

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-17,504

ADACKAPARA, Matthew, 1931-
THE CONCEPT OF LOVE IN THE POEMS OF MARCABRU.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1975
Language and Literature, modern

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

©COPYRIGHT BY

MATTHEW ADACKAPARA

1975

THE CONCEPT OF LOVE IN THE POEMS OF MARCABRU

by

MATTHEW ADACKAPARA

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
Comparative Literature in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York

1975

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

March 14, 1975
date

Frederick Goldin
Chairman of Examining Committee

March 17, 1975
date

Helaine Newstead
Executive Officer

Frederick Goldin
Frederick Goldin
Supervisory Committee

Abstract

THE CONCEPT OF LOVE IN THE POEMS OF MARCABRU

by

Matthew Adackapara

Advisor: Professor Frederick Goldin

Critics who have hitherto studied Marcabru have understood him in terms borrowed from either Arabic spirituality or the Christian notion of charity; they take isolated passages from Marcabru's lyrics and find comparisons and parallels in Arabic or patristic writings. Against this tendency that prevailed till recently in Marcabru studies I have tried to determine the meaning of all his words and expressions from his own context in its totality, and, in a lesser degree, from the context of his contemporaries and the prevailing ideas of the time.

The first chapter deals with the credibility of the vidas. An examination of the details given in the two vidas about his birth, life, and his relation with his fellow troubadour Cercamon indicates that the vidas do not give us any more correct information than what we get in the lyrics; that they are mere conjectures and stories

fabricated from the lyrics themselves by an ordinary jongleur with little historical or critical sense.

In the second chapter a comparison is made between the twofold division of love in Marcabru and the Fathers, especially, Augustine, Bernard, and their companions who contributed most to the development of the theology of charity. The comparison shows that Marcabru does not follow the Fathers in his division of love into amars and amors, that his fals' amors is not identical with the patristic notion of cupiditas.

The third chapter is an analysis of the qualities and characteristics of fin' amor and charity. The analysis reveals that they are concepts far apart, that while charity proposes to lead all men to eternal life after death, fin' amors claims to lead the French nobles to honor and worth. Throughout his lyrics Marcabru is concerned about the welfare of the noble class; his intention is to bring the sap of vitality to the courtiers and the cavaliers of France; he is more concerned with their well being as a class than with their spiritual prosperity.

The fourth chapter examines whether there is a real identity between the elements of fin' amor and charity. A comparative study is made between some of the seemingly parallel concepts in Marcabru and in the Fathers, such as: mezura and temperantia, dreit and justitia, proeza and fortitudo, fes and fides, jovens and juventus, jois and

gaudium, enveja and invidia, orgueih and superbia. The study makes it clear to us that there is no relation between them, that while Marcabru sets the rules of social behaviour and courtly etiquette, the Fathers aim at attaining supreme bliss in heaven.

The dissertation demonstrates that Marcabru's concept of love is unique and has few parallels in literature; that though Marcabru is the most religious of all troubadours, his notion of love corresponds to that of neither a religious teacher nor a troubadour; that we do not get any evidence to show that he was influenced by the Arabic notion of love or that he was in touch with the Arabic literature of the time; that though he quotes Ovid and shows in some instances that he was familiar with Latin literature, his ideas about love are not the same as those of Ovid or any other Latin poet; that though he makes use of many Biblical expressions and images, his concept of love is not of Biblical inspiration. The love which he sings about is matrimonial love; accordingly, a short appendix is added in order to show that the poet's attitude to matrimonial love differs from those of the Fathers.

PREFACE

Many institutions and persons have helped me in the preparation of this work. The manuscript copies of Marcabru's lyrics were made available to me by the Vatican Library, Rome, and the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Professor Aurelio Roncaglia, Director of the Institute of Romance Philology of the City University of Rome and the Editor of Cultura Neolatina, the Bulletin of the Institute, helped me with his suggestions and brought to my attention a few recently published articles concerning Marcabru and his lyrics. Most heartily I thank Professor Frederick Goldin, my mentor, for his encouragement and sustained interest in this work: for going through it many times and for the corrections he made both in matter and form. It was a course I took with him that gave me the inspiration to select this topic for my dissertation. With gratitude I remember the understanding and cooperation of all those with whom I lived while working on this thesis in St. Paul the Apostle Rectory, Irvington; St. Joseph's College, Princeton; St. Paul's, Highland Park; and Our Lady of Fatima, Piscataway.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION :	THE UNIQUENESS OF MARCABRU'S CONCEPT OF LOVE
CHAPTER I :	MARCABRU'S LIFE AND BACKGROUND
II :	THE TWOFOLD DIVISION OF LOVE IN MARCABRU AND IN THE FATHERS
III :	MARCABRU'S <u>FIN'</u> <u>AMORS</u> AND CHARITY
IV :	ELEMENTS OF MARCABRU'S <u>FIN'</u> <u>AMOR</u> AND CHARITY
CONCLUSION :	MARCABRU'S <u>FIN'</u> <u>AMORS</u> IS NOT CHARITY
APPENDIX :	FATHERS AND MATRIMONIAL LOVE

INTRODUCTION

THE UNIQUENESS OF MARCABRU'S CONCEPT OF LOVE

Many scholars have tried to explain Marcabru's concept of love in terms drawn from other contexts. Denomy, for example, tries to explain it in terms of Arabic mysticism; Scheludko, Appel, Errante and Robertson consider the notion of love in Marcabru to be identical with that of Augustine. Against this tendency that existed until recently in Marcabru studies, I would like to contend that though we may speak of the elements that went into the formation of his concept, it would be meaningless to trace it back to a single source. It cannot be quite correct to speak of Marcabru's ideas of love as Platonic, Pauline, Joanine, Augustinian or Arabic, because the mark of his personality is imprinted on them. His concept may reveal many of these influences, but its final form is determined by his own poetic character, not by the qualities of the elements of which it is formed.

Marcabru's concept of love is a new creation. This is particularly true since he is different from most of his contemporaries. He shows clearly in his lyrics that he had his own personal convictions and favorite ideas which he wanted to propagate and openly profess. His concepts or ideas about love were not dictated by his patron or his admirers. Neither his audience nor his well-wishers were able to force him into a particular way of thinking or make

him conform to the general norm. He is aware, as he says in one instance, that he is different from his contemporaries and that his reputation suffers as a result.¹

The different factors that constitute Marcabru's concept of love do not destroy its essential unity and integrity. His concept carries along with it contributions from many earlier ages; we may clearly perceive in his love both the erotic motifs of the mystery cult and the fertility worship of primitive men, as well as the most exalted notions of Christian mysticism. If Platonic Eros has a place in his

¹Moillerat, segon l'endeveing,

Que.us es a venir vos enseing,

Mas si m'avetz espaorit

C'usquecs n'a son coratge feing,

Per que no m'es engal grazit. (Dej. VIII, 16-20)

Text J.M.L. Dejeanne, Poésies Complètes du Troubadour Marcabru (Toulouse, 1909), p. 33. All further references will be to Dejeanne's text unless otherwise noted.

Married men, according to the fate

that is to come to you, I teach you,

but you have so scared me away,

for each one shows his faint heart in his matter,

that I do not get an equivalent reward.

Cf. Translation by K. Lewent, "Beiträge zum Verständnis der Lieder Marcabrus," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXVII (1913), p. 323.

notion, there is also the Agrape of the Bible. However, his idea of love is the same in all his poems; from the first to the last his notion is unchanged. There is no evolution in his concept; all his different poems, cansos, tensos, and sirventes express his essential theme. It would seem as if Marcabru wrote variations of this one theme and formulated only one notion of love throughout his whole life, so that all his works can be grouped together to form one organic and integral whole.

Marcabru always rises from the concrete to the abstract, from the particular to the universal. No matter what he sees or hears in this world - orchard and green grass, the growth of the willow, or the chanting of the frog - it always turns his mind to some abstract idea, such as the fleeting of Youth, and the lack of honor and worth in those who allow themselves to be cheated by felony (Malvestatz). Whatever the season - spring, winter, autumn or summer - he always thinks of the havoc that fals' amors is causing in this world to young men, who would otherwise be valiant and noble.

Marcabru's concept of love cannot be studied apart from his experiences in life. His training and background, the historical, political, religious and social milieu he lived in, and the impressions he received have to be well reckoned with in order that we may have a clear idea of the formation of his concept of love. For, this concept is, at least in

part, his response to the long series of external stimuli he received and the impressions they made on his own consciousness.

The first step, therefore, in the study of the concept of love in Marcabru's poetry is to find out when and in what circumstances he lived and wrote his poems, who his friends and patrons were, and what were his affections and sympathies.

CHAPTER I

MARCABRU'S LIFE AND BACKGROUND

We know almost nothing about the life and doings of Marcabru, one of the most important troubadours, whose reputation during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries was very great. Many have attempted to probe into the life of this renowned writer on the basis of the information we get mainly from his work and the two vidas. The first writers who made critical studies of his life are Diez and Suchier.¹ Their mistakes were later corrected by Paul Meyer, who also provided more information.² But the final and the greatest contribution in this respect was made by the renowned French scholar Paul Boissonnade, who made use of all the relevant documents, charts and chronicles of the history of France and Spain and compared them with those of Germany.³ Equally important in the study of Marcabru and one of the

¹Friedrich Diez, Die Poésie der Troubadours, 2nd ed., rev. Karl Bartsch (Leipzig, 1882), p. 93.

_____. Leben und Werke der Troubadours, 2nd ed., rev. Karl Bartsch (Leipzig, 1882), pp. 37-45.

H. Suchier, "Der Troubadour Marcabru," Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur, XIV (1875), pp. 119-160, 273-310.

²Paul Meyer, "Marcabru," Romania, VI (1887), pp. 119-129.

³Paul Boissonnade, "Les personnages et les événements de l'histoire d'Allemagne, de France et d'Espagne dans l'oeuvre de Marcabru," Romania, XLVIII (1922), pp. 207-43.

scholars to be consulted by every student, is Carl Appel, who shed further light on the life and the times of our poet.⁴ Now, as a result of the works of these scholars, we are in a position to fix the date of most of the poems of Marcabru with a considerable amount of precision. Though the earlier scholars had put Marcabru in the second half of the twelfth century, later scholars are unanimous in ascribing to him a life not contemporaneous with that of King Richard the Lion-Hearted of England but one generation earlier.⁵

The short biography contained in the vidas written in the thirteenth century gives us a few details about his life.

A. - K VERSION

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

Marcabrunsi, lo fills Na Bruna,
Fo engendraz en tal luna
Qu'el saup d'amor cum degruna,

- Escoutatz ! -

⁴Carl Appel, "Zu Marcabru," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XLIII (1923), pp. 403-69.

⁵Cf. Paul Meyer, "Marcabru," p. 125; Diez, Leben und Werke, p. 45; Cf. Hoepffner, Les Troubadours (Paris, 1955), pp. 30-46.

Que anc non amet neguna,

Ni d'autra no fo amatz.

Trobaire fo dels premiers c'om se recort.

De caitevetz vers e de caitevetz serventes fez,
e dis mal de las femnas e d'amor.⁶

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

Marcabru, son of Lady Bruna,

was born under such a moon

that he knows how love ripens (or: crumbles)

- Listen ! -

For he never loved a woman

nor was he loved by any.

He was one of the earliest troubadours that one remembers. He made some wretched verses and some wretched⁷ sirventes and he spoke ill of women and of love.

⁶Jean Boutière et A. H. Schutz, Biographies des Troubadours (Paris, 1964), p. 211.

⁷For the exact meaning of the work caitevetz see Valeria Bertolucci Pizzoruzzo, "Marcabruno e il suo biographo," Studi mediolatini e volgari, XVII (1969), pp. 17-19.

B. - A VERSION

Marcabrunsi si fo gitatz a la porta d'un ric
home, ni anc non saup hom qui.l fo no don. E
N'Aldrics del Vilar fetz lo noirir. Apres estet
tant ab un trobador que avia nom Cercamon qu'el
comensset a trobar. Et adoncs el avia nom Pamperdut;
mas d'aqui enan ac nom Marcabrun. Et en aqel
temps non appellava hom cansson, mas tot qant
hom cantava eron vers. E fo mout cridatz et ausitz
pel mon, e doptatz per sa lenga; car el fo tant
maldizens que, a la fin, lo desfeiron li castellan
de Guian(a), de cui avia dich mout gran mal.⁸

⁸Boutiere et Schutz, pp. 211-12.

The vidas are conserved in about twenty manuscripts, all fragmentary, most of them written in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, but some of them as late as the eighteenth century. There are some two hundred and twenty five "Lives" in all, concerning one hundred and one troubadours. The numbers are approximations because some of these are mutilated and torn. The biographies are vaguely divided into vidas (from Latin vita, meaning life or biography) and razos (from rationem, meaning explanations or commentaries to the poem). The relative length of the biographies is no indication of the reputation or the fame of the corresponding troubadours; the vidas of the early troubadours, such as Guillaume of Poitiers, Cercamon, and Marcabru are very short. This in no way shows that they were less popular. Sometimes rather long and elaborate vidas are given about troubadours who were not popular, not even known.

The two vidas of Marcabru, the longer and the shorter, are included in the manuscripts A and K respectively; the former is kept in the Vatican Library numbered Manuscriptum Latinum 5232, and the latter in the Bibliotheque Nationale de Paris numbered Francaise 12473. The Vatican manuscript is a folio parchment having 217 pages supposedly written by an Italian scribe with many Italianisms in the text. The manuscript in the Bibliotheque Nationale de Paris (K) is also in folio parchment with 189 pages.

Marcabru was deposited at the door of a rich man; no one knew who he was or where he was from. And Lord Aldrics of Vilar had him brought up. Afterwards he remained with a troubadour who had the name of Cercamon so long that he began to compose song. Then he had the name of Panperdut, but from that time onwards he got the name of Marcabru. In those days no one spoke of canson, but everything that one sang was called vers. He was acclaimed and heard of through the world and feared on account of his tongue; for he was so evil-tongued that in the end the castellans of Guyenne murdered him, of whom he had said much great evil.

While the earlier biographies and criticisms of Marcabru were mostly based on these two vidas, modern critics hesitate to rely on these, and some of them call their veracity and credibility into question. It is probable that these vidas were added by some scribes or fabricated by some jongleurs, either to arouse interest in the audience or to satisfy the curiosity of the hearers. These vidas might have also served the later jongleurs as commentaries and explanations to what they sang.

Though the vidas were not historically true and not written after proper research and investigation into the life of the poets, these biographies were able to mislead many

students and scholars of the past and as a result much literature has come out based solely on the false information given by these vidas. Thus, for example, F. Diez, who made the first serious study of Marcabru, gives a synthesis of the two vidas and translates some of his more important pieces. Diez's work shows the belief of the times, when the vidas were considered to be perfectly reliable and the only source of information about a poet's life and works. Diez supposed that Marcabru lived and wrote between 1140 and 1185.⁹ On the other hand, Carl Appel, writing in 1923, is quite skeptical about the traditional biographies and reduces the historical value of the vidas to nothing.

With the object of purging the study of our troubadour from the dust of the centuries, he tries to base his researches on sources more certain and more accurate. He is reluctant to give any critical objective value to the vidas. He says: "Ganz verzichten müssen wir. . . aus den sogenannten Biographien irgend einen Gewinn zu ziehen."¹⁰ He thinks that the only information that is not taken exclusively from his works, and that might have reached us also from other sources as local legends, is the statement that the poet came from Gascony. This is given in the vida of the K manuscript. The author of the vida seems to have got this information from the tornada

⁹F. Diez, Die Poesie der Troubadours, p. 93.

¹⁰C. Appel, "Zu Marcabru," p. 404.

of a lyric beginning Al prim comens de l'ivernaill (Dej. IV):

En Gascoingna, sai, ves Orsaut,
 Me dizo qu'en creis uns petitz,
 O.m trobarez s'ieu sui perdutoz. (Dej. IV 61-63)
 In Gascony, here, towards Ossau,
 they tell me that a small (prince) grows
 at whose side you will find me if I am lost.

These lines do not in any way show that the poet comes from Gascony or that he was born there. If he had lived there for some time and made verses there, it would be a quite sufficient reason for his contemporaries to call him a Gasconian. What we can say at the most is that he was probably from the south of France, which included Gascony.¹¹

Bertoni thinks that the *vida* in the A manuscript contains nothing but information gathered from the lyrics, especially from Tot a estru (Dej. XX), put together with some misunderstanding. Such a story could be fabricated if the author was not able to understand that petitz enfans was a plural in the oblique case.¹²

¹¹J. M. L. Dejeanne, p. 16. The above quoted lines do not exist in the A manuscript; but IKNa have them, and so their authenticity is not questioned.

¹²Giulio Bertoni, "Due note provenzali," Studi Medievali, III (1908-11), pp. 638-72; especially p. 642. This article of Bertoni reduces the vidas ad absurdum. This is the first time in the history of Marcabru studies that the credibility of the vidas was so thoroughly questioned.

Petitz enfans
 M'as trobatz tans
 Que l'uns non pot l'autre levar;
 Cill m'an escos,
 Fe que dei vos,
 Tot quant eu solia gabar. (XX, 25-30)

Reconogut
 T'ai, Pan-perdut,
 E cuidavas ton nom celar;
 Quan tornaras,
 Segurs seras
 De seignor et ieu de joglar. (XX, 37-42)

Small infants -
 you have found so many of them in my home
 that one cannot raise the other.
 They have deprived me,
 by the faith I owe you,
 of everything I used to boast about.

I have recognized you, Pan-perdut,
 and you thought that you would hide your name.
 When you come back,
 you will be sure
 of (having) a lord, and I of a jongleur.

Bertoni says that phantasy and imagination coupled with a bit
 of ignorance in Provencal grammar had formulated the first vida

from these lines. The second vida also may be a fabrication from lines 67-72 of Dirai Vos senes duptansa.¹³ After Bertoni few writers put much faith in the lines of the first vida which say that Marcabru was Fils d'una paubra femna que ac nom Marcabruna - son of a poor woman who had the name Marcabruna-, or believe the statement in the second vida that he was a foundling brought up by a certain Aldrics of Vilar.

The lines in the longer vida signifying that vers was the generic name for all kinds of songs in those days occur in almost the same words in the vida of Peire d'Alvernhe. From this Paul Meyer concludes that: "Il est assez probable que le biographe de Marcabru est aussi celui de P. Auvergne, car la notion que vers était le nom commun de toute espèce de chant, se retrouve dans la vie de P. d'Auvergne dans les mêmes termes que dans celle de Marcabrun."¹⁴ Both the vidas appear in the same A manuscript. The sentence in the vida of Peire d'Alvernhe reads: Canson non fetz neguna, que non era adoncs negus cantars appellatz cansos, mas vers - "He did not compose any canson because no song was at that time called cansos, but vers." We are not sure whether this

¹³Cf. Bertoni, pp. 642-43; Appel, pp. 404-405.

¹⁴P. Meyer, "Marcabru," p. 119n.

sentence about the lack of distinction between cansos and vers was originally written by the author of the vidas or was a marginal gloss subsequently added to the text of the vidas. The existence of the two narratives is perhaps an indication that it belongs to the Italian scribe who copied the manuscript, rather than to the author of the vidas.

There exists some controversy concerning the relationship between Marcabru and Cercamon. The note in the vida was generally considered correct and many held that Cercamon was the teacher of Marcabru. For Vossler, Cercamon is the great teacher of Marcabru and the source of inspiration for all his themes and motifs.¹⁵ But Kastner wonders why "those scholars who have in recent years given special attention to Marcabru and to Cercamon should share the same view as their predecessors." He concludes:

In whichever way we look at the matter the conclusion is forced upon us that Cercamon could not have been the teacher of Marcabru. In a sense he was his pupil. This conclusion is further corroborated by the fact that the rest of the Life, which relates along with other details that Marcabru was a foundling brought up by a certain Lord Audric del Vilar, has been proved to be a mere fabrication.¹⁶

¹⁵Karl Vossler, "Der Trobador Marcabru und die Anfänge der gekünstelten Stiles," Sitzungsberichte der königlich-bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrg. 1913, 11. Abh. (Munich, 1913), pp. 14-15.

¹⁶L. E. Kastner, "Marcabru and Cercamon," Modern Language Review, XXI (1951), pp. 91, 96.

Kastner proves his theory from a chronological and literary study. The first datable lyric of Cercamon was composed in 1137 when William X of Poitou died, while Marcabru had already composed a good many of his important and famous poems by that time, having begun his poetic career at least in 1129. The seven or eight lyrics composed by Cercamon, as against forty-four by Marcabru, do not contain any theme or idea which is not seen in Marcabru with more vigor, force and elaboration. Marcabru is certainly a more powerful and original writer than Cercamon. Who should then be teacher and who the disciple? Kastner's theory is accepted by Aurelio Roncaglia, while Spanke is not convinced by it. He says: "Aus Strophe 8 (of puois nostre temps comens'a brunezir of Cercamon, Jeanroy V) hat man auf eine Abhängigkeit von Marcabrus Lavador-Lied geschlossen (wegen des Ausdrucks lavar); mich überzeugt das nicht recht. Vielleicht ist die Strophe unecht, da ihr Inhalt in den Zusammenhang gar nicht passt.¹⁷ As the last sentence of the quotation shows, Spanke tends to evade the problem, as he does in another instance. He says: "Cercamon gelegentlich ein Lied seines bedeutenderen Schulers imitiert, so ist das gleichfalls kein Beweis."¹⁸

¹⁷Hans Spanke, Marcabrustudien, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge, Nr. 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940), p. 55.

¹⁸Spanke, La Poesie lyrique des Troubadours, " Studi Medievali, VIII (1935), p. 30.

The above sentence is quoted by Mölk, who also leaves the problem unsolved with the words: "Für unsere Untersuchung ist die relative Chronologie ihrer beider Lieder wichtiger als das Jahr ihrer Geburt, weshalb wir dieser Frange im folgenden keine Beachtung mehr schenken."¹⁹

It is important for us to find out whether Cercamon is the teacher of Marcabru and whether he provides us with a clue to the interpretation of all the lyrics of the latter as Vossler assumes. He says:

Ich glaube, er (Marcabru) verdankt sie alle seinen Vorgängern und die meisten vielleicht dem Cercamon . . . Cercamon soll auch Pastorellen gedichtet haben, eine Gattung die Marcabru zur höchsten Vollendung bringt. Auch einige Stilmittel, die Verwendung des Sprichwortes, die Nennung des eigenen Namens, die Personifikation der abstracta moralia, den Binnenreim, den Zehnsilber, manche Künste des Strophenbaus dürfte er seinem Lehrer abgelauscht haben.

If Cercamon is the source book for all the concepts of Marcabru and he has simply borrowed all his ideas from his teacher, naturally we have to look into his teacher's works to understand Marcabru fully. We cannot, therefore, simply evade the problem of Marcabru-Cercamon relationship as Mölk and Spanke do. We have to see whether Cercamon is the only source for Marcabru, whether he is influenced by his supposed teacher, whether Cercamon really provides a key to the

¹⁹Ulrich Mölk, Trobar Clus, Trobar Leu (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1968), p. 23. Cf. Aurelio Roncaglia, "Marcabruno e Cercamondo," Cultura Neolatina, XI (1951), pp. 25-27.

interpretation of Marcabru's love lyrics. If Cercamon is the key to the works of Marcabru, then we will have to study his works also in detail in order to ascertain Marcabru's concept of love.

Since scholars who have made great contributions to the studies of Marcabru are involved in the controversy, any hasty conclusion would be presumptuous. The question of influence is always a delicate one, and from the works alone no one can rightly come to a conclusion as to who was the teacher, who the disciple. We have famous examples for the disciple's being greater than the master in Plato and Aristotle, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, Herder and Goethe. Since both Cercamon and Marcabru were living in the court of Poitou and had the same duke as patron, there might well be some similarity of ideas and expressions between them. From the one line, Ara.s pot hom lavar et esclarzir, we cannot conclude that Cercamon imitated Marcabru. The concept of washing and its association with the Crusade may not be something exclusive to one author or a particular person. As A. Franz says, "Möglich ist es, dass die Stelle V 43 aras pot hom lavar eine damals übliche Metaphor ist."²⁰ We have precedents for this association of washing and remission of sins in many expressions of the Bible. The psalmist prays in one

²⁰A. Franz, Über den Troubadour Marcabru (Marburg, 1914), pp. 7-9.

oft repeated prayer of the liturgy, "Wash me yet more from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin."²¹ Following the language of the Bible, the remission of sins is often called in the Councils and by the Fathers a lavacrum;²² the sacrament of baptism itself is a lavacrum and its effect is the remission of sins.²³

So there is no need to assume Marcabru's influence in Cercamon's Ara.s pot hom lavar. But it is to be attributed to the originality of perception and the poetic skill of Marcabru that out of this commonplace, abstract idea of lavacrum, he invents a concrete and familiar object by means of which he conveys a metaphysical and spiritual idea to his audience.

The baptismal font or the holy water basin found in all Christian churches of the time may have provided Marcabru with the inspiration for this invention. Both of these were

²¹Psalm L, v. 4.

²²Rouet de Journel, Enchiridion Patristicum (Freiburg, 1922), p. 117. This is a quotation from Tertullian, De Peccate, Pl I, 1217.

²³Ibid. In the letter of Pope Eugenius III to Ludovic VII, the young king of France, there is the clear mention of the absolution and the "remission of sins that was offered to all those pious Christians who might take the Cross and undertake the journey to Jerusalem with devotion." In this letter (given in full in Joannes Dominicus Mansi, Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum, (Paris-Leipzig, 1901-27), Vol. xxi, Anno 1109-1166, col. 681-82) the Pope speaks thrice of the remission of sins. This remission of sins was granted to the Crusaders by his predecessor Pope Urban when he called for the First Crusade. Such indulgences and bulls were issued by Popes in the years 1118, 1123, and 1145 as we can see in the already quoted volume of Mansi.

symbols of the interior purification their use was supposed to offer the faithful.²⁴

The arguments of Kastner from chronology are unassailable, for none of the lyrics of Cercamon seems to be composed earlier than 1135. Since the last two lyrics in Jeanroy's edition have clear allusions to events of the day, namely the death of William X and the marriage of Eleanor of Aquitaine to the king of France, their dates can easily be ascertained. The Count of Poitiers died on April 9, 1137, and the marriage of Eleanor with Louis VII took place on the thirteenth of May of the same year. Alfred Jeanroy says in his introduction to the edition of the poems of Cercamon: "C'est donc aux environs de 1135-45, et dans les cours du Poitou et du Limousin, qu'il aurait exercé ses talents."²⁵ No one assigns an earlier date to the poems of Cercamon. But now most of the critics agree with Boissonnade that Marcabru began his poetic career earlier and that some of his lyrics were written before 1130. Kastner says that at least five of Marcabru's songs were written before the spring of 1137,²⁶ when the first of Cercamon's datable lyrics was composed.²⁷ If what Kastner says is true

²⁴See "Eau bénite," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, Vol. IV, pt. 2, col. 1975-1984.

²⁵Alfred Jeanroy, *Les Poesies de Cercamon* (Paris, 1922), p. vi.

²⁶L. E. Kastner, p. 92.

²⁷According to Appel and Boissonnade, the number may be more than five. Cf. Appel, p. 418; Boissonnade, pp. 207-18 passim.

there is reason to believe that Marcabru began his poetic career at a much earlier date than Cercamon and that he was already an established and accomplished troubadour when Cercamon came into the profession. But chronology alone is not a sufficient proof for us to conclude that Cercamon was the disciple of Marcabru as Kastner thinks.

When we go through the songs of Cercamon, we feel that the comment made by Fauriel more than a century ago that he does not show much originality and skill, is still true.

In the Provençal manuscript there are but four or five pieces by him, all of the amatory kind, all in honor of some unknown lady of high rank, whom he adored or pretended to adore. The pieces are too indifferent to bear translation; they contain nothing original, either in matter or in form; they are manifestly nothing more than a refusion, a sort of patchwork combination of the commonplaces of chivalric poetry and gallantry, already in vogue in his time, and before him.²⁸

The lyrics of Marcabru, on the other hand, are so far superior in quality and craftsmanship that the same scholar comments, "This Marcabru was a personage of original mind and character, concerning whom it is to be regretted that we possess not more ample and more reliable sources of information."²⁹

Though Fauriel attributes only "four or five" pieces to Cercamon, in the edition of Alfred Jeanroy there are seven

²⁸C. C. Fauriel, History of Provençal Poetry, trans. G. J. Adler (New York: Haskell House, 1860), p. 352.

²⁹Ibid., p. 353.

lyrics attributed to him and an eighth one of doubtful attribution given in the appendix. Of these the first five are mostly amatory and we see in them many expressions reminiscent of Marcabru. The first one - Quant l'aura doussa s'amarzis - is a love poem in the courtly style. The beloved is unreachable, the lover is without hope and fears that he might lose his senses for the love of her. When the whole world is darkened he sees splendor where she was.

The second - Ab lo temps qi fai refreschar - is a simple love poem. It begins with the Natureingang; it is spring. The poet praises the beauty of his beloved; she is beautiful beyond words; she has a fresh color and a good look; she is of a splendor that is not darkened. She is sincere and faithful; never does she wish to betray her friend. In the sixth strophe there are some generalizations about love: "Love is sweet on entrance and bitter on departure; one day it makes you weep and another day exult and rejoice." In the last strophe he sends a messenger to pay homage to her and tell her that he is dying for love of her.

The third - Assatz es or' oimai q'eu chan - is also a love-poem but a bit different. He begins with a new resolution; he has to wake up, he has been sleeping long, and his songs are not heard very far. He ends with praise of himself and calls for a jongleur to sing and play his song well.

The fourth - Ab lo pascor m'es bel qu'eu chan - has much in common with Marcabru: it is a poem censuring love. It is

spring, the beginning of May and the time of the Passover, a time famous in literature for love. But to the author, "The time of courtship is of little worth to me," because neither has he joy nor does he expect it. The wicked and the lax get more out of love than the better and the more worthy. He speaks against those married men who go courting and finally consoles himself with the thought that all such people are doomed to the fire of Hell.

The fifth lyric of Cercamon - Puois nostra temps comens'a brunezir - also censures love; here the distinction is made between noble and ignoble love. He sees only two out of a thousand as loyal lovers. The number is low in comparison with Marcabru who says (in Bel m'es quan la rana chanta lines 12-13) that he sees only forty out of a thousand whom Proeza loves. Cercamon laments the "fleeting of Youth and the corruption of Prowess; Felony holds the keys of the barons" - all commonplaces very often repeated in Marcabru. All these phrases and ideas are seen more vehemently and with biting sarcasm in Marcabru, while Cercamon's expressions are smooth, polished, and commonplace. In this lyric there is the famous strophe often quoted as a case of Marcabru's influence on Cercamon and vice versa.

Ara.s pot hom lavar et esclarzir
 De gran blasme, silh qu'en son encompros;
 E si es pros yssira ves Roays,
 E gurpira lo segle perilhos,
 Et ab aitan pot si liurar del fays
 Qu'assatz en fai trabucar e perir. (Jeanroy V, 43-48)

Now every one can wash and purify himself
 of great shame, every one who is burdened with it.
 And he who is valiant will leave for Edessa,
 And will abandon the world that is full of dangers.
 And thus he can liberate himself of the burden
 that makes many fall and perish.

Kastner says that the expression Ara.s pot hom lavar et esclarzir "shows that Cercamon had in his mind his predecessor's famous song"³⁰ of the lavador; Vossler thinks that "dieses Lied mit seinem Aufruf zum Kreuzzug in der achten Strophe birgt wohl den Keim zu Marcabrus berühmten Sirventes del Lavador."³¹ There is no intrinsic proof in the passage to show who was the source of inspiration for this concept. All agree that Marcabru's Lavador is more striking and more original. Spanke doubts whether the three strophes 6-8 are genuinely Cercamon's since they are given only in the C manuscript, he thinks that the strophes are "teils unecht."³²

The sixth lyric of Cercamon - Lo plaing comens iradamen - is evidently a lament on the death of the Count of Poitiers, William X of Aquitaine, his patron. The poet makes many direct

³⁰Kastner, p. 94.

³¹Vossler, op. cit., p. 14.

³²Hans Spanke, Marcabrustudien: Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge, Nr. 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940), p. 55.

references to the Count and his relationship with him; it shows clearly how deeply he felt the departure of the Count and how dependent he was on him for his living and writing. It begins directly as a lamentation and ends with a prayer to guard him from Hell.

Lo plaing comenz iradamen
 D'un vers don hai lo cor dolen;
 Ir' e dolor e marrimen
 Ai, car vei abaissar Joven;
 Malvestatz puej' e Jois dissen
 Despois muric lo Peitavis.

Remazut son li prez e ill lau
 Qi solon issir de Peitau.
 Ai! com lo plagno li Barrau.
 Peza.m s'a longas sai estau.
 Segner, lo baro q'ieu mentau
 Metetz, si.us platz, em paradis!

Del comte de Peitau mi plaing
 Q'era de Proeza compaing;
 Despos Pretz et Donars soffraing,
 Peza.m s'a lonjas sai remaing.
 Segner, d'efern lo faitz estraing,
 Qu molt per fon genta sa fis.

(VI, 1-18)

This complaint I begin with sorrow
with a verse which makes my heart suffer.
I have sorrow, suffering and distress;
for I see that Jovens is going down,
Wickedness ascends and Joy descends,
since the Poitevin is dead.

Those good acts and noble qualities are no more,
which always come from Poitou.
Oh, how sad are the Barrois for him.
It will oppress me if I remain long in this world.
Lord, the baron whom I name,
place him, if it please you, in Paradise.

I lament for the Count of Poitou,
for he was the companion of Prowess.
Since Valor and Generosity are no more,
it will oppress me if I remain long in this world.
Lord, guard him from Hell,
for his end was very noble.

From these lines we can note the difference in style and personality between the two poets. Cercamon is direct, logical, clear, articulate, and rational. Marcabru, writing at about the same time, about the same theme, gives expression to his sincere sorrow and sense of loss in a completely different manner.

Antiocha, Pretz e Valor
 Sai plora Guiana e Peitaus.
 Dieus, Seigner, al tieu lavador
 L'arma del comte met en paus:
 E sai gart Peitieux e Niort
 Lo Seigner qui ressors del vas! (Dej. XXXV, 67-72)

Antioch, Worth and Virtue
 are mourned in Guyenne and Poitou.
 God, Lord, by your lavador
 give peace to the soul of the Count.
 And here may Poitou and Niort be guarded
 by the Lord who rose from the tomb.

The title of Marcabru's song shows that Pax in nomine Domini was written as a funeral lamentation. But it took centuries of research and study for scholars to understand that Marcabru had written these lines on the occasion of the death of the Count, his patron. Diez and Suchier, for example, had thought that the Count about whom Marcabru speaks was Richard the Lion-Hearted of England, the grandson of William X.³³ Chabaneau maintained that the poem Pax in nomine Domini was

³³F. Diez, Leben und Werke, p. 55. Cf. Paul Meyer, op. cit., p. 126; C. Chabaneau, "Sur la date du Vers del Lavador de Marcabru," Revue des Langues Romanes, XXVII (1885), pp. 250-51.

composed as a funeral lamentation after the death of Raymond, the Prince of Antioch and the brother of William.³⁴ Though a careful reading of the text would bring us to the conclusion that Marcabru is here bewailing the death of a Count, and not a Prince, and that the people of Poitiers and Niort were exposed to danger, not by the death of the Prince of Antioch on June 27, 1149, in his fight against the Emir of Damas, but by the death of William X, the Count of Poitou during his pilgrimage to the shrine of Compostella,³⁵ we can see that the obscurity of Marcabru has caused many scholars a real problem and led them to many false surmises. In contrast to the obscurity of expression and richness of imagery, which are the characteristic note of Marcabru, we have in Cercamon's lyric a clear and straightforward funeral lamentation: There is no question about the subject, and no rich and ambiguous image like the lavador.³⁶

The seventh lyric of Cercamon - Car vei fenir a tot dia - is a tenson with one Guilhalmi, which also shows the abundance of the favors the poet had received from his patron and the hopelessness of his situation at the death of the Count. In

³⁴Chabaneau, pp. 250-51. Cf. R. Ruggieri, "Chiose interpretative del Vers del Lavador," Cultura Neolatina XII (1952), pp. 81-101.

³⁵Ordericus Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica, PL CLXXXV, pp. 955-56.

³⁶A. Delmonte, Studi sulla poesia ermetica medievale, (Naples, 1953), pp. 46-50.

the tenson Guilhalmi says that the king of France will take the Count's place as his patron, but the poet retorts that he does not believe that.

It is clear from the context that this tenson was written after the death of the Count and the marriage of his daughter with Louis VII, King of France. Cercamon expected little from the King and he had little hope that the new master of Poitou would be very much interested in his writings and listening to his lyrics. He has definitely lost his place in the court of Poitou and the source of his income and his living. So, like a swan, he bids farewell to his world. Here also we see less obscurity and less art in comparison with Marcabru. Cercamon says plainly what he feels and thinks about his future situation. But in Marcabru there is only one passage where he mentions that since the Poitevin is dead he will perish like Arthur of England.

Puois lo Peitavis m'es faillitz

Serai mai cum Artur perdutz. (IV, 59-60)

Since I am deprived of the Poitevin

I will perish as Arthur.

