Despite having appeared several editions and interpretations, this piece continues to pose a number of problems.\(^1\) To what poetic genre does it belong? Should it be regarded as ‘fictive’ in some sense? How coherent is it, and to what should be attributed any incoherence? Are the interlocutors married or not?\(^2\) How many dramatis personae are involved and who are they? What is actually going on?

Starting with a Natureingang and continuing with alternate speeches

\(^1\) This article is an offshoot of Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson, *The Troubadour ‘Tensos’ and Partimens. A Critical Edition*, 3 vols, Cambridge 2010, and I am grateful to Ruth Harvey for her assistance in preparing it for publication. I also thank the British Academy for funding travel related to this research.

between a *seingner* and a *dompna*, this hybrid fails to conform readily to a recognised genre, and has been variously dubbed as a *canso* in the form of a dialogue, a «Tenzone mit einer Dame», a fictive *tenso* or a dialogue without the presentation of a debating topic, a «romance parodique (?)», or a mixed *tenso* and «contre-texte humoristique et burlesque».³ An objection to calling it a *tenso* might be that the first stanza does not conform to the usual pattern of specifically proposing a debate or dispute, though in fact there are a number of dialogue pieces Ruth Harvey and I have included in our recent edition of the *tensos* and *partimens* which do not do so. Even if many of these dialogues are implicitly designed to provoke a debate or dispute of some kind,⁴ some simply ask open questions, for example one consists in a troubadour recounting a dream which his interlocutor interprets, and in another the speakers take turns to lay bets on cowardly barons, thus


⁴ See, for example jongleuresque dialogues consisting in reciprocal insults such as *BdT* 15.1, 84.1, 98.1, 98.2, 189.2, 192.2a, 231.3, 292.1, 422.2, 438.1, 441.1, 458.1, or pieces beginning with an apparently open question such as *BdT* 459.1 (What is your opinion of Sir Guiran’s sisters?), where the point is to force the opponent into an embarrassing choice, *BdT* 248.16, where Guiraut Riquier asks Bofil why he sings and what is his religion, which leads to his abuse of the Jew, or *BdT* 252.1, where Ysabella asks Elias d’Ussel why he has neglected to serve her and they teasingly upraid each other. See the table of themes in Harvey-Paterson, *Troubadour ‘Tensos’*, I, pp. xxxii-xxxix.
arguing on the same side.\textsuperscript{5} So our piece might be regarded as some kind of \textit{tenso}, given that it consists mainly in a dialogue and contains a dispute, if not a debate. On the other hand none of the manuscript rubrics assigns it to any genre, IK do not include it in their \textit{tensos} sections, and they attribute it to Guillem Rainol alone.\textsuperscript{6}

Should it be regarded as ‘fictive’? Here a few elementary distinctions may be helpful. Firstly, one or both of the speakers designated \textit{in the text} may be fictional (for example an animal, or an inanimate object such as a cloak, or a seingner or a domna, or those who are given a fictional voice such as God, or dead troubadours, or a well-known lawyer). Secondly, the \textit{manuscript rubrics} may attribute a piece to one or more troubadours who did not exist, or may not have existed, in reality (for example a seingner or a domna, or a named character). Thirdly, a first-person speaker is not necessarily to be identified with an author; the two may be entirely, or only partially, different. A real troubadour may adopt one or more \textit{personae}: Marcabru is an obvious example, where the preaching persona of numerous pieces stands in stark opposition to that of the philandering knights in \textit{A la fontana del vergier} or \textit{L’autrer jost’ una sebissa}, or the crafty sinner of \textit{D’aiso laus Dieu}.\textsuperscript{7} And fourthly, a piece could, in theory, have been composed by an author or authors for \textit{performance} by different interlocutors named in the text or the manuscript rubrics.

Given the attributions provided by the four manuscripts, and the absence of any evidence to the contrary, there is no reason to doubt Guillem Rainol’s involvement in our piece’s authorship. Rieger challenged the idea that the dialogue was ‘fictive’ in that she considered

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{BdT} 265.2 and 149.1; see also \textit{BdT} 248.37 (What will the king of Aragon do for us?); 248.74 (How do things stand between the count of Rodez and Guilhem de Mur?); 267.1 (How will you (Eble d’Ussel) cope with your debts?). Compare Dominique Billy, «Pour une réhabilitation de la terminologie des troubadours: \textit{tenson}, \textit{partimen} et expressions synonymes», in \textit{Il genere \textquotesingle{tenzone} nelle letterature romanze delle Origini}, ed. by Matteo M. Pedroni and Antonio Stäuble, Ravenna 1999, pp. 237-313, especially pp. 295-296.

\textsuperscript{6} Of the four texts attributed to Guillem Rainol, there is a generic marker (\textit{tenso}) only for \textit{BdT} 231.3, and only in MSS \textit{Ea}\textsuperscript{1}; this piece is indubitably a \textit{tenso}, between our troubadour and Guillem Magret.

that the female speaker might have corresponded to a real trobairitz.\textsuperscript{8} However, the fact that the manuscript rubrics designate no other author or speaker, such as domna, apart from Guillem Rainol, suggests that they firmly considered Guillem to be the sole author, and IK’s positioning of the tensos supports this.\textsuperscript{9}

If Guillem Rainol is the (or an) author, is he also to be identified with the male speaker? In the text itself the man is only ever referred to in the text as seingner, not Guillem, and is therefore no more specified than the female domna, so it is surely questionable, to say the least, to identify him as the troubadour himself—which seems to be Rieger’s position. True, it is quite possible to imagine a performance where the author Guillem performs the part of the fictional man, which could set up a humorous interplay between the latter and the public persona of the real troubadour, but he would still be manifestly playing a part. This is not the same situation as, say, Guiraut Riquier giving his opinion on some debating point, even if he is pretending to adopt a position that he may not hold in reality, since there is no doubt that Guiraut is speaking in his own voice. There is some potential for interplay between author and speaker in the present piece, but it seems likely to me that the seingner is essentially a fictional character—as Frank no doubt implied by his tentative designation «romance parodique».

