Aristotle is right (Poetica 1447a-1448a, 1450a, etc.). Tavani is wrong (2002: 190-231). Not campi semici and stasis, but praxis, action, is the object of poetic mimesis. The actions, or speech-actions (Bing and Cohen 1991: 19-21; Cohen 2011a: 98-102) represented in the cantigas d’ amigo may be less grandiose than those of ancient Greek Tragedy—the tragic muse is hefty; that of love poetry, slender—but the actions in the cantigas are no less worthy of study than those of Agamemnon and Klytemnestra.¹

What kinds of action are represented in cantigas d’ amigo? The speech-actions, or moves (Cohen 1994), of nubile girls, their girlfriends, mothers and boyfriends. All told, there are a few dozen kinds of pragmatic scripts (Cohen and Parkinson 2009: 25-27), depending on where we draw the lines between them.² Sometimes the boundaries are difficult to draw (Wittgenstein 1992: 31-34 [§65-71], 35-36 [§75-77], 41-42 [§88]; 1993: 116-21 [§73-76]). Other times it makes no sense to draw a conceptual boundary when the facts keep dragging us back and forth across it.

Speech-actions can only be understood in context, in relation to background, present situation, and to the speaker and the addressee. The personae in this genre are always drawn from the set of four mentioned above: girl, mother, girl’s girlfriend and boy. There is however another persona, and she merits attention: an other girl, often called outra—a rival for the boy’s affections (Cohen 2012: 67-83; cf. Cohen and

¹ Numbering and (unless otherwise indicated) texts of the cantigas d’ amigo are from Cohen 2003, but punctuation has been altered and tils added where we expect them as a matter of historical phonology and regularly find them in thirteenth century manuscripts of Galician-Portuguese lyric. Translations of the cantigas d’ amigo are from Cohen 2010a, with some slight changes; others were prepared ad hoc. References to Lapa 1970 are to his numbering of the cantigas. For information on the poets see António Resende de Oliveira 1994: 303-440. This essay elaborates on problems in Carpancho 1 raised in Cohen, forthcoming.

² This concept draws on both the speech acts of Austin (1986) and the Sprachspiele or language-games of Wittgenstein (1993: 112-23 [§69-78]; 1992: 11-13 [§23-27], 29-51 [§60-133]).
Corriente 2002: 22-25). But although often mentioned, she does not appear “onstage” as speaker or addressee.

Or does she? In a *cantiga* of João Bolseiro (7) the mother accuses her daughter of having taken away her boyfriend: *Per vós perdi meu amigo* (“Because of you I’ve lost my boyfriend”; v. 16); *pois que mho vós tolhestes* (“since you’ve stolen him from me”; v. 17). The poet inverts the roles of mother and daughter (“you won’t let me see my boyfriend” is what a girl often says to her mother) and at the same time parodies the speech of a girl to an other girl. The mother even claims to be prettier than her daughter (*melhor ca vós paresco*; v. 17), parodying an element that must have belonged to the kind of move a girl would perform when addressing an other girl. Witness the girl in Avoin 5 (vv. 3, 8) who—speaking to the boy—twice boasts (implicitly) that she surpasses her rival in beauty (Cohen 2012: 72-74). Precisely because Bolseiro 7 is a parody, it offers crucial evidence. A parody presupposes a model. There can be no *parodiant* without a *parodié*. And this parody presupposes two models: one where a girl complains to her mother that she won’t let her see her boyfriend; and another where a girl upbraids another girl for stealing her boy.

My main objective here is to show that the other girl is indeed addressed, but in the guise of the girl’s girlfriend, in Airas Carpancho 1, a text that turns out to be more complex than it appears.

Chegades vós, ai amiga, du é meu amigo
e con el falastes, mais eu ben vos digo
que falarei vosco tod’ aqueste dia,
pois falastes con quen eu falar queria.

Du é meu amigo ben sei que chegades
e con el falastes, mais per mi creades
que falarei vosco tod’ aqueste dia,
pois falastes con quen eu falar queria.

