Two Corrections to the Text of the *Cantigas d'Amigo*

Rip Cohen
The Johns Hopkins University
Centro de Literatura Portuguesa, Universidade de Coimbra

1.   The Refrain That Wasn't There: The Text of Johan Zorro 6

How do we read what is not there?

Some scholars argue that brackets are not needed to indicate those parts of a refrain which are regularly omitted by scribes in the manuscripts (*B* and *V*) containing the corpus of Galician-Portuguese *cantigas d'amigo*.[1] Our scribes, when copying a refrain after the first strophe, normally write out no more than the first verse of a two- or three-verse refrain, and sometimes no more than the beginning of that verse, sometimes just one word. Only refrains of a single verse and intercalated refrains are usually copied in full in *B* and *V*. Nevertheless, brackets should be used in all such cases. They serve as a reminder that the refrain is merely assumed to be identical in all strophes. In fact, nothing except our expectations about poetic and scribal practice supports that assumption, since nothing is there in the manuscripts. We are literally reading the darkness.

Modern editors (Nunes, Cunha, Cohen 2003; cf. Tavani 48: 6) have regarded the text of Zorro 6 as unproblematic for the textual critic.[2] There is indeed a problem, and a significant one, in this *cantiga*, but it would be hidden from the reader if no brackets were employed, since the difficulty arises in one of the last two verses of the poem, and both those verses are missing in the codices. Here is the standard text –one might say the vulgate, since it has essentially remained the same since Nunes– with angle-brackets showing what has been supplied by the editor (Cohen 2003; the refrain is in bold, as there):

> Pela ribeira do rio
> cantando ia la dona virgo
> **d' amor:**
> **"Venhan-nas barcas polo rio**
> **a sabor."**   5

---

[1] See Correia. Cf. Parkinson on "false refrains" in the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*.

[2] Numbering and (unless otherwise indicated) texts of the *cantigas d'amigo* are from Cohen 2003. Angle brackets are used for letters missing in the manuscripts, bold for refrains. Punctuation has been altered, and tils added where historical phonology would expect them and thirteenth century manuscripts of Galician-Portuguese lyric regularly supply them. The poets names are usually given in abbreviated form; for the full forms, see Cohen 2003, 9-14, 102-05. Translations are from Cohen 2010b; I have sometimes provided *ad hoc* renderings of isolated verses and phrases.

Pela ribeira do alto
cantando ia la dona d' algo
d' amor:
<"Venhan-nas barcas polo rio
a sabor.">   10

B 1155 f. 247r   ***V*** 757 f. 120r

2 la] ia ***B***   virgo] u'go ***B*** : ugo ***V***   **3-6** *on two lines, with a break after*
barq's ***BV***   **3, 8** damor ***V*** : Namor ***B***   **4, 9** nas] as *Michaëlis (II, 880)*
4 rio] mo ***V***   **7** ia] ya ***V*** : *om.* ***B***   **9-10** *suppl. edd.*: *om.* ***BV***

Along the side of the river
The young girl went singing
Of love:
Let the boats come along the river—
Just as I like.

Along the side of the stream
The noble girl went singing
Of love:
Let the boats come along the river—
Just as I like.

Editors have filled in the last two verses of the second strophe by faithfully repeating those of the first strophe. In so doing, they assumed that the song has a three-verse refrain, and thus produced a *cantiga* with a three-verse refrain. But what we have is something else: a banal error of omission due to a scribe higher up the stemma, long before the copying of the Italian apographs in the early sixteenth century.[3] Against all previous editors, I propose to read *alto* at the end of the penultimate verse, understanding it not as part of the refrain but as a variable verse belonging to the body of the strophe:

<"Venhan-nas barcas polo alto
a sabor">.

With this reconstruction of the last two verses, the poem has an intercalated refrain with a regular rhyme-scheme **aaBaB,** with assonant rhymes in the first two verses of each strophe (I: *rio/virgo*; II: *alto/algo*). It does not switch from **aaBAB** in the first

_____

[3] See Gonçalves on the manuscript tradition.

strophe to **aaBCB** in the second.[4] Furthermore, there is a *dobre* in vv. 1 and 4 of each strophe: I *rio*; II *alto*. In retrospect, the *dobre* with the word *rio* in the first strophe should have made editors wary of breaking the pattern. We should not read the darkness so blithely.

The use of an intercalated two-verse refrain is not unusual in the *cantigas d'amigo*. There are 26 examples (see Appendix), not counting Zorro 6, and our poet provides two of them: *Jus' a lo mar e o rio*, with the rhyme-scheme **aBaB** (Zorro 8); and *Bailemos agora, por Deus, ai velidas*, with the rhyme-scheme **aaaBaB** (Zorro 10). In the latter poem there is a double *dobre* unique is this genre.[5] So the reading I propose recommends itself *prima facie*, but before looking further into its merits we might first ask how we got a vulgate that reads *rio*.

The original source of the error in Zorro 6 was the presumption, on the part of a scribe, that the refrain consisted of three verses. This kind of mistake belongs to a typology of scribal slip-ups regarding strophic form and is the reverse of a *false refrain* in the sense used by Parkinson, where a scribe "creates" a refrain that was not there by recopying the wrong verses in the place appropriate to a refrain.[6] In our case it was a scribe's failure to keep writing that allowed the false image of a three-verse refrain. This image has been retained and propagated in modern times by editors who believe that if the scribe left the rest of a strophe uncopied there must have been a refrain there. We can see from a few examples that this was not always the case. Consider Johan Airas 33:

> Vedes, amigo, ond' ei gran pesar:
> sei muitas donas que saben amar
> seus amigos e soen lhis falar
> e non lho saben, assi lhis aven;
> e nós sol que o queiramos provar,
> **log' é sabud' e non sei eu per quen**.   5
>
> Tal dona sei eu, quando quer veer
> seu amigo a que sabe ben querer,
> que lho non poden per ren entender
> o\<s\> que cuidan que a guarda\<n\> mui ben;   10
> e nós sol que o queiramos fazer,
> **\<log' é sabud' e non sei eu per quen\>**.

---

[4] Here I use bold for all rhyme schemes (my current practice is to use bold only for long verses with internal rhyme).

[5] In a sequential performance (or reading) of Zorro's songs, in the order in which they are found in *BV*, the double *dobre* in Zorro 10 would have been preceded –and so in effect introduced– by the *dobre* in Zorro 6.

[6] There are half a dozen examples of this in the *cantigas d'amigo*. See, for example, Roi Fernandiz 4, where *uel falasse comigo* printed as a third verse of the refrain in Nunes (and so in Brea; see Cohen 2003, 330) and Charinho 1, usually printed with a four-verse refrain (see Cohen 2003, 297-98).

Com' eu querria, non se guis' assi:
falar vosco, que morredes por mi,
com' outras donas falan, e des i   15
nunca lhis mais poden entender ren;
e nós <sol> ante que cheguemos i,
log' é <sabud' e non sei eu per quen>.

Coita lhi venha qual ora a nós ven
per quen nos a nós tod' este mal ven.   20

You see, friend, what upsets me very much:
I know many ladies who know how to love
Their boyfriends, and they can talk with them
And no-one finds out—that's how it happens with them—
And as soon as we want to give it a try
It's known at once and I don't know how.

