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トゥルバドゥール詩人ジョフレ・ルデル作「過ぎ去りし日々の5月に」は、当時の詩人たちによって最も頻繁に取り上げられた「遥かなる愛」をテーマにした作品である。伝説によると、ルデルは小アジアの十字軍国家のトリポリに住むオデルナ伯爵夫人の美しさを、聖地から帰還する途中の巡礼たちから伝え聴いた。巡礼たちの話に霊感を得たルデルは聖地巡礼を思い立つ。巡礼の途中に、ルデルは病に倒れたが、遠くからルデルに会いに来たオデルナ夫人の腕なかで亡くなった。この詩のなかで、ルデルは想い描いていた愛と実際の愛とを対照的に描いている。本論文は、この詩のなかで表されている精神的な愛と実際の愛という二つの愛の側面を追求し、ルデルが作品全体をつうじていくに愛のテーマを表現しているかを探るものである。
Motif of a Troubadour’s Poem

David Aline

Human kind, with its rational mind and physical body, has always searched for its proper position on earth between the concrete and the abstract, the physical and the mental. This theme has been profusely employed in numerous works of literature from *The Odyssey* to *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, and right up to modern literature such as *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*.

Plato dealt with this theme in his dialogues, attempting to discover the way that human kind should live with the division, and at the same time oneness, of the corporeal and ethereal world of human existence. In his dialogue *The Symposium*, Plato expressed the idea, through his persona Socrates, that love should be the love of the form of beauty in the mind rather than the love of physical beauty. But a human’s rational mind is, and is encompassed by, the physical, which restrains and precludes one’s attainment of the abstract forms of true reality.

The quest to achieve the unattainable abstract form of love and, simultaneously, to possess the physical manifestation of love, has confounded humankind for millennia. The theme of the unattainability of both the physical and the ethereal forms of love is employed for considerable effect by the twelfth-century troubadour Jaufre Rudel, the Prince of Blaye. In his classic love poem written in Old Occitan (Provençal),
During May, when the days are long, Rudel expresses the irreconcilability of the abstract view of the form of love with the physical embodiment of that love. By being denied the physical love of his amore de lonh (love far away) the poet is positioned to better understand the ethereal form of love, that which is always “far away.” The phrase de lonh “far away” is employed extensively throughout the poem to express that the corporeal woman whom he loves is separated from him by physical distance, que tan son nostras terras lonh./Assatz hi a pas e camis (so far away our countries are./So many are the crossings and the roads). Furthermore, “far away” is also descriptive of the abstract form of love, which the poet is not able to attain either because of his physical being.

In the first section of this poem, Rudel articulates the incompatibility of the physical and the abstract, for he regards with wonder the sweet song of distant birds, M’es belhs dous chans d’auzelhs de lonh, (the song of the birds from far away), whose song is redolent of a corporeal beauty, but upon parting from their song, E quan mi suy partitz de lay (and when I have gone away from there), he is reminded of his love far away Remembra’m d’un’ amour de lonh. (I remember a love far away), which is the remembrance of the abstract form of beauty innate to his precorporeal soul. However, the abstract idea of his longed-for love is not enough to deliver release for our troubadour from his physical world. Even with the idea of his love to raise him up from the mundane, he is still ruled by the material existence through which he must proceed as he goes forth bowed down to the very earth upon which he walks, Vau de talen embroncx e clis (I go scowling, with my head down), with nothing even to differentiate the seasons or the beauty on earth from the harshest elements, Si que chans ni flors d’albespis/No-m valon plus que l’yverns gelatz. (so much that songs and hawthorn
flowers/aren't better, to me, than the frozen Winter.

Still in pursuit of his theme, in the following stanza of this poem the troubadour remains constant to the geminate meaning of the now famous literary phrase *amor de lonh* (love far away) for he waxes supplicatory in the opening lines of this stanza, *Be tenc lo SENhor per veray/Per que formet sest' amor de lonh,* (I trust the Lord's fairness / in having formed this faraway love,), trusting in an ethereal power in the creation of a duality that equally bestows and denies. This divine division is bailed by Rudel in the continuation of these lines as he observes that the very gift of the love causes a doubling of his pain as it is always in a form dissoned, each happiness being manifested in a bifurcation of the unrealizable, each new joy begetting twin evils because of the irreconcilability of the two, *Mas per un ben que m'en eschay/N'ai dos mals, quar tant suy de lonh.* (but for each consolation I achieve / I get two ills, because I am so far away.). The journey proceeds as Rudel questions his hesitation in not attempting to approach the abstract, and answers his own question with the conclusion that he would still be imprisoned in the mundane drab of his existence, and that this concrete existence would be made all the more evident through its being beheld and reflected in the eyes of the one he loves, *A! quar no fuy lai pelegris,/Si que mos fustz e mos tapis/Fos pels sieus belhs huelhs remiratz!* (Ah! Why didn’t I go there as a pilgrim,/so that my staff and hooded cloak/ would be beheld by her beautiful eyes!).

