
Responción, accentual metrics and metrical irregularity in the *cantiga de amigo*

Stephen Parkinson
University of Oxford

Data de recepción: 31/07/2020 | Data de aceptación: 06/10/2020

Abstract:

This paper defends Parkinson's (2016) claim that the metre of a significant number of *cantigas de amigo* is accentual rather than accentual-syllabic, by rebutting an oblique defence of traditional metrics in Cohen (2018), and a direct critique of accentual metre in Cohen (2017).

Keywords:

cantigas de amigo, metrics, accentual, responcion

Responción, métrica acentual e irregularidade métrica na cantiga de amigo

Resumo:

Este artigo defende a conclusión de Parkinson (2016) de que unha cantidade significativa de cantigas de amigo acusa métrica acentual e non acentual-silábica, respondendo a unha defensa oblíqua da análise tradicional (Cohen, 2018) e a unha crítica do concepto de métrica acentual (Cohen, 2017).

Palabras chave:

cantigas de amigo, métrica, métrica acentual, responción

1. Introduction

Cohen (2018) has claimed to have identified a hitherto unnoticed metrical device in the medieval Galician-Portuguese *cantiga de amigo*, by which a pair of lines or strophes are highlighted by having a closer relation to each other than to the rest of the poem they belong to. Using the term *external responsion* borrowed via Maas (1929/1962) from the metrics of Classical Greek, he claims to detect special patterns linking just these pairs of lines and strophes, and so argues that the strophes in question, despite not conforming to the overall metrical pattern of the poem, are well-formed and require no editorial intervention.

There are in fact two arguments in Cohen's article, an overt one relying on the concept of *responsion* to claim regularity for the poems in question, and a covert one rebutting *in absentia* Parkinson's (2016) description of accentual metre as a basis for the verse design of some *cantigas de amigo*. Cohen (2017), more limited but more explicit, reanalyses the three central examples of Parkinson (2016), claiming either regularity or patterned irregularity of the type described in Cohen (2018). All but two of the ten examples discussed in Cohen (2018) are to be found in Parkinson's provisional catalogue of *cantigas de amigo* which satisfy his positive and negative criteria for accentual metrics, in particular the criterion that accentual metrics, but not accentual-syllabic metrics, provides the basis for a coherent overall analysis of the poem's design. The list (Parkinson, 2016: 37) is reproduced in an expanded form in Appendix 1.

The objective criteria developed by Parkinson (2016: 35-36) for proposing an analysis in terms of accentual metrics are: strong rhythmic coherence and coherent poem design when formulated in terms of accentual metrics (the "positive criteria"); lack of internal consistency of syllable counts (in non-polymetric strophes) and a lack of strophic regularity when traditionally analysed as accentual-syllabic metre (the "negative criteria"). I will not attempt here to distinguish between accentual-syllabic metre and syllabic-accentual metre as points on a continuum between pure syllabic and pure accentual metre.

As a general response to Cohen's overt argument, I will consider the use and usefulness of the term *responsion*, and show that it has no more than rhetorical value, being a borrowing from a different tradition whose meaning is totally subsumed in more critically grounded terminology, notably the Jakobsonian hierarchy of *verse design*, *strophe design* and *poem design*, and a clear typological distinction between syllabic, accentual and accentual-syllabic verse. Poems with accentual verse design do not have isosyllabic lines, and make little or no use of devices like elision which exist to adjust the syllable count of lines: it follows that the metrical editing of such poems will not require such adjustments.

I will look at each of Cohen's examples in the context of the classic design features of the parallelistic *cantiga de amigo*, to show that the strophes in question are indeed anomalous and in need of critical reconsideration; the solidarity between pairs of strophes is not a special poetic device but a predictable consequence of two of the best known principles of poem design in the *cantiga de amigo*, namely parallelism and *leixa-pren*, which Cohen fails to mention. I will also examine whether these divergent strophes can be treated as cases of *tension* or *surprise*, that is deliberate subversion of overall or dominant structures for poetic effect. I will show that in no case is there any identifiable poetic effect which could be claimed to result from the breach of the overall pattern, so that critical metrical reconsideration of some sort is indeed required.

In response to the covert argument, I will show that in the context of a properly understood accentual metrics, many of the apparent divergences between the lines and strophes in Cohen's analyses do not correspond to any underlying metrical difference, but are superficial differences between alternative *instances* of the same *verse design*.¹ In other words, the apparent anomaly of their lack of correspondence with the rest of the poem is a mirage fostered by an inadequate metrical analysis. No definable poetic effect results from this anomaly, as they are not anomalous. In a small number of cases, typically of poems which are only loosely associated with accentual metrics, we will conclude that there is an anomaly deriving from poetic failure or poor transmission. These poems should probably be removed from the 2016 list, which will strengthen rather than weaken the criteria by which accentual structure is identified.

2. Responson

Cohen's analysis makes intensive use of the term *responson* which, explicitly following Paul Maas (1962), he has used as a key analytical concept since Cohen (2010).

According to Cohen (2010: 12), "External responson is the most basic principle of composition in Galician-Portuguese lyric – and of all strophic composition". That article focuses on external responson in the very specific cases of the *tenção*, where we have a situation very close to Greek strophe-antistrophe structure. In a *tenção* the responding poet has not just to reply to the proposing poet but replicate the metrical form set up in the first strophe. Cohen also uses the term to refer to metrical uniformity across the strophes of a poem, describing one case of metrical chaos as

1 Jakobson (1960) defines *verse instance* as any of the concrete lines compatible with the relevant verse design. The distinction is a straightforward application of the Saussurean distinction between *langue* and *parole*.

“an utter lack of external responson, as no two strophes scan alike” (2010: 18). He also uses the term *responson*, unmodified, to refer to the equivalences between *grave* and *agudo* lines (e.g. 7=8) which are found in a syllabic metrics, though his comment that these equivalences are found in “strophic designs that make use of this kind of responson” makes it clear that he believes this relationship (Mussafia’s Law) to be a peculiar strophic design allowing the alternation of different lines, and not a type of verse design itself.

In Cohen (2018) there is an explicit contrast between internal responson, holding inside the strophe, and external responson holding between strophes.

Let us return the term *responson* to its rightful place. It is a term which is only used in studies of Classical Greek or Hebrew.² It is defined by West as “metrical agreement between strophes” (West, 1982: 5, 1987: 4). It is useful insofar as the concept of strophic poetry in classical Greek is much more fluid than in medieval and modern European poetry, and it is unusual for all the strophes of a poem to agree in structure. (According to Maas (1962: 45), “a line and a strophe differ only in extent”.) In West’s manuals the term is mainly used to refer to the relationship between strophe and antistrophe (paired strophes, an organisation akin to the *coblas doblas* of the Occitan and Galician-Portuguese lyric traditions), and the majority of references are to permitted relaxations of “strict responson”. Grammatically, the term is a nominalisation of the verb “respond”. Strophe and antistrophe are “responding pairs”, in that the antistrophe “responds to” the strophe, and corresponding strophes or portions of strophes are “in responson”.

This represents a retreat from Maas’s original 1923 manual, in which responson is a kind of repetition, and thus an essential component of “metric” which consists of “imposing a pattern upon rhythm”. It is only in Maas that we find the distinction between “external responson” and “internal responson”: external responson involves the repetition of a metrical whole (i.e. a line or strophe) inside a larger structure, while internal responson is the repetition of units smaller than the line (typically *metra* or feet, and *cola*, or part-lines). Given that the two types do not intersect, and that internal responson plays a very limited role in Maas’s metrical analysis, it is entirely adequate to use the term responson with no further qualification, and leave the context to determine whether it would have been internal or external for Maas.

2 OED 2nd edn 1989 s.v. *responson*:

2. 1901 *Trans. & Proc. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* 32 p. x The disuse of strophical responson and of the paroemiac close is now explained by Leo as corresponding to an actual development in later Greek chorus music.

So responson is a cover term for any repetitive patterning. It is data, not structure, and is an aid to establishing patterns, while playing no part in describing those patterns. It has no special status in a general theory of metrics.

In Galician-Portuguese, as in most medieval and modern literatures, strophic poetry exhibits “external responson” as a matter of definition, as a strophe is a structure (with ordered internal repetition) and a strophic poem is a structure made up of ordered repetitions of the same strophic form. Cohen’s statement quoted above is thus trivially true but analytically false, in that *responson* is not a technique or a principle but an effect. The more complex the repetition pattern, and the larger the number of units deployed in it, the more individual the poem will be. Internal responson as defined for Classical Greek is not a significant factor, as lines and half-lines are made up of units without internal structure. At the same time, the term *responson* adds nothing to the more specific parameters of verse design, strophe design and poem design which are key to the understanding of GP strophic poetry. The key question of whether to analyse a unit as an independent line or as part of a longer line (“colometry”, in Cohen’s classical terminology) cuts across Maas’s definitions, as internal responson holds between *cola* and externa responson between lines: only by analysing the whole poem can one decide which type of responson is in play.

The term “responson” as used in studies of Classical Greek poetry is thus not a new or a necessary concept for Galician-Portuguese metrics, and Cohen’s importation of it serves only to exempt him from a clear description in appropriate terms. For a proper discussion we need a complete, modern, European terminology, one system of which I will outline in the following section.

3. Fundamentals of (Jakobsonian) metrics

An essential part of any metrical analysis is to understand the difference between verse design, strophe design and poem design (Parkinson (2006a), following Jakobson (1960) and Duffell (2007, 2008)).

3.1 Verse design

Verse design is the grammar of the line, and supplies the principles by which any line of verse conforms or fails to conform to a specified pattern.³ The three types of verse design available to Galician-Portuguese poets – accentual, syllabic and

3 See Hansen & Kiparsky (1996) for a typology of verse design expressed by a choice of parameters. Halle and Fabb (2008) take the universalist approach, by attempting to bring all types of verse design under a formal hierarchical parsing device.

accentual-syllabic – count different units as a way of specifying lines of different length: accentual metre counts beats or accents, syllabic metre counts syllables, and accentual-syllabic metre counts syllables up to a final stressed syllable.

Each line of verse is an abstract structure specifying the number of units making up the full line. Rules of interpretation specific to each type of verse design, and to their implementation in each poet or school, define the way these units may be phonetically realised in the multiple “verse instances” which realise the abstract structure.

In syllabic and accentual syllabic verse design, a number of syllables is specified, and the rules of interpretation relate to the presence of non-metrical syllables, or adjustments by which a sequence of syllables counts as a single syllable.

The first kind of principle is exemplified by the principle of counting syllables “até à última acentuada”, i.e. discounting any unstressed syllables after the final stressed syllable of the line. This is not a straightforward principle, as there are two versions of it, one in which the discounted syllable is irrelevant to the specification of lines, and the other in which different lines are defined by the presence or absence of such a syllable.

