
Linda Paterson

Austorc de Segret

[*No s]ai qui·m so tan suy [des]conoyoissens*
(*BdT* 41.1)

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

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

¹ Césaire Fabre, «Le sirventes d'Austorc de Segret», *Annales du Midi*, 22, 1910, pp. 467-481 and 23, 1911, pp. 56-69, 1910, pp. 475-476.

Agenais and the Quercy, and Jeanroy considered the whole piece likely to have been composed at the Gascon prince's request.²

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

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

² Alfred Jeanroy, «Sur le sirventés historique d'Austorc de Segret», *Annales du Midi*, 23, 1911, pp. 198-200.

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

⁴ Félix duc de La Salle de Rochemaure and René Lavaud, *Les troubadours cantaliens*, 2 vols, Aurillac 1910, II, p. 573; Carlos Alvar, *La poesía trovadoresca en España y Portugal*, Barcelona 1977, pp. 271-272; Martin Aurell, *La Vielle et l'épée. Troubadours et politique en Provence au XIII^e siècle*, Paris 1989, pp. 168-175.

⁵ A point emphasised by Fabre, «Le sirventes», 1911, p. 57.

⁶ Fabre, «Le sirventes», 1910, p. 479; Michael Prestwich, *Edward I*, London 1988, p. 83.

⁷ Noël Denholm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall*, Oxford 1947, pp. 150-151; John Robert Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, Cambridge 1994, p. 370.

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

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

⁸ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, p. 370; Dante, *Inferno*, Canto XII.

⁹ Asperti, *Carlo I*, p. 181; Giulio Bertoni, *I trovatori d'Italia*, Modena 1915, p. 31.

¹⁰ Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, p. 370.

¹¹ Jeanroy, «Sur le sirventès», pp. 199-200.

¹² Aurell, *La Vielle*, pp. 168-175, quotation from p. 168.

dead, noting that Cerveri de Girona, in his *sirventes* dedicated to the support of Henry of Castile, lambasts Charles of Anjou for allowing «s'anta e la mort de N'Anric» (16). Moreover, he argues, whether or not Edward was actually interested in avenging the death of this kinsman, the Catalan troubadour urges him to do so: «N'Audoart [...] / per terra venjara N'Anric». ¹³

Those supporting Jeanroy's hypothesis have no doubt been heavily influenced by these many references to the plight of Henry of Castile by other troubadours. But Austorc's lines «qu'era de sen e de saber ses par / e tot lo mielhs era de sos parens» (27-28) point conclusively towards Henry of Almain. Edward had been brought up with his cousin from childhood, supported him in his political struggles, and took the cross with him in 1268: to quote Michael Prestwich, «Henry of Almain, Edward's cousin and childhood companion, was clearly very close to him, and would undoubtedly have played a major part in Edward's career had it not been for his tragic murder at the hands of Guy de Montfort in 1271». ¹⁴ And not only was he one of Edward's kinsman: an English chronicle attributed to Thomas Wyke shows that he was well recognised as being the wisest among them: «qui caeteris sapientia praepollebat». After the death of Louis at Tunis, Edward and Henry sailed there on 3 October at the invitation of the young Philip III. «Finding nothing to be done in Africa they wintered in Sicily at Charles of Anjou's request, and here, in consequence probably of the official appeal of February 6th from England, Edward determined to send back Henry of Almain. Because "he was wiser than the others", Henry was chosen to go and arrange for the government of Gascony, proceeding thence to help Richard of Cornwall in England. Philip III was going home for his coronation and Charles of Anjou going to Viterbo to hurry up the work of the cardinals who had long been there in conclave». ¹⁵

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

¹⁴ Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 27, and see pp. 5-6, 25, 27-28, 31, 33, 41.

¹⁵ Denholm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall*, p. 150, citing *Chronicon vulgo dictum Chronicon Thomae Wykes*, Rolls Series, pp. 239-240 (*Rerum britannicarum medii aevi scriptores. Annales monastici*, 4 vols, IV), ed. Henry Richards Luard, London 1869. I am grateful to Valeria Bertolucci Pizzorusso for having spurred me to investigate further Austorc's reference to Henry's *sen e saber*.

