

---

Linda Paterson

Peire del Vilar

*Sendatz vermelhs, endis e ros*

(*BdT* 365.1)

This *sirventes* by Peire del Vilar, an otherwise unknown troubadour, presents a number of hermeneutic difficulties, both detailed and global. The issue of dating is also problematic, with some strong arguments in favour of either 1242 (Jeanroy) or 1285 (Kendrick).<sup>1</sup> Kendrick presents her own version of the text in a footnote on her first page, describing it as «slightly more conservative» than Jeanroy's, but unlike Jeanroy does not translate, so it is not always clear how she understands the details. Jeanroy understands the *sirventes* to be announcing the imminent arrival of King Henry III of England to join forces with the southern uprising against France in 1242, warning that success will depend on liberal spending, but expressing despondency about French political and territorial expansion, and somewhat puzzlingly changing tack in stanza V to advocate a joint crusade to the Holy Land. In contrast, Kendrick sees the song as expressing a wish that something *would* happen rather than as a statement of fact: an attempt to persuade the audience, and specifically the count of Rodez, to oppose the attack on Aragon by Philip the Bold of France during the so-called Aragonese crusade. She explains the puzzling fifth stanza as an indictment of the French monarch and his allies for taking advantage

<sup>1</sup> Alfred Jeanroy, «Un sirventés historique de 1242», in: *Mélanges Léonce Couture. Études d'histoire méridionale dédiées à la mémoire de Léonce Couture (1832–1902)*, Toulouse 1902, pp. 115-125; Laura Kendrick, «*Sendatz vermeills, endis e ros*. Another *Sirventes* from 1285», *Romance Notes*, 24, 1984-1985, pp. 277-284.

of the crusading tittle to attack fellow-Christians. I will first offer my own interpretation, which differs from that of both these scholars, before discussing the issue of dating.

### *Interpretation*

All agree that the song concerns a king of England, represented by the heraldic leopard, who is thinking of waging war on the French, represented by heraldic flowers (the fleur-de-lys). Both Jeanroy and Kendrick see the opening echoes of Bertran de Born (see the note to v. 1) as an evocation of the excitement of war, whether to describe what is happening or about to happen (Jeanroy), or to exhort the audience, and specifically Count of Enric IV of Rodez, to want it to happen (Kendrick). A difficulty not raised by either scholar is that *fenh* (7) can have a variety of meanings which raise questions about the attitudes of either the «leopard» or the troubadour: ‘se feindre; s’occuper, s’entremettre; être négligent, hésiter; dissimuler ses sentiments; être suffisant, s’enfler de vanité’ (PD). Jeanroy unquestioningly translates with the neutral ‘se dispose à’, Kendrick (as already indicated) does not translate, or comment. I suggest that the war rhetoric is ironic. The listener is led to expect a war song, but the leopard – an emblem not only of England but also of military ferocity – has lofty aspirations: to pick a flower! Of course, on a metaphorical level this refers to the «flower of France»; but on a literal one this is an incongruous, somewhat bathetic image.

The basic content of stanza II is that the English king will be unsuccessful unless he manages to acquire more allies, but if Castile, Aragon and Navarre (?) will join him he will be able to *passar* his vassals – though he will need to spend a great deal more money than he is doing at present to stand any chance of success. Extending the somewhat bizarre image of flower-picking (killing Frenchmen) by assorted items (a castle, a wing? and a bar, heraldic again, but incongruous literally), the troubadour warns that the King will be *pecx* if he *se pleia* to pick some (vv. 9-10). The epithet *pecs*, which Jeanroy translates as ‘fou’, has a more pejorative nuance than *fols*, more like ‘gormless’ or ‘daft’ (PD ‘sot, niais, stupide’; LR, IV, 475 ‘sot, stupide, nigaud, niais, borné, pécore’). The verb *se pleia* he judges to offer no sense, so emends the ms. to *s’empleja*, translating ‘essaie’. Kendrick prints *se pleia* without comment. In fact the ms. gives the perfectly ac-

ceptable sense of ‘stoops, condescends’ (compare *PD plegar* ‘plier, ployer, courber’ and the reflexive ‘se plier, se ployer’), a verb in keeping with the tone of *fenh* in v. 7. Jeanroy also emends *pro* to *pros* in v. 9, assuming the word to mean ‘valiant’. Kendrick prints *pro* but does not translate. The sense is actually ‘plenty of, enough’: the King will be stupid to embark on this enterprise without enough troops. Jeanroy assumes that *passar* (v. 13) means ‘to make [the Scots etc.] make the voyage from England to France’, translating ‘faire passer’, for which *SW*, VI, 119, 17 offers a single analogous example, ‘to take someone across’ (a river, the sea), though Peire’s text does not specify what would be crossed. Kendrick prints *passat* (presumably a misprint) without comment. I understand differently from Jeanroy, as ‘do without, ignore’ (see *PD* ‘ne pas tenir compte de’ and *SW*, VI, 120, 21 ‘unbertücksichtigt lassen’). In other words, as long as he has Spanish allies he doesn’t need to worry about the support of his own subjects. I will have more to say about this in the dating section.

