

C. E. Heatt  
Department of English  
University of Western Ontario  
London, Canada

### The Relationship of Karlamagnús saga VII to Its Source

Part VII of Karlamagnús saga<sup>1</sup> is the only section of the saga which is generally stated to be based on a single, known source. Unger states uncompromisingly that the French text on which it is based in that published by Michel in 1836:<sup>2</sup> this poem is, of course, the Anglo-Norman work known as the "Pèlerinage de Charlemagne" or "Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient."<sup>3</sup> Later scholars have concurred in this judgment, including Margaret Schlauch,<sup>4</sup> E. F. Halvorsen,<sup>5</sup> and, to a limited extent, Paul Aebischer, although the latter assumes an earlier, more "correct" translation than the extant manuscripts provide from a French version "represented by" the published Anglo-Norman work.<sup>6</sup> Aebischer does not find any one version quite satisfactory, in which he is in apparent disagreement with Henry Goddard Leach, who stated, "so careful was the Norwegian to follow his Anglo-Norman original that his translation is used in editing the Romance text."<sup>7</sup> Like Aebischer, the recent Icelandic editor, Ejarni Vilhjálmsón, shows caution in saying that the text the translator worked from must have been "very close" to the English manuscript.<sup>8</sup> A careful comparison of the texts justifies this more cautious approach, for, while the French and Norse versions correspond to each other far more closely than is the case with any other section of Kms. and its analogues--certainly, there are no exact sources for any other section--the Norse version shows too many divergences from the unique Anglo-Norman text to be based directly upon it.

That the French original had some different readings from the poem

as we know it is made evident by a number of facts. One of the most telling is the different versions of the relics Charlemagne receives from the Patriarch in Jerusalem. The French poem omits one of the relics given in the saga, a shoe left behind by the Virgin Mary on the occasion of her Assumption.<sup>9</sup> Koschwitz<sup>10</sup> and Aebischer<sup>11</sup> agree that the omission of the shoe is a lacuna in the French, since it appears in the Welsh version and in some prose editions of the derived Galien, and none of these could possibly have been influenced by the Norse texts.<sup>12</sup> Horrent points out that the shoe is not in the verse Galien,<sup>13</sup> but it is difficult to see that this invalidates the general argument.

That Leach could claim that the Norse translation can be used in editing the Anglo-Norman poem is significant in itself; obviously, if this is at all true, then the Anglo-Norman ms. must have been at some remove from the text used by the translator, however, slight.<sup>14</sup> W. H. Schofield has remarked that the English ms. "was written in England in the thirteenth century by an Englishman, who, it is clear, had inadequate mastery of French."<sup>15</sup> There seems little reason to disagree with this--and few, if any, have. The ms. seems to have been quite obviously a copy of a previously existing poem, usually dated as being of somewhere around the middle of the twelfth century.<sup>16</sup> Since the ms. itself has been lost,<sup>17</sup> we can only take the word of those who saw it while it was still available to be seen, of course, although there seems to be every indication that the recent editions represent its contents accurately.<sup>18</sup>

But if the writer of the Anglo-Norman ms. had his limitations in dealing with his French original, it is equally true that the Norse translator apparently left something to be desired in his knowledge of

French. Aebischer has had a good deal to say on this subject.<sup>19</sup> In some cases, however, the translator may have been more accurate than Aebischer realized. For example, in the first chapter of the saga, the A translation says that Charlemagne spoke to the queen "playfully," or "to amuse himself." Aebischer criticizes this as an incorrect rendering of the French araisner, 'speak to,' 'harangue.' Perhaps so; but perhaps it may be one of those minor matters of paraphrase and adaptation which Norse translators habitually used. More to the point, however, is the fact that Aebischer fails to note that the B ms. of Kms. adds "and spoke thus," which renders the French verb accurately enough.

