

Estratto

CULTURA NEOLATINA

Rivista di Filologia Romanza fondata da Giulio Bertonì

ANNO LXXI - 2011 - FASC. 3-4

Direzione
ROBERTO CRESPO ANNA FERRARI SAVERIO GUIDA

Comitato scientifico

CARLOS ALVAR Université de Genève Svizzera	ELSA GONÇALVES Universidade Clássica de Lisboa Portogallo
GÉRARD GOURAN Université de Montpellier Francia	ULRICH MÖLK Universität Göttingen Germania
ASCARI M. MUNDÓ Institut d'Estudis Catalans Barcelona, Spagna	WOLF-DIETER STEMPEL Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften München, Germania
GIUSEPPE TAVANI Università "La Sapienza" Roma, Italia	MADELEINE TYSENS Université de Liège Belgio
FRANÇOISE VIELLIARD École Nationale des Chartes Paris, Francia	FRANÇOIS ZUFFEREY Université de Lausanne Svizzera

MUCCHI EDITORE

James the Conqueror, the Holy Land and the troubadours

This article forms part of an Anglo-Italian project on lyric responses to the crusades by troubadours and trouvères which aims to produce an English-language monograph linked to free online critical editions, with some spoken and musical performances, of some 120 texts¹. A critical edition of the Old French texts will also, it is hoped, be published in book form. Such a project requires *inter alia* a fundamental re-examination of the chronology and historical circumstances of these responses, on the basis of expert up-to-date critical editions. Along with others such as Martín Aurell, Sergio Vatteroni, Miriam Cabré and particularly Saverio Guida who have focussed on the historical, social and cultural context of Occitan *sirventes*, I am convinced that the study of this context can lead to richer readings of commonplace ideas or expressions in apparently conventional texts, readings which can reciprocally enrich our knowledge of that context itself².

¹ The project is funded by a joint grant from the British Academy and the Warwick University Humanities Research Fund, and an Arts and Humanities Research Council research grant. I am also grateful to Ruth Harvey, Anna Radaelli, Saverio Guida and Luca Barbieri for their helpful suggestions during the preparation of this article.

² See *inter alia* M. CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo aura-l jorn pretentori*» (BdT 434a,20): *Jaume I i Cerverí interpreten els fets de 1274*, in *Actes del X Col·loqui de l'Associació Hispànica de Literatura Medieval*, Alacant 2005, pp. 453-468, p. 453: «Com en tantes altres ocasions, però, l'estudi del context històric i cultural ens permet fer una lectura més rica de textos aparentment formularis i donar un sentit precis als llocs comuns»; also S. GUIDA, *L'attività poetica di Gui de Cavaillon durante la crociata albigese*, in «Cultura Neolatina», XXXIII (1973), pp. 235-271 and Id., *Sulla tenzone tra Uguet e Reculaire (BdT 458.1)*, in «Studi Mediolatini e Volgari», 52 (2006), pp. 99-130, M. AURELL, *La vielle et l'épée. Troubadours et politique en Provence au XIIIe siècle*, Paris 1989, S. VATTERONI, *Le poesie di Peire Cardenal*, in «Studi Mediolatini e Volgari», 39 (1993), pp. 105-218. As Guida points out, «per destinatari in the know non era necessario esplicitare nei dettagli i contenuti informativi che si prospettavano, bastavano, per farsi capire, minimi accenni a situazioni o eventi arcinoti, “allusions rapides, quelquefois à peine indiquées” e, come ha giustamente osservato G. Gouiran, “ces allusions étaient, sans aucun doute, très bien saisies par les contemporains, qui assistaient et prenaient part aux événements; mais à la distance qui nous sépare du douzième siècle [and equally the thirteenth], elles sont devenues, la plupart

The involvement of the Spanish kings in the Reconquista is of course well known. What is less widely known is that King James I of Aragon, James the Conqueror, also had ambitions to play a leading rôle in crusades to the Holy Land, and that in the 1260s and 1270s, with urgent threats facing the Christians there, others expected him to do so. In the history of vernacular responses to the crusades the troubadours in the orbit of King James I of Aragon constitute an intriguing and relatively little known phase. This *conquistador* of Spanish lands apparently only once set out for the East, in 1269³, but he had been envisaging an expedition from as early as 1245, and in 1274 at the age of sixty he apparently had every intention of leading a second crusade. Four *sirventes* have been hitherto identified as referring to James as a potential or actual participant in eastern crusades: Daspol's *Seinhos, aujas, c'aves saber e sen* (BdT 206,4), Guillem de Mur's *D'un sirventes far mi sia Dieus guitz* (BdT 226,2), Olivier lo Templier's *Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen* (BdT 312,1) and Cerverí de Girona's *En breu sazo aura-l jorn pretentori* (BdT 434a,20)⁴. Others can be added to these: Bertran d'Alamano's *D'un sirventes mi ven gran voluntatç* (BdT 76,8) and the anonymous *El temps quan vey cazer fuelhas e flors* (BdT 168,1a)⁵. Each of these texts will be presented here in what, I will argue, is their approximate chronological order, with a discussion of the historical circumstances of their composition and performance; the anonymous *El temps quan vey cazer fuelhas e flors* has already been

du moins, très obscures pour nous"» (S. GUIDA, *Arnaut de Cumenge: l'avversione di un signore-trovatore per l'«ordo Praedicatorum»*, in «Studi Medievali», LI, 2010, pp. 611-669, pp. 624-625, citing G. GOUIRAN, *À la frontière de l'histoire et de la littérature: le sirventes*, in «Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona», 41, 1987-1988, pp. 213-225, p. 219).

³ In his account of his 1269 voyage James refers to a previous attempt at setting out for the Holy Land but there is no evidence to corroborate this: see G. AVENOZA – S. VENTURA, «*Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen*»: *Olivier le Templier, propagandiste de Jacques Ier*, in «Revue des Langues Romanes», 113 (2009), pp. 465-500, p. 468.

⁴ See I. DE RIQUER, *Presencia trovadoresca en la Corona de Aragón*, in «Anuario de Estudios Medievales», 26 (1996), pp. 933-966, pp. 951-952 and AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen*» cit., p. 466, who refer to the author of BdT 206,4 as Guilhem d'Autpol. For discussion of the identity of Daspol with that troubadour see W. D. PADEN *et alii*, *The Poems of the troubadours Guilhem d'Autpol and «Daspol»*, in «Romance Philology», 46 (1992-93), pp. 407-452, pp. 407-413.

⁵ Attributed in the single MS C to «*Guillem de sant-desdier*», but see S. GUIDA, *Canzoni di Crociata*, Parma 1992, pp. 262-263.

satisfactorily edited, but new critical editions are offered for each of the others. To paint the backcloth for these pieces I will begin with a brief summary of James's involvement in eastern crusades as it is known to us from non-lyric sources.

It is well known that James the Conqueror devoted most of his crusading efforts to the reconquest of Spanish territories: efforts that met with considerable success. Nevertheless, from as early as 1245, following a letter from Pope Innocent IV urging him to direct his attention to the Holy Land, the king had thought about launching an eastern expedition. At first this came to nothing because of internal politics in Aragon. Two decades later, on 16 January 1266, after spending five years attending to the suppression of a Moslem uprising in Murcia at the request of King Alfonso X of Castile, he turned his attention eastwards. But in the eyes of the Church he was in a state of sin. Married to Teresa Gil de Vidaure, he was involved in a relationship with Berenguela Alfonso, the illegitimate daughter of the Castilian king, that was both incestuous and adulterous. Pope Clement IV refused to support his plans, exhorting him to desist from crucifying Jesus Christ and pursuing this *incestuoso conturbinio*, otherwise neither the Church nor God would be able to help him bring a crusade to a successful conclusion. Despite this, James made extensive preparations for an expedition to Outremer throughout 1268, and seems to have entertained no anxieties whatever about the state of his soul. As Villacañas explains, he regarded going on crusade to the Holy Land as his duty as a king and the culmination of a life dedicated to chivalric ideals⁶. Besides, his autobiography, the *Llibre dels feits*, shows without a shadow of doubt that he believed that his conquests on behalf of God and Christendom would suffice for him to be forgiven this liaison⁷. He relates that while he was waiting to do battle with the Moors in Murcia, he decided to make confession to a

⁶ J. L. VILLACAÑAS, *Jaume I el Conquistador*, Madrid 2004, pp. 658-666, p. 659: «Caminar hacia Jerusalén no era para un gran caballero un medio de expiación, fuesen cuales fuesen sus pecados, sino la demostración de la más alta lealdad a los propios ideales y la cima de su honor».

⁷ Cfr. Jaume I, el Conqueridor, *Crónica o Llibre dels feits*, in F. SOLDEVILA, *Les quatre grans cròniques*, Barcelona 1973, ch. 426 (henceforth Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*). English translation in J. FORSTER, *James I (The Conqueror) King of Aragon. Chronicle*, Cambridge, Ontario 2000.

Dominican friar, whom he informed that his only offence against Our Lord of which he was aware was the matter of Doña Berenguela, and that from now on he intended to live with her without sin, as a man should live with his wife. He observed that the friar knew very well that he intended to conquer the whole of the kingdom of Murcia, and that he recognised the good service the king would perform in restoring this territory to the Christians; he considered that his good intention would assist him, so that if there were any sin, it would do him no harm on the day of the battle. When he asked the friar to give him absolution, the latter remarked: «Mortal sin is a great matter; but since you promise me to free yourself from it, I will give you the absolution». The king responded that he was going to enter the battle in the firm belief that he would escape from mortal sin one way or another; that he would serve God so well on that day and in this conquest that He would forgive him his sins, and that besides he entertained no ill-will to anyone. This, he believed, was sufficient. The friar hesitated; James told him to give him his blessing, declaring that he commended himself to God, and the friar gave it⁸.

On 4 September 1269, after King Louis IX of France had announced the date of his second crusade, but before the departure of the French which was to take place in 1270, the king of Aragon – no doubt to protect his commercial interests, to eclipse his rival, and to avoid his crusade being subsumed into that of the king of France⁹ – set sail from Barcelona, at a time of year that was already climatically hazardous. Ten days later a violent storm forced him to abandon the voyage. He felt obliged to provide detailed explanations for this failure, insisting that God had clearly not wanted him to pursue his undertaking. His explanations make no mention of Berenguela, with whom he continued

⁸ S. M. CINGOLANI, *Jaume I. Història i mite d'un rei*, Barcelona 2007, pp. 343-344, argues that the king's conscience was completely clear. James had argued that the Queen was suffering from leprosy, which prevented him from having conjugal relations with her, and that the pope should overlook the question of incest with Berenguela, to whom he was related in the eighth degree, and legitimize his marriage to her: «Com a rei i aristócrata sabia perfectament quns eren els seus drets en aquests casos, l'autorització de l'Església era més un aqüestió legal que no pas de consciència». See also AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai*» cit., pp. 466-467 and p. 493, n. 2. VILLACAÑAS, *Jaume I* cit., p. 461, realistically regards this an «historia más ben inventada».

⁹ E. MARCOS, *La croada catalana. L'exèrcit de Jaume I a Terra Santa*, Barcelona 2007, p. 198.

to have relations until her death. After delays because of the continued bad weather, he finally managed to disembark at Aigues-Mortes, from where he went immediately to Sainte-Marie-de-Vauvert to give thanks to the Virgin for saving him from the perils of the sea. From there he headed for his native town Montpellier, where he asked the consuls to provide him with some compensation for the considerable expenses of his expedition. They offered him the sum of 60,000 sous tournois but, to his great annoyance, only on condition that he reembark for the Holy Land. The king left the town abruptly for Barcelona, firing off some uncomplimentary remarks about the Montpellier citizens' lack of love and loyalty towards their overlord.

Five years later, in 1274, hoping to launch a new crusade, Pope Gregory X summoned European leaders to the second Council of Lyon. James was the only European king to attend. At the assembly the sixty-year-old monarch made a somewhat bombastic speech in which he declared his eagerness to lead the holy expedition. Berenguela was dead and no longer presented any impediment. But his speech was greeted with a few smiles and an embarrassed silence, for no-one present supported the pontifical project. Before returning to Spain, full of self-satisfaction as far as his personal reputation was concerned, James asked the pope to crown him with a crown he had brought with him for that purpose. But the pope refused, making excuses, and the king departed in disappointment and disdain¹⁰.

1. *El temps quan vey cazer fuelhas e flors* (anon., BdT 168,1a)

The unidentified author of this crusading exhortation, given here in Sakari's edition¹¹, laments the failure of many noblemen to defend Jerusalem, and wishes the preaching orders, an English king and his brother Richard, a valiant king of Aragon, a king of France, and an

¹⁰ Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*, ch. 523-542. P. M. THROOP, *Criticism of the Crusade: a Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda*, Amsterdam 1940, pp. 222-224 dubs him «this amazing old braggart» and «the windiest boaster in Christendom», but his dismissive reference to his «empty bragging of crusade exploits» (p. 235) is hardly fair comment given James's Reconquista successes.

¹¹ A. SAKARI, *La chanson de croisade "El temps quan vey cazer fuelhas e flors"*, in «Neuphilologische Mitteilungen», 64 (1963), pp. 105-124, adopted also by GUIDA, *Canzoni di Crociata* cit., pp. 262-267.

unnamed prince were fighting the pagans in Outremer. It concludes with praise of a King Alfonso of Castile for his subjugation of the pagans, and urges his listeners to make their way to him.

- I El temps quan vey cazer fuelhas e flors
 e·ls auzelletz estar dezesperatz
 per lo greu temps que·ls a voutz e giratz,
 4 atressi vey camjatz maynhs autz baros
 e lo secgle tornar en marrimen,
 quar sens e pretz, valors e lialtatz
 los sol guizar, per qu'om era prezat;
 8 er no·y a cor de far nulh fag valen.
- II E denant nos estai lo miradors
 que fo a totz cominalmen donatz,
 Jherusalem, on Jhesus fon liatz
 12 e receup mort sus en la vera cros,
 e·l cors pauzatz el verai monimen;
 e fora bo que no fos oblidatz
 tan ricx mirals qu'er breumen esfassatz
 16 si no·l trazem foras de serva gen.
- III E si membres a totz la grans amors
 que Dieus nos fetz, be fora mielhs gardatz
 Jerusalem, e·y agra mais crozatz;
 20 mas era es venguda la sazoz
 qu'om non a cor mas qu'om sia manen,
 e sabem cert que totz serem jutgatz,
 e bos e mals, segon nostres peccatz,
 24 davant l'aut Rey, al jorn del jutgamen.
- IV Per qu'ieu volgra clergues prezicadors
 fosson part Sur en outramar passatz,
 e·l reys engles e sos fraires Richartz,
 28 e·l reys valens de cui es Aragos,
 selh de Fransa, e·l princeps ab sa gen,
 et estesson entre payas mesclatz;
 adoncx, crey ieu, seria desliuratz
 32 lo cars miralhs qu'es lums de salvamen.

- V Hai! qui volra cobrar sens e valors
 ane s'en lai ont es totz bes granatz,
 joys e ferms cors e tota lialtatz,
 36 en Castelha, al valen rey N'Amfos,
 quar el es caps de pretz e d'onramen,
 e per el son paguas totz jorns bayssatz,
 e del miralh es honrada sa patz,
 40 que·l cor e·l sen hi met e l'ardimen.
- VI Dieus nos lays far e dir que siam salvatz,
 e al bon rey castellan, qu'es honratz,
 cresca sos gaugz e vida lonjamen.

I At the time when I see leaves and flowers falling and the birds in despair because of the harsh weather that has turned and turned them about, I see many high barons similarly changed and the world turned to bleakness, for wisdom and merit, worth and loyalty, through which a man was valued, used to guide them, but now there is no desire in them to perform any valiant deed.

II And before us stands the mirror¹² which was given in common to us all, Jerusalem, where Jesus was bound and received death upon the true cross, and his body placed in the true sepulchre; and it would be good not to forget such a rich mirror that will soon be destroyed if we do not rescue it from the infidels.

III And if all remembered the great love that God showed us, Jerusalem would certainly be better protected, and there would be more crusaders there; but now the time has come when people desire nothing but getting rich, yet we know for sure that we shall all be judged, good and evil, according to our sins, before the high king, on the Day of Judgment.

IV So I wish the preaching clergy¹³ would make the passage to Outremer beyond Tyre, together with the English king and his brother Richard, and the valiant king who rules Aragon, and the one of France, and the prince with his men, and that they would do battle with the pagans; then, I believe, the precious mirror that is the light of salvation would be liberated.

¹² For the image of Jerusalem as a mirror in which we may contemplate the glory of the Lord, see II *Cor.*, 3, 18 and the notes of SAKARI, *La chanson de croisade* cit. and GUIDA, *Canzoni di Crociata* cit.

¹³ Guida rejects Sakari's identification of the *prezicadors* specifically with the Dominicans, the monks of the *Ordo fratrum praedicatorum* founded in 1216, arguing that they are all clergy under an obligation to make propaganda for the crusades.

V Ah! let anyone who desires to acquire wisdom and worth make his way to that place where all good things grow in abundance, joy and firmness of heart and all loyalty, to Castile, to the valiant king lord Alfonso: for he is the leader of reputation and honour, and through him pagans are constantly being humbled, and through him the duty to the mirror is honoured¹⁴, for he puts into it heart and mind and courage.

VI May God let us act and speak in such a way as to be saved, and for the good, honoured Castilian king, let Him long increase his joy in life¹⁵.

The scholarly consensus is now that the leaders mentioned in stanza IV include Henry III of England, Richard of Cornwall, James the Conqueror and Louis IX of France, and that the king of Castile is Alfonso X¹⁶. The prince who appears alongside Louis must then be his son Philip, the future Philip the Bold, who accompanied him on his second crusade. Guida suggests that the song was composed before James's crusade in 1269, or before 1267 when the king of Aragon made a public commitment to it. It would make sense to see it as falling soon after Louis had announced his expedition in 1267, and the preachers mentioned in 25 may be those who were publicising it¹⁷.

It is unclear whether the troubadour is urging his listeners to support Alfonso X in his efforts to subdue the Saracens in Spain, or whether he is thinking of Alfonso as a leader of an expedition to the Holy Land. Just after James broached the possibility of an oriental crusade to Alfonso in December 1268, there was much excited talk about it among various barons, the Master of Uclès, and the Master of the Hospital for all Spain, a Portuguese named Gonsalvo Perero.

¹⁴ See Guida's discussion of the translation of *patz*, p. 372 («Ed è da lui onorato l'impegno verso lo specchio»).

¹⁵ Sakari translates «Que Dieu nous laisse agir et parler de telle sorte que nous soyons sauvés; et que pour le bon roi de Castille, que l'on honore, la joie et la vie croissent longuement» (p. 120), noting (p. 124): «*creiser* peut être vb. actif ou intrans. A moins qu'il n'y ait de faute de déclinaison, *sos gaugz* (pluriel) et *vida* seraient les compléments directs de ce verbe (sujet: *Dieus*), dans le premier cas; dans l'autre, ils en seraient les sujets, et *sos gaugz* représenteraient le singulier. Pour le sing. du vb., cf. v. 7)». However, *vida* cannot be taken along with *gaugz* as the subject or object of *cresca*, since the possessive adjective *sa* would be required (*sos gaugz e sa vida*), which is impossible from the scansion point of view; I therefore take *e* as equivalent to *en*.

¹⁶ See GUIDA, *Canzoni di Crociata* cit., pp. 262-263, and the notes to 22 and 41 on pp. 371-372.

¹⁷ Compare Guida's note to v. 25 on p. 371.

The latter requested James to ask Alfonso to accompany him on the expedition, and allow the Master to take out of the country whatever possessions of the Hospital that were needed for the venture. While James does not exactly say in his *Llibre* that Alfonso refused, the Castilian king obviously did not intend to join what he saw as such a perilous undertaking, and advised against it, but James emphasizes (diplomatically) that Alfonso then offered to help in whatever way he could¹⁸.

2. *D'un sirventes mi ven gran voluntatç* (Bertran d'Alamano, BdT 76,8)

The most recent edition of the songs of Bertran d'Alamano is that of Salverda de Grave in 1902, and is badly in need of updating, both editorially and historically. For the critical apparatus to this and the following texts presented here, see the *Notes* at the end of this article.

I D'un sirventes mi ven gran voluntatç
 ce·l fas'ausir a tutç cominalmen,
 e qu'ieu dirai de las grantç poestatç,
 4 de cells ques an de l'enperi conten;
 c'al mieu semblan il regnan folamen,
 e·l papa len, car los ten e balansa.
 Be·m meravegl car igll an esperansa
 8 ques a nengun en fas'autregiamen,
 puous c'el a d'els renda d'aur e d'argien.

II Al papa val l'Enperi e·l Regnatç
 mais ce sc'era tut sieu domeniamen,
 12 car plus monta l'avens c'es presentatç
 per aces plaï a lui e a sa gen
 ce li renda ce us e[m]peraires pren,
 e puous d'aver n'a tan gran aondansa,
 16 no mi sembla ce g[i]a·i met'acordansa,
 ces ell non a en alre [son e]nten,
 per ce lo monç n'es tut e turbamen.

¹⁸ Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*, ch. 477-479.

- III 20 Gia aices platç non er sentençiatç
 puois ce li rei volon abreuamen
 ab cavaliers et ab cavals armatç,
 e ab vasal[s] bon[s] de concerimen
 vegna cascus apoderadamen,
 24 e en un camp fasa·n un'aïtal dansa
 c'al departir gasagne l'uns l'onransa.
 Puois decretals no·i nosera·n nien,
 puois trobera·n lo papa bendisen.
- IV 28 Aicell sera fil de Dieu apelatç,
 ce aura faïç al camp lo vensimen;
 pe[r] los clerges [el] er leu coronatç
 car il veran c'auran l'afortimen.
 32 Adonc seran tutç a sun mandamen,
 car ades an clerges aital uçansa
 ce, can trobon paio de gran puisança,
 tut cant il vol fan ben e umilmen,
 36 e puois sun dan quan veison *ce* deisen.
- V E si al[s] reis so c'ieu lur dic non platç,
 als podon far c'es er miels per un sen,
 ce utra mar si per[t] crestandiatç.
 40 E s'i pason apoderadamen
 remanra tot so de c'om los repren;
 e autresi pase·s lo rei de Fransa
 el [s]aut primers, ses longia demoransa,
 44 e·l reis Gaumes, qu'a l'astr'e l'ardimen
 dels [S]erasis mescregens d'autra gen.
- VI Assas ai dic a cascun, si m'enten,
 dels autç [p]rimces, e ai ferma speransa
 48 ce s'il pasan ses longia demoransa,
 cristiandat garderan d'aunimen,
 gaçainhan Dieu e pres e salvamen.
- VII Reis castelans, car sob[ei]ranamen
 52 est soiberans de fin preis et d'onransa

donas vos suoign, segner, qu'ieu ai dutança
ce vostre pres non prenna mermamen,
e faitç, segner, ce-l tengas autamen.

VIII 56 Dell papa sai ce dara largamen,
pron del perdon et pauc de son argen.

IX Ce s'outra mar non fan seccors breumen
li terra-s pert ses tut revenimen.

I I feel a strong urge to have everyone listen to a *sirventes*, and to speak out about the great potentates – those who are quarrelling over the Empire; for it seems to me that they are acting foolishly, and the pope tardily, since he is keeping them on tenterhooks. I am amazed they are hoping he will make a commitment to any of them, since they are providing him with rents of gold and silver.

II The Empire and the Regno are worth more to the pope than if they completely belonged to him, for the money presented to him and his people as a result of this dispute exceeds the rent that any emperor receives, and since he has such an abundance of wealth, it does not seem to me that he will ever settle the dispute, since he has his mind set on nothing else – which is why the world is in a state of utter turmoil.

III This dispute will never end in a formal judgement since the kings want to shorten the process with knights and with armoured horses, and for each one to come in full force with fine conquering warriors, and perform such a dance with them on a battlefield that at the end one will win the office. Then no decretal will be any impediment, as he will find the pope will give his blessing to it.