Gran ben m’ é convosco, muit’ ei que vos diga,
pois con el falastes, creades, amiga,
que falarei vosco tod’ aqueste dia,
pois falastes con quen eu falar queria.
Oh my friend, you’ve come from where my boyfriend is
And you talked with him, but I’m telling you
I’ll talk with you all day long today
Since you talked with the boy I wanted to talk with.

I know it’s from where my boy is that you’ve come
And you talked with him, but you can believe me
I’ll talk with you all day long today
Since you talked with the boy I wanted to talk with.

I’m so happy for you, there’s a lot to say about that,
Since you talked with him, you can believe it, my friend
I’ll talk with you all day long today
Since you talked with the boy I wanted to talk with.

A sweet greeting, one would think, and Vicenzo Minervini (1974: 15), in his monographic edition of Airas Carpancho, assures us that it is. On this reading, the girl is eager to spend the whole day talking with her girlfriend because the latter has talked with the girl’s boyfriend and has news of interest to the girl. Minervini writes:

L’amico lontano si è incontrato con un’amica della dona amata. Costei, invece di mostrarsi gelosa della buona ventura toccata all’altra, la invita a un lungo colloquio che le faccia sembrare presente l’innamorato.

To back this up, he invokes “the theme of the colloquium with an intermediary who brings news of the beloved” and cites as a “declaration of principle” of this theme these verses from a cantiga d’ amor by Johan Lopez d’ Ulhoa (A 201 / B 352 [Michaëlis 1904, no. 201], vv. 13-15):

Ca muito per á gran sabor
quen senhor ama, de falar
en ela, se acha con quen.

Because whoever loves a lady
Has great pleasure talking of her
If he finds someone to talk with.

That seems fair enough. In the *cantigas d’ amigo* a girl can ask her girlfriend to tell her news of the beloved, to get some news, or to transmit a message (to come back, to leave her alone, and so on). But there are several odd elements in this text of Carpancho which together add up to an enigma and make Minervini’s interpretation difficult to accept.

The key to a different reading is hidden in the verb *falar*. In this genre *falar* nearly always has a special meaning, which we can gloss as “to have an amorous conversation” [with someone]. This “talking,” which could include sexual activities, is the foundation of the social grammar of the *cantigas d’ amigo* and regularly refers to negotiations for a nuptial (or prenuptial) contract (Cohen 1996: 6-7; 2011a: 102-103; 2012: 10, 19-20). The verb can perform different moves, depending on how (syntactically) and in what situation it is used. For instance, *falade migo* (“Talk with me”), said by girl to boy, is an erotic invitation (Avoin 11, vv. 6, 12, 18; Armea 4, v. 8). When the boy appears to the girl in a dream, the phrase she hears—and evidently wants to hear—is *falade mig’, ai meu lume’ e meu ben* (“Talk with me, O my light and my joy;” Johan Meendez de Briteiros 2, refrain). But if the girl should tell her boyfriend *nunca mi faledes* (“Never talk with me again;” see Pedr’Amigo de Sevilha 1, v. 10; cf. v. 4), she would mean “It’s over”: the relationship has ended.

But the verb cannot be erotic when in Carpancho 1 (vv. 3, 7, 11) the girl says to her girlfriend *falarei vosco* (“I will talk with you”). And no girl ever tells her girlfriend: *falade migo.* And our text is the only place in the corpus of *Amigo* where a girl says *falarei vosco*—or something similar—to her girlfriend. It is to the boy that the girl normally says this (Pero da Ponte 5, v. 16; Roi Martínez d’ Ulveira 1, vv. 8, 15; Johan Airas de Santiago 3, v. 8). 4

---

3 The girl says *falade-o comigo* to the girlfriend, with an internal accusative, meaning “Tell me about it” in Estevan Travanca 1 (v. 16; cf. v. 10 *dizede mho* “Tell it to me” Compare se o vos ... *falardes migo* (“If you talk it over with me”) in Matin Padrozelos 4, v. 4 (girl to mother) and *o falo* (“I say it”) in Martin de Ginzo 1, v. 11 (girl to mother).

