

Guillaume de Machaut and the *mise en page* of
medieval French sung verse

Sheila Kate Maxwell
M.A.(hons), M.Phil

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Departments of French and Music
Faculty of Arts
University of Glasgow

May 2009

*If you want to know to whom this thesis is dedicated,
rearrange the sixth and seventh words from the end of the Conclusion.*

There you will find the name you are looking for.

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to examine what a study of the visual presentation of the fourteenth-century poet-composer Guillaume de Machaut's songs can tell us that studying them simply as pre-defined works cannot. This has involved two distinct, but related fields of enquiry.

Firstly, I have developed a way of considering the six manuscripts of Machaut containing what appear to be his complete works which focuses on the visual impact of each codex as a whole, from the materials used to the content it contains (text, images, music). This methodology, which draws on the works of such scholars as B. Cerquiglini (*Eloge de la variante*, 1989), S. Huot (*From Song to Book*, 1987), and D. Leech-Wilkinson (*The Modern Invention of Medieval Music*, 2002) and relies heavily on primary sources, is founded on the premise that each of the manuscripts is a complete and unique artefact, irrespective of who created it and for what purpose. Building on this, I argue that each manuscript can be considered a performance. When one of Machaut's compositions (poetical, musical, or both) is preserved in more than one source, each such manuscript is considered as a performance in its own right. This performative approach allows for and indeed welcomes variations in interpretation and presentation, including those that appear to entail manipulations of the work itself, by performers as diverse as copyists (involved in internal, possibly mnemonic performance), oral interpreters (singing or reading out loud, either from memory or from a copy), editors (whatever their purpose and medium, be it a paper edition based on all sources or a digital edition of just one: perhaps these are the equivalent of today's copyists?), and readers (scholarly and leisurely, from any era).

Having established this approach in my thesis, I then assess the role of the individuals involved in such a manuscript performance. The differing role of the scribes and the author in a manuscript's production is considered, particularly with reference to the manuscripts over whose compilation the author is perceived to have had some control. The role of the reader is considered in terms of the reception of the manuscript and especially the extent to which manuscript layout and design subconsciously 'control' reader interpretation. In the light of this I analyse the manuscript presentation of Machaut's songs in each of the six principal manuscripts transmitting his works, with particular focus on the literary works that contain musical notation, the *Remede de Fortune* and the *Voir Dit*, the series of lays set to music, and the *Messe de Notre Dame*. The methodology adopted throughout considers the visual impact of the presence of music on the manuscript page and assesses the extent of this impact both on the reader and on its relevance to manuscript design: what can the layout of the music tell us about the manuscript's readers, patrons and creators? This analysis offers insights as to the role of artists in the society of mid- and late-fourteenth-century France, the changing perceptions of words and music, and the role of reading, writing, and memory in society.

Contents

Abstract	p. 3
List of Figures	p. 5
Acknowledgements	p. 13
Preface: The <i>mise en page</i> and Reading	p. 15
Chapter 1: Identity and Performance	p. 23
Chapter 2: Education and Performance in the <i>Remede de Fortune</i>	p. 49
Chapter 3: The Lays and the Performance of Love	p. 93
Chapter 4: Performing Memory in the Mass	p. 128
Chapter 5: Scribal Memory and Authorial Performance in the <i>Voir Dit</i>	p. 168
Conclusion: Performance and the <i>mise en page</i>	p. 220
Bibliography	p. 226
Appendix 1: Manuscript Details	p. 250
Appendix 2: Anagrams	p. 254

List of Figures

Preface: The *mise en page* and Reading

- Fig. P.1: A fol. Fv (detail) p. 15
The third miniature from the *Prologue* in manuscript A

Chapter 1: Identity and Performance

- Figure 1.1: Manuscript C, fols. 58-58v (detail) p. 32
The anagram directions from the *Remede de Fortune*

- Figure 1.2: Manuscript C, fol. 58v (detail) p. 32
The end of the *Remede*, including the anagram passage

- Fig. 1.3: A, fol. 306 (detail) p. 35
The anagram passage from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

- Fig. 1.4: C fol. 26 (detail) p. 37
Guillaume composing (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

Chapter 2: Education and Performance in the *Remede de Fortune*

- Fig. 2.1: C fol. 23 (detail) p. 52
The lady's castle (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

- Fig. 2.2: C fol. 24 (detail) p. 54
Guillaume and Love (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

- Fig. 2.3: C fol. 44v (detail) p. 54
Guillaume and Hope (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

- Fig. 2.4: C fol. 37v (detail) p. 55
Guillaume and Hope (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

- Fig. 2.5: C fol. 56 (detail) p. 56
The exchange of rings (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

- Fig. 2.6: C fol. 58 (detail) p. 56
Guillaume and his lady (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

- Fig. 2.7: C fol. 51 p. 59
The *virelai* from the *Remede de Fortune* in C
- Fig. 2.8: C fol. 59 p. 60
The *chanson roial* from the *Remede de Fortune* in C
- Fig. 2.9: A fol. 49v (detail) p. 62
The opening miniature to the *Remede de Fortune* in A
- Fig. 2.10: C fol. 38 (detail) p. 63
The arms of love from the *Remede de Fortune* in C
- Fig. 2.11: A fol. 62 (detail) p. 63
The arms of love from the *Remede de Fortune* in A
- Fig. 2.12: A fol. 72 (detail) p. 64
Guillaume and the lady's castle (from the *Remede de Fortune* in A)
- Fig. 2.13: A fol. 78v (detail) p. 64
Guillaume and the lady (from the *Remede de Fortune* in A)
- Fig. 2.14: A fol. 80 (detail) p. 65
Guillaume and the god of love (from the *Remede de Fortune* in A)
- Fig. 2.15: C fol. 57 p. 68
The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in C
- Fig. 2.16: A fol. 78v p. 69
The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in A
- Fig. 2.17: Vg fol. 90 (detail) p. 72
The opening miniature to the *Remede de Fortune* in Vg
- Fig. 2.18: Vg fol. 95v (detail) p. 73
A king and courtiers (from the *Remede de Fortune* in Vg)
- Fig. 2.19: Vg fol. 111 (detail) p. 74
Guillaume and Hope (from the *Remede de Fortune* in Vg)

