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Abstract: An analysis of the meter, syntax and pragmatics of Torneol 1 suggests that verses 1 and 4
Levad’, amigo, que dormide-las manhanas frias (frias manhanas in v. 4) and the refrain leda mh and’ eu
are cited from a pre-existing song and used by the girl not to wake the boy up, but to invite him to make
peace and rekindle their love. Parallels from other cantigas d’ amigo and from the Cantigas de Santa
Maria are cited in support of this reading.

Resumo: Uma análise da métrica, da sintaxe e da pragmática de Torneol 1 sugere que os versos 1 e 4
Levad’, amigo, que dormide-las manhanas frias (frias manhanas no v. 4) e o refrão leda mh and’ eu são
citados a partir de uma cantiga preexistente e que a amiga os utiliza não para acordar o amigo mas para o
convidar a fazer as pazes e a reacender a paixão. Em apoio desta interpretação citam-se relevantes
cantigas d’amigo e cantigas de Santa Maria.

Welche Art von Gegensatz etwas ist, sagt die Grammatik.

L. Wittgenstein, Phil. Unt. (par. 373)

To explain my punctuation (COHEN, 2003) of the first two strophes of Torneol-1 –and
of the refrain– is to defend a somewhat new interpretation of this celebrated and much
discussed composition. I shall proceed from meter, rhyme and syntax to a reading of the
overall logic and an assessment of the kind of action represented (a cantiga d’ amigo is
the mimesis “not of persons but of action and of life,” if I may apply here what Aristotle
says about Tragedy in the Poetics [1450a]).

Metrically, I.1 and II.1 are the only verses in the body of the strophe which have fifteen
syllables (=14’), the rest scanning thirteen (=12’)² with a pause after the eighth syllable
(so that 7’ + 4’ = 12’ [a clear division between base and coda³]).

Rhymes are assonant only in I (frias/dizian) and II (manhanas/cantavan), while in II.1
we find a linguistic archaism in rhyme: manhanas (with intervocalic -n- still intact
[LANG, 1894, p. xciv; cf. MICHAÆLIS, 1904, p. 927, n.1, and LAPA, 1965, p. 12-16]).
Syntactically, I.1 and II.1 are the only verses in the body of the strophe with a verb in the present tense: *levad’ .... dormides* –a mark they share with the refrain: *and’ eu*.

More specifically, I.1 and II.1 are the only verses in the poem with a verb in the imperative mood: *levad’*.

Lapa, claiming a stylistic disjunction between I.1 and I.2, seems to suggest (1929, p. 339-340) that this and the difference in verse-length might both be due to the fact (evident for him) that I.1 and II.1 were from an older song.

This is a hypothesis with much in its favor and little against. On my reading I.1, II.1 and the refrain are from another song and cited as such. And while this other song could have been invented *ad hoc*, if such a song existed (as Lapa supposes), it might have been one which either was composed considerably earlier than those in our corpus or did not survive the filtering of successive compilers. Let us begin at the beginning again, and see how this citation might work.

“Levad’, amigo, ...” / ...las aves ... dizian, / “leda m’ and’ eu”.

Reckert (1996, p. 51 [orig. 1976]) argues that there is an ambiguity in the phrase *todas aves do mundo d’ amor dizian* in that we can construe *do mundo d’ amor* instead of or in addition to *d’amor dizian*. But whether we privilege or merely allow the former construction, or even if we insist on the integrity, rhythmic and syntactic, of the phrase *d’amor dizian*, the verb *dizian* in I.2 can govern both the first verse and the refrain. Similarly *cantavan* in II.2. “Wake up....”, the birds were singing, “I’m so happy.” (As in Estevan Coelho-1, vv. 2-3 *dizendo / cantigas* etc.; but cf. Solaz-3 e *d’amor tan ben dizia* etc.).