4 In Pedr’ Amigo de Sevilha 4 (refrain) a girlfriend tells the girl she is tired of being obliged to praise the latter’s boyfriend, and would rather talk about her own: *e queredes falar migo? / falemos no meu amigo!* (“And you want to talk with me? / Let’s talk about my boy!”). This parodies formulas such as that in Pero García de Burgalés 2, refrain: *e queredes falar migo? / e non querrei eu, amigo* (“And you want to talk with me? / Well I don’t want to, friend”). This formula is parodied by Alfonso X in B 474 (Lapa 4).
So, although the verb regularly bears erotic overtones, the girl cannot be saying that she will have an erotic conversation with her girlfriend. And, in principle, *falastes* (vv. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12) should not mean “You had an amorous conversation,” since that would imply a double betrayal—by both her boy and her girlfriend. Still, since *con quen eu falar queria* (“with the one I wanted to talk with;” vv. 4, 8, 12) means that the girl wishes she could have had an erotic “talk” with her boy, how can *falastes*, in the same verses, *not* insinuate that the girlfriend has had just such a talk?

The strongest argument, were it true, would be that this meaning is excluded on pragmatic grounds, since the other girl never appears onstage. We have seen, however, that such a situation is not without parallel. In Juião Bolseiro 7, in addition to parodying a girl’s complaint to a mother for blocking her relationship with her boy, the mother puts her daughter in the role of the other girl and addresses her as a rival who has taken her boyfriend: *Per vós perdi meu amigo, por que gran coita padesco, / e, pois que mho vós tolhestes* (“Because of you I’ve lost my boyfriend, and I’m suffering terribly, and since you took him away from me...”; vv. 16-17).

So we have pragmatic problems in Carpancho 1. And the triple use of *falar* in the refrain, unique in the corpus of *Amigo*, draws attention to the word and its connotations. Can two of those three uses be exceptions to what we know about *falar* in this genre? If this were so, it would be puzzling.

Minervini (1974: 15) sweeps aside the possibility that the girl might be jealous, even though she knows the other girl has taken her place in a *fala* with the boy (“colei che in efetti l’ha sostituita nello sperato incontro con l’amico.” But at least he sees that the situation could be awkward. And if a modern scholar understands that jealousy would be appropriate, why credit the girl with less sensibility to her situation?

Even in a poetics where repetition with variation is the fundamental rhetorical technique, the stress placed on *falastes* is striking. Counting repetitions in the refrain, there are twelve forms of *falar* in twelve verses. And the form *falastes* occurs once in

---

5 We find related scripts in Pedr’ Amigo de Sevilha 8: F–G {another wants to steal your boy}; Johan Airas 43: G–F {another stole my boy}; Dinis 12 F–G {another wants to steal your boy}; and Dinis 42: F–G {another stole your boy}. Here G=girl; M=mother; F=girlfriend; B=boy. The symbols { } enclose the main speech-action (or move) represented in the text (see Cohen and Parkinson 2009: 37-39).

6 The verb appears twice in the refrains of Johan Perez d’ Avoin 11: *cada que migo quiserdes falar / falade mig’, e pes a quen pesar* (“Whenever you want to talk with me, / talk with me, no matter who it upsets”) and Pedr’Amigo de Sevilha 4 (see previous note).
the body of each strophe and in the refrain, a total of six times. As a rule, when a girlfriend reports to the girl news of the boy, she is at pains to preempt suspicion of impropriety. She never says *falei con voss’ amigo* (“I talked with your boy”) although in Dinis 23 (vv. 3, 10, 16) she says *disse-mh assi* (“He told me this”) and then delivers the boy’s plea that the girl have mercy on him. In another poem by Dinis (6), the girlfriend has spoken with an intermediary, *aquel que falou migo* (“the one who spoke with me;” v. 3), positioning herself at one remove from the boy. In a *cantiga* of Fernand’ Esquio (2, vv. 2-3) the girlfriend describes her encounter with the girl’s boy, saying *mui pouc’ o parey / e preguntei o* (“I stopped him briefly and asked him”), implying, “Listen, I just chatted with him for a moment. Don’t worry!” In one text a girlfriend does tell the girl that “your boyfriend talked with me about you today” (*ojé falou comig’ o voss’ amigo*; Johan Baveca 5, v. 1), but the grammatical subject of *falou* is the boy, and the girlfriend says he was talking about the girl: *u m’ estava en vós falando* (“When he was talking to me about you”), anticipating any doubts about her loyalty.\(^7\)

