This finely-wrought piece is impressive for its tightly controlled yet fluid versification, its interweaving of melodic themes and stanzaic forms, and its delicate modulations of mood. As a response to the crusades it typifies in some ways a common theme: the lover’s reluctance to abandon love of an earthly lady in favour of God’s service in the Holy Land, drawing in the element of fear of the dangers and hardships of the crusading venture. But it does so with an engaging lightness of touch, self-deprecation, even playful teasing. The conflict between earthly desire and duty to God is left unresolved, for despite his self-awareness as a sinner the lover chooses to hope to have his cake and eat it, confessing his sinfulness to God and simultaneously invoking His support in his subtly indistinct erotic enterprise. Moreover a barely perceptible shift of voice lends a dreamy quality to the embedded narrative of departure: while poet and lover seem the same, the lover appears to move away from and then back to the lady, but the poet stands before an audience, in a beguiling blend of the real and the imaginary.

My motivation for re-examining this original but highly problematic piece has been to understand it as a response to the crusading movement. Previous editors have rightly regarded their editorial at-

1 For the larger project to which this attempt belongs, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council with further contributions from the British Academy and the University of Warwick, see <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/french/research/crusades>. My thanks also go to Stefano Asperti, Luca Barbieri and Ruth Harvey for their suggestions concerning various aspects of this article for the flaws of which they are in no way responsible.
tempts as ‘work towards’, contributions to the deciphering of puzzles for which there are unlikely ever to be definitive solutions, and the present contribution can certainly not claim or hope to offer more than this. However, its focus on elucidating meaning rather than analysing in extenso its linguistic and metrical features, which primarily characterises Dominique Billy’s approach, makes more sense of not only individual passages but also the song overall. It has benefited from new tools such as COM made available since the publication of Bartsch’s original edition of 1877, useful within its limitations, and Billy’s courageous attempt of 1995. I do not attempt to determine the original language of the piece, although the reference to the land of Urgel (v. 76) suggests a Catalan connection.² Nor does my reading of the text speculate on the possible effect of the mixed language on an audience, or attempt to determine how the text might have arrived at its manuscript destination in north-eastern France. My reading is based on the text as I have edited it, the detailed arguments for which are set out in the notes; I try to make clear which parts of the interpretation depend on conjecture. Some account is taken of the musical form though I am not qualified to analyse this in the context of the music of the period.

There are in fact no obvious textual indications of the period of composition. It is generally accepted that the source of the Occitan section of one of the two manuscripts in which it has been preserved, French ms. M, was a collection of Occitan poems probably made in Lorraine in c. 1250 and copied from an Occitan ms. of the second quarter of the thirteenth century (see Billy, p. 97), though the lai Nompar falls outside of the Occitan section. The other manuscript, T, dates from the late thirteenth century. The argument advanced by Anna Radaelli in her edition of the anonymous Old French song Vous ki ameis de vraie amour (RS 1967, in preparation) would be compatible with a dating of the first half of that century: namely that the absence of allusions to the liberation of the holy places or the loss of Jerusalem and the holy cross suggests a date far removed from any immediate

² For discussion of whether the original language was French or Occitan see Billy’s linguistic section, p. 97 ff, Paolo Canettieri, «Descortz es dictatz mot divers.» Ricerche su un genere lirico romanzo del XIII secolo, Rome 1995, p. 259, and the references there. In ms. M the lai is included in the French rather than the Occitan section. For the Catalan connection, see note 10 below.
pressure for a new crusading expedition, even if this does not mean that there were no such expeditions or calls for them. In support of, or at least compatible with, this rough dating, is the relationship with a descort by Guillem de la Tor, *En vos ai meza*, which Canettieri is inclined to see as a contrafactum of the *lai Nompar*, while conceding that influence may have worked the other way round. Guillem was active in Italy in the mid-thirteenth century and the terminus post quem for his descort is 1225.

It has been hitherto assumed that nothing is known of the author. However, the unusual name *Nompar* has been used from the Middle Ages to this day by the older branch of the aristocratic family of Caumont La Force. It is not easy to find reliable information about the history of this family during the thirteenth century, though in the preface to his book *Les Caumont La Force; dix siècles d’histoire de France* (Paris 1960) the Duc de la Force explains that the abbé Jean Dubois had gathered a huge amount of documentation relating to the period preceding the sixteenth century, which was placed after his death in the departmental archives of Agen, and which I have been unable to consult. The genealogical table on pp. 255-257 indicates the existence of Nompar I (1180-1245), Nompar II (1208-1282), and Nompar III (1252-1320). One of the ways of interpreting the rubric of

3 In this she follows Susanne Schöber, *Die altfranzösische Kreuzzugslyrik des 12. Jahrhunderts. ‘Temporalibus aeterna ... praeponenda’*. Dissertationen der Universität Salzburg 7, Wien 1976, p. 238. Innocent III had been planning a crusade from 1208; in 1219 the Fifth Crusade captured Damietta; Frederick II recovered Jerusalem in 1229, and Thibaut de Champagne’s crusade took place in 1239-1240, followed by Richard of Cornwall’s efforts in the Holy Land during the year immediately after his departure.

4 Canettieri, *Descortz*, pp. 267-268.

5 Antonella Negri, *Le liriche del trovatore Guilhem de la Tor*, Soveria Mannelli 2006, pp. 11 and 113. She does not discuss explicitly the issue of the relationship between the two pieces, but simply observes that the presence of the element /a/abl, «pur nella diversità di alcune risoluzioni metriche», is found in 9 other *descortz* in Italy.

6 See also Peter S. Noble, *Le voyage d’Outremer en Jhérusalem de Nompar, seigneur de Caumont*, Oxford 1975, pp. 132-138 and the family tree on p. 139, though these *Nompar* belong to the 14th and 15th centuries, too late for our mss. I am deeply grateful to Ruth Harvey for having drawn my attention to the existence of this book, and to Peter Noble for having very kindly given me a copy, the two Oxford library copies having gone missing.
ms. **T**, *Li lais Nompar*, is ‘Nompar’s lai’ (though the name also suggests ‘matchless’: see below). The rubric *Nompar* of ms. **M**, simply giving the name, tends to suggest the scribe considered Nompar as the author. Ms. **T**’s rubric might, alternatively, mean that the *lai* is the *story* of Nompar, though the text is not a narrative so this seems less likely. Since the name is so unusual outside the Caumont family it seems reasonable to suggest that the song is associated with one of the Nompars of this period. If our author was indeed one of these, he was a much more gifted composer than Nompar the pilgrim, author of the fifteenth-century work *Le voyage d’Oultremer en Jhérusalem de Monpar, seigneur de Caumont* and «a long, rambling poem for the edification of his children», *Les Dits et Enseignemens*, though it suggests that there may have been a family tradition of writing.

*

The troubadour – or trouvère – presents his song as fine work of art, a peerless courtly *lai* inspired by love and joy and addressed in turn to a courtly audience, a lady, a jealous husband, the Virgin Mary, Jerusalem and God, and finally the lady again to whom he offers his work. The rhyme-scheme, while varied across stanzas of diverse metrical shapes and lengths, is demanding, the great majority of lines being under six syllables long; thus the poet is required to carve sense within tight limits of rhyme and metre. All editors have set out the structure in terms of a composition of 162 lines, though it would be possible to re-arrange them into a shorter whole with internal rhymes. The eleven stanzas include numerous structural repetitions in both metre and melody, and the *lai*, in accordance with the usual characteristic of the genre, returns at the end to its starting-point.

The long first stanza, consisting of three sub-sections repeating the same versification and tune, vaunts the song’s courtly credentials. The poet addresses an audience (*vos*, 3), and claims that his song is a matchless example to lesser, aspiring composers (5-7, 12). Love is the source of the qualities that are needed for such art: «wise awareness and fine wit», and *fin trobar*, the composer’s craft that is at once sub-

---

tle, refined and noble. If my interpretation of *jugar* (19) is correct, it also involves playfulness: the *joc* as well as the *joï d’amor*, presented as essential to the ways of all courtly lovers (20-21). At the end of the second sub-section he turns to the lady, commending her to God and announcing his imminent departure (22-24). The third sub-section issues a general statement about courtly values, targeted at the elite people of excellence (*les prous*, 30) who should aim to give proof of their courtliness by fostering *joï* (27), an environment conducive to courtly activities, and *donar* (28), the giving of gifts. He ends this sub-section by claiming to inculcate wisdom and discipline into himself (32-33), lines which seem to mark a transition between qualities needed for his art and those required by *fin joï* (8): if the reading *blanc* of the manuscripts is accepted (34), as I prefer, he then claims that joy makes him pure of all deceit, leading to his declaration of desire for his lady in stanza II. The three-fold musical repetition in this stanza serves to establish the tune firmly in the listener’s mind, and the opening motif of six repeated notes is particularly emphatic, setting up the basis for later echoes at the beginning of stanzas II (each of three sub-sections), IV, V, VI and the final stanza.

