
Linda Paterson

Joan d'Albuzon ~ Nicolet de Turin
En Nicolet, d'un sognie qu'ieu sognava
(*BdT* 265.2 = 310.1)

A curious thirteenth-century Occitan dialogue poem between two Italian troubadours, Joan d'Albuzon and Nicolet de Turin, presents a dream and its interpretation. In alternate stanzas, Joan claims to have dreamt of a terrifying eagle flying through the air and stirring up a great roaring wind, accompanied by a huge ship of fire sailing across the land from Cologne. Nicolet in turn interprets the dream in terms of an emperor sweeping through Lombardy with a great army of German soldiers at his command, paid from his vast supply of treasure. Joan's dream concludes with a vision of the eagle blowing out the fire, shining a great light over Montferrat, and settling in a high eyrie from which the whole world, now joyful, can be surveyed. Nicolet expounds this as the emperor's desire for peace after vengeance, the Marquis of Montferrat's unduplicitous submission, the emperor's position of supreme command, and the prospect of appropriate rewards. Evidently, this would appear to be a piece of propaganda, but of what kind?¹ What was the relation between the two troubadours, their intended public, and the circumstances of poetic production? Is this simply a case of praising a potential patron in the hope of payment? Why should such a circumstantial piece have been preserved? And what does it have to do with writing history?²

¹ For the considerable recent interest in medieval propaganda and communication, spawning at least eight colloquia in Europe and Canada since 1990, see Martin Aurell, *Convaincre et persuader. Communication et propagande aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, Poitiers 2007, pp. 11-48 («Rapport introductif»), p. 16.

² This essay was originally written for a Festschrift in honour of Professor

The poem is a *tenso*, one of a corpus of 158 surviving *tenso*s and *partimens* between real, as opposed to fictive, interlocutors, currently being edited for the Boydell Press.³ Joan d'Albuzon's datable poems fall between 1229 to c. 1240;⁴ Nicolet de Turin was a knight in the service of Count Geoffrey of Biandrate in c. 1220-25, for how long we do not know.⁵ In our piece he is addressed with the honorific *En* (Sir), while Joan is not, which suggests a difference of status.

The form of six stanzas of alternating speakers, followed by two *tornadas* or short concluding stanzas recapitulating the versification of the end of the preceding stanzas, is conventional for the genre. A *tenso*'s *tornadas* will often contain an explicit appeal to one or more arbiters; here there is no such appeal, though there may be an implied one, namely the emperor himself. Unlike the form, the dream scenario is unique in the corpus of Occitan *tenso*s and *partimens*. And unlike many examples of medieval literary dreams, this piece presents no awareness of dream theory, or of the potential ambiguity and dangers of dreams and their interpretations.⁶ The dream has a single, dogmatic, exegesis.

No-one has doubted that the emperor here is Frederick II Hohen-

Peter Noble, to be published in the next issue of the journal *Reading Medieval Studies* under the title *Writing the present: Boniface II of Montferrat and Frederick II Hohenstaufen*.

³ For further details of the project under the aegis of Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson, supported by the British Academy and the AHRC Resource Enhancement Scheme, see Linda M. Paterson, «L'édition des poèmes dialogués», in *Scène, évolution, sort de la langue et de la littérature d'oc: Actes du VI^e Congrès International de l'AIEO (Reggio Calabria - Messina, 7-13 juillet 2002)*, ed. Rossana Castano, Saverio Guida, and F. Latella, 2 vols., Rome 2003, pp. 593-608. I am indebted in the preparation of this essay to the very helpful suggestions of John Gillingham concerning the dating issue, to Anna Radaelli for kindly checking in Rome bibliographical material unobtainable in the UK, to my co-editor Ruth Harvey who has constantly reviewed the editing process, and to Costanzo Di Girolamo for care in preparing this publication.

⁴ See Jean Boutière, *Les Poésies du troubadour Peire Bremon Ricàs Novas*, Toulouse 1930, pp. XIII-XVIII.

⁵ Raymond Arveiller and Gérard Gouiran, *L'œuvre poétique de Falquet de Romans, troubadour*, Aix-en-Provence, 1987, pp. 129-131; Giulio Bertoni, *I trovatori d'Italia*, Rome 1915, pp. 60-64.