Jeanroy's question presupposes that Charles of Anjou had a direct hand in the fate of *Haenric*, which was not the case with Henry of Almain. But the fact that those guilty of this Henry's murder are Charles's henchmen serves Austorc's purpose in inciting retaliatory violence against Charles himself and the French. Jeanroy's question is the wrong one: it is more relevant to ask which Henry was Edward more concerned to avenge, to which there is a clear answer in Edward's specific appeal to the pope. There is no evidence that Edward took any interest in the fate of Henry of Castile, any more than did Henry's own brother, King Alfonso X.¹⁶

*

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

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

¹⁶ Fabre, «Le sirventes», 1911, pp. 56-57.

¹⁷ See Guglielmo IX, *Poesie*, ed. Nicolò Pasero, Modena 1973, IV, p. 92; *The Life and Works of the Troubadour Raimbaut d'Orange*, ed. Walter T. Pattison, Minneapolis 1952, XXIV, p. 152; Sarah Kay, *Courtly Contradictions: The emergence of the literary object in the twelfth century*, Stanford, California 2001, pp. 336-337. It has not occurred to anyone hitherto to consider the present piece in this light.

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁸ *BdT* 40.1, 17-24, my edition forthcoming on *Rialto*.

¹⁹ *BdT* 439.1, 1-8, 17-18, 31-32, my edition forthcoming on *Rialto*.

Bel seinher Dieus, ben par qu'est poderos,
 qu'en luoc segur estag ez en autura.
 Per que-us pensas que·ns combatam per vos?
 Que sarazins onretz e jent tafura
 que no·s liaison fort castel ni clauzura,
 e·l bastiment volvon de sus en jos?
 [. . .]
 e pogras ben revenir sest damage
 s'al[s] Sarazins donases volontat
 cascus per si conoges son follage;
 pueis non calgra negus annar arage,
 pueis que cascus conogra sa foudat;
 car nos prendem mort per lur viell peccat –
 e vos es leu que·ns gites a carnage.²⁰

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

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

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

²⁰ See the edition of Linda Paterson, «James the Conqueror, the Holy Land and the troubadours», *Cultura neolatina*, 71, 2011, pp. 211-286, p. 250, lines 25-30 and 42-48. Compare also Guiraut Riquier, *Be-m degra de chantar tener* (*BdT* 248.17), lines 33-36 (ed. Monica Longobardi, *Rialto*, 16.xii.2002) in 1292, who expresses his fear of a double death: from the Saracens that threaten to overwhelm the Christians, and from God's indifference.

²¹ *PD marrir* «v. a. affliger, attrister; perdre; v. n. errer; s'égarer; être affligé; v. réfl. s'affliger; *marrit* égaré, errant; affligé, soucieux».

ter the word *esperitz*, given in *PD* as «esprit; âme; sentiments». Fabre translates «Je ne sais d'où est venu un tel esprit», which leaves the sense of the word vague: a state of mind, an atmosphere perhaps? In fact in the vast majority of the hundreds of examples of *esperitz* recorded on *COM 2*, the sense is «spirit» as in «Holy Spirit» or «evil spirit» or «soul», with a few figurative uses recorded in *LR*, for example *En l'esprit de suavetat. L'esperit de servitut*. The third sense given in *PD*, «sentiments», is supported by two examples in *SW*,²² though it is unclear what the sense «attitude» or «feelings» could refer to in the present context. Following on from the unspecified *diabls* of line 6, I suggest that *esperitz* means an evil spirit; and if *tals* anticipates the following lines – such a spirit that has given rise to the death of Louis and so many others – it also may be understood to refer back to the previous line and to Charles of Anjou, *caps e guitz* of all the heathen.²³ In other words, Austorc has exploited the tradition of the *devinalh* or riddle to imply the shocking identification of the Angevin king of Sicily, and Louis' own brother, as a very devil. Fabre argues that the troubadour calls Charles leader and guide of the pagans (13) for several reasons. Firstly, he had Moslem subjects in Sicily and Apulia. He had tried to expel the latter in 1268 under pressure from Clement IV, but Conradin's arrival in Italy had prevented him from following this up. Secondly, he had instigated the peace of Tunis, which obliged the king of Tunis to pay him tribute and tolerate Christian worship in his lands. In exchange for these payments Charles undertook to leave the Saracens of Tunis in peace and protect them. Finally he was a help to the pagans because his political ambitions in Sicily and Naples were distracting the Aragonese and Castilians from fighting them in Spain.²⁴

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

²³ For «evil spirit», see Marcabru, ed. Simon Gaunt, Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson, with John Marshall as philological adviser, *Marcabru: a Critical Edition*, Cambridge 2000, VIII, 8 and the note on p. 124.