I know a lady who, when she wants to see
Her boyfriend whom she knows how to love—
Those who think they're guarding her quite well
Can't find out about it at all,
And as soon as we want to do the same
It's known at once and I don't know how.

It doesn't work out as I would like:
To talk with you, who are dying for me,
As other ladies talk and afterwards
Folks can't find out anything at all;
And even before we can get there,
It's known at once and I don't know how.

May the one who brings us all this pain
Suffer sorrow just the way we do.

Here, in the verse *e nós sol que o queiramos fazer* (v. 11), the scribe of *V* copies right until the end of the verse: *q'o q'yramus faz'r*; but the scribe of *B* mistakenly thinks that the refrain consists of two verses, since v. 5 (*e nos sol que o queiramos provar*) begins identically, so he stops copying. By writing out the whole of v. 11 from the exemplar, the scribe of *V* has saved us the trouble of thinking. And, had we not his help, we could still reflect on the fact that the corresponding verse in the third strophe (*e nós <sol> ante que cheguemos i*) is not identical to v. 5 (III.5 $\neq$ I.5) and therefore

shows that the rhyme scheme is a steady **aaabaB** and does not shift from ***aaabAB** to ***aaabCB** (as we might have thought, if we had only *B* to edit).

Another similar error is to be found in Bolseiro 5:

—Vej' eu, mha filha, quant' é meu cuidar,
as barcas novas vĩir pelo mar
en que se foi voss' amigo daqui.
—Non vos pes, madre, se Deus vos empar,
irei veer se ven meu amig' i.   5

—Cuid' eu, mha filha, no meu coraçon,
das barcas novas, que aquelas son
en que se foi voss' amigo daqui.
—Non vos pes, madre, se Deus vos perdon,
<irei veer se ven meu amig' i>.   10

—Filha fremosa, por vos non mentir,
vej' eu as barcas pelo mar vĩir
en que se foi voss' amigo daqui.
—Non vos pes, madre, quant' eu poder ir,
irei veer se ven meu amigo <i>.   15

—Daughter, I see, as far as I can tell,
The new boats coming along the sea
In which your boyfriend went away from here.
—Don't be upset, mother, so help you God,
I'll go to see if my boyfriend's coming there.

—Daughter, I think with all my heart
That those are really the new boats
In which your boyfriend went away from here.
—Don't be upset, mother, and may God forgive you,
I'll go to see if my boyfriend's coming there.

—Beautiful daughter, to tell the truth,
I see the boats coming in from the sea
In which your boyfriend went away from here.
—Don't be upset, mother: as fast as I can go
I'll go to see if my boyfriend's coming there.

We need *perdon* in v. 9 –a certain correction– where the manuscripts give us *empar*. This song has an intercalated refrain, with the rhyme-scheme **aaBaB**. However

the mistake, though similar to the one in Zorro 6, is an error of commission, not of omission. In v. 9 the common ancestor of *BV* evidently had (expanding manuscript abbreviations) *Non vos pes madre se deus vos empar*, which is identical to v. 4, the corresponding line in the first strophe, even though this leaves the verse without a rhyme. Probably, if we had no third strophe to help us catch this howler (corrected by Bell, resuscitated by Nunes), we would be reading a poem that formally resembles the standard version of Zorro 6: **aaBAB** in the first strophe, and **aaBCB** in the second.

In the case of Zorro 6, the error was committed by a scribe who probably glanced quickly and thought the last three verses of both strophes were identical. Thus, like the scribe of *B* in Johan Airas 33, this copyist did not bother finishing the rest of the strophe. But here we cannot be saved by the scribe of *V*, since the error was in the common source of *BV*. Nor can we be helped by a third strophe, as in Bolseiro 5, because there is none. We can be rescued, as we were by Bell in Bolseiro 5, v.9, simply by performing the two most basic operations of textual criticism: to identify what is wrong and to correct it.

In addition to the case against *rio*, there is evidence that speaks in favor of *alto*: the *dobre*, the strophic form, and the use of *alto* almost exclusively in the parallelistic rhyme-pair *rio/alto*. These three elements are inextricably interconnected in this text, so as we focus on each we will necessarily make reference to the others. But each also deserves some individual attention.

Let us begin with the *dobre*. In Zorro 10, *velidas/frolidas* and *loadas/granadas* figure in a double *dobre* in a poem of the form **aaaBaB**. Moreover, the fifth verse of both strophes is a variable verse located between the two lines of the intercalated refrain, and those variable verses (I.5, II.5) participate in one of the *dobres* (I.2 and I.5: *frolidas*; II.2 and II.5: *granadas*) –exactly as in our proposed version of Zorro 6, except that here there are two *dobres*.

> Bailemos agora, por Deus, ai velidas,
> so aquestas avelaneiras *frolidas*
> e quen for velida, como nós velidas,
> **se amigo amar**,
> so aquestas avelaneiras *frolidas*   5
> **verrá bailar**.
>
> Bailemos agora, por Deus, ai loadas,
> so aquestas avelaneiras *granadas*
> e quen for loada, como nós loadas,
> **se amigo amar,**   10
> so aquestas avelaneiras *granadas*
> **verrá bailar.**
>
> Let's dance now, by God, O lovely girls,

> Beneath these flowering hazelnut trees,
> And whoever is lovely, like we are lovely,
> If she loves a boy,
> Beneath these flowering hazelnut trees
> Will come to dance.
>
> Let's dance now, by God, O worthy girls,
> Beneath these laden hazelnut trees
> And whoever is worthy, like we are worthy,
> If she loves a boy,
> Beneath these laden hazelnut trees
> Will come to dance.

By correcting the standard version of Zorro 6 we discover another *dobre* by the same poet and a steady rhyme scheme **aaBaB**, instead of a switch from **aaBAB** in the first strophe to **aaBCB** in the second (see Appendix). And even if there were no other reason, we could not read *rio* in v. 9 because a *dobre* cannot be displayed in the first strophe and then disappear.[7] A *dobre* consists in the appearance of a word twice in each strophe in exactly the same positions within the strophic form. And a *dobre* on the rhyme-words *rio/alto* would have more than formal significance: this rhyming pair may have belonged to the poetic matrix (see Cohen and Parkinson, 26-27, 37-40).

The *dobre* in the first strophe involves the word at the end vv. 1 and 4, *rio*. That tells us where the *dobre* occurs; and v. 6 tells us what word has been chosen for doubling in the second strophe: *alto*. Thus, we have a *dobre singulars*, with a different rhyme-sound and a different rhyme-word in each strophe.[8] The *dobre* here involves a word in rhyme (which need not be the case) and the correspondence is I.1 = I.4 and II.1 = II.4. A *dobre singulars* is the norm in this genre: of 27 *cantigas d'amigo* with *dobre*, 25 are *singulars* (Cohen 2009a).

The vulgate's *rio* is not based on the reading of any manuscript, nor on any understanding of poetic practice. Rather it reflects a misunderstanding of the formal and rhetorical praxis of this genre. The supplement *rio* rests solely on an expectation regarding scribal habits. That expectation, though generally well-founded, cannot always be trusted.