IV The one who has secured the victory in the field will be called Son of God; he will promptly be crowned by the clergy because they will see their position fortified. Then they will be entirely at his command, for the clergy always behave like this: when they find a very powerful patron they dutifully and humbly do everything he wants, and then work to ruin him when they see he is on the way down.

V But if the kings dislike what I am telling them, they can do something else which is a hundred times better at present, for in Outremer Christendom is being lost. And if they cross the sea in full force everything that people blamed them for will be set aside; and similarly, let the king of France be the first to cross, promptly, without procrastinating, and king James, who has good fortune and courage as far as the heathen Saracens of a different race are concerned.

VI I have said enough to each of the high princes, as long as he takes my meaning, and firmly hope that if they journey overseas expeditiously they will protect Christendom from shame, winning God and glory and salvation.

VII Castilian king, since you are supremely sovereign in noble reputation and honour, take care, my lord, for I fear your reputation may diminish, and act, my lord, so as to keep it high.

VIII As for the pope, I know he will give generously, with many indulgences and little of his wealth.

IX For if they do not bring help swiftly to Outremer, the land will be irrevocably lost.

Bertran must have composed this *sirventes* during the period sometimes referred to as the «Great Interregnum», when there was no established Holy Roman Emperor after the death in 1256 of William of Holland until the election of Rudolf of Habsburg in 1273. Salverda's dating of 1260-1265 was followed by Aurell and Vatteroni, with Asperti at first agreeing but subsequently revising this to c. 1260¹⁹. The circumstances relevant to its dating include the following:

- potentates contending for the imperial crown (3-4);
- the pope keeping them in suspense over the outcome (6);
- the pope receiving large sums from the Empire and the Regno in rents (9-17);
- the world being in turmoil (18);
- the kings wanting to short-cut the electoral decision through armed combat (19-25);
- the belief that the pope, followed by the rest of the clergy, will give his blessing to the victor, and that a papal decree will be no threat to the decision (26-31);
- a grave threat to Christendom in the Holy Land (39, 58-59);
- exhortation to the king of France (Louis IX) to go there without delay;
- reference to King James I of Aragon;
- a warning to the king of Castile (Alfonso X) not to let his reputation slide.

¹⁹ AURELL, *La vielle et l'épée* cit., p. 212; S. VATTERONI, «Falsa clerica». *La poesia anticlericale dei trovatori*, Alessandria 1999, p. 73; S. ASPERTI, *Carlo I d'Angiò e i trovatori. Componenti "provenzali" e angioine nella tradizione manoscritta della lirica trobadorica*, Ravenna 1995, p. 62 and note, then Id., «Miei-sirventes vueilh far dels reis amdos» (*BdT* 80,25), in «Cultura Neolatina», LVIII (1998), pp. 165-323, pp. 265-272 and BEdT.

Since Salverda it has been assumed that the potentates and kings are identical and refer to Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III of England, and Alfonso X of Castile, the two candidates for the imperial crown in the immediate aftermath of William's death, when the Electors were unable to agree on a German prince. Richard was crowned at Aachen in May 1257 and «obtained recognition up the Rhine as far as Basel, but his rule was little more than a fiction» and he never succeeded in gaining the pope's recognition and coronation at Rome²⁰.

Salverda's arguments in favour of his dating range from the helpful to the inaccurate and confused. Helpful is the point that the peril facing Christendom is likely to refer to the time following the accession of the Mameluk leader Baybars in 1260. During the six years after Louis IX's first crusade the Christians of Palestine were not in a critical situation as the Mongol invasion was helping them against the Egyptian Moslems. It was only after the Mameluk victory over the Mongols that danger threatened the Syrian Christians again, since Baybars had a single aim, to exterminate all enemies of Islam. While it was only in 1265, Salverda argues, that Baybars undertook an expedition to Palestine, he had already been causing anxiety to the Christians there. «Ainsi, c'est à partir de 1260, mais surtout en 1265 que les plaintes de Bertran peuvent être considérées comme l'écho des lamentations des chrétiens d'outre-mer». He also states that until 1266 the pope had not had time to concern himself over the fate of Syria: «la lutte suprême des Hohenstaufen avec leurs ennemis accaparait toute l'attention & toutes les ressources dont disposait Clément IV» – his point no doubt being that the pope's lack of attention made the threat in the East all the more urgent²¹.

However, Salverda's consideration of the mention of a possible crusade is confused and unpersuasive. In his commentary to the poem he claims that in 1265 Louis secretly told the pope of his plans to undertake a new crusade, and that the piece cannot be dated to after 1265, since there would then have been no point in Bertran's appeal

²⁰ C. W. PRÉVITÉ-ORTON, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History*, Cambridge 1952, repr. 1978, pp. 794–796; see also *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. D. Abulafia, Cambridge 1995–2005, V (1999), pp. 392–395.

²¹ J. J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE, *Le Troubadour Bertran d'Alamanon*, Toulouse 1902, p. 58.

to Louis²². This dating seems inaccurate: it was late in 1266 that Louis indicated his intentions to the pope, «incidentally ruining the project for a small expedition which was due to leave hurriedly for the East in the following spring», and 1267, at a great meeting of his barons on March 24, when he and his three sons took the cross²³. Moreover if Louis' first intimation to the pope was secret, there is no particular reason for Bertran to have known of it. But in any case Bertran is appealing to the king of France to lead the way without delay, rather than simply to undertake the crusade at all. What is sure is that the *sirventes* must have been composed before Louis' departure from Aigues-Mortes on 1 July 1270, and more precisely, since the poem clearly shows that the pope is alive, before Clement IV's death in November 1268 and the beginning of a three-year papal interregnum prior to the election of Gregory X in December 1271.

Asperti's dating of c. 1260 is based on lines 19-25 where the kings hope to short-cut the electoral decision through armed combat. He links these to references in Matthew Paris and Rolandino da Padova to the prospect of Alfonso X arriving imminently from Spain in 1258 to wage war against Richard of Cornwall, referred to in the song *Miei-sirventes vueilh far dels reis amdos* (BdT 80,25) misattributed to Bertran de Born²⁴. If the kings concerned in Bertran's piece are indeed Alfonso and Richard, this is a strong argument, as there is no sign of any such prospect later on during the lengthy negotiations over the imperial crown. Minor objections might be firstly that Bertran d'Alamanon refers to rumour only, not necessarily reliable as evidence of real intentions, and secondly that 1260 is two years later than the clash mooted in 1258, by which time its prospect is perhaps likely to have faded – with 1260 being a *terminus post quem* if account is taken of the Mameluk threat. But there are a number of other circumstantial factors which, while inconclusive, suggest a later date than 1260.

The first of these concerns Bertran's exhortation to Louis not to delay in setting out for the East. Asperti does not discuss this, but it seems more likely that Bertran would be making his plea once Louis

²² *Ibidem*, giving no source.

²³ J. RILEY-SMITH, *The Crusades: a Short History*, New Haven-London 1987, p. 174.

²⁴ ASPERTI, «*Miei-sirventes*» cit., pp. 265-272, citing these sources *in extenso*; see also J. KEMPF, *Geschichte des Deutschen Reiches während des grossen Interregnums, 1245-1273*, Würzburg 1893, pp. 212-13.

has publicly taken the cross, in 1267, rather than that it should simply be part of a general desire to see the king lead another crusade.

A similar argument applies to the reference to James I of Aragon in lines 44-45. While these lines baffled previous scholars, Bertran is likely to be praising James's valour against the Saracens in Spain (see the notes) and exhorting him also to set out for the Holy Land. If so, this is likely to rule out 1261-1266, since during those years James was preoccupied with crushing a revolt in Murcia by the Mudejars, the subjugated Moors of Andalusia and Murcia, on behalf of Alfonso X²⁵. It would have made no sense to try to draw him away from combatting Saracens in Spain in order to combat other Saracens in Syria – rather, these lines suggest he is being praised for his recent success in this respect, and is now 'free' to turn his attentions to the East, which he did in September 1269. While James would also have been 'free' in 1260, Asperti's preferred date for the piece, the reference would be more topical at the time of Louis' second crusade.

A further argument concerns the perception of renewed threat to the Holy Land from 1260 which, as Salverda pointed out, became much more acute as the decade progressed. He places a turning-point in 1265 when, he states, Baybars undertook an expedition to Palestine. Housley presents the situation as follows: «After a period of careful preparation, the new sultan began a systematic series of campaigns which, between 1263 and 1271, robbed the crusader states of most of their surviving castles and towns. Most ominous was the fall of well-fortified Antioch in 1268. ... Not since Hattin had a crusade been so imperative»²⁶. The horrific sack of that city «shocked even the Moslem chroniclers», and its sudden destruction marked the end of 171 years' occupation by the Franks. It is tempting though unprovable to imagine such a catastrophe as the immediate spur to Bertran's exhortation²⁷.

²⁵ C. J. BISHKO, *The Spanish and Portuguese Reconquest, 1095-1492*, in K. SETTON, *A history of the crusades*, III, Madison 1975, pp. 396-456, p. 434, and see the chapter on *Les campanyes de l'hivern de 1266*, in MARCOS, *La croada catalana* cit., pp. 90-105.

²⁶ N. HOUSLEY, *The thirteenth-century crusades in the Mediterranean*, in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, V, 1999, ed. D. Abulafia, pp. 569-589, p. 582.

²⁷ R. L. WOLFF – H. W. HAZARD, *The later crusades, 1189-1311*, in SETTON, *A history of the crusades* cit., II, Madison-London 1969, pp. 577-78.

In addition, account needs to be taken of the reference in line 10 to the *regnatç* (and not the Empire alone) as a vast source of papal income. Salverda and Aurell translate *regnatç* as “autorité impériale”, but while the word can mean “kingdom” in general, here it is likely to refer specifically to the Regno, or the kingdom of Sicily and southern Italy. In 1263 Pope Urban IV had persuaded Charles of Anjou to accept this as a papal fief, which he then had to conquer from Manfred, the illegitimate son of Frederick II Hohenstaufen, defeating him at the battle of Benevento in 1266, and subsequently from Conradin, the only surviving legitimate grandson of Frederick II, crushed at Tagliacozzo in 1268. According to Dunbabin, under the deal with the papacy finalised with Clement IV in February 1265, Charles agreed to give the pope a one-off payment of 50,000 marks sterling when he acquired the kingdom, followed by an annual rent of 8,000 ounces of gold. (Despite Bertran’s castigation of papal greed, the huge unanticipated costs of the conquest plunged Charles into debt and the pope, raising vast loans from Tuscan bankers, was also in financial difficulties: «Both pope and count were under constant pressure from their creditors to repay their debts»²⁸). The references to the Regno and the huge sums of money going to the pope as part of this deal would therefore be particularly apposite after 1265. Bertran, as Charles of Anjou’s emissary in Italy after 1260, participant in his military campaigns, and dispenser of justice in the principality of Naples after the conquest in 1268²⁹, was in a strong position to be aware of the financial and political situation, and from the point of view of his employer Charles, to have been aghast at the funds channelled to the papacy.

Furthermore, that the “world” was in “utter turmoil” certainly corresponds to this period, with the struggles over the Regno coming to a head, on top of the threats to Christendom in the East and the indecision over the imperial crown.

A further argument in support of the later dating concerns Bertran’s frustration with papal prevarication. While this could apply to any part of the period 1256-1268, it is particularly appropriate for

²⁸ J. DUNBABIN, *Charles of Anjou. Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe*, London-New York 1998, pp. 4, 57 and 132-33; Charles promised an annual tribute to papacy of 10,000 Sicilian ounces of gold, cfr. *The New Cambridge Medieval History* cit., p. 508.

²⁹ AURELL, *La vielle et l’épée* cit., pp. 109-10.

the latest three years. During the imprisonment of Richard of Cornwall from 14 May 1264 to 6 September 1265³⁰ and with Alfonso X being occupied with the Murcian uprising, the pope had been looking for another solution to the problem of the election of the Holy Roman Emperor; but when Richard was freed in 1265 the process needed to continue along its previous path³¹. Clement wrote to Alfonso in 1266 to delay proceedings until Epiphany 1267: according to Kempf³², a striking delay for which the pope gave the extremely odd reason that in these circumstances it was proper that he should at least issue a papal decree. Then just as he was about to decide the outcome of the dispute Charles of Anjou was on the march towards Sicily and soon the whole political landscape of Italy was to change. On 26 February 1266 Manfred lost his life and throne at the battle of Benevento, and although this was a favourable outcome as far as the papal see was concerned, the Ghibellines were now focussing on young Conradin, hoping to make him king of the Germans and to march towards Italy. The pope's anxiety over Conradin drove him to try to decide about the dispute between Alfonso and Richard as soon as possible, and very early, on 8 May 1266, he peremptorily ordered the legates in England to enjoin Richard to meet the deadline of 6 January 1267 for presenting his case for the imperial throne at a meeting with the pope. Richard did send representatives for this meeting, but Alfonso sent only one, presenting mere assertions without documentary evidence. The pope then granted him another delay until 26 March 1268. Kempf maintains that it is clear that Clement would have liked Alfonso to withdraw and to settle the matter because of the threat from Conradin, with Richard seeming the only claimant likely to be the winner³³. It is not difficult to see how these pontifical delays could have struck contemporary observers such as Bertran as unnecessary prevarication and incited them to attribute them to mercenary motives.

But how might this convergence of circumstantial evidence be reconciled with the mention of kings seeking the imperial crown

³⁰ N. DENHOLM-YOUNG, *Richard of Cornwall*, Oxford 1947, p. 129.

³¹ KEMPF, *Geschichte des Deutschen Reiches* cit., pp. 242-48.

³² *Ibidem*, pp. 242-243.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 248.

through force of arms? To accept that some details of the *sirventes* are non-specific, based on rather vague, general attitudes or perceptions, is certainly possible; but it seems unsatisfactory, for the poem gives every indication of topicality where the listeners would know exactly what it was about. A key to this may be held by the kings' identity.

In 1266 a new king had entered the imperial ring. This was young Conradin, another claimant to the throne of the Holy Roman Emperor, heir to Manfred, and as we have observed, a source of much anxiety to pope Clement in his struggle against the Ghibellines. In 1254 the infant Conradin had been made legally king of Jerusalem, and remained so until he was put to death by Charles of Anjou on 29 October 1268 after the battle of Tagliacozzo on 23 August of that year³⁴. In that same year «Conradin's march through northern Italy to Rome was so little opposed as to suggest that his bid for the throne would be successful»³⁵. Certainly he was one king attempting to settle matters by force of arms. It may be objected that line 20 refers to more than one, and that there is no evidence that either Richard of Cornwall or Alfonso of Aragon was heading towards Italy to oppose him. True; but on this busy chessboard there is yet one more king, and that is the troubadour's now royal employer, Charles, king of Sicily and Naples. Is he one of the kings who *volon abreuja men / ab cavaliers et ab cavals armatç*? It is by no means sure that the *rei* of line 20 and 37 are the same as the *grantç poestatç* of line 3 – and Bertran is not in fact likely to be conceding that Richard, whose coronation was not generally recognised, is a king at all, especially as his employer Charles's brother, the king of France, favoured Alfonso's claim.

A final question: why does Bertran warn Alfonso of the possible decline in his reputation? There are two possible reasons, not necessarily mutually exclusive. The context within the poem suggests greater emphasis on crusading, so Bertran may be saying that Alfonso needs to guard his reputation as a soldier of Christ. On the other hand he could be referring to the Castilian king's failure to present a proper case for his imperial claim at the papal meeting of January 1267, or, more broadly, to make more effort to substantiate his claim to the

³⁴ WOLFF – HAZARD, *The later crusades* cit., pp. 761-762.

³⁵ DUNBABIN, *Charles of Anjou* cit., pp. 56-57.

imperial throne during the «interregnum» period. As an administrator to Charles of Anjou Bertran may have been inclined to support Alfonso's claim since he was the preferred candidate of Charles's brother Louis IX of France. At this time (1267, according to De Bartholomaeis)³⁶ Lanfranc Cigala also reproaches Alfonso for inaction:

Lo reis n'Anfos, se de ren bada'langna
de pretz n'i cal, mas de far penedensa,
des qu'el quitet lo regne de la Magna
ni s'emperi don mostr'aital tenensa;
e si no·l ven contrastar ab amdos,
ni plus no·l lai derenan temoros,
er puis tota sa terra ses o[n]ransa:
ja mais per re non viura ses mermansa. (BdT 282,26a)³⁷

If king Alfonso is wasting time complaining his concern is not for reputation but for performing penance [he has give up chivalry for monkishness], now that he has ceded the kingdom of Germany, and its empire on which he shows equally little hold; and if he does not come and fight with both of them [Richard of Cornwall and Charles of Anjou?] for it and continues to abandon it out of fear, his whole land will be without honour from this day forth: whatever he does he will never be able to live undiminished.

In short, Bertran's *sirventes* appears to coincide with a moment of great turbulence in both the Holy Land and in Europe: eastern Christendom threatened with annihilation, conflict over the vacant office of Holy Roman Emperor, and armed conflict between the young Conradin and Bertran's patron Charles of Anjou. It was probably composed between Louis' public announcement of his second crusade on 24 March 1267 and the death of Clement IV in November 1268, and possibly between the sack of Antioch on 18 May 1268 and Conradin's capture on 23 August of the same year.

³⁶ V. DE BARTHOLOMAEIS, *Poesie provenzali storiche relative all'Italia*, Roma 1931, p. 245.

³⁷ For my text, based on that of F. BRANCIFORTI, *Il canzoniere di Lanfranco Cigala*, Firenze 1954, p. 34, see the *Notes* at the end of this article.

3. *Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen* (Olivier lo Templier, BdT 312,1)

The author of this text is unidentified. As Avenoza – Ventura have shown, attempts to identify Olivier as Bernat Oliver, Templar commander, have been disproved on chronological grounds. They also review other untenable hypotheses (*le fraire del Temple* Ricaut Bonomel or Guilhem de l'Olivier d'Arles), to conclude that «Il est probable que nous soyons en présence d'un surnom, un pseudonyme symbolique dont fait usage un personnage proche du roi, plus exactement quelqu'un qui recherchait sa protection en donnant son appui à l'initiative royale et qui aurait appartenu à l'Ordre du Temple, certainement bien connu dans les cercles où le poème vit le jour», and to suggest that such a name «n'est en aucun cas innocent» since it designates the place of Christ's death³⁸.

Milà thought Olivier was a Catalan because of his enthusiastic praise of James I, and Riquer suggested that Catalan origins might explain the many flexional “errors” in the text, though allowed that these might be scribal. The text contains a number of approximate rhymes in *-en/-ens* and *-itz/-it*. Such approximations are found elsewhere in MS R, especially in the dialogues of Guiraut Riquier³⁹. In Olivier's piece at least some of the approximations are authorial (as is the case with Riquier): compare particularly 37 with 38 and 42. Dismissive of Olivier's poetic abilities, Lewent suggests that what he terms this flexional “corruption” may stem from Olivier's possible Catalan origins: «An dem Liede des Olivier del Temple, das eigentlich nur ein dreimal wiederholter Aufruf an Jakob I. von Aragon ist, wird man nicht viel mehr loben als die gute Gesinnung, die ihn zur Abfassung eines Kreuzliedes veranlasste; vielleicht hinderte ihn auch geringe Vertrautheit mit der provenzalischen Sprache an der Entfaltung grösseren Talentes»; «das wäre kein ausreichender Grund, aber die völlige Korruption der Nominalflexion und die engere Beziehung zu Lerida und Gelida, die beide in Katalanien

³⁸ AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai*» cit., pp. 472-474.

³⁹ M. MILÁ y FONTANALS, *De los Trovadores en España*, Barcelona 1861, p. 364; M. DE RIQUER, *Los trovadores: historia literaria y textos*, 3 vols, Barcelona 1975, p. 1473; R. HARVEY – L. PATERSON, *The Troubadour “Tensos” and “Partimens”: A Critical Edition*, 3 vols, Cambridge 2010, pp. XXIV-XXV.

liegen, lassen Milás Ausnahme als sehr wahrscheinlich gelten»⁴⁰. However, given the evidence from the Riquier pieces in MS **R**, it would seem that such approximations may have been acceptable by the second half of the thirteenth century (with the final -s partly or entirely unvoiced?) and that they neither support nor undermine the Catalan hypothesis.

- I Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen
 de so don yeu vuelh un sirventesc far,
 car no vey res que·m pogues conortar
 4 de l'or'en say qe·l bon rey fon perdens
 ab sos baros el cam, [et] desgarnitz
 pels Turcx savais mot laiamen aunitz.
 Mas ara·m platz car vey que no·ls oblida,
 8 ans clamara·y mentr'el cors aia vida.
- II La rezensom e·l sepulcre breumen
 [als serrazis f]als covenc a laisser,
 per qe n'an fag mans homs de say crozar:
 12 coms, ducx, marques e d'autres eysamens;
 per q'ieu prec sel qes visibles Trinitz,
 ver Dieu, vers Homs e vers Sans Esperitz,
 qes el lur sia estela caramida,
 16 e·ls guit e·ls gart, e·ls perdon lor falhida.
- III Rey d'Arago, de tot mal non chalen,
 c'avetz conquist de Tortos'al Biar
 e Malhoga, sovenga·us d'otramar,
 20 pus qe autre non pot esser tenens
 del sieu Temple qe avetz tan gen servit.
 E car vos es del mon lo pus ardit
 de fag d'armas, ni Roma vo·n covida,
 24 acorretz lai on tot lo mon vos crida.

⁴⁰ K. LEWENT, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied*, in «Romanische Forschungen», 21 (1905), pp. 321-448, p. 403.

- IV Si·l rey Jacme ab un ters de sa jen
 passes de lay, leu pogra restaurar
 la perd'e·l dan e·l sepulcre cobrar;
 28 car contra luy Turcx non an garimen,
 ques el [del tot] ja n'a tans descofitz,
 pres e liatz, mortz, nafrazt e delitz
 dins murs e fors en batalha enramida,
 32 et a conquist so qe tanh a sa vida.
- V Paire vrai, senher del fermamen,
 q'en la Verge vengues per nos salvar,
 e baptisme prezes per [renovar]
 36 l'antica ley on moris a turmen,
 e pueys traisís d'ifern los justz peritz,
 resusites, c'aisi o trobam escrig,
 [a vos co]man lo rey qe ten Lerida:
 40 al jutjamen sia en vostra partida.
- VI Rey d'Aragon, volgra·us vezer garnit
 ab mil vassalhs vostres en cam florit,
 e qe·y agues dos coms en qí pres guida,
 44 et tres vescoms, e·l senhor de Gelida.

I I have long been troubling over the subject of the *sirventes* I want to compose, for I have seen nothing that might console me since the good king and his barons lost on the battlefield, stripped of their armour and most shockingly shamed by the vile Turks. But I am pleased to see he is not forgetting them, and will rather make claim there as long as there is life in his body.

II The ransom and the sepulchre had to be swiftly abandoned to [the false Saracens], which led many men over here to take the cross: counts, dukes, marquesses and others likewise; so I pray that the one who is the manifest Trinity, true God, true man, and true Holy Spirit, to be a lodestar for him, and guide and protect them, and pardon them their faults.

III King of Aragon, undaunted by all evil – for you have been victorious from Tortosa to Biar and Mallorca – be mindful of Outremer, since no-one else can preserve (?) His Temple which you have served so nobly. And since you are the bravest in the world at deeds of arms and Rome is inviting you to do so, hurry there where everyone is calling out for you.

IV If king James sailed there with a third of his people, he could easily restore the loss and the damage and recover the Sepulchre; for against him the Turks have no protection, as he has already [utterly] discomfited, captured and bound so many of them, slain, wounded and destroyed them within walls and outside in pitched battle, and has conquered what is fitting for his way of life.

V True Father, lord of the firmament, who entered the Virgin for our salvation, and took baptism to [renew?] the ancient law through which you died in torment and, once you had led the righteous dead from out of Hell, rose again, for so we find it written, [I commend to you] the king who rules Lerida: may he be of your number on day of judgment.

