carnoy, Alfred, *Paradis d'Orient – Paradis d'Occident*, Le Muséon 35 (1922) 213–239.

Casanova, Paul, *Mahom, Jupin, Apollon, Tervagant, dieux des Arabes*, in: Huart, Clément (ed.), *Mélanges Hartwig Dérenbourg* (1844–1908), Paris, Leroux, 1909, 391–395.

Catalano, Michele, *Le statue di Guglielmo e Rinoardo nel Duomo di Verona*, Archivum Romanicum 23 (1939), 359–376.

CC = *Corpus Christianorum*, *Series Latina*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1954–.

CC-CM = *Corpus Christianorum*, *Continuatio Mediaevalis*, Turnhout, Brepols 1971–.

CGLL = Goetz, Georg, et al. (edd.), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, 7 vol., Leipzig, Teubner, 1876–1923 (reprint Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1965).

Chabaneau, Camille/ Anglade, Joseph, *Onomastique des Troubadours*, Montpellier, Société des Langues romanes, 1916.

Chalandon, Ferdinand, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Ier Comnène (1081–1118)*, Paris, Picard, 1900.

Chalandon, Ferdinand, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, 2 vol., Paris, Picard, 1907.

Chalandon, Ferdinand, *Jean II Comnène (1118–1143) et Manuel Ier Comnène (1143–1180)*, Paris, Picard, 1912.

Chamalières = Chassaing, Augustin/ Jacotin,Antoine (edd.), *Cartulaire de Chamalières-sur-Loire en Velay*, Paris, Picard, 1895.

Champagne-d'Arbois = Arbois de Jubainville, Henri d', *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, 7 vol., Paris, Durand, 1859–1869 [especially vol. 1 and 3, *Pièces justificatives*].

Chanson de Roland, *La*, ed. Gautier, Léon [edition of last hand], Tours, Mame, ²⁴1899.
Chanson de Roland, *La, The Oxford Version*, ed. Jenkins, T. Atkinson, Boston, Heath, ²1928.

Chanson de Roland, *La, Editio maior*, ed. Bertoni, Giulio, Firenze, Olschki, 1936.*Chanson de Roland*, *La, Édition définitive*, ed. Bédier, Joseph, Paris, Piazza, 1937.

Chanson de Roland, *La*, ed. Roncaglia, Aurelio, Modena, Società Tipografica Modenese, 1947.

Chanson de Roland, La, Edizione critica a cura di Cesare Segre, Milano, Ricciardi, 1971.

Chanson de Roland, *La, Édition critique par Cesare Segre, Nouvelle édition revue, traduite de l'italien par Madeleine Tyssens*, 2 vol., Genève, Droz, 1989.

Chanson de Roland, *La, Il testo assonanzato franco-italiano della*, ed. Beretta, Carlo, Pavia, Università di Pavia, 1995.

Chanson de Roland, *La, the French corpus*, ed. Duggan, Joseph J., et al., 7 parts in 3 vol., Turnhout, Brepols, 2005.

Chanson de Roland, *La*, cf. also Hilka/ Rohlfs, Hilka/ Pfister, Konrad der Pfaffe, *Rolandslied* and *Rol*. Charles-le-Chauve = Tessier, Georges (ed.), *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve*, *roi de France*, 3 vol., Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1943–1955.

Charles-le-Gros, cf. MGH DD Karl III (ed. Paul Kehr, 1937).

Charles-le-Simple = Lauer, Philippe (ed.), *Recueil des actes de Charles III le Simple*, *roi de France*, 2 vol., Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1940–1949.

Chartres-S.Père = Guérard, Benjamin (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Père de Chartres*, 2 vol., Paris, Crapelet, 1840.

Chaume, Maurice, *Les origines du Duché de Bourgogne*, 2 tomes (4 vol.), Dijon, Jobard, then Rebourseau, 1925–1937.

Chaume, Maurice, cf. also Dijon.

Chatzidakis, Georgios N., *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel, 1892 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1977).

Chédeville, André/ Guillotel, Hubert, *La Bretagne des saints et des rois, V^e–Xe siècle*, Rennes, Ouest-France, 1984.

Chevalier, Jules, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Comtés de Valentinois et de Diois*, vol. 1, Paris, Picard, 1897.

Chevalier, Ulysse, *Description analytique du cartulaire du Chapitre de Saint-Maurice de Vienne*, Valence, Céas, 1891.

Chevalier, Ulysse, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge, Topo-Bibliographie*, 2 vol., Montbéliard, Société anonyme d'imprimerie montbéliardaise, 1894–1899, and *Bio-Bibligraphie*, 2 vol., Paris, Picard, ²1905–1907 (reprint New York, Kraus, 1960–1975).

Chevalier, Ulysse, *Regeste dauphinois, ou Répertoire chronologique et analytique des documents imprimés et manuscrits du Dauphiné, des origines chrétiennes à l'année 1349*, 7 vol., Valence, Imprimerie valentinoise, 1913–1926.

Chevalier, Ulysse, cf. also Dauphiné, GCNss, Paray-le-Monial, Saint-Chaffre, Vienne-S.André-Bas.

CHIA = Sinor, Denis (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P. 1990.

Christmann, Hans Helmut, review of Baldinger, Kurt (ed.), *Festschrift Walther von Wartburg zum 80. Geburtstag* (2 vol., Tübingen, 1968), in: Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 86 (1970), 597–617.

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, Reimer et al., 1862–.

Clauson, Sir Gerard, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1972.

Clavis = Jullien, Marie-Hélène/Perelman, Francoise, *Clavis des auteurs latins du moyen âge, territoire français 735–987*, so far 2 vol. and 2 index vol., Turnhout, Brepols, 1994–.

Cleasby/Vigfússon = Cleasby, Richard/ Vigfússon, Guðbrandur, *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, reprint of the 2. ed. with a supplement by William A. Craigie, Oxford, Clarendon, 1993.

Clemens, Jacques/ Hammam, Mohamed, *Un nom d'épée d'origine arabe dans la Chanson de Roland*, Cahiers de Tunisie 31 (1983), [part in Latin pagination] 117–120.

Clément, Paul, *Notice sur la Roche-Turpin (commune d'Artins)*, Bulletin de la Société archéologique, scientifique et littéraire du Vendômois 38 (1899), 102–139, and 39 (1900), 37–67.

Clot, André, *Al Andalus, das maurische Spanien*, transl. from French into German by Harald Ehrhardt, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002.

Cluny = Bernard, Auguste Joseph/ Bruel, Alexandre (edd.), *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*, 6 vol., Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1876–1903.

Cod.Cajet. = *Codex diplomaticus Cajetanus, editus cura et studio monachorum S. Benedicti archicoenobii Montis Casini, pars secunda*, Monte Casino, Typographia Archicoenobii, 1891.

Cohn, Willy, *Die Geschichte der sizilischen Flotte unter der Regierung Friedrichs II. (1197–1250)*, Breslau, Priebatsch, 1926, quoted from the reprint in: Cohn, Willy, *Die Geschichte der sizilischen Flotte, 1060–1266*, Aalen, Scientia, 1978.

Coll i Alentorn, Miquel, *La introducció de les llegendes èpiques franceses a Catalunya*, in: *Coloquios de Roncesvalles agosto 1955*, Zaragoza, Diputación Foral de Navarra, 1956, 133–150.

Comnena, Anna, *Alexias*, edd. Reinsch, Diether Roderich/ Kambylis, Athanasios, 2 vol., Berlin, de Gruyter, 2001.

Comnena, Anna, Porphyrogenita, *Alexias*, ed. Reifferscheid, August, 2 vol., Leipzig, Teubner, 1884.

Comnena, Anna, *Alexiade: règne de l'empereur Alexis Comnène (1081–1118)*, ed. (with French transl.) Leib, Bernard, 3 vol. and index, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1937–1965.

Conques = Desjardins, Gustave (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Conques en Rouergue*, Paris, Picard, 1879.

Contamine, Philippe, *La guerre au Moyen Âge*, Paris, P.U.F., 1980.

Contini, Gianfranco, *La canzone della Mort Charlemagne*, in: Tyssens, Madeleine (ed.), *Mélanges de linguistique romane et de philologie médiévale offerts à Maurice Delbouille*, vol. 2, Gembloux, 1964, 105–126.

Copenhaver, Brian (transl.), *Hermetica. The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a new English translation with notes and introduction*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., 1992.

Corbeil-Vicomtes = Depoin, Joseph, *Les Vicomtes de Corbeil et les chevaliers d'Étampes au XIIe siècle*, Bulletin de la Société historique et archéologique de Corbeil, d'Étampes et du Hurepoix 5 (1899), 1–71.

Corias-Floriano = Floriano, Antonio C. (ed.), *El libro registro de Corias*, 2 vol., Oviedo, Instituto de Estudios Asturianos, 1950.

Cormery = Bourassé, Jean-Jacques (ed.), *Cartulaire de Cormery*, Tours, Guilland-Verger, 1861.
Coromines, Joan, *D'alguns germanismes típics del català*, in: Salverda de Grave, Jacques, et al. (edd.), *Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature romanes offerts à Mario Roques*, vol. 4, Paris, Didier, 1952, 27–52.

Coromines, Joan [also: Corominas, Juan], cf. also DCECH, DCELC, DECLC und OC.

Correns (Var) = Devos, Jean-Claude (ed.), *Cartulaire du prieuré de Correns (Var) dépendant de l'abbaye de Montmajour*, Mémoire pour le Diplôme d'Études Supérieures, s.l., s.a. (dact.).

Corriente, Federico, *A Grammatical Sketch of the Spanish-Arabic Dialect Bundle*, Madrid, Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura, 1977.

Corriente, Federico, *Árabe andalusí y lenguas romances*, Madrid, MAPFRE, 1992.

Corriente, Federico, *A Dictionary of Andalusi Arabic*, Leiden, Brill, 1997.

Corriente, Federico, *Dictionary of Arabic and Allied Loanwords, Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan, Galician and Kindred Dialects*, Leiden, Brill, 2008.

Corriente, Federico/ Vicente, Ángeles (edd.), *Manual de dialectología neoárabe*, Zaragoza, Instituto de Estudios Islámicos y del Oriente Próximo, 2008.

Cortesão, cf. Portugal.

Cottineau, Laurent-Henri, *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés*, 2 vol., Mâcon, Protat, 1937–1939; suppl. (par Grégoire Poras), Mâcon, Protat, 1970.

Coupland, Simon, *Trading-places: Quentovic and Dorestad reassessed*, Early Medieval Europe 11 (Oxford 2002), 209–232.

Coupland, Simon, *Charlemagne's coinage, ideology and economy*, in: Story, J. (ed.), *Charlemagne: Empire and Society*, Manchester, Manchester U.P., 2005, 211–229.

Courtois, Christian, *Grégoire VII et l'Afrique du Nord*, Revue historique 195 (1945), 97–122, 193–226.

Cramer Vos, Marianne, *Étude sur l'origine du cri de guerre «Munjoie»*, in: *VIII Congreso de la Société Rencesvals*, Pamplona, Príncipe de Viana, 1981, 535–541.

Craon = Bertrand de Broussillon, Arthur, *La maison de Craon: 1050–1480*, *étude historique accompagnée du cartulaire de Craon*, vol. 1, *Les Craon: 1050–1373*, Paris, Picard, 1893.

Cremonesi, Carla, *Le «Enfances Renier» e la Sicilia*, Bollettino del Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani 9 (1965), 249–261.

Cross, Samuel Hazzard/Sherbowitz-Wetzor, Olgerd (edd.), *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, Cambridge MA, The Medieval Academy of America, 1953.

CSEL = *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Wien, Tempsky et al., 1866–.

CSHB = *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Bonn, Weber, 1828–1897.

Curtius, Ernst Robert, *Zur Literarästhetik des Mittelalters*, II, 9, *Helden- und Herrschertugenden*, and 10, *Rolandslied und epischer Stil*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 58 (1938), 199–232.

Curtius, Ernst Robert, *Die Musen im Mittelalter*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 59 (1939), 129–188.

Curtius, Ernst Robert, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern, Francke, [2]1954.

DA = Turner, Jane (ed.), *The Dictionary of Art*, 34 vol., London, Macmillan, 1996.

DACL = Cabrol, Fernand/ Leclercq, Henri (edd.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 15 vol., Paris, Letouzey, 1907–1953.

Dal', Vladimir I., *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka*, 4 vol., Sanktpeterburg, Vol'f, [2]1880–1882.

Dalli, Charles, *Bridging Europe and Africa: Norman Sicily's Other Kingdom*, in: Carvalho, Joaquim (ed.), *Bridging the Gaps*, Pisa, Plus-Pisa U.P., 2008, 77–93.

Daniels, Emil, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, vol. 2, *Mittelalter*, Berlin, Göschen, 1910.

Dauphiné = Chevalier, Ulysse (ed.), *Regeste dauphinois*, vol. 1, Valence, Valentinoise, 1913.

Dauzat, Albert, [note on Durendal], Le Français moderne 7 (1939), 375.

Dauzat, Albert, *«Durand» et «Durendal»*, Revue internationale d'onomastique 4 (1952), 39.

David, Pierre, *Études sur le Livre de Saint-Jacques attribué au pape Calixte II*, Bulletin des Études Portugaises, Nouvelle Série 10 (1946), 1–41, 11 (1947), 113–185, 12 (1948), 70–223, 13 (1949), 52–104.

Davis, R.H.C., *The Carmen de Hastingae proelio*, English Historical Review 93 (1978), 241–261.

DBI = *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 12, Roma, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1970.

DCECH = Corominas, Juan/ Pascual, José Antonio, *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*, 6 vol., Madrid, Gredos, 1980–1991.

DCELC = Corominas, Juan, *Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana*, 4 vol., Francke, Berna, 1970.

DEAF = Baldinger, Kurt/ Möhren, Frankwalt, *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français*, Laval (Québec) et al., 1971–.

Debenedetti, Santorre, *[IMAGO] PATERNA > anc. franc. «paterne», prov. «paterna» (REW 6290)*, Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino 57 (1922), 617–624, quoted from the reprint in: Debenedetti, Santorre, *Studi filologici*, Milano, Angeli, 1986, 243–250.

DECLC = Coromines, Joan, et al., *Diccionari etimològic i complementari de la llengua catalana*, 9 vol., Barcelona, Curial, 1980–1991.

Deér, József, *Die Vorrechte des Kaisers in Rom*, Schweizer Beiträge zur Allgemeinen Geschichte 15 (1957), 5–63 (=1957a).

Deér, József, *Byzanz und die Herrschaftszeichen des Abendlandes*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 50 (1957), 405–436 (=1957b).

Deér, József, *Der Globus des spätrömischen und des byzantinischen Kaisers. Symbol oder Insigne?*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 54 (1961), 291–318.

Defourneaux, Marcelin, *Les Français en Espagne aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, Paris, P.U.F., 1949.

Delbouille, Maurice, *Sur la genèse de la Chanson de Roland*, Bruxelles, Palais des Académies, 1954.

Delbrück, Hans, *Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte*, vol. 3, *Das Mittelalter*, Berlin, Stilke, 1907.

Delisle, Léopold, *Études sur la condition de la classe agricole et l'état de l'agriculture en Normandie au Moyen Âge*, Évreux, Hérissey, 1851.

Delisle-Rouleaux = Delisle, Léopold (ed.), *Rouleaux des morts du IXe au XVe siècle*, Paris, Renouard, 1866.

Demaison, cf. Bertrand.

Denomy, A.J., *«Jois» Among the Early Troubadours: Its Meaning and Possible Source*, Medieval Studies [Toronto] 13 (1951), 177–217.

Desaivre, Léo, *St-Maxire, Deux-Sèvres. Recherches sur une commune rurale*, Niort, Chez l'auteur, 1894.

Deschamps, Paul, *La toponomastique en Terre sainte au temps des Croisades*, in: *Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel*, vol. 1, Paris, Société de l'École des Chartes, 1955, 352–357.

Devic/Vaissète, cf. Languedoc-HgL.

DGE= Sánchez Mazas, Rafael (ed.), *Diccionario geográfico de España*, 17 vol., Madrid, Prensa Gráfica, 1956–1961.

Dhondt, Jan, *Henri Ier, l'Empire et l'Anjou*, Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 25.1 (1946–1947) 87–109.

Dhondt, Jan, *Études sur la naissance des principautés territoriales en France*, Bruges, de Tempel, 1948.

DI = Schweickard, Wolfgang, *Deonomasticon Italicum. Dizionario storico dei derivati da nomi geografici e da nomi di persona*, vol.1–4: *Derivati da nomi geografici, A-Z*, and *Supplemento bibliografico: Seconda edizione riveduta e ampliata*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, then Berlin, De Gruyter, 2002–2013.

Diament, Henri, *Une interprétation hagio-toponymique de l'ancien cri de guerre des Français: «Montjoie Saint-Denis!»* Romance Notes 12 (1970–1971), 447–457.

Diament, Henri, *La légende dyonisienne et la juxtaposition des toponymes «Montjoie» et «Saint-Denis» dans la formation du cri de guerre*, Romance Notes 13 (1971–1972), 177–180.

Díaz y Díaz, Manuel C., *Index Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi Hispanorum*, vol. 1, Salamanca, Universidad, 1958.

Díaz y Díaz, Manuel C., *El Códice Calixtino de la Catedral de Santiago, estudio codicológico y de contenido*, Santiago de Compostela, Centro de Estudios Jacobeos, 1988.

Diefenbach = Diefenbach, Lorenz, *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, Frankfurt/ Main, Baer, 1857 (reprint Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997).

Diehl, Ernst (ed.), *Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres*, 3 vol., Berlin, Weidmann, 1925–1931; *Supplementum*, edd. Moreau, Jacques/ Marrou, Henri Irénée, Dublin, Weidmann, 1967.

Dienemann-Dietrich, Irmgard, *Der fränkische Adel in Alemannien im 8. Jh.*, in: Mayer, Theodor (ed.), *Grundfragen der alemannischen Geschichte*, Lindau, Thorbecke, 1955, 149–192 (reprint Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1970, 1972, 1976).

Dieterich, Karl (transl.), *Byzantinische Quellen zur Länder- und Völkerkunde*, Leipzig, Wigand, 1912 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1973).

Diez, Friedrich Christian, *Kleinere Arbeiten und Recensionen*, ed. Breymann, Hermann, München, Oldenbourg, 1883.

Dijon = Chevrier, Georges/ Chaume, Maurice (edd.), *Chartes et documents de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon*, vol. 2, Dijon, Société des Annales de Bourgogne, 1943.

DLF-MA = Bossuat, Robert, et al. (edd.), *Dictionnaire des Lettres françaises*, vol. 1, *Le Moyen Age*, revised by Geneviève Hasenohr and Michel Zink, Paris, Fayard, 1992.

Doerfer, Gerhard (transl.), *Sibirische Märchen*, vol. 2, *Tungusen und Jakuten*, Düsseldorf, Diederichs, 1983.

Domène = Monteynard, Charles de (ed.), *Cartulare monasterii beatorum Petri et Pauli de Domina*, Lyon, Perrin, 1859.

Donner, Herbert, *Pilgerfahrt ins Heilige Land*, Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979.

Dontenville, Henri, *La mythologie française*, Paris, Payot, 1948.

Dörper, Sven, *Zum Problem der Herkunft des Völkernamens «Saraceni»*, in: Foltys, Christian/ Kotschi, Thomas (edd.), *Berliner Romanistische Studien. Für Horst Ochse*. Berlin, Institut für Romanische Philologie der Freien Universität, 1993, 91–107.

Douai-Brassart = Brassart, Félix, *Histoire du château de Douai*, Preuves, 2 fasc., Douai, Crépin, 1877–1887.

Douglas, David C., *The Song of Roland and the Norman Conquest of England*, French Studies 14 (1960), 99–116.

Douglas, David C., *Wilhelm der Eroberer*, transl. from the Engl. by Edwin Ortmann, München, Diederichs, [2]1995.

Dozy, Reinhart P.A., *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne pendant le moyen âge*, 2 vol., Leyde, Brill, [3]1881 (reprint Amsterdam, Oriental Press, 1965).

Dozy, Reinhart P.A./Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne*, nouvelle édition revue et mise à jour par É. L.-P., vol. 3, Leyde, Brill, 1932.

DT + name of département = *Dictionnaire topographiqu* of the departement concerned.

DTS = Nadelajev, V.M., et al., *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'*, Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1969.

Duby, Georges, *Au XIIe siècle dans la France du Nord-Ouest: les «Jeunes» dans la société aristocratique*, Annales ESC 19 (1964) 835–846.

Duby, Georges, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise*, Paris, SEVPEN, 1971.

Duby, Georges, cf. also La Ferté-sur-Grosne.

DuCange-Rey = Le Rey, Emmanuel (ed.), *Les Familles d'Outremer de DuCange*, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1869.

Duchesne, Louis, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, 3 vol., Paris, Thorin & Fontemoing, 1894–1915.

Dudo, decanus Sancti-Quintini, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, ed. Lair, Jules, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie 23 (1865), 317 p. (separate pagination), also separately Caen, Le Blanc-Hardel, 1865.

Dufournet, Jean, *Cours sur la Chanson de Roland*, Paris, Centre de Documentation Universitaire, 1972.

Dufournet, Jean, *La fin énigmatique de deux Sarrasins dans la Chanson de Roland: Blancandrin et Margarit de Séville*, Olifant 11 (1986), 171–189.

Dufournet, Jean, *Notes sur les noms des Sarrasins dans la Chanson de Roland*, Revue des Langues Romanes 91 (1987), 91–105.

Duggan, Joseph J., *A Concordance of the Chanson de Roland*, Columbus OH, Ohio State U.P., 1969.

Duggan, Joseph J., *The Generation of the Episode of Baligant*, Romance Philology 30 (1976), 59–82.

Duggan, Joseph J., cf. also *Chanson de Roland*.

Duiné, François Marie, *La métropole de Bretagne: Chronique de Dol, composée au XIe siècle, et Catalogues des dignitaires jusqu'à la rèvolution*, Paris, Champion, 1916.

Duiné, François Marie, *Un second manuscrit de la Chronique de Dol. Les archevêques Baudry et Roland. Le catalogue des archevêques*, Annales de Bretagne 35 (1921), 92–99.

Dumas, Auguste, *L'église de Reims au temps des luttes entre Carolingiens et Robertiens (888–1027)*, Revue d'histoire de l'église de France 30 (1944), 5–38.

Du Méril, Édélestand (ed.), *Poésies populaires latines du moyen âge*, Paris, Didot 1847 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1977).

Dümmler, Ernst, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches*, 2 vol., Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 1862–1865.

Dunlop, D.M., *Sources of Gold and Silver in Islam according to al-Hamdānī*, Studia Islamica 8 (1957), 29–49.

Dunois-Marmoutier = Mabille, Émile (ed.), *Cartulaire du Marmoutier pour le Dunois*, Châteaudun, Pouillier et Laurent, 1874.

Dussaud, René, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale*, Paris, Geuthner, 1927.

Dvorník, Francis, *The Slavs. Their Early History and Civilization*, Boston, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956.

Ebhardt, Bodo, *Der Wehrbau Europas im Mittelalter*, 3 vol., Berlin, Deutsche Verlags-Gesellschaft, et al., 1939–1958 (reprint Frankfurt/ Main, Weidlich, 1977).

Ebling, Horst, *Prosopographie der Amtsträger des Merowingerreiches*, München, Fink, 1974.

Ebro-Lacarra = Lacarra, José María (ed.), *Documentos para el estudio de la reconquista y repoblación del Valle del Ebro*, vol. 1–3, in: Estudios de Edad media de la Corona de Aragón 2 (1946), 469–546; 3 (1949), 499–727; 5 (1952) 511–668.

Eckhardt, Karl August (ed.), *Pactus legis Salicae*, Hannover, Hahn, 1962.

Edelstein, Emma/ Edelstein, Ludwig, *Asclepius*, *a collection and interpretation of the testimonies*, 2 vol., Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1945.

Edson, Evelyn/Savage-Smith, Emilie /von den Brincken, Anna Dorothee, *Der mittelalterliche Kosmos*, transl. from the Engl. by Thomas Ganschow and supplemented by the contribution of A.D. von den Brincken, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005.

Edwards, Bateman (ed.), *The Medieval French Roman d'Alexandre*, vol. 7, Princeton NJ, Princeton U.P., 1955.

EI = *The Encyclopædia of Islam. New edition*, 12 vol. and index, Leiden, Brill, 1967–2009, atlas, Leiden, Brill, 2002.

EJ = *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 16 vol., Jerusalem, Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1971–1972.

Élisséeff, Nikita, *Nūr ad-Dīn, un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des croisades (511–569/1118–1174)*, 3 vol., Damas, Institut Français, 1967.

Engel, Arthur/ Serrure, Raymond, *Traité de numismatique du moyen âge*, 3 vol., Paris, Leroux, 1891–1905 (reprint Bologna, Forni, 1964).

Enlart, Camille, *Manuel d'archéologie française*, vol. 3, *Le costume*, Paris, Picard, 1916.

Ennen, Leonard/ Eckertz, Gottfried (edd.), *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Köln*, 6 vol., Köln, DuMont-Schauberg, 1860–1879 (reprint Aalen, Scientia, 1970).

Enzensberger, Horst, *Roberto il Guiscardo: documenti e cancelleria*, in: Fonseca, Cosimo Damiano (ed.), *Roberto il Guiscardo tra Europa, Oriente e Mezzogiorno*, Galatina (Lecce), Congedo Editore, 1990, 61–81.

ER = Eliade, Mircea (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 16 vol., New York, Macmillan, 1987.

Erben, Wilhelm, *Kriegsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, München, Oldenbourg, 1929.

Erdal, Marcel, *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, Leiden, Brill, 2004.

Erdmann, Carl, *Kaiserfahne und Blutfahne*, Treatises of the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin, philosophical-historical class, 1932, 868–899.

Erdmann, Carl, *Kaiserliche und päpstliche Fahnen im hohen Mittelalter*, Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken 25 (1933–1934), 1–48.

Erdmann, Carl, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1935 (reprint Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980).