The three sections of stanza II dramatise a courtly love scenario in which the lover is leaving for the Holy Land, imagining or recalling the lady’s jealous husband and, if my interpretations of the problematic vv. 52-60 are right, the nefarious threat of the slanderers. The lover expresses in courtly terms his yearning for erotic intimacy with the lady (37-41), and it is in this state of mind (*delaitous*) that he makes his way towards the Holy Sepulchre, the poet thus setting up a conflict between earthly desire and religious duty typical of many crusade songs. The lover laments the fact that the lady’s husband remains at home, full of dark thoughts of jealousy and resentment because he knows the lover is successful in obtaining the lady’s love. Whether this means sexual fulfilment or the satisfaction of a more self-con-

---

trolled *joi* is left unstated. The third section appears to introduce the other typical character of the courtly love situation: the slanderer, frequently berated for his sharp ‘beak’, his heart seething with poisonous, wounding words with which to injure the *prous*, implicitly true lovers.

The short stanza III consists of three groups of three tri-syllable lines corresponding to the three-fold repetition of a new melodic motif. It invokes the name of God in the courtly rather than crusading context: here God protects the lovers, the speaker giving Him thanks that the husband cannot hear (or does not listen to?) the backbiters (61-62). He extols the lady and the joy she brings him (63-66), and confidently declares she inspires him with courage to face the coming voyage as he makes his way to the ship (67-69).

Stanza IV expands on the lady’s praise, and ends with what appear to be specific geographical references placing her in Urgel (76). At this point the lover is situated elsewhere, since the lady is «over there» (*lai*, 78).

His steady courage gives way in stanza V to the pain of longing at a distance. The lover claims to feel no true joy now that he experiences only desire without *jauzir*, suggesting the fulfilment evoked in v. 50, but consoles himself with dwelling on reports of her lovely words. God is invoked again, somewhat equivocally: either He is pleased to grant him some compensation for his suffering, or else, since it pleases Him that the lover should suffer, it is a good thing he has some compensation for it. Melodically the stanza consists of another three-fold repetition, corresponding to three groups of four tri-syllabic lines: so a similar but expanded metrical structure to that of stanza III, with a different melodic motif.

Stanza VI introduces a new heptasyllabic rhythm, each line repeating the same new melodic motif. The text has caused a lot of difficulties. It is clear that the lover is turning his thoughts to the coming sea passage, thinking of his fellow pilgrims, and urging them to pray, apparently for a good conclusion to the voyage. If my conjectures for 93-96 are not wide of the mark, he is anticipating not the crusaders’ spiritual goal but the prospect of welcome and hospitality on the far shore, then exclaiming wryly at his own hypocrisy: whether at keeping his mind on bodily comforts, and perhaps a welcome for his rôle as an entertainer overseas, or else because he loves his lady rather than God.
Stanza VII consists of a five-fold melodic repetition corresponding to four-line sections, and like the first stanza, contains much repetition of a single note, here the third to the ninth syllables of each section. The lover’s mind is turbulent, perhaps anticipating the turbulence of the sea crossing. Following his self-accusation of hypocrisy he goes on to accuse himself of baseness, yet confesses he fears the savage hardships to come on the pilgrimage to the Holy Land (97-104). The text seems then to show the lover mentally making an about-turn, deciding not to proceed with the journey, full of fear of sea-sickness (105-108), and appealing to the Virgin Mary to restore his lady to him (or saying that she does?). He imagines turning back to where his lady dwells, since he is receiving no message or joy from there. The last four lines (117-120) appear to contrast the viages ... salvages of 101-103 with the dous voiage which will take him back to her. This could make sense literally if one sees the lover as having set out from Barcelona or Aigues-Mortes, say, on the first part of his journey, but turning back from the next port of call, where the song is being performed to an audience waiting there for the ship’s departure to the Holy Land. In the case of the barons’ crusade of 1239, for example, the crusaders assembled in Lyon, where their leader Thibaut de Champagne headed from Champagne in July, before departing from Aigues-Mortes or Marseille during the first days of August.\(^10\)

In stanza VIII he confesses he is slow to hand his beloved over to God, though begs for His blessing on her. He exclaims in anguish over the torment of which Jerusalem is the cause, since it takes his lady away from him, and prays to the God of the faithful to bring him back to her without delay. The stanza consists of another triple repetition of metre and a fresh tune.

As Billy has observed (p. 94), stanza IX has an underlying metre of heptasyllables as in stanza VI and repeats the tune of that stanza,

\(^{10}\) See Luca Barbieri’s edition of RS 1152 in <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/french/research/crusades/texts/of/rs1152/>, «About the text»). It is interesting that the author of Le voyage d’Oultremer, which is an account of that Nompar’s journey to the Holy Land in the early 15th c., travelled with his friend the count of Foix and set sail from Barcelona, stopping off at various Mediterranean islands such as Mallorca on his way. It would appear that the Gascon family was closely allied to the counts of Foix, at least in the later medieval period. Is there a clue here to the Urgel connection in our piece?
while following the rhyme-scheme of stanza VI. Both deal with a religious theme, but in both cases the lover is reluctant to commit himself to God’s cause. Stanza VI had emphasised his sinful hypocrisy as a pilgrim; stanza IX begins with a quasi-liturgical use of Latin in which the lover begs for forgiveness of sins, yet switches immediately to a prayer that God will return him to his lady and the «tower of Blanchaflor», the bliss of earthly love.

The penultimate stanza draws together melodic motifs from earlier ones, lines 142-144 echoing the repeated motif of stanza VII with a minor variation at the end, and 145-148 echoing 40-43 (see Billy, p. 94). Again the lover addresses the divinity in semi-latinate terms (Rex et salvaire, 143), acknowledges his sinfulness (144), and makes a request. The corrupt state of the text in the manuscripts makes it uncertain what the nature of this request is, though it at least appears that he is thinking of a kiss within the lady’s castle and making some comment about his courtly new song. Previous scholars have failed to recognise the oufin in 148 as the chess piece now known as the bishop. According to my reconstruction of the stanza, which restores rhyme and sense, the lover is asking God to help him to introduce his song secretly into the lady’s castle – whether this is interpreted literally or metaphorically – her heart perhaps? – by means of an oblique manoeuvre, represented by the diagonal move of the bishop on the chessboard. If the manuscripts’ reading baisar is correct, then the ultimate goal is a kiss, though it is not out of the question that the earlier reading was biaisor, to move obliquely; in any case the similarity of the words allows for either to be suggested. It appears that the poet maintains the ambiguity of desire and fulfilment, and the convoluted syntax teasingly delays the most explicit (or at least the clearest) outcome of his manoeuvres: the transmission to his lady of his song.

Finally stanza XI brings text and music full circle, with complete repetition of the melody and metre of each section of stanza I. The song ends as it began, vaunting its own matchless perfection, with the neat addition of presentation to the lady. If we suppose the song to have been performed at an intermediate stop on the way to the Holy Land, then it may be imagined that it will subsequently be transmitted back to her.
Anonymous (Nompar de Caumont?)

Finament / e jauent

(BdT 461.122)

Mss.: M 213v (Nompar), T 74r-75v (Li lais nompar).


Other editions: Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta and Robert Lafont, Las cançons dels trobadors, Toulouse 1979, p. 760 (text Lafont, Mod. Occ. version based on Bartsch; unreliable German, English, Castilian and French translations).