What I am proposing, then, is not to emend the manuscripts, which are voiceless here, but to reverse the inertia of editors, who have passively copied *rio* from v. 4. This was a superficial slip by a scribe when first committed many centuries ago, but

---

[7] There is no example of this in the *cantigas d'amigo*. But see Osoir'Anes 1 in Cohen 2009b, 18-19 and the note *ad loc*. (33).

[8] The only *dobres unissonans* are Guilhade 7, with *coita* in each strophe; and Johan Airas 34, which though *unissonans* has a different word in each strophe: *i, mi, assi* (see Cohen 2009a, 131-32). For the terminology see Lorenzo Gradín 1997.

for editors to repeat it without reflection is sloppy textual criticism. The poem should read like this:

> Pela ribeira do rio
> cantando ia la dona virgo
> **d' amor:**
> "Venhan-nas barcas polo rio
> **a sabor."**   5
>
> Pela ribeira do alto
> cantando ia la dona d' algo
> **d' amor:**
> <"Venhan-nas barcas polo alto
> **a sabor.">**   10

And what can we say about the use of the word *alto* in this genre? It appears in six *cantigas d'amigo*, a total of twelve times (not counting the reading proposed here). Ten times it is a noun meaning "river" or "stream," an archaic usage found only in the *cantigas d'amigo*. Meendinho uses *alto mar*, where as an adjective *alto* could be taken to mean either "deep" or "high" (vv. 10, 17); and these are the only times the word does not appear at verse-end. Perhaps it is not coincidental that *alto* occurs in the last verse (not counting the refrain) of the last of the nine *cantigas* of Pero Meogo: *nunca vi cervo que volvess' o alto* ("I never saw a stag that stirred the stream"). And there too it forms part of the rhyme-pair *rio/alto*. In the enigmatic *Levantou-s' a velida* ("The lovely girl arose") of D. Dinis (17) *alto* appears in an intercalated three-verse refrain nearly as a line unto itself: *eno alto*.[9] But Johan Zorro is the only poet who uses the word in more than one text. It occurs in three of his eleven songs as the rhyme-word in the first verse of the second strophe, in parallelistic alternation with *rio*.[10]

> Zorro 3: Per ribeira do *rio* (I.1); Per ribeira do *alto* (II.1)
> Zorro 6: Pela ribeira do *rio* (I.1); Pela ribeira do *alto* (II.1)
> Zorro 8: Jus' alo mar e o *rio* (I.1); Jus' alo mar e o *alto* (II.1)

We find, then, that *alto*, used as an archaic substantive meaning "river", is always found at verse-end. It appears once in a refrain (Dinis 17) where it does not rhyme. The other times, in Meogo 9 and three songs of Zorro, it is used as part of a rhyme-pair in *i-o/a-o* with *rio*. And the parallelistic alternation in rhyme of *rio* and *alto* appears to have been a traditional element in *cantigas d'amigo* with water imagery and

---

[9] See Cohen 2006 on the textual and interpretative problems of Dinis 17. In that text *alto* does not rhyme, which is only possible in a refrain (or in the case of a *palavra perduda*).

[10] *rio* appears without *alto* in two of Zorro's other *cantigas*: Zorro 7, v. 1: *Met' el rei barcas no rio forte*; Zorro 9, v. 1: *Pela ribeira do rio salido*; v. 5: *Pela ribeira do rio levado*.

to have had deep roots in the formal, rhetorical, and symbolic conventions of the genre. The traces of this alternation in the extant corpus may reasonably be taken as evidence of its presence in the poetic matrix.[11] Certainly Zorro's use of this pair in three of his *cantigas* shows that he regarded it as something more than a useful technical resource (see Ferreira, 66-68, 74-81).

Some might argue that Zorro uses *rio* as a non-rhyming word at verse-end in a refrain, as Dinis uses *alto* (and *rio* is found once in a refrain in this genre: Estevan Coelho 2). But in Dinis 17 *alto* occurs in all six strophes, clearly part of an intercalated refrain. The other occurrences of *alto* in the *cantigas d'amigo* of Johan Zorro compel the conclusion that this poet regularly handled *alto* as one half of the traditional rhyme-pair *rio/alto* and that our conjectured *alto* in v. 9 occurs in a variable –not a fixed– verse; that is, in a verse belonging to the body of the strophe, not to the refrain. Finally, the *dobre* pattern created by *rio* in vv. 1 and 4 of the first strophe requires the presence of *alto* in the corresponding positions in the second strophe: v. 6, where we have it; and v. 9, where it is missing in the manuscripts –along with the rest of the two final lines.

One might say that, in the end, like all questions of textual criticism, it is a matter of judgment. Indeed. And the equivalent errors in Johan Airas 33, v. 11, where a scribe erroneously assumes the verse to be part of the refrain, and in Bolseiro 5, v. 9, where *BV* both have the wrong word at the end of the verse (*empar* instead of *perdon*), seem sufficient evidence to weigh the scales in favor of *alto*. The scale with *alto* plunges when we reflect that *rio* creates an anomalous rhyme-system for the *cantiga* and that *alto* produces a song with a perfect **aaBaB** form. The case is sealed by the *dobre*, paralleled in Zorro's own poetic practice and required by the *dobre* in the first strophe. The repeated use by Zorro of the rhyme pair *rio/alto* fits in with all these considerations and corroborates the reading *alto*.

Although *rio* was a mere conjecture when it first appeared in 1878 in Braga's edition of *V*, it has been sanctified by the inertia of generations of editors. But whereas *alto* has compelling evidence and arguments in its favor, *rio* has none.[12] All we need to do, as Housman says, is to apply thought to textual criticism, the science of finding mistakes and the art of correcting them.[13] But in the *cantigas d'amigo* there is science even in that "art." The study of the manuscripts, of scribal procedures, of strophic forms, rhyme-systems, technical virtuosity (here, the *dobre*), lexicon, traditionally paired rhyme-words, the poetics of the genre, and the poet's own practice –all these are methods, ways of knowing how to correct, reasonably, if not with absolute certainty, what is wrong.

---

[11] Here I mean both the contemporary poetic matrix –an abstraction based on all we can infer from the corpus about the poetics (form, rhetoric and pragmatics) that generated these 500 songs– and the historically prior poetic matrix in which the genre had its roots.

[12] For other corrections to the text of Johan Zorro, see Cohen 2010a, 25-26, 35-38.

[13] "Textual criticism is a science, and, since it comprises recension and emendation, it is also an art. It is the science of discovering error in texts and the art of removing it" (Housman, 67).

In *Remarks on Colour*, notes written at the same time as those on epistemology (published as *On Certainty*), Ludwig Wittgenstein (1999, par. 44) writes: "In jedem ernstern Problem reicht die Unsicherheit bis in die Wurzeln hinab" ("In every serious problem the uncertainty reaches all the way to the roots"). In the text of Zorro 6, v. 9, no editor had even seen a problem. Once we have detected it, we find that this problem reaches to the roots of epistemological questions regarding textual criticism in this genre, and to the historical roots of its rhetoric, pragmatics, and form. Editors should have been uncertain about the refrain of Zorro 6; and now they should have no doubt.