There has been little discussion of these variants of the principle, partly because there has been no adequate terminology or notation to express them. Cohen (2003: 44-47) is a rare attempt to discuss such issues, using as a starting point a “rule” for combining endings from the muddled and mangled *Arte de Trovar*.⁴ In Parkinson (2006a) the key parameter is labelled “cadential adjustment”, so that the formal equivalence of *grave* and *agudo* lines is accentual-syllabic “with cadential adjustment”. The n^* notation is created to express this equivalence, with the number representing the number of metrical syllables without reference to the stress pattern of the line-end: accentual-syllabic octosyllables with cadential adjustment are notated 8^* , implying that *grave* 8^* and *agudo* 8 can be mixed. Galician-Portuguese poetry generally avoids cadential adjustment and separates *agudo* and *grave* lines, while Classical and Modern Portuguese poetry, in which they are interchangeable, assumes it. (The subsidiary question of which counting is used to label the line is not relevant, though it has been a cause of much confusion among those who find it incomprehensible that the Portuguese decasyllable is a Castilian hendecasyllable.) Some accentual-syllabic lines are also defined by local mappings between syllables and lexical stress, for instance in the distinction between heroic and lyric decasyllables, distinguished by the regular occurrence of lexical stress on the 4th or 6th syllable respectively.

The second principle is codified in general principles of elision, synaloepha, and syneresis (brought together as *conflation* by Parkinson (2006b: 116)), and more local

4 Tavani (1999), Parkinson (2018).

principles of apocope and aphaeresis. There are also countervailing principles by which single syllables can be counted as more than one metrical syllable (dieresis), or by which syllables can be added to the phonetic record (paragogy, epenthesis).

In accentual verse design there is greater variety in the type of units recognised (feet of various types, constituted either by syllables or *morae*, beats or metrical accents) and accordingly a greater range of different interpretative principles. In the type of accentual verse proposed for Galician-Portuguese (following Duffell, 2007: 29-34), the basic accentual unit is the beat or *ictus*, and there are no obvious restrictions on the number of non-accented syllables flanking any beat, apart from limitations on the cadence (*grave* or *agudo*) at the line end. In this respect it is close to the Russian *dol'nik* (Duffell, 2007: 38 fn 30) which involves a minimal syllabic element in the requirement that no more than two syllables may separate adjacent beats. The *ictus* does not correspond directly to categories of lexical stress. The main rule of interpretation concerns the type of syllables which can or must be mapped onto the *ictus*. It is usually the case that primary lexical stresses in polysyllabic words must be mapped onto an *ictus*, that secondarily stressed syllables and non-clitic monosyllables may be mapped onto an *ictus*, and that maximally unstressed syllables and clitics will not be mapped onto an *ictus*; but each poetic culture determines a position on these possibilities.

Accentual analyses of lines of verse can be expressed by highlighting the syllables receiving the *ictus*, with the stressed syllables of polysyllabic words presented in bold, and stressed monosyllables underlined. This can be illustrated by the refrain of *Cantiga de Santa Maria* no. 10, analysed and edited as accentual by Parkinson (2015: 52):⁵

Rosa das **rosas**, flor das flores
 dona das **donas**, **sennor** das **sennores**.

In this form of accentual verse, which only counts beats, elision and all its congeners are not part of the rules of interpretation, as by definition elision only operates on the unstressed syllables, which do not contribute to metrical counting. (Other forms of accentual verse which count feet and require particular foot-internal stress patterns, will involve the deployment of elision to regulate these patterns.)

These two types of verse design – accentual and accentual-syllabic – are characterised by a fundamental difference in the way in which alternate realisations (instances) of a given line may differ substantively, and in the ways in which they will differ trivially or redundantly. The verse instances implementing a given accentual-syllabic

5 This and following examples are mainly taken from the religious lyric, to avoid prejudging the applicability of particular analyses to the *cantiga de amigo*. Their function is purely to illustrate concepts and notation.

line or *colon* will differ substantively in the number of syllables NOT counted as a result of elision, as the reversal of any of these elisions would give a line of different length. As an illustration, in the opening strophe of *Cantiga de Santa Maria* 1, a *cantiga de meestria* in regular decasyllables, line 4 depends on the non-elision of *entenda e*, and is thus potentially an eneasyllable; line 5, potentially an 11-syllable line, depends on the elision of *entende e*:

per que entenda e sábia dizer
o que entend' e de dizer lle praz CSM 1.1: 4-5⁶

Verse instances will also differ, redundantly, in the distribution of non-final lexical stress patterns, as in the opening lines of Dinis *Quer' eu en maneira de proençal*, also in decasyllables, where lexical accents may be found on any one of the first five syllables of the line.

Quer' eu en maneira de proençal	2,5
fazer agora um cantar d' amor	2,4
e querrei muit' i loar mha senhor	3
a quen prez nen fremosura non fal	3
nen bondade; e mais vos direi em	3
tanto a fez Deus comprida de bem	1,4,5
que mais de todas las do mundo val	2,4 (B520 / V123) ⁷

Spaggiari (2001: 175), discussed at length by Duffell (2007: 96-104), concludes that “the Gallego-Portuguese *decassilabo* is defined by nothing but the number of syllables.”

Accentual verse instances, by contrast, will vary substantively in the type of accentuable syllables selected to carry the fixed number of beats, and redundantly in the number of unstressed syllables between the beats, as in the opening lines of the first strophe of the well-known Spanish *villancico Riu riu chiu*, where either two or three unstressed syllables separate the stressed syllables:

El lobo rabioso la quiso morder
Mas Dios poderoso la supo proteger. st 1 ll 1-2⁸

The converse of all this is that the number of different lines of verse to which a given non-metrified phrase could be assigned in metrical analysis (assuming the line type was not given in advance) will vary according to the type of verse design. The

6 Parkinson (2015: 20).

7 Parkinson (2006a: 22).

8 *Cancionero de Uppsala*, ff 42v-43r. The music (syncopated so that the musical stresses do not always match the lexical stresses) is adjusted to fit the variable syllable count.

range of possibilities for accentual-syllabic analysis will reflect the gross number of phonological syllables and the number of elidable vowels; the possibilities for accentual analysis will reflect the number and distribution of obligatorily accented and optionally accentuable syllables. If the type of verse design is itself not a given, the analytical possibilities are numerous.

Thus the line *Entre Ave e Eva* (the opening line of the refrain of CSM 60) can be an instance of six non-accentual verse designs (three accentual-syllabic and three pure syllabic) in which patterns of elision are significant, and two accentual verse designs differing only in the number of beats:

accentual-syllabic:

4' Entre Ave e Eva

5' Entre Ave e Eva , Entre Ave e Eva

6' Entre Ave e Eva

syllabic:

5! Entre Ave e Eva

6! Entre Ave e Eva , Entre Ave e Eva

7! Entre Ave e Eva

accentual:

2-beat **Entre Ave e Eva**

3-beat **Entre Ave e Eva**

3.2 Strophe design and poem design

Strophe design is the combination of lines to make the strophe, determining among other things a rhyme pattern and whether the lines are of the same type (monometric) or different lengths (polymetric). It can also divide the strophe into subparts, such as a body and a refrain. Rhyme schemes and metrical schemes are in principle independent components of strophe design, though they often correlate. It is a fatal flaw of printed metrical repertoires such as Tavani (1967) and Betti (2005) that they have to choose one of the two as more basic than the other.

Poem design governs the combination of strophes to make a full poem, including their number and type, any interstrophic relationships and any additional material. The classic *cantiga de amigo* devices of parallelism and *leixa-pren*, which involve the systematic repetition of material from one strophe to another, are part of poem design, as are the presence of *fiindas* in the *cantiga de amor* and the use of initial refrains in the *zajal* structure of the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*.

In short poems of less than three strophes the distinction between strophe design and poem design is significantly eroded, as a minimum of three strophes is usually needed to establish a consistent strophe design. In the case of the parallelistic *cantiga de amigo* the basic poem design needs at least four strophes to establish a pattern of parallelism and *leixa-pren*. For this reason the list of accentual *cantigas* in Appendix 1 contains only four parallelistic poems of two strophes (three by Joan Zorro and one by Pero Meogo).

4. Metrics and editing

It is assumed that a poet, particularly in a courtly culture such as medieval Galician-Portuguese, has a clear design in mind for any composition, and so has determined the verse design, strophe design and poem design of the composition. The metrical editor (by which I mean the editor who sees metrical emendation as a normal part of editorial activity), the literary critic commenting on the poetry as literature, and the scribe copying a poem in a format which recognises strophic structure and/or associates the text to music, all have the task of deducing the design from the text as transmitted, with or without help from the analysis of comparable poems, paratextual material (such as the title “sonnet” applied to a poem of fourteen lines), contemporary poetic treatises, or other reflective material.

In the case of the Galician-Portuguese lyric there is very little to aid the editor, and all analyses have to be based on evidence of consistent structure. At times the editor often has to undo the emendations of scribes who have intuited and applied a different structure.⁹

The poem design and strophe design will involve a categorisation of sets of lines as “the same” (i.e. instances of the same line), or as different (contrasting) and thus instances of different lines. This will establish the correspondence patterns between instances from which verse design can be deduced, as it is verse design which specifies how many concrete lines implement the same abstract line (i.e. are instances of that verse design). Thus the phrase *Entre Ave e Eva* analysed above, if taken in isolation, could be an instance of many different lines. It is only its insertion in a monometric AA bbbb AA structure using pure syllabic hexasyllables (as the first line of the refrain of *CSM 70*) that allows us to select 6! as its design in that poem.

If there is evidence that a poem is polymetric (which involves strophe design confirmed by poem design), then correspondences of line length will be different at different points in the strophe. If there is no evidence of polymetry, then we have

9 See Parkinson (2008) for an account of *CSM 113* in these terms.

to assume consistent verse design unmitigated by strophe design or poem design. If there is evidence of poem design features incorporating features of the strophe design, this higher-level structure will override any lower level correspondence. The poem and strophe design will determine what lines have the same length (as defined by the verse design) and/or the same rhyme. This is why Cohen's assertion that "verse design is part of strophic design" (2010: 13) is inaccurate.

From this it must be clear that no one part of the analysis is independent of the others, and that no analysis can be assumed to be true without testing. Taking the whole analysis, the editor should seek the greatest degree of regularity over the whole poem.

For too long it has been complacently assumed that Galician-Portuguese poems use accentual-syllabic metrics as a matter of course, and that the burden of proof is entirely on those proposing analyses involving syllabic or accentual verse design.

If we wish for contemporary testimony of the novelty of accentual-syllabic verse design, we have a 12th-century Spanish source not usually cited in this context: the foundational text of Spanish *mester de clerecía*, the *Libro de Alexandre*, asserts that poetry which counts syllables is a new invention.

Mester traigo fermoso, non es de juglaria
 mester es sin pecado, ca es de clerezia
 fablar curso rimado por la quaderna via
 a silabas contadas, ca es grant maestria.

(*Libro de Alexandre*, Stanza 2, ed. Cañas Murillo, 2007)

Whatever the text may or may not imply about *juglares*, it clearly asserts that non-syllabic poetry previously existed. "The poet's expression of pride in his achievement confirms [...] that full rhyme and a regular syllable count were not typical of Castilian versification before the beginning of the thirteenth century" (Duffell, 2007: 86). Anyone who believes that there was a pre-existing non-courtly female-voice poetry as a substrate for the *cantigas de amigo* (Cohen, 2009) must accept that such poetry was accentual before being absorbed into the courtly lyric which was dominated by accentual-syllabic metrics.

