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Austorc de Segret

\[ No s\]ai qui-m so tan suy \[des\]conoyssens

\( BdT \) 41.1

This sirventes by the otherwise unidentified troubadour Austorc de Segret was composed in the aftermath of the failure of King Louis IX’s second crusade and his death at Tunis in 1270, when Christians were desperately trying to explain the inexplicable: how could God have permitted such an appalling disaster, when the saintly monarch was known to have set out with absolutely pure intentions and total commitment of mind and resources? The troubadour declares himself to be at a total loss to understand how this catastrophe could have come about. Pagans everywhere show utter indifference to the young king Philip «the Bold» of France and Charles of Anjou, now King Charles I of Sicily; indeed, instead of opposing them Charles has become their captain and leader, and his is the shameful responsibility for the collapse of Christendom. Austorc urges the English king Edward I «Longshanks» of England (Audoart) to wage war on the French, avenge a certain «Henry» (Haenric), and concludes by sending his sirventes to a lord Othon (Mosenher N’Oth), reiterating that Charles and Philip are bringing shame on the Church.

Fabre argued that Mosenher N’Oth was Viscount (Arnaud-)Othon II of Lomagne and Auvillars from 1235 to 1274, and this has been generally accepted.\(^1\) Fabre maintained that Othon had a compelling interest in the king of England opposing the claims of France in the

Agenais and the Quercy, and Jeanroy considered the whole piece likely to have been composed at the Gascon prince’s request.\(^2\)

Opinion has since divided as to whether *Haenric* was the son of Richard of Cornwall, Henry of Almain, originally proposed by Fabre,\(^3\) or the Infant Henry of Castile, younger brother of Alfonso X of Castile, a secondary proposal by the same scholar. Jeanroy thought the more likely identification to be Henry of Castile, though did not entirely rule out the alternative. The Castilian Infant was also the choice of Félix de La Salle and René Lavaud, Carlos Alvar, and Martin Aurell.\(^4\)

Arguments hitherto advanced in favour of Henry of Almain include, firstly, the way in which Austorc apparently refers to Henry as dead: «qu’era de sen e de saber ses par, / e tot li mielhs era de sos parens».\(^5\) Secondly, Edward specifically appealed to the pope to help him avenge the death of this Henry, who was his cousin,\(^6\) and who had been assassinated while attending mass at the church of San Silvestro in Viterbo on 13 March 1271 by his cousins Guy and Simon de Montfort, in revenge for the brutal deaths of their father and brother at the battle of Evesham, while Charles and Philip were hearing mass in another chapel in the same town.\(^7\) The brothers were excommunicated for this, «one of the most infamous crimes of European history», and Dante placed Guy, submerged to the throat, in a river of boiling blood


\(^3\) Fabre, «Le sirventes», 1910, pp. 476-481; also Henry J. Chaytor, *The Troubadours and England*, Cambridge 1923, pp. 93-94 and Stefano Asperti, *Carlo I d’Angiò e i trovatori. Componenti ‘provenzali’ e angioine nella tradizione manoscritta della lirica trobadorica*, Ravenna 1995, p. 181 and note 65, also *BEdT*. Appel had wrongly identified *Haenric* as Henry III of England. He corrected *Haenric* to *Na Enric*, though if the *H* is an error eliminating an honorific this would have to read *N’Aenric*, as Fabre observed; see his note 5 on p. 471.


\(^5\) A point emphasised by Fabre, «Le sirventes», 1911, p. 57.


in the seventh circle of his *Inferno*.\(^8\) As Stefano Asperti has argued, Dante’s mention of it shows that the assassination must have had enormous resonance, and it is also referred to in the «cobla de Mar-chabrun per lo rei Aduard e per lo rei A(nfos)» (*BdT* 293a.1).\(^9\) Guy and Simon both served Charles in the campaigns that led to his conquest of Sicily and were handsomely rewarded, and by 1270 Guy was acting as Charles’s vicar-general in Tuscany.\(^10\)

