

**HE DOESN'T WANT TO SEE YOU:
A SCRIPT IN THE MATRIX³⁰**

Rip Cohen (Independent Researcher)
rip.cohen@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses four *cantigas d'amigo* which contain a variable formula whose gist is “He didn't want to see you.” This formula of reproach belongs to a pragmatic script with a configuration of mother-to-daughter and a speech-action that can be described as “Stop loving him”.

Keywords:

Speech-action. Pragmatic script. *Cantigas d'amigo*.

RESUMO

Este artigo analisa quatro *cantigas d'amigo* que contêm uma fórmula variável, cuja essência é “Ele não queria te ver”. Essa fórmula de reprovação pertence a um roteiro pragmático com uma configuração de mãe para filha e um discurso-ação, que pode ser descrito como “Pare de amá-lo”.

Keywords:

Discurso-ação. Roteiro Pragmático. *Cantigas d'amigo*.

Adapting a phrase of Ludwig Wittgenstein, we might say that if some *cantigas d'amigo* seem puzzling, that may be because they do not *all* seem puzzling enough.

A grammar of scripts (COHEN, 2009a, p. 37-9) for this genre must identify and describe kinds of *speech-action* or *move* (BING; COHEN, 1991, p. 19-21; COHEN, 1994, p. 171-6; 2011a: 98-102), say which texts and scripts represent each kind (COHEN, 2011a, p. 104-39), determine if two similar scripts should be taken as variations of the same move or as distinct but related moves, and (where appropriate) array interrelated moves in families of scripts (WITTGENSTEIN, 1993, p. 32 [§66]; cf. AUSTIN, 1986, p. 150)³¹. Here I will examine a move (or

³⁰ This essay, dating from 2014, is here published without revision or updating of bibliography. A full exposition of my views on pragmatic grammar will be found in my upcoming book *Girl-Song: aaB cantigas d'amigo*.

³¹ The numbering and texts of the *cantigas d'amigo* are from Cohen 2003. Angle brackets have been removed where (as nearly always) refrains are not copied fully after the first

speech-action) already dubbed “the mother reproaches her daughter for loving a boy who has proved faithless” (COHEN, 2010b, p. 28). But that description omits the key fact that such a reproach functions as an indirect way of saying, “You should not love that boy.” In the four texts where this speech-action appears, the mother, speaking to her daughter, normally expresses the move indirectly by phrases like “He didn’t come to see you,” or “He never spoke with you again.” I will argue that this move (“Stop loving him”) belongs to the pragmatic matrix of the genre. Here I mean both the contemporary poetic matrix – an abstraction based on all we can induce from the corpus about the *active* poetics (form, rhetoric and pragmatics) of these 500 songs – and the historically prior poetic and social matrix in which the genre had its roots (as argued by LANG, 1894, p. lxiii-ciii).³² The contemporary matrix provides compelling evidence for a prior matrix. Nothing else explains the strophic forms (COHEN, 2005; 2010d; 2014), the extremely limited and conservative lexicon (COHEN, 2010e, p. 2-3), the pervasive rhetoric of repetition with variation (LANG, 2010, p. 123; COHEN, 2011a, p. 51n), or the pragmatic rules, conventions and constraints of the genre.

The four texts that represent the kind of speech-action under study here conform to the combinatory possibilities of speaker and addressee found in the rest of the corpus. They were composed during the thirteenth century, over an unknown stretch of time and in unknown locations, by authors of different social extraction: two *trobadores*, a *jogral* and a *burguês*.³³ Are four texts enough to demonstrate the existence of a script in the matrix? *One* is enough – even a parody, if there is corroborating evidence.

But do these *cantigas* represent variations on the same action? Do they provide sufficient evidence for a *distinct* script of the general form (COHEN, 2009a)?

strophe, but have been retained for supplements. Changes have been made in punctuation. Tils have been added where historical phonology expects them and early manuscripts of Galician-Portuguese lyric normally provide them. Verse translations of the *cantigas* are from Cohen 2010a, sometimes slightly modified.

³² These two meanings of “matrix” are explained by Cohen 2009a: 26-27, 37-40. Although these dimensions of the matrix – and their importance in textual criticism – can be difficult to separate, see Cohen 2005, 2010c, 2010d, 2014 on form; 1996, 2012a on rhetoric; 2010b, 2011a on pragmatics. On the origins and development of the genre, see also Cohen 2011b.