VI King of Aragon, I should like to see you equipped with a thousand of your men on the flowery battlefield, and two counts guided by merit to be there, and three viscounts, and the lord of Gelida.

The dating and interpretation of this *sirventes* depend on certain textual cruces. Lines 4-6 and 9-10 show that it must postdate Louis' defeat at Mansourah in 1250 and pre-date his death in 1270. The poet recalls the ill-treatment inflicted on the French nobility, the ransom paid to the Saracens and the fact that they remain in possession of the Holy Sepulchre. Lines 7-8 have caused some uncertainty, but it seems clear that it is Louis himself who is not forgetting the Turks. Unlike other editors I follow the manuscript reading in line 8, *clamaray*, not *clamaran*, and consider that the word *ans* indicates that the subject of the first verb must be the same as that of the preceding verb *oblida*: in other words it is Louis who *clamara* as long as he lives, who will continue to lay claim to the rights of the Christians. In the expression *mentr'el cors aia vida* there may be an allusion to the legendary circumstances of his decision to take the cross before his 1248 crusade: Louis was gravely ill, to the point that one of the women taking care of him believed he was already dead; he recovered the use of his voice, demanding to be given the cross, and his example was immediately followed by his three brothers. However this may be, if Louis were no longer alive in 1270, the troubadour would certainly not have evoked the defeat at Mansourah without mentioning the monumental catastrophe of his death in Tunis. There is therefore no reason to question the conclusion of all previous editors⁴¹ that we are

⁴¹ LEWENT, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied* cit., pp. 358-59, places it in 1267 after Louis and his three sons took the cross, on March 24, at a great meeting of his barons

dealing with the period between 1268, the year in which the French king decided to prepare for his second crusade, and the year of his death in 1270. And since the troubadour expresses his desire to see the king of Aragon speed to the Holy Land, it is clear that the *sirventes* coincides with James the Conqueror's crusade of 1269.

But when, exactly? Until now everyone believed we were dealing with the period before his departure in September of that year. Avenoza – Ventura understood Olivier to be a «propagandiste de Jacques Ier», which would mean he composed his song before the king's departure to assist his efforts to assemble the necessary supporters and resources. But this hypothesis comes up against a contradiction regarding the attitude of Rome, in line 23. The manuscript reads *ni Roma no couida*, with a titulus above the word *no*. Lewent understood this as *non* and corrected to *vo·n*: so the poet would be saying «and Rome is inviting you to do so». Avenoza – Ventura were perfectly aware that Rome, in other words Pope Clement IV, had firmly opposed James's plans to go on crusade «to avenge the injuries against the Crucified One», referred to in a charter of 16 January 1267, so to declare that Rome was inviting him to launch it would be in flagrant contradiction with the historical facts⁴². They therefore preserved the negative form

(compare 11-12 and see WOLFF – HAZARD, *The later crusades* cit., p. 509), and when James of Aragon took the cross prior to his short-lived crusade of 1269. RÍQUER, *Los trovadores* cit., places it in spring 1269 when James was thinking of organising the crusade, before setting sail on 4 September. AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai*» cit., p. 466, convincingly reject the possibility of a date just prior to 1266, coinciding with diplomatic initiatives with the papacy, when James was considering launching a crusade, since the proposal was rejected by Clement IV, probably «parce qu'il doutait de ses capacités militaires et financières», but explicitly because of the king's incestuous relationship with Berenguela Alfonso.

⁴² The king had asked him to annul his marriage to Teresa Gil de Vidaure, in the hope of legitimising his relationship with Berenguera Alfonso. Clement declared in a letter to James that he did not consider that Christ would accept the *obsequi* of a man stained with the sin of an incestuous relationship, and urged him to give up “the noble lady Berenguera”, and in another letter some ten days later he continued to exhort the monarch to give up the “adulterous lady”, his relationship with whom was incompatible with a crusade. He makes direct reference to a new argument James had recently added as evidence of the invalidity of his marriage with Teresa Gil de Vidaure: James had declared with the support of witnesses that before his relationship with her he had had sexual relations with a cousin of hers in the third degree, meaning that his relationship with Teresa was incestuous and therefore void. Clement pointed out drily that this might free him from sin of adultery, but not of incest, since Berenguera remained his cousin, MARCOS, *La croada catalana* cit., pp. 139-140.

given in the manuscript, interpreting the *titulus* as a *u* and adding an *s*, *ni Roma no·u[s] covida*, translating «et même si Rome ne vous y convie pas». But as they acknowledge, there is no evidence whatever that the conjunction *ni* can have concessive force (“even if”), and besides, it would seem extremely odd to include such an element in an exhortation to participate in a crusade: «even if Rome does not summon you, everyone else is calling for you, so go there anyway»! In my view Lewent was quite right to conclude that *no* is a scribal error for *vo*: *n* pour *u* is so common that this really presents no difficulty. But in that case how can we resolve the contradiction between Rome’s invitation or order and the established facts? When, during the 1269 crusade, could Rome have invited the king to set sail for Outremer?

It should first be pointed out that Clement, who had opposed his crusade, was no longer alive in 1269. He had died on 29 November 1268, nine months before the departure of the Aragonese fleet, and his successor had not yet been elected⁴³. But when James left for the Holy Land, it was still in despite of the papacy, as had been all his preparations. For even if there was no pope in Rome at that time it would be hard to maintain that Rome was *inviting* or *summoning* him to set out for Outremer. But when he returned to France almost immediately after his abortive attempt, a different ethical framework applied. As Turlouton had already observed in 1863, James had been blamed for undertaking the expedition, but he was also widely blamed for renouncing it⁴⁴. The news of the débâcle was spreading throughout the West, which was an embarrassment to the king’s reputation. The *Estoire d’Eracles*, William of Puylaurens (c. 1200-74), and Bernard Gui (c. 1261-1331) mention the popular rumour attributing the disaster to Berenguera, whose dark arts had allegedly dominated the will of the monarch and made him renounce his proposed crusade⁴⁵. In addition

⁴³ Obviously this is not the same as an invitation on the part of Rome, but as MARCOS, *La croada catalana* cit., p. 161 observes, once the pope was absent, everyone could pursue his own objectives without feeling obliged to submit to the will of the supreme pontiff.

⁴⁴ C. J. M. DE TOURLOUTON, *Études sur la maison de Barcelone. Jacme I^{er} le conquérant, roi d’Aragon*, Montpellier 1863-1867, pp. 396-397.

⁴⁵ *L’Estoire d’Eracles Empereur et la conquête de la Terre d’Outremer*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades occidentales*, Paris 1859, p. 457; J. DUVERNOY, *Guillaume de Puylaurens, Chronique*, Paris 1976, p. 196; Bernard Gui, *Vita Clementis Papae IV*, in L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum*, Milano 1723-51, III (1723), pp. 594-597 (p. 596, a

it must be emphasized that popes in the past had not hesitated to excommunicate crusaders who had failed to fulfil their vow for one reason or another⁴⁶. To justify his decision to abandon his crusade James circulated his official version of the episode which he later included in his *Llibre dels feits*⁴⁷. He was clearly anxious to defend and bolster his decision with ecclesiastical support. In the *Llibre* he describes how on board ship off the island of Menorca «the Bishop of Barcelona, the Master of the Temple, and the Master of the Hospital in Aragon, along with all the chief men (*prohomens*) of Barcelona, and the masters of the ships and the sailors» came and entreated him «in the name of God and of Saint Mary» not to continue with the voyage; and he emphasizes that the bishop declared that «we have already spent at sea two months, when a lesser time would have been sufficient for the passage had the wind been prosperous. Since in that time we could not cross, and Our Lord delayed us through the season, it is clear that our voyage was not agreeable to Him. We could endure the bad weather, if time remained for our voyage; but since He will not give us a wind to impel us where we want to go, it seems to us as if it was not His pleasure we should go there»⁴⁸. When they finally made it to land and went to give thanks at Sainte-Marie-de-Vauvert, James relates how the Bishop of Maguelone and the son of the royal vicar of Montpellier, Ramon Guancelm, came and told him immediately «that if I wished it, they would go to sea with me, and that we could renew our supplies of provisions there. The fleet, they said, would be greatly discouraged if I were not with it. I said to them: «What assistance would you give if we went to sea again?». The son of En Ramon Guancelm then said: «I will follow you with ten knights». Then the Bishop of Maguelone said he would follow me with twenty; and they added that unless I again tried to cross the sea, people would talk a great deal about it. I answered them that people did certainly talk a great deal too much; I did not care what they said: our Lord knew that I was forced to do what I did, and that nothing in the world grieved me more, nor so much, as to be obliged

word-for-word copy of William of Puylaurens), referred to by MARCOS, *La croada catalana* cit., pp. 201-202.

⁴⁶ MARCOS, *La croada catalana* cit., p. 201.

⁴⁷ Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*, ch. 488-493.

⁴⁸ Translation FORSTER, *James I* cit.

to abandon my enterprise». The king goes on to report a conversation with En Ramon March and «others who talked of it», the outcome being that «the Bishop and En Ramon Guancelm felt reproved for what they had said to me. So I took no more notice of what they had said». Thence he went to Montpellier, sent for the consuls, and rehearsed his reasons for aborting the voyage: «As it would lengthen the book to repeat much of what was said on the occasion, I will pass on to what is most important», which was in fact the matter of money, as he was asking them to help him through the Franciscans of Montpellier, «at the same time offering them good pledges for repayment». When on the next day they offered him 60,000 sous tournois on condition he re-embark for the East, he replied: «Barons, you have made to me the most novel reply ever a subject made to his lord, not to say to such a lord as I am to you. And I marvel at the little sense and judgment of the people of Montpellier, that you should think to satisfy me with such an answer. You would actually give me more to leave you than to remain with you in the land! My subjects of Aragon and Catalonia would indeed give me a thousand thousands of sous for remaining in their land; and I marvel greatly how you can offer me money on condition I leave you and go to another land, where I may be killed or taken prisoner». James is clearly keen to invoke the authority of one bishop in his initial decision to turn back; when another bishop disagrees with him and warns him of public criticism, he deals with it by putting him and his lay supporter in the wrong. He passes over any potentially awkward discussions of the moral or spiritual rights and wrongs of the affair with his Montpellier subjects, emphasizing instead the issue of money, and when they come up with the means for him to carry on, he dismisses their offer by disdainfully accusing them of lacking the love and loyalty owed by subjects to their lord.

So once the king arrived at Sainte-Marie-de-Vauvert and the bishop of Maguelone exhorted him to persevere in his enterprise, Olivier could now say that Rome, in the person of the bishop, was inviting him to fulfil his destiny. The troubadour's exhortation does not limit itself to enumerating all the reasons which could have motivated the king to undertake his crusade in the first place – the defence of the Holy Land, the reversal of a shameful Christian defeat, the protection of the Templars' Order, military and political glory – but adds the critical new element of spiritual support. His declaration of Rome's invitation

was an important rhetorical ploy to persuade the king that whatever he may have thought about God's will in impeding his passage, he should not now give up.

In the context of the *sirventes*, where are the king and the troubadour? Does Olivier's direct address imply they are in the same place? It is tempting to think so, although it is true that he could have sent him the song to be performed by someone else. Is it conceivable that he composed it quickly to perform it before the king during his brief overnight stay in Montpellier? Or was James now back in Barcelona – or on the way back there? At any rate it would seem that Olivier is not urging him simply to re-embark on the same ship and turn right back towards the East. The idea that James could restore the losses in the Holy Land if he made the passage *ab un ters de sa jen*, with a third of his people (25), suggests that he would have to regroup. Furthermore, the troubadour introduced his song with his satisfaction that Louis is committing himself to claiming back the holy places (7-8), so it would seem that Olivier envisages James's conquering rôle as taking place within the context of the French crusade⁴⁹. This was not what James originally had in mind, whether or not the troubadour was aware of it; but the *sirventes* is sufficiently flattering, implying James and his men could alone recover the Holy Sepulchre (25-27).

Without the mention of Rome, it might well be thought that Olivier was a propagandist for James I, and that the king of Aragon had asked him to exhort him publicly to do what he had every intention of doing. But in my view Olivier is instead exhorting him to persist in a project he firmly intended to abandon. Was this *templier* in fact a propagandist of the Church in general and the Templars in particular? Or was he simply adding his voice to the various popular responses to James's great débâcle? In that case, it would have been a theatrical masterstroke to present himself as a Templar, particularly in view of James's lifelong close relations with this Order.

⁴⁹ I am grateful to Stefano Asperti for suggestions that made me re-think these aspects of the piece.

4. *D'un sirventes far mi sia Dieus guitz* (Guillem de Mur, BdT 226,2)

Guillem de Mur was probably from Mur-de-Barrès, a few kilometers from Rodez. His poetic ability seems to have enabled him to ingratiate himself with local rulers and their more distant suzerain, the king of Aragon and lord of Montpellier, which may have provided him with a certain economic prosperity. He took part in *tensos* and *partimens* produced in the literary circle of which Guiraut Riquier was the most notable member⁵⁰.

- I *D'un sirventes far mi sia Dieus guitz,*
 quar *comensat* l'ay per *bona* razo:
 qu'ar lo sanh *vas* on Dieus fon *sebelhitz*.
 4 volon liurar aissilh qui de luy so.
 E siatz certz, quals que s'en entremeta
 e n'ynt' en mar ab bon' *entensio*,
 que Jhesu Crist en tan bon luec los meta
 8 en paradis quon li siey martir so.
- II Pero quascus gart quon ira garnitz,
 quar Dieus no vol qu'ab l'autruy garnizo,
 de qu'autre a tort sia despossezitz,
 12 lai pas nulh hom ses satisfactio
 far, qu'ieu non cre qu'aital home prometa
 Dieus son regne ni qe s'amor li do,
 si ben lai vay ab arc ni ab sageta,
 16 qu'el sout que pren cobra son gazarado.
- III Non cre sia per Dieu gent acullitz
 rics hom que pas ab l'autruy messio,
 ni selh qu'a tort n'a los sieus descauzitz,
 20 ni fai raubar per aquelh ochaizo;
 quar Dieus sap tot que port'en sa maleta,
 e s'ap tortz vay, treballa·s en perdo;
 quar Dieus vol cor fin ab voluntat neta
 24 d'ome que pas mais per luy que per do.

⁵⁰ See S. GUIDA, "Jocs" poetici alla corte di Enrico II di Rodez, Modena 1983, pp. 34-39 and HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit., p. 306.

- IV Don tem que moutz n'i aura d'escharnitz,
 quar mais los aug querre·l sout que·l perdo,
 e dels tort[z] vielhs vey paucs restituitz,
 28 ...
 quar yeu no vey qu'om esmenda trameta
 ni sai ni lay; e no·n cre nulh sermo
 q'us raubaire per la crotz d'una veta
 32 ses esmendar venh'a salvatio.
- V Pero aisselh c..... litz
 del esmend...
 dels tortz qu'a f..... guanditz
 36 ab q..... confessio
 e sera..... violeta
 a Dieu pren passio
 ont elh la pres aspr'a nostr'ops dousseta.
 40 qu'eram liurat tug a perdicio.
- VI L'arcivesque prec de cuy es Toleta.
 qu'amoneste lo bon rey d'Arago
 que per complir son vot en mar se meta,
 44 e per tener en pes son bon resso.
- VI E s'al comte de Rodes platz que·m meta
 en mai d'arnes, yeu mezeis ...

I May God be my guide in composing a *sirventes*, for I have begun it for a good reason: for now those who are on His side wish to liberate the Holy Sepulchre where God was buried. And be sure that whoever undertakes this and sets out on the sea with a good intention, Jesus Christ will place him in as high a place in paradise as His martyrs are.

II But let each one take care to go properly equipped, for God does not wish anyone to make the passage there with another's equipment without making reparation, if some man has been wrongly dispossessed of it; I do not believe that God promises such a man His kingdom or gives him His love, even if he does go there with bow and arrow, for he will gain his reward in the pay he receives.

III I do not believe that a rich man who makes the journey at another's expense will be graciously welcomed by God, nor will a man who has mistreated his own

people or had them robbed for this purpose; for God is well aware of all that he carries in his trunk, and if he goes unjustly, he troubles himself in vain; God wants a pure heart with clean desire in a man who makes this passage for His sake rather than for the sake of a gift.

IV So I fear that there will be many mocked in this [enterprise], for I hear them seeking the pay rather than the indulgence, and I see few old wrongs set to rights, ... for I cannot see anyone sending reparation either here or over there; and whatever anyone says, I do not believe a thief who fails to make reparation can come to salvation by means of a cross made of ribbon.

V But the ... repentance ... of the sins from from which he promises ... broken free, provided that ... confession, and will ... violet; ... to God ... takes on suffering and death, where He took on a bitter one, most sweet to us, for our sake, so that we shall be entirely delivered from perdition.

VI I beseech the Archbishop of Toledo to admonish the good king of Aragon to set sail in order to accomplish his vow and to be mindful of his good name.

VII And if it pleases the count of Rodez to put me in more armour, I myself ...

The king of Aragon (42) must be James the Conqueror, as Chabaneau originally thought, since James's successor Peter (1276-1285) did not go on crusade (but rather had a political crusade launched against him known as the Aragonese Crusade). The king of Aragon was the suzerain of Count Enric II of Rodez, Guillem's immediate lord⁵¹. The Archbishop of Toledo is James's son Sancho⁵².

Because of the reference to the count of Rodez (45), Asperti⁵³ places the *sirventes* in that location. If the king of Aragon was present at the first performance then this is in fact likely to have taken place in Montpellier. Guida observes that Guillem's surviving compositions suggest that he did not travel much, the only evidence of his location elsewhere being his visit to Montpellier to meet James I in early 1265. At this time, when the king was about to leave on his Murcian

⁵¹ See GUIDA, "Jocs" poetici cit., p. 39, and HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit., p. 306.

⁵² J. MIRET i SANS, *Itinerari de Jaume I «el Conqueridor»*, Barcelona 1856-1919, *Sans*, index, p. 626.

⁵³ *Bibliografia Elettronica dei Trovatori*, http://w3.uniroma1.it/bedt/BEdT_02_15/default.htm (= BEdT).

campaign, a *tenso* between Guillem and Guiraut Riquier records that James had failed to give them any gift but had expressed a wish for them to accompany him there, perhaps as mercenaries⁵⁴. If Guillem encountered James in Montpellier in 1265, he could equally well have done so at other times, in the company of the Count of Rodez who could have gone there to pay his respects to his overlord.

Guida dated Guillem de Mur's poetic activities from the mid 1260s to approximately the 1280s, with more or less all his compositions having been first presented at the court of Rodez, and accepted Chabaneau's dating of this troubadour's *sirventes* to 1268 or 1269, at the time of James's crusade⁵⁵. They do not consider the possibility that it might have been composed in 1274 when James spent at least eight days there on his way to the second Council of Lyon⁵⁶. Muntaner (who may well have exaggerated) describes celebrations and festivities in Montpellier as the culmination of a whole series of court festivals paid for by the Aragonese king in honour of the king of Castile as James made his way through Castile and Aragon to his Occitan city:

mas los jocs e l'alegre qui foren a Montpestller, passarien a totes altres festes. E aqui estegren quinze jorns, e d'aquí trameteren llurs missatges al pape; e aquí hagueren resposta⁵⁷.

This would have been an obvious occasion for the performance of troubadour songs. If Guillem was performing in the presence of the king of Aragon, this was likely to have been in Montpellier rather than Rodez, as there is no evidence that James ever went to Rodez⁵⁸, whereas there would be strong reasons for the Count of Rodez to attend

⁵⁴ BdT 248,37, ed. HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit.

⁵⁵ GUIDA, "Jocs" poetici cit., pp. 37; C. CHABANEAU, *Cinq tensos de Guiraut Riquier*, in «Revue des Langues Romanes», 32 (1888), pp. 109-27, pp. 124-125; see J. ANGLADE, *Le Troubadour Guiraut Riquier: Etude sur la décadence de l'ancienne poésie provençale*, Bordeaux-Paris, 1905, p. 51, n. 1.

⁵⁶ Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*, ch. 523, pp. 179 and 390, n. 13, and MIRET i SANS, *Itinerari de Jaume I* cit., pp. 499 and 566. The king visited Montpellier 15-21 April 1274 on his way to the council of Lyon, and then on his return stayed in Montpellier from 29 May to 12 June (MIRET i SANS, *Itinerari de Jaume I* cit., p. 566), the last time he was to visit that city.

⁵⁷ Ramon Muntaner, *Crónica*, in SOLDEVILA, *Les quatre grans cròniques* cit., pp. 665-1000, ch. 21-23, especially p. 687.

⁵⁸ MIRET i SANS, *Itinerari de Jaume I* cit., *Llista* and index.

his suzerain in Montpellier, and we know that Guillem had gone there at least once before.

However, certain factors argue against this. The first is that James's presence at the first performance of Guillem's song is by no means certain. The second concerns the reference to the archbishop of Toledo, James's son Sancho. When James and the pope discussed «the business of the Holy Land beyond sea» at the second Council of Lyon in the presence of certain Aragonese prelates, Sancho is not named as one of them, as the king's son surely would have been had he been there, and according to Desclot the king of Castile had sent Sancho to fight with *gran cavalleria per tenir frontera als sarraïns*, where he was killed by Muslims in Toledo in 1275⁵⁹. In other words, he was so far out of the picture that it would hardly have made sense for Guillem to appeal to him to support his exhortation to the king.

Tourlouton placed Guillem's piece *after* James's return from his 1269 venture, when the king's reputation was suffering as a result of his decision to turn back after such a short attempt at a crusade⁶⁰. In this case Guillem's emphasis on the need for a *bon'entensio*, on God's awareness of what a crusader *port'en sa maleta*, on the idea that if he is in a state of sin he is wasting his efforts, on the need for setting right former wrongs and purifying one's heart, takes on a great deal of topical interest and implies some notably telling admonitions to the king himself, whose reputation for immorality was considerable – not to mention the need for him to take heed to his reputation (44 *per tener en pes son bon resso*). Moreover *complir son vot* would then imply not simply following up on his crusading vow but bringing it to proper completion and not abandoning it half-way.

What of the plea to the archbishop of Toledo? Sancho had been one of James's family firmly opposed to his crusade. Seven months before James's departure from Barcelona in 1269, the king spent Christmas in Toledo where he attended Sancho's first Mass. This was when James learned that envoys of the Tartar khan and the Greek emperor Michael Paleologus, with whom he was interested in collaborating on

⁵⁹ Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*, ch. 523-25; Bernat Desclot, *Llibre del rei en Pere*, in SOLDEVILA, *Les quatre grans cròniques* cit., pp. 403-664, ch. 66 and *ibidem*, p. 397, n. 3 to ch. 552 of Jaume I.

⁶⁰ TOURLOUTON, *Études sur la maison de Barcelone* cit., II, p. 398.

a crusading expedition, had disembarked in Barcelona. According to Tourtoulon he gave them audience in Valencia and prepared for his departure, whereupon Sancho and James's other children all rushed to beg him weepingly *not* to go⁶¹. According to Miret, James travelled from Toledo in the first week of January 1269 for various places in Aragon, stayed in Montpellier from 29 March until at least 7 April, was back in Perpignan on 16 April, Gerona on 19-20, Barcelona 22-27, Emposta 10 July; Miret supposes he went to Portfangós on the mouth of the Ebre where a ship was being prepared to take him to Mallorca⁶². There is no reason to suppose, and no evidence, that Sancho accompanied him in any of these travels, so there is really no question of Guillem making a direct appeal to the archbishop; but it does make sense in the context of the 1269 crusade to mention his potential influence on his father.

Even if it seems unlikely that Guillem would expect his song to reach the archbishop's ears, the point would be to remind James, directly or indirectly, of an influential spiritual and family voice. As in Olivier's case, Guillem would be tapping into James's wish for spiritual legitimacy.