Jeanroy was reluctant to accept this identification, asking: which Henry had Charles wronged more? and answering: undoubtedly Henry of Castile, whom he had exhibited in an iron cage to his enemies after the battle of Tagliacozzo in 1268 and kept in prison indefinitely, whereas the only wrong he had done to Henry of Almain was to have «rempli avec quelque mollesse des fonctions d’arbitre, dans une affaire qui intéressait sa mémoire».\(^11\) Those supporting the identification of *Haenric* with the Infant of Castile, who continued to languish in prison until his eventual release in 1284, point to the widespread resonance of this situation among troubadours such as Paulet de Marselha (*BdT* 319.1), Bertolome Zorzi (*BdT* 74.16), Calega Panzan (*BdT* 107.1), Folquet de Lunel (*BdT* 154.1), and Cerveri de Girona (*BdT* 434a.52): see particularly the chapter «Le géolier de l’infant don Enrique (1268-1285)» in Aurell’s *La Vielle et l’épée*, where this scholar encapsulates his charisma as follows: «Figure devenue presque mythique de son vivant, héros chevaleresque d’un monde perdu à jamais, don Enrique a gagné la sympathie et l’admiration de toute sa génération. Sa popularité déclenche un véritable mouvement d’opinion, sur laquelle M. de Riquer a pu écrire: “cette authentique campagne en vers pour sa liberté nous rappelle les campagnes modernes en faveur de la libération des prisonniers politiques”. En exigeant la liberté de don Enrique, les troubadours portent une nouvelle atteinte à l’image de marque de Charles d’Anjou, son geôlier».\(^12\) Alvar deals with Austorc’s apparent reference to him as dead by saying that he is referred to *as if* he were

\(^8\) Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, p. 370; Dante, *Inferno*, Canto XII.


\(^12\) Aurell, *La Vielle*, pp. 168-175, quotation from p. 168.
dead, noting that Cerveri de Girona, in his *sirventes* dedicated to the support of Henry of Castile, lambasts Charles of Anjou for allowing «s’anta e la mort de N’Anric» (16). Moreover, he argues, whether or not Edward was actually interested in avenging the death of this kinsman, the Catalan troubadour urges him to do so: «N’Audoart [...] / per terra venjara N’Anric».

Those supporting Jeanroy’s hypothesis have no doubt been heavily influenced by these many references to the plight of Henry of Castile by other troubadours. But Austorc’s lines «qu’era de sen e de saber ses par / e tot lo mielhs era de sos parens» (27-28) point conclusively towards Henry of Almain. Edward had been brought up with his cousin from childhood, supported him in his political struggles, and took the cross with him in 1268: to quote Michael Prestwich, «Henry of Almain, Edward’s cousin and childhood companion, was clearly very close to him, and would undoubtedly have played a major part in Edward’s career had it not been for his tragic murder at the hands of Guy de Montfort in 1271». And not only was he one of Edward’s kinsman: an English chronicle attributed to Thomas Wyke shows that he was well recognised as being the wisest among them: «qui caeteris sapientia praepollebat». After the death of Louis at Tunis, Edward and Henry sailed there on 3 October at the invitation of the young Philip III. «Finding nothing to be done in Africa they wintered in Sicily at Charles of Anjou’s request, and here, in consequence probably of the official appeal of February 6th from England, Edward determined to send back Henry of Almain. Because “he was wiser than the others”, Henry was chosen to go and arrange for the government of Gascony, proceeding thence to help Richard of Cornwall in England. Philip III was going home for his coronation and Charles of Anjou going to Viterbo to hurry up the work of the cardinals who had long been there in conclave».

---

13 Alvar, *La poesía trovadoresca*, p. 27; Martín de Riquer, *Obras completas del trovador Cerverí de Girona*, Barcelona 1947, 37, stanza IV.


Jeanroy’s question presupposes that Charles of Anjou had a direct hand in the fate of Haenric, which was not the case with Henry of Almain. But the fact that those guilty of this Henry’s murder are Charles’s henchmen serves Austorc’s purpose in inciting retaliatory violence against Charles himself and the French. Jeanroy’s question is the wrong one: it is more relevant to ask which Henry was Edward more concerned to avenge, to which there is a clear answer in Edward’s specific appeal to the pope. There is no evidence that Edward took any interest in the fate of Henry of Castile, any more than did Henry’s own brother, King Alfonso X.

The *sirventes* presents itself from the outset as a sort of *devinalh*, following in the tradition of Guilhem de Peitieus’ *Farai un vers de dreyt nien* (*BdT* 183.7; compare lines 1-5 with Guilhem’s «No sai en qual hora·m fui natz», 7; «No sai cora·m fui endormitz», 13; «e re no sai mas quan n’aug dir», 20, and so on), with Raimbaut d’Aurenga’s *Escotatz, mas no say que s’es* (*BdT* 398.28), and with some nine others which have hitherto been considered as *devinalhs* by different critics.¹⁷ The speaker’s state of «knowing nothing», of mental and spiritual confusion, is here attributed to the defeat of the Christian faith and the triumph of the Saracens, at the behest of some unknown force which might conceivably be God Himself.