- Fig. 2.20: *B* fol. 119v p. 78
The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in *B*
- Fig. 2.21: *B* fol. 93 p. 81
Extract from the lay from the *Remede de Fortune* in *B*
- Fig. 2.22: *E* fol. 35v p. 85
The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in *E*
- Fig. 2.23: *E* fol. 23v (detail) p. 86
Extract from the lay from the *Remede de Fortune* in *E*
- Fig. 2.24: *F* fol. 40 (detail) p. 89
The opening miniature to the *Remede de Fortune* in *F-G*
- Fig. 2.25: *F* fol. 62v p. 91
The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in *F-G*

Chapter 3: The Lays and the Performance of Love

- Fig. 3.1: *C* fol. 165 (detail) p. 98
Miniature to the first lay in manuscript *C* ("Loyauté que point ne delay")
- Fig. 3.2: *C* fol. 170 (detail) p. 98
Miniature to the third lay in manuscript *C* ("Pour ce qu'on puist")
- Fig. 3.3: *C* fol. 26 (detail) p. 99
Guillaume composing (from the *Remede de Fortune* in *C*)
- Fig. 3.4: *C* fol. 173r (detail) p.100
Miniature to the fourth lay in manuscript *C* ("Aus amans")
- Fig. 3.5: *C* fol. 28v (detail) p. 100
Guillaume reading his lay to his lady (from the *Remede de Fortune* in *C*)
- Fig. 3.6: *C* fol. 188v p. 102
Extract from the tenth lay in manuscript *C* ("Lay de Plour")

- Fig. 3.7: *C* fol. 189r (detail) p. 105
Miniature to the eleventh lay in manuscript *C* ("Ne say comment")
- Fig. 3.8: *C* fol. 194v (detail) p. 106
Miniature to the fourteenth lay in manuscript *C* ("On parle de richesses")
- Fig. 3.9: *A* fol. 367 (detail) p. 108
The opening miniature to the lays in manuscript *A*
- Fig. 3.10: *A* fol. 373v p. 112
Extract from the third lay in manuscript *A* ("Pour ce qu'on puist")
- Fig. 3.11: *A* fol. 410v p. 113
Extract from the twenty-second lay in manuscript *A* ("Lay de Plour")
- Fig. 3.12: *Vg* fol. 251 (detail) p. 115
Extract from the sixteenth lay in manuscript *Vg* ("Je ne cesse de prier")
- Fig. 3.13: *B* fol. 249 (detail) p. 116
Extract from the sixteenth lay in manuscript *B* ("Je ne cesse de prier")
- Fig. 3.14: *E* fol. 157 (detail) p. 119
The opening miniature to the lays in manuscript *E*
- Fig. 3.15: *E* fol. 16r (detail) p. 120
The opening miniature to the *rondeaux* in the *Louange des dames* in manuscript *E*
- Fig. 3.16: *E* fol. 113v (detail) p. 124
Opening of the eighth lay in manuscript *E* ("Pour ce qu'on puist")
- Fig. 3.17: *G* fol. 74 (detail) p. 125
Opening miniature to the lays in manuscript *F-G*
- Fig. 3.18: *G* fol. 87v (detail) p. 126
Extract from the twelfth lay in manuscript *F-G* ("Lay mortel")

Chapter 4: Performing Memory in the Mass

- Fig. 4.1: *A* fol. 438v p. 131
The opening of the Kyrie in manuscript *A*
- Fig. 4.2: *A* fol. 447 (detail) p. 134
Tenor and Contratenor from the Credo Amen in manuscript *A*
- Fig. 4.3: *A* fol. 448 (detail) p. 134
Tenor and Contratenor from the Sanctus in manuscript *A*
- Fig. 4.4: *A* fols. 444v-445 p. 137
Extract from the Credo in manuscript *A*
- Fig. 4.5: *Vg* fol. 283v p. 140
The opening of the Mass in manuscript *Vg*
- Fig. 4.6: *Vg* folios 288v-289 p. 141
The opening of the Credo in manuscript *Vg*
- Fig 4.7: *Vg* fols 294v-295 p. 143
Extract from the Agnus Dei in manuscript *Vg*
- Fig. 4.8: *B* fol. 281v p. 145
The opening of the Mass in manuscript *B*
- Fig. 4.9: *B* fols 287v-288 p. 147
Extract from the Credo in manuscript *B*
- Fig. 4.10: *B* fol. 282v p. 150
Extract from the Kyrie in manuscript *B*
- Fig. 4.11: *Vg* fol. 284v p. 150
Extract from the Kyrie in manuscript *Vg*
- Fig. 4.12: *E* fols 164v-165 p. 152
The opening of the Mass in manuscript *E*
- Fig. 4.13: *E* fols 167v-168 p. 158
Extract from the Credo in manuscript *E*

Fig. 4.14: *G* fols 125v-126 p. 160
 The opening of the Mass in manuscript *F-G*

Fig. 4.15: *G* fols 129 (detail) and 130 (detail) p. 162
 Extract from the Credo in manuscript *F-G*

Chapter 5: Scribal Memory and Authorial Performance in the *Voir Dit*

Fig. 5.1: *A* fol. 224 p. 170
 The first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.2: *A* fol. B (detail) p. 172
 The entry of the *Voir Dit* in the index to manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.3: *A* fol. 221 (detail) p. 174
 The opening miniature to the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.4: *A* fol. 235 (detail) p. 176
 The delivery of the portrait from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.5: *A* fol. 293 (detail) p. 177
 The portrait in the dream from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.6, *A* fol. 297 (detail) p. 178
 The portrayal of Toute Belle as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig 5.7: *A* fol. 255 (detail) p. 180
 Venus and the lovers from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.8: *A* fol. 301v (detail) p. 181
 The lover as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.9: *A* fol. 226 p. 183
 The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