No girl says to her girlfriend *falade con meu amigo* (“Talk with my boy”), whereas *dizede-lhi* (“Tell him”) occurs in four texts (Pero Viviaez 2, vv. 7, 13; Pedr’Amigo de Sevilha 6, v. 13; Johan Airas 16, vv. 4, 10, 16; Dinis 45, vv. 3, 9, 15). Exclusivity is a basic rule of *fala* (Cohen 2012: 61, 84). No girl wants to hear that her boy has talked with another girl. In Afonso Mendiz de Briteiros 1 (vv. 13-15) the girl, who was an eye witness to the event, concludes that she has lost him—or that he has lost her: *e quando vos eu vi falar / con outra, log’ i ben vi eu / ca seu erades, ca non meu* (“And when I saw you talking with another girl, / I saw then and there that you were hers, not mine;” Cohen 2012: 69-70). The girl in Juião Bolseiro 10 also witnesses the betrayal and says no girl who has not seen *that* can know what real suffering is (vv. 1-5; Cohen 2012: 68). And in Johan Garcia de Guilhade (22, v. 10) the fact that the boy talks with another girl is one reason among several to reject his plea for reconciliation: *con outra fala en Guilhade* (“He speaks with another girl in Guilhade”).\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) In Pero d’ Ornelas 1, vv. 1-2, *avedes ... guisado / de falar vosc’ oj’ o meu amigo* (“You have...arranged / that my boyfriend talk with you”), the girl knows her girlfriend has been asked to help make peace.

\(^8\) Cf. Juião Bolseiro 10. In Pedr’Amigo de Sevilha 8 (vv. 1-2) the girlfriend has seen the boy talk with another: *amiga, voss’ amigo vi falar / oje con outra* (“Friend, I saw your boyfriend talking / today with another girl”). But the girl says she doesn’t care: *mando me lh’ eu falar con quantas vir* (“I order him to talk with all the girls he sees”; v. 22). By scoffing at the rule she shows she is familiar with it.
If outra were to appear onstage and speak to the girl, she could say, “I spoke with your boyfriend.” But from all the poems in this genre we would infer that *falei con voss’ amigo* is blocked by a pragmatic constraint (see Cohen 2010a). Neither the situation nor the speech-action should occur, and in referring to any conversation between her and the boy, the girlfriend avoids this formulation. Carpancho 1 is not an exception to that rule, since the girlfriend does not say, “I talked with your friend.” But the text presupposes she has said this or has let it be known that she talked with him.

There are reasons, then, to take *con el falastes* as an accusation, not merely as an affirmation. On this reading, the girl is not happy or eager to talk with her girlfriend, who has talked with the girl’s boy. She is angry. Her anger, though masked by the ambiguity of her greeting, can be detected by philological analysis. The thrust of her welcome might be paraphrased in a colloquial register: “So you talked with my boy, did you? Well I’ve got something to say to you!”

Are there other signs in the text that signal her displeasure? The first candidate is the meter of the opening verse, which scans two syllables longer than all the others. This is an extremely rare phenomenon (Cohen 2003: 45) and therefore emphatic; but that emphasis can be taken as expressing either enthusiasm or anger. Some support may be provided by the exclamation *ai*, which does not normally show pleasure, but “dezprezo” or “ironia” (Lapa 1970, s.v. *ai*).

