

MARCABRU

A Critical Edition

SIMON GAUNT • RUTH HARVEY
LINDA PATERSON

Marcabru

A Critical Edition

One of the earliest troubadours, Marcabru was a remarkable artist and entertainer, and figure of crucial importance to the development of the European courtly lyric. His attacks on contemporary court society reveal an intellectual insider's view of the clash between clerical morality and the emerging secular ethics of love and courtesy, and his engagement with contemporary events provides a unique southern perspective on political upheavals and crusading movements in twelfth-century Occitania and northern Spain.

This new critical edition is the first for nearly a hundred years, supplying translations, full critical apparatus, textual notes with glossary, and a substantial introduction covering contemporary history, language, manuscript transmission, troubadour versification and editorial method.

SIMON GAUNT is Professor of French Language and Literature at King's College, London; RUTH HARVEY is Senior Lecturer in French at Royal Holloway, University of London; LINDA PATERSON is Reader in French at the University of Warwick.

Marcabru

A Critical Edition

by Simon Gaunt, Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson

with John Marshall as philological adviser

and with the assistance of Melanie Florence

Research Associate of the Modern Humanities Research Association

D. S. BREWER

Editorial matter © Simon Gaunt, Ruth Harvey, Linda Paterson 2000

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

The right of the Contributors to be identified as the authors of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

First published 2000
D. S. Brewer, Cambridge

ISBN 978 0 85991 574 8 hardback
ISBN 978 1 80543 174 9 ePDF

D. S. Brewer is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620–2731, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

Acknowledgements

The project of producing a critical edition of Marcabru's poems was instigated by Linda Paterson and Peter Ricketts at the first meeting of the *Association Internationale d'Etudes Occitanes*, held in Southampton in 1984. Ruth Harvey joined the team from the outset, but Peter Ricketts was soon obliged to withdraw under pressure of his other scholarly and administrative commitments. The team was at that point fortified by the addition of Simon Gaunt, together with John Marshall as philological adviser. The Modern Humanities Research Association generously granted a Research Associateship, held by Melanie Florence, to assist in the transcription of the manuscripts, and the assembly of material relating to these, under the direction of Linda Paterson at the University of Warwick. The team wishes to thank the MHRA for its initial help in thus providing impetus for the project; Melanie Florence for her diligent and meticulous labour; Warwick University for its own financial contribution to the cost of the Associateship; and the University of London Central Research Fund for a grant enabling Ruth Harvey to complete the manuscript checking in Paris. The project has further benefited from subsidies towards the costs of publication, generously provided by the MHRA, the University of Warwick, the Humanities Research Centre at Warwick University, the Warwick University French Department, Royal Holloway University of London, and King's College London, for which the team is most grateful. Warm thanks are due in addition to the Universities of Cambridge and Warwick, and Royal Holloway University of London, for granting sabbatical leave to enable team members to devote the necessary time to the work, and to the British Academy for providing top-up leave for Simon Gaunt for the same purpose.

During the long gestation of this edition, many friends and scholars have very kindly contributed information, expertise, and on occasion, lay brainpower, particularly Malcolm Barber, Ron Bartlett, Simon Barton, Michael Clanchy, Richard Fletcher, John Gillingham, Angelika Gross, Christopher Harper-Bill, Christopher Holdsworth, Sophie Marnette, Jane Martindale, Maria-Luisa Meneghetti, Jonathan Phillips, Mike Paterson, Pål Skårup, Patricia Stirnemann and Tom Winniffrith. Their help and support have been invaluable; they are of course in no way responsible for the mistakes which, despite our best efforts, ineluctably remain. We are also profoundly grateful to Boydell and Brewer for their courage and good will in accepting such a large and difficult undertaking from the publisher's point of view, as well as their quite exceptional care and accuracy at the proofs stage. Finally we should like to express our thanks to the Institute of

Romance Studies, University of London, and to Ian Short for kindly providing us with venues for many of our meetings. We warmly appreciate the interest Ian Short took in the project and his witty notices on the door of our room in Birkbeck College displaying apposite and ever-varying Marcabrunian quotations.

Abbreviations

1 p. 2 p.	first person, second person (and so on)	p. part.	past participle
adj.	adjective	pl.	plural
adv.	adverb	pr.	present
cond.	conditional	pret.	preterite
conj.	conjunction	pron.	pronoun
dem. pron.	demonstrative pronoun	sb.	substantive
f.	feminine	sg.	singular
fut.	future	subj.	subjunctive
impf.	imperfect	v. imper.	impersonal verb
ind.	indicative	v. intr.	intransitive verb
indecl.	indeclinable	v. refl.	reflexive verb
m.	masculine	v. tr.	transitive verb
nom.	nominative	v. tr. abs.	transitive verb used absolutely
obl.	oblique		

Abbreviations for dictionaries

(For full details see the Bibliography, section 4)

Alcover	Alcover and Moll, <i>Diccionari Català-Valencià-Balear</i>
AND	<i>Anglo-Norman Dictionary</i>
Bloch and Wartburg	Bloch and von Wartburg, <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française</i>
BDEL	Corominas, <i>Breve diccionario etimológico de la lengua castellana</i>
DECLC	Corominas, <i>Diccionari etimologic I: Complementari de la llengua catalana</i>
DCECH	Corominas and Pascual, <i>Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispanico</i>
Du Cange	Du Cange, <i>Glossarium mediae et infimae latinatatis</i>
DOM	<i>Dictionnaire de l'Occitan Médiéval</i> , ed. Stimm, Stempel et al.
FEW	von Wartburg et al., <i>Französches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i>
Godefroy	Godefroy, <i>Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française</i>
Huguet	Huguet, <i>Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle</i>

Lewis and Short	<i>A Latin Dictionary</i>
Latham	Latham, <i>Revised Medieval Latin Wordlist from British and Irish Sources</i>
Latham, <i>Dictionary</i>	Latham, <i>Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources</i>
LR	Raynouard, <i>Lexique roman</i>
Mistral	Mistral, <i>Lou Tresor dóu felibrige</i>
Niermeyer	Niermeyer, <i>Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus</i>
Palay, <i>Dictionnaire</i>	Palay, <i>Dictionnaire du béarnais</i>
PD	Levy, <i>Petit dictionnaire</i>
PSW	Levy, <i>Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch</i>
REW	Meyer-Lübke, <i>Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i>
TLF	Imbs, <i>Trésor de la langue française</i>
TL	Tobler and Lommatzsch, <i>Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch</i>

Abbreviations for other works

(For full details see the relevant sections of the Bibliography)

DBF, II	Balteau, Barroux, and Prévost, <i>Dictionnaire de biographie française, II</i> (Bibliography, section 5)
HGL	Devic and Vaissete, <i>Histoire générale du Languedoc</i> (Bibliography, section 5)
NRCF	<i>Nouveau Recueil Complet des Fabliaux</i> , ed. Noomen and Van der Boogaard (Bibliography, section 2)
PC	Pillet and Carstens, <i>Bibliographie der Troubadours</i> (Bibliography, section 5)
PL	Migne, <i>Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina</i> (Bibliography, section 5)
RHC Occ.	<i>Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux</i> (Bibliography, section 5)
RHGF	Bouquet and Delisle, <i>Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France</i> (Bibliography, section 5)

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations	vii
Introduction	1
Marcabru's name, 'career' and patrons	1
Marcabru in the <i>chansonniers</i>	5
Language	13
Versification	20
Editorial policy and practice	26
Concordance	35
<i>Vida in A</i>	37
<i>Vida in K</i>	38
I A la fontana del vergier	40
II A l'alena del vent doussa	46
III Al departir del brau tempier	55
IV Al prim comenz de l'invernailh	65
V El son d'esviat chantaire	88
VI Amics Marchabrun, car digam	98
VII Ans que'l terminis verdei	108
VIII Assatz m'es bel el temps essuig	118
IX Auias de chan com enans' e meillura	131
XI Bel m'es qan li rana chanta	147
XII Bel m'es can s'esclarzis l'onda	165
XIII Bel m'es cant son li frug madur	178
XIV [Co]ntra [l'i]vern que s'e[n]ansa	190

XV	Cortesianen vuoill comensar	200
XVI	D'aiso laus Dieu	209
XVII	Dirai vos e mon latin	226
XVIII	Dire vos vuoill ses doptanssa	237
XIX	Doas cuidas a-i, compaigner	265
XX	[A]d un estrun	276
XXI	Bel m'es quan la fueill' altana	296
XXII	Empeaire, per mi mezeis	308
XIII	Empeaire, per vostre prez	319
XXIV	En abriu	324
XXV	Estornel, cueill ta volada	343
XXVI	Ges l'estornels no'n s'ublida	355
XXVIII	Lanquan fuelhon li boscatge	365
XXIX	L'autrier, a l'issuda d'abriu	369
XXX	L'autrer jost' una sebissa	375
XXXI	L'iverns vai e-l temps s'aizina	388
XXXII	Lo vers comenssa	402
XXXIII	Lo vers comens cant vei del fau	415
XXXIV	Hueymais dey esser alegans	427
XXXV	Pax in nomine Domini	434
XXXVI	Per l'aura freida que guida	455
XXXVII	Per savi teing senz doptanza	464
XXXVIII	Pus la fuelha reviola	474
XXXIX	Pois l'invern d'ogan es anatz	494
XL	Pos mos coratges esclarzis	503
XLI	Pus s'enfulleysson li verjan	513
XLII	Qan l'aura doussana bufa	521
XLIII	Seigner n'Audric	530
XLIV	Soudadier, per cui es jovens	541

Poems of doubtful attribution

DI	Bel m'es qan s'azombra·ill treilla	556
DII	Lan qan cor la doussa bisa	564

Bibliography	573
Glossary	594
Index of Proper Names	607

Introduction

1. *Marcabru's name, 'career' and patrons*

There is no external documentary record which features a 'Marcabru' who can plausibly be identified with our poet.¹ 'Marcabru' was probably a nickname or stage-name, similar to that adopted by his contemporary, Cercamon, or those given to *joglars*,² though it would be unwise to conclude from this that he was a 'professional poet', solely dependent for his livelihood on his art.³

The only information available about Marcabru has to be deduced from allusions in the songs themselves. This is substantially the position in which the medieval biographers found themselves and, as others have observed, the debts which the *vida* in *A* owes to poem XX and that in *K* to XVIII are evident.⁴ Marcabru may have come from Gascony, but there is no other evidence to support this,⁵ and the traditional view of him as being of humble origins and illegitimate birth is without any historical foundation. It is interesting, however, that the biographer in *A* preserves an association of Marcabru with Cercamon: modern scholarship has shown that both poets were active at the court of William X and such a connection is historically very plausible,⁶ although it is not possible to confirm the notion that Marcabru served a period of poetic apprenticeship with Cercamon.⁷

Furthermore, since fewer than twenty of Marcabru's songs are datable, and

¹ See Pirot, 'Ce n'était point', and most recently the survey in Spaggiari, *Nome*, pp. 10–16.

² Compare *A*'s *vida* which presents Marcabru as an adopted name. See ed. Tortoreto, p. 48 note 59 on 'Cercamon'. See Paden, 'Role', pp. 100–103 on *joglars*' names. Speculation on Marcabru's name has focused on the etymology suggested by the MSS (see rubrics in *CR Marc e bru* and compare XVIII, 73 variants in *CDMa¹z: Brus marcs*), understanding the second apparent element, *bruns*, as adjectival ('brown' or 'dark'), and has sought to link this with the stanza in poem XVIII, also cited in his *vida* (*K*), which evokes his mother, *Bruna* (see Harvey, 'Public', p. 62 and compare Spaggiari, *Nome*, pp. 16–24 for an exhaustive survey of previous work). However, it is difficult then to explain the combination of a f. sb. and m. adj. Spaggiari understands the name as adopted but real, based on the Germanic *MARCA*, but we find her approach unconvincing and misguidedly literal.

³ See Harvey, 'Joglars'.

⁴ See for example Bertoni, 'Due note', p. 644; Pirot, 'Ce n'était point', p. 538.

⁵ See 'Language' below. Compare Poe ('Old Provençal *vidas*', p. 516) on the *vidas*' references to Gascony as a means of evoking the early stages of the troubadour lyric tradition.

⁶ For Marcabru, see below. For Cercamon, see VII and VIII.

⁷ Despite the attempts by Tortoreto ('Cercamon, maestro di Marcabruno?'). Compare Rosenstein and Wolf, *Poetry*, p. 14 and see Meneghetti, *Il pubblico*, p. 153 note 127.

Date chart

<i>Poem</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Place of composition</i>
I	After Easter 1146	?
IVb	Autumn 1137	Castile
IV	After 1137	Gascony
V	1140? / 1150–51?	N.Spain?
VI	c. 1146	France?
VII	After 1148–49?	?
VIII	(1130?) before 1136	Poitou
IX	(1133–) before 1137	SW France / N Spain
XII	After 1137	?
	poss. after 1146	
XV	After summer 1148	Europe
XXI	After Spring 1148	?
XXII	Winter 1137	Castile
XXIII	Postdates XXII	?
XXV–VI	After 1134?	?
XXXI	Before 1147	?
XXXIII	before 1137	Poitou?
XXXIV	After 1146	?
XXXV	1148–1149	Poitou/Gascony?
XXXVI	Poss. c. 1145	?
XXXVII	Poss. 1152–1154?	?
XXXIX	After 1137	(Gascony?)

many of these only approximately, they do not allow us to establish more than a patchy picture of the troubadour's movements: see our chart. We do not take all references to historically attested figures as indications of a patron–poet relationship,⁸ nor all allusions to places as signs that Marcabru actually went there.⁹ In our view, there is no perceptible relationship between the chronology of his compositions and their style.¹⁰

Our researches have, however, modified a number of elements and points of detail concerning the dating and circumstances of composition of the songs and the troubadour's patrons.¹¹ In general, our findings confirm the accepted view of Marcabru as active in the second quarter of the twelfth century in south-western

⁸ In contrast to Boissonnade, for example ('Personnages', pp. 224–30).

⁹ See for example XI, 40 (Portugal), and contrast Frank, 'Troubadours'.

¹⁰ We reject, for example, Appel's suggestion ('Zu Marcabru', p. 431) that the gloomy, disillusioned tone of XXXII indicates a late date of composition; nor do we believe there is any necessary chronological significance in Marcabru's use of *amors*, *amars* (compare Taylor, 'Lyrics', but see the notes to XV, 31–34).

¹¹ For full details, see 'Dating' of the poems mentioned here, though we do not flatter ourselves that we have identified or accurately decoded all topical allusions.

<i>Patron</i>	<i>Nature of reference</i>
?	Muster of French crusaders
?	Death of William X
P. de Gabaret?	Peire de Gabaret?
Alfonso VII??	Betrothal of Sancho & Blanca?
?	Uc Catola?
?	Literary dialogue with Jaufre Rudel
William X	Conflict with Anjou
William X	Diverse
?	'Lord of Gerona' and fighting pagans
?	Jaufre Rudel <i>oltramar</i>
?	Second crusade (Attalia?)
Alfonso VII	Diverse
?	Attack on Alfonso VII
?	Lerida
?	Eble of Ventadour
William X?	Compliment to Poitou
?	Guerau de Cabrera
?	Diverse
'Lord Alfonso'?	Alfonso and maintaining 'peace'
?	Angevin whore?
?	Poitou and France corrupted

France (Poitou and Aquitaine) and in northern Spain. As Boissonnade suggested earlier this century, it is not impossible that Marcabru's earliest datable poem (VIII) was composed early in 1130, and very likely that it dates from before 1136.¹² His last (XXXV) probably dates from 1149 and it is likely that he was still composing in the early 1150s (see XXXIV, XXXVII and compare XII). In several of his early songs (VIII, XXXIII, IX), he espouses the interests of William X of Aquitaine or alludes to the duke in positive terms which suggest that he was under the patronage or attached to the entourage of the Poitevin count until William's sudden death in Santiago in April 1137. Thereafter, at least one piece indicates that he sought support at the court of Alfonso VII of Castile-Leon: he was certainly there in the winter of 1137–38 (XXII), but it is impossible to say how successful these approaches were or how long his sojourn(s) in Spain may have lasted (see IV, V, XXIII and XXXVI).¹³

¹² But we do not agree with the idea of a 'poitevinischen Zyklus' proposed by Appel ('Zu Marcabru', p. 418): see VIII.

¹³ If IVb, 55–60 suggest that Marcabru was in Spain shortly after the death of William X, IV, 61–69 imply that he returned thereafter (but when is unknown) to Gascony and at least considered travelling to Béarn. Poem V may have been composed in 1140 and may indicate

The remaining songs for which a date of composition can be proposed largely concern the crusading expeditions of the 1140s: several allude to the Second Crusade (I, XV, XXI and XXXV), some in terms which suggest that the poet had indeed returned north of the Pyrenees and was in a position not only to know who had left for Syria (Jaufre Rudel: XV), but also to gather news and gossip from pilgrims and crusaders returning from the Latin East (XXI, XV, XXXV). Marcabru seems also to have sustained the same fervent commitment to the Reconquista effort as he expressed in 1137 (XXII), exhorting men to participate in the 1148–49 campaign led by Ramon Berenguer IV of Barcelona against Tortosa and Lerida (XXXV).¹⁴ It is also to the period c. 1146–49 that we are inclined to assign both his *tenso* with Uc Catola (VI), and poem VII, while XXXIV and possibly also XII could date from even later.