Of course, it adds to our problems here that there are several manuscripts of the Norse version, of which two (B and b) are complete and one is nearly so (a).<sup>20</sup> It is very difficult indeed to decide which of these four is closest to the original translation--if there was only one original translation. There are, further, fragments of somewhat earlier date, which agree sometimes with one ms., sometimes with another, sometimes with none: as well as later works obviously based upon a Norse original.<sup>21</sup> All of these versions have, here and there, details closer or more distant from the Anglo-Norman poem.<sup>22</sup> The problem is further compounded by certain ambiguities in Unger's text of the saga, which purports to give all ms. variants but, in fact, does not: a problem which will be discussed more fully below. Aebischer is somewhat unfair when he says that Unger never makes it at all clear which ms. he is using as his base: "En réalité, nous n'en savons rien."<sup>23</sup> While it is quite true that Unger did often depart from his stated policy of using ms. A except when a reading from another ms.

seemed clearly preferable, he obviously uses a most of the time for the part missing in A, and one would think it ought to be clear enough that if an entire passage is noted as missing in a, and the A and B variants are given in the notes, he must have been following b. Here, as elsewhere, there is some argument for b as a more reliable text to follow. While Koschwitz<sup>24</sup> concluded that A and a were independent of B and b, a conclusion with which Aebischer agrees,<sup>25</sup> B,b nevertheless seems to have rather more reliable readings, to judge by the degree of agreement between these versions and the French poem, even though it must be corrected by consulting A and a (as available), and, of course, the fragments, as well as the Swedish version, and, to some extent, the Danish.<sup>26</sup>

A further problem is that Unger's reporting unfortunately left something to be desired, as remarked above. Comparison with the mss. shows that he left a good many variants unrecorded. For example, in the opening passage of the first chapter based on the first *laisse* of the poem, he follows A in reading "en ef þú hefir logit, þá [skal þér dýrkeypt vera, ok skaltu þar fyrir týna lífi þínu."<sup>27</sup> He notes that the four words following his editorial bracket--"skal þér dýrkeypt vera"--are additions in B,b; but he makes no mention at all of the fact that the b passage ends "týna sæmd þínu," though it would seem to make considerable difference whether the queen is threatened with death or just disgrace. One cannot help wondering what principles guided his choice of variants to print. In this case, the French, Swedish, and Danish texts all agree with the A readings, but such confirmations have not deterred Unger from giving some pretty wild variants elsewhere.<sup>28</sup>

In chapter 4, in a passage corresponding to *laisse* xvi,<sup>29</sup> Unger

gives "Hálfa mílu frá borginni var garsgarðr konungs með allskonar grösum."<sup>30</sup> He notes that B,b adds "at lengd"<sup>31</sup> before "frá borginni," a rather trifling addition; however, he does not note the rather more significant fact that the last three words of the sentence, which appear to summarize two lines of the French poem (ll. 265-266) describing the various plants and flowers in the garden, occur only in A. In chapter 5 Unger follows B in a passage which ends "Allskonar skemtan var þar . . ."<sup>32</sup> and states in a footnote that A is identical here, although not elsewhere in the passage. In fact, A reads "kirkiu," 'church,' rather than "skemtan," 'entertainments.' The A variant hardly makes sense, but it is so peculiar that one would certainly have expected Unger to notice it and give the variant, instead of silently emending.

There are a great many other such lapses in Unger's documentation, including unnoted confluations, but most of them are of very little consequence. Nevertheless, even minor inaccuracies make the reader who wants to know what the texts really say distinctly uneasy. One such example occurs towards the end of chapter 14, where the following variants are noted: A,a, "aldri menn"; B, "né einn mann; b, "engan mann." The difference in meaning is inconsequential: they all mean 'nobody,' 'no one.' But it is disturbing to find that Unger neglects to mention the rather more consequential fact that B, and only B, neglects to preface this angelic prohibition of making gabs against anyone with words stating that this is a direct order from God.<sup>33</sup>

Thus any comparison of the Kms. texts with the Anglo-Norman poem must be hedged around with many cautions, bearing all these chastening facts

in mind. That is, we must recall that the now lost sole ms. of the Anglo-Norman version was itself corrupt; that there are a range of different readings in the various versions of the Norse text, including the fragments and later translations and adaptations; and that Unger's witness to the contents of the mss. is by no means always to be trusted. Still, a close comparison of what we have in the various Norse versions with the French text may shed some light on their relationships, and on the comparative reliability of this version or that. In doing so, we should also bear in mind that while we do not have a complete version of this part of the saga in either of the A,a mss., the portion that is missing in one is present in the other, and the two are usually very close; and we may also note that while there are a great number of minor variants both between and within the A and B groups, the general shape of the tale is the same in all: if the B redactor (or translator) was working separately from the original writer of A,a, there seems no reason to think he was working from a different French original, from which he may have been correcting an earlier Norse translation.