³³ For information on the chronology of the poets (see OLIVEIRA, 1994, p. 303-440).

P1 – P2 {x, y + z → A}

This notation means that *Persona 1* speaks to *Persona 2*, and provides, within the symbols { }, background and new information {x, y + z} leading to {→} a main action/emotion {A}, usually performed – or, if an emotion, felt – in the present, sometimes foreseen in future time, and sometimes narrated.

Let's look first at the least problematic example, which nonetheless raises questions. Unlike the other three texts, only the mother speaks here, so we need not deal with the girl's response. And it is the girl's reaction in the other texts, all dialogues, that distinguishes them one from another, although I will try to show that in all four poems the mother's move, while nearly always indirect, is essentially the same (see COHEN, 2011a, p. 107).

JohanServando 13
 $a^7a^7b^7B^7B^7$ (I, III) / $a^7a^7b^7B^7B^7$ (II, IV) (x4)
 ener ades eraler ando er || er

Filha, o que queredesben
 partiu s' agora daquen
 e non vos quisoveer,
e ides vós ben querer
aquen vos non quer veer? 5

Filha, que mal baratades,
 que o sen meu grad' amades,
 pois que vos non quer veer,
e ides vós ben querer
aquen vos non quer veer? 10

Por esto lhiquer' eu mal,
 mha filha, e non por al,
 por que vos non quis veer,
e ides vós ben querer
aquen vos non quer veer? 15

Andades por el chorando
 e foi ora a San Servando
 e non vos quisoveer,
e ides vós ben querer
aquen vos non quer veer? 20

Daughter, the one you love
 Went away from here now
 And didn't want to see you,
 And you go on loving
 Someone who won't see you?

Daughter, you've bargained badly
By loving him against my will
Since he doesn't want to see you,
And you go on loving
Someone who won't see you?

And so for this I wish him ill,
Daughter, and for no other reason,
Because he wouldn't see you,
And you go on loving
Someone who won't see you?

You go around crying for him
And he's just gone to San Servando
And didn't want to see you,
And you go on loving
Someone who won't see you?

“A language game is something that consists in the recurrent procedures of the game in time,” says Wittgenstein (1979, p. 68 [§519]). For an audience to recognize and appreciate representations of any *Sprachspiel* or move, it must be a common “speech event” (GUMPERZ, 1982, p. 165-7; ARISTOTLE, *Poetics*, 1448b). That is a logical argument, sufficient in itself. Cultural anthropology tells us that – across a wide range of societies – mothers, as representatives of their families or clans, try to control their daughters’ sexual behavior (see SODRÉ, 2008, on the medieval and Galician-Portuguese contexts). The connections between wooing, marriage (*de facto* or *de jure*), child-bearing and inheritance underlie many *cantigas d’amigo* where, in one way or another, the mother attempts to protect the girl’s sexuality, which is a family asset but also a potential vulnerability (COHEN, 2012a. p. 25-6). The girl often asks her mother to let her go see her boyfriend, which presupposes maternal control, or complains that she will not let her go, or refers to the difficulty (or impossibility) of escaping her oversight. Sometimes the mother denies her daughter permission. A *cantiga* by Bernal de Bonaval is paradigmatic in its assertion of maternal authority, although the thrust of the utterance is more specific: the girl is not forbidden to talk with the boy, but she must not do so unless the mother is present. What the mother implies is that her daughter cannot act alone as her own agent, negotiating her future on her own behalf (BONAVAL, 8, vv. 1-3).

Filha freiosa, vedes que vos digo:
que non faledes ao voss’ amigo
sen mi, ai filha freiosa.

Lovely daughter, look what I'm telling you:
Do not talk with your boyfriend
Without me, oh lovely daughter.

The mother in Servando 13, who does not approve of the situation (“que o senmeu grad’ amades” “whom you love against my will;” v. 7), tries to persuade the girl not to love the boy, insisting that he has showed he cannot be trusted. “How can you love him? He was nearby, yet he left without coming to see you,” she argues. This move is *erotic apotreptic*: the mother tries to *dissuade* her daughter from loving someone (compare the mother’s erotic *protreptic* moves – attempts to *persuade* – in: COHEN, 2011a, p. 111-12, 138).