Fig. 5.10: *A* fol. 242 (detail) p. 184
 The lover composing in the lady's presence from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

- Fig. 5.11: A fol. 470v p. 187
The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the music section in manuscript A
- Fig 5.12: E fol. 172 p. 189
The first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript E
- Fig. 5.13: E fol. Er (detail) p. 191
The entry of the *Voir Dit* in the index to manuscript E
- Fig. 5.14: E fol. 210 (detail) p. 193
The anagram passage from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript E
- Fig. 5.15: E fol. 171 (detail) p. 196
The opening miniature to the *Voir Dit* in manuscript E
- Fig. 5.16: E fol. 198v p. 197
The *rondeau* "Dix et sept" and letter 36 from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript E
- Fig. 5.17: E fol. 173 (detail) p. 200
The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript E
- Fig. 5.18: F fol. 140 p. 202
The first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript F-G
- Fig. 5.19: F fol. 137v (detail) p. 203
The opening miniature to the *Voir Dit* in manuscript F-G
- Fig. 5.20: F fol. 138v (detail) p. 204
The exchange of the first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript F-G
- Fig. 5.21: F fol. 148 (detail) p. 205
The lover worshipping the portrait from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript F-G
- Fig. 5.22: F fol. 192v (detail) p. 206
Toute Belle as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript F-G

Fig. 5.23: *F* fol. 195v (detail) p. 207

The lover as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

Fig. 5.24: *G* fol. 145v p. 209

The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the music section of manuscript *F-G*

Fig. 5.25: *F* fol. 181 (detail) p. 213

The lover dictating a letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

Conclusion: Performance and the *mise en page*

Fig. C.1: *F* fol. 75v (detail) p. 220

The opening miniature to the *Dit de l'alerion* in manuscript *F-G*

Acknowledgements

Ma treschiere et souveraine dame, je ne sui mie telz ne si sages que je vous sceüsse
 mercier...
 (Voir Dit, letter 4)

A project such as this one invariably creates many debts of gratitude, too many to be listed here. Yet despite the best efforts of all, any errors which remain are, of course, my own. Numerous colleagues and friends have provided inspiration and support, often without realising it. A discussion over a drink, a kind comment at a conference, generous sharing of papers and ideas... all of these things can trigger off a train of thought even long after the event. To all of these far too numerous to mention, my heartfelt thanks. I can only hope that I may have sometimes provided something similar in return.

Nevertheless, there are plenty who can be thanked by name. First and foremost, of course, come my two wonderful supervisors, Peter Davies and Warwick Edwards, who have carefully guided me through the entire process, patiently listening to the formation of the infamous Great Ideas (good and bad), making sense of my raw ramblings, providing wisdom and encouragement when it was most needed, and having confidence in both me and the project. I couldn't have done it without you, boys.

Others in the departments of French and Music and the University of Glasgow have also been of great help. Jim Simpson and John Butt, the victims chosen to be my annual reviewers (and, later, internal examiner and chair), showed remarkable genius and perseverance in making sense of and commenting on half-finished drafts, which duly became far more finished thanks to their efforts. One of the greatest pleasures of the project was, perhaps surprisingly, my viva, and for this I especially have to thank Emma Dillon, my external examiner, whose wealth of ideas and enthusiasm were welcomed with delight (and relief). Jim Simpson (he's a busy chap) also had the dubious pleasure of being Head of French for the four years of my PhD, and he, together with his

opposite number in Music, Bill Sweeney, deserve extra thanks for all the patient form-signing, smiling, officialdom, and above all for the support that they both managed so apparently effortlessly. In Music, I must also thank (to quote Bill) "those who really run the department", the admirable Diane Thomson and the effervescent Tommy Cameron, for so many happy memories of gossip, home-baking appreciation, restaurant reviews, dog-sitting, not to mention the splendid organisation skills for which they are rightly famed.

My research also took me to Paris and to the Sorbonne, where Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet and Isabelle Ragnard provided incalculable amounts of help and inspiration. I particularly thank them both for allowing me to present my ideas to them and even their students, and for making my time at the Sorbonne memorable and above all worthwhile. Julia Dobrinsky and Domenic Leo deserve special thanks for generously sharing their own theses which were a great inspiration to me. The project was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, and I acknowledge their financial support for the undertaking, and I am also grateful to the staff at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. I would also like to thank the all members of the Paris branch of the International Medieval Society, as well as the Sorbonne group Questes, for many delightful evenings of wine, food, and of course discussion. Such a support network away from "home" was invaluable.

Speaking of home, I must thank all of my lovely family who have shown faith and forbearance, together with a good deal of bemused puzzlement and polite interest. My husband Gregor has of course been the sounding board for ideas, the punchbag for frustrations, and the shoulder of support and comfort. Rhuaridh the laborador provided sterling service as a footrest and walking companion. And I cannot forget Matilda Elizabeth, who, due to somewhat fortuitous timing, provided a constant inspiration to finish during the last nine months of work.

Preface: The *Mise en page* and Reading

"Interpretation is the revenge of the intellect upon art."¹

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. P.1: A fol. Fv (detail)

The third miniature from the *Prologue* in manuscript A

Presentation is everything. Or, if not, it is everything at first. Form shapes meaning. We may think that we know that we should not judge a book by its cover, yet in a bookshop a glance at covers of the myriad of editions of a popular work such as the volumes in the Harry Potter series, some of which are designed to appeal to adults, some to children, some to those who thus far have only seen the films, shows that we are evidently influenced by visual presentations of a written artefact. Add to this the fact, too, that people will happily buy multiple copies of the same book in these different formats, and we see that the pleasure of owning, and being able to touch, the written word is still strong.