The third section of the poem introduces the possibility of being physically close to his love, of actually lodging near her, and having the opportunity of conversing face to face. While these lines bring the poet's thoughts down to earth, so to speak, as he builds an image of life as connected to the earth in expounding the proximity of living close to his love, they yet betray that very possibility as if creating a fantasy
as he can only dream of being close to her and talking with her in that he is still “far away” and the dream is of the distant and seemingly unattainable future, *alberguarai/Pres de lieys, si be’m suy de lonh,* (I shall lodge/near her, although I come from far away).

Having anchored the physical aspect of his love in the earthly place where he would lodge, even though that very earthly place is itself an ethereal dream, Rudel continues to express the unattainability of his true love in the physical distance exemplified by space that separates them, *que tan son nostras terras lonh./Assatz hi a pas e camis,* (so far away our countries are./So many are the crossings and the roads), and through the physical separation exhibited in time, *No’m sai quora mais la veyrai,* (I don’t know when ever I shall see her.).

The poem progresses as Rudel demonstrates his adamantine stance toward his quest for the abstract from of love in his refusal to have any pleasure in love unless it is the unattainable “love far away,” *Jamai d’amor no’m jauziray/Si no’m jau d’est amor de lonh,* (Never shall I enjoy love/unless I enjoy this faraway love,). This inexorable position, in which the “love far away” is seen as possessing the greatest merit, is further portrayed through the poet’s wishing upon himself an incarceration as a prisoner in a metaphysical world, at once detained in the mundane for the numinous “love far away,” *Tant es sos pretz ricx e sobris/Que lai el reng dels Sarrasis/fos hieu per pieys chaitius clamatz.* (So abundant and sovereign her merits are / that down there, in the Saracen’s realm,/ I wish I were held in thrall for her sake.).

Rudel persists in seeking his “love far away” through a prayer to God, the creator of all that exists and the creator of the duality of existence, *Dieus que fetz tot quant ve ni vay/E formet sest’amor de lonh* (God, who created all that comes and goes/and shaped this faraway love), to give him the power to apprehend his distant love, *Mi don poder, que cor be n’ai,* /
Qu’ieu veya sest’amor de lonh, (give me strength, since I already have the intention,/so that I see this love far away). Notwithstanding this call to a higher power at the apogee of the abstract, Rudel couches his plea for envisioning the reality of his love through the physical terms of mundane rooms and gardens, elevating the tellurian only through a metaphor of earthly riches and palatial places, Verayamen en luec aizis, / Si que las cambras e’l jardis / Mi resemble novels palatz. (in reality and in a fitting place /so that rooms and gardens /shall seem to me to be new palaces.). The poet is unable to surpass and transcend the physical obstacles to fully obtain the abstract ideas as the very language used to describe the ideal, and the language itself in its physical manifestation, locks him in the commonplace of the physical world. Like Augustine before him, Rudel struggles with the inability to fully realize a release from the corporeal to attain the ethereal, nor can he combine the two as the one remains “far away.”

The Prince of Blaye introduces an outside authority to speak the truth about his dilemma in the lines of the next stanza, Ver ditz qui m’appella lechay /e deziros d’amor de lonh (He is true who calls me grasping/and longing for a faraway love), and these lines are followed with a confession of the poet’s apparent content with the conundrum, que nulhs autres joys tan no’m play /Cum jauzimen d’amor de lonh. (since no other merriment pleases me as much/as enjoying a faraway love.) Examining the ambivalence of the recurrent “far away” as referring to both the physical and abstract loves, and, moreover, to the rich enjoyment of his far away love and to the rich enjoyment that his love is far away, demonstrates to the reader that Rudel is expressing his deep love for the physical embodiment of the woman he loves as entwined with the fact that she is physically remote, which enables the poet to enjoy the distant, abstract form of love while still
loving, from a distance, the earthly manifestation of love. But Rudel continues to express his inability to fully attain the abstract love in the next line, *Mas so qu’ieu vuelh m’es tant ahis*, (But that which I want is denied to me). The repetition of this theme expresses the ambivalence of his desire, which is the attaining of his far away love and the attaining of the true form of love, blocked by his own physical desire.

Then the poet blames his godfather, who has blocked him from his “love far away,” for creating this predicament, *Qu’enaiisi’m fadet mos pairis / Qu’ieu ames e nos fos amatz*. (since my godfather made it so / that I love and am not loved.). Use of the term “godfather” further reflects the ambivalence of the theme in that it expresses both the corporeal godfather blocking attainment of a physical attachment with his love and God the Father blocking his desire of attaining the concomitant love in the abstract and physical by placing him in a physical existence, far removed from his far away love.

The poem is constructed of seven stanzas consisting of seven lines for each stanza. In each of these seven stanza, the phrase *de lonh* (far away) appears twice, which is expressive of the ambivalence of the phrase, one occurrence exemplifying the abstract and one occurrence exemplifying the physical. Moreover, in many versions of this poem, the final three lines of the final stanza are repeated. The repetition presents a mirrored contrast in which the abstract and physical are constructed as identical but inevitably and irreconcilably divided by the gap between the stanzas. Thus Rudel reveals the theme of the unattainability of both the corporeal and the ethereal forms of love simultaneously through the ambivalence of the terms and the structure of the poem.
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