If we read the syntax this way (instead of the usual reading with two successive asyndeta: at the end of v. 1 and again at the end of v. 2), the girl says that the birds used to sing such and such a song and quotes its beginning and its refrain. She would not, then, be telling the boy to wake up now in the present moment of the utterance (except, perhaps, figuratively speaking).
This has consequences for our interpretation of the poem. Instead of imagining a girl calling “Wake up!” – perhaps in bed with her boyfriend, or, if not, at the window of his house, or while he sleeps beneath a tree (?!!), situations without parallel in the corpus of *Amigo* – we hear a girl citing another discourse, something for which we can easily find parallels. What is decisive here, I think, is that the social grammar, that is, the system of pragmatic rules, constraints and conventions of the other 502 cantigas d’amigo does not permit face to face spoken encounters in which a girl could wake up a sleeping boy.

The girl says that all the birds were singing this song. This is a way of saying that all the birds *seemed* to be singing of their love, an old conceit (All nature seemed to reflect and echo our love [“They sing, in unison with her, the same words and the same happiness;” {RECKERT, 1998, p. 11}]).

Applying the arguments of Dionísio (1994, p. 16-18) in support of our own case, we may say with confidence that the girl portrays the birds as lauzengiers or mezcradores who would thus have named them by name (*i enmentavan* IV.2, VI.1 [enmentar is itself a technical term]). On this reading, the birds would have been singing something like “So-and-so and So-and-So are in love”, quite against the rule of secrecy.

In V. 2, VI. 2, and all of VII-VIII the girl accuses the boy of having destroyed the birds’ base of operations, the ramos, and of having taken away their most basic need, water (so Tavani and others). In short, he destroyed their love, so the birds had nothing to sing about any more, no *raison d’être*.

For Dionísio these are not accusations but grounds for gratitude and motive for her present happiness as (he argues) expressed in the refrain; I take the mezcradores who had to be silenced as an elaborate metaphoric system which operates within the poem at an ironic second level, fully subsumed, however, within the primary one. The refrain, which continues to belong to the song cited in I.1 and II.1, keeps on sounding a happy note, though separated further with each passing strophe from its initial context in this cantiga, in strophes I and II, as well as from the birds as grammatical subject of *dizian, cantavan, en ment’ avian, enmentavan*. At the end, in VII and VIII the refrain seems (as
has so often been noted) rather a distant echo of happy times than a proclamation of present happiness.

The girl herself wields a rhetoric of blame and accusation softed significantly by an especially designed metaphoric system (which deflects the underlying charge): birds singing of love, the boy breaking branches and drying up fountains.

She cannot, after all, say, “Wake up, you traitor, and love me again!” Yet elsewhere in Galego-Portuguese lyric Santa Maria can do just that, as on this occasion (CSM 132. [=To 77] 101-115 [text of Mettmann modified to reflect the Toledano]):

... “Pois m’ ás leixada
á cousa eu te rogo
me di que saber querria:
[...]
Non es tu o que dizias
que mi mais que al amavas
e que me noytes e dias
mui de grado saudavas?
Porqué outra fillar yas
amiga e desdennavas
a mi, que amor te avia?
...
Demais saudar-me vées
pois que te de mi partiste.
En todo torto me tées.
Di, e porqué me mentiste?
Preçaste mais los seus bêes
cà os meus? Porqué feziste,
sandeu, tan grand’ ousadia?”

In another curious passage Santa Maria visits (again, in his dreams) a boy on his wedding night, accuses him of infidelity to her, and tells him to get up and come back to her on the run (CSM. 42. [=To 57] 75-80 [cf. vv. 65-70]):

“Mao, falsso, desleal!

[...]
Vês? E porqué me leixaste e sol vergonna non ás?
Mas se tu meu amor queres, daqui te levantarás
e vai-te comigo logo, que non esperes a cras;
erge-te daqui correndo e sal desta casa, sal!”
Here Santa Maria’s tone rings out like that of a *matrona* in Plautus who has found her husband in a brothel and orders him home—as in the final scene of *Asinaria* (921): *surge, amator, i domum* (repeated thrice, like a refrain, in 923-925).