¹ "Sontag, Susan" *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, ed. Elizabeth Knowles (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). *Oxford Reference Online* 18 December 2007: <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t115.e2854>

As a further example, let us take three possible ways of reading what you are reading now. You may be reading it in a sage, bound volume in a library somewhere. You may be reading it online. You may be reading it on a print-out from a computer, or a photocopy. You may intend to read the whole thesis, or you may intend to read only those parts which you find most relevant to your purpose. In whichever scenario, you may already have preconceived ideas about how you are going to read it. If you are in the library cradling "the real thing", you will have had to have made the effort to travel there, locate the work in a catalogue and find it on the shelf (or, better still, have it delivered to your seat like a restaurant delicacy). You may have other similar-looking volumes next to you; there will certainly be others on the shelves. You will no doubt be in company, although you will be reading silently: you must observe library rules and regulations. You can flick through pages at leisure, look at the pictures, find chapter divisions, assess the structure. Any notes you make will be in a separate format, either on a notepad or computer - writing in the volume will result in your being promptly evicted from the library.

Yet what if you are reading this on a computer screen, perhaps in your home or office? You may be listening to music (is it by Machaut?). You can go and get a coffee, make lunch, surf the internet for a while if you get bored. You can lose your place with a misadventurous click of a mouse, yet you can also search the document for key words. You may well have another document open alongside for your own notes. As the work was written in much the same environment, do you feel closer to it and to the author? Finally, if you are reading a photocopy (I am tempted to say exemplar), you may well have a pencil in your hand, with which you can add your commentaries, your opinion, your gloss on the material itself, either for your own use or for eventual re-transmission to author and/or audience. Your notes need not be decipherable by anyone else.

In each of the given scenarios, although the content of the work does not change, its reception does. In the first instance quoted, the reader tends to regard the hard-bound volume in the library as an object containing information which has been created, ordered, and finally approved by its author. Reading from the computer screen, the

reader has more of a sense of a work-in-progress: the effervescent culture of the internet cannot help but provoke a loss of formality, possibly at a subconscious level, yet one which tempts the reader further into the work and appeals to her or his own creative instinct. In the final scenario, the photocopy, the reader is able to visually manipulate their personal copy of the work in whichever way he or she chooses, including perhaps the production of further or new works: in this case the work is an immediate stimulus to new thoughts, whilst at the same time showing its vulnerability.

This thesis aims to explore this concept by analysing the *mise en page* of the six manuscripts which appear to contain the "complete works" of the fourteenth-century poet and composer Guillaume de Machaut. These manuscripts contain exclusively works by the poet-composer, and, as far as we can see, each transmits every work of his available to the compilers with surprisingly little deviation from a common order.² In the first chapter I establish the methodology used for the analysis. In the ensuing chapters I turn to some of the implications of the *mise en page* through consideration of, (1°) the *Remede de Fortune*, a narrative work with lyric insertions produced when Machaut was certainly not young (yet of course had no way of knowing he would live for another three decades), (2°) the lays, most of which are set to music and the composition of which appears to span his entire career, (3°) the mass, a late, purely musical work, and finally (4°) the *Voir Dit*, the work for which Machaut is best known today, and which, like the *Remede de Fortune*, combines both textual narrative and music, but with the addition of prose letters. After these four central chapters I draw together in the Conclusion the links between the manuscripts as shown in their *mise en page*, consider the roles of those involved in their production, and discuss the reception of the Machaut manuscripts past, present and future.

In the past thirty years, the resurgence of interest in Machaut studies, in particular in the exceptional manuscript sources, has led to an

² For a complete summary of the contents of each manuscript, see Lawrence Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research* (New York: Garland, 1995), pp. 77-95. I do not discuss the fragmented manuscript *W* (Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 5010 C). As the "complete-works" nature of these manuscripts is an assumption - no matter how reasonable - I have chosen to contain it within inverted commas.

increasing awareness of the written word as artefact and its effect on the beholder. Any scholar wishing to pursue studies on Machaut is indebted to the work of Lawrence Earp, whose 1983 dissertation "Scribal Practice Manuscript Production and the Transmission of Music in Late Medieval France: The Manuscripts of Guillaume de Machaut" is the bedrock of any investigation into the codices themselves.³ In addition, Earp's seminal *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research* is the constant desk-side (and, sometimes, bedside) companion for its wealth of information regarding Machaut's works, the manuscripts, and the wider context. The unsurpassable quality of these works is attested by the fact that they are dated only the passing of time and with it the publication of new bibliographic items. Without these two works the progress of Machaut scholarship would have been severely hindered.

The time was surely ripe for a re-awakening of interest in Machaut in the 1970s and 1980s. Following Daniel Poiron's *Le Poète et le prince* (1965),⁴ a book devoted to a series of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century authors beginning with Machaut, the foundations were laid for the discipline as we now know it. Paul Zumthor's 1972 *Essai de poétique médiévale*,⁵ although one of several to be produced around the same time, is a work which still stands out for its approach to manuscript texts. It was followed soon after (1974) by William's Calin's study of Machaut's poetry which, like Poiron's, is still a work read by all students beginning work on Machaut.⁶ In the domain of art history, François Avril, from his privileged position as curator of the département des manuscrits at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris in the 1970s, produced important evidence of the dating of the Machaut manuscripts, from which all further work has since stemmed.

It is surely no coincidence that the names cited so far have come from the disciplines of philology, art history, and music, and that their contributions to scholarship appeared in that chronological order. For although scholarly interest in Machaut in general has been well in

³ Lawrence Marshburn Earp, "Scribal Practice, Manuscript Production and the Transmission of Music in Late Medieval France: The Manuscripts of Guillaume de Machaut" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Princeton University, 1983).

⁴ Daniel Poiron, *Le Poète et le Prince: l'évolution du lyrisme courtois de Guillaume de Machaut à Charles d'Orléans* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965).

⁵ Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1972).

⁶ William Calin, *A Poet at the Fountain: Essays on the Narrative Verse of Guillaume de Machaut* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1974)

evidence since the nineteenth century, it was only towards the end of the twentieth century that the disciplines represented by the manuscripts began to work together. In other words, Machaut scholarship tended towards that which we are now happy to label interdisciplinarity. This interdisciplinary approach is now pursued, to a greater or lesser extent, in virtually every study of Machaut.