This apotreptic logic is emphasized by an unusual formal feature. There is a *palavra rima* in the third verse, the last in the body of the strophe, which forms a *dobre* with the final word of the fifth verse, the last verse of the refrain.³⁴ Both verses end with the infinitive *veer* (“to see”), in a construction consisting of *non + querer + veer* (not + to want + to see), with the boy as grammatical subject and the girl as direct object. *He does not want to come to see you*. How, then (asks the mother), can she go on loving him?

The script could be summarized as follows:

{he was nearby, he left + didn’t want to see you → don’t love him/you’re sad, I loathe him}

The background and present information {x, y + z} make the main action or emotion {A} different from those in Bonaval 8, since here the boy is untrustworthy and the girl should therefore (the mother implies) end the relationship, or *fala* (COHEN, 1996, p. 6-7; 2012a, p. 10, 19-21). The opposite attitudes and actions of boy and girl are emphasized by the contrastive repetition of the verb *querer* in the refrain: “e ides vós ben *querer* / a quen vos *non quer veer*?” (“And you *want* [love] someone who *doesn’t want* to see you?”). The mother bases her *dissuasio* on the boy’s faithlessness, and this attempt to dissuade is here equivalent to an injunction not to love him.

Servando 13 is a monologue, although we can draw inferences about the girl’s prior and present actions and emotions. In the other three

³⁴ It is possible that this is a three verse refrain whose first verse varies. The rhyme-scheme would then be aaBBB (instead of aabBB), but the difference would merely be one of terminology (see COHEN, 2012b, p. 61-62 n12). Compare Airas Carpancho 5, Gonçalves Eanes do Vinhal 3 (see COHEN, 2009b).

texts the girl does respond, and each answer represents a different speech-action. The girl in the second example says her mother is to blame.

Nuno Perez Sandeu 5
a⁸a⁸B¹⁰a⁸B¹⁰(x3)
ia ado ava || er

— Ai filha, o que vos ben queria
aqui o jurou noutro día
epero non xe vos vëo veer.
— Ai madre, de vós se temia,
que me soedes por el maltrager. 5

— O que por vós coitad' andava
ben aqui na vila estava
epero non xe vos vëoveer.
— Ai madre, de vós se catava,
que me soedes por el maltrager. 10

— O que por vós era coitado
aqui foi oj', o perjurado,
epero non xe vos vëoveer.
— Madre, por vós non foi ousado
que me soedes por el maltrager. 15

- Oh daughter, the one who loved you
Swore an oath here the other day
And yet he didn't come to see you.
— Oh mother, it was you he was afraid of,
Since because of him you treat me badly.
- The one who was was sad because of you
Was right here in the town
And yet he didn't come to see you.
— Oh mother, it was of you that he was wary,
Since because of him you treat me badly.
- The one who because of you was sad
Was right here today, the liar,
And yet he didn't come to see you.
— Mother, because of you he didn't dare to,
Since because of him you treat me badly.

The boy swore that he loved the girl (v. 2). But although he was there in the *vila* on that very day (vv. 7, 12), he did not come to see the girl, and so broke his oath (v. 12). Not keeping one's oath is a violation of the rules of *fala* and entitles the offended party to break off the contract in progress (COHEN, 2012a, p. 16, 61). So the mother upbraids her

daughter for continuing to love the boy.³⁵ The girl counterattacks by blaming *her* for his failure to appear. The boy was afraid of her (vv. 4, 9, 14). Each speaker in the dialogue enacts a script.

M – G {he swore he loved you, he was here + he didn't come see you → don't love him}

G – M {you beat me, he was afraid + he didn't come → I do love him}

We may ask what *maltrager* means. Does it merely imply that the mother is treating her daughter badly? The verb can have that meaning; but since the girl says this ill treatment was enough to keep the boy away, it seems more likely that it refers to physical punishment. Other such references in the *cantigas d'amigo* support this reading.³⁶ So the girl's defense is an aggressive offense. She accuses her mother of keeping the boy away, since he fears she may suffer physical abuse if he comes to see her.

In Sandeu 5 the girl responds to the mother's reproach by criticizing her and defending the boy. In the next example, the girl assumes responsibility: she forbade him to come.