²⁴ The crown prince of Aragon Peter, the future Peter III, had married Manfred's daughter Constance, who had claims to Sicily. Charles was proposing

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

a competitor to Alfonso for the office of Holy Roman Emperor in the person of the King of France (Philip III). See Jean Dunbabin, *Charles of Anjou. Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe*, London and New York 1998, pp. 99 and 137; William Chester Jordan, «The Capetians from the death of Philip II to Philip IV», in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. David Abulafia, Cambridge 1999, pp. 279-313 (pp. 299-300). Fabre also states that Alfonso of Castile was in conflict with the court of France concerning the royal children («les enfants de la Cerda»), though this would appear to have occurred only after the death of Henry III, king of Navarre and count of Champagne, in 1274, and conflict over the betrothal of his three-year-old daughter Joan: see Elizabeth M. Hallam, *Capetian France 987-1328*, London and New York 1980, pp. 276-277. Alessandro Barbero (*Il mito angioino nella cultura italiana e provenzale fra Duecento e Trecento*, Turin 1983, p. 80) declares that no-one before Austeric had dared to denounce Charles in such terms: not only was the king of Sicily not a dangerous enemy for the pagans, he had shown himself to be in complete agreement with them. Now the most prestigious king of Christendom, the only one entrusted with the protection of the Church, Charles reveals himself in the eyes of the dismayed troubadour to be on excellent terms with the pagans, and in the violence of Austeric's polemic he is denounced virtually as apostate: in him the pagans have their best protector! Pretending to be the defender of Christianity, Charles, and with him his nephew Philip the Bold, is in reality leading it to dishonour and ruin. Barbero argues that the great scandal of the Tunisian expedition was not so much the death of Louis, who had left amidst the consternation of his vassals who refused to accompany him, as the fact that the crusade had deviated from its proper objective, which Ghibelline chroniclers attributed to Charles's political objectives.

overcome his own rebellious subjects, having even been temporarily imprisoned by them, and almost as soon as he had disembarked in the Holy Land he had been wounded by a fanatic; moreover at the time of the *sirventes* he was risking losing his legitimate claims in Guyenne. He concluded that the *rey* has to refer to Charles of Anjou (pp. 198-199), and this identification has been accepted by all subsequent scholars. This still leaves the slight awkwardness that so far in the song the only king to have been referred to as *rey* apart from Louis is Philip, but at this time Philip is too young and inexperienced to be seen as a man of many martial conquests, nor did he ever achieve this, whereas Charles had seemed to succeed in all he set out to do. His present *abaissamens* then presumably refers to his part in the failure of the crusade. Perhaps Austorc was introducing another riddling element in this stanza, before answering it in lines 23-24, or perhaps it is simply that his audience would have understood that the only possible allusion was to the Angevin.

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

²⁵ Kay, *Courtly Contradictions*, p. 145.

Austorc de Segret
 [No s]ai qui.m so tan suy [des]conoyssens
 (BdT 41.1)

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

Editions: Carl Appel, *Provenzalische Inedita aus Pariser Handschriften*, Leipzig 1890, p. 14; Césaire Fabre, «Le sirventes d'Austorc de Segret», *Annales du Midi*, 22, 1910, pp. 467-481 and 23, 1911, pp. 56-69 (1910, p. 469) (on Appel); Félix duc de La Salle de Rochemaure and René Lavaud, *Les troubadours cantaliens*, 2 vols, Aurillac 1910, II, p. 572 (on Fabre, with misprints).

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

Author: Chabaneau and Fabre suggested identifying Austorc de Segret with an abbot from the Puy-en-Velay, *Austorgius abbas Secureti*, though this remains purely hypothetical, and why an abbot from the Velay should be concerned with the piece's content remains unexplained. See Camille Chabaneau, «Les biographies des troubadours en langue provençale», in *Histoire générale du Languedoc*, ed. Dom. Claude Devic and Dom. Joseph Vaissete, 15 vols, Toulouse 1872-1892, XV (1885), pp. 209-411, on p. 334, and Fabre, «Le sirventes», 1910, p. 468.