His songs mention several other historical figures by name – Alfonso Jordan, count of Toulouse (IX, XXXVI?); Guerau de Cabrera (XXXIV); Eble II of Ventadour (XXXI) – but it is not clear whether any offered him sustained support after the death of William X.¹⁵ It is possible that Marcabru may also have visited Saint-Denis, or have known someone who had, if Gaifier's bracelets are correctly identified (see XIX). Given the context of the reference, we are inclined to doubt that Marcabru's travels included Blois, and Aldric del Vilar, if indeed he existed, remains unidentified (see XX, XLIII and XVI).

Our work has, however, enabled us to put forward several more precise identifications of references in his songs. Firstly, Marcabru's attachment to the dynastic interests of the house of Poitou seems more profound than has hitherto been suspected. In poem IX, his reference to the Toulousain reveals that the Poitevin claims to the county, more serious and well-founded than most historians have recognised, were still an issue and far from forgotten or renounced by the mid-1130s.¹⁶ The early and inopportune death of the last duke led to the marriage of Eleanor to the future Louis VII and Marcabru's poem XXII betrays a certain anxiety and hostility to the idea of the subjection of Aquitaine to the French prince. (The fact that the poet pairs France with Poitou, both tainted by corruption, in poem XXXIX similarly hints at a date of composition after 1137.) Secondly, in our view, the balance of probabilities suggests that XXXV was indeed composed in the late 1140s: the dead 'count' mourned in the last stanza would not then be William X, but the allusion to Antioch, ruled for thirteen years by William's younger brother Raymond, points to a continuing connection between the poet and the ducal family or the region of Poitou-Aquitaine (see also XXI). We are, however, disinclined to understand the *tomadas* of poem XII as a tribute to William X;¹⁷ rather, it seems more likely that the rising fortunes of the

continuing links between the poet and the concerns of Alfonso VII, links which the highly critical tone of XXIII (undatable) may imply were not lasting. The reference to *n'Anfos* and 'peace' in XXXVI may be to the count of Toulouse or to Alfonso VII.

¹⁴ See Paterson, 'Syria'.

¹⁵ See Boissonnade, 'Personnages', pp. 221 and 226–27. See also our hypothesis that 'the count' in XXXV is Baldwin of Marash and our tentative speculation on the identity of 'a certain Angevin whore' in XXXVII.

¹⁶ See Harvey, 'Nouvelles questions'.

¹⁷ Compare Boissonnade, 'Personnages', pp. 217–18.

lord predicted there are those of the lord of Gerona. We suggest that it was at the court of Castile that Marcabru first came into contact with the house of Cabrera (see XII) and this would explain why he later sent a song to Guerau III at Urgel (see XXXIV).

Our own impression of Marcabru is of a poet with more learning than he has generally been credited with (see for example VIII, XIII, XLIV), in contact with some of the most important secular political figures of his day and familiar with the atmosphere and intrigues of their courts, whose songs are often vehicles for a hard-line, clerical, orthodox morality. It seems likely to us that he was a clerk, retained at various courts alongside other *soudadiers* (see III, 24; XLIV, 1), and that the audiences he addressed included some people able to recognise his more learned allusions as well as those familiar with epic material (see for example III, VII, VIII, XIII, XLIV), legends (see for example IVb, XIX) and the compositions of other troubadours (see for example VII, XI, XV, XXIV, XXXI).¹⁸

That Marcabru in turn was a name to be conjured with by later poets is borne out by the fact that some eleven later writers refer to him,¹⁹ not to mention the pride of place he is accorded in MS *R*, which begins the lyric pieces by the notice 'aisi comensa so de marc e bru qe fo lo premier trobador qe fos'.

2. Marcabru in the chansonniers

There are some forty-odd surviving *chansonniers* in which troubadour poetry was written down between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries in Occitania, Catalonia, France and above all Italy. Their relationship has been the subject of a considerable body of modern scholarship since the nineteenth century, and more recently there has also been a good deal of interest in their organisation and aesthetics. In particular, scholars have sought to determine the relative merits of the texts transmitted in individual *chansonniers*, both generally and in relation to specific troubadours: do the texts as preserved in the *chansonniers* represent something close to what the original poets might have composed, both poetically and linguistically, or are they later *remaniements*? Which *chansonniers* preserve texts that are closest to what the troubadours themselves composed and which are more prone to error? In what ways are texts reworked by transmitters? Scholars have also sought to determine whether the primary mode of transmission before the production of the surviving *chansonniers* was written or oral; and they have sought to assess the aesthetics that lie behind the principles of arrangement of the songs in

¹⁸ See 'Versification' below.

¹⁹ See Peire d'Alvernha, ed. Del Monte, XIII, 38–42; Guillem de l'Olivier, ed. Bartsch, *Denkmäler*, p. 57, *cobla* 7; Bernart Marti, ed. Beggiato, IX, 25–28; Marco, ed. Riquer, *Los trovadores*, I, 33, 28–30; anonymous *trobairitz* (PC 404.5), ed. Rieger, 45, 25–28; Guerau de Cabrera, *Cabra, juglar*, 25–30, ed. Pirot, *Recherches; Breviari*, V, 28238–39, ed. Ricketts and see our poems XV, XVIIIb, XXXI, XXXII; *Flamenca*, 702; *vida* of Peire de Valera, Boutière and Schutz, *Biographies*, p. 14. Guillem Magret, ed. Riquer, *Los trovadores*, II, 181, 9 refers to the *Vers del Lavador*. Jouffroi, 3601–92 features a troubadour Marcabru as a character. See also Harvey, 'Public', pp. 47–49 and Spaggiari, *Nome*, pp. 91–136.

the *chansonniers*, whether these be by troubadour (with or without a *vida* or biography) or by genre.²⁰

This section of our Introduction outlines what we have been able to deduce about the relationship of the *chansonniers* in the Marcabru corpus and there are of course local exceptions to the general trends described here. A few remarks are also offered about how our findings concerning the Marcabru corpus fit into the broader picture of what is known about the transmission of troubadour lyrics through the *chansonniers*. We did not think it useful (or an economical use of space) to replicate here detailed information from our analyses of the MS traditions of individual poems and references to poems should be taken as references to examples in the relevant 'Analysis of the manuscript(s)' sections of editions. Specific examples concerning individual readings are confined here to cases where these are needed for clarity. This section of the Introduction should be read in conjunction with the final section on 'Editorial policy and practice'.

Poems attributed to Marcabru survive in sixteen *chansonniers*, as follows (where a MS contains poems generally believed to be of doubtful attribution these are given by PC number in square brackets, otherwise numbers refer to this edition):²¹

A Rome, Vatican Latin 5232; Italian; 13th-c.

Marcabru section: 27^r–34^v

vida, XV, XVII, XXXI, XXIV, XXXII, XX, XLIII, XXXIII, XVIII, XXXV, XIX, XL, XVI, IX, XLII, XLI, XXIX, [PC 293.27], [PC 293.12], XXII, XXXVI, VIII, XXXVIII, V, IV, XXX, XXXVII, XIII, XXXIX, XLIV

C Paris, BN f.f. 856; Occitan; 14th-c.

Marcabru section: 171^r–178^r

XIV, XXI, XLI, XXXII, XVI, III, XI, II, XXVIII, I, XXXI, XXXVIII, XXV, XVIII, XXXIX, [PC 323.5], XXXIV, XXX, XVII, XLIII, XXXIII, XX, XXXV

Also transmits XV attributed to Huc de la Bacallaria (with a second attribution to Bertran de Sayshac noted in the register, but with Marc e bru written alongside), XXIV attributed to Helyas Font Salada (with a second attribution to Marc e bru noted in the register) and XL attributed to Bernart de Ventadorn.

D Modena, Biblioteca Estense α, R.4.4; Italian; before 1254

Marcabru section: 188^v–189^v

XXXI, [PC 34.3], XVIII, XXIII, XXXVII

Also transmits VI and XX/XLIII attributed to Ugo Catola.

E Paris, BN f.f. 1749; Occitan; 14th-c.

XXXVI, XXXVIII, IX, XXI, XVI, XXIV, XXXIII, XXV, XXVI, VII, XLIV
Marcabru section: 151–156

²⁰ On these issues, see Avals, *Letteratura* and *I manoscritti*; Burgwinkle, *Love* and 'The *chansonniers*'; Gaunt, 'The text'; Gröber, 'Liedersammlungen'; Kendrick, *Game*; Marshall, *Transmission*; Meneghetti, *Pubblico*; Van Vleck, *Memory*; Zufferey, *Recherches*.

²¹ We use the conventional *sigla* to designate the *chansonniers* throughout our edition. Our descriptions of the *chansonniers* draw on Pillet-Carstens, *Bibliographie*, pp. x–xlv, Riquer, *Los trovadores*, I, pp. 12–14 and Zufferey, *Recherches*, pp. 4–6.

Also transmits XL attributed to Bernart de Ventadorn.

G Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana R 71 sup.; Italian; 14th-c.

XV (anonymously)

I Paris, BN f.f. 854; Italian; 13th-c.

Marcabru section: 117^v–122^v (a folio is missing at the beginning of the Marcabru section, but the index indicates that *I* originally contained XV, XVII and XXXI, which were presumably preceded by the *vida*; though the beginning of the Marcabru section is missing in *I*, it is reasonable to assume that it was the same as *AK*'s).

End of XXIV, XXXII, XX, XLIII, XXXIII, XVIII, XXXV, XIX, XL, XVI, IX, XLII, XLI, XXIX, [PC 293.12], XXII, XXXVI, VIII, XXXVIII, V, IV, XXX, XXXVII, XIII, XXXIX, XLIV

J Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Conv. Sopp. F.IV.776; Occitan; 14th-c.
XVII (anonymously)

K Paris, BN f.f. 12473; Italian; 13th-c.

Marcabru section: 102^r–107^r

vida, XV, XVII, XXXI, XXIV, XXXII, XX, XLIII, XXXIII, XVIII, XXXV, XIX, XL, XVI, IX, XLII, XLI, XXIX, [PC 293.12], XXII, XXXVI, VIII, XXXVIII, V, IV, XXX, XXXVII, XIII, XXXIX, XLIV

M Paris, BN f.f. 12474; Italian; 14th-c.

Marcabru section: 141^v–142^v (both songs originally attributed to Raimbaut d'Aurenga, with attribution then changed to Marcabru, which concurs with the attributions in the index (Malcabrun)).

XI, XVIII

N New York, Pierpont Morgan 819; Italian; 14th-c.

Marcabru section: 266^r–271^r

IV, XXX, XXXVII, XIII, XXXIX, XLIV, XV, XVII, XXXI, XXIV, XXXII

R Paris, BN f.f. 22543; Occitan; 14th-c.

Marcabru section: 5^{r-v} and 8^v

XXXV, XXXIV, XXXVIII, XXX, XVII, XV, XXXI, XLIII, XXXIII, XVIII
[. . .]²² XXIV, XXXII, XX

Also transmits XI attributed to Alegret.

T Paris, BN f.f. 15211; Italian; 15th-c.

Marcabru section: 204^v–206^v

XVI, XVII, XXX

W Paris, BN f.f. 844; French; 13th-c.

XIII (stanza I only, anonymously), XXXV (stanzas I-II only, anonymously); both extracts have been translated into a form of Old French

²² There are two Marcabru sections in *R*, with a fair number of intervening poems by, *inter alia*, Peire d'Alvernhe, Raimbaut d'Aurenga, Peire Rogier, Bertran de Born, Guilhem IX. *R* in fact opens with Marcabru, whose poems are introduced as follows: 'aisi comensa so de marc e bruo fo lo premier trobador qe fos'.

*a*¹ Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Campori γ.N.8.4; 11, 12, 13; Italian; before 1589; a 16th-c. copy of a lost 13th-c. MS (the so-called *chansonnier* of Bernart Amoros); corrected by Del Nero (whom we refer to as the corrector) as well as by its scribe

Marcabru section: 293–312

XXXV, [PC 293.27], [PC 293.12], [PC 323.17], XIII, XXXIX, XXXI, XII, IV, XXII, VIII, XXXVI, XXXVIII, V, XXXVII, XVIII, XXX, XVII

Also transmits XI attributed to Alegret, XV attributed to Bernart de Pessars and the conjoined XX/XLIII in its *tenso* section attributed to Marcabru and n'Enric.

d Modena, Biblioteca Estense α, R.4.4, final section; a 16th-c. copy of K Marcabru section: 301^v–309^f

XV, XVII, XXIV, XXXII, XX, XLIII, XXXIII, XXXV, XIX, XL, XVI, IX, XLII, XLI, XXIX, [PC 293.12], XXXVI, VIII, XXXVIII, V, IV, XXX, XIII, XXXIX, XLIV

z lost (but we refer to de Bartholomaeis, 'Avanzi' for a transcription); Italian?; 13th-c.?

XXXI, XXIV, XVIII, XXIII, [PC 34.3], VI, XX, XLIII, XXXII, XXXV

α Group of *Breviari* MSS containing lyric quotations from the troubadours (see Richter, *Troubadourzitate*, pp. 304–11 for editions of extracts from XV, XVIII, XXXI and XXXII with full variants)

There are relatively few poems of doubtful attribution. In our view, there are no serious grounds for questioning the attribution of VI, XI, XV, XX, XXIV and XLIII, despite some equivocation in the MSS, and we also accept the attribution of XL to Marcabru, though perhaps a little more tentatively. The remaining poems attributed to Marcabru in some MSS, but of doubtful attribution are:

PC 34.3: attributed to Arnaut de Tintinhac in *CE* and to Marcabru in *Dz*.

PC 293a.1 (a *cobla* in *P* only).

PC 293.12: attributed to Marcabru in *AIKa*¹ and to Bernart de Venzac in *C*.

PC 293.27: attributed to Bernart de Venzac in *C* and to Marcabru in *Aa*¹.

PC 323.5: attributed to Marcabru in *C*, to Bernart Marti in *C Reg.* and *R*, and to Peire d'Alvernhe in *ABDEIKNN*².

PC 323.17: attributed to Peire d'Alvernhe in *ABCDEIKN* and to Marcabru in *a*¹.

In our view, there are no grounds for including PC 34.3, PC 323.5 and PC 323.17 in the Marcabru corpus. Arnaut de Tintinhac names himself in the *tornada* of PC 34.3, the attribution of PC 323.17 to Peire d'Alvernhe is not seriously undermined by *a*¹'s anomalous attribution, given the weight of evidence in the other MSS, and, although the attribution of PC 323.5 remains uncertain, the evidence for Marcabru's authorship is slight given the incompatibility of historical allusions in the piece with the dates of Marcabru's career and given the conflicting evidence of *C* and *C*'s register, the latter unsurprisingly corroborating *R*'s attribution.²³ Similarly, PC 293a.1 is clearly not by the same Marcabru as our

²³ For the most recent edition of PC 323.5, see Beggiato, 'Belha m'es'.

poet, given the historical references in this piece.²⁴ The arguments against Marcabru's authorship of the two remaining pieces (PC 293.12 and PC 293.27) are not, in our opinion, conclusive: for PC 293.12 there is no internal evidence that proves the poem could *not* have been by Marcabru; it has been assumed in the past that PC 293.27 could not have been by Marcabru because of phonological features of some rhyme words, but this assumption rests on the premise that the poem's versification must have been perfectly regular, which we do not believe would necessarily have been the case for a Marcabru poem (see 'Versification' below). Given the uncertainty concerning the attribution of these pieces we offer editions of both, but classify them separately since we are inclined, like previous scholars, to question their attribution to Marcabru (PC 293.12 = DI; PC 293.27 = DII). Both pieces are also included by Simonelli in her edition of Bernart de Venzac.²⁵

Having defined our corpus, we limit the following remarks about the relation of the *chansonniers* in the Marcabru corpus to MSS with substantial Marcabru sections: *ACDEIKNRa*¹. We exclude *z* because we have not been able to consult the MS itself (though we note that it often seems to bear a relation to *D*) and *d* since it is a much later copy of an extant medieval MS. The other *chansonniers* transmitting Marcabru songs (*GJMTW*) transmit too few poems for general conclusions to be drawn about filiation and in any case these MSS often offer texts of poor quality, either substantially reworked, or error-strewn, sometimes both (the possible exception being XI in *M*, where the text may be the best surviving version, but nonetheless has a number of errors).

*ADIKNa*¹ represent an Italian tradition deriving most probably from lost MSS taken to Italy from as early as the last decade of the twelfth century and throughout the first few decades of the thirteenth. *CR* and *E* represent Occitan traditions. In both Italy and Occitania it is likely that interest in twelfth-century troubadour poetry was concentrated largely in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century urban courts and that considerable cultural prestige was attached to the twelfth-century Occitan lyric tradition in this milieu. The two main discernible 'families' of MSS are *AIKNa*¹ and *CR*, with *D* and *E* standing somewhat apart and *a*¹ more loosely affiliated with the *AIKNa*¹ 'family' than are any of the other MSS that belong in it. Some Marcabru poems are known only in the Italian tradition (IV, V, VI, VIII, XII, XIII, XIX, XXII, XXIII, XXIX, XXXVII, XLII), others only in the Occitan traditions (I, II, III, VII, XIV, XXI, XXV, XXVI, XXVIII, XXXIV, of which I, II, III, XIV and XXVIII are *unica* in *C* and VII and XXVI *unica* in *E*), but a fair number are known in both the Italian and Occitan traditions (IX, XI, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XX, XXIV, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL, XLI, XLIII, XLIV) and constitute therefore the main Marcabru canon as widely disseminated in the Middle Ages (though within this canon IX, XI, XXXVI and XLIV are possibly marginal since IX, XXXVI and XLIV are in neither *C* nor *R* and XI is not in *AIK*). Marcabru's

²⁴ See Pirot, 'Ce n'était point'; and see Jeanroy's edition.