Analysis of the mss.: That the mss. are corrupt in a number of places is virtually certain given the extreme difficulty of making coherent sense of them without emendation (see for example vv. 93-95, 105, 122, 145-148). It is a delicate matter to judge whether apparent irregularities at the rhyme and isolated rhyme-endings (for example 22, 30, 34, 85, 99, 136, 159) are in every case a reliable basis for the identification of errors or for correction, since the versification is variable, and the very expression lai non par, which is echoed in the rubrics, might even hint at this; in other words it is not only «matchless» but also «unpaired», «unmatched» (compare Arnaut Daniel, e·ls letz / becs / dels auzels ramencs / ten balps e mutz, / pars / e non pars, BdT 29.13, vv. 5-10). Strange graphies are also a doubtful basis for the identification of errors given the song’s linguistic hybridity. Nevertheless, rin (93) and grain (96) at the rhyme are almost certainly common errors in the two mss., and it is certainly tempting to regularise, or assume as equivalent, certain rhymes such as those of 1-2 (as does Bartsch, though Billy and I do not).

The mss. are closely related, sharing many other common errors in 17, 52, 53 54(?), 92, 93, 94, 95(?), 105, 116 (?), 126 (x2), 145, 146, and the omission of a cedilla in 121 and 137. As M contains fewer individual errors than T (M 28, 31, 62 (?), 79, 95, 148; T 8, 11, 20, 23, 26, 29, 47, 49, 57, 74, 75 (?), 78, 88, 89, 94, 95 and so on) it has been chosen as base, with T providing some corrections. Further support for the choice of M as base is Billy’s observation (p. 77) that T is almost entirely responsible for the errors in transcription of the melody of the 65 lines (out of 162) for which it has preserved musical notation.

M marks stanza breaks by decorated initials at vv. 1, 13, 25, 45, 70, 91,
97, 130 and 151, T at 1, 37, 130 and 151. I have followed Billy’s divisions but have subdivided stanzas I and II where there is repetition of verse form and melody.

I did not start out with the intention of correcting for rhyme or scansion, though some of my conjectural emendations do appear to do so (17, 52, 93, 145-146). If the transmitted melody does not match the emended lines (see Billy’s transcription, p. 59), it seems reasonable to assume that they would originally have done so (it cannot of course be assumed that the melody in either of these mss. is necessarily the original one).

**Versification and melody:** Frank, I, p. 194 (descort no. 29) occitanises the rhymes and regularises the rhyme schemes; Billy presents a different version on p. 92, with his «restored» elements underlined. I present the details in accordance with my edition. I am unsure whether some rhymes should be regarded as distinct or approximate (e.g. -ant/-anc in III and -ent/-ant in XIV; see the note to 22).

Melodic sections are (approximately) repeated within stanzas I, II, VII (not always corresponding to sentence breaks), VIII, IX. For further details, including the different handling of possible elisions in each ms., see Billy’s comments on pp. 93-96.

---

Ia. a3 a3 a3 b3 b3 b5 c6’ d6 d4 d5 d4, -ent/-ens, -ar, -ence, -ant  
Ib. a3 a3 a3 b3 b3 b5 c6’ d6 d4 d5 d4, -ens, -ar, -ence, -ant  
Ic. a3 a3 b3 b3 x3 b5 c6’ d6 d4 d5 d4, -ens, -ar/-ous, -ence, -ant/-anc  
IIa. a4’ a5’ b5 c5’ c5’ b5 b6 b5, -ine, -os/-ous, -ire  
IIb. a4’ a5’ b5 c5’ c5’ b5 b6 b5, -ine, -ous, -ire  
IIc. a4’ a5’ b5 c5’ c5’ b5 b6 b5, -ine, -ous, -ire  
III. a3 a3 b4 a3 a3 b3 a3 b3, -au, -or  
IV. a5’ a5’ b5 a5’ a5’ b5 a5’ a5’ b5, -ece/-ese, -ai  
V. a3 a3 b3 b4 a3 a3 c3 b4 a3 a3 b3 b4, -ai,-ir, -is  
VI. a7 a7 b7 b7 a7, -in, -is  
VII. a4’ a4’ b4 c4 / d4’ d4’ d4’ b4 / a4’ a4’ e4 c4 / a4’ a4’ e4 e4 / d4’ d4’ d4’ c4 / d4’ d4’ d4’ b4, -ie, -an(s), -en/-an, -age(s), -ai  
VIII. a5 a5 b5’ / a5 a5 b5’ / a5 a5 b5’, -en/m, -ighe/iche  
IX. a3 a4 b3 b4 / a3 a4 c3 b4 / a3 a4 b3 b4, -as, -or, -es  
X. a4’ a5’ b6 a6’ c5’ b5 b6 b6 b5, -aire, -el, -ent  
XI. a3 a3 b3 c3 d3 c3 c5 e6’ a6 a4 a5 a4, -ent/-ant, -ar, -on, -ence

---

1 In vv. 62-63 M’s melody, unlike that of T, elides au / a, effectively making 63 trisyllabic in line with all other lines of this stanza.  
2 The melody repeats in four-line blocks, though with an extra note in v. 103 accommodating the f. rhyme.  
3 As Billy observes, rendas would be possible here, making this a «b» rhyme.
Ia Finament
e jauent,
vos comens
lai non par.
Qui chantar
non sap far
ben deit escoutar,
car a fin joi comence
joës son; curteis chant
jen vai laschant
desore enant,
per bon samblant.

Ib Asïens
sapiëns
et bon sens
ist d’amar,
hoc, et car
fin trobar,
per qu’en dei jugar,
car ital captinence
tot li corteis dru fant.
Dosne valent,
a Dieu vos comant,
qu’eu vai loignant.

Ia. With finesse and joy I begin for you a peerless lay. Whoever does not know how to compose a song should listen well, for it is with pure joy that a joyful melody begins. Gracefully I now unloose a courtly song, as a fine example.

Ib. Wise awareness and fine wit, and the troubadour’s precious, subtle art, spring from love, yes, so I ought to play [make songs?] with it, since this is the way of all courtly lovers. Noble lady, I commend you to God, for I am about to leave you.
Ic. Gracious, noble merit, youth and free-spending ought to hold sway among the excellent because they give rise to acclaim. I am inculcating wisdom and self-control / discipline / temperance into myself: joy makes me as pure as I ask, entirely without deceit.

IIa. Ah, noble lady, with your gracious, queenly figure, would that I were there with you where my heart desires, for I devote my thoughts to nothing else. Devoted to worldly delight I make my way to the glorious Holy Sepulchre where God lay for us.
IIb  Ahi! chiere grine, maris, teste encline, çai restai jalous: son cor en griu tire qui d’al non empire car eu sui jauous; molt en est pesançous et s’en fai *songeous*.

IIc  Ahi, bec d’espine, noirens fuma-vine! Faus contratious tant mal vous consire: lou cor vos arbire que disas des prous, car est tant envious et tant anuious!

45 ai chaire **T**  47 cai **M**, car **T**  48 engrin *or* engriu **T**  50 iauos **T**  51 en *missing* **T**; pesancous **M**, pensatos **T**  52 len fais (T lenfais) langous **MT**  53 ai **T**; beche **MT**  54 nairens fu maunique **MT**  57 lour *with the r written above* **T**; arbrie **T**

IIb. Alas! – the grey-faced husband remains behind, his head bowed in jealousy: he drags himself around in vexation which only grows worse because I am fulfilled; he is deeply troubled about this and he becomes full of anxiety (?).

IIc. Ah, you spike-beak, you destructive vine-robber (?)! The false enemy (the Devil) seeks out so much evil for you! He thinks up for your heart (*or quickly?*) what you should say about noble people, because he is so envious and so vexatious!
III  Mais Deu lau
que no·us au.
A la meillor
tant m’esjau
que me[n]tau
sa lauxor.
Per li vau
ver la nau
sanz paor.

IV  Beltaz et prohece
et la grant richece
de mi dosn’en fai,
tant es ben aprese,
seignade et cortese,
que tot lament jai.
La terre urgalese,
la gent bersendese
sal Dex per li, lai.
V. I have no true joy, alas; without pleasure I feel intense desire. I am quite assuaged when someone relates to me her lovely words that I like to hear. Since it pleases God, it is a good thing that I have compensation for the suffering.

VI. May St Martin’s good pilgrims pray God He grant a good end, and if they smile on me there [in the Holy Land], hospitality will be well (or soon, tost?) provided. Now I am that holy Isengrin (?) and long-faced like a false pilgrim!
Or di folie
et vilenie, 100
com hom vilans;
del Flum Jordan,
mi par salvages,
sein dieu plaisie, 105
nom ‘Mi Eschai’: 110
non vol greg ren.
Sancta Marie,
tu rens m’amie,
et tore lai 115
ou ele estai,
pos del rivage
non vei message
ni alegrage,
\(n\) joi non sen.
Al prin passage 120
cel douz voiage
verrai corage
fin et certan.