Date: The sirventes must date from after Louis IX's death at Tunis in 1270, and almost certainly after the assassination of Henry of Almain on 13 March 1271 (see above). If, as seems probable, Fabre's identification of Oth is right, it must have preceded the death of viscount Arnaud-Othon II of Lomagne in 1274. In 1271 Edward was on his way to the Holy Land, only returning in spring 1273. While the song might have immediately been provoked by Henry's murder, it seems more likely that it was composed in 1273 or the earlier part of 1274, when the English king went to Gascony to attempt to deal with the rebellious Gaston of Béarn (see Michael Prestwich, *Edward I*, London 1988, pp. 85 and 300).

- I [No s]ai qui·m so tan suy [des]conoyssens,
ni [say] don venh, ni sai [on] dey anar,
ni re [no] sai que·m dey di[re] ni far,
ni re no sai on fo mos nayssemens, 4
ni re no say tan fort suy esbaÿtz:
si Dieus nos a o diables marritz,
que Crestias e la ley vey perida,
e Sarrazis an trobada guandida. 8
- II Yeu vey gueritz los paguas mescrezens:
e·ls Sarrazis e·ls Turcx d'outra la mar,
e·ls Arabitz, que no·n cal un gardar
del rey Felips dont es grans marrimens, 12
ni d'en Karle, qu'elh lur es caps e guitz!
No sai dont es vengutz tals esperitz
que tanta gens n'es morta e perida,
e·l reys Loïx n'a perduda la vida. 16
- III Anc mais no vim del rey que fos perdens:
ans l'avem vist ab armas guazanhar
tot quant anc volc aver ni conquistar.
Mas eras l'es vengutz abaissamens, 20
et es ben dreitz quar es a Dieu falhitz:
qui falh a Dieu en remanh escarnitz,

I. I am at such a loss I cannot tell who I am, or where I come from, or where I ought to go, I know nothing of what I ought to say or do, or anything about my birth: I know nothing, I am so bewildered: God or a devil has so afflicted us that I see Christians and the Christian religion destroyed, and Saracens have found safe haven.

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

III. Never before have we seen the king [Charles] defeated: instead we have seen him win by force of arms all that he ever wished to own or conquer. But now he has been humbled, and this is right, because he has failed God:

- qu'anc mais no fo mas per Karl'escarnida
crestiantatz, ni pres tan gran falhida. 24
- IV Ar aura ops proez'et ardimens
a-n Audoart, si vol Haenric venjar,
qu'era de sen e de saber ses par,
e tot lo mielhs era de sos parens; 28
e si reman aras d'aisso aunitz,
no-l laissaran ni cima ni razitz
Frances de sai, ni forsa ben garnida
si sa valors es de pretz desgarnida. 32
- V Guerra mort sanglens
qu pogues escapar
. no conogues s
. mor et ab desca 36
. gra vezer e ca
e derrocar fortz castelhs ben bastitz,
e qu'om crides soven «a la guerida!»
a N'Audoart qu'a la patz envazida! 40
- VI Mosenher N'Oth, qu'es de donar razitz,
de Lomanha, e de pretz caps e guitz,
fatz assaber que Karles nos desguida,
e-l reys frances, don la gleyz'es aunida. 44

anyone who fails God ends up in ignominy, for never before, except through Charles, has Christendom been mocked or suffered such a failure.

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

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

VI. I let my lord Sir Othon of Lomagne, who is the root of gift-giving, and the captain and leader of merit, know that Charles is leading us off course, and so is the French king, which brings shame on the Church.

VII Mos sirventes, Cotellet, sia digz
 mos senhor N'Oth qu'es lauzatz e grazitz
 per los plus pros a sa valor grazida,
 e donar t'a rossin a la partida.

48

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

3. For the reflexive pronoun see Wallace S. Lipton, «Imposed Verb Pronominalization in Medieval French and Provençal», *Romance Philology*, 14, 1960-1961, pp. 111-137 (pp. 113-114).