How coherent is it? Riquer refers to the «aspecto desordenado y a veces absurdo de la discusión» which, he suggests, may be designed to reflect the nature of a domestic quarrel.\textsuperscript{10} But there might be other reasons for such an impression of disorder such as, obviously, faulty manuscript transmission and the difficulties of interpretation. Or was

\textsuperscript{8} «... auch wenn kaum feststellbar ist, wer Guillem Rainols potentielle Gesprächspartnerin gewesen sein könnte, kann die zuletzt von Erich Köhler erneuerte Klassifizierung als “ fingierte Tenzone” für beide gemischte tensos durchaus in Frage gestellt werden» (p. 351).

\textsuperscript{9} When Ruth Harvey and I were considering which texts to include in our edition of the troubadour tensos and partimens, following on from John Marshall’s original project, we never intended to include pieces involving non-existent authors, and we decided that this piece’s parodic nature, its narrative opening stanza, and the indeterminate designations seingner and, more particularly, domna, made it on balance more likely that Guillem was indeed the sole composer.

\textsuperscript{10} Riquer, Los trovadores, vol. III, p. 1240.
Guillem perhaps composing in *trobar clus*? After all, his *tenso* with Guillem Magret, *Maigret, piolet m’est el cap*, is a virtuoso piece of wordplay reminiscent of Marcabru’s famous *gap* and its *colors*, where Magret, if not Guillem, boasts of his ability to snatch his words from a dark place.\(^{11}\) I shall in fact argue that any impression of incoherence derives from the manuscript transmission and the difficulties of interpretation springing from the unusual vocabulary and elements of a popularising register; that the narrative situation is probably simpler than has been previously thought; and that any wordplay or semantic ambivalence works primarily as humour rather than purely as jongleuresque display.\(^{12}\) My conviction—followed in most of the *tensos* edition (not to mention *Marcabru*)—has been that the troubadours usually intended to make sense. A very few *tensos* and *partimens* seem to have been composed or possibly improvised in a hurry, or were fashioned by less than competent troubadours,\(^ {13}\) but Guillem Rainol enjoyed a fine poetic and musical reputation: both of his *vidas* praise his poetic and musical skills, particularly in his *sirventes*, for which he was said, remarkably, always to have composed new tunes.\(^ {14}\)

The song opens with hybrid generic signs, a parodic *Natureingang* where the farmyard cockerel mixes with birds characteristic of both *canso* (*merl*, *rossignols*) and, often though not exclusively, *sir-**


\(^{12}\) Krispin, p. 235: «Les doubles sens et les allusions sont nombreux, il [sic] ne sont souvent pas clairs pour nous, mais l’étaient sans doute pour les contemporains».


\(^{14}\) «Bons trobaire fo de sirventes de las rasos que corien en Proensa entre l rei d’Arragon e-l comte de Tolosa; e si fez a toz sos sirventes sons nouz. Fort fo tempsuz per totz los baros, per los cosens sirventes qu’el fazia» (*Biographies des troubadours: textes provençaux des XIII\textsuperscript{e} et XIV\textsuperscript{e} siècles*, ed. Jean Boutière and Alexander Herman Schutz, second edition by Jean Boutière and Irénée-Marcel Cluzel, Paris 1973, LXXVII, p. 495), «E fez bonas cansos e bons sirventes e bonas coblas» (*Boutière-Schutz-Cluzel, Biographies des troubadours*, LXXVI, p. 493).
ventes (pic, jai). Line 4 announces the speaker’s intention to sing without anyone inviting him to do so. This allows first of all for the interpretation that his singing will be importunate—leading to the woman’s complaint in line 9. At the same time a vers ses prec may suggest that the song will be a non-request, inverting a common introductory topos of the canso and signalling the man’s clumsiness both at handling courtly rhetoric and, more mundanely, asking for what he wants. The manuscript transmission in line 3 is almost certainly faulty, and none of the previous attempts to interpret e la guises perier (as some kind of bird) carries any conviction. My conjectural emendation e·l rossignols se languis el perier, if correct, may introduce the motif of adultery, of ‘sensuality and fabliau laughter’: see the note to this line, below.

For line 6 Kolsen, Riquer, Chambers and Bonaugurio adopt the D⁴H reading falco as opposed to IK falcos. Kolsen (also Chambers) interprets «that she makes me tamer (‘trains me more’) than a lanner falcon», commenting that these birds are hard to train, which as Rieger remarks, contradicts his interpretation; in any case it strains the sense of loirar (PD «leurrer»). Krispin translates «elle m’attire plus qu’un lanier», interpreting «la femelle du laneret, le faucon lanier, attrire comme oiseau de leurre le faucon parti en chasse», which I accept, assuming that he takes falco as direct object representing the

15 The adjective pic often means unreliable, fickle (BdT 210.7, 9), especially coupled with vair (BdT 30.7, 25, BdT 70.24, 25, BdT 133.9, 25, see COM). As a noun it appears in the context of satire (Peire Vidal, Et es assatz plus secs que pics [BdT 364.38, 82]) and trobar brau (Anon., «Can vei la flor sobre·l sambuc / et au lo pic e·l merle e·l gais, / e lo refrim del brau airol» [BdT 461.205, 1-3]). The jay appears in the context of satire (vers, sirventes) connoting pride (Marcabr: BdT 293.42, 2; 293.38, 17) and false love (Peire d’Alverne: BdT 327.17), and see BdT 461.205 cited above. Exceptions are Garin lo Brun’s ensenhamen for a lady, Garin Lo Brun: l’ ‘ensegnamen’ alla dama, ed. by Laura Regina Bruno, Palermo 1996, lines 11-15, which lists a variety of birds in the context of courtly love («e auzi pels ramels / lo dolz chant dels aucels: / que le merles e·l iais / e·l torz e l’auriols / e·l pics e·l rossinols, / e dels altres gran massa»), and a canso of Arnaut de Maroill (BdT 30.10, 2-8), ed. Ronald Carlyle Johnston, Les Poésies du troubadour Arnaut de Mareuil, Paris 1935.

16 Krispin, «La tradition manuscrite des trobairitz», p. 235: «Je pense que le seigneur ne jouit plus des faveurs de sa dame, parce qu’il chante sans être prié».