⁶ Steven F. Krueger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 1992, pp. 16, 23, and *passim*.

staufen, though its other allusions have been hitherto regarded as obscure. Schultz-Gora dubbed them «dunkel und widersprechend», Bertoni «Preziosa, sebbene alquanto oscura»; Bozzola referred to it in 1910 as «un singolare documento poetico del tempo che, per essere contemporaneo degli avvenimenti che celebra e quindi scritto con assoluta freschezza d'impressioni, ha un pregio di verità e immediatezza che non possono avere sempre le cronache . . . nella quale l'oscurità delle allusioni e l'allegoria non impedisce di affermarne il senso complessivo».⁷ Our new edition sheds some light in purely linguistic terms. Other elements of obscurity prove to be the result of imperfect understanding of the historical circumstances. The question that then emerges is, what is the poem *for*? I will argue that it is intended to write history in the making. If, as Orwell claimed, «He who controls the present, controls the past» and «He who controls the past, controls the future», this poem seems to be a case of hoping to control the (immediate) future by (re)writing the present.

So what were the historical circumstances? Schultz-Gora considered the piece could only have been composed 1238 after the battle of Cortenuova, when almost the whole of Lombardy lay at Frederick's feet. He enters into no explanations, and his dating was accepted by Bozzola without further investigation.⁸ De Lollis subsequently placed it in c. 1226 on the basis of avowed guesswork, claiming there was nothing in the text to support Schultz's suggested date of 1238: «Congettura per congettura, apparirebbe più verosimile una data anteriore di dieci o dodici anni».⁹ Torraca in 1895 proposed a date of c. 1236, on the grounds that our troubadours did not mention Frederick's victory at Cortenuova: «prediceva la vittoria dell'imperatore su tutti i nemici» («Lo Schultz crede composta la tenzone nel 1238, quando,

⁷ Oskar Schultz-Gora, «Das Verhältnis der provenzalischen Pastourelle zur altfranzösischen», *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 8, 1884, pp. 106-112 (p. 216); Bertoni, p. 62; Annibale Bozzola, «La politica imperiale di Bonifacio II di Monferrato e una pretesa donazione di Federico II», *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, 45, 1910, pp. 700-713 (p. 709).

⁸ Oskar Schultz(-Gora), «Zu den Lebensverhältnissen einiger Trobadors», *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 9, 1885: 116-135, p. 216; Bozzola, pp. 709-710.

⁹ Cesare De Lollis, *Nuova Antologia di scienze, lettere ed arti*, 139 (3rd series, 55), 1895, p. 421.

cioè, invece di fare predizioni e augurî, Nicoletto e Giovanni avrebbero potuto narrare la sconfitta toccata a' Lombardi a Cortenuova».¹⁰ Seven years later Schultz-Gora summarily rejected De Lollis's dating and simply mentioned Torraca's without comment.¹¹ In 1911-12 De Bartholomaeis dated it to 1231, on the basis of arguments he was to reiterate twenty years later.¹² Here he focused on three circumstances which he sees mentioned in the text: 1) Frederick was on his way from southern Italy towards rebel Lombardy (a trajectory that depends on his interpretation of the word *devers* in line 5, see below); 2) an army assembled in Germany was heading for Italy; 3) Marquis Boniface II of Montferrat was fighting against the Emperor. This could only, he argued, date from summer or autumn 1231, when Frederick was making his way northwards along the Adriatic coast to a diet in Ravenna on All Saints Day, while an expedition of Germans under his son Henry, King of the Romans, was heading south towards the Alps. De Bartholomaeis argues that it must fall before October, since at that time, at the congress of Bologna, delegates from Guelf cities were discussing resistance to Frederick and sending an army to block the passes at Trentino, which led to Henry being held up in the Tyrol, and Joan's 'dream' would not have been so confident once this happened.

Bertoni in 1915 agreed with De Bartholomaeis that Frederick was heading south to north: he noted that *devers* (5) is ambiguous, «ma poichè noi abbiamo un "venia" (v. 4), il primo significato è da preferirsi al secondo». He also thought the *tenso* must pre-date the battle of

¹⁰ Francesco Torraca, «Federico II e la poesia provenzale», *Nuova Antologia di scienze, lettere ed arti*, 139 (= 3rd series, 55), 1895, pp. 224-254 (p. 240, and n. 2).

¹¹ Oskar Schultz-Gora, *Ein Sirventes von Guilhem Figueira gegen Friedrich II*, Halle 1902, p. 36.