In view of this circumstantial evidence and the relevance of the poem's content to James's failed venture, I am therefore strongly inclined to accept the traditional dating of 1269, but *after* rather than *before* James's voyage. In this case the *sirventes* will have been composed at roughly the same time as Olivier's *Estat aurai lonc temps en pessamen*. While it could conceivably have been performed in Montpellier in the presence of the king himself, it could have been produced at any time after James's return during king Louis' preparations for his second crusade, *aissilh qui de luy so* (4) no doubt being those who plan to accompany him, in which case one can accept the location of production as Rodez.

Guillem's admonitions that they need to go with the right intention, with their hearts set on spiritual rather than material matters, certainly reflect preaching commonplaces, but in the topical context they

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, II, p. 392; J. ZURITA, *Anales de la corona d'Aragón*, Saragossa 1668-1671, I (1668), f. 195r, who places the meeting with his sons and his daughter the queen of Castile at the monastery of Huerta.

⁶² MIRET I SANS, *Itinerari de Jaume I* cit., pp. 418-428.

5. *En breu sazo aura·l jorn pretentori* (Cerverí de Girona, BdT 434a,20)

I En breu sazo aura·l jorn pretentori,
 mas hom
 quera baratz, car tal son sey contrari.
4 Mel que·l
 reys [En] Jaxmes, ab mans, crey, que·s plevischas
 pel lo[c] de Deu cobrar, e pels Turcs tondre,
 sol Roma·ls prest, que·s fay tan seynoriv[a]
8 que·n paron li layc pech.

II Tal ira·m do c'a pauc pel cor no[·m] tori,
 car no·m
 pes c'us s'en port, can es mortz, mas soari
12 e lan[c]el;
 per que·l rey prech d'Arago que·s garnischa
 e pas la mar per totz los tartz confondre:
 que lay son prest de nostra ley preziva
16 mermar, don dan nos sech.

⁶⁴ CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo*» cit.

- III Pus le temps fo de Tristan e de Flori,
 ab nom
 no·l volc nuls reys, ab quar[t] dins son armari,
 20 anel,
 balays, ne aur ne argen, no·l partischa;
 que reys no deu trop gran tresor rescondre:
 si l'a conquest ab valor esforciva,
 24 meta·l en pretz, so·l prech.
- IV Li croy baro sabon de mal l'estori:
 al som
 son de vils faitz, e fan un letoari
 28 novel,
 don cobeytatz e fla[s]quez'enfortischa,
 e [si] puschan valor e pretz tot fondre:
 c'usquecz se vest blasme, per que·s n'aviva
 32 desonors que·ls cossech.
- V No temen so ara pel porgatori
 c'un – c'om
 vey c'a pres pretz, com sol veser corsari –
 36 qu'isnel
 no vey un rich de dar que no·y gandischa
 o no·us diga un per als, al respondre,
 can l'auretz quest; per que tam fort m'esquiva
 40 c'a pauc ades no·m nec!
- VI Le Cardones sab be en meyls respondre
 car pretz ha lest e valor esforciva,
 qu'en escolas n'anech.
- VII 44 Na Sobrepretz, plazens don'agradiva,
 datz me·l do don vos prech!

I The day of reckoning is almost upon us, but some people will look to do deals, for this is what their enemies are like. Better, I think, that the king, lord James, with summonses/many others, should pledge himself to recover God's place and thrash the Turks, as long they (the *mans*) are supported by Rome, which behaves so arrogantly that it makes the laymen look like fools.

II I feel such sorrow that it is as if I am cutting myself through the heart; for I do not believe that a man takes with him, when he is dead, anything but shroud and winding-cloth (?); so I beg the king of Aragon to equip himself and pass over the sea to confound all the laggards: for over there they are ready to deplete our holy religion, with consequent harm to us.

III Since the days of Tristan and Floris, no king of high repute wished, with a coin, a ring, a balas-ruby, gold or silver in his cupboard, not to share it. A king should not hide vast treasure away: if he has won it through force of arms, let him put it towards something worthy, I beseech him.

IV The base barons know the history of evil: they are at the peak of vile deeds, and are concocting a new potion to strengthen greed and flabbiness and [so] be able to ruin worth and merit completely: for each one clothes himself in guilt, so dishonour, overtaking them, thrives.

V Now they have no fear of purgatory: I see not one – for I can see someone who has taken payment just as I commonly see pirates [behave] – not one single rich man who does not avoid giving, or speaks to you about something else in his answer when you have asked him for something; which is why this disgusts me so much that I almost go and drown myself forthwith!

VI The Cardones (the viscount of Cardona) excels at rejoinder, as he has studied price/ worth/ reputation and the force of arms/ the value of force, for he has been to their schools.

VII Lady Sobrepretz (Supreme Worth), pleasing, attractive lady, give me the gift I beg of you.

The *sirventes* was almost certainly composed in 1274, rather than 1269: see Cabré's article, which interprets it in the light of precise historical circumstances that would have been familiar to the audience⁶⁵. Her arguments are based on a careful reassessment of the textual difficulties (Riquer dubbed it as «sin duda, una de las poesías más oscuras de Cerverí»⁶⁶), and her overall argument seems to me to be conclusive. Firstly it explains the allusion to the *tartz* (14) and to kings who refuse to commit funds to a crusade (stanza III): those who held

⁶⁵ J. COROMINES – B. S. FITZPATRICK, *Cerverí de Girona, Lítica*, Barcelona 1988, and S. ASPERTI, BEdT, date it to 1269; see CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo*» cit.

⁶⁶ M. DE RIQUER, *Obras completas del trovador Cerverí de Girona*, Barcelona 1947, p. 97.

back when James of Aragon was the only European monarch to attend the council of Lyon in 1274 at Gregory X's request, and to support the pope's plans for another oriental expedition⁶⁷. Secondly it explains the vehement attacks on the *croy baron*, the turbulent barons whose rebellion was particularly serious in that year and whose circumstances were exclusively likely to have provoked such a violently hostile attitude towards the nobility as we see in Cerverí's poem (see note 25-32). Thirdly, it offers the only explanation hitherto advanced of the first *tornada* addressed to the leader of the rebels (note 41-43). Fourthly, it best explains the reference to an arrogant Rome making the laymen look foolish (7-8). After discussions of the proposed crusade at the council of Lyon had ground to a halt in the absence of support from the other European monarchs, James asked to be crowned by the pope. The pope agreed as long as James paid a tribute he owed him relating to the kingdom of Aragon, at which the king tartly reminded Gregory that he had given him his counsel and proffered his aid, and that the pope for his part should have paid *him* three times that sum⁶⁸. The pope excused himself saying that some of his cardinals had refused to overlook the debt. Cabré notes interestingly that in his account of these events in his *Llibre*, James explains that in the absence of either a crusade or a crown, he wanted at least papal blessing, so as not to embody the proverb «qui fol ca a Roma pech se'n torna»: a phrase having some verbal resonance with the final accusation of stanza I. And finally, her account offers an plausible explanation of the reference to piracy (35) which, she suggests, may relate to the behaviour of James's arch-enemy Charles of Anjou during the aftermath of Louis IX's disastrous 1270 crusade. Charles had been accused of being the cause of the crusade being deflected to Tunis. When he arrived there immediately after Louis' death, he entered at once into negotiations with the Caliph, obtaining a double tribute to himself as king of Sicily, indemnification in coin, the expulsion of anti-Angevin Sicilian exiles from Tunis with its profitable commercial port, and free trade for Christians, and returned forthwith to Sicily. In other words, from the Catalan point of view he went there in a ship, gained booty, and left. His action was opposed to the policy of James who had prohibited Catalan pirate activity in

⁶⁷ CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo*» cit.

⁶⁸ Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*, ch. 536-538.

Tunis in order not to harm commerce, interceded previously with the pope to avoid an attack on Tunis, and refused the help of Alfonso X in a campaign against that city, claiming that «hi ha allà tanta gent de nostres terres i tants béns». After the conquest of Mallorca James had entertained relations with the caliph of Tunis, receiving tributes from him, and the Catalans held mercantile colonies and a consulate there, and took part in the town militia. If Charles was damaging Catalan economic interests, Cabré argues that this could clearly contribute to the formation in a Catalan poem of the image of him as a pirate, while other events may have contributed to this image, such as the looting after Charles' victories at Benevento and Tagliacozzo, constant accusations of greed made against him, denunciations of robberies on part of his officials, and his capture of the Infant Henry of Castile. At this time piracy was also a current theme in relation to crusade: the council of Lyon, among other economic arrangements, prohibited trade with Saracens, specified that pirates were enemies of the crusade because they impeded the journeys of crusaders, and anathematised those who had been «knowingly associating with them in any contract of sale or purchase» or who «exercise command in piratical ships of the Saracens, and who give them counsel or assistance on equipment or anything else at the expense of the Christians, particularly in the Holy Land»⁶⁹.

The location of the composition and early performance of this piece cannot be determined with any certainty, but it is not out of the question that it could have been presented in Béziers or Montpellier. James I of Aragon was in Béziers on 12 April 1274 and in Montpellier between 15-21/22 April, 29-31 May, and again in early June⁷⁰. On the other hand it makes more sense to place it originally in Aragon, where the audience could be expected to be more aware of the references to the *croy baron*.

⁶⁹ CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo*» cit., pp. 460-461, and N. HOUSLEY, *Documents on the Later Crusades, 1274-1580*, London 1996, p. 19.

⁷⁰ MIRET I SANS, *Itinerari de Jaume I* cit., pp. 498-499 and 566.

6. *Seinhos, aujas, c'aves saber e sen* (BdT 206,4, Daspol)

The poem presents a fictive *tenso* with God, somewhat in the manner of the Monk of Montaudon and Peire Cardenal, in the form of a dream⁷¹. Like Daspol, Peire challenges God for his creation arrangements, in this case for having given the troubadour suffering in this life and the threat of further pain for his sins in the life to come; he argues provocatively that it would be a sin on God's part not to be forgive him his sins on the Day of Judgment, since he would not have committed them if God had not caused him to be born.

It is uncertain whether Daspol is to be identified with Guillem d'Autpol. For this reason Paden rejects Riquer's suppletion of the missing two syllables in 17, 33 and 49 with the name *Guillem*, and instead inserts *Senher*, arguing that this makes fewer uncertain assumptions than other possibilities⁷². I have followed this, though of course nothing can be deduced from this about Daspol's social status.

- | | |
|----|---|
| I | Seinhos, aujas, c'aves saber e sen,
que m'esdevenc l'autre ser can dormia.
Sus el sel fuy on Dieu tenc parlament, |
| 4 | es entorn si saria·l compainhia;
e dir vos ai la clamor que tenia
de crestians: com reinhon falsament,
car non <i>claman</i> lo sieu sant moniment |
| 8 | comte ni duc ni prinse ni cle[r]sia. |
| II | |
| | Et ieu leviei, que respos sapchament:
«Tort n'aves, Dieus, e prendes outra via,
car vos donas poder a falsa jent |
| 12 | que·n fan quex jorn erguell e vilania;
qu'il non crezon ni fan ren que bon sia,
e vos das lor sobras d'aur e d'argent, |

⁷¹ For MoMont see BdT 305,7, 305,11, 305,12, ed. M. J. ROUTLEDGE, *Les Poésies du Moine de Montaudon*, Montpellier 1977, poems XIV, XV, XIII; for PCard see BdT 335,67, ed. VATTERONI, *Le poesie di Peire Cardenal* cit., p. 200.

⁷² PADEN, *The Poems of the troubadours Guilhem d'Autpol and «Daspol»* cit., pp. 407-413.

- 16 tant que n'estan crestians recrezen –
 car combatre no-s pot hom cascun dia!»
- III «[Seinher] Daspol, car iest contrarios,
 als clers darai tota mal'aventura,
 e als ordes tolrai possessions
20 que s'ar son ricxs, de tems n'auran frachura,
 pueis dar lur ai malautia mot dura
 e li prinse perdran indiccions;
 doncs remanran aunitz e vergoinhos
24 tant qu'en efern sera lur sebeutura!»
- IV «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?
28 Que sarazins onretz e jent tafura
 que no-s liaison fort castel ni clauzura,
 e·l bastiment volvon de sus en jos.
 Et a durat lonc tems esta tensos,
32 per qu'ieu non say de que·us fassam rancura».
- V «[Seinher] Daspol, si·l prinse ni·l prelat
 m'agueson jes d'amor en lur corage,
 que·l[s] sovengues ab vera caritat
36 com fuy en cros mes per l'uman linhage,
 cascus fora voluntos del passaje,
 si lur membres mon sanc c'ai escampat,
 e s'il moron can si son trebailhat;
40 e nus non pren guarda d'aquel viage».
- VI «Bel seinher Dieus, ben mot aures parlat,
 e pogras ben revenir sest damage
 s'al[s] Sarazins donases volontat
44 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 –
48 e vos es leu que·ns gites a carnage».

- VII «[Seinher] Daspol, de Temple e d’Espital
e dels ordes, comensat ab santeza,
s’es devengut qu’en luoc de ben fan mal,
52 e volon trop dormir en lur maleza,
car tutz son plens d’erguelh e d’avareza
e non volon pensar d’autre jornal.
Mas ie·ls farai camjar cambra’s hostel,
56 que·l plus ardit de totz n’aura fereza!»
- VIII «Bel seinher Dieus, la gloria rial
pogres emplir s’esquivases lageza:
pos conoises que tutz son deslial,
60 per que·[l]s laisas reinhar en lur vileza?
E pues le mont si pert per cobezeza
donas nos tant que tutz siam egal;
e pueis serem tutz fin e natural,
64 cascun volra pensar de sa nobleza!»
- IX E pueis m’esprit. Mas Dieus per sa santeza
vuella, si·l plas, que·l rei e·l cardenal
e li prelat e·l prins’er sian tal
68 c’usquecs vuella fenir en gran boneza.
- X Rei d’Aragon, pair’e fil de prozeza
castel de pres, fons de so per c’om val,
mon som ie·us dic, seinher, si Dieus vos sal,
72 que·l menares en dreg vostra franqueza.

I Lords, you who have knowledge and sense, listen to what happened to me the other night when I was asleep. I was up in Heaven where God was holding assembly, and people were crowding all around here; and I’ll tell you about the charge He was making against Christians: that they behave falsely, since neither counts nor dukes nor princes nor clerics are claiming back His Holy Sepulchre.

II And I stood up and spoke wisely in refutation: «You are in the wrong here, God, and you should take a different approach: you give power to false people who commit the sin of pride and villainy with it every day, for they neither believe nor do anything that is good; and you give them heaps of gold and silver, so that Christians are spineless – for after all, people can’t be fighting all the time!»

III «Lord Daspol, since you confute me I'll send the clerics every misfortune, and I'll take property away from the Orders, so that if they're rich now they'll soon be in want, and on top of that I'll make them gravely ill and the princes will lose tax revenues; then they will be shamed and dishonoured and eventually have their grave in hell!»

IV «Fair lord God, you're obviously powerful, since you live in a safe place and on high. Why do you think we should fight for you, since you honour Saracens and vicious people who leave you no stronghold or stockade, and raze the buildings to the ground? But this dispute has gone on a long time so I don't know what's the point of us accusing you».

V «Lord Daspol, if the princes and prelates had any love for me in their hearts, they ought to remember with true charity how I was put on the cross for the human race; each of them would willingly take part in the passage if they recalled the spilling of my blood, even if they died after such a hard endeavour; but none of them pays any attention to that journey».

VI «Fair lord God, you've talked a great deal, but you could easily repair this damage if you made each Saracen want to acknowledge his sin of his own accord; then no-one would need to go astray, since each would recognise his error. For we suffer death for their ancient sin – and you think nothing of pitching us into a massacre».

VII «Lord Daspol, it's turned out that the Temple and the Hospital and the Orders, begun in holiness, do evil instead of good, and are keen to go on sleeping in their wickedness, for all of them are full of pride and avarice and don't want to think of any other task. But I'll make them change room and lodging so that the very boldest of all will be in terror!»

VIII «Fair lord God, you could achieve royal glory if you put a stop to base behaviour: since you recognise that they're all disloyal, why do you let them carry on in their vile ways? And since the world is going to ruin through greed, give us enough so that we are all equal; and since we'll all be true and faithful / high-minded and high-born, everyone will want to think about his nobility!»

IX Then I awoke. But may it please God through His holiness to ordain that the kings and cardinals, prelates and princes now have a change of heart so that (lit.: be such that) each may desire to end in great goodness.

X King of Aragon, father and son of prowess, castle of worth, fount of what makes a man worthy, I tell you my dream, lord, God save you, for you will direct your nobility aright towards Him.

Meyer took *Rei d'Aragon, pair'e fil de proeza* to refer to James I (1213-1276) rather than his son Peter III (1276-1285), on the grounds that in the romance of *Jaufre* he was addressed as *Paire de pretz e filltz de don*, an argument rightly rejected by Paden⁷³. Riquer considered the song was probably composed shortly before James's crusade of 1269. Paden comments that «a somewhat later date than 1269 is suggested by Throop's observation (1940, pp. 115-46) that the criticism of crusading, which the poem echoes, reached its climax in the period 1270-91»⁷⁴. The dating of 1269 in fact seems unlikely given Daspol's blame of princes and prelates, since at that time many princes and prelates were known to be supporting the plans for Louis IX's second crusade of 1270. A more likely context is that of the second Council of Lyon in 1274, which James was the only European monarch to attend; his grandiloquent support for Gregory X's call for a new crusade met with conspicuous silence on the part of both lay and ecclesiastical attendees. While the identification of Peter III cannot be ruled out, he did not go on crusade or show any intention of doing so.

The blame of apathetic princes may, if this later date is correct, include implicit criticism of Philip III of France (ruled 1270-1285), son and heir of Louis IX whose death Daspol laments in his *planh* BdT 206,2⁷⁵, where the troubadour warns Philip not to heed false counsellors who encourage him to give up doing good.

Conclusions

The pieces here fall into three phases: the lead-up to the second crusade of Louis IX of France in 1267-1268, James's failed crusade of 1269, and the prospect of a new expedition raised at the second Council of Lyon in 1274. The chronology within each phase is unclear.

In the first phase James is one of several leaders who are urged to join the French king's enterprise. Bertran d'Alamano's *sirventes* advocates a crusade as a vastly preferable alternative to the chaotic conflicts and political manoeuvres surrounding the succession to the

⁷³ PADEN, *The Poems of the troubadours Guilhem d'Autpol and «Daspol»* cit., note to 69; for *Jaufre* see now the edition of CH. LEE, *Jaufre*, Roma 2006, v. 62.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 436.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 442-447.

Holy Roman Empire, and sees hope in James's record of success in the Spanish *Reconquista*. The unknown author of *El temps quan vey cazer fuelhas e flors* simply lists him among the preaching orders and various lay leaders exhorted to take part.

In the second phase, Olivier lo Templier and Guillem de Mur both target the king of Aragon at the point when his reputation is suffering as a result of his failure to fulfil his crusading vow. Olivier urges him to remember the plight of Outremer and sail there with a third of his men, at the time when the king of France is determined not to forget the barons who lost their lives at Mansourah and intends to commit himself wholeheartedly to his claims in the Holy Land. Guillem de Mur, after warning his listeners about the need to go on crusade with the right intention and with a soul purged of sin, reminds James to fulfil his vow and defend his good reputation.

In the third phase of James's concern with oriental crusades, the Catalan troubadour Cerverí de Girona warns of the coming day of reckoning and urges James to get ready to attack the Turks threatening to overwhelm the Christian religion. He inveighs against the sluggishness and avarice of other western leaders, the king's rebellious barons «at the peak of vile deeds», in particular the viscount of Cardona, and the arrogance of the pope who makes laymen look like fools. The reference to the pope suggests that the *sirventes* was composed after James's return from Lyon without the papal coronation he had requested. Daspol's fictive *tenso* with God mockingly condemns the kings, princes, prelates and religious orders for ignoring the plight of the Holy Land, making James the sole exception to this. It is uncertain whether it was composed and first performed before the king reached Lyon or after he turned back, though the latter seems more likely in the light of the overwhelming lack of support for Gregory's plans evinced during the Council.

The versification of the troubadours addressing the events of 1269, and the manuscripts **CRf** in which their *sirventes* have been preserved, connect them to a circle of troubadours in the Narbonne - Montpellier - Béziers area that included Guiraut Riquier, Raimon Gaucelm de Béziers, Austorc de Segret, Guillem Anelier de Tolosa and Raimon Menudet. Olivier le Templier appears to have set a fashion for borrowing the versification and doubtless the tune of one of Sordel's *cansos*, followed by all of these five troubadours. As Avenoz - Ventura

have shown, all of these troubadours, either in pieces adopting this form or in other compositions, denounce the vices of the barons, which (except in the case of Raimon Menudet's *planh*) prevent them from defending the Holy Land. The débâcle of James's crusade, sending shockwaves through the south-west region on his landing at Aigues-Mortes and subsequent angry encounter with his Montpellier subjects, together with the fact that Louis left from Aigues-Mortes on his second crusade, were events of immediate regional significance that provoked considerable response among the troubadours and their audiences. This was no doubt the spur to local collectors of troubadour verse to preserve these pieces for posterity. The high number of *unica* may suggest that their resonance was primarily local. But the evidence from William of Tyre, William of Puylaurens and Bernard Gui shows that the events themselves reverberated much further afield. The very preservation of these *sirventes* testifies to grave public concern.

NOTES TO NEW EDITIONS⁷⁶

2. BdT 76,8 (*D'un sirventes*, here p. 219)

MANUSCRIPT

T 219 (*Beltrans dalamano*). The single MS is defective, and difficult to read in a few places. I do not correct for flexion in 2, 11 (see HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit., pp. XXII-XXVI).

CRITICAL EDITIONS

C. CHABANEAU, *Poésies inédites de divers troubadours*, in «Revue des Langues Romanes», 32 (1888), pp. 550-580, p. 568; C. APPEL, *Provenzalische Inedita*

⁷⁶ Abbreviations: DCVB = *Diccionari Català-Valencià-Balear* [...]. Obra iniciada per Mn. A. M.^a ALCOVER, 10 vols, Palma de Mallorca 1980; Ducange = C. DU CANGE, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 10 vols, Niort, 1883-87; FEW = F. VON WARTBURG *et alii*, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 25 vols to date, Tübingen 1922-; LR = F. J. M. RAYNOUARD, *Lexique roman*, 6 vols, Paris 1836-44; PD = E. LEVY, *Petit dictionnaire provençal-français*, fifth edition, Heidelberg 1973; PSW = E. LEVY, *Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch*, 8 vols, Leipzig 1894-1924; TL = A. TOBLER and E. LOMMATZSCH, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, 10 vols to date, Berlin 1925-; NIERMEYER = J. F. NIERMEYER, *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus*, Leiden, 1976¹; SOED = *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford 1933 (1965 edition); Frank 1953-57 = I. FRANK, *Répertoire métrique de la poésie des troubadours*, 2 vols, Paris 1953-57.

aus *Pariser Hand-schriften*, Leipzig 1890, p. 55; J. J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE, *Le Troubadour Bertran d'Alamanon*, Toulouse 1902, poem VIII, p. 54.