Garcia Soarez 1
aaBBB (x3): 10
eneron || i

- Filha, do voss' amigo m' é granben,
que vos non viu quando se foi daquen.
— **Eu <mh>o fiz, madre, que lho defendi,
se m' el non viu quando se foi daqui,
eumho fiz, madre, que lho defendi.** 5
- Nunca lhi ben devedes a querer,
por que se foi e vos non quis veer.
— **Eu mho fiz, madre, que lho defendi,
se m' el non viu quando se foi daqui,
eumho fiz, madre, que lho defendi.** 10

³⁵ On the importance of oaths, swearing, and other rules in the *cantigas d'amigo* (see COHEN, 2012a: 17, 25, 61, 63, 81, 84).

³⁶ Airas Carpancho 7, vv. 7-8: “Trage me mal mha madre velida, / <e mui> pouc' á que fui mal ferida” (“My darling mother mistreats me, / and it wasn't long ago I was badly beaten”); Nunes Perez Sandeu 3, vv. 7-8: “Polaco itaque mi destes / foi ferida e maltreita” (“Because of the love-sorrow you caused me, / I was beaten and mistreated”). Compare the parody in Juião Bolseiro 7, v. 1, where the mother addresses her daughter: “Mal me tragedes, ai filha, porque quer' aver amigo” (“You mistreat me, daughter, because I want to have a boyfriend”). In Johan Lopez d' Ulhoa 2, vv. 6-7, *maltreito / de morte* refers to death-pains.

— Gran prazer ei <e>no meu coração,
por que se foi e vos non viu enton.
— **Eu mho fiz, madre, que lho defendi,
se m' el non viu quando se foi daqui,
eumho fiz, madre, que lho defendi.**

15

— Daughter, I'm very happy about your boyfriend
Who didn't see you when he went away from here.
— I did it, mother, because I forbade him to,
If he didn't see me when he went away from here,
I did it, mother, because I forbade him to.

— You shouldn't love him any more,
'Cause he went away and didn't want to see you.
— I did it, mother, because I forbade him to,
If he didn't see me when he went away from here,
I did it, mother, because I forbade him to.

— I feel great pleasure in my heart
'Cause he went away and didn't see you then.
— I did it, mother, because I forbade him to,
If he didn't see me when he went away from here
I did it, mother, because I forbade him to.

The main speech-action performed by the mother occurs in v. 6: “Nunca lhi ben devedes a querer.” Here she expresses directly the move that is implied or indirect (even if emphatic) in the other three texts: “You should not love him.” She is delighted that the boy has not come to see her daughter (vv. 1, 11). We can notate the two halves of the dialogue thus:

M – G {boy left + didn't come to see you → do not love him/I am happy}
G – M {I told him not to come + he didn't come → he loves me, I love him}

The principal move in the girl's half of the dialogue is implied by the logic of her discourse. Since the mother has got it wrong, and it was the girl who forbade the boy from coming, he is not disloyal but rather a faithful and obedient boyfriend. Hence, he loves her, and there is no reason (as her mother claims) for her not to love him.³⁷

In the fourth and final example the situation is more complicated. The girl has done all the boy asked her to do – an expression with clear

³⁷ We do not know why she forbade him to come.

Círculo Fluminense de Estudos Filológicos e Linguísticos

erotic overtones (COHEN, 2012a, p. 33-60, especially 40-42) – and then abandoned her. The mother inveighs against her daughter.³⁸