Appendix

Intercalated Refrains, Three-verse Refrains
and Shifting Rhyme-schemes in the *Cantigas d'Amigo*

1) INTERCALATED REFRAINS

aaBaB (6 texts)
Airas Carpancho 5; Ulhoa 7; Barroso 2; Sandeu 5; Zorro 6; Dinis 33

aaaBaB (9 texts)
Coton 1; Vinhal 5; Guilhade 12; Zorro 10; Bolseiro 2; Dinis 23, 44, 47, 52.

aBaB (4 texts)
Solaz 2; Zorro 8; Dinis 18; Afonso Sanchez 2

aBaCB
Dinis 17 (unique)

aBaC
Dinis 18 (unique)

abbaCaC (4 texts)
Roi Fernandiz 7; Airas Nunes 2, 3; Johan Airas 11

ababCbC Rodrig' Eanes d' Alvares 1

Total intercalated refrains: 26 texts

2) THREE-VERSE REFRAINS
(at strophe-final position, not intercalated)

With one rhyme (20 examples):

> **aaBBB** (13 texts)
> Carpancho 3, 5; Charinho 1; Garcia Soares 1; Servando 6; Bolseiro 7; Meogo
> 8; Padrozelos 1; Giinzo 3, 5, 6; Requeixo 4; Johan Airas 36
>
> **aabBB > aaBBB**
> Garcia Soares 2 (unique)
>
> **aaaBBB** (5 texts)
> Sandeu 1; Servando 3, 10, 14; Johan Airas 15
>
> **abbaaCCC** (unique)
> Guilhade 20

With two rhymes (3 examples):

> **abaBCC**
> Roi Fernandiz 5
>
> **ababCCD**
> Coelho 8; Ulhoa 1

With three rhymes, all rhyming with verses in body of strophe (1 example):

> **ababcABC**
> Ponte 2

Total three-verse refrains: 24 texts.

3) SHIFTING RHYME SCHEMES (see Cohen 2009a):
(The number of genuine examples is uncertain. Some may be errors in transmission, others may result from an incorrect analysis of strophic form; see Cohen 2010c. Repeated rhymes and words in rhyme are noted [in the notation, II**a** = the **a**-rhyme in strophe II, etc.]).

> Burgalês 2: **ababAA** (I), **ababCC** (II-III); probably **aaB** with internal rhymes;
>   Cohen and Parkinson, 38
> Carpancho 6: *edes* I**a; aaBAB** (I), **aaBCB** (II-III)
> Baian 2: *er* I**b** (*prazer* repeated); **abbaBB** (I) **, abbaCC** (II-III)
> Ornelas 1: *igo* I**b** (*amigo* repeated); **abbaBB** (I), **abbaCC** (II-III)
> Pardal 5: *igo* I**a; abbaCCA** (I), **abbaCCD** (II-III)

Ponte 3: *i* I**a**; **aaabAB** (I), **aaabCB** (II-III) + *fiinda* **aab**
Ponte 7: *ou* I**a**; **abbaCAC** (I), **abbaCDC** (II-III)
J. Garcia 2: *ar* III**b**; **abbaCC** (I-II), **abbaBB** (III)
Casal 3: *ar* I**b**; **abbaBB** (I), **abbaCC** (II-III) + *fiinda* **cc**
Bolseiro 11: i II**a**; **a(x)bbaCC** (I, III); **a(c)bbaCC** (II) (in 1st v. of each strophe
       there is an internal rhyme [=**a**], but no end-rhyme (=**x**); internal rhyme
       of 1st v. rhymes with end rhyme of 4th v.; see Cohen 2010c)
Treez 1: *on* III; **ababCCCC** (I-II), **ababAAAA** (III) – if printed in short lines;
       should probably be **aaBB** with long verses with internal rhymes as in
       Cohen 2003
Treez 3: *igo* VI; **aaB** (internal rhyme in V-VI; in the internal rhyme also
       rhymes with refrain; see Cohen 2010c)
Armea 2: *on* I**b** (*palavra perduda* in v. 1); **abbcCB** (I), **abbcCD** (II-III)
Cangas 2: *en* III**b** (*ben* repeated); **abbaCC** (I-II), **abbaBB** (III)
Codax 2: *igo* I.1-2, III.1, V.2; **aaA** I, III, V; **aaB** II, IV, VI
Johan Airas 24: *en* I**b**; **ababABA** (I), **ababACA** (II-III) + *fiinda* **bba** < III
       (maybe false example)
Johan Airas 31: ẹr I**a**; **ababCAC** (I), **ababCDC** (II-III) + 2 *fiindas* **dad** < III
       (probably **ababCaC** throughout; see Cohen 2012, 33

[Not a three-verse refrain:

    Berdia 4 is printed by Cohen 2003 as **ababcCCC**. It could also be taken as
    ababCCCC with variation in the first verse of the refrain. Cohen 2011, 132-33
    corrects to **aaBB** with long verses and internal rhymes.

    Sevilha 3 (**AbbaCDD**): a four-verse refrain, with 3 verses at the end of the
    strophe and with a *dobre* between the body of the strophe and the refrain: **A/a**.]

2. Critical Rights and Erotic Wrongs:
Emendation and Action in Johan Perez d'Avoin 1

There are two kinds of sin in textual criticism: to fail to recognize what is wrong (and correct it, if possible); and to change what is already right –either in the manuscript(s) or in a critical edition. Here, using –among other things– the pragmatics of the genre, I would like to propose an emendation in the text of a *cantiga d'amigo* of Johan Perez d' Avoin (1) where I left intact a glistering error (Cohen 2003, 151). The text as it appears in that edition, with the sin uncorrected, reads as follows.

Quando se foi noutro dia daqui
o meu amigo, roguei lh' eu por Deus,
chorando muito destes olhos meus,
que non tardass' e disse m' el assi:
que nunca Deus lhi desse de mi bem   5
se non vẽesse mui ced', e non ven.

Quando se foi noutro dia, que non
pud' al fazer, dixi lh' eu, se tardar
quisesse muito, que nunca falar
podia mig', e disse m' el enton   10
que nunca <Deus lhi desse de mi ben
se non vẽesse mui ced', e non ven>.

Non sei que x' ést' ou que pode seer
por que non ven, pois que lho eu roguei,
ca el mi disse como vos direi   15
e sol non meteu i de non poder,
que nunca Deus lhi desse <de mi ben
se non vẽesse mui ced', e non ven>.

Non sei que diga, tanto m' é gran mal
do meu amigo, de como morreu,   20
ca mi diss' el, u se de mi quitou,
e non sacou ende morte nen al
que nunca Deus <lhi desse de mi ben
se non vẽesse mui ced', e non ven>.

B 665 f. 143r   ***V*** 267 f. 39r
10 migue ***B*** : mi que ***V***   **19** dica ***V***   **22** e*n* de ? ***B*** : eu de ***V***

When my boyfriend went away from here
The other day, I asked him, by God,
And these eyes of mine were crying a lot,
That he not tarry, and this is what he said:
That God never grant him a favor from me
If he didn't come very soon, and he hasn't come.

When he left the other day, since I could not
Do anything else, I told him that, if he meant
To tarry long, he would never be able
To talk with me, and then he told me this:
That God never grant him a favor from me
If he didn't come very soon, and he hasn't come.