²⁵ There is perhaps one further problem of attribution in the corpus: XXXVI, 31 raises at least the possibility that Marcabru was already dead at the time of composition and therefore that the line represents a posthumous reference to Marcabru by a later poet: see the note to this line.

lyrics therefore have a relatively wide dissemination, though not perhaps as wide as those of some poets, for example Bernart de Ventadorn, whose best-known songs often survive in over twenty MSS.

The fact that *AIK* transmit a virtually identical Marcabru corpus in the same order and have common errors in a number of poems suggests a single written source for these three MSS. Our analyses of the MSS of *all* the poems that *AIK* contain support this view, though it is also clear that there is at least one stage of transmission between this written source and *AIK*, since it is unlikely that *A* on the one hand and *IK* on the other were all copied directly from the same source: thus *IK* often contain common errors that almost certainly derive from their common source where *A* contains a good reading that is supported by other MSS (an indication that the good reading in *A* is not likely to be the result of *A* intervening to correct a faulty source in these instances, even though *A* frequently does this, see for example XXX, 1). Where *A* seems to differ markedly from *IK* in its transmission of Marcabru poems this is generally due to one of three factors: first, in two instances *A* seems to have sought a second source for a whole section of a poem, probably because it regarded its first source as in some way unsatisfactory (see IV and VIII); secondly, as already noted, *A* (or possibly *A*'s immediate source) will intervene to correct its source when it finds it wanting on a local level and where this occurs *A* tends to produce a plausible and grammatically correct reading; thirdly, *IK*'s source seems also to have intervened to correct what it perceived to be a faulty source, though it tends to do so with less finesse than *A*, to leave some errors that *A* corrected and to introduce some new errors. Cases of *I* or *K* intervening independently are relatively rare, though each has occasional individual errors, as does *A*. The presence of a fair number of common errors in *IK* sometimes means that *A* is a better source than *IK*; on the other hand, because it is sometimes possible to demonstrate that *A* intervenes more liberally than *IK*, the latter sometimes represent the better source (see also 'Editorial policy and practice'). Because *A* and *IK*'s sources are capable of producing plausible emendations to a faulty source, thereby obscuring what the *AIK* common source contained, it is not always possible to tell where this common *AIK* source was defective; similarly, it is not always possible to tell when apparently correct readings in the *AIK* tradition result from innovation, either by *AIK*'s common source, or at a later intermediate stage.

*Na*¹ transmit fewer Marcabru poems than *AIK*, *N* preserving fewer than *a*¹, but a number of the poems that *Na*¹ have in common suggest that for some Marcabru songs these two MSS derive from the same source (albeit, again, with at least one intermediary stage of transmission) and that this source was similar to *AIK*'s common source: see poems IV, XIII, XXX, XXXVII, XXXIX. *Na*¹ are not, however, of equal merit. *N* seems to be a sloppy transcription of a MS that already contained errors, whereas *a*¹ is a more careful copy of a better source, though one which was not without problems and some badly corrupted passages, the problems being exacerbated by the fact that this MS is a sixteenth-century copy of a lost thirteenth-century *chansonniér*. *N* is more closely related to *AIK* than is *a*¹: witness the fact that the order of the poems in *N* follows first the sequence of the end of the Marcabru section in *AIK* (IV, XXX, XXXVII, XIII, XXXIX, XLIV) and then the sequence of the beginning of the Marcabru section

in *AIK* (XV, XVII, XXXI, XXIV, XXXII), which suggests that *N*'s comparatively brief Marcabru section possibly results from some leaves going missing at some stage from a compilation of Marcabru poems similar to *AIK*'s and that the first and last leaves were then interverted. The ordering of the lyrics attributed to Marcabru in *a*¹, on the other hand, shows little sign of similarity with the ordering of any other MSS,²⁶ and *a*¹ will sometimes show filiation with MSS that are not part of the *AIKN* tradition (see for example XI, XV, XVII, XVIII, XXXVI, XXXIX) and/or occasionally transmit poems that do not otherwise belong to this tradition (see XI, XII). We believe that the Marcabru section in *a*¹ represents a particularly interesting source deriving from an early stage of transmission (see particularly IV, V, XVII, XXX, XXXI, XXXV, possibly also XXXVII), even though it is not always viable as a base MS because of copying errors or (more frequently perhaps) corrupt passages in its source. Only for XX/XLIII, which it treats as one poem, does *a*¹ transmit a text that seems to have been subject to substantial *remaniement* and/or corruption in transmission and here it is noteworthy that it transmits these pieces separately from the rest of the Marcabru corpus.

CR are clearly related for some Marcabru poems (XVII, XX, XXX, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXVIII, XLIII), but they are by no means identical, with C transmitting a much larger corpus than R (including five *unica*) and with marked differences between the two MSS in some poems (XI, XVIII, XXIV, XXXI, where R agrees with other MSS against C in the material that they have in common).²⁷ R contains a fairly large number of mistakes, but in one instance seems to offer access to an earlier version of a song than any other MS (XXXVIII). C (or its source) will patch liberally where it fails to understand (XVI, XXXIX) and, where a song is transmitted by the Italian and the Occitan traditions, it is often possible to see that C or CR together transmit 'vulgate' versions of Marcabru's lyrics, that is versions that have been substantially reworked (probably in the thirteenth century) and which appear to have displaced earlier versions in certain strands of transmission. These are characterised by simplified syntax and vocabulary (XX, XXX, XLIII), hypercorrect grammar (see the notes to XX and XLIII), the elimination of historical detail (XXXV), and the transmission of material that may be apocryphal (XVIII, XXIV, possibly also XL).

DE offer idiosyncratic and in some respects non-canonical Marcabru sections that may represent the personal selections of these individual scribes (or their patrons) since a fair number of the songs they transmit are not in the common corpus of well-known pieces disseminated in both the Italian and Occitan traditions (VI, XXIII and XXXVII for D and VII, XXI, XXV, XXVI, XXXVI, XLIV for E, which also transmits the somewhat marginal IX). For both MSS there is evidence that for some Marcabru songs D and E had access to

²⁶ XIII and XXXIX occur in the same order in *Na*¹, but this seems to be chance. It may, however, be significant that although not in the same order as in *AIK*, *a*¹ has IV, XXII, VIII, XXXVI, XXXVIII, V in a cluster: compare *AIK* where the order is XXII, XXXVI, VIII, XXXVIII, V and IV.

²⁷ It is no doubt significant that R shares the sequences of XXIV, XXXII, XX and XLIII, XXXIII, XVIII with *AIK*, though in *AIK* these poems come in one sequence: in R they are separated and the order of the two sequences of three pieces is inverted.

particularly early and good sources (or at least sources that were substantially better than the alternatives that have survived): see XXXVII for *D* and IX, XXI, XXV, XL, XLIV for *E*, which also has two *unica* (VII and XXVI).

In many respects our findings concerning the relationship between the *chansonniers* within the Marcabru corpus confirm work done by other scholars on the *chansonniers* as a whole. The relationship between *AIKNa*¹ is well documented, as is that between *C* and *R*; equally well-known is the tendency of *A* and *C* (or their sources) to intervene in order to tidy up or clarify sources that they deemed problematic for one reason or another.²⁸

What are the relative merits of the two main traditions? Paradoxically, it is possible that the Italian tradition is more reliable than the Occitan tradition as a source for an early poet like Marcabru, if by 'reliable' one means offering access to the earliest surviving version of a poem (see also 'Editorial policy and practice'). This is because, whereas it is likely that the Italian tradition is an exclusively written tradition from the late twelfth century onwards, the Occitan tradition may have had more contact with continued oral performance of the lyric and thereby with revisions deriving, if not from oral transmission, certainly from a continuing tradition of reworking the songs for and in performance.²⁹ This goes some way towards explaining the 'vulgate' versions of *CR*, particularly of very well-known Marcabru poems such as XXX and XXXV. However, if the two traditions are distinct, there is nonetheless evidence that many of the Marcabru poems surviving in both traditions derive ultimately from a single written source. This is the case with XX, for example, where, if our analysis of the first line is correct, *ACIKR* all derive from a source with a missing initial, with *Da*¹ attempting to make good the damage, but without concealing it altogether. Furthermore, we also see evidence in a number of other poems for a defective archetype (that is a single defective written source) from which *at least one* MS in each of the two main traditions derives (XI, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XXIV, XXXI, XXXII, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XLI, XLIV). This suggests that at some early stage in the transmission of the Marcabru corpus there existed a single *written* source for many of these poems and that this source lies behind both the Italian and the Occitan traditions. The two main traditions are thus distinct in the form in which they have come down to us, but nonetheless clearly related at an earlier stage of transmission. Evidence for purely oral transmission (that is for poems being reworked from memory or becoming badly garbled through oral transmission) is slight and confined perhaps to *T* (particularly XVII and XXX), a few poems in *C*, possibly XXXIII in *E*.

It should be noted, however, that the survival of a fair number of poems in just one of the two main traditions together with textual differences in the poems that are widely disseminated in both traditions mean that the largest Marcabru collections in the *chansonniers* (*AIK* on the one hand and *C* on the other) are different in tone and character. The *unica* in *C*, together with the poems surviving either in *CR* only or in *CE* only, lead to a corpus that contains some

²⁸ See also 'Editorial policy and practice' and the works cited above in note 20.

²⁹ See most recently Burgwinkle, 'The *chansonniers*', p. 249.

uncharacteristically limpid pieces (I, XXVIII, XXXIV), along with some damaged *unica* (II, III, XIV) and some parodic satirical songs that are somewhat atypical of the more vituperative and acerbic style usually associated with Marcabru (XXV, XXVI). It is also noteworthy that C's Marcabru collection contains few references to early twelfth-century politics and topical events, even where such references survive in the 'Italian' version of a song (as they do in XXXV, for example). Furthermore, C misattributes one poem that is probably by Marcabru (XL) and transmits XX and XLIII detached from each other. All this suggests that C is not a reliable source for Marcabru poems, which may well call the attribution of some of the *unica* in C into question, though the use of his name in II and XIV can perhaps be seen as evidence that he did 'sign' these lyrics.

The poems surviving in *AIK* only (or *AIKa*¹/*A(D)IK(N)a*¹(*z*) only) combine with the 'Marcabru canon' (see above) to give in the main Italian tradition a far more uniform and homogeneous image of Marcabru as a strident, vituperative and unrelenting satirist with a moralising and quasi-philosophical agenda: IV, V, VIII, XIII, XIX, XXII, XXIX, XXXVII, XLII. The ordering of the poems also leads to a different version of Marcabru in the different *chansonniers*. The larger collections have a tendency to open their Marcabru sections with well-known 'canonical' poems: *AK* (and presumably originally *I*) begin with XV, which perhaps inscribes the whole corpus as engaging in a satirical dialogue with Jaufrè Rudel, while *Ra*¹ begin with XXXV, which foregrounds Marcabru's role as a proponent of the Spanish Reconquista, or as a poet whose primary inspiration is religious. C, on the other hand, begins its Marcabru section with XIV, an atypical poem in the corpus (the only one, for example, to use derived rhyme). Even if C opens its Marcabru collection with XIV by accident rather than by design, the effect is perhaps to highlight artistry and craft. It is also worth noting that, if our interpretation of XIV as a jocular parody of a *canço* is accepted, C's Marcabru section opens with a piece that sets the tone as humorous, and that C's Marcabru corpus generally seems more varied than *AIK*'s, including more jocular and parodic satire alongside the hard-hitting vituperative satire that is often associated with Marcabru's style (consider also I, III, XVI, XX, XXX, XXVIII, XXXIV, XLIII all also in C).

3. Language³⁰

This section will first discuss features of Marcabru's poetic language; then present a number of conclusions concerning Occitan poetic usage in the first half of the twelfth century suggested by the Marcabru corpus; and finally offer a list of unusual linguistic structures or forms which are not well documented in the reference works.

As Roncaglia noted,³¹ Marcabru's lexis covers a great range, from the

³⁰ For details of all examples, see the relevant notes. Our discussion here does not include 'b' versions of poems, nor 'extra' stanzas transmitted by one or two MSS only.

³¹ 'Per un' edizione', p. 48

customary,³² to the forensic,³³ to the learned,³⁴ to the occasionally obscene,³⁵ and his songs contain a large number of words rare in the troubadour corpus (see the Glossary). Some may have been of limited currency, others, though apparently not frequently attested, are by their very nature hardly recondite,³⁶ but in any case, the large number of rare words may have been related to his predilection for unusual rhymes (see 'Versification').³⁷

Among the unusual words, we count the coinages of compounds, usually nouns, which are generally recognised as characteristic of Marcabru's poetic language. We identify twenty-five individual compound neologisms: one is clearly an adjective (*pic-vairada*, XXV, 68),³⁸ but all the rest are nouns or used substantivally and most refer pejoratively to people, either to groups or to an individual,³⁹ the distinction being largely grammatical: the latter have singular verbs. Unflattering soubriquets such as *Front-Baldit*, XII, 28; *Acropit-Bec-d'Aysola*, XXXVIII, 22; *Flaira-Fum*, XLII, 24 evoke a social or moral type, but some – particularly those preceded by an honorific⁴⁰ – may have designated a real individual, recognisable at least to the first audience of the song. If so, they can be understood as ironic *senhals*, fabricated aliases designed both to conceal and reveal the identities of those designated.

The majority of compounds in Marcabru's works are formed from a verbal element followed by a noun which represents, in broad syntactical terms, its direct object complement, a word-formation process very productive in Romance languages:⁴¹ *guasta-pa*, II, 13; *gara-niz*, XIX, 67; *cora-vi*, XXXV, 46; *coita-disnar*, *buffa-tizo*, XXXV, 47; *creba-mostier*, XL, 18; *Flaira-Fum*, XLII, 24 (which we understand as a *senhal*).⁴² The noun + preposition + noun type is represented by *crup'-en-cami*, XXXV, 48 (compare also *Acropit-Bec-d'Aysola*, XXXVIII, 22), while the personification *senes-razo*, XXXII, 36 is composed of a preposition + noun.

Lenga-loguat (XL, 18) (noun + m. nom. pl. past part.) is an example of what has been noted as the 'Greek accusative', giving the sense 'ceux qui sont loués (vénaux) quant à leur langue'.⁴³ Further compounds invented by Marcabru to

³² See for example *seignoriu*, XXII, 56; *alos*, XVI, 43; *salutz*, XXXIX, 60; *aventura*, IX, 9; *estaing*, XLII, 19.

³³ See for example *esprovaire*, *deffendens*, *engistaire*, V, 43–44; *mostraire*, V, 49; *intrar en plag*, XVI, 8; and compare Ourliac, 'Troubadours et juristes'.

³⁴ See for example *guimerra*, XLIV, 17; *caladri*, XLIV, 20; *luxorios*, XXXV, 46, XL, 24; *sentenssa*, XXXII, 3; *gauzignaus*, XXXV, 34; *embecylli*, XXXVIII, 34.

³⁵ See for example *con*, XXIV, 22; *sobrefotre*, XXXVIII, 31.

³⁶ See for example *trabuix* III, 43; *segon*, II, 33; *regaing*, IV, 9; *congrenh*, XLIV, 59; *gastauz*, XXXIX, 63; *aysola*, XXXVIII, 22; *mignar*, XVIII, 19.

³⁷ Terms which occur at the rhyme are marked [r] in the glossary, and any *hapax legomena* by [h].

³⁸ Compare Raimbaut d'Aurenga, I, 14–15 (*picvaira*).

³⁹ The exceptions being *parelh-paria*, XXX, 19; *pela-cill*, XXXIII, 48 and the personification *Senes-Razo*, XXXII, 36.

⁴⁰ *na Front-Baldit*, XII, 28; *na Bona-illi-fo*, XXXI, 58; *na Cropa-Fort*, XXXIV, 41; *n'Acropit-Bec-d'Aysola*, XXXVIII, 22. Compare *don Chaut-Morsel*, XXXII, 78.

⁴¹ See Méjean, 'Mots composés', p. 95; Klingebiel, *Noun and Verb Compounding*.

⁴² See also the hapax *pela-cill*, XXXIII, 48, which we include although it is unlikely to be a coinage by Marcabru.

⁴³ Schultz-Gora, 'Zum "griechischen" Akkusativ'; Méjean, 'Mots composés', p. 96.

stigmatised wicked gossips belong to the noun + modifier type: *lengua-traversana*, XXI, 19; *lenguas-trencans*, XXXIV, 15; *lenguas-planas*, XXXVI, 17. *Pan-Perdut*, XX, 38, *Chaut-Morsel*, XXXII, 78 and *Cropa-Fort*, XXXIV, 41 are composed of noun + adj. The uninflected forms *Front-Baldit*, XII, 28 (nom. sg.), *Acropit-Bec-d'Aysola*, XXXVIII, 22 (nom. sg.) and *fraich-faillit*, XXXV, 62 (obl. pl.) suggest that such formations could be treated as invariable. *Francs-faillitiz*, XIX, 71, like *viu-mort*, XI, 58, coordinates two adjectival elements, both of which are inflected, and are used substantivally. *Bona-ilh-fo*, XXXI, 58 is a *senhal* formed from a verbal phrase (< *bona* (adj.) + *fo(n)* 'she was' = 'She was good to him') with an ironic connotation in this context.