REJECTED READINGS

2 cominalmentç, 5 seblan, regna, 6 papal car, 12 mouta, 14 cous eperaires, 16 nami, 17 ce sc̃ll, enalrenenten, 19 sentençiat, 22 vasal bon, 24 en nun, una | ital with *titulus* above 'una', 29 caura (-1), faic, 30 pe, clerges er (-1), 32 tutc, 33 ade*, 34 puisanta, 36 don, ce *unclear*, 37 al, plas, 39 crestandias, 41 remara with long *titulus* above 'ara', cam or com, 42 the first letter is *unclear*, 'e' or 'c', pases, 43 elaut with *tilda* above the second syllable, 44 qualastre lardimen with what looks like an abbreviation mark on the descender of 'q', 45 delserasis; the 'g' of 'mescregens' may have been altered to a 'ç', 47 rimces, 51 sobranamen (-1), 56 papa with *titulus* above the first 'a'

VERSIFICATION

Frank, 326:1, a10 b10 a10 b10 b10 c10' c10' b10 b10, *atz, en ensa*; five *coblas unissonans* followed by two five-line and two two-line *tornadas*. Six other pieces have the same versification and rhymes, including Bertran's *canço* BdT 76,13. The metrical model for these, three *coblas* of Bertran Carbonel, and a *sirventes* of Peire Cardenal (BdT 335,62), appears to be BdT 225,10 (Frank 326:6), a piece by Guilhem Montanhagol which P. T. RICKETTS, *Les Poésies de Guilhem de Montanhagol, troubadour provençal du XIIIe siècle*, Toronto 1964, p. 118 dates to 1252, and which was widely circulated, to judge by its transmission in 29 MSS (including MS T) and citations in Matfre Ermengaud's *Breviari d'Amor* (see RICKETTS, *Les Poésies* cit., p. 108). Like the present piece this one refers to Alfonso X of Castile, though in the early part of his reign, praised for his wisdom (*qu'el es joves de jorns e vielhs de sen*, 58). Peire Cardenal's piece, poem LXXVIII, 43, has similar phrasing to Bertran's line 33: *Et en clergues es aquella uzansa*. Lavaud dates it to 1272 (ed. R. LAVAUD, *Poésies complètes du troubadour Peire Cardenal (1180-1278)*, Toulouse 1957, p. 518); it must be later than Bertran's since it refers to king Philip, hence postdating the death of Louis IX in 1270.

NOTES

- 1 Appel corrects to *grans*.
- 2 Correction to MS *cominalmentç* by Chabaneau, Appel, Salverda de Grave. Chabaneau changes *ce* to *c[h]e* throughout (except for 20 and 36, *que*), and alters other graphies (22 *conquerimen*, 24 *camp*, and so on).
- 4 Appel *que-s*.
- 5 Correction to MS *seblan* and *regna* by Chabaneau, Appel, Salverda de Grave; Chabaneau prints *regno*.
- 6 Hypometric: Appel correctes to *papa*, *car*, without supplying the missing syllable; Chabaneau, Salverda de Grave *E-l papa* mal; *len* is more apt in the context and preserves the *l* of the MS.

7-8 AURELL, *La vielle et l'épée* cit., glossing: «Je m'étonne beaucoup qu'ils aient de l'espoir qu'il accordera l'Empire à l'un d'eux». Salverda de Grave reads *auengun*.

9 Appel prints *argen*, no variant. Literally: "he has from them".

10 *regnatç*: the Regno, or the kingdom of Sicily and southern Italy.

11 Appel corrects to *tutç sieus*.

12 Chabaneau reads *Cor* and corrects. Despite Appel and Salverda de Grave, the MS has *mouta*.

14 Appel and Salverda de Grave correct to *ce us enperaires*, Chabaneau *c'us* [Ms *cons*] *e[m]peraire*.

16 Despite all previous scholars, the MS reads *nami*.

MS *cegai* unclear, so read by previous editors. I accept Appel's correction (compare 19); Chabaneau prints *gai*, Salverda de Grave *ga-i*. Aurell, *La vielle et l'épée* cit.: «qu'il mette d'accord les prétendants».

17 Corrections by Appel (also Salverda de Grave); Chabaneau *C[h]es ell non a en altr'enten*; «Suppléez son cor ou sa pensa après ai? ou corr. *en alre son enten?*».

18 Appel corrects to *tutç*.

19 Correction by Appel (also Salverda de Grave); Chabaneau to *aicest platz, sentenziatz*.

21 Horses with iron armour are attested from the late 12th c.: see J. BUMKE, *Höfische Kultur: Literatur und Gesellschaft im hohen Mittelalter*, Munich 1994, p. 238, and R. DAVIS, *The medieval warhorse*, London 1989, p. 7: after a victory over the French in 1198, King Richard I announced that he had captured 200 horses, 140 of them «clad in iron» (*cooperti de ferro*) (*Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. W. STUBBS, 4 vols, London 1868-1871, iv, pp. 58-59). According to J. BARKER, *The Tournament in England: 1100-1400*, Woodbridge 1986, pp. 175-176, tournament horse armour from the 13th c. included leather (probably *cuir bouilli*) headpieces and cruppers, with a trapper or long flowing cloth of velvet or taffeta covering the horse's back and reaching almost to the ground, decorated with a coat of arms, badge or other device. The specific mention of armoured horses here no doubt implies, with some irony, the martial pomp of the proposed combat. For other troubadour references to armoured horses in the early 13th c. compare Gui de Cavaillon, BdT 192,2, 12, ed. GUIDA, *L'attività poetica di Gui de Cavaillon* cit.: «qu'el jorn estam nos el caval armat» («perchè il giorno noi e i cavalli stiamo armati»); *Crotzada*, 188.14: «e per mei las carreiras van li caval armat» (ed. E. MARTIN-CHABOT, *Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois*, 3 vols, Paris 1931-1961).

22 Correction of *vasal bon* by Appel; Salverda de Grave translates as pl. but does not emend and asks whether emendation is really necessary. ASPERTI, «*Miei-sirventes*» cit., p. 262 rightly observes that «Bertran usa il termine *vassals* (v. 22) in unione a *cavaliers*: per quanto lo spettro semantico sia assai ampio, la connotazione è nettamente distinta da quella di *sodadiers*, che campeggia in *Miei-sirventes*».

The phrase *de concerimen* means literally "of conquest"; Salverda de Grave translates «animés du désir de vaincre». The adjective *bon* seems feeble; was it originally *plen*?

23-24 Correction of *en nun* by Appel (also Salverda de Grave). Both print *fasan*, Salverda de Grave «ils doivent exécuter une danse», followed by AURELL, *La vielle et l'épée* cit., p. 213, C. ALVAR, *La poesia trovadoresca en España y Portugal*, Barcelona 1977, p. 204 and VATTERONI, “*Falsa clerchia*” cit., p. 73. The latter takes the verbs here as functioning as 3 p. imperatives, and interprets this stanza to mean that it is Bertran who, in Aurell’s words, «propose de substituer aux pourparlers le langage des armes, décisif s’il en est: qu’ils livrent tous bataille en champ clos avec leurs troupes!». While this is not grammatically impossible, the context suggests that the verbs depend on *volon*, in other words it is the kings who want to cut to the chase and settle things on the battlefield rather than wait for a legal judgment, and that Bertran, rather than urging them to do this, is treating their impatience with legal process with a dose of cynicism. The sarcastic tone is corroborated by the further sarcasms at their expense, and of course also at the expense of the clergy, and the whole idea of might being right, in 28-29, and particularly by 37 where Bertran indicates the kings may dislike his remarks. For the frequent paratactical structure in noun clauses following governing verbs expressing will, desire and so on, see F. JENSEN, *The Syntax of Medieval Occitan*, Tübingen 1986, § 1051 and Id., *Syntaxe de l’ancien Occitan*, Tübingen 1994, § 786.

25 *onransa*: the office of Holy Roman Emperor. Compare Niermeyer *s.v. honorantia* «a major office, a dignity».

26 Previous editors take *decretals* and *noseeran* as plural, Appel emending to *decretal*. I understand literally «then a decretal will do no harm to this in any way».

27 Again, contrary to previous editors I understand the verb as singular, the subject being *l’uns* (25).

28-29 Appel supplies the missing syllable in 29 with *ci*, Chabaneau *che* and Salverda de Grave *ce*. Chabaneau and Salverda de Grave emend MS *faic* to *fait*. These lines are heavily sarcastic: the clergy will praise either king to the skies, to the point of blasphemy, if it fortifies their cause. Bertran also derides the idea that even in the eyes of the pope and the clergy “might is right” – an idea that, interestingly, underlay the notion of *judicium dei* found ubiquitously in *chansons de geste* and crusading literature.

30 Chabaneau emends to *pe[r]* and *[s]er[a]*; Appel and Salverda de Grave retain MS *pe*. I follow the latter’s suppletion of the missing syllable.

31 Appel, «*lies* Can?», unnecessarily. Salverda de Grave prints *c’aura·n* and translates «car alors ils verront qu’il a le plus d’énergie». For my translation, compare PD *afortir* «renforcer, fortifier», and *Crotzada* (MARTIN-CHABOT, *Chanson de la Croisade* cit.), III, 197.18-21: «*nos creisserem la vila de novel creissement / e bastirem per forsa tot lo vielh bastiment / e farem i tal obra e tal afortiment / que nos perdrem temensa e ilh siran tement*».

32 Corrected by Salverda de Grave (Appel *tut*). Chabaneau prints *Adon*, *son*.

33 The second word is unclear (also to Salverda de Grave); Chabaneau reads *ades*, Appel (also Salverda de Grave) reads *ade* and corrects. Appel corrects *clergues* to *clerge*.

34 I follow Appel's correction.

36 Appel and Chabaneau read *dan*, Salverda de Grave *don*, making the correction. MS *ce* is unclear; I follow Appel's reading (also Salverda de Grave; Chabaneau *que*).

37 Correction to *al* by previous editors; Chabaneau and Salverda de Grave retain MS *plas*, Appel corrects to *plaç*.

39 Appel (also Salverda de Grave) reads *coutramar*, correcting to *ces outramar*; Chabaneau *C[h]e [o]utra*; all editors correct *per*; Appel corrects *crestandias* to *crestiandac*, Chabaneau and Salverda de Grave to *crestiandas*.

40 The repetition of rhyme-word is suspect: was the original perhaps *aparelhadamen*, PD «en (bon) ordre»? Salverda de Grave punctuates *si*.

41 MS *com* unclear; Chabaneau and Salverda de Grave read *cam* and correct.

42-45 These lines have caused considerable difficulty. Salverda de Grave's translation reads «& que le roi de France y aille aussi, sans tarder, & le roi Jacme, car il a la chance & le courage», leaving the remainder blank, and no other scholars have attempted to fill the gap. In 42 Appel and Salverda de Grave read *cautresi* and correct. Appel corrects *rei* to *reis*. Neither instance affects the sense. For MS *pases* Appel suggests «*lies passe? vielleicht auch pase-s*», presumably understanding a present subjunctive form serving as 3 p. imperative, since he goes on to emend 43's *elaut* (with an abbreviation mark above) to *el an*. Chabaneau and Salverda de Grave retain *pases*, though the latter translates it in accordance with Appel's emendation. Other grammatical possibilities for the form *pases* include (a) an imperfect subjunctive implying a wish: «would that the king would cross the sea», but this seems unlikely, especially as there is no preceding *si* or *car* (see JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., §§ 822-23, 825 and *Syntaxe* cit., § 6, 570-571; there are no such examples in COM), or (b) a 3 p. pres. indicative, though this appears to be a rare epic form (see J. ANGLADE, *Grammaire de l'ancien provençal ou ancienne langue d'oc*, Paris 1921, p. 270; again there are no analogous examples on COM). A conceivable emendation to *paset* does not appear compatible with the following lines. I therefore accept Appel's suggestion of *pase-s*.

The beginning of 43 *elaut* with its titulus is almost certainly corrupt. Chabaneau emends to *E l'aut primce(s)*, no doubt by analogy with 47, which does not explain the presence of the *s* in the MS, the titulus (which however may simply be one of several such errors in this MS: see 24 and 56 in this piece alone), or more tellingly, who this prince might be. Appel's *El an*, «Let him go», gives reasonable sense and is not too remote from the MS reading, though the force of the emphatic *el* is unclear. Salverda de Grave prints *El aunt*, supposing a form of *an* unattested in COM or the dictionaries, though this in itself is perhaps inconclusive given MS T's unusual graphies. He omits to translate any of *el aunt primers*, without signalling this in his translation. My emendation *el [s]aut* deals with the unexplained *el* and explains *primers*. Perhaps a scribe at a previous stage of transmission wrote *aut* through eyeskip to 47. The scribe of T is not consistent with tituli. Compare PSW, VII, 487, 1, *de s*. «sofort, gleich»; 3 *lo s*. «im Sprunge, eilends, schleunig», citing BdT 29,13, 99-101, Arnaut Daniel (now ed. G. TOJA, *Arnaut Daniel: Canzoni*, Firenze 1960, poem IX): «*qu'anc*

non estei / jorn d'Aragon que-l saut / no-i volgues ir» (R. LAVAUD, *Les poésies d'Arnaut Daniel. Réédition critique d'après Canello*, Toulouse 1910, p. 176 printed *qu'el saut*, translating «d'un seul élan»); also «*Al premier saut que venc en Ronsasvals, / dens la montanha dels Frances e dels fals*» (G. GOUIRAN – R. LAFONT, *Le Roland occitan. Roland à Saragosse. Ronsasvals*, Paris 1991, pp. 437-38), and perhaps «*Al primier saut an Cesaria conquiza*», BdT 439,1, 9, Templier, MS **a**¹, (MS **C** *Al comensar*). For *de saut* compare *Flamenca*, ed. U. GSCHWIND, *Le Roman de Flamenca. Nouvelle occitane du XIIIe siècle*, 2 vols, Bern 1976, 4553-54: «*non sai nul home tan asaut; / be-l deuri'om amar de saut*»; the *Mystère de Saint Pons* (P. GUILLAUME, *Istorie de Sanct Poncz*, in «*Revue des Langues Romanes*», 31 (1887), pp. 317-420, 461-553, and 32 (1888), pp. 5-24, 250-85), 5951-52: «*Et tu, Anabi, de prim saut / Non me far per ren plus attendre*», and the *Roman d'Arles* (H.-C. HAUPT, *Le "Roman d'Arles", dans la copie de Bertran Boyssset [Manuscrit Aix-en-Provence, Musée Paul Arbut, M.O.63]*, Tübingen-Basel 2003), 829: «*ves la ost Carle Maine s'en anet de gran saut*». The idea behind these expressions is no doubt “Jump to it!”. Louis was later praised for leading the way without hesitation: see BdT 282,20, 18-20, Lanfranc Cigala, ed. BRANCIFORTI, *Il canzoniere di Lanfranco Cigala* cit., poem XXII: «*Zo quez a faig l'onratz reis dels Frances, / Car s'es primers per far secors crozatz / Al saint regne, on Dieus fu mortz e natz*».

Chabaneau's *qu'a l'astre d'ardimen* is an unconvincing emendation. The words *astre* and *ardimen* are coupled in *Crotzada*, MARTIN-CHABOT, *Chanson de la Croisade* cit., 162.52-53: «*qu'en aiso qu'en ai vist me soi desesperatz / que l'ardimens e l'astres nos sia cambiatz*» and 183.11-13: «*nos cobrarem la terra e-l lial eretier, / car ardimens e astres e coratges enquier / que cascus se defenda del contrast sobrancier*».

In 45 MS *delserasis* was corrected by Appel. Neither he nor Salverda de Grave seems to have understood *mescregens*, where the *g* is oddly written, possibly having been changed to a *ç*, and they print *mescre gens*; Chabaneau on the other hand prints *mescrezens*. There is little doubt about the collocation here: compare analogous examples in COM under *mescrezens*. For *dels* in the sense of “with respect to, with regard to, concerning”, see JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., §§ 659, 951-952 and 1134-1140, and *Syntaxe* cit., § 704, and compare line 1 of the present piece.

d'autra gen here must refer to a group of Saracens other than those of the East. In a crusading context *gens* is notoriously tricky to translate, since “race” is seen as too loose a term, though if taken broadly is probably what was understood. Compare the *Canso d'Antioca*, ed. C. SWEETENHAM – L. PATERSON, *The «Canso d'Antioca»: an Epic Chronicle of the First Crusade*, Aldershot-Burlington 2003, lines 5 (translated “people”), 115 and 125 (“group”), and C. SWEETENHAM, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade, Historia Hierosolimitana*, Aldershot-Burlington 2005, p. 1, “men”, with L. and J. RILEY-SMITH, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, London 1981, p. 42 translating the same passage with “race”.

46 Salverda de Grave «et chacun m'entend».

47 Appel (also Salverda de Grave) correct *rimces* to *princes*, Chabaneau *autz primces*.

51 Corrected by previous editors.

53 Chabaneau corrects to *segnor*, misguidedly.

57-59 These lines are grouped together in the MS, with no stop at the end of 57 (*argen*), but there follows a capital *C* separated from *esoutra*, which all previous editors ignore. Nevertheless they separate 58-59 from 56-57, as the rhyme-scheme implies.

Chabaneau prints *terras*.

For *pron del perdon* Salverda translates «beaucoup d'indulgences»; "indulgence" is almost certainly the overall sense here, but should we understand "many indulgences" or a "great" or "plenary" one? For BdT 154,1, 43-44: «*quar del rei n'Anfos no vol far, / e del rei Carle, bon perdo*», Tavani (<http://www.rialto.unina.it/FqLun/154.1%28Tavani%29.trad.htm>) translates *perdo* as "agreement": «perché egli non vuol fare un buon accordo tra re Alfonso e re Carlo»). Does this perhaps also refer to an indulgence to enable the kings to go on crusade? For "indulgence" compare Du Cange 1845, V, 199 s. v. PERDONARE «Concedere, condonare, indulgere, parcere», and many examples of OF *pardon* meaning "indulgence" in TL, VII, 218.

2 bis. BdT 282,26a (*Lo reis n'Anfos*, here p. 229)

My text of this stanza is based on the edition of BRANCIFORTI, *Il canzoniere di Lanfranco Cigala* cit., p. 34; see also P. RAJNA, *Un frammento di un codice perduto di poesie provenzali*, in «Studj di Filologia Romanza», 5 (1891), pp. 1-64, p. 46 and DE BARTHOLOMAEIS, *Poesie provenzali storiche* cit., poem II, pp. 245-46. The text is in MS **r** only, which I have not seen. Branciforti's translation reads «Il re don Alfonso, se in qualche modo perde, vanamente, il proprio tempo (?), non si cura del pregio ma soltanto di far penitenza, da quando disputò il regno di Alemagna e il suo impero, di cui mostra [di avere] tale [ossia: così scarsa] preoccupazione; e se non lo viene a difendere con decisione e se più non lo trascura [ossia se non cessa di trascurarlo] d'ora innanzi da timoroso (?), la sua terra sarà poi tutta senza onore: giammai in nessun modo vivrà senza menomazione».

REJECTED READINGS

17 badalanga, 19 qu'el] ql *with line above* 1st 'q' *joined to ascender of 'l' according to Rajna*, quites] *Rajna* qtes, Branciforti quites *with 'qui' written with the usual abbreviation*, 20 *Rajna* mostrai tal, 21 abansdos, 22 *Rajna* uollai *or possibly 'uestai'*, Branciforti: «*Le ultime tre lettere di temoros sono state scritte dal solito revisore*», 23 Branciforti, *er puis tota written by the reviser alone*, oransa.

NOTES

17 Previous editors retain MS *badalagna* (17) as one word, unattested in the dictionaries or COM; in fact it represents an elided form of either *bada e l*. «wastes time and complains», or *bada + e* for *en + l*. «wastes his time in complaining».

19-20 MS *quites*. Branciforti accepts Rajna's emendation to *contes*, paleographically explicable through a misreading of the abbreviation for *com*, but he is not wholly satisfied with it. As Rajna, he is even less satisfied with emendation to *quitet* (De Bartholomaeis retains *quites* but his translation of *Des qu'el* as «Se egli» is impossible). Although misreading of *t* for *s* is marginally less convincing paleographically, it is nonetheless quite possible, and seems to me to produce better sense in conjunction with the problematic *tenensa*, for which PD gives «territoire; tenance; possession; durée», compare LR, V, 333 «tenance, possession, jouissance», and PSW, VIII, 144-45. Branciforti follows De Bartholomaeis' interpretation «preoccupazione» on the basis of *tener* «“tener in conto [di...]”, “considerare”, “stimare”», which seems weak. Since the primary sense of *tener* is “to hold” it seems reasonable to accept *tenensa* simply as “hold”, though as in the case of previous interpretations, it is necessary to gloss *aital* as “such [little]”. This emendation makes clearer that Lanfranco is goadingly accusing Alfonso of having given up his imperial ambitions in favour of spiritual concerns.

21 Previous editors emend MS *abansdos* to the otherwise unattested form *a bandos*, understanding “unreservedly”. Although De Bartholomaeis' retention of the MS reading is unacceptable, his interpretation seems right. “Both” would seem to refer to both Richard of Cornwall and Charles of Anjou (see stanza IV), in which case Charles is likely to have been referred to in the lacunary first stanza.

23 Previous editors accept MS *oransa*, but this is otherwise unattested in the dictionaries or COM.

24 Rajna reads MS *rei*, Branciforti *reis*, which he emends to *rei*, translating «in nessun modo». De Bartholomaeis prints *Rei* and translates «e come Re non vivrà senza mancamento», but *per* cannot have this sense.

Like Bertran, Lanfranc remarks that the outcome will have to be settled by force of arms: «*car ges omais non podon acordansa / far entre lor mas per bran o per lansa*» (31-32).

Interestingly, Luquet Gatelus in 1264-65, on the eve of Charles's expedition to Italy, held up Alfonso as an example of someone whose reputation shone out across the world because he did *not* delay action: «*Se·l pros coms val segon q'es poderos / un mirail ha, on mirar se deuria, / e se·s mires els faitz del rei n'Anfos, / ben sai per cert qe tant non tardaria / zo q'a empres, qe laisser non poiria, / s'el non laisses tot lo pres q'a conges; / qe·l bruitz es tan vas totas partz estes, / q'o sabon ja de la mar, en Suria, / e d'Espagna entro en Normandia*», «Se il prodo conte ha tanto valore quanta è la sua potenza, ha uno specchio nel quale dovrebbe rimirarsi, e se si specchiasse nelle imprese del re don Alfonso, io so bene, per certo, che non differirebbe tanto ciò che ha intrapreso, che non potrebbe abbandonare senza perdere tutto il pregio che ha acquistato, poiché la fama si è tanto diffusa da tutte le parti, che sanno già ciò di là dal mare, in Soria, e dalla Spagna fino in Normandia» (M. BONI, *Luchetto Gattilusio. Liriche*, Bologna 1957, poem III, 10-18).

3. BdT 312,1 (*Estat aurai*, here p. 230)

MANUSCRIPT

R 60r (*lo templier en olivier*. Blank staves above stanza I).

EDITIONS

MILÁ y FONTANALS, *De los Trovadores en España* cit., p. 366; F. CARRERAS Y CANDI, *La creuada a Terra Santa (1269-1270)*, in *Congrés d'història de la Corona d'Aragó*, Part 1, Barcelona 1909, pp. 106-138, p. 113; LEWENT, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied* cit., p. 439; RIQUER, *Los trovadores* cit., III, p. 1475 (Lewent's text); AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai*» cit., p. 482. Lewent was working from a defective transcription made by someone else.