It is, in fact, a perfectly logical assumption that a translation from the French had already been made. If the A and B writers were working independently, it is hard to see how they would have ended up with almost exactly the same re-arrangements, omissions, and so forth, unless they were working from an earlier Norse version. Most of these changes are absolutely typical of of the usual practices of the Kms. translators: some passages are condensed or paraphrased, while others are somewhat elaborated or brought more in line with the prose style of the sagas. And the *laisse* structure of the poem is almost completely ignored.

To turn first to the relationship between *laisse* structure and saga chapter divisions, it may be seen that the relationship (or lack of it) is similar to that seen in the only other part of Kms. where any close comparison with an analogue is possible, Part III, "Oddgeir the Dane." In that case, there are a number of chapters which correspond exactly to the contents of individual *laisse*s of the Chevalerie Ogier, but the majority of chapters combine from two to twelve *laisse*s and/or parts of *laisse*s.<sup>34</sup> While only one chapter of Part VII corresponds to the content of a particular *laisse* of the Voyage--chapter 3, which corresponds to *laisse* xv--Part VII is much shorter than Part III, so the proportion is about the same.<sup>35</sup> The saga translators were simply uninterested in the effect of the poetic structure, and were aiming at prose units which seemed to be logical units in the saga manner. Here, as elsewhere in Kms. (and the Old Norse saga in general), the chapters are of varying length: chapter 2, the longest, is six times as long as chapter 3, the shortest. But the length of the chapters does not necessarily correspond to the material translated. While chapter 3, as remarked above, covers only one *laisse*, and the ten *laisse*s which form the matter of chapter 2 are indeed about six times as many lines, other chapters are either more or less condensed. If, for example, chapter 1, which contains the material of *laisse*s i - v, were proportionately the same length as 2 and 3, it would be half the length of 2, but actually it is closer to two-thirds that length.

A detailed analysis of the first chapter of the saga demonstrates a number of points, particularly in regard to the closeness of this or that version to the French poem. The saga account begins with a transitional

sentence relating it to the saga as a whole (or the immediately preceding section) and stating the subject of this part: this sentence has, of course, no parallel in the French. The first four lines of the poem are then summarized in one brief sentence, which omits all of the content of ll. 2 and 3, and changes "the church of St. Denis" to the vaguer "Paris" --possibly as a more familiar locale to the Norse audience. The B,b mss. further clarify this locale by adding "the great city" (b) or "the great city in France" (B). Line 4 seems to be most accurately rendered (if the French text is used as touchstone) in the a version; all the others are less specific about the ranks of those summoned, calling them simply "knights" or "powerful men." Still, it will be noted that this summary sentence is so similar in the different mss. that either the French original was very different indeed from the surviving poem or the A,a and B,b versions are drawn from a common earlier translation into Norse: it is hardly likely that two different translators would both choose to make exactly the same changes and omissions.

The saga versions all also agree that he was sitting with these men under an olive tree with the queen by his side; in the French, he takes her aside under the olive tree, although the men cannot be far away since they apparently hear her injudicious remarks. After his challenge, the queen is said in the French to be not "sage," and to have responded "folement" (l. 12); A,a describes her as "rash, and B,b adds "in speech," but B,b is closer to the French in saying that she responded "foolishly," where A says "incautiously." Her bald accusation that he thinks too much of himself in the French (l. 13) is softened by the more characteristically