The solution given by Spanke and quoted by Mölk about the Cercamon-Marcabru relationship: "Aber selbst wenn Cercamon gelegentlich ein Lied seines bedeutenderen Schülers imitiert, so ist das gleichfalls kein Beweis; man denke an ein ganz ähnliches Verhältnis zwischen dem früheren Trouvere Huy d'Oisy

und seinem bekannteren Schüler Conon de Bethune."³⁷ is not fully satisfactory. Here it is not a question of Cercamon's quoting from one of his disciples, but how Marcabru, who began his poetic career in 1129-30, could be the disciple of Cercamon whose first datable poem appeared only after 1137, which is the date of the death of the Count. Spanke says about Lo vers comens quan vei del fau (Dej. XXXIII) that this poem shows the poet at his best: "Originalität und Schönheit jedoch teilt es mit dem besten des Dichters."³⁸ There is clear indication that this lyric was written before 1135. So if Marcabru was a well established troubadour many years before Cercamon began composing, there is absolutely no way of calling Marcabru Cercamon's disciple.

Judging from the lyrics, the relationship between Cercamon and Marcabru seems to have been not one of master and disciple, but that of competitors in the same profession, and rivals for the favor of the same patron. There are lines both in Marcabru and in Cercamon which might suggest such a relationship.

³⁷H. Spanke, "Poésie lyrique des Troubadours," Studi Medievali, p. 30.

³⁸Spanke, Marcabrustudien, p. 88.

Plas es lo vers, vauc l'afinan
 Ses mot vila, fals, apostitz,
 E es totz enaissi bastitz
 C'ap motz politz lo vau uzan,
 E tot ades va's meilluran
 S'es qi be.l chant ni be.l desplei (Jeanroy III, 31-36)

The verse is simple, and I refine it
 without one vile, false, or improper word.
 It is entirely constructed in such a way
 that I use only polished words.
 And it goes on improving always
 if there is someone who signs and presents it well.³⁹

These lines, though they express a commonplace theme, may
 very well be directed against Mercabru in whom we meet with many
 "vile" and "improper" words. The lyrics of Mercabru abound in
 expressions like, "amor deu truoill" (VI, 53), "maritz qui l'autrui
 con grata" (XI, 49), "seguon la natura del ca" (II, 28), etc.⁴⁰
 All these expressions are used invariably to mean illicit love
 relations indulged in by men who belong to the upper niveau
 of society. Unlike Cercamon, who is always vague and hazy

³⁹For more examples of such texts see Dejeanne. IX, 1-4; XIIa 5; XV, 3-5 etc.

⁴⁰"Love of the winepress," "husband who scratches the cunt of another," "they follow the nature of the dog."

about individual people, and satisfied with universal and general comments about married men going after new courtships and gallantry, Marcabru, for greater directness, gives names to these people. Though some of these names are fictitious and perhaps invented for the sake of rhyme, there is an image of reality and an enhancement of verisimilitude in such proper names as N'Esteves, En Constans, En Ucs, Berartz Monleydier, etc.

In Assatz es or' oimai q'en chan (Jeanroy III) Cercamon says that he has to wake up, that he had been sleeping long, his songs are not heard very far. Why does he have to wake up unless there is an abler and more popular competitor in court who engulfs his reputation as a troubadour? Whose songs are then heard very far, if not Marcabru's songs that make him realize that he must "wake up"? These lines can well be interpreted to show that the relationship between Cercamon and Marcabru was more that of competitors than of teacher-disciple. Scheludko goes even further and asserts that by these lines Cercamon means a moral waking up, because he just learnt from Marcabru that there are two kinds of loves and the poet is thereby enriched in his concept of love.⁴¹

⁴¹"Über die Theorien der Liebe," pp. 214-15.

Thus both chronology and the literary skill evinced in the poems contradict the statement in the vida that Cercamon was the teacher of Marcabru. Even if the three strophes of Cercamon were spurious in part, as Spanke suggests, there is nothing in Cercamon's songs to show that he was the teacher of Marcabru, who was evidently a more significant troubadour and a better known personality.

Knowing the real nature of their relationship is not as important to us as knowing that Cercamon was not a source of inspiration for Marcabru, that Cercamon does not provide us with any clue to the interpretation of Marcabru's lyrics, that Marcabru's concept of love is not necessarily related to Cercamon's.

The sentence in the vida stating that Marcabru was acclaimed and heard of through the world and feared on account of his tongue, may well be true. There is no doubt that he was a prominent personality and few of his contemporaries and successors could escape his influence. About his influence on his contemporaries Kastner says:

No troubadour has exercised a greater influence than Marcabru not only on his immediate contemporaries, but also on his successors; no one attracted greater attention for more than a hundred and fifty years after his death. The Vers del Lavador is mentioned about 1200 by Guilhem Magret as a favorite piece for recitation. Another troubadour, Bermon Rascas, alludes to it in one of his songs;

and we are told by the author of Flamenca that it was sung by the minstrels at the marriage of his heroine. In Joufroi, a thirteenth century French romance, we read that Marcabru was a "trouvere de grand pris" and that he was well known to Henry of England, whose court he visited in London.⁴²

Here Kastner follows Appel, who says: "Kaum wird ein anderer Trobador so oft von ältern und jüngern Dichtern genannt wie er, von den unmittelbaren Zeitgenossen an über 150 Jahre hinweg bis zu Matfre Ermengau, zum Verfasser der Flamenca und zum französischen Dichter des Joufroyromans."⁴³

For the first time in Provençal Marcabru made use of the hissing sword of satire for the reform of society. Vossler and Scheludko think that Marcabru owes his ideas of reforming society to the sermons and homilies of the time.⁴⁴ This cannot be ascertained because we do not possess any example of this type of satire and invective in the sermons and the homilies of the day. The Fathers never make use of satire as a means of reforming society or as a part of their didacticism. There might have been monks and religious who, though living in the abbey or the monastery, indulged in literary pursuits and composed verses of satire in imitation of Ovid or Juvenal.⁴⁵ But these verses were not a part of

⁴²Kastner, pp. 95-96.

⁴³Appel, p. 428.

⁴⁴Scheludko, "Beiträge," p. 178; Vossler, p. 44 et passim.

⁴⁵For a specimen of such a satiric verse by a monk see Spanke, Marcabrustudien, p. 69.

any homily or sermon, and they are vastly different from Marcabru's songs both in style and intention. Marcabru's idea of reforming society is remote from monastic idealism. Marcabru's primary aim is not religious reform, but the cultivation of Jovens and Jois, and the reform of the noble class.

Though the manner of Marcabru's death is not essential to the understanding of his lyrics, it may give us a clue to their influence and popularity at the time. Whether the vida is true or not,⁴⁶ it shows that even a century after the death of Marcabru there existed a tradition in Provençal that Marcabru was murdered by those nobles whom he had accused in his lyrics. Those people who heard Marcabru's lyrics believed that the same lyrics had cost the author his life. The fact that such a story spread among the people and was believed by them as true is itself a testimony to the fame and influence of Marcabru's songs.

Thus we see how many questions and doubts have been raised by scholars about most of the details concerning the birth, life, and career of our poet. We are now apt to suspect everything that the vidas say about him. Since the vidas are of subsequent origin, written at least a century

⁴⁶Bertoni reduces the whole vida in the Vatican manuscript ad absurdum; however no other critic has seriously questioned what the vida says about his death. It was against those nobles and knights of Guyenne that the poet had directed most of his sirventes. To say that only the filla de vilana and pastora mestissa knew how to keep Mezura and that only the low-class peasants understood fin' amor was an insult to the society founded on feudalism. Such insults, whether they are true or not, will have their remuneration, namely, death.

later than the lyrics themselves, a better and more authentic source of information about the life of the poet is the collection of the songs themselves. From these songs we can gather many details about his life and career.

There is a clear and precise allusion to King Louis VII of France in A la fontana del vergier (Dej. I).

Ay! mala fos reys Lozoicx
Que fay los mans e los prezicx
Per que.l dols m'es en cor intratz! (I, 26-28)

Ay! Cursed by King Louis
who caused these orders and the summons
on account of which sorrow entered my heart.

The reference is evidently to the Second Crusade of 1147. Earlier scholars, like Diez and Suchier, considered this piece the first of Marcabru, dating it at the beginning of his poetic career and stretching the period of his creativity until as late as 1180.⁴⁷ But later scholars like Paul Meyer, Boissonnade, and Appel consider this lyric as one of his last and close the career of the poet around the year 1152.⁴⁸ Appel gives as a probable date of Marcabru's birth the year 1110,⁴⁹

⁴⁷Diez, Leben und Werke, p. 55; C. Chabaneau, pp. 250-51; Cf. Paul Meyer, p. 126.

⁴⁸C. Appel, p. 404; Boissonnade, pp. 207-210 passim. Cf. Anna Hatcher, "Marcabru's A la fontana del vergier," Modern Language Notes, LXXIX (1964), pp. 284-95.

⁴⁹Appel, p. 421.

which is not much different from the supposition of Boissonnade.⁵⁰ A date far away from this would be unreasonable because the first song of Marcabru is supposed to have appeared in 1129-30.⁵¹ The two poets, Cercamon and Marcabru, might have lived at the court of the famous troubadour William IX and his son William X, because in 1137 Cercamon laments the death of the two Counts of Poitou. The rule of William, the ninth Duke of Aquitaine, the seventh Count of Poitou and the earliest known troubadour, extended from October, 1086, to February, 1126.⁵² The reign of his son, William X, whom both poets admired, lasted only eleven years, and he died young during a pilgrimage to the Abbey of Compostella in doubtful circumstances.⁵³ Since Marcabru does not mention the name of William IX in any of his poems, it is almost certain that his principal patron and protector was his son, William X, during whose time the poet rose in reputation. The favor that the Count showed to the poor troubadour from Gascony must have been constant and generous, for while Marcabru speaks satirically of all counts and princes, he praises the Count of Poitou, and the Count in turn has inspired the poet with some of his

⁵⁰Boissonnade, p. 209.

⁵¹Cf. Ibid., p. 213

⁵²Boissonnade, p. 210.

⁵³Ordericus Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica, PL, CLXXXV, pp. 955-56.

best pieces. In the poem Lo vers comens quan vei del fau (Dej. XXXIII) the poet laments bitterly the decadence of virtue and Youth and the fall of Prowess in the whole of Christendom, with the exception of Poitou, where this flower of chivalry was still flourishing.

Que non aug dir, fors en Peitau,
C'om s'en atill. (XXXIII, 23-24)

For nowhere else, except in Poitou, do I hear it said
that people adhere (to virtue).

In another poem, Al prim comens de l'ivernaill, where he deplores the death of his protector, his despair attests to the extent of the benefits he had been receiving through the generosity of the Count of Poitou. He says that since he is deprived of the Poitevin he will be lost like Arthur (lines 59-60).

In two other lyrics, namely in Assatz m'es bel del temps essuig (Dej. VIII) and Aujatz de chan com enans' e meillura (Dej. IV), the poet refers to William X. Each of these four instances indicates a particular period in the life of the Count and of the poet, and there are many historical associations with the events suggested in those lines.

The lyric Assatz m'es bel del temps essuig was evidently written during the war between Poitou and Anjou. The lyric ends with a war-cry against Anjou. The rivalries between the Angevins and the Poitevins had culminated in a war which began

in 1129 and ended in 1131. According to Boissonnade, this was the only occasion when William had to fight with the Count of Anjou, and later they were always at peace.⁵⁴

The troubles in the dukedom of Anjou were hardly over when there came the news of the death of Pope Honorius and the anarchy that prevailed in the Church after his death. In the year 1130 Pope Honorius died.⁵⁵ Two Popes were immediately consecrated by different factions, Innocent II and Anacletus II, and both appealed for acceptance to the whole of Christendom. A Council was convened at Etampes by King Louis VI of France who called upon St. Bernard to preside over it. The Council unanimously voted for Innocent and acclaimed Innocent as Pope forthwith.⁵⁶ The Council's decision, however, did not end the controversy, and the various kings and princes did not accept Innocent automatically. The only place north of the Alps where Innocent found difficulty and saw people clinging to the party of Anacletus, the Antipope, was Poitou.⁵⁷ The reason was that there was no one to resist Count William of Poitou, all of whose subjects

⁵⁴Boissonnade, pp. 212-13. Cf. P. Falk, "Sur un vers de Marcabru Que i ant fait li buzat d'Anjou, cal desmerill," Studia Neophilologica, XXXIII (1960), pp. 41-52.

⁵⁵Watkin Williams, St. Bernard of Clairvaux (Manchester, 1935), pp. 99-133. A whole chapter deals with the schism of Aquitaine.

⁵⁶Mansi, Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum, vol. XXI, pp. 437-38; PL CLXXXVIII, pp. 933-34.

⁵⁷Ernauld Bonval, Vita Prima Sancti Bernardi, PL CLXXXV, p. 286.

remained loyal to Anacletus. Finally, through the influence and efforts of St. Bernard, William was brought to the side of Innocent and peace was restored to the Church.⁵⁸

We are not sure how many lyrics of Marcabru have been directly influenced by the Count's adherence to the party of Anacletus. Though all critics agree that Marcabru adhered to the party of Anacletus, they are not unanimous in their account of the influence of the papal schism on the poet, some ascribing more passages in his lyrics to this influence than others.

An example of the disagreement among scholars in the interpretation of particular passages in Marcabru can be seen in their explanation of the sixth strophe of Aujatz de chan.

Proeza.s franh et avoleza.s mura
E no vol Joi cuillir dinz sa clauzura;
Dreit ni razon no vei mantener gaire
Quan per aver es uns gartz emperaire. (IX, 21-24)

Prowess is broken and Avoleza remains within the walls
and does not want to welcome Joy within the enclosure;
I don't see right and reason kept at all
when thanks to money a scoundrel (a boy) is emperor.

Robertson thinks that the line "It does not want to welcome Joy in the enclosure" refers to the monks of Clairvaux who were

⁵⁸Ordericus Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica, PL CLXXXV, p. 290; Williams, p. 133.

active in the elections of Popes and in the political affairs of the time.⁵⁹ The last line of the strophe, which says that thanks to money a boy (or a scoundrel) is emperor, has given rise to many conjectures and surmises. Diez and Suchier, who take gartz to mean "boy," think that the line refers to the Emperor Alexius of Constantinople who ascended the throne at the age of thirteen.⁶⁰ The main objection to identifying Marcabru's Emperaire in this strophe with Alexius II of Constantinople consists in this: Alexius II became Emperor of Constantinople only in 1180, and this lyric was definitely written before 1135.⁶¹ The idea that Marcabru refers here to Lothaire, as suggested by Paul Meyer and approved and elaborated by Boissonnade, does not convince us completely, because we do not see any historical document which proves that the attitude of Lothaire to the Pope was too servile. What we do get is the implication that Lothaire made some demands of Pope Innocent II which were denied him because of the intervention of St. Bernard, "who spoke with him (Emperor Lothaire II) with a wonderful freedom and authority" even after denying him what he had asked.⁶² There is more

⁵⁹"Five Poems," p. 544.

⁶⁰H. Suchier, "Der Troubadour Marcabru," Jahrbuch für rom. und eng. Sprache und Literatur XIV (1875), p. 143.

⁶¹See Paul Meyer, pp. 127-28 and Boissonnade, pp. 215-16.

⁶²Watkin Williams, p. 109.

reason to think that this is a general statement, as Appel suggests,⁶³ for there are many occasions in the history of those times when money played an important role in the election of kings, dukes, bishops, and even popes.⁶⁴

Robertson thinks that the two lines in Al departir del brau tempier, namely,

Neys l'ortolas ab lo clavier,

Jos ab un vent, s'en fuy huelhs cucx (Dej. III 41-42)⁶⁵

The gardener himself with the keyring,

has fled with closed eyes at the blast of a wind.

reflect the condition of the Church during the schism; and that the statement that the gardener has fled with the keys means that there is no Pope to take care of the flock.⁶⁶

Again, critics disagree and it is not clear whether there is

⁶³"Zu Marcabru," p. 407.

⁶⁴See Watkin Williams, pp. 114-33.

⁶⁵Cf. Aurelio Roncaglis, "Marcabruno: Al departir del brau tempier," Cultura Neolatina XIII (1953), p. 8.

⁶⁶D. W. Robertson, "Five Poems by Marcabrun," p. 542.

an allusion in the passage to the schism.⁶⁷

In the last strophe of Bel m'es can s'esclarziz l'onda the poet refers to his patron.

Se.l segnorius de Gironda

Poia, encar poiara plus,

Ab qe pense com confonda

Paia, so.ilh manda Jhezus. (XII bis, 46-49)

⁶⁷This is not a clear passage and many interpretations are given to it. According to Dejeanne, ortolas means the people in the garden (Poésies Complètes, p. 12); but Lewent says that ortolas is singular which means "gardener" and clavier means "Schlüsselbund" (Beiträge, p. 312). Lewent does not come to a conclusion about its reference. Appel also is vague about the passage; for him clavier is "Schlüssel zum Garten" (Zu Marcabru, p. 445). But Spanke gives it a definite meaning and a definite reference. He says that: "Der Herr des Gartens, der Gärtner mit dem Schlüsselbund ist plötzlich geflohen, in vertauschter Kleidung mit geschlossenen Augen: er ist gestorben. Der Schluss der Strophe, den Appel nicht übersetzt, befürchtet schlimme Folgen für die verlassenen 'Bäume'. Der Gestorbene war offenbar Wilhelm X.von Poitou" (Marcabrustudien, p. 64). Errante thinks that the lines refer to the words of the Bible: "Ego sum pastor bonus. Bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ovibus suis. Mercenarius autem et qui non est pastor, cujus non sunt oves propriae, videt lupum venientem, et dimittit oves et fugit, et lupus rapit, et disperget oves: mercenarius autem fugit, quia mercenarius est, et non pertinet ad eum de ovibus. Ego sum pastor bonus, et cognosco meas, et cognoscunt me meae" (John X, 11-16). Guido Errante, Marcabru e le fonti sacre dell'antica lirica romanza (Florence, 1946), p. 213. Aurelio Roncaglia, on the other hand, thinks that we should not look for references in the world of the time or in the Sacred Scripture, but rather in the fantasy of Marcabru and his usual motifs. According to Roncaglia, it is Jois et Jovens that has fled (Marcabruno: Al departir del brau tempier pp. 27-28).

If the lordship of Girond ascends,
it will ascend still more,

provided that he wants to confound the pagans.

Jesus commands him to do that.

Boissonnade says that this passage refers to a time in the life of William just after his reconciliation with Innocent II under the auspices of St. Bernard.⁶⁸ He enumerates a series of events and circumstances to show "how fortune smiled for the first time on the Duke of Aquitaine," and to prove that he really "ascended" as the poet says.⁶⁹

But contrary to the expectation of the poet, the Count died on Good Friday, 1137, on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Compostella.⁷⁰ The death of the Count was a severe blow to the poet and his thought now turned in another direction. He wrote the Lavador song, the most famous of all Marcabru's

⁶⁸"L'histoire dans le Marcabru," pp. 217-18.

⁶⁹Ibid.

⁷⁰"Eodem tempore, Gulielmus, Pictavensium dux, memor malorum quae nuper in Normandia operatus est, poenitentia motus, ad Sanctum Jacobum peregre profectus est. Deinde feria VI Parasceve, V Idus Aprilis, sacra communione munitus est, et ante aram Beati Apostoli venerabiliter defunctus est. Filiam vero suam Ludovico juveni Francorum regi in conjugem dari praecepit, ipsumque regem totius juris sui haeredem constituit: quod ita postea factum est." Ordericus Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica, PL CLXXXV, pp. 955-56.

compositions. The title Pax in nomine Domini suggests that it was written at the demise of someone he loved. This was none other than his patron.

Having lost his patron, Marcabru turns to the Emperor of Spain, Alphonse VII of Castille and Lyons, and addresses two lyrics to him. The first is a sort of eulogy to the Emperor and the poet invites him to the Crusade; the second refers to his own person and shows his disillusionment. Around the year 1147, Marcabru comes back to France and writes A la fontana del vergier which is set against the background of the Second Crusade. In the poem, Marcabru realistically depicts a situation which was common and was typical of the times of the Crusade. "Many beautiful ladies and daughters of the Lords of castles" had to mourn then and weep for their lovers who were far away in the Orient. St. Bernard wrote in a letter to Pope Eugenius III about the success of his preaching the Crusade: "The cities and the castles are deserted to such an extent that there is scarcely a man left for seven women; everywhere we see nothing but widows whose husbands are yet alive."⁷¹ It is about one such "widow" that Marcabru writes here. The intense love which she had for her lover who is far away in the Orient makes her think that all her woes and miseries were caused by King Louis who led the Crusade.

⁷¹St. Bernard, Litterae, PL CLXXXV, 1207.

At this time he writes another lyric - Cortesamen vuoill commensar - (Dej. XV) in which he defines Courtly love. This lyric is the key to the interpretation of all his other lyrics. He dedicates this song to Jaufre Rudel beyond the sea and to the people who had gone with him on the Crusade. We are not sure of the time or the extent of the relationship that existed between the poet and Jaufre Rudel.

There are three lyrics which belong together, the two starling poems, - Estornel, cueill ta volada (Dej. XXV) and Ges l'estornels non s'oblida (Dej. XXVI) - and Hueymais dey esser alegrens (Dej. XXXIV) because of their allusions to places that are not far from one another. Lerida in the starling poems and Urgel are places in the Northeast of Spain and these lyrics might have been written when Marcabru spent his time there.⁷²

Since all the datable lyrics of Marcabru have now been dealt with, we may recall some of the most important phases of his life and those political, social, and ecclesiastical events of the time which he had to witness and had, more or less, to participate in. During the time he stayed in Poitou, he witnessed the rivalries between Anjou and Poitou and the resulting social upheaval. The troubles with Anjou were hardly over when there arose the papal schism. Peace was restored to the Church in the year 1135 when the Count submitted to

⁷²Boissonnade, op. cit., pp. 231-32.

St. Bernard. Around 1135, Marcabru went to Alphonse Jordan of Toulouse; he was unhappy there and thought of going over to Alphonse VII of Castille. While in Spain, the poet heard of the death of the Count and wrote the Lavador song. Finding no hope in the new master of Poitou, he went over to the Emperor of Spain, and wrote the two songs addressed to him. He came back to France at about the time of the Second Crusade, wrote A la fontana and dedicated another song to Jaufre Rudel. He spent some time in the Northeast of Spain near Lerida, and while there, wrote the Starling poems. He found a patron with the name of Lord Audric whom he later left in dissatisfaction.

The life of the poet, as far as we can gather from his lyrics, shows that the poet spent much of his time in worry and anxiety. After leaving Poitou he never found a generous patron. Still, he had a pride and self-consciousness of his own; he felt that he was superior to all the others of his profession in his ideas about love, in his capacity as a troubadour, in the art of verse making. Sometimes he felt that the bad and the frivolous got more encouragement and patronage than those who sang about noble love, that the rich, the kings, and the dukes took more pleasure in hearing about adulterous and lustful love than about noble and pure love. Still he was not prepared to change his ideas or his concepts; he had taken upon himself the obligation to teach the world the art of pure and noble love. He had to castigate adulterous love even when he knew that it would be to no avail.⁷³

⁷³Cf. Jeremias, vi, 17; vii, 27; Isaias, i, 19 etc.

CHAPTER II

THE TWOFOLD DIVISION OF LOVE IN MARCABRU AND IN THE FATHERS

In most of his poems Marcabru analyses the essence of love. His purpose is to teach his audience how to love well and with nobility. This didactic purpose of the poet is discernible in each of his poems, from the first to the last. His fight is mainly against the adulterous habits of the nobility.

In his poems Marcabru distinguishes two kinds of love. He makes use of two different names to designate them: amors and amars. The word amors comes obviously from the Latin substantive amor and is the general term for love. We are not quite sure of the origin of the word amars. James J. Wilhelm says that the word amars comes from the gerund of the Latin verb amare and is obviously colloquial.¹ But Aurelio Roncaglia thinks that it is derived from the Latin adjective amarus, and was commonly used in medieval writings in the meaning of false love, especially after the distinction of St. Anselm: "Duo sunt amores, alter bonus, alter malus, alter dulcis, alter amarus, non se

¹Seven Troubadours, (Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 1970), p. 71.

simul in uno capiunt corpore."²

Marcabru does not always use the word amars when he wants to designate false or unfaithful love. For example, in Al son desviat, chantaire (Dej. V), in the third line he speaks of fals' amistat and in the seventh line refers to this false friendship as cest' amors. Since it seems that Marcabru makes use of the word amars only when he wants to stress the bitterness that follows adulterous love, most likely the word does not in itself mean false love but only an aspect of it, namely bitterness. Many Fathers have emphasized that false love does not lead to real joy but only to bitterness.³ Roncaglia's explanation thus appears to be more probable, and amars, therefore, does not seem to be derived from amandus, the gerund, or from amans, ("n" in Latin could become "r" in Old Provençal) the present participle of amare, but from the adjective amarus.

In Marcabru there are more songs that speak about illicit love than about noble love; the poet castigates false love more often than he praises faithful love. The

²"Trobar clus: discussione aperta," Cultura Neolatina, XXIX (1969), 20.

³Cf. Adam Scot, Sermones: PL, CXCVIII, 384; 2 Kings xiii, 14-15.

poet's stress on the condemnation of illicit love might have been occasioned by the attitude of his contemporaries toward false love. The poet is quite aware of the kind of love that is noble and honest and some of his verses are devoted to the exaltation of noble love.

The poet's fundamental attitude to love that is not sincere and honest is shown in the poem Ans que.l terminis verdei (Dej. VII). He says in this lyric that he hates love because it knows so much how to deceive and lie.

Amor no vueill ni dezir,
Tan sap d'engan ab mentir; (VII, 9-10)

I do not wish or desire love,
it knows so well how to deceive and lie.

The poet repeats the same idea in another instance in the same poem:

Per Amor sueill esser guais,
Mas eu no.n serai jamais
C'una.m n'enguanet e.m trais
Per que m'en gup e m'en lais. (VII, 17-20)

By love one is accustomed to be gay,
but I will never be so,
because a woman cheated and betrayed me.
Therefore I abandon and reject love.

In the strophe that follows, Marcabru explains further the nature of this deceitful love:

C'Amors es plena d'enguan,
Per aver se vai camjan (VII, 25-26)

This love is full of deceit
it changes for the sake of money.

Amors que vai mercadan
A diables la coman. (VII, 31-32)

The love which turns into a trade,
I commend it to the devil.

In this lyric Marcabru shows clearly which kind of love he dislikes and why he dislikes it. He disapproves of false and unfaithful love, for it easily turns into a trade. Even if you are as worthy as a marquis, he says in the next strophe, do not strive for love when you have no more money left.

In the lyric En arbriu, s'esclaira il riu contra.l pascor (Dej. XXIV), Marcabru castigates love in a similar vein, although here the role of money is false love is not mentioned. He speaks about the colors of love: according to the poet, noble love has a uniform white color, and unfaithful love a changing color.

Denan mei n'i passon trei al passador,
 Non sai mot tro.l quartz la fot e.l quinz lai cor.
 Enaissi torn' a decli l'amors e torn en negror.

(XXIV, 19-21)

Three [wicked men] pass before my eyes on the way,
 I don't say a word till the fourth fucks her
 and the fifth runs to the place.

It is thus that love declines and turns black.
 This unending line of lovers being received by the same lady
 is distressing to the poet. He calls them deceivers and
 robbers. These lines censure adultery and the profession
 of prostitution. By means of a familiar and homely pro-
 verb he makes himself clear in the last strophe:

Aquist con son deziron e raubador,
 Tuit cill gartz i clamon partz et ill en lor,
 E qui mieills fa sordeitz a, cum de l'agnel an
 pastor. (XXIV, 22-24)

These cons are ravenous and lustful,
 All those scoundrels claim their share, and they
 theirs.

And who does better has the worse, as pastors
 have the worst part of the lamb.⁴

⁴Translation, Cf. Lewent, "Beiträge," p. 430.

The tornada says that he who skins the vulture removes the skin from a hard bird, which suggests that the poet who wants to correct the adulterous habits of the people is aware of the fact that he is handling a difficult situation. Bel m'es can s'esclarziz l'onda (Dej. XII^{bis}) can also be included among the lyrics of direct castigation of false love. Some of Marcabru's expressions in this poem are as outright and rough as we find in any other. He compares the gallantry of men who have a second key and hunt after cons to the smile of a dog and the jewel of an ass. Later he laments about the misery that women cause us and says that if one strips and the other shaves, he has no part in it. He concludes with a prayer that God confound those whose gallantry goes overboard.

The same idea is repeated in some other poems though not in such direct terms. In these lyrics the censuring of adultery and false love is more sober and the poet's indignation more restrained. In the lyric Al son desviat, chantaire (Djeanne V), he says in the second strophe that false love is a cheat; by its cunning it shaves without water. After shaving in one place, the fool moves on to another and spends all his time in thus going around. In Assatz m'es bel del temps essuig (Dej. VIII) he says in the second strophe about false lovers that they are destroyed in the fires of the evil spirit when they add one sin to another. These sinful habits of the people

make them uncertain of the parenthood of their children, because the husbands and the wives cheat on each other.

In L'iverns vai e.l temps s'aizina (Dej. XXXI), the poet says in the third strophe that amars attracts and tricks with a gluttonous will; by a sensual sweetness it sets the wicked man on fire; and in the fifth that such love makes the fool thin to the bone. In the sixth strophe he says that out of this kind of love are born men who are not noble, who lack generosity, and who give no feasts and no money. In Lo vers comens quan vei del fau (Dej. XXXIII) he says in the eighth strophe that if amars has a loyal friend, he is not surprised that they resemble beasts when they share something, because you will seldom see fair play with such a reavenous person.⁵ In the fourth strophe of Hueymais dey esser alegrans (Dej. XXXIV), Marcabru speaks about the women who are deceitful and make their husbands entertain and nourish the children of others. From such women are born the detestable and the avaricious, none of whom loves joy or merry-making. This is not the first time that Marcabru speaks against the deceitful nature of women and states that the wicked and those who lack generosity are born of such marriages and unlawful love-relations. In the eighth strophe of

⁵Alexander Denomy, "Fin' Amors: the Pure Love of the Troubadours, Its Amorality, and Possible Source," Medieval Studies, VII (1945), 139-207.

Per savi.l tenc ses doptansa (Dej. XXXVII) the poet says that amars is a cursed folly and a corruption of the heart.

There are a few poems in which Marcabru expresses a kind of resignation to the immorality of the world; he is aware that he is not able to change the evil habits of the people. The whole lyric D'aisso laus Dieu (Dej. XVI) is a satire and, though the terms used in it are not as direct as in some other poems, the idea is perhaps stronger. The poet has not changed a bit in his stand against deceitful love; he has only changed his strategy. He makes use of satire instead of direct invective. In the sixth strophe of Dirai vos en mon lati (Dej. XVII) the poet warns married people against the con that turns into a cheat. In a tone of satire the poet takes pity on the one who complains, "My son mocks me," while he has had nothing to do with his birth. The poet in the next strophe says that there is no point in scolding such men, because they come back to the same folly. He admits that he has never seen any one of them abandon his course of love. The same attitude of the poet towards the incorrigibility of the people's evil ways and immoral habits is shown in some of the lines of Lo vers comenssa (Dej. XXXII). In its fifth strophe he says that he never finds true love in its pure state without some falsehood. In Pus

s'enfulleysson li verjan (Dej. XLI) the poet expresses the same idea. He knows that the number of cuckolds is increasing; still he is reluctant to chastise them, for he thinks that he is sowing his seed, that is, his word of remonstrance, on pure rocks where he sees neither grain nor flower sprouting. The imagery is evidently from the Bible, from the parable of the sower (Matt. xiii, 3-23; Mark iv, 3-20; Luke viii, 5-15). The poet ends the lyric Quan l'aura doussana bufa (Dej. XLII) in a tone of despair; since he does not dare to elaborate on his point about cuckolds, he will let things go as they will and prays to God to come to his aid.

Apart from these lyrics which castigate, ridicule, and reprimand love, there are a few other poems in which the attitude of the poet is different. For example, in the pastoral poems there is the kind of love that Marcabru approves of. In A la fontana del vergier (Dej. I) the young noble lady is truly in love; her love is good and noble. She refused to be unfaithful and rejects the intruder. The same is true of the other two pastoral poems, L'autrier, a l'issida d'abriu (Dej. XXIX) and L'autrier jost' una sebissa (Dej. XXX). In the former the lord asks the young woman for love and suggests that they should make a couple in that spring season when joy revives. She flatly refuses and says that her thoughts

and desires are directed somewhere else. In the latter the young woman is more clever and mischievous; the lord entreats her earnestly with many arguments, but she refutes him in all his arguments. Here there is a difference: the lady is not of the nobility, but of the middle class, a vilana. He attempts to bypass the social distinctions by affirming that her father was a noble man; she denies it and proves that the conduct of some noble men is worse than that of the peasants. In all these instances the lords are rejected in their attempt to debase love, while the ladies hold fast to an honest and noble love.

There are two poems which are exceptional in that they are written entirely in the mode of the courtly love lyric, namely, Contra l'ivern que s'enansa (Dej. XIV) and Languan fuelhon li boscatge (Dej. XXVIII). In the fourth strophe of the former lyric, the poet says that his love for this lady does not leave him. He hopes that she will not leave him alone in love, but love him with a sincere affection, a recompense that seems to him less than his merit. In the next strophe he says that he hopes that her friendship with him will not be of a short duration. In the ninth strophe he says that the honor of the lady whose praise he sings is immaculate without any doubt, and her worth is sovereign even if one were to watch her closely. So he says that if he is not excited by her

he does not expect that anything else would arouse him.

In Languan fuelhon li boscatge (Dej. XXVIII) the poet says that she who should send him a message from her country either fears to debase her nobility or is angry with him, or her pride has intervened. He confesses that he has never found any other lady as noble, refined, and pure as she is. Because of his love for her, he loves all those who have praised her, he was her intimate from the time she saw him. He loves her without any falsehood, and so she should not refuse him what he has often asked of her.

These are some of the rare occasions when Marcabru speaks in the language of the courtly love lyric. What he says in these poems is not necessarily contradictory to his other statements, because there is no reason to assume that these two poems are autobiographical. However, these two poems give us a solid proof for the fact that Marcabru's fin' amors has nothing to do with love of God: it is directed towards a woman of flesh and blood living in this world.

The poet is eloquent in praising faithful love, a love that keeps Mezura and remains within the limits of noble love. He says about noble love that no one knows its value, its power, its end or its beginning (Bel m'es quan son li fruich madur, lines 15, 16). In the third

strophe of this lyric, the poet says that he ventures on a kind of love where there is no cheating or trouble; in summer, winter, and spring he rejoices immensely and will have more happiness out of it again with security. In the next strophe he affirms that all who are inebriated with love become better, and he has never heard that any one became worse by it. The poet himself has the greatest worth because of a woman. In Pus mos coratges s'es clarziz, the poet, in a sort of ecstasy, calls noble love the "source of happiness, by which the whole world is illumined" (lines 36-37).

The kind of obscurity that prevails in Marcabru's lines has caused many to come to different and contradictory conclusions about his meaning in many instances. Though most of the critics agree that the love which he condemns and disapproves of in strong terms is illicit and adulterous love, it has not been determined with certitude what his fin' amors is. There are two opinions that prevail about the nature of his fin' amor. One is represented by Alexander Denomy who thinks that Marcabru's noble love is of an oriental origin, and it

should be identified with the futuwwa of the Arabs.⁶

But against this hypothesis there is a strong and more popular opinion supported by scholars like Errante, Scheludko, Appel, and Robertson that his noble love is of a supernatural nature and should more or less be

⁶"In ordinary usage, futuwwa means all the honorable qualities that denote a youth (fatā), particularly generosity. Originating wholly independently of religion, it was assimilated completely to Sufism and became an ideal of their system. In their language, it is a disposition described 'as placing others above himself.' This finds expression in liberality, self-effacement, unselfishness, self-denial, superiority to disappointment, indulgence of the faults of others.' For the mystics, then, futuwwa assumed an ethical characteristic. In the abstract, futuwwa denotes an ethical value embracing those virtues that distinguish a noble youth (fatā); a religious or mystic virtue that can serve as a moral standard of social conduct.

In the concrete sense, moreover, futuwwa indicates a sociological phenomena [sic], a club or association of men, typical examples of men's clubs in general, whose primary end is social goodfellowship and whose secondary ends arise from ethical and religious spheres. These clubs were made up of fityān, devotees and cultivators of futuwwa. These corporative unions were known in Islam from earliest times, underwent the influence of Sufism and were reorganised by the Kalif al-Nasir (1180-1225) into aristocratic and civic centers of political and religious importance. (Jovens: the Notion of Youth among the Troubadours, its Meaning and Source, "Medieval Studies, XI, (1949), 14-15.)

identified with charity.⁷ In order to see which opinion is more correct and more consonant with the concept of Marcabru, we will have to study the poems more carefully and examine the merit of the arguments both for and against the two theories.

The first error we have to avoid in our procedure is to take isolated lines from Marcabru's poems and search for parallels in other literatures of the time. Marcabru should be understood and interpreted mainly from his own context in its totality, rather than from the context of his contemporaries and the prevailing ideas of the time. They surely help us to understand the poet, but they should never be preferred to the poet's own explanations

⁷K. Vossler, Der Trobador Marcabru und die Anfänge des gekünstelten Stiles, Sitzungsberichte der K. Bayer. Akademie der Wissenss., Munich, 1913.

C. Appel, "Zu Marcabru," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XLIII (1923), 403-69.

E. Kastner, "Marcabru and Cercamon," Modern Language Review, XXI (1931), 91-96.

Dimitri Scheludko, "Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der altprovenzalische Lyrik," Archivum Romanicum, XI (1927), 273-312; XII (1928), 30-127; XV (1931), 137-206; "Religiöse Elemente in weltlichen Liebesliedern der Troubadors," Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, LIX (1935), 402-21; "Über die religiöse Lyrik der Troubadors," Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, XXXVIII (1937), 224-50; "Über die Theorien der Liebe bei der Troubadors," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, LX (1940), 191-234; "Marcabru, Klagen über den Verfall der Welt, allegorische Darstellungen der Kämpfer der Tugenden und Laster," Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, XLIV (1943), 31-37.