To give such analyses an empirical base, Parkinson (2016) proposed parallel series of criteria – both negative and positive– for syllabic, accentual and accentual-syllabic verse. The mere fact that a poem has hitherto been analysed, unthinkingly or by default, as accentual-syllabic does not exempt the analyst from confirming empirically that the traditional analysis was well founded.

The treatment of elision is radically changed by this perspective. In the traditional (accentual-syllabic) perspective, an elision implemented in the witnesses is

evidential, and can only be overturned if deemed to be a scribal error, implying metrical misunderstanding on the part of the scribe. (There are numerous cases of *false elision* in the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*. Cohen is happy to restore elided vowels where it creates congruent accentual-syllabic metrics, see §7.7). But under an assumption of accentual metrics, elision is irrelevant, as it adjusts precisely the syllables of the line which do not contribute to the metrical analysis; accordingly any implementation of elision in the witness can be queried, as scribal incomprehension of the verse design underlying the poem in question.

5. Relations between pairs of strophes: parallelism and *leixa-pren*

The formal devices of parallelism and *leixa-pren* are features of poem design which by definition establish links between pairs of strophes, by systematic repetition. Parallelism establishes congruence between the corresponding lines of odd- and even-numbered strophes, so that the same content is encoded with maximal identity of syntactic construction and divergence is limited as far as possible to different rhymes and lexical items. *Leixa-pren* is the repetition of whole lines from the second line of a two-line strophe to the first line of the next eligible strophe. (When combined with parallelism, as is usual in the *cantiga de amigo*, the line copying holds between non-adjacent strophes. For an instructive example of *leixa-pren* without parallelism and with systematic variation of line length, see *CSM* 160.)¹⁰

The intersection of the two devices is well illustrated by the four-strophe *cantiga de amigo* Codax – 1 (Cohen, 2003: 513, see also Ferreira (1986)).

Ondas do mar de Vigo
se vistes meu amigo?
e ai Deus, se verrá cedo?

Ondas do mar levado
se vistes meu amado?
e ai Deus, se verrá cedo?

Se vistes meu amigo?
o por que eu suspiro
e ai Deus, se verrá cedo?

¹⁰ Mettmann, 1986-9, II: 156, Parkinson, 2015: 112-113

Se vistes meu amado?
o por que ei gran coidado
e ai Deus, se verrá cedo?

Parallelism links the corresponding lines of successive odd and even numbered strophes (1.1 / 2.1; 1.2 / 2.2) and *leixa-pren* repeats the second line of a strophe as the first line of the corresponding strophe in the next pair (1.2> 3.1; 2.2>4.1). The first lines of the opening pair of strophes and the last lines of the final pair are involved in parallelism but not *leixa-pren* and are thus structurally distinct from the rest of the poem. A metrical anomaly shared by the opening (or closing) parallelistic pair will be limited to that pair, and a metrical crux involving them will not be resolved by repetition.

If we accept that parallelism and *leixa-pren* are features of poem design and thus independent of verse design, any metrical peculiarity limited to sets of lines linked by parallelism or *leixa-pren* cannot be claimed to be a metrical innovation *per se*. All other things being equal, an analysis of the whole poem in which the divergent lines are consistent with the remainder of the poem must be preferable to one which assumes their individuality. In many of Cohen's examples, accentual metrics provides just such an analysis.

6. Two-strophe poems

With these methodological and technical principles in place, we can look at Cohen's (2018) arguments and examples. We present the texts initially in a simplified version of Cohen (2018), eliminating editorial noise and unnecessary detail¹¹. Poem identifiers follow Cohen (2003). Line numbers are omitted, as any line is easily identified by strophe and line numbers. Refrains (which by definition are invariable unless shown to be otherwise) and lines repeated under *leixa pren* are regularised without markers of editorial reconstruction, unless the manuscript variants indicate possible emendations. All remaining cases of editorial marks indicate emendations introduced by Cohen for the purposes of his metrical analysis (e.g. 7.1). For the purposes of accentual analysis, relevant sections of the poems will be presented with elisions removed and accented syllables highlighted in bold type.

Cohen first attempts to establish a "technique" of constructing distichs with lines of different lengths, as exemplified by a two-strophe poem by Pero de Veer *A Santa Maria fiz ir meu amigo* (B1130 V722):

¹¹ For the concept of 'noise', see Parkinson (2013)

A Santa Maria | fiz ir meu amigo
e non lh' atendi | o que pos comigo:
con el me perdi | por que lhi menti.

Fiz ir meu amigo | a Santa Maria
e non foi eu i | con el aquel dia:
con el me perdi | por que lhi menti.

It has been demonstrated that a two-strophe poem is a questionable basis for any general technique of poem or strophe design, especially where there are no guarantees that it is not incomplete. It is also unlikely to provide sufficient data for a definitive analysis of verse design.

This poem seems to display complete internal polymetry, as the three lines of this aaB structure are all metrically distinct:

a a B
11' 10' 10

The mistake Cohen makes is to consider these as whole lines. As he partly explains, this is a poem which uses combinations of *grave* and *agudo* half-lines, so the full analysis is

a a B
11' [5'+5'] 10' [5+5'] 10 [5+5]

The half-lines, however, are not polymetric for Cohen: “the first colon of the first verse corresponds to the first colon of the second verse as n'=n” (2018: 76). This means that for this poem, cadential adjustment (see p. 96) is required, and these are all examples of the same 5* line. This has to be correct, because otherwise we have an anomalous situation in which two complex lines with the same internal composition are deemed to be different. So the true analysis is

a a B
[5*+5*]

or possibly, recognising the deliberate reordering of rhymes

ab cb cc ba ca cc
5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5*

This is indeed a technically complex poem, and one which is clearly playing with the components of the conventional parallelistic *cantiga de amigo*, in a way which could probably only be done in a two-strophe piece, where poem design is more prominent than strophe design. By presenting it as an example of a widely used technique, Cohen is in fact underestimating the individuality of Pero de Veer.

On the back of this example, Cohen approaches the presumed irregularity of two other two-strophe aaB(B) *cantigas* (*Ai eu coitada* attributed to Afonso X, and *Pela ribeiro do rio salido* by Zorro) in which one line has the same metre as the refrain, with the other line two syllables shorter (Alfonso X) or one syllable longer (Zorro).

The first of these can convincingly be analysed as having polymetric strophes, with the second line (in fact the second half-line) of each strophe two syllables shorter.

Alfonso X B 456 (Cohen, 2018: 76)

Ai eu coitada, | como vivo en gran cuidado
 por meu amigo | que ei alongado;
muito me tarda | o meu amigo na Guarda.

Ai eu coitada, | como vivo en gran desejo
 por meu amigo | que tarda e non vejo;
muito me tarda | o meu amigo na Guarda.

It could also be analysed accentually, but the shortness of the piece and the prevalent parallelism means that we cannot establish a clear accentual pattern for the second half-line of each opening line. While all the other half lines have two clear beats, the longer lines could be analysed as having four beats

como vivo en **gran** cuidado

or two beats

como vivo en gran cuidado.

Additional strophes would be needed to resolve this ambiguity.

The second poem (Cohen, 2018: 77) falls squarely into the category of potentially accentual poems.

Zorro - 9 (B 1158 V 760)

Pela ribeira | do rio salido
 trebelhei, madre, | con meu amigo;
amor ei migo | que non ouvesse,
fiz por amigo | que non fezesse.

Pela ribeira | do rio levado
 trebelhei, madre, | con meu amado;
amor ei migo | que non ouvesse,
fiz por amigo | que non fezesse.

It seems clear that the difference between the 5-syllable half-lines *do rio salido/levado* and the 4-syllable half-lines *con meu amigo/amado* boils down to the contrast between a paroxytonic disyllable *rio* and a monosyllabic diphthong *meu*, with the same rhythmic two-beat base found in the other four-syllable lines.

These two pieces were not listed as accentual by Parkinson (2016) because two-strophe poems are generally too short to satisfy either the positive criterion of accentual regularity or the negative criterion of lack of overall metrical congruence in non-accentual analyses. By the same token they fail to meet the corresponding criteria for an accentual-syllabic analysis.

It should be emphasised that these short compositions are anomalous, in that they are potentially the opening of a fully developed traditional *cantiga de amigo*, with a pair of strophes linked by parallelism and use of archetypal rhymes, in readiness for the development of *leixa-pren* in successive pairs of strophes. As they are not developed in this way, either by design or poor transmission, they cannot be used, as Cohen intends, as models for what actually occurs in the opening pair of strophes of a complete *cantiga de amigo*.

7. Longer poems

Cohen then proceeds to analyse eight *cantigas de amigo* with limited polymetry in a pair (or several pairs) of strophes. These poems will be discussed one by one, in the order of their presentation, in subsections 7.1 to 7.8. In all cases except one (7.1) the divergence in line length between the exceptional lines and the norm is a single syllable. All eight poems are parallelistic, in the sense that the strophes are deployed in pairs, with the second pair reworking the text of the first so that the initial portion of each line is constant and the final portion introduces a new rhyme or assonance, with minimal change to the overall meaning. Seven of the poems also involve the feature of *leixa-pren*, in which the second lines of one pair of strophes becomes the first lines of the following pair of strophes. This has to be significant, in that such poems, which can be labelled “(neo-)traditional” *cantigas de amigo* in contrast to the “courtly” *cantigas de amigo* which use the strophic forms of the *cantiga de amor*, are statistically in the minority in the complete corpus of *cantigas de amigo* (Deyermond, 2001: 52). Cohen (2009) rejects the widely held view that the traditional *cantigas de amigo* are the essence of the genre, even though he assumes the aaB form to pre-date the troubadour development of the genre. Were this a widespread feature of virtuoso *trovador* metrics we would expect it to be found in the *cantiga de amor* and in the courtly *cantiga de amigo*. (The seven poets concerned are, to be sure, *trovadores* rather than *jograis*, and include three

noted stylists in Torneol, Coelho and Dinis.) A genuine example of polymetry in a poem with *leixa-pren* (but not parallelism) is to be found in *Cantiga de Santa Maria* 160, where every repeated line is systematically lengthened by a syllable to give an overall 7 8 strophic structure.¹²

In only two of these seven poems is the divergent metre repeated inside the *leixa-pren* structure: in one (7.7) it is claimed to affect almost the entire second half of a poem, and in the other (7.8) it is propagated regularly through the entire 4-strophe poem, so that the polymetry of the opening pair of strophes is inverted in the second pair. The remaining five cases (7.1-3, 5-6) have the divergent lines in the positions which fall outside the *leixa-pren* repetition pattern, namely the opening lines of the opening strophes and the closing lines of the closing strophes. In terms of their position in the poem, four poems (7.1-3, 8) introduce the variant in the opening pair of strophes; two (7.5-6) introduce it in the final pair, and two introduce it at the mid point (strophe 3 of a four-strophe poem in 7.4, and strophe 4 of an eight-strophe poem, with separate *leixa-pren* patterns in each half, in 7.7).

In all cases the differences in syllable counts are significant for an accentual-syllabic metre but do not affect an accentual analysis of the verse design. All of these poems were flagged as probably accentual in Parkinson (2016). To highlight these lines Cohen is forced to claim, with varying degrees of success, that the remainder of the poem is metrically regular, denying accounts claiming “irregularity” or “fluctuating versification” (a label applied by metricists of a bygone age to poems which are now analysed as accentual, see Parkinson (2006a)). In three cases we will conclude that there is an element of irregularity (meeting the negative criteria for accentual analysis) but that the divergent lines are failures of accentual-syllabic composition or transmission rather than subtle accentual intrusions, so that the positive criteria for accentual analysis are not clearly met. In the remainder we will confirm or develop the accentual analysis of Parkinson (2016).