¹² Vincenzo De Bartholomaeis, «Osservazioni sulle poesie provenzali relative a Federico II», *Memorie della Real Accademia delle scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna*, Classe di scienze morali, sezione storico-filologica, serie 1^a, tomo 6, 1911-12, pp. 18 and 112, and *Poesie provenzali storiche relative all'Italia*, 2 vols., Rome 1931, p. 114. This date is accepted by Alessandro Barbero, «La corte dei marchesi di Monferrato allo specchio della poesia trobadorica: ambizioni signorili e ideologia cavalleresca fra XI e XIII secolo», *Bollettino storico-bibliografico subalpino*, 81, 1983, pp. 641-703 (p. 702), where he misleadingly refers to our piece as a «canzone» or *partimen*, and the marquis of Montferrat as William VI.

Cortenuova in 1237, since in the poem Boniface still figures among Frederick's opponents and since the two troubadours predict Frederick's great power for the future rather than observe its existence in the present. He concluded that the piece probably dates before 1234 when Frederick went to Germany to punish his rebellious son Henry, but on the other hand that it was known that Frederick came down from N. Italy several times («mosse alla volta dell'Italia superiore» in 1231.¹³ So he did not appear wholly convinced by the arguments which De Bartholomaeis had advanced earlier,¹⁴ and presents the more cautious dating of 1231-34. In his discussion of 1231 De Bartholomaeis does not refer to Bertoni.

Much hinges on the direction in which the emperor is supposed to be travelling. As Bertoni remarks, *devers* (v. 5) is ambiguous, since it can mean both 'from' and 'to' (*PD* «de vers, de; vers, envers, du côté de»). It cannot therefore be used to determine Frederick's trajectory. But neither, however, can *venia* (v. 4), as Bertoni thought. It is hardly likely that Nicolet de Turin and Joan are anywhere but northern Italy, in other words in between Salerno (Frederick's Kingdom of Sicily) and Germany, so in whichever direction the Emperor was travelling, he was broadly speaking coming towards where the troubadours are.

Other circumstances that need to be taken into consideration are the evocation of Frederick's terrifying punitive power (vv. 3, 6-8, 12-13, 43, and especially 31), and the specific mention of Cologne and the enormous treasure being used to finance and ensure the support of his German army (vv. 19, 26-30). Here note should be taken of *bandia* (v. 28), those who have been summoned to military service.

To situate the poem at the time when Frederick was on his way to Ravenna fails to explain the first of these elements. Van Cleve reports that the emperor summoned the Diet at Ravenna, on the advice of the pope, «to restore the universal peace of the Empire and to dispose affairs in Italy to a state of prosperity and peace». Obstacles to this «peace» lay in Lombardy and Germany, not in the area of Italy to the south of Ravenna, and the Emperor only took a «small following» to

¹³ Bertoni, pp. 62-63.

¹⁴ De Bartholomaeis, *Osservazioni*, p. 18.

Ravenna.¹⁵ This does not tally with the idea of an all-powerful army sweeping menacingly through the land. Moreover it fails to explain why the marquis of Montferrat should have been the focus of attention in the poem.

More telling is the evocation of the vast treasure on its way from Cologne. In 1235 Cologne was the site of huge festivities, when Isabella, daughter of King Henry III of England, arrived there in May with a dazzling trousseau, to spend six weeks there prior to her wedding with Frederick in Worms in July.¹⁶ July in Worms also saw the abject submission of Frederick's son Henry, whom the Emperor humiliated, exiled and imprisoned.¹⁷ Frederick then immediately prepared for a campaign against the Lombard League, collecting an army to cross the Alps. Masson reports that «The gold of the empress's dowry was used to hire the knights and mercenaries who would constitute the hard core of the army, and the feudal armies of the princes were called up».¹⁸ This may be something of a simplification: this was no doubt not the emperor's only source of funds, the cash seems to have been paid in 30,000 silver marks rather than gold, a «large, but not such large» sum according to Spufford,¹⁹ and Henry III had considerable difficulty in collecting his daughter's dowry.²⁰ It nevertheless appears that the final instalment was on its way from England by 12 July 1237, and the fame of the wedding and dowry are likely to have made an impression on troubadours hoping to benefit from their fall-out. This would seem to offer a ready explanation of our two troubadours' reference to the ship from Cologne whose treasure commands the support of the German army and fans the flames of war.

