

THOUGHTS ON *LO SOPNI QUE FETZ EN CERVERI**

This is a summary of the poem :

STANZA I. — The poet is sleeping in a house between Aragon and Navarra, in spite of a thunderstorm and a heavy rain, the latter even coming down upon him. He dreams that his lady has sent (or will send) him a message.

STANZA II. — He has a pleasant vision : it is the eve of All Saints Day, and he will ask his lady later on whether she has thought of him at the same time. He wishes he could be with her.

STANZA III. — The other (or next) day he has been in his lady's boudoir. She has kissed him more than a hundred times, although they are observed by a guardian.

STANZA IV. — He addresses his listeners, telling them that he has asked the lady to kiss him until he gets tired of it, which, of course, never will be the case. At the end, he wishes that he may always find such an *ostal* and that what he has experienced in his dream may become true when he is awake.

As one can see from our summary, Cerveri's *sopni* is quite interesting and pleasurable in its details, but a little confusing as a whole. One can hardly find out whether all the incidents described in the poem have happened in the same dream¹ or whether all of them are really meant to form part of that dream.² One also might have some doubts about the poet's capability to sleep and dream in such a rough weather and blame him for the fact that the kissing scene in stanza IV is a duplication, not an intrinsic continuation, of that in stanza III.

* Ed. M. DE RIQUER, No. 15.

1. This uncertainty caused the editor to start his translation of stanza III with [«Soñé que»]. See also the beginning of the same stanza. The adverbial adjunct *L'autre jorn*, whether it means «on the following day» or «the other day», indicates a time different from that of the other stanzas.

2. See, e. g., the poet's intention later on to ask his lady a question.

Metrically, the poem is composed of *coblas doblas* with six lines each, each line consisting of ten syllables with a caesura after the fourth. The first couple of stanzas rhyme in *-ia*, the second in *-ava*. There is in all the lines an internal rhyme in the caesura, which is close *ø* in the first two stanzas, *-es* (with close *e*) in the others. The last stanza, however, seems to have seven instead of six lines, a fact which the editor does not fail to mention in a note (p. 43). He thinks that this surplus line may be the first of a lost *tornada*. We shall come back to this question when discussing the last lines of the poem.

And now for the text itself.

Ll. 1-3.

«Entr' Arago e Navarra jazia
en tal mayzo que de sus me plovia,
e lamps ab tro e vens plugs y fazia.»

(Editor's translation : «Entre Aragón y Navarra estaba durmiendo en una casa tal que me llovía encima ; y relampagueaba, tronaba, hacía viento y diluviaba».)

This translation, at least as it concerns the third of the above three lines, is rather free. The only verb occurring in l. 3 is *fazia*. It is used in the same impersonal way as in French, where it is connected with expressions indicating meteorological phenomena such as «il fait beau (mauvais) temps, il fait froid (chaud), il fait nuit», etc.³ This *fazia* has several nouns as objects : *lamps*, *tro*, *vens* *plugs*. The editor's translation keeps this function of *fazia* only in connection with *vens* : «hacía viento» ; otherwise, it replaces those nouns by the corresponding verbs : «relampagueaba, tronaba, diluviaba». So far, no harm has been done by this change of style. It is of greater importance that the editor inserts in his translation an «y» between the Provençal words *vens plugs* : «hacía viento y diluviaba», without indicating, either in his translation or in a note, that this «and» is an addition of his.

This coordination of two Provençal words, supposed to be nouns, without a connecting *e* 'and' is striking, indeed. One could provide such a connection by putting the *e* standing before *vens* behind this word and read the line thus : *e lamps ab tro, vens e plugs y fazia*. This would, however, mean a rather strong alteration of the manuscript.

But is *plug* really a noun meaning 'rain'? So far as I know, the

3. LEVY, PSW, III, 384 (with literature). For Old French examples see TOBLER-LOMMATZSCH, III, 1576-77.

Romance words for rain are derived from Latin *PLÖVIA for PLUVIA and, consequently, are of the feminine gendre. The Provençal dictionaries at least do not list a masculine **plug*. That this word is somehow connected with the stem of Latin *PLÖVIA for PLUVIA seems rather certain. There is indeed a Latin adjective PLUVIUS, -A, -UM meaning 'rainy, rain-bringing'.⁴ This PLUVI- or PLÖVI- could have become Provençal **plueg* and, losing the second element of its diphthong, developed to **plug*.⁵ So, Cerverí's *vens plug*s, in view of its identity with Horace's *pluvios ventos* (see footnote 4), cannot mean anything else but the latter. But since the adjective *plug* is not attested in Provençal, we must assume that, in our poem, it is one of Cerverí's catalanisms. Indeed, the word exists or existed in Catalan.⁶

So the reading of the manuscript is correct, and we must translate l. 3 : «and there were lightnings and thunder and rain-bringing winds».