It is notable that Cohen does not give a clear account of what is achieved by this “technique”, apart from the obvious effect of making the lines in question stand out from the remainder of the poem. Cohen’s analysis of Torneol 1 (7.1) claims that the common irregularity of the opening lines of strophes 1 and 2 is itself a regularity (responsion) and the limitation of this regularity to the opening lines is a compositional structure. It should be clear that the concept of regularity is being abused here, as what we have is positional polymetry. A solidarity between the opening lines of two strophes which excludes both the opening lines of other strophes and the second lines of the strophes concerned is a limited structure

¹² Mettmann, 1986-9, II: 156; Parkinson, 2015: 112-113.

which implies a lack of integration with the rest of the poem. As the strophes concerned are in most cases the ones which fall outside the integrating structure of *leixa-pren*, they already stand out. And when they are the opening strophes, it is only with hindsight that they can be deemed to stand out from what follows. In a poem where the opening lines are not otherwise problematic, and the expected strophe-level agreement between the two lines of the distich holds, as it holds for every other strophe, the lack of integration of the first lines in the *leixa-pren* system has no visible effect.

Cohen's claim that this limited polymetry (or "special external responson") is a compositional device is thus completely vacuous, as the pattern of correspondence he describes is automatically produced by the features of poem design.

Indeed, in the four cases in which the divergence appears in the opening strophes, it would seem to be eminently counterproductive, when deployed in a form redolent of oral tradition, performed rather than read, and based on extensive repetition. Listeners would depend on the opening strophe to set their metrical expectations, both of the rhythmic and or syllabic structure and of the internal patterns of musical repetition, and their correspondence with the strophic form. In the six *cantigas de amigo* by Martín Codax for which music is extant, the aaB metrical structure is consistently implemented in a musical AA' form, with the same melody used for both lines of the strophe. The A and A' variants typically differ in that the A variant has a non-final cadence while the A' variant, ending the strophe, has a final cadence. A significant metrical variation between the lines of the opening distich, or between them and the lines which should replicate their metre, would either be disruptive or difficult to capture orally.

The assumed regularity of strophic form similarly underlies the standard practice (in all the manuscripts in which staves are provided for musical notation, whether or not the notation is extant) of providing music for the first strophe only. This rests on the assumption that the music can then be applied to every subsequent strophe. In a traditional *cantiga de amigo* this implies that in strophes 3 and 4 onwards, the lines which were set to the music for the first line of the strophe are now sung with the music originally provided for the second line.

When the written form of an accentual-syllabic poem is recorded with music, each musical figure is in principle aligned with the appropriate syllable of the text; accordingly, a first strophe which was not representative of the overall metre would create problems of interpretation. By contrast, an accentual poem would carry with it the assumption that accents in the text were matched with appropriate portions of the music, with the intervening melodic material expanded or contracted according

to the rhythm of each line, and so a first line with more or fewer syllables than the remainder of the poem would not pose any problem to an accentual poem. If a poet wished to create a metrical effect of tension or surprise, it would have to be deployed *after* the basic pattern had been established. (It has been argued that Codax deploys such a device in Codax 6, when the normal order of *leixa-pren*, established in strophes 1-4, is reversed in strophes 5-6. The same feature is found in one of Cohen's examples, Portocarreiro, in sect. 7.8.) In this way, a medial or line (or pair of lines) with metrical variation would be an effective use of tension, and a final divergent line would create a metrical surprise: in each case the variation would be running counter to a pattern established over the bulk of the poem.

There is no lack of genuine cases of this device. Cohen (2003: 47) notes cases of hypermetric lines strategically placed in the line preceding the final refrain and Parkinson (2010: 317-20) has identified a metrical *ritardando* produced by this device in *CSM* 276. When we consider Cohen's examples, we find scant evidence of a concrete and deliberate metrical effect, but rather a mixed bag made up of defective accentual-syllabic poems (often distorted by faulty transmission) and accentual poems misunderstood by scribes and editors.

7.1 Torneol - 1 (B 641, V 242; Cohen, 2018: 77-78).

Strophes 1-2 are apparently polymetric (14' 12') after which isometry (12' 12') is restored. Only the first four strophes are reproduced, as nothing hangs on the final four strophes.

“Levad', amigo que dormides | as manhanas frias,”
 totalas aves do mundo | d' amor dizian:
“Leda mh and' eu.”

“Levad', amigo que dormide- | las frias manhanas,”
 totalas aves do mundo | d' amor cantavan:
“Leda m' and' eu.”

Todalas aves do mundo | d' amor dizian,
 do meu amor e do voss<o> | en ment' avian:
“Leda m' and' eu.”

Todalas aves do mundo | d' amor cantavan,
 do meu amor e do voss<o> | i enmentavan:
“Leda m' and' eu.”

The overall pattern of this poem is in 3-line strophes, aaB rhyme pattern, and with the lines of the aa distich divided into unequal hemistichs. At the level of strophe design, there is parallelism between corresponding verses of pairs of strophes, and *leixa-pren* between the corresponding strophes. Without editorial intervention we have *grave* lines of 12, 11 or 10 syllables in the strophe, and an *agudo* 4-syllable line in the refrain. Inside an accentual-syllabic metrics, then, this remains an anomaly calling for editorial scrutiny. Extensive surgery is needed to create any coherent strophe design using accentual-syllabic metrics, and most analysts opt for an ad-hoc polymetry with strophes 1 and 2 the exceptions. There is no way of using the concept of a metrical surprise interrupting regularity to explain these strophes, as by definition the opening strophe cannot subvert a pattern not yet established. In Cohen's account the presumed uniqueness of 1.1 and 2.1, guaranteed by their exemption from *leixa-pren*, has been artificially enhanced by the brute force elimination of other questionable 12-syllable lines. It may well be true, as Cohen's punctuation makes explicit, that lines 1.1 and 2.1 are quoted direct speech. But that interpretation does not depend on the lines being metrically marked, which would only become apparent retrospectively when strophe 3 failed to replicate the polymetry of strophes 1-2.

There is a long tradition of attributing accentual metrics to this poem, even though in some cases it is not clear the analysts were aware of the implications of their analysis. Piera (2008: 126-129) limits his discussion of Galician-Portuguese to an analysis of this poem as "loose anapaestic" metre prefiguring Castilian *arte mayor*, with each line consisting of a trimeter followed by a dimeter. Duffell (1999) identified this poem as one in which editors have attempted to "metrically cleanse" aberrant structures. Before being analysed as accentual in Parkinson (2016: 39-40), this poem was flagged as "a clear case of accentual verse design" in Parkinson (2006a: 24-27) a reference which Cohen (2017: 1) ignores, claiming that Parkinson (2006a) takes a "more prudent approach" in which accentual and accentual-syllabic metrics are "concurrent patterns, where stress rhythm coexists happily with regular syllable counts". This is a simple misreading of the title of the article, where "concurrent" refers to the co-presence of syllabic, accentual and accentual-syllabic metrics in the Galician-Portuguese corpus, and not to their coexistence in poems. This is an impossible situation for pure syllabic metre, though it is frequent in accentual-syllabic *cantigas de amigo* which count both syllables and accents and thus meet the positive criteria for both analyses and the negative criteria for neither. The accentual analysis is given below.

"Levad', amigo que dormides | las manhanas frias,"
 todalas aves do mundo | d' amor dizian:
 "Leda m' and' eu."

“Levad’, amigo que dormides | las frias manhanas,”
todalas aves do mundo | d’ amor cantavan:
 “*Leda m’ and’ eu.*”

Todalas aves do mundo | d’ amor dizian,
 do **meu amor** e do **vosso** | en **ment’ avian:**
 “*Leda m’ and’ eu.*”

Todalas aves do mundo | d’ amor cantavan,
 do **meu amor** e do **vosso** | i **enmentavan:**
 “*Leda m’ and’ eu.*”

The rationale for the accentual analysis is that we can identify a constant verse design for all the lines of the strophes only if we posit an accentual structure of five beats (3+2). This has the advantage of integrating the refrain as a 2-beat line congruent with the second half of each line of the strophe.

Given that there is no poetic motivation for making the opening lines irregular, there can be no doubt that the accentual analysis, in which they are not metrically irregular at all, is superior. It does not affect any of the literary analyses in which the opening lines are quotational, as the effect does not depend on metrical divergence. Torneol (as an expert user of two metrical systems) may well have been aware that the opening strophes may have seemed metrically unbalanced to his peers and *jograis*, led to expect accentual-syllabic verse, as they did to puzzled copyists working on similar assumptions.

7.2 Martiinz do Casal - 2 (*B* 1162, Cohen, 2018: 79, 90).

In this poem the opening pair of strophes are polymetric (12 10), followed by monometric 10 10 (or a different polymetry 11 10) in strophes 3-4:

Rogo te,_ai amor, que queiras migo morar
 tod’ este tempo_en quanto vai andar
a Granada meu amigo.

Rogo te,_ai amor, que queiras migo seer
 tod’ este tempo_en quanto vai viver
a Granada meu amigo.

Tod’ este tempo_en quanto vai andar
 lidar con Mouros e muitos matar
a Granada meu amigo.

Tod' este tempo_en quanto vai viver
lidar con Mouros e muitos prender
a Granada meu amigo.

It should first be noted that this poem is a failed experiment in *leixa-pren*. The opening two strophes are built on the common courtly device of textual continuity between the strophe and the refrain, as the second line of the strophe requires the refrain to complete its construction and supply its subject: *vai andar/viver || a Granada meu amigo*. Promotion of the second line of the strophe to the initial position in strophes 3 and 4 creates a syntactic challenge in which the poet must either use the second line of the strophe to change the construction or ensure that the interpolated line does not disturb the continuity. (The construction *vai andar a Granada* is itself ambiguous, as *a Granada* could either modify *vai* as a verb of motion with *andar* as a dependent verb, or *vai andar* as a periphrastic verb form; in strophe 2 only the first is acceptable, unless the construction *viver a Granada* is acceptable.) The poet manages neither outcome well. In strophes 3 and 4 we have two infinitives (*lidar, matar*) separating *vai andar/viver* and *a Granada*, with the least clumsy option being to see line 2 as an interpolation. The poem is an object lesson in the perils of mixing traditional oral style and courtly linguistic devices.

Given the general stylistic failure of this poem, there seems little reason to pursue the issue of the effect or effectiveness of the hypermetric opening lines. It could be analysed in accentual terms with two beats in each half-line and in the refrain, but it is too far from traditional form for this to be convincing, and so should probably be removed from the 2016 list.

When read beside Martiinz do Casal 3 (B 1163, V766), which uses much of the same material, including the invocation to *Amor*, in a classic three-strophe composition, with refrain

e meu amigo que se foi andar
a Granada por meu amor lidar

and *fiinda*, it becomes clear that the parallelistic *cantiga* is a case of recycling of old poetic material.