This seemingly blasphemous idea that God may be to blame (6-8), is not new. Shortly after the failure of Louis’ first crusade in 1250, when the king was captured at Mansurah and held to ransom, Austorc d’Aorlhac had expressed his outrage that God should bring such misfortune on the French king, declaring that it was hardly surprising that Christians should convert to Islam:

Crestiantat vey del tot a mal meza;
tan gran perda no eug qu’anc mais fezes,
per qu’es razos qu’hoom hueymais Dieus descreza,
e qu’azorem Bafomet laj on es,
Tervagan e sa companhia,
pus Dieus vol e Sancta Maria
que nos siam vencutz a non-dever,
e·ls mescrezens fai honratz remaner. 18

In a *sirventes* dating from after Baibars’ capture of Arsuf on 29 April 1265 and before Louis IX’s second crusade of 1269-1270, the Templar Ricaut Bonomel professed himself to be in such despair that he was ready to lay down the cross he had taken up, since God seemed to want to support the Turks at the expense of the Christians:

Ir’e dolors s’es e mon cor asseza,
si c’ab un pauc no m’ausi demanes,
o meta jus la cros c’avia preza,
a la honor d’aqel q’en cros fo mes;
car crotz ni lei no·m val ni guia
contrels fels Turcx cui Dieu maldia;
anz es semblan, en so c’om pot vezer,
c’al dan de nos lo vol Deus mantener.

This troubadour declared that «anyone who puts up a fight against the Turks is mad, because Jesus Christ opposes them with nothing», for God’s dear son himself, «who ought to grieve at this, wishes and likes this»:

Doncs ben es fols qi a Turcs mou conteza,
pois Jhesu Crist non los contrasta res;
[.. .]
e·l sieus car fis, q’en degra dol aver,
o vol e·il plaz: ben deu a nos plazer. 19

And in 1274, Daspol (*BdT* 206.4) was to treat this idea comically in a mock *tenso* with God whom he blamed for not organising his creation better:

---

18 *BdT* 40.1, 17-24, my edition forthcoming on *Rialto*.
Bel seinher Dieus, ben par qu’est poderos,  
qu’en luoc segur estag ez en autura.  
Per que-us pensas que·ns combatam per vos?  
Que sarazins onretz e jent tafura  
que no·s laisai fort castel ni clauzura,  
e·l bastiment volvon de sus en jos?  
[. . .]  
e pogras ben revenir sest damage  
s’al[s] Sarazins donases vontat  
cascus per si conoges son follage;  
pueis non calgra negus annar arage,  
pueis que cascus conogra sa foudat;  
car nos prendem mort per lur viell peccat —  
e vos es leu que·ns gites a carnage.\(^\text{20}\)

Such accusations against the deity no doubt seemed natural to men who were used to thinking that it was their overlord’s bounden duty to protect his faithful servants and who also regarded warfare as ruled by the *judicium Dei*. Defeat could generally be accounted for by the sins of men, but this could not apply to the saintly French king.

This said, the troubadour presents an alternative scapegoat: *si Dieus nos a o ñiables marritz*. Unlike Appel (whose edition contains no translation), Fabre capitalizes *Diables*, translating «si c’est Dieu ou bien le diable qui nous a [ainsi] égarés». However, «*the Devil*» is normally represented in Occitan (as in English) with the definite article, so it is questionable whether line 6 is simply opposing God and Satan; rather, we have to do with an as yet unspecified devil, who has rendered «us» *marritz*. *Marritz* means both «afflicted» and «lost», suggesting at one and the same time ideas of sorrow, defeat, and spiritual perplexity.\(^\text{21}\) So what devil might this be?

In the corresponding line of the following stanza (14), we encoun-


\(^\text{21}\) *PD marrir* «v. a. affliger, attrister; perdre; v. n. errer, s’égarer; être affligé; v. réfl. s’affliger; marrit égaré, errant; affligé, soucieux». 
ter the word esperitz, given in PD as «esprit; âme; sentiments». Fabre translates «Je ne sais d’où est venu un tel esprit», which leaves the sense of the word vague: a state of mind, an atmosphere perhaps? In fact in the vast majority of the hundreds of examples of esperitz recorded on COM 2, the sense is «spirit» as in «Holy Spirit» or «evil spirit» or «soul», with a few figurative uses recorded in LR, for example En l’esprit de suavet. L’esperit de servitut. The third sense given in PD, «sentiments», is supported by two examples in SW, though it is unclear what the sense «attitude» or «feelings» could refer to in the present context. Following on from the unspecified dïables of line 6, I suggest that esperitz means an evil spirit; and if tals anticipates the following lines – such a spirit that has given rise to the death of Louis and so many others – it also may be understood to refer back to the previous line and to Charles of Anjou, caps e guitz of all the heathen.