In stanza III Peire declares that if the English ruler does commit himself to lavish spending, he will be able to live up to the glorious reputation of his ancestors Henry the Young King, Richard the Lionheart and Geoffrey of Brittany, and will be able to recover Guyenne and Normandy. All fine and good. But what is the tone of the last two lines of the stanza? I suspect its professed astonishment to be exaggerated: how truly amazing that the King hasn’t had any more support for this scheme! And this tone seems to me to continue in stanza IV: yes, wouldn’t it be wonderful for the English king to lord it over the French one by taking over a small part of France?<sup>2</sup> What an amazing enterprise! But unfortunately the flower appears in the right season for it to blossom and spread out everywhere unless there is some unseasonal heat or cold – in other words the French are blessed by fate to extend their hegemony, unless there is some extraordinary circumstance to hold them back. In these last lines of the stanza (30-32) a more realistic tone takes hold: France is expanding everywhere these days, and it will take a lot to stop it.

The fifth stanza drops the sarcastic tone entirely. There are two points here. One is that the kings ought to be going on crusade rather

<sup>2</sup> For discussion of the amphibolous sentence in vv. 25-29 see the notes.

than fighting each other: a common enough theme of the age. The second is economic: a crusading tithe is the only way anyone can finance a war these days, so by implication, any hopes of the English king suddenly finding more support for his enterprise and deciding to indulge in vast spending are unrealistic.

The *tornadas* show no direct evidence of a wish to persuade the count of Rodez of anything in particular, beyond confirming the courtly nature of the performance situation, though it might be concluded that the troubadour reflects a position of cautious reserve before the prospect of English intervention (see below).

### *Dating*

Jeanroy is right to reject previous attempts at dating,<sup>3</sup> and to observe that vv. 22-23 prove that the piece must have been composed after the confiscation by France of Normandy and Guyenne in 1202. He also maintains that it must date from before the treaty of 1259, when Henry III of England renounced his claim to these territories, and that it belongs to the southern uprising of 1242, between the beginning of May, before the 15<sup>th</sup> when Henry III of England embarked for France, and his defeat at Saintes on 22 July.<sup>4</sup> He has strong arguments to support this broad conclusion. The southern coalition included the kings of Aragon, Castile and Navarre, apparently referred to in v. 12. Henry was very busy collecting money for the expedition: a necessity emphasised in vv. 16-18 and 38-40. Peire addresses his song to a count of Rodez (v. 41): Uc IV of Rodez was one of the main conspirators. However, Jeanroy is puzzled by the references to crusading in stanza V. Why does the troubadour switch from exhorting Henry to attack the French to urging both kings to depart for the Holy Land? One possibility he suggests, though does not believe, and to which he offers a number of objections (pp. 120-121), is that this stanza was added later, after the capture of Jerusalem by the Kwarismians in 1244. He considers it more natural to think that the troubadour, seeing his cause lost in

<sup>3</sup> Jeanroy, «Un sirventés historique», pp. 116-118.

<sup>4</sup> In his article «Le soulèvement de 1242 dans la poésie des troubadours», *Annales du Midi*, 16, 1904, pp. 311-329 (on p. 312) he gives the dates as 9 May and 23 July.

advance, turns aside from it and suggests to the princes a better use of their forces. He identifies the wish for the kings to recover the place where the infant Jesus was adored (vv. 34-36) as a particular difficulty, since in 1242 Jerusalem still theoretically belonged to the Emperor, but he tries to deal with this by arguing that security there was far from being the rule: «les Infidèles, enhardis par les discordes des chrétiens de Palestine, ne se gênaient point pour dévaster les environs de la ville sainte, pour molester et massacrer les pèlerins; il était donc naturel de convier les princes chrétiens à faire cesser ce triste état de choses» (p. 121).

Kendrick presents various objections to Jeanroy's hypothesis. Firstly, she reproaches Jeanroy with being too literal-minded in his interpretation of the future tense, *veirem* (7) in stanza I, to mean the poet is informing the audience of what will happen. She interprets this as a wish that something *would* happen, and as a rhetorical device to persuade his audience, and specifically Count Enric IV of Rodez, to oppose the French King, Philip the Bold. «The opening strophe of «Sendatz vermelhs» is calculated to persuade; it cannot be read literally as an announcement of Henry III's imminent arrival in Languedoc» (pp. 278-279). This interpretation is a possibility, but it is untrue that it «cannot be read literally».