¹⁵ Thomas Curtis Van Cleve, *The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen: Immutator Mundi*, Oxford 1972, p. 361.

¹⁶ Ernst Kantorowicz, *Frederick the Second 1194-1250*, London 1931, pp. 406-407; Georgina Masson, *Frederick II of Hohenstaufen. A life*, London 1957, pp. 66-67; Van Cleve, p. 381.

¹⁷ Van Cleve's unsourced claim that Gaucelm Faidit refers to this is impossible, Gaucelm's career dating 1173-1203.

¹⁸ Masson, p. 373.

¹⁹ Peter Spufford, *Money and Its Uses in Medieval Europe*, Cambridge 1988, p. 161.

²⁰ Robert C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy and Finance under Henry III*, Oxford 1987, pp. 98, 109, 117 and Björn K. U. Weiler, *Henry III of England and the Staufen Empire, 1216-1272*, Woodbridge and Rochester 2006), p. 80.

Moreover the reference to Frederick punishing his enemies resonates particularly with his imperious treatment of his rebellious son, who was to remain a prisoner for the rest of his life.

But not only that particular punishment. As soon as the Alps could be crossed the emperor marched south, arriving in Verona on 16 August. Shortly afterwards he sacked the town of Vicenza in exemplary fashion: Abulafia relates that he aimed «to create a cloud of fear in north-eastern Italy in which the cities, aware that they could save themselves by abandoning the league, would avoid Vicenza's fate and ally with the emperor». Returning to his northern kingdom when the autumn weather made further campaigning impossible, he was back in Lombardy the following September, when his campaign culminated in the zenith of his power as a consequence of the battle of Cortenuova in November 1237.²¹ After Cortenuova, «Frederick's propagandists went rapidly to work. They made sure that Cortenuova became prominent news in the European courts».²² The Lombard league began to dissolve; in January 1238 Frederick received the submission of Vigevano, Novara and Vercelli, and in February entered Piedmont, holding a diet in Turin in the second half of February where nobles of the region, including the marquis of Montferrat, paid him homage.²³ It is noteworthy that according to Nicolet, the emperor is coming *per*, not *en*, Lombardy—in other words *through* it (compare Albert of Malaspina's mention of Raimbaut de Vaqueiras wandering *per Lombardia / . . . a lei de croi joglar*), which corresponds with his trajectory in 1237-38.²⁴

Since Turin is the home town of Nicolet, it is worth considering whether the *tenso* was composed there on this occasion.²⁵ The verb

²¹ Masson, pp. 274-279.

²² David Abulafia, *Frederick II. A medieval emperor*, London 1988, pp. 298-303.

²³ Kantorowicz, p. 459-460; Teofilo Rossi and Ferdinando Gabotto, *Storia di Torino*, I, Turin 1914, pp. 261-263; *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. XII, Rome 1970, p. 126.

²⁴ *BdT* 15.1, 23-24, our edition, forthcoming in *The Troubadour 'tensos' and 'partimens': a Critical Edition*, ed. by Ruth Harvey and Linda Paterson (also *The Poems of the Troubadour Raimbaut de Vaqueiras*, ed. Joseph Linskill, The Hague 1964, IV).

²⁵ Bertoni, p. 64, suggested this location for the 'dictation' of the piece («ove poté essere dettata la sua tenzone con Joan d'Albusson»).

describing his handing over of Montferrat without deceit is in the present tense (*ren*, 44). Stanzas V-VI may be read as a celebration of this event. But would this mean the moment when Frederick arrived in Turin, or just before, when he was on his way? According to Rossi and Gabotto, on February 2 or earlier, when Frederick was still some distance from Turin, the city had already submitted to his authority through his representative.²⁶ Frederick soon afterwards arrived in Turin in person with the marquis of Montferrat at his side; from Turin, the emperor went on to Cuneo, then returned again to Turin in April with an entourage that included *inter alia* Boniface and count Guido of Biandrate, with whose family Nicolet is known to have been connected.²⁷

But why should the eagle of Joan's dream be flying towards *Salerno*? Montferrat is not neatly situated on a direct route from his Alpine crossing, or even from Cortenuova, to Salerno, lying as it does to the west of his earlier victories in Lombardy. This in itself may not present a problem: if the idea that Frederick was moving from Germany towards his Sicilian kingdom in a broadly southward direction does not fit tidily with a modern mental image of a map of Europe, medieval people may have had a much vaguer sense of geography. In addition, the evocation of Frederick's southern kingdom resonates with his ambitions to be emperor of all Italy and indeed the world.