In other words, Austorc has exploited the tradition of the devinalh or riddle to imply the shocking identification of the Angevin king of Sicily, and Louis’ own brother, as a very devil. Fabre argues that the troubadour calls Charles leader and guide of the pagans (13) for several reasons. Firstly, he had Moslem subjects in Sicily and Apulia. He had tried to expel the latter in 1268 under pressure from Clement IV, but Conrudin’s arrival in Italy had prevented him from following this up. Secondly, he had instigated the peace of Tunis, which obliged the king of Tunis to pay him tribute and tolerate Christian worship in his lands. In exchange for these payments Charles undertook to leave the Saracens of Tunis in peace and protect them. Finally he was a help to the pagans because his political ambitions in Sicily and Naples were distracting the Aragonese and Castilians from fighting them in Spain.

22 LR, III, 174, Trad. de Bède, fol. 64 and 30; SW, III, 260, Vie de Sainte Douceline, ed. Joseph H. Albanès, Marseille 1879, p. 76, Car alcuna persona, per malvais esperit, avia fach alcunas malas obras, per nozer lur, and the Chanson de la Croisade albigeoise, now ed. Eugène Martin-Chabot, 3 vols, Paris 1931-1961, 145.33-34, «“Senher”, so ditz lo coms, “mos grans dreitz m’esconditz / e ma leial drechura e mos bos esperitz”».


24 The crown prince of Aragon Peter, the future Peter III, had married Manfred’s daughter Constance, who had claims to Sicily. Charles was proposing
In stanza III the troubadour declares that «the king» had never previously been defeated, but had succeeded in conquering through force of arms everything that he wanted. The identity of the rey here (17) is ambiguous, since the previous stanza has mentioned three kings, rey Felips, rey Loïx, and Charles, king of Sicily, qualified only by the honorific en. Fabre argued with some justification that, given the stanza order in the MS, the rey in 17 would appear to refer to Louis IX who has just been mentioned in the previous line, but that this makes no sense since the French king has suffered not simply abaissemens (20) but death, and it should be added that he had hitherto certainly not conquered all he wanted, since his first crusade had ended in failure. Fabre concluded that the stanza order must be wrong, and interverted stanzas III and IV, maintaining that the rey must refer to Edward of England. Jeanroy rejected this outright, convincingly arguing that Edward had made no conquests: in his own country he had hardly

a competitor to Alfonso for the office of Holy Roman Emperor in the person of the King of France (Philip III). See Jean Dunbabin, Charles of Anjou. Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe, London and New York 1998, pp. 99 and 137; William Chester Jordan, «The Capetians from the death of Philip II to Philip IV», in The New Cambridge Medieval History, ed. David Abulafia, Cambridge 1999, pp. 279-313 (pp. 299-300). Fabre also states that Alfonso of Castile was in conflict with the court of France concerning the royal children («les enfants de la Cerda»), though this would appear to have occurred only after the death of Henry III, king of Navarre and count of Champagne, in 1274, and conflict over the betrothal of his three-year-old daughter Joan: see Elizabeth M. Hallam, Capetian France 987-1328, London and New York 1980, pp. 276-277. Alessandro Barbero (Il mito angioino nella cultura italiana e provenzale fra Duecento e Trecento, Turin 1983, p. 80) declares that no-one before Austorc had dared to denounce Charles in such terms: not only was the king of Sicily not a dangerous enemy for the pagans, he had shown himself to be in complete agreement with them. Now the most prestigious king of Christendom, the only one entrusted with the protection of the Church, Charles reveals himself in the eyes of the dismayed troubadour to be on excellent terms with the pagans, and in the violence of Austorc’s polemic he is denounced virtually as apostate: in him the pagans have their best protector! Pretending to be the defender of Christianity, Charles, and with him his nephew Philip the Bold, is in reality leading it to dishonour and ruin. Barbero argues that the great scandal of the Tunisian expedition was not so much the death of Louis, who had left amidst the consternation of his vassals who refused to accompany him, as the fact that the crusade had deviated from its proper objective, which Ghibelline chroniclers attributed to Charles’s political objectives.
overcome his own rebellious subjects, having even been temporarily imprisoned by them, and almost as soon as he had disembarked in the Holy Land he had been wounded by a fanatic; moreover at the time of the *sirventes* he was risking losing his legitimate claims in Guyenne. He concluded that the *rey* has to refer to Charles of Anjou (pp. 198-199), and this identification has been accepted by all subsequent scholars. This still leaves the slight awkwardness that so far in the song the only king to have been referred to as *rey* apart from Louis is Philip, but at this time Philip is too young and inexperienced to be seen as a man of many martial conquests, nor did he ever achieve this, whereas Charles had seemed to succeed in all he set out to do. His present *abaissamens* then presumably refers to his part in the failure of the crusade. Perhaps Austorc was introducing another riddling element in this stanza, before answering it in lines 23-24, or perhaps it is simply that his audience would have understood that the only possible allusion was to the Angevin.