Erfurth, Paul, *Die Schlachtschilderungen in den älteren Chansons de geste*, Halle, Hohmann, 1911.

Erich, Oswald A., *Die Darstellung des Teufels in der christlichen Kunst*, Berlin, Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1931.

Esp.crist. = Pérez de Urbel, Justo, *La España cristiana: comienzo de la reconquista, 711–1038*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1964.

Esp.sagr. = Flórez, Enrique, et al., *España sagrada*, 56 vol., Madrid, Rodríguez, 1747–.

Eudes = Bautier, Robert-Henri (ed.), *Recueil des actes d'Eudes, roi de France*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1967.

Ewert, Christian, *Islamische Funde in Balaguer und die Aljafería in Zaragoza*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1971.

Ewert, Christian, *Spanisch-islamische Systeme sich kreuzender Bögen*, vol. 3, *Die Aljafería in Zaragoza*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1978.

EWFS = Gamillscheg, Ernst, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache*, Heidelberg, Winter, [1]1928, [2]1969.

Ewig, Eugen, *Xanten dans la Chanson de Roland*, in: Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, et al. (edd.), *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien*, *Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 1, Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay, Musée archéologique régional, 1982, 481–490.

Ewig, Eugen, *Die civitas Ubiorum, die Francia Rinensis und das Land Ribuarien*, Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 19 (1954), 1–29.

Faggion, Bortolo, *Le incursioni de' Normanni in Francia e la Chanson de Roland*, separate printing (12 p.) from *Il Saggiatore*, 1902.

Falc'hun, François, *Le système consonantique du breton*, Rennes, Imprimeries Réunies, 1951.

Falk, Hjalmar, *Altnordische Waffenkunde*, Kristiania, Dybwad, 1914.

Faral, Edmond, *Les débats du clerc et du chevalier*, Romania 41 (1912), 473–517.

Faral, Edmond, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du Moyen Âge*, Paris, Champion, 1913.

Fasoli, Gina, *Carlo Magno nelle tradizioni storico-leggendarie italiane*, in: Braunfels Wolfgang/ Schramm, Percy Ernst (edd.), *Karl der Große, Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 4, *Das Nachleben*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, [2]1967, 348–363.

Fassanelli, Rachele, *«Oliverius filius domini Rolandi». La diffusione dell'onomastica letteraria romanza nella Padova dei secoli XII e XII*, in: Paccagnella, Ivano (ed.), *Lingue, testi, culture: l'eredità di Folena vent'anni dopo. Atti del XL convegno interuniversitario (Bressanone 12–15 luglio 2012)*, Padova, Esedra, 2014, 231–248.

Fattal, Antoine, *Le statut légal des non-Musulmans en pays d'Islam*, Beyrouth, Imprimerie Catholique, 1958.

Fauroux, Marie, *Deux autographes de Dudon de Saint-Quentin*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 111 (1953), 229–234.

Favati, Guido, *Olivieri di Vienne (con appendice rolandiana)*, Studi Francesi 6 (1962), 1–18.

Favati, Guido, *Il Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient*, Studi Mediolatini e Volgari 11 (1963), 75–160.

Favière, Jean, *«Montjoie» et «Moultjoie»*, Romania 69 (1946–1947), 101–103.

Fehring, Günter P., *Einführung in die Archäologie des Mittelalters*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, [2]1992.

Feilitzen, Olof von, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, Uppsala, Almquist & Wiksell, 1937.

Felder, Egon, *Die Personennamen auf den merowingischen Münzen der Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, München, Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003.

Félibien, Michel, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale de Saint-Denys en France*, Paris, Leonard, 1706 (reprint Paris, Palais Royal, 1973).

Ferrand, Gabriel, *Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turks* [sic] *relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient du VIIIe au XVIIIe siècles*, 3 vol., Paris, Leroux, 1913–1914.

Festugière, le R. P. André Jean, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, 4 vol., Paris, Gabalda, 1950–1954.

FEW = Wartburg, Walther von, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 25 vol., Bonn, Klopp, et al., 1922–2002.

Figge, Udo, *Die romanische Anlautsonorisation*, Bonn, Romanisches Seminar, 1966.

Findebuch = Gärtner, Kurt, et al., *Findebuch zum mittelhochdeutschen Wortschatz*, Stuttgart, Hirzel, 1992.

Finkbeiner, Brigitte/ Finkbeiner, Uwe, *Barbalissos-Balis, eine weitgehend versunkene Festung und Handelsstadt am Euphrat*, Antike Welt 35:4 (2004), 83–90.

Finó, J.F., *Machines de jet médiévales*, Gladius 10 (1972), 25–43.

Flandre-Comtes = Vercauteren, Fernand (ed.), *Actes des comtes de Flandre 1071–1128*, Bruxelles, Palais des Académies, 1938.

Flavigny = Bouchard, Constance Brittain (ed.), *The Cartulary of Flavigny, 717–1113*, Cambridge MA, Medieval Academy of America, 1991.

Fleckenstein, Josef, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, 2 vol., Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1959–1966.

Fleckenstein, Josef, *Karl der Große und sein Hof*, in: Beumann, Helmut (ed.), *Karl der Große, Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 1, *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, [2]1966, 24–50.

Floß, Heinrich Joseph, *Das Kloster Rolandswerth*, Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein 19 (1868), 76–219.

Flutre, Louis-Fernand, *Notes sur le vocabulaire des Faits des Romains*, Romania 65 (1939), 478–536.

Flutre = Flutre, Louis-Fernand, *Table des noms propres avec toutes leurs variantes figurant dans les romans du moyen âge écrits en français ou en provençal et actuellement publiés ou analysés*, Poitiers, CESCM, 1962.

Fmg.ac, cf. Foundation for Medieval Genealogy.

Foerster, Wendelin, *«Sebre» im Roland*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 15 (1891), 517–518.

Fontevraud = Bienvenu, Jean-Marc (ed.), *Grand cartulaire de Fontevraud, Pancarta et cartularium abbatissae et ordinis Fontis Ebraudi*, 2 vol., Poitiers, Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest, 2000–2005.

Forcellini = Forcellini, Aegidius, *Lexicon totius Latinitatis adiecto onomastico*, revised by Vincentius de Vit, 6 vol., Prato, Typis Aldinianis, 1860–1879 (reprint Padua, Forni, 1965).

Formisano, cf. Gontier de Soignies.

Forssner, Thorvald, *Continental-Germanic Personal Names in England in Old and Middle English Times*, Uppsala, Appelberg, 1916.

Ganshof, François Louis, *L'armée sous les Carolingiens*, in: *Ordinamenti militari in Occidente nell' alto medioevo, Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto medioevo 15, 30 marzo – 5 aprile 1967*, vol. 1, Spoleto, Sede del Centro, 1968, 109–130.

García Gallarín, Consuelo, *Diccionario histórico de nombres de América y España (estudio preliminar)*, Madrid, Silex, 2014.

Gariel, Ernest, *Les monnaies royales de France sous la race carolingienne*, 2 vol., Strasbourg, Fischbach, 1883–1884 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1974).

Garufi, Carlo Alberto, *Margarito di Brindisi, Conte di Malta*, in: *Miscellanea di archeologia, storia e filologia dedicata al prof. Antonino Salinas*, Palermo, Virzi, 1907, 273–282.

Gauthier, Nancy, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule*, vol. 1, *Province ecclésiastique de Trèves (Belgica Prima)*, Paris, de Broccard, 1986.

Gautier, Émile-Félix, *Le passé de l'Afrique du Nord*, Paris, Payot, 1937.

Gautier, Léon, *Les épopées françaises*, 5 vol., Paris, Palmé, 1878–1897 (reprint Osnabrück, Zeller, 1966).

Gautier, Léon, cf. also *Chanson de Roland*.

Gazetteer 1961 = *Spain and Andorra* (*Gazetteer* des U. S. Board on Geographic Names 51), Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961.

GC = Sainte-Marthe, Denis de, et al., *Gallia Christiana*, 16 vol., Paris, Coignard, then Firmin-Didot, 1715–1865 (reprint Farnborough, Gregg, 1970).

GCNss = Albanès, Joseph Hyacinthe/ Chevalier, Ulysse/ Fillet, Joseph, *Gallia christiana novissima*, 7 vol., Montbéliard, Hoffmann, et al., 1899–1920.

GdT = Hunger, Herbert (ed.), *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, vol. 1, Zürich, Atlantis, 1961.

Geith, Karl-Ernst, *daz bůch … gescriben ze den Karlingen. Zur Vorlage des deutschen «Rolandsliedes»*, in: Mennemeier, Franz Norbert (ed.), *Deutsche Literatur in der Weltliteratur*, Acts of the VII. International Congress of Germanists (Göttingen 25–31 August 1985), vol. 9, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1986, 137–142.

Gellone = Alaus, Paul (ed.), *Cartulaire de Gellone*, Montpellier, Aine, 1898.

Genzmer, Felix (transl.), *Die Edda*, 2 vol., Düsseldorf, Diederich, [5]1979.

Gerzaguet, Jean-Pierre (ed.), *Les chartes de l'abbaye d'Anchin (1079–1201)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2005.

Gesta regis Henrici secundi et regis Ricardi, The Chronicle of the reigns of Henry II. and Richard I., A.D. 1162–1192, known commonly under the name of Benedict of Peterborough, ed. William Stubbs, 2 vol., London, Longmans, 1867.

Gibson, Margaret, *Lanfranc of Bec*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1978.

Gibson, Margaret, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, London, MHRA, 1992.

Gicquel, Bernard, *Généalogie de la Chanson de Roland, suivie de Sources et Modèles*, Paris, Publibook, 2003.

Gillespie, George T., *A Catalogue of Persons Named in German Heroic Literature (700–1600)*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1973.

Glöckner, Karl, *Die Anfänge des Klosters Weißenburg*, Elsass-Lothringisches Jahrbuch 18 (1939), 1–46.

Glöckner, cf. also Lorsch.

Godefroy = Godefroy, Frédéric, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IXe au XVe siècle*, 10 vol., Paris, Vieweg, 1881–1902 (reprint Nendeln, Kraus, 1969).

Goffart, Walter, *The Le Mans Forgeries*, Cambridge MA, Harvard U.P., 1966.

Golden, Peter, *The Pechenegs*, in: Sinor, Denis (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., 1990, 270–275.

Golden, Peter, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkish Peoples*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1992.

Gontier de Soignies, *Il Canzoniere*, ed. Formisano, Luciano, Milano, Ricciardi, 1980.

González, Julio, *Repoblación de la Extremadura Leonesa*, Hispania 3 (1943), 195–273.

González, Julio, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*, 3 vol., Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Escuela de Estudios Medievales, 1960.

Gorze = Herbomez, A. d' (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Gorze*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1898.

Graesse, Johann Georg Theodor/ Benedict, Friedrich/ Plechl, Helmut, *Orbis Latinus*, 3 vol., Braunschweig, Klinckhardt & Biermann, 1972.

Grande-Sauve = Cirot de la Ville, Jean-Pierre A., *Histoire de l'abbaye et congrégation de Notre-Dame de la Grande-Sauve, ordre de Saint Benoît, en Guienne*, 2 vol., Paris/Bordeaux, 1844–1845.

Granja, Fernando de la, *La Marca Superior en la Obra de al-ʿUdrí*, Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón 8 (1967), 447–545.

Graubünden-UB = Meyer-Marthaler, Elisabeth/ Perret, Franz (edd.), *Bündner Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, *390–1199*, Chur, Bischofsberger, 1955.

Grégoire, Henri, *La Chanson de Roland de l'an 1085: Baligant et Califerne ou l'étymologie du mot «Californie»*, Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Belgique (Classe des Lettres) 25 (1939), 211–273 (=1939a).

Grégoire, Henri, *Encore la Chanson de Roland et Byzance*, Byzantion 14 (1939), 689–691 (=1939b).

Grégoire, Henri, *Des dieux Cahu, Baraton, Tervagant, et de maints autres dieux non moins extravagants*, Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves 7 (1939–1944), 451–472.

Grégoire, Henri, *The actual date and the true historical background of the Chanson de Roland*, Belgium [New York] 3 (1942), 59–64.

Grégoire, Henri, *The historical element in Western and Eastern Epics*, Byzantion 16 (1942–1943), 527–544.

Grégoire, Henri, *De Marsile à Andernas*, in: *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, vol. 3, *Letteratura e storia bizantina*, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946, 431–463 (reprint ibd. 1973).

Grégoire, Henri, *«Imphe», la ville d'Amphion en terre d'Épire*, in: *Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hoepffner*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1949, 183–190 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1974).

Grégoire, Henri, *L'étymologie de «Tervagant (Trivigant)»*, in: *Mélanges d'histoire du théâtre du moyen âge et de la Renaissance offerts à Gustave Cohen*, Paris, Nizet, 1950, 67–74.

Grégoire, Henri/de Keyser, R., *La Chanson de Roland et Byzance, ou de l'utilité du Grec pour les Romanistes*, Byzantion 14 (1939), 265–319.

Grégoire, Henri/ Mathieu, Marguerite, *Trivigant, prétendue divinité musulmane de nos chansons de geste, et son étymologie*, La Nouvelle Clio 1–2 (1949–1950) 193–196.

Gregorovius, Ferdinand, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, vol. 2, Stuttgart, Cotta, 1869; Stuttgart, Cotta, [7]1926.

Grenoble = Marion, Jules (ed.), *Cartulaires de l'Église cathédrale de Grenoble*, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1869.

Grierson, Philip, *La trouvaille monétaire d'Ilanz*, Gazette numismatique suisse 4 (1953), 46–48.

Grierson, Philip, *Le sou d'or d'Uzès*, Le Moyen Âge 60 (1954), 294–309.

Grierson, Philip, *Some modern forgeries of Carolingian coins*, in: Ingholt, Harald (ed.), *Centennial Publication of the American Numismatic Society*, New York, American Numismatic Society, 1958, 301–315.

Grierson, Philip, *Money and coinage under Charlemagne*, in: Beumann, Helmut (ed.), *Karl der Große*, *Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 1, *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, ²1966, 501–536.

Grierson, Philip/ Blackburn, Mark, *Medieval European Coinage*, vol. 1, *The Early Middle Ages (5ᵗʰ–10ᵗʰ centuries)*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., ²2006.

Grierson, Philip/ Travaini, Lucia, *Medieval European Coinage*, vol. 14, *Italy (III) (South Italy, Sicily, Sardinia)*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., 1986.

Grimm, Jakob, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Berlin, Dümmler, ⁴1876.

Grisward, Joel H., *Le motif de l'épée jetée au lac: la mort d'Artur et la mort de Batradz*, Romania 90 (1969), 289–340, 473–514.

Gros, Gérard, *La chambre de Marsile, à Saragosse. Étude sur une évocation de l'art islamique (Chanson de Roland, laisse CLXXXVIII)*, Le Moyen Âge 117 (2011), 605–623 (=2011a).

Gros, Gérard, *Margariz, onzième pair sarrasin*, in: Bazin-Tacchella, Sylvie (ed.), *Le souffle épique: l'esprit de la chanson de geste. Études en l'honneur de Bernard Guidot*, Dijon, Université de Dijon, 2011, 13–22 (=2011b).

Gros, Gérard, *«Set anz tuz pleins ad estét en Espaigne». Étude sur l'exposition de la Chanson de Roland: temps et espace*, in: Possamaï-Pérez, Marylène (ed.), *Chanter de geste. L'art épique et son rayonnement. Hommage à Jean-Claude Vallecalle*, Paris, Champion, 2013, 121–136.

Groten, Manfred, *Die Urkunde Karls des Großen für Saint-Denis von 813 (D 286) eine Fälschung Abt Sugers?*, Historisches Jahrbuch 108 (1988), 1–36.

Grousset, René, *Histoire des Croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, vol. 1, Paris, Plon, ²1948.

Grunebaum, Gustav Edmund von, *Der Islam*, in: Mann, Golo, et al. (edd.), *Propyläen Weltgeschichte*, vol. 5, Berlin, Propyläen-Verlag, 1963 (quoted from the reprint, ibd., 1986), 21–179.

Guido = Pinder, Moritz/ Parthey, Gustav (edd.), *Ravennatis anonymi Cosmographia et Guidonis Geographica*, Berlin, Nicolai, 1860 (reprint Aalen, Zeller, 1962).

Guiette, Robert, *Notes sur la Prise de Nobles*, Romanica Gandensia 4 (1955), 67–80, reprinted in: Guiette, Robert, *Forme e senefiance*, Genève, Droz, 1978, 181–194.

Guiette, Robert, *L'entrée de Charlemagne en Espagne et la tradition des «Croniques et conquestes de Charlemaine» (1458)*, Cultura Neolatina 21 (1961), 206–213, reprinted in: Guiette, Robert, *Forme e senefiance*, Genève, Droz, 1978, 163–171.

Guillaume de Pouille, *La Geste de Robert Guiscard* [before 1111], ed. (with French transl.) Mathieu, Marguerite, Palermo, Istituto siciliano di studi bizantini e neoellenici, 1961.

Guillot, Olivier, *Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XIᵉ siècle*, 2 vol., Paris, Picard, 1972.

Guillotel, Hubert, *L'action de Charles le Chauve vis-à-vis de la Bretagne de 843 à 851*, Mémoires de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Bretagne 53 (1975–1976), 5–32.

Guillotel, Hubert, *Des vicomtes d'Alet aux vicomtes de Poudouvres*, Annales / Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de l'arrondissement de Saint-Malo 1988, 201–215.

Guillotel, Hubert, *La place de Châteaubriand [...]*, Mémoires de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Bretagne 66 (1989), 5–46.

Guillotel, Hubert, *Combour: proto-histoire d'une seigneurie [...]*, in: Keats-Rohan, K.S.B. (ed.), *Family Trees and the Roots of Politics*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1997, 269–298.

Guillou, André, *La soie sicilienne au Xe–XIe siècles*, in: *Byzantino-sicula II: Miscellanea di scritti in memoria di Giuseppe Rossi Taibbi*, Palermo, [s.n.], 1975, 285–288.

Guillou, André, *La soie du Katepanat d'Italie*, Travaux et Mémoires, Centre de Recherche d'histoire et civilisation byzantines 6 (1976), 69–84.

Gummere, Francis G., *The Sister's Son in the English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, in: *An English Miscellany presented to Dr. [Frederick James] Furnivall*, Oxford, Oxford U.P., 1901, 133–149.

Günther, Wilhelm Arnold, *Codex diplomaticus Rheno-Mosellanus*, 5 vol., Koblenz, Hölscher, 1822–1826.

Guy, bishop of Amiens, *Carmen de Hastingae proelio*, edd. Morton, Catherine/ Muntz, Hope, Oxford, Clarendon, 1972; 2. ed. by Frank Barlow, Oxford, Clarendon, 1999.

Györy, Jean, *Étude sur la Chanson de Roland*, Paris, Droz, 1936.

Gysseling, Maurits, *Toponymisch woordenboek van België, Nederland, Luxemburg, Noord-Frankrijk en West-Duitsland (vóór 1226)*, Brussel, Belgisch Interuniversitair Centrum voor Nederlandistiek, 1960.

Gysseling, cf. also Huy-Gysseling.

Haarmann, Harald, *Lexikon der untergegangenen Völker*, München, Beck, ^2 2012.

Habicht, Werner, *Die Gebärde in englischen Dichtungen des Mittelalters*, München, Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1959.

Hallberg, Ivar, *L'Extrême-Orient dans la littérature et la cartographie de l'Occident des XIIIe, XIVe et XVe siècles*, Göteborg, Zachrisson, 1907.

Halphen, Louis (ed.), *Recueil d'annales angevines et vendômoises*, Paris, Picard, 1903.

Halphen, Louis, *Le Comté d'Anjou au XIe siècle*, Paris, Picard, 1906 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1974).

Halphen, Louis/ Poupardin, René (edd.), *Chroniques des Comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise*, Paris, Picard, 1913.

Halphen, Louis, cf. also Lot/Halphen and Lothaire/Louis V.

Halvorsen, Eyvind F., *The Norse Version of the Chanson de Roland*, København, Munksgaard, 1959.

Hämel, Adalbert, *Vom Herzog Naimes «von Bayern», dem Pfaffen Konrad von Regensburg und dem Pseudo-Turpin*, Proceedings of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities, philosophical-historical class, 1955, Nr.1.

Hämel, Adalbert/ Mandach, André de (edd.), *Der Pseudo-Turpin von Compostela*, Proceedings of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities, philosophical-historical class, 1965, Nr.1.

Hanak, Miroslav J., *Sven Forkbeard, Bjoern Ironside and the City of Iomsborg in the Chanson de Roland*, Romania 92 (1971), 433–457 (= 1971a).

Hanak, Miroslav J., *Torleus and Dapamorz, Two Examples of Ethnic Amalgamation in the Song of Roland*, Romanische Forschungen 83 (1971), 405–422 (= 1971b).

Harris, James W., *Spanish Phonology*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press, 1969.

Harris, Julian, *«Munjoie» and «reconuisance» in Chanson de Roland, l. 3620*, Romance Philology 10 (1956–1957), 168–173.

Hartenstein, Judith (transl.), *Eugnostos (NHC III,3; V,1) und die «Weisheit Jesu Christi» (NHC III,4; BG 3)*, in: Schenke, Hans-Martin/Bethge, Hans-Gebhard/Kaiser, Ulrike Ursula (edd.), *Nag Hammadi deutsch*, study edition, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2007, 240–288.

Hasnon = Dewez, Jules, *Histoire de l'abbaye de St. Pierre d'Hasnon*, Lille, Don Bosco, 1890.

Haubrichs, Wolfgang, *Georgslied und Georgslegende im frühen Mittelalter*, Königstein, Scriptor, 1979.

Haussig, Hans Wilhelm, *Die Geschichte Zentralasiens und der Seidenstraße in vorislamischer Zeit*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, [2]1992.

Haussig, Hans Wilhelm, *Die Geschichte Zentralasiens und der Seidenstraße in islamischer Zeit*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, [2]1994.

Haute-Marne = Roserot, Alphonse (ed.), *Chartes inédites des IXe et Xe siècles, appartenant aux archives de la Haute-Marne (851–973)*, Bulletin de la Société des sciences historiques et naturelles de l'Yonne 51 (1897), 162–207.

Havet, Julien, *Les chartes de Saint-Calais*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 48 (1887), 5–58, 209–247.

Hawicks, Heike, *Sanctos-Xantum-Troia*, in: Ludwig, Uwe/ Schilp,Thomas (edd.), *Mittelalter an Rhein und Maas. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Niederrheins, Dieter Geuenich zum 60. Geburtstag*, Münster, Waxmann, 2004, 27–42.

HdA = Bächtold-Stäubli, Hanns/Hoffmann-Krayer, Eduard (edd.), *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, 10 vol., Berlin, de Gruyter, 1927–1942.

HdR = Erler, Adalbert (ed.), *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, 5 vol., Berlin, Schmidt, 1971–1998.

Heim, Wolf Dieter, *Romanen und Germanen in Charlemagnes Reich*, München, Fink, 1984.

Heinrich of Neustadt, cf. Birkhan.

Heisig, Karl, *Die Geschichtsmetaphysik des Rolandsliedes und ihre Vorgeschichte*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 55 (1935), 1–87.

Heisig, Karl, *«Munjoie»*, Romanistisches Jahrbuch 4 (1951), 292–314.

Heitmann, Klaus, *Eine altfranzösische Heiligenvita des 10. Jahrhunderts: das Leodegar-Lied (Vie de Sant-Léger)*, in: Walz, Dorothea (ed.), *Scripturus vitam: lateinische Biographie von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart, Festgabe für Walter Berschin zum 65. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg, Mattes, 2002, 781–796.

Heller, Bernhard, *Die Bedeutung des arabischen ʿAntar-Romans für die vergleichende Literaturkunde*, Leipzig, Eichblatt, 1931.

Helmerichs, Robert (ed.), *Planctus for William Longsword* [facsimile and transcription of the two mss. plus reprint of the edd. Lair, Lauer and Ph. Aug. Becker], Kansas City, University of Kansas, 1999–2002 = http://vlib.iue.it/carrie/documents/planctus/planctus (last access 8 sept 2022).

Hennecke, Edgar/ Schneemelcher,Wilhelm, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 2 vol., Tübingen, Mohr, [6]1999.

Henri-I = Soehnée, Frédéric, *Catalogue des actes de Henri Ier, roi de France (1031–1060)*, Paris, Champion, 1907.

Henri-II = Delisle, Léopold/ Berger,Élie (edd.), *Recueil des actes de Henri II roi d'Angleterre et duc de Normandie*, 3 vol., Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1916–1927.

Herbert le Duc de Danmartin [sic], *Folque de Candie*, ed. Schultz-Gora, Oskar, vol. 1–3, Dresden, Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, 1909, 1915, 1936, vol. 4 (introduction, ed. Mölk, Ulrich), Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1966.

Herbillon, Jules, *Marcourt et Montjavoult (Montjoie)*, Revue Internationale d'Onomastique 29 (1977), 128–131.

Hermann, Joachim (ed.), *Die Slawen in Deutschland*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, ⁴1985.

Hernández Jiménez, Félix, *El «ribāṭ» de Kaškāllū en la provincia de Marmaria*, al-Andalus 4 (1939), 317–332.

Hernández, Francisco J., *Los cartularios de Toledo*, Madrid, Fundación Ramón Areces, 1985.

Heusler, Andreas, *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, Winter, ⁷1967.

Hibbard Loomis, Laura, *The Passion Lance Relic and the War-cry «munjoie» in the Chanson de Roland and Related Texts*, Romanic Review 41 (1950), 241–260 (= 1950a).

Hibbard Loomis, Laura, *The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan*, Speculum 25 (1950), 437–456 (= 1950b).

Hibbard Loomis, Laura, *The Athelstan Gift Story; its Influence on English Chronicles and Carolingian Romances*, Publications of the Modern Language Association 67 (1952), 521–537.

Hibbard Loomis, Laura, *L'oriflamme de France et le cri «Munjoie» au XIIᵉ siècle*, Le Moyen Âge 65 (1959), 469–499.