17 «dass sie mich zahmer macht (‘mehr abrichtet’) wie einen Würgfalken».

man. Rieger adopts IK’s nom. sg. *falcos* and translates «dass sie mich besser ködert als der Lockvogel den Würgfalken». This is also possible, although *lanier* is elsewhere unattested as an Occitan noun referring to the lanner falcon (though it is common enough in Old French), either in the dictionaries or *COM*. While in courtly love literature the woman’s capturing of her lover’s heart «may be likened to the falcon’s seizure of the heart of his quarry, or, more exactly, her quarry»,¹⁹ it is also possible to see in lines 4–6 the idea that, contrary to the premises of the *canso*, the *domna* will not need to be asked for her favours, since in opposition to the courtly lady that she is said to be, she is the sexual predator luring the man. For his part the male speaker is represented by the type of falcon considered the poorest for hunting purposes,²⁰ an image which both reinforces the low-status effect introduced by the *gal* of line 1, and, given the erotic imagery often associated with raptors, quite possibly his weaker sexual performance.²¹

The word *esterlins/esterlis* of the manuscripts (line 11) most probably represents another transmission error in the common source. Following Kolsen’s emendation to *esterles* on the basis of Mistral,²² otherwise attested in the dictionaries and *COM* only as an adjective, most editors and translators (myself included) understand ‘youths’. Rieger’s conjecture that *esterlins* may be a pejorative term for something along the lines of ‘moneybags’ («*Geldsäcke*») does not really square with *cusson ni fatonier* in line 15 and there is nothing to support the idea that the woman is after money rather than sex, but a fourteenth-century example of the word *esterle* in *SW*, III, 320, apparently imply-


ing idle frivolousness,\textsuperscript{23} seems an apt nuance in the present case. However this may be, the woman is obviously claiming—with blatant disingenuousness, in the light of stanza IV—that the man has no rivals.

More critical for the overall interpretation of the piece, Kolsen and subsequent editors take \textit{plasentier} in line 9 to mean ‘charming, pleasant’\textsuperscript{24} and have consequently concluded that the woman is fundamentally well-disposed towards him, despite the fact that she has just expressed her irritation with his bad temper and said that she is constantly thinking of leaving him. A consequence of this perception has been to argue that the woman’s references to his potential rivals, here and in subsequent stanzas, are designed deliberately to arouse his jealousy in order to attach him more closely to herself. But it makes much more sense to see in the word \textit{plasentier} a sarcastic sneer at the man’s inept blandishments in stanza I: compare «e ges d’aiso no-il soi fals plazentiers / que mais la vol, non di la boca·l cors» (Arnaut Daniel), «Paraulas d’ops e drechurieras / vueillas mais dir que plazentieras, / que no redon nuilla sabor / al dizin ni al auzidor / mas un paubre de-leichamen, / quan se dizon primeiramen/ c’ab eissas las paraulas fug, / car non es dignes c’om l’estug; / l’autre son plazentier / escarnen e trufan» (Daude de Pradas),\textsuperscript{25} and my translation «so full of blarney», in other words smooth talking, soft soap. I see her claim to rush and

\textsuperscript{23} Jean-Baptiste Noulet and Camille Chabaneau, \textit{Deux manuscrits provençaux du XIVE siècle}, Montpellier and Paris 1888, XXVI, 40-45: «Mas oms de patz que vuelha noyir tort, / Per alegrar, o rossinhol o merle, / Sera cuntatz per nessi filh esterle, / Senes eret, cum son en tota cort / Li bort»; see the note on p. 187: «*ESTERLE, XXVI, 43, propr. stérile, d’où inutile, incapable? Doujat: garçon, jeune homme à marier, drôle. Sauvages: stérile, qui n’engendre pas. Cf. Las Joyas del gay saber, gloss.».


hide from passing youths as making fun of the man’s gullibility—since he goes on thick-wittedly to take her at her word.

In stanza III, as in stanza I, registers mix and clash. Lines 13-14 present courtly elements: the designation of the woman as *dompna*, the notion of *celar* fused with the typical courtly lover’s inability to reveal his true feelings, and praise of the lady, all undermined by the man’s possessiveness, his allusion to the low-born and uncourtly *cusson ni fatonier*, his avoidance of chivalric opportunities—reminiscent of the fabliau *Berenger au long cul*—, and his preference for the comforts of peasant food. Kolsen originally struggled in vain to make sense of this stanza, but then in a note (p. 65, n. 1) referred to a letter from Levy translating 13-17 as «Deshalb lobe ich euch und danke euch dafür, dass ihr nie einen gemeinen Menschen oder Narren liebet, sondern ihn floht (vermiedet), ich ich die Kampfreihen des Turniers (eigentlich aufmarschiertes, in Reihen geordnetes Turnier) floh, denn ich bin nie mehr bei einem solchen (*i* = dabei) gewesen, seit ihr es mir verboten habt». Riquer rightly accepted this sense of *tornier*, repunctuating Kolsen’s text of 16-17 to read *anz lo fugist, com eu tornier rengat, / qu’anc no’i foi pois,* though, as Kolsen, made no sense of the connection between lines 13 and 14: why should the man be asking the woman why she is pleased he does not reveal his heart to her? Krispin’s translation of 14, «pourquoi acceptiez-vous mon service, et pourquoi vous était-il agréable?», is hardly meaningful. Rieger follows Levy’s punctuation of 15-16 in SW, III, 419, printing 13-17 as ...

---

26 *Domna, tostems vos ai mon cor cellat; / Per que n’auez de mi lauzor e grat / quant non amest cusson ni fatonier, / anz lo fugist com eu tornier rengat /qu’anc no’i fos pois, ... («verheimlicht; deshalb zolle ich Euch Lob und Dank*

27 «Nunca amasteis a tunante ni a necio, sino que lo rehuisteis, como yo al torneo alineado, al que no volvi más desde que me lo prohibisteis».