G. Errante, Marcabru e le fonti sacre dell' antica lirica romanza (Florence, 1948), passim.

and should not be given value in such cases where we can find an explanation and meaning in the poems themselves. Thus a line or a strophe in the poems of Marcabru should be interpreted mainly against the whole background of all the poems and strophes of the poet, not from parallel expressions in medieval religious writers and Fathers of the Church. This means that even when Marcabru uses a word from the Bible or the liturgy, it does not necessarily mean that the word has all of its Biblical and the liturgical connotations. Marcabru may make use of words and expressions which the Fathers of the Church used in a different context with an entirely different meaning; all the nuances of the meaning attributed to that word in the Fathers should not be attached to the same word in Marcabru. The final norm for the interpretation of the meaning of words and expressions in Marcabru is the context in which he uses them.

Scheludko⁸ and Robertson⁹ begin their study of Marcabru with the supposition that all his lyrics are allegorical. It is true that Marcabru makes use of allegories in his lyrics. But how far his poems are allegorical, how we should interpret them, what is the meaning and purpose of each allegory: all these questions

⁸Klagen über den Verfall der Welt, p. 31.

⁹"Five Poems," p. 540.

can be answered only from the context of Marcabru's work. We can never say, for example, that Marcabru's lyrics are to be interpreted in the same way as the Divina Comedia or the Roman de la Rose. All of Marcabru's lyrics are not bound together by one single allegory. He uses many allegories in many respects and contexts; the context will explain to us the meaning and purpose of each allegory. The allegory of the Lavador, for example, is explained by the poet himself; he himself gives a clue to the meaning of the allegory. When we read this lyric (Dej. XXXV) we understand easily that it stands for the Crusade, and nothing else. In such a case we should not use our phantasy to find out a meaning different from what the poet intends. The poet himself gives us the norm and direction in most instances for the interpretation of his allegories, and so we do not have to search outside his lyrics to find out his meaning; there is no reason to assume that all meanings found in the allegorical works of his contemporaries are necessarily in his lyrics. The basis and norm for our interpretation of any allegory should be provided by the poet himself in his lyrics.¹⁰

¹⁰D.W. Robertson, "The Doctrine of Charity in Medieval Literary Gardens: A Topical Approach Through Symbolism and Allegory," Speculum, XXIV (1951), 24-49.

The second error we have to avoid in the interpretation of Marcabru's love is a confusion of terms. There are many instances in the Bible and in the Fathers where the word "love" or "charity" is not used in its strict meaning. "Charity" may mean in some instances merely love and may stand for any kind of love, including sexual love. At times it stands for divine love alone in contradistinction to human and sexual love; sometimes amor or dilectio can also be used in the sense of divine love. But the context will tell us the exact meaning of the word in every instance. For example, St. Augustine writes:

Charitas alia divina, alia humana.
 Charitas humana alia licita, alia illicita
 . . . Licitam est humana charitas ubi uxor
 diligitur; illicita qua meretrix vel uxor
 aliena. In foro enim et plateis magis
 licita charitas qua diligitur meretrix.
 In domo Dei, in templo Dei, in civitate
 Christi, in corpore Christi, etiam
 meretricis amor ad gehennas amantem
 perducit. Licitam ergo charitatem
 habete; humana est sed licita est. Non
 solum autem ita licita est, ut concedatur;
 sed ita licita, ut si defuerit, reprehendatur.
 Liceat vobis humana charitate diligere

conjuges, deligere filios, deligere
 amicos vestros. Omnia enim ista nomina
 habent necessitudinis vinculum, et
 quodammodo charitatis.¹¹

In this analysis the word charitas is used by Augustine to designate human love. His charitas illicita is the same as illicit or adulterous love. However, this is not the usual terminology in the Fathers or even in Augustine for love and charity. They follow the division of love given in the Bible, especially in the Epistle of John, namely, love of the world and love of God, amor mundi and amor Dei (1 John ii, 15-16). This division of love is important in the Fathers; it is the basis for dividing the world into two: the world of those who belong to the heavenly Jerusalem and those who belong to Babylon (Apoc. xviii, 2 and xxi, 2, 10). In general, the Fathers follow the division of John in their writings and the threefold division of love quoted above from Augustine is not much stressed even in Augustine's own writings. More often Augustine uses the word charitas for divine love and cupiditas for illicit human love. He does not dwell on licit human love because, as he points out, it has the bond of necessity in it. It is not a typical Christian

¹¹Tractatus Liber I: PL, XI, 276, 277.

love and the Christians do not need special explanation and exhortation to practice it. The two loves that the Fathers, including Augustine, speak about are the ones that lead men either to Hell or to Heaven after death; only these two loves have a direct effect on the supernatural life of the faithful. Only these two loves put a characteristic and distinguishing mark on them and categorize them as citizens either of heavenly Jerusalem or of Babylon; only these two loves include them among those who are either elect or condemned.

A twofold division of love that is more in keeping with the rest of Augustine's teaching and that of the Fathers we get in his explanation of the Psalm ix: "Pes animae recte intelligitur amor; qui cum pravus est, vocatur cupiditas aut libido, cum autem rectus dilectio vel charitas."¹² In this sentence the division is clearer; here charity or dilectio stands for divine love and libido or cupiditas stands for illicit human love and nothing is mentioned about licit human love. In another instance he explains the nature and the characteristic of these two loves further:

¹²Enarratio in Psalmum IX, PL, XXXVI, 124.

Est amor qui ad omne recte factum,
 et amor qui ad omne peccatum ducit. Ut
 facias bene, amas Deum et times Deum; ut
 autem facias male amas mundum et times
 mundum. Haec convertuntur ad bonum;
 amabas terram, ama vitam aeternam;
 timebas mortem, time gehennam. Amor
 quippe inflamat, ideo peccata mali
 amoris; accendit et bonus amor sed aliter
 atque aliter . . . Ac per hoc, sicut
 omnia opera bono timore et bono amore
 fiunt, sic malo timore et malo amore
 omnia peccata committuntur.¹³

This is the vein in which the Fathers speak about the two loves; their division corresponds to the division of Augustine given above. The love that is praised in the writings of the Fathers is called charity; it has a supernatural orientation and there is a whole theology built around this spiritual concept. It is a love that raises men towards God and makes them share in the divine nature. The love that is condemned is illicit sexual love which leads men to hell and makes them slaves to sin and death.

¹³Enarratio in Psalmum LXXIX: PL, XXXVI, 1026.

There is a long tradition of the division of love into two in the writings of the Fathers. The love that is condemned is said to proceed from the devil and is called by various names, such as, libido, concupiscentia, cupiditas, etc.; the other, proceeding from God is called charity. The effects of cupidity and charity in the human soul are not always described in the same way or exactly in the same words. All agree that libido takes the human soul away from God and leads to perdition and eternal ruin, while charity elevates the soul to the level of God and makes man son and heir of God. These ideas are already in the Epistles of Paul and the Biblical ideas remain the same in the writings of the Fathers. When they give further explanations to the notions contained already in the Bible they vary slightly.

Arnobius, for example, says that libido blinds the mind and makes men do things that are harmful to and destructive of his own salvation. He calls libido a weakness of human nature and says that many are inclined to it; the blunders of this infirmity of the human soul are so common that every one should be watchful that he be not deceived and fall victim to the infirmity of his own nature.¹⁴

¹⁴Adversus Gentes: PL, V, 1207 and 1044.

St. Zeno distinguishes two kinds of love and gives the characteristics of each. One is sincere and salutary, while the other is contrary to our salvation. He says that insincere and deceitful love, as depicted in painting, has puerile clothes, lascivious face, naked body with wings, and blind eyes; and it possesses arrows. "Hic amor lineamento puerili depingitur, lascivio vultu, nudus, pennatus, telis constructus et caecus . . ." ¹⁵ Evidently this is the description of Cupid as painted in Greek and Roman literature. Cupid is used here in the sense of cupiditas and stands for the love of the world in the Epistle of John. About this love Zeno says that it jokes, plays, prays, tempts, deceives and commits many blunders, is unsteady. "Iste amor jocatur, ludit, suspirat, obsequitur, tentat, decipit, blanditur, furit." ¹⁶ He asks the Christians of his time to beware of this love and follow the other love which will lead them to salvation. ¹⁷

In Absalom the Abbot the distinction is between the love of chastity and the love of concupiscence or concupiscence of the flesh. He personifies these loves and depicts them as if there is a constant fight and machination

¹⁵XI, 276.

¹⁶XI, 277.

¹⁷Tractatus Liber I: PL, XI, 276, 277

going on in the human body between the spirit and the flesh. "Quilibet amator castitatis a carnis concupiscentia impugnatur."¹⁸ He says that flesh is always trying to seduce the spirit and plots against it everyday. "Caro quotidie machinatur . . . castitati in illicitis desideriis."¹⁹ He sees three rivers flowing between heaven and earth; these rivers he calls the rivers of Babylon. "Currunt tria Babylonis flumina inter coelum et terram, quae deorsum rapiunt ascendere cupientes, quorum primum est inundatio carnalium cupiditatum, secundum spiritualium tentationum, tertium imminentium molestiarum."²⁰ These rivers separate heaven from earth and all those who want to reach heaven have to pass through all these rivers. The concupiscence of the flesh is something that daily attacks the lover of chastity.²¹

Adam Scot sees love in a different way; for him it is the door to life and death. "Amor est porta mortis vel vitae; bonus vel malus est: malus cupiditatis, bonus

¹⁸Sermones: PL, CCXI, 42.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., col. 184.

²¹Ibid.

charitatis vocatur."²² The two loves are called charity and cupidity. He adds that bitterness always follows cupidity and bad love. "Amori succedit amaritudo ut factum est in insensato Ammone." He gives the example of Ammon, the eldest son of David, who loved his half-sister Thamar passionately, but after he had raped her, he despised her. This is what he refers to: "But he would not hearken to her prayers, but being stronger overpowered her and lay with her. Then Ammon hated her with an exceeding great hatred; so that the hatred wherewith he hated her was greater than the love which he had loved her before. And Ammon said to her, 'Arise and get thee gone'" (2 Kings, xiii, 14-15).²³ So Scot says: "Concupiscentia damna."²⁴ He says again that the beginning of carnal life is as sweet as good wine, but its end is bitter and bad as bad wine. "Carnalis vitae initium suave ut vinum bonum, finis autem

²²De Triplici Genere Contemplationis: PL, CXCVIII, 809.

²³"Noluit autem adquiscere precibus ejus, sed praevalens viribus oppressit eam et cubavit cum ea. Et exosam eam habuit Amnon odio magno nimis, ita ut majus esset odium, quo oderat eam, amore quo ante dilexerat." Dixitque ei Amnon: Surge et vade." (The Latin Biblical texts are taken from Bibliorum Sacrorum Juxta Vulgatam Clementinam Nova Editio Breviario Perpetuo et Concordantiis Aucta ed. Aloisius Gramatica (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1946).

²⁴Sermones: PL, CXCVIII, 373.

miser ut vinum deterius."²⁵ His conclusion, therefore, is: "Caro refrenanda."²⁶

St. Chrysologus divides love into charity and luxuria. According to him, charity unites us with God but luxuria brings about all evil; luxuria is similar to despair and disappointment in this that the one who goes after it does not want to be redeemed and saved from it but always insists on going to death and perdition with it. Luxuria always seeks the destruction of chastity and it puts the sanctity in man to death after killing his shame and modesty. Charity on the other hand, only increases and grows by death and it is a better and a greater heritage. "Charitas nos a Deo jungit, Luxuria autem mala parturiat; luxuria est desperationi similis; qui luxuria ardet, mavult cum ea perire quam redire."²⁷ "Luxuria petit castitatis interitum, pudicitiae necem, mortem sanctitatis."²⁸ "Charitas crescit morte; est haereditas major meliorque."²⁹

²⁵Ibid., col. 436.

²⁶Ibid., col. 236. See also Ibid., col. 384.

²⁷Sermo CXXVII: PL, LII, 550.

²⁸Sermo CLXXIV: PL, LII, 654.

²⁹Ibid.

Richard of St. Victor divides love into two: amor verus et amor vanus. Vain love brings in the occasions of corruption while the other leads to the virtues of the spirit. In another instance he speaks about amor terrenarum et amor spiritualium; while the former leads to peccata carnalia, the latter aims at virtutes spirituales. "Amor verus amor vanus aliquando eodem tempore causati . . . Amor terrenorum ad peccata carnalia ducit, amor autem spiritualium ad virtutes spirituales tendat."³⁰

St. Ambrose also speaks about two kinds of love; one comes from the devil, the other comes from God; one is the weakness of the body, the other is the strength and the life of the soul. The weakness of the body is described elaborately and he brings in various instances in the Bible when the great and the chosen persons of Israel became victims of this weakness of the body and went after adultery and relations with strange women.³¹

In the writings of St. Jerome we meet with two kinds of love: one is the love of the spirit, the other is called by various names, such as amor impudicus and amor illicitus. He insists that no one can have two loves at

³⁰Exegetica, PL, CXCVI, 38, 39.

³¹Hexaemeron, PL, XIX, 167-68; De Cain et Abel, PL, XIV, 363; Liber de Tobia, PL, XIX, 825.

the same time; if he is a lover of the flesh, he is not able to understand anything about the love of the spirit. "Nemo potest duobus amoribus possideri, si carnis amator est, amorem spiritus non capit" (XXIII, 1121).³²

In Alanus de Insulis we find two loves, or two cupids: the love of this world and the love of God, which he often calls charity. The love of God is sweet and the love of this world is impure; love of God is the mother of all virtue while the love of the World is the mother of all vices. He who indulges in acts of concupiscence is dead even when he is living. By "dead" he means that the person is spiritually dead, for in him there is no sanctifying grace, which is the life of the soul. He is full of praise for charity. Charity is the first of all virtues, and without charity no one can come to the Beatific vision; without charity the gift of prophecy or the title of martyr is of no use. It is the bond of perfection. "Therefore, love God that you may be loved by God, so that you may reach him soon and be with him earlier." "O homo, considera quam dulcis amor Dei, quam impurus sit amor hujus saeculi! Amor Dei mater est omnium virtutum, amor saeculi mater est omnium

³² Epistolae: PL, XXIII, 1121. See also XXII, 957 and 1195.

vitiorum. Qui luxuriatur vivens mortuus est."³³

Leo the Great speaks about two loves: love of God and love of the world. Love of the world does not agree and coexist with the love of God. One who does not part from the carnal generation cannot become the son of God and does not come to any association with the sons of God. The rational soul cannot exist without love, his love of God is charity which is the greatest of all virtues and has no end. It is charity that distinguishes man from animal. "Animalia carentia intellectu nullo sunt erudita mandato, nec acceperunt legem, quae non acceperere rationem; ubi autem est illuminatio rationis, ibi est et disciplina pietatis, quae dilectionem et Deo debet et proximo."³⁴

In St. Bernard we see a slight difference in his attitude towards love. He speaks about two kinds of loves, but in him we do not get many instances of condemning concupiscence or cupidity. According to him concupiscence is the first grade of love. He gives the reason: "Verumtamen quia carnales sumus, et de carnis concupiscentia nascimur, necesse est cupiditas vel amor noster a carne incipiat, quae si recto ordine dirigitur, quibusdam suis gradibus duce gratia

³³Summa de Arte Praedicatoria: PL, CCX, 152-53, 121.

³⁴Sermones: PL, LIV, 465, 300, 190.

proficiens, spiritu tandem consumabitur." The highest grade of this love is charity, about which he gives a long discourse. Quoting the lines from the Canticles vi, 9 "Quae est illa quae ascendit sicut aurora consurgens, pulchra ut luna, electa ut sol, terribilis ut castrorum acies ordinata," he identifies the sol with charity and explains that it means that the just will shine as the sun.³⁵

He sees two laws in men: lex cupiditatis and lex charitatis. The law of cupidity is sin, while the law of charity is sweet and good. There are also two wisdoms in men: the wisdom of heaven, and the wisdom of earth. The wisdom of earth goes in for delicacies of the flesh, and these have a corrupting influence on the spirit; for the desires of the flesh are always against the spirit and it is evil. This is not a strength but an infirmity of the flesh; but the strength of the spirit is good for the body and soul, it is the wisdom of heaven. Of all the evils of the flesh, the first is luxuria, and it is carried by a cart with four wheels and two horses. The four wheels are: gluttony, sexuality, soft dress, and desire for a good and restful sleep. The two horses which carry luxuria are prosperity of life and abundance

³⁵Sermones de Diversis: PL, CLXXXIII, 711.

of things necessary for life.

lex cupiditatis est peccatum, et iniquitas; lex
 charitatis est lex filiorum;³⁶ . . . bona lex charitae
 et suavis . . . Alius est sapor coeli, alius sapor
 terrae³⁷ . . . Carnis deliciae, et spiritus corruptelae³⁸
 . . . Carnis voluptas malum est; carnis infirmitas robur
 spiritus auget et e contra³⁹ . . . Luxuria omni immunditiae
 et turpitudini carnis praeest . . .⁴⁰ Luxuriae vero
 currus quadriga nihilominus volvitur vitiorum, ingluvie
 videlicet ventris, libidine coitus, mollitie vestium,
 otii soporisque resolutione. Trahitur equis aequae duobus,
 prosperitate vitae, et rerum abundantia.⁴¹

More than in any of the other Fathers we see in
 Augustine the emphasis on the twofold division of love.
 To his rhythmic and antithetic prose style and the rhetorical
 devices of isocolon, parison, and paromoion this division

³⁶Sermones in Cantica; PL, CLXXXIII, 997.

³⁷Ibid., CLXXXIII, 719.

³⁸Ibid., CLXXXII, 77.

³⁹Ibid., CLXXXIII, 953.

⁴⁰Ibid., CLXXXIII, 979.

⁴¹Ibid., CLXXXIII, 980.

into two fits well, and there is a kind of literary enjoyment and pleasure in reading through his exposition of love. The tenor of his usual exhortation to practice charity and avoid cupidity can be seen in the following passage:

Duae sunt in homine uno: charitas
et cupiditas. Charitas nascatur in te si
nondum nata est; et si nata est, alatur,
nutriatur, crescat. Illa vero cupiditas,
etsi in hac vita extingui penitus non
potest, in quantum autem est in nobis
cupiditas, sine peccato non sumus. Caritas
crescat, cupiditas decrescat, ut aliquando
illa, id est, charitas, perficiatur,
cupiditas consumatur.⁴²

This is the usual way of Augustine's admonition; he gives many reasons why we should avoid cupidity and choose charity. His first reason is that charity makes us similar to God while cupidity makes us dissimilar to God (PL, XLI, 271), cupidity does not come from God (XXXVI, 291), cupidity is the root of all evil (XXXVI, 115⁴). Cupidity for him is a general concept that includes many sins other than adultery and fornication. He includes in his concept of

⁴²Sermones. XC: PL, XXXVIII, 562-63.

libido and cupidity (XXXII, 1329) the love of gold, of praise, of women. The devil reigns in man by cupidity (XL, 201); cupidity and wicked desires are the doors of death (XXXVI, 123); they make one the citizen of Babylon (XXXVI, 72-73); wherever there is no charity there cupidity reigns (XL, 287). Men are immersed in mundane affairs through cupidity and they come out of them through the power of charity and sanctity (XXXII, 847). Fear of God is the greatest incentive for the diminution of cupidity, which begins to decrease when one is affected by fear of God (XL, 23). Exactly in the proportion in which the power and dominion of cupidity is destroyed, the power and dominion of charity increases. Thus in Augustine charity and cupidity are two equal and opposite powers which balance each other. Man finds himself in the middle of these two powers and it is his duty to ascend to God and heaven by attaining charity and belonging to the city of Jerusalem where peace and order reign.

Though this is the usual division of love in Augustine, sometimes he goes back to his first division of love, namely, licit and illicit human love. Augustine admits that no man can overcome cupidity completely and be possessed by charity alone. However holy a man is, there is always in him some residue of the power of concupiscence. Marriage and licit love are recommended as a medicine

and remedy for this concupiscence. Matrimonial love, for him, is a love of concupiscence, yet it is licit. He compares human love with the love of the animals and birds. It is only in licit human love that he finds any comparison and similarity with love in nature, with the love of animals and birds. Augustine warns, that this love is not to be considered something very great or noble in man. He says:

Amor hominis alius rectus, alius
 perversus . . . Tractemus ergo aliquantum
 de amore hominis in hominem, quia sunt
 amores hominum perversi. Ipse perverse
 amat alterum, qui et se perverse amat;
 qui autem se recte amat, et alterum recte
 amat. Verbi gratia sunt amores flagitiosi,
 detestabiles, amores adulterorum, amores
 corruptorum, immundi amores. Malos amores
 detestantur omnes leges humanae et leges
 divinae. Remove ergo istos illicitos,
 queramus licitos.

Incipit licitus amor cum conjugio; sed
 adhuc carnalis est. Videtis quia communis
 est cum pecoribus; et passeret illi qui
 personant, habent conjugia, et nidos
 faciunt, simul ova confovent, simul pullos
 nutriunt. Licitus quidem amor iste in

hominibus, sed videtis quia carnalis est.
 Secundus amor filiorum est; sed adhuc iste
 carnalis est. Non enim est laudandus qui
 amat filios, sed detestandus qui non amat.
 Pro magno laudaturus sum in homine quod
 video in tigride? Serpentes amant filios suos.
 Noli ergo magnum putare, quod amas filios
 tuos . . . Adhuc est ista amicitia consuetudinis
 et in pecoribus; surgamus adhuc et ab ista.
 Est alius superior amicitia, qua diligimus
 hominem propter fidem. Hac superius quidquid
 jam invenerimus, divinum est. Incipiat homo
 amare Deum, et non amabit in homine nisi Deum.⁴³

As seen in these lines from Augustine, though licit human love is something allowed to man as a remedy for his concupiscence, it is not fully worthy of man. He has to rise above this level of animals and brutes and to ascend to the higher levels of divine love and charity. Since in this kind of love we share a common experience with animals and birds, this is not praiseworthy in man or very honorable.

The twofold division of love might have been both a theological and a literary commonplace during the Middle

⁴³Sermones, CCCLXXXV: PL, XXXVIII, 1690-91.

Ages. Wilhelm of St. Thierry, an older contemporary of Marcabru, makes such a distinction of love in his treatise De Natura et Dignitate Amoris.⁴⁴ According to him, the two loves are divine and human love. But after giving the philosophic reason for the existence of two loves, he says that we are interested only in the love of God and so he does not say anything about the love of the world. Marcabru's contemporaries, like Cercamon and Jauffre Rudel, also make a division of love; they speak about true and false love, but they do not elaborate on the nature and distinction of the two loves. In no other troubadour do we get such a sharp and impressive division of the two loves; no other poet condemns false love so strongly and recommends pure and honest love with such force and praise.

D. Scheludko begins his attempt to prove that Marcabru's fin' amors is charity with a general statement that the two-fold division of love in Augustine is of Platonic origin.⁴⁵ This assertion is confusing and not well established by Scheludko. It is true that Plato speaks about two loves in the Symposium: love of the body and love of

⁴⁴ PL, CLXXXIV, 379 ff.

⁴⁵

the spirit. He defines love as the way in which the mortal body partakes of immortality. Men whose bodies only are creative betake themselves to women and beget children. Those people whose souls are creative "use the beauties of the earth as steps along which they mount upwards for the sake of other beauty, going from one to two, and from two to all fair forms, and from fair forms to fair actions, and from fair actions to fair notions, until from fair notions they arrive at the notion of the absolute beauty, and at last know what the essence of beauty is."⁴⁶ According to Plato, the most noble life that is imaginable consists in beholding absolute beauty with the eyes of the mind, not imitations of beauties but realities, thus becoming the friend of God and immortal.

This is the highest notion of Eros in Plato. Since the notion of love ends in The Symposium as the mystical and the spiritual contemplation of the infinitely beautiful and the infinite good, there is occasion to think that this notion of love is identical with the Christian notion of love, namely charity. It is true that both charity and Eros shine with the light of heaven and the ultimate aim of both is to reach the infinite Good and the infinite

⁴⁶B. Jowett trans., The Best Known Works of Plato, Garden City, New York, 1942, p. 257.

Beauty.⁴⁷ But charity needs no spiritualising, it is always the most sublime notion of love. With Eros that is not the case. It needs spiritualization and sublimation; only the highest notion of Eros has any relationship with heaven; otherwise it is mere homosexual love.⁴⁸

The source book for Augustine for his concept of love was not Plato but the Bible, especially the writings of the Apostle Paul and the Evangelist John. Many Fathers in the early centuries of Christianity, including Augustine, had felt themselves obliged to refute the notions of Plato and they did it with vigor.⁴⁹ There are many instances in which Augustine attacks Plato.⁵⁰ He says concerning the Greek gods that they [the Greeks] made human crimes honors for gods and that their gods were impure demons of virtue and strength and did not have any higher quality

⁴⁷Cf. Anders Nygren, Agape and Eros trans. Philip Watson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), p. 52.

⁴⁸Cf. Ibid., pp. 166-81.

⁴⁹See Tertullian, PL, I, 404, 500; II, 674, 670; Lactantius, PL, VI, 153-55, 408, etc.; St. Jerome, PL, XXIII, 298, 412; cf. Peter Abelard, PL, CLXXVIII, 766, 917, 1015, 1151, 1175, 1178 etc.

⁵⁰Epistolarum Classis, II, PL, XXXIII, 442; Liber de Peccato Originali, PL, XLIV, 403.

in them. Concerning original sin, he says that it does not consist in the sin the infant committed before it was born, as Plato asserts. He once says that it is his duty to defend the Christian doctrine from the errors of Plato and his followers. "Contra Platoniorum errores magnos defendenda est doctrina Christiana."⁵¹ So we cannot imagine that Augustine borrowed any of his ideas about the love of God from an author who, he considers, has erred in most of his ideas about God and the spiritual. Charity, for Augustine, is the most sublime notion of Christian life and the center of Christian virtues.

When we go through the works of Augustine we see that he always refers to the Bible. Even in the passages which Scheludko claims to be influenced by Platonic thought, we can get better references to the writings of Paul than to any work of Plato. Scheludko says: "Die Gegenüberstellung des amor carnalis und des amor spiritualis bei Augustin ist unbedingt platonischen Ursprungs . . . Sie ist weder lateinischen heidnischen Literatur noch der Bibel eigen, da die biblische Lehre von der Liebe zu Gott und von der Verachtung der Welt die Gegenüberstellung des amor carnalis und des amor spiritualis nicht kennt."⁵²

⁵¹Retractionum Liber I: PL, XXXII, 587.

⁵²"Über die Theorien der Liebe," p. 206.

This assertion is not quite correct since we can get better references to the writings of Paul than to any work of Plato. In Paul we see the distinction of Spirit and flesh, Caro et Spiritus (Rom vii, 14-18; viii, 4-6). Paul is the accepted authority for Augustine while Plato is to be refuted. Augustine's Deus est Charitas is not based on Plato, but is evidently the translation of Deus est Agape in the Epistle of John (I, iv, 8). So the twofold division of love in Augustine is based more on the Bible than on any work of Plato; Augustine derived his notion of charity and love not from Plato but from Paul and John. This does not in any way mean that Augustine was not influenced by Plato in his philosophic concepts. Most of his ideas in philosophy can be traced back to Plato; but his concepts related to theology he derived from the Bible and the Fathers before him.⁵³

Marcabru does not follow the twofold division of love in Augustine as Scheludko asserts.⁵⁴ Even the love which Marcabru condemns is not the same as that of Augustine and the Fathers. The reasons why Marcabru condemns

⁵³See Augustine, De Civitate Dei, PL, XLI, 229; Epistolarum Classis II, PL, XXIII, 442; Epistolarum Classis III, PL, XXXIII, 718; Liber de Peccato Originali, PL, XLIV, 403.

⁵⁴D. Scheludko, "Über die Theorien der Liebe bei der Trobadors," p. 206.

adulterous love are also not the same as those in Augustine and the Fathers. For example, Marcabru condemns adulterous love because it is a cheat (Al son desviat, chantaire, line 7); because it changes color (ibid, line 14-15); because it shaves the fool without water (ibid, line 9); because adulterous lovers follow the nature of the dog (A l'alena del vent doussa, line 28), because on account of the love for the winepress money goes out (Amics Marcabrun, car digam, line 53-54); because it can be recommended only to the devil (Ans que.l terminis verdei, line 32); because it has killed thousands of men without a sword (Dirai vos senes duptansa, line 44); because it is a terrible enchanter (ibid, line 45). Are these reasons the same as those in the Fathers? Nothing of the kind is found in Patristic writings. The main reason why Marcabru condemns unfaithful love is that a man loses his money and his means and is deceived and ruined by it; even a marquis comes to nothing if he goes in for false friendship (Dej. VIII, 34-36).

The ideas stressed in the Fathers when they condemn adultery and fornication are the following: you are a member of the mystical body of Christ, so you should not pollute it (Augustine); this sin is not worthy of the new man in you, it is a degrading love, it destroys you, you

fall by it, you are destroyed by it (Augustine),⁵⁵ it comes from Satan (Jerome),⁵⁶ it causes tempests in your life (Ambrose),⁵⁷ it exiles you from paradise,⁵⁸ it brings down the anger of God on you,⁵⁹ it makes you belong to the city of Babylon, the city of confusion (Hilary of Poitou),⁶⁰ it is against your salvation (Zeno of Verona),⁶¹ it is excited by the devil (Ambrose),⁶² it fights and aggravates our soul (Anselm),⁶³ it is bitter⁶⁴ it is the root of all evils (Augustine).⁶⁵

⁵⁵Augustine, Sermones: PL, XXXIX, 1690-91; De Nuptiis et De Concupiscentia: PL, XLIV, 412-74 passim.

⁵⁶Epistolae: PL, XXII, 401.

⁵⁷Hexaameron: PL, XIV, 167-68.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁰Tractatus in CXVII Psalmum: PL, IX, 613-14.

⁶¹De Pudicitia et de Continentia: PL, XI, 288-311 passim.

⁶²Cf. Hexaameron: PL, XIV, 167-68; De Cain et Abel: PL, XIV, 363; Liber de Viduis, PL, XIV, 825.

⁶³De Concupiscentia Carnis et Spiritus: PL, CLVIII, 1026-29.

⁶⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵Enarratio in Psalmos: PL, XXXVI, 1154.

Let us examine those instances where Marcabru's reason corresponds to the ones given in the Fathers. For example, "it destroys you." While the Fathers stress the destruction of the soul, there is nothing in Marcabru to conclude that he speaks about the soul; he is actually speaking about the destruction of wealth and financial status, or honor and worth. This difference is really as great as the difference between the body and soul, between the natural and the supernatural, between heaven and earth. The emphasis in the Fathers is that it kills our souls and takes us away from God. In Marcabru we never hear about God or about the soul. There is a great difference between the poet and the Fathers in the scale of values, in the esteem given to spiritual reality and the supernatural life.⁶⁶ Marcabru mentions Satan and Cain only in reference to worldly prosperity, never in reference to man's spiritual life. There is never a direct reference to God in this connection in Marcabru, none of his motifs is related to God; at most he holds up the alternative of amors, which has nothing to do with charitas.⁶⁷ On the other hand, in

⁶⁶Cf. Etienne Gilson, The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard tr. A.A.C. Downes (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940), pp. 170-214.

⁶⁷See next chapter.

the Fathers the reference to God and heaven is always evident and clear. The only aim of the teachings of the Fathers is to lead the faithful to God and heaven, to their eternal salvation. The fact that the Fathers are writing in a spiritual and supernatural context is seen in every page of their writings.

The Fathers never use satire as a part of their didacticism; for Marcabru it is the usual method.⁶⁸ The Fathers show in their writings great sympathy and love for those who practice adultery, while Marcabru simply berates them and calls them names. St. Ambrose, writing about adultery and exhorting the people not to be presumptuous in their approach to it, brings in the examples of David, Samson, Solomon etc. and tells them that if such men fell victim to the sin of concupiscence, how much more they themselves have to be vigilant against the bondage of cupidity.⁶⁹ He says that David was able to defeat all his enemies, but his own interior enemy he could not defeat. The internal fight is much greater than the external one. The strength of concupiscence in him was much greater than that of Goliath, the huge Philistine.

⁶⁸ Cf. Etienne Gilson, p. 174.

⁶⁹ De Interpretatione Job et David; PL, CVI, 891-95.

Ambrose continues with the example of Samson, who was able to tear a strong lion to pieces but was not strong enough to strangle his own perverse love. Samson loosened the bondage of his enemies, but he did not loosen the ties of his own cupidity. He says that Solomon built a temple and consecrated it to God, but could not dedicate to God the temple of his own body. Finally he tells them never to look intently into the eyes of women, not to give ear to gossip and story telling, and gives such other practical advice to avoid this sin.⁷⁰

In Marcabru there is no love and sympathy for the people who complain, "My son mocks me."⁷¹ Emphatically he gives expression to his indignation at the nobles who fill their ranks with bastards who are naturally incapable of promoting the glory of the noble class. He believes in racial purity and hopes great things from the French nobility. He speaks against infidelity in marriage not because it kills the soul but because it is destructive to the noble class; not because it brings man under the bondage of sin but because by it the noble class loses its strength and its superiority. Marcabru believes that

⁷⁰ Ibid., PL, XVI, 810; 337, 296.

⁷¹ "Mos fills me ri," Cf. Dej. XVII, 35.

the purity and integrity of the class is vital if it is to preserve its quality. Unlike the Fathers, Marcabru never speaks about the life of the soul or the life of man after his death; he thinks always in terms of the temporal welfare of the noble class. He is a teacher and a prophet of the nobility, but he never intends to bring them to supreme bliss in heaven as the Fathers do; he only claims that he would bring them to real worth and honor.

Thus there is a great difference in the attitude of the Fathers and of Marcabru to people who practice false love. As Etienne Gilson affirms, the Fathers speak a completely different language and there can be made no comparison between their writings and those of the troubadours about love.⁷² There is no similarity between the worldly love sung about by the troubadours and the mystic love preached and written about by the Fathers.

Like the Fathers, Marcabru also speaks about death and the transitoriness of the world. Does this similarity of theme indicate that the twofold division of love in Marcabru is the same as in the Fathers?⁷³

⁷²Etienne Gilson, op. cit., p. 184.

⁷³D. Scheludko, "Über die religiöse Lyrik der Troubadours," pp. 224-250.

It is true that the word morir or mort occurs in Marcabru more than a dozen times; but there is no parallel in the way in which he speaks about death to the use of it in the Fathers. No one would perceive any similarity between Marcabru's use of the word in Estornel, cueill ta volada - "I will die if I cannot know how she goes to bed, naked or clothed"⁷⁴ - and the occurrence of the word in the Fathers. Marcabru thinks of death only in reference to those whom he reviles and accuses. In both the Crusade poems, Pax and Emperaire, he speaks about death; but this reference is only to those who do not go on Crusade, the rich and lazy barons on the other side of the mountains, the people of France and Poitou, who do not help the Emperor in his Crusade against the Saracens of Spain.⁷⁵ In the

⁷⁴Dejeanne, XXV, 52-55.

⁷⁵Paul Boissonnade, "Les personnages et les événements de l'histoire d'Allemagne dans l'oeuvre de Marcabru," Romania, XLVIII (1922), 222. Cf. the last strophe in Emperaire:

Mas Franssa Peitau e Beiriu
Aclina un sol seignoriu,
Venga sai Dieu son fieiu servir!

Qu'ieu non sai per que princes viu
S'a Dieu no vai son fieiu servir.

This refers to Louis VII of France.

Fathers there are no such political and national references; they never say that the rich people in France will die sooner than those in Spain, or that at death only the people beyond the Pyrenees, namely in France, will stink like garlic. In most of the other instances Marcabru gives expression to the ordinary troubadour complaint that he will die if he cannot reach the beloved in physical union. There is nothing salutary or exemplary in Marcabru's thought of death, and this in no way corresponds to the thought of death in the Fathers, who speaks of death as a deterrent against committing sin, and as a stimulant to do good. They insist that death comes for all, and speak about it even in reference to those whom they love and respect. The thought of death in them is never a part of their revenge.

We can be rather sure that Marcabru had a clerical training.⁷⁶ During the Middle Ages there were better chances for clerics to learn Latin and the Classics. History tells us that at that time most of the students of the schools of Paris and Chartres, as well as most of the public institutions of learning, were clerics with minor

⁷⁶Vossler, "Der Trobador Marcabru," p. 38; Mölk, Trobar Clus, Trobar Leu, p. 23; D.W. Robertson, "Five Poems," passim, especially p. 549, otherwise implied in the whole article; Scheludko, "Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte," p. 176.

orders and that priests, either secular or religious, had the administration of most of the schools.⁷⁷ It is possible that Marcabru left the clerical profession after having undergone a part of the training which would have led to his ordination as priest. Peire d'Alvernhe was a canon. Though Marcabru may not have gone as far in his clerical studies, his language and style, especially his allusions to the Bible, show that his training could not have been merely that of an ordinary lay person.

Marcabru makes use of many allegories; his poetry is representative of the symbolic tendency in medieval art. He sees two levels of meaning in all reality. For him there is nothing in the world without a hidden meaning; behind the visible things of this life there exist always the immaterial and the moral essences. All the material things directly and immediately lead him to the spiritual, the visible to the invisible, the sensible to the supra-sensible. Every aspect of the spring season, every form of resuscitation of life in Nature makes him think of the moral and the ethical. This sensitivity to the prophetic dimension of things is the characteristic of medieval philosophy and art.