VII. Now I am speaking foolishly and basely, like a lout; I readily grumble, for that journey and pilgrimage to the river Jordan seems brutal to me, but please God, I would never have the name ‘It-Behooves-Me’: I do not want to be seasick. You, holy Mary, return my sweetheart to me, and I will go back to the place where she is, since I see no message coming from the shore where she dwells, nor feel any joy. At the first crossing of this sweet journey I shall see a heart pure and firm.
VIII Tost çai non vai jen
a Deu os donen,
qui vous benedighe!
O Jherusalem,
com fort me tormen,
que·m toles m’amighe.
Rex de Belleem
qu’aorent creden,
nen tornas sans triche.

IX Trinitas
et unitas,
redemptor
et salvator,
mos peccas
mi perdonas;
pos rendes
m’a la gençor,
et si plas,
si me tornas
a la tor
de Blanchaflor.

VIII. Here I am not quick to hand you over graciously to God – may He bless you! Oh Jerusalem, how bitterly you torment me, for you steal my lover from me! King of Bethlehem adored by the faithful, bring me back to her without delay.

IX. Trinity and Unity, Redeemer and Saviour, forgive me my sins; then take me back to the most gracious one and hence, if it please [you], return me to the tower of Blanchaflor.
X Rex et salvaire,
cest vostre peccaire
donas, s’il vous soit bel,
asîndoi lai bon lai[re]
per baiser, selaire,
dins son ric chastel,
od l’oufin del chadel,
sol’, e mon avinent,
curteis chant novel.

XI Finament
et jauzent,
vos defin
lai non par.
Meiller non
pot trobar
hom qui sap chantar,
qu’el est de tal valence
per que l’en vait presant.
Dosna valent,
vos en faz present
per bon talent.

X. King and Saviour, grant to this your sinner, if this is acceptable to
you, that I, a good thief, may introduce there, secretly, in order to kiss [or by
moving obliquely?], within [or: into?] her rich castle, through the alphin (the
bishop of the chessboard) of the keep, my pleasing, courtly new song alone.

XI. Subtly and joyfully I conclude for you a peerless lay. No man who
knows how to sing can compose a better one (also Better is not to be found
by a man who can sing), for it is of such worth that people are esteeming it
highly. Worthy lady, I offer it to you with all my heart.
1-2. It is tempting to emend to *Finamens e jauens* (with adverbial -s) for the rhyme.

4. As well as claiming that his song is «matchless» because it has no equal, the troubadour is perhaps also introducing its titular versification and rhyming.

10-12. I do not understand why Billy rejected Bartsch’s «sich loslassen»: vom Dichten gebraucht» (p. 77). He translates «Je m’en vais désormais pour de bon», with no note on the sense, but how can *vai laschant* mean «I go away», or *per bon semblant* mean «pour de bon»? Dictionaries give *laschier* v. n. as «lâcher, abandonner» (*DLF*), «se fatiguer, faiblir» (*LAF*), v. refl. «se retirer, s’abstenir» (*DLF*, *LAF*); *PD* «v.a. laissez laisser; laisser tranquille; omettre; mettre en liberté; légner; faire grâce à; v.n. cesser; v. réfl. se désister». Although the speaker states *later* in v. 24, that he is going away, the context here appears still to be the composition process, which continues in 13-21. For *laisser* ‘to set free’ see also *BdT* 364.35, vv. 30-31, *Mas pero s’ueimais laiss’en fat / Richard, pus en sa preizon es*. For *per bon semblant* compare SW, VII, 544, 18 per s. «in ähnlicher, gleicher Weise» and *BdT* 389.10a, vv. 1-3, *Era·m platz, Guiraut de Borneill, / que sapcha per c’anatz blasman / trobar clus, ni per cal semblan, «[…] and for what reason». – I take *jen* (10) as an adv. (a normal Occitan graphy for *gen*).

11. Billy prints *desore en avant* here, resorting to *T* for the last three syllables. He comments that the text «présente un autre élément d’origine française apparemment irréductible (nombre de syllabes): des er en avant 11T où M substitue la forme occitane, hypométrique, francisée *desore en an* (ao. *deserenan*), qui peut au demeurant résulter d’une simple haploglie» (p. 102). As he observes, the melody in *M* treats *desore* as 3 syllables with a hiatus before *en*, and as the sense remains unchanged I prefer to leave what is in the base.

12. For *semblan* as ‘example’ see SW, VII, 542, 6.

13. Mss. *absiens*: all previous editors have printed this as two words, *Ab siens* (3 syllables). Bartsch (p. 77) sees *siens* as a form constructed on the gerundive, like *escien*, «sans le rattacher, comme cela semble ici s’imposer, à l’ancien français» (Billy, p. 84 and see also p. 102). Billy translates «Empreint de savoir, de sagesse et de bonté, c’est l’amour, qui l’inspire oui», though it is hard to see how this accounts for the syntax of the original. I take *absiens* to be a scribal error for *asciens = esciens*: it is easy to see how a scribe could have assumed a meant *ab*. For *escien* as a noun see SW, III, 164-165 and compare OF *escient*, *DLF* 1. «Intelligence; raison; 2. Connaissance, sagesse». Under III, 164, 3) Levy translates as «Ansicht», but compare 165, 5) *escien*, *ad e.*, *mon e*, «wissentlich, mit Bedacht, absichtlich» and 166, *esciensa* ‘Wissen, Verstand’. For the form compare the single example from *Mettra Ceneche*, vv. 55-56: *Non queras a ton ascien / nenguno choso deconoysent, which
induces me to leave the graphy found in the mss., though emendation to *esciens* would not cause much difficulty paleographically.

17. I follow Bartsch in emending the suspect *de*, an isolated rhyme with the line ending with a preposition, to *car*. The German scholar suggested that *car fin trobar* could be taken either as a nominative (= *trobars*) or as dependent on *ab*. The latter is excluded under my understanding of 13 (see above) and I have opted for the former. The absence of a m. nom. sg. inflexion on *trobair* is mirrored in v. 28 *donar*, 31 *presar*, and 32 *saber* (an indifferent matter in Occitan: see William D. Paden, «Declension in twelfth-century Occitan: on editing early troubadours, with particular reference to Marcabru», *Tenso*, 18, 2003, pp. 67-115 on p. 93, and Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson, *The Troubadour Tensos and Partimens: A Critical Edition*, 3 vols, Cambridge 2010, vol. I, p. xxiii), and although the text does sometimes show inflected nom. sg. (see for example vv. 25-27, 47, 50, 51, 59-60), this is not always the case (see *joi* in 35, *lament* 75). For the singular verb with plural subject see Frede Jensen, *Syntaxe de l’ancien occitan*, Tübingen 1994, § 478. Although there is an argument for leaving the joint reading of the mss. as Billy does, since they make a kind of sense, in fact it seems more likely that the troubadour is saying that wisdom and poetry come from love rather than that wisdom comes from love and poetry, as in Bernart de Ventadorn for example: *Chantars no pot gaire valer / si d’ins dal cor no mou lo chans, / ni chans no pot dal cor mover / si no i es fin’Amors coraus* (*BdT* 70.15, vv. 1-4).

19. Billy «par quoi je dois juger» (no note on *jugar* or *en*). I take *jugar* to be a form of *jogar*: compare the many examples of *jugan rizen* on *COM*, for example Peire de Valeria, *BdT* 362.3, vv. 5-6, *Qe tant gen ri ez esgarda / Q’ell’auci jugan rizen*; Cerveri de Girona, *BdT* 434a.25, vv. 15-16, *e sas douças paraulas m’aucion gen parlan; / sens desviar me pres tot rien e jugan*; Flamenca, v. 6082, *Alis li dis, jugan, risen* and vv. 301-302, *Tantost con fon dicha la messa / tuit van jugar a taula messa*. The sense in Occitan would be «so I ought to play with it [fin trobar]» (*PD* *jogar* «jouer, s’amuser, folâtrer»), though I wonder whether we should understand *juglar* (OF *jougler*) (*PD* «faire des tours d’adresse», *LAF*, «dire des chansons || plaisanter»; *DLF* *jogler* «faire des tours»; «dire des chansons»; *plaisanter* and *jongler* «faire des tours, dire des chansons».