But if this is the reason for mentioning his southern kingdom, why should this be embodied in Salerno in particular—a rather unimportant town? Firstly, Salerno is likely to have been the city in the Sicilian kingdom most familiar to troubadours simply for its fame as a centre of medicine. More particularly, a *sirventes* dating from c. 1220 by the troubadour Aimeric de Peguilhan had celebrated the emperor as a Salernitan doctor (*metgia*) who might cure the ills of the world.²⁸

²⁶ Rossi and Gabotto, p. 262: «la città aveva accolto, obbediente, un suo “vicario e capitano da Pavia in su” in persona di quel “signor Vinciguerra” a cui ivi, in tal giorno, l'abate di Pinerolo, Girardo II, presteva fedeltà per tutto il feudo che egli e i suoi predecessori tenevano dall'Imperio, e che poi il 7, in Asti, investiva del castello e della giurisdizione di Albugnano il prevosto di Vezzolano».

²⁷ See n. 4, above.

²⁸ *BdT* 10.26, ed. De Bartholomaeis, *Poesie*, I, pp. 246-248 and *The Poems of Aimeric de Peguilhan*, ed. William P. Shepard and Frank M. Chambers, Evans-ton 1950, p. 148.

Preserved in ten manuscripts, it would seem to have achieved a certain fame, since Guilhem Figueira says of Aimeric *Pero ben fez la Metgia, / E dis del rei gran lauzor, / Sol q'el so tegn'ad honor*.²⁹ In the minds of troubadours and their audiences, then, Frederick may have been particularly associated with Salerno.

Is the *tenso* a piece of propaganda instigated by the Emperor? It could certainly serve as such; and yet Montferrat does not appear to have been particularly central to his concerns, and the brilliant light settling over this particular region seems a little puzzling. Were the Turin troubadour and his companion speculatively praising a potential patron in the hope of personal reward? They may have a somewhat different agenda. The spotlight falling on Montferrat, in a blaze of outwardly-radiating joy, the evocation of the Marquis's lack of deceit when his past conduct to the emperor had been far from unequivocal, with the immediate sequitur of great rewards (45), suggest rather a placatory, if not ingratiating, tactic. I suggest that this piece was composed in February 1238 (as Schultz-Gora originally thought), very possibly at Boniface's behest, at the moment when Frederick was about to receive or had just received the marquis's submission and when the issue of rewards and punishments may have still hung in the balance: rewards for troubadours, no doubt, but rewards and punishments for the allies of this most wavering of subjects. Boniface was soon, in that same year, to switch his allegiance back to the pope, and in 1245 the troubadour Lanfranc Cigala was to launch a bitter invective against this *fiils o fraire de ven* for yet again renewing homage to the emperor.³⁰

Frederick himself possessed a powerful propaganda machine,

²⁹ *BdT* 217.1b, 8-10, ed. Shepard-Chambers, p. 94. Guilhem's text includes the lines *C'un bon metge nos a Dieus sai trames / devas Salern, savi e ben apres* (11-12). In this case *devas* (= *devers*) is associated with movement from south to north. The fact remains that the preposition in medieval Occitan can work both ways. The presence of the phrase in our piece may be explained simply by it having stuck in the mind of later troubadours.

³⁰ *BdT* 282.6, ed. Bertoni, *Trovatori*, XLIV and *Il Canzoniere di Lanfranco Cigala*, ed. Francesco Branciforti, Florence 1954, XXI; for the dating of this *sirventes*, see Schultz-Gora, *Ein Sirventes*, 1902, pp. 36-37 and Branciforti, pp. 34-37.

well adapted to the «expression solennelle du pouvoir politique».³¹ Two years earlier in the palace of Piacenza, his most eloquent propagandist Peter of La Vigna had made a speech taking as his theme «The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined»:³² an inspiration to the illuminations of Joan's imperial eagle? And does Frederick's passion for divination explain the prophetic nature of the troubadour's visionary dream? Whatever the rhetoric, it seems designed to write history in the making and make history in the writing.

³¹ Aurell, p. *38 and note 96.

³² Isaiah 9,2; see Jean Louis Alphonse Huillard-Bréholles, *Vie et correspondance de Pierre de la Vigne*, Paris 1865, pp. 24-25.