28 Riquer, *Los trovadores*, translates 14 as «¿por qué estáis satisfecha de mí e agradecida?». 
dafür, / da Ihr keinen Flegel oder Schurken liebet; – eher floht Ihr ihn, 
wie ich den Turnieraufmarsch, / denn ich was nicht mehr dort»). If I 
have correctly understood the force of deshalb here and in Levy’s 
translation cited by Kolsen, Levy and Rieger understand per qe to an-
ticipate cant: ‘I praise and give thanks to you for this reason, that you 
have never loved...’, which gives good sense—but can per que = per 
so? I have taken per qe as a clarification of mon cor, and cant to mean 
‘since’, explaining the lauzor e grat, in other words 14 as dependent 
on 13, and 15 as a clause dependent on 14: so literally ‘I have always 
concealed from you my feelings whereby you have approval and ap-
preciation from me since you never loved a crook or a knave’, or, 
more simply, ‘I’ve never mentioned how grateful I am that you’ve 
never loved’ and so on.29 It is unclear whether the man is steering 
clear of tourneys or real battles.30 What is clear is that he is both gulli-
ble about the woman’s chastity and an idle coward. It is also clear that 
he is supposed to be a knight but is living like a peasant. And the 
comment about her not loving anyone basely born proves double-
edged, since she goes on to declare her interest in a shepherd that she 
would like to clothe as a knight.

Following on from his interpretation of stanza II, Kolsen saw 
stanzas IV-VI as revealing the woman’s attempts to bind the man to 
her by arousing his jealousy.31 Again, I understand them to show the 
woman’s fabliau-like infidelity and mockery, and the man’s impotent 
rage.

Much confusion has arisen here from the word so in lines 20-21, 
attested by all MSS. Kolsen, followed by Riquer, Rieger and in es-
sence Krispin, retains it, understanding it as a possessive adjective and 
translating «daß wir sein (Michels) gestreiftes Schwein verkaufen und 
[note 1: Mit dem für das Schwein erhaltenen Gelde] dessen Hirt, den

29 For fatonier (PD «fou»), previous editors hesitate between ‘fool’ (Kolsen, 
with a query, Riquer, Krispin) and ‘rogue’ (Rieger, following LR, III [sic, not I]), 
284, and seeing cusso / fatonier as a pair of synonyms reinforcing each other.
30 See Linda Paterson, «Tournaments and knightly sports in twelfth- and 
thirteenth-century Occitania», Medium Aevum, 55, 1986, pp. 72-84.
suscitar los celos del marido».
Michel, einkleiden». However Miquel has not yet put in an appearance, so Kolsen is obliged to add the gloss «(Michels)» to explain to whom the possessive refers; moreover it is clear from berbeguier (line 21) and lanutz (line 29) that Miquel is a shepherd, but not at all clear that he is a swineherd. When the puzzling so reappears in line 27, again attested by all MSS, Kolsen, Riquer and Rieger feel constrained to emend to lo since the definite article is inescapably intended. Chambers realised that so is a rarely attested form of the definite article (sometimes called «pyrénéen ou archaïque»), which the Leys d’Amors condemns as a fault, its use in the piece being perhaps intended to convey popular speech. Hence the sense in stanza IV is simply that the woman proposes to the man that they sell the, in other words their, biggest pig in order to dress up the shepherd—a sense clearly understood by Bonaugurio. It is then clear that the man and woman are indeed a married couple, living on a farm (as has been clear from the cock’s crow in line 1 and the barn in line 12), and that the wife considers the shepherd to have much greater promise than her husband as both a knight and a lover.

In stanza V the husband does indeed clearly show signs of jealousy (but not, I repeat, as a result of deliberate provocation on the wife’s part), remembering that the shepherd has attracted his wife’s attentions in the past and that this has made him look a fool. However, line 28 has provoked confusion because all previous scholars have understood sas as a possessive adjective qualifying vertuz. Kolsen translates «denn in Anbetracht seiner Eigenschaften schwöre ich Euch jetz», noting encontra as «im Vergleich mit», «hier eher ‘in

---

32 In her note to 21 Rieger, Trobairitz, comments that all MSS have so and that Kolsen, Dichtungen, emended to lo, which is incorrect. Krispin understands so and translates ‘son’ in both cases.

33 Riquer, Los trovadores: «que vendiéramos el mayor puerco cinchado de Miquel y que vistiéramos a su pastor».


35 «chiede al seignier di vendere il suo maiale più bello per far confezionare una mantellina a Miquel, un giovane e avvenente pastore». 
Anbetracht’). Riquer translates *encontra sas vertutz* as «*por sus huesos*» (‘on his bones’), glossing «Literalmente: ‘*por sus virtudes*’», the latter in the sense of ‘relics’ as in SW, VIII, 699, 9, a sense rejected in this instance by Rieger who translates «*trotz seiner ‘Tugenden*’». Krispin saw *vertutz* as ambivalent: ‘relics’ and also physical force; he translates «*je vous soutiens un serment contre ses reliques*». The difficulties encountered by these editors can be substantially simplified by understanding *sas* as an error for the adjective *sans*, ‘holy’, the error easily explicable by the omission of an abbreviation mark. The grandiose topos in this line, reminiscent of Yseut’s *escondit*, is deployed for comic effect in the humble domestic setting. It must be allowed that *encontra* poses a problem: its usual senses are «*contre, à l’encontre de; par comparaison à*» (PD), the usual preposition for swearing on relics is *sobre*, and I have been unable to find an another example of *jurar encontra* with this sense. Nonetheless it seems imposed by the context.

The last two lines of stanza V imply that Miquel owns his sheep but has grazing rights on the couple’s land, perhaps on a year’s lease. In line 30 the manuscripts hesitate between *nos* (D*I and *uos* (K), the reading of H being unclear (Grüzmacher read *nos*, Gauchat-Kehrli *uos*). The *nos* of *D*I implies the jealous husband will see to it that Miquel will not be allowed on their land any more; *uos* (adopted by all but Bonaugurio) seems less likely since the husband does not seem to have accepted, despite the evidence and the ambiguity of *amas* in 26, that his wife has definitely ‘been with’ Miquel.