Ll. 3-4.

«Mays puis fo bo ço qu'en durmen vezia
que cil cuy so missatge m trametria.»

(Editor's translation : «Pero luego fue bueno lo que vi durmiendo,
pues aquella a quien yo pertenezco me envió mensaje».)

1. Rendering the *que* in l. 4 by «pues», the editor considers what follows to be a causal clause. I prefer seeing in that *que* the one of which Schultz-Gora speaks in his *Provenzalische Studien* I (Strassburg 1919), 20. It introduces a principal (?) clause which gives an explanation of what has been said before. In our case, the *que*-clause explains the *ço* of l. 3. Schultz-Gora renders this *que* by 'nämlich' ('namely, to wit, that is to say'). To the examples given by him I would like to add some more. Brunissen has fallen in love with Jaufre, whom she has never seen before, and tries to persuade herself that she can find another man worthy of her love, but finally gives up this idea : *Mas also qe dic is foudatz*,⁷ | *C'om*

4. It occurs, e. g., in an ode by Horace (ADOLF KISSLING (ed.), *Oden und Epoden*, 7th ed., 1930, Liber I, No. 17, l. 4) : ... *et igneam Defendit aestatem capellis*
Usque meis pluviosque ventos.

5. Cf. Provençal *enueg>enug* and APPEL, *Prov. Lautlehre*, § 33a and § 34.

6. Professor Aramon i Serra shares my opinion that *plug* cannot be a masculine noun standing for *pluja*. True, the Catalan dictionary of Alcover-Moll cites a passage where this seems to be the case : *Fer el aire molt de fret y pluix*. But this is the only example and comes from a document of 1786, written, as Professor Aramon says, in a horrible Catalan. On the other hand, the same dictionary defines *vent plug* as «venet fi acompañat de gotes molt menudes (Tremp i Espluga)». I am deeply indebted to Professor Aramon for this information.

7. «Namely that one may find a better one.» I would put a colon after *foudatz*.

*ne puesca melor trobar | Ni qe tan fassa ad amar (Jaufre, ed. BRUNEL, l. 3763); D'aquetz tres dic comunalmen | Una retgla d'ensenhamen: | Que sel que a lo cap menor | Deu hom cauzir per lo mejor (DAUDE DE PRADAS, Auzels Cassadors, ed. SCHUTZ, l. 383).⁸ The conjunction *car* is used in the same way as *que*, a fact that Schultz-Gora does not mention : *Mortz fora, so m'es avis, | Mas una res m'en defen,*⁹ | *Quar sap silh en cui m'enten | Cum li sui leials e fis (JAUSB. DE PUYCIB., ed. SHEPARD, No. XIII, l. 36); E veus lo tort de que li suy mespres | Quar anc l'auzei tan finamen amar (P. G. DE TOLOZA, ed. CAVALIERE, No. XV, l. 16).*¹⁰*

In our poem, Cerverí uses the same *que* a second time (l. 20) : *Er auziretz ço don eu la preyava: | Que mi baizes tan ... Tro que·m nuges.*

2. *trametria*. In the translation, this conditional is rendered by the preterite «envió». The editor does not give any explanation for this change of tenses. We may well see in *trametria* for *trameitia* a scribe's mistake caused by *tr-* in the beginning of the word or the influence of the rhyme word of the next line *diria*. But it would not seem quite impossible to keep the reading of the manuscript. The poet dreamt (*en durmen vezia*) that his lady would send him a message.

II. 9-10

«E querrai do a ma dona que·m dia
cela sazo si de mi·l sovenia.»

(Translation : «Le pediré el favor a mi señora de que me diga si en aquella sazón se acordaba de mí.»)

This translation is correct. However, a note would have been welcome pointing to the fact that the adjunct of time *cela sazo* (l. 10) is not where, logically, one should expect it to be. The above two lines consist of three syntactical elements : 1) a principal clause *E querrai do a ma dona*; 2) a subordinate clause ; *que·m dia cela sazo*; 3) a second subordinate clause depending on the first : *si de mi·l sovenia*. So the first subordinate clause forms the principal clause to the second ; it includes the adverbial adjunct *cela sazo*, which logically belongs in the (second) subordinate clause. The

8. «Of those three I give an instructive rule : namely, the one that has the smallest head such be considered best.»