The rhetorical evocation of the *devinalh* tradition in the opening stanza of this piece serves to express the confusion and dismay of Louis’ failure and the dire straits of Christians in the Holy Land, and to focus blame and anger on Charles of Anjou. Essentially propagandistic, it lacks the subtlety of earlier examples of the riddling tradition in which Sarah Kay has subtly explored «the notion of an ‘edge’ of reason beyond which the lines of contradiction converge on the unthinkable»,25 though the potential for this, not pursued, flutters around the possibility of God destroying his own religion.

---

Austorc de Segret

[No s]ai qui.m so tan suy [des]conoyssens

(BdT 41.1)

Ms: C 369r-v (Naustorc de segret). A decorated initial has been cut out of the folio leaving gaps in 1-3, 33-37.


Versification: Frank, 577:66, a10 b10 b10 a10 c10 c10 d10’ d10’, -ens, -ar, -itz, ida; five coblas unissonans and two four-line tornadas. The versification is identical in all respects to that of a number of songs deriving from a canso of Sordel, BdT 437.2 including a crusading song of RmGauc (BdT 401.1), and with slight modification, that of OlTempl (BdT 312.1); see Linda Paterson, «James the Conqueror, the Holy Land, and the Troubadours», Cultura neolatina, 71, 2011, pp. 211-286 (pp. 211-212 and 264-265), for full discussion. This form may have become particularly associated with Louis IX’s second crusade in the south-western area and in Mss produced there.


Date: The sirventes must date from after Louis IX’s death at Tunis in 1270, and almost certainly after the assassination of Henry of Almain on 13 March 1271 (see above). If, as seems probable, Fabre’s identification of Oth is right, it must have preceded the death of viscount Arnaud-Othon II of Lomagne in 1274. In 1271 Edward was on his way to the Holy Land, only returning in spring 1273. While the song might have immediately been provoked by Henry’s murder, it seems more likely that it was composed in 1273 or the earlier part of 1274, when the English king went to Gascony to attempt to deal with the rebellious Gaston of Béarn (see Michael Prestwich, Edward I, London 1988, pp. 85 and 300).
I. I am at such a loss I cannot tell who I am, or where I come from, or where I ought to go, I know nothing of what I ought to say or do, or anything about my birth: I know nothing, I am so bewildered: God or a devil has so afflicted us that I see Christians and the Christian religion destroyed, and Saracens have found safe haven.

II. I see the false-believing pagans left in peace: the Saracens, and the Turks of Outremer, and the Arabs too, for none of them needs pay regard to king Philip, most sad to say, or lord Charles, for he is their captain and leader! I cannot tell what place has brought forth such a spirit that has caused so many people to die and perish, but king Louis has lost his life from it.

III. Never before have we seen the king [Charles] defeated: instead we have seen him win by force of arms all that he ever wished to own or conquer. But now he has been humbled, and this is right, because he has failed God:
anyone who fails God ends up in ignominy, for never before, except through Charles, has Christendom been mocked or suffered such a failure.

IV. Now Edward will need valour and courage if he wants to avenge Henry, who was unparalleled in wisdom and knowledge, and he was the very best of his kin. But if he now stays shamed in this matter, the French over here will leave him neither root nor branch nor well-armed forces, if his worth is stripped of merit.

V. War [...] bloody [...] might escape [.....], and demolish strong well-built castles, and may men often cry «take cover!» to lord Edward who has disturbed the peace!