Yet things have not always been this way, and, before moving on to more recent scholarship, it is worth taking a brief step back and considering the broader historical context of Machaut studies. Earlier work on Machaut, especially in the nineteenth century, was primarily text-based. Although "considered boring and colourless for the most part",⁷ the poetry at least provided its nineteenth-century readers with (apparent) autobiography or history. The music, on the other hand, in the opinion of the greatest minds of the day, was "unspeakably inept, the pitifully crude attempts of an amateur".⁸ A publication by Prosper Tarbé in 1849 was devoted exclusively to Machaut, providing excerpts of his poetry and a much advanced biography.⁹ The Paulin Paris edition of the *Voir Dit* in 1875, was for all its faults, the first published edition claiming to be a "complete" work by Machaut (although in fact it was not, for it had passages missing, it rearranged the order of the letters, and of course it contained no music).¹⁰

Despite Friedrich Ludwig's transcription of Machaut's music in the opening years of the twentieth century, it would be the literary works which would be the first to make it into print. The narrative poems appeared at the hands of Ernest Hoepffner between 1908 and 1921, and the lyric works were edited by Vladimir Chichmaref and published in 1909.¹¹ Although these editions did not make up even Machaut's complete poetic output, the Hoepffner edition of the *Remede de Fortune*

⁷ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 277.

⁸ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 277.

⁹ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 195.

¹⁰ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, pp. 195-96; Paris's edition is also extensively criticised throughout Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet, *"Un Engin si soutil": Guillaume de Machaut et l'écriture au xive siècle* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1985).

¹¹ The following discussion is based on Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, pp. 195-201 and 277-82. de Machaut, Guillaume, *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. by Ernest Hoepffner (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1908-21), de Machaut, Guillaume, *Guillaume de Machaut: Poésies lyriques. Edition complète en deux parties; avec introduction, glossaire et fac-similés publiée sous les auspices de la Faculté d'Histoire et de Philologie de Saint-Pétersbourg*, ed. by Vladimir F. Chichmaref, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1909).

also included Ludwig's transcription of the music: the first publication to combine Machaut's poetry and music. The Ludwig edition of the music did not begin to appear until the 1920s, and, interrupted by war and the death of the editor, the final volume (which included the mass) was not published until 1954. By this time, however, a new edition of Machaut's music was underway by Leo Schrade, and this appeared in 1956. Despite being imperfect, these two editions meant that by the end of the decade all of Machaut's music was accessible in print.¹² By contrast, despite recent additions, a complete edition of the literary works by a single editor is still lacking.¹³

It is with this formidable background that today's scholar embarks on a personal journey of contributing her or his own take to the appreciation of Machaut's works, and it is at this point that this survey of the scholarly literature must briefly take on the mantle of the first person. As the majority of readers will surely know, finding one's feet (and indeed one's thesis topic) is a long process subject to many influences, and it is also a process which is gloriously fluid. The difference in perspective from the start of a project and the end is enormous, yet it is my hope the remainder of this survey will serve to explain the evolution of my thought processes, as well as furnishing the reader with at least some of the answers to the delicate issues of situating an interdisciplinary study within the wider scholarship.

Other than the works already mentioned, if I had to nominate the studies which have been the most influential to me they would be Sylvia Huot's *From Song to Book* (1987), Emma Dillon's *Medieval Music Making and the Roman de Fauvel* (2002), Mary Carruthers's *The Book of Memory* (first edition published 1990), and Daniel Leech-Wilkinson's *The Modern Invention of Medieval Music* (1997).¹⁴ These works (which I must

¹² Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 281.

¹³ A number of recent editions of individual works have been published. These include: Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Jugement du Roy de Behaigne and Remede de Fortune*, ed. and trans. by James I. Wimsatt and William M. Kibler (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988); Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Livre dou Voir Dit*, trans. by R. Barton-Palmer and ed. by Daniel Leech-Wilkinson (New York: Garland, 1998); and Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Livre du Voir Dit*, ed. Paul Imbs (Paris: Livre de Poche lettres gothiques, 1999). At the time of writing, a full edition of Machaut's works, both poetry and music, is rumoured to be in the pipeline. It is to be hoped that any new edition will make use of the advances offered by modern technology in order to transmit as far as possible the whole of Machaut's corpus.

¹⁴ Sylvia Huot, *From Song to Book* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987); Emma Dillon, *Medieval Music Making and the "Roman de Fauvel"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in*

insist are by no means alone in their accomplishments but rather spoke to me on a level that was somehow more than scholarly) are all undoubtedly interdisciplinary, and each advocates primary importance to the understanding of medieval culture and thought, especially in the production and layout of manuscripts. It is also not insignificant that the majority of them do not focus on Machaut, and even Huot's work, like Poiron's before her, studies Machaut in the context of the broader literary situation. Leech-Wilkinson's book was the first to make me appreciate the importance of our pre-conceptions on our treatment of medieval works. From Dillon I have drawn the idea of the manuscript as a work of art, an object to be held and appreciated for itself, even (perhaps especially) for readers today. From Carruthers I learned to appreciate the hitherto unimaginable (for me, at least) feats of memory of which our medieval forebears were not merely capable, but which they achieved subconsciously. Finally, Huot's book helped me to understand the extent to which different manuscript presentations effect their readers, and reflect the intentions of their creators.

Returning, then, to the broader situation of Machaut studies, the work presented here will, I hope, take its place in the series of recent research into manuscript sources and their effect on reader reception. Notable contributions to this topic have come from the so-called "New Philologists" such as Stephen Nichols, Howard Bloch and David Hult, whose call for re-evaluation of texts has been heard and heeded.¹⁵ Elizabeth Eva Leach has approached Machaut primarily from the musical side, and her work, particularly on music in the manuscripts, offers a nuanced analytical understanding of the presentation of the music.¹⁶ Ardis Butterfield's work on poetry and song is a vital recent contribution

Medieval Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, repr. 2008); Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, *The Modern Invention of Medieval Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, repr. 2004).

¹⁵ See, for example, the essay collections *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*, eds R. Howard Bloch and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), *The New Medievalism*, eds Marina S. Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991), and *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*, ed. by Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (n.p.: University of Michigan Press, 1996; repr. 1999).