All previous editors take 31 to introduce a question about a new lover (MSS *cals es aicel*, ‘who is that?’). They take this to reinforce Kolsen’s idea that the woman is still trying to arouse the man’s jealousy with a view to making herself more attractive to him. Kolsen, followed by Riquer, prints 31-33 as *cals es aicel coma tondutz, / Uns grans, uns loncs, ab esperos agutz* and translates «*was ist das für einer, einer mit geschorenem Kopfe, ein grosser, langer, mit spitzen*

---

36 For various arrangements for the ownership and administration of pastures, see Linda Paterson, *The World of the Troubadours*, Cambridge 1993, p. 127.
He understands *coma tondutz* as ‘shaven head’, explaining the form *tondutz* (rather than the expected *tonduda*) as a Greek accusative and citing examples from Diez. In *SW*, II, 449 Levy prints *cals es a[i]cel c’om a*, followed by Krispin in his translation: «quel est celui qu’on a tondu, / un grand, un long, avec des éperons aigus [...]?», and by Rieger, who translates «was ist das fur einer, mit dem geschorenen Haar, / ein grosser, langer, mit spitzen Sporen [...]?»). Bonaugurio essentially prints Kolsen’s text but adds a comma after *aicel*, omitting the commas in 32, and retaining the double *n* of the MSS: Seingner, *cals es aicel, coma tondutz, / uns grans uns loncs ab esperos agutz / entopennatz a lei de cavalier?* Although she does not translate, she interprets as follows: «Nella sesta cobla la domma accende ulteriormente la gelosia del seignier additandogli un giovane ‘impennacchiato’ come un cavaliere».

The epithet *loncs* to praise a man’s height and qualifying a person, rather than an aspect of a person such as the noun *cors*, is unusual, but found in one other example, so may be compatible with this interpretation. The repeated *uns* requires some explanation: conceivably it could have the force of ‘a certain’ (‘who is that man..., a certain big, tall man,...?’), again not inconsistent with the idea that she might be trying to arouse his jealousy. But why would he have a shaven head? Should he be understood as a cleric in knight’s clothing? And what of *encopennatz* or the possible emendation *entopennatz* (33)?


---

37 Riquer, *Los trovadores*: «quien es este cabeza pelada, grande, alto, con agudas espuelas...?».


39 Peire Guilhem’s allegorical *Lai on cobra sos drez estatz*, ed. Maria Grazia Capusso, «La novella allegorica di Peire Guilhem», *Studi mediolatini e volgari*, 43, 2003, pp. 35-130, lines 25-27 «Un cavazier, / Bel e gran e fort e sosbrier / E lonc e dreg e ben talhatz», and accompanying a noun, 45 «Lonc cors e dalgatz per sentura», also *BdT* 70.16, 45 «Lonc lonc, dreih e covinen», and other examples on *COM*. 
prints entopenatz and translates «eingemummt (?)». Riquer and Rieger, followed by Bonaugurio, also emend to entopenatz, which Riquer hesitantly renders as «arrogado», while acknowledging that entopenatz is an emendation, referring to Appel (loc. cit. in SW), who found the sense «abrigado» (covered, of clothes) in modern dialects. Krispin retains encopennatz and translates «la tête couverte comme un chevalier», making a link with cop ‘skull’ and copar «couvrir d’un chapeau», though this would not explain the form of the word. Rieger tentatively translates entopenatz as «mit einer Kopfbedeckung», citing «AF topin “boule de métal placée au sommet d’un clocher”, hanc. toupin “mèche de bonnet de coton” (FEW, XVII, 344a under *TOP (anfrk.) ‘spitze’)». She concludes that the exact sense is undecidable, but that Krispin’s interpretation (if not his explanation) is probably correct; but the senses she cites from the FEW suggest not a kind of hat but, if anything, a bobble or tuft on the end of a hat—a bizarre image indeed. Bonaugurio places her interpretation in angle brackets («impennacchiato», decked with feathers), though it is far from clear how she has arrived at this from the emendation entopenatz.

Given the unsatisfactory nature of all attempts to make sense of these lines, the text is likely be corrupt, and calls for emendation. I conjecture that reference is being made to fashions in facial hair, and that cals es should be emended to caises (cheeks), uns grans, uns loncs to uns grenons loncs, and encopennatz to encor pennatz, all cases easily explicable paleographically (l for i, misinterpretation of the word grenons which was either blotched or squashed up, omission of an abbreviation mark over the o of encor and misleading lack of word division). For penat/pennat see LR, IV, 491 and PD. Rather than to a new lover, the woman would still be alluding to the handsome Miqel, a youth just beginning to acquire facial hair. The force of uns (32) may be to suggest the sparseness of the hairs on his upper lip, hence his youth, this incipient moustache being in line with the latest fashion. Compare Bertran de Born (BdT 80.45, ed. Gouiran, 30, 3031), «E de pel penzenat son pro, / Rasas denz et en cais greno».41

40 In his n. 22 («La tradition manuscrite des trobairitz», p. 241).
41 Rieger, Trobairitz, p. 354, raises the possibility that tondutz might refer to Guillem Magret, who partnered Guillem in BdT 231.3, where reference his made to his abandonment of the cloister: «Der Hinweis jedoch, daß es sich dabei um
In line 36 H is the only manuscript to have what must be the correct reading *dei*. Kolsen, Riquer, Krispin, and Bonaugurio take this to mean ‘owe’. As a consequence Kolsen wrongly interprets *car* as a conjunction introducing a clause of purpose, ‘so that’ (‘so daß ich jetz seinem Jagdfalken ein Hünchen schulde’). Krispin, weakly, translates *car* as ‘and’, «et maintenant je dois un petit oiseau à son laneret». Riquer avoids the difficulty posed by *car* by printing *c’ar*, and translates «que ahora debo un polluelo a su terzuelo lanero». Rieger was the first to see that *dei* is a preterite form of *dar* («und ist mir besser gesonnen als ein gehörnten Stier, / da ich seinem Jagdfalken ein Hünchen gab»). Bonaugurio prints *c’ar* and interprets «che le ha fatto tante dimostrazioni d’affetto da spingerla a ricompensarlo e ‘dare un pollo al suo terzuolo’», which seems imply to that the gift was a result, rather than a cause, of the man’s enthusiasm.