Higounet, Charles, *Bordeaux pendant le haut moyen âge*, Bordeaux, Fédération historique du Sud-Ouest, 1963.

Hildebrand, F., *Über das französische Sprachelement im Liber Censualis Wilhelms I. von England (Exchequer- und Exon-Domesday-Book)*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 8 (1884), 321–362.

Hildesheimer, E., *L'activité militaire des clercs à l'époque franque*, École nationale des chartes, Position des thèses, 1936, 59–76.

Hilka/Pfister = Hilka, Alfons (ed.), *Das altfranzösische Rolandslied nach der Oxforder Handschrift*, 8. ed. by Max Pfister, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1997.

Hilka/Rohlfs = Hilka, Alfons (ed.), *Das altfranzösische Rolandslied nach der Oxforder Handschrift*, 3. ed. by Gerhard Rohlfs, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1948. [Quoted only when deviating from Hilka/Pfister.]

Hincmar de Reims, *De ordine palatii*, edd. (with German transl.) Gross, Thomas/ Schieffer, Rudolf, Hannover, Hahn, 1980.

Hippeau, Célestin (ed.), *La Chanson du chevalier au cygne et de Godefroid de Bouillon*, 2 vol., Paris, Aubry, 1874–1877 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1969).

Hjelmslev, Louis, *Die Sprache. Eine Einführung*, transl. from Danish into German by Otmar Werner, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968.

Hlawitschka, Eduard, *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder in Oberitalien (774–962)*, Freiburg (Breisgau), Albert, 1960.

Hlawitschka, Eduard, *Die Vorfahren Karls des Großen*, in: Beumann, Helmut (ed.), *Karl der Große*, *Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 1, *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, ²1966, 51–82.

Hoffmann, Hartmut, *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei*, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1964.

Hofmann, Konrad, *«Tere de Bire», Rol. 3995*, Romanische Forschungen 1 (1883), 429–430.

Hollister, Charles Warren, *The Military Organization of Norman England*, Oxford, Clarendon,1965

Hollyman, K.J., *Wissant and the Empire of Charles the Simple*, Journal of the Australasian Universities' Modern Language and Literature Association 8 (1958), 14–28.

Holmes, Urben T., *Medieval Children*, Journal of Social History 2 (1968), 164–172.

Holzhausen, Jens (transl.), *Das «Corpus Hermeticum» deutsch: die griechischen Traktate und der lateinische Asclepius*, Stuttgart, Frommann-Holzboog, 1997.

Honemann, Volker, *El Pseudo-Turpín y la literatura alemana*, in: Herbers, Klaus (ed.), *El Pseudo-Turpin, Lazo entre el Culto Jacobeo y el Culto de Carlomagno, Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Estudios Jacobeos*, Santiago de Compostela, Xunta de Galicia, 2003, 359–371.

Honigmann, Ernst, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071 nach griechischen, arabischen, syrischen und armenischen Quellen*, Bruxelles, Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales, 1935.

Hopf, Karl [Χόπφ, Κάρολος], ΓΡΑΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΖΟΡΖΗΣ, Αὐθέντης Λευκάδος, ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΗ ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΙΑ, transl. from German into Greek by Joannes A. Romanos [Ἰωάννης Α. Ρωμανός], Korfu, 1870.

Horák, Bohuslav/ Trávníček,Dušan (edd.), *Descriptio civitatum ad septentrionalem plagam Danubii (t. zv. Bavorský geograf)*, Praha, Českoslov. Akad. věd, 1956.

Horn, Wilhelm/ Lehnert,Martin, *Laut und Leben. Englische Lautgeschichte der neueren Zeit (1400–1950)*, vol. 1, Berlin, Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1954.

Horrent, Jules, *La Chanson de Roland dans les littératures française et espagnole au moyen âge*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1951 (=1951a).

Horrent, Jules, *Roncesvalles, étude sur le fragment de cantar de gesta conservé à l'Archivo de Navarra (Pampelune)*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1951 (=1951b).

Horrent, Jules, *La bataille des Pyrénées de 778*, Le Moyen Âge 78 (1972), 197–227.

Houth-Baltus, Madeleine, *L'expression en toponymie de quelques aspects de l'occupation du sol d'une région d'Île-de-France (Cruye et Val de Galie)*, Bulletin philologique et historique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques 1965 (1962), 213–233.

HPM = *Historiae Patriae Monumenta*, Augusta Taurinorum, e Regio Typographeo, 1836–1901.

Huet, Gédéon, *Duresté, Durester, Durestant*, Romania 41 (1912), 102–105.

Huguet = Huguet, Edmond, *Dictionnaire de la langue française du XVIe siècle*, 7 vol., Paris, Champion, then Didier, 1925–1967.

Hünemörder, Christian, *Das Lehrgedicht «De monstris Indie» (12. Jh.). Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Solinus und Honorius Augustodunensis*, Rheinisches Museum 119 (1976), 267–284.

Huy-Gysseling = Gysseling, Maurits, *Zur Romanisierung germanischer Personennamen in Wallonien im Frühmittelalter*, in: Schützeichel, Rudolf/ Zender,Matthias (edd.), *Festschrift für Adolf Bach*, Heidelberg, 1965, 49–54 [used as source for name material from Huy].

IA = *Islâm Ansiklopedisi*, 13 vol. and index, Istanbul, Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1945–1994 (reprint Eskişehir, Anadolu Üniversitetesi, 1997).

Idris, Hady Roger, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Zīrīdes*, Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1962.

Idrīsī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ash-Sharīf Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-, *Géographie d'Edrisi*, French transl. by Amédée Jaubert, 2 vol., Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1836–1840 (reprint Frankfurt a. M., Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science, 1992).

Idrīsī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ash-Sharīf Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-, *Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*, French transl. by Reinhart P. A. Dozy and Michael Jan de Goeje, Leyde, Brill, 1866.

Idrīsī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ash-Sharīf Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-, *L'Italia descritta nel «Libro del re Ruggero» compilato da Edrisi*, edd. (with Ital. transl.) Amari, Michele/ Schiaparelli, Celestino, Roma, Salviucci, 1883.

Idrīsī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ash-Sharīf Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-, *Los caminos de al-Andalus en el siglo XII*, ed. (with Span. transl.) Mizal, Jassim Abid, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Filología, 1989.

Idrīsī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ash-Sharīf Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-, *La première géographie de l'Occident*, transl. into French by Pierre Amédée Jaubert, revu par Annliese Nef, presentation, notes, index and bibliography by Henri Bresc and Annliese Nef, Paris, Flammarion, 1999.

Île-Barbe = Charpin-Feugerolles, le Comte de/Guigue, Georges (edd.), *Grande pancarte ou cartulaire de l'abbaye de l'Île-Barbe*, 2 vol., Montbrison, Brassart, 1923.

Indre = Hubert, Eugène (ed.), *Recueil général des chartes intéressant le département de l'Indre, VIe–XIe siècles*, Paris, Picard, 1899.

Isaïa, Marie-Céline, *Remi de Reims. Mémoire d'un saint, histoire d'une Église*, Paris, Cerf, 2010.

Istrin, V., *Die griechische Version der Judas-Legende*, Archiv für slavische Philologie 20 (1898), 605–619.

Itala, *das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung nach den Handschriften*, ed. Jülicher, Adolf, 4 vol., Berlin, de Gruyter, [2]1963–1976.

Jaffé/Löwenfeld = Jaffé, Philipp, *Regesta pontificum romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, 2. ed. procured by Samuel Löwenfeld et al., 2 vol., Leipzig, Veit, 1885 (reprint Graz, Akademische Druck- und Verlagsgesellschaft, 1956).

James, David, *A History of Early Al-Andalus: The Akhbār majmūʿa. A study of the unique Arabic manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, with a translation, notes and comments*, London, Routledge, 2012.

Jamison, Evelyn, *Notes on S. Maria della Strada at Matrice, its History and Sculpture*, Papers of the British School at Rome 14 (1938), 32–97.

Jaurgain, Jean de, *La Vasconie, étude historique et critique*, 2 vol., Pau, Garet, 1898–1902.

Jeanroy, Alfred, *Notes sur la légende de Vivien*, Romania 26 (1897), 175–207.

Jedin, Hubert, *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte*, Freiburg, Herder, 1970.

Jefferies, Henry Alan, *Desmond before the Norman invasion: a political study*, Journal of the Cork Historical and Archeological Society 89 (1984), 12–32.

Jenkins, cf. *Chanson de Roland*.

Jeremias, Johannes, *Der Gottesberg*, Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1919.

Jerusalem-Josaphat = Kohler, Charles (ed.), *Chartes de l'abbaye de Notre-Dame de la Vallée de Josaphat en Terre-Sainte (1108–1291)*, Revue de l'Orient latin 7 (1900), 108–222.

Jerusalem-Röhricht = Röhricht, Reinhold, *Regesta regni Hierosolymitani (1097–1291)*, Oeniponti, Libraria academica Wagneriana, 1893; *Additamentum*, ibd., 1904.

Jerusalem-S.Sépulcre = Rozière, Eugène de (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'église du Saint-Sépulcre de Jerusalem*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1849.

Jireček, Constantin, *Die Romanen in den Städten Dalmatiens während des Mittelalters*, Memoranda of the Academy of Sciences in Vienna, philosophical-historical class, 48:3 (1902), 1–104; 49:1 (1904), 1–77.

Johannes de Plano Carpini = P. Anastasius van den Wyngaert O.F.M. (ed.), *Sinica Franciscana*, vol. 1, *Itinera et relationes fratrum minorum saeculi XIII et XIV*, Firenze-Quaracchi, Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1929, 1–130.

Jones, Ethel Cecilia, *Saint Gilles. Essai d'histoire littéraire*, Paris, Champion, 1914.

Jones, Gwyn, *A History of the Vikings*, Oxford, Oxford U.P., 1968.

Jones, Michael, *The Family of Dinan in England in the Middle Ages*, *La Famille de Dinan en Angleterre au Moyen Âge*, Dinan, Le Pays de Dinan, 1987.

Joos, Lorenz, *Überblick über die Münzgeschichte […] von Graubünden*, annual report of the Historical-Antiquarian Society of the Grisons 86 (1956), 99–138.

Josippon, The, ed. [hebr.] Flusser, David, 2 vol., Jerusalem, The Bialik Institute, 1980. Jouanno, Corinne, *Naissance et métamorphoses du Roman d'Alexandre, domaine grec*, Paris, CNRS, 2002.

Julien, Charles-André, *History of North Africa […], from the Arab Conquest to 1830*, translated [from the French] by John Petrie, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

Julien, Charles-André, *Histoire de l'Afrique du Nord*, vol. 2, *De la conquête arabe à 1830*, Paris, Payot, [2]1978.

Jullian, Camille, *La tombe de Roland à Blaye*, Romania 25 (1896), 161–173.

Jullian, Camille, *De la précision géographique dans la légende carolingienne*, I, *«Narbonne» en pays basque*, Revue des études anciennes, 4e série, 1 (1899), 233–237.

Jumièges = Vernier, Jules-Joseph (ed.), *Chartes de l'abbaye de Jumièges (v. 825–1204) conservées aux Archives de la Seine-Inférieure*, Rouen, Lestringant, 1916.

Jungandreas, Wolfgang, *Historisches Lexikon der Siedlungs- und Flurnamen des Mosellandes*, Trier, Lintz, 1963.

Justi, Ferdinand, *Kurdische Grammatik*, Sankt-Peterburg, Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1880 (reprint Walluf, Sändig, 1981).

KAGI = Kettermann, Günter, *Atlas zur Geschichte des Islam*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001.

Kahane, Henry/ Kahane,Renée, *Magic and Gnosticism in the «Chanson de Roland»*, Romance Philology 12 (1959), 216–231.

Kahane, Henry/ Kahane,Renée, *Die Magariten*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 76 (1960), 184–204.

Kahane, Henry/ Kahane,Renée, *Contributions by Byzantinologists to Romance etymology*, Revue de Linguistique Romane 26 (1962), 126–139.

Kahane, Henry/ Kahane,Renée, Art. *Abendland und Byzanz, Literatur und Sprache*, in: Wirth, Peter (ed.), *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik*, vol. 1, fasc. 4, Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1970, 345–640.

Kaiser, Rolf, *Alt- und mittelenglische Anthologie*, Berlin, self-published by the author, [2]1955.

Kaiserswerth = Kelleter, Heinrich (ed.), *Urkundenbuch des Stiftes Kaiserswerth*, Bonn, Hanstein, 1904.

Kajanto, Iiro, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1965.

Kalbow, Werner, *Die germanischen Personennamen des altfranzösischen Heldenepos und ihre lautliche Entwicklung*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1913.

Karl, Maria, *Der Pseudoturpintext des Sebastian Ciampi und seine Quellen*, Diss. (typoscript), Würzburg, 1940.

Karmon, Yehuda, *Israel. Eine geographische Landeskunde*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983.

Kartschoke, Dieter, *Die Datierung des deutschen Rolandsliedes*, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1965.

Kaspers, Wilhelm, *Der Name «Montjoie» und seine Bedeutungsvarianten*, Beiträge zur Namenforschung 9 (1958), 173–179.

Kaufmann, Henning, *Untersuchungen zu altdeutschen Rufnamen*, München, Fink, 1965.

Kaufmann, Henning, *Ergänzungsband* zu: Förstemann, Ernst, *Altdeutsches Namenbuch*, vol. 1, *Personennamen* (Bonn, Hanstein, [2]1900), München, Fink,1968.

Kehr, Karl Andreas (ed.), *Die Urkunden der normannisch-sizilischen Könige*, Innsbruck, Wagner, 1902 (reprint Aalen, Scientia, 1962).

Kehr, Paul, *Die Belehnungen der süditalienischen Normannenfürsten durch die Päpste (1059–1192)*, Treatises of the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin, philosophical-historical class, 1934, no.1.

Keller, Hans-Erich, *Introduction, La version sandionysienne de la Chanson de Roland*, *La Chanson de Roland, poème de propagande pour le royaume capétien du milieu du XIIe siècle*, and *La conversion de Bramimonde*, in: Keller, Hans-Erich (ed.), *Autour de Roland. Recherches sur la chanson de geste*, Paris, Champion, 1989, 9–34, 37–75, 77–92, 109–128.

Keller, Hans-Erich, *Renier de Gennes*, Memorias de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 21 (1990), 369–383.

Kettermann, Günter, *Atlas zur Geschichte des Islam*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001.

Keussen, Hermann, *Topographie der Stadt Köln im Mittelalter*, vol. 1, Bonn, Hanstein, 1910.

Khitrovo, B. de (transl.), *Itinéraires russes en Orient*, vol. 1:1, Paris, Leroux, 1889 (reprint Osnabrück, Zeller, 1966).

Kieft, Co van de, *Étude sur le chartier et la seigneurie du prieuré de la Chapelle-Aude*, Assen, van Gorcum, 1960.

Kienast, Walther, *Die fränkische Vasallität. Von den Hausmeiern bis zu Ludwig dem Kind und Karl dem Einfältigen*, ed. Herde, Peter, Frankfurt, Klostermann, 1990.

Kiesewetter, Andreas, *Megareites di Brindisi, Maio di Monopoli e la signoria sulle isole ionie (1185–1250)*, Archivio Storico Pugliese 59 (2006), 45–90.

Kirkwall, Viscount, *Four Years in the Ionian Islands*, 2 vol., London, Chapman & Hall, 1864.

Klein, Hans-Wilhelm, *Saragossa und die Berge im Rolandslied*, in: Thomas, Johannes (ed.), *Studia neolatina, Festschrift für Peter M. Schon*, Aachen, Mayer, 1978, 91–100.

Klein, Hans-Wilhelm (ed. with transl. into German), *Die «Chronik von Karl dem Großen und Roland». Der lateinische Pseudo-Turpin in den Handschriften aus Aachen und Andernach*, München, Fink, 1986.

Klein, Hans-Wilhelm, *Herzog Naimes als «Bayer» im französischen und deutschen Rolandslied und im Pseudo-Turpin*, in: Lüdi, Georges (ed.), *Romania ingeniosa, Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Gerold Hilty*, Bern, P. Lang, 1987, 171–178.

Klingebiel, Kathryn, *«Persian» in French. The Case History of a Language*, Romance Philology 37 (1984), 302–312.

Kluge, Friedrich, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 25th ed. revised by Elmar Seebold, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2011.

KMS = for branches I, III, VII, IX: *Karlamagnús saga. Branches I, III, VII et IX*. Édition bilingue projetée par Knud Togeby et Pierre Halleux. Texte norrois édité par Agnete Loth. Traduction française par Annette [Patron-] Godefroit. Avec une étude par Povl Skårup, Kopenhagen, Reitzel, 1980. For the other branches: Unger, Carl Richard (ed.), *Karlamagnus saga ok kappa hans*, Kristiania, Jensen, 1860.

KMS, cf. also Aebischer 1954 and Halvorsen 1959.

Knudson, Charles A., *Études sur la composition de la Chanson de Roland*, Romania 63 (1937), 48–92.

Koch, Hannsjoachim W., *Medieval warfare*, London, Prentice Hall, 1978.

Koch, John T., *Celtic Culture: a Historical Encyclopedia*, Santa Barbara CA, ABC-Clio, 2006.

Koch, Klaus, et al. (edd.), *Reclams Bibellexikon*, Stuttgart, Reclam, 1978.

Köln-Regesten = *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln im Mittelalter*, vol. 1 [a. 313–1099], ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Oediger, Bonn, Hanstein, 1961; vol. 2 [a. 1100–1205], ed. Richard Knipping, Bonn, Hanstein, 1901.

Kölzer, Theo (ed.), *Die Urkunden der Merowinger*, 2 vol., Hannover, Hahn, 2001.

Konrad der Pfaffe, *Das Rolandslied*, ed. Wesle, Carl, 3rd ed. revised by Peter Wapnewski, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1985.

Köprülü, Fuad, *Les «Eugiez» de la Chanson de Roland*, Romania 61 (1935), 488–491.

Kostrencic, Marko, *Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi Iugoslaviae*, 2 vol., Zagrebiae, Historijski Institut, 1973–1978.

KPauly = Ziegler, Konrat/ Sontheimer, Walter (edd.), *Der Kleine Pauly*, 5 vol., München, Artemis, 1975 (reprint München, dtv, 1979).

Krahe, Hans/ Meid, Wolfgang, *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 3, *Wortbildungslehre*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1969.

Kremer, Dieter, *Die germanischen Personennamen in Katalonien*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1972 (first published in: Estudis romànics 14 (1969), 1–245, 15 (1970), 1–121).

Kremer, Dieter, cf. also Piel/Kremer.

Krusch, Bruno, *Reise nach Frankreich im Frühjahr und Sommer 1892*, Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 18 (1893), 551–649 (=1893a), and 19 (still 1893), 13–45 (=1893b).

Kunitzsch, Paul, *«Dodekin» und andere türkisch-arabische Namen in den Chansons de geste*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 88 (1972), 34–44.

Kunitzsch, Paul, *Noch einmal: «Mauduit de Rames»*, Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, N.F. 30 (1980), 350–354.

Kunitzsch, Paul, *Namenkundliche Anmerkungen zu P. Bancourt* (1982a), Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 103 (1987), 257–270.

Kunzler, Michael, *Die Liturgie der Kirche*, Paderborn, Bonifatius, 1995.

Küpper = Küpper, Heinz, *dtv Wörterbuch der deutschen Alltagssprache*, 2 vol., München, dtv, 1971.

Lacarra, José María, *Sobre espadas y otras armas en la España de la Alta Edad Media*, in: Álvar, Carlos (ed.), *Studia in honorem prof. M. de Riquer*, vol. 3, Barcelona, Cuaderns Crema, 1988, 619–625.

Lacarra, José María, *Textos navarros del Códice de Roda*, Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón 1 (1945), 193–283.

Lacarra, José María, cf. also Ebro-Lacarra and Vázquez de Parga.

Ladner, Gerhart B., *Handbuch der frühchristlichen Symbolik*, Wiesbaden, VMA, 1996.

Lafaurie, Jean, *Numismatique: des Mérovingiens aux Carolingiens. Les monnaies de Pépin le Bref*, Francia 2 (1974), 26–48.

Lafaurie, Jean, *La surveillance des ateliers monétaires au IXe siècle*, in: Paravicini, Werner/ Werner, Karl Ferdinand (edd.), *Histoire comparée de l'administration (IVe–XVIIIe siècles)*, Zürich, Artemis, 1980, 486–496.

La Ferté-sur-Grosne = Duby, Georges (ed.), *Recueil des pancartes de l'abbaye de la Ferté-sur-Grosne, 1113–1178*, Gap, Ophrys, 1953 (reprint Bruxelles, De Boeck université, 2000).

Lafont, Robert, *Le mystère de l'Archamp*, Medioevo Romanzo 13 (1988), 161–180.

Lafont, Robert, *[Okzitanisch/L'occitan], Interne Sprachgeschichte I. Grammatik/Histoire interne de la langue I. Grammaire*, in: Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin, Michael/ Schmitt, Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 5:2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1991, 1–18.

Lafuente y Alcántara, Emilio (ed.), *Ajbar machmûa* [*Akhbār madžmūˈa*], Madrid, Rivadeneyra, 1867 (reprint Madrid, El Bibliófilo, 1984).

Lagardère, Vincent, *Le vendredi de Zallāqa, 23 octobre 1086*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1989 (=1989a).

Lagardère, Vincent, *Les Almoravides jusqu'au règne de Yūsuf b. Tāšfīn (1039 – 1106)*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1989 (=1989b).

Lager, Johann Christian, *Urkundliche Geschichte der Abtei Mettlach*, Trier, Lintz, 1875.

Lair, cf. Dudo and Helmerichs.

Lampe = Lampe, Geoffrey, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, Clarendon, [11]1994.

Langlois, Ernest, *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les Chansons de geste imprimées*, Paris, Bouillon, 1904.

Langosch, Karl, *Überlieferungsgeschichte der mittellateinischen Literatur*, in: Langosch, Karl (ed.), *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung*, vol. 2, Zürich, Atlantis, 1964, 9–185.

Languedoc-HgL = Devic [also: de Vic], Dom Claude/ Vaissète,Dom Jean Joseph, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, modernised and continued by Alexandre du Mège et al., 16 vol., Toulouse, Privat, 1872–1905. [Of interest for us are the *preuves*.]

Laon-évêques = Dufour-Malbezin, Annie (ed.), *Actes des évêques de Laon des origines à 1151*, Paris, CNRS, 2001.

La Réole = Grellet-Balguerie, Charles (ed.), *Cartulaire du prieuré conventuel de Saint-Pierre de La Réole en Bazadais du IXe au XIIe siècle*, Archives historiques du Département de la Gironde 5 (1864), 99–186.

La Roë = *Cartularium Sanctae Mariae de Rota (Andegavensis dioecesis) arte et industria D. A. Sigoigne ad ipsius codicis speciem expressum tabulaque onomastica donatum a D.P. de Farcy edidit A. Angot*, vol. 1, [Laval, Goupil], 1904.

Lasteyrie, Robert de, *Étude sur les Comtes et Vicomtes de Limoges antérieurs à l'an 1000*, Paris, Franck, 1874 (Reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1977).

Lauer, Philippe, *Les plus anciennes mentions de Roland*, Romania 68 (1944–1945), 381–385.

Lauer, cf. also Helmerichs, Charles-le-Simple and Louis IV.

Lauranson-Rosaz, Christian, *La Paix populaire dans les montagnes d'Auvergne au Xe siècle*, in: Duranton, Henri (ed.), *Maisons de Dieu et Hommes d'Église, Florilège en l'honneur de Pierre-Roger Gaussin*, Saint-Étienne, CERCOR, 1992, 289–333.

Laurent, Joseph, *Byzance et les Turcs Seldjoucides dans l'Asie occidentale jusqu'en 1081*, Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1913.

Lautier, Jean, *La montagne de Bernicaut*, Revue du Tarn, 3e série, cahier 50 (juin 1968), 163–182.

Lautier, Jean, *Berniquaut, commune de Sorèze, Tarn*, Travaux et recherches, Bulletin de la Fédération Tarnaise de Spéléo-archéologie 14 (1977), 173–191.

Lavisse, Ernest, *Histoire de France illustrée*, t. 2:1, Paris, Hachette, 1911.

LCI = Kirschbaum SJ, Engelbert (ed.), *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, 8 vol., Herder, Freiburg, 1968–1976.

Le Blant, Edmond, *Étude sur les sarcophages chrétiens antiques de la ville d'Arles*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1878.

Leblond, B., *«Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet»*, Annales de Normandie 7 (1957), 159–163.

Leccisotti, Don Tommaso (Domenico), *Il «Monasterium Terrae Maioris»*, Montecassino, Abbazia, 1942 (reprint Torremaggiore, Comune, 1982).

Lecouteux, Claude, *Les cynocéphales. Étude d'une tradition tératologique de l'Antiquité au XIIe siècle*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 24 (1981), 117–128 und Tafel.

Lecouteux, Claude, *Les monstres dans la littérature allemande du moyen âge*, 3 vol., Göppingen, Kümmerle, 1982.

Lecoy, Félix, review of Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, *La Chanson de Roland et la tradition épique des Francs* (Paris, Picard, ²1960), in: Romania 84 (1963), 88–133.

Le Gentil, Pierre, *La Chanson de Roland* (Connaissance des Lettres 43), Paris, Hatier-Boivin, 1955.

Lehmann, Paul, *Judas Ischariot in der Legendenüberlieferung des Mittelalters*, in: Lehmann, Paul, *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 2, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1959, 229–286 (quoted from the supplemented reprint in Studi Medievali, nuova serie, 3 (1930), 289–346).

LEI = Pfister, Max, and (from vol. 8) Schweickard, Wolfgang, *Lessico etimologico italiano*, *LEI*, Wiesbaden, Reichert, 1979–.

Leib, Bernard, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XIᵉ siècle*, Paris, Picard, 1924.

Leib, Bernard, cf. also Anna Comnène.

Leithäuser, Joachim G., *Mappae mundi*, Berlin, Safari-Verlag, 1958.

Lejeune, Rita, *Recherches sur le thème: les chansons de geste et l'histoire*, Liège, Faculté de Pilosophie et de Lettres, 1948.