Johan Airas 21

abbaCC (x3)+ *fíinda* cc: 10

eu ou en ar oner || i

- Ai mha filha, de vós saber quer' eu
por que fezeistes quanto vos mandou
voss' amigo, que vos non ar falou.
— Par Deus, mha madre, direi volo eu:
cuid<ava m>' eu melhor aver per i 5
e semelha mi que non ést' assi.
- Por que fezeistes, se Deus vos dében,
filha, quanto vos el vëo rogar?
cades enton non vos ar quis falar.
— Direi vol<o> eu, se Deus mi dében: 10
cuid<ava m>' eu melhor aver per i
e semelha mi que non ést' assi.
- Por que fezeistes, se Deus vos perdon,
filha, quanto vos el vëo dizer?
cades enton non vos ar quis veer. 15
— Direi vol<o> eu, se Deus mi perdon:
cuid<ava m>' eu melhor aver per i
e semelha mi que non ést' assi.
- <En>bon dia naceu, com' eu oí,
que<n> se doutro castiga e non de si. 20
- Oh my daughter, I'd like to know from you
Why you did all that your friend told you to,
Since he didn't talk to you again?
— By God, mother, I can tell that to you:
I thought that I'd be better off that way,
And now it seems to me that it's not so.
- Why did you do, so may God give you joy,
Daughter, all that he came and asked you to do?
'Cause after that he didn't talk to you.
— I'll tell you, so may God give me joy:
I thought that I'd be better off that way,
And now it seems to me that it's not so.
- Why did you do, so help you God,

³⁸ This is the only dialogue between mother and girl in the 47 *cantigas d'amigo* of Johan Airas de Santiago (there are only two other dialogues in his *Amigo* compositions: 12 (girl/boy) and 37 (girlfriend/girl)).

Círculo Fluminense de Estudos Filológicos e Linguísticos

Daughter, all that he came to tell you to?
'Cause after that he hasn't looked at you.
— I'll tell you that, so help me God:
I thought that I'd be better off that way,
And now it seems to me that it's not so.

— She was born on a lucky day, so I've heard say,
That learns from another's errors, not her own.

The girl accepts her mother's criticism and shows clear if understated remorse for having brought shame upon herself (and also, presumably, on her family). The two sides of the dialogue can be summarized as follows:

M – G {you did all he asked, he hasn't come + you've shamed yourself → end it}
G – M {I thought it would help + it didn't → I'm sorry}

A significant detail of this song by Johan Airas is the parallelism between *veer* and *falar*. Here is the last verse the mother speaks in her half of the dialogue in each strophe.

voss' amigo, que vos non ar *falou* (I.3)
cades enton non vos ar quis *falar* (II.3)
cades enton non vos ar quis *veer* (III.3)

This confirms that *falar* and *veer* can function as equivalent code words for erotic conversation and activities (like *fazer ben*; cf. COHEN, 2011a, p. 120n36; 2012a, p. 10). “He hasn't come to see you again” is tantamount to “He hasn't come to talk with you again.” The mother rebukes her daughter for having yielded to the boy's erotic demands, implying that she must now end the relationship.

On what basis can we claim that these four songs represent the same speech-action and are variations of the same script? It is the mother's move that allows us to posit in the matrix a script where mother tells daughter: “He doesn't want to come to see you,” implying “He doesn't love you and you should not love him.” In all four *cantigas* we find nearly identical phrases: “He didn't come to see you,” “He doesn't want to come,” “He hasn't come to see (talk with) you again,” and so forth. Let us look more closely at all the verses in these texts where we find this phraseology.

Johan Servando 13
e non vos quis o *veer* (I.3)
a quen vos non quer *veer*? (refrain)
pois que vos non quer *veer* (II.3)
por que vos non quis *veer* (III.3)
e non vos quisover (IV.3)

Nuno Perez Sandeu 5
e pero non xe vos vëo veer (refrain)

Garcia Soarez 1
que vos non viu quando se foi daquen (I.2)
por que se foi e vos non quis veer (II.2)
por que se foi e vos non viu enton (III.2)

Johan Airas 21
voss' amigo, que vos non ar falou (I.3)
cades enton non vos ar quis falar (II.3)
cades enton non vos ar quis veer (III.3)

We find a total of twelve variations in four *cantigas*, not counting repetitions in refrains. And two of the poems use a variation in the refrain, giving it added emphasis. The only reasonable explanation for what we find in these examples is that the expressions used ultimately derive from a tradition of oral-formulaic song (COHEN, 2011b, p. 639-41, 648-50). They are manifestations of a morpho-syntactically, lexically and metrically variable formula.³⁹ And this formula in turn presupposes that the matrix includes a script with a configuration of mother-to-daughter and a speech-action we can describe as “Stop loving him.” In this script, as we find it represented in these four songs, the mother criticizes her daughter for her handling of a relationship with her boyfriend and uses phrases such as “He doesn’t want to see (or talk with) you.” What she means is that the girl should recognize she has been betrayed and end the *fala*. The girls’ responses represent distinct moves, but based on our analysis we can posit a script whose essential elements are these:

M – G {he swore he loved you + he didn’t talk with you → end it}

The same logic applies to the phrase “per vós perdi meu amigo” (“Because of you I lost my boyfriend,” *i.e.*, “You stole him”) in a very different script. This formula occurs only once in the *cantigas d’amigo*, in Juião Bolseiro 7 (v. 16), a parody where the mother takes on the girl’s role and addresses her daughter as though *she* were the mother. We find the same formula in the *pastorela* of Pedr’Amigo de Sevilha (SEVILHA, 12, vv. 20-21; see COHEN, 2012c: 2, 5, 9, 13). The phrase, identical in both texts, assumes a script in the matrix where a girl accuses another

³⁹ Evidence for wider dissemination of this formula in the Iberian Peninsula is found in a mainly Romance *kharja* in the Arabic Series (A8): YA NIN QES AD MIB VER (“he didn’t even want to see me anymore” [upper case for Romance; text – without diacritics or editorial symbols – from Corriente 2009; translation mine]).

girl of taking away her boyfriend, even though we haveno “serious” examples in the genre. In both cases, “He doesn’t want to see you” and “You stole my boy,” the formula is not just some kind of evidence for the existence of a script centered on a given move; in each case the formula presupposes a script with that move.

There are many *cantigas d’amigo* where the mother obstructs the relationship between boy and girl (or tries to), whether onstage or off. These differ from our script because the mother does not mention, let alone stress, that the boy failed to come to see the girl. So we may legitimately distinguish this script from those. And the most weighty evidence for the prior history of this script is the use of the formula, repeatedly and with only slight variation, in all four texts, with the boy always the grammatical subject of the verb and the girl the direct object: *non + vos* (+ auxiliary verb) *veer*. Although in one case (JOHAN AIRAS, 21, v. 9) *falar* takes the place of *veer*, the variation is almost entirely syntactic (with *querer* as preferred optional auxiliary verb).

Towards the end of his life, in notes posthumously published as *Über Gewissheit (On Certainty)*, Wittgenstein makes an apparently startling claim (startling for him in the last phase of his intellectual trajectory) for the role of logic in the analysis and interpretation of natural language or everyday speech: “Und zur Logik gehörtalles, was ein Sprachspiel beschreibt” (“And everything that describes a language-game belongs to Logic;” Wittgenstein 1979, p. 9 [§16]). By *Logik* he must mean here the philosophy of language. Earlier he had tried to understand the concepts *word* and *sentence*, and these, *Wort* and *Satz* (sentence, phrase, proposition), figure prominently in his reflections down to the 1930s. During that decade he sees that it is the utterance that must be examined and understood (cf. BAKHTIN, 1986). And since the utterance belongs to action and to life, Wittgenstein comes up with the concept *Sprachspiel*, where no clear boundary can be drawn (he will draw none) between the total context and the meaning, use or function of an utterance. In the *Philosophische Grammatik* he writes: “You might as it were locate (look up) all of the connections in the grammar of the language. There you can see the whole network to which the language belongs” (Wittgenstein 1992, p. 149 [§102}). So when he uses expressions like “grammar,” “philosophical grammar,” and “logic” of the *Sprachspiel*, Wittgenstein means the study of the utterance in its full context (cf. AUSTIN, 1986: 148), beyond the reach of formal logic, but without leaving logic behind. The investigation now centers on the use of language, with po-

tentially limitless dimensions. Each *Sprachspiel* is part of a *Lebensform* (“form of life”) without which it would make no sense, since a *Sprachspiel* assumes meaning only against the background of life and action (cf. ARISTOLE, *Poetics* 1447a, p. 27-8).