I don't know what it is or what it could be,
Why he hasn't come, since I asked him to,
And he said to me what I'll say to you
(And he didn't mention it might not be possible):
That God never grant him a favor from me
If he didn't come very soon, and he hasn't come.

I don't know what to say, I'm so upset
About my friend, that he has died,
Because he told me, when he left
(And made no exception for death or anything),
That God never grant him a favor from me
If he didn't come very soon, and he hasn't come.

What is wrong is *morreu* in v. 20, found in both manuscripts. First of all, it does not rhyme. This poem uses the most common rhyme-scheme in Galician-Portuguese lyric, **abbaCC**, and much as some editors might strain to defend a "rhyme" of *-ou* with *-eu*, there is no such thing. And contrary to what was long believed, based on flawed editions (Braga, Nunes, Machado and Machado), there are no unrhyming verses in the body of the strophe in the *cantigas d'amigo*, except for *palavras perdudas*, which are quite rare in this genre (with only five examples; Cohen 2009a), and which must occur at exactly the same location in all strophes—not the case here.[14]

Consider for a moment a similar instance, in a poem of Afonso Lopez de Baian (1, vv. 13-16), of verses that do not rhyme in the manuscripts (the corrected text printed here is from Cohen 2003, 226):

---

[14] The text of Sandeu 3 as transmitted by the manuscripts, where there appears to be an unrhyming verse, is almost certainly corrupt, but no convincing correction has yet been found. See Cohen 2003, 266.

Fui eu rogar muit' a Nostro Senhor
non por mha alma, <e> candeas queimei,
mais por veer o que eu muit' amei   15
sempr', e non vẽo o meu traedor.

14 queymey *Monaci* : q'ymar ***BV***   <e> *addidi*

I went to really beg Our Lord,
And to light candles, not for my soul,
But to see the boy I've always loved
So much, and the traitor didn't come.

The manuscripts offer *q'ymar* in v. 14, possibly because the phrase *candeas queimar* appears earlier in the poem (v. 7), possibly due to a supposed parallelism with *Fui eu rogar* in the previous verse. But Monaci in 1875 already understood that *queimar* cannot stand, since it does not rhyme, and suggested *queymey*, a certain correction –which, however, was not adopted by Braga, Nunes, or the Machados. However, even accepting Monaci's proposal, a problem still remained in the verse: *non por mha alma candeas queimei* is suspect. It presumes a break in the movement of the syntax through the strophe –a stop after the first verse, a phenomenon for which I find no parallel in *cantigas d'amigo* of this form (**abbaCC**). Adding the conjunction *e* (which does not affect the meter, *pace* Lorenzo Gradín 2008), we restore the syntactic parallelism between *Fui eu rogar* and *queimei*, taking *non por mha alma* not just with *candeas queimei* but also with the preceding clause, *Fui eu rogar*. The girl should be going to pray and light candles for her soul; instead she is going to see her boy. Now we can make out the forward motion of the sentence*: Fui eu rogar...e candeas queimei, non por mha alma, mas por veer...* These two changes, correcting *q'ymar* to *queimei* and adding *e*, yield a verse that is syntactically viable, and not coincidentally rhymes. The absence of rhyme, the lack of syntactic flow, and the awkward sense all signal an error, and the proposed emendations correct all three problems with two minor adjustments.[15]

As in the *cantiga* of Baian, so in the poem of Avoin we can ask if what is wrong might not be the word in rhyme in the *other* verse. In the poem of Baian one could consider substituting *amar* for *amei*, but the subsequent changes that prove necessary are too many to be plausible. And in the text of Avoin, while *quitou* makes perfect sense in context, the same cannot be said of *morreu*.

---

[15] Lorenzo Gradín (2008a, 116) prints *queimei* in v. 14 but attributes the correction to Braga, even though it belongs to Monaci, as reported by Cohen (2003, 226). She also rejects *<e>*, erroneously believing it would produce a hypermetric verse. There is no problem with the scansion: *non por mha alma_e candeas queimei*.

So the second reason for suspecting a corruption in Avoin 1, v. 20 is that the reading as it stands in the manuscripts and critical editions, although it is grammatical, does not yield an appropriate sense in this context. The lack of both rhyme and acceptable meaning are sure signs of a corrupt text. Let us briefly examine the pragmatic context to see if it can help us to correct the mistake (see Cohen 2010a).

The girl tells us that the boy, when he left, swore that he would return without delay (under threat of never being able to talk with her again; vv. 7-9), and did not make any exception for not being able to (v. 16), or even for the risk of dying (v. 22). And nowhere in the poem (unless we were to accept *morreu*) does she allude to the possibility that he might be dead. In fact, the corrupt reading as we have it, *tanto m' é gran mal / do meu amigo, de como morreu* ("I am suffering so much because of my friend, because he has died"; vv. 19-20) would contradict what she says in v. 22: *e non sacou ende morte nen al* ("and he made no exception for death or anything else"). Since he ruled out –and she consequently rules out– death as cause of his delay, she cannot be referring to the boy's possible demise in v. 20. It is precisely because death or anything else (*al*) cannot be the reason for his tarrying that she is amazed, and her amazement hints that the problem is another. And what could that be, in accordance with rhyme, paleography, and above all the pragmatics or –more precisely– the erotic logic of the *cantigas d'amigo*?

I propose to read *m'errou* ("he has wronged me"). I will argue that the girl suspects the boy has been untrue, that he has betrayed her by being with another girl, and that is why he has not yet returned. But even if some might consider this interpretation too specific, the reading should still be *m' errou*, which pointedly refers to *some* wrong. It should be easy to persuade competent textual critics that the emendation is necessary, but I will try now to demonstrate the stronger hypothesis, that *errar* refers here to infidelity.

Infidelity presupposes a rival, another girl, or *outra*, and this persona is mentioned in around forty *cantigas d'amigo* (Cohen 2012, 61-86; cf. Cohen and Corriente, 22-25). What we find in this text could be called, without irony, "the implied other". Though not named outright, the poem hinges on *her*. This interpretation of *m'errou* is supported by three factors: a link between tarrying and erotic treason with another girl; the semantics of *errar*; and the significance of infidelity in the pragmatics of the genre.

In numerous *cantigas d'amigo* the girl interprets the boy's delay as a sign that he has been unfaithful. The girl in Johan Lopez d' Ulhoa 6 (v. 2) openly makes the connection, although her suspicions are unconfirmed: *el que tan muito tarda, se outr' amor á sigo* ("the one who is taking so long, if he has another love with him"; cf. vv. 6 and 10). In Sancho Sanchez 2 the girl has now found out that she was right to suppose that the reason for his tarrying was another girl:

> Amiga, do meu amigo
> <o>í eu oje recado
> que é viv' e namorado

doutra dona, ben vos digo,
mais jur' a Deus que quisera   5
oír ante que mort' era.

Eu era maravilhada
por que tan muito tardava,
pero sempr' esto cuidava,
se eu del seja vingada,

Friend, today I heard
A message from my boy:
That he's alive and in love
With another lady, I'm telling you,
But I swear to God I would
Rather hear that he was dead.