Germanic phrasing "a man should not praise himself too much" in all the mss. which give this passage. The king's angry response, 8 lines in French, is here a much shorter, simpler statement, but the B version, and in part b, seems to echo words and phrases of the French which are not in A. On the other hand, in the queen's second speech, A is parallel to the French in having her ask mercy "for the love of God," a phrase missing in B,b, although Unger does not note this omission. But A then omits her offer to undergo an ordeal by being thrown from a high tower, which is in B, b. A is again closer to the French in saying that she gave in when "she saw she could not escape speaking" (cf. l. 43), as against B,b's "she saw what was at stake." But B,b preserves the epithet "the strong" (cf. l. 46) describing Hugon, which A omits. A, like the French text, says Hugon rules over Capadocia as well as Constantinople; none of the mss. mention Greece and Persia, as the French text does, but the latter is mentioned (along with Capadocia) in the Swedish translation.<sup>36</sup> The B,b mss. simply summarize it all as "Constantinople and all the realms that belong to it." Line 49 of the French, describing Hugon as the most handsome knight "from here to Antioch," is most closely paralleled in B,b: A substitutes "Mount Mudiu" for Antioch--possibly because, like Paris, as against St. Denis, it was more familiar to the saga audience.

Thus, the variants between the B,b group and the A,a group seem to split almost fifty-fifty in their degree of closeness to the French text. This continues to be the case with other minor variants in the chapter, but perhaps the most notable case is the passage listing the king's chosen companions. In the French (ll. 61-66), these are: Rolland, Cliver,

Willeme d'Orengre, Naimon "l'adurez," Oger de Denemarche, Gerin, Berenger, "L'arceveske Turpin," Ernalz, Haimmer, Bernard de Brusban, Bertram and "tel .M chevaler ki sunt de France nez." A gives all these, in quite recognizable forms, omitting only Ernalz and the exact number of other Frenchmen, but the order differs after the first two: we then get the order Nemes, Oddgeir, Villifer (Willelme), Bertram (identified as the nephew of Nemes), Turpin, Gerin, Baeringur, Eimer, Bernard ("of Bruskam"). B, however, mentions only Rolland, Clifer, Villifer, Oddger, and Turpin; later on it specifies that he took others, and Bertram is mentioned specifically in the next chapter; b is somewhat closer to A, but does not exactly correspond to either A or B. At this point, there is a corresponding passage in Fragment 3, where we also find Ernalz unmentioned, but otherwise the passage in the fragment is closer to the French: it follows the same order and specifies the same number of accompanying knights. It does, however, have some rather weird spellings of places: Villifer is of "Ringe," and Bernard of "Brusean"-- which hardly suggests it could have been A's source, since A's "Bruskam" is a little closer to "Brusban." Or, at least differently distant.

It appears that Ernalz was omitted from the list in all versions of the Norse translation; he does turn up later on, in the gab scenes, but his absence from the initial list may explain why the Swedish translator did not give any list at all here, simply saying that the king met with the Twelve Peers:<sup>37</sup> perhaps he noticed that the list in his Norse source did not add up to the requisite number.

Despite the omission of Ernalz, then, Fragment 3, which is certainly from an early version, appears to be the most reliable witness to the--or an?--

original Norse translation here, to judge by its correspondence to the French text. Yet there are other points where it is actually rather further from the French than other mss. For example, in the French Charlemagne says he has dreamed three times (l. 71); A agrees, but B,b and Fragment 3 state that he has had the dream twice, rather than three times. On the other hand, B,b and the fragment are closer to l. 72 in rendering "This king of whom much has been said to me" than is A, which says "of whom the queen has spoken to me."

Thus, Fragment 3 sometimes agrees with one and sometimes another of the ms. groups, and not always the one closest to the French text. In later sections, where we have corresponding passages of both Fragment 3 and Fragment 2, the two fragments are very close to each other, and sometimes closer to the French than one or all of the complete (or nearly complete) mss. For example, the spy's remarks after the gab of Villifer is almost exactly the same in the French and in Fragment 2; it is not in Fragment 3, and not at all closely translated in A or B,b. However, in Turpin's gab Fragment 2 agrees with A,a in giving the name of the river as "Iber"; Fragment 3 gives no such name, and neither does B,b; In this case, Fragment 3 and B,b agree with the French text, against Fragment 2 and A,a.