Lejeune, Rita, *Les noms d'épées dans la Chanson de Roland*, in: Salverda de Grave, Jacques, et al. (edd.), *Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature romanes offerts à Mario Roques*, vol. 1, Baden-Baden, Arts et Sciences/ Paris,Didier, 1950, 149–166 (=1950a).

Lejeune, Rita, *La naissance du couple littéraire «Roland et Olivier»*, Annaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves 10 (1950), 371–401 (=1950b).

Lejeune, Rita, *Rôle littéraire de la famille d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 1 (1958), 319–337.

Lejeune, Rita, *La signification du nom «marche» dans la Chanson de Roland*, Boletim de Filologia 18 (1959), 263–274.

Lejeune, Rita, *Le péché de Charlemagne et la Chanson de Roland*, in: *Studia Philologica, Homenaje ofrecido a Dámaso Alonso*, vol. 2, Madrid, Gredos, 1961, 339–371.

Lejeune, Rita, *La légende de Roland dans l'art italien du moyen âge*, in: *Atti del Convegno internazionale sul tema: la poesia épica e la sua formazione (Roma 28 marzo – 3 aprile 1969)*, Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1970, 299–314.

Lejeune, Rita, *La légende de Roland et la fausse donation de Fulrad*, Le Moyen Âge 81 (1975), 191–210.

Lejeune, Rita, *Le héros Roland, mythe ou personnage historique?*, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, 5ᵉ série, 65 (1979), 145–165.

Lejeune, Rita, *Les «ports» et les Pyrénées dans la Chanson de Roland*, in: D'Heur, Jean-Marie (ed.), *Études de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offertes à Jules Horrent à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversiaire*, Liège, D'Heur, 1980, 247–253.

Lejeune, Rita, *Le nom de «Vivien», héros épique. Étude anthroponymique*, in: Álvar, Carlos (ed.), *Symposium in honorem prof. M. de Riquer*, Barcelona, Edició dels Quaderns Crema, 1986, 115–136.

Lejeune, Rita/ Stiennon, Jacques, *La légende de Roland dans l'art du moyen âge*, 2 vol., Bruxelles, Arcade, 1966.

Le Laboureur, Claude, *Les masures de l'abbaye royale de l'isle Barbe lez Lyon*, Lyon, Galbit, 1665.

Le Maho, Jacques, *Une source perdue de la Chanson de Roland*, in: Guéret-Laferté, Michèle/ Lenoir, Nicolas (edd.) *La Fabrique de Normandie. Actes du colloque international*

organisé à l'Université de Rouen en décembre 2011, Publications numériques du CÉRÉdI, 2013, URL: http://ceredi.labos.univ-rouen.fr/?une-source-perdue-de-la-chanson-de.html.

Le Mans-Cath. = Cauvin, A. (ed.), *Chartularium insignis ecclesiae Cenomanensis quod dicitur Liber albus capituli*, Institut des Provinces de France, 2ᵉ série, t.2, Le Mans, Monnoyer, 1869.

Le Mans-S.Vincent = Charles, Robert/ Menjot d'Elbenne, le Vicomte (edd.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Vincent du Mans*, 2 vol., Le Mans, 1886–1913.

Lema Pueyo, José Ángel (ed.), *Colección diplomatica de Alfonso I de Aragón y Pamplona (1104–1134)*, San Sebastián, Eusko Ikaskuntza, 1990.

Lemarignier, Jean-François, *Recherches sur l'hommage en marche et les frontières féodales*, Lille, Bibliothèque Universitaire, 1945.

Le Prévost, cf. Ordericus.

Lérins = Moris, Henri/ Blanc, Edmond (edd.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Lérins*, 2 vol., Paris, Champion, 1883–1905.

Le Strange, Guy, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., 1905 (reprint London, Cass, 1966).

Lesueur, Frédéric, *Thibaud le Tricheur*, Mémoires de la Société des Sciences et Lettres de Loir-et-Cher 33 (1963), 5–242.

Levillain, Léon, *Les Nibelungen historiques et leurs alliances de famille*, Annales du Midi 49 (1937), 337–407.

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *La Mora Zaida, femme d'Alphonse VI., et leur fils l'infant don Sancho*, Hespéris 18 (1934), 1–8, reprinted in Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *Islam d'Occident*, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1948, 139–146.

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *La Mora Zaida, belle-fille d'al Muʿtamid*, Hespéris 18 (1934), 200–201, reprinted in: Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *Islam d'Occident*, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1948, 146–148.

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *La Péninsule Ibérique au Moyen-Age: d'après le «Kitab ar-rawd al- miʿtar fi habar al-aktar»* [*Kitāb al-Rawḍ al-miʿṭār fi kh abar al-aḳṭār*] *d'Ibn ʿAbd al-Munʿim al-Himyari* [*al-Ḥimyarī*] Leiden, Brill, 1938.

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste/García Gómez, Emilio, *Novedades sobre la batalla llamada de al-Zallāqa (1086), I, Una versión oficial de la batalla*, al-Andalus 15 (1950), 111–135 (=1950a).

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *Le rôle de la Marche Supérieure dans l'histoire politique de l'Espagne califienne*, Pirineos 6 (1950), 35–50 (=1950b).

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *Le titre souverain des Almoravides et sa légitimation par le califat ʿabbāside*, Arabica 2 (1955), 265–280 (=1955a).

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste (ed. with French transl.), *Les «mémoires» de ʿAbdallah, dernier roi Ziride de Granade*, al-Qāhira, Dār al-Maʿārif, 1955 (=1955b).

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *España musulmana hasta la caída del Califato de Córdoba*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, ²1957.

Lévi-Provençal, Évariste, *España musulmana hasta la caída del Califato de Córdoba, Instituciones y vida social e intelectual*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, ²1965.

Levison, Wilhelm, *Bonn – Verona*, Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 1 (1931), 351–357.

Levy, Raphael, *Contribution à la lexicographie française selon d'anciens textes d'origine juive*, Syracuse NY, Syracuse U.P., 1960.

Levy Wb = Levy, Jacob, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, 4 vol., Berlin, Harz, ²1924 (reprint Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963).

Lewicki, Tadeusz, *Słowianie nad Menem w relacji al-Masʿūdīego?*, Onomastica 7 (1961), 317–326.

Lex, Léonce, *Eudes, comte de Blois, de Tours, de Chartres, de Troyes et de Meaux (995–1037), et Thibaud son frère (995–1004)*, Troyes, Dufour, 1892.

Lexer = Lexer, Matthias, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*, 3 vol., Leipzig, Hirzel, 1872–1878 (reprint Stuttgart, Hirzel, 1979).

Lézat = Ourliac, Paul/ Magnou,Anne-Marie (edd.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Lézat*, 2 vol., Paris, CTHS, 1984–1987.

LFM = Rosell, Miquel/ Javier,Francisco (edd.), *«Liber feudorum maior»: Cartulario que se conserva en el Archivo de la Corona de Aragón*, 2 vol., Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1945–1947.

Liebrecht, Felix, review of Gautier, Léon (ed.), *La Chanson de Roland* (Tours, Mame, 1880), in: Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie 1 (1880), 178–181 (=1880a).

Liebrecht, Felix, *Zur Chanson de Roland*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 4 (1880), 371–373 (=1880b).

Liège-S.Croix = Poncelet, Edouard, *Inventaire analytique des chartes de la collégiale de Sainte-Croix à Liège*, vol. 1, Bruxelles, Weissenbruch, 1911.

LiGotti, Ettore, *La Chanson de Roland e i Normanni*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1949.

LiGotti, Ettore, *Sopravvivenza delle leggende carolingie in Sicilia*, Palermo, Sansoni Antiquariato, 1956.

Limoges = Font-Réaulx, Jacques de (ed.), *Sancti Stephani Lemovicensis Cartularium*, Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin 68 (1919), 1–258.

Liré = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Cartae de Liriaco*, Archives d'Anjou 2 (1850), 15–27.

LM = *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 9 vol., study edition, München, dtv, 2003.

LMLMAe = Bernhard, Michael, *Lexicon musicum Latinum medii aevi*, München, BayrAdW, 1992–.

Löffel, Kurt, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von «montjoie», mit einem Anhang über die Sitte des Steinwerfens und die Bildung von Steinhaufen*, Tübingen, Göbel, 1934.

Löfstedt, Lena, *Les neveux de Charlemagne*, Neuphilologische Mitteilungen 91 (1990), (487–489).

Lombard, Maurice, *Études d'économie médiévales*, vol. 1, *Monnaie et histoire d'Alexandre à Mahomet*, Paris, Mouton, 1971 (=1971a).

Lombard, Maurice, *L'Islam dans sa première grandeur*, Paris, Flammarion, 1971 (=1971b).

Lombard, Maurice, *Espaces et réseaux du haut moyen âge*, Paris, Mouton, 1972.

Lombard, Maurice, *Études d'économie médiévales*, vol. 2, *Les métaux dans l'Ancien Monde du Ve au XIe siècle*, Paris, Mouton, 1974.

Lombard, Maurice, *Études d'économie médiévales*, vol. 3, *Les textiles dans le monde musulman du VIIe au XIIe siècle*, Paris, Mouton, 1978.

Lombard-Jourdan, Anne, *«Montjoie et saint Denis!» Le centre de la Gaule aux origines de Paris et de Saint-Denis*, Paris, Presses du CNRS, 1989.

Lombard-Jourdan, Anne, *«Munjoie!», «Montjoie» et «Monjoie»*, Nouvelle Revue d'Onomastique 21–22 (1993), 159–180.

Lomnitzer, Helmut/ Müller, Ulrich (edd.), *Tannhäuser: die lyrischen Gedichte der Handschriften C und J*, Göppingen, Kümmerle, 1973.

Longnon, Auguste, *Recherches sur une famille noble dite «de Paris» au XIe, XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France 6 (1879), 132–144.

Longnon, Auguste, *Documents relatifs au comté de Champagne et de Brie 1172–1361*, vol. 1, *Les fiefs*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1901.

Longnon, Auguste, *Atlas historique de la France depuis César jusqu'à nos jours*, vol. 1, Paris, Hachette, 1912.

Longnon, Auguste, *Les noms de lieu de la France*, Paris, Champion, 1929.

Longpérier, Adrien de, *Cent deniers de Pépin, de Carloman et de Charlemagne, découverts près d'Imphy en Nivernais*, Revue numismatique, nouvelle série, 3 (1858), 202–262 (=1858a).

Longpérier, Adrien de, *Deniers de Waïfre, duc d'Aquitaine; monétaires de Pépin et de Charlemagne*, Revue numismatique, nouvelle série, 3 (1858), 331–337 (= 1858b).

Longpont = Marion, Jules (ed.), *Le cartulaire du prieuré de Notre-Dame de Longpont de l'Ordre de Cluny*, Lyon, Perrin & Marinet, 1879.

Loomis, cf. Hibbard Loomis.

Lorraine-Calmet = Calmet, Dom Augustin, *Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Lorraine*, 7 vol., Nancy, Leseure, [2]1745–1757.

Lorsch = Glöckner, Karl (ed.), *Codex Laureshamensis*, 3 vol., Darmstadt, Historischer Verein für Hessen, 1929–1936.

Lot, Ferdinand, *Geoffroi Grisegonelle dans l'épopée*, Romania 19 (1890), 377–393.

Lot, Ferdinand, *Les derniers carolingiens*, Paris, Bouillon, 1891.

Lot, Ferdinand, *L'élément historique de Garin le Lorrain*, in: Ardaillon, E., et al. (edd.), *Études d'histoire du Moyen Âge dédiées à Gabriel Monod*, Paris, Cerf, 1896, 201–220.

Lot, Ferdinand, *Mélanges Carolingiens*, I, *Veteres domus*, Le Moyen Âge 17 (1904), 468–477.

Lot, Ferdinand, *Études sur les légendes épiques françaises*, II, *Girard de Roussillon*, Romania 52 (1926), 257–295.

Lot, Ferdinand, *Études sur les légendes épiques françaises*, V, *La Chanson de Roland*, Romania 54 (1928), 357–380.

Lot, Ferdinand, *L'art militaire et les armées au Moyen Âge en Europe et dans le Proche-Orient*, 2 vol., Paris, Payot, 1946.

Lot, Ferdinand, *Études sur les légendes épiques françaises*, Paris, Champion, 1958 (reprint of the essays of this supertitle from Romania 52–54 (1926–1928)).

Lot, Ferdinand, cf. also Lothaire/Louis V.

Lot, Ferdinand/ Fawtier, Robert, *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen-âge*, 3 vol., Paris, P.U.F., 1957–1962.

Lot, Ferdinand/ Halphen, Louis, *Le règne de Charles le Chauve (840–877)*, vol. 1 [840–851, only this appeared], Paris, Champion, 1909 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1975).

Loth, Joseph, *Les noms des saints bretons*, Paris, Champion, 1910.

Loth, Joseph (transl.), *Les Mabinogion et autres romans gallois du Livre rouge de Hergest et du Livre blanc de Rhydderch*, 2 vol., Paris, Fontemoing, [2]1913.

Lothaire/Louis V = Halphen, Louis/ Lot, Ferdinand (edd.), *Recueil des actes de Lothaire et de Louis V, rois de France (954–987)*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1908.

Louis le Bègue etc. = Grat, Félix (ed.), *Recueil des actes de Louis le Bègue, Louis III et Carloman II, rois de France (877–884)*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1978.

Louis III, cf. Louis le Bégue etc.

Louis-IV = Lauer, Philippe (ed.), *Recueil des actes de Louis IV, roi de France (936–954)*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1914.

Louis V, cf. Lothaire.

Louis-VI = Dufour, Jean (ed.), *Recueil des actes de Louis VI, roi de France (1108–1137)*, 4 vol., Paris, Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, diffusion De Boccard, 1992–1994.

Louis-VII-Luchaire = Luchaire, Achille, *Études sur les actes de Louis VII*, Paris, Picard, 1885 (reprint Bruxelles, Culture et civilisation, 1964).

Louis, René, *À propos des «Montjoie» autour de Vézelay. Sens successifs et etymologie du nom de «montjoie»*, Auxerre, Société des Fouilles, 1939.

Louis, René, *De l'Histoire à la légende: Girart, Comte de Vienne [...]*, 3 vol., Auxerre, Imprimerie Moderne, 1946–1947.

Louis, René, *Le préfixe inorganique* es- *dans les noms propres en ancien français*, in: *Festgabe Ernst Gamillscheg*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1952, 66–76.

Louis, René, *L'épopée française est carolingienne*, in: *Coloquios de Roncesvalles agosto 1955*, Zaragoza, Diputación Foral de Navarra, 1956, 327–460.

Louis, René, *La grande douleur pour la mort de Roland*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 3 (1960), 62–67.

Louis, René, *De Livier à Olivier*, in: Tyssens, Madeleine (ed.), *Mélanges de linguistique romane et de philologie médiévale offerts à M. Maurice Delbouille*, vol. 2, *Philologie médiévale*, Gembloux, Duculot, 1964, 447–476.

Louis, René, *À propos de l'épitaphe métrique d'Eggihard, sénéchal de Charlemagne (15 août 778)*, in: *Studi in onore di Italo Siciliano*, 2 vol., Firenze, Olschki, 1966, 686–710.

Löwe, Heinz, *Studien zu den Annales Xantenses*, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 8 (1950/1951), 59–99.

LRL = Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin, Michael/ Schmitt, Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik (LRL)*, 8 vol., Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1988–2005.

LThK = *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 13 vol. and index, Freiburg i. Br., Herder,[2]1957–1967; 11 vol. and index, Freiburg i. Br., Herder, [3]1993–2001.

Lubac, Henri de, *Exégèse médiévale*, 4 vol., Paris, Aubier, 1959–1964 (reprint Paris, Cerf, 1993).

Luchaire, Achille, *Les premiers Capétiens (987–1137)*, Paris, Hachette, 1901 (reprint Genève, Mégariotis, 1979).

Luchaire, Achille, *Études sur quelques manuscrits de Rome et de Paris*, Paris, Alcan, 1899.

Luchaire, Achille, *Louis VI le Gros, Annales de sa vie et de son règne (1081–1137)*, Paris, Picard, 1890.

Luchaire, cf. also Louis VII-Luchaire.

Lugge, Margret, *«Gallia» und «Francia» im Mittelalter*, Bonn, Röhrscheid, 1960.

Luschin von Ebengreuth, Arnold, *Allgemeine Münzkunde und Geldgeschichte des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*, München, Oldenbourg, [2]1926.

Luscombe, David (ed.)/Radice, Betty (transl. from Latin), *The Letter Collection of Peter Abelard and Heloise*, Oxford, Clarendon, 2013.

Mâcon = Ragut, Camille (ed.), *Cartulaire de Saint-Vincent de Mâcon*, Mâcon, Académie de Mâcon, 1864.

Madoz = Madoz, Pascual, *Diccionario geográfico-estadistico-histórico de España y sus posesiones de Ultramár*, 16 vol., Madrid, Madoz y Sagasti, 1847–1850.

Maenchen-Helfen, Otto, *Der Schuss auf die Sonnen*, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 44 (1937), 75–95.

Magnani Soares-Christen, Eliana, *Monastères et aristocratie en Provence, milieu X[e]–début XIIe siècle*, Münster, Lit, 1999.

Maier, Bernhard, *Lexikon der keltischen Religion und Kultur*, Stuttgart, Kröner, 1994.

Maillet-Guy, Dom L., *Les origines de Saint-Antoine (Isère)*, Bulletin de la Société départementale d'archéologie et de statistique de la Drôme 41 (1907), 91–106, 176–186, 319–327, 378–396, 42 (1908), 66–78, 182–186.

Maillezais = Lacurie, J.L., *Histoire de l'abbaye de Maillezais depuis sa fondation jusqu'à nos jours, suivie de pièces justificatives la plupart inédites*, Fontenay-le-Comte, Fillon, 1852.

Maine-Latouche = Latouche, Robert, *Histoire du Comté du Maine pendant le Xe et le XIe siècle*, Paris, Champion, 1910.

Maine-Marmoutier = Laurain, Ernest (ed.), *Cartulaire manceau de Marmoutier*, 2 vol., Laval, Goupil, 1911–1945.

Mallett, Alex, *The battle of Inab*, Journal of Medieval History 39 (2013), 48–60.

Mandach, André de, *Naissance et développement de la Chanson de geste en Europe*, vol. 1, *La Geste de Charlemagne et de Roland*, Genève, Droz, 1961.

Mandach, André de (ed.), *Chronique dite Saintongaise. Texte franco-occitan inédit «Lee»: à la découverte d'une chronique gasconne du XIIIe siècle et de sa poitevinisation*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1970.

Mandach, André de, *Le problème de la présence de Roland à la défaite pyrénéenne de 778. Pour une nouvelle édition critique de la Vita Karoli*, in: Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, et al. (edd.), *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien*, *Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 1, Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay, Musée archéologique régional, 1982, 363–378.

Mandach, André de, *La prise de Nobles et de Gormaise par Roland*, in: *Essor et fortune [...]*, Actes du IXe Congrès international de la Société Rencesvals, 2 vol., Modena, Mucchi, 1984, 717–728.

Mandach, André de, *Oxford, copiste ou rénovateur de génie?*, Revue des Langues Romanes 94 (1990), 1–9.

Mandach, André de, *Naissance et développement de la Chanson de geste en Europe*, vol. 6, *Chanson de Roland, transferts de mythe dans le monde occidental et oriental*, Genève, Droz, 1993.

Manitius, Max (ed.), *Anonymi de situ orbis libri duo*, Stuttgart, Cotta, 1884.

Manitius, Max, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vol., München, Beck, 1911–1931 (reprint München, Beck, 1964–1965).

Manteyer, Georges de, *Les origines de la maison de Savoie en Bourgogne*, *910–1060*, 3 vol., Roma, Cuggiani et al., 1899–1904.

Manteyer, Georges de, *La Provence du Ier au XIIe siècle*, Paris, Picard, 1908.

Manteyer, Georges de, *La Chanson de Roland et le pape bourguignon Calixte II*, Bulletin de la Société d'Études des Hautes-Alpes 52 (1933), Nr. 5–8.

Marca, Petrus de, *Marca Hispanica*, Paris, Muguet, 1688 (reprint Barcelona, Base, 1972).

Marchegay, Paul/Mabille Émile (edd.), *Chroniques des églises d'Anjou*, Paris, Renouard, 1869.

Marcigny = Richard, Jean, *Le cartulaire de Marcigny-sur-Loire (1045–1144), essai de reconstitution d'un manuscrit disparu*, Dijon, Bernigaud & Privat, 1957.

Marcos Marín, Francisco, *Notas de literatura medieval (Alejandro, Mainete, Marco Polo ...) desde la investigación léxica de «brahman» y sus variantes*, Vox Romanica 36 (1977), 121–161.

Marcos Marín, Francisco, *El nombre en árabe de Toledo*, in: *Homenaje a Álvaro Galmés de Fuentes*, vol. 2, Madrid, Gredos, 1985, 599–607.

Marmardji, Augustin-Sébastien, *Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine*, Paris, Gabalda, 1951.

Marquart, Josef, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig, Dieterich, 1903.

Marquette, Jean-Bernard, *Les Albret, I: Les origines (XIe siècle–1240)*, Cahiers du Bazadais 30–31 (1975) [both issues contain only this contribution].

Marseille = Guérard, Benjamin (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Marseille*, 2 vol., Paris, Lahure, 1857.

Martène, Edmond, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*, vol. 1, pars 2, Rouen, Behourt, 1700; vol. 3, ibd., 1702.

Martène, Edmond/ Durand, Ursin, *Veterum scriptorum […] amplissima collectio*, 9 vol., Paris, Montalant, 1724–1733.

Martin, Gabriel (ed.), *Ordinaire de l'abbaye Saint-Pierre d'Airvault*, Poitiers, Archives historiques, 1911.

Martin, Jean-Baptiste, *Frankoprovenzalisch, Francoprovençal*, in: Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin, Michael/ Schmitt, Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 5:1, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1990, 671–685.

Martinet, Suzanne/ Merlette, Bernard, *Ganelon, évêque de Laon, contemporain de Charlemagne*, in: Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, et al. (edd.), *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien*, *Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 1, Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay, Musée archéologique régional, 1982, 67–84.

Martínez, Salvador, *El «Poema de Almería» y la épica románica*, Madrid, Gredos, 1975.

Mas-Latrie, Louis de, *Traités de paix et de commerce et documents divers concernant les relations des chrétiens avec les Arabes de l'Afrique septentrionale au moyen âge*, 2 vol., Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1865–1868.

Mas-Latrie, Louis de, *Trésor de chronologie, d'histoire et de géographie*, Paris, Palmé, ²1889 (reprint Torino, Bottega d'Erasmo, 1969).

Mason, Emma, *The Mauduits and their Chamberlainship of the Exchequer*, Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 49 (1976), 1–23.

Masson, Paul (ed.), *Les Bouches-du-Rhône, Encyclopédie départementale*, vol. 2, *Antiquité et Moyen Âge*, Paris, Champion, 1924.

Masʿūdī, *Les Prairies d'or*, French transl. by Charles Pellat et al., 2 vol., Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1962–1965.

Masʿūdī, *The Meadows of Gold. The Abbasids*, edd. (with Engl. transl.) Lunde, Paul/ Stone, Caroline, London, Keagan, 1989.

Mazel, Florian, *La noblesse et l'Église en Provence, fin X^e–début XIVe siècle*, Paris, CTHS, 2002.

Mazur, Jan, *Geschichte der polnischen Sprache*, Frankfurt a. M., Lang, 1993.

McMillan, Duncan, *Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland?*, Modern Language Review 47 (1952), 334–339.

Meazey, Peter, *Dinan au temps des seigneurs*, Guingamp, La Plomée, 1997.

MED = Kurath, Hans, et al., *A Middle English Dictionary*, 12 vol. and suppl., Ann Arbor MI, U. of Michigan P., 1952–2001.

Megas, Georgios A., Ὁ Ἰούδας εἰς τας παραδόσεις τοῦ λαοῦ, in: Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Λαογραφικοῦ Ἀρχείου 3–4 (1941–1942) [1951], 3–32.

Meier, Christel/ Suntrup, Rudolf, *Zum Lexikon der Farbenbedeutungen im Mittelalter*, Frühmittelalterliche Studien 21 (1987), 390–478.

Mellor, Geoffrey, *The Route of Charlemagne in the Chanson de Roland*, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 31 (1965–1966), 167–176.

Ménager, Léon-Robert, *Amiratus-Ἀμηρᾶς*, Paris, S.E. V.P.E.N., 1960.

Ménager, Léon-Robert (ed.), *Recueil des actes des Ducs normands d'Italie, Les premiers ducs (1046–1087)*, Bari, Società di Storia Patria per la Puglia, 1980.

Ménard, Philippe, *Le rire et le sourire dans le Roman courtois en France au Moyen Âge (1150–1250)*, Genève, Droz, 1969.

Ménard, Philippe, *L'édition du «Devisement du monde» de Marco Polo*, Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 149 (2005), 407–435.

Ménard, Philippe, cf. also Marco Polo.

Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino, *Antología de Poetas Líricos Castellanos* (Edición Nacional del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas), vol. 6, Santander, Aldus, 1944.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, *«Galiene la Belle» y los palacios de Galiana en Toledo*, Anales de la Universidad de Madrid, Letras, 1 (1932), quoted from the reprint in: Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, *Poesía árabe y poesía europea*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1941, 79–106.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, *La Chanson de Roland et la tradition épique des Francs*, Paris, Picard, ²1960.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, *La España del Cid*, 2 vol., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, ⁷1969.

Mercier, Ernest, *Histoire de l'Afrique Septentrionale (Berbérie) depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la conquête française*, Paris, Leroux, 1888.

Mercier, Louis, *La chasse et les sports chez les Arabes*, Paris, Rivière, 1927.

Meredith-Jones, Cyril (ed.), *«Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi», ou Chronique du Pseudo-Turpin, textes revus et publiés d'après 49 manuscrits*, Paris, Droz, 1936 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1972).

Méril, Édélestand du, cf. Du Méril.