Joan d'Albuzon – Nicolet de Turin
En Nicolet, d'un sognie qu'ieu sognava
 (BdT 265.2 = 310.1)

Ms: U 129^r-30^r (*Joan dalbuzon*).

Diplomatic editions: Grüzmacher 1863, pp. 297-298; Grüzmacher 1864, p. 453.

Editions: Raynouard 1816-21, V, pp. 236-237; Crescini 1892, pp. 131-133; Wittenberg 1908, pp. 78-79 and 105-106 (= Crescini 1892; German translation); Bertoni 1915, pp. 256-259 (critical edition; Italian translation); Crescini 1926, pp. 304-306 (critical edition); De Bartholomaeis 1931, II, pp. 114-117 (= Crescini; Italian translation); Ugolini 1949, pp. 80-81 (= Bertoni 1915); Bonnarel 1981, p. 187 (Mod. Occ. version on Bertoni).

Versification: a10' b10' a10' b10' c10 c10 b10' b10' (Frank 362:3). Six *coblas unissonans* with two four-line *tornadas*. Rhymes: a: -ava, b: -ia, c: -an. The verse form, with different rhymes, is found only in a *cobla* by Bertran Carbonel (BdT 82.85, ed. Routledge 2000, Cobla 1, p. 88), and may be original.

Dating. The piece was probably composed in 1238 when the emperor Frederick II, after his victory at the battle of Cortenuova in 1237 and subsequent subjection of several cities of the rebellious Lombard League, was arriving in Turin to receive the homage of Boniface II of Montferrat.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| I | En Niccolet, d'un sognie qu'ieu sognava maravillios, una nuit qan dormia, voil m'esplanez, qe molt s'espaventava tot lo seigles d'un aigla qe venia | 4 |
| | devers Salern su per l'aire volant, e tot qant es fugiea le denant, si c'al seu senz encauzava e prendia, c'om denant lei defendre no's poiria. | 8 |

2 qan] qan mi (+1) 3 s'e.] mes paudentava 7 prendria

I. Sir Nicolet, I want you to expound a miraculous dream to me that I dreamt one night when I was asleep, for it filled the whole world with fear of an eagle that came flying through the air towards / from Salerno, and all creatures were fleeing before it, so that it was pursuing and capturing at will, as no-one would be able to defend himself against it.

- a cui dera del seu gran tesaur tan
 qe l'ost fara per toz locs son talan.
 E plaz mi fort qe·ls enemics castia;
 e qe·ls amics meillior e bon lur sia! 32
- V En Niccolet, tot lo foc amorzava
 aqest'aigla, e un gran lum metea
 en Monferrat, qe tan fort esclarava
 qe lo segles per tut s'en esbaudeia, 36
 e mettia d'autre lum per locs tan
 qe tot qant es s'en annava allegran;
 puis l'aigla sus en l'aira s'asedea
 en tant alt luoc qe tot lo mond vesia. 40
- VI Joan, l'amorzament del foc semblava
 paiz, qe vorra l'empeaire aisi sia
 qan s'er venjaz, e lo lum demostrava
 qe·l marqes ren Monferrat ses bausia; 44
 e li altri lum seran guierdon gran
 q'auran de lui sel q'aver lo deuran;
 e lo saiser dell'aire·m singnifia
 qe·l mond er pois toz a sa signoria. 48
- VII A l'onrat ric emperador presan,
 En Niccolet, don Dieu forza e talan

29 seu *om.* (-1) 30 loc 32 e] A 37 e *om.* (-1) 42 qaisi (+1) 43 serueiaz;
 qe mostraua 44 ren] rendea (+1) 48 *apparently el corrected to er*

the Germans summoned to military service, to which he will give so much of his huge treasure that the army will do his bidding everywhere. And I am delighted that he is punishing his enemies; and may he make his allies prosper and do them good!

V. Sir Nicolet, this eagle blew out all the fire, and cast a great light over Montferrat which it lit up so brightly that the world grew utterly joyful at the sight, and it caused other light to shine elsewhere so that all existence became full of happiness; then the eagle settled in its eyrie in such a high position that it could see the whole world.