7.3 Estevan Coelho -1 (B 720 V 321 Cohen, 2018: 80).

This is another famous and markedly courtly poem bridging the genres of *cantiga de amigo* and *pastorela*. All the lines are *grave*: for Cohen the first two strophes have a 12' 11' structure, followed by 11-syllable lines in the second pair of strophes and the *fiinda*.

Sedia la fremosa | seu sirgo torcendo,
 sa voz manselinha | fremoso dizendo
cantigas d' amigo.

Sedia la fremosa | seu sirgo lavrando,
 sa voz manselinha | fremoso cantando
cantigas d' amigo.

– Par Deus de cruz, dona, | sei eu que avedes
 amor mui coitado, | que tan ben dizedes
cantigas d' amigo.

Par Deus de cruz, dona, | sei eu que andades
 d' amor mui coitada, | que tan ben cantades
cantigas d' amigo.

– Avuitor comestes, | que adevinhades.

Here the extra syllable in 1.1 / 2.1 is achieved by the blocking of the expected elision *sedia_a fremosa* by the use of the *la* variant of the definite article (rather like in Codax-3, *a la igreja de Vigo*, see §7.2). It seems odd that this metrical trick should be used to achieve metrical irregularity: equally likely is that it is a metrical error by copyists who were confused over the metre. There is no obvious attempt to emulate traditional accentual metrics (as found in the other *cantiga de amigo* by Estevan Coelho, also listed in Parkinson (2016: 37)): the courtly context is clear from the use of *dona* as the address from “Boy” to “Girl”, the diminutive *manselinha*, the metapoetic reference to *cantigas de amigo* and the reference to birds of augury.¹³ This trivial polymetry is best seen as an anomaly resulting from poor transmission, suggesting that this poem too can be removed from the 2016 list.

7.4 Esquio-3, (B 1298, Cohen, 2018: 81)

The basic monometric pattern of 11 11 is varied by polymetric 12 11 in strophes 3-4:

Vaiamos, irmana, | vaiamos dormir
 nas ribas do lago | u eu andar vi
a las aves meu amigo.

¹³ See Cerdeira (2013) for a Barthesian account of this poem.

Vaiamos, irmana, | vaiamos folgar
nas ribas do lago | u eu vi andar
a las aves meu amigo.

En nas ribas do lago | u eu andar vi,
seu arco na mano a | las aves ferir,
a las aves meu amigo.

En nas ribas do lago | u eu vi andar,
seu arco na mano a | las aves tirar,
a las aves meu amigo.

Seu arco na mano a | las aves ferir
e las que cantavan | leixa-las guarir,
a las aves meu amigo.

Seu arco na mano a | las aves tirar
e las que cantavan | nō-nas quer matar
a las aves meu amigo.

In Cohen's edition the key distinction is between *nas* in 1.2/2.2 and *en nas* in 3.1/4.1. This is one of the best-known metrical doublets in the *Lirica Galego-Portuguesa*, used by poets to achieve metrical uniformity and by editors to perform metrical emendation. The idea that a poet would use such a device to create a difference between two lines which listeners would otherwise expect to be the same, is bizarre in the extreme. (By contrast, in *CSM* 160 (§7.1) the polymetry is consistent throughout the poem, and the use of metrical doublets is one of the means of achieving it.) It is a basic ecdotic assumption of editing the *cantiga de amigo* that the lines repeated by *leixa-pren* will be uniform, and so where there is metrical variation associated such a basic morphological feature good practice requires the selection of the variant which is consistent with the overall metre, here the shorter half line *nas ribas do lago*.

In any case, the clear accentual pattern of this poem, four beats in the strophe and two in the refrain, combined with an overriding dactylic rhythm, makes this superficial variation unimportant. (It is conceivable that the text reflects a performance in which the *jogral* emphasised the promotion of the line to strophe initial with an additional anacrusis, knowing that it did not change the metre.) A possible metrical surprise comes in the last line, where the sequence *non-nas* could take the beat on *nas*, as predicted by the rhythmic pattern, or on *non*, in an equivalent of English "iambic reversal".

Vaiamos, irmana, | vaiamos dormir
nas **ribas do lago** | u **eu** andar **vi**
a las aves meu amigo.

Vaiamos, irmana, | vaiamos folgar
nas **ribas do lago** | u **eu** vi andar
a las aves meu amigo.

En nas **ribas do lago** | u **eu** andar **vi**,
seu arco na **mano**a | las aves **ferir**,
a las aves meu amigo.

En nas ribas do **lago** | u **eu** vi andar,
seu arco na **mano**a | las aves **tirar**,
a las aves meu amigo.

Seu arco na **mano**a | las aves **ferir**
e **las** que cantavan | **leixa**-las **guarir**,
a las aves meu amigo.

Seu arco na **mano**a | las aves **tirar**
e **las** que cantavan | **nō**-nas quer **matar**
a las aves meu amigo.

An accentual analysis also gives a much superior account of lines 3.2/4.2 and their repetition in 5.1/6.1. Cohen imposes a regular subdivision on the long lines of the strophe, identifying a basic 5' hemistich with a 6' variant. In accentual syllabic verse such as the *CSM* such a regular caesura implies a constant internal cadence associated with a clear syntactic break. Elision across the caesura is rare. Lines 3.2-4.2 breach the first principle, with a caesura in the middle of a syntactic unit *a* | (*l*) *as aves*, so as to avoid the second. Logically the line is

seu arco na **mano**a | las aves tirar

(The line division could also make visible a play of internal assonances by which the classic *cantiga de amigo* rhymes are deployed internally while more trovadoresque *agudo* rhymes are used for the end-rhyme: a-a, a-o, a-o a-o_a, a-o_a aa aa.)

In an accentual reading there is no need to divide the lines metrically, as the symmetry between the two sequences of two beats is audible. And the metrical crux

mano a las is simply the trough between two accentual peaks, and is thus ambiguous between *mano a* and *man' a*.¹⁴

7.5 Meogo-8 (B 1191 V 796, Cohen, 2018: 82)

The monometric 8' 8' of the body of strophes 1-2 is followed by polymetric 8' 9' in strophes 3 and 4.

Fostes, filha, | eno bailar
e rompestes | i o brial,
poilo cervo | i ven
esta fonte | seguide a ben
poilo cervo | i ven.

Fostes, filha, | eno loir
e rompestes | i o vestir,
poilo cervo | i ven
esta fonte | seguide a ben
poilo cervo | i ven.

E rompestes | i o brial,
que fezeastes | ao meu pesar,
poilo cervo | i ven
esta fonte | seguide a ben
poilo cervo | i ven.

E rompestes | i o vestir,
que fezeastes | a pesar de min,
poilo cervo | i ven
esta fonte | seguide a ben
poilo cervo | i ven.

Here the metrical variation is in the second line of the strophe, and in the final strophes of the piece, so that *leixa-pren* does not give any further metrical clues. The key metrical point is that the new material *que fezeastes ao meu pesar/ a pesar de min* is an imperfect match with preceding lines. In the first occurrence of this phrase, *ao meu pesar* is in fact a syntactic anomaly, as all the other cases of this phrase in the

¹⁴ For similar ambiguity in Dinis 'Levantou-s' a velida', see Parkinson (2006a: 32-34).

lirica profana are a meu pesar.¹⁵ If it is edited as such, the final line is isolated as either a metrical infraction necessary to achieve the only possible parallel phrase, or a metrical surprise.

From the predominance of *agudo* endings (rhyme and assonance) the arcane vocabulary and the extended and grammatically complex refrain, it would seem unlikely that this poem set out to use or emulate traditional accentual rhythm, and so it is best excluded from the list of accentual poems. Other poems by Meogo are much clearer.

7.6 Dinis 14 (Cohen, 2003: 599, regularised)

8'8' with 8' 9' on final pair of strophes

Non chegou, madr' o meu amigo,
e oj' ést' o prazo saído;
ai madre, moiro d' amor.

Non chegou, madr', o meu amado,
e oj' ést' o prazo pasado;
ai madre, moiro d' amor.

E oj' ést' o prazo saído;
por que mentiu o desmentido?
ai madre, moiro d' amor.

E oj' ést' o prazo pasado;
por que mentiu o perjurado?
ai madre, moiro d' amor.

Por que mentiu o desmentido
pesa mi, pois per si é falido;
ai madre, moiro d' amor.

Por que mentiu o perjurado,
pesa mi, pois mentiu per seu grado;
ai madre, moiro d' amor.

¹⁵ Ferreira (2018-), *Glossario*, sv *pesar*, [consult. 10.6.2020]

Once again the variant lines are the final ones, linked by parallelism but not replicated by *leixa-pren*, and the extra syllables are a necessity of verbal texture rather than a metrical surprise. In a strict accentual-syllabic metrics the failure to replicate a parallel line must be a technical failure.

The textual structure of the piece is much clearer if, as in other examples, we separate “base” and “coda” and restore vowels elided in the copy:

Non chegou, madre ,	o meu amigo ,
e oje éste	o prazo saído ;
<i>ai madre, moiro d' amor.</i>	

Non chegou, madre	o meu amado ,
e oje éste	o prazo pasado ;
<i>ai madre, moiro d' amor.</i>	

E oje éste	o prazo saído ;
por que mentiu	o dementido ?
<i>ai madre, moiro d' amor.</i>	

E oje éste	o prazo pasado ;
por que mentiu	o perjurado ?
<i>ai madre, moiro d' amor.</i>	

Por que mentiu	o dementido
pesa mi, pois	per si é falido ;
<i>ai madre, moiro d' amor.</i>	

Por que mentiu	o perjurado,
pesa mi, pois	mentiu per seu grado ;
<i>ai madre, moiro d' amor.</i>	

Accentually the piece has two accents in each part-line and three in the refrain. The final lines in fact have a purely semantic parallelism, as there is no material in common between *per si é falido* and *mentiu per seu grado*. These two lines also set a rhythmic surprise as they have a line-initial beat on *pesa-me*, as opposed to the dominant anacrusis.

7.7 Dinis 16, (B 566 V 169, Cohen, 2018: 83-4)

The basic pattern of 10' 10' [5'+4'] changes to 11' 11' [5' + 5'] in strophes 6 and 7, and to 11' 10 in strophes 7 and 8 as a result of *leixa-pren*.

– Ai flores, ai flores | do verde pino,
se sabedes novas | do meu amigo?
ai Deus, e u é?

Ai flores, ai flores | do verde ramo,
se sabedes novas | do meu amado?
ai Deus, e u é?

Se sabedes novas | do meu amigo?
aquele que mentiu do | que pos con migo,
ai Deus, e u é?

Se sabedes novas | do meu amado?
aquele que mentiu do | que mh á jurado,
ai Deus, e u é?