9. Put colon instead of comma after *defen*. Shepard translates : «Mais ce qui m'a sauvé c'est que celle dont je suis amoureux sait que je lui suis loyal». This «c'est que» exactly corresponds to German «nämlich».

10. «This is the wrong I have done to her : namely that I ever dared to love her dearly.» In his text, Cavaliere has no punctuation after *mespres*, but a colon in his translation.

latter, therefore, should run thus: *si de mi'l sovenia cela sazo*. Such illogical transfers of adverbial adjuncts from a subordinate to a principal clause are not infrequently met with in Provençal poetry. The following, less complicated example may give a clearer idea of this grammatical phenomenon :

«Et ai m'amor miza
en tal, fe que'us dey,
non cug *tro en Friza*
que genser n'estey.»¹¹

(PEIROL, P.-C. 366.18, ed. ASTON, No. 25, III, 3.)

Ll. 11-12

«Ay! car no so lay on tan gen se lia
e que ab so dixes ço que solia.»

(Translation: «¡Ay! ¿Por qué no estaré allí donde tan gentilmente se atavía, para decirle, con mis canciones, lo que solía [decirle] ?»)

1. *so* (l. 11) is the present tense, and one does not see the reason why it is rendered by the future «estará».

2. L. 11 forms syntactically a question, although its real sense is that of a wish: «Why am I not there?» = «Would I were there!»¹²

3. L. 12 likewise expresses a wish, introduced by *que* and with the verb in the subjunctive mood: *dixes*. Because of their identity in meaning ll. 11 and 12 are connected by *e* 'and'. The editor, disregarding this *e*, translates l. 12 by «para decirle...», thus using, instead of the *que*-clause, a prepositional infinitive which equals an adverbial clause of purpose.

4. The poet does not indicate the subject of *dixes* and *solia*.¹³ It could be either the same as that of *lia* (l. 11), i. e., the lady, or the poet

11. Aston translates correctly: «I love such a mistress, by my faith, that I do not think there exists a fairer between here and Friesland». The «that» of this sentence is necessary in the translation, but there is no equivalent to it in the Provençal text. There is parataxis between the first and the second two lines of the text, and *non cug* (l. 3) starts a real principal clause.

12. For *car* introducing a wish see APPEL, *Prov. Chrest.*, No. 15, 33; 16, 33; 100, 48. In all the three cases the verb is in the subjunctive mood of the imperfect tense.

13. Such a negligence is not rare in Provençal poetry. Here is another example from Cerverí (RIGUER, No. 61, ll. 6-9):

- 6. «Car hom ditz tota via
can ve croj fyll felo :
- 8. “De tan bo payre fo
e tan gran be fazia!”»

The subject of 1. 8 is «the son», that of 1. 9 «the father».

himself. By adding «*le*» to «*decir*» in his translation, the editor decides in favor of the second alternative. A different choice might not be quite impossible.

5. L. 12 bears some resemblance to the following passage of Cerverí's third *pastorela* (RIQUER, No. 13) :

5. «Trobey un pastor seyan
erb' en un camp d'avena...
9. e dezia ab so notan :
 “Fols es qui no's refrena
 e qui mena guerreyan
12. caval c'a mal s'affrena”.

The editor translates 1. 9 by: «y decía, acompañándose con música».¹⁴ Here the word *so* 'melody' connected with *notar* 'to sing' seems to be quite appropriate, although one should expect the word to be accompanied by an article: *notan un* (or *lo*) *so*. At any rate, *so* does not mean 'música', but 'melody'. So it seems still more doubtful that, in our poem, *aire alcuna re ab so* could mean «to say something with one's songs». And is it not rather a strange idea that the lover should wish to be in the lady's most private room (*lay on se lia*)¹⁵ singing his songs (to her)?