Similarly, several neologisms unique to Marcabru seem to be satirical or parodic coinages, inspired by the poetic context: see especially the *pastorela*: *pareil-paria*, XXX, 19; *pareillatura*, XXX, 73; *pareilla*, XXX, 77; and *pareillaria*, XXX, 24; *atropellada*, XXX, 48; and *cogular*, XXIX, 28.⁴⁴

Prefixed forms which, according to the available dictionary evidence, are apparently found only in Marcabru's works, generally conform to ordinary models and patterns examined by Adams, *Word-formation*: *contra* + verb (*contradonar*, XIX, 27; *contradenteiar*, XXXVIII, 21; *contramerir*, VIII, 53; *contrapareiar*, XXXVIII, 56);⁴⁵ *en* + verb (*eviolar*, XXXVIII, 57; *engualhar*, XIV, 26; *endoschar*, XVIII, 63; *enbruigar*, XIX, 17; *encativir*, XIX, 58; *engirbaudinar*, XXXI, 63; *enfullir*, XLI, 1; *enleconir*, XLII, 20);⁴⁶ *a* + verb (*acaminar*, IV, 34; *affondre*, XII, 24; *acomudar*, V, 22; *avezinar*, XXXI, 64, XXXVII, 33;⁴⁷ *amolar*, XXXVIII, 8),⁴⁸ including one example of a double prefixation (*a* + *con* *acovidar*, XXXVIII, 57); *re-* frequentative (*recoindar*, XII, 11); *sobre-* (*sobrefotre* (sb.), XXXVIII, 31). *Perdonar* (XXV, 71) seems to have been used in its original sense, suggested by the etymology (*per* + *donar*).

In contrast, suffixations and resuffixations are much more frequent and striking in Marcabru's songs. While many are formed according to common models, a few are not and we refer readers to the notes to XXXIII, 10 (*entrebesquill*), XXV, 2 and 15 (*matinada*) and XLIV, 67 (*moren*). In a number of cases, suffixations – or resuffixations⁴⁹ – combine with rare words, including three possible post-verbal formations (*graiüs*, XL, 38; *rebon*, II, 34; *roill*, XXXIII, 54), in order to satisfy the demanding requirements of the rhyme of a particular song (see 'Versification' below).

Adjectival and substantival suffixes:

- ada* (sb.): *atropellada*, XXX, 48; *matinada*, XXV, 2 and 15
- ador* (agent noun): *ganador*, VIII, 6; *mesclador*, XXXVI, 35
- aire* (verbal noun): *copaire*, V, 23

⁴⁴ Contrast his usage of other formations such as *non-cura* (IX, 18; XXVIII, 27) which are frequent in Occitan.

⁴⁵ The last two are probably parasynthetic formations.

⁴⁶ The last seven are perhaps best regarded as parasynthetic formations.

⁴⁷ The last two are probably parasynthetic formations.

⁴⁸ *amolar*, XXXVIII, 8 is not attested elsewhere in this sense; *abreichar*, XLII, 24 probably also belongs in this category: see the note. See also *acuillir*, XXII, 39, and compare Adams, *Word-formation*, p. 412 on prefixation with no change of meaning.

⁴⁹ See *sordegier*, III, 12; *verdon*, *chanton*, II, 7–8; *frescum*, II, 4; *damnuix*, III, 19.

- al (adj.): *sabençaus* XXXV, 32
- aria (sb.): *pareillaria*, XXX, 24
- at: *donatz* (verbal noun), XXXIX, 43
- atura (sb.): *pareillatura*, XXX, 73
- el (sb.): *badarel*, XLII, 16; *bufarel*, XLII, 25; *cornudel*, XLII, 30
- ensa (sb.): *amortensa*, XXVI, 22; *durensa*, XXXII, 10
- es (sb.): *laides*, XXXII, 31
- et (sb. dim.): *floquet*, IX, 34; *gozet*, IX, 24
- ic (sb.): *meric*, XXVI, 31
- idor (agent noun): *felpidor*, XXXV, 49
- ier (adj.): *sordegier*, III, 12
- il/-ilh: *acaptil*, XXXIII, 32; *departill*, XXXIII, 46; *entrebesquill*, XXXIII, 10; *naugill*, XXXIII, 26
- illa (sb.): *frondilla*, XXI, 36
- in: *moillerzin*, XII, 37; *badoï*, XVII, 36; *fraitina*, XXXVII, 20
- iu (adj.): *badiu*, XLII, 16; *descoberti*, VIII, 24; *femeniu*, XXXVIII, 28; *veilliu*, XXVI, 39
- on (sb.): *verdon*, *chanton*, II, 7–8
- os (adj.): *abduros*, VII, 47; *cogossos*, XXIX, 19; *luxorios*, XXXV, 46 and XL, 24
- uc: *baudux*, III, 23, 31; *damnux*, III, 19
- um (sb.): *frescum*, II, 4

Verbal suffixes (see also parasynthetic formations above, notes 45–47):

- ar: *cogular*, XXIX, 28; *enbruigar*, XIX, 17; *endoschar*, XVIII, 63; *enguasalhar*, XIV, 26; *eviolar*, XXXVIII, 57; *mignar*, XVIII, 19;
- eiar: *amoreiar*, XXXVII, 46; *contradenteiar*, XXXVIII, 21; *contrapareiar*, XXXVIII, 56; *girbaudoneiar*, XXXVIII, 35
- illar: *amaïstrillar*, XXXIII, 28; *branquillar*, XXI, 2; *brondillar*, XXXIII, 6; *bruzillar*, XXI, 16; *buzillar*, XXI, 18; *fremillar*, XXI, 44; *grazillar*, XX, 18, XXI, 6; *grondillar*, XXI, 12; *ranquillar*, XXXIII, 30;
- inar: *engirbaudinar*, XXXI, 63
- ir: *encaitvir*, XIX, 58; *enfullir*, XLI, 1; *enleconir*, XLII, 20
- olar: *badaiolar*, XXXVIII, 43; *faysolar* XXXVIII, 31; *trebaiolar*, XXXVIII, 38.⁵⁰

Transitive verbs used absolutely appear to be common in Marcabru's corpus: *brisar*, XVIII, 7; *canar*, XXI, 35; *degrunar*, XVIII, 75; *dezertir*, XXI, 22; *esclarzir*, XL, 1; *essilhar*, XI, 19 and XXI, 22; *fretar*, XVIII, 57; *intrar*, XXXIII, 53; *mastinar*, XXXI, 48; *raire*, V, 8; *refondre*, II, 37; *tressaillir*, VI, 54; possibly also *partir* and *chauzir*, XL, 3. The normally intransitive *braire*, however, seems to be used transitively in XXXI, 79, 83.

As others have observed, the language of the songs features a few Gasconisms (see *escoutar*, XV, 2; *partiram*, VI, 3 and *seaz*, VI, 48),⁵¹ but it also contains traits

⁵⁰ See also the note to *reviolar* XXXVIII, 1.

⁵¹ Compare Mölk, *Trobar clus*, p. 86: he sees word-formation by composition as a Gascon trait (referring to Rohlf's, *Le Gascon*, p. 156); he also cites as evidence *lucs*, III, 10 (but *FEW*, V, 441 and Roncaglia, 'Al departir', p. 12, note only that the word *survives* now in Gascon, whereas it

from other areas, even perhaps from outside the Occitan region (see the notes to XXX, 31 on *-ec* preterite forms in the Albigeois, Toulousain, Foix; VIII, 61 on *escarabot* as a regionalism, possibly a Gallicism; see also VI, 9 on *no m'es pas* as a Gallicism) and these very slight pieces of evidence do not in our view allow any secure conclusions to be drawn concerning the origins of the poet Marcabru himself.⁵²

A number of linguistic features highlighted by our edition encourage us to draw conclusions concerning Occitan lyric usage in the period when Marcabru was composing. First among these are the numerous instances of non-normative case-inflexions in the corpus of Marcabru's songs. The overall tendency of such forms favours the obl. at the expense of the nom. – nom. sg. forms tend to lack inflections and nom. pl. to acquire them. The evidence is scattered across the entire MS tradition (see 'Editorial policy and practice') and is at times very complex: see for example the hypercorrection of CR in XLIII, 30 and of AIK in XL.

Forms at the rhyme (whether internal or end-rhyme) are given in bold.

Inflected nom. pl. and pl. which have been subject to form levelling:

e·ls plors, I, 25; *e·ls auzels*, II, 7; *encaritz*, II, 13; *·ls gilos*, II, 16; *els*, II, 32; *dolens*, III, 16; *mortz*, III, 17; *e·ls vius*, III, 18; *quals mortz*, III, 37; *·ls rics*, III, 50; ***pagutz***, IV, 14; *moilleratz*, pl. voc. IV, 31; *trichaire*, XVII, 23; *los baus*, XIX, 20; ***efanz petiz***, XIX, 53; ***gartz***, XXIV, 23; *elhs*, XXVIII, 7; *Homisidas*, XL, 22; *simoniax*, XL, 23; *sels*, XL, 26; *ebriaicx* and *escogosatz*, XL, 29; *preveires* and *abatz*, XL, 30; *los fals*, XL, 33.

Uninflected nom. sg.:

donar, IV, 48; *auzit* uninflected p. part. VIII, 45; *enap*, XI, 47; *drech*, XI, 54; *segnoriu*, XII, 46; *amar*, XIV, 19; *tal m.*, XVII, 34; *nostre cuiar*, XIX, 23; *rossinholet*, XXI, 3; *amor*, XXI, 38; *gen*, XXI, 43; *chant*, XXVIII, 3; *freig*, XXXI, 10; *amar*, XXXI, 39; *voluntat*, XXXI, 48; *gen*, XXXIV, 5; *soffrir*, XXXVII, 24; *amor*, XL, 3; *amor*, XL, 8; *fin' amor* voc. XL, 34.

Inflected sg. obl. and sg. nouns which have been subject to form levelling:

jovenz, IV, 50; *chantaire*, V, 1; *amors*, VI, 14; *amors*, VII, 31; *amos* for *amors*, VII, 33; *donaire*, IX, 32; *d'en Constanz l'engignaire*, XVII, 11; *amors*, XXI, 23; *amors*, XXV, 77; *jois*, XXXVI, 11.⁵³

Of those nouns which we understand as personifications, a possible seven represent uninflected nom. sg. (*amar*, XXXI, 39; *amor*, XXI, 38; XL, 3 and 8;

was originally widespread across Gallo-Romania); VI, 7 *baissa* (but see our note); XL, 42 *per tu* (but see our note); XXVI, 81 *mandi* 3 p. sg. pr. subj. (but see our note); IX, 28 *per son* (but see our note).

⁵² VI, 3 *partiram* and VI, 9 *no m'es pas* occur in what are ostensibly the words of Uc Catola, but we include these forms in the 'Marcabru' corpus. It is possible that *prist*, XXXVI, 30 is also a regionalism.

⁵³ The following examples do not fit into the above categories but may offer unusual forms of words which decline: *autruis* (inflected), XL, 20 and XXXIV, 24; *avol* pl. obl. IV, 53.

donar, IV, 48; *drech*, XI, 54; *fin' amor* vocative, XL, 34), while up to seven more are inflected obl. sg. (*amors*, VI, 14; VII, 31; XXI, 23; XXV, 77; *amos*, VII, 33; *jois*, XXXVI, 11; *jovenz*, IV, 50). If these last two are, as we suggest, formed by analogy with *Amors*, obl. sg., they demonstrate that treatment of inflected personifications as invariable was an early development, but one which was not systematic.

More significant as an indication of authorial usage is the case-levelling of imparisyllabic nouns: six of the seven examples of apparent deviation from the supposed norm in Marcabru's songs occur at the rhyme, both end-rhyme (*chantaire* obl. sg. V, 1; *donaire* obl. sg. IX, 32; *engnaire* obl. sg. XVII, 11; *trichaire* nom. pl. XVII, 23; *abatz* nom. pl. XL, 30) and internal rhyme (*gartz* nom. pl. XXIV, 23). A further five flexional 'irregularities' appear at the rhyme: *pagutz* (IV, 14); *auzit* p. part. nom. sg. (VIII, 45); *cuia* nom. sg. (XIX, 23); *efanz petiz* nom. pl. (XIX, 53); *escogozatz* nom. pl. (XL, 29). Not only are these forms assured by the versification, but several are supported by MS evidence which cuts across the divisions in the MS tradition (see *gartz*, XXIV, 23, and compare *auzit*, VIII, 45 in *AIKa'*).

Marcabru's poems present several examples of special tense usages which affect aspect: preterite expressing a supposition in the past *degron esser* (III, 12); 'non-perfective' preterites (XIII, 13; XVIII, 31–32; XVIII, 77–78; and possibly XXXVI, 31–32); present with the force of the preterite (VII, 17); future perfect with the force of the perfect (VIII, 37 and XXXVI, 15); future used for a repeated action (XLI, 20).

The conditional and subjunctive are sometimes used with special functions. Conditional II is employed in a context envisaging the non-realisation of a (sometimes only implicitly stated) hypothesis (XXXIX, 36). Conditional I occurs with the same force in III, 31, but we suspect this usage to be scribal, not authorial. In XXXIII, 6 *jusc' al* appears to trigger use of the subjunctive, as does *atendre com* (XLIV, 39); and the subjunctive is found instead of the usual future or conditional to denote futurity and legal obligation (XVI, 21).

The corpus also contains examples of unusual verb morphology, several of them at the rhyme: *seghorui* 1 p. sg. pr. ind. (XII, 13); *diu* for *dic* (VIII, 26 at the rhyme); 1 p. sg. pr. ind. *puos* for *puosc* (XXXIX, 50); 2 p. sg. pret. *vengues* (XX, 35 at the rhyme); *baissa* 3 p. sg. pret. (VI, 7); *auziz* 2 p. pr. ind. (XIX, 17); *luira* 3. p. sg. fut. of *luzir* (XXXV, 33); *engenrec* and *faizonec* 3 p. sg. pret. (XXX, 31 and 44 Albigeois, Toulousain and Foix); *vair* 3 p. sg. pr. ind. (XXIV, 6 a Limousin feature at the internal rhyme). Less unusual but perhaps striking by their early appearance are the examples of reduced 2 p. pl. forms: *avetz* > *aves* (VII, 37); *auiatz* > *auias* (IX, 1); *intratz* > *intras* (XVI, 8).

Alongside these one may note certain unusual forms of the personal pronoun: *us* 2 p. pl. nom. (XVIII, 60); *os* for *vos* accusative (XXVI, 75); and an early example of *tu* obl. (XL, 42).

This evidence suggests that the language at this time was in a greater state of flux than modern textbooks imply.

The following miscellaneous morphosyntactical points are recorded not because they are all particularly unusual, but because they have proven difficult to corroborate in standard reference works.

There are three instances of *a-i* (III, 45; XIV, 27; XIX, 1); on two occasions we understand *que* to have the force 'whereas' (IV, 11; XXX, 40) and *per* to mean 'despite' (XX, 15; XIV, 20); *per* indicates contrast in XXIV, 7 and 8; in XIV, 35 *que* represents *so que*; *contra* is used temporally on five occasions (IV, 9; III, 7; XIV, 1; XXIV, 1; XXXI, 11); *per cho* anticipates the following clause (XXXVII, 19–20); compare *per so* anticipates *que* (VII, 11–12; XXXIX, 22–24); and twice *so don* appears to serve as direct object (XII, 15; XIX, 70).

According to our interpretation, the corpus contains several pleonastic constructions: two relative clauses (*c'a* VIII, 14; *c'ai agut* VIII, 34); at least two instances of pleonastic *en* (see for example VII, 51; XXXI, 30); semi-pleonastic 'i' (XXXIII, 41); and a passage where *l'* object pron. is part of a complementary relation clause anticipating a noun object (VIII, 13–14). In V, 9 and XLIV, 27, however, pronouns refer back to a noun absent but implied. A relative pronoun may function as an object in one clause and subject in the next (VIII, 34–35; compare the functions of *Estz lauzengiers* in XXXIV, 15–18).

There are two instances of anacoluthon: VIII, 10; XV, 29 (compare also the note to XXXVI, 3–6), and several examples of the variety of functions of the conjunction *e* studied by Ménard ('*E* initial'): *e* 'and yet' (III, 38 and XII, 38); *e* contrastive (XXII, 28); *e . . . e . . .* (XII, 24–25), while the forms *a* for *ab* and *e* for *en* are also frequently attested.⁵⁴

Marcabru's songs also offer isolated examples of the following points:

- a construction *a* + infinitive is apparently used in place of the gerund (XLII, 12)
- a construction involving f. adj. + m. adj. to qualify following f. sb. and m. sb. (VIII, 29–30)
- construction *ad sensum* switches from sg. to pl. subject (XLIV, 18–20)
- *mieills*, adv., with adj. function, *-s* in obl. (XXXVIII, 29)
- *no-u* representing *no o* (VII, 18)
- earliest instance of *n' = no* (XV, 36)
- *tan non* as emphatic negative (XXXIX, 28)
- paratactic construction following *tal* (XVI, 45)
- *sol* as invariable adv. (XIX, 35)
- *ab . . . que* separable (XXXVI, 37–38)
- *tals . . . qe* separable (V, 25; see also XXX, 89–90)
- *ab tan que*, XXXVII, 40 (assumed construction)
- *a tal . . . per qe*, as a possible variant of *per tal que* 'so that', with inversion? (XVII, 32–33)
- *mas que* with the sense 'what is more, moreover' (XXVI, 36)
- *puois . . . ancse* with the sense 'since first' (VIII, 34)
- *qal . . . qal* with the sense 'whether . . . or' (XI, 69)

⁵⁴ See *a* for *ab*, XXXVII, 7, 16, 28 and so on; *e* for *en*, see XXX, 46; XXXIII, 26; XXXVII, 2 and 23; III, 52; XXI, 5 and 38; XIII, 38; XVI, 28; XXVI, 83.