REJECTED READINGS

2 un] .i., 5 cam desgarnitz (-1), 9-10 after 'breumen' the rest of the line in the MS is left blank with sufficient space for the missing 3 syllables, 15 sia uers estela caramita (+1), 18 tortoiral biarn, 19 ab quer, 23 no with abbreviation mark above 'o', 24 sai, 25 .i., 29 tans descofitz (-2), 35-36 e baptisme prezes per l'antica ley on moris a turmen (-3), 37 traies, 39-40 space left before 'uan l. r.', sufficient for the missing 2 syllables (-2), 40 nostra p., 42 .m., 43 e with titulus above and punctus following, .ii., 44 en. with something possibly erased after or under the punctus, galida

VERSIFICATION

Frank, 577:72: a10 b10 b10 a10 c10 c10 d10' d10', *en/ens, ar, itz/it, ida* (Frank records *-en* and *itz*); five *coblas unissonans* and one four-line *tornada*. On the irregular rhymes in this piece, see above, p. 230. The rhyme-scheme is of a very common type within which there are twelve other pieces with the same metrical shape, nine with the same rhyme-endings though with *ens* for *en* (which in any case is ambiguous in Olivier). Sordel's *canço* (BdT 437,2) is almost certainly the model for the others, as Riquer thought. AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai*» cit., p. 472, have interestingly observed that seven of the pieces imitating Sordel's versification are transmitted in **C**, **R** or **f** (five of them in **C** or **R** only), manuscripts which we know to have been copied in south-west France in the region between Toulouse and Narbonne, and that the texts copied in these manuscripts belong, according to the BEdT, to poets originating from the same area: Guiraut Riquer, Austeror de Segret, Guillem Anelier de Tolosa, Raimon Gaucelm de Beziers, Raimon Menudet; all troubadours who in these or others of their pieces denounce «les vices de ces *bellatores* et causent leur incapacité de défendre la Terre Sainte» (in actual fact RmMen makes no mention of the Holy Land: see A. RADAELLI, *Il "planh" di Raimon Menudet*, in «Istituto Lombardo. Accademia di Scienze e Lettere. Rendiconti», 128 (1994), pp. 489-514, pp. 503-505). These scholars also state that texts that deal with James the Conqueror's

attempts to go on crusade, by Olivier, Guillem de Mur (226,2), Guillem d'Autpol (206,1), and Cerverí (434a,20), are all troubadours who gravitate around the court of Aragon or of great lords linked to it (though Guillem d'Autpol may not be the same troubadour as Daspol, to whom 206,1 is attributed in the MS: see the discussion of this piece below). All are *unica* in different manuscripts, but these manuscripts are **CRf** and **Sg**, in other words from the region of south-west France and Catalonia (pp. 470-71). Olivier's piece falls in small group of three poems in MS **R**, no. 502 being 401,2 by Raimon Gaucelm de Beziers, no. 503, Sordel's *canso* already mentioned, and no. 504 Olivier's piece, following immediately after its versification model.

Elizabeth Poe has suggested that there may have existed «source-collections of troubadour verse which brought together thematically dissimilar but metrically identical poems that could be sung to a single melody» (E. W. POE, «*Compilatio*». *Lyric Texts and Prose Commentaries in Troubadour Manuscript H* (Vat. Lat. 3207), Lexington, Kentucky 2000, p. 252). The observations of AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai*» cit., suggest that there may have been such a collection or collections in the Toulouse-Narbonne region, though the situation in the material discussed here is complicated by similarities of both theme and troubadour provenance.

Whose piece was the first to be modelled on Sordel's *canso*? Of the seven known relevant texts (discounting the *coblas* of Bertran Carbonel and an anonymous author), five postdate the death of Louis IX in 1270: 41.1 (Austorc de Segret), 206.1 (Daspol), 401.1 (Raimon Gaucelm de Beziers), 405.1 (Raimon Menudet), all of which refer to it, and 204.3 (Guillem Anelier de Tolosa), dated by Straub to 1270-1276 (R. E. F. STRAUB, *Les "sirventes" de Guilhem Anelier de Tolosa*, in «*Cantarem d'aquestz trobadors*». *Studi occitanici in onore di Giuseppe Tavani*, ed. L. Rossi, Alessandria 1995, pp. 127-168, p. 141). This leaves Olivier's *sirventes* and Guiraut Riquier's *tenso* with Enveyos, 248.14, composed before 1270 when he left for Spain. Riquier's relative prestige might suggest he was the first to adopt Sordel's tune and form, and if Olivier composed his song in haste it would have made it convenient for him to pick up a local well-known tune and form. On the other hand, like Sordel, Olivier ends stanza I with the rhyme-word *vida*, and also uses (v. 15) the rhyme-word *caramida* (M. BONI, *Sordello. Le poesie*, Bologna 1954, p. 7, v. 16), which suggests direct imitation, and the positioning of his *sirventes* directly after Sordel's *canso* in MS **R** may support this. The fact that the other songs in the same region, and within the same short space of time, deal with crusading matters suggests that after Olivier's composition the tune itself soon acquired the function of generating particular audience expectations.

NOTES

- 1 For the future anterior used in contexts that call for a past indefinite, see JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., § 810 and *Syntaxe* cit., § 559.

Avenoz – Ventura translate *en pessamen* as «à songer», which is also possible, though what follows suggests the more negative nuance.

2 For the form of *sirventesc*, see Avenoz – Ventura, p. 486.

5 Lewent supplied the missing syllable (Milá y Fontanals *baros (et) el cam*).

7-8 Lewent misreads *nols* as *uos* and corrects to *no l'*, and *clamaray* to *clamara-n*, printing «*Mas ara-m platz car vey que no l'oblida, / ans clamara-n mentr'el cors aia vida*» («Aber jetzt gefällt es mir, dass ich sehe, dass er es nicht vergisst, / vielmehr darüber klagen wird, solange er noch Leben im Leibe hat»). Riquer gives the same text, but seems unhappy with the idea that Louis is the subject of *clamara*, translating «Pero ahora me place porque veo que [hay quien] no lo olvida, sino que clamará mientras tenga vida en el cuerpo». The idea that the poet is pleased because the king will continually lament is clearly unsatisfactory, but Riquer's gloss is hardly convincing. Avenoz – Ventura also print *clamara-n* but translate «il leur en demandera des comptes», without comment (despite having returned to the MS they do not correct Lewent's original version, but the MS is clear). The MS shows the object of *oblida* as plural, which must refer either to the Turks, the most recently mentioned, or possibly the *baros* (line 5), or both. It does not seem possible to accept MS *clamaray* as a 1st p. verb, *ans* almost certainly registering an opposition to *oblida*. I take *clamara* to mean Louis will pursue the Christian claim to the Holy Land: compare LR, II, 400-1, PSW, I, 256-57, and *Crotzada* (MARTIN-CHABOT, *Chanson de la Croisade* cit.), 148.54-56: «*Ab sol que-l senher papa sia dreitz e sufrens, / ja l'ondratz filhs del comte, tant es de rics parens, / no er dezeretatz senes clam longamens*» («sans qu'il y ait de réclamation»), 202.78-79: «*per so que-l coms Ramons, que es dux e marques, / la clama per linatge*» («parce que le comte Raimond, duc et marquis, la revendique par droit de naissance»), and NIERMEYER, 184, *clamare*, 8 to “claim, to lay claim to”.

The phrase «*mentr'el cors aia vida*» may possibly evoke the reported circumstances of Louis' decision to take the cross before his first crusade in 1248. Louis was so seriously ill that one of the two women tending him thought he had died, and wanted to draw the sheet over his face. While he lay listening to them disputing whether this should be done, he recovered his speech and immediately asked to be given the cross, and his example was followed by his three brothers.

9 The ransom which Louis IX had had to pay after his capture in April 1250 amounted to 400,000 pounds tournois = 800,000 gold bezants (Joinville, ed. A. PAUPHILET – E. POGNON, *Historiens et chroniqueurs du moyen âge*, Bruges 1953, p. 276).

10 Milá y Fontanals (*Als turcs felos*) *las convenc a deixar*, «les toca dejar (á los infieles)»; Lewent *als [pagas fals] convenra [a]*, accepted by Avenoz – Ventura, but which was emended from the faulty transcription available to him that included the misreading *convent*. MS *convenc*, seen also by Milá y Fontanals, makes far better sense: at the time of their defeat at Mansourah the crusaders were forced to abandon the ransom and the Holy Sepulchre, but there is no reason to suppose the latter, at any rate, will be so abandoned in the

future. On the contrary, the whole thrust of the piece is exhortation to James to reverse this setback. The rest of Lewent's emendation is plausible, implying scribal eyeskip between *als* and *fals*, but the syllable count requires a different conjecture. Avenoza – Ventura translate «il faudra que les [païens trompeurs] les abandonnent» (continuing «car ils ont amené beaucoup de gens d'ici à se croiser»).

15 The faulty transcription available to Lewent read *ques es lur sia uers estela caramita*, which he emended to *ques er lur sia estel'e caramida*, omitting *uers* («dass er ihnen Leitstern und Magnetnadel sei», without translating *er*, and was followed by Riquer («que será su estrella y calamita»). The second word in the MS is in fact *el*. But Lewent was most probably right to see the extra syllable as *uers*, repeated through eyeskip.

Although *caramida* is otherwise unattested in the dictionaries or COM as a noun having adjectival force, compare the *Breviari d'amor*, 5475, *l'estela caneta*, and 5526T1 on COM, *de l'estela cometa*.

16 It is rare to find examples of *perdonar* taking a double accusative (*-ls x 3 + lor falhida*) instead of an accusative and a dative (English “to forgive s.one [acc.] for s.thing [dat.]”), but Lewent cites one in FqRom, BdT 156,12, now ed. R. ARVEILLER – G. GOURAN, *L'œuvre poétique de Falquet de Romans, troubadour*, Aix-en-Provence 1987, poem VIII, 22-2: «*e selhs qu'auran de mi tort e peccat, / ses falhimen, que no.ls er perdonat*» (MSS **CR**, with var. *noilh e. M*), and compare A. JEANROY, *Les Joies du Gai Savoir*, Toulouse 1914, 17, 15-16: «*De bon voler, al Payr' omnipotent, / Que-lz perdones, com a pecx, lor holtrage*».

17 Previous critics (LEWENT, *Das altprovenzalische Kreuzlied*, p. 443, AVENOZA – VENTURA, «*Estat aurai*» cit., p. 489) found the switches between first- and third-person address awkward and unskilful. This may ignore the theatrical, performative aspect of the song, where apostrophe to a figure present or imagined permits a change of pace or stance.

18-19 That Avenoza – Ventura's *Tortois'a* is a typographical error is clear from their note.

Lewent argued plausibly that the scribe did not recognise *biar*, then on the border between Valencia and Murcia, and misunderstood the reference to be to the Béarn, consequently adding the definite article and the *-n* ending. *Biar* fell to James in February 1245 after a five-month siege. Lewent (also Avenoza – Ventura) gives the date as 1253, following F. W. LEMBKE, *Geschichte von Spanien*, 7 vols, Hamburg 1831-1902, III, p. 115, but see F. SOLDEVILA, *Història de Catalunya*, Barcelona 1963, p. 335, § 358, n. 2 and Riquer. Lewent also observed that Tortosa was not conquered by James, but fell to the Christians on 31 December 1148, so either Olivier was misattributing the victory to him (which seems unlikely), or he meant that James had driven his conquests further than Tortosa. Mallorca was conquered in 1232.

20-21 Riquer suggests that the Temple refers both to the Temple of Jerusalem and the Order of the Templars. However, Malcolm Barber has indicated in a private

communication that the former hypothesis seems unviable: to what would Olivier be referring? It would be odd to talk about preserving or supporting the Temple area of Jerusalem, rather than making the usual call to regain the Holy Sepulchre, and the only building the Latins (as opposed to the Jews) would have called the Temple was the al-Aqsa mosque (the Temple of Solomon), no longer in Christian hands. Such a reference would in any case still lead back to the Order, as the al-Aqsa mosque had been its former headquarters.

Lewent translates *esser tenens* as «behaupfen», Riquer «ser posesor», Avenzoa – Ventura «être maître». The only examples of *esser tenens* de I have found in the dictionaries and COM are three in *Crotzada* (ed. MARTIN-CHABOT, *Chanson de la Croisade* cit.) which largely support their interpretation, see 170.17-18: «*que Dieus no vol suffrir que vos siatz tenens / del castel de Belcaire ni del als longamens*», «que vous possédiez»; 148.23-26: «*Mas lhiura li la terra tota cominalmens / e a lhui e al lhinatge, ses totz retenemens; / e si no la-lh das tota, qu'el ne sia tenens, / eu volh que per tot passe glazis e focs ardens*», «Si tu ne la lui donnes pas tout entière sans aucune réserve»; 189.103: «*E pessem com estem e-l seti longamens / per destruire la vila e pendre-ls venjamens, / que ja nulhs temps per forsa no-n seriatz tenens*», «car certes jamais vous ne la maintiendriez de force sous votre autorité». But can James really be said to be the “possessor” or “holder” or “ruler” of the Temple? A more plausible interpretation is suggested by the sense of *tener* “to preserve” (PSW, VIII, 147, 7, “bewahren”), or conceivably “support” (PSW, VIII, 151, 17 “unterstützen, beistehen” with a query). James of Aragon was closely allied to the Templars, having been brought up and supported by them and in turn having fought with them during the Reconquista, and it would be natural for a Templar to turn primarily to him for support.

For 21 to scan *temple* must count as one syllable with lyric caesura, and *qe avetz* as two syllables.

23 Lewent, Riquer correct to *fagz*. For *fag d'armas*, see BdT 248,37, 19-20, *tenso* of GrRiq and GlMur, ed. HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour “Tensos”* cit.: «*e ni-n es de mi ni de vos / fag d'armas*», and *Breviari d'Amor*, ed. P. T. RICKETTS, *Le «Breviari d'amor» de Matfre Ermengaud*, 5 vols (V, Leiden 1976; II-III, London 1989 and 1998; IV, Turnhout 2004; I, not yet published), IV, 17478-79: «*e li autre se perregen / en fag d'armas comunamen*».

For the penultimate word Milá y Fontanals prints *vos*, Lewent *vo-n* corrected from *non*, Avenzoa – Ventura *no-us*.

24 As all previous editors I correct MS *sai* to *lai*: it is obviously in the Holy Land that people are calling for help.

26 Previous editors assumed that *de lay* means “there” rather than “from there”, no doubt rightly: compare for example Peirol, BdT 366,28, 11, ed. S. C. ASTON, *Peirol, Troubadour of Auvergne*, Cambridge 1953, poem IX: «*quar s'ieu era de lay mar veramen*» («for if I were truly there across the sea»), Raimon de Cornet, ed. J.-B. NOULET – C. CHABANEAU, *Deux manuscrits provençaux du XIV^e siècle contenant des poésies de Raimon de Cornet, de Peire de Ladils et d'autres poètes*

de l'école toulousaine, Montpellier-Paris 1888, pp. 41-45: «Pueys tug li rey don ve leyls amors / vas Gezu Crist, que-s mes per nos en gatge, / faran de cor tug essemps lo passatge; / pero de lay premier comensaran / de batalhar frayre de san Johan».

The word *passes* in this context no doubt implies the *passagium*, the voyage to the Holy Land.

29 I have followed Lewent's suppletion (*ques el ia n'a tans [del tot] descofitz*) for the sake of scansion, but placed it earlier in the line to avoid an awkward caesura. In all the texts presented here, with exclusively decasyllabic lines, the caesura falls after the fourth syllable, with a number of lyric caesurae after bi-syllables, but this is a different case.

31 COM2 from CARRERAS Y CANDI, *La creuada a Terra Santa* cit.: «*de mons e tors en batalla en ramida*», wrongly. As Lewent notes, *enramida* is unattested in the Occitan dictionaries, but Godefroy gives one OF example (III, 219), and TL, II, 492, two of *esrami*. Riquer comments that it is undoubtedly the same as *aramida* or *arramida*, a common term in medieval Occitan and Catalan to designate «combates concertados previo desafío»; nevertheless, here it is placed in opposition to «within walls» so seems to mean fighting on the open battlefield.

32 MS *so que tanh a sa uida* puzzled Riquer sufficiently for him to add a gloss to the effect that James has conquered what is fitting for the life of his soul. Lewent: «was seinem Leben wohl ansteht»; Avenoz – Ventura: «ce qui convient à sa vie». The reading is also suspect in that it repeats the important last rhyme-word of stanza I (Olivier's model, Sordel's *Aitant ses plus viu hom quan viu jauzens* (BdT 437,2) also repeats *vida*, but only in the *tornada*, as does RmGauc in BdT 401,1). It is tempting to conjecture a scribal error for *s'auzida*, «in accordance with his reputation», in other words James's deeds match his reputation (he was after all termed «the Conqueror»), and it is not hard to see how a scribe could have misread *asauzida*, especially if the letters were squashed together in the exemplar. I take the MS reading to mean that James has done all that can be expected from a military leader: his way of life is the secular one.

35-36 CARRERAS Y CANDI, *La creuada a Terra Santa* cit., corrected to «*E batisme prezes per l'antica ley / (Sus en la crotz) hont moris a torment*», an impossible solution since the rhyme scheme requires -ar in 35. Lewent and Riquer leave 35 blank after *prezes* and 36 blank before *on moris*; Riquer adds a suppletion to his translation, «[y fuisteis puesto en la cruz]». What is missing must be the end of 35 with the rhyme-word in -ar, and what follows *prezes per* in the MS satisfactorily makes up line 36. While one might think of a tri-syllabic word meaning «overthrow» (*desrocar*, *trabucar*, *desfermar*, *reversar*, *enversar*, *degitar*, *raüzar*), according to Matt. 5. 17, Jesus said: «Nolite putare quoniam veni solvere legem aut prophetas: non veni solvere, sed adimplere». The missing word cannot be *ademplir* because of the rhyme, but a possible solution, *renovar*, is suggested by a Vaudois gloss on this part of the Sermon on the Mount in A. DE STEFANO, *La Noble Leçon des Vaudois du Piémont: texte critique, introduction et glossaire*, Paris 1909, pp. 233-41: «*E apelle .xii. apostol li cal son ben nomna / E volc mudar la lei, qu'enant avia dona: / el non*

la mude pas, qu'ilh fos abandona, / ma la renouvelle, qu'ilh fos prus fort garda. / El receop lo baptisme per donar salvament, / E dis a li apostol, baptejesan la gent, / car adonc començava lo renovellament. / Ben defent la lei velha fornigar e avoutrar, / ma repren la novella veser e cubitar», and so on.

37 Lewent misreads and accepts *traisses*, though this appears to be a 1 or 3 p. imp. subj. For another example of *traisis* see E. LEVY, *Poésies religieuses provençales et françaises du manuscrit extravagant 268 de Wolfenbüttel*, in «Revue des Langues Romanes», 31 (1887), pp. 173-288 and 420-35, p. 228, lines 958-67: «*Aisi cum sens faillensa / et si cum plac a vos / de la gola au leos / traisis san Daniel / e-l poble d'Israel / des mains dels Faraons, / del ventre del poisons / traisistes sain Ionas / et del ardent fornas / los tres enfant traises*». Lewent and Riquer punctuate with a comma after *e*.

39 The suppletion was first made by Lewent.

43-44 Lewent corrects his misreading *ques* (43) to *que·i*. He and subsequent editors take the reference in 44 to be to «three viscounts»; Lewent (also Riquer) reads the first word as *et*; Avenoz – Ventura read the MS correctly and emend to *et*. There may have been an erasure in the MS, but what is there now is *e* with titulus above, followed by a punctus, a space with possible signs of erasure, and *tres*, the latter spelled out, by contrast with the numeral *ii*. in the previous line. The MS reading suggests «among viscounts», as Milá y Fontanals thought («y entre vizcondes el señor de Gelida», though the first *s* in his text «*E' ntre 's vescoms el s. d. G*» is meaningless. For the form *entres* see *Girart de Roussillon*, ed. W. M. HACKETT, *Girart de Roussillon*, Paris 1953-1955 and M. COMBARIEU DU GRÈS – G. GOUIRAN, *La Chanson de Girart de Roussillon*, Paris 1993: «*Entres mur e-l palaz ac un plan gent*», also 2564, 2890, 7738; *Jaufre* 8111-8112: «*Aisi respondet Brunentz / Tot suavet entres ses dentz*» (ed. LEE, *Jaufre* cit.), and so on (see COM). However, this reading seems awkward, and correction to the MS desirable.

As previous editors I emend *Galida* to *Gelida*, despite the notorious instability of medieval names. Avenoz – Ventura identify the *senhor de Gelida* as Guillem II de Cervelló, lord of Gelida c.1235-1290, «un homme du cercle royal, ami de saint Ramon de Penyafort, et, comme allié des Moncada et fidèle à ce groupe puissant» (p. 476). They grant that it is difficult to identify the counts and viscounts from the archives, but suggest Olivier may be referring to the counts of Foix and Empúries (the latter being close to the king) and the viscounts of Moncada, Cardona and Castellnou. «Réunir de pareilles forces supposait de la part d'Olivier une grande confiance en la résolution du conflit qui avait opposé les nobles pour la succession du comté d'Urgell et qui allait finir par retomber sur la maison de Foix» (p. 479).

4. BdT 226,2 (*D'un sirventes far*, here p. 239)

MANUSCRIPT

C 368r-v (*uilem. de murs*). The MS is damaged by the removal of an illuminated initial, affecting the text on both folios.

CRITICAL EDITIONS

CHABANEAU, *Cinq tensons de Guiraut Riquier* cit., p. 124; APPEL, *Provenzalische Inedita* cit., p. 144. Chabaneau's mere changes of graphy are not recorded in the notes below.

OTHER EDITIONS

F. J. M. RAYNOUARD, *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*, 6 vols, Paris 1816-21, V, p. 203, lines 1-24 and 41-44 only; MILÁ y FONTANALS, *De los Trovadores en España* cit., p. 359, Raynouard's text; M. PERUGI, *Trovatori a Valchiusa: un frammento della cultura provenzale del Petrarca*, Padova 1985, p. 196, Appel's text.

REJECTED READINGS

1 ... siruentes far mi | ... dieus guitz, 2 qar | ... nensat lay per bo | ... razo, 3 quar lo sanh | ... s on dieus fon se | ... hitz, 6 bonænsio, 21 portæn, 28 *missing*, 36 unclear letter after final 'f', perhaps 'a'

VERSIFICATION

Frank, 353:3: a10 b10 a10 b10 c10' b10 c10' b10, *itz, o, eta*; five *coblas unissonans* with one four-line and one two-line *tornada*. The verse-form is one of a number which adapt and regularise the much looser structure of a *sirventes* of Bertran de Born (BdT 80,33): on these see J. H. MARSHALL, *Imitation of Metrical Form in Peire Cardenal*, in «Romance Philology», 32 (1978-79), pp. 18-48, pp. 35-36 and HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit., p. 1099. Marshall analyses the way in which he sees Peire Cardenal as having fashioned a regular pattern from Bertran's irregular form (BdT 335,30), and adds that Guillem de Mur (in the present piece) and Raimon Gaucelm de Beziers (a *tenso*, BdT 401,6) «also look to Bertran's *sirventes* as their model, which they regularise in a fashion analogous to but not identical with that employed by Cardenal». In a note he adds that «Both have the *b*-rhyme in *-o* and the *c*-rhyme in *eta*; the *tenso* also has the *a*-rhyme in *-ol* (not *-olh*, as given by Frank). The authors of these texts would therefore seem to have known both BtBorn's metrical form and PCard's more regular pattern». Following J. H. MARSHALL, *Une Versification lyrique popularisante en ancien provençal*, in *Actes du premier congrès international de l'AIEO*, ed. P. T. Ricketts, London 1987, pp. 35-66, HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit. note that the form proposed by RmGauc has features in common with three of the imitations of BtBorn: its *a* and *c* rhymes are identical with those of PCard's *sirventes* BdT 335,30, its *b* and *c* rhymes with Guillem de Mur's crusade song, its *a* rhyme only with that of a *tenso* of Guigo de Cabanas and Bertran d'Alamanon (BdT 197,3), and that it is «likely that Raimon Gaucelm knew one or more of these pieces and that his imitation of Bertran de Born was indirect. The "popularising" feature in 401,6, 31-32 (enclisis at the feminine rhyme) is to be regarded in the same light as the "popularising" characteristic of Bertran de Born's original (fluctuation of rhyme-scheme)». It is

unclear why Marshall apparently believed that RmGauc followed PCard rather than the other way round, or imitated BtBorn's scheme independently (though in that case both would be 'credited' with regularisation), since it could be argued that RmGauc adopts not only three of Bertran's rhymes (as opposed to two by PCard) but also a popularising register. A. RADAELLI, *Raimon Gaucelm de Béziers. Poesie*, Firenze 1997, pp. 4-21 dates RmGauc's poetic activity to 1262-79; there is no internal evidence in PCard's *sirventes* to assist in dating. The place of GIMur's *sirventes* in all this is uncertain, but it is more than likely that he had some contact with RmGauc. In the first place, he asks a certain Miquel to perform his crusading song BdT 401,8 to Aimeric of Narbonne: Radaelli suggests that «Miquel» may have been Miquel de Castillo who composed a *partimen* with Guiraut Riquier and Codolet (BdT 248,11) and was called upon as arbiter in BdT 248,28, 69 (see HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour Tensos and Partimens* cit., p. 756), where he is also referred to simply as «Miquel». ANGLADE, *Le Troubadour Guiraut Riquier* cit., p. 99 had thought this identification unlikely (though I disagree), but in any case RmGauc and GIMur clearly were linked to the Narbonne circle of troubadours, came from the same region, wrote crusading songs within a year or two of each other, and featured in the same group of south-western manuscripts, with a religious song of RmGauc immediately preceded by Sordel's *canso* and Olivier's *sirventes* in **R**.