⁷⁷Achille Luchaire, Social France (New York, 1929), passim.

There are many themes which Errante and Scheludko claim that Marcabru has borrowed from the Bible and the Fathers.⁷⁸ His predilection for the imagery of the fruit trees and the garden, his reference to the fear of God and death, his stand for fidelity in marriage, his distinction of wisdom and understanding, his lament about the degradation of the world, his condemnation of the adulterous habits of the people, his two ways and two kinds of thoughts, etc. have a Biblical flavor. No one can deny that there are many references in Marcabru to the Bible and the Fathers. But simply because Marcabru refers to the Bible and the Fathers, it does not mean that his ideas are similar to those of the Fathers. We have to examine every instance and see what Marcabru does with those Biblical and Patristic allegories and images and determine whether each instance is something like the devil quoting the Bible, or whether it amounts to an identity of concept. Marcabru quotes Ovid and makes many references to classical writings. But he does not follow Ovid or the Classical writers in his concept of love. So quoting the Bible or the Fathers does not prove by itself that he had the same ideas of the Bible and the Fathers

⁷⁸Errante, Marcabru e le fonti sacre, pp. 172-262; Scheludko, "Beiträge," pp. 178-190.

in his twofold division of love.

Whether a cleric or not, whether he had a religious formation and left the order after some time, or had no theological training at all, there is no doubt that he was an original artist. He had some high and challenging conceptions of poetry and aesthetics. He sets the essence of higher poetic art in a kind of obscurity of expression and strangeness of imagery that we may sometimes find it difficult to understand him fully. His obscurity arises not from a conscious stylistic device as in Peitire d'Alvernhe, but from the intrinsic nature of the things that he is speaking about and the tone in which he expresses them.

There is a long tradition of obscure language in Christian literature. Jesus himself used parables and obscure language when he spoke to the people in general. He explained the parables only to his disciples because, he says: "Quia vobis datum est nosse mysteria regni coelorum, illis autem non est datum . . . , ideo in parabolis loquor eis, quia videntes non vident et audientes non audiunt neque intelligunt, et adimpletur in eis prophetia Isaiae dicentis: Auditum audietis et non intelligetis et videntes videbitis et non videbitis" (Matt. xiii, 11-14).

About the obscure language in the Sacred Scriptures, St. Augustine says:

Scripturam Sacram valde caute audire debemus, ad quae capienda parvuli sumus, et corde pio et cum tremore . . . Ad exercendas et eliminandas quodammodo mentes legentium, et ad rumpenda fastidia atque acuenda studia discere volentium, celandos quoque, sive ut ad pietatem convertantur, sive ut a mysteriis secludantur, animos impiorum utili ac salubri obscuritate dixerunt. Si quippe illi locuti sunt, ut posteriores qui eas recte intelligerent et exponerent, alteram gratiam disparem quidem, verumtamen subsequentem in Dei Ecclesia reperirent.⁷⁹

In consonance with this Biblical and patristic tradition,

Marcabru says:

Per savi.l tenc ses doptanssa
 Cel qui de mon chant devina
 So que chascus motz declina,
 Si cum la razos despleia,
 Qu'ieu mezeis sui en erransa
 D'esclarzir paraul' escura. (Dej. XXXVII, 1-6)

I consider that man wise without any doubt
 who can guess what each word signifies in my song
 and how the theme develops,
 for I spare myself no pains
 to clarify any obscure word.⁸⁰

⁷⁹Tractatus in Joannis Evangelium: PL, XXXV, 1536;
De Doctrina Christiana: PL, XXXIV, 98-99.

⁸⁰For text and translation see Lewent, p. 441; Cf.
 Molk, Trobar Clus Trobar Leu, p. 70.

In these lines Marcabru shows that special attention and careful study is needed to understand his song, that his lyrics should not be interpreted in the usual way.

In his attitude towards love Marcabru is again original and far removed from all his contemporaries. He is totally and vehemently against the kind of ordinary love that was celebrated by the poets of his time. In his dislike of an adulterous and mercantile kind of love, he is so persistent that he uses hyperbolic expressions appropriate to a fanatic or a religious zealot. His satire is strong and courageous; he speaks in the vein of a preacher, and in that sense he is emphatically didactic. His aim is to reform society by exposing the follies and foibles of which it is guilty. Using the tone of a sermon he warns that hunger, war, death, or any other evil is not as bad as deceitful love. Some of his expressions have the flavor of vehement attacks on adultery by the Fathers of the Church, especially Augustine. His complaint that he is castigating in vein, de nien sui chastiaire, gives us the impression that he considers himself a prophet or teacher; and his words remind us of the complaints of Isaiah and the lamentations of Jeremias.⁸¹

⁸¹Jeremias, vi, 17; vii, 27; Isaias, i, 20 etc.

However, the similarity with the Fathers in his expressions and Biblical imagery should not make us conclude that his division of love is also identical with the Biblical concept of amor Dei and amor mundi or the patristic, especially Augustinian, concept of charity and cupidity. His own words should explain the nature of his fin' amor, he treats of it so often that we do not have to draw conclusions from words and expressions used in other contexts.

Is Marcabru the head of the realistic school of troubadour poetry who sang about the pure love of charity, in opposition to the "ideal school" of Eblo and his followers, especially Cercamon?⁸²

It is true that Marcabru says in one of his lyrics that he would never agree with Lord Eblo and his followers in their ideas of love (L'iverns vai e.l temps s'aizina, lines 73-76). It is also true that Cercamon dedicates a lyric to Lord Eblo, (Jeanroy, VI). From these facts can we logically conclude that Cercamon and Marcabru belonged to two different schools of poetry that may be called respectively "ideal" and "real" and that Marcabru wrote about charity in opposition to Cercamon, who sang about

⁸²Mölk, Trobar Clus, Trobar Leu, p. 15; Appel, Bernart von Ventadorn, (Halle, 1915), p. LXV; Roncaglia, Trobar Clus, passim.

adulterous love? Mölk says:

Eble II., Vizegraf von Ventadorn, gilt seit Appel und A. Jeanroy als des einen, der "école idealist," die das neue Ideal der hofischen Liebe propagiere; zu ihr wurden vor allem Bernart von Ventadorn und Jaufre Rudel, Graf von Blaya zu rechnen sein. Gegen Ebles Schule hatten sich Marcabru und die Gruppe um ihn ("école realiste") gewandt, indem sie die höfische Liebe als ehebrecherische, die Minnetugenden als Laster entlarvten und dieser "modischer Irrlehre" einerseits die reine Liebe der Caritas entgegenhielten)Appel, Hoepffner, Jeanroy, Scheludko, Errante).⁸³

Against this opinion held by many scholars, it should be said that to classify the troubadours in this way into separate schools with opposite tendencies and ideals and principles of life does not contribute much to the study of the early troubadours and it does not help us to understand them any better. Here we have to make a distinction between trobar and school. We can clearly see that there existed two different trobars, trobar clus and trobar leu.

⁸³Mölk, ibid., p. 15.

Were there also two schools of thought? First the word "school" is a misnomer; it stands for something exclusive, formal, organized. We have no proof that these early love singers did conceive or compose poems collectively or that they took lessons under one single master. In all probability they thought, wrote, and sang individually and personally. Most of them overlap, and there is absolutely no quality or characteristic by which we can group them into one category against another with a different distinguishing mark. Every one of them agrees with others in many respects and disagrees in several others. All scholars agree, for example, when we take the case of Marcabru and Cercamon who are put into opposite schools, that there are many passages in their lyrics in which they express the same point of view. Both of them condemn the courtship of married men and both speak about the results of illicit love relationships. Some examples taken from both these poets may illustrate that they are sometimes identical in their attitude to illicit love:

Q'a glazi fer a glazi es

Feritz d'eis lo seu colp nortau (Jeanroy IV, 20-21)

Whoever strikes with the sword,

is struck by the sword, with the same mortal

(stroke).

El fuec major seretz creman
 En la pena qe non trasvai,
 Enganador fals e truan,
 Al juzizi del derrer plai,
 On sera totz lo mals e.l bes
 Jutjatz; e no clam ja merces
 Domna c'aja drut desleita (IV, 29-35)

In the great fire will be burned,
 in punishment that does not end,
 treacherous and perfidious debauchers,
 at the judgment of the last trial
 where every evil and every good will be
 judged; and let her not then beg for mercy,
 the lady who had a disloyal lover.

In contrast to these warnings of Cercamon, Marcabru
 says about the same kind of people:

Maritz qui l'autrui con grata
 Ben pot saber que.l sieus pescha
 E mostra com hom li mescha,
 Qu'ab eis lo sieu fust lo bata,
 Et aura.n tort si s'en clama,
 Car drech e razos deviza
 Que qui car compra car ven,
 Ar, segon la lei de Piza. (Dej. XI, 49-56)

The husband who scratches the cunt of another,
 can know well that his own (cunt) sins
 and shows how (to pour) an evil brew for him,
 beats him with his own stick.
 And he will be wrong if he complains of it,
 for justice and reason decide
 that who buys dear, sells dear,
 now, according to the law of Pisa.

In spite of such instances of similarity between Marcabru and Cercamon, Kastner says that "Cercamon follows the new fashion set by William VII of Poitiers and Ebles II of Ventadorn, surnamed Cantator by the chronicler Geoffroi de Vigeois. To Ebles he dedicated his planh on the death of William of Poitiers. This explains why Cercamon is hostile to Marcabru and the other troubadours of his kidney who preach against free love and spoil the fun."⁸⁴ This would seem to be a conclusion drawn from an a priori postulation of the existence of two schools which mutually excluded each other and indulged in reciprocal slanders and invectives. But a more careful reading of the lyrics of the first three troubadours would make us feel that there is no ground for such a division into two. William

⁸⁴Kastner, "Marcabrun and Cercamon," Modern Language Review, XXX (1931), 91-96. Cf. Lewent, p. 436.

stands as far apart from Cercamon as Cercamon from Marcabru. William is the only one of the three who approves of illicit and adulterous love. Cercamon is strongly against the illicit love relations of men. The difference between Cercamon and Marcabru, then, in their concepts of love, does not seem to be one of kind but only of degree. Marcabru's language is stronger when he speaks about the love that is founded on money, for him it is a mere traffic without sincerity and loyalty. The love he condemns is illicit and adulterous and changes its hue every moment. A sincere and loyal love he is able to praise and extol to the skies. There are many passages in Marcabru that praise noble love. But concerning these verses of Marcabru that praise noble love, some critics feel that the poet is speaking about the love of God and not of anything worldly. Appel, for example, after quoting the strophes i to viii of Pus mos coratges s'es clarzitz (Dej. XL) says:

Hier ist kein Zweifel mehr was fin'amor bedeute. Jetzt handelt es sich nicht um keusche Liebe, im Gegensatz zu sundiger Brunst. Es handelt sich um keine irdische Liebe mehr. Fin' amor ist zum Himmel aufgestiegen. Es ist die Liebe, die um Gott ist und mit ihm selber eins wird. Was die

italienische Dichtung einst in höchster
 Poesie vollenden wird, ist hier nicht nur
 vorbereitet, sondern schon, freilich,
 trotz aufrichtiger Gesinnung, unbeholfen,
 in scholastisch dürre Form, zum Ereignis
 geworden.⁸⁵

This assumption is prompted only by the strength of Marcabru's language, the force of his expressions, and the aptitude of his imagery. He uses hyperboles both in the invective against false love, and in the adulation of faithful love.

While Cercamon dedicates his planh on the death of William X of Poitiers to Ebles, Marcabru dedicates his song about courtly love - Cortesamen vuoill comenssar - to Jaufre Rudel de Blaya. If the fact that Cercamon dedicates a song to Lord Eble is proof to show that he belonged to his school, by the same argument Marcabru should belong to the school of Jaufre Rudel to whom Marcabru dedicated his lyric. But both Jaufre Rudel and Eble II belong to the same school according to the scholars who make this division of the troubadours into two schools. The dedication, therefore, of a poem to Eble by Cercamon is no proof that the poet Cercamon belonged to his school or shared his

⁸⁵"Zu Marcabru," ZFRP, p. 454.

ideas. In the same way the fact, that Marcabru says in his lyric that he would never agree with Lord Eble in his concept of love, does not show that the love he sings about is identical with charity or divine love. Before concluding whether Marcabru's noble love is heavenly or divine, we have to examine all the instances in Marcabru where he speaks about heaven and God in reference to his love. No love can be godly or heavenly if it has no reference to God and heaven. If there is no direct reference to God and heaven when the poet sings about noble love, we will have to conclude that his fin' amor is neither heavenly nor divine; that he speaks only about human love. The division of love given in Augustine and the Fathers into cupidity and charity is not applicable to the division of love in Marcabru, because there is no God and heaven in relation to his noble love. This division may perhaps be parallel to Augustine's division of human love into licit and illicit love, not charity and cupidity.

The fact that the love in Marcabru is not divided into charity and cupidity as in the Fathers can be understood from some other instances also. The poet begins most of his lyrics with a Natureingang; he sees life and love in nature and then he is excited to sing of love. He compares human love with the love he sees in nature and says that the simple creatures mate for love; their Joy follows the

right road while ours is unsteady. What the poet means here is that the simple creatures mate for love, but human beings mate for money. Mating for money, without sincere love is what the poet condemns; his objection is not against mating for love, he is against infidelity and insincerity and the aspect of trade in love. He never says anything against mating for love:

Sesta creatura vana
 D'amor s'aparilha,
 Lur joys sec la via plana
 E.l nostre bruzilha;
 Quar nos, qui plus pot enguana,
 Per qu'usquecx bousilha. (XXI, 13-18)⁸⁶

These simple creatures
 mate for love,
 their joy follows the right road
 and ours errs;
 because we cheat, each as much as he can,
 every one does badly.

The poet sees lack of love only in men; in nature and among the birds there is love and joy. The tone of the poet in Bel m'es quan la fuelh' ufana (Dej. XXI), Bel m'es quan la

⁸⁶Text emended by Lewent, p. 428.

rana chanta (Dej. XI), Bel m'es quan son li fruich madur (Dej. XIII), and L'iverns vai e.l temps s'aizina (XXXI) is the same. In all these lyrics he sees the mating instinct in nature or hears the song of the birds, he is aroused by them, he has a disposition to sing. But then the thought crosses his mind that there is love only in nature and among the birds, not in men. Human beings mate not for love but for money; among them there is no lasting love, no faithfulness and loyalty, every one of them cheats.

This idea of the poet is not in agreement with the teachings of the Fathers. They do not say that natural love should be the ideal for men. They say that human love should be far superior and nobler than that of the animals and that it should never go down to the level of the beast. Natural love is for them a product of the libido and concupiscence; it is carnal. This love does not deserve praise or commendation according to the Fathers. Augustine, for example, asks, "Should I praise a love that I see in the tiger, in the lion, and in the birds?"⁸⁷ This is not the love that the Fathers admire. The love that the Fathers recommend, namely charity, is something else;

⁸⁷Sermones, PL, XXXVIII, 690-91.

it is not related to mating, or the change of season. Marcabru's love flourishes in the spring, when the winter is gone, and the time is pleasant, (Dej. XXXI, 1-9), or when the frog chants and the nightingale calls its companion with pride and the bird lowers its voice in fear of darkness, or when the fruits are ripe. The noble love in the Fathers is a supernatural love, it is not related to nature, it does not consist in anything that we see in this world; it transcends nature, it has a relation only to God. It consists in the contemplation of the essence and goodness of God, it does not please the senses, neither sight nor hearing has anything to do with charity. It is a virtue that affects only the intellectual faculty of the will. This love is completely different from the love that Marcabru sings about. His love is always bound to nature, it is aroused by the mating season, often occasioned by the sight of mating animals and birds and their enthusiasm and love for their female partner.

Marcabru, to be sure, does not mean that man should descend to the animal level or that he should imitate the animals. He means rather that loyalty and devotion are so natural that we see them even in animals, and that adultery and deception are perversions of nature. One who practices them debases oneself to a level that is even

inferior to animals. But the allusions to nature and the mating seen in nature surely indicate that the love he speaks about is natural love, that love which is inherent in the nature of all animals and men. Marcabru always sees man as a natural being. But the Fathers are always conscious of the fact that man is a superior being, that every man is called to a supernatural life. Their constant exhortation consists in this, that men should not descend to the natural level, that man should always be mindful of his superior calling. It is with contempt that they speak of animal and natural love. Even conjugal love which is licit and recommended to men, is accepted by the Fathers only with restrictions, always stressing that it is evidently an act of cupidity and concupiscence.⁸⁸

⁸⁸See discussion of matrimonial love below.

CHAPTER III

MARCABRU'S FIN' AMORS AND CHARITY

In his lyrics Marcabru distinguishes two kinds of love. He uses the words fina, bona, and veraia¹ to designate the kind of love that he recommends; the other love is venal, inconsistent, false, treacherous, and promiscuous. The people who practice false love he calls perfidious and deceitful, both men and women are equally accused by him. They destroy everything praiseworthy, and noble in man and follow the nature of the dog and the greyhound. Now only perversity, infidelity, cupidity and avarice reign supreme in man. We see a parallel distinction in the writings of the Fathers: they always speak of charity and the accompanying virtues in opposition to cupidity and the other vices related to it. The words and expressions seem at least externally and superficially similar. Are they identical in context? Is the purpose of the poet and the religious teacher the same? Do they teach the same thing in the same way? Are their motifs

¹Bon' Amors in L'iverns vai e.l temps s'aizina, lines 28, 64 and Per savi.l tenc ses doptanssa, line 27, etc. Fin' Amor in Pus mos coratges s'es clarzitz, lines 34 and 36, etc. Veraia or vera in Dirai vos senes duptansa line 31 and Lo vers comenssa, line 39, etc.

the same? Many critics like Vossler, Appel, Scheludko, Errante, and Robertson have discovered many parallels in their language and conclude that both the poet and the Fathers speak more or less about the same thing.² According to Scheludko there is a corresponding virtue in theology for every quality of fin' amor mentioned by Marcabru.³ Do these assumptions correspond to the intentions and meaning of Marcabru? Is his fin' amors the same as charity?

Marcabru defines fin' amor in many of his lines. It is the love that he praises and approves of. He says in Lanquan fuelhon li boscatge (Dej. XXVIII) that he always praises love and joy together, that is, a love that is accompanied by joy; love without joy he hates and despises. Amors e Joys, d'eyssa guiza - Love and Joy, I value them both the same. So the first characteristic of Marcabru's fin' amor is that it is accompanied by joy. Such a love is engendered by the singing of the birds, by the green vegetation, and the sweetness and the beauty of nature in

²Vossler (Karl), "Der Trobador Marcabru und die Anfänge des gekünstelten Stiles," passim; K. Appel, "Zu Marcabru," pp. 403-69; D. Scheludko, "Religiöse Elemente in weltlichen Liebeslied der Trobadours," pp. 402-421; "Über die religiöse Lyrik der Troubadours," pp. 224-50; "Über die Theorien der Liebe bei den Trobadours," pp. 191-234; "Klagen über den Verfall der Welt," pp. 31-37; G. Errante, Marcabru e le fonti sacre dell' antica lirica romanza, passim; D. W. Robertson, "Five Poems by Marcabru," pp. 539-560.

³D. Scheludko, "Über die religiöse Lyrik" and "Klagen über den Verfall der Welt."

spring. We see an example in A la fontana. Since it is the spring season and the poet sees all the pleasant and beautiful things in nature that call for noble love, he approaches the noble lady of the castle. The poet hopes that she will listen to his proposal; though we are not told what that proposal might be, we can imagine that it is sexual union with her. To his disappointment the poet comes to learn that the lady is already in love; but she has no joy, her only "joy" is taken away from her, he is gone with King Louis on the Second Crusade. Her love is faithful and honest; she would have had joy, but the object of her love is gone with the king into the distant Orient. When the knight, attempting to console her, says that God is able to give her joy, she answers that she wants the joy and the love of this world, not of the next.

"Senher, dis elha, ben o crey
 Que Deus aya de mi mercey
 En l'autre segle per jassey,
 Quon assatz d'autres peccadors;
 Mas sai mi tolh aquela rey
 Don joys mi crec; mas pauc mi tey
 Que trop s'es de mi alonhatz. (Dej. I, 36-42)

"O Lord, said she, I believe indeed
 that God will have mercy on me
 in the other world for ever,
 with many other sinners;
 but here he takes away from me that one
 who increases my joy; nothing affects me any more
 for he is so far away from me."⁴

In these lines Marcabru tells us explicitly whether his noble love is charity or not. Here the lady belongs to the nobility; she is in love. She is not much concerned with the love and the joy which God may give to sinners in the other world. Her love, as well as her joy, is of this world; the object of both her love and joy is her lover who has gone away from her.

In Al son desviat, chantaire, Marcabru says that the "love he has in view is born in a noble dwelling; in the place where it has grown it is protected by the branches and the twigs from heat and frost, so that no stranger can take it away" (Dej. V, 49-54). Here again the poet is clear about fin^e amor. He is speaking about the love of the nobility; his noble love does not belong to the

⁴This passage may also mean "he has little love or esteem for me."

peasants; it is meant only for a particular class of people. The word gentil should be understood against the background of the feudal structure of medieval society; it does not refer to the generations descending from Abel, or the just man, as Robertson wants to interpret these lines.⁵

It is true that on two other occasions Marcabru speaks about the generation of Cain. In Pax in nomine Domini, Marcabru says that, "there are many descendants of Cain, the first wicked man, of whom none will bear honor to God" (lines 37-40). He makes this comment about those who would not go on the Crusade. In Bel m'es quan li fruich madur (Dej. XIII) the poet says that false friendship and strange attachments are the characteristics of the descendents of Cain (lines 41-42). Following the use of the Fathers, Marcabru calls wicked men descendents of Cain. Augustine, for example, says that Cain is the first citizen of the terrestrial city, and that from

⁵"Five Poems," p. 550. Robertson says that gentil refers to the opposite of the descendents of Cain. M. Raynouard says that the Provençal word gentil comes from Latin gentilis and means gentle, noble. (M. Raynouard, Lexique Roman, rep. Paris 1836-45; see also Emil Levy, Petit Dictionnaire Provençal-Française, 4th ed., Heidelberg, 1966).

Cain arose the city of Babylon. Cain est primus civis civitatis terrenae and A Cain coepit civitas Babyloniae.⁶

Concerning Abel Augustine says that he was the figure of Christ, that Abel was the beginning of the city of Jerusalem, the city of God - Abel initium civitatis Dei.⁷ Does the word gentil refer to the generation of Abel and the people of sanctifying grace? There is nothing in the context that warrants such an interpretation. There are some other lines in the same lyric which clarify Marcabru's meaning:

Fals amic, amador tafur,
 Baisson Amor e levo.l crim,
 E no.us cuidetz c'Amors pejur
 C'atrestant val cum al prim;
 Totz temps fon de fina color,
 Et ancse d'una semblansa;
 Nuills hom non sap de sa valor
 La fin ni la comensansa. (Dej. XIII, 9-16)

False friends, treacherous lovers,
 debase Love and exalt crime;

⁶Augustine, De Civitate Dei: PL, XLI, 437, 441.

⁷Ibid.

but do not imagine that Love has become worse,
 because it is worth as much as in the beginning;
 it was always of a pure color,
 and had the same appearance;
 no man knows the end
 or the beginning of its worth.

Here the contrast is between false love and true love, the love of pure color and constant appearance. The poet speaks in both instances about human love, which can sometimes be faithful and other times treacherous and false. In the next strophe the poet says, concerning love, that he lets anyone who so wishes believe in insane prophesies, but for his part he prays God to guard him from this outlook. Because he engages in a kind of love in which there is no cheating and no trouble, in summer, winter and spring he rejoices immensely and he hopes to have more joy from it again, with security. What is the nature of this love? Is this love divine or human? He tells us explicitly in the next strophe:

Ja non creirai, qui que m'o jur,
 Que vins non iesca de razim,
 Et hom per Amor non meillur;
 C'anc un perjurar non auzim,
 Qu'ieu vaill lo mais per la meillor,

Empero si.m n'ai doptansa,
 Qu'ieu no.m n'aus vanar, de paor
 De so don ai m'esperansa. (Dej. XIII, 25-32)

I will never believe, no matter who swears to me,
 that wine does not come from grapes,
 and that a man does not become better by love;
 for we have never heard that anyone became worse by it;
 because I have the greatest worth thanks to the
 greatest [of women],
 and yet I have some doubts,
 for I do not want to boast of it, for fear
 of the one in whom I have my hope.

If the poet has the greatest worth because of a woman, his fin' amors is definitely of a woman and not of heaven or God. After these explanations of fin' amor he speaks about "the false love of evil impulse" - l'amistat d'estraing atur falsa - of the descendents of Cain.⁸ Still, in order to prove that fin' amors is charity, Robertson goes through patristic literature to see whether there is anything to relate Abel with charity.⁹ Marcabru says that the generation of Cain practices false love, they have strange

⁸Cf. Lewent, "Beiträge," p. 329.

⁹"Five Poems," p. 550.

relationships, while the descendents of Abel practice noble and faithful love. In the same way Augustine says in De Civitate Dei that the descendents of Cain practice cupidity and the descendents of Abel practice charity. From this Robertson concludes that Marcabru's noble love is charity. Such a conclusion would be right if Augustine and Marcabru made these statements while speaking of the same subject or in the same context. The context in Augustine is the distinction between cupidity and charity, in Marcabru between false and true love. Though both refer to Cain and Abel as ideals of the two loves they speak about, their meanings are not the same. In Augustine Cain and Abel are personifications of cupidity and charity and in Marcabru of false and true love. But in his lyrics Marcabru shows clearly that the nature and the characteristics of his true and false love are not the same as those of charity and cupidity in Augustine. So the passage cited from Augustine by Robertson does not provide us with sufficient proof to conclude that Marcabru's fin' amors is charity.

Some of the lines in the lyric Cortesamen vuoil comenssar (Dej. XV) further confirms the secular nature of Marcabru's fin' amor:

Lo vers e.l son vuoill enviar
 A.n Jaufre Rudel outra mar,
 E vuoill que l'aujon li Frances
 Per lor coratges alegrar;
 Que Dieus lor o pot perdonar,
 O sia pechatz o merces. (Dej. XV, 37-42)

The verse and the melody I wish to send
 to Jaufre Rudel across the sea,
 and I wish the French to hear it
 in order to rejoice their hearts;
 for God can pardon them for it,
 whether it be a sin, or a praiseworthy deed.¹⁰

The whole lyric is about courtly love. Are the Crusaders allowed to sing and hear songs about worldly love, a chaste and honest worldly love? Marcabru's lines depict exactly the attitude of the times to faithful matrimonial love. It is an inferior kind of love and a love of concupiscence, but it is allowed, as taught by Augustine and some other Fathers of the Church. The Crusaders were given absolution from all their sins; they were all in the state of grace according to the concept of the times. They have gone to do a noble work, to redeem the Holy Sepulchre, as Marcabru

¹⁰Cf. Lewent, p. 331.

himself says.¹¹ They are noble and valiant and do not belong to the generation of Cain. For these people a song about faithful human love can be a matter of joy and pleasure. This pleasure may not be fitting to a group of monks in the cloister or in the monastery of Clairvaux who have vowed chastity. But to the Crusaders it can even be of merit. If it is a sin, their meritorious acts of taking up the Cross for Christ is itself a reason for God to pardon them their sins, which are evidently not mortal. A venial sin is absolved by any good act or prayer. Such is the idea expressed in these lines. It is clear from these lines that the poet speaks about licit human love and not about charity or love of God.

Again the worldly nature of Marcabru's fin' amor is revealed in the following lines:

Bon' Amors porta meizina
 Per garir son compaigno,
 Amars lo sieu disciplina
 E.l met en perdicio; (Dej. XXXI, 28-31)

Noble love brings a cure
 for healing the one who is faithful to it.
Amars tortures its man
 and throws him into perdition.

¹¹Emperaire, per mi mezeis, line 14.

Bon' Amors porta meizina alludes to the Latin idiom "remedium concupiscentiae" which is said to be one of the purposes of marriage by the Fathers. Saint Epiphanius, for example, says: "In Cana . . . sunt celebratae nuptiae, ut . . . diffluentem furiosorum hominum in mundo libidinem nuptiarum castimonia et honestate constringeret . . ."¹² St. Augustine also speaks in the same vein: "Conjugium mihi non videtur propter solam filiorum procreationem, sed propter ipsam etiam naturalem in sexu societatem . . . Habent etiam id bonum conjugia, quod carnalis vel juvenalis incontinentia, etiamsi vitiosa est, ad propagandae prolis redigitur honestatem, ut ex malo libidinis aliquid boni faciat copulatio conjugalis."¹³ Before all the Fathers St. Paul taught this principle: "Propter fornicationem (vitandam) unusquisque suam uxorem habeat, et unaquaeque suum virum habet. Uxori vir debitum reddat, similiter autem et uxor viro . . . Quod si non continent, nubant; melius est enim nubere quam uri" (1 Cor. vii, 2-4, 9). It is on the basis of this admonition given to the Christians of Corinth by Paul that many of the Fathers considered "remedium concupiscentiae" as one of the

¹²Text quoted from Epiphanius, Adversus haereses Panarium PG, XLI, 941. "Tertullian and Origen thought of marriage chiefly as a cure for concupiscence," Jean de Fabregues, Christian Marriage: Twentieth Century Encyclopedia Series, (New York: Hawthorn, 1959), p. 37.

¹³Augustine, De Bono Conjugali PL, XL, 375.

objectives of marriage.

In the same lyric Marcabru says again that fin' amor is a source of Honor, Worth and Esteem:

Qui bon' Amor a vezina
E viu de sa liurazo,
Honors e Valors l'aclina
E Pretz sens nuill' ochaio; (Dej. XXXI, 64-67)

Who has good love as neighbour
and lives by what is allows
Honor and Worth incline to him,
and Esteem, without any doubt.

Here the word liurazo shows that the good lover is the one who is happy with what noble love permits. He who looks for more than what noble love grants, transgresses the social customs and the restrictions of the class. The poet means that he who does not live by what honest love permits acts immorally. He insists on loyalty and sincerity in love and condemns adultery and deception in marriage. But Marcabru's morality is a purely secular one and cannot be identified with that of the Fathers.¹⁴

In the previous strophe the poet spoke of a lady who loves a vulgar man. "If a lady loves a vulgar man

¹⁴Cf. ab dig verai, line 69.

in her house, she does not know anything about refined love and she resembles a female greyhound which gives herself to the cur. From them are born the rich and wicked people who do not give any feast or any money." (Dej. XXXI, 46-52). The poet's good and bad love, the noble lady and the "bitch," are distinguished by whether they obey the rules of their class and are generous to the troubadours or give feasts or money to them. There is no supernatural norm for the poet, no consideration whether love is salutary to the life of the soul or not, whether it pleases or displeases God.

All the songs in which there is any mention of fin' amor have now been dealt with except Pus mos coratges s'es clarzitz (Dej. XL). There are some lines in this lyric which do indeed make us feel that they are spoken either to or about God, who is called Love by John (1 John iv, 8). These lines need more careful examination and study before we can decide what is referred to. Lines from this lyric have often been quoted both to prove and to disprove the assertion that Marcabru's fin' amors is identical with charity. Some of the most controversial lines in this poem are the following:

Aicel cui fin' amors causitz
 Viu letz, cortes e sapiens,
 E selh cui refuda delis
 E met a totz destruzemens;
 Car qui fin' amor vol blasmar
 Elha.l fai si en folh muzar
 Que per art cuid' esser peritz. (Dej. XL, 8-14)

Ai! fin' amors, fons de bontat,
 C'as tot lo mon illuminat,
 Merce ti clam, d'aquel grahus
 E.m defendas qu'ieu lai non mus;
 Qu'en totz luecx me tenh per ton pres,
 Per confortat en totas res,
 Per tu esper estre guidatz. (Dej. XL, 36-42)

He whom fin' amors has chosen
 lives in a manner that is gay, courtly and wise.
 And he whom it rejects it destroys
 and abandons to total destruction,
 because he who wants to blame fin' amor
 is made to gape like a fool by love,
 so that he thinks he is destroyed by cunning

O, noble love, source of all goodness,
 You who have illumined the whole world,
 I pray you for mercy and defend me
 from that pain, let me not remain there.
 In all places I hold myself as your prisoner,
 and I hope to be comforted and guided
 by you in all things.¹⁵

Denomy says, for example:

In truth, it is difficult to reconcile Marcabru's expressions concerning fin' amor with divine love: the love of God, for example, is hardly a matter of self promise and pledge as Amors is (Dej. XXXVII, 37-40), nor is its birth confined to the well born and its growth to a leafy bower protected from the cold and heat (V, 49-53); nor, like fin' amor, does charity single out or reject an individual (XL, 8-11); nor is it fearful to boast of its possession because of the possibility of loss thereby (Dej. XIII, 31-32).¹⁶

Denomy does not think that this lyric expresses any clear idea of fin' amor in Marcabru. He concludes from the Starling poems that the poet's fin' amors is of oriental origin. It is true that Pillet and Nykl think that these lyrics are the best of Marcabru and they express his

¹⁵Cf. Translation by Lewent, p. 446.

¹⁶A. J. Denomy, "Fin' Amors: the Pure Love of the Troubadours," Medieval Studies, VII (1945), 139-207.

original concept of love.¹⁷ However, since these two lyrics have been considered parodies and imitations and examples of the poet's cynicism and mockery regarding courtly lyric, it is not fair to take arguments from these lyrics alone and come to conclusions about his concept of noble love.¹⁸

In response to Denomy's supposition that Marcabru's fin' amors is related to the futuwwa of the Arabs,¹⁹ Robertson writes: "The cult of futuwwa existed in two forms during the Middle Ages, one of which flourished among the illiterate people who idealized noble and generous warriors for the faith, especially those who fought crusaders; the other was associated with the Sufis and is not relevant to our purpose. But it seems to me unlikely . . . that a poet whose works show genuine crusading zeal would borrow a Moslem religious idea for purposes of exhorting Christian knights in nomine Domini to fight against the heathens. In his famous Pax in

¹⁷A. R. Nykl, Hispano-Arabic Poetry and its Relations with the old Provencal Troubadours, (Baltimore, 1946), p. 385.

¹⁸Carl Appel, "Zu Marcabru," p. 435; Ernest Hoeffner, "Le Troubadour Bernard Marti," Romania, LIII (1927), p. 127 and 146n, Denomy, op. cit., p. 148.

¹⁹See note on p. 59.

nomine Domini . . . Marcabru shows no tolerance for the Saracens and their ways."²⁰

The Arabic influence on Marcabru and other troubadours is in itself a vast subject and many articles and books have come out dealing with this theme. For our purpose I think that the following remark would suffice: there is no indication that Marcabru could in any way have been in contact with the ethical concept of the Arabs. We do not have any evidence from the history of the times that Marcabru could have studied the Arabic authors or that any Arab professor taught in Provençal. There seem to be more arguments against the theory of the Arab influence on Marcabru than for it. Further, when we study both of these concepts carefully, we come to know that there is no real similarity between Marcabru's fin' amor and the Arab futuwwa.²¹

Robertson, on the other hand, takes most of his arguments to prove that Marcabru's fin' amors is charity from this lyric. According to him, the lines addressed to fin' amors as source of goodness that has illumined the world and the invocation - "I pray you for mercy - etc. (XL,

²⁰ "Five Poems," pp. 544-45.

²¹ Cf. Scheludko, "Beiträge," pp. 30-127.

36-42) are to be understood as referring to God.²² It is true that this is a very confusing passage in Marcabru, for there are many instances in the writings of the Fathers where God or Jesus is called the "source of all good things." St. Augustine, for example, says that God is the one good from whom all good things come: "Deus est bonum omnium bonorum, bonum a quo sint omnia bona."²³ So also says St. Maximus: "In Deo est omnis plenitudo bonitatis."²⁴ But we cannot come to any conclusion about Marcabru's meaning from the context of the Fathers; we should study him in his own context.

The statement that "He whom fin' amors has chosen lives in a manner that is gay, noble, and wise etc." refers, according to Robertson, to God. Robertson's reason for this conclusion is the sentence in Augustine, "Deus est charitas." There is a logical and theological

²²"Five Poems," p. 558.

²³Enarratio In Psalmos, PL, XXXVII, 1742.

²⁴Tractatus Contra Judaeos, PL, LVII, 800. Cf. "Deus est totus bonus et ipsa bonitas" (Gennaedius, Notae in Librum de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, PL, LVIII, 1018); "Dei essentia non est aliud quam bonitas" (St. Anselm, Meditationes, PL, CLVIII, 803).

error in the interpretation of Robertson. In order to show the logical error, Robertson's argument can be put in the following syllogistic formula:

Deus est charitas according to St. Augustine

Atqui fin' amors (in Marcabru) est charitas

Ergo fin' amors (in Marcabru) est Deus

This syllogism seems to be identical with the equation $A = B, B = C, \text{ therefore } A = C$. But when we look closely we can understand that this formula cannot be used in the above syllogism in order to derive a conclusion. The fallacy of the syllogism consists in this: the terms used in the major and minor premise do not have the same meaning.²⁵ The proposition Deus est charitas is correct according to theology, and Augustine was the first to formulate it; the equivalent of this proposition in John is Deus est Agape. Neither St. Augustine nor any of the theologians, however, meant that charitas is a term that can be equated with Deus. Deus est charitas, true; but in the same way it must be said: Deus est esse subsistens, Deus est veritas, Deus est summum bonum, Deus est Lumen, Deus est sapientia etc. These are some of the attributes and names by which God is called in the Bible and in the

²⁵Cf. V. Remer, Logica Minor (Rome, 1927), p. 100.