- *tantas* f. pl. used pronominally with the sense 'so much' (XV, 10)
- *aital* back reference (XVIII, 8)
- *si* forward reference (XVIII, 33)
- Syntax: position of *nos* (IV, 58)

4. Versification⁵⁵

In our view, Marcabru's works display a number of the traits of rough or 'jongleuresque' versification which have been identified *inter alia* among the early troubadours or those somewhat marginal to the mainstream courtly lyric tradition: these include toleration of irregularities in the quality, position and sequence of rhymes (both end-rhymes and internal rhymes), and differences in the length and construction of both strophes and their constituent lines.⁵⁶

Three of the songs feature metrical irregularities, though none of these would make them impossible to sing.⁵⁷ Hypermetric lines are to be found in VII, 13, 14 and line 18 is hypometric. This song is a *unicum* with other features characteristic of looser versification, so we do not attempt to correct. In songs composed of decasyllabic or longer lines, the irregularities are more frequent, and the evidence of the MSS strongly suggests that these were authorial. In the decasyllabic poem IX, lines 14 and 34 feature a lyric and an epic caesura respectively, and the disposition of internal rhymes at the caesura is irregular (see especially IX, 18–19), with assonance replacing a full rhyme on at least one occasion (IX, 15–16). Similarly, XXIV is composed of lines of eleven and fourteen syllables each of which contains two internal rhymes, but their placing and treatment in relation to the scansion of the lines display numerous irregularities. On the other hand, several of Marcabru's songs containing short lines can be construed as made up of octosyllables or decasyllables, with *regular* caesuras and internal rhymes.⁵⁸ Some songs allow for correct scansion through an elastic use of hiatus and/or liaison,⁵⁹ but the vast majority of Marcabru's songs display regular scansion.

In contrast, a much more flexible approach emerges in the poet's treatment of rhymes, and a number of songs feature phonetically approximate rhymes.

⁵⁵ For fuller discussion, see 'Versification' for each poem.

⁵⁶ See Marshall, 'Versification'.

⁵⁷ On anisosyllabic lines and musical performance, see Marshall, 'Versification', pp. 53–61; Billy, *Architecture*, pp. 48–49 and see the note to IX, 33–34.

⁵⁸ See XIX: eight octosyllabic lines, with an internal rhyme in the fifth line of every stanza (compare, however, the note to XIX, 41–42); XXXII: four decasyllabic lines (with an epic caesura and internal rhyme) and a tail-rhyme (see however XXXII 'Versification'); XLIV: the last four lines of every stanza as decasyllabic lines with an internal f. rhyme; XVI, XX, XLIII: *versus tripartitus caudatus* as 4 octosyllabic lines with internal rhymes in the first and third lines (see XVI 'Versification').

⁵⁹ Hiatus: see *mange e* 3 syllables XVI, 18; *proeza ama* 4 syllables + f. ending, no elision XI, 13. Compare liaison: *ja acueilh* 2 syllables, XII, 29; *m'a 'pres* 2 syllables, XII, 7; *a usar* 2 syllables, XXXII, 69; *l'aura envazit* 4 syllables, VIII, 13.

Table of rhymes

We include only the main edition of the poems (excluding the poems of doubtful attribution) and use arabic numbering. We include here both end-rhymes and internal rhymes. Entries presented as x (y) indicate the presence of one or more rhyme-words which are phonetically approximate. Anomalies which arise from irregularity or fluidity in the rhyme-schemes are discussed below (see pp. 24–25). Readers are referred to the ‘Versification’ for each poem for detailed discussion of these irregularities.

We adopt the conventional graphies used by Frank, *Répertoire*, I, pp. xxxvi–xxxvii note 2, and Beltrami and Vatteroni, *Rimario*, I, pp. vii–viii:

a grave accent is used for open ‘e’ and ‘o’
 an acute accent for close ‘e’ and ‘o’
 (n) for unstable ‘n’
 nh for palatalised ‘n’
 lh for palatalised ‘l’
 ch for palatal fricative
 -j- for intervocalic yod
 -z- for intervocalic voiced ‘s’

-a	24	-at	4, 25
-a (-a(n))	7	-at (-as)	35
-ach	16, 24	-ata	11, 18
-ada	5, 18, 25, 28, 30	-atge	28, 30
-ai	6, 16, 20, 25, 29, 31, 32, 43	-atz	1, 6, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 39, 40
-aire	5, 9, 17, 24, 30, 32	-aus (-als)	16, 35
-ais	7	-auza	11
-aja	32	-avi	18
-al (-au)*	4, 8, 19, 22, 33, 38, 40, 43	-èc	43
-ala	11	-éch	16
-alh	4, 14, 16, 22, 43	-écha	18, 42
-alha	14, 42	-ècha	24
-am	6	-èga	18
-ama	11	-éi	1, 7, 23, 24, 25
-a(n) (-a)	7	-éis	22
-a(n)	2	-éis (-és)	25, 32, 43
-an	2, 4, 7, 22, 24, 41, 44	-éja	37, 38
-ana	21, 30 (or -aina), 36	-èja (-éja)	37
-anas (-ana)	36	-èl	1, 24, 32, 42
-anh	4	-élha	32
-a(n)s	43	-élha (-ilha)	21
-ans	14, 20, 25, 34	-èls	16
-ansa	13, 14, 18, 37	-ems	4
-anta	11	-é	8
-ar	1, 8, 15, 19, 20, 23, 29, 32, 34, 40, 43	-en	11, 24, 44
-art	16, 23	-enh	8, 44
-artz	24	-enh (-en)	40
-as	22, 25, 35	-enhs	16
		-enha	18, 24

22 Introduction

-ens	16, 20, 23, 40, 44	-óis	20
-ensa	26, 32	-ól	16
-ér	20, 23, 38	-óla	38
-ér (-ir)	39	-òlh	6, 16, 23, 24
-éra	18	-óls	43
-èrs	23	-ó	2, 4, 6, 9, 16, 22, 31, 32, 35
-érs (-és)	7	-ón	1, 2, 4, 24
-és	7, 15, 16, 20, 25, 32, 35, 39, 40	-onda	12
-és (-éis)	43	-oinda (-onda)	12
-ès	6	-onja	11
-ésc	14	-ór	6, 9, 13, 24, 35, 36, 40, 43
-ésca	11, 14	-órs	1
-èt	26	-órs (-ós)	7
-étz	20	-òrt	9, 34, 35
-étz	23, 43	-òrt (-òrtz)	22
-éu	24	-òrtz	22
-èu	16	-ós	4, 7, 20, 29
-i	4, 12, 17, 24, 26, 35, 44	-ósca	18
-ia	24, 25, 30, 32, 42, 44	-ót	24
-ic	22, 26, 32, 43	-ót (-utz)	4
-icx	1	-ótz	20
-ida	26, 36, 42	-u	20
-ier	1, 3, 19, 24, 40	-uch	8, 16
-iers	41	-ucs	3
-iga	24	-uda	5
-ilh	33, 38	-ufa	42
-ilha	11, 21	-ui	16, 26
-im	13	-uida (-uda)	5
-ina	31, 36, 37	-uja	18
-inh (-im)	13	-um	2
-inha	18	-una	18
-ir	7, 16, 20, 22, 23, 34, 39, 41, 42, 43	-ur	13, 16
-is	40	-ura	9, 28, 30, 37
-issa	30	-us	4, 12, 16, 25, 40, 43
-it	8	-us (-utz)	4
-itz	4, 6, 19, 40, 44	-usca	11
-iu	8, 22, 24, 26, 29	-ustz (-utz)	4
-iza	11, 18, 28	-ut	20, 24
-òc	2, 31	-utz	4, 26, 39
		-uza	42

* All pieces show mixture of words with etyma in -l- and words with etyma in -u- or -w-, except for 22, 40 and 43: in these pieces, no doubt because the rhyme-words are so few in number (respectively four, two and two), all the rhyme-words have etyma in -l-.

In order to supply some of the necessary rhymes in -ia, forms involving the disappearance of intervocalic -d- are used in XXV, 11 (*tras[a]lia*), 55 (*vestia*) and 66 (*frai[di]a*), while VII, 54 and 56 show the rhyming of forms in -a with those in

-a(n), a feature found in the works of other twelfth-century troubadours. On several occasions, approximate or faulty rhymes are attested by all the relevant MSS across the traditions,⁶⁰ suggesting that the irregularities were both authorial and acceptable at the time that Marcabru was composing. Overall, twelve out of forty-two songs have at least one instance of an irregular rhyme, and some have several.⁶¹

Repeated rhyme-words are similarly rather common in Marcabru's corpus: they feature in fifteen out of forty-two songs and we have not seen repetition alone as sufficient grounds for editorial intervention.⁶² In eight of these cases, we understand such repetitions as examples of *rim equivoc*.⁶³

While loose, approximate rhymes are features of some songs, others by contrast demonstrate concern for accuracy within restricted parameters. Characteristic of the Marcabru corpus is the use of rare and/or difficult rhymes:⁶⁴ -avi (XVIII); -éu (XXIV); -ósca (XVIII); -ufa (XLII); -uza (XLII), for example, are apparently found only in Marcabru, while -èls (XVI); -enhs (XVI); -inha (XVIII); -um (II); -uja (XVIII); -usca (XI) are used by Marcabru and one other troubadour,⁶⁵ and many of his songs which feature rare rhymes demonstrate considerable care in rhyming. A striking example of Marcabru's virtuosity and rigour as a versifier is XIV which, although damaged in transmission, is built on an intricate pattern of derived rhymes including the rare -ésc/-ésca

Marcabru often shows a virtuoso proficiency in the accurate rhyming of difficult rhymes. As has been observed ('Language'), many of the rare words attested by his songs are found at the rhyme and Marcabru does not hesitate to confect forms for the sake of the rhyme.⁶⁶ Poem XXXIII may conveniently serve as an illustration of the variety of devices he employs to achieve correct rhymes. The song is composed of *coblas unissonans* with two rhyme-sounds, -au and -ilh, the former represented by a mixture of forms in -au and in a + palatalised l. Rhymes in -ilh are supplied by ordinary nouns,⁶⁷ a subject pron. and demonstrative pron. (*ill*, 40, and *cill*, 16) and finite verbs which exploit the similar flexional patterns of the 1 and 3 p. sg. pr. ind. and subj.⁶⁸ Suffixation and resuffixation are exploited: (*brondill*, 6; *amaistrill*, 28; *ranquill*, 30), and result in the creation of apparent nonce-words (*departill*, 46; *naugill*, 26), including – unusually – two adjs (*acaptill*, 32, and *entrebesquill*, 10). In addition, a compound neologism

⁶⁰ See for example IV, 30; XXXVI, 17; XXXIX, 33 and 47.

⁶¹ We refer here only to the main edited versions of the poems.

⁶² I, 17 and 20 (*mon*); V, 15 and 40 (*saubuda*), 16 and 46 (*perduda*), 26 and 36 (*laire*); IX, 2 and 29 (*pura*); XIII, 4 and 20 (*refrim*), 8 and 32 (*speranza*); XVIII, 54 and 72 (*gardatz*); XXIV, 8 and 21 (*peior*); XXXI, 6 and 43 (*gai*); XXXIV, 14 and 21 (*renhar*); XXXIX, 2 and 18 (*vengutz*) and 22 and 57 (*enraigatz*); XLII, 1 and 3 (*bufa*); see also the next note.

⁶³ See III, 17 and 37 (*primier*); III, 23 and 31 (*baudux*); IX, 10 (*penchura*) and 34 (*peintura*); XVI, 21 and 27 (*partir*); XXII, 53 and 56 (*seignoriu*); XXV, 2 and 15 (*matinada*); XXXIII, 52 and 54 (*roill*); XXXIX, 47 and 60 (*salutz*); compare the near-repetitions of IX, 15 and 31 (*aire* and *de bon aire*) and XIII, 17 and 43 (*agur* and *malaiür*).

⁶⁴ This may have had an influence on the attribution of some poems marginal to the tradition, such as our DI and DII (see 'Marcabru in the *chansonniers*').

⁶⁵ Compare these entries in Beltrami and Vatteroni, *Rimario*, I.

⁶⁶ See the rhyme-words in -ey in poem I.

⁶⁷ *branquill* (2), *grazill* (4), *fozill* (8), *gratill* (12) and so on.

⁶⁸ *meravill* (44) and *atill* (24); see Sutherland, 'Flexional patterns', pp. 68–69.

(*pela-cill*, 48), two rare words (*foill*, 50 and *becill*, 38) and what we understand as a post-verbal sb. (*roill*, 54), which produces a *rim equivoc* (see 52), are pressed into service to meet the demands of the rhyme. Compare also poem XLII, where several of the rhyme-words, including suffixed forms, are apparently attested in Marcabru's corpus only.⁶⁹

Other unusual devices are occasionally exploited to ensure a correct rhyme. Marcabru has recourse to what seem to be the earliest examples of a *rim accentual* or systole, in which the accent of a paroxyton shifts to the post-tonic vowel (XXVI, 81; compare the note to XLI, 19) and a *rim trencat*, which involves the syllabic splitting of a word over two lines in order to supply the rhyme (XXVI, 82–83). While what Billy terms 'post-toniques supplétives', some with elision, are employed to supply rhymes in *-ama*, *-ana*, *-ada* and *-aire*,⁷⁰ XXII, 23 gives a rhyme in *-òrtz* by means of a peculiar elided form, created by enjambement, which seems unparalleled in troubadour usage. It may be that some of these techniques were special effects, possibly comic, for example. Recourse to such devices may be thought to demonstrate a concern for meeting the technical challenge, ensuring exact rhymes in some songs, whereas in others irregularities appear for rhymes which are by and large not difficult ones. On occasion, loose rhymes seem to have a positive function: see poem VII where we suggest assonance may evoke the epic. We conclude that Marcabru's priorities varied and his practice gives proof of considerable versatility and inventiveness.

It is usually assumed that *tornadas* repeat the versification of the last lines of the last complete stanza of a song,⁷¹ and the majority of *tornadas* present in Marcabru's corpus conform to this model, but the fact that at least five pieces do introduce variations in the rhymes of their *tornadas* (V, XVI, XXV – XXVI and XXXVI) suggests that in this respect also, early troubadour practice was more flexible than later prescriptive writings imply.⁷²

Fourteen of Marcabru's songs employ versification schemes not found elsewhere in the troubadour corpus (according to Frank, *Répertoire*): I, II, IV, V, XI, XVII, XIX, XXV–XXVI, XXXI, XXXII, XXXV, XXXVII and XL. In the cases of II and XL, our interpretation of the evidence leads us to different conclusions concerning the versification from those advanced by Frank – or, indeed, other scholars. Both pieces demonstrate regular features, as well as a number of unique ones (especially in the permutations of rhymes and/or shifts of rhyme scheme), and they suggest that such licences were regarded as acceptable in the early period of troubadour lyric poetry.

Irregularities in the versification of a song sometimes involve the appearance of rhyme-sounds at unexpected positions within the rhyme-scheme of the song. In XXXVI, 5, *-ida* (an 'a' rhyme in the conventional representation) appears where a

⁶⁹ See also poems III, XXI and XXXVIII.

⁷⁰ See *Architecture*, pp. 64–65; see *bram' a*, XI, 5; *Jordan a*, XXI, 47; *beutat esmerad' a*, XXX, 45; *vair' e*, V, 14.

⁷¹ See Mölk, 'Deux remarques', Chambers, *Introduction*, p. 32.

⁷² See 'Versification' for these poems. In the case of XVI it may be that the influence of the non-stanzaic *versus tripertitus caudatus* form encouraged the use of new rhymes in the lyric *tornada*.

strict system of *coblas alternadas* would lead one to expect a 'c' rhyme in *-ina*. Rhymes in *-ada* and *-aire* are features of V, but on two occasions (*copaire*, 23 and *desiraire*, 55), the latter appears in place of the former. Poem XXXIX contains rhymes in *-atz*, *-és* and *-utz*, but their disposition is not perfectly regular: in place of rhymes in *-és*, line 33 presents *-atz* and in 47 *-utz*. Line 15 of XXV features an 'a' rhyme in *-ada* where a 'b' *-ia* would normally be expected. In stanza VI of XX, the 'a' rhymes may be identical with the 'c' rhymes, and in II the last complete stanza of the song apparently lacks a 'c' rhyme, though other examples of this feature are not absent from the troubadour corpus.⁷³

Repetitions which are part of the structure of the composition include refrains. Single *Refrainrufe* occur in XVIII (*Escoutatz*), XXXI (*ai* and *hoc*), and refrain-words in the same position at the rhyme in each stanza in III (*saücs*), XXX (*vilana* or *vilaina*), XXXV (*lavador*), and in XIX in all but the second stanza (*cuiar*).