20-21. Billy lists *captinence* p. 101 under «formes probablement originales» (T *carp*); the word does not appear to exist in OF, *PD* giving *captitenensa* as «conduite, manière d’agir; façon d’être, extérieur; maintenance, secours?». He translates «Puisque tous les amants courtois ont une telle attitude», «attitude» apparently based on «façon d’être» (*PD*), though it is unclear to what this attitude would refer. The lines might mean that it is courtely to commend one’s lady to God on departure, so this is what he is doing, though this does seem rather a plodding statement in a song professing itself
subtle and refined. I take the lines with what precedes them, placing a comma rather than a full stop after 19.

22. Billy (p. 84) emends the approximate rhyme to *valant*, stating that «On attendrait ici af. *valant* au lieu du *valent* des mss. Cependant, à ce vers fait manifestement écho le v. 160 où *valent* semble irréprochable. On a du reste, curieusement, un phénomène apparentemment semblable et symétrique au v. 159 avec *presant* dans un cadre rimique en «ent». On p. 102 he identifies *val[al]nt* (which of course is his emendation) as a specifically French form, but compare the *Roman d’Arles*, vv. 1022-1024, *Gran brega fon davant Arle lo Blanc, / que fazien los Sararins an los Crestians valants. / Mot ben si van portar Olevier e Rollant.*

30-31. Line 30 ends with a rhyme-word unechoed elsewhere in the stanza. Billy translates «avec preux qui en sont d’autant plus prisés», but how does this account for *en* and *deit*? The note refers to Bartsch *qu’om* and Lafont «qui en sont d’autant prisés», but I do not understand where «d’autant» comes from. I print *endert* (T *en dert* << *enderzer*, PD «v.a. éllever»), with *presar* (= *prezar*) as a substantival infinitive, subject of *endert*. The sense would be that those with excellent courtly qualities are the best to appreciate the quality of a song – though this interpretation must remain tentative. For *derzer* as v. intr. (PD gives only v. a.), compare the *Essenhamen de la donzela*, vv. 640-641, *com d’onor e de pretz / creys, mont’ e dertz e pueia*. The error may be attributable to eye-skip from v. 29 (it is noticeable that T makes an error the other way round, with *dert* in 29).

32-33. Rather than ‘abstinence’, *abstinence* here is synonymous with *mezura*. Compare Guillem de Montanhagol, *BdT* 225.13, vv. 4-5, *e no sia autius ni reprendens, / ans ay’ab si meuzr’et abstinensa* (which Ricketts translates as «mesure et discrétion»), and cf. vv. 21-22, *quar mezura non es mas solamens / so que de pauc e de trop tol falhensa*. Billy translates «Je m’en vais enseignant la sagesse et la continence». Rather than taking *mi vai* as «Je m’en vais» (Billy, PD *anar* << *s’en aller»; the examples in *TL*, I, 294 show only the reflexive with *en*, as modern French *s’en aller*), I take *vai e doctrinant* to be a continuous present analogous to the examples in vv. 10, 24, 121-122 and 159 and *mi* as its direct object.

34-35. Billy translates as «La joie me rend flatteur, comme je le demande», but how does flattery fit the context? Rather than teaching others, the speaker is inculcating wisdom and self-restraint into himself, thus making himself blanc, ‘pure, innocent’. Despite previous editors (see in particular Billy, p. 118) I see no reason not to accept this as an approximate rhyme.

40. I have preferred to translate *cors* as heart rather than *mos cors* as ‘I’ (Billy «je») (or even ‘my body’), given the affective context. But of course the sense is ambivalent and has erotic overtones.

42. For the pronominal grouping *M’en*, queried by Billy, compare *LR*,...
II, 78 = BdT 183.12, vv. 1-2, En Alvernhe, part Lemozi, / m’en aney totz sols a tapi. The juxtaposition of delaitos with the journey to the Holy Sepulchre apparently puzzled Billy who added a gloss to his translation, «Je m’en vais heureux [malgré tout]». The word in fact appears to encapsulate the central conflict of the piece, namely the tug between the divine call of the crusade and the intense longing for the beloved lady. Occitan delech and delechamen can mean both ‘pleasure’ (< DELIGERE, FEW, III, 34, «auswählen») and ‘sin’ (< DELICTUM, FEW, III, 34, «Vergehen») (compare FEW «Apr delech» and TL, II, 1333 delit). See also BdT 262.6, v. 36, E qui sai reman delechos / E qui sai rema delecham, «dedito ai piaceri», p. 117, where pleasure and sin appear synonymous. For the same theme of intense conflict between love for a woman and the duty to serve God on crusade found in Old French songs see the introduction, above.

45. The cry of lament is because the husband, whatever his jealousy, still remains with the lady. For grine see Billy, p. 114, who notes that it is otherwise attested only in Girart de Roussillon and possibly Raimon de Cornet.

47. This is the only attestation of restai on COM; Billy notes «influence probable d’ao. estai», which is plausible.

49. The only attestation of empirir (SW, II, 391, «schlechter werden») in the Occitan dictionaries and COM is from a 15th-c. Alpine source, the Istorio de Sanct Poncz; Levy found the present passage obscure. I understand as Billy, who regards empire as a specifically French form and the Sanct Poncz attestation as a gallicism (p. 102).

52. Billy prints e l’enfais langous and translates «mon bavardage l’accable [plus encore]», taking enfais as 1 p. pres. ind. of enfaisar in the figurative sense of «charger, accabler», and OF langos (?) / Occitan lengos «bavard», «attribut du sujet implicite d’enfais». He adds that the only two attestations given by TL, V, 144 have the form lengous(e), and that Max Pfister had suggested seeing a lexical creation with a deverbal from LANGUERE, in the sense of «accablé», which would take better account of the spelling in -an. A problem with Billy’s suggestion is that the lover, by obligation discreet, is unlikely to be «bavard». Although it is tempting to see langous as the slanderer, anticipating stanza IIc, it is hard to see how to adjust the line without making it hypermetric (e.g. et l’enfaisa langous, ‘and the tongue-wagger is a burden to him’), the corresponding lines 44 and 60 also having five syllables, these lines matching the melody as transcribed in the mss. A possibility might be to take a cue from Pfister’s suggestion and print et l’enfais lag nous, ‘and the burden grievous’, supposing a simple metathesis of an earlier ng; however, this would require acceptance of two apparent hapaxes: enfais as a noun from enfaisar, and lagno(u)s (lanhos) as an adjective from lanha (PD «chagrin, affliction, souci» and cf. lanhar v. refl. «se plaindre», and furthermore the subject of est in 51 would be different from that of 52. I hesitantly suggest that the last word
of the line was originally a form of *sonhos* (OF *songeos*). At some stage of transmission the text could have read *len faissonhos* (*l’en faissongeos?*), the *o* having been subsequently misread as *e* and the second *s* as *l*. Double *ss* after a monosyllable is found in a number of Occitan mss.: see François Zufferey, *Recherches linguistiques sur les chansonniers provençaux*, Geneva 1987, pp. 144-145, 214 and 259. Although *l’en* is possible, with the subject of *fai* being the idea contained in 50, it seems to make clearer sense to see the pronoun as reflexive, an *s* having been misread as an *l*.

53. Billy emends mss. *beche* to *bec*, which brings the scansion into line with 37 and 45, but translates «croc» («il fut un croc d’épine blessant ma vigne»), despite this only being given as a translation of *beca* in the Occitan dictionaries.

54. I suspect we are faced here with another insulting name for the *lausengier*. The emendation *nafrens* proposed by Bartsch for ms. *nairens* is the only attestation of the word on *COM*, and although it follows well from *bec d’espine* in the previous line, it would need a following noun to qualify. I have preferred to emend to *noirens*, ‘harmful’, as *a* for *o* seems marginally closer paleographically than *i* for *f* (see *PD nozer, noire*, *LR* IV, 341 and *SW*, V, 434), though the sense is little affected. I accept *vine* for *vinha* with some hesitation, since this depalatalisation is possible in the North and especially Anglo-Norman (see Mildred K. Pope, *From Latin to modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman: phonology and morphology*, Manchester 1952, § 1182); the word *vinas* appears in Occitan charters and three poetic texts on *COM* but since the word is not at a rhyme its pronunciation is unclear. Although the northern Italian family name *Fumagalli* = ‘chicken-thief’ suggests that *fumar* may have had the sense of ‘steal, pilfer’ I have not been able to find any supporting evidence for this. It is nevertheless tempting to suspect a connection with the little foxes that spoil the vines (of love) in *Cantica canticorum*, II:15, *Capite nobis vulpes parvulas quae demoliunter vineas; nam viens nostra floruit*, and furthermore to wonder whether *fuma* may be a scribal error for *furta*, where *rt* could easily have been misread as *m* (compare *LR*, III, 409 *furt* > *FURTUM* «vol, larcin» and 402 *furtier* «fripon, fureteur, furtif»).