¹⁶ See especially her dissertation, "Counterpoint in Guillaume de Machaut's Musical Ballades" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1997), and her articles "Interpretation and Counterpoint: The Case of Guillaume de Machaut's *De toutes fleurs* (B31)", *Music Analysis* 19 (2000), 321-51, "Machaut's Balades with Four Voices", *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 10 (2001), 47-79, and "Singing More About Singing Less: Machaut's *Pour ce que tous* (B12)" in *Machaut's Music: New Interpretations*, ed. by Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 111-24.

to the understanding of both.¹⁷ Deborah McGrady's 2007 publication *Controlling Readers: Guillaume de Machaut and his Late-Medieval Audience*¹⁸ came to my attention in the late stages of work, but has been extremely useful. Finally, the recent interdisciplinary dissertations by Domenic Leo¹⁹ and Julia Dobrinsky,²⁰ which consider the Machaut manuscripts as a whole but from the art historical and textual standpoints respectively, offer important analyses of these two aspects of the manuscripts.

It is from this background, then, that in Chapter 1 I argue the case for a performative understanding of the Machaut manuscripts, before applying this methodology to some of his works in the chapters which follow. Despite its focus on Machaut's works which contain music, my study is unashamedly interdisciplinary. By considering his works from the starting point of the manuscripts themselves and of their *mise en page*, it is my hope that, whether they specialise in philology, musicology, art history, codicology, or any of the disciplines touched by Machaut and his medieval scribes and readers, this study will appeal to all those interested in Guillaume de Machaut and his works.

¹⁷ See especially her monograph: Ardis Butterfield, *Poetry and Music in Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

¹⁸ Deborah McGrady, *Controlling Readers: Guillaume de Machaut and his Late-Medieval Audience* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007)

¹⁹ Domenic Leo, "Authorial Presence in the Illuminated Machaut Manuscripts" (unpublished doctoral thesis, New York University Institute of Fine Arts, 2005).

²⁰ Julia Dobrinsky, "'Peindre, pourtraire, écrire': le rapport entre le texte et l'image dans les manuscrits enluminés de Guillaume de Machaut (XIV^e-XV^e siècles)" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne, 2004).

Chapter 1

Identity and Performance

L'écrivain original n'est pas celui qui n'imité personne,
mais celui que personne ne peut imiter.

[The original writer is not he who refrains from imitating others,
but he who can be imitated by none.]²¹

Guillaume de Machaut, the fourteenth-century poet and composer, is known to us today largely through six manuscripts, five of which are now housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, and one in private ownership, currently deposited in the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.²² These manuscripts are unusual for their time in being single-author collected editions, containing both narrative and music.²³ Such focus, which stems from the careful (though varied) ordering of composers and their works seen in the troubadour and trouvère chansonnier tradition, appears to have been limited to a relatively small number of collections of well-known authors such as Adam de la Halle.²⁴ Even without the survival of these manuscripts, Machaut would still be an important figure in fourteenth-century French literature and music on account of the glowing terms in which contemporary and later writers speak of him and the substantial distribution of his work in other sources. However, the existence of this

²¹ "Chateaubriand, François-René" *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, ed. Elizabeth Knowles (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) *Oxford Reference Online*, 12 July 2008: <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t115.e645> (the entry also provides the translation).

²² The full catalogue details of these manuscripts, together with their sigla as will be used throughout, are as follows:

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1584 (A), 1585 (B), 1586 (C), 9221 (E), 22545-6 (F-G).

Cambridge, Parker Library, Corpus Christi College (on long-term loan from a private owner), Codex Vogüé (Vg).

There is a seventh manuscript which is likely to have once contained Machaut's "complete works": Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 5010 C (W). As this source is extremely fragmentary (containing only 74 folios, no works in their entirety, no remaining miniatures, and only one folio of music), I have chosen not to include it in my thesis.

Appendix 1 provides further details of these and other principal manuscripts containing works by Machaut; for a full listing and description of all Machaut sources (including possible lost manuscripts) see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, Chapter 3.

²³ When discussing the innovations between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Sylvia Huot writes that "the works of these later poets appear in anthology codices devoted entirely to a single author". Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 211.

²⁴ Despite this, as Earp says, "the prior examples do not prepare us for the Machaut manuscripts" (*Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 73). For further discussion of these compilations see Huot, *From Song to Book*, especially chapter 7.

large body of author-specific work makes him stand out in a century which is otherwise little-represented in terms of poet-composers, and his influence lasts well into the fifteenth century and beyond.²⁵

Details of Machaut's life are known partly from his own writings and partly from contemporary records.²⁶ From his qualifications, his date of birth has been estimated as 1300. When he entered the service of Jean of Luxembourg, King of Bohemia (1296-1346: crowned 1310) in the early 1320s, he is described as *maître*. For Jean he worked first as *aumonier*, then *notaire* and finally as *secrétaire*. Records at Reims cathedral show that Machaut was a canon there from 1338 until his death in 1377. Guillaume had a brother, Jean, who also worked for Jean of Luxembourg and was canon of Reims cathedral from 1355 until his death in 1372. During this time the brothers shared a house in Reims, and in death they shared the same grave.²⁷

The richest source of information about Machaut's life, however, is his works themselves, which offer invaluable insights into life in courtly service, significant contemporary events (such as outbreaks of the plague and the siege of Reims by the English) and, especially in the *Voir Dit*, the production of literature and music and the practice of *fin'amour*.²⁸ Although Machaut combines "fact" with "fiction" in his works, as a medieval *faiseur* he drew on what he knew and had experienced in his life and time. Even where no specific information can be established, references to general practices and societal attitudes provide both entertainment and scholarly interest. (No-one today thinks that *Eastenders* is literally taken from real life, but in years to come it

²⁵ For a discussion of Machaut's influence on his successors see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, chapter 2.

²⁶ Except where otherwise stated the following details are taken from Wulf Art, "Machaut [Machau, Machault], Guillaume de [Guillelmus de Machaudio]" in *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy <http://www.grovemusic.com>, accessed 3rd January 2006, and Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, chapter 1.