For these reasons I venture to advance the hypothesis that the word *so* here may not be the noun coming from Latin *sonum*, but the neuter demonstrative pronoun *so*. The rhyme requires the *o* of that pronoun here to be close. Scholars, however, are not quite in agreement about the nature of the *o* in *o* 'it' (< HÖC) and its compounds *so*, *aiso*, *aquo*. Levy, *Pet. Dict.* lists *aiso* with *ø*, but simple *o* and *aco* with close *o*, while he does not indicate the quality of the *o* in *so* at all. Appel, *Provenzalische Lautlehre* has *ø* (p. 70), *aø* and *aïø* (p. 118), and *sø* (p. 133), all of them with open *ø*, while the glossary of his *Chrestomathie* shows *ø*, *aquø*, and *aïø*, but *so* without indication of the quality of the *o*. Grandgent, who takes HÖC, not HÖC as a basis in his *Outline* § 132, gives the four pronouns an open *o*, while Schultz-Gora, *Prov. Elementarbuch* (index of words), lists all of them with a close *o*. The cases cited by Erdmannsdörfer, *Reimwörterbuch*, p. 42, and increased by Contini, *AdM*, XLIX, pp. 35-36 and p. 36, note 2, prove at least that those pronouns could rhyme with words in *ø(n)*.

14. See my remarks *R*, 74 (1953), 390 ff., where I am dealing with that passage: here *notar* means «to sing» and *ab so notan* is = *ab notan so* «singing a melody».

15. Other troubadours use expressions still more unmistakably erotic, such as *lai o's despuelha* P. Rogier (ed. APPÉL, No. I, l. 49) or *on sos gens cors si despuelha* G. de Calanso (ed. ERNST, P.-C. 243.4; VI, 3). Cf. LEWENT, *StM*, n. s., IX, 124-25.

The meaning of *ab so* seems to me similar to that of *ab tan*, which Levy, PSW, VIII, 47 No. 26, renders by «darauf, dann, da» (*Pet. Dict.* «alors»). I have, it is true, no exact parallel for *ab so = ab tan*, but there is one for *ab aiso* in Appel's *Chrestomathie* No. 116, l. 63: *E Judas... saludet lo* (sc. Christ) *e anet lo baizar, e ab aiso li Juseu anero'l penre*. If the editor's interpretation of *ab so* «con mis canciones» is correct, which seems rather doubtful, the subject of *dixes* and *solia* would be the poet. If, however, *ab so* means 'then' we could imagine that it is the lady who is supposed to say the words — words of love — which she used to say and which the poet wishes her to say again.

Ab so literally means 'with that'. Could one, on this basis, interpret the above quoted passage of the third pastorela: *e dezia ab so notan*: «and he said singing with it (simultaneously)?

Ll. 13-15.

«L'autra jorn pres en la cambra m'estava¹⁶
on midons es, e tan gen mi baisava
plus de cent ves c'un sol [tan] norm pauzava.»

(Translation: «[Soñé que] el otro día me encontraba en la habitación de mi señora y que muy gentilmente me besaba más de cien veces, sin dejarme un solo momento de reposo».)

1. Although this «dream» poem is rather confused in its composition, it may be debatable whether it was appropriate for the translator to complement the narration by additions such as «Soñé que» in l. 13. At any rate, the «que» between «y» and «muy» should also have been put between brackets.

2. Why did the editor not change *autra* (l. 13) to *autre*, the former obviously being a scribe's mistake? And what does *l'autre jorn* really mean, «the other day» or «the next day»? In either case, we would face here the strange fact that the events of the dream extends over more nights than one.

3. The word *pres* (l. 11) has not been taken care of in the translation. Since the rhyme requires the word to have a close *e*,¹⁷ it cannot be anything but the past participle of *prendre*. But its meaning is rather obscure. It seems to be substantivized and as such may signify «as a prisoner», here used as an expression of the language of love.¹⁸

16. Text: *cambra·m estava*.

17. See, however, *baizes* (l. 20), which has an open *e*.

18. Cf. *cil cuy so* (l. 5).

4. The second part of l. 15 runs thus in the manuscript: *que sol no·m pauzava*, whit one syllable missing. The editor tries to supply that syllable by reading *c'un* for *que* and adding [*tan*] to the text. But *un sol tan* does not mean «un solo momento» and *no·m pauzava* not «sin dejar me». We need not add anything to get a satisfactory text if we read *non i* for *nom* and translate *que sol non i pauzava* by «even without pausing in it (sc., the kissing)».

Ll. 16-18.

«E·ns sobrepres una qui la·m gardava,
mas per ço ges del baysar no·s laxava,
ans dis qu'en res non era si·l pezava.»

(Translation: «Y [aunque] nos sorprendía una que estaba a su guardia, no por esto dejaba de besar[me], y decía que tanto se le daba si ello le molestaba».)