8. Appel and Fabre regularise inflexions in 12, 28, 41.

9-11. For *e ... e* as 'both ... and' see Jensen 1986, § 989 and *SW*, II, 313, 9. Fabre (1910, p. 470, n. 2) comments that the division of *paguas mescrezens* into Saracens, Turks and Arabs is not new in the troubadours: Gavaudan localised Arabs in Spain and Morocco; Turks are mentioned in all poems concerning the eastern crusades, and it is almost the same for Saracens. He notes that Joinville calls Moslems of Damietta either Saracens or Turks, but that the Moslems of Barbarie he calls exclusively Saracens. So he concludes that Saracens (8 and 10) are the Tunisians, the Turks (10) the Moslems of Palestine and Syria, and Arabs (11) those of Spain and Morocco, and that Aустorc is therefore referring to (a) the peace concluded at Tunis (30 October 1270) by Philip the Bold and Charles of Anjou, (b) the truce signed by Edward of England in August 1272 with Baibars and the Palestinian Turks, and (c) the Spanish Arabs left in peace by the kings of Aragon and Castile, who are afraid of the aggressive policies of France and Charles of Anjou. Charles was the enemy of the Infant Pere of Aragon, married to Constance, daughter of Manfred and claimant to the crown of Naples and Sicily, and the Aragonese, preoccupied with Southern Italy, were no longer fighting the Arabs of Spain. Neither was Alfonso X of Castile, at a time when Charles was urging Philip to put himself forward as a rival for the imperial crown. Ingrid Hartl (*Das Feindbild der Kreuzzugslyrik. Das Aufeinandertreffen von Christen und Muslimen*, Berne 2009) identifies no such distinctions between different types of 'pagans', seeing the terms in her corpus of lyrics in various European languages as generally synonymous (p. 198), but it is tempting to agree with Fabre's more specific categorization.

24. Appel signals the line as missing and leaves the line blank; Fabre generates a hypothetical line. As Jeanroy («Sur le sirventés», p. 201) noted with a certain Schadenfreude, the line is in fact present in the Ms.

30. Literally 'top nor root'.

31. Fabre («Le sirventes», 1910, p. 474): *sai* refers to the French domains

of the king of England, that is Guyenne, Gascony and Périgord, and also the Agenais, Quercy and Bigorre. He opines that *sai* here is opposed to the Holy Land, not to England, since Edward is on his way back from Palestine.

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

45. Fabre and La Salle-Lavaud correct to *ditz* for the rhyme. — The Cotellet referred to in the second tornada may or may not be the same man as the Codolet who engaged in a *partimen* (*BdT* 248.11) with Guiraut Riquier and Miquel de Castillo in Narbonne before 1270. The latter is possibly the *Raymundus de Codaletto, civis Narbone* who appears in a Narbonnese document of the time Fabre, «Le sirventes», 1911, pp. 59-60; Joseph Anglade, *Le Troubadour Guiraut Riquier. Étude sur la décadence de l'ancienne poésie provençale*, Bordeaux and Paris 1905, p. 99, n. 2, and Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson, *The Troubadour Tensos and Partimens: A Critical Edition*, 3 vols, Cambridge 2010, II, p. 725. Since the Cotellet of the present piece is led to hope for the reward of a rouncy, he is unlikely to be a citizen of much standing, and may be a simple performer.

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

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

University of Warwick

References

Manuscript

C Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 856.

Reference works

- BdT* Alfred Pillet, *Bibliographie der Troubadours*, ergänzt, weitergeführt und herausgegeben von Henry Carstens, Halle 1933.
- BEdT* *Bibliografia elettronica dei trovatori*, ed. Stefano Asperti, online, 2003ff.
- COM 2* *Concordance de l'occitan médiéval (COM 2). Les troubadours, Les textes narratifs en vers*. Direction scientifique Peter T. Ricketts, CD-rom, Turnhout 2005.
- Frank István Frank, *Répertoire métrique de la poesie des troubadours*, 2 vols, Paris 1953-1957.
- Jensen Frede Jensen, *The Syntax of Medieval Occitan*, Tübingen 1986.
- LR* François Raynouard, *Lexique roman ou dictionnaire de la langue des troubadours*, 6 vols, Paris 1836-1844.
- PD* Emil Levy, *Petit dictionnaire provençal-français*, Heidelberg 1909.
- SW* Emil Levy, *Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch*, 8 vols, Leipzig 1894-1924.
- Rialto* *Repertorio informatizzato dell'antica letteratura trobadorica e occitana*, ed. Costanzo Di Girolamo, online, 2001ff.