What are the implications of *tersol lanier*? Firstly, erotic, harking back to line 6.42 Secondly, social: *lanier* usually connotes the base churl.43 But the *tersol* is a noble bird, referring to ‘the male of the goshawk and of some falcons, especially the principal one, the peregrine’. So the oxymoronic juxtaposition of *tersol* and *lanier* no doubt evokes both the lowly social status of the shepherd and the comical knightly aspirations the woman has for him, and which his fashionable pretensions suggest he has for himself. If the *tersol* is male, it is also «noticeably smaller than the female»,44 and sometimes appears to be employed, as is appropriate here, as a metaphor for a youth: «Eu sai un austor tersol / mudat, q’anc non pres ausel, / franc e cortes et isnel, /


43 Evans, «Nobility», pp. 88 and 98.

44 Evans, «Nobility», p. 80.
ab cui eu m’apel Tristan». But, also pertinently in the present context, it was seen as less rapacious than the female, and needing a female to fire it up to hunt: «de totz auzels cassadors / te hom los femes per meillors, / e tug li masle son tersol; / e son tan caut que, per lur vol, / non penrion mas lur aon; / mas li feme son deziron, / e-l femeniges si-lls destrenh / que de penre non a desdenh, / ans son volontos de cassar». This might help to explain the image of the *bous cornuz* in line 35. On one level, both the obscenity and the farmyard associations of *bous cornuz* serve to undermine the courtly cliché of line 34. On another, some comedy may be implied by the idea of the suitor as an ox, which after all is a castrated bull.

But what of the *pol*? Rieger doubts Krispin’s hypothesis that the ‘chick’ refers to pregnancy, but it seems to me that this idea does in fact form part of a *triple entendre*: the literal idea of giving food to his falcon (chicks being the normal food for such birds), then the figurative, obscene, sense of making a sexual gift to his ‘lanner’, and thirdly the idea of pregnancy, with all that implies for the husband. Any contradiction with the lover’s ox-like designation simply adds to the comic potential through its deliberate incongruity. There is also likely to be wordplay on *lana* ‘wool’, appropriate to a shepherd: compare 29 *aver lanuz* and Giraut de Borneil’s play on the name of the joglar to whom his song *Cardaillac, per un sirventes* is addressed: «Cardaillac approximately = ‘wool-carder’ and *lanier* = ‘wool-dealer’ and also ‘worthless’, ‘low’, ‘base’».

---


46 Alexander Herman Schutz, *The Romance of Daude de Pradas called «Dels Auzels Cassadors»*, Columbus, Ohio 1945), lines 67-75.

47 I do not understand Krispin’s interpretation of stanza VI («La tradition manuscrite des trobairitz», p. 236): «elle se moque de son ami de naguère même si au début elle s’est laissée séduire par sa poésie et qu’elle se trouve maintenant enceinte de lui». Who is «son ami de naguère»?

48 Rieger, *Trobairitz*, p. 348 and p. 354; Krispin, «La tradition manuscrite des trobairitz», p. 236. Rieger objected to «den biologische unsinnigen Vergleich (das Hühnchen als Falkenjunges)», but *pol* can mean the chick of any bird, not just of a hen: see *PD, LR*, IV, 589, and examples on *COM*.

This piece would appear to be designed for performance as a comic sketch. With its parodic *canso* beginning, jumbling courtly and rustic elements and undermining the expectation of a courtly request for love, followed by a *tenso*-like dialogue, it is readily imaginable in dramatised form with appropriate costumes, props and gestures, and conceivably a ‘shepherd’ lurking in the background, suitably equipped with facial hair and of both lustful and bovine demeanour. If Guillem Rainol himself, a knight according to his *vida*,\(^{50}\) was performing the man’s part, he could have come on stage in his own persona, starting the song as if it were going to be a *canso* but of a questionable, hybrid sort, and being interrupted by a ‘woman’ whose part could have been sung and acted by another man, a woman, or even the troubadour himself—in falsetto, perhaps?

Giuseppe Tavani has suggested that the text constitutes a «*fabliau* dialogato», a *fabliau* in dialogue form. This seems an apt and felicitous designation.

---

\(^{50}\) Boutière-Schutz-Cluzel, *Biographies des Troubadours*, LXXVI, p. 493.
Guillem Rainol d’At

Quant aug chantar lo gal sus el erbos

(BdT 231.4)

Mss.: Dª 170v (willems rammols), H 44r-v (Guillems ranals), I 143r-v (Guillem rainols dat followed by vida), K 129r (Guillems rammols dat followed by vida); miniatures in IK.


Versification: a10 a10 b10 a10 a10 b10 (Frank 91:3), a: -os, -at, -utz; b: -ier. Six coblas doblas.

Attribution and dating. The text cannot be precisely dated, though Guillem Rainol was active at the time of the Albigensian Crusade, his sirventes BdT 231.1a having been composed in 1216 just after Simon de Montfort raised the siege of Beaucaire (see Martin Aurell, La Vielle et l’épée. Troubadours et politique en Provence au XIIIe siècle, Paris 1989, p. 47, and for further details, the General Note to the edition of BdT 231.3 in Harvey - Paterson, The Troubadour ‘Tensos’.

Textual discussion. All MSS derive from a common faulty source, Avalle’s b (d’Arco Silvio Avalle, La letteratura medievale in lingua d’oc nella sua tradizione manoscritta, Turin 1961; revised ed., I manoscritti della letteratura in lingua d’oc, ed. Lino Leonardi, Turin, 1993) according to Maria Careri, Il canzoniere provenzale H (Vat. Lat. 3207). Struttura, contenuto e fonti, Modena 1990, p. 204 and p. 211; see 3, 11(?), 20, 21, 27, 32, 33(?), 36(?), and Rossella Bonaugurio, in Rialto, Note to 231.1, who observes that
the order of *BdT* 231.1 and this piece is the same in all MSS and that the two pieces have the same *stemma codicum*, though she does not present the latter. The poor state of *H* and particularly *K* make these undesirable as base; *D* preserves the proper name in 21 (despite misleading word-division), and (with *I*) a better reading in 30, and has slightly fewer errors than *I*. My readings of the MSS and interpretations differ from those of all previous editors on a number of occasions.

Base: *D*.