With these citations I have been trying to answer the question: what kind of *praxis*, what genre of action is represented in Torneol-1?

I hold that every *cantiga d’amigo* represents at least one significant speech action or *move*, normally (though not always) performed in the present (narrated acts are usually background). Normally we can determine the kind of speech-action (what I used to call the genre [COHEN, 1987]) of a *cantiga* by finding the most forward looking tenses, ones which stands out against the rest of the poem’s verbal system, for instance a present or future indicative first person set in relief against third person past tenses in narrative mode. Applying that method here, we see that the present tenses “Levad’... *dormides”*/ .../ “...and’eu” should reveal the move. And they do indeed reveal a move, but one cited from a song, and therefore not belonging to the present moment of the lyric drama (Lang saw that the *cantigas d’amigo* have an essentially “lyrisch-dramatischen charakter” [1894, p. xcvii]).

By citing the song, the girl reappplies it to a new dramatic context. She recontextualizes it, if I may use that word. In its new context the cited verses of the ‘old song’ (I.1, II.1 and the refrain) would seem to function as an offer of reconciliation which the girl makes to the boy. She does not directly ask him to come back. In 500 *cantigas d’amigo* I find only one example (Roi Fernandiz-1) where a girl, in a direct face-to-face plea, asks a boy to come back to her—and there the girl acknowledges it was her fault that the *fala* ended.

So the girl’s indirectness in Torneol-1 is wholly in keeping with the principle that it should be the boy to offer peace. The girl makes an *appropriately* indirect plea. What I think she means to say is much like what Santa Maria says in this passage (CSM 6.80ff), which I quote out of context quite on purpose, as though it were erotic discourse:
“....leva t’ende,
cama muito per ás dormido, dormidor te fiziste
e o cantar que dizias meu ja escaeciste,
mas leva-t’ e di-o logo mellor que nunca dissiste” (CSM 6.80).

The girl in Torneol wants to get back her boy, so she reminds him of a song which (within the poem’s metaphoric system) the birds used to sing during the days of their love. It is as citation that the quoted song, whose pragmatic presuppositions would be inadmissible in the social grammar of the cantigas d’amigo, constitutes the offer of reconciliation. As citation, these borrowed words perform (in Austin’s sense) the action.

On this reading, we need not worry whether in the cited song it is early or late in the morning, whether she is coming to greet him or they have spent the night together, whether it is, as the song goes, “winter, spring, summer or fall / all you gotta do is call / and I’ll come runnin’ / to see you again” (J. Taylor, c. 1968). The girl need only cite an erotic summons because after a break-up any erotic summons is likely to be meant by the speaker and interpreted by the addressee as an offer of peace (COHEN, 1994).

* * *

And there I would have ended, were it not for those echoing birds, that old song. Others have looked elsewhere, to other languages, for parallels to the incipit of Torneol-1, and there may be some key yet to be found. But there is rule of philological evidence that provides that the further a parallel is from the center (same author, same genre) and the closer to the periphery (other language, other period), the weaker it becomes. By that rule, we have already made our case on evidence in the text itself (meter, rhyme, syntax and semantics) and we have religiously observed the social grammar of the corpus of cantigas d’Amigo.

Still, for those of us who are interested in the generic logic of the request for pax in the history of European love poetry there is an impressive list of texts in Greek and Latin from the seventh to the first century BCE, and I would like to conclude by citing one example with some relevant features. Of course we must remember that the social
grammar for one of Ovid’s *Heroides*, or for a heroine based on Ovidian style and characterization\(^{16}\), is very different from that of *Amigo*. As we have seen, Santa Maria has her own grammar, in the same time and period as our text of Torneol (*Theologie als Grammatik* is the end of the epigraph of this essay). That said, there may be a clue for us in *Heroides* 15.