– Vós me preguntades | polo voss' amigo
e eu ben vos digo | que é san' e vivo.
– **Ai Deus, e u é?**

– Vós me preguntades | polo voss' amado
e eu ben vos digo | que é viv' e sano.
– **Ai Deus, e u é?**

– E eu ben vos digo | que é san' e vivo
e será vosco ant' o | prazo saído.
– **Ai Deus, e u é?**

– E eu ben vos digo | que é viv' e sano
e seerá vosc' ant' o | prazo pasado.
– **Ai Deus, e u é?**

This is the only poem in which we can see a poetic purpose for metrical variation, namely to mark the change of voice in the second block of four strophes. In Cohen's text, curiously, the original 10' 10' metre is forced back into the final lines, where

the division of lines according to poetic structure would give a more substantial metrical difference, namely a final 11 or 12-syllable line:

E será vosco | ant' o prazo saído/passado
E seerá vosco | ant' o prazo saído/passado

Cohen presumably rejects this division because his metrical principles would oblige him to retain the elision in *vosco ant'*, which would not be possible across a caesura. Aware of this, he suggests that eliminating the elision in *ante o* would extend the longer lines to the entire second half, making each half internally consistent.

Both of Cohen's solutions suffer from the extreme oddness of retaining two parallel passages exhibiting complementary conflation devices to achieve the same metrical outcome:

E será vosco ant' reduced form of root *seer*, no elision of *vosco*
E seerá vosc' ant' full form of root *seer*, elision of *vosco*

The reduced form *será* is in fact an editorial emendation designed to preserve the MS reading *vosco*. Both MSS have *seera*, and the alternation of *vosco* in S7 and *vosc'* in S8 is found in both MSS, so the two lines are not congruent and can be assumed to be wrong in one if not both witnesses.

We must here ask if the metrical device is up to the task claimed for it. The difference between the 4'- and 5'-syllable half-lines is slight enough, and consists of function words, mainly unstressed: *do*, *que* in the first block, *polo*, *que é*, *ant' o* in the second. On its own such a metrical shift would not clearly mark a discourse break. In fact it is utterly unnecessary, as the change of voice between the two halves is marked not only by the change from question to answer, but by the interruption of the whole pattern of *leixa-pren* and parallelism, so that each half of the poem functions as a separate repetitive structure, with only the refrain constant.

An accentual reading combined with a poetically motivated line division shows clearly how the line structure is unchanged beneath the shift in strophic structure. The new sequence is also marked by line-initial beats instead of upbeats.

– Ai flores, ai flores | do verde pino,
se sabedes novas | do meu amigo?
ai Deus, e u é?

Ai flores, ai flores | do verde ramo,
se sabedes novas | do meu amado?
ai Deus, e u é?

Se sabedes **novas** | do **meu** amigo?
aquel que mentiu | do que **pos** con **migo**,
ai Deus, e u é??

Se sabedes **novas** | do **meu** amado?
aquel que mentiu | do que **mh á** jurado,
ai Deus, e u é?

– **Vós** me preguntades | polo **voss'** amigo
 e **eu** ben vos **digo** | que é **san'** e **vivo**.
 – *ai Deus, e u é?*

– **Vós** me preguntades | polo **voss'** amado
 e **eu** ben vos **digo** | que é **viv'** e **sano**.
 – *ai Deus, e u é?*

– E **eu** ben vos **digo** | que é **san'** e **vivo**
 e **seerá vosco** | ant' o **prazo** saído.¹⁶
 – *ai Deus, e u é?*

– E **eu** ben vos **digo** | que é **viv'** e **sano**
 e **seerá vosco** | ant' o **prazo** pasado.
 – *ai Deus, e u é?*

This poem thus satisfies the positive and negative criteria for accentual metrics, as its metrical and discourse structure is clearly implemented without the need for editorial adjustments.

7.8 Portocarreiro-3. (*B 920 V 507*, Cohen, 2018: 86)

Here the initial polymetry of 7' 8' is inverted to 8' 7' under *leixa-pren*.

O anel do | meu amigo
 perdi o so-lo | verde pino
e chor' eu bela.

¹⁶ The stress clash of *seerá vosco* would almost certainly be resolved by transferring the accent to the (secondarily stressed) initial syllable, as *seerá*. The absence of studies on accentual metre means that there is no literature on the phenomenon of clash resolution in the Galician-Portuguese lyric.

O anel do | meu amado
perdi o so-lo | verde ramo
e chor' eu bela.

Perdi o so-lo | verde ramo;
por en chor' eu | dona d' algo
e chor' eu bela.

Perdi o so-lo | verde pino;
por en chor' eu | dona virgo
e chor' eu bela.

In this poem the second line of the first pair of strophes is longer than the lines that precede and follow it. The result is that all the strophes are polymetric, but without a consistent pattern, 7' 8' in the first pair, followed by 8' 7' in the second when the anomalous line is repeated and promoted by *leixa-pren*. Were it not for the *leixa-pren* it could indeed be argued (with Cohen) that the polymetry creates a coherent pattern, of *coblas doblas alternadas*. But parallelism and *leixa-pren* automatically create a pattern of *coblas doblas*. This poem is distinctive for its own variation on *leixa-pren* with a chiasmic abba pattern of strophic repetition instead of the usual aabb.¹⁷ The polymetry is here a distraction, as is to be expected where there are two simultaneous variations on a model.

Once again we observe that the linguistic material by which the variation of line length is brought about is trivial, in this case the pairing of a monosyllabic preposition+article fusion *do* with an unavoidable disyllabic one *so-lo*. Cohen's division of the lines into half-lines is designed to present the alternating sequences as whole metrical units rather than individual function words. This involves the placement of a caesura mark between an article and the remainder of the noun group noun in *o anel do | meu amigo/amado*, and *perdi o so-lo | verde pino/ramo*. This is clearly not a conventional metrical caesura, which has to respect grammatical boundaries, but is one possible boundary between the base and the coda of the parallelistic line. In an accentual analysis we have three beats in the strophe, with two in the coda and one in the base, regardless of where any boundary is placed, and two beats in the refrain.

O anel | do meu amigo
perdi o | so-lo verde pino
e chor' eu bela.

17 MS V has strophes 3 and 4 in reverse order, which would restore normal *leixa-pren*, but Cohen opts for the more innovative reading.

O *anel* | do *meu amado*
 perdi o | so-lo *verde ramo*
e chor' eu bela.

Perdi o | so-lo *verde ramo*;
 por en *chor' eu* | *dona d' algo*
e chor' eu bela.

Perdi o | so-lo *verde pino*;
 por en *chor' eu* | *dona virgo*
e chor' eu bela.

8. Two bailadas

Cohen (2017) attempts to rebut Parkinson (2016), by developing a defensive critique of the three cases (Torneol-1, Nunes-2, Codax-3) discussed in detail in that still programmatic article, claiming to prove that none shows “irreducible metrical irregularity”. (The astute reader will note that what Cohen (2018) claims for his cases of special responsion is precisely an irreducible irregularity.) Torneol-1 has already been covered in 7.1.

8.1 Airas Nunes

Nunes-2 is an interesting selection, as Parkinson (2016) in fact deals with Zorro-10, which was expanded by Nunes-2.

Zorro-10 (B1158bis, V361, Parkinson, 2016: 38)	beats	syllables
Bailemos agora , por Deus , ai velidas ,	4	11'
so aquestas avelaneiras frolicas,	3	11'
e quen for velida , come nos velidas ,	4	11'
se amigo amar ,	2	6? 5? 4?
so aquestas avelaneiras frolicas,	3	11'
verrá bailar	2	4
Bailemos agora , por Deus , ai loadas ,	4	11'
so aquestas avelaneiras granadas ,	3	11'
e quen for loada , come nos loadas ,	4	11'
se amigo amar ,	2	6? 5? 4?
so aquestas avelaneiras granadas ,	3	11'
verrá bailar	2	4

Airas Nunes -2 (*B* 879 *V* 462, Cohen, 2017: 1-2)

Bailemos nós ja todas tres, ai amigas,
so aquestas avelaneiras frolicas,
e quen for velida, como nós, velidas,
se amigo amar,
so aquestas avelaneiras frolicas
verrá bailar.

Bailemos nós ja todas tres, ai irmanas,
so aqueste ramo destas avelanas,
e quen for louçana, como nós, louçanas,
se amigo amar,
so aqueste ramo destas avelanas
verrá bailar.

Por Deus, ai amigas, mentr' al non fazemos
so aqueste ramo frolico bailemos,
e quen ben parecer, como nós parecemos,
se amigo amar,
so aqueste ramo, sol que nós bailemos,
verrá bailar.

Zorro-10 is a poem where the strong rhythmic basis of the verse constitutes an essential underpinning of an accentual analysis. If this is really a *bailada*, or dancing song, we would expect no less, as dance relies on regular rhythm. What pushes the analytical preference towards accentual metre (as opposed to accentual-syllabic metre with regular non-final accents), is the so-called intercalated refrain of lines 4 and 6 of each strophe:

se amigo amar
verrá bailar.

which is the one portion of Nunes-2 common to both poems.

Cohen's objections to identifying these two lines as instances of the same verse design are twofold.

Firstly he makes the unjustified assumption that Parkinson 2016 claims or assumes that all intercalated refrains must match: "There is no rule that says that the verses of an intercalated refrain must be of equal scansion". The claim of Parkinson 2016 is simply that in this poem the two lines, loosely labelled *refrão intercalar*, work better

if they do match metrically. (As a label for the phenomenon in which repeated text appears before the final line, it serves to give a false unity to a diverse set of cases, bringing together those where the same text is repeated internally, and those where we have more properly a discontinuous refrain, in which only part of the refrain is strophe final. As there is no rule that the component lines of a refrain must match, there can be no such rule for discontinuous refrains.)

In support of the null hypothesis that intercalated refrains may not match, he cites (fn 5) seven other cases, two of which are clearly irrelevant as the two lines match neither in metre nor rhyme (Dinis 17 (aBaCB 6' 3' 6'), and Dinis 18 (aBaC 3 6), and three where the differences of metre are clearly intentional: we have Juião Bolseiro 2 (aaaBaB 6 10), Pedr'Eanes Solaz 2 (aBaB 3 5), and Dinis 18 (aBaB 3 6). The two remaining cases are ABaB Zorro 8 and aaaBaB Dinis 44. Dinis 44 (B596 V199, Cohen 2003: 633) is a typical courtly *cantiga* developing the same idea over three strophes, with the 4th and 6th lines repeated intact in each strophe. In each case the text of the “refrains” is syntactically continuous with the rest of the strophe.

Meu amig' u eu seja
nunca perço desejo
se non quando vos vejo,
e por en vivo coitada
con este mal sobejo
que sofr' eu ben talhada.

More pertinently, the intercalated line *e por en vivo coitada* is the only 7-syllable line in a strophe made up of 6-syllable lines. It would not take a very bold editor to remove the non-functional conjunction *e*. Zorro-8 is on the list of accentual cantigas (Parkinson, 2016: 37). Basically 7' 7 7' 8, it has not so much an intercalated refrain as a counterpoint of narrative and refrain lines, where it is perfectly reasonable to expect metrical congruency:

Jus' a lo mar e o rio
eu namorada irei
u el **rei arma navio**
amores convusco m'irei

Cohen's second general objection is that only interstrophic correspondences can count towards establishing metrical equivalences: “At any rate, a difference in scansion between two verses of an intercalated refrain is an *intra*-strophic phenomenon, and what needs to be shown to support the claim for accentual metrics is a lack of *inter*-strophic correspondence.” While interstrophic correspondences

are stronger evidence for accentual metre, and are essential for establishing pure syllabic metre, Occam's Razor pushes us to maximise intrastrophic regularity and not multiply the number of internal units.