55-58. Bartsch’s note: «so grosses Uebel sinnt euch und meint euch das Herz, was ihr von den Guten sagt»; Billy translates «adversaires déloyaux, votre cœur vous inspire tout le mal que vous dîtes des preux», which conflates the two verbs. In his note to 58 he states that «Le passage est problématique, moins à cause de la désinence de *disas* au lieu de l’ao. *diztez/disetz* (af. *dites*; cf. §3.3.4.2), qu’à cause de la syntaxe des vv. 56-57, les verbes en question ne semblant pas admettre une telle construction». Either singular or plural is acceptable for the vocative; my conjecture for 54 suggests the singular. It seems right to take the *faus contralious* to refer to the *lausengiers*,
often designated as contrarios: compare Perdigon, BdT 370.3, vv. 41-42, fals lauzengiers, quar en joi dechazer / ponhon totz temps, tant son contrarios; Jaufre, vv. 7923-7926, e mieltz venir e mieltz anar / ses tot repte de malestar / de lausengiers contrarios, / que ves amor son enoios and other examples on COM. I take the first verb, consire, as 1st p., «I wish you so much ill», literally «I consider so much harm for you»: for the 1st p. ending in -e see Joseph Anglade, Grammaire de l’ancien provençal ou ancienne langue d’oc, Paris 1921, p. 269. For the use of que instead of so que in v. 58, compare Guiraut Riquer, Lettre 11, vv. 410-411, Aras vos albiratz / que fan cambiador, «Pensez, par exemple à l’activité des marchands», p. 215). For the form disas, otherwise unattested as far as I can see, compare Anglade dig(u)as (p. 328). For the alternation between the familiar 2nd person singular and the polite 2nd person plural direct address form, see Jensen, Syntaxe, § 477.

59. est: Occitan 2nd person singular (but the other 2nd person verbs are in the plural); OF 3rd person singular.

62. Bartsch, p. 77, «dass ich euch nicht höre», taking au as 1st p.; Billy interprets the ms. as nous, «qui nous écoute».

65. Mss. me tau, the error for mentau doubtless arising from the loss of an abbreviation mark.

72. Billy translates en fai as «en sont la cause», though I can find no support for this. I take vv. 70-75 as one sentence, en fai ... que tot lament jai, with en pleonastic, anticipating the complement in v. 75 (see Jensen, Syntaxe, § 266).

74. Billy translates seignade as «insigne» (‘distinguished’), though this sense seems uncertain from PD senhar, signar «v. a. signer (un écrit); marquer d’un fer chaud, flétrir; poinçonner (une mesure); faire le signe de la croix sur; indiquer», LAF seignier «v. a., faire une marque à, marquer, poinçonner || faire signe à || désigner || faire le signe de la croix sur, bénir», TL IX, 332 seignier «bezeichnen, kennzeichnen». The context seems to call for the equivalent of enhadada. Cf. also Girart de Roussillon, glossary, seinaide, «sensé, sage».

76. Bartsch (p. 73) saw this reference to the land of Urgel as proof of the Catalan origins of the poet.

77. For gent bersendese as a possible reference to the people of Barcelona, see Billy’s note. A tri-syllabic form Barsaunes is found in Raimon de Miraval, BdT 406.11; see Wilhelmina M. Wiacek, Lexique des noms géographiques et ethniques dans les poésies des troubadours des XIIe et XIIIe siècles, Paris 1968, p. 81.

79. I follow Billy in adopting T’s reading here.

84. Although an earlier version might well have had qui·m (Billy’s emendation; Bartsch qu’ieu), I take ·n to be a pleonastic use of the pronoun anticipating the following complement: see Jensen, Syntaxe, § 266.
85. Billy is inclined to think Bartsch was right to emend to *son bel dir* for the rhyme, but observes that «Le pluriel s’oppose néanmoins à une émendation strictement locale, et nous remarquons que l’altération rimique intervient au niveau d’une articulation faible, dans le cadre d’un octosyllabe sous-jacent, qui rend plus acceptable une entorse à la rime. L’infinitif substantivé pur *dir(e)* paraît en fait d’un usage assez limité; citons GrRiq 248.15:81 et RbAur 389, 38:18).» As the sense is unchanged I reproduce the reading of the mss. The form *dis* is found in the following other examples: *Fierabras*, v. 4594, *que l’almiran no preza ni sos faytz ni sos dis*; Istoria Petri et Pauli, vv. 824-825, *per sos beoulx dis / de Ciceron lo philosophe*; An., *BdT 461.35a*, v. 4, *se mes chantair et mes dis vos agraide.*

86. Billy «que l’on a plaisir à entendre»; I take *vol* as a 1 p. form: compare the examples in the glossary to *Girart de Roussillon.*

91-96. This stanza is highly problematic. Billy heavily emends at the rhyme, changing the united readings of the two mss. in v. 92 (*fin to feus*), v. 93 (*rin to ris*), v. 94 (*mis to meus*), and v. 96 (*romin to romeus*): see his long note on pp. 87-88 and further remarks on p. 116. He translates «Que les bons pèlerins de Saint Martin prient Dieu qu’il [me] donnent un bon fief, et si les gens me sourient, ma joie sera toute louange. Alors que je suis ici, seul, très affligé, et morne comme un pèlerin sans foi». For his emendation *feus* (v. 92) he rightly argues that the f. noun *fin* would require the adjective *bona*, which would then make the line hypermetric. He supports the idea of a request for a fief with a metaphorical example in Peire Vidal, according to which a suitor claims to be his lady’s vassal and to deserve a «fief» as a reward for his service. While such an image is found in association with the courtly love relationship, it strains credibility to see crusaders asking for a fief as the only explicit reward for their pilgrimage – even if some crusade preachers did offer such territorial gain as an inducement among the spiritual rewards – and moreover introduces a completely new idea into the stanza. In contrast, the prayer for a ‘good end’ is commonplace (see the many examples on COM under *bona* + *fi(n)*, for example: *e Dieu m’aport a bona fi* (Raimon Vidal de Bezaudun, *Ensenhamen*, v. 1776); *Bona fin deu ben far, e Dieus li deu far be* (Uc de Saint Circ, *BdT* 457.42, v. 9); *et quant nos partirem de la vida presen / nos mene a bona fin e nos don salvamen / lay sus en Paradis tostems eter-nalmen* (from the anonymous religious poem *O, Regina excellent, verges de pietat*, vv. 68-70). While the m. form of *bon* is impossible in the preserved text, *bona* can be restored by omitting *qu’il*: for examples of *pregar* + subjunctive without *que*, in a penitential context, compare Camille Chabaneau, «Traduction des psaumes de la pénitence en vers provençaux», *Revue des langues romanes*, 19, 1881, pp. 209-241, 71.77-78, *preg te me syan remetutz / he garnes me de tas virtutz*, 73.139-141 *Ihesus, tu qui es mon desir, / preg te volhas me corregir / segon ta merce dossamen*, and many other examples
from this source on COM. A scribe might have found this formulation unusual and opted for the more common *pregar que*, leading to an erroneous *bon* for scansion. I take *la* (v. 93) as *lai*, ‘there in the Holy Land’, and *gent* as an adverb. The rhyme-word *rin* certainly looks like an error, and Billy’s emendation to *ris*, which would then rhyme with *mis* (v. 94), makes good sense: the troubadour would be hoping for a favourable reception for his song from the other pilgrims. Billy’s «*ma joie sera toute louange*» for *lous en joi fore toz m<eus>» is an approximation (the phrase would literally give «praise in joy would be all mine»), since *meus* would have to qualify *lous* (understood as *laus* or *los*). I take *mis* of the mss. to be a past participle, suggest that *lous en joi(e)* is a common error of the mss., and emend conjecturally to *lousenje*: see TL, V, *lo senge* «Schmeichelei; Freundlichkeit (auch ohne Worte). *Or doint Deus que trop ne li cost Ceste losange et cist servise* (die sorgsame Ausstellung des Gastes mit Wäsche und Kleidung)», and *Trois jorz, sans plus, le sejorna, Que plus n’i ot mester losange* («gütliches Zureden»). Compare PD *lauzenja* «flatterie; médisance, calmonie; amitié?; preuve d’amitié?» and SW, IV, 343-344. For the phrase *metre losenge* see TL, V, 1739 and compare the example at SW, IV, 344, 2. The graphy of *T, joie* with final *-e*, might preserve a remnant of this. The reading *lous en joi(e)* could be explained by an attempt to make local sense of a puzzling word division in the source, for example *lous|enje*. The potential ambivalence of the word leads on well to the idea of hypocrisy in 95-96. Billy’s interpretation of 95 is questionable: *nul* is unattested in the Occitan dictionaries as a noun meaning ‘anyone’ and *sans/sanz nul* is unattested elsewhere on COM or in TL, as far as I can see; LAF gives *nul* as a noun meaning «aucune partie», which is unhelpful, and an adjective «quelque, quelqu’un», but Billy’s punctuation allows for no noun with which this would agree. TL, VI, 908 gives «*nul subst. mit ne: keiner, niemand*» which does not work here, and 911 «*nul subst. irgend wer (in Sätzen mehr oder weinger negativer Färbung, auch in Fragesätzen)*», which might be possible, see the examples *A molt grant peine vos puet miax nuls troveir*, and 912 *Se vus eslirez nul encontre sun* (des Königs) *voleir*. But how can *fin* mean «très»? (For *grin* as «en colère, de mauvaise humeur», see Billy, § 3.1.4, p. 114.) I hazard the conjecture that *nul fin grin* is a corruption of *isengrin*, when *T*’s *cil* could be retained (see my translation). Billy’s text of 96 retains *grain* though he translates *gram*, «morne» (Bartsch *grams*). COM has no other attestations of *grain* and *gram* is clearly right. The form *romi* is attested four times in *Girart de Roussillon*, vv. 9563, 9565, 9647, 9741.