I was just amazed
Why he was taking so long
But I kept thinking this—
So may I get back at him!—

The girl had been amazed at how long her boy was taking to return (vv. 7-8), and had suspected the cause (vv. 9-10), but now she knows why: he is indeed alive, but in love with another girl (vv. 1-4). She swears she would rather hear that he was dead (refrain).

One way of referring to infidelity is the verb *errar.* This usage was already noted by Lang in his 1894 edition of the *cancioneiro* of D. Dinis, in both the glossary and the introduction (Lang 2010, 115, 256 s.v. *errar*).[16] Among other texts, he cites Dinis 22. There the girl's ironic expressions of astonishment at the boy's tarrying (strophes I and III) are understood by her girlfriend to be accusations of infidelity, and she promptly defends the boy against the implicit charge (strophes II and IV). The girlfriend has no doubts about what the girl means. And when a persona in a text interprets an expression, we should pay heed. As the poet's creation, she knows the conventional language of the genre and the connotations of words and phrases far better than we do.

Here is a passage from Pae Gomez Charino (5, vv. 7-10) where *errar* appears:

–Non sei, amiga, que foi ou que é
ou que será, ca sabemos que non
vos errou nunca voss' amigo, e son

---

[16] None of the examples of *errar* in the glossaries of Michaëlis or Lapa seems relevant; but the glossary of *CSM* provides pellucid parallels for an erotic meaning of the verb (see below).

maravilhados todos end' aqui.   10

—I don't know, friend what it was or is
Or what it could be, 'cause we know your boy
Never wronged you, and everyone
Around here is amazed because of this.

We cannot *prove* that *errou* refers to infidelity; the reference seems to be left ambiguous on purpose. It could allude to *any* violation of the rules and conventions governing *fala* or wooing (Cohen 2011, 102-03; 2012, 10, 19-20, 61, 84). But the girlfriend and everyone else (*todos...aqui*; v. 10) are amazed that the girl should renounce the boy. What grave violation of the rules could he have committed? Since exclusivity is the fundamental rule of *fala* (Cohen 2012, 61), and its violation carries the heaviest consequences, the likely answer is that the girl believes the boy has been untrue.

In Pero de Berdia 1 (vv. 1-4) the boy is angry, and the girl cannot figure out why: she has always done what he asked, and has never *wronged* him.

Sanhudo m' é meu amig' e non sei,
Deu-lo sabe, por que xi m' assanhou,
ca toda ren que m' el a mi mandou
fazer, fij' eu e nunca lh' <i> errei.

My boyfriend's angry with me and I don't know,
God knows, why he got angry with me,
'Cause every thing he told me
To do I did, and I never wronged him.

What is implied is this: if she had been unfaithful –which would mean talking with another boy, *falar con outro*– the boy would have a reason to be angry (Cohen 2012, 61-67). As it is, he has none. The location of *errei* corroborates its erotic overtones. It is the last word in the body of the strophe, immediately before the refrain, a privileged position in the form of a *cantiga*.

Another example is found in Roi Martĩiz d' Ulveira (1, vv. 15-18).

Falarei con el, pois está <a>ssi,   15
par Deus, amiga, ca sempre punhou
de me servir, des i nunca m' errou
des que meu fui, per quant' eu aprendi.

I'll talk with him, since that's the way it is,
By God, friend, for he's always tried

> To serve me, and he never did me wrong
> Since he was mine, from what I've learned,

As far as the girl knows (*per quant' eu aprendi*; v. 18), the boy has never wronged her. Again, the expression allows no specific inference, but it apparently means that he has not spoken with another girl –*falar con outra*. Since the girl obviously knows what the boy did in her presence, it is what he did *elsewhere* that she would need to know. And this example is important for another reason: the form *errou* is found in rhyme, with the (elided) pronoun *me* immediately preceding: *m'errou*. This is exactly the combination I propose for Avoin 1, v. 20.

A currious case of *errar* occurs in Pae Calvo 1 (vv. 5-8).

> Foi s' el con perfia por mi fazer guerra;   5
> nembrar se devia de que muito m' erra;
> **torto <mi ten ora o meu namorado,**
> **que tant' alhur mora e sen meu mandado>.**

> He went away stubbornly, to take revenge on me;
> He should remember how much he wrongs me.
> My boyfriend is doing me wrong right now
> By living elsewhere so long when I don't want him to.

The boy decided to leave, and did so stubbornly (*con perfia*; v. 5) to get back at the girl (*fazer guerra* = "to take vengeance"). But he has now been away for a long time without her permission. The boy's absence *alhur* ("elsewhere") can be a sign of possible infidelity (Cohen 2011, 122); and the longer he stays, the more suspicious any girl would become. And the verb *errar* is again used (emphatically) in rhyme-position.

In a dialogue by Fernand' Esquio (1, vv. 6-7) the boy spent too long a time in Lugo. He was not there for any extended period; he simply tarried there "the other day". That is long enough for the girl to offer him a less than warm welcome.

> –Que adubastes, amigo, u tardastes noutro dia,
> ou qual é essa fremosa que vos tan ben parecia?

> —What did you get done, friend, the other day when you tarried,
> Or who's that gorgeous girl that seemed to you so pretty?

The girl makes the connection between *tardar* and *outra* explicit, openly accusing the boy of infidelity (Cohen 2012, 76-77 and forthcoming). Although the word *errar* is not used, the text provides evidence for the pragmatic association between tarrying and an other girl, and so for the treatment of infidelity in the pragmatics of the *cantigas d'amigo*.

In a poem outside the genre, but closely related, a *pastorela* of D. Dinis (54, vv. 5-6 and 13-15), the verb *errar* appears twice.

> E diss', "Oimais non é nada   5
> de fiar per namorado
> nunca molher namorada,
> pois que mh o meu á errado".

> And she said, "From now on
> No woman in love
> Should ever trust her boy,
> Since mine has wronged me".

Then, in the next strophe, after the introduction of the *papagai* (parrot), the girl addresses her absent boy:

> e diss': "Amigo loução,
> que faria por amores,
> pois m' errastes tan en vão?"   15

> And she said, "Handsome friend,
> What should I do about love,
> Since you wronged me so senselessly?"

The configuration of words, situation, and action are relevant: the girl cannot trust the boy because he wronged her. But do these expressions ("he wronged me," "you wronged me") refer to infidelity? Certainty is elusive; but doubt is probably unnecessary. She declares that from now on no girl should trust any boy, since hers has wronged her, and the rhetoric of this declaration is stressed by its position in the form, occurring at the end of the strophe.

The role of unfaithfulness in the erotic logic of this genre is backed up by a similar link in Pero da Ponte 2 (vv. 17-21), but here the connection is explicit. The girl asks why any woman should trust a boy, since hers now has another girl. This in turn closely resembles the erotic actions and reactions in another song of Avoin (10, vv. 7-12).

> E mui pouc' á que lh' eu oí jurar
> que non queria ben outra molher
> se non min, e <ben> sei eu que lho quer
> e por esto non poss' en ren fiar,   10
> **ca mi mentiu o que mi <soía**
> **dizer verdad' e nunca mentia>.**

> Not long ago I heard him swear
> He didn't love another woman
> But only me, and I know he loves one,
> And so there's nobody I can trust,
> 'Cause the boy who'd always tell the truth
> And never would lie has lied to me.