What “Sappho” wants is for Phaon, who is busy elsewhere (51), to come back\(^{17}\). To this end she reminds him of their love-making in explicit terms (43-50), and begins by recalling how much he used to enjoy her songs (43-44):

\[
\text{Cantabam, memini (meminerunt omnia amantes);}
\text{Oscula cantanti tu mihi rapta dabas.}
\]

I was singing, I remember (lovers remember everything);
And you were stealing kisses from me as I sang.

Later she tells (137ff) how she goes back to the places where they used to be together and remembers their love-making\(^{18}\). She finds that though the ground is still there the *animator* of the scene is absent\(^{19}\). She lies down and touches the spot where he had been\(^{20}\). And then she remarks (151-152):

\[
\text{quin etiam rami positis lugere videntur}
\text{frondibus, et nullae dulce queruntur aves}
\]

Why, even the branches seem to mourn, their leaves
lost, and no birds sing sweetly.

Though the branches are not broken, this image is enough like that in Nuno Fernandez Torneol-1 that one may be forgiven for being struck by the comparison. I do not, however, mean to suggest a direct, or even an indirect, influence of *Heroides* 15 on Torneol (though perhaps we ought not rule out the possibility entirely). Rather I wish merely to point out that both the image of *trees without the song of birds*, symbolizing love lost (or cooled), and the call *to remember an old song* (and so to reignite the flame\(^{21}\)) had formed part of the discursive logic of erotic peace-talks long before the girl in Torneol-1 cited the birds who used to sing, “*Levad’, amigo, que dormide-las manhanas frias*”\(^{22}\).
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“Levad’, amigo que dormide-las manhãs frias”
todalas aves do mundo d’ amor dizia
“leda m’ and’ eu”

“Levad’, amigo que dormide-las frias manhãs”
todalas aves do mundo d’ amor cantavam
“leda m’ and’ eu”

Todalas aves do mundo d’ amor dizian,
do meu amor e do voss guem’ avian:
“leda <m’ and’ eu>”

Todalas aves do mundo d’ amor cantavam,
do meu amor e do voss guem’ i enmentavam:
“leda <m’ and’ eu>”

Do meu amor e do voss guem’ en ment’ avian
(vós lhi tolhestes os ramos em que siían):
“leda <m’ and’ eu>”

Do meu amor e do voss guem’ i enmentavam
(vós lhi tolhestes os ramos em que pousavan):
“leda <m’ and’ eu>”

Vós lhi tolhestes os ramos em que siían
e lhis secastes as fontes en que bevian;
“leda <m’ and’ eu>”

Vós lhi tolhestes os ramos em que pousavan
e lhis secastes as fontes u se banhavan;
“leda <m’ and’ eu>”

________________________

1.4 hypermetric (by two syllables)  1 dormide-las Filgueira Valverde (cf. v. 4): dormides as V : dormid’s as
B manhãas Nunes  2 todalas aues V : Todiaas aue B dizia BV  3 mhandeu BV  6 mādeu B :
mandeu V  8,11,13,16 voss<o> Filgueira Valverde : uoss BV  9 (Vos lhi tolhestes) Leda B 14 tolet’sestes
B 16 i y V : om. B enmentauã V : êmêtauyã B 18 ledaj le. V 17,19,22 Tolestes B 19 osj or V :
o B 24 ledaj le V

Verses 1 and 4 scan 14’ while all other verses in the body of the strophe scan 12’. The restoration (in vv. 8, 11, 13 and 16) of the final o in vosso is supported by the regular pause after the eighth syllable (vv. 2, 5, 7, 10, 14, 17, 19-20, 22-23). Lapa (1929, p. 339) correctly sees here an “excess of elision” due to scribal error.

1 O número, que acompanha o nome dos trovadores, refere-se à posição das cantigas na edição crítica do autor (2003). (N.E.)
There is no clear parallel case of such a phenomenon in the corpus of *cantigas d’amigo* (but see Roi Martínez do Casal-2). Scholars who base their interpretations on metrical “irregularity” in Torneol-1 are building on bad ground.