Fathers.²⁶ All these propositions are correct and valid in theology. This means that in the major proposition of the syllogism the subject and the predicate are not used in the same sense. So the syllogism is false and such a syllogism does not prove anything. The theological error in the proposition lies in this fact that caritas is said to be the sole property of God, whereas caritas is only one of the many attributes of God.

From the line Aicel cui fin' amors causitz, Robertson concludes that fin' amors makes distinctions and chooses just as God bestows grace on some and not on others.²⁷ This would give us an impression that the choice of Amors is the principal reason why the wicked and the good are such. This is not correct because Marcabru never depicts fin' amor as a divine agency that makes a choice, it is only a quality by which men can be distinguished. The kind of Amor which the people choose causes them to be

²⁶ There are many other names by which the Fathers call God, as for example, Lumen (St. Ambrose, Expositio in Psalmos, PL, XV, 1364, 1687; In Psalmos Enarratio, PL, XIV, 1029); Lux (St. Cyprian, Epistolae, PL, IV, 258; Gregory the Great, Moralium Liber IV, PL, LXXV, 671); Magister (Tertullian, Apologeticus, PL, I, 395; Cyprian, Epistolae, PL, IV, 205); Medicus (St. Ambrose, In Psalmos Enarratio, PL, XIV, 1011); Lampas (Gregory the Great, Homiliarum in Ezechielem Liber II, PL, LXXVI, 951); etc. For more names and attributes see "Index omnium nominum quibus SS. Patres Christum designarunt in Scriptis," PL, CCXIX, 47-84; and "Index de Deo et de Variis Illius Attributis," ibid., 9-20. Cf. G. Van Noort, Tractatus de Deo Uno et Trino (Bussum in Hollandia, 1947), passim.

²⁷ "Five Poems," p. 558.

included into a whole category, and so those people who claim and profess to be noble and valiant must choose fin' amor. This is a warning or a lesson that the poet gives his audience, rather than an assertion that Amors is responsible for each man's being what he is. That means that there is no causality attributed to love, it is only a distinguishing mark, a quality by which people can be socially and ethically distinguished. Robertson's conclusion, therefore - "A statement that charity chooses or rejects individuals may thus mean simply that God chooses or rejects individuals, for Deus charitas est" - is not correct and not logically or theologically tenable.

In order to prove that the fin' amors in

Aicel cui fin' amors causitz,

Viu letz, cortes e sapiens, (XL, 8-9)

is identical with charity, Robertson quotes from Rabanus Maurus who says: "Nemo perfecte sapit, nisi is qui recte diligit."²⁸ It is true that wisdom and charity are considered by the Fathers coexistent in man; but there is never an instance in the Fathers where it is said that the one who has charity lives in a courtly manner - Viu cortes. This is a typical courtly term and cannot be understood unless against the background of medieval civilization and courtly etiquette. Viu letz - "lives with gaiety" - might be

²⁸Ibid.

associated with charity in the sense of supernatural joy and supreme bliss if it were used alone; but since it is used in combination with cortes we have to conclude that there is nothing of the supernatural and the spiritual in this context. Even in those instances where we see charity associated with sapientia in the Fathers, we note that they distinguish between sapientia mundi, sapientia coelestis, sapientia Dei,²⁹ etc. In this context there is no indication that Marcabru is referring to the wisdom of God or to that of heaven.

Robertson concludes: "The objection that Amors cannot be charity in this poem seems to be ill founded, and I see nothing to suggest 'courtly love'." For Robertson the main objection against assuming that fin' amors means courtly love is the fact that Marcabru says in another instance that he does not love any woman and was never loved by any.³⁰

Marcabrus, fillis Marcabruna,
Fo engenratz en tal luna
Qu'el sap d'Amor cum degruna,
- Escoutatz -

²⁹Rom, viii, 6; I cor, i, 20; ii, 5; etc.

³⁰Op. Cit., p. 559.

Quez anc non amet neguna,
 Ni d'autra non fo amatz. (XVIII, 67-72)

Marcabru, son of Lady Bruna,
 was born under such a moon
 that he knows how love falls away (or crumbles)

- Listen -

For he never loved a woman
 nor was he loved by any.

This assertion of the poet's has to be understood together with some of his other lines where he says that he is in love (XIV, 19-24; 43-48; XXVIII, 36-42) and his worth increases because of a woman (XIII, 25). The word cortes used in this lyric is itself a sign that the poet is speaking about courtly love in this context. What we do not find in Marcabru is any clear reference to charity. The references cited as examples by Robertson are all vague and general and in each instance applicable to faithful human love.

Charity, as the Christian concept of love, is a complex notion and has been used at different times with slightly varying senses. The various stages in the evolution of the concept of charity may be well marked if we go through the history of the writings about this virtue. The beginning of the concept of charity is in the Bible and the Biblical notion is the basis of all

treatises on the subject. In the Bible itself, we may notice a kind of evolution and growth in the idea of the love of God.

The starting point of the Christian concept of love is in the Old Testament, in the twofold commandment to love God and one's neighbour. This is the datum and the beginning of the New Testament concept. In Luke x, 24 and Matthew xxii, 37 the passage from the Shema is quoted by Jesus and the scribe agrees with him heartily.

The real Christian theology of love is formulated by Paul, who stands further away from Jesus than Jesus himself from Judaism. In Paul we see a complete change from the synoptic notion of the love of God. Paul's story is of a man who in his very ardent pursuit of the law of God finds himself cut off from God, and in the midst of his pursuit of sin hears the voice of God and is justified. So for him justification or righteousness is an act of God's grace; it is gratuitously given him by God through no merit of his own. For the first time in the Bible we see Paul using the word "love" (Agape) in a theological sense. In the synoptics we see this word used only twice (Matt. xxiv, 12 and Luke xi, 42) without any theological meaning attached to it. Paul says that the love of God (agape) is the fulfillment of the law (Rom. xiii, 10). In Paul, the love of God is a free gift. When is it that man loves God, according to Paul? It is

not when he keeps the law, not when he does acts fulfilling the will of God as he knows it, but when God is pleased with him. The only duty of man towards God consists in his love of his neighbour. "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word: thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." *Omnis enim lex in uno sermone impletur: "Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum,"* (Gal. v, 14).

The culmination of the New Testament concept of the love of God is reached in the writings of John, who says, "God is love, and he that abideth in love abideth in God and God in him." "*Deus caritas est, et qui manet in caritate in Deo manet, et Deus in eo,*" (1 John, iv, 16). Here we have the most exalted notion of the love of God in the Bible. The word used by John for love is Agape; Agape and God are one. Yet in another place John warns us of a kind of love, namely love of the world. "Do not love the world or the things that are in the world. If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him." "*Nolite diligere mundum neque ea quae in mundo sunt. Si quis diligit mundum, non est caritas Patris in eo,*" (1 John ii, 15). John gives the reason why he asks his disciples not to love the world: "Because all that is in the world is lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life; which is not from the Father but from the world. And the world with its lust

is passing away, but he who does the will of the Father abides forever." "Quoniam omne quod est in mundo concupiscentia carnis est et concupiscentia oculorum et superbia vitae; quae non est ex Patre, sed ex mundo est. Et mundus transit et concupiscentia ejus; qui autem facit voluntatem Dei manet in aeternum," (1 John, ii, 16-18).

According to the division of loves in John, only the love of the Father is good, holy, and salutary; all the other loves are included in the love of the world, either lust of the flesh, or lust of the eyes, or the pride of life. The only love that is approved in John comes from the Father.

There is no single line in Marcabru which suggests that his fin' amors is the love of the Father or that it comes from God. He says that false love is bitter and does not last; but he never says that his fin' amors lasts forever. On the contrary, there are indications in his lines that his noble love is neither for the things of heaven and God nor does it last forever. He calls fin' amor the source of happiness that illumines the whole world. This is the only statement he makes that is applicable to divine love. Can this be said of the love of a lady? For a Christian, the Fathers teach unanimously that to say that the love for a woman is the source of happiness and it illumines the whole world is a sacrilege

and an abomination. John gives the reason: it is of the world and does not last forever. Then how can Marcabru, who had a clerical training and probably was himself a priest, make such a statement? Marcabru's C'as tot lo mon illuminat (XL, 37) should not be isolated from his context and interpreted as an absolute statement about love, but should be understood in the context of all his lyrics. His tot lo mon does not mean the entire universe or the whole world in its literal sense. Marcabru is a poet of the court; he is speaking about the courtly class; his world does not include the peasants or the nobles outside Provence; his world is limited, he means by tot lo mon only the courtly world. According to Marcabru's ideas, the love of a woman can illumine and enlighten a courtier and a cavalier; love of a noble lady is an ideal quality in any noble man. So the line C'as tot lo mon illuminat agrees well with all the other statements about love made by Marcabru. If we interpret this line alone in the context of Patristic literature, we will have many difficulties in understanding his various other statements.

The Christian notion of love of God formulated by Paul and John came into conflict with the Platonic notion of Eros in the first centuries of Christianity. The early Fathers, like Origen, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria,

Athanasius, John Chrysostom, etc. had to face the problem of responding to criticisms from Non-Christian writers who were instructed in the Platonic or gnostic notion of love. These critics, like Marcion, Celsus etc. were real scholars and their criticisms could in no way be discarded as cheap and unfounded. The general tendency of the Fathers in this exchange of ideas between Christian and non-Christian considerations of love was, while not surrendering any of the Christian beliefs taught by Paul and John, to assimilate those ideas which were not directly opposed to the teaching of the Bible. This tendency of assimilating non-Christian, especially, Platonic concepts, into the Christian notion of love reached its culmination in Augustine who made charity the central theme of Christian doctrine. Augustine's new view of love, Charitas, emerges from the fusion of the Biblical and the Platonic ideas of love. His idea of charity and love of God has exercised by far the greatest influence in the history of the Christian concept of love. While what Paul and John taught remained the basis for his discussion about love, for explaining and further interpreting the New Testament notion of love of God Augustine made use of ideas borrowed from Plato.

After the encounter with Neoplatonism and its transformation into charity in the hands of Augustine, the Christian notion of love did not make any substantial progress or undergo any great change till the times of Bernard of Clairvaux and the courtly poets. When the troubadours and Minnesänger sang of the love of a noble lady of superior station and status in life and taught the courtiers how they should refine and reform themselves in order to rise to her level in social status, the mediaeval mystics preached a love by which the faithful can ascend to God through the ladder of mysticism. The idea of purging and purifying the soul from all its mundane affinities and elevating and sublimating it to the level of God in order to be his bride and spouse is of mediaeval origin, and this is far different from the New Testament concept of love. The pattern to this mystical ascent is the Ascension of Christ as taught by Bernard and the mystics of his time.

Augustine and Bernard are the main writers who contributed most to the development of the theological notions of love. While Augustine restated the New Testament concept of love in terms of Platonic Eros, Bernard, borrowing some ideas from the troubadour poets, transformed charity into a mystic ladder by which the faithful can ascend to God and the divine realm. Since these Fathers,

Augustine and Bernard, stand at the center of the Christian theology of love, in the following pages an attempt is made to compare Marcabru's concept of love with that of Augustine and his associates in the Platonic synthesis of Christian love and then that of Bernard and his contemporaries who contributed to reshape it into the monastic ideal. Moreover, these are the authors who could have influenced Marcabru in the formation of his concept of charity and Christian love.³¹

There is no parallel whatsoever between Charity in Augustine and fin' amor in Marcabru as Scheludko thinks. Augustine defines charity as a movement of the soul in order to enjoy God in Himself and one's neighbour for the sake of God. His tendency is to rise towards God and the divine Essence from whatever beauty and goodness he sees in this world. He says in his Confessions:

O eternal verity, and veritable charity,
and charitable eternity! Thou art my God;
for Thee I sigh day and night. When I
first knew Thee, Thou didst take me up to
Thee, so that there was something to see,

³¹See Frank Cassidy, Molders of the Medieval Mind, (New York, 1944), passim.

but I was not yet ready for the vision.
 Shining thy light upon me so strongly,
 Thou didst strike down my feeble gaze,
 and I trembled with love and with awe.³²

According to Augustine, charity comes from God first; then we are raised to God to see and grasp that eternal and veritable Charity and love. It is a light that shines in the soul of men. How different is the praise of fin' amor in Marcabru in comparison with Augustine's praise of charity.

Augustine's love either ascends or descends. His ascending love is directed upwards towards God, his creator.³³ It is not a social ascent, it is not a love of refinement. Marcabru's noble love, however much it ascends, does not ascend to God. It remains always on the level of the world. Marcabru's thoughts of love and joy are aroused by a worldly phenomenon, a wind, the singing of a bird like the nightingale, the chanting of the frog. He thinks of love and joy usually when he sees the mating instinct of birds and animals in nature. There is never a supernatural entity to initiate the feeling of love in him.

³²St. Augustine, Confessions tr. Vernon Bourke (New York, 1953), Book VIII, ch. 10, p. 181.

³³Ibid., Bk. VII, ch. 17, p. 187.

Man has to choose between charity and cupidity in Augustine.³⁴ What makes this choice so significant is that we ourselves are transformed into what we desire and love. Love binds man to his beloved object; love enters in man as Bonum, and if it is the summum bonum it will lead us to charity; only the summum bonum leads us to our salvation, everything below the summum bonum is of the world and should be counted as one of the other forms of cupidity and concupiscence. For Augustine, even faithful and licit matrimonial love is a form of concupiscence, because it is not directed towards God and the summum bonum.³⁵

Love for a lady or for anything less than the Summum Bonum, which is God Himself, is considered below man's dignity. If man has to come to the level of the beasts on account of his earthly existence and the weakness of his body, he does it not for the sake of the joy that arises from the use of material things. The difference between uti and frui is very much emphasized in Augustine.³⁶ The spiritual man does not enjoy the things of this world; he merely uses them. He has only one single object of his enjoyment, that is God. All other things he only uses,

³⁵Contra Julianum Pelagianum, PL, XLIV, 730; Enchiridion de Fide, Spe et Charitate, PL, XL, 269.

³⁶Augustine, PL, XXXIV, 33.

always recognizing that the joy and pleasure he derives from them is far inferior to the supreme and eternal joy of paradise. He never exalts or praises the joy he derives from the use of temporal goods, for he is aware that it is only an infinitesimal part of the joy and bliss that is reserved for him in the other world, in his life after death. He does not see any absolute or real beauty in this world, for even the most beautiful things of this world are but poor imitations of the infinite beauty of the divine essence.

Charity is the characteristic Christian relationship between God and man. It is different from affection which is a need-love and from friendship which is an appreciative love.³⁷ Charity neither originates from the internal resources of man nor is it an urge that arises from the imperfection of man's essence in his present existence as Platonic Eros.³⁸ Charity is infused into the soul of man by God Himself. No one can acquire it by his own acts or efforts; the only thing man can do is to dispose his soul for the reception of this grace through repeated acts of benevolence towards other men.³⁹ Love for one's

³⁷Cf. C. S. Lewis, The Four Loves (London, 1960), p. 10 and passim.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 106-32.

³⁹Gregory the Great, Homiliae in Evangelia PL, LXXVI, 1220, 1221

neighbour is the sign and symbol of the existence of divine love, because no one can love the invisible God without loving his visible brethren. This love of God, which is Christian charity, has nothing to do with the libido in men; for libido is essentially a need love, a filling love. Charity is not the natural affection that one feels for the other sex or for beautiful youths.⁴⁰ This love is completely different from sexual love; charity cannot be reached by an exaltation and sublimation of sexual love; for these loves differ in kind, not in degree.⁴¹

The main objection to calling Marcabru's fin' amor charity is that charity has always a purely theological connotation; a whole theology is built up around this notion so that it cannot be comprehended without a direct reference to God and a participation in the internal life of the Holy Trinity.⁴² Charity, for the Fathers, is a theological virtue which is implanted in the human soul as a pure gift of God, not merited and cherished by human actions.⁴³

⁴⁰Cf. Nygren, Agape and Eros, passim.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²John Chrysosto, In Actus Apostolorum Homiliae: PG, LX, 285; Cyril of Alexandria, Commentarius in Joannem: PG, LXXIV, 260.

⁴³St. Augustine, Epistulae: PL, XXXIII, 767.

The main theological propositions given in the Fathers concerning charity are:

1. Charitas est radix et perfectio ceterarum virtutum; . . . est pretiosius quam agnitio, gloriosius quam prophetia, omnibus autem reliquis charismatibus supereminens.

Dilectio Dei diffusa est in corporibus nostris, per Spiritum Sanctum qui datus est nobis (Rom. v, 5). Nullum est isto Dei dono excellentius. Solum est quod dividit inter filios regni aeterni et filios perditionis aeternae. Dantur et alia per Spiritum Sanctum munera, sed sine caritate nihil prosunt . . . Sine caritate quippe fides potest quidem esse, sed non et prodesse.⁴⁴

2. Charitas per Deum in animam humanam infunditur; nemo potest hanc virtutem suis meritis et actionibus acquirere.⁴⁵

3. In justificatione homo interne renovatur; vere delentur peccata;⁴⁶ inhabitat in illo Spiritus Sanctus;

⁴⁴ St. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, PG, VII, 1077; St. Augustine, Epistolae, PL, XXXIII, 818; Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannem Commentarius, PG, LXXIV, 384.

⁴⁵ St. Augustine, De Genesi Ad Litteram, PL, XXXIV, 353 and 383; De Peccatorum meritis et remissione PL, XLIV, 114; De Spiritu et Littera, PL, XLIV, 209, 229.

⁴⁶ Clemens Alexandrinus, Paedagogus, PG, VIII, 280; John Chrysostom, In Actus Apostolorum Homiliae, LX, 285.

fit novus homo; fit divinae consors naturae,⁴⁷ fit filius Dei adoptivus; haeres regni coelestis et amicus Dei.⁴⁸ Justificati verum meritum habere possunt; possunt mereri vitam aeternam et augmentum gratiae.⁴⁹

1. Charity is the root and perfection of all other virtues. It is more precious than agnition and more excellent than the gift of prophesy and more eminent than all other charisms in man. The love of God has been poured out into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us (Rom. v, 5). Nothing is more excellent than this gift. It is the one thing that distinguishes the sons of the eternal kingdom of God from the sons of everlasting perdition. Other gifts are also given by the Holy Spirit, but nothing is useful without charity. Faith can surely exist without charity, but it cannot be useful also.

2. Charity is infused into the soul of man; no one can acquire this virtue by one's own merits and actions.

⁴⁷ Ignatius of Antioch, Epistula ad Ephesios, PG, V, 660; Clemens Alexandrinus, Paedagogus, PG, VIII, 556; Athanasius, Orationes Adversus Arianos, MG, XXVI, 373.

⁴⁸ John Chrysostom, Catechesis Ad Illuminandos, PG, XLIX, 227; Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatos, PG, LXII, 13.

⁴⁹ Novatianus, De Trinitate, PL, III, 944; St. John Chrysostom, Fragmenta, PL, XLIV, 654.

3. When charity is infused into the soul of man, he is internally changed and renewed; all his sins are removed; the Holy Spirit dwells in him; he becomes a new man; he participates in the nature of God; he becomes the adopted son of God, heir to the kingdom of heaven and a friend of God. Those who have acquired charity can perform meritorious actions, they can merit the augmentation of grace and eternal life.

Though charity essentially consists in an act of the will and a habit of the soul, as taught by Thomas Aquinas and by later theologians,⁵⁰ it was often considered in some way connected with the heart, which is often spoken of as the seat of love. The concept of charity and divine love often loses its purely spiritual and intellectual character and comes to be associated with the senses when it is spoken of in exhortations and sermons. Sensual and carnal images abound, and even sexual images find a place in the most mystical and ascetical works on the love of God. This is what happened to the notion of charity in the Middle Ages. It was a period of religious exaltation, and purely spiritual and intellectual appeals to charity would have remained unintelligible and unattractive to the

⁵⁰ Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, I, q. 110-114 quoted from Rahner, Sacramentum Mundi, p. 414.

mostly uneducated masses. So it is no wonder that some of the preachers and religious teachers, paying little attention to the dogmatic and theological expositions of this virtue, emphasized the sensual and the sensational aspects. In this way they could easily recommend charity to the people as a substitute for the vices and sinful forms of love which were celebrated in Latin literature and popular among all peoples at all times throughout history. It has always been characteristic of Christianity to accept and assimilate any secular movement by connecting it with God or by referring it to spiritual motives.⁵¹

A typical example of this new development in the popular concept of charity is discernible in the devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Even from its very beginnings this devotion existed in the Church in some form or other. But in the Middle Ages it took some special turns. If a secular knight fought his battles in the service of a mostly inaccessible idealised lady, praised by the Minnesänger and the troubadours, what could be more natural than that the monk in the cloister should feel himself a spiritual knight devoted also to a great lady, the Mother of God. As

⁵¹Hilda Graef, The Devotion to Our Lady, (New York: Hawthorn, 1963), p. 41.

contemporary secular poets like Gottfried von Strassburg often gave erotic experiences religious overtones, so preachers and religious writers tended to express themselves in terms of human passion.⁵²

It is significant that at this period for the first time appears the exclusively Marian interpretation of the Canticles, though individual passages of it had already been applied to her much earlier, especially in the liturgy. Both Rupert, the abbot of the Benedictines at Deutz,⁵³ and the learned Honorius of Autun,⁵⁴ wrote commentaries on the Canticles in which Mary is the bride, and at the end of the century the Augustinian monk William of Newburgh wrote an independent commentary in the same tenor at the request of the Abbot Roger of Byland.⁵⁵ The attitude of the twelfth century monk is best expressed in the words of Aelred de Rievaulx: "The spouse of Our Lord is our mistress, the spouse of our king is our queen, therefore let us serve her."⁵⁶ The whole spirit of the medieval

⁵²Ibid., pp. 45-65.

⁵³PL, CLXVIII, 837-962 quoted in Hilda Graef, Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), I, p. 226.

⁵⁴Sigillum Beatae Mariae, PL, CLXXII, 509, quoted in Hilda Graef Mary, I, p. 228.

⁵⁵Hilda Graef, Mary, I, pp. 257-59.

⁵⁶PL, CXCIV, quoted in Hilda Graef, I, p. 250.

feudalism is in these words. Mary is no longer primarily the Mother of Christ, but His spouse. She is the bride of the Canticles; this conception now becomes so predominant that it gives erotic coloring even to the relationship between Mary and God Himself. This would have been inconceivable in the early patristic age, though she is sometimes called the bride, as for example, in the Akathistos, but in a purely metaphorical sense, without any erotic connotations.

Though the notion of charity was represented in sensory images in the Middle Ages, it never lost its reference to God; no one could speak of it without attributing its origin and growth in the human soul directly to God. For the theologians charity is a gift of God, it is a participation in the internal life of the Holy Trinity.⁵⁷ For ordinary people it might have also been embodied in the love of the Blessed Virgin, the spouse of God, and in the image of being her vassal and obeying her orders.

When we go through the writings of St. Bernard concerning the love of God and his commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, we will be able to see how different he is from Marcabru. He brings in worldly imagery but in a completely different way. He comments on the kiss of the lover in

⁵⁷ Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, I, q. 43, art. 4, ad. 2.

the Canticles, but he makes it clear that his words have no sexual reference by immediately referring that kiss to something spiritual and divine. He is always clear and precise about such references. He speaks continually about the love of God; that is his only theme. There is no instance in St. Bernard when anything worldly approaches the supernatural in worth and esteem. He would never say, for example, that he prefers the joys of this world to those of heaven, as in Marcabru (I, 40-42). Such a statement would be sacrilege and blasphemy for St. Bernard. Sometimes he speaks about a beloved lady, or a kiss, or the breasts of a lady.⁵⁸ But the way in which he treats them does not resemble anything in Marcabru.

The Canticle of Canticles might have been a hymn written for wedding ceremonies and nuptial celebrations, and verses from it might have been sung on such occasions. The lover and the beloved in that song were originally a man and a woman, and the love signified the love of a man for a woman.⁵⁹ But in Bernard there is no hint of the

⁵⁸St. Bernard, Cantica Canticorum: Eighty Six Sermons on the Song of Solomon tr. & ed. Samuel Eales (London, 1895), pp. 17-21 et passim; PL, CLXXXIII, 794-96.

⁵⁹Raymond Brown, ed. The Jerome Biblical Commentary (Englewood Cliffs, 1968), pp. 506-510.

physical and the sexual. He introduces his series of sermons by declaring that this book of the Bible is meant only for those who have advanced in sanctity and spiritual life; that those who are going to read this Book should be aware of the fact that they are going to eat hard bread and that there is not milk in it (1 Cor., iii, 2). It requires sufficient spiritual growth and maturity in the monk to understand the verses of the Canticles in their proper meaning.⁶⁰ Such an understanding is possible only for those who have renounced the world completely and are living in total dedication to God. They are able to attach everything they feel and experience in this world directly and immediately to the presence and providence of God. Their only thought is the supernatural and the things of the other world. In Marcabur's words, they live on pure Manna (Quan l'aura doussana bufa, line 22). But they are unlike Marcabru, who asserts in a sort of triumph, that he does not live on pure Manna and complains that he is not treated well by his patrons, after receiving the patronage and protection of the Duke, the Emperor, and Lord Audric.

In his Sermons on the Canticles, St. Bernard never even thinks of the literal meaning; he always goes after

⁶⁰ St. Bernard, Cantica Canticorum tr. & ed. Samuel Eales, p. 7. PL, CLXXXIII, 785.

the allegorical and the figurative meaning and explains them in a spiritual way. According to Bernard the kiss of the lover is the Holy Spirit and the Church asks for this kiss, that shw may have the knowledge of the Holy Trinity (pp. 38-43). The bridegroom has two breasts, of which one is patience in waiting for the conversion of sinners; the other benignity in receiving them (pp. 43-49). The perfumes of the beloved are three: namely, patience, devotion and piety (pp. 49-55). The breasts are better than wine, because the unction of grace, which flows from God's breasts, is more efficacious for our spiritual advancement than the severe reprimand of those set over us. Not only are they better than wine, but their fragrance is better than the choicest of perfumes, because not content with nourishing those who are present with the milk of inward sweetness, God sprinkles over those who are absent the pleasant odour of good reputation, and causes them to have a good reputation. The perfume of piety is the most excellent of all (p. 160). The name of the beloved is a medicine. The beloved is Jesus; his name is a means of salvation. It is an oil poured forth and this oil spreads from heaven to Judea and hence over the whole earth. It is an oil because it gives light, it is a nourishment, it anoints. It maintains flame, it nourishes the flesh, it relieves pain, it is light, it is

food, and it is a medicine. Since all these things are done by the name of the Lord who is the bridegroom, it is an oil. The name of Jesus is as honey to the mouth, as melody to the ear, and as a song of gladness to the heart.⁶¹

This is the vein in which Bernard explains the verses of the Canticles. Every sexual and carnal image he elevates and sublimates, relating it directly to the working of divine love in man.

Bernard speaks about carnal love also, but it is quite different from the carnal love of which the other Fathers speak. It is love for the person of Christ: "Such devotion to the flesh of Christ is a gift of the Holy Spirit and a great gift. Yet I must call such love carnal at least in comparison with the other affection which has regard not so much to the Word as flesh as the Word as Wisdom, as Righteousness, Goodness and all other perfections of whatever kind" (p. 113). He says that this type of love is still good, it makes progress and becomes rational, and it is perfect when it becomes spiritual (p. 115). Since the way in which God is loved is related to the feelings and the senses of the body, not purely to the faculties of the soul, he calls it carnal. This carnal love, according

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 78-79.

to him, is not always strong and deep, though it is good and a gift of the Holy Spirit (p. 114).

Bernard says of love that it is sufficient in itself, it pleases by itself, and it is for its own sake. It is itself a merit, itself its own recompense. It seeks neither a cause nor a consequence beyond itself; it is its own fruit and its own object and usefulness. He says: "Amor praeter se non requirit causam, non fructum. Fructus ejus, usus ejus. Amo, quia amo; amo, ut amem, Magna res amor, si tamen ad suum recurrat principium, si suae origini redditus, si refusus suo fonti semper ex eo sumat, unde jugiter fluat. Solus est amor ex omnibus animae motibus, sensibus atque affectibus, in quo potest creatura, etsi non ex aequo, respondere auctori, vel de simili mutuum respondere vicem."⁶² "I love because I love. I love that I may love. Love, then, is a great reality and very precious, provided that it recurs to the principle on which it rests, and it is kept in continual relation with Him who is its origin, and draws from that pure source of waters that flow continually in greater abundance" (p. 509). Bernard's pure love has only one source and it is God. He says that of all the feelings, affections, and

⁶²Sermones in Cantica, PL, CLXXXIII, 1183.

movements of the soul, love is the only one by which the reasonable creature is able to respond to its Creator. In Bernard's pure love the Bridegroom stands the highest of all. The love which he suspects is caused by the hope of acquiring something. Such love is weak; for if that hope is withdrawn, that love is either extinguished altogether, or greatly diminished. It is impure because it is founded on the hope of something else. Love that is pure is not mercenary; it does not draw strength from hope, nor is it weakened by distrust.⁶³

When we compare the love in Bernard with the love in Marcabru, we easily come to the conclusion that Bernard's love is as remote from Marcabru's as is the earth from heaven. Marcabru's love is of a lady, Bernard's of God. The bride in Bernard is the human soul and the bridegroom God, while in Marcabru both the lover and the beloved are human beings of flesh and blood.

In Languan feulhon li boscatge (lines 40-42) the lover expresses the hope that his beloved will not refuse him that which he has often asked of her. The lover seeks physical sexual union with the beloved, and that is all. There is no ulterior aim, no further end; there is no

⁶³Ibid., p. 510.

figure or allegory used here. In Bernard the case is completely different. Wherever there is mention of physical and sexual union in the Canticles, he explains it in figurative language. Sexual union in the Canticles means for him the highest stage of contemplation.⁶⁴

The love of God is never disappointing; a man imbued with charity never complains about the love of God. The only object of his love, namely God, loved him before he loved God; he is only trying to reciprocate the love that he has received from his creator. In charity there is never a complaint by the lover languishing in solitude. Charity is never jealous and is not worried whether some one else has taken possession of the beloved. Charity is founded on humility and it would never ask God: "Who has given her the right to be loved without giving love?" (Dej. XXV, 12-13).

Marcabru's love is not a love of submission to the will of God and to His providence, but one dependent on a lady of fickle will and changing moods, and so he is constantly haunted by the fear of the loss of his love. None of the common symbols of charity is used by Marcabru. In the writings of the Fathers we can find many such

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 315.

symbols: "the law of the city of God,"⁶⁵ "water,"⁶⁶ "oil,"⁶⁷ "tunica Christi desuper texta,"⁶⁸ "vestis nuptialis,"⁶⁹ "Margarita Evangelii pretiosa,"⁷⁰ etc.

Marcabru's is a worldly conception of love; his fin' amors reflects nature during the spring season. His love never transcends the natural and the congenital instincts in man; it is awakened when the grass is green and the earth is adorned with white flowers, and we hear around us the usual song of spring. The knight in A la fontana approaches the lady hoping that these natural phenomena have engendered love in her. The poet thinks of love in A l'alena del vent doussa because the wind blows and the meadows are red and yellow with the freshness of spring. Marcabru likes to sing about love at the time of the year when the mountains are shady, and the birds cry and sing under the green bushes, and each bird gives joy to its mate in its nest (lines 1-10). The thought of love

⁶⁵Augustine, Enarratio In Psalmum, XCVIII, PL, XXXVII, 1261.

⁶⁶Augustine, Enarratio In Psalmum CII, PL, XXXVII, 1333.

⁶⁷Augustine, Tractatus VII, PL, XXX, 1435.

⁶⁸Augustine, Enarratio in Psalmum, PL, XXXVII, 176.

⁶⁹Augustine, Sermo XC, PL, XXXVIII, 563.

⁷⁰Augustine, Disciplina Christiana, PL, XL, 670.

occurs to the poet when the sap of the tree ascends through the branches and resuscitates the broom and the broom heath, and when the peach trees flourish, and the frog chants in the pool, and the elder and the willow grow (Dej. III, 1-8). Marcabru compares the old generation of lovers to the new during the dry season when the spring sighs, and the fountain murmurs, and the fields are green again (VIII, 1-5). He thinks of noble lovers and gallant men when the frog sings and the sap comes up through the bark; and thus the flower, the leaves, the branches, and the fruits come to life again in plants; and the nightingale cries and calls its companion whom it has conquered by joy and when it is full of pride, since it does not have to fight any more against the cold, the ice, the frost, and the north wind (XI, 1-8). Marcabru complains of shameful libertinism when the wave clears itself and every bird in the garden expresses its joy in its warbling and the song from their beaks resounds (XII bis, 1-5). Marcabru sings about the joy of loyal love when the fruits are ripe and the second crop is green again (XIII, 1-2). He likes to sing of love when the leaf appears proud on the high small branch, and the nightingale uses up its strength in singing under the twigs, because it is pleased to make its cracking sound in the morning twilight, when every bird which has a healthy voice is disposed to sing; and

when even the frog makes its efforts along the fountain and the owl groans with its female, since it cannot do anything else (XXX, 1-12). The lady in the Ges l'estornels non s'oblida immediately recognizes in the singing of the bird a message of love and asks, "What kind of love torments you?" Ho cals amors tensa? (XXVI, 22). This message of love is conveyed by nature when the groves are full of leaves and the flower appears in the meadow; and the little birds on the branches make sweet chants in the middle of verdure, and they are full of joy. Marcabru gives the reason why he likes the spring season: because it is the season of joy and love; because he always likes a love that is accompanied by joy (XXVIII, 1-14). He likes to think of love because winter is gone, and the time is pleasant, and the bushes are again becoming green; the flower appears on the hawthorne, and the birds rejoice. Now love furnishes the gaiety, everyone is attracted to his mate, according to the pleasure of the heart. The cold and the drizzling season is succeeded by the gentle season. Near the hedges and in the woods he hears the contests of songs, and so he prepares himself to sing and to tell us how love goes (XXXI, 1-18). The poet sings about love when love enters his heart; when he sees in nature those conditions for the birth of love; when birds rejoice his heart by their songs and their chirrups and chants (XXXIV, 1-7). He hates summer

because it gives birth to libertine life and envy (XXXVII, 4-7). He exhorts the lovers, that at least when the jackdaw shows himself proud and mimicking under the branches and the sweet wind whistles, they should choose a good and noble love (XLII, 1=7).

All the signs and symbols used by Marcabru in his lyrics refer to the phenomena of mating and reproduction in nature. When he sees life and vitality all around him in plants, animals, and birds, he thinks of the different kinds of love that the nobles engage in and the consequences of each kind of love. In nature he sees all the elements of noble love that is engendered in spring; among the ranks of the nobility alone, he seldom finds an honest and noble love. In nature he sees many white flowers and laments that he does not find any white love among the nobles. Why this particular affection for the color white? Because, he says, white is the color of a loyal and consistent love. As he sees only white flowers in nature, he exhorts the nobles to choose a white love, which is identical with his fin' amor or noble love. From nature and white flower he always goes on to noble love, and then continues to describe the qualities and effects of both noble and ignoble love.⁷¹

⁷¹See De j. I, 4; XVII, 27; XXIV, 5; XLI, 2; XLIV, 43; XXXVII, 30; V, 14; XXXII, 66.

It is true that the color white is used in the Bible and in the Fathers to indicate charity. It is in this sense that the verse in the Psalm: "Adsperges me hyssopo et mundabor; lavabis me, et super nivem dealbabor" (Ps., L, 9). "Cleanse me of sin with hyssop, that I may be purified; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow," - has been interpreted. So also the verse in the Apocalypse: "Sed habes pauca nomina in Sardis, qui non inquinaverunt vestimenta sua et ambulabunt mecum in albis, quia digni sunt." - "But you have a few persons in Sardis who have not soiled their garments; these shall walk with me in white because they are worthy." There are many such instances in the Bible where the color white and white vestments designate charity. Here again, it is the context that should give us the exact meaning. When Marcabru says that the color of one of the two colts, which were born white, turns to grey to resemble the donkey (XVII, 27) he means that the noble man who is unfaithful in his love debases his nobility. In En abriu, s'esclaira.il riu contra.l Pascor he tells us explicitly what he means when he says the noble love has only one color and it is white, it is the love that does not know of any deceit (XXIV, 5). When he sees the orchard and grass along the white rivulet he thinks that love also should be white; But it has now become spotted. Why?, because the noble men and women are not loyal to each other (XXIV, 5).

In XLIV, 43 also the poet speaks of love that it turns from white into grey in the context of unfaithful love. In A la fontana the Lord approaches the lady and thinks that the sight of white flowers would induce her to a noble love (I, 4). In XXXVII, 30 the poet says that white is the color of pure and true love; so also in XXXII, 66, love is white when one courtier goes to his equal and that love flourishes. White love that changes its color is the love that becomes disloyal as he states in V, 14.

Can we say that the color white in Marcabru has the same meaning and significance as in the Bible where the Psalmist says "Wash me, and I will become whiter than snow" (L, 9). Here the Psalmist speaks obviously of the remission of sins and the restitution of charity. Apocalypse vii, 13-18 tells us that those who are dressed in white are those who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.⁷²

Loyalty and fidelity are the principal characteristics of Marcabru's noble love. The lover always yearns for the possession of the beloved; when either one is separated, the beloved is in distress and she weeps and complains. She curses all those who were responsible for the departure

⁷²Cf. Apocalypse vi, 11; xv, 6; xix, 14; etc. Cf. also Peter Dronke, "Tradition and Innovation in Medieval Western Color Imagery," Eranos Jahrbuch, XLI (1972), 51-107 passim, esp. p. 63.

of the beloved (I, 25-28). Supernatural and spiritual joys are no substitute to the beloved who languishes in solitude (I, 36-42). Since there is loyalty and fidelity in pure love, there is no need of a guard to keep the lady away from other men. The sight of guarded wives who cheat their husbands is distressing to the poet; a guard is necessary simply because there is no fin' amors between them. Here each cheats the other and the wicked guardians cheat their masters. In true love there is no competition between lover and beloved as to who cheats the other more; they are both attached to each other (V, 19-24). No guardian comes in between them to cheat and make the husband a cuckold (V, 29-30). Fin' amors gives birth to noble and valiant men who are enterprising and excell in heroic deeds. Noble love is enjoyable; there is no complaint or sorrow; rather it brings a cure. When the lover is gloomy and sad and depressed, there comes the beloved and greets him with a kiss: Immediately he is sound, healthy, and cured (VI, 49-52). There is no place for envy and lust in noble love, it is not suspicious of the beloved.