100. I follow Billy in seeing *ren* as a 1 p. pres. ind. of Occitan *renar*.

105-120. Because of the difficulties of this stanza Billy, following Bartsch (see p. 89) has changed the line order, placing the original vv. 117-120 before the original v. 110. He translates «Mais j’aurais tout, s’il plaît à Dieu [105-
Ne venez pas ici: je n’aurais plus de volonté [107-108]. A la première traversée de cette douce expédition, je reprendrai fermement courage [117-120]. Sainte Marie, tu rends mon amie, et je retourne là où elle demeure [109-112], puisque du rivage où je ne vois ni message ni allégresse, je ne jouis pas, je ne guéris pas» [113-116]. The change of line order might seem to explain «Mais j’aurais tout» if it follows on from a «douce expédition» provided that we suppose the latter to be a journey to see the lady and «having everything» to mean to have all her love. But given that the troubadour has just complained about the cruelty of the journey to the Holy Land, how can it suddenly be regarded as «sweet»? I have decided with some hesitation to respect the manuscripts’ line order, though the version produced by Bartsch and Billy gives a more regular rhyme scheme, with the second half of each of the three eight-line sections then having the pattern ddddb.

105-108. These lines seem particularly impenetrable. If *vines* is a 2 p. sg. imperative of *venir* (so attested in *Flamenca*, v. 4178 and v. 4531.), who is being addressed? Is the troubadour telling his lady not to come from Catalonia (vv. 76-78) to his port of embarkation, since he is on his way to a ship to take him to the Holy Land (vv. 67-68), and how likely is that? What does *non volgre gren* mean: surely not «je n’aurais plus de volonté», but conceivably ‘I would not wish this it all’, *non volgrei ren*? I suggest that the problem in fact lies in the interpretation at some stage of transmission of a string of minims in v. 107 and word-division in v. 108, and conjecture on the basis of the admittedly slight evidence of a *senhal* in Arnaut de Mareuil, *BdT* 30.2, vv. 36-39, *Pueis digas a Mon Ben S’Eschai / qu’en tal son pauzat mei dezir, / si l puesc’a son plazer servir, / de ric guizardon serai certz*, that we are faced with another *senhal*, the sense being ‘I would never wish it to be said that it is my duty [to set sail]’. I then interpret *volgre gren* (108) as *vol greg ren*, where *greg* is a form of *greuch*, *greug* (*PD* «malaise, maladie», compare *grejuar*, *grejar*), and which has the advantage of retaining the *g* in *gren* which is otherwise hard to explain.

109-116. Billy edits these lines as *Sancta Marie, / tu rens m’amie, / et torne lai / ou elle estai. Pos del rivage / ou non vei message / ni alegrage, / non joi, non s[a]n*. His translation («puisque du rivage où je ne vois ni message ni allégresse, je ne jouis pas, je ne guéris pas») does not match up with his text, which has a full stop after *estai*. If *joi* is a verb, as in OF, though unattested in the Occitan dictionaries, it should no doubt be bisyllabic (*joï*), which would give a five-syllable line, the only other such line in this stanza being v. 114, all others having four. Although given the metrical variability of the song this is not necessarily wrong, I have preferred to emend v. 114 omitting *ou*. The note for the extra syllable in the melody can be explained by the need to provide one. Billy explains the situation differently (p. 73), suggesting that the *-age* of 113 could be elided into the *ou* of v. 114. I retain *sen*,
and rather than expanding Ms n followed by an abbreviation mark (v. 116) to non, as Billy, I expand to ni. For the present tense torne expressing the immediate future, see Jensen, Syntaxe, § 543, though his examples do relate only to si constructions. I then take the douz voyage (v. 118) to be, in contrast to the voyage to the Holy Land, the (sea?) journey back to his lady (in Catalonia?), where he will see the one whose heart is ‘true and reliable’ (vv. 119-120). I cannot see how verrai corage (literally ‘I will see courage / a heart’) can mean «je reprendrai courage» (Billy).

121-122. Billy prints a Dé [v]ous, translating «C’est sans plaisir que je viens ici sans tarder, vous confiant à Dieu», though it is unclear where to what «sans plaisir» relates. Although the form De for Deu is found in Girart de Roussillon (see Glossary), both mss. allow the reading a Deu o(u)s. The form ous may be an attempt to gallicise Occitan os, a form of vos: for os see Marcabru, BdT 293.26, v. 75. I take vai done as a continuous present.

123-127. Billy identifies benedighe (123) and amighe (126) as dialect forms: see his long discussion on pp. 103-113. Mss. quen (126) is clearly a scribal slip; Billy queries the subjunctive tolas (T tornas) and correction seems required, a for e being the result of scribal inadvertence. Billy (pp. 117-118) regards Iherusalem (124) and Belleem (127) as «mauvaises rimes»: «confusion classique chez les troubadours (cf. Erdmannsdörffer 140)».

129. Billy «ne m’en détournez pas dès à présent», but suggesting in the note: «faites-moi retourner sans attendre», which makes better sense in the context. He classifies triche as a «bad rhyme» (p. 118) and emends to tri<g>he.

136. Billy observes that rendas would be possible here («may you return me»). He attributes rendas in T to the context of the rhyme-scheme.

138. si plas: one would normally expect an indirect object (si·us plas).

141. As Billy notes, the poet is evoking the romance of Floire et Blancheflor, where Floire is separated from his childhood sweetheart and locked up in a tower in Babylon, where he finally manages to find her.