1. *una qui la·m gardava* (l. 16) is supposed to mean : «una que estaba a su guardia». But what is the ·m in *la·m*? I think we have to read *la·ns* (see, in the same line, *E·ns sobrepres*), where *la* is the local adverb «there». The verb *gardar* then would have the sense of «to observe» rather than «estar a la guardia». The meanings of «to guard» and «to observe» are closely related. Cf., English «to watch = «to keep one's eyes fixed on, keep under observation» (*Concise Oxf. Dict.*, p. 1448) and Old French *garder*, which also may mean «to observe» (Tobler-Lommatsch, IV, 143, 33-45 : «jem. oder etwas beobachten»).

2. Chaytor¹⁹ understands l. 18 thus : She (the lady) said that, if she (the guardian) troubled her, it was no matter, i.e., the presence of the guardian did not disturb her at all. But transitive *pezar* does not mean «to trouble somebody», and the ·l in *si·l* could not be = *la*. In its figurative sense, *pezar* is intransitive and means «to cause trouble to somebody, to displease». So in *si·l peza* the pronoun ·l is dative and refers to the guardian, not the lady.

3. *qu'en res non era* (l. 18). At first sight, one is surprised at finding the nominative singular *res* — the word cannot be plural here — after the preposition *en*. But others, too, have used the word the same way. Raynouard, *Lex. Rom.*, V, 56, quotes two passages where *res* appears as accusative singular. The first is from Guillem Augier Novella, P.-C., 205,3. I am quoting the passage after the edition by Johannes Müller, *ZRPh*, XXIII,

¹⁹. Chaytor reviewed M. de Riquer's edition in *MLR*, 43 (1948), 277-78. In addition, he sent the author some textual remarks. The above is one of them.

p. 61, l. 12 : *E res no sai vas on la m'an sercar.* I found that the same poem offers another example in l. 5 : *E res no sai on me lansa Esmansa.* Raynouard's second passage is taken from the Albigensian Chronicle — I suppose the prose version : *D'aco no qual que s'en parle plus en res ni per res.*²⁰

There are two examples of the same use of *res* in the poetic version of the *Croisade Albigeoise* (ed. Paul Meyer) ; they occur both in the first part of the chronicle composed by Guillem de Tudela :

«Cant venc la noit escura, que anc om no'n saup res,
ichiron del castel senes autres arnes»

(l. 1300) ;

«Dixon que mais voldrian estre tuit mort o pres
qu'eli aisso sufrisan ni o fessan per res»

(l. 1411).

Another example from epic poetry :

«E dis Jaufre : “No'n farai res,
qe fort greu o auri'apres”»²¹

(*Jaufre*, ed. BRUNEL, l. 1461).

Finally one from a *tenson* of Peire de Mont Albert and Gaucelm (P.-C. 350.1; III, 7 edited *StFR*, VIII, 477) :

«... con lo maritz s'esmaia
qi ten forsatz so que non ama res».²²

In all these examples *res* stands in a negative sentence, used as an object case or preceded by a preposition. In our case, the preposition is *en*, just as in the prose version of the Albigensian Chronicle quoted by Raynouard. But while in the latter the *en* may possibly have a meaning, though a none too clear one, in Cerverí's passage it would not seem to make sense at all. So I ask myself whether it would not be preferable to eliminate the *n* in *qu'en* and read the line : *e dix que res non era, si'l pezava.* We thus would get the phrase *res non era*, meaning : «it would not be of any importance, it would not matter».²³ At the same time this correction would show that Cerverí knew his Provençal too well to use a nominative where an accusative would be the right thing.

20. Raynouard's translation : «De cela il ne faut qu'il s'en parle plus en rien ni pour rien».

21. Past participle of *aprendre*.

22. *res* rhymes with *conques*.

23. See LEVY, *PSW*, VII, 224 b, No. 3 : *non es res* «es ist nichts, d. h. ohne Bedeutung».

Incidentally, ll. 16-18 are an instructive example of the way the poet changes, without grammatical indication, the person he is speaking of. In l. 16, the subject is *una* (i.e., the guardian), in l. 17 and half of l. 18 it is the lady, while the *·l* in l. 18 (second half) refers again to the guardian (see above p. 7 and footnote 13).

Ll. 19-20.

«Er auziretz ço don eu la preyava :
que mi baizes tan, pus axi m'onrava...»

1. One should, I think, read *auzires* (l. 19) instead of *auziretz* in order to make the rhyme in *-es* more conspicuous, just as the manuscript itself does in the case of *ves = vetz* (l. 15). The original form was, of course, *auziretz*; but in later times final *-tz* was pronounced *-s*.

2. The *que*-clause (l. 20) is another of those that have been dealt with above on the occasion of ll. 3-4. Here, too, *que* means: «namely, to wit».