²⁷ I am grateful to M. l'Abbé Jean Goy, chief archivist for the diocese of Reims, for sharing with me his knowledge and research into Machaut's house, role in Reims, and grave (personal communication). For Machaut's life in Reims, see Anne Walters Robinson, *Guillaume de Machaut and Reims: Context and Meaning in his Musical Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), especially Chapter 1. Whether or not Machaut was actually resident at Reims for the whole of his canonicate is discussed by Roger Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims, 1338-1377" *Early Music History* 23 (2004), pp. 1-48.

²⁸ This is discussed in detail by Kevin Brownlee throughout his *Poetic Identity in Guillaume de Machaut* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), where he dedicates a chapter to each of Machaut's personas that he identifies (for example "Lover Protagonist" in Chapter 2). The concept is introduced in detail on pp. 3-4 and 18.

may provide a supplementary source of evidence of the attitudes, problems, and entertainment which prevail in late-twentieth- and early-twenty-first-century London.)

It is this fine line between the fictional and the real, the presumed and the known, the guessed and the deduced, that this chapter seeks to clarify in relation to the works of Guillaume de Machaut. To accomplish this, I will consider in detail the play of identity and authority in Machaut's works, before proposing the performative approach to the sources which will characterize the present thesis as a whole.

While the expression "identity" can have many meanings, I use it here in a relatively narrow sense: the invocation of a set of individuating and intrinsic characteristics which make a person recognisable and distinguishable by name. "Authority", as I have come to understand it, is a much broader, more troublesome concept. It differs from identity in that its use implies legitimacy, real or imagined, which need not necessarily be that of the author (i.e. associated with authorship). When applied to an artefact, authority concerns the credence that is attributed to a particular version of a work at any point in historical time. When applied to people, it refers to the recognition and respect accorded to any individual who is responsible for the production or performance of a work (or body of work), and to the influence that this individual exerts upon others.²⁹

The approach to the sources which I have devised pre-supposes an understanding of "performance" broadly as any reception or delivery of the contents of a manuscript in any circumstances (including oral rendition, silent reading, and the production of the manuscript itself). Bernard Cerquiglini's essay *Eloge de la variante* [In Praise of the Variant] is fundamental to my thinking here, particularly his separation of manuscripts from their printed editions, and his questioning of the notion of the medieval vernacular text:

The work copied by hand, manipulated, always open and as good as unfinished, invited intervention, annotation, and commentary. Confronted with an earlier peice of writing, it constructed itself and sustained itself simply with the distance it assumed in

²⁹ The bibliography of medieval authorship and authority is large, and many studies touch on it at some point. Nevertheless, two items in particular have influenced my thinking here: Alastair J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1988), especially "Introduction" (pp. 1-8); and Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, chapter 7.

relation to the utterance that was its basis. The scribal work was commentary, paraphrase, supplementary meaning, supplementary language, brought to bear upon a letter that was essentially unfinished. We can see that the term text is hardly applicable to these works. [...] [V]ariance is so widespread and constitutive that, mixing together all the texts among which philology so painstakingly distinguishes, one could say that every manuscript is a revision, a version.³⁰

Indeed, one could say that every manuscript is a performance.

Paul Zumthor, too, has discussed the instability of the manuscript presentations of works in what he calls "la mouvance des textes".³¹ In this sense, the medieval work is:

something that undoubtedly had real existence, as a complex but easily recognizable entity, made up of the sum of material witnesses to current versions. These were the synthesis of signs used by successive "authors" (singers, reciters, scribes) and of the text's own existence in the letter. The form-meaning nexus thus generated is thereby constantly called in question. The work is fundamentally unstable. Properly speaking it has no end; it merely accepts to come to an end, at a given point, for whatever reasons.³²

Therefore we could say that our reading (or performing through reading) of the medieval work plays on its instability, its "mouvance", and thus it continues to grow.

This idea of the never-ending performance has much in common with the contemporary music philosopher Christopher Small's term "musicking". Here, music serves not as a noun, but as a verb expressing varying degrees of activity, and is defined thus:

To music is to take part, in any capacity, in a musical performance. That means not only to perform, but also to listen, to provide material for a performance - what we call composing - to prepare for a performance - what we call practising or rehearsing - or any other activity which can affect the nature of the human encounter. [...] To music is to pay attention in any way to a musical performance, at whatever level or quality of attention [...] the verb to music is not concerned with valuation. It is descriptive, not prescriptive. It concerns all participation in a musical performance, whether active or passive, whether we like

³⁰ Bernard Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology* trans. by Betsy Wing (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1999), p. 34 and p. 38. Unless otherwise stated, italics in citations are rendered as in the source.

³¹ First discussed in Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale*, pp. 65-75, and further expounded in Paul Zumthor, "Intertextualité et mouvance", *Littérature*, 41 (1981), pp. 8-16.

³² Paul Zumthor, *Toward a Medieval Poetics* trans. by Philip Bennett (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), p. 47. (The emphasis mine: the French term is "fondamentalement mouvante". *Essai de poétique médiévale*, p. 73.)

the way it is being done or not, whether we consider it constructive or destructive, sympathetic or apathetic.³³

While accepting and appropriating in its entirety this very broad definition of musical performance, in Machaut's case I further extend the notion of *performance* to include poetry and prose as well as music, no matter how written works were received or presented (oral rendition or silent reading), or by whom. By this interpretation, therefore, Machaut, his silent or vocal readers past and present, the scribes who made the earliest surviving manuscripts, and the editors who prepare modern printed editions, all take part in a performance.

The identity of Guillaume de Machaut as a poet and composer is undisputed: we know his biography as has been indicated above, and he is referred to as "poète" (a status which had previously been reserved only for an *auctor* of antiquity) in later works by his younger contemporary Eustache Deschamps.³⁴ The authority of the extant manuscript sources attributed to him, however, is more open to question for reasons that will be explored in later discussion (including the possibility of authorial intervention in manuscript production). One of the goals of this chapter will be to move away from the idea of an "original" or "authoritative" version of Machaut's works as presented in the six principal manuscripts. The approach adopted here, therefore, accepts that we will never be able to uncover an "original" or "authoritative" version of any Machaut piece; instead it proposes that we take as a starting point the clearer issues of identity and performance which do not obscure all that we do have for certain – the works of art which are the manuscript sources.