In several songs the sense and syntax require one to understand an enjambement from one stanza to the next: IX, 16–17; XIII, 40–41; XXXVIII, 56–57, a device which can also be paralleled in the works of other twelfth-century troubadours, and one which is found also in the *tomadas* of XII and XVI.⁷⁴

The most common scheme of versification used by Marcabru is *coblas unissonans* (III, V, IX, XII, XIII, XV, XVII, XIX, XXI, XXIV, XXVIII, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXVII, XXXIX, XLI), followed by *coblas singulares* (I, IV, VII, XVI, XVIII, XX and XLIII, XXII, XXIII, XXV and XXVI, XLII). Three pieces, which we also believe to be connected from the point of view of theme and performance, XVI, XX and XLIII, are examples of the *versus triperititus caudatus* form. There are two examples of *coblas alternadas* (XXXVI and XXXVIII), in the first of which the principle of alternating 'c' and 'd' rhymes is carried over into the *tomada*, and nine songs composed of *coblas doblas* (VI, VIII, XI, XIV, XXIX, XXX, XXXII, XL, XLIV). Of these, three (XIV, XXIX and XLIV) have apparently undergone damage during the process of transmission and the pairs of stanzas are incomplete (at least one stanza seems to be lacking), and VIII may also belong to this category in that, as transmitted by A, its final eleven lines form stanzas (or *tomadas*) of shorter length. Compare VII, which we also see as having two *tomadas* of unequal length, and see Cercamon, ed. Tortoreto, VI, 49–56.⁷⁵

Overall, one is struck by the variety in Marcabru's songs. Some aspects find sporadic parallels with the works of other early troubadours and it is possible that for contemporary audiences some forms may have had intertextual or generic resonances. The *incipit* and versification of XXXII, for example, may recall the epic, while VII's monorhyme verse structure may echo saints' lives as well as the *chanson de geste*. The use of the liturgical form *versus triperititus caudatus* in XVI, XX and XLIII may have parodic overtones as well as possibly recalling an Occitan

⁷³ See also XVIIIb which presents three sets of repeated rhyme-sounds within the scheme of *coblas unissonans* (stanzas IV and VI *-inha*; VIII and X *-ina*; XVII and XX *-ura*): although it may be significant that several of these stanzas are not preserved in the A version, we do not believe it is possible to determine their authenticity or otherwise.

⁷⁴ See Mölk, 'Deux remarques', p. 10.

⁷⁵ Within Marcabru's own poems, the same versification is used in poems XV and XXII; in XVI, XX, XLIII; XXVIII and XLII have same rhyme scheme; XXXIV and XXXIX have identical versification.

religious piece. In XXIV we see parodic imitation of Guilhem IX as well as possible religious echoes. It has been suggested that XXIX and XXXIII may have Latin models, while XXV–XXVI, whose versification is possibly reminiscent of the *zadjal*, may also parody a Latin composition on the Annunciation. Further connections with other troubadours are suggested in XI, a parodic response to Alegret; XXIV, XXX and XXXIII are possibly responses to Guilhem IX; XV and XXVIII are probably ripostes to Jaufrè Rudel, as may also be VII. See also the explicit references to Uc Catola (VI) and Eble II of Ventadour (XXXI).

The evidence offered by Marcabru's corpus suggests that features of irregular versification may be more widespread in the troubadour lyric than has hitherto been thought: similar phenomena are certainly found in *trouvère* poetry.⁷⁶ Some of the linguistic peculiarities noted (see 'Language') occur in poems which feature licences or irregularities of versification (see for example VII). Less normative editing of other troubadours may bring more parallels and 'licences' to light (see 'Editorial policy and practice').

The melodies to only four of Marcabru's compositions have been preserved, two in MS R (XIII and XXXV) and two in the 'frenchified' MS W (XVIII and XXX). All have been recently edited by Margaret Switten.⁷⁷ Musicologists stress their individual distinctiveness and the evidence they offer of a powerful formal imagination (Pollina, 'Les mélodies', pp. 299–300; Switten, in Rosenberg *et al.*, *Songs*, p. 42; and see the commentaries to our editions). Despite this individuality Pollina (p. 290) groups XIII and XXXV together as 'cantor's pieces', reminiscent of some Gregorian chant, designed for expert or virtuoso performance, demanding a fairly wide vocal range and frequently employing ornamentation and skips, while he considers XVIII and XXX to be designed for an average vocal capacity. He suggests (pp. 299–300) that certain musical features are characteristic of Marcabru, even if they did not originate with him: for example the way in which the initial and final notes in a number of lines are identical, the use of various mimetic effects, and the interval of a rising third which always links the end of one stanza to the next.

5. *Editorial policy and practice*

The methodology used for editing medieval texts has been the subject of considerable scholarly controversy. The debate has often been polarised into so-called Lachmannian and Bédieriste positions: broadly speaking a Lachmannian editor seeks to reconstruct what s/he believes the original author to have written, whereas a Bédieriste editor edits what s/he considers to be the best MS to have survived. Recently, the proponents of the so-called New Philology have offered a critique of both methodologies and some have called for the production of diplomatic editions, offering thereby access to the texts in a form similar to their form in MSS.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ See Billy, *Architecture*, pp. 161–69.

⁷⁷ See Rosenberg *et al.*, *Songs*, pp. 47–51; see also Pollina, 'Les mélodies', pp. 303–6.

⁷⁸ For a good synopsis of traditional editorial practice see Foulet and Spear, *On Editing*, pp. 1–

Previous editors of Marcabru have by and large used a Lachmannian or neo-Lachmannian method of editing, which is to say that on the basis of an analysis of the relation of the MSS for any given poem, using in particular common errors to classify the MSS, they have attempted to reconstruct the lyric as they believe Marcabru composed it. In some instances (Roncaglia, Lazzerini) this is quite explicit; in other instances this is implicit in the results of their work (Dejeanne, Ricketts). Thus Roncaglia and Lazzerini work from a *stemma* (a diagram that depicts a hypothetical genealogy of the MSS for a song, including lost common sources) and do not edit any one MS, but rather edit (or conflate) the entire tradition to produce a single poem, while Dejeanne and Ricketts signal which MS they are using for orthography, but again edit the entire tradition as reflecting a single original work. It is true that Dejeanne sometimes offers more than one version of a song, privileging one version over another by using different fonts, but here he usually avoids a decision in favour of one version. Analysis of variants (where this is articulated, as in Roncaglia and Lazzerini's work) usually takes place on the level of the word or the line: consider, for example, Lazzerini's treatment of IV, where no consideration of the poem as a whole in its different manifestations is offered, or Roncaglia's editions of IX, XV, XVI and XXXIII which, despite seeking to evaluate the merits of entire versions of the poems in the MSS, nonetheless proceed largely by selecting between variants at a local level. In other words these scholars tend to consider 'variants' horizontally across the tradition, rather than vertically down the poem in its linguistic context, and they have a tendency to produce texts that are largely composite, often drawing heavily on two traditions that we are inclined to see as distinct, or of differing quality, or, sometimes, as dating from different stages in the poem's transmission.

Indeed, it follows from our remarks above in 'Marcabru in the *chansonniers*' that we do not accord equal status to the different MS manifestations of Marcabru's poetry, and therefore that not all the texts of the poems in the Marcabru corpus as defined in this volume can securely be viewed as reflections of the twelfth-century troubadour's work. Where we have been able to compare a version of a poem in *AIK* (and/or other MSS of the Italian tradition) with a version in *C*, we find that *AIK* almost invariably offer the better version of the text (the possible exception being *XL*), if by 'better version' one means a text that has been subjected to less *remaniement* and corruption in the course of transmission. This is not to say that *C* (or *R*) does not sometimes transmit a better reading than *AIK*, nor that *AIK* represent an 'authentic', authorial version of Marcabru's poems. As already noted, often *AIK*'s common source or *A* or *IK* (or their sources) independently contain errors or innovations. However, on the whole, as we have already indicated, we find that *AIKNa*¹ are more likely to derive from an earlier version of a poem than *CR*. The status of poems found in *C* or *CR* only is therefore open to question.

39. For new philological critiques of traditional editorial practice, see Cerquiglini, *Eloge*, Hult, 'Reading it right', and Masters, 'Distribution'. For some responses to the new philology, see Busby (ed.), *Towards a Synthesis*. On editing troubadour lyrics, see particularly Avalle, *Manoscritti*; Frank, 'L'art'; Gaunt, 'Discourse desired' and 'The text'; Lazzerini, 'Un caso esemplare'; Marshall, *Transmission*; Perugi, *Saggi*; Roncaglia, *Principe* and 'Critique textuelle'.

We have by and large used a 'best-manuscript' method of editing, which means that where a poem survives in more than one MS, we have chosen a base MS for our edition and then followed it fairly closely. We have not, however, done so at all costs, and, when we consider the base MS to be in error or unsatisfactory, we have used the other MS(S) in the first instance to produce our critical text. It should be noted that we have avoided conflating different traditions wherever possible, which makes our methodology distinct from previous editors of Marcabru since, for example, to introduce a *CR* reading into a text based on *AIK* is to mix versions that may be clearly distinct.⁷⁹ On the other hand, we have not always systematically emended our base MS from a MS belonging to the same 'family' where this is possible, since to do so might simply mean compounding an error in a common source (if, for instance, *IK* diverges from *A*, but both readings represent scribal attempts to correct an error in a common source). In other words, although we have endeavoured to be methodical, following our base MS wherever possible and then using our analysis of the MS tradition when rejecting its readings, we have also exercised judgement in every instance where we have rejected a reading in a base MS, rather than allowing a critical decision to be dictated by a rigid methodology. In a relatively small number of cases where we consider all MSS to be unsatisfactory (and thus where we posit an archetype error, which may have survived in all versions or alternatively given rise to a series of different errors or suspect readings) we emend conjecturally. Thus, on a few occasions we reject all MSS in favour of a conjectural emendation, even though one or more MSS may offer a possible reading, because there is strong evidence that a superficially correct reading (for example a grammatically correct, but clearly *facilior* reading) is in fact the result of innovation.

This of course raises the question of how a reading is to be defined as an 'error' or 'correct'. Scribes may produce copying errors of their own or reproduce errors from their source or sources, for example grammatically incorrect readings (such as plural noun + singular verb, or vice versa), botched syntax, meaningless words that they left because they thought them possibly correct even if they did not understand them, missing words, lines, or sometimes even whole stanzas (eye-skip), or interpolated words that make a line hypermetric. Sometimes an error will lead to botched versification as well as metre. An error-free transcription of a troubadour lyric in a medieval MS is extremely rare, which means that virtually all lyrics require some intervention on the part of the modern editor if the text is to be offered in a form that modern readers will find readable.

However, we have a more restricted view of 'error' than many editors of troubadour poetry, including previous editors of Marcabru lyrics, who have tended to make normative assumptions about Occitan grammar, particularly about the case system, and about troubadour versification. Thus, it has generally been assumed hitherto that the disintegration of the two-case system in Occitan took place in the thirteenth century and that early troubadours took pains to ensure regular rhyming and strict observation of regular rhyme schemes. 'Infractions' of the case system – whether these be 'incorrectly' inflected forms, uninflected forms, or 'incorrect' forms of imparisyllabics – and irregular rhymes

⁷⁹ See, for example, all previous editions of XXX.

have been seen as reflecting scribal rather than authorial practice and, consequently, corrected by editors so as to 'restore' what was taken to be the latter. In Marcabru's corpus in the MSS instances of 'infractions' of the case-system are frequent (see the section on 'Language' above). Similarly, irregularities in rhyming and scansion, though by no means the norm, are sufficiently commonplace to lead us to suspect that they are often authorial rather than scribal (see the 'Versification' section above).⁸⁰ To put all the 'infractions' of the case-system and instances of irregular versification down to scribal practice, when these phenomena are scattered across the entire MS tradition and where apparently irregular rhymes or 'incorrect' case inflections or forms of imparisyllabics are supported by MSS that otherwise diverge, is to discard the evidence that the MSS may offer for Marcabru's practice and thereby for linguistic and poetic usage in the first half of the twelfth century. Furthermore, in a number of notable instances 'infractions' of the case system occur at the rhyme, and are therefore almost certainly part of Marcabru's practice and not simply scribal (again see 'Language' and 'Versification'). We conclude from the MS evidence that Marcabru's versification was less rigid than has previously been thought and that the case-system was already showing clear, if sporadic, signs of disintegration in the first half of the twelfth century. If 'infractions' of the case system are particularly common in MSS belonging to the Occitan tradition (*CER*), it cannot be assumed that this always reflects later Occitan spoken practice, since *CR*'s source sometimes appears to have been hypercorrect in its marking of the case-system through inflections (see for example XLIII, 30) or to have avoided apparently incorrect forms of imparisyllabics (XXIV, 23), whereas a number of 'infractions' of the case-system in *CER* are supported by *AIK*. In short, our notion of 'error' is narrower than that of previous editors and scholars in that it excludes many 'infractions' of the case system and instances of irregular versification. This means that our editorial practice tends, in this respect, to be more conservative than that of previous editors, in that we retain more MS readings than they do.

On the other hand, we have perhaps made a more liberal use of the notions of *facilior* and *difficilior* readings in our analyses of the MSS, and in our editorial practice generally, than have some previous editors (the possible exception being Roncaglia), which means that our methodology is not strictly Bédieriste, despite our use of a 'best manuscript' method of editing. We see the scribes of *A* and *C* in particular (or their immediate sources) as intelligent editors of the material they collected, seeking to eliminate problematic readings and sometimes seeking alternative sources (see IV and VIII in *A*; *C* collated at least its register with another MS). These two MSS, which are in many respects attractive as bases for editions in that they often require little intervention to produce limpid and grammatically correct versions of the lyrics they transmit, contain many readings that are not technically 'errors' in that they make sense and are grammatical where other MSS might be suspect, but which we think in all likelihood result from a scribe attempting to make sense of a source he deemed unsatisfactory (for example see XXXVII in *A*): in these instances, to adopt a 'correct' medieval reading is not

⁸⁰ We have therefore also endeavoured to respect the conventions of our base manuscripts regarding the notation (or absence of notation) of elisions.

necessarily to adopt a reading that can securely be regarded as reflecting what was in the original composition and we have often sought alternative solutions. We have used *C* as a base MS only where a poem is unique to *C* (or to *C* and one other MS which is clearly defective). We have used *A* as a base for a number of poems where we felt that there was no better alternative, but in many instances we have rejected *A* in favour of a MS that we believe offers access to an earlier version of the poem that has been subject to less intervention by transmitters, even though the alternative might sometimes require more correction than *A* (IX, XIII, XV, XIX, XXX, XXXIII, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL).⁸¹

In many respects, then, we give preference to the version of the poem that we consider to reflect the earliest redaction available in extant MS sources, but this does not mean that we consider other versions to be without interest, nor that we necessarily believe that all the poems as edited by us are close to what Marcabru originally composed. In some instances we have posited a layered process of production both in Marcabru's life-time (as in IV) and beyond, with discernible distinct versions of the same poem in circulation, either because of the reordering of material, or because of the existence of additional material in some MSS, or because of substantive local reworking (IV, VIII, IX, XVIII, XX, XXIV, XXX, XXXV, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XL, XLIII, XLIV), and in some of these cases this leads us to offer more than one version of the same poem (IV, XVIII, XX, XXIV, XXXV, XXXVIII, XLIII). However, as already noted, it is crucial to realise that the evidence available for the poems in our corpus is not consistent across the corpus, either qualitatively or quantitatively. Some poems survive in a large number of MSS, including *chansonniers* from both main traditions and other, more maverick *chansonniers*: with these poems the evidence sometimes allows us to see the evolution of the text from an early version which might be close to what Marcabru composed, to later *remaniements*, in circulation in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and this evidence may be linguistic, formal, aesthetic or historical (for example see XVIII, XX and XLIII, XXIV, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL, XLIV). It is noteworthy, however, that the progression is not always *AIK* > *CR* (consider for example XL), even if this is the usual trend, and also that *remaniement* does not always lead to 'dégradation',⁸² as is so often assumed by editors of medieval texts, since the so-called vulgate versions of *CR* are often fairly plausible in their own right and only seem less convincing when compared with versions from other MSS. Sometimes it is even possible to chart the evolution of a text in transmission when it survives in only one of the main MS families (IV and XXXVII). With many pieces, however, comparison between two traditions (or within a tradition) is not possible and we are necessarily either editing a single MS or producing a text on the basis of a number of MSS deriving fairly closely from the same source. With these poems, the status of the text we edit is much less secure and it is not possible to determine whether such texts represent versions of the poems that are close to what Marcabru composed: this is perhaps particularly the case with *unica*

⁸¹ In some instances, of course, we have rejected *A* simply because it is defective or because we regard the *AIK* tradition as defective, for example XVI, XVII, XXXI, XXXV, XLIV.

⁸² On the notion of *dégradation*, see particularly Rychner, *Contribution*.

in C, where we are obliged to adopt C's testimony even though we reject it elsewhere. Furthermore, as with the *unica* in C, the attribution of some of the poems in our corpus to Marcabru may not be secure and it is possible, even likely, that the Marcabru corpus went on growing after his life-time as pieces that had a style that resembled his became attached to it, or possibly even as other poets consciously imitated his work and then tried to pass their own songs off as his.⁸³ We have to rely on the combined evidence of the MSS (which includes the *vidas* and registers, as well as the poems themselves), and, as the *chansonniers* are fictionalised representations of the lives and works of troubadours that post-date the lives of the poets whose works they transmit by in some cases up to two centuries, they may or may not be reliable.

Our aim has been to give our readers as much useful information as possible concerning the poems and their MS manifestations, but without cluttering our edition with superfluous material. We have aimed at producing a text that makes grammatical and semantic sense and that is accessible to the modern reader with a reasonable command of medieval Occitan (a text, therefore, that is 'translatable'), and this is why we have not heeded the recent call towards more diplomatic or semi-diplomatic editions (that is editions that do not use modern punctuation and reproduce medieval word division and *mise en page*). We have consulted all the surviving MSS of Marcabru lyrics on microfilm and in most instances we have also consulted the MSS themselves, as well as previous editions. The general layout of our editions of individual lyrics is as follows, though in a few instances other sections may be included where an issue that is specific to a particular poem is addressed:

- 1 The poem number in our edition, its *incipit* and its PC number.
- 2 The number of MSS together with the folio or page numbers, the poem's heading (where relevant) and its entry in the register (where relevant).
- 3 The stanza order in the MSS (where this differs between MSS) and an analysis of the stanza order (where relevant); roman numerals indicate the stanza number in our edition, arabic numerals the position of each stanza in the MSS.
- 4 A discussion of the attribution of the poem (where this is uncertain).
- 5 An analysis of the MS tradition for the poem, including a justification of our choice of base MS (where relevant); we have excluded *d* from our analyses, since it is a copy of *K*, and the *Breviari* quotations, since these all derive from a source very similar to C.
- 6 A description and discussion of the poem's versification. Frank's description of the versification is given first unless we disagree with it.
- 7 A selective bibliography of previous scholarship on the poem with, where relevant, a brief discussion; we have endeavoured to note all significant

⁸³ See, for example DI and DII, but also some of the *unica* in C or even XXXVI.

discussions of a poem, but have not tried to offer an exhaustive list of all references to it in secondary literature.