In 1.1 and II.1 we may have an upbeat in front of both base and codas, so that \( (1 + \text{base}) + (1 + \text{coda}) \); or, put another way: 
\[
(1 + ?') + (1 + 4') = 14'.
\]

It is still worth recalling the words of Monaci (1873, p. ix): “Tali canti, sia pure in una forma più rude ed agresti, dovettvero necessariamente preesistere a quel periodo in cui dominò la scuola dei trovatori; e una conferma di ciò l’abbiamo nei frequenti arcaismi che vi s’incontrano...” (cf. LANG, 1894, p. lxxvii).

Reckert (1998, p. 11, n. 13) observes: “Lines 2-3 and 5-6 can simultaneously be taken to mean ‘All the birds in the world of love are saying [or singing]: «happy I go».’” But he does not suggest putting vv. 1 and 4 in quotation marks, as proposed here.

Compare Dinis’ *papagai*: STEGAGNO PICCHIO, 1975 (where Dinis-16 is cited [1979, p. 57; 1982, p. 40-41]).

30 texts by my count; no other poem-initial example (but B 1371 / V979 = CEM 303, the only poem-initial example in CEM is by Torneol). Berdia-5 has a poem-final citation: “*quen leve vai leve x’ar ven*.”

Recognized by Tavani (1961 = 1988, p. 262). In Boleseiro-1 the girl remembers when she used to sleep with her boy, and this is exceptional (cf. Boleseiro-2). In Johan Airas-29 a girl foresees a situation in which the boy shall not sleep while in her company; presumably, if he fell asleep she would wake him as Cynthia wakes Propertius [2.15.8]: “*Sicine, lente, iaces?*”). In Solaz-2, the girl narrates how she waited for the boy apparently at night and alone, then cites what she said when she greeted him (muito desejei, amigo...), and finally gloats that she has won him back from her rival (mentioned in Solaz-1 where editors have emended her out of existence). In Sevilla-10, vv. 12-13 (e diss’ ‘*Oi ia dona falar?’ / Dix’ eu ‘*Oistes’ ja polo guarir*') a girl helps to resuscitate a boy whom she has just rendered unconscious with a renunciation (“*non me veredes ja mais des aqui*” v. 3).

In the narration of strophes V-VIII there is not a hint of the rhetoric of praise.

Brea and Lorenzo Gradín (1998, p. 223) cite with approval the conclusions of Pepió Beltrán (1997), who sees an attempt to “reuni-los lazos que o amigo rompeu” (DIONÍSIO, 1994, is relegated to a footnote [n. 31]; on p. 128, however, they seem persuaded by his arguments and Beltrán’s study is not even mentioned). It is interesting to note that in Giinzo-1, vv. 16-17 *Rog’ eu Santa Cecilia e Nostro Senhor / que ach’ of’ eu i, madr’, o meu truedor* while speaking with her mother about the boy the girl uses language which she would presumably avoid when conversing with the boy if she means to talk him back into love.

Note that only in the Toledano do we learn that Santa Maria is *irada* and only there does she begin her speech with the words *pois m’ as deixada*. Thus in T and E, where these words have been replaced, the persona of the *sanhuda* (*irada*) has been eliminated and the basis of the recall, namely that she has been “left” or abandoned, is also gone. We might think of this as *decontextualization* in the later fate (in T and E) of Santa Maria’s speech (after the Toledano).