3. As pointed out in note 35, *baizes* has an open *e* and should not rhyme with *auzires* (future tense), *nuges*, *desplagues*, *cortes*, etc., whose *e* is a close one.

Ll. 21-22.

The poet, in his dream, asked his lady to kiss him till it annoyed him :

«... pero no m'acordava²⁴
que'm desplagues, si totz temps m'o durava.»

(Translation : «pero que no creía que me llegase a fatigar, aunque ello durase toda la vida».)

1. «no creía» for *no m'acordava* seems to me a somewhat colorless translation. The Provençal dictionaries do not offer a suitable one either, which may indicate that we face here a catalanism (cf., Spanish *acordarse* «to remember»). So I suggest to render *no m'acordava* by «it did not enter my mind» or «the thought did not occur to me».

2. The rendering of simple *que'm desplagues* («that it might displease me») by «que me llegase a fatigar» leaves some doubt as to what the subject of *llegase* is supposed to be. In my opinion, the subject of intransitive *desplagues* is «it» and the *'m* (= *me*) is dative. The two lines therefore

24. Text : *no·m acordava*.

mean: «it did not enter my mind that it (the kissing) might displease (annoy) me, even if it lasted forever».

3. More striking, however, is the fact that Cerverí, provided the scribe's text is correct, uses the neuter personal pronoun *o* as a nominative (subject to *durava*), although it has its usual place as an accusative between the dative of the personal pronoun (*me*) and the verb (*durava*). This is not the only case where Cerverí gave *o* this function. In No. 21, ll. 36 ff., the poet praises the Infante Peter:

- «... al noble Peyre l'enfan
cuy Deus a dat de sen tan
38. c'anc tort ab luy no parec
e, paro[n] els cavalers,
40. que frances es e dretxurers.»

The editor translates ll. 39-40 by «y, como demuestran sus caballeros, es franco y justiciero». Without changing the syntactical structure of this passage, he takes *els cavalers*, which is *en los cavalers*, as a nominative plural, which would be *li cavaler*, and attributes to *paro* or, as he has it, *paro[n]*, a meaning which the verb cannot have. If we cancel the comma after *cavalers* and read, without changing the manuscript, *par o*, where *o* would again be a nominative, we get a satisfactory sense by translating: «and it appears in the knights (is visible in their attitude) that he is sincere and just». In this interpretation I fully agree with Jeanroy, who, criticizing Kolsen's text published before M. de Riquer's edition, translates this passage (*AR*, XXIII, p. 18): «Il paraît bien, à voir ses chevaliers, que ...».

A third example of *o* as nominative occurs in Cerverí's second *estampa* (*pida*) (Riquer, No. 25), l. 2:

- «Si com midons es belayre
del mon, o m'o es vigaire,²⁵
li'm laix Deus tantz plazers fayre...»

Since we have discussed this passage in *NM*, LIII (1952), 426-27, it may here suffice to say that, restoring the reading of the manuscript, we translate the first two lines: «As my lady is the most beautiful in the world, or (at least) it seems so to me...». The above examples show that the editor's translation of *o* by «ello» in l. 22 of our poem is correct, but a note should have pointed to its unusual function.

25. Riquer had changed this to: [tot] hom [n'es] jut[g]ayre.

Ll. 23-25.

«Si tan cortes ostals totz jorns trobava!
Ay, cors cortes! Si com dormen estava,
si ans d'un mes veylan pres m'alegrava!»

(Translation: «¡Ay, cuerpo cortés! Así como [entonces] estaba durmiendo, ¡ojalá antes de un mes, velando, me haga feliz de cerca!»)

1. These three lines are the last of the poem, which consists of four stanzas. While the first three stanzas comprise six lines each, the fourth has seven. Such an irregularity no doubt violates the rules of Provençal prosody. So the editor suggests to see in that seventh line «la aglutinación de una *tornada* perdida en el manuscrito». That that line is part of a *tornada* is not impossible. The strophic arrangement of the poem is in *coblas doblas*, the first couple running on the rhyme *-ia*, the second on the rhyme *-ava*. Since the surplus line of stanza IV ends in *-ava* like stanzas III and IV, it cannot be the beginning of a third couple of strophes. Nor can it be the first line of an allegedly lost *tornada*, because it is, logically and syntactically, closely connected with the sixth line of stanza IV.²⁶ On the other hand, it is hard to believe that the sixth line of stanza IV belongs to the latter, because otherwise the word *cortes* would occur as internal rhyme in two consecutive lines. There would, however, be no objection to the two *cortes*, if the *tornada* began with 1. 24: *Ay, cors cortes*. So the conclusion may be justified that ll. 24-25, i.e., the sixth and seventh lines of what is now stanza IV, form the *tornada*, which, then, need not be considered lost. Its text:

«Ay, cors cortes! Si com durmen estava,
si ans d'un mes veylan pres m'alegrava!»

would be in accordance with the nature of a *tornada*, which often enough sums up the essence of the whole poem. In establishing this two-line *tornada* we had to detach the sixth line of stanza IV from its main body. One could imagine that the line thus missing in stanza IV followed 1. 21, which marks the end of the kissing scene. There is indeed a rather abrupt transition

26. ISTVÁN FRANK, *Répertoire métrique de la poésie des troubadours*, I (Paris 1953), No. 230.4 also doubts that 1. 25 could be a *tornada*. True, he assigns to our poem a two-line *tornada*, but it must be kept in mind that he does not admit internal rhymes and counts verses that show them in modern editions as separate lines, an opinion which I do not share. So the «2» which he puts at the end of the metrical scheme of our poem means the ten syllables of 1. 25. The question mark with which he accompanies his statement is only too justified.

from the latter to the praise of the poet's *ostal* in what is now l. 22, and M. de Riquer seems to have been under the same impression, since he put some dots at the end of that line.

2. There is another possibility of giving stanza IV its regular number of verses. In quite a few cases, editors of troubadour poems have eliminated whole stanzas from the manuscript texts, considering them apocryphal. Could the same procedure be applied to one single line? L. 23 might be a case in point. The kissing scene described in ll. 19-22 may have induced an envious scribe (or joglar) to utter the ardent wish: *Si tan cortes ostals totz temps trobava!* and insert it in the poem he was copying (or reciting). This rather modest wish for more such dream-*ostals* may even seem to clash with the second, farther-reaching one where the poet hopes that his dream will come true. Eliminating l. 23 would reduce stanza IV to its normal length without leaving any gap in the trend of thought. On the other hand, it would avoid the stylistic awkwardness of ll. 23-25, in which we find two wishes introduced by *si* «'if'», sc., *Si tan cortes ostals... trobava* (l. 23) and *Si ans d'un mes ... m'alegrava* (l. 25) plus a third *si* «'so'» in *Si con durmen estava* (l. 24). If this second hypothesis is accepted, ll. 24 and 25 would not form a *tornada*, as suggested under No. 1, but belong to the stanza itself. However, in this case, the two *cortes* forming the internal rhymes in ll. 23 and 24 would have to stay on as a serious prosodic flaw.

Which of the two hypothesis is more suitable to explain the surplus line 25 is hard to decide. I personally prefer the first one. However, the possibility that neither is correct or even necessary in case Cerverí simply made a mistake is not to be excluded.²⁷

3. Some syntactical remarks concerning ll. 23-25 would seem to be in order here.

a) In these lines we find two cases of an if-clause whose principal clause has been suppressed. Such an if-clause here is equivalent to an expression of wish: *Si tan cortes ostals ... trobava* «If I only found such courtly inns!» and *Si ... veylan ... m'alegrava* «If she only rejoiced me while I am awake!». Such an if-clause is the protasis of a conditional sentence implying the non-fulfilment of the condition, and it is this character of unreality that those incomplete conditional clauses and a wish have in common. This phenomenon is met with in various languages. Cf., Latin: *Si nunc se ostendat!*;²⁸ French: *Ah! si je vous avais là pour*

27. Cerverí's *Libel* (RIQUER, No. 9) also has a surplus line at the end. In an article recently submitted to the NM of Helsinki, I have tried to explain this irregularity.

28. Quoted from Virgil in Cassell's Latin Dictionary.

*me le dire!;*²⁹ English: *If I had only been there!*³⁰ and similarly in German: *Wenn ich nur dabei gewesen wäre!*

In view of this widely spread use of the if-clause it is surprising to see that it does not seem to have existed in Provençal. To my knowledge, no dictionary or grammar dealing with that language mentions it, and I myself do not remember ever having met with it. In this respect, it is rather significant what Jules Ronjat has to say about exclamatory sentences:³¹ «On trouve des frases exclamatrices avec verbe à l'impf. ou au plus-que-pf. quand en fr. on aurait ... *si + impf.* ou plus-que-pf. ind.». Among others, he gives this example: *Aguësses vist boumbi lou moustre!*, which he renders by: «Si tu avais vu bondir le monstre!». Since he points to French *si* as a means of forming exclamatory sentences and translates his examples accordingly, he would certainly not have failed to speak of its Provençal parallel, if there had been one.