Merk, C. Josef, *Anschauungen über die Lehre und das Leben der Kirche im altfranzösischen Heldenepos*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1914.

Mesves-sur-Loire = Lespinasse, René de (ed.), *Titres du prieuré de Mèves-sur-Loire, XIIᵉ–XVIIIᵉ siècle*, Bulletin de la Société Nivernaise des Lettres, Sciences et Arts 7 (1899), 171–232.

Metcalf, D.M., *Coins of Pepin minted at Saint-Denis?*, Cunobelin 11 (1965), 19–29, 54.

Metcalf, D.M., *Artistic borrowing, imitation and forgery in the eighth century*, Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik 6 (1966), 379–392.

Metz, Martin, *Bäume im Rolandslied*, in: Bergerfurth, Wolfgang (ed.), *Festschrift für Rupprecht Rohr zum 60. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg, Groos, 1979, 321–326.

Metz, Martin, *Zur Tradition und Perspektive in der Geographie der Chanson de Roland*, Frankfurt a. M., Haag & Herchen, 1981.

Metzeltin, Michael, *Venezianisch und Italienisch in Dalmatien/Veneziano e Italiano in Dalmazia* in: Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin, Michael/ Schmitt, Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 4, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1988, 551–569.

Meuthen, Erich, *Karl der Große – Barbarossa – Aachen, Zur Interpretation des Karlsprivilegs für Aachen*, in: Braunfels, Wolfgang/ Schramm,Percy Ernst (edd.), *Karl der Große, Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 4, *Das Nachleben*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, ²1967, 54–76.

Meyer, Paul, *«Chenelius», «Canineus»*, Romania 7 (1878), 441–444.

Meyer, Paul, *Les premières compilations françaises d'histoire ancienne*, I, Romania 14 (1885), 1–81.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm, *Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache*, vol. 2, *Wortbildungslehre*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1921.

MGH = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*; with the following series titles: AA. = *Auctores antiquissimi*, Capit.r.F. = *Capitularia regum Francorum*, Conc.= *Concilia*, Const. = *Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum*, DD.mer. = *Die Urkunden der Merowinger*, DD.kar. = *Diplomata Karolinorum*, DD.burg. = *Die Urkunden der burgundischen Rudolfinger*, DD.dt.KK. = *Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser*, DD.lat.K.Jer. = *Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, Ep.mer.&kar. = *Epistolae aevi merovingici et karolini*, F.iur.schol. = *Fontes iuris germanici antiqui in usum scholarum separati editi*, LC. = *Libri Confraternitatum Sancti Galli, Augiensis, Fabariensis, ed. Paul Piper* (the documents quoted from the Reichenau are verified in the more recent facsimile edition L.mem.n.s. 1), L.mem. = *Libri memoriales*, L.mem.n.s. = *Libri memoriales et necrologia, nova series*, LL. = *Leges*, Ord. = *Die Ordines für die Weihe und Krönung des Kaisers und der Kaiserin*, PLAeC. = *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini*, SS. = *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, SS.Lang. = *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*, SS.mer. = *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, SS.n.s. = *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, nova series*, SS.schol. = *Scriptores in usum scholarum separatim editi*.

Michaëlsson, Karl, *Études sur les noms de personne français d'après les rôles de taille parisiens (rôles de 1292, 1296–1300, 1313)*, 3 vol., Uppsala, Almquist & Wiksell, 1927–1936.

Michel, Francisque, *Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication et l'usage des étoffes de soie, d'or et d'argent [...]*, 2 vol., Paris, Crapelet, then Lahure, 1852–1854.

Michelena, Luís, *Fonética Histórica Vasca*, San Sebastián, Diputación Foral de Gipuzkoa, [3]1990.

Mickel, Emanuel (ed.), *«Les Enfances Godefroi» and «Le Retour de Cornumarant»*, Tuscaloosa, University of Alabama Press, 1999.

Migliorini, Bruno, *Notarella rolandiana*, Studi Medievali, nuova serie 9 (1936), 181–187.

Migliorini, Bruno, *A proposito di «Oriflamme» e «Orifiamma»*, Revue Roumaine de Linguistique 20 (1975), 543–545.

Migne, Jacques Paul, cf. PG and PL.

Milà y Fontanals, Manuel, *De la poesía heroico-popular castellana*, Barcelona, Verdaguer, 1874 (reprint Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1959).

Millàs Vallicrosa, Josep M., *Els textos d'historiadors musulmans referents a la Catalunya Carolingia*, Quaderns d'Estudi 14 (1922), 51ss., quoted from offprint with its own pagination.

Miller, Konrad, *Mappaemundi: die ältesten Weltkarten*, 6 vol., Stuttgart, Roth, 1895–1898.

Miller, Konrad, *Mappae arabicae, Arabische Welt- und Länderkarten*, vol. 2, *Die Länder Europas und Afrikas im Bilde der Araber*, Stuttgart, self-published by the author, 1927.

Mireaux, Émile, *La Chanson de Roland et l'histoire de France*, Paris, Michel, 1943.

Miret y Sans, Joaquim, *Los noms personals y geogràfichs de la encontrada de Terrasa en los segles X y XI*, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 7 (1913–1914), 385–407, 485–497.

Mischlewski, Adalbert, *Grundzüge der Geschichte des Antoniterordens bis zum Ausgang des 15. Jahrhunderts*, Köln, Böhlau, 1976.

Mlat.Wb. = Prinz, Otto, et al. (edd.), *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*, München, Beck 1967–.

MLLM = Niermeyer, Jan Frederik/van de Kieft, C./Burgers, J.W.J. *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, [2]2002.

Moisan, André, *Répertoire des noms propres de personnes et de lieux cités dans les Chansons de geste françaises et les œuvres étrangères dérivées*, 3 tomes in 5 vol., Genève, Droz, 1986.

Moisan, André, review of Gicquel, Bernard, *Généalogie de la Chanson de Roland* (Paris, Publibook, 2003), in: Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 49 (2006), 188–189.

Moldenhauer, Gerhard, *Herzog Naimes im altfranzösischen Epos*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1922.

Molesmes = Laurent, Jacques (ed.), *Cartulaires de l'abbaye de Molesmes, ancien diocèse de Langres (916–1250)*, vol. 2, Paris, Picard, 1911.

Mombritius, Boninus, *Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum*, vol. 1, Paris, Fontemoing, 1910 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1978).

Monés, Ḥussayn, *Les Almoravides*, Revista del Instituto de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid 14 (1967–1968), 49–102.

Montbéliard = Tuetey, M. (ed.), *Recueil chronologique de documents relatifs aux comtes de Montbéliard*, Montbéliard, Société de Montbéliard, s. a.

Montier-en-Der = Bouchard, Constance Brittain (ed.), *The Cartulary of Montier-en-Der, 666–1129*, Toronto, Toronto U.P., 2004.

Montjuich = Carreras y Candi, Francesch, *Lo Montjuich de Barcelona*, Memorias de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 8 (1903), 197–450.

Mont-Saint-Michel = Keats-Rohan, K.S.B. (ed.), *The Cartulary of the Abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel*, Donington, Shaun Tyas, 2006. [This excellent edition offers only the original cartulary produced a. 1149/1150, namely Bibliothèque municipale d'Avranches nº 210 to f. 112r of the modern foliation (which is 4 units higher than the late medieval one). The additional materials are recorded according to the facsimile edition Poulle, Emmanuel/ Bouet,Pierre/ Desbordes,Olivier (edd.), *Cartulaire du Mont- Saint-Michel*, Mont-Saint-Michel, Amis du Mont-Saint-Michel, 2005.]

Moralejo, Abelardo, et al. (transl.), *«Liber Sancti Jacobi», Codex Calixtinus, traducción*, Santiago de Compostela, Instituto Padre Sarmiento de Estudios Gallegos, 1951.

Morlaàs = Cadier, Léon (ed.), *Cartulaire de Sainte-Foi de Morlaàs*, Pau, Ribaut, 1884.

Morlet, Marie-Thérèse, *Étude d'anthroponymie picarde. Les noms de personne en Haute Picardie aux XIIIe, XIVe, XVe siècles*, Amiens, Musée de Picardie, 1967.

Morlet = Morlet, Marie-Thérèse, *Les noms de personne sur le territoire de l'ancienne Gaule du VIe au XIIe siècle*, vol. 1, *Les noms issus du germanique continental et les créations gallogermaniques*, Paris, CNRS, 1971.

Morlet, Marie-Thérèse, *Les noms de personne sur le territoire de l'ancienne Gaule du VIe au XIIe siècle*, vol. 2, *Les noms latins ou transmis par le latin*, Paris, CNRS, 1972.

Morrison, Karl Frederick/Grunthal, Henry, *Carolingian Coinage*, New York, American Numismatic Society, 1967.

Mortier, Raoul, *La Chanson de Roland, essai d'interprétation du problème des origines, quelques suggestions nouvelles*, Paris, Union latine d'éditions, 1939.

Moyse, Gérard, review of Lombard-Jourdan, Anne, *«Montjoie et saint Denis!» Le centre de la Gaule aux origines de Paris et de Saint-Denis* (Paris, Presses du CNRS, 1989), in: Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 149 (1991), 177–179.

Müller, Klaus (transl.), *Itineraria Rossica. Altrussische Reiseliteratur*, Leipzig, Reclam, ²1991.

Müller, Ludolf (ed.), *Die Nestorchronik*, München, Fink, 2001.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, *Das Heilige Land. Ein archäologischer Führer*, München, Piper, 1981.

Muthesius, Anna. *Byzantine Silk Weaving, A.D. 400 to A.D. 1200*, Wien, Fassbaender, 1997.

Naumann, Nelly, *Die bedrohte Schöpfung und ihre Errettung*, in: Heindrichs, Ursula/ Heindrichs, Heinz-Albert (edd.), *Märchen und Schöpfung*, Regensburg, Röth, 1993,

Navarra-Johanniter = García Larragueta, Santos A., *El gran priorado de Navarra de la orden de San Juan de Jerusalén*, vol. 2, Pamplona, Diputación Foral de Navarra, 1957.

Navarro Tomás, Tomás, *Manual de pronunciación española*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, [15]1970.

Nègre, Ernest, *Toponymie générale de la France*, 4 vol., Genève, Droz, 1990–1998.

Nelis, H., *Saint Mathieu, Saint Mathias dans la chronologie belge du Moyen-Âge*, Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 17 (1938), 147–156.

Nelson, Jan A. (ed.), *«Le Chevalier au Cygne» and «La Fin d'Elias»*, University AL, U. of Alabama P., 1985.

Néronville = Stein, Henri (ed.), *Recueil des chartes du prieuré de Néronville près Château-Landon*, Annales de la Société historique et archéologique du Gâtinais 13 (1895), 298–373.

Nestorchronik, cf. Cross/Sherbowitz-Wetzor, Müller and Tschižewskij.

Neubauer, Adolf/ Stern, Moritz (edd.), *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge*, Berlin, 1892 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1997).

Neue Pauly, Der, Enzyklopädie der Antike, edd. Cancik, Hubert/ Schneider, Helmuth, 16 vol., Stuttgart, Metzler, 1996–2003.

Neustria-du-Monstier = Du Monstier, Arthur, *Neustria Pia*, Rouen, 1663 [*Neustria* here means *«Normandie»*].

Nevers = Lespinasse, René de (ed.), *Cartulaire de Saint-Cyr de Nevers*, Nevers, Gremion, 1916.

NGML = Blatt, Franz, et al. (edd.), *Novum Glossarium mediae Latinitatis*, Hafniae, Munksgaard, 1957–.

Niederle, Lubor, *Slovanské starožitností*, vol. 3 [=part 2:2], Praha, Bursík & Kohout, 1927.

Niederrhein = Lacomblet, Theodor (ed.), *Urkundenbuch für die Geschichte des Niederrheins*, vol. 1, 779–1200, Elberfeld, Schönian, 1840.

Niemeier, Wolf-Dietrich, *Griechenland, die Ägäis und das westliche Kleinasien in der Bronzezeit*, in: Latacz, Joachim, et al. (edd.), *Homer. Der Mythos von Troia in Dichtung und Kunst*, München, Hirmer, 2008, 72–80.

Nîmes = Germer-Durand, Eugène (ed.), *Cartulaire du Chapitre de l'Église cathédrale de Notre-Dame de Nîmes*, Nîmes, Catélan, 1874.

Nitze, W.A., *Some Remarks on the Origin of French «Montjoie»*, Romance Philology 9 (1955–1956), 11–17.

Nogent-le-Rotrou = Souancé, le vicomte Hector de/Métais, Charles, *Saint-Denis de Nogent-le-Rotrou (1031–1789), histoire et cartulaire*, Vannes, Lafolye, [2]1899.

Nolting-Hauff, Ilse, *Zur Psychoanalyse der Heldendichtung: das Rolandslied und die einfache Form «Sage»*, Poetica 10 (1978), 429–468.

Noordeloos, P., *La translation de Saint-Antoine en Dauphiné*, Analecta Bollandiana 60 (1942), 68–81.

Normandie-Ducs = Fauroux, Marie (ed.), *Recueil des actes des Ducs de Normandie (911–1066)*, Caen, Caron, 1961.

Normandie-S.Florent = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Chartes normandes de l'abbaye de Saint-Florent près Saumur*, Les-Roches-Baritaud (Vendée), 1879 (from Mémoires de la Société des antiquaires de Normandie 30, 1880, 663–711). *Nova Vulgata Bibliorum sacrorum editio*, Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1979. *Novae concordantiae bibliorum*

sacrorum iuxta vulgatam versionem critice editam, ed. Fischer, Bonifatius, 5 vol., Würzburg, Frommann & Holzboog, 1977.

Noyer-Weidner, Alfred, *Zur «Heidengeographie» im Rolandslied*, in: Stimm, Helmut/ Wilhelm, Julius (edd.), *Verba et vocabula. Festschrift für Ernst Gamillscheg*, München, Fink, 1968, 379–404, reprinted in: Noyer-Weidner, Alfred, *Umgang mit Texten*, ed. Hempfer, Klaus W., Stuttgart, 1986, vol. 1, 381–404.

Noyer-Weidner, Alfred, *Farbrealität und Farbsymbolik in der «Heidengeographie» des Rolandsliedes*, Romanische Forschungen 81 (1969), 22–59, reprinted in: Noyer- Weidner, Alfred, *Umgang mit Texten*, ed. Hempfer, Klaus W., Stuttgart, 1986, vol. 1, 405–432.

Noyer-Weidner, Alfred, *Vom biblischen «Gottesberg» zur Symbolik des «Heidentals» im Rolandslied*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 81 (1971), 13–66.

Noyer-Weidner, Alfred, *Kontextbedeutung und Wortsemantik. Zur Eingangslaisse des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes und zur «Berglage» von Saragossa*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 89 (1979), 289–318.

Noyers = Chevalier, Casimir (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Noyers*, Tours, Guilland-Verger, 1873. [Diocese of Tours, today in the parish of Nouâtre.]

Nyrop, Kristoffer, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, vol. 1 and 3, Copenhague, Gyldendal, [4]1935 and [2]1936 respectively [last hand editions] (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1979).

Obarra = Martín Duque, Ángel J. (ed.), *Colección diplomatica de Obarra (Siglos XI-XIII)*, Zaragoza, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1965.

OC = Coromines, Joan, *Onomasticon Cataloniae*, 8 vol., Barcelona, Curial, 1994–1997.

Ó Cathasaigh, Tomás, *The sister's son in Early Irish Literature*, Peritia 5 (1986), 128–160.

ODB = *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vol., Oxford, Oxford U.P., 1991.

ODNB = *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 60 vol., Oxford, Oxford U.P., 2004.

OED = *The Oxford English Dictionary*, *being a corrected re-issue*, 12 vol. and 5 suppl., Oxford, Clarendon, 1970–1986.

Oelsner, Ludwig, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter König Pippin*, Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1871 (reprint Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 1975).

Olschki, Leonardo, *Der ideale Mittelpunkt Frankreichs im Mittelalter in Wirklichkeit und Dichtung*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1913.

Olschki, Leonardo, *«Ci falt la geste … »*, Archivum Romanicum 19 (1935), 425–431.

Olschki, Leonardo, *Tervagant*, Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 14 (1959), 202–215.

Oman, Charles, *A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages*, vol. 1, *A.D. 378–1278*, New York, Franklin, [2]1924.

Oppenheimer, Sir Francis, *The Legend of the Sainte Ampoule*, London, Faber & Faber, 1953.

Ordericus, Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. Le Prévost, Auguste, 5 vol., Paris, Leroux, 1838–1855.

Oulx = Rivautella, Antonio/ Berta, Francesco (edd.), *Ulciensis Ecclesiae Chartarium*, Torino, Typis Regiis, 1753.

Oviedo-Catedral = García Larragueta, Santos (ed.), *Colección de documentos de la Catedral de Oviedo*, Oviedo, Diputación de Asturias, 1962.

Panofsky, Erwin, *Signum triciput*, in: Panofsky, Erwin, *Hercules am Scheidewege und andere antike Bildstoffe in der neueren Kunst*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1930, 1–36.

Paray-le-Monial = Chevalier, Ulysse (ed.), *Cartulaire du prieuré de Paray-le-Monial*, Paris, Picard, 1890.

Pardessus, Jules, *Diplomata, Cartae [...]*, 2 vol., Paris, Typographeum Civitatis, 1843–1849.

Paris, Gaston, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, Paris, Franck, 1865 (reprint with additional remarks Paris, Bouillon, 1905) (=1865a).

Paris, Gaston, *De Pseudo-Turpino*, Paris, Franck, 1865 (=1865b).

Paris, Gaston, *La géographie de la Chanson de Roland*, Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature 4:2 (1869), 173–176.

Paris, Gaston, *Noms de peuples paiens dans la Chanson de Roland*, Romania 2 (1873), 329–334 and 480.

Paris, Gaston, *Mainet, fragments d'une chanson de geste du XIIe siècle*, Romania 4 (1875), 305–337.

Paris, Gaston, *La Chanson du Pélerinage de Charlemagne*, Romania 9 (1880), 1–50.

Paris, Gaston, review of Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 4, issue 2/3, in: Romania 10 (1881), 299–305.

Paris, Gaston, *Sur la date et la patrie de la   Chanson de Roland   *, Romania 11 (1882), 400–409 [=1882a].

Paris, Gaston, *Le «Carmen de proditione Guenonis» et la légende de Roncevaux*, Romania 11 (1882b), 465–518.

Paris, Gaston, review of Thomas, Antoine, *Vivien d'Aliscans et la légende de Saint-Vidian* (in: *Études romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris*, Paris, Bouillon, 1891, 121–136), in: Romania 22 (1893), 142–145.

Paris, Gaston, review of Suchier, Hermann (ed.), *Aucassin et Nicolete* (Paderborn, Schöningh, ⁴1899), in: Romania 29 (1900), 287–292.

Paris, Gaston, review of Marignan, Albert, *La tapisserie de Bayeux* (Paris, Leroux, 1902), in: Romania 31 (1902), 404–418, plus postscriptum, 418–419 (=1902a).

Paris, Gaston, *Naimeri – nAymeric*, in: Battifol, Pierre (ed.), *Mélanges Léonce Couture*, Toulouse, Privat, 1902, 349–357 (=1902b).

Paris-Cart.gén. = Lasteyrie, Robert de (ed.), *Cartulaire général de Paris*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1887.

Paris-Montmartre = Barthélemy, Édouard de (ed.), *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye royale de Montmartre*, Paris, Champion, 1883.

Paris-Notre-Dame = Guérard, Benjamin (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'église Notre-Dame de Paris*, 4 vol., Paris, Crapelet, 1850.

Paris-S.Germain = Poupardin, René (ed.), *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Prés, des origines au début du XIIIe siècle*, vol 1, *558–1182*, Paris, Champion, 1909.

Paris-S.Magloire = Terroine, Anne/ Fossier, Lucie (edd.), *Chartes et documents de l'abbaye de Saint-Magloire*, vol. 1, Turnhout, Brepols, 1998.

Paris-S.Martin-des Champs = Depoin, Joseph (ed.), *Recueil de chartes et documents de Saint-Martin des Champs, monastère parisien*, 5 vol., Paris, Jouve, then Picard, 1912–1921.

Parisot, Robert, *Le royaume de Lorraine sous les Carolingiens*, Paris, Picard, 1898 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1975).

Parthey Not. = Parthey, Gustav (ed.), *Hieroclis «Synecdemus» et notitiae graecae episcopatuum*, Berlin, Nicolai, 1866 (reprint Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1967).

Paschini, Pio, *Storia del Friuli*, vol. 1, Udine, Aquileia, ²1953.

Pätzold, Steffen, *Einhards erste Leser: Zu Kontext und Darstellungsabsicht der «Vita Karoli»*, Viator 42, 2011, 33–55.

Pätzold, Steffen, *Ich und Karl der Große. Das Leben des Höflings Einhard*, Stuttgart, Klett- Cotta, 2013.

Pauly, cf. PW; *Kleine Pauly, Der*; *Neue Pauly, Der*.

Pauphilet, Albert, *Sur la Chanson de Roland*, Romania 59 (1933), 161–198.

Pellat, Charles, *Mahom, Tervagan, Apollin*, Primer Congreso de Estudios Árabes e Islámicos (Córdoba, 1962), Madrid, Comité Permanente del Congreso de Estudios Árabes e Islámicos, 1964, 265–269.

Pellat, Yvette/ Pellat, Charles, *L'idée de Dieu chez les «sarrasins» des chansons de geste*, Studia Islamica 22 (1965), 5–42.

Pellegrini, Giovan Battista, *Toponomastica italiana*, Milano, Hoepli, 1990.

Pellegrini, Silvio, *Studi rolandiani e trobadorici*, Bari, Adriatica Editrice, 1964.

Perdrizet, Paul, *L'archange Ouriel*, Seminarium Kondakovianum [Prag] 2 (1928), 241–276.

Pérès, Henri, *La poésie andalouse en arabe classique au XIe siècle*, Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve, ²1953.

Pérez de Urbel, Fray Justo, *Historia del Condado de Castilla*, 3 vol., Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1945.

Pérez de Urbel, Fray Justo/del Arco y Garay, Ricardo, *España cristiana: comienzo de la Reconquista (711–1038)*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1956, ⁷1997.

Périgord-S.Florent = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Chartes anciennes de Saint-Florent près Saumur pour le Périgord*, Périgueux, 1879.

Perman, R.C.P. (ed.), *Henri d'Arci: The Shorter Works*, in: Barnett, F.J., et al. (edd.), *Studies in medieval French presented to Alfred Ewert*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1961, 279–321.

Perschmann, Hermann, *Die Stellung von O in der Überlieferung des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes*, Marburg, Pfeil, 1880.

Petrus Tudebodus, cf. Tudebodus.

Peultier = Peultier, Étienne, *Concordantiarum universae scripturae sacrae thesaurus*, Paris, Lethielleux, 1897.

Pfaff, R.W., *Eadui Basan, Scriptorum Princeps?*, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 2 (1992), 267–283.

Pfister, Friedrich, *Kleine Schriften zum Alexanderroman*, Meisenheim am Glan, Hain, 1976.

Pfister, Max, *Lexikalische Untersuchungen zu Girart de Roussillon*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1970.

Pfister, Max, review of Lombard-Jourdan, Anne, *«Montjoie et saint Denis!» Le centre de la Gaule aux origines de Paris et de Saint-Denis* (Paris, Presses du CNRS, 1989), in: Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 109 (1993), 187–189.

Pfister, Max, cf. also LEI and *Rolandslied*.

PG = *Patrologiae cursus completus*, *Series Graeca*, ed. Migne, Jacques Paul, 104 vol., Paris, Migne, 1858–1912.

Philipon, Édouard, *Suffixes romans d'origine pré-latine*, Romania 43 (1914), 29–58.

Philippe-I = Prou, Maurice (ed.), *Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, roi de France (1059–1108)*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1908.

Pichon, Édouard, *Les principes de la suffixation en français*, Paris, d'Artrey, 1942.

Piel, Joseph M., *Nomes de «possessores» latino-cristãos na toponímia asturo-galego-portuguesa*, Biblos [Coimbra] 23 (1948), quoted from an offprint with its own pagination.

Piel, Joseph M./Kremer, Dieter, *Hispano-gotisches Namenbuch*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1976.

Pigeonneau, Henri, *Le cycle de la Croisade et de la famille de Bouillon*, Saint-Cloud, Belin, 1877.

Piper, Ferdinand, *Mythologie und Symbolik der christlichen Kunst von der ältesten Zeit bis ins 16. Jahrhundert*, 2 vol., Weimar, Landes-Industrie-Comptoir, 1847–1851.

Pirenne/Hübinger = Pirenne, Henri, *Mahomet und Karl der Große*, transl. from French into German by Paul Egon Hübinger, Frankfurt, Fischer, 1963.

Pirot, François, *Olivier de Lausanne et Olivier de Verdu(n). Sur les traces d'une épopée occitane?*, in: *Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune*, Gembloux, Duculot, 1969, 247–265.

PL = *Patrologiae cursus completus*, *Series Latina*, ed. Migne, Jacques Paul, 221 vol., Paris, Migne, 1844–1864.

Place, Edwin, *Geographical Problems of the Oxford «Roland»*, Publications of the Modern Language Association 62 (1947) 873–886.

Place, Edwin, *Once more Durendal*, Modern Language Notes 64 (1949), 161–164.

Poitiers-S.Cyprien = Rédet, Louis-François-Xavier (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Cyprien de Poitiers*, Poitiers, Oudin, 1874.

Poitou-S.Florent = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Chartes poitevines de l'abbaye de Saint-Florent près Saumur*, Archives historiques du Poitou 2 (1873), 1–148.

Polge, Henri, *Nouveaux mélanges de philologie, d'archéologie et d'ethnographie gersoises*, Auch, Cocharaux, 1959.

Polo, Marco, *Marka Pavlova z Benátek «Milion»*, ed. Justin V. Prášek, Praha, 1902. [Edition of *De condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum* by Franciscus Pipinus from Bologna, Latin transl. of Marco Polo's «Milione».]

