

Jones, George Fenwick, The Ethos of the Song of Roland (Johns Hopkins Press: Baltimore) 1963

p. 160 (cont'd) On the other hand, although Jules Horrent considers the Baligant episode an addition(258), he nevertheless believes that it had appeared in the original version on which the Carmen and the saga were based (125-129). This would seem likely, since the Baligant episode appears in the Rolandslied, which was written before the Carmen and the saga, even if not as early as previously believed.<sup>1</sup> If it is true that the authors of the Carmen and the saga both deleted the Baligant episode intentionally, this would suggest that they considered the Roncevaux episode sufficient in itself and in no need of a sequel.

In 1950 W. S. Woods (p. 1256) argued that the Baligant episode must have been written by a different author not only because it has no laisses similaires, but also because it is not divided, as the rest of the song is, into triads of closely related but dissimilar strophes. Nine years later Robert A. Hall, Jr. still argued for multiple authorship on the grounds of varying linguistic strata in the song,<sup>2</sup> for which purpose he reverted to arguments presented by Wendelin Foerster three quarters of a century earlier. These arguments have been known all this time, yet most critics, including Bédier, Becker, Paulhilet, and Curtius, have ignored them and insist that the poem is the work of a single author.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 The RL was formerly dated ca. 1130 and thus served as an early terminus ante quo for the SR. Now it is more generally dated ca. 1170.

2 "If we accept the evidence of the assonances, there can no longer be any question of the Roland being the work of a single author, even in a large part" (Hall, "Linguistic Strata . . .", p. 158)

3 Bédier (Légendes, III, p. 399, footnote 1) refutes arguments based on vocalism. Becker (p.3) denies an earlier version on stylistic and literary grounds: "Jede Untersuchung über das Rolandslied muss bei dieser Schläge von der Oxforder Fassung ausgehen, und sie darf es mit gutem Gewissen tun; denn bisher ist es trotz aller Anstrengung nicht gelungen, die dichterische Ursprünglichkeit unseres Rolandslieds mit Erfolg anzufechten und das Vorhandensein einer älteren Rolanddichtung als Vorstufe der unseren wahrscheinlich zu machen. Alle darauf gerichteten Versuche kommen gegen die feste Geschlossenheit und die geniale Einheitlichkeit der Dichtung, wie sie vorliegt, nicht auf." In Brief: "Wer behaupten kann, das Werk sei nicht aus einem Guss, hat es eben nicht verstanden" (Ibid., p. 7).