The only conclusion which seems possible, then, is that none of the extant mss. or fragments represents the original Norse translation, presuming it is correct to deduce that there was one original translation, any more accurately than the others. When we also realize that the now missing unique ms. of the Anglo-Norman poem does not seem to represent that poem with complete accuracy either, it would seem overly optimistic to

speak of that poem as the indubitable "source" of the saga version. Rather, it appears that a version (or versions) very close to that lost ms. must have been the source for the original Norse translation, and possibly used to correct it by independent redactors, with the end result several different ms. traditions, each of which is only fitfully accurate to the original. Some phrases in each version are tantalizingly close to the Anglo-Norman version; others are quite different; and no one version ever seems to be always the closest to the French text as we know it.

Later parts of the saga version show a good many expansions and divergences from the French which may or may not be original with the Norse translator or translators. The description of the feast in chapter 5, corresponding with the end of *laisse* xxi, is rather more detailed than that found in the French: yet many of these details are of a sort much more characteristic of French romances than of Norse saga style. The order, and sometimes the nature, of the gabs is different in many respects from that found in the Voyage, where the order of the speakers is Charlemagne, Roland, Oliver, Turpin, William, Ogier, Naimés, Berenger, Bernard, Ernalz, Aïmer, Bertram, and Gerin. The saga order is Charlemagne, Roland, Oliver, Bernard, Naimés, Berenger, Turpin, William, Ogier, Ernalz, Aïmer, Bertram, and Gerin. Thus the first three and the last four are in the same order as in the French version, but the others are changed--as are some of their gabs. The most notable departure is that the gab about diverting the course of the river is exchanged between Bernard (Voyage) and Turpin (Kms.) in all the Norse versions, including the fragments. The

Welsh version assigns it to Bernard, which confirms (if any confirmation is needed) the complete independence of the Welsh version from the Norse.<sup>38</sup>

Another notorious difference between the Norse and French versions is the chaste version in the saga of Oliver's fulfillment of his gab to embrace the emperor's daughter one hundred times in a single night. In both versions, the spy--and, presumably, everyone else--assume this means her will perform the sexual act a hundred times in that one night. Implausibly, the emperor turns over the girl for a night, stipulating that Oliver had better make his boast good. In the Voyage he apparently does just that, while in Kms. he simply kisses her a hundred times, as against the three preliminary kisses he gives her in the French version; further, in Kms. the outcome is positively pious, in that he persuades the lady to convert to the Christian faith. The Norse author, among others, thought the eastern empire was pagan.<sup>39</sup> Some readers have seen this version as an evidence of censorship or prudishness, but the whole matter is debatable. Aebischer argues that this is the true intention of the French version;<sup>40</sup> but, in any case, the hundred kisses are a perfectly adequate fulfillment of the terms of the gab, as Horrent points out (p. 99).

Again, the original Norse translator may have been following a French text quite accurately here. Or he may have been editing to suit his own tastes or those of his audience, though saga texts on the whole are not renowned for their prudishness about sexual matters. But there is no way we can be sure, since, as it must now be clear, the French text as we have it cannot be the exact source of the saga; nor is the "original" text of the saga a matter which can be simply determined, considering the

many discrepancies between the various mss., fragments, and derivatives. One thing, however, can certainly be said. The tale as it was told in whatever Old French text it was found in was certainly congenial subject matter for a Norse audience. Schofield (p. 152) compares the Voyage to the latter ballad of "King Arthur and King Cornwall," which appears to have been influenced by the earlier poem. The ballad also begins with a queen's challenge: in this case, she states she has heard of a better Round Table. It proceeds with absurd boasts as the main factor in its action, which vows are, as Schofield says, "in true Norseman fashion."

Thus, whatever the relationship of this tall tale may be to its origins,<sup>41</sup> here is part of the Charlemagne cycle with a very natural appeal to a Norse audience, and one which was almost bound to be included in the Kms. collection. It is not just "l'espreit gaulois," as Schofield puts it (p. 151), that informs this yarn, but a comic yet, in its way, heroic zest which would have obvious appeal to the audiences which enjoyed the Old Norse saga--and even Beowulf and The Battle of Maldon, where there is also a good dose of irony (if not exactly humor, most of the time) made of the failure of lesser men to keep their vows, as against those of stronger mettle, who fulfill their words at whatever cost.