- 8 A discussion of the dating of the poem or any historical allusions where this is appropriate.
- 9 A list of previous critical editions of the poem; reproductions of lyrics in anthologies are not given here unless they involve substantial editorial work.
- 10 Our base MS is then signalled where the poem survives in more than one MS.
- 11 Our critical text, or our first critical text (where there is more than one, the second text is designated as the 'b' text). We use the following editorial conventions:
 - [R] in the right margin indicates an irregular rhyme;
 - + or – followed by a digit to the right of the text indicates a hypermetric or hypometric line;
 - where roman or arabic numerals in round brackets are set alongside stanza and line numbers, this offers a concordance with line and stanza numbers in any other version of the poem that we edit;
 - we write 'v' and 'j' according to modern conventions, where medieval graphies are often 'u' and 'i';
 - we indicate enclisis with a raised full-point;
 - italics indicate an emendation;
 - square brackets indicate a suppletion;
 - round brackets indicate superfluous letters in a text based on a single MS.

In addition the following points should be noted:

- we have made no attempt to regularise spelling either at the rhyme or elsewhere;
 - we use modern punctuation and word-division;
 - we lay the poems out using the conventions of modern verse. We generally determine versification on the basis of end-stops in the MSS, but in some poems the status of the rhymes is problematic (that is, it is not clear whether the rhyme is an end-rhyme or an internal rhyme or where a rhyme should fall); and in these instances the problems are discussed and our decisions concerning internal rhymes and line-length clearly signalled in the section headed 'Versification'.
- 12 Deviations from base MS or (in the case of *unica*) rejected readings; here we retain MS word division and orthographies, noting missing or apparently erroneous end-stops only where we consider this relevant.
 - 13 Variants (where relevant). The following principles have been observed:
 - we give full non-orthographic variants and use italics to indicate where we have expanded abbreviations;
 - where there may be uncertainty concerning the word(s) to which a

- variant is keyed, this word precedes the variant and is followed by a closing square bracket;
- where we give the full line in a MS this always follows any other variants;
 - variants to the same segment of a line are separated by a comma, variants to different segments of the line are separated by a semi-colon;
 - in the variants we retain MS word division and orthographies following the word division and orthographies of the first MS mentioned;
 - the variants will sometimes repeat for clarity information given in other sections (for example 'Stanza order', 'Deviations from base');
 - where we are uncertain about a MS reading we indicate this with a query (?);
 - we note missing or apparently erroneous end-stops only where we consider this relevant;
 - we do not give the variants from *d* (unless *K* is damaged and a reading can be supplied from *d*), or from *Breviari* quotations; for *z* we follow de Bartholomaeis's transcription;
 - where the form of a word is not at issue but the word is nonetheless necessary to a variant for clarity, we may abbreviate it to its first letter followed by a full-point;
 - we signal corrections to *a*¹, systematically when *a*¹ is our base MS, and otherwise, where relevant, we distinguish between corrections made by the scribe and corrections made by the corrector (del Nero).
- 14 An English translation of our critical text. Round brackets indicate glosses, square brackets suppletions that are necessary to render the Occitan text into idiomatic English. Translating medieval Occitan poetry obviously poses considerable difficulties which are exacerbated when the target language is not a romance language. The precise meaning of certain key terms (for example *pretz*, *onor*, *joven* and so on) is difficult to gauge and even harder to render in English; furthermore abstract nouns often veer towards being used as personifications without this being entirely clear. Readers will notice that our translations of some terms vary because we do not assume consistent usage on Marcabru's part, the precise meaning often being determined by the context of the poem. Also, we have not usually attempted to retain the gender of abstract nouns because this becomes awkward in English.
- 15 Commentary on the text and translation. Notes will include, where appropriate, not simply justification of our own text and translation, but discussion of the work of previous editors and commentators; it should be noted, however, that, in the interests of space, we have not always discussed the work of previous commentators (including ourselves) exhaustively and that in particular we have not seen fit to elaborate and refute in detail hypotheses put forward and then rejected by previous scholars (including ourselves), or hypotheses that we deem unworthy of consideration for

methodological reasons (for example fanciful etymologies, heavy-handed emendations and so on).

16 Any other versions of the poem, followed by notes.

In our translation and notes we have regularised the spelling of proper names. All biblical translations are based upon the Authorised translation into English in the first instance.

Although we collectively take responsibility for all the material in this edition and have worked collaboratively throughout, contributing ideas for the resolution of textual problems, checking each other's work, and taking key decisions (for example concerning base MSS) together, readers might find it helpful to know that each of the three main editors took primary responsibility for producing the material for a proportion of the corpus as follows:

Simon Gaunt: IV, V, VI, XIV, XIX, XX, XXIV, XXVIII, XXX, XXXIV, XXXVII, XL, XLII, XLIII

Ruth Harvey: I, II, III, IX, XII, XV, XVIII, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXVI

Linda Paterson: VII, VIII, XI, XIII, XVI, XVII, XXV, XXVI, XXXII, XXXV, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XLI, XLIV, DI and DII

Ruth Harvey took primary responsibility for sections 1, 3 and 4 of the introduction; Simon Gaunt for sections 2 and 5. The glossary was a joint responsibility, but Linda Paterson had the unenviable task of splicing material together. Throughout the project we have met regularly. The majority of the lyrics have gone through a considerable number of drafts. John Marshall has been present at and made major contributions to all our meetings. A proportion of the transcription of all the poems from the *chansonnières* was undertaken by Melanie Florence, who worked for the team for a year as a research assistant, funded by the MHRA.

Concordance

<i>Our edition</i>	<i>PC number</i>	<i>Dejeanne</i>
I	293.1	I
II	293.2	II
III	293.3	III
IV	293.4	IV
V	293.5	V
VI	293.6 = 451.1	VI
VII	293.7	VII
VIII	293.8	VIII
IX	293.9	IX
XI	293.11	XI
XII	293.12a	XIIbis
XIII	293.13	XIII
XIV	293.14	XIV
XV	293.15	XV
XVI	293.16	XVI
XVII	293.17	XVII
XVIII	293.18	XVIII
XIX	293.19	XIX
XX	293.20 = 16b.1	XX
XXI	293.21	XXI
XXII	293.22	XXII
XXIII	293.23	XXIII
XXIV	293.24	XXIV
XXV	293.25	XXV
XXVI	293.26	XXVI
XXVIII	293.28	XXVIII
XXIX	293.29	XXIX
XXX	293.30	XXX

<i>Our edition</i>	<i>PC number</i>	<i>Dejeanne</i>
XXXI	293.31	XXXI
XXXII	293.32	XXXII
XXXIII	293.33	XXXIII
XXXIV	293.34	XXXIV
XXXV	293.35	XXXV
XXXVI	293.36	XXXVI
XXXVII	293.37	XXXVII
XXXVIII	293.38	XXXVIII
XXXIX	293.39	XXXIX
XL	293.40	XL
XLI	293.41	XLI
XLII	293.42	XLII
XLIII	293.43	XXbis
XLIV	293.44	XLIV
DI	293.12	XII
DII	293.27 (71.1a)	XXVII

Vida in A (27^r)

Marcabrus si fo gitatz a la porta d'un ric home, ni anc non saup hom qui'l fo ni don. E'n Aldrics del Vilar fetz lo norrir. Apres estet tant ab un trobador que avia nom Cercamon qu'el comensset a trobar. Et adoncs el avia nom Pan-Perdut, mas d'aqui enan ac nom Marcabrun. Et en aqel temps non appellava hom cansson, mas tot quant
5 hom cantava eron vers. E fo mout cridatz et ausitz pel mon, e doptatz per sa lenga, car el fo tant mal dizens que a la fin lo desfeiron li castellan de Guian[a] de cui avia dich mout gran mal.

Marcabru was abandoned at a rich man's gate, and no-one knew who he was or from where. And Sir Aldric del Vilar had him brought up. Afterwards he stayed with a troubadour named Cercamon until he himself started to compose. And at that time his name was Pan-Perdut, but from then on his name was Marcabru. And in those days people did not use the term *canso*, but everything that was sung was called *vers*. And he was greatly famed and listened to everywhere, and feared because of his tongue, for he spoke so vituperatively that in the end the castellans of Guyenne whom he had criticised so much put him to death.

Previous scholarship

Bertolucci Pizzorusso, 'Marcabru'; Bertoni, 'Due note', pp. 642–44; Boutière and Schutz, *Biographies*, pp. 10–11; Lejeune, *Littérature*, pp. 159–63; Roncaglia, 'Lo vers comens', pp. 25–27; Spaggiari, *Nome*, pp. 40–48; Spence, 'Changing life styles'; Tortoreto, 'Cercamon'; and see XX, 'Previous scholarship'.

Vida in K (102^r)

Marcabrunsi si fo de Gascoingna, fils d'una paubra femna que ac nom Marcabruna, si com el dis en son cantar:

5 Marcabrunsi lo fills na Bruna
 fo engendraz en tal luna
 qu'el saup d'amor cum degruna,
 – Escoutatz! –
 que anc non amet neguna
 ne d'autra no fo amatz.

10 Trobare fo dels premiers c'om se recort. De caitivetz vers e de caitivetz serventes fez e dis mal de las femnas e d'amor.

Marcabru was from Gascony, son of a poor woman whose name was Marcabruna, as he says in his song:

 Marcabru, the son of Lady Bruna, was begotten under such a moon that he knew how love wreaks havoc, – Listen! – for he never loved any woman, nor was he loved by another.

He was one of the first troubadours people remember. He composed miserable *vers* and miserable *serventes* and he spoke ill of women and of love.

Previous scholarship

Bertolucci Pizzorusso, 'Marcabru', pp. 17–19; Bertoni, 'Due note', pp. 636, 641; Boutière and Schutz, *Biographies*, pp. 10–11; Spaggiari, *Nome*, pp. 4–10, 67–68; Spence, 'Changing life styles'; and see XVIII, 'Previous scholarship'.

Notes

5 Compare XVIII, 73–78 (where all MSS read *sap* in 75).

9 *caitivetz* may be a description of subject-matter and tone, rather than the critical judgement of the songs usual in the *vidas*: see Bertolucci Pizzorusso, 'Marcabru', pp. 17–19.

I
A la fontana del vergier
(PC 293.1)

1 MS: C (173^v) marcabru (*C Reg. marc e bru*)

Analysis of the manuscript

The only surviving copy of this song contains a repeated rhyme-word (17 and 20), several apparent flexional irregularities (18, 25 and 41), obvious errors in lines 2 and 23, plus a syntactical difficulty in 12–13 which is possibly the result of scribal error, and it presents problems of rhyme forms in stanza VI which have been attributed to scribal practice (see the notes to lines 36–42). Given the abrupt and inconclusive ending, it is not impossible that only a truncated version of the song has been preserved.

Versification

Frank, *Répertoire*, 54.1: a8 a8 a8 b8 a8 a8 c8; six *coblas singulares*; ‘b’ (–ors) and ‘c’ (–atz) are constant; *unicum*. In our view, the –ey rhyme-words of stanza VI are forms confectioned for the sake of the rhyme (see the notes to lines 36–42).

Previous scholarship

Appel, ‘Zu Marcabru’, pp. 412, 437; Boissonnade, ‘Personnages’, pp. 222–23; Caluwé, ‘Pour une relecture’; Chambers, *Introduction*, p. 57; Cholakian, *Troubadour Lyric*, pp. 57–64; Errante, *Marcabru*, pp. 238–39; Hamlin, Hathaway and Ricketts, *Introduction*, pp. 69–70; Harvey, ‘*Lavador*’, pp. 134–37; Hatcher, ‘*A la fontana*’; Hölzle, *Kreuzzüge*, II, pp. 690–91; Köhler, ‘Remarques’, p. 124; Lawner, ‘Marcabrun’, p. 500; Lewent, ‘Kreuzlied’, pp. 324, 398; Lewent, ‘Les adverbos provençaux’, p. 295; Limentani, ‘*A la fontana*’; Limentani, *L’eccezione*, pp. 29–44; Olson, ‘Immutable Love’, pp. 194–97; Paden, *Medieval Pastourelle*, I, pp. 42–43, II, p. 540; Pagani, ‘Per un’interpretazione’; Pirot, ‘*A la fontana*’; Roncaglia, ‘Schedario’, pp. 280–83; Saiz, *Personae*, pp. 80–85; Spanke, *Marcabrustudien*, p. 13; Thiolier-Méjean, ‘Croisade’, p. 299; Vossler, ‘Marcabru’, pp. 54–58.

Previous scholarship has concentrated on the generic classification of this song, on its references to crusading and Marcabru’s attitude towards this, and on the interpretation of the *donzelha*’s and the suitor’s attitudes to love in the light of Marcabru’s other songs. Pirot’s edition was to have been followed by a ‘commentaire historique’: this has never appeared.

Dating

The reference to King Louis (VII), the preaching and the call to arms (lines 26–27) indicate that this song alludes to the Second Crusade. If ‘lo mans’ has a precise referent, it would most likely be to the mustering of French troops at Metz in

June 1147. Compare Boissonnade, 'Personnages', p. 223 note 2, who proposes a date of composition 'entre mai 1146 et juin 1147'.

Previous editions

Dejeanne; Hamlin, Hathaway and Ricketts, *Introduction*, Poem 9, pp. 69–70; Paden, *Medieval Pastourelle*, I, pp. 42–43; Pirot, '*A la fontana*'.

- I A la fontana del vergier,
on l'erb' es vertz josta'l gravier,
a l'ombra d'un fust domesgier,
en aiziment de blancas flors
e de novelh chant costumier, 5
trobey sola, ses companhier,
selha que no vol mon solatz.
- II So fon donzelh' ab son cors belh,
filha d'un senhor de castelh;
e quant ieu cugey que l'auzelh 10
li fesson joy e la verdors
e, pel dous termini novelh,
qu'ela entendes mon favelh,
tost li fon sos afars camjatz.
- III Dels huelhs ploret josta la fon 15
e del cor sospiret preon.
'Jhesus', dis elha, 'reys del mon,
per vos mi creys ma gran dolors,
quar vostra anta mi cofon,
quar li mellor de tot est mon 20
vos van servir, mas a vos platz.
- IV Ab vos s'en vai lo mieus amicx,
lo belhs e'l gens e'l pros e'l ricx;
sai m'en reman lo grans destrix,
lo deziriers soven e'ls plors. 25
Ay! mala fos reys Lozoicx,
que fai los mans e los prezicx
per que'l dols m'es el cor intratz!'
- V Quant ieu l'auzi desconortar,
ves lieys vengui josta'l riu clar: 30
'Belha', fi'm ieu, 'per trop plorar
afolha cara e colors;
e no vos qual dezesperar,
que selh qui fai lo bosc fulhar
vos pot donar de joy assatz.' 35
- VI 'Senher', dis elha, 'ben o crey
que Dieus aya de mi mercey
en l'autre segle per jassey,
quon assatz d'autres peccadors;
mas say mi tolh aquela rey 40
don joy mi crec; mas pauc mi tey,
que trop s'es de mi alonhatz.'

I

By the spring in the orchard, where the grass is green beside the bank, in the shade of a fruit tree, with its pretty white flowers and the usual spring birdsong, I came across that young woman who, alone and without companion, does not want my company.

II

She was a beautiful young lady, the daughter of the lord of a castle; and just when I thought that the greenery and the birds would delight her and that, on account of the sweet springtime, she would listen to my suit, her preoccupations suddenly changed.

III

Beside the spring she wept and sighed from the bottom of her heart; 'Jesus', she said, 'king of the world, because of you my great sorrow is increasing, for your shame is my undoing: the best of all this world are going to serve you, since it is your will.

IV

My love, the handsome, courtly, brave and noble, departs with you; great distress, frequent longing and tears stay here with me. Oh! Cursed be King Louis, who orders the call to arms and the preaching which are the cause of this grief entering my heart!

V

When I heard her lamenting, I went up to her by the clear stream. 'Pretty lady,' I said, 'too much crying spoils one's looks and complexion, and you don't need to despair, for He who makes the woods come into leaf can give you much joy.'

VI

'Sir', she said, 'I do believe that God will have mercy on me forever in the next world, as He will on many other sinners; but here He is taking away from me the one person who gave me joy (literally 'through whom my joy increased'), but he thinks little of me, for he has gone so far away from me.'