Secondly she has an explanation for Peire's apparent switch of position in stanza V: its purpose, she maintains, is not to encourage a joint crusade. «Rather, it indicts the French king and his allies for profiting from the grant of the papal tenth to attack fellow Christians (instead of pagans in the Holy Land)», and is designed to undermine the moral authority of the French «by pointing out that their motive for fighting is not piety, but greed» (p. 280), the pope having granted Charles of Anjou and Philip III the crusading title for this purely political war. This is a strong and attractive argument, but not conclusive. In the first place Peire may be simply making an economic point: the crusading title is the only realistic way of financing a war these days. Secondly, he and his audience may be wishing that the pope would launch a crusade to secure the Christian position in the Holy Land. Security, as Jeanroy indicated, was far from being the rule. Thibaut de Champagne, King of Navarre, had headed a crusade in 1239. There were divisions within the crusading army. Count Henry of Bar was killed along with more than a thousand men, with 600 more being

captured and taken off to Egypt. An-Nasir of Kerak occupied the city of Jerusalem without difficulty and although the garrison surrendered on 7 December, in return for a safe-conduct to the coast, he destroyed the fortifications, including the Tower of David. In 1240 Thibaut entered into various defensive alliances with different Moslem leaders, with Templars and Hospitallers in dispute with each other. Public opinion in Outremer was shocked by Thibaut's «shameless abandonment» of Damascus, a traditional ally of the Christians, and he became so unpopular that he sailed home at the end of September. Richard of Cornwall arrived in Acre in October, authorised by the Emperor Frederick II to make whatever arrangements he thought best for the kingdom of Jerusalem. He was horrified by the anarchy he discovered on his arrival, but succeeded in recovering all the ancient lands west of the Jordan, as far south as the outskirts of Gaza, «with the ominous exception of Nablus and the province of Samaria. Jerusalem remained unfortified; but Odo of Montbéliard, whose wife was the heiress of the prince of Galilee, began to rebuild the castle of Tiberias; and the work on Ascalon was completed». After his successes Richard returned to Europe in May 1241, but the order he had established did not last for long. «In the Holy Land quarrels soon began again.» When the Templars attacked the Moslem city of Hebron, an-Nasir of Kerak cut off the road to Jerusalem and levied tolls on passing pilgrims and merchants, and the Templars retaliated by sacking Nablus and massacring many of its inhabitants, including large numbers of native Christians. «Within the kingdom there was no overriding authority. The Orders behaved as independent republics. Acre was ruled by the Commune, which, however, could not prevent the Templars and Hospitallers from fighting each other in the streets. The barons kept to their fiefs, ruling them as they pleased». <sup>5</sup> Our troubadour could well have regarded another crusade as desirable in 1242.

Thirdly Kendrick argues that the heraldic imagery provides enough information to date the poem (p. 281): heraldic symbols for rulers, she argues, were not common in Occitan verse before late thirteenth century, and she relates Peire's *sirventes* to the largest group of Occitan poems using heraldic symbols, in particular the *flors* of

<sup>5</sup> Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 voll., Harmondsworth 1971, first published Cambridge 1951-1954, vol. III, pp. 211-220.

France and the *basto* of Aragon. This is a series of *coblas* published by Martín de Riquer which he dates to 1285, at the time of the Aragonese crusade.<sup>6</sup> It is understandable that she should have been tempted by the similarity of these heraldic references, for in the *coblas* we also find much play on the picking of (French) flowers by her enemies.<sup>7</sup> However, again this is not conclusive, for what is to say that Bernart d'Auriac is not referring back to a piece composed in the past, either the present piece or another that has not survived? Kendrick found only one previous example of a troubadour using the symbol of the *fleur-de-lys* to designate the French side in a conflict, namely between Charles of Anjou and Conrad of Germany: Aicart del Fossat, shortly before September 1268: *L'Aigla, la Flors a dreitz tant comunals / Que no i val leis ni i ten dan decretals*,<sup>8</sup> but there is a much earlier example in a piece by Peirol of 1221-1222: *Qu'En[g]laterra a croy emendamen / del rey Richart; de Fransa ab sas flors / soli'aver bon rey e bos senhors*.<sup>9</sup>

Finally Kendrick develops a suggestion of Riquer's, concerning the Count of Foix's contribution to the exchange of *coblas*, with a suggestion of her own. Both Jeanroy and Riquer had understood the Count to be referring to songs about the King of Aragon that, allegedly, everyone has been hearing. The ms. reads *Salvatz tuitz ausem cantar / enamorar* which produces a hypometric first line. Jeanroy corrects to *Salvatge, e tuit qu'auzem cantar*, in other words adding the letter *e* twice and inserting the relative pronoun *que*, and translating «Salvatge et vous tous qui entendez chanter, comme un amoureux, le

<sup>6</sup> Martín de Riquer, «Un trovador valenciano: Pedro el Grande de Aragón», *Revista valenciana de filologia*, 1, 1951, pp. 273-311.