**Man**  
Quant aug chantar lo gal sus el erbos  
e-l pic e-l jai e-l merl’e-l coaros,  
e-l rossignols se languis el perier,  
farai un vers ces prec e ses somos.  
Ma dompn’es tan bel’e cortez’e pros  
qe-m fai loirar plus que falco lanier.

**Woman**  
Seingner, tan m’es mals e contrarios  
cen vez ai cor qe mi parta de vos:  
mais anc non vi home tan plasentier!  
Mas d’una ren es ben aventuros:  
cant cent venir esterles orgoillos,  
ades m’escont en granj’o en sellier.

**Variants:** The stanzas in *H* are grouped together in pairs, i.e. each stanza beginning with seignor running on from the previous 6 lines.

**Deviations from base:** 2 merlel] merlet 3 rossignol elaguises 9 planzentier 11 esterlins

2 merlel] merlet *D*; illegible between second el and lel coar** H 3 rossignol *D*, russion*l H, rossignor K; elaguises (ela guises l) p. *D*IK, elagi | ses prec or proc H 6 lorrar K; falcos *IK; lainier H 7 eigner H 9 plan- zentier *D* 11 esterlins *D*IK, esterlis *H*

I. When I hear the cock crowing up in the meadow with the magpie, jay, blackbird and redstart, and the nightingale languishes in the pear tree, I will compose a song without request or command. My lady is so lovely, courtly and worthy that she lures me more than a [decoy does a] lanner falcon.

II. Sir, you are so unpleasant and annoying towards me that a hundred times I feel like leaving you; never have I come across a man so full of blarney! But in one respect you’re in luck: when I spot the cocky fancy-free (?) young men coming, I rush to hide in the barn or the cellar.
Man III

Dompna, tostems vos ai mon cor celat
per qe n’avés de mi lauzor e grat
cant non amest cusson ni fatonier,
anz lo fugist—com eu toreme rengat,
c’anc no·i foi pueis pos m’o aguest vedat:
mais am flauzons e sopas en sabrier!

Woman IV

Seingner, tostems vos aurai prezicat
que vendesem so maior porc faissat,
e vestissem Miqel, so berbeguier:
fezessem li blizaut fendut trepat.
Tant a gen cors e bella magestat,
cent vez er pres a lei de cavalier!

Man V

Dompna, Miqels volria fos penduz,
qe tant l’amas qu’ie·n son per fols tengutz—
so bacalar tracher mesoneguier—
que ar vos jur encontra sans vertuz
que ja Miqels ni sos aver lanuz
non estara ab nos un an entier.

Deviations from base: 21 mi qel e s. (+1) 23 agon 26 quin 28 sas

III. Lady, I have always concealed from you my attitude through which you incur my approval and thanks for you not giving your love to a base man or a fool, but having fled from him—as I have a pitched battle, for I’ve never been in one, since you’ve forbidden it: I prefer cheesecakes and sops in broth!

IV. Sir, I have constantly urged that we should sell the biggest striped pig and dress Miqel the shepherd in a slit lined tunic. He has such a handsome physique and splendid bearing, he will be taken for a knight a hundred times!

V. Lady, I’d like to see Miqel hanged, for you’re so keen on him that people take me for a fool—the treacherous lying varlet! On the contrary, I now swear to you on holy relics that Miqel and his woolly wealth will not outstay the year with us.
Seingner, caises a cel coma tonduz, 
uns grenons loncs ab esperons aguz 
encor pennatz a lei de cavalier; 
tant me mandet amistaz e saluz 
e·m grazis mais qe si fos bous cornuz 
car dei un pol a son tersol lanier.

Deviations from base: 31 cals es aicel 32 granz uns 33 Encopennaz 36 de] die

31 eigner H; cals es DhHIK; aicel DhH; com atondutz IK 32 Uns grans uns loncs DhHIK (first ‘Uns’ illegible K) 33 Encopennatz DhH, Encopennaz I, En copenaz K (?) 35 grazis unsure K 36 die DhIK; tresol IK; lainer H

VI. Sir, he has cheeks that look shaven, long moustaches grown to sharp points, still downy, in knightly fashion; he has sent me so many tokens of friendship and greetings and appreciates me more than if he were a horned ox because I’ve given a chick to his lanner falcon.

1. Kolsen translates Quant as ‘Weil’, which is equally possible.
2. Despite Rieger’s insistance (p. 343) that MS I reads cuares, cuaros seems clear. — MS merlet, ‘merlon’ (part of a battlement) is an individual scribal slip.
3. perier is unattested elsewhere in Med. Occ. as a type of bird. Kolsen (p. 64, accepted by Riquer) emends to l’aguilos perier «spurred greenfinch», on the basis of NF perier and the existence of a Provençal greenfinch (Emberiza Provincialis) with a rear claw that often sticks out in spur-like fashion. Rieger (also Bonaugurio) is unconvinced by aguilos and emends to l’aguisset p., which she interprets as ‘tamed greenfinch’ (see LR, III [not II as Rieger records], 521, aguisar «affaiter, arranger, disposer»). However, even if the word could be stretched to mean ‘tamed’, this would be an unlikely member of a list of wild birds, and her claim that her alternative hypothesis, aguis perier, would not be out of place in this «bunte Reihe» is unconvinving, as well as failing adequately to explain aguis’. Krispin interprets the emendation aguilos as having a «cri strident, pointu», and perier as «proyer», bunting («le proyer pointu»), p. 235; in the note (p. 241, n. 17) he quotes TF petardi «emberiza miliaria (Lin.), oiseau dont en [sic] traduit le chant par tri-tri-tri-tri…». My emendation has the advantages of understanding perier to have a sense that is otherwise attested in Med. Occ. (see LR, IV, 514), and being less strained. For another example of a reflexive form of languir see BdT 434a.80, 25-38, ed. Joan Corominas, Cerverí de Girona, Lírica, 2 vols,
Barcelona 1988, XLIII, _Pus dan, sanan, ges an, se languiran, riran, pauzan_ (for _languir_, not recorded in _PD_, see _LR_, IV, 17, and compare, perhaps, reflexive forms of _laguir_, _languiar_, _lanhar_, _lagnar_, _laigner_ with a similar sense; _FEW_, V, 161 notes «pr. languir v.r. ‘s’ennuyer’»—compare _TL_, II, 185 _se languir_, v.r. «S’ennuyer dans l’attente, attendre avec impatience, trouver le temps long»). The error may have arisen because a previous source with _el rossignolsselaguiel p._ was perhaps misunderstood as a continuation of the list of object nouns from 1-2, the inflexion of _rossignols_ being ‘corrected’ and a stab made at what was assumed to be another bird; confusion of _l_ and _s_ in the last character before _perier_ would represent a common enough scribal error. For the pear tree as suggestive of adultery in _fabliau_ and romance, see Lucy Polak, «Cligés, Fenice et l’’arbre d’amour», _Romania_, 93, 1972, pp. 303-316, and _Chrétien de Troyes: Cligés_, London 1982, p. 68.