Commentary

- 2 MS *lerbera*: hypermetric. It may be that line 1 led C or its exemplar to expect a narrative and they supplied the impf. form; the pr. could imply that the poet and his audience know this fountain.
- 4 PD *en aizimen de* 'pourvu de, orné de'; see PSW, I, 43, where lines 4–5 are taken to refer to the tree. Pirot ('*A la fontana*', pp. 628–30) argues that *costumier* qualifies *aiziment* and translates: 'dans l'harmonieux entourage – habituel – de blanches fleurs et de chant de renouveau'. Both 'habituel' and 'usual' have pejorative connotations which may also have been present in *costumier*. Marcabru may be criticising the formulaic openings and settings of such songs of 'rencontres amoureuses'.
- 7 *mon solatz*: Dejeanne 'mon bonheur'; Pirot 'mon plaisir'. Roncaglia ('Schedario', p. 380) prefers to understand 'the comfort I could give her', rather than 'the delight [*solatz d'amor*?] which I want from her'. The few dictionary examples of *solatz* with a possessive adj. are late (Aimeric de Peguilhan, *Flamenca* and *Jaufre*); the sense 'comfort, consolation, solace' does not seem to be attested (but is not very far from the meanings which are given: LR, V, 252 and PSW, VII, 772: 'Unterhaltung, Kurzweil, Belustigung, Vergnügen'; 'Freude, Lust'; 'Scherz, scherzhafte Rede'; 'Unterhaltung, Gespräch', 'Gesellschaft'). 'She who does not want my happiness' is technically equally possible.
- 11–13 MS: '. . . li fesson ioy e la uerdors . e pel dous termi | ni nouelh . equezentendes mon fauelh'. As transmitted, the syntax of these lines is unsatisfactory and previous commentators located the problem at line 12. Bertoni ('K. Lewent, "Beiträge"', p. 497) saw *pel* as a scribal reflex action, since *pel* is so often used to introduce a season, with *e* added to restore the metre, and he suggested correcting to 'entre 'l'. Pirot, followed by Paden, puts line 12 in parentheses and translates it '– à cause, aussi, du doux printemps –' ('*A la fontana*', p. 624). We find these suggestions unconvincing and suspect that the difficulty lies rather in line 13. We suppose that the source of the error here was *e* mistakenly copied twice, and we correct *equez* to 'qu'ela'. Alternatively, one might understand an ellipsis here: 'I thought that the birds would delight her and the greenery, and [that she would be delighted] because of the sweet springtime, and that she would listen . . . '.
- 13 *favelh*: PSW, III, 421 (this example) 'Rede'; PD 'discours, paroles'. Compare the examples of the word-family in LR, III, 246. Pirot notes ('*A la fontana*', p. 634) that the etymon (*FABULARI) suggests 'un discours construit et même élaboré'. Compare Mistral *favello* 'faconde, causerie, babil'; FEW, III, 341 *FABELLA* 'erzählung' 'apr. *favela* "discours, paroles"; apr. *favel*'; *FABELLARI* 'erzählen' 'apr. *favelar* "parler, chanter"'. We understand here 'the chat-up line' of the speaker.
- 18 MS *gran dolors*: nom. sg.: note the analogical case-inflection.
- 19 *anta*: could be a reference to the fall of Edessa (24 December 1144); compare the OF Crusade song, 'Chevalier, mult estes guariz' (Bec, *Lyrique*, II, poem 68), which treats this event in terms of the *deshonors* done to the Lord which requires vengeance from His vassals.
- 21 Compare XXII, 55–59.
- 23 MS *els*: we see here a scribal error, attributable perhaps to the tendency noted in C to treat nouns ending in 's' as plural (see Zufferey, *Recherches*, p. 150), although here *gens* is clearly nom. sg. Compare line 25.
- 24 *destrix*: a recognised reduction in C of the graphy *-cx*: see Zufferey, *Recherches*, p. 142.

25 *lo deziriers soven*: on noun + adv. combinations, see Schultz-Gora, *Provenzalische Studien*, II, p. 134 and Jensen, *Syntax*, § 884.

e·ls plors: strict grammar would require 'e·l plors' ('and the grief') or 'e·il plor' ('and the tears'), but we accept *·ls* nom. pl. (see the Introduction, p. 17).

36–42 Pirot sees the *-ey* rhymes here as rhymes in [e] and ascribes the 'y' to 'un usage de scribe de C, ou d'un autre intermédiaire' ('*A la fontana*', p. 638), although nothing in Zufferey, *Recherches*, or Monfrin, 'Notes' indicates such a practice by C. He emends systematically.

All five rhyme-words here would have had a close [e] in Occitan, despite the *-ey* ending in the MS, though *crey* and *mercey*, with the diphthong characteristic of OF and Poitevin, were accepted into the troubadour lyric as alternative forms from Guilhem IX onwards (see Pfister, 'Langue', pp. 106–7; Appel, *Provenzalische Lautlehre*, pp. 16–17; compare ed. Pasero, pp. 338–41). We understand the rhyme-words of 38, 40 and 41 to have been confectioned by analogy with those of 36 and 37 and we see them not as graphies or as scribal but as authorial innovations, possibly included to give the piece an 'old-fashioned' or *popularisant* flavour, reminiscent of Guilhem IX's poems II and III.

40 *mas* here could also be 'since' (Roncaglia, 'Schedario', p. 381).

41 *don joy mi crec*: the syntax is odd. Dejeanne emends to *joys*, Pirot to *qui*. Roncaglia ('Schedario', p. 381) suggested understanding *crec* as a v. tr., its subject the same as that of *tolh* (that is, God: see line 37), its object *joy* (which would give roughly: 'but He takes away from me here that person through whom (?) He increased joy to me (?)'). But this would leave *tey* and *s'es alonhatz* either with God still as the grammatical subject (unlikely), or with the knight as the subject without this change being explicitly signalled. It seems better to leave the MS reading alone here and to understand uninflected *joy* as subject of *crec* (see the Introduction), and *aquela rey don* as the object of line 40 and the subject of *tey* and line 42.

pauc mi tey: previous interpretations of this phrase are discussed by Pirot, '*A la fontana*', pp. 639–40. We agree with Bertoni ('K. Lewent, "Beiträge"', p. 498), Hatcher ('*A la fontana*', p. 291) and Pirot ('*A la fontana*', pp. 640–42) in understanding the girl to be lamenting the contrast between her constant attachment to the knight and his (easy?) abandonment of her, with *pauc tener* as analogous to *vil tener* (PD 'mépriser'); compare PD *car tener* 'chérir, estimer, aimer' and the note to XV, 32.

II

1 MS: C (173^r) marcabru (C *Reg.* marc e bru)

Analysis of the manuscript

Line 26 as transmitted is hypometric and it is possible that *C* preserves only an incomplete version of the song (stanza VIII may lack one line, probably the initial line, and the end of the song seems rather abrupt). There are probable scribal errors in lines 11, 12, 14, 22, 27, 30, 31, 34 and 37 and lines 23–24 seem to have been interverted (see the notes to these lines). Lines 7, 13, 16 and 32 feature inflected nom. pl. characteristic of *C*, but occurrences elsewhere in the Marcabru corpus mean that it is not possible to determine whether these forms reflect scribal or authorial practice.

Versification

We agree with Billy (*Architecture*, p. 91), who describes the versification of the song as a ‘cas marginal à tous les égards’. What survives is seven stanzas and one *tornada* of four lines which may perhaps be an incomplete eighth stanza (compare poems VIII and XIV). We treat the rhymes in *-a(n)* and *-an*, *-o(n)* and *-on* as different (a question to which previous editors have given little sustained attention: see below), and this gives a total of six rhyme-sounds in this song: *-a(n)*, *-on*, *-um*, *-oc*, *-o(n)*, *-an*. We have emended the text conjecturally on the grounds of sense and syntax. The following table sets out what we see as the rhyme scheme.

[illegible]

* or $o(n)$.

Following the scheme used by Frank to present *coblas singulares*, the same information can be presented thus:

[illegible]

The regular features of the scheme seem to be that the last line of every stanza is in *-oc*; apart from stanza VII, the rhyme in *-on* has a regular permutation; the rhyme-scheme for *each stanza* is infringed only in VII, which lacks a 'c' rhyme but compare the irregularities noted in Frank, *Répertoire*, 246.1 (PC 80.21); 362.4 (PC 80.45); 577.208 (PC 202.7); 35.1 (PC 327.1); 274.2 (PC 437.21), and so on, where the same rhyme-sound is used first as an 'a' rhyme and later as a 'b' or 'c' rhyme, and similar. In Marcabru's song, it is noteworthy that where the two 'b' rhymes of a stanza are in *-a(n)* or *-an*, the pair is always matching, not mixed, which suggests strongly that *-an* is distinguished from *-a(n)* and *-on* from *-o(n)*.

Frank, *Répertoire*, 733.1 (*unicum*) gives 8a 8b 8b 8c 8d: 'a': *an, on, or*, 'b': *on, or, an*; 'c': *or, an, on*, and notes 'Texte corrompu, rimes altérées'. This follows Levy's suggestion (PSW, VIII, 662) of a perfectly regular versification (where a = *an*, b = *on*, c = *um*, d = *oc*), an approach also adopted by Perugi, but one which makes no distinction between rhymes in stable and unstable 'n' and which would require frequent intervention to produce (rare) rhymes in *-um* at lines 7, 8, 22, 26 and 34.

Ricketts argues that the rhymes in *-on* and *-um* should be considered as the same rhyme ('b') and proposes a versification of 'rimes alternées par groupes de trois', with the possible loss of one or two stanzas at the end of the song:

1. a b b b c I, IV, VII
2. b b b a c II, V, VIII (*tornada?*: b b a c)
3. b a a b c III, VI

For objections to this hypothesis, see Lazzerini, 'Marcabru', pp. 48–50. Lazzerini's printed text reproduces the rhymes as they occur in the MS with the exception of line 22, where she emends to 'no vau cobert *om*', an emendation which is scorned by Perugi (*Saggi*, p. 47 note 20). We disagree with Beltrami and Vatteroni, who base their analysis on Lazzerini's edition and treat as equivalent all rhymes in *-a(n)* and *-an* (*Rimario*, II, p. 44 note 10) and all rhymes in *-on*, *-um* and line 22's conjectural *om* (II, p. 241 note 1).

Previous scholarship

Bertoni, 'Due note', pp. 644–45; Billy, *Architecture*, pp. 91 and 141; Chambers, *Introduction*, p. 68; Dinguiraud, 'Une lecture', pp. 41–45; Errante, *Marcabru*, p. 173; Franz, 'Marcabru', p. 13; Gaunt, *Troubadours*, pp. 40–41, 53, 69–70; Harvey, *Marcabru*, pp. 16, 44–45, 146; Lazzerini, 'Marcabru'; Lazzerini, 'Un caso esemplare', p. 22; Lewent, 'Beiträge', pp. 314–15; Marshall, 'Versification', pp. 44–45; Mölk, *Trobar clus*, p. 88; Nelson, 'Animal imagery', pp. 52–53; Payen, 'Un moraliste', pp. 998–99; Perugi, *Saggi*, pp. 41–50; Ricketts, 'A l'alena'; Spanke, *Marcabrustudien*, pp. 28, 34, 106–8, 111; Speroni, 'Questioni', pp. 318, 322; Vossler, 'Marcabru', p. 19.

Previous editions

Dejeanne; Ricketts, 'A l'alena'; Lazzerini, 'Marcabru'; Perugi, *Saggi*, pp. 41–50.

- I A l'alena del vent doussa
que Dieus nos tramet, no sai don,
ai lo cor de joy sazion
contra la dousor del frescum
quan li prat son vermelh e groc. 5
- II Belh m'es quan son ombriu li mon
e-ls auzels de sotz la verdon
mesclon lurs critz ab lo chanton
e quascus, ab la votz que an,
jauzis som parelh en son loc. 10
- III De say sen um pauc de ferum
que lai torna-l pala-l busa;
qu'encaritz son li guasta-pa,
quais per elh[s] son gardat li con
qu'estrays mas lo senher no-y toc. 15
- IV Si-ls gilos s'en van seguran
e li guardador jauzion,
ges egual no chant e respon,
qu'ilh van a clardat e ses lum:
quan vols, t'en pren ab eis lo broc! 20
- V D'aquestz sap Marcabrus qui son,
que ves luy no[s] van cobertan
gilos que-s fan baut guazalhan;
li guandilh vil e revolum
meton nostras molhers en joc. 25
- VI Greu cug mais que[ran] ja lur don;
aquist soldat vac, estraitz pla,
seguon la natura del ca:
pus lo guos ro e-l lebriers gron,
dejus ves del plat bufal foc. 30
- VII Quontr' els non a clau ni meia
qu'els non aion del plus preon
e del frug lo prim e-l segon.
Cist fan a malvestat rebon
quan nos fan donar 'non' per 'oc'. 35 [R]
- VIII Gilos, pus de sa foudat bon,
enfla, desenfla e refon;
saber deu qual vetz a puta,
si non, digua que mays no-n poc!

I

With the breath of the sweet wind which God sends us, I don't know from where, my heart is filled with joy in the face of the sweetness of the fresh season when the meadows are red and yellow.

II

I like it when the mountains are shady and the birds beneath the greenery mingle their cries with song and each one, with the voice they have, gives joy to its partner in its place.

III

From here I smell a bit of a stink, for over there the spade is turning over the dung, for the bread-spoilers have gone up in price, as if the cunts are properly guarded by them so that no stranger except the lord can touch them.

IV

If the jealous men and the joyful guardians go about confident as a result, I hardly sing along in the same way, for they go about by day and by night: whenever you want, take some for yourself – and with the skewer!

V

Concerning these people, Marcabru knows who they are, for jealous men who turn themselves into lusty whoremongers do not conceal themselves from him; the vile twists and stratagems put our wives at risk.

VI

I hardly think they ever ask for their gift; these idle hired men, the stupid bastards, follow the dog's nature: just as the little dog gnaws and the greyhound growls, a starving mongrel blows the heat from the dish (?).

VII

For there is no enclosure or dividing wall to prevent them from getting (some of) what is most deeply concealed, the first fruits as well as the chaff (*or*: second ones). These men give a rebuff to wickedness every time they give us a 'no' instead of a 'yes'.

VIII

A jealous man, since he boasts about his folly, swells up, deflates and pays his dues; he should know what a whore is like – if he doesn't, he may as well admit that he never could!

Commentary

- 4 *frescum*: Adams (*Word-formation*, p. 84) gives this as an Occitan formation from *fresc* + *-um* < *-UMINEM/-UDINEM*; compare Bernart de Venzac, V, 4, where it also appears at the rhyme.
- 6 As Dejeanne notes (variants), the rhyme-word is 'presque effacé'.
- 7 *e-ls auzels*: apparently the wrong case, but inflected nom. pl. is frequent in C and occurs elsewhere in the Marcabru corpus (see the Introduction).
- 7-8 We take *verdon*, *chanton* (with unstable 'n') to be suffixations with no change of meaning: see Adams, *Word-formation*, pp. 247-51.
- 9 'with the voice typical of each'.
- 10 *en son loc*: not in the dictionaries. The force could be 'in its place (on the branch); its perch', or perhaps underlining the appropriateness of each bird addressing its own partner.
- 11 MS *feron*: Dejeanne and Ricketts misread this as *feton*. We agree with Lazzerini ('Marcabru', p. 65) and Perugi (*Saggi*, p. 43) that the rhyme-word here is *ferum* 'stink' < *FERUMEN*: see *DECLC*, III, 971-72; Alcover, V, 831 *ferum*, *farum*; Bernart de Venzac, V, 39; Mistral *ferun* (Gascon *herun*) 'odeur de sauvagine'.
- 12 *bussa* is not recorded in the dictionaries. We find previous explanations, involving some kind of creature's skin, incongruous and unconvincing. Dejeanne and Ricketts translate 'buisson', but *bussa* < **BOSK-* is unattested and the resulting sense is obscure; Lazzerini's solution ('Marcabru', pp. 56-57) 'a snakeskin being sloughed' < *BESTIA/BISTIA* + *-ANUS*, depends on a dubious etymon; Perugi's case for a buzzard's 'skin' rests on one MS variant and moulting birds do not produce a *pel* (*Saggi*, p. 43). Less enigmatic as a source of the stink, although equally conjectural, is our suggestion *bussa/boza* '(cow)dung' (*LR*, II, 245, 11), a m. suffixed form (+ *-ANUS*) from **BOVACEA* (see *FEW*, I, 473, which gives other suffixations; for second thoughts about the etymon, compare Bloch-Wartburg, *Dictionnaire*, *bouse* 'probablement prérom.'): see also XXI, 18 and the note.
- MS *pel al*: we conjecture that the scribe expected a sb. m. (*pel* 'poil?') and we emend.
- 13 We understand the *guasta-pa* to be followers and servants of a lord, filling much the same role as the *girbaut* of XXIX, 19-30, and that they have 'become more expensive' either to hire or to bribe (*PD encaritz* 'devenir plus cher'; see *PSW*, II, 429, 1).
- encaritz*: strict grammar would require *encarit*.
- 14 *quais*: conj. 'as if' (see *Donatz*, 1514). The implication would be that *gardat* means 'properly guarded', whereas the rest of the song gives the lie to this.
- MS *per elh*: this is probably a scribal error arising from the following 's' of *son* and we correct.
- MS *li don*: from the context, these are unlikely to be 'gifts'. The parallel with XXIX, 19-24 strongly suggests that what is being guarded here is 'women', but *don* from *sidons/midons* would be otherwise unattested; compare Paden, 'Etymology', pp. 321-22, who can cite only this example, from Ricketts's edition. Like Perugi, we agree with Lazzerini ('Marcabru', p. 58) that a correction to 'con' is most plausible, although we do not see the scribe of C as the censor (compare the obscenities in XVIIIb); it is more likely that this change occurred at an earlier stage of transmission.
- 16 *si-ls*: m. nom. pl. (see the Introduction, p. 17).
- 16-17 We take *seguran* to be an adj. in *-a(n)*: for the sense, see *PD* 'sûr, ferme'; *LR*, V,