145-150. Billy prints these lines as asin doi lai bon lai / per baisar selon<c> / dins son ric chastel. / od lou fin de<l> chadel, / sol, mon avinent, / curteis chant novel (the reading of T; M has selone). As he states, this stanza is almost certainly heavily corrupted: «outre qu’il paraît incohérent en dépit de fragments intelligibles, la rime fait défaut aux vv. 145, 146 et 149. Un sens général peut toutefois apparaître, avec l’idée que seul son lai peut rendre à l’aimée, à l’insu du mari (though he translates «avec l’accord du mari», which can hardly be right), les hommages que l’amant aimerait lui porter». He suggests that the suppression of the second lai in 145, which was in the common source, would restore the correct scansion and rhyme in -om; and he suggests that doi may be a 1 p. ind. pres. of OF doire < lat. DUCERE with the
sense of «façonner»: «je façonne un bon lai». I interpret asin doi as asi·ndoi (= asi endoi), ‘I may thus introduce’ (< INDUCERE), and take its direct object to appear at the end of the stanza, namely mon avinent, / curteis chant novel. The troubadour is begging God to grant that he introduce his song into the lady’s castle. I suggest conjectural emendations to restore rhymes not in -on but in -aire: asi·ndoi bon lai[re] / per baiser selaire. The second lai of the mss. could be explained by the end of the last syllable being unclear or cut off. For selaire compare Peire Cardenal, BdT 335.69, vv. 4-6, per qu’eu no voill iamais esser selaire / de lors crois faitz on es desleialtatz; Peire Vidal, BdT 364.12, v. 14, Ben aia ieu, qar sui lials celaire (doubtful attribution); Gui d’Ussel, BdT 194.13, vv. 8-9, Qu’er ai trobat, ses bauzia, / Lejal amic celador, and other examples of selaire / celaire on COM. The -aire- of selaire could have been misread as -on-if the letters were written close together; T’s selonc would represent a misreading of this. Mss. lou fin baffled previous editors (see Billy’s note), but oufin is a recognisable form of alfin, the chess piece now known as the bishop, and understood in the Middle ages as bishop, count, judge or counsellor (see Richard Eales, Chess. The history of a game, London 1985, p. 45). The alphinus and the queen were less powerful than they are in the modern game: the alphinus moved and captured along the diagonal, but its movement was a rigid jump of three squares including the one landed on. The queen also moved and captured on the diagonal alone, moving only one square, so was the weakest of the major pieces, the most powerful being the rook, which could move and capture as the modern piece but could not castle with the king: see Silvio Melani, «Metafore scacchistiche nella letteratura medievale di ispirazione religiosa: I “Miracles de Nostre Dame” di Gautier de Coinci»}, Studi Mediolatini e Volgari, 35, 1989, pp. 147-173 (p. 161). The OF form is usually auffin: see Gautier d’Arras, Eracle, vv. 4388-90, Li rois ert matés par sa fierge, / Mais ce n’ert mie par l’auffin: / Par autrë ert li jus a fin («The king was going to be check-mated by his queen, but not by a move involving the bishop – another piece would finish off the game»), and Charles d’Orléans (poem LVIII, vv. 82-83), Je n’avoye pion, ne chevalier, / Auffin, ne rocq qui peussent ma querelle / Si bien aidier, though see also Jacquemart Gielee, Renart le Nouvel, vv. 5844-5846, Diaules vous dit eschiec et mat / D’oifin de largue consienche / Ou point d’estroite pas-sienche. Billy takes chadel to mean ‘lord’ (as in PD), but see also Girart de Roussillon, glossary s.v. caduel «forteresse, donjon» (cadel in v. 9156). I understand the poet to be saying he would like to be introducing his song into the lady’s castle by means of the alfin: in other words, through a chess manoeuvre. Mss. baiser has led previous editors to assume that the troubadour is expressing the hope that he will be able to kiss his lady. If this is the case, then the idea may be that he imagines himself as a thief (a ‘good’ thief, because his love is good?) secretly entering the lady’s castle. A similar idea of
stealing a kiss is found in *BdT* 364.2, 25-28, *qu’un mati / intrei dins sa maizo / e-lh baiziei a lairo / la boca e-l mento*; compare also *BdT* 16.20, vv. 8-9, *e s’ieu podi’esser laire / del sieu bel cors gen* and *BdT* 104.2, vv. 15-16, *Qan de ma dona sui laire / ges no-m tenc per malvatz afan*. There is no obvious direct object of *baisar*, which is given in *PD* as a transitive verb only, though examples of this being used absolutely or as a substantival in infinitive occur in *BdT* 167.52, vv. 14-15, *qu’eu no-ill deman, tan tem dir forfaitura, / baisar ni jazer; BdT* 236.4, vv. 43-44 *c’ab baissar et ab jaser / m’a trait d’ira e de tristor; Flamenca*, vv. 6601-6602, *neguna sason oblidar, / ni per tener ni per baisar*. It is, however, tempting to conjecture that *baisar* might be a scribal error for *biaisar*, ‘to move obliquely’ – as the bishop or *alfin* does on the chessboard. Eales (Chess, p. 65) cites 13th-c. source, probably written by a friar involved in preaching to laymen, which states that *alphins* are bishops who move and capture obliquely, because all prelates are corrupt and greedy. While such clerical corruption is unlikely to be relevant here, the allusion offers an example of medieval awareness of the indirectness and indeed surreptitiousness of the move. The *alfin* is of course also a powerful piece, so a useful assistant. (Billy’s suggestion of a potential ambiguity in *baisar* between ‘kiss’ and ‘bow down before’ would not work in this case, and in any case it is not clear what the object of ‘bow down before’ would be. But even if *baisar* and *biaisar* are not homonyms, the latter might well evoke the secondary idea of kissing.) Since as Billy observes, *peccaire* is normally a nom. sg. form but is clearly used here as obl. sg., the same might apply to *laire*, which is occasionally found elsewhere as obl. sg. (see Hermann Suchier, *Denkmäler provenzalischer Literatur und Sprache*, Halle 1883, p. 237, vv. 725-727, *e per l’amor que-l portas, cals qu’ieu sia peccaire, / fai m’atrestal perdo, coma fezist al laire / et a la Magdalena, a cui fust bos donaire and a treatise on geomancy ed. Gianfranco Contini, Un poemetto provenzale di argomento geomantico*, Fribourg 1940 (rpt. in Id., *Frammenti di Filologia romanza. Scritti di ecdotica e linguistica* (1932-1989), 2 vols., Firenze 2007, vol. II, pp. 861-932), vv. 80-82, *de moltas batalhas de gens, / de perda, de foc o de laire / siei be ver dire e retraire*); compare also examples of obl. sg. *chantaire, donaire* and *engignaire* in Marcabru (Simon Gaunt, Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson, *Marcabru: a Critical Edition*, Woodbridge 2000, p. 17). If *laire* is taken as nom. sg. it would apply to the lover himself: ‘I, a good thief, by moving obliquely, and being discreet, may introduce into her rich castle, through the *alphin* of the fortress … my … new song’, in which case the troubadour will be like a thief taking a secret communication into the lady’s castle, but he will also be like the good thief crucified but forgiven alongside Christ. If we take *laire* as a direct object, then it is the song that is the ‘good thief’.

149. In M *sol* is followed by a superscript *e*, T reading *sel*. Billy com-
ments that «Le e suscrit de sol*/ dans M peut avoir la même origine que celui de bone 145M. De quoi le syntagme est-il complément? De donas? De baiser dont le sens fait alors problème et qui serait dans ce cas, peut-être, une faute (pour laisser par exemple)?» Perhaps the scribe of M thought sol should refer to the lady (hence sole, Occitan sola), though this is impossible in the context. I take it as an adverb relating to the song. The convoluted syntax with the delayed direct object of the verb in 145 is a tease: the troubadour expresses the wish to send only his song into the lady’s rich ‘castle’ (with its erotic connotations) and not to enter there himself. So he will be a ‘good thief’ who needs God to pardon him for his sins (of desiring love too much at the expense of God’s service) but who exercises restraint in love (compare 32-34). Although avinent does not rhyme with any other line in the stanza it is not necessarily an error of transmission, since it anticipates the rhyme of the first two and the last lines of the following stanza.

151-162. Billy considers the non-rhymed lines here to derive from «corruptions manifestes» (p. 93), but they do make sense, and it is not certain that irregularity was not originally intentional.

159. Billy rightly rejects Bartsch’s emendation per qu’el vai / en presensa. He prints per que l’en vait pre<n>ent («qu’on ne peut que l’agréer»), arguing that presant, from Occitan prezar, is certainly unsatisfactory «parce qu’on attend ici un mot en -ent, même si GirRouss n’hésite pas à adopter des formed irrégulières comme plorent ou orent dans des laisses en -ent». Despite his arguments in favour of emendation I prefer to leave the mss. as they are, since the piece contains other approximate rhymes, some of which Billy accepts (85, 99, 100, 108, 124, 127). For the periphrastic verbal phrase vait presant see Jensen, Syntax, § 517 and the example from Bernart Marti cited in Billy’s note.
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