<sup>7</sup> *BdT* 57.3, 5-10, 13-16; 325.4, 10, 13; 357.1, 4-12; 182.2, 13, in Riquer, «Un trovador», and my forthcoming editions on *Rialto*.

<sup>8</sup> *BdT* 7.1, ed. Vincenzo di Bartholomaeis, *Poesie provenzali storiche relative all'Italia*, 2 voll., Rome 1931, II, p. 249, CLXVIII, 37-38.

<sup>9</sup> *BdT* 366.28, 15-17, in Ruth Harvey's forthcoming edition on *Rialto*. Compare also Enrique of Castile's *l'altezza del fiordaulis* in his song *Alegramente e con grande baldanza* (*PSs* 50.8 v. 13), in *I poeti della Scuola siciliana. Edizione promossa dal Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani*: vol. I. Giacomo da Lentini, edizione critica con commento a cura di Roberto Antonelli; vol. II. *Poeti della corte di Federico II*, edizione critica con commento diretta da Costanzo Di Girolamo; vol. III. *Poeti siculo-toscani*, edizione critica con commento diretta da Rosario Coluccia, Milano 2008, vol. III, p. 1148 (composed 1267-1268).

roi». Riquer suppressed one *e* of Jeanroy (which was certainly an unnecessary addition) but retained the relative *que*, printing *Salvagg'e* [sic], *e tuit qu'ausem cantar / e'namorar / rei d'Aragon*, «Salvatge, [vos] y todos los que oímos cantar y enamorar al rey». On the basis of Riquer Kendrick (p. 283) writes that the Count says he does not believe the songs he hears about the coalition between Aragon and England, and that Riquer considers this to be a reference to Pere of Aragon's call in his *coblas* to the lords of Gascony and the Agenais, vassals of the English king. She argues that the Count of Foix is more probably referring to *Sendatz vermelhs* or lost poems like it, «partisan poems announcing the support and imminent arrival of Edward I of England in order to persuade uncommitted lords to join Peter of Aragon against Philip the Bold». My edition avoids the unnecessary *que*, which had changed the sense, and simply supplies the extra *e* needed to make up the scansion, Peire Salvatge's name elsewhere clearly having a final *e*: *Salvatz[e]*, *tuitz ausem cantar / e'namorar / reis d'Arragon. / Digatz me se poria tant far* etc. The meaning here is quite different: «Salvatge, we can all hear the King of Aragon singing and falling in love. Tell me whether he will be able to achieve so much». The Count is simply referring to the *coblas* previously sung by King Pere of Aragon that ended with the King's hope of favour from his courtly lady.

Peire del Vilar's allusion to the «Scots and English, Norwegians and Irish and Welsh» offers another argument in favour of Jeanroy's dating, though one that Jeanroy did not use. Both he and Kendrick see the reference as a neutral enumeration of the King of England's various subjects and, as we have seen, the prospect of them making a crossing. But in 1242 the allusion might well not be neutral, for at this time there were unruly elements in all of these groups. The English parliament which met on 29 January 1242, before Henry's expedition to Poitou, criticised the King and refused him supplies: «Henry got nothing from the assembly as a body, and had to resort to bargains with those individuals who could be persuaded to help him».<sup>10</sup> This is highly relevant to the troubadour's allusions to Henry's lack of funds. Relations with Scotland also had its strains: in 1237 his brother-in-law

<sup>10</sup> Frederick Maurice Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward*, Oxford 1966 (originally 1947 in 2 voll.), p. 298.



the Scottish king Alexander II was heading for war against him, and although a treaty between them was announced on 28 September, a conspiracy to assassinate Henry in 1238 led to the father of William de Marisco, the murderer, taking refuge in Scotland. «The reception of Geoffrey de Marisco was one of the grievances which King Henry had against King Alexander and Walter Comyn, when he made a military demonstration against Scotland two years later, in 1244».<sup>11</sup> A member of an important Anglo-Norman family, William was connected with many of the houses which «rose to local greatness in south-west Ireland», and his father Geoffrey had been active in the service of King John and King Henry, being justiciar of Ireland three times.<sup>12</sup> After the murder William escaped and managed to survive on piracy until 1242 when he was finally dislodged from the island of Lundy, and hanged after being dragged by horses from the Tower to the place of execution. The stories of these men might help to explain any doubts expressed by the troubadour concerning the support available from that quarter. As for Wales, after the death of Llewelyn the Great in 1240 conflict arising from the Welsh and English view of the implications latent in Henry's overlordship led to Henry making military expeditions there in 1241 and 1245.<sup>13</sup> Mention of Norwegians or Norsemen may have called to mind their disputed rule in the Scottish islands and the attempts at this time of Alexander II of Scotland (1214-1249) to reconquer the Hebrides from the Norsemen.<sup>14</sup> In short, this list of Henry's subjects, or those he would like to see as his subjects, being unavailable for military service looks like a satirical jibe. By contrast, although Dafydd ap Gruffydd, brother of Llewelyn prince of Wales, rebelled against Edward in 1282 and was executed as a traitor the following year, I have found nothing to suggest particularly bad relations with the other groups at the later time.<sup>15</sup>

Kendrick argues that the purpose of the song is to exhort the Count of Rodez to support a military intervention in the Aragonese

<sup>11</sup> Powicke, *King Henry*, pp. 750-751 and 758-759.