And what do we make of *mais* in the second verse of strophes I and II? Normally *mais* is adversative, but what could the contrast be here? “You’ve come from talking with my boy, but let me tell you, I’ll talk with you all day.” Why “but”?

Consider too the common phrases *eu ben vos digo* (“I’m telling you”; v. 2) and *per min creades* (“You’d better believe...”; v. 6). If, as I am arguing, the girl is not glad, not eager to hear about the “talk” between her girlfriend and her boy, these phrases could sound menacing. And if they are, then *falarei vosco* would veil a threat (as if to say “I wanna have a little talk with you!”).

An apparently positive expression is *ben m’ é con vosco* (“I’m so happy for you”; v. 9). But this can be read as ironic, rather like “Well that’s swell!” A similar phrase is used with overt sarcasm in an insulting rebuke of the boy’s infidelity in Johan Perez d’

---

9 Cohen (2003: 141) encloses *vós, ai* in square brackets, indicating that they should perhaps be excised, but that a reasonable doubt persists (40). These words should be kept for the reasons expounded here.
Avoin 7: *e ben vos é se vos a ben sair* (“And that’s good for you, if it turns out well;” v. 9).

And why does the girl, in saying *muit’ ei que vos diga* (“I’ve got a lot to say to you”) and *falarei vosco*, portray herself in an active role in the upcoming conversation, instead of seeing herself listening passively, drinking in news of her boy from the lips of her girlfriend? The reason, I am led to conclude, is that she suspects those lips have been where hers would like to be: *falastes con quen eu falar queria*.

If this is so, Carpancho 1 represents a unique violation of a constraint regarding combinations of speaker and addressee, namely that the girl never speaks to an outra. But the evidence and arguments adduced here lead me to infer that the girlfriend has become an other girl. In welcoming her, the girl greets a rival, and it is through this paradox that an other girl appears onstage.

What do we know about the other girl? She is mentioned in 40 texts in this genre (Cohen 2012: 85-86). Sometimes the girl rejects the boy because of her, sometimes her existence provokes a jealous outburst or insult; other times, tears, scorn or indifference (Cohen 2012: 67-83). But, except for this text and the parody in Juião Bolseiro 7, we have no examples of a face to face confrontation between girl and rival in the *cantigas d’ amigo*. Philological rules of evidence therefore allow us to look to other genres for further support.

A direct encounter between female rivals takes place in a *cantiga de Santa Maria* (CSM 68) under the rubric: *Como Santa Maria avêo as duas conboças que se querian mal* ("How Santa Maria reconciled the two rivals that hated each other"). There the other woman apologizes to the wife with whose husband she has been having an affair. They run into each other in the street (vv. 39-46):

```
Tan tost’ aquela se espertou
e foi-ss’; e na rua topou
con a outra, que sse deitou
ant’ ela e disse: «Malvaz
```

[refrain]

---

10 For *conboça*, so far without any convincing etymology, I propose *CONVÖLÜPTIA*. I hope to explain this etymon and its various reflexes in a future article.
Demo foi, chus negro ca pez,
que m’ este torto fazer fez
contra vós; mas já outra vez
nono farei, pois vos depraz.

As soon as she woke up
And went out in the road she found
The other, who threw herself down
In front of her and said, “It was

The wicked devil, blacker than pitch,
That made me do this wrong
Against you; but never again
Will I do it, since it brings you pain.”

This reconciliation is due to the miraculous intervention of the Santa Maria, and even her powers cannot get the wife (equivalent to the girl in Amigo) to speak to the other.