The *tenso* of Guigo and BtAlam, which does not actually have any rhymes identical to BtBorn's, since Guigo's *a* rhyme is in *-olh*, is likely to be earlier: HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit., pp. 506-507) suggest a date of the 1240s for BdT 197,1b, a *tenso* also involving BtAlam and Guigo, probably GgoCaban, and probably deriving, along with BdT 335,68 of PCard, from a *tenso* of Joan Lag and Eble (BdT 267,1).

NOTES

- 1-2 I follow the previous editors' emendations.
- 3 Raynouard and Chabaneau *bers, sebelhitz*; Appel *vas, sepelitz*.
- 4 Chabaneau: «corr. *cobrar*? Ou *Deliurar volon cilh*?».
- 5 Appel's correction to *cert* is not strictly necessary: see HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit., pp. XXII-XXVI.
- 6 Chabaneau and Appel make the suppletion.
- 7 Appel reads *Qus* and "corrects". Chabaneau prints *en tan [aut] luec*, unjustifiably.
- 12-13 Raynouard and Chabaneau print *ses satisfactio*; / *Per qu'ieu non cre*. The enjambement indicated by the MS reading is odd, but emendation does not seem justified.
- 26 Chabaneau prints *querrel*, without any indication of what he thought this meant.
- 27 Corr. Chabaneau, Appel.
- 28 The rhyme-word is likely to be *emendazo*, in accordance with the emphasis on this idea in the rest of the stanza, and it would seem to be too appropriate a

choice for Guillem to have omitted it. The line might be emended to *ni dels forfaitz far nulh emendazo*.

33-40 The text might possibly be restored as follows: «Pero aisselh crozatz tot acomplitz / del esmendar *aura remissio* / dels tortz qu'a fatz, *e-n sia tot guanditz*, / ab que fassa vera confessio, / e sera *fin e net* com violeta; / a Dieu passa e lai pren passio / ont elh la pres aspr'a nostr'ops dousseta, / qu'eram liurat tug a perdicio» («However, that wholly perfect crusader will, through his repentance, receive remission of the wrongs he has committed, and will be entirely free of them, as long as he makes true confession, and will be as pure and clean as a violet; he makes the passage to God and there takes on suffering and death ...»). However this may be, lines 38-39 almost certainly mean that the penitent crusader, in the proper spiritual frame of mind, will be ready to accept suffering and death in return for God's *passio*, and in this is reminiscent of BdT 156,12, 32-40 (FqRom, ed. ARVEILLER – GOUIRAN, *L'œuvre poétique* cit., poem VIII, 33-40): «Adoncs er fag l'ira e-l dols e-l plors / quan Dieus dira: “Anatz, malaiirat, / yns en infern on seretz turmentat / per tostemps mais ab pena e ab dolors, / quar non crezetz qu'ieu sufri greu turmen; / mortz fuy per vos, don vos es mal membrat!” / E poiran dir selhs que morran crozat: / “E nos, Senher, mort per vos eyssamen!”».

35 Appel does not record *f*; Chabaneau prints *fa*.

39 Chabaneau prints *Ont elh la pres aspra, nos trop dousseta*. Appel reads *aspro* and corrects, but MS *aspra* is clear.

46 The last three syllables are missing. Supplete with *m'i ado* (with elision, “I give myself to this”)? Cf. BdT 364,2, 99-102: «Mas a Tripol m'ado, / Que quan l'autre baro / Caço prez, et el lo rete / e no-l lascia partir de se» (ed. d'A. S. AVALLE, *Peire Vidal: Poesie*, Milano-Napoli 1960). Chabaneau suggested *l'en somo?*, unconvincingly.

5. BdT 434a,20 (*En breu sazo*, here p. 245)

MANUSCRIPT

Sg 27v-28r (*Seruentez*)

CRITICAL EDITIONS

RIQUER, *Obras completas* cit., p. 97; PERUGI, *Trovatori a Valchiusa* cit., p. 60; COROMINES – FITZPATRICK, *Cerverí de Girona* cit., II, p. 123; CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo*» cit., p. 453.

REJECTED READINGS

4 mel with the first three minims apparently written over an erasure; Perugi and Cabré read ‘niel’, 5 reys jacmes (-1), 6 lo, 7 seynoriu, 9 no-m] no, 12 elanel, 19 ab quer, 21 dolays, 29 flaquezen fortischa, 30 e puschan ualor (-1), 31 cus quetz, 33 temon

VERSIFICATION

Frank, 882:3, a4 b6' c2 d10' e2 f10' g10' h4 i6' j6, o, ori, om, ari, èl, isca, ondre, èst, iua, éc, five *coblas unissonans* and two *tornadas*, one of three lines, one of two. The *sirventes* is modelled on, and elaborates, a *canso* attributed by MS C to Guillem de Saint Gregori, BdT 233,4 (see Frank, 881:1 and p. 178, note), which has essentially the same versification, including rhyme-words, bar the final line and internal rhymes (a10' b2 c10' d2 e10' f10' g10' h6). Perugi's hypothesis that the author of BdT 233,4 was Guillem de Mur (PERUGI, *Trovatori a Valchiusa* cit., especially pp. 42 ff., 161 ff. and chapter IX) has been undermined by Asperti (*Carlo I d'Angiò* cit., pp. 20-21) and P. G. BELTRAMI – M. SANTAGATA, "Razo e dreyt ay si-m chant e'm demori": un episodio della cultura provenzale del Petrarca, in «Rivista di Letteratura Italiana», V (1987), pp. 9-89, pp. 27-28, on chronological grounds: under the troubadours' established generic hierarchy a *sirventes* must succeed a *canso*, and Perugi's reconstruction is based on a dating of 1280 at the earliest for the *canso*, whereas Cerverí's *sirventes* must date from before the death of James I in 1276.

NOTES

1-5 *pretentori*, a hapax. Riquer translates «inaplazable» ("unpostponable"), taking the word to refer to the crusade judged to be imminent: an interpretation that fits poorly with the historical situation where it is James himself who decides whether or not to go on crusade. Perugi, Coromines and Cabré take it as the day of the individual's death or the day of judgment. For the possible derivation see Coromines, p. 125.

None of the solutions hitherto proposed for these difficult lines is entirely satisfactory. Riquer, who terms his as purely conjectural, reads *mel* in 4 and emends to *niel*, the reading accepted by other editors, and translates 2-4 implausibly as «pero habrá quien pretenderá hacer fraude, porque son tan negros sus enemigos», interpreting «pero algunos barones cobardes procurarán hacer fracasar le empresa porque los enemigos contra quienes tendrían que luchar son negros».

Perugi does not comment on Riquer's idea that people are behaving fraudulently in trying to break up the crusading project, but understands *niel* figuratively, and more convincingly, as "ferocious". He makes the locally plausible emendation of *mas* to *mans* (an 'error' explicable by the loss of a titulus in the transmission process) and prints *ma<n>s hom / qu'er a baratz, car tal son sey contrari / niel: / que-l reys Jacmes ab mans crey que-s plevscha* («per molta gente che ora esercita frodi, tanto feroci sono gli avversari saraceni: il re Giacomo credo che faccia giuramento»). While this has the advantage of recognizing that *niel* is always bisyllabic and obviating the need for a suppletion in 5, can *tal* really function as an adverb? See JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., §§ 546-51, and the discussion of Arnaut Daniel, ed. TOJA, *Arnaud Daniel* cit., poem VII, 40, *Amors tals fora granda*, «l'Amore, quanto grande potrebbe essere», in Toja's note on p. 241, a reading rejected by M. PERUGI, *Le canzoni di Arnaut Daniel*, 2 vols, Milano-Napoli 1978, as hypometric. Moreover

the phrase *a baratz* is weak, and unlikely, for “practises frauds”: one would expect *far barat*, and I have been unable to find any examples of *aver barat(z)* in the dictionaries or COM.

Coromines saw *aura* as impersonal (“there will be”), and *hom* in 2 as a gentle prod to James himself (p. 125, n. 2): «Amb hom el poeta es refereix suaument a Jaume I, i als seus hipotètics auxiliars, per recordar-los que els cal absolutament fer una gran acció de penitència». But it would hardly have been necessary to urge the king to commit himself just before the 1269 expedition, since he had clearly already done this against the advice of many members of his family (Jaume I, *Llibre dels feits*, ch. 482 and MARCOS, *La croada catalana* cit., pp. 184-85) and the express refusal of the pope to support him, and indeed had spent many months actively drumming up support and resources for his crusade. He prints 2-5 as «*mas hom / quer<r>à baratz, car tal són sey contrari! / Mel<s> que. / reys <En> Jacmes, ab mans, crey que-s plevisha*», and translates in a note «però hom (llavors) / cercerà subterfugis (fraus), perquè les seves males accions són tals! / Menys mal que el / rei En Jaume, amb l’ajuda de molts, crec que està per comprometre’s». This retains the adjectival function of *tal*, though the interpretation of *contrari* as “bad deeds” is unconvincing, being based on PD «préjudice», «contrarietat, temps advers, acció en contra», this in turn on a single highly doubtful example in PSW, I, 348 (with no support in COM).

Cabré emends *mas* to *mals* (without explaining how this ‘error’, less likely than *mas* for *mans*, might have occurred), which she then takes as the subject of *aura*, and accepts Perugi’s doubtful *qu’er a baratz* «che ora esercita frodi». She prints «*En breu sazo aura-l jorn pretentori / mals hom / qu’er a baratz*» and translates «El dia del judici arribarà aviat al mal home que ara practica fraus».

An interpretation more solidly anchored in contemporary events, in keeping with Cabré’s overall interpretation of the *sirventes*, would understand the *jorn pretentori* not (or not so much) to refer to death of the individual or Judgment Day, but the day of reckoning looming in the Holy Land as Christianity is faced with imminent annihilation by the Turks. Instead of putting up a fight, the troubadour would be saying, some people do deals or enter into fraudulent negotiations, for this is what their enemies are like. This avoids the problem of glossing *tal*, and anticipates neatly the allusions to piracy in stanza V. Those who are prepared to barter with their enemies behave just like them and by implication are therefore no better than they: it is preferable to set out on crusade with the king and give the Turks a definitive thrashing (*tondre* literally “shave, fleece”).

In 3 Riquer and Coromines emend to *quer[r]a*, but the future form *quera* is attested in BdT 323,9, 57–58, ed. A. FRATTA. *Peire d’Alvernhe*, *Poesie*, Manziana 1996, 6: «*Peire d’Alvergnat mot qera / qi acoint tos us a concas*» («cercherà») and corroborated by numerous examples on COM of *querai*: for example *Jaufre* 579-81: «*Seiner, si vos platz, non ferai, / tro que-l primier don que-us querai, / auzen totz, me sia autreiatz*», 6564-66: «*Mas ja enjan ni tracion / no-m perdonetz, ni-us o querai, / que voluntiers m’en defendrai*». It is tempting to emend *quera* to *quer a[r]*.

For the form *mel* see Coromines' note to this line, pp. 125-26: since it is found elsewhere in the MS his emendation to *melf[s]* seems unnecessary, although it is true that *meyls* appears in line 41.

In 5 Coromines and Cabré understand *mans as* = *mant*s: «amb l'aiuda de bastants aliats, esperança que fou decebeuda» (p. 125). While this interpretation is perfectly possible, so is that of *mans* = "summonses, commands": Cerverí may be urging James to reinforce any crusading pledge by summoning his barons to assist him. Compare BdT 293,1, 26-27: «Ay! mala fos reys Lozoïc, / que fai los mans e los prezicx / per que-l dols m'es el cor intratz!» (ed. S. GAUNT – R. HARVEY – L. PATERSON, with J. Marshall as philological adviser, *Marcabru: a Critical Edition*, Cambridge 2000, I); *Aigar et Maurin*, 1001-2: «E quant ores que trametra sos mans / Per ajustar los Ingleis abs Normans» (ed. A. BROSSMER, *Aigar et Maurin*, Erlangen 1902); *Crotzada*, 185.62: «e tramet en Proensa sos sagels e sos mans» (MARTIN-CHABOT, *Chanson de la Croisade* cit.). It may be worth noting that in January 1273 the king summoned all his *ricos hombres* of Aragon and Catalonia to come and carry out *las Cauallerias* fourteen days after Easter, and that the viscount of Cardona disobeyed (Cf. ZURITA, *Anales de la corona* cit., I, 204v).

6 MS *lo*: Perugi prints *que-s plevisca / pe-llo de Deu cobrar*, «di riscattare quello che è di Dio»; Coromines' correction is clearly what is required.

7 Correction to *seynoriu* is required for both grammar and rhyme.

8 Riquer translates *layc*, oddly, as «los clérigos»; Coromines takes it as a semantic inversion whose «malícia» Riquer did not quite understand.

Cabré translates «que fa semblar ximples els laics» but interprets «que pren els laics per ximples» (no note), which is not quite the same thing. Cerverí's expression is of course elliptical. Perhaps the sense is that the laymen look like fools for trusting Rome to collaborate in good faith, when instead it behaves with astonishing arrogance.

9 I follow Coromines' correction (also Perugi) to *no-m*; he found no example of this verb being intransitive, and the only one on COM is: «Anc ne covent a torar, / tant l'avian tirat, alongat» (*Traductions de l'Évangile de l'enfance*, ed. K. BARTSCH, *Denkmäler der provenzalischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1856, p. 304, 29-30), where the sense is "There was (correct to *venc*?) no need to saw", in the context of carpentry. Riquer and Cabré retain the MS reading, translating «que per poco se me parte el corazón» (Riquer, loosely) and «que per poc no em trencó pel cor» (Cabré). I take the text to mean literally "I am almost cutting / sawing myself through the heart".

12 Riquer prints *-l anel*, hypometrically; Coromines *e anel*. He comments that the MS clearly shows that the scribe initially wrote *e*, then went to blot it out and wrote *lanel*: there are therefore two consecutive MS readings, with the first looking correct in the context. He defends the hiatus in *e anel* as being not so much a true hiatus as a question of pronunciation (p. 126), arguing that the *e* may have been pronounced *i* as in 15th-c. and modern Catalan examples. Cabré sees the ring as a symbol not of earthly riches but of nobility, or, possibly, royalty. In view of the repetition of *anel* at the rhyme in 12 and 20 (though 20 may require emendation,

see the note below), the puzzling nature of the “ring” here, not to mention the apparent hiatus, I conjecture that the text may originally have read *lencel* or *lancel*, an unusual form of *lensol*, “shroud, clinen cloth”: compare «*il viron quez en miej del sol / era·l suzaris e·ilh lensol / on fo le corss envolopatz / quant el monumen fo pauzatz*», in RICKETTS, *Le «Breviari d’amor» de Matfre Ermengaud* cit., IV, 24997-25000. Levy (PSW, IV, 367-368) gives an example of *linseu* from the *Hist. sainte béarn*. II, 112, 8, commenting «Ist nicht *linsou* zu andern? Mistral verzeichnet zwar auch *lencieu*, *lenceu* (d.), aber ist die Form in einem bearn. Text zulässig?». FEW, V, 366 s. v. LINTEOLUM «kleines stück leinwand», cites OF *lincel* (12th-14th c.), Spanish *lenzuelo* and Old Aragonese *lançuele*.

14 Riquer and Perugi take *tartz* to mean “Tartars”, though this form is otherwise undocumented in this sense; from a linguistic point of view the word for this should be bisyllabic (*tartars* in Occitan and Catalan, *tartres* in OF). It would also be quite inappropriate for a dating of 1269 or later given that James was in alliance with the Tartars against the Turks (though conceivably it might fit with an earlier dating of c. 1265, which however the weight of evidence is against: see the main discussion above). Coromines first suggested the sense “laggards, foot-draggers” («*avergonyir els lents, els tardans*»), referring to those Christians who impede the undertaking of the crusades. Cabré’s clever interpretation shows them to be those kings and others who, in 1274, are slow to support James’s crusade at the Council of Lyon.

15-16 The subject of the verb here must be the Christian’s enemies overseas.

19 *no·l*: Coromines takes the pronoun to refer back to the previous stanza, Perugi and Cabré, as anticipating what follows.

19-21 These lines have caused editors considerable difficulty. Riquer prints *no volc nuls reys abquer dins son armari / anel / dolat ne aur ne argen [que] no·l partischa*, translating *abquer* as «encerrar», which is pure guesswork. He emends *dolays* to *dolat* and translates «anillos tallados», thinking of the cutting of gemstones, but this is paleographically implausible, and it is hard to see how a ring, as opposed to a gem, can be «cut»; he also generates a hypermetric line. Coromines objects that *dolar* refers to wood, not gemstones. He sees the difficulty as lying in *anel*, which he emends to *anyel* to avoid repetition of the rhyme-word (but see the note to 12), seeing the latter as a type of coin with an image of a lamb stamped on it. He prints *an<y>el, / d’o<n> lays ne aur, ne argén, no·l partischa*, «del qual deixi que no parteixi (deixi sense repartir) l’or o l’argent» (i.e. «of which he fails not (?) to share the gold or silver»): a dizzying accumulation of negatives. Perugi (p. 60) prints *anel- / do·l ays*, translating 16-21 as «Sin dal tempo di Tristano e di Florio nessun re di nome – pur quanto ora nel suo forziere spirino i venti dell’afflizione – non volle oro né argento se non per distribuirlo», with an unconvincing long note; as Cabré remarks, it is over-complicated, and Perugi himself admits to considerable hesitation. As Cabré states, none of these explanations is entirely satisfactory. She retains Coromines’ emendation to avoid repetition of the rhyme-word (her text *aynel* rather than *anyel* is no doubt a misprint) and thinks this probably refers to an unknown coin (the one

identified by Coromines was not minted until 1311) and *dolays* some other precious item, or a coin (a form of *dobla*?), or an adjective qualifying *anyel*. But if this is so the *s* ending is puzzling, given that there is no inflection marker elsewhere in these lines; moreover no editor has explained the indicative in *ab qu'er*, despite concessive *ab que* invariably requiring the subjunctive.

I conjecture hesitantly that the abbreviated word *q'* in the MS masks a noun *quart/cart*, attested by DCVB, IX, 20 s.v. *quart*, 8, and by LR, V, 5, in a 15th-c. source, as a type of coin, and that *dolays* is a scribal error for *balays*, a balas-ruby, 'a delicate rose-red variety of the spinel ruby' taking its name from the Persian location where it is found, Badakhshan near Samarcand (SOED, s.v. *balas*): compare LR, II, 171, *balach*, *balays*, «balais, diamant»; PD «rubis balais», Niermeyer s.v. *balascus*; BdT 167, 29, 68-71 (Gaucelm Faidit, ed. Mouzat, XXVI), *a N'Agout mon seignor / sobr' atretant e mais / cum a mais de valor / d'un veir' us rics balais!*, and *Palaytz de Savieza*, ed. K. BARTSCH, *Denkmäler der provenzalischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1856, p. 59, vv. 4-5: *Sa rauba fo partida, be larc teza, / balagtz robis no si fan de beleza*. I cannot say whether the origin of the word explains the -s ending.

I take *.l* in 19 to be pleonastic, anticipating what follows: see JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., § 360. According to P. SKÅRUP, *Morphologie élémentaire de l'ancien occitan*, 2 vols, Aarhus 1990, II, p. 48: *partir* almost never takes the inchoative flexional suffix *-iss/-isc-*, though there are a few other examples on COM.

24 Cerverí may be playing on different senses of *pretz* here – as elsewhere in the piece.

25–32 Cabré sees Cerverí's vehement attacks on the *croy baron* as referring to those revolting against the king, which James describes in detail in his *Llibre* (ch. 543-550). On his return from the council of Lyon he is dealing with a serious conflict with noblemen led by Ramon de Cardona, and Cabré argues that there can hardly be any doubt that Cerverí's references to wicked barons must refer to them in particular. She suggests various reasons for his allegations of wickedness on their part, including an alliance with James's enemy Charles of Anjou against their natural lord. In chapter 550 James refers to his summary execution by drowning of Ferran Sanxic, one of his illegitimate sons and head of rebellious nobles, who had already appeared in previous chapters as the main reason or excuse of the nobles for not reaching an accord with the king: they had said they would not respond to the king's demand until he restored to Ferran Sanxic all that the Infant En Pere had stolen from him. Ferran Sanxic had a pact with Ramon de Cardona and the rebel barons. He had been to Acre during the 1269 expedition, and on the way back he was taken hostage by Charles with whom he then established an alliance. According to the chronicler Desclot (CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo*» cit., p. 459; Desclot, *Llibre del rei en Pere* cit., ch. 68), Ferran Sanxic and his father-in-law Eiximèn d'Urrea went to talk to Charles as the Infant Peter's greatest enemy. Charles received them lavishly and did a deal with them to murder Peter and make Ferran Sanxis king of Aragon. So from the point of view of the entourage of Peter the Great (Pere el Gran), Ferran Sanxic could be described as a crusading noble who is profiting from the expedition

to involve himself in fraudulent negotiations (*baratz*, 3). Descloit describes this episode as an element justifying Ferran Sanxic's execution, and goes on to speak of hostility of nobles against Peter, because he was unwilling to tolerate the wicked acts the knights were carrying out in the land, killing and blinding the people of the land and robbing on the highways: a picture, Cabré suggests, of the wicked *barons al som ... de vils faits* (26-27).

29 The dictionaries gives *enfortir* as transitive only (*enfortischa* in this line is the only example on COM of a verb form relating to *enfortimens*).

30 Riquer and Cabré leave the line hypometric; Coromines emends to *puschan-ne*, Perugi *puschan e*, suggestions which produce a weak syllable at the caesura, by contrast with all the other decasyllables of the piece.

31 Perugi and Cabré leave MS *usquetz* unemended.

33 Riquer translates *so* in 33 as "esto"; as Coromines argues, the internal rhyme requires closed *o*, which excludes the pronoun; so it must therefore be a variant graphy of *son*, and *temon* requires emendation.

34-37 Riquer translates 34-37 conjecturally. For 34-35 he gives «pues veo uno que ha adquirido el mérito que se suele ver en los corsarios (?)»; Perugi prints *c'uncom* but leaves a dotted line in the translation; Coromines, whose punctuation I follow, interprets «perquè un que hom / veu que ha posat pres a Mèrit, tal com sol veure-ho fer a un corsari (que tracta les seves víctimes, tenint-les preses, captives)»; Cabré, with similar punctuation, translates 34-35 as «perquè hom en veu un que ha obtingut recompenses, tal com se sol veure (que fa) el corsari», commenting that *pretz* here has the sense of «paiement, rémunération, argent» (see PD). While this is likely to be the primary sense – see the General note above for the discussion of piracy – wordplay should not necessarily be ruled out, with the secondary sense (as Coromines suggested) being that in a kind of psychomachia someone has taken prisoner through piracy merit or reputation personified: compare the siege of *proeza* in *Marcabru* IX (ed. GAUNT – HARVEY – PATERSON, *Marcabru* cit.).

Coromines explains the repetition of *c' = que* in 34 and 36 as a common feature of Catalan in cases of parenthetic speech.

What is the function of *y* in 37? Riquer and Cabré take the line simply to mean that all rich noblemen wriggle out of giving their wealth away (Riquer «No veo ni un solo rico que no sea pronto en escaparse de dar»; Perugi, «non vedo un potente che, in grado di donare, non accampì scuse»; Cabré «que no vey cap ric que ràpidament no eviti de donar»). Coromines links *y* to the mention of purgatory in 33: «car veig que, l'estament, / no hi ha ni un ric que del donar no s'hi refugii (a l'excusa del purgatori, amb el pretext que fa moltes caritats per escapar-se d'anar-hi)». Tempting though this is, at a time when redemption of crusading vows through money payments was a lively issue, it seems clear from the following lines that this is about avarice, not using money to get out of time in purgatory, so 33 must simply mean that the rich seem to have forgotten about what awaits them in purgatory or worse. In this case *y* must simply refer back to *de dar*.