<sup>12</sup> Powicke, *King Henry*, p. 744.

<sup>13</sup> Powicke, *King Henry*, pp. 632-634.

<sup>14</sup> Charles W. Prévité-Orton, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History*, 2 voll., Cambridge 1952, reprinted 1978, II, p. 814.

<sup>15</sup> Powicke, *King Henry*, pp. 661-663.

crusade by Edward of England. This is considerably at variance with the reality of Edward's rôle in this war, as Kendrick acknowledges. He was only involved in the Aragonese crusade in as far as he was in Gascony between 1286 and 1289 working for a peaceful settlement between Aragon and the house of Anjou;<sup>16</sup> he was certainly not thinking about attacking the French in 1284-1285. Powicke states that Edward owed a great deal to France, and recognized in his cousins Philip III and Philip IV as overlords who had the right to ask of him what he had the right to ask of others.<sup>17</sup> Peire del Vilar would have had to be naïve and ignorant to imagine that Edward might take the opportunity to come over to Gascony and lay claim to lands his father had renounced a quarter of a century earlier. This would be a considerable assumption to make, both in contrast to the close match between the details of his *sirventes* and the events of 1242, and in the light of many other political *sirventes* that show intimate knowledge of the events to which they allude.<sup>18</sup> By contrast, Count Uc V of Rodez was closely involved in the uprising of 1242. He allied himself to Raimon VII through the treaty of 5 April but defected soon afterwards along with the counts of La Marche and Foix, a defection criticised by the troubadour Guilhem de Montanhagol.<sup>19</sup> It seems to me that the doubts expressed by Peire del Vilar about the viability of help from Henry III of England, his mockery of the King's ambitions, and his preference for a crusade to the Holy Land, might reflect a position of some cautiousness and doubt on the part of the Count of Rodez. If this is right, we should perhaps think of the date of composition as preceding Uc's decision to join forces with the Count of Toulouse in April.

The 1242 dating also fits better with the heraldic emblems to which Peire refers in v. 12: *lo castel, l'ala ni'l bastos*. Castile (*lo cas-*

<sup>16</sup> Powicke, *King Henry*, p. 730.

<sup>17</sup> Powicke, *King Henry*, p. 725.

<sup>18</sup> See for example Bertran d'Alamanon's *sirventes* BdT 76.8 in Linda Paterson, «James the Conqueror, the Holy Land and the troubadours», *Cultura neolatina*, 71, 2011, pp. 211-286, p. 219; Ead., «Guillem Fabre, *Pus dels majors* (BdT 216.2) and *Hon mais vey, pus truep sordeyor* (BdT 216.1)», *Lecturae tropatorum* 6, 2103, <http://www.it/unina.it/Paterson-2013.pdf>; Bernart de Rovenac, BdT 66.2 and 66.3, ed. Linda Paterson on *Rialto*.

<sup>19</sup> Peter T. Ricketts, *Les poésies de Guilhem de Montanhagol, troubadour provençal du XIIIe siècle*, Toronto 1964, p. 64, poem IV.

*tel*) and Aragon (*l bastos*) were part of the coalition against the French in 1242,<sup>20</sup> whereas there is no evidence of any Castilian involvement in 1285. The same applies to Navarre, which has been less securely identified with the mysterious *ala*. Again, one would have to assume considerable ignorance on the troubadour's part to assign their participation to wishful thinking. It is not impossible that the *ala*, which has given rise to scholarly contortions in order to make the heraldic connection with Navarre, is in fact a scribal error for *aigla*, the emblem of the Hohenstaufen. This would make no sense in 1285, but Jeanroy claims that in 1242 the emperor Frederick II was said to be ready to join the southern alliance.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> See the notes to my edition of Bernart de Rovenac, *BdT* 66.3 on *Rialto*.

<sup>21</sup> Jeanroy, «Un sirventes», p. 119, though he offers no evidence. See however Powicke, *King Henry*, p. 191 for Henry's close contact with Frederick at this time: «He kept in touch with the emperor, and, copying Frederick's own practice, wrote him full reports of his doings. Indeed, his letters to his distinguished brother-in-law give the best and most coherent story of a fruitless and incoherent campaign».

Peire del Vilar  
*Sendatz vermelhs*  
 (BaT 365.1)

*Ms.*: R 41r (p. del uilar).