The move examined here is a recurrent kind of utterance in the social world represented. To identify this as the action in a script belonging to the matrix of the genre is a step in the construction of a pragmatic grammar for the *cantigas d’amigo*. We might also, following Wittgenstein, call it a *philosophical grammar*. This grammar aims to insure that in this area of philology the logic of praxis occupies center stage.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

AUSTIN, J. L. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail Mikhailovich. The Problem of Speech Genres. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Trans. By Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. p. 60-102

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

COHEN, Rip. Speech-Acts and *Sprachspiele*: Making Peace in Plautus. *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (= *Mnemosyne*, supplement 130). Ed. Irene J. F. de Jong and J. P. Sullivan. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994. p. 171-205

_____. Dança Jurídica. *Revista Colóquio-Letras*, n. 142, p. 5-50, 1996.

_____. *500 Cantigas d’ Amigo: Edição Crítica/Critical Edition*. Porto: Campo das Letras, 2003. Disponível em: <http://jhir.library.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/33843>

_____. In the Beginning was the Strophe: Origins of the *Cantiga d’ Amigo* Revealed! *Modelo: Actas do X Colóquio da Secção Portuguesa da Associação Hispânica de Literatura Medieval*. Ed. Ana Sofia Laranjinha and José Carlos Miranda. Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, 2005. p. 243-55

Círculo Fluminense de Estudos Filológicos e Linguísticos

_____. The Galician-Portuguese Lyric. The secular genres. *Companion to Portuguese Literature*. Ed. Stephen Parkinson, Cláudia Pazos Alonso and T. F. Earle. Warminster: Tamesis, 2009a. p. 25-40

_____. Technical Virtuosity in the *Cantigas d' Amigo*. *Floema: Caderno de Teoria e História Literária*, n. 5, p. 125-44, 2009b.

_____. The *Cantigas d'Amigo*: An English Translation. Baltimore: JScholarship, The Johns Hopkins University, 2010a.

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

_____. Cantar Igual: External Responson and Textual Criticism in the Galician-Portuguese Lyric. *La corónica. A Journal of Medieval Hispanic Languages, Literatures and Cultures*, n. 38.2, p. 5-25, 2010c.

_____. Colometry and Internal Rhyme in *Vidal, Judeu d'Elvas*. *Ars Metrica*, n. 12. Web, 2010d.

_____. An Etymological Wordlist for the *Cantigas d' Amigo*. Baltimore: JScholarship, The Johns Hopkins University, Web, 2010e.

_____. The Poetics of Peace: Erotic Reconciliation in the *Cantigas d'Amigo*. *La corónica. A Journal of Medieval Hispanic Languages, Literatures and Cultures*, n. 39.2, p. 95-143, 2011a.

_____. From Folksong to Lyric Theater: The Evolution of the *Cantigas d'Amigo*. *Por s'Entender Bem a Letra. Homenagem a Stephen Reckert*. Org. Manuel Calderón, José Camões and José Pedro Sousa. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda. 637-63, 2011b.

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

_____. Angelo Colocci's Crosses and a Text of Airas Carpancho. *Variants. Journal of The European Society for Textual Scholarship*, n. 8, p. 171-81, 2012b.

_____. *The Other Girl Onstage: The Pragmatics of Airas Carpancho 1*. Baltimore: JScholarship, The Johns Hopkins University. Web, 2012c.

Círculo Fluminense de Estudos Filológicos e Linguísticos

_____. *Internal Rhyme and the History of Strophic Song*. Washington DC: Virtual Center for the Study of Galician-Portuguese Lyric. Web, 2014.

CORRIENTE, Federico. The Kharjas: An Updated Survey of Theories, Texts and their Interpretation. *Romance Philology*, n. 63.1. p. 109-29, 2009.

GUMPERZ, John J. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

LANG, Henry R. *Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis Von Portugal*, zum ersten mal vollständigherausgegeben und mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Glossarversehen. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1894.

OLIVEIRA, António Resende de. *Depois do Espectáculo Trovadoresco: a estrutura dos cancioneiros peninsulares e as recolhas dos séculos XIII e XIV*. Lisbon: Colibri, 1994.

SODRÉ, Paulo Roberto. *Cantigas de Madre Galego-Portuguesas: Estudo de Xéneros das Cantigas Líricas*. Trad. de. António Augusto Domínguez Carregal e Marta López Macias. Santiago de Compostela: Centro Ramón Piñeiro, 2008.

WITTGENSTEIN, Ludwig. *On Certainty*. Ed. G. E. M. Anscombe and G. H. von Wright. Trans. By Denis Paul and G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.

_____. *Philosophical Grammar*. Ed. Rush Rhees, Trans. By Anthony Kennedy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992.

_____. *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. by G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.