The girl's unwillingness to trust her (former) boyfriend –or any other boy– is a consequence of his infidelity: he swore he didn't love another woman (vv. 7-9), but now she knows he does (v. 9). In the *fiinda* she reformulates her generalization:

> E, se outr' ouvesse, mentir m' ia,
> pois mi mentiu o que non mentia.   20

> And if I had another, he'd lie to me,
> 'Cause the boy who would never lie has lied.

Since she cannot trust this boy, she cannot trust any.

It seems, on the evidence, that one of the worst wrongs boy can do to girl (or girl to boy) is to be unfaithful (Cohen 2012, 62, 67-84), which can mean neither more nor less than "talking with another," especially since such talking can involve sexual activities (Cohen 2012, 10-26). To get an idea of the angry reaction infidelity can provoke, we need only look at two other texts of Avoin (5 and 7). There both the boy and the other girl are insulted and revenge is promised –and partially exacted by the utterances themselves (Cohen 2012, 72-76).

But it is in the *Cantigas de Santa Maria* that we find unmistakable examples of *errar* meaning "to cheat on," "to be unfaithful." This is because in that genre erotic situations are usually far more fully sketched out, or even described in detail, allowing a precise and unequivocal interpretation of the verb. Here are some examples.

> *CSM* 5.56 *non quisera con ela errar.* "He didn't want to have sex with her" (The brother of the emperor of Rome wanted the empress to have sexual relations with him in his brother's absence, but she refused. He now claims that it was he who refused her advances.)

> *CSM* 49.13-14 *don' Eva que foi errar / per sa gran folia.* "Lady Eve had sex, out of great folly." (Eve is not cheating on Adam, but *errar* means "to have sexual relations," not just "to sin.")

> *CSM* 64.8-9 *Santa Maria, que a moller dun infancon / guardou de tal guisa, por que non podess' errar.* "Santa Maria, who protected the wife of

an *infançon*, so that she could not be unfaithful." (A woman is unable to remove a shoe that a suitor, in an effort to seduce her, gives her while her husband is away, and this keeps her faithful.)

CSM 341, rubric: *Como Santa Maria do Poy salvou hũa dona d'erro que ll'apoýa seu marido.* "How Santa Maria of Poy saved a lady from the wrong that her husband blamed her for." (The whole tale deals with the husband's unfounded suspicion that is wife is untrue.)

Useful for grammatical reasons are those examples where we find *errar* with an indirect object (as proposed in Avoin 1, v. 20), in a construction meaning "to be unfaithful to (someone)."

CSM 341.15 *En coidando que ll' errara, dava-lle mui maa vida.* "Thinking that she was being unfaithful to him, he made her life miserable" (The husband is suspicious, tortures his wife with jealousy, and demands that she undergo an ordeal to prove her innocence.)

CSM 341.51 *jurando que non ll' errara* "Swearing that she had not cheated on him".

Let us return now to the text of Avoin 1, v. 20, where the manuscripts offer *morreu* "he died" and I propose to read *m'errou* "he wronged me". In terms of critical operations, all we need to do is divide the *m* from the other letters, taking it as the pronoun *me* (with elision of the unstressed final vowel), and change *o* to *e* (*mo- > me-*) and *e* to *o* (*-ou > -eu*), the confusion between these two letters being one of the most common errors in *B* and *V* (and countless other manuscripts). The latter change is required by the rhyme, and the switch from *o* to *e* follows automatically, yielding *m'errou* (as in Ulveira 1, v. 17). Here the textual critic has not only the right but the duty to correct.

As far as erotic logic is concerned, we then have yet another poem where the girl's amazement at her boyfriend's excessive tarrying is an ironic or indirect hint that she suspects he has been untrue to her. But even if the wrong allegedly committed were not infidelity, *m'errou* is a necessary and –I believe– certain emendation. The need for a rhyme, the sense of the phrase in its specific context, the general meaning of the discourse, and the pragmatics of the genre all require a correction, and all these considerations support the (paleographically easy) emendation *m'errou*. Thus the boy's (feared) death, in the corrupt reading of the manuscripts, gives way to his wrong (imagined or real). This reading reverses more than a century of passive acceptance of an unacceptable mistake.

In textual criticism the basic critical operations cannot function in a vacuum. In rhymed strophic poetry with external responsion (where the shape of all strophes must

correspond; Cohen 2010d), the reading of the manuscripts can be checked against strophic form, meter and rhyme. And any text must be checked for grammar and sense. But we cannot really check meaning without understanding pragmatics (Cohen 2010a).

Here, in righting the wronged text, we have discovered in this song of Avoin more than a rhyme. We have found one more instance of erotic wronging that fits into a widespread phenomenon in the pragmatics of the genre, where the *amigo* often betrays, or is thought to betray, his *amiga* by tarrying elsewhere with another girl.

The pragmatics of the *cantigas d'amigo* had long been neglected and only recently has become a methodological concern (for a theoretical introduction, see Cohen 2011, 95-102). Maybe the speech-actions (Bing and Cohen, 19-21) of a nubile girl, her mother, girlfriend and boyfriend, have not seemed important enough to warrant study, much less to develop methods of analysis. Editors and commentators rarely provide more than vague –and often inaccurate– descriptions of what happens in any given text. Yet this corpus of 500 female-voiced love songs provides an ideal laboratory for the study of action.

Accurate descriptions of kinds of speech-action can be conveniently conceived of as *scripts* whose general form can be notated as $P1\text{–}P2\ \{x, y + z \rightarrow A\}$ (Parkinson and Cohen, 37-39; Cohen 2010a; 2011, 98-99). This notation identifies speaker and addressee (*P1* and *P2*) and describes background and new information (x, y + z) leading to ($\rightarrow$) a present action or emotion (*A*). A grammar of scripts, still under construction, will be as useful for the textual critic as historical grammar, meter or rhyme. The script of Avoin 1 would be:[17]

$$G\text{–}\emptyset\ \{he\ left, swore\ he\ wouldn't\ tarry\ +\ hasn't\ come\ \rightarrow\ he's\ wronged\ me\}$$

The correction *m'errou* in Avoin 1, v. 20, is one example of the utility of pragmatics as a check for the textual critic. To make full use of this check we need a complete description of the actions represented in this genre (Cohen 2011, 135-37). Such a description will not be easy to construct, but neither is a manual of historical morphology, phonology or syntax. They are all tools that we cannot do without.

Philology makes use of, and contributes to, many fields. One of the most fundamental, always presupposed but nearly never mentioned, is epistemology (on which see Wittgenstein 1979). When we say we know what a text means, or how to identify –and, with knowledge and skill, correct– a corrupt text, we must be able to say how we know, or at least to explain how we think we know. And we can do that only if we have reliable methods. A grammar of scripts is –and must become accepted as– one of the basic methods needed to edit and interpret the *cantigas d'amigo*.

---

[17] G = girl; Ø = no identified addressee. Hence G – Ø means that the girl speaks to no addresse (or to an unidentified one).

Manuscripts and Works Cited

B = Biblioteca Nacional (Lisbon), cod. 10991.
V = Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Rome), cod. lat. 4803.