38 Perugi thought this line was probably hypometric since a hiatus at the caesura seemed to him unlikely.

39-40 *tam fort m'esquiva*: Riquer «lo que tanto me desagrada», Coromines «em revolta tan fortament». Although PD gives only «éviter; refuser; défendre, prohiber; empêcher; éloigner; blâmer», compare *esquiu*, with the senses *inter alia* of «désagréable, rebutant». Coromines suggests in a note (p. 128, n. 13) that the poet's threat to drown himself in 40 produces a rare and somewhat shocking expression, and a small emendation, of *no·m* to *om*, would give the sense «(em revolta) que a l'humil (el petit) hom sempre (li) negui (allò que demana)». While complaints of avarice towards poor supplicants on the part of the rich are commonplace in troubadour poetry, the historical context adduced by Cabré suggests that this is not the issue here, but rather the failure of rulers to support the crusade, and the behaviour of the *croy baron* (25). The rhyme-word *respondre* anticipates an equivocal comment in 41 about viscount Ramon de Cardona, leader of the king's rebellious barons: see the next note.

41-43 Viscount Ramon Folc V of Cardona (1241-1276), a member of one of the wealthier and more powerful families of the Catalan nobility, was one of Cerverí's two major patrons, the other being James the Conqueror's eldest son Pere, the Infant and then King Peter the Great. Relations between the viscount and the king of Aragon were unstable, Ramon on several occasions actively promoting rebellions on the part of the nobility against the Crown, especially in 1259 and, most pertinently here, 1274 (M. CABRÉ, *Cerverí de Girona and his Poetic Traditions*, London 1999, pp. 2-5). Cabré argues persuasively that the «poor state of relations between Ramon de Cardona and the king of Aragon suggests that Cerverí's link with the House of Cardona must have begun earlier than his service to the royal family, because it would be unlikely for a troubadour already in the king's service to take simultaneously a rebel viscount as his second patron». Cerverí was critical of Ramon's conflicts with the Crown, generally indirectly through blame of the conduct of other specific noblemen; but «despite the confrontation between his two patrons there were periods of cooperation and Cerverí's double loyalty does not seem to have been totally untenable. Cerverí always showed his affection for Ramon de Cardona». Given this background to their relations, and if Cabré's interpretation of the historical circumstances to the *sirventes*, in which the viscount is in open revolt against the king, is correct, it is unlikely that the *tornada* represents unqualified praise of the Cardones; on the other hand it is not necessarily entirely censorious either.

As Cabré, I understand the statement in 41 to mean that Cerverí is praising the viscount's ability to give a skilful answer: an equivocal comment in the context of contemporary events. Cabré has pointed out that one of James of Aragon's complaints of the disloyal or irregular conduct of the rebellious nobles was avarice: after negotiations between them broke down in March 1274, the nobles refused to pay their part of expenses; Ramon de Cardona, who was James's principal adversary in 1274, wrote in his reply to James's request that he was not obliged to follow the

king or attend *Corts convocades* outside Catalonia, but that he would go «per gràcia e per amor de vós, con agégessem guanyat que no us en fóssem tenguts per deute» which, she suggests, might well justify Cerverí marking him as clever in his responses (CABRÉ, «*En breu sazo*» cit., pp. 457-58).

Cabré translates *lest* (42) as «selecte» and comments in her note that the word has been interpreted as «llest» (Perugi) or «llegit» (Coromines), while DCVB s.v. *llest* gives the meaning “selecte, legitim”, confirmed by LR, IV, 40 for medieval Catalan. It is certainly hard to see how it can be a past participle of *legir*. She translates *valor esforciva* as «valor esforçat [strong, tough]» (Riquer «esforzado valor», Perugi «forza e valore»). While these adjectives can be taken as bestowing praise, equivocation again seems a possibility: does *pretz*, played on throughout the *sirventes*, mean “merit” or “reputation” or “price”, and could *lest* be ironic? The phrase *valor esforciva*, repeating that used of the king in 23, could also mean “martial valour”, or even “the worth of force” (see PD *esforciu* «qui fait des efforts, zélé; violent», *esforcivamen* «fortement; à main armée», *esfortz* «... force, armée»). I am inclined to see it as an example of the troubadour’s wit, subtlety, and adroitness in diplomacy: wryly offering both praise and criticism at the same time.

Coromines regards it as indispensable to change the word order in 41, for the sense and to avoid hiatus: *sab be meyls en r*. The only analogous example I can find is *E per aisso dey m'en miels esforssar*, BdT 248,88, 17, Guiraut Riquier, ed. U. MÖLK, *Guiraut Riquier. Las cansos*, Heidelberg 1962, poem XXVII, where *en* clearly means “concerning this” rather than being part of an adverbial phrase *en meyls*, otherwise unattested, as far as I can see, in the dictionaries or on COM. Cabré does not emend, and translates «El cardonenc sap com respondre al bé amb millor», though *be* is surely an adverb, not a noun. The syntax gives literally «well knows how to respond as the better one», in other words excels at outdoing his opponent in an argument.

Cabré translates *anech* (43) as «va anar», though it must be a preterite (Riquer «fué»). The reference to schools suggests praise for Ramon de Cardona’s education, but the *-n* implies «the schools of *pretz* and *valor esforciva*, again with the possibility of equivocation.

44 Coromines notes that Cerverí rhymes *-etz* here with *-est* («Per aquesta rima veiem que admetia Cerverí ocasionalment la pronúncia descuidada de *lest* ‘llegit’ i *quest*, amb omissió vulgar de la *-t*, i així els apareia en rima amb *-pretz* (*Sobrepretz*), ja pronunciat llavors amb *-s* en molts parlars occitans» (p. 128).

6. BdT 206,4 (*Seinhos, aujas*, here p. 250)

MANUSCRIPT

f 11r-v (13 old numbering; *daspol*). The MS is difficult to read in parts and has some superfluous abbreviation marks. The last four lines appear as part of stanza IX, but the rhymes show them to be a second *tornada*.

CRITICAL EDITIONS

P. MEYER, *Les derniers troubadours de Provence*, Paris 1871, p. 43; RIQUER, *Los trovadores* cit., III, p. 1520 (Meyer's text); PADEN, *The Poems of the troubadours Guilhem d'Autpol and «Daspol»* cit., p. 436.

REJECTED READINGS

1 *sens*, 4 *es* ***ntorn* with a vertical line, apparently an abbreviation sign, above 't', 5 *edir* (?) *edir* with the first 'edir' possibly struck through; Paden reads 'e det e dir (det expunctuated)', 7 *claman*] *deman*, 8 *clesia*, 15 *recrezens*, 17 [so also 33, 49] *begins* with 'Daspol' (-2), 19 *possesions* with a mark above the first 'o', 25 *seinher* with *titulus* above 2nd 'e', 26 *estag unclear*, 27 *queus*, 28 *eient* with the first letter badly formed, 35 *quel*, 36 *linhage* with *titulus* above 'ha', 43 *sal*, 56 *naura* apparently corrected, and difficult to read, 60 *ques laisal*, *maleza* crossed out before 'uileza', 65 the 'e' of 'santeza' carelessly formed

VERSIFICATION

Frank 295:5, a10 b10' a10 b10' b10' a10 a10 b10', a: *an, en, os, al*, b: *eza, ura, atge, eza*; eight *coblas doblas* with two four-line *tornadas*. The piece is modelled on a *canço* of Peirol, BdT 366,4, with which it shares the metrical shape (as do three other pieces) and some of the rhyme-endings (*en, os, eza, atge*).

NOTES

I do not normally correct for inflexion but do usually correct for rhyme: see HARVEY – PATERSON, *The Troubadour "Tensos"* cit., pp. XXII-XXVI. I have adopted a somewhat more idiomatic translation than Paden (who chooses to match his closely and line by line to the text), particularly in the dialogue, since the tone seems to be a comic mixture of the formal and colloquial.

1 Paden retains MS *sens* as an «imperfect rhyme», also found in 15 (*recrezens*). Meyer (also Riquer) corrected to *sen*. I take *sens* and *recrezens* to be scribal errors.

4 Meyer printed *Es [a l'] entorn si sarial c.* (also Riquer, with *saria-l*), Paden *es entorn*. The MS is unclear here.

MS *sarial compainhia* can hardly be «estaba el acompañamiento» (Riquer), as the *l* immediately preceding the last word must be an object pronoun referring to God. Paden suggests that *saria* may be an imperfect form of *serrar*, *sarrar* (see PD), and translates «and his companions pressed around him». The graphy *sarar* has some slight support in a single 14th-c. source in PSW, VII, 615, 5, and FEW, XI, 501, 3 «zusammendrücken, pressen», including 15th c. *sarar* «serrer (la main)». Paden's other suggestions (a variant of *sezia*, with alternation of *z* and *r* and opening of *e* > *a* under the influence of the *r*, for which however he has no supporting evidence in the form of similar variants of *sezer*; or «an unusual imperfect form of *eser*, a blend of dialectal *èria* and the sigmatic stem *se-* (RONJAT 1930-41, § 639, attested in Limousin)», suggested by H.-E. Keller in a private communication to Paden)

are not very convincing. Paden apparently takes *si* as a reflexive pronoun, but this would disrupt the caesura, which otherwise occurs throughout the piece after the fourth syllable. Meyer's emendation would require the imperfect verb *saria* to be bisyllabic, which is surely impossible. I therefore take *si* to be an adverb of place, and the verb to be intransitive.

5 Literally "the grievance He was holding with respect to"; Paden «the complaint He was making». The context implies that *clamor* here has quasi-legal overtones; compare PD *clama* «plainte en justice», *clamada* «accusée», and associated entries.

6 Meyer (also Riquer) emend to *De c.*; it is more likely that an *s* has been omitted rather than an *l* added.

7-8 The subjunctive *deman* is puzzling. Paden explains it as being under influence from *clamor* 5. JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., § 841 and *Syntaxe* cit., § 587 comments that «Governing expressions of emotion are usually followed by the indicative, the emphasis being placed on the factual aspect of a happening»; compare § 1064. JENSEN, *Syntaxe* cit., § 589 notes that expressions implying a subjective judgment govern the subjunctive, but not following *car*. If the singular verb *deman* is correct, its subject, *comte ni duc* etc., appears to be a list of singular nouns without the flexional indicator -s, the verb agreeing, as is common, with the first noun. However, it seems more likely that *deman* is a scribal error for *claman*, paleographically (and rhetorically) explicable, and compare BdT 312,1, 8: «*ans clamara-y mentr'el cors aia vida*» (see above).

Meyer, followed by Riquer, read *monument*, wrongly.

The correction to MS *clesia* is Meyer's.

9 For the quasi-legal nuance of *respos* here (Paden «answered») compare FEW, X, I.1.b, French «raisonner, parler ou écrire pour réfuter», TL, VIII, 1065 «vor Gericht Rede stehen, sich rechtfertigen», DCVB, XI, 417, 3, intr. «Parlar defensan-se contra alguna cosa (imputació, acusació, objecció, argument) que ha estat dita abans».

sapchament is otherwise unattested in the dictionaries and COM.

10 Riquer «y tomáis mal camino», though I have found no example of *autre* in this sense; *prendes* must be a 2 p. pl. imperative (compare the form of *aves* here and *vos donas* in the following line).

16 I have translated idiomatically: Daspol is imagining the slackers' feeble response to calls to arms.

17 God appears to have accepted the speaker's refutation of His original position.

19 Riquer *possessions*, wrongly.

20 For *de tems* PD and PSW, VIII, 128, 17 give «bientôt?» on the basis of this sole example; COM offers no analogies. It is hard to see what else it could mean.

23 Meyer and Riquer emend to *auuit*.

24 Paden «so dishonoured and ashamed that», though it is unclear why shame should cause damnation.

26 Meyer (followed by Riquer) read *estas*, though the somewhat unclear word in the MS ends in -g. Paden accepts it as 2 pl. of *estar*, normally *estatz*: «The final -g apparently represents the dental affricative [ts]. Grafström (1958:185) interprets the same graphy in the charters as normally representing [ty] or the palatal affricate, but asks if it might not also represent the dental affricate». F. ZUFFEREY, *Recherches linguistiques sur les chansonniers provençaux*, Genève 1987, p. 213, § 14.c gives the 2 p. pl. endings in this MS as -tz, -ts, -s, more rarely -z, and other forms, but does not mention -g. The sense nonetheless seems uncontroversial.

28 Paden's note refers to PD «bien que» for *que*, though he translates it as a relative pronoun («who»).

29 Meyer takes *nos* to be *no nos*.

32 Riquer translates «no sé de qué nos reprocháis», wrongly; Paden «that I don't know why we should cause you grief». The word *rancura* has a quasi-legal sense of “complaint” or “accusation”. Although it is unclear that *de que* can mean “why” rather than “of / about what”, this does seem to be the required sense. The implied subject of the 1 p. pl. verb *fassam* is presumably the Christians God was accusing of disloyalty in 6-8, with Daspol as their spokesman.

35 Correction Meyer.

37-40 Meyer suggests that 39 is corrupt; Riquer places a semi-colon after 38 and translates 39-40 as «y si mueren cuando se han afanado en ello, nadie tiene en consideración aquel viaje», which ignores the *e* at the beginning of 40 and makes no sense. Paden, who rightly sees *e* in 40 as adversative, translates «each one would be glad [to make] the journey, / if they remembered my blood, which I have spilled; / and these men [i.e., crusaders] die when thus they are put to the test, / but no one [else] has a care for that voyage», commenting in the note: «if *sil* (masculine nom. pl. of the demonstrative pronoun *cel*) refers to those who do go on crusade, “Crusaders die, but no one else cares to go”; or, reading *s'il*, “If they (prelates, etc., who should go on crusade but fail to do so) die here, then no one cares”». It is hard to see how the second of these suggestions can match up with the text («and if they [the prelates etc] die when they [the crusaders??] have been put to the test / have so suffered / have taken such pains, and / but no-one cares about that journey». But the first suggestion is not wholly satisfactory either, because it entails glossing over a slippage from the princes etc who do not go on crusade to crusaders in general who have gone, and moreover how would the simple stress on the death of crusaders here be a persuasive argument to the princes to join the crusade? It seems that *e si* in 39 must have the force of “even if”: if the princes etc. were to remember God's crucifixion and think of the blood He had spilled for humankind, they would eagerly join the crusade, even if they were to die at the end of the hardships it entailed. The tense sequence *condit. II + pres. ind. fora–moran* can be explained by A. J. HENRICHSSEN, *Les phrases hypothétiques en Ancien Occitan. Étude syntaxique*, Bergen 1955, pp. 86-88, on the type of hypothetical sentence *fas / farias*: «Evidemment l'emploi du présent rend la condition plus proche de la réalité; par conséquent il devrait s'employer là où les chances pour qu'elle se réalise sont grandes». This is apt in the context

here, and moreover there is a temporal difference between the idea of people calling something to mind before deciding to go on crusade, and the idea of dying as a future consequence of it. More problematic is Jensen's categorical statement (JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., § 1028 and *Syntaxe* cit., § 763) that the Latin concessive conjunctions *etsi* and others all disappeared and new ones took their place. I cannot supply another secure example of *e si* "even if"; clearly *si* alone can have this sense (see PSW, VII, 642-643, under *si* 3 and 4, «wengleich, wenn auch, obgleich», «und wenn auch, selbst wenn»), but Levy's examples here do not offer unequivocal support for *e* in the collocation meaning anything other than "and". But see, perhaps, p. 645: «Auch *e si* *doncs non?*», under 10: *si doncs non*, «wenn nicht etwa», where Levy cites the *Leys d'Amors* I, 342: «*Et en cas que aytal bordo passesso .viii. sillabas, seria irregulars aytals dansa, anormals e for a son propri compas, e si donx li rim no seran (cor. s'eran?) multiplicatiu*, Gatien-Arnould «à moins pourtant que les rimes ne fussent multiples». Oder soll man das *e* vor *si* tilgen?». The force of *e* here and in our piece would seem to be emphatic, since *e* alone can have concessive force (see JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., § 1075). Compare JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., § 1074, where he discusses «*e* followed by a concessively colored *si* or *pois*. Such groupings, the equivalent more or less of "and yet", may not rate as fully-fledged subordinating conjunctions, although they are tantamount in value to "even though"; they represent a stage in an evolution that may eventually lead to the formation of new conjunctions». His examples are however restricted to the tense sequence pres. ind. + pres. ind.

41 For the use of the future anterior in contexts calling for a past indefinite, especially in the context of repetition, duration or intensity, see JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., § 810 and 1994, § 559. Paden «very well have you spoken», though *ben* here seems to qualify *mot*. The point is that God talks a lot but does nothing.

45 Riquer rightly corrected Meyer's *a rage*.

49 For scansion *Temple e* must elide.

50 Meyer (also Riquer) emends to *comensatz*, but the scribe consistently spells the 2 p. pl. with *-as* in this piece, so I leave the past participle as it is here; compare ZUFFEREY, *Recherches* cit., p. 213, § 14.c.

53 Meyer (also Riquer) emends to *tut, plen*; also to *tut* in 63 and 64.

54 Paden «and they don't want to think of another day's light», citing PD «*lumière du jour or travail d'un jour*».

55 Riquer simply translates MS *camiar cambras hostal* as «*cambiar de albergue*». The scribe has elided the last two words (= *cambra es hostal*); Paden prefers to correct to *cambr'es hostal*. For *es* as a form of *e* before a vowel, see PD and Paden's note.

57-58 Although the dictionaries give the sense of *emplir* simply as "fill" (PD «*remplir*»), here it must be the equivalent of *ademplir*, PD «*accomplir, achever*». Paden translates «*fulfill your royal glory*», though it is unclear what this means. Daspol's remark is no doubt humorous, reducing God to the level of an ordinary man who, if he only tried, could attain the glory of a king – something rather less than that of a divinity!

Meyer prints *s'esquiva ses*. The sense of *esquivar* here is not "avoid" (Paden; Riquer «esquivarais») but "prohibit, prevent": see PSW, III, 4-5. God is not being accused of being base, but of not putting a stop to baseness in humans – which, Daspol implies, He could easily do given His omnipotence; compare stanza VI.

60 Corrections Meyer.

61 Meyer (also Riquer) reads *epueis*.

62 Paden «grant us just this, that we may all be equal». I take Daspol to be asking God to even the stakes in power and wealth.

63-64 MS *seran* creates an awkward switch from first to third person, and is likely to be an error arising from a misinterpreted titulus in a previous exemplar.

The epithets *fin* and *natural* have a broad extension: Daspol seems to be playing on the idea of nobility of both conduct and status. Riquer translates «leales y sinceros»; Paden «and once we are all faithful and true, / each one will want to give thought to his nobility». I take Daspol's comment to be sarcastic, at least on one level.

65 Paden notes the rarity of the 1 p. sg. pret. form *-it*.

69 Riquer *pair'e e fil*, mistakenly. Daspol may mean this line both in the abstract and in reference to James I's dynasty: he was son of Peter II of Aragon and father of the Infant Peter who would become Peter III.

71-72 For the translation of *franqueza* see G. M. CROPP, *Le Vocabulaire courtois des troubadours de l'époque classique*, Paris 1975, pp. 83-88, especially p. 85, where she stresses that «generous, sincere, affable» are secondary, context-dependent senses.

Riquer translates «os explico mi sueño, señor, y, si Dios os protege, con vuestra franqueza lo llevaréis derechamente a término», an approximation that slips over the syntactic difficulties; he suggests that the syntax is corrupt in 72. Paden emends MS *quel* to *que*: «so you will lead aright your noble life», or «that you [may] bring your nobility to a good end». He comments that *menares* is apparently future indicative, although the subjunctive is the norm in clauses of purpose (JENSEN, *The Syntax* cit., §§ 296-97 and *Syntaxe* cit., §§ 613-614), and that this form could possibly be regarded as an example of the extremely rare future subjunctive, as in Spanish *vosotros amareis*, stressed *amáreis*. A simpler solution is to take the future form at face value, as well as retaining the pronoun, which I have taken to be an indirect object referring to God rather than the dream, though either would seem possible. The sense is then not (ostensibly at any rate) an exhortation to, but praise of, the king.

LINDA PATERSON
University of Warwick
linda.frac@gmail.com

Riassunto

Anche un noto *conquistador* iberico, Giacomo I re d'Aragona, volle porsi a capo di una crociata in Terrasanta. La sua potenziale o fattiva partecipazione alla missione in Oriente fu al centro di una serie di sei canzoni trobadoriche, cinque delle quali sono qui presentate in una nuova edizione critica. Sono quelle di Bertran d'Alamano (BdT 76,8), Olivier lo Templier (BdT 312,1), Guillem de Mur (BdT 226,2), Cerverí de Girona (BdT 434a,20), Daspol (BdT 206,4) e l'anonima BdT 168,1a. Una riconsiderazione della loro cronologia e delle circostanze storiche della loro composizione ed esecuzione offre una nuova e più ampia comprensione dei testi e dei contesti: la conduzione della crociata di Luigi IX nel 1267-1268, le conseguenze del fallimento della crociata di Giacomo I nel 1269 e il secondo Concilio di Lione nel 1274.

A well-known *conquistador* of Iberian lands, King James I of Aragon also had ambitions to lead a crusade to the Holy Land. Secular responses to James's potential or actual participation in an oriental expedition include six troubadour songs, five here presented in new critical editions, by Bertran d'Alamano (BdT 76,8), Olivier lo Templier (BdT 312,1), Guillem de Mur (BdT 226,2), Cerverí de Girona (BdT 434a,20), Daspol (BdT 206,4), and an anonymous author (BdT 168,1a). A re-assessment of their chronology and the historical circumstances of their composition and performance offers a new and richer understanding of both the texts and their contexts: the lead-up to the crusade of Louis IX in 1267-1268, the aftermath of James's failed crusade of 1269, and the second Council of Lyon in 1274.

S O M M A R I O

SAGGI E MEMORIE

Saverio GUIDA, <i>Trovatori poco noti del Biterrese agli inizi del '200 (Berengier de Puysserguier, Ademar de Rocaficha, Peire de Pomairols)</i>	»	167
Linda PATERSON, <i>James the Conqueror, the Holy Land and the troubadours</i>	»	211
Paolo DI LUCA, <i>Le novas del manoscritto Didot</i>	»	287
Alessandro DE ANGELIS, <i>Un'etimologia di Boccaccio e il toponimo Faro "Stretto di Messina"</i>	»	313

NOTE E DISCUSSIONI

Luciano ROSSI, <i>Per Cercamon e i più antichi trovatori</i>	»	335
Riassunti	»	363
Norme per i collaboratori	»	367

CULTURA NEOLATINA

DIREZIONE SCIENTIFICA E REDAZIONE

Tutte le comunicazioni relative all'attività centrale della direzione scientifica e tutti i materiali (scritti da pubblicare, pubblicazioni da recensire, riviste inviate in scambio) dovranno essere indirizzati alla prof. Anna FERRARI, via della Mendola 190, 00135 ROMA, Tel. 06.3050772.

AMMINISTRAZIONE EDITORIALE

Per tutto quanto riguarda l'amministrazione (ordini e abbonamenti) rivolgersi a MUCCHI EDITORE, via Emilia est, 1527 – 41122 MODENA, Tel. 059.374094, Fax 059.282628, e-mail info@mucchieditore.it, web www.mucchieditore.it

Abbonamento annuale: Italia € 126,00 Estero € 180,00

Pre-stampa Mucchi Editore (MO), stampa GECA (MI). Annate arretrate (nei limiti della disponibilità)

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Modena - Periodico scientifico N. 334 dell'1/10/1957

Direttore responsabile Marco Mucchi