Polo, Marco, *Il Milione, prima edizione integrale*, ed. Benedetto, Luigi Foscolo, Firenze, Olschki, 1928.

Polo, Marco, *Milione. Versione toscana del Trecento. Edizione critica*, ed. Bertolucci Pizzorusso, Valeria, *Indice ragionato di Giorgio R. Cardona*, Milano, Adelphi, 1975.

Polo, Marco, *Milione*, Le devisement dou monde. Il «Milione» nelle redazioni toscana e franco-italiana*, ed. Ronchi, Gabriella, Milano, Mondadori, 1982.

Polo, Marco, *Il Milione, […] testo toscano («Ottimo»)*, ed. Ruggieri, Ruggero, Firenze, Olschki, 1986.

Polo, Marco, *Milione, Redazione latina del manoscritto Z*, ed. Barbieri, Alvaro, Parma, Guanda, 1998.

Polo, Marco, *Il «Milione» veneto*, ms. CM 211 della Biblioteca Civica di Padova*, edd. Barbieri, Alvaro/ Andreose, Alvise, Padova, Marsilio, 1999.

Polo, Marco, *Le devisement du monde*, edd. Ménard, Philippe, et al., 6 vol., Genève, Droz, 2001–2009.

Polo, Marco, cf. also Barbieri and Yule.

Poly, Jean-Pierre, *La Provence et la Société féodale (879–1166)*, Paris, Borda, 1976.

Poncet, Jean, *La Chanson de Roland à la lumière de l'Histoire: vérité de Baligant*, Revue de l'Occident musulman et de la Méditerranée 8 (1970), 125–139.

Ponthieu = Brunel, Clovis (ed.), *Recueil des actes des comtes du Ponthieu (1026–1279)*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1930.

Pontoise = Depoin, Joseph (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Pontoise*, 5 fasc., Pontoise, Société historique, 1895–1904.

Pope, Mildred, *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman*, Manchester, Manchester U.P., [2]1952.

Porée, André, *Histoire de l'abbaye du Bec*, 2 vol., Évreux, Hérissey, 1900–1902 (reprint Bruxelles, Culture et Civilisation, 1980).

Portugal-Cortesão = Cortesão, A.A., *Onomástico Medieval Português*, O Archeólogo Português 8 (1903) 186ss.–17 (1912), 121ss. (in 23 sections).

Prentout, Henri, *Étude critique sur Dudon de Saint-Quentin et son Histoire des premiers Ducs normands*, Paris, Picard, 1916.

Prinz, Friedrich, *Klerus und Krieg im früheren Mittelalter*, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1971.

Prioult, Albert, *Au sujet des notions géographiques de Turold*, Les Lettres Romanes 2 (1948), 287–295.

Prost, Auguste, *Études sur l'histoire de Metz. Les Légendes*, Paris, Picard, [2]1897.

Prou, Maurice, *Les monnaies mérovingiennes*, Paris, Rollin et Feuardent, 1892.

Prou, Maurice, *Les monnaies carolingiennes*, Paris, Rollin et Feuardent, 1896.

Prou, cf. also Philippe-I.

Pseudo-Methodius = Aerts, Willem Johan/ Kortekaas,G.A.A. (edd.), *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius, die ältesten griechischen und lateinischen Übersetzungen*, 2 vol., Louvain, Peeters, 1998.

PT = the Pseudo-Turpin, cf. the edd. Hämel/de Mandach, H. W. Klein, Meredith-Jones and Smyser.

Pundt, Marianne, *Metzer Bankiers im Spätmittelalter. Die Familie Le Gronnais (1250–1350)*, in: Burgard, Friedhelm (ed.), *Hochfinanz im Westen des Reiches 1150–1500*, Trier, THF, 1996, 153–178.

PW = *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, new ed. by Georg Wissowa et al., 81 vol. and index, Stuttgart, Metzler, later München, Druckenmüller, 1893–1978 (reprint ibd. 1957–1997).

Quilis, Antonio, *Principios de fonología y fonética españolas*, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 1997.

Quimperlé = *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Sainte-Croix de Quimperlé*, edd. Maître, Léon/ Berthou, Paul de, Paris, Champion, [2]1903.

Raamsdonk, I. N., *En marge des chansons de geste*, Neophilologus 24 (1939), 30–39.

Raby, Frederic J.E., *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2 vol., Oxford, Clarendon, [2]1957.

RAC = *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. Klauser, Theodor, et al., Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1950–.

Radlov, Vasilij [Radloff, Wilhelm], *Opyt slovarja tjurskich narěčij, Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte*, 4 vol., Sanktpeterburg, Imp. Akad. Nauk, 1893–1911.

Radtke, Edgar, *Typologie des sexuell-erotischen Vokabulars des heutigen Italienisch, Studien zur Bestimmung der Wortfelder «prostituta» und «membrum virile»*, Tübingen, Narr, 1980.

Rajna, Pio, *Le origini dell'epopea francese*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1884.

Rajna, Pio, *Contributi alla storia dell'epopea e del romanzo medievale*, Romania 14 (1885), 398–420, 18 (1889), 1–69, 23 (1894), 36–61, 26 (1897), 34–73.

Rajna, Pio, *Un'iscrizione nepesina del 1131*, Archivio Storico Italiano, serie 4[a], 18 (1886), 329–354, 19 (1886–1887), 23–54.

Rajna, Pio, *Un eccidio sotto Dagoberto e la leggenda epica di Roncisvalle*, in: Lenz, Rudolf (ed.), *Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie, Festgabe für Wendelin Foerster*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1902, 253–279.

Ramerupt = Arbois de Jubainville, Henri d', *Les premiers seigneurs de Ramerupt*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 22 (1861), 440–458.

Ramiro = Ibarra y Rodríguez, Eduardo (ed.), *Documentos correspondientes al reinado de Ramiro I (1034–1063)*, Zaragoza, Comas/ Iriarte, 1904.

Ramułt, Stefan, *Słownik języka pomorskiego czyli kaszubskiego*, 2 vol., Kraków, Akademia Umiejętnośći, 1893–1993.

Raoul, cf. Robert Ier.

Räsänen, Martti, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Turksprachen*, 2 vol., Helsinki, Suomalais-Ugrilainen seura, 1969–1971.

Rasin, J.A. [Razin, Evgenij A.], *Geschichte der Kriegskunst*, vol. 2, *Die Kriegskunst der Feudalperiode des Krieges*, transl. from Russian by Arno Specht, Berlin, Verlag des Ministeriums für nationale Verteidigung, 1960.

Rathgen, Bernhard, *Das Geschütz im Mittelalter*, Berlin, Verlag der Deutschen Industrie, 1928 (reprint with *mise à jour* in a new introduction of 48 p. by Volker Schmidtchen, Düsseldorf, Verlag der Deutschen Industrie, 1987).

Rauschen, Gerhard, *Die Legende Karls des Großen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1890.

Ravier, Xavier, *[Okzitanisch/L'occitan] Areallinguistik/Les aires linguistiques*, in: Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin, Michael/ Schmitt, Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 5:2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1991, 80–105.

Raymond d'Aguilers, *Le Liber de Raymond d'Aguilers*, edd. Hill, John Hugh/ Hill,Laurita, Paris, Geuthner, 1969.

Raymond, Paul, *Dictionnaire topographique du département des Basses-Pyrénées*, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1863.

Raynouard = Raynouard, François, *Lexique roman ou dictionnaire de la langue des troubadours*, 6 vol., Paris, Silvestre, 1836–1844 (reprint Genève, Slatkine, 1977).

ar-Rāzī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Mūsa, *Crónica* [= *Akhbār mulūk al-Andalus*, only preserved in the Old Span. Version of the port. translation (from about 1300) of the 10th century Arabic Chronicle], edd. Catalán, Diego/ Andres, María Soledad de, Madrid, Gredos, 1975.

RB = Wirth, Peter (ed.), *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik*, 6 deliveries [more not published], Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1968–1976.

RdK = Schmitt, Otto (ed.), *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, up to now 10 vol., Stuttgart, Metzler, later Munich, Beck, 1937–.

Réau = Réau, Louis, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, 3 vol. (7 tomes), Paris, P.U.F., 1955–1959.

Regino von Prüm, *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*, ed. Wasserschleben, Friedrich Wilhelm, Leipzig, Engelmann, 1840 (reprint Graz, Akademische Druck- und Verlagsgesellschaft, 1964).

Regino von Prüm, *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*, *Das Sendhandbuch des Regino von Prüm*, ed. (with German transl.) Hartmann, Wilfried, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004.

Reg.Reg.Anglonorm. = *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, 1066–1154*, vol. 1, *1066–1100*, ed. Davis, H.W.C., Oxford, Clarendon, 1913; vol. 2, *1100–1135*, edd. Johnson, Ch./Cronne, H.A., Oxford, Clarendon, 1956; vol. 3, *1135–1154*, edd. Cronne, H.A., Oxford, Clarendon, 1968.

Reiffenberg, Frédéric A.F.Th. de (ed.), *Chronique rimée de Philippe Mouskés*, 3 vol., Bruxelles, Hayez, 1836–1845.

Reimann, Wilhelm, *Die Chanson de Gaydon, ihre Quellen und die angevinische Thierry-Gaydon-Sage*, in: Perschmann, Hermann/ Reimann, Wilhelm/ Rhode, August, *Beiträge zur Kritik der französischen Karlsepen*, Marburg, Elwert, 1881, 49–120.

Reims-Marlot = Marlot, Dom Guillaume, *Histoire de la ville, cité et université de Reims*, 4 vol., Reims, Jacquet, 1843–1846.

Reims-Pol. = *Polyptyque de l'abbaye de Saint-Remi de Reims* [mid 9th century], ed. Guérard, Benjamin, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1853.

Reims-Varin = *Nécrologe de l'Église de Reims*, in: Varin, Pierre (ed.), *Archives législatives de la ville de Reims*, vol. 2:1, Paris, Crapelet, 1844, p. 62–105 notes.

Reisinger, Jutta/ Sowa,Günter, *Das Ethnikon «Sclavi» in den lateinischen Quellen bis zum Jahr 900*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1990.

Remiremont = Hlawitschka, Eduard/ Schmid,Karl/ Tellenbach,Gerd (edd.), *Liber memorialis von Remiremont*, 2 vol., Dublin, Weidmann, 1970 (= MGH L.mem. 1). [Only part of the documents can be dated, and even these mostly just palaeographically, so that caution is required in their evaluation. I quote only this part of the evidence. For the dating of the individual scribes cf. the ed. p. 177–212].

Remppis, Max, *Die Vorstellungen von Deutschland im altfranzösischen Heldenepos und Roman und ihre Quellen*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1911.

Rennes-S.Georges = La Bigne Villeneuve, P. de (ed.), *Chartularium abbatiae Sancti Georgii Redonensis*, Bulletin et mémoires de la Société archéologique du Département d'Ille-et-Vilaine 9 (1875), 127–312, 10 (1876), 1–327.

RGA = *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, founded by Johannes Hoops, new ed. by Heinrich Beck et al., 35 vol. and 2 index volumes, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1973–2008.

RHC = *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, 16 vol., Paris, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1841–1906; with the following series titles Occ. = *Historiens Occidentaux*, Or. = *Historiens Orientaux*, Arm. = *Documents Arméniens*.

Ribagorza = Serrano y Sanz, Manuel (ed.), *Noticias y documentos históricos del condado de Ribagorza hasta la muerte de Sancho Garcés III (año 1035)*, Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1912.

Ribemont = Stein, Henri (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'ancienne abbaye de Saint-Nicolas-des-Prés sous Ribemont (diocèse de Laon)*, Saint-Quentin, Poette, 1884.

Richard, Alfred, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou*, 2 vol., Paris, Picard, 1903.

Richard, Jean, *Huon de Tabarie*, in: Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, et al. (edd.), *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien*, *Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 2, Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay, Musée archéologique régional, 1982, 1073–1078.

Richthofen, Karl Otto von, *Friesische Rechtsquellen, mit altfriesischem Wörterbuch*, Göttingen, Dieterich, 1840 (reprint Aalen, Scientia, 1960).

Richthofen, Erich von, *Estudios épicos medievales*, Madrid, Gredos, 1954.

Richthofen, Erich von, *Esprit hispanique dans une forme gallo-romane*, Boletín de Filología 12 (1960), 5–49, 13 (1961), 5–31.

Richthofen, Erich von, *Nuevos estudios épicos medievales*, Madrid, Gredos, 1970.

Riese, Alexander (ed.), *Geographi latini minores*, Heilbronn, Henninger, 1878.

Riezler, Sigismund von, *Naimes von Bayern und Ogier der Däne*, Proceedings of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, philosophical-philological and historical class, 1892, 713–788.

Riley-Smith, Jonathan (ed.), *The Atlas of the Crusades*, London, Guild Publishing, 1991.

Riquer, Martín de, *Les Chansons de geste françaises*, Paris, Nizet, ²1957.

Riquer, Martín de, *El segundo «Duc Aymon» del fragmento de «Roncesvalles» (v. 97)*, Revista de Filología Española 42 (1958/1959), 261–266.

Robert Ier/Raoul = Dufour, Jean (ed.), *Recueil des actes de Robert Ier et de Raoul, rois de France*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1978.

Robert II = Newman, William Mendel, *Catalogue des actes de Robert II, roi de France*, Paris, Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1937.

Robert, Louis, *Villes d'Asie Mineure, études de géographie ancienne*, Paris, Boccard, ²1962.

Robert, Ulysse (ed.), *Bullaire du pape Calixte II*, 2 vol., Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1891 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1979).

Robinson, James M. (general editor), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, Leiden, Brill, [3]1988.

Roë, cf. La Roë.

Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, William, 4 vol., London, Longmans, 1868–1871 (Rolls Series 51).

Rohlfs, Gerhard, *Was bedeutet der Schwertname «Durendal»?*, Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen 169 (1936), 57–64.

Rohlfs, Gerhard, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana*, vol. 3, *Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Torino, Einaudi, 1969 (=1969a).

Rohlfs, Gerhard, *Ci conte de Durendal l'espee*, in: *Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune*, Gembloux, Duculot, 1969, 859–869 (=1969b).

Rohlfs, Gerhard, *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten*, vol. 1 and 2, Bern, Francke, [2]1972.

Rohlfs, Gerhard, *«Munjoie, ço est l'enseigne Carlun»*, Revue de Linguistique Romane 38 (1974), 444–452.

Röhricht, Reinhold, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem 1100–1291*, Innsbruck, Wagner, 1898 (reprint Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1966). Röhricht, Reinhold, cf. also Jerusalem-Röhricht.

Rol. = the Old French *Chanson de Roland*, unless otherwise stated, the ed. Segre 1971, continuously checked on the ed. Segre 1989; cf. *Chanson de Roland*. Where Segre deviates from the ms. O, this ms. was checked in the photographic reproduction http://image.ox.ac.uk., Ms. Digby 23 (pt.2).

Romainmôtier = Gingins-la-Sarra, Frédéric de (ed.), *Cartulaire de Romainmôtier*, Lausanne, Ducloux, 1844.

Romans = Giraud, Paul Émile, *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Saint-Barnard et sur la ville de Romans*, 5 vol., Lyon, Perrin, 1856–1869.

Roncaglia, Aurelio, *Gli studi del Grégoire e l'ambiente storico della Chanson de Roland*, Cultura Neolatina 6–7 (1946–1947), 92–122.

Roncaglia, Aurelio, *«Sarraguce, ki est en une muntaigne»*, in: *Studi in onore di Angelo Monteverdi*, vol. 2, Modena, Editrice Modenese, 1959, 629–640.

Roncaglia, Aurelio, *Les quatre eschieles de Roland*, Cultura Neolatina 21 (1961), 191–205.

Roncaglia, Aurelio, *Rolando e il peccato di Carlomagno*, in: Álvar, Carlos (ed.), *Symposium in honorem prof. M. de Riquer*, Barcelona, Edició dels Quaderns Crema, 1986, 315–347.

Roncaglia, Aurelio, *Durestant*, Memorias de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona 21–22 (1990), 2.191–206.

Roncaglia, Aurelio, cf. also *Chanson de Roland*.

Roques, Mario, *Publications relatives à la Chanson de Roland*, Romania 66 (1940–1941), 382–395.

Rosellini, Aldo, *Onomastica epica francese in Italia nel medioevo*, Romania 79 (1958), 253–267.

Rosenfeld, Hans-Friedrich, *Der heilige Christophorus, seine Verehrung und seine Legende*, Leipzig, Harassowitz, 1937.

Rouche, Michel, *Remarques sur la géographie historique de la Neustrie (650–850)*, in: Hartmut Atsma (ed.), *La Neustrie. Les pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850*, Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1989, 1–23.

Round, J.H., *Calendar of Documents preserved in France illustrative of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. 1 (918–1206), London, H.M.'s Stationery Office, 1899.

Ruggieri, Ruggero, *Valore, tradizione e diffusione dell «episodio di Baligante»*, Cultura Neolatina 13 (1953), 57–85, 191–217.

Ruggieri, Ruggero, *Expressivité et polymorphisme dans l'onomastique de l'ancienne littérature chevaleresque française et italienne*, Le Moyen Âge 71 (1965), 275–288.

Runciman, Steven, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, *The First Crusade*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., 1951 (reprint London, The Folio Society, 1994).

Runciman, Steven, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 2, *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East 1000–1187*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P., 1952 (reprint London, The Folio Society, 1994).

RussEW = Vasmer, Max, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vol., Heidelberg, Winter, [2]1976–1979.

Rütten, Raimund, *Symbol und Mythus im altfranzösischen Rolandslied*, Braunschweig, Westermann, 1970.

Rybakov, B.A., *Uliči*, Moskva/ Leningrad,Akademija Nauk, 1950 (Kratkie soobščenija […] instituta istorii material'noj kul'tury 35).

Rypins, Stanley (ed.), *Three Old English Prose Texts in Ms. Cotton Vitellius A XV*, Oxford, Oxford U.P., 1924.

Sackur, Ernst, *Die Cluniazenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vol., Halle, Niemeyer, 1892–1894.

Sackur, Ernst, *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1898.

Sainéan, Lazare, *Les sources indigènes de l'étymologie française*, 3 vol., Paris, Boccard, 1925–1930.

Saint-Bertin-Haigneré = Haigneré, Daniel (ed.), *Les chartes de Saint-Bertin d'après le Grand Cartulaire de Dom Charles-Joseph de Dewitte*, vol. 1 (648–1240), Saint-Omer, D'Homont, 1886.

Saint-Calais = Froger, Louis (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Calais*, Mamers, Fleury & Dangin, 1888.

Saint-Chaffre = Chevalier, Ulysse (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Chaffre-du-Monestier*, Paris, Picard, 1884.

Saintes = Grasilier, Théodore (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye royale de Notre-Dame-de-Saintes*, Niort, Clouzot, 1871.

Saint-Jean-d'Angély = Musset, Georges (ed.), *Cartulaire de Saint-Jean d'Angély*, 2 vol., Paris, Picard, 1901–1903.

Saint-Jean-Ordre = Delaville le Roulx, Joseph (ed.), *Trois chartes du XIIe siècle concernant l'Ordre de Saint-Jean de Jerusalem*, Archives de l'Orient Latin 1 (1881), 409–415.

Saint-Jouin = Grandmaison, Charles de (ed.), *Chartularium Sancti Iovini*, Niort, Société de statistique du département des Deux-Sèvres, 1854.

Saint-Leu = Muller, Eugène (ed.), *Le prieuré de Saint-Leu d'Esserent, Cartulaire (1080–1538)*, Pontoise, Société historique, 1901.

Saint-Maixent = Richard, Alfred (ed.), *Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de Saint-Maixent*, 2 vol., Poitiers, Oudin, 1886.

Saint-Maur, François, *Roncevaux et la Chanson de Roland*, 12 p., Pau, Vignancourt, 1870.

Saint-Maur-sur-Loire = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Le cartulaire de Saint-Maur-sur-Loire*, in: Marchegay, Paul, *Archives d'Anjou*, vol. 1, Angers, Labussière, 1843, 293–429.

Saintonge-S.Florent = Marchegay, Paul (ed.), *Chartes saintongeaises de l'abbaye de Saint-Florent près Saumur de 1067 à 1200 environ*, Tours, Bousrez, 1877.

Saint-Quentin-Charles = Hemeraeus, Claudius, *Augusta Viromanduorum vindicata*, [1643], French transl. by Charles, in: La Petite Revue [Saint-Quentin] 3 (1874).

Saint-Quentin-Héméré = Hemeraeus, Claudius, *Augusta Viromanduorum vindicata*, Paris, 1643.

Saint-Sépulcre = Rozière, Eugène de (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'Église du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1849.

Saint-Sever = Pon, Georges/ Cabanot,Jean (edd. with French transl.), *Chartes et documents hagiographiques de l'abbaye de Saint-Sever (Landes) (988–1359)*, 2 vol., Dax, Comité d'Études sur l'Histoire et l'Art de la Gascogne, 2010.

Salazar = Martín Duque, Angel J., *La Comunidad del Valle de Salazar*, Pamplona, Junta General del Valle de Salazar, 1963.

Salemann, Carl G./Zhukovski, Valentin, *Persische Grammatik*, Sankt-Peterburg, Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1889 (reprint Saarbrücken, Müller, 2008).

Salin, Édouard/France-Lanord, Albert, *Rhin et Orient*, vol. 2, *Le fer à l'époque mérovingienne*, Paris, Geuthner, 1943.

Samaran, Charles, *Lectures sous les rayons ultra-violets*: *Chanson de Roland (Manuscrit d'Oxford)*, Romania 55 (1929), 401–410.

Samaran, Charles, *Sur la date du Fragment de la Haye*, Romania 58 (1932), 190–205.

Sancho Ramírez = Salarullana y de Dios, J./Ibarra y Rodríguez, Eduardo (edd.), *Documentos correspondientes al reinado de Sancho Ramírez (1063–1094)*, 2 vol., Zaragoza, Gasca, then Larra, 1907–1913.

Sander, E., *Der Belagerungskrieg im Mittelalter*, Historische Zeitschrift 165 (1942), 99–110.

San Juan de la Peña = Ubieto Arteta, Antonio (ed.), *Cartulario de San Juan de la Peña*, 2 vol., Valencia, Gráf, 1962–1963.

San Millán = Serrano, D. Luciano (ed.), *Cartulario de San Millán de la Cogolla*, Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1930.

Sant-Cugat = Rius, José (ed.), *Cartulario de Sant Cugat del Vallés*, 3 vol., Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1945–1947.

Santiago-L.F. = López Ferreiro, Antonio, *Historia de la Santa Apostólica Metropolitana Iglesia de Santiago de Compostela*, 11 vol., Santiago de Compostela, Seminario Conciliar Central, 1898–1911.

Sars, le Comte Maxime de, *Le Laonnois féodal*, 5 vol., Paris, Champion, 1924–1934.

Sautel-Boulot, Marguerite, *Le rôle juridictionnel de la cour des pairs aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles*, in: *Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel*, vol. 2, Paris, Société de l'École des Chartes, 1955, 507–520.

Sauvage, Eugène-Paul, *Elenchi episcoporum Rotomagensium*, Bruxelles, Polleunis, 1889 (quoted from separat print of Analecta Bollandiana 8).

Sauxillanges = Doniol, Henri (ed.), *Cartulaire de Sauxillanges*, Clermont-Ferrand, Thibaud, 1864.

Savigny = Bernard, Auguste Joseph (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Savigny suivi du petit cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Ainay*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1853.

Scalia, Giuseppe (ed.), *Il carme pisano sull'impresa contro i Saraceni del 1087*, in: Boni, Marco (ed.), *Studi di filologia romanza offerti a Silvio Pellegrini*, Padova, Liviana, 1971, 565–627.

Scalia, Giuseppe, *Oliverus e Rolandus*, Studi mediolatini e volgari 4 (1956), 285–301.

Schäfer, Dietrich, *Mittelalterlicher Brauch bei der Überführung von Leichen*, Treatises of the Prussian Academy of Sciences at Berlin, philosophical-historical class, 1920, 478–498.

Schäfke, Werner, *Kölns romanische Kirchen*, Köln, Dumont, 1996.

Schaller, Hans Martin, *Der heilige Tag als Termin mittelalterlicher Staatsakte*, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 30 (1974), 1–24.

Scheindlin, Raymond P., *Form and Structure in the Poetry of al-Muʿtamid ibn ʿAbbād*, Leiden, Brill, 1974.

Scheludko, D., *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Aucassin und Nicolete*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 42 (1922), 458–490.

Scheludko, D., *Über das Wilhelmslied*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 50 (1927), 1–38.

Scheludko, D., *Orientalisches in der altfranzösischen erzählenden Dichtung*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 51 (1928), 255–293.

Schiller, Karl Christian/Lübben,August, *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 6 vol., Bremen, Kühtmann, 1875–1881.

Schilling, Beate, *Wilchar von Vienne und das Pallium*, in: Kranz, Horst/ Falkenstein,Ludwig (edd.), *Inquirens subtilia diversa, Dietrich Lohrmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, Aachen, Shaker, 2002, 23–36.

Schilling, Beate, *Gallia Pontificia*, vol. 3:1, *Diocèse de Vienne*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Schimmel, Annemarie, *Von Ali bis Zahra. Namen und Namengebung in der islamischen Welt*, München, Diederichs, 1993.

Schirmunski [Žirmunskij], Viktor M., *Deutsche Mundartkunde*, transl. from the Russian and edited by Wolfgang Fleischer Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1962.

Schlumberger, Gustave, *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du Xe siècle*, 3 vol., Paris, Hachette, 1896–1905.

Schmitthenner, Paul, *Krieg und Kriegführung im Wandel der Weltgeschichte*, Potsdam, Athenaion, 1930.

Schmittlein, Raymond, *Le nom d'Olivier*, Revue Internationale d'Onomastique 18 (1966), 301–303.

Schnabel, Paul, *Die Weltkarte des Agrippa*, Philologus 40 (1935), 405–440.

Schneider, Jean, *La ville de Metz aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles*, Nancy, Thomas, 1950.

Schneider, Rudolf, *Die Artillerie des Mittelalters, nach den Angaben der Zeitgenossen dargestellt*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1910.