7. **H**: Grüzmacher and Gauchat-Kehrli mals e.

11. The word _esterlins_ is only otherwise attested as ‘sterlings’ (English coins). Toussaint-Bernard Emeric-David, _Histoire littéraire de la France_, XVII, 1832, p. 536 linked the piece to a period when the _Esterlings_ were invading the Angoumois or the Languedoc in 1176-84 and was followed by M. Perugi, _Trovatori a Valchiusa: un frammento della cultura provenzale del Petrarca_, Padua 1985, p. 53, but this has met with no other acceptance.

12. Instead of _seillier_, Kolsen (followed by Riquer, by implication Krispin, and Bonaugurio) printed _sollier_ («Söller» = loft, attic); this was not a silent emendation, as Rieger thought, but the misreading given in both diplomatic editions of _H_.

15. In his variants Kolsen gives the D⁰ reading as _faronier_. Kolsen, Riquer and Krispin understand _fatonier_ as ‘fool’ (Kolsen «Narren (?)», Riquer «nescio», Krispin «fou»). Despite Levy (SW, III, 419), who rightly questions Raynouard’s translation «faquin» (_LR_, III, 284, 7) and wonders whether the translation should be «Thor», Rieger prefers to translate «Schurke», seeing _cusson ni fatonier_ as a «verstärkendes Synonympaar», even though there is no support for this other than Raynouard’s guess. Raynouard also cites Albertet (see now Harvey-Paterson, _Troubadour ’Tensos’_, p. 82, _BdT_ 16.15, 31-32, «Albert, be-us teng per fatonier / car mais presatz foudat que sen», ‘a mere fool’), which does not support such an interpretation, and neither does the passage by Daude de Pradas (see now Peter T. Ricketts, _Le Roman de Daude de Pradas sur les quatre vertus cardinales_, _La France Latine_, 134, 2002, pp. 137-183, 1484-1489, «ne vuellas essser menuziers / en tos avers ne fatoniers, / assi con son aquil borzes / c’un denairet, sol que mai pes / del aubre, tot lo jorn bavecon»): Levy rightly considered that Raynouard’s translation «fanfaron» for _fatoniers_ here could not be right: «Aber wie ist zu verstehen? Vgl. auch Chabaneau, Revue 16m 68 zu 1468 und Gröbers Zs, 15m 535m s. v. _bavecar_». The sense here could also be ‘foolish’ in the sense of ‘ridiculous’: ‘do not choose to be petty or ridiculous with respect to your
wealth, as are those burghers who are always weighing one small penny to see that it weighs more than the other.’

19. As all previous scholars, I adopt H’s reading prezicat. For the use of the future anterior in contexts that call for the past definite, and implying «repetition, duration or intensity», see Frede Jensen, The Syntax of Medieval Occitan, Tübingen 1986, § 810.

20-21. In 21 Dª appears to have preserved the erroneous reading and word division of the common source, with HIK emending for scansion but still leaving the sense garbled. All previous editors rightly accept Dª’s migel (mi qel).

22. Kolsen’s translation of blizaut fendut trepat, «einen samttenen Faltenrock (?)», referring to Levy’s query in SW, V, 14, 1 (under magestat), has rightly been discarded by subsequent editors, who accept Riquer’s interpretation «una saya acuchillada» (see SW, VIII, 444, and DCVB, X, 495, «Guarnit de trepes, de talls o oberturas que permeten veure la tela de sota»). Rieger translates «machen wir ihm einen geschlitzen Überwurf mit farbig abgefärbten Falten», citing various troubadour miniatures showing this fashion: see Angelica Rieger, «“Ins e·l cor port, dona, vostre faisso”. Image et imaginaire de la femme à travers l’enluminure dans les chansonniers des troubadours», Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale, 28, 1985 (not 1984 as in her bibliography), pp. 385-415, fig. 8, and to René Nelli, Troubadours et trouvères, Paris 1979, figs 23, 29, 37, 52. Linkskill notes that trepas appears to refer to the pendant pieces of a banner (Joseph Linkskill, The Poems of the Troubadour Raimbaut de Vaqueiras, The Hague 1964, II, 42-48 and the note). His suggestion of a possible connection with trepar ‘dance’ seems unlikely.

23. Despite all previous editors, Dª appears to read agon for a gen.

25. Bonaugurio prints perdutz, wrongly.

26. Previous editors all retain DºH fols, Kolsen citing «Stimming, B. Born ¹ 1, 6 und I, 6 und Tobler, Verm. Beitr.,1², 270 ff» (I have been unable to verify the latter reference), for the use of the nominative after a preposition. See also Harvey-Paterson 2010, Introduction, pp. xxi-xxiv, on inflexions.

27. Previous editors emend to trachor, unnecessarily; the noun can be understood in apposition to nominative Miqels (25), and see Harvey-Paterson 2010, Introduction, on inflexions.

29. Kolsen (also Riquer) emends to avers, seeing an archetype error here, but see Harvey-Paterson 2010, Introduction, pp. xxi-xxiv.

35. Kripsin translates ‘ëm grazis mais as «et il m’est plus agréable»: a tempting interpretation, liked by Rieger, but I have found no dictionary or COM support for this sense of grazir. (Kolsen «Er [...] liebt mich mehr»; Riquer «me alabó más».)
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