It is in the pastorela of Pedr’Amigo de Sevilha (12) that a wronged girl is given a voice (though an imaginary one) and speaks (in an imagined scene) to a rival. The narrator recalls an encounter with a pastor (“girl,” not necessarily “shepherdess”), whom he tries to seduce, offering gifts. She is an other girl. At first she says “No” to the man’s come-on, aware that he already has a girlfriend and that the gifts on offer were meant for her. Then, in cited discourse within cited discourse, the pastor imagines what she fears the girl might say to her if they met: per vós perdi, / meu amig’ e dōas que me tragia (“Because of you I lost my boyfriend, and the gifts that he was bringing to me;” vv. 20-21). Since the same phrase, per vós perdi meu amigo, appears in Juião Bolseiro 7 (v. 16; see above), we may infer that this is a formula drawn from a speech-action where one girl accuses another of stealing her beloved. In Bolseiro 7, where the mother addresses her daughter, the formula is parodied; in the pastorela of Sevilha it is employed (although in an imagined scene) in what must have been its usual context.

Rivalry between male friends comes up in a cantiga d’amor by Pero Garcia Burgalês (A 84 / B 188 bis). The speaker foresees that any friend he sends to deliver a
message to his girl would take one look at her, forget about him, and try to win her for himself.

ca non sei eu quen tal poder ouvesse
pois mha senhor visse, que lhe soubesse
dizer qual coita, pois la vi, mi-á dada;
ca pois que viss’ o seu bon parecer
aver-lh’ ia log’ eu d’ escaecer
20
e dizer x’ ante por si, se possesse.

‘Cause I don’t know anyone who could
See my lady and then be able
To tell her the sorrow I’ve felt since I saw her;
‘Cause once he saw her good looks
I would simply drop out of his thoughts
And he would speak for himself—if he could!

This can be read as hyperbolic praise of the beloved. But suppose we take it seriously. What would this hypothetical friend say when he came back, assuming he succeeded in his intentions? Can we imagine, in the context of Galician-Portuguese lyric, a situation where one man tells another, “I made love with your woman”?

Two poets have done the work for us. In a cantiga of Sevilha (B 1662 / V 1196; Lapa 256) the speaker tells his friend, Pero d’ Ambroa, that he has been with Pero’s senhor (“lady”). The text begins: *Pero d’ Ambroa, tal senhor avedes / que non sei quen se dela non pagasse* (“Pero, you have such a lady, / that I don’t know anybody who wouldn’t enjoy her”). The speaker says she implored him to spend the night with her (*jazede logo aquesta noite migo*; v. 17)—and for Pero’s sake. Pero, she says, would regard such service as proof of the speaker’s loyalty. Similar is *a cantiga de maldizer* by Martin Soares (B 1368 / V 976; Lapa 298, slightly modified):

*Pero Rodriguiz, da vossa molher
Non creades mal que vos ome diga,
Ca entend’ eu dela que ben vos quer
E quen end’ al disser, dirá nemiga;
E direi-vos en que lho entendi:*
En outro dia, quando a fodi,
Mostrou-xi-mi muito por voss’ amiga.

Pois vos Deus deu bôa molher leal,
Non temhades, per nulha jograria,
De vos nulh’ ome dela dizer mal,
Ca lh’ oí eu jurar en outro dia
Ca vos queria melhor doutra ren;
E, por veerdes ca vos quer gran ben,
Non sacou ende mi, que a fodia.

Pero Rodriguiz, don’t believe
Anything bad they tell you of your woman,
Because I know she really loves you,
And whoever says otherwise says nothing,
And I’ll tell you how I understood:
The other day, when I fucked her,
She really showed she was your girl.

Since God gave you such a good loyal woman,
Don’t be afraid if the guys start to joke,
If anybody speaks ill of her,
‘Cause I heard her swear the other day
That she loves you more than anyone in the world,
And just so you see how much she loves you,
She made no exception for me, though I was fucking her!

In both these poems a man speaks to his friend regarding the latter’s girlfriend (or wife, or lover). In Carpancho 1 a girl speaks to her girlfriend about the former’s boyfriend. In the two cantigas de escarnho (or maldizer) the speaker reveals—or jokingly affirms—that he has had sexual relations with the addressee’s woman. In Carpancho 1 the girlfriend is, on my reading, accused by the girl of having “talked with” the speaker’s boy. In the song of Martin Soarez, the phrase Mostrou-xi-mi muito por voss’ amiga (v. 7) pointedly means the opposite of what it says, coming after en outro dia, quando a fodi (v. 6), and the paradox recurs throughout the second strophe. The girl in Carpancho 1 deploys a comparable degree of irony. Obscenity is excluded from
the linguistic register of the genre, but if there is any equivalent in the *cantigas d’amigo* for *fodi vossa molher* (“I fucked your woman”), it would be *falei con voss’ amigo* (“I talked with your boy”).