b) The editor's translation of ll. 24-25 is basically correct.³² However, it does not do full justice to the syntactical structure of these lines. They show a grammatical phenomenon of which Tobler gives Old French examples in his *Vermischte Beiträge*, I, 2nd ed., pp. 128-29. Where a subordinate clause is the principal clause of a second subordinate clause, the latter is not infrequently placed before the word that introduces the first-degree subordinate clause. What is true of Old French is also true of Provençal.³³ It seems that Stimming was the first to call attention to this fact in his first edition of Bertran de Born (p. 152 and note p. 259), where he deals with the following passage of P.-C. 80.14, ll. 46-48.³⁴

«Que'l Norman en son enoiat
e dizon, si's n'eron tornat
qu'us mais d'els sai no venria.»

The principal clause is *e dizon*. This *dizon* has an object clause: *qu'us ... no venria*, which is, again, the principal clause of the second-degree subordinate clause *si's n'eron tornat*. The logical order of the two subordinate

29. Quoted from Daudet by GAMILLSCHEG, *Historische Französische Syntax* (Tübingen [1957]), 611. G. calls the above sentence an exclamation, but on p. 612 he points to the close relationship of wishes and exclamations.

30. C. T. ONIONS, *An advanced English syntax* (London 1929), § 42, No. 5.

31. *Grammaire istorique des parlers provençaux*, III (Montpellier 1937), 628.

32. The real sense of *pres* (l. 25) is not clear to me. Is it the same as that of the *pres* in l. 12, or does it mean «near, close», i. e., in physical contact? In the latter case, it would be the counterpart of *veylan*. While the poet enjoys love's pleasures only in his dream and far from his lady, he wishes to enjoy them awake and in physical contact with his lady. I do not know whether the editor, rendering *pres* by «de cerca», had the same idea.

33. And of Latin, too. See TOBLER, *l. c.*, 128, note one.

34. In his second edition, he does not comment on this passage.

clauses would be : *e dizon que, si's n'erón tornat, us mais ... no venria.*

The following example from Cerverí's No. 68 (ll. 16 ff.) may show that the poet was well familiar with this arrangement of two subordinate clauses depending on each other :

18. «Ja reys ne coms no s'o tenya en anta,...
 si'l paubres fes en vida tot quant dec,
 si Deus asis pres si'l te e l'estanca³⁵
 20. ez [es] als reys c'an fait mal durs con fers.»³⁶

These lines offer even two if-clauses in the position we are dealing with here, that of l. 19 being the principal clause of that of l. 18. Logically, the if-clause of l. 18 should follow the *si* of l. 19 : ... *si, si'l paubres fes ... quant dec, Deus ... pres si'l ten e l'estanca*. The editor's translation gives an adequate picture of the syntactical structure of those four lines : «No tengan en mengua reyes ni condes ... que, si el pobre hizo en vida todo cuanto debía, Dios lo tenga a su lado y lo conserve, y que con los reyes que hayan obrado mal sea duro como el hierro». Only, no doubt for stylistic reasons, he substitutes a «que» for the second *si* and consequently uses the subjunctives «tenga» and «conserve» (for the *te* and *estanca* of the Provençal text) in what is now an object clause depending on «no tengan en mengua».

This passage from another of Cerverí's poems may lead us back to the two lines of our poem from which we started :

«Ay, cors cortes! Si con durmen estava,
 si ans d'un mes veylan pres m'alegrava!»

This is a special case of the grammatical phenomenon under discussion. We have two subordinate clauses, an if-clause : *si ans d'un mes ... m'alegrava* and a comparative clause subordinate to, and placed before, it : *si³⁷ con durmen estava*. The specialty of this case consists in there not being a principal clause at all. However, the construction is the same as in the other passages dealt with here. The if-clause remains grammatically a subordinate clause, although it has taken the sense of a wish.

KURT LEWENT

New York University.

35. Text *e'l estanca*.

36. The last line lacks one syllable. The editor supplies it by putting [es] between *mal* and *durs*. This would destroy the metre of the decasyllabic verse, in which the caesura lies after the fourth syllable. Moreover, it is more probable that the scribe dropped the *es* after the *ez*, which begins the line, than after *mal*.

37. This *si* is not the conditional conjunction, but is = *aisi* and belongs to *con*.