TABLE: The Overall Correspondences Between  
Kms. VII and the Voyage de Charlemagne

<u>Voyage ls.</u>	<u>Kms. VII ch.</u>	<u>Voyage Ls.</u>	<u>Kms. VII ch.</u>	
1 - 5 —	1	35 }	11	
6 - 14 —	2	36 }		
15 —	3	37 }	12	
16 }	4	38 }		
17 }		39 }	13	
18 }		40 }		
19 }		5	41 }	14
20 }	42 }			
21 }	6		43 }	15
22 }		44 }		
23 }		7	45 }	16
24 }			46 }	
25 }	47 }			
26 }	8	48 }	17	
27 }		49 }		
28 }	9	50 }	18	
29 }		51 }		
30 }		52 }		
31 }	10	53 }	19	
32 }		54 }		
33 }				
34 }				

Notes

<sup>1</sup>Karlamagnus saga ok Kappa Hans, ed. C. R. Unger (Christiania, 1860) is the only printed edition giving all--or nearly all--the ms. variants; hereinafter abbreviated Kms. Part VII, entitled "Geipunar þáttur" in Ms. B ("The Tale of the Gabs"), is usually referred to as the "Jórsalaferð."

<sup>2</sup>Introduction, p. xxx: "Det franske Dig, hvorpaa dette Afsnit af vor Saga grunder sig, er udgivet af Francisque Michel under Titel: Charlemagne an Anglo-Norman Poem from the twelfth Century, London 1836."

<sup>3</sup>Most editors and scholars have preferred the latter title: Eduard Koschwitz's much used edition (Heilbronn, 1880; 7th ed., Leipzig, 1923) is entitled Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel; the recent critical edition of Guido Favati (Bologna, 1965) is Il "Voyage de Charlemagne", and Paul Aebischer's text of the same year (Geneva) is Le Voyage de Charlemagne a Jerusalem et a Constantinople. Among those who have chosen to follow Gaston Paris in using the alternate title is Jules Horrent, whose study Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne (Paris, 1961) is the most recent major scholarly work in the field.

<sup>4</sup>Romance in Iceland (Princeton and New York, 1934), p. 158; she calls it a "fairly close translation."

<sup>5</sup>The Norse Version of the Chanson de Roland (Copenhagen, 1959), p. 56; he says it is "a translation of the Pèlerinage de Charlemagne, with practically no additions and few omission," though he agrees with others that the Swedish

Karl Magnus has some "better" readings (p. 37).

<sup>6</sup>Les versions norroises du 'Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient' (Paris, 1956), p. 18.

<sup>7</sup>Angevin Britain and Scandinavia (Cambridge, Mass., 1921), p. 250.

<sup>8</sup>Karlamagnús saga og Kappa Hans (Reykjavik, 1950), Introduction, p. xxxii: "Þýðandi þáttarins hefur haft fyrir sér handrit, sem verið hefur náskylt þessu enska handriti."

<sup>9</sup>Kms.VII, Ch. 2; cf. Voyage, ll. 170 ff. Line number references to the Voyage correspond to those in Aebischer's ed., cited above.

<sup>10</sup>Pp. 64-65.

<sup>11</sup>Versions, pp. 70-71.

<sup>12</sup>For these versions, and others, see Koschwitz, Sechs Bearbeitungen des altfranzösischen Gedichts von Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel (Heilbronn, 1879); this includes an English translation of the Welsh version. Cf. also Koschwitz's remarks on the subject in "Über das Alter und die Herkunft der Chanson du Voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople," in Romanische Studien, ed. Eduard Boehmer, II (1875-77), 1-60.

<sup>13</sup>p. 40, n. 6. --It is interesting to note that the Swedish text gives the same list in the same order but add "the lance which pierced God" ("oc aff spiwte thy som gudh war stungin met") at the end; see Gustav Storm, Sagnkredsene om Karl den Store of Didrik af Bern hos de nordiske Folk (Christiania, 1874), p. 231.