Bell, Aubrey F. G, ed. "The Eleven Songs of Joan Zorro." *Modern Language Review* 15 (1920): 58-64.

Bing, Peter, and Rip Cohen. *Games of Venus: An Anthology of Greek and Roman Erotic Verse from Sappho to Ovid*. New York and London: Routledge, 1991.

Braga, Theophilo, ed. *Cancioneiro portuguez da Vaticana*. Edição critica restituida sobre o texto diplomatico de Halle, acompanhada de um glossario e de uma introducção sobre os trovadores e cancioneiros portuguezes. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1878.

Brea, Mercedes, coord. *Lírica Profana Galego-Portuguesa*: *Corpus completo das cantigas medievais* (con estudio biográfico, análise retórica e bibliografía específica). 2 vols. Santiago de Compostela: Centro Ramon Piñeiro/Xunta de Galicia, 1996.

Cohen, Rip, ed. *500 Cantigas d'Amigo.* Porto: Campo das Letras, 2003. http://jhir.library.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/33843.

---. "Girl in the Dawn: Textual Criticism and Poetics." *Portuguese Studies* 22.1 (2006): 173-87.

---. "Technical Virtuosity in the *Cantigas d'Amigo.*" *Floema: Caderno de Teoria e História Literária* 5 (2009a): 125-44.

---, ed. "Three Early Galician-Portuguese Poets: Airas Moniz d'Asme, Diego Moniz, Osoir'Anes. A Critical Edition." *Revista Galega de Filoloxia* 11 (2009b): 11-59.

---. "Pragmatics and Textual Criticism in the *Cantigas d'Amigo.*" In Mariña Arbor Aldea & Antonio F. Guiadanes eds. *Estudos de edición crítica e lírica galego-portuguesa.* Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 2010a (=*Verba, Anuario Galego de Filoloxia*, Anexo 67). 25-42.

---. *The* Cantigas d'Amigo: *An English Translation*. Baltimore: JScholarship, The Johns Hopkins University, 2010b. http://jhir.library.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/33843.

---. "Colometry and Internal Rhyme in Vidal, Judeu d' Elvas." *Ars Metrica* 12 (2010c). http://irodalom.elte.hu/mezura/?q=node/77.

---. "*Cantar Igual*: External Response and Textual Criticism in Galician-Portuguese Lyric." *La Corónica* 38.2 (2010d): 5-25.

---. "The Poetics of Peace: Erotic Reconciliation in the *Cantigas d'Amigo.*" *La Corónica* 39.2 (2011): 95-143.

---. *Erotic Angles on the* Cantigas d'Amigo. Papers of the Medieval Hispanic Research Seminar, 68. London: Department of Iberian and Latin American Studies, Queen Mary, University of London, 2012.

---. "Hello, Honey: The Pragmatics of Greeting in the *Cantigas d'Amigo*." In Stephen Parkinson ed. *Cantigas United. Papers on the Medieval Galician-Portuguese Lyric*. London: Department of Iberian and Latin American Studies, Queen Mary, University of London. Forthcoming.

---, & Federico Corriente. "*Lelia doura* revisited." *La Córonica*, 31.1 (2002): 19-40.

---, & Stephen Parkinson. "The Galician-Portuguese Lyric." In Stephen Parkinson, Cláudia Pazos Alonso & T. F. Earle eds. *Companion to Portuguese Literature*. Warminster: Tamesis, 2009. 25-44.

Correia, Ângela. "O refram nos cancioneiros Galego-Portugueses (Escrita e tipologia)." (Master's Thesis, Universidade de Lisboa [I: Dissertação; II: Transcrição; III: Repertório - Lista por tipos; IV: Repertório - Lista por autores]). 1992. 4 vols.

Cunha, Celso Ferreira da ed. *O cancioneiro de Joan Zorro*. Aspectos lingüísticos. Texto crítico/Glossário. Rio de Janeiro: [Imprensa Nacional], 1949.

---. *Cancioneiros dos Trovadores do Mar*. In Elsa Gonçalves ed. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1999 [contains Cunha 1949].

CSM = Walter Mettmann ed. *Afonso X, O Sábio. Cantigas de Santa Maria*. Coimbra: Por Ordem da Universidade, 1959–72. 4 vols. (rpt. Vigo: Ediçóns Xerais de Galicia, 1981. 2 vols.).

Ferreira, Maria do Rosário. *Águas Doces, Águas Salgadas. Da funcionalidade dos motivos aquáticos nas Cantigas de Amigo.* Porto: Granito, 1999.

Gonçalves, Elsa. "Tradição manuscrita da poesia lírica." In Giulia Lanciani & Giuseppe Tavani, orgs. *Dicionário da Literatura Medieval Galega e Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Caminho, 1993. 627-32.

Housman, A. E. "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism." *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 18 (1922): 67-84.

Lang, Henry R., ed. *Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis von Portugal*. Zum ersten mal vollständig herausgegeben und mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Glossar versehen. Halle a.S.: Max Niemeyer, 1894 (rpt. Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972).

---. In Lênia Márcia Mongelli & Yara Frateschi Vieira orgs. *Cancioneiro d'El Rei Dom Denis e Estudos Dispersos*. Niterói/Rio de Janeiro: Xunta da Galicia/ EdUFF, 2010.

Lapa, Manuel Rodrigues, ed. *Cantigas d'escarnho e de mal dizer dos cancioneiros medievais galego-portugueses*. Vigo: Editorial Galaxia, 1970.

Lorenzo Gradín, Pilar. "El dobre gallego-português o la estética de la simetria." *Vox Romanica* (1997) 56: 212-41.

---, ed. *Don Afonso Lopez de Baian*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2008.

Machado, Elza Pacheco, & José Pedro Machado, eds. *Cancioneiro da Biblioteca Nacional, Antigo Colocci-Brancuti*. 8 vols. Lisbon: Edição da "Revista de Portugal," 1949-64.

Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, Carolina, ed. *Cancioneiro da Ajuda*. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1904. 2 vols. (rpt. with "Glossário" [= Michaëlis 1920], Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1990.)

---. "Glossário do *Cancioneiro da Ajuda." Revista Lusitana* 23 (1920): 1-95.

Monaci, Ernesto, ed. *Il canzoniere portoghese della Biblioteca Vaticana* (messo a stampa, con una prefazione con facsimili e con altre illustrazioni). Halle a.S.: Max Niemeyer, 1875.

Nunes, José Joaquim, ed. *Cantigas d'amigo dos trovadores Galego-Portugueses*. (Edição crítica acompanhada de introdução, comentário, variantes, e glossário). Coimbra: *Universidade*, 1926-28. 3 vols. (rpt. Lisbon: Centro do Livro Brasileiro, 1973.).

Parkinson, Stephen. "False Refrains in the *Cantigas de Santa Maria." Portuguese Studies* 3 (1987): 22-55.

Tavani, Giuseppe. *Repertorio metrico della lirica galego-portoghese*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1967.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. G. E. M. Anscombe & G. H. von Wright eds. Denis Paul & G. E. M. Anscombe trans. *On Certainty/Über Gewissheit*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.

---. G. E. M. Anscombe ed. Linda L. McAlister & Margarete Schättle trans. *Remarks on Colour*/*Bemerkungen über die Farben*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.