VII. God grant strength to the honoured, mighty, worthy emperor, Sir

qe restauri valors e cortesia,
si cum li creis lo poder chascun dia. 52

VIII Joan, tot ço conosc, qe ben esta-n
l'empeiraire; per q'eu non vau dottan
q'aisi com a del mond mielz em bailia,
deu ben aver del prez la segnorìa. 56

56 Dieu

Nicolet, and the desire to restore worth and courtliness, just as He enhances his power day by day.

VIII. Joan, I recognise all this, for the emperor pursues this insistently; so I have no doubt that just as he best rules the world, so he must be lord of worth.

The MS in several instances (4, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19 and so on) does not observe the 'traditional' case system; where previous editors emend and we retain the MS readings. Similarly, unlike previous editors, we do not emend the graphies at the rhyme in 5, 6, 21, 22, 39. Our interpretation differs from theirs in a number of instances.

2. The emendation is Crescini's; Bertoni *Qe-m d.*

3-4. Previous editors retain *m'espaventava*. Raynouard printed *Tot los eignes* which, as Bertoni suggests, is meaningless. Crescini 1926 emended to *totz lo segl'es*. Bertoni found the passage unclear and emended to *Totz lo sogni' es*, though conceded that the whole dream is not simply about the eagle, given the later presence of a ship; however he thought that «tutto il sogno» could more or less mean «la parte principale del sogno consiste». Our minor emendation restores full sense, the idea of the world being fearful according with 6.

5. Previous editors emend to *sus*. COM2 attests two examples of the form *su* (prep.) in 13th-c. verse narrative texts (as well as some later examples): see Cianciòlo 1941, 1507, *e sus su penchenil lo mit tota sazoni*; Berthe-Cierbide-Kintana-Santalo 1995, 3948, *que su el portal se mes*.

6. Crescini 1892 emended to *fugia li*.

12-13. Bertoni understood «per cui ciascuno fuggiva di coloro che hanno torto o colpa verso di lui», but sense surely requires us to understand *ciascuns de totz aicels* as the subject.

22. Crescini 1926 emended to the imperf. tense (*buffava-l foc*), in line with the context. But Bertoni accepts the MS reading as a historic present; in this case *l'aigla ab* counts as three syllables.

24. We follow Bertoni's emendations (though he prints *partz*).

25-27. Crescini 1926 emended *l'aigla* to *l'aura*, unnecessarily. — In both his editions he supplied the missing syllable in 25 by adding *vitz* after *qe*. Levy 1895, p. 232 suggested emending to *Joan, l'aura qe tan fort[men] ventava / El gran[z] tesaur[s] qe mena en Lombardia / L'emperaire, e la naus qel [foc] portava / Es la granz ostz*, which Bertoni rejected on the legitimate grounds that *el* in 26 could not represent *es lo*. We follow Bertoni but adopt Levy's suggestion (also De Bartholomaeis) of *fortmen* for 25; he plausibly suggests that the scribe's eye could have lit upon the following syllable *uen*. — As Bertoni saw, 27 is not hypometric if a hiatus between *l'emperaire* and *e* is assumed, so Crescini's suppletion *qe [foc] portava* (1926 edition; also De Bartholomaeis) is unnecessary. A dir. obj. does however seem required; we adopt Bertoni's more conservative emendation to *qe-l*.

28. For the translation of *bandia* (Bertoni «bandita»), compare Niermeyer, *bannire*, 1, citing examples of *in exercitum banniti, in hostem bannire, cum armis / cavallo bannitus*. For the disappearance of Latin intervocalic T after O or I, see Anglade 1921, pp. 150-51, and compare Gaunt-Harvey-Paterson 2000, poem XXV, 11 and note.

29. The suppletion, for scansion, is Crescini's, adopted also by Bertoni.

30. As Bertoni, we emend MS *loc* in agreement with *toz*: compare 37. The omission of *-s* no doubt arose from the proximity of the *s-* in *son*.

32. We follow Bertoni's emendation of *aqels*; it is easy to see how the scribal error arose. — Bertoni takes *meillior* as indicative (*meillior', e*), which is also possible. We take Nicolet to be describing the present in 31 and hoping for the future in 32.

37. The suppletion is Crescini's, followed by Bertoni.

39. By *aire* we understand 'eyrie' (*PD aire = aize*, «lieu; lieu où on habite, demeure, résidence»). Here 'up in the air' would simply be padding; in 47 other editors, accepting 'air', were obliged to emend for sense.