Schnetz, Joseph (ed.), *Itineraria Romana*, vol. 2, *Ravennatis anonymi cosmographia et Guidonis geographica*, Lipsiae, Teubner, 1940.

Schramm, Gottfried, *Namenschatz und Dichtersprache*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.

Schramm, Percy Ernst, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, 3 vol., Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1954–1956.

Schramm, Percy Ernst, *Sphaira, Globus, Reichsapfel*, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1958.

Schultz[-Gora], Oskar, *«Nat de Mons» oder «n'At de Mons»?*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 18 (1894), 124–129.

Schultz[-Gora], Oskar, *Afrz. «sartaigne»*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 23 (1899), 334–336.

Schultz-Gora, Oskar, cf. also Herbert le Duc de Danmartin.

Schulze, Wilhelm, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1904 (reprint ibd., 1966).

Schüssler, Heinz-Joachim, *Die fränkische Reichsteilung von Vieux-Poitiers (742)*, Francia 13 (1985), 47–112.

Schuster-Šewc, Heinz, *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*, 4 vol. and index, Bautzen, Domowina, 1980–1996.

Schutz, A.H., *Roland v. 337*, Modern Language Notes 62 (1947) [sic], 456–461.

Schwaiger, Georg (ed.), *Mönchtum, Orden, Klöster. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Ein Lexikon*, München, Beck, 1993.

Schwarze, Christoph, *Der altprovenzalische Boeci*, Münster, Aschendorff, 1963.

Schweickard, Wolfgang, *«Deonomastik». Ableitungen auf der Basis von Eigennamen im Französischen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1992.

Schweickard, Wolfgang, *Eretici in Terra Santa*, in: Bellone, Luca, et al. (edd.), *Filologia e Linguistica, Studi in onore di Anna Cornagliotti*, Alessandria, Edizione dell'Orso, 2012, 949–953.

Schweickard, Wolfgang, cf. also DI and LEI.

Schweiz-Hidber = Hidber, Basilius, *Schweizerisches Urkundenregister*, 3 vol., Bern, Blom, 1863–1877.

Schweiz-Hidber-D.V. = Hidber, Basilius, *Diplomata Helvetica Varia*, supplement to Schweizerisches Urkundenregister, Bern, Wyss, 1873.

Schwyzer, Eduard/ Debrunner,Albert, *Griechische Grammatik*, 4 vol., München, Beck,[2–4]1968–1994.

Sébillot, Paul, *Le folklore de France*, 4 vol., Paris, Guilmoto, 1904–1907 (reprint in 8 vol. Paris, Imago, 1982–1987). Sées = Bibliothèque de la ville d'Alençon Ms. 190, copy (from 1747) of the *Cartulaire ou «livre blanc» de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Sées* (14th c.).

Segre, Cesare, *Tradizione fluttuante della Chanson de Roland?*, Studi Medievali, 3rd series, 1 (1960), 72–98.

Segre, Cesare, *La tradizione della Chanson de Roland*, Milano, Ricciardi, 1974.

Segre, Cesare, cf. also *Chanson de Roland*.

Séguier, Jean Marc, *L'oppidum de Berniquaut à Sorèze*, Archéologie Tarnaise 5 (1990), 111–170.

Ségur = Cabié, Edmond (ed.), *Chartes du prieuré de Ségur (Tarn) du XIe au XIIIe siècle*, Albi, Nouguiès, 1889.

Seibicke, Wilfried, *Historisches deutsches Vornamenbuch*, 5 vol., Berlin, de Gruyter, 1996–2007.

Seine-Inférieure = Chevreux, Paul/ Vernier,Jules, *Les archives de Normandie et de la Seine-Inférieure*, Rouen, Lecerf, 1911. [10 facsimiles of documents from before 1150.]

Selig, Maria, *«Weitergeschriebene» Texte, Der altokzitanische Boeci und seine lateinischen Quellen*, in: Tristram, Hildegard (ed.), *Text und Zeittiefe*, Tübingen, Narr, 1993, 149–184.

Sénac, Philippe, *Les carolingiens et al-Andalus (VIIIe–IXe siècles)*, Paris, Maisonneuve, 2002.

Sepet, Marius, *Le drapeau de la France*, Paris, Palmé, 1873.

Seringe, Philippe, *Pour une relecture de la Nota Emilianense*, in: Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, et al. (edd.), *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien*, Mélanges René Louis, vol. 1, Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay, Musée archéologique régional, 1982, 390–415.

Sermoneta, J.B., *Sull'origine della parola «Ghetto»*, in: Toaff, Elio (ed.), *Studi sull'ebraismo italiano in memoria di Cecil Roth*, Roma, Barulli, 1974, 187–201.

Seror, Simon, *Les noms des Juifs de France au Moyen Âge*, Paris, CNRS, 1989.

Serra, Giandomenico, *Da Altino alle Antille*, in: Serra, Giandomenico, *Lineamenti di una storia linguistica dell'Italia medioevale*, vol. 1, Napoli, Liguori, 1954, 1–66.

Serralta, Frédéric/Tusón,Vicente, *Phonétique espagnole pratique*, Toulouse, Université, 1970.

Serrano, D. Luciano, *El obispado de Burgos y Castilla primitiva desde el siglo V al XIII*, 3 vol., Madrid, Maestre, 1935–1936.

Serrano, D. Luciano, cf. San Millán.

Settegast, Franz, *Die letzte Tirade des Rolandsliedes und die Beziehungen desselben zum thüringischen Kriege vom Jahre 531*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 18 (1894), 417–424.

Settegast, Franz, *Quellenstudien zur galloromanischen Epik*, Leipzig, Harassowitz, 1904.

Settegast, Franz, *Über einige deutsche Ortsnamen im französischen Volksepos*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 38 (1917), 458–468.

Settipani, Christian, *Les ancêtres de Charlemagne*, [Paris, F. Christian], 1989.

Settipani, Christian, avec la collaboration de Patrick Van Kerrebrouck, *La préhistoire des Capétiens*, vol. 1, Paris, Van Karrebrouck, 1993.

Settipani, Christian, *Les comtes d'Anjou et leurs alliances aux Xe et XIe siècles*, in: Keats-Rohan, Katharine (ed.), *Family Trees and the Roots of Politics: the Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1997, 211–267.

Settipani, Christian, *La noblesse du Midi carolingien*, Oxford, P&G, 2004.

Setton, Kenneth Meyer (general ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, *The First Hundred Years*, Madison WI, U. of Wisconsin P., ^{2}1969 (=1969a).

Setton, Kenneth Meyer (general ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 2, *The Later Crusades 1189–1311*, Madison WI, U. of Wisconsin P., ^{2}1969 (=1969b).

Seznec, Jean, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods*, translated from the French by Barbara F. Sessions, New York, Harper, ^{2}1953.

Shboul, Ahmad M. H., *Al-Masʿūdī and His World*, London, Ithaca Press, 1979.

Sholod, Barton, *Charlemagne in Spain: the Cultural Legacy of Roncesvalles*, Genève, Droz,1966.

Sicard, Damien, *La liturgie de la mort dans l'Église latine des origines à la réforme carolingienne*, Münster, Aschendorff, 1978.

Siciliano, Italo, *Les origines des Chansons de geste*, Paris, Picard, 1951.

Siebert, Johannes, *Der Dichter Tannhäuser. Leben, Gedichte, Sage* [with ed.], Halle, Niemeyer, 1934.

Sievers, Eduard/ Brunner,Karl, *Altenglische Grammatik*, Halle, Niemeyer, ^{2}1951. Simek, Rudolf, *Altnordische Kosmographie*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1990.

Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Histoire des Tartares*, ed. Richard, Jean, Paris, Geuthner, 1965.

Simoni-Aurembou, Marie-Rose, *Französische Skriptaformen V: Haute-Bretagne, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, Orléanais, Berry*, in: Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin,Michael/ Schmitt,Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 2:2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1995, 347–365.

Simpson, James, *Fantasy, Identity and Misrecognition in Medieval French Narrative*, New York, Lang, 2000.

Simson, Bernhard von, *Jahrbücher des Fränkischen Reichs unter Ludwig dem Frommen*, 2 vol., Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1874–1876.

Skårup, Poul, *La fin de la traduction norroise de la Chanson de Roland*, Revue des Langues Romanes 94 (1990), 27–37.

Skeat = Skeat, Walter William, *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, Oxford, Clarendon, [4]1991.

Smičiklas, Tade (ed.), *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. 4 and 5, Zagreb, Tisak Dioničke Tiskarf, 1906–1907.

Smyser, Hamilton Martin (ed.), *The Pseudo-Turpin, ed. from Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin, Ms. 17656*, Cambridge MA, The Medieval Academy of America, 1937.

Socin, Adolf, *Mittelhochdeutsches Namenbuch nach oberrheinischen Quellen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Basel, Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1903 (reprint Darmstadt,Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966).

Solesmes = Bénédictins de Solesmes, Les (edd.), *Cartulaire des abbayes de Saint-Pierre de la Couture et de Saint-Pierre de Solesmes*, Le Mans, Monnoyer, 1881.

Solin, Heikki/ Salomies,Olli, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*, Hildesheim, Olms, [2]1994.

Sommerard, Alexandre du, *Les arts au Moyen Âge*, 5 text vol. and atlas, Paris, Hôtel de Cluny, 1838–1846.

Sophocles = Sophocles, Evangelinos Apostolides, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods*, Memorial Edition, Cambridge MA, Harvard U.P., 1914 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 2005).

Soria-Audebert, Myriam/ Treffort,Cécile, *Pouvoirs, Église, société: conflits d'intérêts et convergence sacrée (IXe–XIe siècle)*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2008.

Spahr, Kolumban (ed.), *Das Leben des hl. Robert von Molesme, untersucht und ediert*, Fribourg, Paulus-Druckerei, 1944.

Sperber, Hans, review of Gamillscheg, Ernst, *Französische Bedeutungslehre* (Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1951), in: Romance Philology 8 (1954–1955), 138–142.

Speyer, Wolfgang, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike, mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Spicq, P.C., *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au Moyen Âge*, Paris, Vrin, 1944.

Spicilegium = d'Achery [also: Dachery], Luc, *Veterum aliquot scriptorum, qui in Galliae bibliothecis, maxime Benedictorum, latuerant, spicilegium*, 13 vol., Paris, Savreux, 1655–1677; improved new edition in 3 vol. as *Spicilegium sive collectio scriptorum [...]*, ed. La Barre, L.F.J. de, Paris, Montalant, 1723.

Spiegel, Gabrielle, *The Chronicle Tradition of Saint-Denis, a Survey*, Leiden, Brill, 1978.

Spitzer, Leo, *Zur Methodik der etymologischen Forschung*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 48 (1928), 77–113.

Spitzer, Leo, *The Name of Roland's Sword*, Language 15 (1939), 48–50.

Spitzer, Leo, *Durendal once more*, Language 16 (1940), 213–214.

Spitzer, Leo, *Études d'anthroponymie ancienne française*, Publications of the Modern Language Association 58 (1943), 589–596.

Spitzer, Leo, *Tervagant*, Romania 70 (1948–1949), 397–407.

Spruner-Menke = Spruner, Karl von/Menke, Theodor, *Handatlas für die Geschichte des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*, Gotha, Perthes, 1880.

Stabile, Giuseppe, *Valacchi e Valacchie nella letteratura francese medievale*, Roma, Nuova Cultura, 2011.

Stavelot = Halkin, Joseph/ Roland,Charles Gustave (edd.), *Receuil des chartes de l'abbaye de Stavelot-Malmédy*, vol. 1, Bruxelles, Kiessling & Imbreghts, 1909.

Steenstrup, Johannes C.H.R., *Normannerne*, vol. 1, København, Klein, 1876.

Steiger, Arnald, *Contribución a la fonética del hispano-árabe y de los arabismos en el ibero-románico y el siciliano*, Madrid, Hernando, 1932.

Stein, Henri, *Bibliographie générale des cartulaires français ou relatifs à l'histoire de France*, Paris, Picard, 1907.

Stein, Henri, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de Seine-et-Marne*, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1954.

Steinmeyer, Karl-Josef, *Untersuchungen zur allegorischen Bedeutung der Träume im altfranzösischen Rolandslied*, München, Hueber, 1963.

Steinmeyer/Sievers = Steinmeyer, Elias von/Sievers, Eduard (edd.), *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, 5 vol., Berlin, Weidmann, 1879–1922 (reprint ibd. 1999).

Steitz, Karl, *Zur Textkritik der Rolandüberlieferung in den skandinavischen Ländern*, Romanische Forschungen 22 (1908), 631–674.

Stengel, Edmund (ed.), *Galïens li restorés*, Marburg, Elwert, 1890. Stiennon, Jacques, *Le denier de Charlemagne au nom de Roland*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 3 (1960), 87–95.

Stiennon, Jacques, with the collaboration of Hasenohr, Geneviève, *Paléographie du Moyen Âge*, Paris, Colin, 1973.

Stimming, Albert (ed.), *Der anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1899.

Stone, Herbert K., *Decliner*, Modern Philology 33 (1936), 337–350.

Stoob, Heinz, *Norba-Ninfa-Norma-Sermoneta. Latinische Modelle zu Problemen von Fortdauer und Abbruch städtischen Lebens*, in: Besch, Werner, et al. (edd.), *Die Stadt in der europäischen Geschichte. Festschrift Edith Ennen*, Bonn, Röhrscheid, 1972, 91–107.

Straeten, Joseph van der, *Saint Livier. Notes sur son culte et sur sa légende*, Analecta Bollandiana 86 (1968), 373–389.

Stricker, E., *Enstehung und Entwicklung der Floovent-Sage*, Diss. Tübingen, 1909.

Stussi, Alfredo, *Venezien/Veneto*, in: Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin,Michael/ Schmitt,Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 2:2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1995, 124–134.

Subrenat, Jean, *Étude sur «Gaydon», chanson de geste du XIIIe siècle*, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 1974.

Subrenat, Jean (ed.), *«Gaydon», chanson de geste du XIIIe siècle*, with transl. in Modern French by Subrenat, Jean/Subrenat, Andrée, Louvain, Peeters, 2007.

Subrenat, Jean, *Les divinités sarrasines sont-elles des personnages bibliques?*, in: *Chanter de geste. L'art épique et son rayonnement. Hommage à Jean-Claude Vallecalle*, Paris, Champion, 2013, 441–456.

Suchier, Hermann, *Josqu'as Seinz*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 4 (1880), 583–584.

Suchier, Hermann, *Quelques passages du «Fragment de la Haye»*, Romania 29 (1900), 257–259.

Suchier, Hermann, *Vivien*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 29 (1905), 641–682, 33 (1909),41–57, 34 (1910), 343–348.

Suger, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Lecoy de la Marche, Albert, Paris, Renouard, 1867.

Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. Molinier, Auguste, Paris, Picard, 1887.

Suhle, Arthur, *Deutsche Münz- und Geldgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zum 15. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1955.

Sweet, Henry (ed.), *King Alfred's Orosius*, London, Early English Text Society, 1883.

Szkilnik, Michelle, *Roland et les chameaux. Sur la date de la Chanson de Roland*, Romania 122 (2004), 522–531.

TA = *Türk ansiklopedisi*, 34 vol., Ankara, Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1952–1984.

Tacitus, Publius Cornelius, *De origine et situ Germanorum*, ed. Anderson, J.G.C., Oxford, Clarendon, 1938.

Takayama, Hiroshi, *«Amiratus» in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily. A Leading Office of Arabic Origin in the Royal Administration*, in: Borchardt, Karl (ed.), *Forschungen zur Reichs-, Papst- und Landesgeschichte Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag […] dargebracht*, vol. 1, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1998, 133–144.

Talbi, Mohamed, *L'Émirat Aghlabide*, Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1966.

Talmont = La Boutetière, Louis de (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Talmont*, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest 36 (1872), 41–498.

Tangl, Michael, *Das Testament Fulrads von Saint-Denis*, Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 32 (1907), 167–217.

Tannhäuser, cf. Lomnitzer.

Tardif, Jules (ed.), *Monuments historiques, Cartons des rois*, Paris, Claye, 1866 (Reprint Nendeln, Kraus, 1977).

Tattersall, Jill, *«Terra incognita»: allusions aux extrêmes limites du monde dans les anciens textes français jusqu'en 1300*, Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale 24 (1981), 247–255.

Tavernier, Wilhelm, *Zur Vorgeschichte des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes (Über R im Rolandslied)*, Berlin, Ebering, 1903.

Tavernier, Wilhelm, review of Schober, Willy, *Die Geographie der Chansons de geste* [partial print, comprising only the letter *A*-] (Diss., Marburg 1902), in: Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 27 (1904), 19–21.

Tavernier, Wilhelm, *Über einen terminus ante quem des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes*, in: Baist, Gottfried (ed.), *Philologische und volkskundliche Arbeiten Karl Vollmöller […] dargeboten*, Erlangen, Junge, 1908, 113–129.

Tavernier, Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur Rolandforschung*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 36: 1(1910), 71–102; 37: 1(1911), 83–124 (=1911a); 38: 1(1912), 117–135; 39: 1(1913), 133–159; 41:1 (1914), 49–101.

Tavernier, Wilhelm, *Zu Roland 3995: tere d'Ebire*, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur 37 (1911), 272 (=1911b).

Tavernier, Wilhelm, *Vom Rolanddichter*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 38 (1914–1917), 99–107, 412–446, 703–710 (=1914–1917a).

Tavernier, Wilhelm, *Tervagant*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 38 (1914–1917), 226–229 (=1914–1917b).

TAVO = *Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients*, part B, *Geschichte*, Individual deliveries, Tübingen, University, 1977–1994.

Tellenbach, Gerd, *Königtum und Stämme in der Werdezeit des Deutschen Reiches*, Weimar, Böhlau, 1939.

Temple = Albon, le Marquis André d' (ed.), *Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple, 1119?-1150*, 2 vol., Paris, Champion, 1913–1922.

Thiel, Helmut van (ed. with German trransl.), *Leben und Taten Alexanders von Makedonien, Der griechische Alexanderroman nach der Handschrift L*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1974.

Thomas, Antoine, *La rivière de Rune dans l'épopée française*, Romania 23 (1894) 146–148.

Thompson, James Westfall, *The manuscripts of Einhard's Vita Karoli Magni and the matter of Roland*, in: *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne*, vol. 2, Bruxelles, Vromant, 1926, 519–532.

Thumb, Albert, *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*, Straßburg, Trübner, 1910 (reprint Berlin, de Gruyter, 1974).

Till, Walter (ed. with German transl.), *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1955.

Timm, Erika (with the collaboration of Gustav Adolf Beckmann), *Frau Holle, Frau Percht und verwandte Gestalten*, Stuttgart, Hirzel, 2003, ²2010.

Tiron = Merlet, Lucien (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de la Sainte-Trinité de Tiron*, 2 vol., Chartres, Garnier, 1883.

Tischler, Matthias, *Einharts Vita Karoli. Studien zur Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption*, 2 vol., Hannover, Hahn, 2001.

TLF = Imbs, Paul (ed.), *Trésor de la langue française*, 16 vol., Paris, CNRS, later Gallimard, 1971–1994.

TLL = *Thesaurus linguae latinae*, Leipzig, Teubner, later de Gruyter, Berlin, 1900–.

Tobler, Titus (ed.), *Descriptiones terrae sanctae*, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1874 (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1974).

Tobler, Titus (ed.), *Itinera Hierosolymitana et descriptiones Terrae Sanctae bellis sacris anteriora et Latina lingua exarata*, Genève, Fick, 1879–1885 (reprint Osnabrück, Zeller, 1966).

Tobler/Lommatzsch = *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, Adolf Tobler's bequeathed materials […] ed. by Lommatzsch, Erhard, et al., 11 vol. and *Gesamtliteraturverzeichnis*, Berlin, Weidmann, later Wiesbaden, Steiner, 1925–2018.

Tomassetti, Giuseppe, *La Campagna Romana antica, medioevale e moderna*, 4 vol., Roma, Loescher, 1910–1926.

Toulouse-S.-Sernin = Douais, Célestin (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Sernin de Toulouse*, Paris, Picard, 1887.

Touraine-Cat. = Mabille, Émile, *Catalogue analytique des diplômes, chartes et actes relatifs à l'histoire de Touraine contenus dans la collection de Dom Housseau*, Tours, Ladavèze, 1863.

Touraine-Marmoutier = Chantelou, Dom Claude [† 1664], *Cartulaire Torangeau* [du Marmoutier] *et sceaux des abbés*, ed. Nobilleau, Paul, Tours, Guilland-Verger, 1879.

Touraine-PU = Ramackers, Johannes (ed.), *Papsturkunden in Frankreich*, N.S. 5, *Touraine, Anjou, Maine und Bretagne*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Tournus = Juénin, Pierre, *Nouvelle histoire de l'abbaye royale et collégiale de Saint-Filibert et de la Ville de Tournus*, Dijon, Fay, 1733.

Tours-archevêché = Grandmaison, Louis de (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'archevêché de Tours*, 2 vol., Tours, Péricat, 1892–1894.

Tours-S.Julien = Denis, Louis-J. (ed.), *Chartes de Saint-Julien de Tours*, 2 fasc., Mans, Archives historiques du Maine 12:1 and 2 (1912–1913).

Tours-S.Julien-frg. = Grandmaison, Charles de (ed.), *Fragments de chartes du Xe siècle provenant de Saint-Julien de Tours*, Paris, Picard, 1886.

Tours-S.Martin-privés = Gasnault, P. (ed.), *Les actes privés de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Tours du VIIIe au XIIe siècle*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 112 (1954), 24–66.

Tramontana, Salvatore, *La Sicilia dall'insediamento normanno al vespro (1061–1282)*, in: Romeo, Rosario (ed.), *Storia della Sicilia*, Napoli, Società editrice Storia di Napoli e di Sicilia, 1980, vol. 3, 177–304.

Trepczyk, Jan, *Słownik polsko-kaszubski*, 2 vol., Gdańsk, Zrzeszenie Kaszubsko-pomorskie, 1994.

Tritton, Arthur S., *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects*, London, Milford, 1930 (reprint London, Routledge, 2008).

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij (ed.), *Die Nestor-Chronik*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1969. Tudebodus, Petrus, *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, ed. Hill, John Hugh/ Hill,Laurita, Paris, Geuthner, 1977.

Turk, Afif, *El Reino de Zaragoza en el siglo XI*, Revista del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid 17 (1972/1973), 7–122, 18 (1974/1975), 7–74.

Tyssens, Madeleine, *La geste de Guillaume d'Orange dans les manuscrits cycliques*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1967.

Ubieto, Agustín, *Toponimía aragonesa medieval*, Valencia, Facsímil, 1972.

Ubieto Arteta, Antonio (ed.), *Colección diplomatica de Pedro I. de Aragón y Navarra*, Zaragoza, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1951.

Ubieto Arteta, Antonio, *La derrota de Carlomagno y la Chanson de Roland*, Hispania 22 (1963), issue 89, 3–28.

Ubieto Arteta, Antonio, cf. also Albelda and San Juan de la Peña.

Ueltschi-Courchinoux, Karin, review of Beckmann, Gustav Adolf, *Onomastik des Rolandsliedes*, Berlin 2017, in: Cahiers de Civilisation médiévale 59 (2016 [sic]), 459–460.

Ughelli, Ferdinando, *Italia Sacra*, 10 vol., Venedig ^{2}1717–1722 (reprint Bologna, Forni, 1972).

Urbańczyk, Stanisław, et al. (edd.), *Słownik Staropolski*, 11 vol. and index, Wrocław, Polska Akademia Nauk, 1955–2007.

Urwin-Duddridge, I., *«Perrun de Sartaigne» in the Chanson de Roland*, Modern Language Review 37 (1942), 365–367.

Usener, Hermann, *Dreiheit*, Rheinisches Museum 58 (1903), 1–47, 161–208, 321–362.

Ussher, James [Usserius, Jacobus], *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*, London, Benjamin Tooke, ^{2}1687 (reprint Farnborough, Gregg, 1970).

Uzerche = Champeval, Jean Baptiste (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Uzerche*, Paris, Picard, 1901.

Vabres = Fournial, Étienne (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Vabres au diocèse de Rodez. Essai de reconstitution d'un manuschrit disparu*, Saint-Étienne, CERCOR, 1989.

Vajay, Szabolcs de, *Rayonnement de la Chanson de Roland: le couple anthroponyme Roland et Olivier en Hongrie médiévale*, Le Moyen Âge 68 (1962), 320–329.

Valdeavellano, Luís de, *Historia de España, De los orígenes a la baja Edad Media*, 2 vol., Madrid, Revista de Occidente, ^{2}1955.

Valenti, Gianluca, *La «Commendatio animae» dans les littératures romanes des origines*, in: Draelants, Isabelle, et al. (edd.), *La Formule au Moyen Âge II / Formulas in Medieval culture II (Actes du colloque international de Nancy et Metz, 7–9 juin 2012 / Proceedingsof the International Conference, Nancy and Metz, 7th–9th June 2012*, vol. 2), Turnhout, Brepols, 2015, 237–256.

Valentini, Giuseppe (ed.), *Acta Albaniae Veneta*, pars 1 (4 vol.), Palermo, 1967–1968.

Vallvé, Joaquín, *La industria en al-Andalus*, Al Qantara 1 (1980), 209–241.

Valvanera = Lúcas Álvarez, M. (ed.), *Libro Becerro del Monasterio de Valbanera*, Estudios de Edad media de la Corona de Aragón 4 (1951), 451–647.

Vàrvaro, Alberto, *L'Espagne et la géographie épique romane*, Medioevo Romanzo 14 (1989), 1–38.

Vasmer, Max, *Die Slaven in Griechenland*, Treatises of the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin, 1941, no. 12.

Vasmer, Max, cf. also RussEW.

Vatteroni, Sergio, *«Blacs e Drogoiz». Valaques et Sklavènes dans un poème de Raimbaut de Vaqueiras*, Romania 131 (2013), 467–475.