A noble lover does not boast, he shows his excellence not in words but in actions. Noble lovers are born of noble stock - from a noble father and mother - in the same way as "a good fruit comes out of a good garden and a bad son from a bad mother" (XVII, 19-24). A noble lover does not follow the counsel of a woman, he is always mindful of the

teaching of Solomon who asks the lover to beware of the counsel of the woman (XVIII, 61-66). Real love comes from the heart, it is not fickle, it is not a mere fancy (XIX, 37-40). Good lovers are true cavaliers and knights, not hen-pecked fools following the whims and fancies of the woman (XIX, 55-58). Pure white color is the symbol of noble love for Marcabru, changing or grey color signifies carnal and promiscuous love (XXIV, 4-6). Good love is satisfied with what it provides; it does not wish for the illicit and the forbidden pleasures. It does not go to excesses. Love that goes beyond the limits set for it is tainted according to Marcabru; that love, like too much wine, only enervates the man and Marcabru invokes God's curse on such unbridled love. (En abriu, s'esclaira. il riu contra. l Pascor (XXIV), lines 10-12). Fin' amors is not found in houses of prostitutes. The prostitute who receives all those who approach her is condemned by the poet (XXIV, 19-21). It is very difficult to keep love always pure (XXIV, 25). A good lover does not believe in deceitful ladies, he escapes her tricks. He always gets real, loyal and faithful love from his lady; not a love tainted with many colors. If there is real love, there is no need for the husbands to shut their wives in houses in such a way that no stranger can enter, or give the custody of their wives to vulgar men with the result that the

custodians entertain their passions. These vulgar people are, according to Marcabru, the worst companions because they corrupt the race with their own children mixing their blood with that of the nobility (XXIX, 19-30). Noble love is not dependent on money; it does not look for wealth in the lover. Both in adversity and in prosperity the true lovers are equally in love, and love is a cure and medicine for all the ills of the couple (XXXI, 28-36). The true lover decks his house with courtliness, and is neither puffed up nor angry, and does not believe in big words; he is noble, worthy and generous (XXXII, 55-63). Good lovers go on the Crusade and care about Christianity and the destruction of the pride of the pagans. Fin' amors is not mean and it does not have a forked tongue; it always produces good fruit (XXXVI, 19-24).

The whole purpose of Marcabru's ethics of love and marriage is the breeding of a pure race of nobles for the future. According to the poet, all the noble qualities are natural to those who really belong to the class of nobles. Those who are of a pure breed are naturally generous to the troubadours; they excell in heroic deeds and practice Cortezia. Those who lack these noble qualities are born from those who go courting around the plough of the farmers (XXXII, 22-23). The love that embraces its own equal is white, and it flourishes and produces good

seed; noble love raises the lover to the level of the friend (XXXII, 64-69), while those companions that corrupt the race are worse than robbers (XXIX, 26-28). The wicked fertility of noble ladies brings forth bad fruits (XXXVI, 23-24). Those nobles born of a mixed breed are not capable of performing any good or heroic deed; their boasting is, to the poet as pleasant as seeing a dog kneading the dough (XXXVI, 27-30). The baptism of Jordan hurts these perverse Christians because it puts them in danger; while the real noble-born cavaliers take up the cross to confound the pride of the pagans (XXI, 37-42). The lady who loves a vulgar man is similar to the greyhound that gives itself to the cur. From such love are born the rich who are lax in their morals and lack generosity (XXXI, 46-54; XXXIV, 26-28). Libertines are men of low birth according to the poet (XXXVI, 33). If he were of noble birth, he could not but be an honest lover excelling in noble qualities. One is not generous because he is not born noble; though one may belong to the noble class, if he is not generous, then his nobility is doubtful (XXXVI, 34). The nobles annihilate worth and youth because instead of loving a noble lady in true and honest love, and thus engendering really noble young men, they go around spreading the profession of cuckolds (XLI, second and fourth strophe) and fill the nobility with all kinds of mean and vulgar people (XXXVIII, fifth and sixth strophe).

Robertson's supposition that the poet is concerned in Al departir del brau tempier with a great garden is correct. It is true that the garden is used by the Fathers as a very common symbol of the Church, not of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but of the body of the faithful. There are many instances in the writings of the Fathers where the Church is compared to a garden and that garden, which is the church, takes its origin from Abel, "Ab Abel justo incipit,"⁷³ says Gregory the Great. The Church is called "Ager Christi benedictus"⁷⁴ by Abbot Rupert in one instance and "Ager sanguinis"⁷⁵ in another. St. Bernard calls it "Agricultura Christi,"⁷⁶ while St. Ambrose calls the Church merely "garden."⁷⁷

There are instances also where the garden is the symbol of the individual soul. Peter Damian, for example, calls the soul "deliciarum hortus"⁷⁸ and venerable Gottfried Abbas calls a good soul a "faithful garden,"⁷⁹ while

⁷³Homiliae in Evangelia, PL, LXXVI, 1164.

⁷⁴Rupert Abbot, De Trinitate et Operibus Ejus, PL, CLXVII, 963.

⁷⁵Commentarius in Matthaeum, PL, CLXVIII, 1573.

⁷⁶St. Bernard, Sermones in Cantica, PL, CLXXXIII, 935.

⁷⁷Commentarius in Cantica Canticorum, PL, XV, 1863.

⁷⁸Epistularum Liber Octo, PL, CXLIV, 269.

⁷⁹Sermones, PL, CLVII, 171.

Hugo of St. Victor identifies the soul with a garden of pleasures, "animus, hortus Voluptatis."⁸⁰

Concerning the verse in the Canticles, "Hortus conclusus, soror mea sponsa, hortus conclusus, fons signatus" (Cant. IV, 12), which is now often interpreted as referring to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin,⁸¹ St. Augustine comments that: "The garden is the Church, both because it gives birth to many people in faith and as good soil grows many beautiful flowers. Here it is spoken of as an enclosed garden and it is good because it is fortified by charity on all sides so that no one who is not worthy be allowed to enter this enclosed garden."⁸² Every holy soul is also understood as an enclosed garden because it hides all its good activities by the intention of eternal life, and also it has perfect contempt of all human praises and vain glory. This soul fences itself on all sides with the hedge of good intentions

⁸⁰ Opera Mystica, Sermones Centum, PL, CLXXVI, 1086.

⁸¹ See the application of this text to the Blessed Virgin Mary in Pseudo-Jerome, Epistolae, Cogitis me, PL, XXX, 131; See also the fifth lesson on the feast of the Immaculate Conception on December 8 in the Office of the Latin Rite. This text is applied also to the Church; see A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (New York: 1951), pp. 497-98.

⁸² Augustine, De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. VI, PL, XLIII, 196; Contra Cresconium Donatistam, Lib. II, PL, XLIII, 477; Ibid., Lib. IV, PL, XLIII, 590.

so that the old enemy may not be able to enter into it and plunder the interior of the garden.⁸³

But the image of the garden in Marcabru is different. The key to the interpretation of all of Marcabru's images about gardens and fruit trees and the central principle of Marcabru's comparison of garden and nobility lie in two strophes of Dirai vos en mon lati (Dej. XVIII). In proverbial language he says that the noble and promising young men are born only to a noble couple through fin' amor; that if the sons are born not from really noble parents, or if the love of the parents is tainted, the new generation can never be noble. It may have the appearance of nobility, but in their actions these young men will not be different from peasants. Herein he gives the main reason for his exhortation to the nobles that they should choose fin' amor and not go around courting the peasants. Only fin' amors can keep the nobility in its vitality and purity.

Lo mouniers jutg'al moli;
 Qui ben lia ben desli;
 E.l vilans ditz tras l'araire;
 Bons fruitz eis de bon jardi,

⁸³Hugo of St. Victor, De Claustro Animae, PL, CLXXVI, 1177-78. Cf. Index de Ecclesia, PL, CCXIX, 669; Alcuinus, Exegetica, PL, C, 653.

Et avols fills d'avol maire
 E d'avol caval rossi.

Eras naisson dui poilli
 Beill, burden, ab saura cri
 Que.is van volven de blanc vaire
 E fan semblan aseni;
 Jois e Jovens n'es trichaire
 E malvestatz eis d'aqui. (XVII, 19-30)

The miller judges in his mill:
 "Who ties well should untie well."
 The peasant says behind his plough:
 "Good fruit comes out of a good garden;
 a bad son is born from a bad mother,
 and from a bad horse a nag is born."

Now two colts are born
 beautiful, kicking the ground and with a golden mane
 which goes on changing from white into grey
 that makes them resemble asses.
 Joy and youth have become deceitful
 and felony comes out of it.

In these lines Marcabru points out that only from a good garden can a good fruit come forth, that no horse is born of a donkey. In the same way, if the nobles want a good

future generation, they should themselves be good. As the miller says that only he who ties well unties well, so in order that the nobility may have a good progeny they should practise noble love. If they go beyond what noble love permits, their sons may have the appearance of nobility when they are born, but when they grow up they will change their color like the colt and be no better than a peasant.

Marcabru's garden stands for neither the Church as a whole, nor the individual soul; it stands for the noble class in Provence. The lyric Al departir del brau tempier should be interpreted in the context of these two strophes. He says there that the grafts are good, meaning that the old generation of nobles were valiant men; 'but the fruits are hollow',⁸⁴ means that the present generation is idle and unworthy. It has all the appearances of nobility. The leaves and the flowers seem to be from the apple, but when the fruits appear, they are only elders and willows (III, 9-16) means that in all appearance the young men look noble, but their actions are mean and peasant-like. There were in this garden at one time very good

⁸⁴ I agree with Aurelio Roncaglia who says that though the Provencal word bacuc means "plump" or "fleshy," in the line gent sont l'empeut, e.l frugs bacucs, this has a pejorative sense and should be translated as "hollow." (Aurelio Roncaglia, "Marcabruno: Al departir del brau tempier," Cultura Neolatina, XIII (1953), 12-15.)

apples, meaning, enterprising noble men; but now they are all dead and gone; what is left are only pines and branches. The present generation of nobles do not resemble their parents because they do not practice fin' amor. The parents were noble men of worth and honor, but the present generation is not. They merely boast, they have no actions. All these changes, destructive to the nobility, have taken place because their love has lately become spotted, because there is no honesty among the married people; husbands and wives compete in cheating each other. The young men are lazy and inept for any valiant enterprise because they are grey and ash-colored donkeys, not well-bred horses (Dej. IV, fourth strophe). The old generation of noble men maintained Prowess openly and secretly because loyal youth was their father and pure love their mother; but now the dukes, kings, and emperors have destroyed loyal youth and vilified pure love (V, 37-42); so the new generation is not sure of its parenthood. Since foreign elements have crept into their blood, the nobles of today have become lazy and boasting, inept for any valiant enterprise, good only for the contest of words. Lust and felony have struck them, and they are rotten to the core (XLII, 9-12).

Marcabru sees that the whole of nature resuscitates and rejuvenates during the spring season; he expects the

same from the nobility: Fin' amors should fill the ranks of the nobles with valiant and enterprising men. But he sees that the noble love has almost disappeared. For Marcabru fin' amors is a natural source by which real noble men will be added to the class. Thus, the class will be strengthened and restored to life again. The irony of the situation lies in this: that the whole of nature does what it ought to but the noble class does not. The nobles do exactly what leads them to hell, what corrupts the race, what destroys youth and joy. They trick and cheat and deceive each other, the greater and the more powerful they are, the more they do it. The whole pre-occupation of Marcabru is the garden of the noble class, how to rejuvenate it, how to make it stronger, more generous and enterprising. He is confident that fin' amors can bring about the change in the garden, but there are few to follow its rules.

Marcabru's hell is not identical with the hell of the Fathers. His exclamation, "Ah, how sad it is that most men go there where all their gain is hell" (XXXV, 21-23) does not mean that the poet is admonishing them to avoid sin and thus escape the punishments of hell. According to Marcabru, sin is not the greatest evil. Twice he speaks of sin and sinners in a secular manner. In A la fontana del vergier he puts in the mouth of a lady whose love he approves that, "I believe that in the other world

God will have mercy on me forever as He does with all sinners" (I, 37-39). The rich noble men who go courting around the plough, says Marcabru, will receive pardon for their sins at the last judgment according to their penitence (XXXII, 16-18). For Marcabru, the evil of corrupting the race and debilitating the noble class is of much greater consequence than that of committing a sin. If they commit a sin, God will pardon them easily if only they repent; but when they fill the ranks of the nobility with bastards and cowards, the class is doomed and destroyed. Marcabru's hell is not the place where the sinners are punished, but it is the state where the noble class is weakened and debilitated; a state where the nobility does not receive the respect and honor due to it; a state where the noble class is not capable of fulfilling its proper function. According to Marcabru, noble men and knights go to hell for not practicing fin' amor and filling the noble rank with real noble men, for not making the sap of vitality come up through the tree of the noble class, and, above all, for corrupting the race.

This does not in any way mean that Marcabru does not care for religion or that he is either against or ignorant of the accepted religious notions. As far as we know, Marcabru is the most pious and religious of all the early troubadours and because of his clerical training he could have well known the real meaning of sin and hell. But

in his lyrics, he does not stress the theological points of sin and hell. Since these lyrics are intended for the nobles and the courtiers he stresses that adultery and disloyalty in marriage are destructive to the nobility as a class. He tells them that it is sinful not to go on the Crusade, because the Crusade ennobles and sanctifies their profession. To go on the Crusade is an ideal adventurous deed for a knight and a noble man, and a cavalier should be enthusiastic about such heroic enterprises and should not waste his time and means by courting peasants. Marcabru is very conscious of the sense of waste; he exhorts the nobles against being loiterers and spending their time (Dej., V, second strophe), and wasting their energy by engendering low class peasants (Dej. XXXVIII, fifth and sixth strophes). The Crusade poems (Lavador, Emperaire), reveal to us that Marcabru is aware of the fact that religion needs the help and support of the nobles, that warriors and enterprising young men have to support and sustain the Christian religion. So, considering the potential danger from the Saracens and the destruction the nobles may cause their religion unless they are watchful and enterprising, Marcabru lays stress in these lyrics not on the theological notions of sin and hell but on the importance of practicing fin' amor.

If Marcabru's fin' amors is not identical with charity, can we say that it is conjugal love? Marcabru's fin' amors

is definitely conjugal love, but he does not treat conjugal love in the same way as the Fathers do. In the primitive Church, and to some extent during the Middle Ages, matrimonial love was something merely tolerated by the Fathers rather than directly recommended and praised. It was sometimes, though rarely, praised indirectly as participating in the creative action of God and helping the growth of the human race.⁸⁵ There is no author of any theological or spiritual treatise who speaks of matrimonial love as a state of supreme bliss, or the source of all happiness, or even as the ideal form of life to be chosen by the faithful. All the Fathers speak of it as an evil that cannot be avoided; though not in itself a grave sin, often it is considered a venial sin, and surely a form of life far inferior to that of celibacy or virginity. In the primitive Church there was never a question of extolling matrimonial love; the problem was always to convince the faithful that the matrimonial act in itself was not a sin. Though it was not exactly sinful, most of the Fathers exhorted the people to abstain from sexual acts and conjugal life during Lent and on special days devoted to spiritual duties.⁸⁶

⁸⁵Didymus Alexandrinus, Contra Manichaeos, PG, XXXIX, 1096.

⁸⁶St. Athanasius, Fragmenta, PG, XXVII, 240; St. John Chrysostom, In Genesim Homiliae, PG, LIII, 123.

All the Fathers are unanimous in teaching that the primary end of marriage is the procreation of children, and any act that is not directly intended for the procreation of children is sinful.⁸⁷ St. Augustine says that it is the only cause and reason why there should be the union of bodies.⁸⁸ "Procreatio filiorum una est miscendae carnis legitima causa." "Matrimonium non est, ubi datur opera ne uxor sit mater."⁸⁹ "Usus contra naturam execrabilior est in uxore quam in meretrice."⁹⁰ These ideas of marriage were more or less accepted by later theologians, we see little change in the later Fathers.

St. Augustine argues that though the matrimonial act was evil in itself, the result of it is good and he found no contradiction if something good comes out of an act which is evil in itself.⁹¹ St. Thomas, on the other hand, thinks that if an act is good the pleasure with which it

⁸⁷De Nuptiis et de Conscientia, PL, XLIV, 429.

⁸⁸Augustine, De Moribus Manichaeorum, PL, XXXII, 1373.

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰De Bono Coniugali, PL, XL, 382.

⁹¹Jean de Fabrègues, Christian Marriage, p. 37.

is linked could not be a sin.⁹² A human action performed in the normal way and in submission to its normal ends cannot be sinful and evil in itself.⁹³ This statement in St. Thomas is new; no one before him had taught this. All were of the opinion that the marriage act is a necessary evil, and man has to accept it since it is essential for the preservation of the species.

Marcabru does not make any distinction between charity and conjugal love nor does he coincide with the Fathers in his ideas about matrimonial love. Just as his false love does not include in itself all the illicit forms of sexual relationship, which are often enumerated by the moral theologians and the Fathers - adultery, incest, prostitution, fornication, bestiality, etc.⁹⁴ - he does not follow the Fathers in his definition and explanation of fin' amor. The theologians of all times have distinguished between loving God for himself and one's neighbours for the sake of God, or have spoken about other divisions of love such as, ascetic love, mystic love, and the many degrees of the

⁹²Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae Secunda Secundae, q. 40 art. 2 ad 4.

⁹³Ibid.; Jean de Fabregues, Christian Marriage, p. 37.

⁹⁴Cf. A. Tanquary, Synopsis Theologiae Moralis, vol. II, Supplementum (Baltimore, 1902), pp. 1-46.

love of God. All these divisions existed both during and before the time of Marcabru. He must have heard of these distinctions and divisions of love. But the poet does not say anything about such matters often discussed by the Fathers. Why? Because he wants his concept of love to be different from that of the Fathers. Marcabru speaks a different language; his purpose, his aim, are all different from those of the Fathers.

Marcabru's audience might have been in part the same as that of the Fathers. The same nobles and courtiers who heard Marcabru's songs were also in the church together with all other different classes of people to take part in the services and to hear the Fathers speak. But these same nobles had a different disposition while they were in the Church. They knew that they were only a part of the audience and they did not expect to hear much about something that is peculiar to their own class and profession; in short, in the church they were disposed to hear about charity and love of God. Marcabru's audience did not include the peasants, nor is the poet in any way interested in improving their lot. So when the nobles listened to Marcabru, it could be presumed that they wanted to hear about worldly love, the love of a noble lady.

It is true that Marcabru disagrees with his contemporaries and looks down upon their concepts of love; but

simply because he disagrees with other troubadours, we cannot conclude that his ideas about love are borrowed from the Fathers. The concept of fin' amor in Marcabru is his own, not identical with any that existed before or after him. If we insist on finding some parallels or related concepts, we have to look for them not in the theological writings of the Fathers or in the exhortations and sermons given in the monasteries or abbeys to a group of monks or novices, but rather in the poetry of his contemporaries and companions in profession.

CHAPTER IV

ELEMENTS OF MARCABRU'S FIN' AMOR AND CHARITY

Marcabru's fin' amors is characterised by a number of qualities which he enumerates and explains in his lyrics. Scheludko thinks that these qualities correspond to the theological virtues and moral concepts taught by the Church.¹ But the more attention we give to a comparative study of these concepts in Marcabru and in the Fathers, the more we become convinced that there is no similarity between them at all and that they speak about entirely different subjects.

One of the qualities of Marcabru's fin' amor is Mezura.² In Cortesamen vuoiill comenssar (Dej. XV) he says:

Mezura es de gen parlar,
 E cortesia es d'amar;
 E qui non vol esser mespres
 De tota vilania. is gar,
 D'escarnir e de folleiar,
 Puois sera savis ab qu'el pes. (XV, 19-24)

¹D. Scheludko, "Klagen über den Verfall der Welt bei den Troubadours," Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, XLIV (1943), pp. 31-37.

²Jacques Wettstein, "Mezura, l'idéal des Troubadours, Son essence et ses aspects" (Zurich, 1945), passim.

Mezura consists in speaking nobly
 and Courtliness in loving;
 and he who does not want to be scorned
 should keep himself from all vulgarity,
 from mockery and foolishness,
 then he will be wise, if he reflects.

Here Mezura is an essential quality of courtly behavior and a part of cultured manners. There is nothing in this context that would make us imagine that it has anything to do with the Christian virtue of temperantia, as Scheludko says.³ There is no religious reference; as an ethical value Mezura is completely secular, its reference is confined to the court. In the same lyric Marcabru says again about Mezura:

De Cortesia. is pot vanar
 Qui ben sap Mesur' esgardar; (XV, 13-14)

He can boast of being courtly,
 who knows how to keep Mezura.

Here again Mezura refers to a manner of conduct befitting a social class, not to the degree of the religious value of any activity; it refers to people and not to things; it expresses a quality in the person acting, not a norm applied to the quality or extent of things acted upon.

³Scheludko, "Klagen über den Verfall der Welt,"
 p. 30.

In Marcabru's Pastorel, the vilana reproaches the Seignor in these words:

- "Don, oc; mas segon dreitura
Cerca fols sa follatura,
Cortes cortez' aventura,
E.il vilans ab la vilana;
En tal loc fai sens fraitura
On hom non garda mezura,
So ditz la gens anciana." (Dej. XXX, 78-84)

Lord, yes; but according to justice
a fool seeks his folly,
a courtier courtly adventure,
and a vilein [company] with a vilana;
in that place good sense is lacking
where men do not keep mezura,
so say the ancient people."

Here also Mezura is not a religious norm regarding marriage relations but a social virtue which insists that friendship and love should be on the same social level. In the history of the Church there was never a law which prohibited marriage relations between two classes of society; the Church always taught that all men are born equal. St. Paul insists in his Letter to the Galatians that there is no difference in worth between a Jew and a Greek, or between man and woman, that all are equally the children of Abraham and heirs to the promises of God (iv, 28).

Let us compare these lines with the teaching of the Fathers concerning the virtue of temperance. The virtue of temperantia is defined by Augustine as "Amor sese integrum Deo incorruptumque servans;"⁴ in another instance he defines it as "Affectio coercens et cohibens appetitum ab his rebus, quae turpiter appetuntur,"⁵ and in a third place he defines it as "Refrenatio cupiditatis ab iis quae temporaliter delectant."⁶ These three definitions do not in any way suggest the social virtue of Marcabru. Temperance causes us to avoid loving anything that would give us delight and pleasure only in this world: voluptates, divitiae, honores⁷ - pleasures, riches and honors. Temperance is especially recommended by Origen to the priests who go to the altar in order to pray for the people and who do not have their "inheritance and portion"⁸ in this world. Their "portion and inheritance" should be in heaven and in the Lord, not in temporal things. He then speaks about moderation in drink: drinking too much corrupts

⁴De Moribus Ecclesiae, PL, XXXII, 1326.

⁵De Libero Arbitrio, PL, XXXII, 1235; Cf. Index de Temperantia, PL, CCXX, 637.

⁶De Moribus Ecclesiae, PL, XXXII, 1328.

⁷Ibid., 1327; Sermo CVII, PL, XXXVIII, 628.

⁸Origenes, Homiliae in Leviticum PG, XII, 475.

both the body and the soul at the same time, and by it the spirit is vitiated and the flesh is weakened.⁹ According to him intemperance in drink blinds the eyes, causes the tongue to waver; but in temperance there is tranquillity of soul and peace of mind. If we possess the virtue of temperance we will know how to show reverence to older people and love to the young. This description of the effects of temperance shows us how different it is from Marcabru's Mezura, which refers exclusively to courtly deportment. Marcabru's Mezura is recommended in wooing a lady; temperance is especially recommended for those who pray for the people and who go to the altar. The main difference is clear: one is an essential part of a spiritual life, the other of a courtly life. The Fathers and the poet speak about completely different subjects, with entirely different objectives. One is asked to practice temperance so that one may advance in the love of God;¹⁰ Marcabru recommends Mezura to a courtier in order that he may attain the love of the lady and be able to keep it.

⁹Ibid., p. 476.

¹⁰Ibid., Augustine, Enarratio in Psalmum PL, XXXVII, 1066.

According to Marcabru, a lord does not keep Mazura when he courts a peasant girl with no regard for his social condition and in spite of the social conventions. Then he is not noble or courtly. But in the Fathers it is not a virtue to keep such social customs. They speak about temperance because the lack of it vitiates the mind and weakens the soul.¹¹ Temperance does not consist in maintaining social equality in choosing a partner, but in keeping moderation in the use and enjoyment of the things of this world, such as riches, honor, and the pleasures arising from food and drink.¹² Both Augustine and Paul speak about keeping temperance in conjugal life;¹³ but both of them insist on the equality of all men and women born in this world.¹⁴

Mezura is not an end in itself but is intended for the happiness of the lovers, as the poet says, que lor benananssa es Jois, Sofrirs e Mezura (Dej. XXXVII, 23) - for their happiness consists in Joy, Restraint, and Mezura. Marcabru makes this statement while he compares

¹¹ Julian Pomerius, De Vita Contemplativa; PL, LIX, p. 502.

¹² Ibid., pp. 502-503.

¹³ Augustine, see the discussion in Appendix about matrimonial love.

¹⁴ Galatians iii, 28-29; Augustine, see above.

amars and amors - bitter and noble love. The main difference consists in this: amars shows a sad face when the wallet is empty (lines 17-18), while amors is loyal and continues to be a good neighbour even when the wallet is empty; the lack of money does not make the couple part their ways (lines 25-28). According to the poet, the principal quality of amor and the chief characteristic that makes love different from amars is Mezura. It is Mezura that gives amor the meaning of the emerald and the sard, that makes it the zenith and nadir of joy and its power sovereign over every creature (lines 31-36).

The whole lyric Per savi.l tenc ses doptanssa explains the meaning of Marcabru; he states clearly there what Mezura consists in. Mezura makes love pure, true, and white; it causes the lover not to part from the beloved when money is gone. Mezura makes the noble man love a single lady loyally and truly and makes the lady love the noble man consistently without any consideration whether the wallet is empty or full. Mezura makes the lover choose the lady always from the noble class and thus not corrupt the race.

Such a social and ethical restriction fits well in the whole context of Marcabru's fin' amor. The noble man who keeps Mezura in his love affairs follows nature and contributes to the regeneration and the rejuvenation of the nobility, while the one who does not keep Mezura fills

the noble ranks with bastards and peasants.¹⁵ Real noble young men naturally inherit all the noble qualities while the bastards look noble externally but in their actions they are only peasants.¹⁶ According to the poet, Mezura is the quality that makes the sap of vitality come up through the trunk of the tree of the noble class to its branches and flowers, while the lack of it drains its sap. The opposite of Mezura is lust and felony. The poet is worried that Mezura is lacking in the young men and felony and lust have struck the heart of the nobility and the whole class is destroyed by them.¹⁷

Another quality of Marcabru's fin' amors is dreit, which corresponds to Jus or Justitia according to Scheludko. There are only a few instances where the poet speaks about dreit or dreitura; however, in these instances he makes it clear that he is speaking not about the cardinal virtue of justice spoken about by the Fathers, but about social customs in secular relationships. Justitia in the Fathers has a different meaning.¹⁸

¹⁵See *Lo vers comenssa* (Dej. XXXII), lines 64-72; See also Dej. XXXVIII, lines 29-39.

¹⁶See Dej. XVII fifth strophe and XXIX fifth strophe.

¹⁷Dejeanne, XLII, 8-11.

¹⁸Cf. Ambrose, Enarratio in Psalmos, PL, 956; Augustine, Epistolarum Classis III PL, XXXIII, 569-70.

Marcabru's vilana in L'autrier jost' una sebissa (Dej. XXX) says to the lord who approaches her with petitions of love: "According to justice, a fool seeks his folly, a courtier a courtly adventure."¹⁹

In the same way, in Per savi.l tenc ses doptansa (Dej. XXXVII) Marcabru says:

Fols pos tot cant au romanssa;
Non sec razo, mas bozina,
Car s'Amors viu de rapina,
Autrei c'Amors s'amoreia
E que Constans es constanssa
E fals usatges dreitura. (Dej. XXXVII, 49-54)

Since the fool tells everything that he hears,
he does not follow reason, but botches things up,
for his love lives by rapine,
I agree then that love is passionate
and Constans is constancy
and wicked habits justice.²⁰

In both instances Marcabru's Dreit consists in this: a noble man should always act as a noble man, his actions should always be worthy of his class and his race. In the

¹⁹See quote on p.

²⁰Cf. Lewent, Beiträge zum Verständnis der Lieder Marcabrus, "Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXVII (1913), 443.

affairs of love he should never stoop down to the level of a peasant girl; he should always woo a noble lady of rank and distinction. In order to please a noble lady of high rank, a young knight should perform some noble adventure, he should not miss any opportunity to show his lady his courage and strength. It is cowardly and foolish for a knight to approach a peasant girl with petitions of love and thus avoid all effort and hardship. He should really seek noble adventure, and by his heroism he should win a noble lady of rank. A noble man should have a noble purpose in life, he should follow reason and not botch things up. A man whose love lives by rapine, meaning, one who always goes promiscuously to other women and seeks possession, thinks that love is a mere passion. According to Marcabru, love is much nobler and more sublime. A noble man's love should not be a mere passion, it is as precious as emerald and sard (XXXVII, 32).

According to Marcabru's Dreit there should be parity between the name and the reality; but very often, he complains, that is not the case. There are, for example, many noble men who are really peasants and who should work behind the plough seven days a week. These noble men debase love and degrade their class (Dej. XXX, 36-42).

In both these instances Marcabru's Dreit insists on social distinction; the rights and duties of both nobles and

peasants are completely different. A noble man alone is allowed to seek noble adventure; a peasant and a knight should always act within their social limits and feudal conventions. Marcabru speaks of Dreit only in relation to the idea of class.

Justitia in the Fathers and in the moral and theological teaching of the Church is a cardinal virtue which gives everyone his right and due. We get three definitions of this virtue in Augustine: "Justitia est virtus qua sua cuique tribuuntur"²¹ and "Justitia est habitus animi, communi utilitate servata suam cuique tribuens dignitatem,"²² and in another instance, "Est ordinatio animae qua fit ut nulli serviamus, nisi uni Deo; nulli coaequamur nisi purissimis animis; nulli dominari appetamus, nisi naturae bestiali atque corporeae."²³ Apart from these definitions, he says in one instance: "Justitia est amor Deo tantum serviens, et ob hoc bene imperans ceteris quae homini subjecta sunt."²⁴ From all these definitions it is clear that the virtue spoken of by the Fathers is one that refers

²¹De Libero Arbitrio, PL, XXXII, 1235.

²²Enarratio in Psalmos, XXXVII, 1577.

²³Ibid.; Cf. Index about Justitia, PL, CCXX, 633.

²⁴De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae, PL, XXXII, 1322.

to the soul, and it consists in the soul's rendering to God, to neighbor and to itself what is due and proper to each. This is the virtue that keeps and preserves the relations of the soul to everything else in the world.

St. Ambrose says that justice is the fountain and source of all other virtues, that this virtue is to be kept even in our relationship with our enemies.²⁵ If justice is necessary even during war, how much more during peace time. It keeps secure the possessions and belongings of all the people in the community; it illumines the other virtues and sets limits and proper proportions to each of them. For example, it shows how much and how often we should be generous and charitable. This virtue should be our guiding motive and principle when we practice other virtues. Prudence and fortitude are the other cardinal virtues; these can be harmful to society and to ourselves if they are not guided by the virtue of justice. This is the only virtue that is recommended to all and that which tempers, moderates, guides, and rules all other virtues in relation to the total and allround welfare of the soul.²⁶

²⁵St. Ambrose, De Paradiso: PL, XIV, 282, 283; De Noe et Arca: PL, XIV, 363; De Abraham, PL, XIV, 498.

²⁶De Interpellatione Job et David: PL, XIV, 815.

Fons est justitia caeterarum virtutum,
 quae virtutes alias illuminat. Si ergo
 etiam in bello justitia valet, quam
 magis in pace servanda est. Sola justitia
 est quae omnibus temporibus, aliis potius
 nata quam sibi, quotidiano usu, et fructu
 publico, suo damno alienas custodit
 utilitates . . . Prudentia enim sine
 justitia nocet; fortitudo quoque nisi eam
 justitia temperet, intolerabilis insolentia
 est . . . justitia sola est quae virtutes
 omnes complectitur et commendat omnes . . .²⁷

In the same vein some of the other Fathers also speak about justice: it sets and fixes our relationship to everything else; it teaches us that we should prefer God to our friend, that reason should prevail over vices, that the soul should dominate the body, and the soul should be subject only to God.²⁸ Thus, Marcabru's Dreit and the Justitia of the Fathers are used in different contexts and they signify entirely different things.

Proeza is an important quality of fin' amor in Marcabru. It does not seem to have any religious or spiritual value. Marcabru says in Al prim comens de l'ivernaill (Dej. IV) that he wants everyone to measure up to Proeza without wavering and to be eager regarding it (lines 1-6). He says in Aujatz de chan (Dej. IX) Proeza.s franh et avoleza.s mura (line 21) - Proeza is broken and felony

²⁷St. Ambrosius, PL, CCXX, 633.

²⁸Julianus Pomerius, De Vita Contemplativa, Lib. III, PL, LIX, 568.

prevails. In Bel m'es quan la rana chanta (Dej. XI) the poet says that out of a thousand men he does not see forty whom Proeza loves (lines 12-13). In Lo vers comens quan vei del fau (Dej. XXXIII) he says that felony takes the key and sends Proeza into exile (lines 19-20). In Hueymais dey esser alegrans (Dej. XXXIV) he involkes the curse of God on those who put Proeza in check (lines 16-17) and prays the valiant not to walk in company with the wicked and the felons if they wish to keep Proeza (lines 19-21). From these instances we do not see that Marcabru attaches any religious meaning to Proeza. He considers it as a virtue of the members of the court: the knight, the soldier, and the emperor, not of the common people. Marcabru's Proeza is related to cortez' Aventura - courtly adventure - rather than to any virtue in the Fathers. In Emperaire, per mi mezeis, the poet praises the Emperor saying that he knows himself that the Proeza of the emperor is increasing (line 2). He gives the reason in the second strophe: because the Emperor has taken upon himself the duty of avenging the issue of Pharoah. While the other barons beyond the Pyrenees, who have the greatest number of followers and the most gifts, defile the doors of other women, while they look only for their own ease and comfort, soft beds and sweet sleep (line 27), the Emperor has undertaken a noble adventure, a great task: to chase the Saracens and confound

their pride. Marcabru's Proeza consists evidently in deeds of arms in which every courtier and knight should excell. This is not a virtue for the peasant, not the quality of an ordinary man, it is the distinguishing mark of a valiant knight: Proeza guides him in his constant pursuit of noble adventure.

In Christian moral principles there is no special code of virtues intended for the courtier alone; all should have the virtues recommended by the Church. The Fathers do not classify virtues according to social status or class distinctions. The virtues recommended by the Fathers are for all, without exception.

The virtue that comes nearest to Proeza in the moral code of the Church is fortitudo.²⁹ But we cannot see any parallel between fortitudo and Proeza, nor do the Fathers speak in the same vein about fortitude. According to St. Augustine, the virtue of fortitude is the love in the human soul that makes everything easy for man; it is the affection of the soul by which we condemn and despise all the inconveniences and losses of things placed in our power, it is firmness of mind against those things that are

²⁹ Scheludko does not identify Proeza with fortitude, "Klagen über den Verfall der Welt," p. 35.

inconvenient and harmful to us in this world and acquiring holiness in this life.³⁰ There is nothing related to arms or deeds of arms in the virtue of fortitude according to the Fathers. It keeps one in the love of God in spite of adversities. Origen would call this the most necessary virtue till the end of man because of man's attractions and affections regarding the delights and pleasures of this world, riches, and worldly honors.³¹

Marcabru's prudence and wisdom consists in restraining one's lust (VIII, 11) and not associating with prostitutes (XLIV, 41) and not allowing oneself to be cheated by fools (XVI, 27). The wise man speaks nobly and guards himself from all villainy; he does not mock and trick others, he reflects (XV, 19-25). These are the qualities of a wise man according to the poet; he thinks only in terms of courtly conduct and marriage relations. The greatest wisdom consists, according to the poet, in guarding the wives from villains and felons (XVIII, 47) and in not being cheated by a prostitute. There is nothing of the divine or heavenly wisdom or Prudence in Marcabru. These

³⁰ Augustine, De Moribus Ecclesiae: PL, CCXX, 635.

³¹ Origen, De Diversis Haeresibus Bk. VI: PL, CCXX, 635.

are practical suggestions for a courtier so that he may not waste his money and means and have a safe and orderly life.

Prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance are together called cardinal virtues in patristic writings. Why they are so called and what their role is in the salvation of man is explained by St. Bernard.³² He says that there are four ways by which faithful Christians are led into the ways of the unjust and the wicked. Some are led to evil ways unwillingly, others because they are not sufficiently instructed, others unknowingly, and still others spontaneously. Those who are unwilling should be armed by the virtue of fortitude, so that they may be able to resist evil till their death. Those who are led to evil because they are not sufficiently instructed need the virtue of temperance that they may suppress their temptations and not be persuaded by friends who are inclined to evil. Those who are ignorant need the virtue of prudence so that they may be able to distinguish useful things from those that are harmful, and know what is to be rejected and what is to be kept. Justice is needed by those people who are led to evil spontaneously, because justice is the virtue of the rectitude of the soul; it tells

³²St. Bernard, De Consideratione: PL, CLXXXII, 737-38.

us how to keep the correct norm and measure in everything. This virtue helps us to resist sin and not to consent to it. The virtue of justice is ordained in this way: to help man always to avoid sin and to love those things that would be salutary to his spiritual life.³³

Ad consilium impiorum itur quatuor modis. Quidam trahuntur inviti, alii trahuntur illecti, alii seducuntur ignari, alii sequuntur spontanei. Istis necessariae sunt quatuor virtutes per quas armati resistant, ne in consilio eant. Invitis necessaria est fortitudo, qua resistant usque ad mortem minis, cruciatibus et damnis. Illi qui attrahuntur illecti, indigent temperantia quae reprimit illicita desideria, nec cedit promissionibus, nec emollitur blanditiis. Illis qui seducuntur ignari est opus prudentia, quae ab utilibus inutilia discernit et docet quid tenendum, quidve rejiciendum sit. Justitia indigent illi qui sequuntur spontanei: justitia est rectitudo voluntatis, quae nec amat peccare, nec peccato consentire. Est autem justitia ordinata hoc modo, scilicet mala respuens, bonis meliora praeponens.

Est quippe prudentia ratio docta, scilicet a gratia, vitare contagia injustitiae propter justitiam . . . Justitia est perfectio animae rationalis . . .

Ubinam, quaeso, vera prudentia nisi in Christi doctrina? unde vera justitia, nisi de Christi misericordia? ubi vera temperantia, nisi in Christi vita? ubi vera fortitudo nisi in Christi passione? Soli ergo qui ejus doctrina imbuti sunt, prudentes dicendi sunt; soli justi, qui de ejus misericordia veniam peccatorum

³³Sermo in Psalmos: PL, CLXXXIII, 243-44.

consecuti sunt; soli temperantes,
 qui ejus vitam imitari student; soli
 fortes, qui ejus patientiae documenta
 fortitius in adversis tenent . . .³⁴

St. Bernard asks where we can then find prudence except in the doctrines of Christ; where real justice, unless in the life of Christ; where real fortitude, unless in the suffering of Christ. All, therefore, who are imbued with His teaching should be called prudent; they are just who have acquired the remission of sins from His mercy; only those are temperate who are bent on imitating His life; only those have the virtue of fortitude who try to keep always in memory the patience and suffering of our Lord and try to be like Him in all adversities and trials of this life.³⁵

What relation can these virtues have to the Proeza, Mezura, and Dreit of Marcabru which do not refer to the teaching, suffering, and mercy of Jesus? Marcabru speaks a different language than the Fathers, and his concepts are his own, not in any way related to those of the Fathers.

Faith, hope, and charity are together called theological virtues. Since the words "faith" and "hope" occur in Marcabru, Scheludko tries to establish an identity

³⁴Cf. PL, CCXX, 630-31.

³⁵Cf. Liber de Modo Bene Vivendi PL, CLXXXIV, 1283-84.

between them.³⁶ But when we study them carefully in their context, we can easily see that there is no similarity between Marcabru and the Fathers in these concepts either.

A virtue in theology is a gift of God by which the human soul is facilitated to acknowledge and practice the duties of Christian life.³⁷ It is a habit of the soul that makes it easy for the person to do things in a Christian way.³⁸ A theological virtue cannot be acquired by one's own strength; it is a free gift of God.³⁹ Giving no consideration to the principles of theology, Scheludko wants to identify Fes and Esperansa in Marcabru with the theological concepts of faith and hope taught in the Bible and in the Fathers.⁴⁰ A close examination of these concepts in their contexts in Marcabru will reveal that there is no comparison between them in the poet and in the Fathers.

In Pos l'inverns d'ogan es anatz Marcabru says that: Que. is parti de lui Dreitz ni Fes - (XXXIX, 42) - Right and Faith have parted from it [Youth]. How should we understand Fes here? Is it the theological virtue of faith, or

³⁶Scheludko, "Klagen über den Verfall der Walt," pp. 35, 36.

³⁷Augustinus, Ennarrationes in Psalmos: PL, XXXVII, 1065; Tractatus in Epistolam Joannis ad Parthos PL, XXXV, 2035.

³⁸Cf. St. Ambrose, De Paradiso: PL, XIV, 282; Augustine, De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae: PL, XXXII, 1322.

³⁹St. John Chrysostom, In Actus Apostolorum Homiliae PG, LX, 285; St. Augustine, Ennarrationes in Psalmos PL, XXXVI, 659.

⁴⁰Scheludko, op. cit., pp. 35, 36.

the Christian religion in general? From the context it appears that the poet means neither of these. The poet makes this statement in a context in which he says that in former times youth was called the hard and the strong one, but now has become so degenerate that at no time will it be sufficiently honored that joy can be attached to it, for laxity has conquered it and never will it be liberated from its laxity, and justice and faith have parted from it. The barons have proscribed it into exile, and it will not come back (lines 36-44). Since youth has fled into exile so that it may not be a prisoner here, people have no faith in youth. The entire context shows that the poet speaks about the lack of faith the people should have in youth; the young nobles do not care about the noble virtues of their class. In the next strophe the poet condemns the married men who go courting and compares them to the donkey in the court who wants to play with its master, like the dogs. Only those young men who are not married and settled in life are allowed to call themselves lovers according to the moral code of Marcabru; he speaks mainly to these men; the poet is worried over the fact that these young men are not reliable. Seeing the laxity of these men, the poet fears that the whole future of the noble class is endangered; he cannot have any confidence in youth, for he does not see any noble lover among them who is on

the look out for a noble adventure. The whole lyric is about the wickedness of youth; the poet remarks there-- in how impotent the young men are to live up to the prestige and honor of their forefathers, the youth of the older generation. The poet does not mean that they have lost faith in religion, but that the noble people have lost their faith in young men; the poet has lost his confidence in youth. Marcabru is more concerned in these lines with the welfare of the aristocracy than with that of the Church or the virtue of faith.

Scheludko wants us to understand Fes here as a virtue, in contrast to the vices about which Marcabru speaks often in the lyrics. He insists that Fes is used by Marcabru in the concrete sense of the Church and the Fathers.⁴¹

It is true that the Fathers often speak about the theological virtue of faith. According to them, faith is a supernatural light infused into the soul of men by God; it is a gift of God, a virtue which we can in no way acquire.⁴² This virtue makes us firmly believe everything

⁴¹Op. cit., pp. 35-36.

⁴²Ambrosius, Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam PL, XV, 1633; Augustine, De fide rerum quae non videntur PL, XL 171.

that God has revealed to men, even when these things contradict our experience and empirical knowledge. An example for this kind of faith is the faith in the mystery of transsubstantiation. It is a light that illumines the soul and makes us see things in a new way. This light makes us see and feel the presence of God everywhere in the world. We believe even when we do not fully grasp and understand the reasons; we believe in things beyond our senses, beyond the human capacity to know. The reason for our belief in revealed things is that God, being the most wise, is not able to be deceived in His knowledge; nor can He deceive, being goodness itself. He is the truth that can never lie.⁴³ The instrument of the revelation of God is the Church; to the Church God has confided the duty of keeping His revealed word.⁴⁴ The revealed words are contained in the sacred books of the Scripture, and the Church takes her faith from the words of the Scriptures. The Fathers write extensively about the virtue of faith, about the authenticity of the writings of the Apostles and the Evangelists, of the tradition of the Church, the

⁴³St. John Chrysostom, In Matthaeum Homiliae PG, LVIII, 743; Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos PL, XXXVI, 364; St Ambrose, De Abraham PL, XIV, 428.

⁴⁴St. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses PG, VII, 855; Tertullian, De Praescriptione Haereticorum PL, II, 40; St. Augustine, Contra Epistolam Manichaei PL, XLII, 176.

veracity and the infallibility of the decisions of the Councils, the Canons of the Bible, etc.⁴⁵ These are obviously written in reference to the virtue of faith, in order to vindicate the veracity of the Christian religion. But it is difficult to believe that Marcabru's Fes should be taken in such a precise sense and should be considered identical with the theological virtue of Faith. There is not a single instance in Marcabru which warrants such an interpretation. In Marcabru, Fes is a social quality and a courtly virtue, rather than a theological and religious outlook on the things of this world.

Jovens (from Latin juventus) or Jove (from Latin juvenis) in a word used by most of the troubadours. In Marcabru it occurs twenty-seven times. This word has been interpreted in various ways. While Denomy thinks that this is a concept borrowed from Arabic literature,⁴⁶ for Robertson jovens is a word used in the spiritual writings of the day and it means sanctifying grace.⁴⁷ Erich Köhler has still another view about jovens;⁴⁸ it stands

⁴⁵St. Athanasius, Epistula de Synodis PG, XXVI, 688; St. Ambrose, Epistolae PL, XVI, 1005; St. Augustine, Epistolae PL, XXXIII, 200.

⁴⁶A. Denomy, "Jovens: the Notion of Youth among the Troubadours," Medieval Studies, XI (1949), 1-22.

⁴⁷D. W. Robertson, "Five Poems by Marcabru," Studies in Philology, LI (1954), 539-560, passim, esp. p. 546.

⁴⁸Erich Köhler, "Sens et fonction du terme 'jovens' dans la poésie des troubadours," Melanges offert à René Crozet (Poitiers, 1966), vol. I, pp. 569-83.

for the ideal of a certain class of people: soudadier.⁴⁹
 All these claims can be examined in the light of the context in which the poet uses this word. But our concern here is only to examine whether the word jovens is used by Marcabru in his poem in a religious and theological sense as Scheludko claims, whether Marcabru means by it sanctifying grace, as Robertson thinks.

Robertson quotes a sentence from Alanus de Insulis' Distinctiones: "juvenis, proprie dicitur, renovatus per gratiam" and concludes that jovens in Marcabru stands for sanctifying grace, or the man divested of the old habits and having put on the new man, that is, one who has the

⁴⁹There are some instances in Marcabru which are really puzzling and we wonder what exactly the poet might have meant. Sometimes he makes use of novel and original expressions which confuse us because we do not meet with such statements about youth anywhere else in literature. It is obvious from the context that Marcabru means by "youth" something other than a particular age in human life, or an abstract quality that is peculiar to that age. For example, he says:

Tant cant bos Jovens fon paire
 Del segle e fin' Amors maire,
 Fon Proeza mantenguda
 A celat et a saubuda,
 Mas er l'ant avilanada
 Duc e rei et emperaire. (V, 37-42)

As long as loyal Youth was father
 of the world and noble love [its] mother,
Proeza was maintained
 secretly and publicly,
 but now they have debased it,
 duke and king and emperor.

This is one of the instances in Marcabru where we find it difficult to decipher his exact meaning.

"similitudinem novi hominis, id est Christi." Robertson also quotes St. Paul, who speaks in Col. iii, 6-7 of putting on the new man after stripping oneself of the old Adam with his deeds.⁵⁰ The relevant Biblical text is this: "Nunc autem deponite et vos omnia, iram, indignationem, malitiam, blasphemiam, turpem sermonem de ore vestro. Nolite mentiri invicem, exspoliantes vos veterem hominem cum actibus suis, et induentes novum, eum qui renovatur in agnitionem secundum imaginem ejus qui creavit illum" (Col. iii, 8-10). "But now put you also all away: anger, indignation, malice, blasphemy, filthy speech out of your mouth. Lie not one to another: stripping yourself of the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new, he who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of him that created him". From these instances Robertson concludes that Marcabru's jovens is identical with sanctifying grace. Let us examine whether we have to be so specific about the meaning which Marcabru attaches to that word.

The word "Youth" appears several times in the Bible.⁵¹ Though most of the times "Youth" is used for a particular

⁵⁰ Robertson, "Five Poems," p. 546.

⁵¹ Cf. for example, Genesis viii, 21; xlvii, 15; Deuteronomy xxxiii, 25; Psalms xxiv, 7; xlii, 4; lxvii, 28; lxx, 5; lxxxvii, 16; Proverbs ii, 17; v, 18; xxx, 19; Wisdom ii, 6; iv, 6; vii, 2; Isaias xlvii, 12; liv, 4; Matthew xix, 20; Mark x, 20; Acts xx, 12; xxvi, 4; 1 Timothy iv, 12, etc.

period of life, there are instances when we have to doubt whether it has a purely temporal connotation. For example, the psalmist sings: "Introibo ad altare Dei, ad Deum qui laetificat juventutem meam." (XLIII, 4). This verse of the psalm was very important and well known to the Middle Ages, because this was the first sentence of the Mass.⁵² From the context of the psalms it is obvious that this verse was sung by King David to mean that he wanted to give thanks to God for all the favors which he had received from God during the time when he was a young man.⁵³ Though it had this sense in the Old Testament, the meaning might have changed in the Middle Ages. Because of their predilection for the abstract and the metaphysical, medieval writers may well have preferred the spiritual to the literal meaning.⁵⁴ There are instances in the writings of the Fathers where the word "Youth" occurs in its allegorical sense. In such contexts it is not impossible to ascribe to the word "Youth" a meaning suggested by

⁵²Innocent III, De Sacro Altaris Mystério, PL, CCXVII, 773; Pius Parsch, The Liturgy of the Mass tr. H. E. Winstone (London, 1957), pp. 91-94. The commentary on the Mass of Pope Innocent III says that this verse was recited at the beginning of the Mass at the foot of the altar. The document from Pope Innocent III tells us that this was the first verse of the sacred liturgy even in the twelfth century.

⁵³The Jerome Biblical Commentary ed. Raymond E. Brown, (Englewood Cliffs, 1968), p. 583.

⁵⁴For the different senses of the Sacred Scripture see Summa Theologiae Ia, q. 1, a. 10; also Hugo of St. Victor, De Scripturis et Scriptoribus Sacris PL, CLXXV, 11 and 176, 184.

Robertson. Peter Damian, for example, writes in the eleventh century about the monastic ideal:

Quapropter, charissimi, sobrietatis, humilitatis, patientiae, obedientiae, castitatis, charitatis, omniumque virtutum arma corripite, et non pro agris et urbibus, non pro filiis, vel uxoribus, sed pro animabus vestris, quae omnem affectum necessitudinis superant, dimiccate. Praecipue ut aetas vestra vim sentiat, jejunandum vobis est, et orandum; quatenus et jejunium carnis robur edomet, et oratio ad Deum animam levet.⁵⁵

Therefore, dearest brothers, snatch up the weapons of sobriety, humility, patience, obedience, chastity, charity and all the virtues, and do not concern yourselves over fields and cities, sons and wives, but only about your own souls which rise above every other consideration. And that your youth may grow strong, you must above all else fast and pray, since fasting will tame the desires of the flesh while prayer raises the soul to God.

Here the word "Youth," which is my translation for aetas vestra, may mean simply, "You who are young;" since the whole exhortation is given in a spiritual setting, "growth" means growth in spirituality. Often such exhortations were given to a group of novices or young religious who had not been long in the religious order.

But in Marcabru's lyrics there is nothing typically monastic, nor are they addressed to a group of young monks. There is nothing spiritual or supernatural in his reference

⁵⁵Peter Damian, Opusculum XIII, De Perfectione Monachorum: PL, CXLV, 320.

to Youth. He speaks about Youth in a totally different context, not in the context of the Youth that has to find its nourishment in the mortification of the body, in fasting and prayer, in abstinence and the taming of the desires of the flesh, as recommended by Peter Damian.

Marcabru's ideas about Youth can be summed up in this way: Youth has a great responsibility, it should be the father of the world (V, 37-38); but now the king, duke and emperor have debased it (V, 41-42); Youth is banished (IV, 34-35); it is defeated (IV, 43-44); it is extinguished (V, 45); the poet is worried about Youth, because it flees (VIII, 4); it is imprisoned and tortured (XI, 17-24); Youth has deviated from its way and has turned to its own ruin (XVII, 7-8); Youth has become deceitful and only wickedness comes out of it (XVIII, 7); Youth fails, falls, and is broken (XIX, 43); Youth is shamed (XIX, 70); Youth withers (XIX, 70); Youth is wicked and ridiculous (XXI, 25); Youth is declining (XXIX, 17); Youth sleeps (XXXII, 73); Youth now receives a bad reputation (XXXV, 59). Marcabru makes these statements mostly in reference to love affairs and marriage relations.⁵⁶ These words are obviously spoken not by a satirist who wants to amuse his audience

⁵⁶Cf. Dej. IV, 34-35; 43-44; V, 45; VII, 4; XI, 17-24; XVII, 7-8; 29-30; XVIII, 7; XIX, 43; 70; XXI, 25; XXIX, 17; XXXII, 73; XXXIII, 25-26; XXXIV, 6; XXXV, 20; 59; XLI, 21.

and please them by exposing their follies and foibles, but by a moralist and a teacher who really cares for the future of the nobility, who has a great deal of idealism and hopes and aspirations concerning the young noble men. Marcabru is the great prophet and instructor of Youth who strives to lead his disciples to real worth and honor in this world.

Jois is an important quality of fin' amors in Marcabru. He says in Bel m'es quan son li fruich madur (Dej. XIII) that he sings by the joy of fin' amor (line 7), and in Doas cuidas ai compaignier (Dej. XIX) that if the thought of love is forgotten joy will be destroyed (lines 44-45). Marcabru thinks of joy often in reference to Youth and love. He says that he praises love and joy always (Dej. XXVIII, 14). The exact nature and meaning of jois in Marcabru can be determined from the context in which the word is used and we can see for ourselves whether Robertson is correct when he says that Marcabru's jois is the joy of the spirit and is related to the verse of the Bible: "Gaudete in Domino semper; iterum dico, gaudete" (Phil., iv, 4).

In the first lyric of the edition of Dejeanne, namely in A la fontana del vergier, there are three instances when the word jois occurs:

E quant ieu cugey que l'auzelh
 Li fesson joy e la verdors, (Dej. I, 10-11)

And when I thought that the birds
 and the verdure gave her joy,

Mas say mi tolh aquela rey
 Don joys mi crec; (Dej. I, 40-41)

But here he takes from me that thing
 by which joy increases for me.

Que selh qui fai lo bosc fulhar
 Vos pot donar de joy assatz. (Dej. I, 34-35)

Because he who cause the forest to blossom again
 can give you much joy.

These three instances do not speak of a supernatural joy or of a joy that is a permanent state of the heart.⁵⁷ Here the lady is alone and she is in love. Her love is honest; she is loyal to her friend, who is far away in the Orient. She has Mezura inasmuch as she curbs her concupiscence; she refuses the knight [or the poet] who approaches her with petitions of love. Though she is in love, she does

⁵⁷ See Denomy, "Jois among the early Troubadours: Its Meaning and Possible Source," Medieval Studies, XIII (1951), pp. 177-217.

not have jois, which means that her joy is not an immediate result of love. She is sorry that her beloved is taken away from her. She says that the Lord has taken away from her that one thing which increased her joy. The speaker suggests that the Lord who brings the forest to blossom again can give her joy. The lady understands this joy as the supernatural joy which comes directly from God, and she at once refuses it. The speaker was clearly hinting that she could have another lover. She repeats that she needs the joy of this world and wonders where she will find it when her beloved is far away in Palestine. There is nothing of the Gaudete in Domino motive in the joy of which the lady speaks. It comes neither from the inner recesses of the heart, nor directly from God. Those critics who would see a Gaudete in Domino motive in the joy of Marcabru ignore the fact that Paul wrote those words to the Philippians when he was in prison and had lost all hope of release from his impending trial and death.⁵⁸ Some other instances may clarify Marcabru's meaning still further.

A l'alena del vent doussa
 Que Dieus tramet, no sai d'on,
 Ai lo cor de joy sazion
 Contra la doussor del frescum
 Quant li prat son vermelh e groc (Dej. II, 1-5)

⁵⁸See Jerome Biblical Commentary, p. 249.

At the breath of the sweet wind
 which God sends us, I don't know from where,
 I have a heart filled with joy
 in the sweet freshness
 when the meadows are red and yellow.

The context tells us that the sweet wind which God sends no sai d'on (I don't know from where) is not the Holy Spirit, come to make the poet rejoice.⁵⁹ It is the ordinary wind that the spring season brings with it. The cause of his joy, therefore, is in nature, in the fresh rejuvenation that is seen in spring when the meadows are red and yellow.

E.l rossinhols crid' e brama
 Sa par qu'a per joi conquisa. (XI, 5-6)

And the nightingale cries and calls
 its mate whom it has conquered by joy.

No one would ascribe a supernatural quality to the joy of the nightingale, or of any other bird.

In most of the other instances where the word jois occurs in his lyrics, Marcabru thinks of spring and sees joy all over nature, except in men and in Youth.

Bel m'es can s'esclarziz l'onda
 E qecs auzels pel jardin
 S'esjauziz segon son latin;
 Lo chanz per los becs toronda, (XII^{bis}, 1-4)

⁵⁹Errante, Marcabru e le fonti sacre, pp. 246-50.

I am happy when the wave clears itself
 and every bird in the garden
 expresses its joy in its warbling
 and the song from their beaks resounds.

We cannot say that there is any relation between the joy of the bird in these lines and the supernatural joy about which the Fathers speak. The same is the case with all the other instances where the word Jois occurs in Marcabru. He says, for example, that Joy is choked (Dej. XI, 23), that he sings on account of Joy (XIII, 7), that Joy is deceitful (XVII, 29), that Joy will fail among the Franks (XIX, 71), that no Christian will ever rejoice (XX^{bis}, 36), that the simple creatures mate for Joy (XXI, 15), that he praises love and Joy always (XXVIII, 14), that Joy is declining (XXIX, 17), that none loves Joy (XXXIV, 27), that he is filled with such a Joy that he is disposed to sing (XXXIX, 6). Cf. also Dej. II, 1-5; XI, 5-6; XIX, 44-45; XXI, 15; XXIII, 8; XXVIII, 7; XXX, 34; XXV, 63; XXXVI, 6; 11; XXXVII, 24; XXXIX, 6-7; 39. Jois in these instances has a deeper meaning than mere pleasure attached to love. Marcabru considers jois as an essential part of noble love. He sees joy in nature because the birds and plants are participating in the rebirth and rejuvenation of their species, and thus, of all nature; but in man there is no joy because he does not contribute to the growth of his class, he contributes only to its destruction. So for the

poet jois consists in one's participation in helping his class and species grow in vitality.

The idea seen in Marcabru, that spring is a season of joy, is not something new in our poet or necessarily profane. We have similar instances in the Bible and in the liturgical writers of the Church. The Canticle of Canticles is, as a whole, filled with passages where we are invited to love. In this book there is a long description of spring and the joy and love it brings.⁶⁰ But this is not the same supernatural joy about which the Fathers speak.

There is nothing in Marcabru to indicate that the joy he sings about is the joy of the faithful who believe in God and in His second coming, or that it comes directly from the supernatural, as Robertson thinks. The lady in A la fontana, an ideal female character in Marcabru's philosophy of love, does not understand jois in this way. She is not satisfied with that jois which she will have in the other world together with other sinners. She asks for a natural and temporal joy, not that supernatural supreme bliss that she can have forever after death (lines 40-42).

⁶⁰ Jerome Biblical Commentary, pp. 506-507; and see Hilda Graef, Devotion to Our Lady (New York: Hawthorne, 1963), p. 46.

Donars and Largeza are interchangeable words in Marcabru. The appeal to generosity and large-heartedness is a constant theme with the poet.⁶¹ Marcabru's idea of Largeza is expressed in Aujatz de chan (Dej. IX). Pois l'inverns d'ogan es anatz (Dej. XXXIX) and in Al prim comens de l'ivernaill (Dej. IV). In Aujatz de chan, the poet complains that the most wretched poets get gifts while the better ones are gaping in front of vain images; this fact makes him sad. Among the young there is no hope, because they have given up Largeza; they have now started to rob others. Many act shamefully and immoderately for the sake of money and are no longer concerned about honor or nobility in their conduct; the poet calls them companions of the hedgehog, or the dogs of thieves. No one gives money to the troubadours because the times are so bad that with money one can even become an emperor. He singles out his three patrons. With the Count of Poitiers he is satisfied; with the Count of Toulouse less so, therefore, he intends to go to Lyons where he hopes that he will be well treated by the newly made Emperor, Alphonse VII of Castile. He reminds his hearers of the passages in the Bible which urge them to be prepared for death.⁶²

⁶¹See H. Spanke, Marcabrustudien (Göttingen, 1940), pp. 94-100.

⁶²See Aurelio Roncaglia, "Marcabruno: Aujatz de chan," Cultura Neolatina (XVII (1957), 20-48); see also Bertoni, passim.

The passage the poet might have had in mind while writing Aujatz de chan is: "Nolite thesaurizare vobis thesauros in terra, ubi aerugo et tinea demolitur, et ubi fures effodiunt et furantur; thesaurizate autem vobis thesauros in coelo, ubi neque aerugo neque tinea demolitur, et ubi fures non effodiunt nec furantur" (Matt. vi, 19-20). There are some other passages also in the Bible where the hoarding of wealth is condemned. Marcabru may be referring to any of those texts, or perhaps expressing the general idea that if the rich man is not going to take all his wealth with him, why can't he be a bit more generous to a poet who sings for the sake of the cultivation of Youth, Joy, and Cortezia and thus encourage the troubadour profession.

In Pois l'inverns d'ogan es anatz the poet speaks in the second strophe about a tree which has encompassed the whole world and has grown to a surprising extent. It has lately come to cross over from France into Poitiers on the other side of the river where it would always maintain its verdure (strophe, 3). This tree, according to Spanke, stands for Louis VII of France who became the master of Poitiers by an opportune marriage.⁶³ The poet thinks of the days he spent in the court of Poitou when William X was alive, and of the change that has taken place there.

⁶³Spanke, Marcabrustudien, p. 95-96.

So the poem has no religious meaning; it only expresses the sentiments of the poet at a time when he found it difficult to get a generous patron.

In Al prim comens the poet thinks about what may happen to him since he lost the protection of the Count of Poitou. He sends greetings to Castille, Portugal, and Barcelona (strophe 10) and says that since the people of Poitou did him wrong, he will henceforward be lost to them, as Arthur to the Bretons. Here also we do not find any parallel between Marcabru's idea of Largeza and the appeal of the Fathers for generosity and almsgiving. Generosity in the Fathers proceeds from the virtue of justice; the faithful are urged to help the poor because it is stated in the Bible that the poor will inherit the kingdom of heaven. There is always a supernatural motive when the Fathers speak about generosity and liberality towards the poor.⁶⁴ They seldom exhort the people to promote jovens and jois in the sense in which Marcabru understands these words. They speak about helping the needy and the poor, about being charitable to all and not hoping for any reward while helping them. In Marcabru none of these Biblical motives and considerations is mentioned; what the poet thinks of is more often his own personal relations and well being rather

⁶⁴Augustine, Epistolarum Classis III: PL, XXXIII, 659; Bernard, De Modo Bene Vivendi: PL, CLXXXIV, 1224-26.

than the means of attaining merit in heaven by helping the poor and being charitable to one's own neighbors, as commanded in the Bible.

Cortezia stands for a set of rules and regulations in social behaviour to be observed by all who aspire to nobility and honor.⁶⁵ So understood, it stands for all those virtues and qualities which distinguish a man of noble birth from one of lower class. These precepts of courtly behaviour do not coincide with the moral principles taught by the Fathers. These rules of conduct were not the same for different classes of people, because they were made in response to the imperatives of feudal society. In the Church the moral principles were the same for all classes of people, and there was never any class and caste distinction in moral theology.

The word Cortezia itself shows that it has something to do with the courts, not with the common people, or with the Church. Cortezia applies to the upper class, to those who belonged to the upper niveau of society. In a feudal society each class had its own calling, training, and function. The opposite of Cortezia is vilania, meaning something vile, common, vulgar, or mean.

⁶⁵Cf. A. J. Denomy, "Courtly Love and Courtliness," Speculum, XXVIII (1953), 44-63.

Marcabru never elaborates on the nature of Cortezia or states in what it precisely consists. He says that a man makes himself vulgar if he blames Cortezia (Dej. XV, 7-8); and he who really wants to invite love home should deck his house with Cortezia (XXXII, 55-58). He says that he does not find anyone who keeps sovereign Cortezia with a loyal heart (XXXIII, 27-29); in whichever direction he turns he does not find Cortezia (XXXIV, 11-12). From these lines alone we cannot find out what Cortezia meant for Marcabru and his contemporaries. The only thing that we can know for certain about Cortezia is that it has no religious value and that it has no parallel in moral theology or in the teachings of the Fathers. Cortezia is in no way related to charity and it does nothing to further the love of God in the human soul.⁶⁶

The word Cobeida does not occur very often in Marcabru. However, where it does occur, it clearly has no religious significance. In Quan l'aura doussana bufa (Dej. XLII) Marcabru says that youth has no life because two stones have struck it; these two stones are, as he explains in the next lines, evil and lust (Malvestatz e Cobeida).

⁶⁶Scheludko agrees that Cortezia is a courtly concept, cf. "Klagen über den Verfall der Welt," p. 36.

According to Scheludko cobeida in Marcabru is identical with cupiditas⁶⁷ which is said to be the source of all vices in the Fathers.⁶⁸ "Radix omnium malorum est cupiditas. Nemo potest perfecte spiritualia bella suscipere, nisi prius carnis edomuerit voluptates; non potest mens ad contemplandum Deum esse libera, quae terrena et transitoria hujus mundi concupiscit. Non potest videre oculus mentis alta, si eum claudit pulvis terrenae cupiditatis. Cupiditas grave peccatum est, omnium criminum materia est."⁶⁹ Marcabru does not seem to be so specific here; the better meaning of cobeida in Marcabru may be "lust." Cupidity is the source of all evil in the Fathers, for it binds the mind to the desires of the flesh and does not allow it to soar to the supernatural and the heavenly.⁷⁰ Lust blinds the eyes with the dust of mundane cupidity; it disables the mind for contemplating the things concerning God. So the main difference between Marcabru and the Fathers consists in this: while Marcabru's cupidity prevents us from having a good natural love, in the Fathers

⁶⁷Scheludko, "Klagen über den Verfall," p. 35.

⁶⁸Augustine, Enarratio in Psalmos, PL, XXXVII, 1154; see also Index cupiditas in CCXX, 835.

⁶⁹Augustine, Enarratio In Psalmos, PL, XXXVIII, 1154. Cf. PL, CCXX, 835.

⁷⁰Ambrosius, Sermones, PL, XVII, 760; De Vocatione Gentium, PL, XVII, 1067-68.

it does not allow our love to rise above nature.

In Bel m'es can s'esclarziz l'onda Marcabru speaks of cobezeza which is also translated by Scheludko as cupiditas.⁷¹ Marcabru speaks of cobezeza while he condemns adultery; his cobezeza impedes the true love of the young couple while in the Fathers it impedes the spiritual life of the soul. In Marcabru, because of cobezeza the husband Porta capel cornut conin, wears a horned hat, which comes from cons. This shows that Marcabru means by cobezeza only that which impedes faithful secular and sexual love.

The same difference exists between the enveja of Marcabru and the invidia of the Fathers. When Marcabru says that Enveja will never be satisfied to the end, (XIIb, 17), he means sexual desire. So also his Ab dos desirs d'un envieia (XXXVII, 28) means desire for sexual union (rather than envy); the same is the case in Pois la fuoilla revirola where he says that he prefers the cold winter season to the resourceful summer Don nais puti' et envieia - from which fornication and desire are born.

In contrast to sexual desire and lust, invidia in the Fathers means sorrow in the good of our neighbor - tristitia de bono proximi.⁷² Marcabru never means such sorrow by

⁷¹Scheludko, op. cit., p. 35.

⁷²St. Jerome, Commentarius in Ecclesiasten: PL, XXIII, 1045.

enveja. Envy in the Fathers is a capital sin and it consists in considering the progress that one's neighbor makes as detrimental to one's own good, excellence.⁷³ The cause of envy is always pride and the concupiscence of the flesh and the eyes. In respect to envy the Fathers cite the example of Abel and Cain and say that by envy death entered into the world; that the envy of the devil caused the temptations in Eden.⁷⁴

The context makes it clear that there is nothing in Marcabru that is applicable to envy in the Christian sense, nor does his enveja have any religious significance.

Orguelh - Pride - in Marcabru is not a sin but a virtue while it is the first of the capital sins in the Fathers.⁷⁵ It is the cause of all destruction and harm in men and it is a presumption against God for it appropriates to himself that which is due to God. In Emperaire per votre prez, Marcabru says that if he ever showed pride on account of the Emperor, matters have completely changed now (Dej. XXIII, 9-10). There is no hint in these words that there is any sin in being proud. The same is the case in Pois la fuoilla revirola,

⁷³Augustine, Sermo ad Frantres in Eremo: PL, XL, 1264-66.

⁷⁴Ibid., see also De Catechizandis Rudibus: PL, XL, 315.

⁷⁵Ambrose, Expositio in Psalmos, PL, XV, 1282; De Noe et Arca: PL, XIV, 386.

where the poet says that the pride of the vulgar man is full of grumbling until he shows his teeth in summer. The winter setting of the poem explains the words of Marcabru; he means that till the time of spring in the next year the vulgar and adulterous lover cannot show his pride and go about with his debaucherous actions; he is sorry and grumbles on that account. The poet does not attack his pride, only his adulterous behavior. The fact is confirmed by the lines in Bel m'es quan la rana chanta where he says of the nightingale that it is full of pride (line 7). In the same vein, the poet speaks about his beloved lady who should have sent him a letter; he consoles himself saying that she either fears to debase her nobility, or is angry with him; or that her pride cannot suffer it or indifference has intervened between them (Languan fuelhon li boscatge lines 24-28). The poet is not surprised that she is proud; she is noble and has a right to be proud. The fact that she is proud does not make the poet have contempt for her; rather, he is all the more in love with her and he loves and admires all of her class, and still hopes that he would be allowed to be intimate with her (strophe 6). The pride of the jackdaw is not something to be hated or despised according to the poet, but it is the reason why men should choose a better love - a love that will not deceive, a love that has no falsehood in it (Dej. XLII, 3). Marcabru encourages and exhorts the emperor to

confound the pride of the Saracens not because they are proud, but because they are Saracens (Emperaire, per mi mezeis, line 17). He speaks about the pride of the pagans in Pax in nomine Domini; but here also Marcabru does not hate pride as such, but the pride of the pagans. This shows that Marcabru does not despise pride in a Christian courtier; in him it is a good quality. There is never a hint in Marcabru that pride is a sin; it is a virtue and an essential quality of nobility. The proud Saracens should be destroyed because they are pagans; the pride of Christian nobles should triumph over them.

The Fathers never speak in this vein about pride. For them pride is the first of the capital sins and the cause of all evil in man.⁷⁶

In Bel m'es quan la rana chanta (Dej. XI) Marcabru speaks of a castle in which Youth, Joy and Prowess are imprisoned and the assailants cry out from outside, "Let us enter and take it by assault." He continues saying that the dukes and kings are the first in closing Proeza's mouth. Every one of the assailants is persecuting her, tears her to pieces, strikes her, and breaks her teeth.

Almost in similar terms, Honorius of Autun speaks about the body.⁷⁷ According to him, the human body is a

⁷⁶Ibid.; see also Ambrose Sermones: PL, XVII, 756.

⁷⁷Honorius Augustodun, Speculum Ecclesiae: PL, CLXXXII, 1097.

castle which is inhabited mainly by the soul and peopled by other virtues. This castle which is the body is attacked by the outside mob and the inside factions. One who overcomes both the external enemy and the internal faction will be crowned triumphantly with the laurel of beatitude by the king of supreme glory in the heavenly Jerusalem.

Is there any real comparison between Marcabru and Honorius as Scheludko claims?⁷⁸ From this passage can we conclude that Marcabru is speaking about the castle of the spirit and the body where the soul and the virtue dwell? It is clear from the passage that Marcabru is not speaking here about any castle, he is speaking about Proeza. The francha causa that is captured is Proeza (Dej. XI, line 34) and it is again Proeza that the captors want to put to death (line 24). The passage from Honorius of Autun is part of a sermon given to the people. Honorius begins the sermon with a comparison between the two cities of Jerusalem and Babylon. He says that the king of Jerusalem is Christ and the king of Babylon is the devil. After a long description of the founder, citizens, princes, type of government, etc. of both the cities he asks his hearers to which city each of them belongs. He then describes a

⁷⁸Op. cit., p. 33.

monk and a lay person belonging to each city. He says about the monk:

Item sunt duo canonicam vitam profitentes,
sed diversa exercitia habentes. Alter enim
caste vivit, judicia mundi respuens assidue
legit, divinum officium devote peragit,
populum verbo et exemplo instruit . . .
Porro alter, Dei ordinisque sui oblitus
libidini et luxui deservit, negotiis
secularibus insistit, divinum officium
postponit, ludis, spectaculis, venationibus
tempus consumit, populi salutem negligit,
immo ruina populi existit . . .⁷⁹

Augustodun makes the same kind of distinction between two lay people also. He says:

Item sunt duo laicalem vitam ducentes, sed
diversis moribus viventes. Alter etenim,
ecclesiam frequentans, Christianam religionem
scrutatur; mala declinans, bona sectatur,
pauperes recreat, proximos pace et concordia
conciliat, conjugem causa prolis diligit,
filios in Dei timore nutrit et hic procul
dubio civis Hierosalem existit. Alter autem

⁷⁹Ibid., col. 1098.

furtis, rapinis, vel latrociniiis, insudat,
 ebrietatibus, commersationibus luxuriis,
 immunditiis se ingurgitat. Hic alterius
 vitam summo odio lacerat, et sic se civem
 Babyloniae demonstrat. Cives item
 Babyloniae, cum veritatem per nos audiunt,
 quae in se ipsis minime recognoscunt; sed
 cum rex convivii intraverit, et hos sine
 veste nuptiali, scilicet charitate,
 invenerit, ligatis manibus et pedibus,
 in tenebras exteriores ejici jubebit;
 suos autem recumbere faciens in gaudio,
 illis ministrabit.⁸⁰

In the passage quoted there are many words and expressions used by Marcabru; charity and joy are the most important inhabitants or companions of the soul. What is lacking in Babylon's citizen is joy, and the crowning glory of the citizen of Jerusalem is the joy that he is going to have there.