In Johan Airas-10 *O meu amigo, que xi mi assanhou* the girl insists that the boy must take the initiative in seeking reconciliation. Elsewhere, however, we find an indirect plea to the mother to go ask the boy to come and make peace (Airas Carpancho-3), a readiness to make peace if the boy comes back (Johan Lopes d’ Ulhoa-4, Sancho Sanchez-4) and narrated instances where the girl forgives the boy and takes him back (Seabra). We also find a girl ready to make peace in Pero de Veer-5 (but it is *she* who got angry in the first place). Only rarely, such as in Nuno Porco-1 and Lopo-8 is a girl is willing to make up even though the boy is at fault. In Reimon González and Martin Padrozos-3 we see a girl forgive a guilty boy face to face. (In ten poems the girl rejects, has rejected, or plans to reject the boy’s offer of *pax*: J. S. Coelho-1, Vinhal-5, Guilhade-18 [she ‘forgives’ him, but renounces him forever], Guihade-22, Talaveira-5, Solaz-3, G. Gomez-1, Boleseiro-6, Boleseiro-8, Baveca-9; cf. also Froyaz-4, Lourenço-6). In Roi Fernandez-4 a girl tells her mother that there is no point in trying to renew the *fala*, although the mother advises her to do so. In Ponte-1...
and Johan Airas-2 and 6 the mother gives the girl advice on how to achieve a reconciliation (by obedience in Ponte, by inciting jealousy in Johan Airas-2 and by arousing desire in Johan Airas-6).

13 In Plato’s *Phaedrus* (267A) Socrates mentions *parepainoi* (“indirect praises”) and *parapsogoi* (“indirect censures”) as inventions of Evenus. * Appropriateness is a key concept of ancient rhetoric, Greek and Latin (see for example, Plato, *Phaedrus* 271D-272A; Cicero, *De oratore*, III.211: *Refert etiam qui audiant, senatus an populus an iudices, frequentes an pauci an singuli, et quales; ipxihe oratores qua sint aetate, honore, auctoritate; tempus pacis an belli, festinationis an oti*).

14 Without accepting the theory of speech acts as a cure-all for problems in the philosophy of language.

15 For the subtlety of the citation, cf. Pai Soarez de Taveirós-1. In that text the boy’s return (*aqui é ja refrain*) is tantamount to an offer of reconciliation. The girl’s reply, insofar as there is one, is hinted at in the fiinda: *melhor o fezo ca o non disse*. When the boy left he would have said something like, “I swear I shall not see you ever again, thank God”, and this is what is narrated as: *Que muito m’ el avia jurado / que me non visse mais, “a Deus grado”* (vv. 4-5; my interpretation of this phrase has been accepted by Vallin [1995, p. 242]). By citing part of the boy’s renunciation (and not limiting herself to narration) the girl gives us a bit of the boy’s prior speech action as she heard it.

16 According to Kenney (1996, p. 1, n. 5; 26, n. 100 with references), *Her*. 15 is not by Ovid.

17 *Huc ades, inque sinus, formose, relabere nostros* (95); *efficite ut redeat* (205).

18 Something Ovid warns against in *Remedia Amoris* 725ff.: *fugito loca conscia uestri / concubitus: causas illa doloris habent. / “hic fuit, hic cubuit, thalamo dormiuimus illo; / hic mihi lasciua gaudia nocte dedit.” / admonitu refricatur amor uulnusque nouatum / scinditur...*

19 *At non invenio dominum silvaeque meumque / vile solum est: dos erat ille loci* (145-146).

20 An ambiguous expression in context: *incubui, tetigique locum qua parte fuisti* (149 (cf. 133-134).

21 *The fire hidden beneath the ash* is an image which Ovid lifted from Callimachus (*Epigr*. 44 Pfeiffer = IX Page = *Anthologia Palatina* 12.139) and used repeatedly in the *Remedia Amoris* and elsewhere. Later it spread like wildfire through European love poetry, thanks to Ovid’s theft.

22 In *Her*. 15 there are probably phrases cited and adapted from the songs of Sappho, nearly all of which are now lost to us (v. 112, for example, recalls *Lobel-Page* 31, v. 9-12), just as the source and ‘original’ context (if such existed) of *‘Levad’, amigo, que dormide-las manhanas frias’* are lost and unlikely to be recovered.