Cohen (2003) notes of line 4 (and its repetitions in strophe 2 and in Nunes -2) "the meter of these vv is uncertain", which is an understatement, confirmed by his aside (2017: 2) "whether we scan *se amigo amar* as five or six syllables (I suspect there is a hiatus between *amigo* and *amar*, yielding six)". The metre of line 4 is totally unverifiable, precisely because it has no responson (congruence or correspondence) with any other line of the strophe. It may be 6 syllables (*agudo*) without elision or 5 syllables with elision. By contrast, the metre of line 6 is totally verifiable, but still has no congruence or responson with any other line, as it has to be 4 syllables. Given that lines 4 and 6 rhyme, and are the only *agudo* rhymes in the piece, one would expect a high level of congruence. The accentual reading provides this, as they are both 2-beat lines. In place of a polymetric accentual-syllabic poem with a 11' 11' 11' 5 11' 4 strophic structure, we have an accentual piece with a 4 4 4 2 4 2 distribution of beats, in which the intercalated lines are equivalent to half a full line.

The case becomes more interesting when we put together the original poem by Zorro and its rewriting in three strophes by the ingenious Airas Nunes. Nunes's version retains the rhythmic consistency of Zorro and the refrain, and shows a few irregularities providing precisely the interstrophic correspondence which Cohen demands. In the third strophe we have an unnoticed metrical anomaly in line 15

E **quen** ben parecer como nós parecemos

which has 12' syllables in place of the overriding 11' pattern. It also breaks the pattern of association of stresses with positions in the verse. In the 3rd verse of strophes 1 and 2, as in both strophes of Zorro's original, there is a clear rhythmic accent on the 2nd, 5th, 9th and 11th syllables

E **quen** for **velida** come **nós** **velidas**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11(12)

e **quen** for **louçana** como **nós** **louçanas**.

in Nunes's strophe 3, however, the accents are displaced

E **quen** ben parecer como **nós** parecemos

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12(13)

This anomalous line sits in the prominent position preceding the refrain, in the last strophe, which Cohen himself identifies as a locus of metrical innovation. It is unlikely that a skilled metrist like Nunes would have failed to meet his metrical scheme. If we take the underlying verse design to be accentual, then we have a metrically congruent line – still four beats – which nevertheless breaks a perceptible if metrically irregular pattern of syllable count. It also breaks a pattern established by the third lines of all other strophes, of a clear caesura with feminine cadence.

So we have an original poem by Zorro, clearly in accentual metre, later taken up by Nunes who maintains the accentual regularity but pushes the envelope of ambiguity between accentual and accentual-syllabic metre. Cohen’s rebuttal might just work for Nunes, but it cuts no ice with Zorro.

8.2 Codax

Cohen (2017) finally takes issue with what is probably one of the clearest cases of accentual metrics, Codax -3 (*N 3 B 1280 V 886*, Parkinson, 2016: 37-38). For Cohen this poem has regular 12-syllable lines, divided 6’+5’, in the strophe, achieved by strategic use of emendation, elision and caesura:

Mha irmana fremosa, | treides <vos> comigo
 a la_igreja de Vigo_u | é o mar salido
e miraremos las ondas.

Mha irmana fremosa, | treides <vos> de grado
 a la_igreja de Vigo_u | é o mar levado
e miraremos las ondas.

A la_igreja de Vigo_u | é o mar salido
 e verrá i mha madr<e> | e o meu amigo
e miraremos las ondas.

A la_igreja de Vigo_u | é o mar levado
 e verrá i mha madr<e> | e o meu amado
e miraremos las ondas.

This is Cohen’s latest edition of the poem (first seen in Cohen 2016) and diverges from the more sensible but metrically irregular version in Cohen (2003: 517).

The accentual analysis has a symmetrical arrangement of 4-beat strophe lines and 2-beat refrain lines, contrasting with a range of accentual-syllabic lines. (All editorial emendations have been removed except the restoration of the the final *e* of *madre*, which does not affect the analysis.)

	accents	syllables
Mia irmana fremosa , treides comigo	4	11'
a la igreja de Vigo u é o mar salido	4	14'
e miraremos las ondas	2	7'
Mia irmana fremosa , treides de grado	4	
a la igreja de Vigo u é o mar levado	4	
e miraremos las ondas	2	
A la igreja de Vigo u e o mar levado	4	
e verrá i mia madr <e> e o meu amado	4	
e miraremos las ondas	2	
A la igreja de Vigo u e o mar salido	4	
e verrá i mia madr <e> e o meu amigo	4	
e miraremos las ondas	2	

We have already identified the strategic use of non-syntactic caesura in other of Cohen's editions. Here the only point in dividing the line after the conjunction *u* is to privilege elision in *Vigo u* (following the MSS) and allow the restoration of the final *e* of *madre* (against the MSS). The inserted *vos*, justified by Cohen (2017: 5) by "a combination of linguistic and metrical considerations" has no function except to equalise half lines, as the intransitive construction *treides migo* is more frequent over the corpus than the reflexive *treides-vos migo*. Two poems other than by Codax have reflexive constructions, and five have intransitive constructions.¹⁸ Interestingly, Codax-5 *Quantas sabedes amar amigo* has significant MS variation around this construction: the phrase *Treides comig' a lo mar* is the base for four lines connected by parallelism and *leixa-pren*, where we would normally expect no textual variation.

Cohen claims that the presentation of *Vigo u* as a hiatus in Parkinson (2016) is a metrical error, when in fact it asserts the metrical irrelevance of the syllable count at that point, as there are no elisions marked in the accentual editions of 2016. However that phrase is counted, there is irreducible syllabic divergence between the two

¹⁸ Ferreiro (2018-) *Glossario* s.v. *traer*₂ [consult. 11.6.20]

lines of each distich, beside clear rhythmic and accentual unity. Cohen undermines his own position by arguing that if these lines are irregular, the irregularity can be accommodated as another case of special external responson.

This is indeed one of the few songs where the music and the rhythm match (as compared to *Cantigas de Santa Maria* where the syllables match notes and accents are randomly distributed), another strong pointer towards accentual metrics, and a possible rare case of a documented song in which text and music fully meet the definition of *cantiga* as a form made up of indivisible text and music. Cohen (2017: 4) comments

This text offers the possibility for an irregular metrical analysis only by presupposing that the musical notation of the *Pergamino Vindel* (siglum *N*) allows the textual critic to infer the metrics of the poems from the music – a risky procedure that confutes [*sic*] metrical and musical form.

This is methodologically wrong. The accentual character of the poem is patent from reading, and the issue of text-music fit is an objective one. Once the assumption of accentual-syllabic metrics and syllabic music is abandoned, the metrical structure of such poems can be clearly perceived.

9. Conclusions

This detailed analysis of the poems where Cohen seeks to analyse metrical variation as “special external responson” shows that the poems in question fall into two groups: one of accentual-syllabic poems where there is metrical irregularity requiring editorial intervention, and the other of accentual poems where the apparent irregularity results from the failure to recognise the metrical pattern. The case for a systematic device of metrical variation in pairs of strophes rests on an opportunistic use of the term “responson” and does not resist critical examination, particularly where there is an alternative analysis of regularity inside accentual metrics. Cohen’s overt analysis must thus be rejected.

At the same time, the analysis overturns the case against recognising a substantial body of accentual *cantigas de amigo*, made explicitly in Cohen 2017 and covertly in Cohen 2018. The catalogue of accentual *cantigas de amigo* which satisfy both positive and negative criteria remains substantially intact, to be complemented by a much longer list of *cantigas de amigo* whose authors “counted both syllables and accents” (Duffell 2007: 32) and which satisfy only the positive criteria for accentual metre.

In the light of these conclusions, it is time to conduct a more wide-ranging investigation of alternatives to accentual-syllabic metre in the Galician-Portuguese lyric. The use of syllabic metre in the *cantiga de amor* requires further investigation (Fassanelli 2012). The *cantigas de escarnho e maldizer*, with their closer links to popular poetry, can be expected to provide additional cases of accentual metre.

Cohen suggests in his conclusion (2018: 86) that what he claims to be external resposion over pairs of strophes “may have belonged to an earlier poetic tradition that was left behind”. His examples point indeed to an earlier tradition, of accentual metre: one that was not left behind but was artfully preserved, imitated, and maintained as a parallel structure to the syllable-counting metres cultivated by the *trovadores*.

Appendix I

Accentual *cantigas de amigo* (following Parkinson, 2016: 37).

Pieces analysed in Cohen (2018) are in bold; those now recommended for removal from this list are in parentheses. Reference numbers from Tavani (1967) and *Universo Cantigas* (following d'Heur (1975)) are given for easy location of editions other than Cohen (2003). Asterisks by Tavani numbers indicate poems for which more than one metrical scheme is identified (thus satisfying one negative criterion).

Cohen 2003	incipit	rhyme	strophes	Tavani	D'Heur	B	V
Joan Perez de Aboim 1	Quando se foi noutro dia daqui	abbacc	4	75.18	680	665	267
Afonso Lopez de Baian 4	Disseron mh úas novas	aaBC	4	6.2*	756	740	342
Bernal de Bonaval 1	Fremosas, a Deus grado	aaa (ab cb bb)	4	22.9	1137	1135	726
3	Ai fremosinha se ben ajades	aaB	4	22.5	1139	1137	728
Pero Garcia Burgales 2	Non vos nembra meu amigo	ababCC	3	125.27*	665	650	251
Fernan Rodriguez de Calheiros 4	Direi vos agor' amigo	aaBB	3	47.7*	644	629	230
7	Madre, passou per aqui un cavaleiro	aaBBBBB	3	47.12	647	632	233
Airas Carpancho 1	Chegades amiga du é eu amigo	aaBB	3	11.4	671	656	257
7	A mha coita non lhe sei guarida (Molher com' eu non vive coitada)	aaB	4	11.8	677	662	263-4
8	Por fazer romaria puj' en meu coraçon	aaB	3	11.10*	678	663	265
Roi Martiinz do Casal 2	(Rogo t', ai Amor)	aaB	4	145.8+	1175	1162	765
Martin Codax 1	Ondas do mar de Vigo	aaB	4	91.6	1295	1278	884
3	Mía irmana fremosa	aaB	4	91.5*	1297	1280	886
5	Quantas sabedes	aaB	4	91.7	1299	1282	888

Cohen 2003	incipit	rhyme	strophes	Tavani	D'Heur	B	V
6	Eno sagrado en Vigo	aaB	6	91.3	1300	1283	889
Dinis 13	Bon dia vi amigo	aaB	8	25.19	582	565	168
14	Non chegou, madre, o meu amigo	aaB	6	25.50	583	566	169
15	De que morredes, filha	aaB	6	25.31*	584	567	170
16	Ai flores, ai flores do verde pinho	aaB	8	25.2	585	568	171
17	Levantou-s' a velida	aBaCB	6	25.43	586	569	172
18	Amig' e meu amigo	aBaC	6	25.4	587	570	173
40	Mha madre velida	aaB	8	25.44	609	592	195
Fernando Esquio 3	Vaiamos, irmana, vaiamos dormir	aaB	6	38.8*	1314	1298	902
Estevan Coelho 1	(Sedia la fremosa)	aaB	4	29.1*	735	720	321
2	Se oj' o meu amigo	aaBB	3	29.2	736	721	322
Mirtin de Ginzo 4	Non poss'eu, madre, ir a Santa Cecilia	aaB	4	93.5	1290	1273	879
8	A do moi bon parecer	aaB	4	93.1	1294	1277	883
Joao Garcia de Guilhade 7	Amigas, tamanha coita	aaBB	3	70.8	763	747	349
22	Vëestes me, amigas, rogar	abbaaCC	3	70.51*	784	787	371
Joao Soares Coelho 2	Foi se meu amigo daqui noutro dia	aaaB	3	79.23	694	679	281
3	Amigo, queixum' avedes	abbaCC	4	79.7	695	680	282
5	Oje quer eu meu amigo veer	abbaC	3 + fiinda	79.41	697	682	284
6	Falei un dia por me baralhar	abbaCC	3	79.21	698	683	285