VI. I let my lord Sir Othon of Lomagne, who is the root of gift-giving, and the captain and leader of merit, know that Charles is leading us off course, and so is the French king, which brings shame on the Church.
VII Mos sirventes, Cotellet, sia digz
mos senhor N’Oth qu’es lauzatz e grazitz
per los plus pros a sa valor grazida,
e donar t’a rossin a la partida.

VII. Cotellet, let my sirventes be performed to my lord Sir Othon, who with his acclaimed valour is praised and appreciated by the worthiest, and he will give you a rouncy when you leave.

3. For the reflexive pronoun see Wallace S. Lipton, «Imposed Verb Pronominalization in Medieval French and Provençal», Romance Philology, 14, 1960-1961, pp. 111-137 (pp. 113-114).
8. Appel and Fabre regularise inflexions in 12, 28, 41.
9-11. For e ... e as ‘both ... and’ see Jensen 1986, § 989 and SW, II, 313, 9. Fabre (1910, p. 470, n. 2) comments that the division of paguas mescrezens into Saracens, Turks and Arabs is not new in the troubadours: Gaualdian localised Arabs in Spain and Morocco; Turks are mentioned in all poems concerning the eastern crusades, and it is almost the same for Saracens. He notes that Joinville calls Moslems of Damietta either Saracens or Turks, but that the Moslems of Barbarie he calls exclusively Saracens. So he concludes that Saracens (8 and 10) are the Tunisians, the Turks (10) the Moslems of Palestine and Syria, and Arabs (11) those of Spain and Morocco, and that Austorc is therefore referring to (a) the peace concluded at Tunis (30 October 1270) by Philip the Bold and Charles of Anjou, (b) the truce signed by Edward of England in August 1272 with Baibars and the Palestinian Turks, and (c) the Spanish Arabs left in peace by the kings of Aragon and Castile, who are afraid of the aggressive policies of France and Charles of Anjou. Charles was the enemy of the Infant Pere of Aragon, married to Constance, daughter of Manfred and claimant to the crown of Naples and Sicily, and the Aragonese, preoccupied with Southern Italy, were no longer fighting the Arabs of Spain. Neither was Alfonso X of Castile, at a time when Charles was urging Philip to put himself forward as a rival for the imperial crown. Ingrid Hartl (Das Feindbild der Kreuzzugslyrik. Das Aufeinander-treffen von Christen und Muslimen, Berne 2009) identifies no such distinctions between different types of ‘pagans’, seeing the terms in her corpus of lyrics in various European languages as generally synonymous (p. 198), but it is tempting to agree with Fabre’s more specific categorization.
24. Appel signals the line as missing and leaves the line blank; Fabre generates a hypothetical line. As Jeanroy («Sur le sirventés», p. 201) noted with a certain Schadenfreude, the line is in fact present in the Ms.
30. Literally ‘top nor root’.
31. Fabre («Le sirventes», 1910, p. 474): sai refers to the French domains
of the king of England, that is Guyenne, Gascony and Périgord, and also the Agenais, Quercy and Bigorre. He opines that *sai* here is opposed to the Holy Land, not to England, since Edward is on his way back from Palestine.

33-40. The lacunary stanza is clearly a call to arms. Fabre fashioned a hypothetical reconstruction, unwisely accepted by Chaytor, *The Troubadours and England*, Cambridge 1923, p. 92, and revised by La Salle-Lavaud. — *a la guerida* (39), lit. «to the assault shelters!» (*LR*, III, 432 «à la retraite!»; Fabre: «A l’aide!»); *PD* «secours, salut; abri placé sur les remparts ou construit par l’assiégeant pour protéger son approche». *SW*, IV, 65-66 gives several examples of the latter though considers the present case unclear; however, since the previous line concerns attacking castles this is certainly the sense in the present case. Various kinds of protective constructions, sometimes named cats, sows, mice or weasels, were used in siege warfare, particularly to shield miners digging beneath castle walls: see Jim Bradbury, *The Medieval Siege*, Woodbridge 1992, pp. 270-272.


46-47. I take *a* in 47 as equivalent to *ab* (see *LR*, II, 1 and 3, 2) and punctuate differently from Fabre, who places a full stop after 46: «...car il est loué et chéri. — Sa valeur est admirée par les plus valeureux...».

48. Fabre «il doit te donner», corrected in La Salle-Lavaud; *donar t’a* is a split future form.
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