*Rejected readings*: 12 nil, 38 ses] si, 39 non es *repeated at the beginning of this line*, 45 nin preh

*Analysis of the ms.*: Repetition of *non es* in 38-39, together with other problematic features of 33-40 (see the note), suggest that the scribe may have been working from a corrupted source, or more than one source. The ms. treats the two *tornadas* as a single one, which could result from conflating two sources at some stage in the transmission.

*Critical editions*: Henri Pascal de Rochegude, *Le Parnasse occitanien*, Toulouse 1819, p. 377; François Juste Marie Raynouard, *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*, 6 voll., Paris 1816-1821, IV, p. 187; Carl August Friedrich Mahn, *Die Werke der Troubadours, in provenzalischer Sprache*, ed. 4 voll. (Berlin, 1846-1886), III, p. 267; Alfred Jeanroy, «Un sirventés historique de 1242», in *Mélanges Léonce Couture. Études d'histoire méridionale dédiées à la mémoire de Léonce Couture (1832-1902)*, Toulouse 1902, pp. 115-125 (p. 121, with some normalisation of spelling; French translation).

*Other editions*: Laura Kendrick, «Sendatz vermeills, endis e ros. Another Sirventes from 1285», *Romance Notes*, 24, 1984-1985, pp. 277-284 (no translation).

- |     |  |                                  |
|-----|--|----------------------------------|
| I   | Sendatz vermelhs, endis e ros,<br>e tendas e traps despleyar,<br>elmes et ausbercs flameyar<br>e brandir lansas e bordos,<br>e cayrels dessarrar espes,<br>e ferir de bran demanes<br>veirem en breu: que l lhaupart fenh<br>que say per flor culhir s'espenh.   | 4<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>8   |
| II  | Pecx er si ses pro companhos<br>se pleia de las flors triar;<br>pero si'l en vol amparar<br>lo castel, l'ala ni'l bastos,<br>passar pot Escotz et Engles,<br>Noroecx et Yrlans e Gales.<br>Mas tart n'aura'y flor de ver senh<br>si de larc despendre s'estrenh. | 12<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>16 |
| III | E si'l play bela messios,<br>gen prometr'e largamen dar,<br>semblara de[I] linhatge car<br>don foro'ls frayres valoros,<br>n'Anricx e'n Richartz e'n Jofres,<br>e poira cobrar Guianes<br>e Normandia, don me senh<br>car pus tost no'n troba mantenh.           | 20<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>24 |

I. Soon we shall see banners of scarlet, indigo and red-gold silk and tents and pavilions unfold, helmets and hauberks flashing, lances and pikes brandished, bolts fired thickly, and swords struck on the instant: for the leopard purposes to leap over here to pick a flower.

II. He will be simple-minded if he stoops to pick the flowers without enough companions; however, if the Castle, the Wing (Eagle?) and the Rod are willing to gather some for him, he can manage without the Scots and English, Norwegians and Irish and Welsh. But it will be a long time before there is a flower that gives any sign of spring (*or* shows any green ensign) if he refrains from spending generously.

III. And if he favours lavish spending, gracious promises and liberal gifts, he will seem to stem from the precious lineage of the valorous brothers, Lord Henry, Lord Richard and Lord Geoffrey, and he will be able to win back Guyenne and Normandy; and I cross myself in amazement that he is not more quickly finding support for this.

- IV Mot era genta l'ochaizos  
que flor pogues lhaupart mandar  
e sobre luy senhoreyar,  
e l'agues tot jorn a sos pros 28  
per un pauc que de luy tengues.  
Mas la flor nasc en aital mes  
que per tot s'espan et atenh,  
si caut o freg non la destrenh. 32
- V E fora genser la razos  
que s coitesso del loc cobrar  
on per Melchion e Gaspar  
fon adzortatz l'altisme tos 36  
que can l'us a l'autre comes;  
c'ar ses la decima, non es  
us tant caut qu'en arme un lenh  
ni'n bastis trabuquet ni genh. 40
- VI Al valen gay com de Rodes  
tramet mon novel sirventes,  
que si'l play de s'amor me denh  
far alqun novel entressenh. 44
- VII Estiers do, qu'ieu non vuelh ni'ngenh  
mas honor de son bel captenh.

IV. It was a splendid opportunity for the leopard to be able to command the flower, and lord it over him, and have him constantly at his service for a small possession held from him! But the flower is destined to bloom and spread everywhere if not checked by cold or heat.

V. And the cause would have been better were they to hasten to recover the place where the highest Child was worshipped by Melchior and Gaspar, rather than for the one (king) to attack the other; for without the tithe, there is no-one keen enough to arm a ship or construct a trebuchet or war machine for this.

VI. To the worthy, merry Count of Rodez I send my new *sirventes*, so that if he likes it he may deign to make me some new sign of his love.