The rhetoric, the pointed polyvalence in forms of *falar*, the parallel and related situations and kinds of speech-action in this and other genres, and the widespread use of an other girl compel the conclusion that Carpancho 1 constitutes an exception to a general rule in the social grammar of the *cantigas d’amigo*. “Our rules leave backdoors open, and the praxis must speak for itself” (Wittgenstein 1989, §139). If the girlfriend has turned into an *outra*, we have a speech of greeting turned upside down and used for other ends (Cohen, forthcoming). As she welcomes her girlfriend, the girl accuses her of betrayal and threatens her: *falarei vosco tod’ aqueste dia / pois falastes con quen eu falar queria.*

It is difficult to say what kind of *stasis* Tavani and his *epigonoi* would detect in this song. Austin might say: the kinds of illocutionary force in the refrain are accusation (“I hereby accuse...”) and threat (“I hereby threaten...”). The problem with this is that illocutionary force, in logical terms, has no propositional content (this is a major flaw in Austin’s theory); so we wind up with “I accuse...” without “...you of stealing my boy,” and “I threaten...” without “...to take revenge against you.” To understand kinds of erotic action, identifying illocutionary force (assuming we accept that part of the theory) is not enough; we also need propositional content (Cohen 2011a: 100). And these two kinds of illocutionary force, even if we add propositional content, are here subordinated to an overall kind of move: an inverted greeting to a person who has arrived, which in turn functions as an accusation and a threat.

Wittgenstein might put it like this: the *Sprachspiel* played here can only be understood once we are thoroughly familiar with the *philosophic grammar* of language in the society where this speech-action takes place, as well as the specific situation and the relationship between speaker and addressee. The *Sprachspiel* is one that a girl performs when she greets a girlfriend who she thinks has betrayed her.

To interpret the *cantigas d’amigo* we must find the speech-action, the move in the script. And though the *cantigas* are not Attic tragedy, there are similarities. In the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, when Klytemnestra greets Agamemnon on his return from Troy (talk about being late), she welcomes him home to his palace with an elaborate
and ambiguous greeting. But though she welcomes him sweetly, the bath is ready, and so is the axe. Things do not look that dark for the girlfriend in Carpancho 1, but the girl’s greeting is not in the end sweet at all.

The meaning of this text seemed straightforward to generations of scholars. But an analysis of the song in relation to the pragmatics and rhetoric of the genre leads to a very different interpretation. And this reading reinforces a wider view: there is far more irony and (sometimes dark) humor in the cantigas d’ amigo than has hitherto been detected (see Cohen 1996: 23-27; 1996: 23-27; 2011a: 105-106). Nearly from the beginning of its known history (Cohen 2011b), many songs in this genre parody the social and poetic matrix in which it was rooted (Cohen and Parkinson 2009: 26-27, 37-40). That may help to explain why we find the formula per vós perdi meu amigo in a parody by Bolseiro and in an imagined scene in the pastorela of Sevilha, but never in a “serious” cantiga d’ amigo. On my reading of Carpancho 1, that is just what the girl, in effect, is telling her girlfriend. Here “Welcome!” hides and reveals “You stole my boy.” Both these moves are found in the grammar of Amigo scripts as we know them—if we include, as we must, the parody in Bolseiro 7. What is unique is that only here does the girl address the other onstage in a text that is not a parody. And if, as seems evident, per vós perdi meu amigo is a formula that belongs to the poetic matrix, then both the configuration of speaker and addressee (the girl speaks to the other girl) and the main speech-action (“You stole my boy”) that this formula presupposes must also be part of that matrix.
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