Vázquez de Parga, Luis/Lacarra,José María/Uría Ríu, Juan, *Las peregrinaciones a Santiago de Compostela*, 3 vol., Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1948 (2. reprint Pamplona, Gobierno de Navarrra, 1993).

Vendôme-Trinité = Métais, Charles (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme*, 5 vol., Paris, Picard, et al., 1893–1904.

Vendômois-Marmoutier = Trémault, Auguste de (ed.), *Cartulaire du Marmoutier pour le Vendômois*, Paris, Picard, 1893.

Vendômois-Métais = Métais, Charles (ed.), *Chartes vendômoises*, Vendôme, Bureau de la Société, 1905.

Verbruggen, Jean François, *De krijgskunst in West-Europa in de middeleeuwen (IXe tot begin XIVe eeuw)*, Brussel, Paleis der Academiën, 1954.

Verbruggen, Jean François, *L'armée et la stratégie de Charlemagne*, in: Beumann, Helmut (ed.), *Karl der Große, Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 1, *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, ^{2}1966, 420–436.

Verbruggen, Jean François, *L'art militaire dans l'Empire carolingien*, Revue belge d'histoire militaire 23 (1979–1980), 299–310, 393–411.

Verelst, Philippe, *Pour une relecture du vers 3 de la Chanson de Roland*, Olifant 11:1 (1986), 7–21.

Verf.-Lex. = Ruh, Kurt, et al. (edd.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasserlexikon*, 14 vol. and supplement, Berlin, de Gruyter, ^{2}1978–2008.

Vérité, Isabelle, *Les entreprises françaises de recensement des cartulaires (XVIIIe–XXe siècles)*, in: Guyotjeannin, Olivier, et al. (edd.), *Les cartulaires. Actes de la Table ronde (Paris, 5–7 décembre 1991)*, Paris, École des Chartes, 1993, 178–213.

Vérité, Isabelle, et al., *Répertoire des cartulaires français: provinces ecclésiastiques d'Aix, Arles, Embrun, Vienne, Diocèse de Tarentaise*, Paris, CNRS, 2003.

Vermandois-Colliette = Colliette, Louis-Paul, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique, civile et militaire de la Province de Vermandois*, 3 vol., Cambrai, Berthoud, 1771–1772.

Vermaseren, Maarten J., *Mithra ce dieu mystérieux*, Paris, Sequoia, 1960.

Vicens Vives, Jaime, *Atlas de Historia de España*, Barcelona, Teide, ^{11}1980.

Vidier, Alexandre, *La mappemonde de Théodulfe et la mappemonde de Ripoll (IXe–XIe siècle)*, Bulletin de géographie historique et descriptive 26 (1911), 285–313.

Vienne-S.André-Bas = Chevalier, Ulysse (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-André le Bas de Vienne*, Lyon, Schevring, 1869.

Villeloin = Denis, Louis-Jean (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Sauveur de Villeloin*, Paris, Champion, 1911.

Vincent, Auguste, *Toponymie de la France*, Bruxelles, Librairie Générale, 1937 (reprint Paris, Montfort, 2000).

Viré, François, *À propos de Tervagan, idole des Sarrasins*, Les Cahiers de Tunisie 1:2 (1953), 141–152.

Virolleaud, Charles, *Khadir et Tervagant*, Journal Asiatique 251 (1953), 161–166.

Vita Meriadoci, ed. Bruce, J. Douglas, Publications of the Modern Language Association 15: 1 (1900), 326–414.

Vives, José (ed.), *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos*, Barcelona, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1963.

Vizcaya-Balparda = Balparda, Gregorio de, *Historia crítica de Vizcaya y de sus fueros*, 2 vol., Madrid, Artes de la Ilustración, 1924–1934.

Vogel, Cyrille, avec la collaboration de Reinhard Elze, *Le Pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle*, 3 vol., Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963–1972.

Voile, C., *Tervagant*, Revue Internationale d'Onomastique 2 (1950) 45–48.

Völckers, Hans H., *Karolingische Münzfunde der Frühzeit (751–800)*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1965.

Vopelius-Holtzendorff, Barbara, *Studien zu Dudo von Saint-Quentin, dem ersten Geschichtsschreiber der Normandie*, Diss. (Göttingen 1967), typoscript 1970.

Vos, cf. Cramer Vos.

Vries, Jan de, *La Chanson de Gormont et Isembart*, Romania 80 (1959), 34–62.

Vulgata, cf. *Biblia Sacra*, BSCF, and *Nova Vulgata*.

Waard, Roelof van, *Études sur l'origine et la formation de la Chanson d'Aspremont*, Groningen, Wolters, 1937.

Wagner, Fritz, *Studien über die Namengebung in Köln im 12. Jahrhundert*, Diss. Göttingen, 1913.

Wagner, Pierre-Édouard, *La chapelle des Gournais en l'église paroissiale Saint-Maximin de Metz*, Mémoires de l'Académie Nationale de Metz 2004, 95–130.

Wais, Kurt, *Über themengeschichtliche Zusammenhänge des versenkten Schwertes von Roland, Arthur, Starkad und anderen*, Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, N.F. 26 (1976), 25–53.

Waitz, Georg, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, vol. 1, Berlin, Weidmann, [3]1880 (Reprint Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1953).

Walker, Roger M., *«Tere major» in the Chanson de Roland*, Olifant 7 (1979), 123–130.

Walpole, Ronald, *Two Comments on Recent Studies on the Chanson de Roland*, *I*, Romance Philology 6 (1952), 34–39.

Waltz, Matthias, *Rolandslied, Wilhelmslied, Alexiuslied. Zur Struktur und geschichtlichen Bedeutung*, Heidelberg, Winter, 1965.

Warner, Philip, *Sieges of the Middle Ages*, London, Bell, 1968.

Warren, F.M., *The Arabic Origin of Galafre, Galienne, and Orable*, Modern Philology 27 (1929–1930), 23–26.

Wartburg, Walther von, cf. FEW.

Wasserstein, David, *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings. Politics and Society in Islamic Spain 1002–1086*, Princeton NJ, Princeton U.P., 1985.

WAW = Stier, Hans-Erich, et al. (edd.), *Westermanns Atlas zur Weltgeschichte*, Braunschweig, Westermann, 1956.

Weczerka, Hugo, *Verkehrsgeschichtliche Grundlagen des Weserraumes*, in: Stoob, Heinz/ Mikat, Paul (edd.), *Kunst und Kultur im Weserraum 800–1600*, Münster, Aschendorf, 1966, vol. 1, 192–202.

Weinfurter, Stefan, et al. (edd.), *Für Königtum und Himmelreich: 1000 Jahre Bischof Meinwerk von Paderborn*, Regensburg, Schnell und Steiner, 2009.

Weiß, Günter/ Katsanakis,Anastasios, *Das Ethnikon Sklabenoi, Sklaboi in den griechischen Quellen bis 1025*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1988.

Wendt, Michael, *Der Oxforder Roland: Heilsgeschehen und Teilidentität im 12. Jahrhundert*, München, Fink, 1970.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Die Legitimität der Kapetinger und die Entstehung des «Reditus regni Francorum ad stirpem Karoli»*, Welt als Geschichte 12 (1952), 203–225.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Untersuchungen zur Frühzeit des französischen Fürstentums*, Welt als Geschichte 18 (1958), 256–289, 19 (1959), 146–193, 20 (1960), 87–119.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Die Entstehung des Fürstentums (8.–10.Jahrhundert). Studien zur fränkischen Reichsstruktur, zum Fürstenbegriff und zur Geschichte des nicht königlichen Herrschertums*. habilitation thesis Heidelberg 1961 (Ms., XLVIII–580 p.).

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Das hochmittelalterliche Imperium im politischen Bewusstsein Frankreichs (10.–12. Jh.)*, Historische Zeitschrift 200 (1965), 1–60.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Bedeutende Adelsfamilien im Reich Karls des Großen*, in: Beumann, Helmut (ed.), *Karl der Große*, *Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 1, *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, ²1966, 83–142, reprinted in: Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Vom Frankenreich zur Entfaltung Deutschlands und Frankreichs*. Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1984, 22–81.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Die Nachkommen Karls des Großen bis um das Jahr 1000 (1.–8. Generation)*, in: Braunfels, Wolfgang/Schramm, Percy Ernst (edd.), *Karl der Große*, *Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 4, *Das Nachleben*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, ²1967, 403–482 and genealogical table.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Das Geburtsjahr Karls des Großen*, Francia 1 (1973), 115–157.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Gauzlin von Saint-Denis und die westfränkische Reichsteilung von Amiens (März 880). Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte von Odos Königtum*, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 35 (1979), 395–462, reprinted in: Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Vom Frankenreich zur Entfaltung Deutschlands und Frankreichs*. Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1984, 157–224.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Vom Frankenreich zur Entfaltung Deutschlands und Frankreichs. Festgabe zu seinem 60. Geburtstag* [collection of his own essays], Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1984.

Werner, Karl Ferdinand, *Die Ursprünge Frankreichs bis zum Jahr 1000*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1989.

Werner, Matthias, *Adelsfamilien im Umkreis der frühen Karolinger*, Sigmaringen, Thorbecke, 1982.

Wexler, Paul, *The Ashkenazic Jews*, Columbus (Ohio), Slavica Publications, 1993.

Wiacek, Wilhelmina M., *Lexique des noms géographiques et ethniques dans les poésies des troubadours des XIIᵉ et XIIIᵉ siècles*, Paris, Nizet, 1968.

Widengren, Geo, *Der Feudalismus im alten Iran*, Köln, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1969.

Wilhelm, Richard (transl.), *Chinesische Volksmärchen*, Jena, Diederichs, 1914.

Wilke, Wilhelm, *Die französischen Verkehrsstraßen nach den Chansons de geste*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1910.

William of Apulia, cf. Guillaume de Pouille.

William of Rubrouck = P. Anastasius van den Wyngaert O.F.M. (ed.), *Sinica Franciscana*, vol. 1, *Itinera et relationes fratrum minorum saeculi XIII et XIV*, Firenze-Quaracchi, Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1929, 145–332.

Wilsdorf, Christian, *La Chanson de Roland, l'épopée franque et l'épopée chrétienne*, Le Moyen Âge 68 (1962), 406–418.

Wise, Terence, *Medieval Warfare*, London, Osprey, 1976.

Withycombe, Elizabeth Gidley, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names*, Oxford, Clarendon, ³1977.

Wittkower, Rudolf, *Marvels of the East*, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 5 (1942), 159–197.

Wolf, Heinz-Jürgen, *Die Bildung der französischen Ethnica (Bewohnernamen)*, Genève, Droz, 1964.

Wolff, Robert Lee, *Romania: the Latin Empire of Constantinople*, Speculum 23 (1948), 1–34.

Worstbrock, Franz Josef, Art. *Judaslegende*, in: Ruh, Kurt, et al. (edd.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 4, Berlin, de Gruyter, [2]1983, 882–887.

Yanguas y Miranda, José, *Diccionario de Antigüedades del Reino de Navarra*, 4 vol., Pamplona, Goyeneche, 1840–1843 (reprint in 3 vol. Pamplona, Príncipe de Viana, 1964).

Yewdale, Ralph Bailey, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch*, Princeton NJ, Princeton U.P., 1924 (reprint Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1970).

Yule, Henry, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian*, 2 vol., London, Murray, [3]1903, Notes and addenda by Henri Cordier, London, Murray, 1920 (reprint *The Travels of Marco Polo*, 2 vol., New York, Dover Publications, 1993).

Zajadacz-Hastenrath, Salome, Art. *Fabelwesen* in: Schmitt, O., et al. (edd.), *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 6, Stuttgart, Druckenmüller, 1973, 739–816.

Zakythinos, D.A., *Le thème de Céphalonie et la défense de l'Occident*, L'Hellénisme Contemporain 8 (1954) 303–312.

Zambaur, Eduard von, *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam*, Hannover, Lafaire, 1927 (reprint Bad Pyrmont, Lafaire, 1955).

Zamboni, Alberto, *Venezien/Veneto*, in: Holtus, Günter/ Metzeltin,Michael/ Schmitt,Christian (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 4, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1988, 551–569.

Zamora Vicente, Alonso (ed.), *Poema de Fernán González*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1946.

Zeki, Ahmed, *L'Égypte et l'Espagne*, in: *Homenaje a D. Francisco Codera*, Zaragoza, Escar, 1904, 455–481.

Zenker, Rudolf, *Die Chanson d'Isembart und J. Bédiers Epentheorie*, Romanische Forschungen 39 (1926) 433–480.

Zerner, Monique, *L'élaboration du grand cartulaire de Saint-Victor de Marseille*, in: Guyotjeannin, Olivier, et al. (edd.), *Les cartulaires. Actes de la Table ronde (Paris, 5–7 décembre 1991)*, Paris, École des Chartes, 1993, 295–322.

Zerner, Monique, *Cartulaire et historiographie à l'époque grégorienne: le cas de Saint-Victor de Marseille*, in: Boyer, Jean-Paul (ed.), *De Provence et d'ailleurs*, *mélanges offerts à Noel Coulet*, Marseille, Fédération Historique de Provence, 1999, 523–539.

Zerner, Monique, *L'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Marseille et ses cartulaires: retour aux manuscrits*, in: Le Blévec, Daniel (ed.), *Les cartulaires méridionaux, actes du colloque*, Genève, Droz, 2006, 163–216.

Zerner, Monique, *Le grand cartulaire de Saint-Victor de Marseille: comparaison avec Cluny, crise grégorienne et pratiques d'écriture*, in: Fixot, Michel/ Pelletier,Jean-Pierre (edd.), *Saint Victor de Marseille, études archéologiques et historiques. Actes du colloque Saint-Victor (Marseille 18–20 novembre 2004)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2009, 295–322.

Zeuss, Kaspar, *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, München, Lentner, 1837.

Zink, Michel, *Apollin*, in: Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, et al. (edd.), *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien*, *Mélanges René Louis*, vol. 1, Saint-Père sous Vézelay, Musée archéologique régional, 1982, 503–509.

Ziolkowski, Theodore, *Der Karfunkelstein*, Euphorion 55 (1961), 297–326.

D.3.1 Proper names in the Song of Roland

This index contains (usually in the obliquus) all the proper names in the Rol. which Segre included in his Index of Names, i.e. all of the names in his critical edition and all of the names in O. In cases where my determination of the archetype of all surviving texts differs from that of Segre, a reference to Segre's form is included. For various reasons, there are a few additional names (e.g. the *Aiglent* and the *Imance*, because Hilka/Pfister and Jenkins include them in their editions). A slash/between two forms means that the first is more likely to belong in the archetype than the second. A comma is used when there are two forms, both of which occur in the archetype. The identifications are either suggested by me for the first time or have been suggested by others and are accepted by me. In order to keep the index to a reasonable size, some of the most common *lemmata* are summarised with 'passim' instead of a host of marginal references which are only used to characterise different people or issues. If there is more than one page reference, bold type indicates the most important page number(s), usually those most relevant to stemma issues and the identification of people and places.

Aachen cf. *Ais*

[Abir]un 'Abiram', Old Testament tribe 235n, **237**

Abisme Marsilĩe's standard-bearer XXXVI, XXXIX, 196, 223, 234, 238n, **271–274**, 330, 349, 357, 362, 428, 453

Acelin [. . .] de Gascuigne count **725–727**, 771, 1004n

Aegidius cf. *Gilĩe, Seint*

Aëlroth Marsilĩe's nephew, anti-peer **307s.**, 319, 367

Affrican 'African' 111n, **185**, 254, 256, 260, 263, 362

Affrike 'Africa' 175, 254, 260, **281**, 608, 632, **636**

Aiglent 'Agulani, Muslim armoured cavalrymen' 150–152

Ais 'Aachen', Charlemagne's main residence XXn, 23, 387, 389s, **645**, 646–650, 657

Alde Olivier's sister, Roland's fiancée L, 387, 531n, 585n, **727–730**, 753, 870, 872s., 884, 941n, 1028

Alemaigne 'Alemannia' 622n

Alemans 'Alemannians' 23, 656, 660, **662s., 672–674**

Alexandrin 'from Alexandria' **167**, 495–498

Alfrere (< *Alfr*) 'Africa' **253–255**

Algalife, l' '[quasi-] Caliph', title of the Ruler of the Almoravids XXXVI, XXXIX, XLII, 55, **245–260**, 271, 274, 281, 331, 335, 340, 344, 346, 350, 486n, 609n

Alixandre 'Alexandria' XXXIII, **167**, 183, 254

Almace cf. *Almice*

Almari King of *Belferne* 50, **264–267**, 319, 340

Almice / Almace Turpin's sword XLI, 481n, **485–489**, 493

Alphaïen, le duc 203n, **360**, 366, 596

Alverne 'Auvergne' 33, 253, 304, **661**

Amborre d'Oluferne Baligant's standard-bearer XXXV, 180, **193s.**, **222–225**, 997, 999

Angevin XIXn, 147n, 498, 622n, 1001

Anjou LIIIs., 147n, 222s., 495, 532, 542, 578, 621s., 665, 688, 694, 711n, 717, 721s., 762s., **996–1021**

Anseïs peer XLVIII, 704, 705, 716, **718–720**, 725

Antelme de Maience 23, **642 656**, 731

Antonĩe, Seint 'Saint-Antoine-l'Abbaye (Isère)' XLVIII, 193, 709, 714, **747–752**, 764

Apollin 'Apollo', pagan divinity XLI, 224, 235n, 435, 445, 452, 456, 460n, 461, 463, **466s.**

Deu(*s*) 'God' **507s.**

Digun 'Dijon' 745s., 764

Droün 'Drogo', Uncle of Gualter del Hum **746**

Durendal / Durendart Roland's sword XXI,
XLIs., XLIII, XLV, 316s., 434n, **474–484**,
489, 490, 493, 513n, 515, 519, 613,
620s., 665n, 884

Durestant proverbially distant town
(originally Dorestad) 380, **422–428**

Ebire cf. *Bire*

Eis cf. *Ais*

Enfruns 'cannibals' in the Arctic-Scythian
area 27, **120–122**

Engeler, *li Guacuinz de Burdele* peer XLVIII,
352, 704s., 707, **721s.**, 725s.

Engletere 'England' 531, 621s., **628s.**, 630,
641

Envers 'opposite side/other side (facing the
other way)' (not a name!) 731–734

Equitaigne 'Aquitaine' 621, **625**, 631

Ermines 'Armenians' 19n, **45–50**, 53, 95, 595

Escababi **361s.**, 365n

[Es]clavers '(north-eastern) Slavs' 8n, 42,
107–**109**, 595n, 674

Esclavoz '(southern) Slavs' **33–42**, 108, 351,
595n

Escoce 'Scotland' 621s., **628s.**

Escremiz de Valterne anti-peer **321–324**,
405, 707

Espaigne, *porz d'* 'Roncevaux
Pass' **380–383**, 425

Espaigne 'Spain' XXn, XL, **277s.**, 380–383,
424n, 494, 526n, 595n, 625n, 645

Espaneliz one of Baligant's confidants 201s.

Espa[n] 'Spanish' 277

Esp<er>veris [. . .] filz Bur(d)el 304, 321n,
352s.

Estorgans anti-peer 318, **326–328**, 329s.,
351

Est<r>amarin one of Marsilīe's
messengers 227, **329s.**, 363–365, 372

Estramariz, *Astramariz* anti-peer 144, 327,
328–331, 365, 707

Esturguz, *Esturgion* 7n, 43n, **351**, 707

Ethiope 'Sub-Saharan Africa' **258–260**

Eudropin one of Marsilīe's messengers 92n,
329, 363, **366s.**, 372

Eug<l>ez a people close to the Black
Sea **90–101**, 595n

Faldrun de Pui XXXIX, 349, **362s.**

Falsaron ruler of the land of Datan et Abiram,
Marsilīe's brother, anti-peer XXXV,
147n, 235, **237s.**, 308, 350s. 362

Flamengs 'Flamen' Flemish people 57n,
626n, **661**

Flandres 'Flanders' 338n, **625s.**

Floredee 'Dorylaeum' **177**–**180**

Flurit one of Charlemagne's attributes (not a
name!) **172s.**, 176s.

Franc, *Franceis* 'Frank, French person;
Frankish, French' (mostly referring to
the whole of Charlemagne's realm,
occasionally only to the central
core of his realm) 23, 198, 218, 324,
494, 575, 577, 631, **660**, 662, 664,
956n, 1029

France 'France' (with reference to the same
areas as *Franc*) 474, 517s., 532, 574,
613, 615, 622, 624, 628n, 645s., 651,
655s., 657, 661n, 673, 693n, 763, 785n,
829, 1027

Franceis cf. *Franc*

Frise 'Frisia (including northern and southern
Holland)' 661, 684s., 763

Frisuns 'Frisians' 661n

Gabriël, *Seint* the archangel XLIII, 101,
511–513, 607, 620

Gaifier duke (pseudo-)peer 323, 499, 686,
704, **721–722**, 879, cf. also *Engeler*

Gaignun Marsilīe's horse XLII, 323n, 347n,
499

Galaf<r>es (former) Emir, Baligant's
predecessor 238n, 272, **274–276**,
453, 609n

Galazin 'from Galata' **495–498**

Galice '(southwest-European) Galicia' 255,
428s., **684–687**, 763, 806n

Galne cf. *Valterne*

Ganelon cf. *Guenelun*

Perre cf. *P(i)er(r)e*, *seint*

Pers 'Persians' **76**–**79**, 86, 123n, 125, 132, 147

Persis 'Persian' (adj.) **78**, 146s.

P(i)er(r)e, *seint* 'St. Peter' XXIII, XLIII, 467, 515, 517, **518**, **531**–**539**, 578s., 630, 641

Pinabel (*del castel*) *de Sorence* dueller for Ganelon XLVIII, 291, 522, 656, 662n, 740, **753**–**761**, 762, 785, 1002–1004, 1009–1012

Pinceneis 'Pechenegs' **79**–**81**, 84, 98, 125

Pine 'Pina de Ebro' 385, **404s.**, 407, 418

Preciuse Baligant's sword XLII, **471s.**, 478n, 493, 580

Priamun one of Marsilĭe's messengers 92n, 363, **367**, 372

Primes 'once, previously' (not a name!) XXXV, **238**

Provence 'Provence' 495, **625**, 631, 656, 662, **682**, 764

Pui one of the many places called *Puig*/ *Pueyo* in north-eastern Spain XXXIX, 349, **362s.**

Puillain 'Apulians' 85, 626n, 632, **634s.**, 661n, 757

Puillanĭe 'Poland' 108, 621, **626**

Puille 'Apulia' 619, 625n, **635**, 641, 757

Rabel count, a leader of the Frankish troop of young warriors 118n, **665**–**667**, 668, 670, 685n, 871, 873

Reiner of *Runers* / *Riviers* duke, Olivier's father **873s.**

Reins 'Reims' 658, **677**, 764, **795**

Rembalt leader of the Frisians **684**–**687**, 879

Rencesvals the plateau to the south of the Pass 'of Roncevaux', the *porz de Sĭzer* XL, **383**–**385**, 895

Richard le veil ruler of Normandy, leader of the Normans 477n, **657s.**, 674, 717, 752, 1001

Riviers / *Runers* 'Valley of the Lower and Middle Rhône' LI, 690n, 764, 866, 869n, **873**–**877**, 877–879, 884

Rollant count/margrave, peer, Charlemagne's nephew XXI, LI, **705**, **812**–**836**, **886**–**996** und passim

Romain 'Romans, Central Italians' 85, 578, **634**, 661n

Romain 'pertaining to the Papal States' **531**–**539**, 578

Romain, *Seint* 'St. Romanus of Blaye (Gironde), the main church of Saint-Romain in Blaye' 436n, **529s.**

Romaine 'Central Italy (including Rome und Romagna)' 621, **625**, 631, **634n**

Rome cf. *Rume*

Ros 'Russians' 25, **33**–**41**, 105–107

Rosne 'Rhône' 731, **874**

Rossillon 'Roussillon', originally the one in Dép. Isère 704s., 707, **722**–**724**, 764

Rume, *Rome* 'Rome' 467, 531

Runers cf. *Riviers*

Russillun cf. *Rossillon*

Saisnes 'the (tribal) Saxons' 23, 27n, 75, **631**–**633**, 661, 672n

Saisonĭe 'the land of the tribal Saxons' today in north-western Germany 106, 621, 627, **632**

Salomon the Old Testament king 233, 521

Salt Perdut Malquiant's horse XLII, 498, **500**

Samuël 'Tsar Samuel of Bulgaria' (perhaps contaminated with a younger relative) **101**–**105**, 128, 634

Sansun duke, peer XLVIII, 315, 704s., **716**–**718**, 720, 725

Saraguce cf. *Sarraguce*

Sarazin cf. *Sarrazin*

Sarazineis 'Saracen (adj.)' 124n, **494s.**

Sard[a]nĭe 'Cerdagne' **422**, 433n

Sar(r)aguce 'Saragossa' **279**–**281** and passim, 521, 530, 695, 720, 740, 754, 893, 936–938

Sarraguzeis 'from Saragossa' **494s.**

Sarrazin 'Saracens, Saracen (adj.)' (in the Rol. only relates to Spain!) 108n, **124n**, 188, 272, 379, 636

Sathanas 'Satan' **515**, 587n

Se[b]ilĭe, *Sibilĭe* 'Seville' XX, 238, 306, **332**–**335**, 339s., **405**–**407**, 413n, 517

Sebre 'the Ebro' 220, 311, 320, 324, **430**–**433**, 440

Seint-Antonĭe cf. *Antonĭe*, *Seint-*

D.3.2 Authors and texts from before 1600

This index records (especially lesser known, non-Romance) authors and titles, with place and date. Monarchs were originally cited only as grantors of deeds; but to avoid confusion between relatives or namesakes, a more generous approach was taken to their inclusion, with the addition of their dates of death. Hagiographical texts appear with their number in the Bibliotheca hagiographica latina or graeca. Descriptors are used such as 2/4 XII 'second quarter of the 12th century', x/y 'sometime between the years x and y' or x-y 'reigned/extended from year x until year y'. Manuscript references refer to the oldest surviving (even if fragmentary) manuscript; n means occurring on the relevant page only in a footnote.