Cohen 2003	incipit	rhyme	strophes	Tavani	D'Heur	B	V
8	Amigas, por nostro senhor	ababCCC	3	79.5	700	685	287
10	Filha direi vos ùa ren	abbaC aa	3 + fiinda	79.22	702	687	289
12	Fui eu, madre, lavar meus cabelos	aaB	4	79.25	704	689	291
13	Ai Deus, a volo digo	aaB	4	79.2	705	690	292
Lopo 5	Filha, se gradoedes	aaB	4	86.6	1268	1252	857
Mendinho 1	Seia-m'eu na ermida de san Simhon	aaB(B)	6	98.1*	848	852	438
Pero Meogo 4	Ai cervos do monte	aaB	2	134.1*	1203	1187	792
5	Levou s' aa alva	aaB	6	134.5*	1204	1188	793
8	Fostes, filha, eno bailar	aaBBB	4	134.4	1207	1191	796
9	Digades, filha	aaB	6	134.2	1208	1192	797
Joan Nunes Camanês 2	Vistes, fiha, noutro dia	abbacca	3	74.8	667	652	253
3	Par Deus, amigo, mui' a gran sazon	aaB	4+ fiinda	74.4	668	653	254
Fernan Gonçalvez de Portocarreiro 3	O anel do meu amigo	aaB	4	128.3	922	920	507
4	Ai meu amigo e meu semhor	abbaCDDC	3	128.1	923	920b	508
Vasco Praga de Sandim 1	Sabedes quant' á, amigo	aaBB	4	151.22*	649	633	235
3	Meu amigo, pois vos tan gran pesar	aaBB	4	151.7	651	636	237
Joan Servando 8	Mha madre velida e non me guardedes	aaB	4	78.17	1152	1149	741
Pedro Eanes Solaz 2	Eu velida non dormia	aBaB	8	117.4	826	829	415
Nuno Fernandes Torneol 1	Levad' amigo	aaB	8	106.11*	656	641	242

Cohen 2003	incipit	rhyme	strophes	Tavani	D'Heur	B	V
5	Vi eu, mha madr', andar	aaB	7	106.22	660	645	246
Estvem Travanca 4	Por Deus, amiga, que preguntedes	abbaCC	3	36.3*	737	722	323
Joan Lopez de Ulhoa 3	Que trist' oj' eu and' e faço gran razon	aaBB	4	72.16*	712	697	298
7	Que mi queredes, ai madr' e senhor	aaBaB	3	72.15	716	701	302
Gonalo Eanes do Vinhal 5	Amiga, por Deus vos venh' ora rogar	aaaBaB	4 + fiinda	60.2	725	710	311
Pero Viviaes 1	Pois nossas madres van a San Simon	abbaCC	3	136.4	750	735	336
Joan Zorro 3	Per ribeira do rio	aaB	6	83.10*	1163	1150a	753
5	Cabelos, los meus cabelos	aaB	2	83.2	1166	1154	756
8	Jus alo mar e o rio	aBaB	4	83.5	1169	1157	759
9	Pela ribeiro do rio salido	aaBB	2	83.9*	1170	1158	760
10	Bailemos agora por Deus, ai velidas	aaaBaB	2	83.1	1171	1158b	761

Bibliography

- Betti, Maria Pia (2005): *Repertorio Metrico delle Cantigas de Santa Maria di Alfonso X di Castiglia* (Pisa: Pacini).
- Cañas Murillo, Jesús (ed.) (2007): *Libro de Alexandre*. 5th edn (Madrid: Cátedra).
- Cerdeira, Teresa (2013): “A tela da dama”, in Pazos Alonso, Cláudia / Parkinson, Stephen (eds.), *Reading Literature in Portuguese. Commentaries in Honour of Tom Earle*, 15-22 (Oxford: Legenda).
- Cohen, Rip (ed.) (2003): *500 Cantigas d’amigo* (Porto: Campo das Letras).
- Cohen, Rip (2009): “The Galician-Portuguese Lyric”, in Parkinson, Stephen / Pazos-Alonso, Cláudia / Earle T.F. (eds.), *A Companion to Portuguese Literature*, 25-40 (Warminster: Tamesis).
- Cohen, Rip (2010): “*Cantar Igual*: External Responson and Textual Criticism in the Galician-Portuguese Lyric”, *La corónica* 38.2, 5-25. DOI: 10.1353/cor.0.0076
- Cohen, Rip (2016): “The Cantigas of Martin Codax – edited with commentary and prolegomena”, in *Pergamino Vindel*, coordinación de Mariña Arbor Aldea, 285-305 (Barcelona: Moleiro).
- Cohen, Rip (2017): “Are there purely accentual metrics in the Cantigas d’amigo?”. Unpublished paper uploaded to <academia.edu>, October 2017 [consulted 11.6.2020].
- Cohen, Rip (2018): “Metrics and Textual Criticism in the Cantigas d’amigo: External Responson by Pairs of Strophes”, *Revista Galega de Filoloxía* 19, 73-91. doi: 10.17979/rgf.2018.19.0.4947
- Deyermond, Alan (2001): “Some Problems of Gender and Genre in the medieval *Cantigas*”, in Cortijo-Ocaño, Antonio / Perissonotto, Giorgio / Sharrer, Harvey L. (eds.), *Estudios Galegos Medievais*, 43-59 (Santa Barbara: UCSB).
- D’Heur, Jean-Marie (1975): *Recherches internes sur la lyrique amoureuse des troubadours galiciens-portugais (XII^e-XIV^e siècle): contribution à l’étude du «corpus des troubadours»* (Liège: Université de Liège).
- Duffell, Martin J. (1999): “The Metric Cleansing of Hispanic Verse”, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* (Liverpool) 76, 151-68. DOI:10.3828/bhs.76.2.151
- Duffell, Martin J. (2007): *Syllable and Accent: Studies on Medieval Hispanic Metrics* (Papers of the Medieval Hispanic Research Seminar 56. London: Queen Mary University of London).
- Duffell, Martin J. (2008): *A New History of English Metre* (Oxford: Legenda).
- Fabb, Nigel / Halle, Morris (2008). *Metre in Poetry. A New Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

- Fassanelli, Rachele (2012): “Questioni metriche galego-portoghesei. Sulla cosiddetta *Lex Mussafia*”, *Ars Metrica* <www.arsmetrica.eu> 2012-05.
- Ferreira, Manuel Pedro (1986): *O Som de Martim Codax. Sobre a dimensão musical da lírica galego-portuguesa (séculos XII-XIV)* (Lisbon: Unisys-INCM).
- Hansen, Kristin and Kiparsky, Paul (1996): “A parametric theory of poetic meter”, *Language* 72, 287-335. DOI: 10.2307/416652
- Jakobson, Roman (1960): “Linguistics and Poetics”, in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 350-377 (Boston: MIT Press).
- Maas, Paul (1962 [1929]): *Greek Metre*. Translated Hugh Lloyd-Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press). [Based on the 1929 revision of *Griechische Metrik*, Heft 7 of *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. Alfred Grecke and Eduard Norden, Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1923¹, 1927², 1929³ with additional material from 1961.]
- Mettman, Walter (ed.) (1986-89): *Alfonso X, Cantigas de Santa María*. 3 vols (Madrid: Castalia).
- Piera, Carlos (2008): “Southern Romance”, in Fabb and Halle 2008, 94-132.
- Parkinson, Stephen (2006a): “Concurrent patterns of verse design in the Galician-Portuguese lyric”, in Whetnall, Jane / Deyermund, Alan (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Colloquium*, 19-38 (Papers of the Medieval Hispanic Research Seminar, 51, London: Department of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary, University of London).
- Parkinson, Stephen (2006b): “Rules of Elision and Hiatus in the Galician-Portuguese Lyric: The View from the *Cantigas de Santa María*”, *La corónica* 34.2, 113-33. DOI: 10.1353/cor.2006.0049
- Parkinson, Stephen (2008): “The Evolution of *Cantiga* 113: Composition, Recomposition, and Emendation in the *Cantigas de Santa María*”, *La coronica* 35.2 (Spring 2007 [published 2008]), 227-72. DOI: 10.1353/cor.2007.0007
- Parkinson, Stephen (2013): “Towards a New Edition of the *Cantigas de Santa María*”, in *Proceedings of the 17th Colloquium of the Medieval Hispanic Research Seminar*, 93-113 (London: Queen Mary University of London).
- Parkinson, Stephen (2014): “Text-music mismatches in the *Cantigas de Santa María*”, *Revista Portuguesa de Musicologia* 1.1, 15-32. Accessible at <http://rpm-ns.pt/index.php/rpm/article/view/33> [consult. 12.10.2020].
- Parkinson, Stephen (ed.) (2015): *Alfonso X the Learned. Cantigas de Santa María. An Anthology* (MHRA Critical Texts 40, London: MHRA).
- Parkinson, Stephen (2016): “Métrica acentual nas cantigas de amigo”, in Lopes, Graça Videira / Ferreira, Manuel Pedro (eds.), *Do Canto à escrita: Novas questões em torno da Lírica Galego-Portuguesa – Nos cem anos do pergaminho Vindel*, 29-42 (Lisbon: Instituto de Estudos Medievais / Centro de Estudos de Sociologia e Estética Musicais).

- Parkinson, Stephen (2018): “Géneros imaginados na lírica galego-portuguesa: a ‘cantiga de seguir’ e a ‘cantiga de vilãos’”, in Zinato, Andrea / Bellomi, Paula (eds.), *Poesía, poéticas y cultura literaria*, 375-390 (Pavia: Ibis).
- Spaggiari, Barbara (2001): “The Decasyllable in Portugal”, in Michaux, Christine / Dominicy, Marc (eds), *Linguistic Approaches to Poetry*, 173-85 (Special issue of *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 15.1. Amsterdam: Benjamins).
- Tavani, Giuseppe (1967): *Repertorio Metrico della Lirica Galego-Portoghese* (Rome: Ateneo).
- Tavani, Giuseppe (1999): *Arte de Trovar do Cancioneiro de Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa* (Lisbon: Colibri).
- Ferreiro, Manuel (dir.) (2018-): *Universo Cantigas*. Edición crítica da poesía medieval galego-portuguesa. Universidade da Coruña <<http://universocantigas.gal>>.
- West, M. L (1982): *An Introduction to Greek Metre* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- West, M. L (1987): *An Introduction to Greek Metre* (Oxford: Clarendon Press [abridged version of West 1982]).