VII. May he give to others, for I do not wish or envisage anything but honour from his favour.

3. The *incipit* echoes the opening of *BdT* 80.35, *Cant vei pels vergiers despleigar / Los cendatz grocs, indis e blaus* (*L'Amour et la guerre: l'œuvre de Bertran de Born*, éd. Gérard Gouiran, 2 voll., Aix-en-Provence 1985, I, p. 482, poem 24, 1-2).

4. *bordos*: Jeanroy 'masses d'armes'. *PD* 'pique, lance'.

7. *fenh*: Jeanroy 'se dispose à'. He capitalises *Lhaupart* and *Flor passim*. For the sense of *se fenher* here see *LR*, III, 304 'se préoccuper, rêver'. The nuance no doubt conveys the idea of something still envisaged in the mind rather than existing in reality.

9. Jeanroy corrects to *pro[s]*, 'vaillants', wrongly, and without comment.

10. Jeanroy corrects to *s'empleja*: «*Se pleja (se plicare) ne me paraît pas donner de sens*». See however *se plejar* 'être enclin, être porté à, se mettre à, se laisser aller à' in *PD*, and *SW*, VI, 379, 8) 'sich einlassen auf, zu etwas schreiten, sich gehen, sich hinreissen lassen', citing this example *inter alia*. For another example of *se plejar* + *de* + infinitive, compare *Qui's pleya de falhir / mens o pot escondir / on pus es poderos*, in *Il trovatore N'At de Mons*, ed. Fabrizio Cigni, Pisa 2012, p. 152, vv. 58-60 («Chi ingulge all'errore»), also referred to by Levy. English 'pick' happily combines ideas of both 'chooses' and 'gathers' (Jeanroy: «on choisit les fleurs qu'on cueille»).

11-13. Jeanroy misreads ms. *le(n)* in 11 as *be(n)* and corrects to *be'l*, translating «mais si le Château, le Bâton et l'Aile le veulent bien soutenir». – The castle, wing and *bastos* have been identified as heraldic emblems of Castile (unproblematically), Navarre (less securely), and Aragon. In the latter case, although Jeanroy refers to *los palos* of Aragon (the bars or 'pales' on the Aragonese coat of arms), he takes *bastos* as singular, and therefore the subject of *vol*. Since the Aragonese coat of arms from the time of Raimon Berenguer IV appears to have consisted of four bars (Faustino Menéndez-Pidal de Navascués, «Palos de oro y gules», in *Studia in honorem prof. M. de Riquer*, ed. Carlos Alvar, 4 voll., Barcelona 1991, IV, pp. 669-704), it is tempting to emend to *nil[s]*, a scribal slip easily explained by inadvertence or local misunderstanding, and take the nouns here as direct objects, as suggested by *lo castel* («but if he wants slowly / gradually to draw in (*len*) the castle» etc.). However, in an exchange of *coblas* concerning the Aragonese crusade, the count of Foix warns Peire Salvatge to watch out for *lo sieu baston* if he wants to get mixed up in flowers, and this suggests that the singular is what was intended in the present piece. – The identification of Navarre with *l'ala*, 'the wing', is a puzzle. Jeanroy admits there is no absolute certainty about it. The coat of arms of Navarre consisted of a link chain, but Jeanroy cites Riestap's *Armorial general* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Gand 1877) who describes the arms of Navarre-Castile as «Parti: au 1 coupé: a. repartí d'argent à la demi-aigle de sable, mouvant du repartí et d'argent à trois fleurs de lis d'azur; b. d'or à une chaîne de chaînons carrés d'azur, posés en orle carrés; à la bande de gueules brochant sur la chaîne; au 2 d'argent un lion rampant au naturel» (cited by Jeanroy). Jeanroy comments: «Le "demi-aigle" fournit bien, ce semble, *l'ala*

que nous cherchons.» As he concedes, this raises a number of questions, but he finds enough diplomatic attestations of the use of the eagle, and concludes that Thibaut may sometimes have used on his shield the old arms of the kings of Navarre, and in any case the poet may not have known exactly what they were and may have designated Navarre by its traditional emblem. «La difficulté est plutôt d'expliquer pourquoi, au lieu de *aigla*, il a choisi *ala*».

15-16. Jeanroy translates «et la Fleur trouvera avec peine signe de printemps, s'il s'efforce de largement dépenser», noting «Je comprends: “La fleur aura alors (y) difficilement signe de printemps”, c'est-à-dire trouvera difficilement une saison qui lui soit favorable, la fasse épanouir» (p. 124). The sense of 16 is the opposite of Jeanroy's interpretation: the «leopard» will have difficulty in doing whatever is going on in 15 if he does *not* spend liberally. But what is a flower *de ver senh*? Jeanroy's «sign of spring» is fine, but *senh* could also mean 'ensign': see *BdT* 242.10, 23, Ruth V. Sharman, *The Cansos and Sirventes of the Troubadour Giraut de Borneil*, Cambridge 1989, XXIV, 23, *Convenra c'al seu sejn rejn*, «it will be fitting for me to submit to its ensign». So could *ver* = *vert* and refer to heraldry, and if so, is anyone or anything in particular intended?