<sup>14</sup>Koschwitz makes it quite clear that the unique ms. was not the "original": see especially the stemma on p. xii of his introduction.

<sup>15</sup>English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer (New York and London, 1906), p. 153.

<sup>16</sup>See, e.g., Favati, pp. 95-130; Horrent, p. 118; J. Coulet, Etudes sur l'ancien poème français du Voyage de Charlemagne en Orient (Montpellier, 1907), p. 69; Aebischer, Voyage, p. 29.

<sup>17</sup>See, e.g., Horrent, p. 12, n. 1.

<sup>18</sup>See Aebischer, Voyage, pp. 17-18.

<sup>19</sup>Versions, especially p. 59 ff.

<sup>20</sup>Two leaves are missing in a from early in the first chapter to about the middle of the ninth; A ends in the middle of ch. 16.

<sup>21</sup>These include the Swedish and Danish versions, printed in Storm, pp. 228-245; a separate pátrr and rímur based on the saga, for which see Koschwitz, Sechs Bearbeitungen; and the Galien romances (also in Sechs Bearbeitungen), which are later continuations (or sequels).

<sup>22</sup>See Aebischer, Versions, esp. pp. 24-30; but I shall have more to say about this below.

<sup>23</sup>Versions, p. 24.

<sup>24</sup>Alter, pp. 16-19.

<sup>25</sup>Versions, p. 34.

<sup>26</sup>The Swedish text is less drastically condensed and changed than the Danish, though still much shorter than the Norse.

<sup>27</sup>"But if you have lied, then you shall pay dearly for it, and for it you shall lose your life."

<sup>28</sup>In the French and Swedish, he will cut off her head (Voyage, l. 25; Storm, p. 229); the Danish agrees closely with the A wording.

<sup>29</sup>Laisse numbers are those of Favati's edition, which is close (or identical) to the numbering of Koschwitz; Aebischer's division is different, and unnumbered. While I believe there is much to be said for Aebischer's arrangement (see his comments on p. 19 of his introduction), readers may find it easier to check the matter in other editions. In any case, the saga usually combines several separate laisses in one chapter, and in Aebischer's edition there are many more laisses; comparison simply shows even more units being combined.

<sup>30</sup>"Half a mile from the city was the king's garden, with all sorts of plants"; p. 470.

<sup>31</sup>"In distance."

<sup>32</sup>"There were all sorts of entertainments there," p. 472.

<sup>33</sup>A, a: pau oröi send guö; b, hat vill Guö; cf. Voyage 674, ço te mandet Jhesus.

<sup>34</sup>See chart of these correspondences in Heatt, Karlamagnus saga I (Toronto, 1975), p. 237.

<sup>35</sup>A table of the correspondences between the saga chapters and the laisses of the poem is appended below.

<sup>36</sup>Storm, p. 229.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Horrent discusses--and dismisses--the theory that this gab should have been originally assigned to Turpin; see p. 72, n. 2.

<sup>39</sup>See Horrent, "Sur les sources épiques du "Pèlerinage de Charlemagne," Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire 38 (1960); pp. 763-764, for other texts of the period which assume Constantinople to be Saracen territory.

<sup>40</sup>Versions, pp. 48-53; "Le gab d'Olivier," Revue belge 34 (1956), 659-679; "Sur quelques passages du 'Voyage de Charlemagne . . .,'" Revue belge 40 (1962), 815-842 (a sort of review in extenso of Horrent, as remarked in n. 1); Voyage, 90-91. Aebischer undermines his argument a bit by citing the Welsh version, in which Oliver possesses the lady twenty times--suspiciously like the thirty of v. 726, which Aebischer argues against retaining in the French; for a defence of its retention, see Horrent, Pèlerinage, pp. 98-99 (esp. n. 2).

<sup>41</sup>See, e.g., Heatt, introduction to Part 1, Karlamagnus saga I, pp. 46-47; Aebischer, Versions, esp. pp. 143-145, and Textes norrois et littérature française du moyen âge, II, pp. 77-84; Horrent, "Sur les sources . . ." 750-764.