In spite of these exterior similarities, it should be said that there is no real connection between the narrations of Marcabru and of Honorius. The differences

⁸⁰ Ibid.

are mainly the following: Marcabru never says that the joy he speaks about is the joy of the soul, or of the spirit or of heaven. In the passage quoted from Honorius, joy is of the spirit and of heaven. It is the joy the monk and the layman can experience only after death.

Concerning love for the wife, Autun emphasizes the fact that the citizen of Jerusalem loves his wife only for the sake of the child; that implies that the love of wife for the sake of pleasure is a characteristic of the citizen of Babylon. So the difference between the two is as great as the difference between the life of the body and of the soul, the life on earth and in heaven.

Aelred the Abbot of Rievaulx in one of his exhortations to the monks of his abbey says that this life is a war. He exhorts the monks that they should be brave in war, and whoever in the abbey is not at war with himself is not worthy to be called a man, but a bull. If he does not fight against the pleasures and desires of the flesh but consents to them, then he does not live as a man, but a bull. He tells them that by entering the abbey, they have come to a place of war, and the abbey is a place of constant fighting. "Sic Dominus noster, quia scit quam callidus et fortis sit hostis, hortatur nos ut fortes simus et dicit: Estote fortes in bello (Heb. xi, 34) . . . Nam ille qui hic non est in spirituali militia, non debet appellari homo, sed pecus. Si enim non pugnat contra carnis voluptates et

desideria, sed consentit eis, utique non vivit sicut homo, sed sicut pecus. Sciatis, utique, fratres, quia ex quo die huc venistis, et coepistis servire Christo, ingressi estis locum pugnae . . . Haec est pugna. Estote ergo fortes in bello."⁸¹

Here again the comparison with the castle of Marcabru is not on the same level; because in Marcabru the terms used are of the court, - proeza, jovens, jois - while in the exhortation of Aelred it is evident that he speaks about the walls of the abbey. In the life of the abbey the only consideration is the cultivation of the spirit and the acquisition of virtues. Everything spoken by an abbot in an exhortation can usually be interpreted in terms of charity, but not so in Marcabru where there is nothing about spiritual life.

There are some other themes which, Sheludko claims, are borrowed from the Fathers by Marcabru.⁸² But when we study them carefully in context we readily see that the poet is speaking about an entirely different idea, one that has no relation at all to the ideas in the Bible and in the Fathers.

⁸¹Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx, Sermones: PL, CXCv, 294.

⁸²For example, Sobreparlar (Lo vers comenssa, line 60) is identical with Multiloquium; Non-cura (Lanquan fuelhon li boscatge, (Dej. XXVIII, line 27) identical with Otiositas; Engan with Fraus; Escarsetatz with Avaritia; Putia with fornicatio etc.

In his lyrics Marcabru stand for order, discipline, and submission to social and ethical rules and regulations. He feels that the noble class should keep its identity and solidarity, that is should be different from the lower classes. He is conscious of its responsibilities; he is convinced of the importance of the role that the nobles have played in the past and they will have to play in the future in order that the French may survive as a people and withstand the invasions of the enemy both in the West and in the East. In a feudal society every class has its own proper functions and duties; the main duty of the nobles is to defend the country from foreign invasion. Marcabru wants to strengthen and discipline the French aristocracy in order to defend their religion and culture from the Saracens. This purpose of Marcabru is seen in all his lyrics; he is not an ordinary troubadour who has undertaken his profession either for entertainment or for a living. Marcabru has become a troubadour in order to be the prophet and the leader of the French nobility and lead them to security and prosperity. He refuses to be their flatterer and thus earn a good living. He is the most sincere and honest of all the troubadours and the one who loves his nation and his people most. He does not care for reward as much as he loves his people; he does not care for their approbation as

much as their well being. He says what he feels true and sacrifices everything, even his life, for a noble cause, the vitality and the rejuvenation of the nobility. At all costs the French should be a strong nation, a great people whom no Saracen, no Moor can ever overcome or subdue: this is his only aim, only purpose in life.

CONCLUSION

The twelfth century offers us, from the outset, an efflorescence of highly original concepts and doctrines of love, apparently springing up simultaneously in different surroundings.¹ One is found in troubadour literature, the other in the rising and flourishing spirit of monasticism. These two schools did not have identical trends; their objectives and motives were different. While the troubadours followed the secular traditions coming from Greek and Latin literature with Ovid as one of its chief exponents, there developed another concept in the monasteries based on the teachings of the Bible and of the Fathers.² Since Christian culture and outlook was dominant, even in the secular concept of love, we may meet with words and expressions similar to the ones used in describing the monastic concept of love. But they speak entirely of different things; they do not have the same outlook on life. Their ambitions and aspirations are not the same, nor do they run a parallel course. The objects of these two loves are not

¹Etienne Gilson, The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard, tr. A.H.C. Downes (New York, 1940), passim esp. pp. 198-214.

²Cf. D. Scheludko, "Entstehungsgeschichte der Altprovenzalischen Lyrik," Archivum Romanicum, XI (1927), pp. 273-312; XII (1928), pp. 30-127; and XV (1931), pp. 137-206.

identical; the exponents of these two loves do not propose the same means to achieve their objects. One might have influenced the other in the sense that the external structure of both sometimes appear similar. Though their words appear similar, their contents have no similarity at all.³ One kind of love was practiced, taught and exalted within the enclosures of a monastery, while the other was admired and sung about within the walls of a princely court.

From the life of the poet, insofar as we can piece it together from the vidas and the lyrics, we see that he went around from one court to another. He always looked for a patron and a benefactor; most of the time he sings for some Count, Prince or Lord. It is true that Marcabru's ideas are different from those of his contemporary poets who also sang for the court; but they are not identical with those of the monks in the monastery either. Once he even criticises the monks of the cloister and shows that he does not have much faith in their ways.⁴ We do not get a single instance in Marcabru where he gives us any hint that he admires the kind of love that the monks cherish and celebrate.

³Cf. H. Spanke, Untersuchungen über die Ursprünge des romanischen Minnesangs, part 2, Marcabrustudien (Göttingen, 1940), pp. 1-40; G. Errante, Marcabru e la fontè sacre, passim.

⁴Cf. line E no vol Joi Cuillir dinz sa clauzura (Dej. IX, 22) and An laissat mantalh e causier (Dej. III, 44) and the interpretation given to the latter by Robertson, "Five Poems," pp. 543-44.

Marcabru, in spite of all his condemnation of adultery and unfaithful love, in spite of his almost triumphant assertion that he never loved a woman and was never loved by any, is still a poet of the court, not an instructor of the monks. In these lyrics he does not seem to be very enthusiastic about the ideals of love which were taught and practiced in the cloister and he never mentions them. Marcabru thinks always in terms of the court; he is the exponent of a kind of refined and reformed love for the courtier.

Marcabru holds to an ethical concept, he stands for a set of values. He has a higher standard of moral principles than all his fellow troubadours. He insists that the courtiers and nobles should follow an ethical code of religious and moral principles. He has taken upon himself the duty of teaching the nobles these concepts and educating them in a manner of conduct. He has great hope in nobility and he wants to make the noble men of his time recognize their duties and responsibilities and make them lead a life worthy of their class. The rising aristocracy, thought Marcabru, could make its influence felt in all spheres of life if the nobles were conscious of their status and class. With this objective in view, the poet tries to correct them, to educate them, to instruct them.

But the values of Marcabru are of this world; he does not speak in the language of the Fathers whose sole objective is to attain blessedness in the life after death. The standard of the poet is far from that of the Fathers and of the monks who had taken the vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience and were always trying to live up to their vows. These are the greatest of monastic virtues and the main qualities of a monk. But Marcabru never speaks about these virtues.

Marcabru is a secular poet; he sings of a secular love; his joy is of this world and his jovens has nothing to do with sanctifying grace. Marcabru is never concerned about charity and the love of God; his concern is the love of a lady.

Marcabru makes use of some expressions and similes borrowed from the Bible; but these do not amount to an identity of concept. His language was influenced by the Bible and the Fathers; but this does not mean that he wrote about the life of the soul or about the supernatural; this is his language, his usual mode of expression.

Marcabru is a true Christian secular poet; there is nothing in his love that is prohibited and abominable to a conscientious Christian; but his concept of love is not typically Christian in the sense that he sings of supernatural love. His love is of this world; his love does

not transcend the mundane level.

Marcabru's concept of love is not borrowed from the Fathers, nor is it identical with the concept of other troubadours. His concept is unique, he stands as far from the Fathers as from his contemporaries. He sings about the love of a lady of flesh and blood, of passions and sentiments, but in a language that is not as disagreeable to the Fathers as that of other troubadours. He sings of a love not commendable in an abbey though tolerable in a Christian court. Marcabru for the first time in troubadour history sings about a love that is permissible to a Christian, he teaches the nobles that there is a licit and legitimate form of entertainment and a form of love that is irreprehensible in a noble Christian knight.

All peoples at all times have felt the effects of love; they thought about love and made theories about it. But all these various theories and concepts which developed among different peoples in diverse circumstances are not the same nor are they oriented to the same goal. There may be comparisons in their expressions and similarities in style which manifest a superficial identity. But when we study them carefully we see more differences in their approach, ideals, and aims than similarities. The yearning of the soul to reach its ultimate end and the prime source of its being cannot be identified with man's desire for sexual and sensual union, no matter how abstract, dis-

interested, and sublime are the terms used in expressing this desire.

APPENDIX

FATHERS AND MATRIMONIAL LOVE

The Fathers never speak very highly about marriage. St. Jerome, for example, considers marriage very inconvenient and troublesome. He quotes from Theophrasti de Nupitiis Liber and says:

Non est ergo uxor ducenda sapienti.
Primum enim impediri studia philosophiae;
nec posse quemquam libris et uxori pariter
inservire. Multa esse quae matronarum usibus
necessaria sint, pretiosae vestes, aurum,
gemmae, sumptus, ancillae, . . . Deinde per
noctes garulae conquestiones: illa ornatior
procedit in publicum: haec honoratur ab
omnibus, ego in conventu feminarum misella
despicior . . . Verum quid prodest etiam
diligens custodia, cum uxor servari impudica
non possit, pudica non debeat? Infida enim
custos est castitatis necessitas; et illa
vere pudica dicenda est, cui licuit peccare
si voluit. Pulchra cito adamatur, foeda facile
concupiscit. Difficile custoditur, quod
plures amant. Molestum est possidere, quod

nemo habere dignetur. Minore tamen miseria deformis habetur, quam formosa servatur. Nihil tutum est, in quod totius populi vota suspirant. Alius forma, alius ingenio, alius facetiis, alius liberalitate sollicitat. Aliquo modo, vel aliquando expugnatur, quod undique incessitur. Quod si propter dispensationem domus et languoris solatia, et fugam solitudinis, ducuntur uxores: multo melius servus fidelis dispensat, obediens auctoritati domini, et dispositioni ejus obtemperans, quam uxor, quae in eo se existimat dominam, si adversum viri faciat voluntatem, id est, quod placet, non quod jubetur. Assidere autem aegrotanti magis possunt amici, et vernulae beneficiis obligati, quam illa quae nobis imputat lacrymas suas, et haereditatis spe vendit illuviem, et sollicitudinem jactans, languentis animum desperatione conturbat. Quod si ipsa languerit, coaegrotandum est, et numquam ab ejus lectulo recedendum. Aut si bona fuerit et suavis uxor (quae tamen rara avis est), cum parturiente gemimus, cum periclitante torquemur. Sapiens autem numquam solus potest.

He now cites a series of examples of famous men in Greek and Latin history and literature who had to suffer from the infidelity and misbehaviour of their wives. He cites, for example, Socrates, Sylla, Cneius Pompeius, M. Cato, Philip King of Macedon, etc. and proves that all evils come from the wives: "omnia mala ex muleiribus."¹

He concludes:

Amor formae, rationis oblivio est et
insaniae proximus. Turbat consilia, altos
et generosos spiritus frangit, a magnis
cogitationibus ad humillimas detrahit . . .²

In no other Father do we find such a strong condemnation of marriage as in Jerome; we do not see any of them praising marriage and conjugal love as a state of happiness or fons de bontat either. The people among whom the first Christians lived did not have such a sublime conception of marriage.

The Manichaeans, for example, believed in a sort of cosmic dualism, and thought that the whole universe is composed of two principles, namely light and darkness, and that to set the light substance from the pollution of all matter was the ultimate aim of Manichaean spirituality.

¹Adversus Jovinianum Lib. I: PL, XXIII, 276-82.

²Ibid.

Those who entirely devoted themselves to this process of self-purification were the elect or Primates of Manichaeans; and they had to observe very strictly three principles of abstinence which they called three seals or signacula: those of the mouth, of the hands, and of the breast (oris, manuum et sinus). The first forbade all evil words and all evil food; the second forbade all actions detrimental to the light-substance, such as the slaying of an animal, or the plucking of fruit, etc. The third principle forbade all detrimental thoughts, whether against the Manichaean faith or against purity. It was this third principle that forbade them marriage and caused them to consider marriage an evil in itself, because the propagation of the human race meant the continual reimprisonment of the light-substance in matter and a retardation of the blissful consummation of all things; maternity was for them a calamity and a sin.³

These were the heretical doctrines that were prevalent among the first Christians, which the early Fathers always had to fight against. Not only the Manichaeans, but also the Jovinians and the Pelagians and the Marcionists had the same doctrinal tenets. What the Fathers had to do was to convince the people that it is not a sin to marry, that

³Catholic Encyclopedia, (New York: Appleton Co., 1910) art. Manichaeism.

it is a dignified thing to get married. It is in this vein that the Fathers from Tertullian to Peter Abelard speak about the matrimonial state.⁴

Against Marcion the heretic, Tertullian asks "Quanta dignitas matrimonii, in quo conjuges simul orant in Ecclesia Dei, pariter in convivio Dei."⁵ St. Ambrose on the other hand, in his exhortation to the widows is far from praising marriage as a state of supreme bliss; he not only does not praise marriage, but exhorts them to remain widows. "Quia monimenta conjugii arma sunt castitatis; . . . Abstinenciae meritum pudicitiae gratiam reservavit . . . ; temperantia enim virtus est feminarum."⁶ He continues:

Non ergo copula nuptialis quasi culpa vitanda, sed quasi necessitatis sarcina declinanda. Lex enim astringit uxorem, ut in laboribus et in tristitia filios generet, et conversio ejus ad virum sit, quod ei ipse dominetur. (Gen. III, 16). Ergo laboribus et doloribus in generatione filiorum adjicitur nupta, non vidua; et dominatui viri sola subditur copulata, non virgo. Omnium autem horum virgo libera est, quae Verbo Dei suum spondit affectum; quae sponsum benedictionis cum facibus expectat, (Matt. XXV, 4) bonae lumine voluntatis accenso. Et ideo provocatur consiliis, non vinculis illigatur."⁷

⁴Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem: PL, II, 282.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ambrose, Liber de Viduis: PL, XVI, 259.

⁷Ibid., Co. 273.

Honorabile itaque conjugium, sed honorabilior integritas; nam est qui matrimonio jungit virginem suam, bene facit; et qui non jungit, melius facit. (1 Cor VII, 38) Quod igitur bonum est, non vitandum est, quod est melius, eligendum est. Itaque non imponitur, sed proponitur. Et ideo Apostolus dixit: 'De virginibus praeceptum Domini non habeo; consilium autem do.' (1 Cor VII, 25). Etenim praeceptum in subditos fertur, consilium amicis datur. Ubi praeceptum est, ibi lex est; ubi consilium, ibi gratia est. Praeceptum ut ad naturam revocet, consilium, ut ad gratiam provocet. Et ideo lex Judaeis lata est, gratia autem electioribus reservata est. Lex ut a naturae finibus culpae studio demeantes, ad naturae observantiam poenae terrore revocaret; gratia autem, ut electos cum studio bonorum, tum propositis etiam praemiis provocaret."⁸

In the same vein St. Jerome writes to the Jovinians:

Sed ita nuptias recipimus, ut virginitatem, quae de nuptiis nascitur, praeferamus. Numquid argentum non erit argentum, si aurum argento pretiosius est? Aut arboris et segetis contumelia est, si radici et foliis, culmo et aristis poma praeferantur et fructus? Ut poma ex arbore, frumentum ex stipula, ita virginitas ex nuptiis. Centesimus et sexagesimus et tricesimus fructus, quamquam de una terra, et de una semente nascatur, tamen multum differt in numero. Triginta referuntur ad nuptias . . . sexaginta vero ad viduas, numerus centesimus exprimit virginitatis coronam.⁹

Nunc autem cum haereticorum sit damnare conjugia . . . Ecclesia enim non damnat matrimonia, sed subjicit; nec abjicit, sed

⁸Ibid., Col. 269.

⁹St. Jerome, Epistola XLVIII, seu Liber Apologeticus ad Pommachium, pro libris contra Jovinianum: PL, XXII, 495.

dispensat, sciens (sicut supra diximus) in domo magna, non solum esse vasa aurea et argentea sed et lignea et factilia; et alia esse in honorem; alia in contumeliam . . . Ecclesia non nuptias, sed nuptias in suo opere permanentes, potestate vestra est, si velitis, secundum pudicitiae gradum scandere. Quid indignamini? Si in tertio stantes, nolitis ad superiora properare?¹⁰

In none of these instances is there any hint of praise of the state of matrimony in any way; the attitude is only one of toleration, out of necessity. In fact, there are many invitations, as in St. Jerome, to ascend to the higher grade of Christian life by choosing the state of virginity or of widowhood.

Alanus de Insulis writes to the married people:

O quanta est dignitas conjugii quod in paradiso habuit initium, quod incontinentiae removet vitium, quod in se complectitur coeleste sacramentum: quod servat tori fidem, quod inter conjuges individuum retinet vitae societatem, quod prolem ab infamia liberat, quod excusat carnale commercium a culpa . . .¹¹

Sed quamvis a peccato excuset carnale commercium, celebratur tamen ad susceptionem prolis, non ad voluptatem carnis, ratione loci, ratione temporis, ratione religiose officii. Observet etiam homo spirituale conjugium inter carnem et spiritum, ut caro tamquam milier spiritui obediat, spiritus tamquam vir, carnem ut uxorem regat.¹²

¹⁰St. Jerome, op. cit., PL, XXII, 501.

¹¹Alanus de Insulis, Summa de Arte Praedicatoria: PL, CCX, 193.

¹²Ibid., 192-93.

In St. Augustine we get a clear remark that it is always a sin to have cohabitation; and matrimony can never exist without the evil of concupiscence: He writes against the Pelagians:

Non enim copula nuptialis, sicut putas, propter carnis concupiscentiam, sed propter bonum quod de isto malo fit, instituta est. Quod quidem bonum sine isto malo fieret, si nemo pecasset. . . . Ita connubium non potest esse sine malo concupiscentiae.¹³

He says in another instance that every use of marriage is at least a venial sin and there cannot be a marital act which is not sinful. "Veniale peccatum quandonam in usu matrimonii."¹⁴ So the Pope Liberius gave this exhortation to the faithful: "In sacris diebus jejuniorum conjugati a conjugibus se abstineant."¹⁵ St. Ambrose also tells the people that there should be some fixed seasons and times in order to procreate children. "Tempora praescripta esse conjugio et liberis procreandis."¹⁶ St. Jerome warned his people that there should be extreme care and watchfulness in their attitude to their bodies: "Uxor et vir non habent sui corporis potestatem, nec habent pudicitiae libertatem."¹⁷

¹³Augustine, Contra Julianum Pelagianum: PL, XLIV, 730.

¹⁴Enchiridion de Fide, Spe et Charitate: PL, 269.

¹⁵Epistola ad Athanasium: PL, VIII, 1408-9.

¹⁶Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucam: PL, XV, 1550-51.

¹⁷Hieronymus, Epistulae, PL, XXII, 1048-49.

The Hibernian Council which treated marriage as a sacrament has this passage among its decisions: it gives the days and times when the people have to abstain from the matrimonial act.

"In tribus quadragesimis anni, et in Dominica die, et in feriis quartis, et in sextis feriis conjuges continere se debent. Item, in omnibus solemnitatibus, et in illis diebus quibus uxor pregnant, hoc est, a die quo filius in utero ejus motum fecerit, usque ad partus sui diem. Item a partu 36 dies si masculus, si vero filia 46 dies."¹⁸

St. Paulinus, the patriarch of Aquileia made the following decisions in the Council of Forojulien:

Diem autem Dominicum inchoante noctis initio, id est vespere sabbati, quae in prima lucescit sabbati, quando signum insonuerit, vel hora est ad vespertinum celebrandum officium, non propter honorem sabbati ultimi, sed propter sanctam illam noctem primi sabbati, hoc est Dominici diei, cum omni reverentia et honorifica religione venerari omnibus mandamus Christianis. Abstinerere primum omnium ab omni peccato, et ab omni opere carnali, etiam a propriis conjugibus, et ab omni opere terreno et ab nihil aliud vacare, nisi ad orationem . . .¹⁹

Peter Lombard writes in his Book of Sentences that married people should abstain from cohabitation from certain days:

¹⁸Capitula Selecta ex antiqua Canorum Collectione Facta in Hibernia: PL, XCVI, 1303.

¹⁹Concilium Forojuliense: PL, XCIX, 300, 301.

Propter processionis enim dies, et
 jejuniorum aliquando non licet convenire;
 quia etiam a licitis abstinendum est, ut
 facilius impetrari possit quod postulatur.
 Quoties enim vel dies Nativitatis, vel
 reliquae festivitates advenerint, non solum
 a concubinarum consortio sed etiam a propriis
 uxoribus abstinete.²⁰

All these show the attitude of the Fathers and medieval writers to matrimonial love; not only was it far from being a source of good and happiness, but a shadow of sinfulness was often attributed to it.

These ideas of marriage were more or less accepted by later theologians; we see very little change in later Fathers. Until St. Thomas, no writer ever said in a spiritual and theological context that the marriage act was in itself something good.²¹

²⁰ Liber Sententiarum: PL, CXCII, 923.

²¹ Cf. Hugo of St. Victor, Summa Sententiarum: PL, CLXXVI, 155-56.

LIST OF WORKS CITED

TEXTS

- Abelard, Peter. Theologica et Philosophica Sic et Non: PL, CLXXVIII.
- Absalom, Abbas. Sermones: PL, CCXI.
- Adamus, Scotus. De Triplici Genere Contemplationis: PL, CXCVIII.
- Aelrad of Rievaulx. Sermones: PL, CXCV.
- Alanus de Insulis. Summa de Arte Praedicatoria: PL, CCX.
- Alcuinus. Exegetica: PL, C.
- Ambrose, St. De Abraham: PL, XIV.
- Ambrose, St. De Cain et Abel: PL, XIV.
- Ambrose, St. De Interpellatione Job et David: PL, XIV.
- Ambrose, St. De Noe et Arca: PL, XIV.
- Ambrose, St. De Paradiso: PL, XIV.
- Ambrose, St. De Vocatione Gentium: PL, XVII.
- Ambrose, St. Enarrationes In Psalmos: PL.
- Ambrose, St. Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucam: PL, XV.
- Ambrose, St. Hexaameron: PL, XIV.
- Ambrose, St. Liber de Viduis: PL, XVI.
- Ambrose, St. Liber de Tobia: PL, XIV.
- Anselm, St. De Concupiscentia Carnis et Spiritus: PL, CLVIII.
- Anselm, St. Meditationes: PL, CLVIII.
- Arnobius. Adversus Gentes: PL, V.
- Athanasius, St. Epistula de Synodis: PG, XXVI.

- Athanasius, St. Fragmenta: PG, XXVII.
- Athanasius, St. Orationes Adversus Arianos: PG, XXVI.
- Augustine, St. Confessiones.
- Augustine, St. Contra Epistolam Manichaei: PL, XLII.
- Augustine, St. Contra Julianum Pelagianum: PL, XLIV.
- Augustine, St. Contra Cresconium Donatistam: PL, XLIII.
- Augustine, St. De Baptismo contra Donatistas: PL, XLIII.
- Augustine, St. De Bono Conjugali: PL, XL.
- Augustine, St. De Catechizandis Rudibus: PL, XL.
- Augustine, St. De Civitate Dei: PL, XLI.
- Augustine, St. De Fide Rerum Quae non Videntur: PL, XL.
- Augustine, St. De Genesi ad Litteram: PL, XXXIV.
- Augustine, St. De Libero Arbitrio: PL, XXXII.
- Augustine, St. De Moribus Ecclesiae: PL, XXXII.
- Augustine, St. De Moribus Manichaeorum: PL, XXXII.
- Augustine, St. De Nuptiis et de Concupiscentia: PL, XLIV.
- Augustine, St. De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione: PL, XLIV.
- Augustine, St. De Spiritu et Littera: PL, XLIV.
- Augustine, St. Enarrationes In Psalmos: PL, XXXVI et XXXVII.
- Augustine, St. Enchiridion de Fide, Spe et Caritate: PL, XLIV.
- Augustine, St. Epistolae: PL, XXXIII.
- Augustine, St. Liber de Peccato Originali: PL, XLIV.
- Augustine, St. Refractionum Liber I: PL, XXXII.
- Augustine, St. Sermo ad Fratres in Eremo: PL, XL.
- Augustine, St. Sermones: PL, XXXVIII et XXIX.

- Augustine, St. Tractatus in Epistolam Joannis ad Parthos: PL, XXXV.
- Augustine, St. Tractatus in Joannis Evangelium: PL, XXXV.
- Bernard, St. De Consideratione: PL, CLXXXII.
- Bernard, St. Liber de Modo Bene Vivendi: PL, CLXXXIV.
- Bernard, St. Sermones in Cantica: PL, CLXXXIII.
- Bernard, St. Sermones de Diversis: PL, CLXXXIII.
- Bernard, St. Sermones in Psalmos: PL, CLXXXIII.
- Boutière, Jean and A. H. Schutz. Biographies des Troubadours. Paris, 1964.
- Cercamon. Les Poésies de Cercamon, ed., Alfred Jeanroy, Paris, 1922.
- Chrysologus, St. Sermones: PL, LII.
- Chrysostom, St. John. Catechesis ad Illuminandos: PG, XLIX.
- Chrysostom, St. John. Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatos: PG, LXII.
- Chrysostom, St. John. Fragmenta: PG, XLIV.
- Chrysostom, St. John. In Actus Apostolorum Homiliae: PG, LX.
- Chrysostom, St. John. In Genesim Homiliae: PG, LIII.
- Chrysostom, St. John. In Matthaeum Homiliae: PG, LVIII.
- Clement of Alexandria. Paedagogus: PG, VII.
- Cyril of Alexandria. Commentarius in Joannem: PG, LXXIV.
- Damian, Peter. Opuscula Varia: PL, CXLV.
- Damian, Peter. Opusculum XIII: De Perfectione Monachorum: PL, CXLV.
- Didymus Alexandrinus. Contra Manichaeos: PG, XXXIX.
- Epiphanius, St. Adversus Haereses Panarium: PG, XLI.
- Ernard Bonval. Vita Prima Sancti Bernardi: PL, CLXXXV.

Gramatica, Aloisius. Bibliorum Sacrorum Juxta Vulgatam Clementinam Nova Editio. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1946.

Gregory the Great. Homiliae in Evangelia: PL, LXXVI.

Hilary of Poitou. Tractatus In Psalmos: PL, IX.

Honorius of Autun. Sigillum Beatae Mariae: PL, CLXXII.

Honorius of Autun. Speculum Ecclesiae: PL, CLXXII.

Hugo of St. Victor. De Claustro Animae: PL, CLXXVI.

Hugo of St. Victor. De Scripturis et Scriptoribus Sacris: PL, CLXXV.

Hugo of St. Victor. Summa Sententiarum: PL, CLXXVI.

Ignatius of Antioch. Epistola ad Ephesios: PG, V.

Innocent III. De Sacro Altaris Mysterio: PL, CCXVII.

Irenaeus, St. Adversus Haereses: PG, VII.

Jerome, St. Admonitio Adversus Jovinianum: PL, XXIII.

Jerome, St. Commentarius in Ecclesiasten: PL, XXIII.

Jerome, St. Epistolae: PL, XXII.

Jerome, St. Liber Apologeticus ad Pommachium pro Libris Contra Jovinianum: PL, XXII.

Julianus Pomerius. De Vita Contemplativa: PL, LIX.

Lactantius. Divinae Institutiones: PL, VI.

Leo the Great. Sermones: PL, LIV.

Mansi, J. D. Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum. Florence, 1759-98.

Marcabru. Poésies Complètes du Troubadour Marcabru, ed., J. M. L. Dejeanne, Toulouse, 1909.

Novatianus. De Trinitate: PL, III.

Ordericus Vitalis. Historia Ecclesiastica: PL, CLXXXV.

- Origenes. Homiliae in Leviticum: PG, XII.
- Peter Lombard. Sententiarum Libri Quattuor: PL, CXCII.
- Richard of St. Victor. Exegetica: PL, CXCVI.
- Tertullian. Apologeticus: PL, I & II.
- Tertullian. Adversus Marcionem: PL, II.
- Tertullian. De Praescriptione Haereticorum: PL, II.
- _____. Concilium Foro-Julienne: PL, XCIX.
- _____. Capitula Selecta ex Antiqua Canonum Collectione Facta in Hibernia: PL, XCVI.
- Zeno of Verona. De Pudicitia et de Continentia: PL, XI.
- Zeno of Verona. Tractatus Liber I: PL, XI.

Studies

- Appel, Carl. "Zu Marcabru," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XLIII (1923), 403-69.
- Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologiae, 4 vols.
- Augustine, St. Confessions, trans. Vernon Bourke, New York, 1953.
- Bernard, St. Cantica Canticorum: Eighty-Six Sermons on the Song of Solomon, tr. and ed. Samuels Eales. London, 1895.
- Boissonnade, Paul. "Les personnages et les événements de l'histoire d'Allemagne, de France et d'Espagne dans l'oeuvre de Marcabru," Romania, XLVIII (1922), 207-43.
- Broudehoux, J. P. Marriage et Famille chez Clement d'Alexandrie. Paris, 1970.

- Brown, Raymond E. ed. The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Englewood Cliffs, 1968.
- Cassidy, Frank P. Molders of the Medieval Mind. New York, 1944.
- _____. Catholic Encyclopedia. New York, 1967, art. Manichaeism.
- Chabaneau, C. "Sur le date du Vers del Lavador de Marcabru," Revue des Langues Romanes, XXVII (1885), 250-51.
- Delmonte, A. Studi sulla poesia ermetica medievale. Naples 1953.
- Denomy, Alexander J. "An Inquiry into the Origins of Courtly Love," Medieval Studies, VI (1944), 175-260.
- Denomy, Alexander J. "Fin' Amors: the Pure Love of the Troubadours," Medieval Studies, VII (1945), 139-207.
- Denomy, Alexander J. "Jois among the Early Troubadours," Medieval Studies, XIII (1951), 177-217.
- Denomy, Alexander J. "Jovens, the Notion of Youth among the Troubadours," Medieval Studies, XI (1949), 1-22.
- Diez, Friedrich. Die Poesie der Troubadours, 2nd ed., rev. Karl Bartsch. Leipzig, 1882.
- Diez, Friedrich. Leben und Werke der Troubadours, 2nd ed., rev. Karl Bartsch, Leipzig, 1882.
- _____. Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique. Paris, 1909.
- _____. Dictionnaire de Spiritualité. Paris, 1964.
- Dronke, Peter. "Tradition and Innovation in Medieval Western Color Imagery," Eranos Jahrbuch, XLI (1972), 51-107.
- Errante, Giulio. Marcabru e le fonti sacre dell' antica lirica romanza. Florence, 1948.
- Fabrègues, Jean de. Christian Marriage. New York: Hawthorn, 1959.
- Falk, P. "Sur un vers de Marcabru Que i ant fait li buzat d'Anjou, cal desmerill," Studia Neophilologica, XXXIII (1960), 41-52.

- Fauriel, C. C. History of Provençal Poetry, trans. G. J. Adler. New York: Haskell House, 1890.
- Franz, A. Über den Troubadour Marcabru. Marburg, 1914.
- Gilson, Etienne. The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard, trans. A. A. C. Downes. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940.
- Graef, Hilda. Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
- Graef, Hilda. The Devotion to Our Lady. New York: Hawthorn, 1963.
- Hatcher, Anna. "Marcabru's A la fontana del vergier," Modern Language Notes, LXXIX (1964), 284-95.
- Hoepffner, E. Les Troubadours. Paris, 1955.
- Journel, Rouet de. Enchiridion Patristicum. Freiburg, 1922.
- Kastner, L. E. "Marcabrun and Cercamon," Modern Language Review, XXI (1951), 91-96.
- Levy, Emil. Petit Dictionnaire Provençale-Française, 4th ed. Heidelberg, 1966.
- Lewent, Karl. "Beiträge zum Verständnis der Lieder Marcabrus," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXVII (1913), 313-337 et 427-51.
- Luchaire, Achille. Social France. New York, 1929.
- Meyer, Paul. "Marcabru," Romania, VI (1887), 119-29.
- Molk, Ulrich. Trobar Clus Trobar Leu. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1968.
- Nelson, Thomas ed. A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. New York, 1951.
- Nygren, Anders. Agape and Eros trans. Philip Watson. Philadelphia: West Minister Press, 1953.
- Nykl, A. R. Hispano-Arabic Poetry and its Relation with the Old Provençal Troubadours. Baltimore, 1946.
- Parsch, Pius. The Liturgy of the Mass trans. H. E. Winstone. London, 1957.

- Pizzoruzzo, Valeria Bertolucci. "Marcabruno e il suo biographo," Studi mediolatini e volgari, XVII (1969).
- Raynouard, M. Lexique Roman rep. Paris, 1836-45.
- Remer, V. Logica Minor. Rome, 1927.
- Robertson, D. W. "Five Poems by Marcabru," Studies in Philology, LI (1954), 539-60.
- Robertson, D. W. "The Doctrine of Charity in Medieval Literary Gardens: A Topical Approach Through Symbolism and Allegory," Speculum, XXVI (1951), 24-49.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Cortesamen vuoill comensar," Revista di cultura classica e medievale, VII (1965), 948-61.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Due schede provenzali per gli amici ispanisti," Studi di Letteratura Spagnola, 1966, 129-39.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "I due sirventesi di Marcabruno ad Alfonso VII," Cultura Neolatina, X (1950), 153-83.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Il gap di Marcabruno: Fondamenti di critica interpretativa," Studi Medievali, XVII (1951), 46-70.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "La tenzone tra Ugo Catola e Marcabruno," Linguistica e filologia, Milan, 1968.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Marcabruno: Al departir del brau tempier," Cultura Neolatina, XIII (1953), 5-33.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Marcabruno: Aujatz de chan," Cultura Neolatina, XVII (1957), 20-48.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Marcabruno: Lo vers comens quan vei del fau," Cultura Neolatina, XI (1951), 25-48.
- Roncaglia, Aurelio. "Trobar clus: discussione aperta," Cultura Neolatina, XXIX (1969), 5-55.
- Ruggieri, R. "Chiose interpretative del Vers del Lavador," Cultura Neolatina, XII (1952), 81-101.
- Scheludko, Dimitri. "Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der altprovenzalische Lyrik," Archivum Romanicum, XI (1927), 273-312; XII (1928), 30-127; XV (1931), 137-206.

- Scheludko, Dimitri. "Klagen über den Verfall der Welt: Allegorische Darstellungen des Kämpfers der Tugenden und Laster," Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, XLIV (1943), 31-37.
- Scheludko, Dimitri. "Religiöse Elemente in weltlichen Liebesliedern der Troubadours," Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, LIX (1935), 402-21.
- Scheludko, Dimitri. "Über die religiöse Lyrik der Troubadours," Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, XXXVIII (1937), 224-50.
- Scheludko, Dimitri. "Über die Theorien der Liebe bei den Troubadours," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, LX (1940), 191-234.
- Spanke, H. "La Poesie lyrique des Troubadours," Studi Medievali, VIII (1935)
- Spanke, H. Marcabrustudien. Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge, Nr. 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940.
- Spitzer, L. "Parelh-paria chez Marcabru," Romania, LXXIII (1952), 79-82.
- Suchier, H. "Der Troubadour Marcabru," Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur, XIV (1875), 119-60, 273-310.
- Tanquary, A. Synopsis Theologiae Moralis, 2 vols. Baltimore, 1902.
- Van Noort, G. Tractatus de Deo Uno et Trino. Bussum, Holland, 1947.
- Vossler, Karl. "Der Troubadour Marcabru und die Anfänge des gekünstelten Stiles," Sitzungsberichte der königlich-bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrg. 1913, 11. Abh., Munich, 1913.
- Wettstein, Jacques. Mezura l'ideal des Troubadours: Son Essence et ses Aspects. Zurich, 1945.
- Wilhelm, James J. Seven Troubadours. Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 1970.
- Williams, Watkin. St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Manchester, 1935.