18. Jeanroy prints *prometre, largamen*.

19. The emendation is Rochegude's, followed by Jeanroy.

23. Jeanroy «et je me signe de voir qu'il ne trouve pas plus vite qui le secoure», commenting (p. 124) «proprement “je me signe”; le signe de la croix au moyen âge marquait souvent l'étonnement ou la crainte».

24. Raynouard, Mahn and Jeanroy print *plus* without comment.

25-29. Jeanroy's translation is loose here: «Bonne était, certes, l'occasion pour le Léopard de dominer la Fleur, d'exercer sur elle son empire et, bien qu'il tienne d'elle son empire, de la voir toujours sous sa dépendance». His rendering of *mandar* as 'dominer' is possible (*PD* 'envoyer; mander, faire savoir; commander; mander, convoquer, citer (en justice); assurer; gouverner; confier; fiancer'), though the point is surely that the «leopard» owes service to the King of France for a «small amount of territory» that he holds from him in fief, and can therefore be summoned, ruled and obligated to be available for service. Line 29 can hardly be translated as «bien qu'il tienne d'elle son empire», and «de la voir toujours sous sa dépendance» masks the specificity of services owed. As he observes, the sentence is amphibolous: the subject could grammatically be either *flor* or *lhaupart*, and *lui* in 29 might appear to refer to the latter, which is how Emeric David understood it: «L'occasion était belle pour les Fleurs de régner sur le Léopard» (*Histoire littéraire de la France*. Ouvrage commencé par des religieux bénédictins de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, et continué par des Membres de l'Institut [Académie royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres], 38 voll., Paris 1733-1927, III, p. 426). But as Jeanroy states, this does not fit the overall sense, and he cites examples of *lui* as a f. pron., from Appel, *Chrest. prov.*, p. xiv; see also Frede Jensen, *Le Syntaxe de l'ancien occitan*, Tübingen 1994, § 220.



31. Jeanroy mysteriously prints *s'espan(h)*.

33-40. Jeanroy emends *si* to *ses* in 38 and translates the stanza as «Nos princes agiraient plus noblement si, au lieu de se provoquer l'un l'autre, ils se hâtaient d'aller recouvrer la terre où Melchior et Gaspar adorèrent le très haut Enfant. En effet, sans la décime, il n'est nul baron assez habile pour équiper un vaisseau ou faire construire mangonneau ou engin de guerre». There are a number of problems here. – Jeanroy prints ms. *razos* in 33, but avoids translating it, commenting in the note «Razos a ici un sens très vague, assez voisin de celui de *ratio*, quelque chose comme “façon de dire, d'agir”». This is unconvincing. With some hesitation I take *razos* to mean 'argument', and understand Peire to be saying that it would have been better to argue for a crusade to the Holy Land than to launch into this war, since there is a critical lack of funds (compare 15-16), and the only way to raise these seems to be through a tithe for a crusade. The syntax is awkward: literally «The argument would have been better that they should hasten to recover the place where the highest Child was worshipped by Melchior and Gaspar, rather than when the one defied the other». For *can* with conditional force see Arne.-Johan Henriksen, *Les Phrases hypothétiques en ancien occitan. Etude syntaxique*, Bergen 1955, p. 70. – Jeanroy (p. 117) sees Peire regretting that the Christian princes aren't uniting in a bid to regain the Holy Land, but I'm not sure this is the case - I think rather that he's making a financial point. – Reluctantly I accept Jeanroy's emendation of *si* to *ses* (38), though it is not easy to see how the error arose. – I take *en* and *n* in 39-40, glossed over by Jeanroy, to refer to 38: there are no funds to support this proposed war. – Jeanroy emends to *Melchior* in 35 (as printed in in Raynouard and Mahn). The form *Melchion* is the norm: see the eight examples of the two forms in *COM*, among which this line, taken from Jeanroy's edition, is isolated.

41-46. The two *tornadas*, conflated into one in the ms., do not appear to be alternatives.

41. Jeanroy points out the curious form of the oblique case of *coms*, reformed on the nominative through suppression of the final *s*.

45. Mahn prints *pren*, as does Jeanroy without comment, though the ms. is clear and *pren* would be an astonishing failure to rhyme with the last word of the song. But *prenh* ('pregnant, full') is also impossible, hence my emendation. For *engenh*, v. tr., see *SW*, II, 503, 1 'ausdenken, ersinnen' and the first example.

*University of Warwick*

## References

## Manuscript

**R** Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 22543.

## Reference works

- BdT* Alfred Pillet, *Bibliographie der Troubadours*, ergänzt, weitergeführt und herausgegeben von Henry Carstens, Halle 1933.
- 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.
- 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.