42. As Levy, we emend for scansion.

43. As other editors, we follow Levy's emendation of MS *serueiatz* (1895, p. 232). — Crescini emended the second part of the line to *lo lums* (1892 *lum*) *demostrava*, which was accepted by subsequent editors (though De Bartholomaeis retains *lum*, as do we). This does create a repeated rhyme, but it is hard to make syntactic sense of the MS version.

44. We follow Crescini's emendation; MS *rendea* perhaps represents miscopying of an earlier fut. (condit.?) form.

45. Crescini emends to *l'altre*; we follow Bertoni in accepting the form *altri* (see his note for further references).

46. Bertoni 1926 emends to *los*, referring to *guierdon gran*, though *lo* can refer to the general idea of being rewarded.

47. Bertoni 1926 emends to *e lo sesers en l'aire*, translating with a somewhat incongruous image «e il suo assiedersi nell'aria». There is no need to correct the inflexion. For *aire* see the note to 39. We retain the graphy *saiser*.

51. Bertoni emends to *restaure valor*.

52. Crescini emends to *poders*; Bertoni retains *poder*, seeing the subject of *creis* as *Dieu*. We follow his interpretation.

53. Crescini 1926 (also Bertoni, De Bartholomaeis) emends to *tot ço conois q'es benestan* (Bertoni «L'imperatore sa quali sono le cose che convengono»; 1892 edition *conos q'es ben estan*). While this may well have been the original reading, the text makes sense as it stands. For *estar* 'to insist upon', see *PD* and *SW*, III, 309, «beharren, nicht ablassen».

55. Bertoni alters the word order to *com a-l mierz del mond*, which changes the sense.

University of Warwick

References

BdT

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

Berthe Maurice, Ricardo Cierbide, Xabier Kintana y Julián Santalo
1995 Guilhem Anelier de Tolosa, *La Guerra de Navarra – Nafarroako Gudua*, 2 vols.: I: Edición facsímil del manuscrito de la Real Academia de la Historia; II: Estudio y edición del texto original occitano y de las traducciones al castellano y al euskera, a cargo de M. B., R. C., X. K. y J. S., Pamplona.

Bertoni Giulio

1915 *I trovatori d'Italia*, Modena.

Bonnarel Bernard

1981 *Las 194 cançons dialogadas dels trobadors*, Paris.

Cianciòlo Umberto

1941 «Il compendio provenzale verseggiato della *Chirurgia* di Ruggero da Salerno», *Archivum romanicum*, 25, pp. 1-83.

COM 2

Concordance de l'Occitan Médiéval (COM 2). Les troubadours, Les textes narratifs en vers, direction scientifique Peter T. Ricketts, Turnhout 2005, CD-Rom.

Crescini Vincenzo

1892 *Manualetto provenzale*, Verona 1892.

1926 *Manuale per l'avviamento agli studi provenzali. Introduzione grammaticale, cretomazia e glossario. Terza edizione migliorata*, Milan [Reprint con una Postfazione di Alberto Varvaro, Roma 1988].

De Bartholomaeis Vincenzo

1931 *Poesie provenzali storiche relative all'Italia*, 2 vols., Rome 1931.

Gaunt Simon, Ruth Harvey, Linda Paterson

2000 *Marcabru: A Critical Edition*, by S. G., R. H. and L. P., with John Marshall as philological adviser, and with the assistance of Melanie Florence, Cambridge.

Grüzmacher Wilhelm

1863 «Zweiter Bericht an die Gesellschaft für das Studium der neueren Sprachen in Berlin über die in Italien befindlichen provençalischen

Liederhandschriften», *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 33, pp. 288-341.

- 1864 «Die provençalische Liederhandschrift Plut. XLI cod. 43 der Laurenzianischen Bibliothek in Florenz», *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 35, pp. 363-463.

PD

Emil Levy, *Petit dictionnaire provençal-français*, Heidelberg 1909.

Raynouard François Juste Marie

- 1816-21 *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*, 6 vols., Paris.

Routledge Michael J.

- 2000 *Les poésies de Bertran Carbonel*, éd. par M. J. R., Birmingham.

SW

Emil Levy, *Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch*, 8 voll., Leipzig 1894-1924.

Ugolini Francesco A.

- 1949 *La poesia provenzale e l'Italia*, Modena (1st ed. 1939).

Wittenberg Friedrich H. A.

- 1908 *Die Hohenstaufen im Munde der Troubadours*, Inaugural-Dissertation, Münster i. W.