I have already made use of the term "work". Is this viable when considering a fourteenth-century poet and composer? Can we truly say that Machaut created "works"? The term "work" has been much debated in the last few decades.³⁵ Lydia Goehr argues that the concept of the work emerges around 1800: in other words that it is closely related to

³³ Christopher Small, "Musicking - A Means of Performing and Listening. A Lecture" *Music Education Research*, 1 (1999), pp. 9-21, p. 12.

³⁴ For the significance of this term, see Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, pp. 7-9.

³⁵ For a full discussion and bibliography see Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992; repr. 2002), "Part 1" and "Bibliography".

the changes in belief and attitude which we now label Romanticism.³⁶ She also puts forward the notion that those who took part in music prior to 1800 did not generally consider it in terms of the work concept. Is it therefore anachronistic to discuss Machaut's "works"? And if so, is it wrong? Goehr answers the first of these questions herself:

Given that we have an explicit concept of a work, Bach composed works. [...] Just as a piece of pottery or pile of bricks can come to be thought of as, or transfigured into, a work of art through the importation of the relevant concepts, so, since about 1800, it has been the rule to speak of early music anachronistically; to retroactively impose upon this music concepts developed at a later point in the history of music. Implicit existence has become here essentially a matter of retroactive attribution.³⁷

Although Goehr's concepts have been qualified in relation to some pre-1800 composers, just how anachronistic is the term "work" when applied to Machaut? In the unnumbered folios in manuscript A which follow the index but are before the beginning of the first indexed poem — the *Dit dou vergier* — (in other words, what we now call the Prologue), Amours introduces his inspirational children to Machaut, whom he addresses thus:

Or peus tu cy prendre grande substance
Dont tu pourras figurer & retraire
Moult beaux dis et par mainte ordenance
Sur doux penser plaisance et esperance (fol. Dv)

[Now here you can draw much inspiration
From which you can form and relate
Many pleasant *dits* by frequent command
Treating Sweet Thought, Joy, and Hope.]³⁸

The term "dis" ("dit"), as we now understand it, generally has the narrow meaning of a narrative poem (for example, Machaut's *Dit de l'Alerion*). In this passage, however, the term "dis" could be taken as a general term covering all of Machaut's compositions, rather than a distinct category.³⁹ The use of "dis" in this general sense contrasts with

³⁶ Goehr, chapters 4 and 6, and *passim*. See also John Butt, *Playing With History: The Historical Approach to Musical Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 63.

³⁷ Goehr, pp. 114-15.

³⁸ Unless otherwise stated, all transcriptions and translations are my own.

³⁹ It is worth noting the use of the verb "dire" in the frequent "or dient et content / or se cante" [now we recite / now we sing] distinction between words and music in the anonymous early thirteenth-century Picard *cantefable*, *Aucassin et Nicolette*. As no music notation exists for *Aucassin et Nicolette*, these instructions are the only indication that parts of the tale may have been sung.

the more specific sense that it seems to have in the following passage, further on in the prologue, where it is the first among many forms and genres listed in Machaut's CV-like presentation of his own skills:

A faire dis et chansonnettes
 Pleinnes d'onneur et d'amourettes
 Doubles hoqués et plaisans lais
 Motés rondiaus et virelais
 Qu'on clamme chansons baladées
 Complaintes balades entées
 A l'onneur et a la louange
 De toutes dames sans soulange (fol. Fv)

[To make dits and chansonnettes
 Full of honour, and love songs,
 Double hockets and sweet lays,
 Motets, *rondeaux*, and *virelais*
 Which are called danced songs,
 Complaintes, fixed dances,
 To the honour and praise
 Of all ladies, without exception.]

In addition to these uses of the word "dis" in the prologue, the overarching fact that no fewer than six "complete-works" manuscripts survive and the knowledge that at least one and possibly more of them were compiled within Machaut's lifetime suggest that Machaut did have a concept not only of his works as an achievement, but also of their preservation. In which case he is one of the rare pre-1800 examples that Goehr admits when she declares that:

Music was not always produced to outlast its performance or survive more than a few performances. And when it did survive many performances, numerous changes could and usually would be made to the music in the process. Rarely did musicians think of their music as surviving past their lifetime in the form of completed and fixed works.⁴⁰

While it is possible to think of the term "work" as an anachronism, it is also possible to think of it as a modern equivalent to one of Machaut's meanings of the word "dis". With all due reserve, then, I use the term "works" in the sense it seems likely Machaut uses *dis* in the prologue to manuscript A.

Having settled on the term, we must next ask what is a "work"? Whereas the philosopher Roman Ingarden writes that a work is "an

⁴⁰ Goehr, p. 186.

artistic product of its composer" derived from the score,⁴¹ the twentieth- and twenty-first-century composer Brian Ferneyhough offers a more complex interpretation of a musical work which is further-reaching in its consequences and which seems to call for a detailed analysis of any notation in order to locate the work itself. Although ostensibly writing in general terms, these comments are perhaps best understood in relation to Ferneyhough's own compositions which are characterised by extremely complex notation (sometimes categorised as the "New Complexity").

A consequence of increased emphasis on the unstable interface: performer / notation, the deeply artificial and fragile nature of this often naively questioned link, is the constant stressing of the "fictionality" of the work ("work") as a graspable, invariant entity, as something that can be *directly transmitted*. That this is no longer the case has been recognized ever since indeterminacy assumed the mantle of progress: here, however, where the "work" is posited at least to the degree that an attempt has been made to correlate the topologies of sound and notation, directionality in both physical and temporal dimensions, the *notation* (its depth of perspective) must incorporate, via the mediation of the performer (his personal "approach"), the destruction (secondary encoding) which it seems to be the task of music to brush impatiently aside. The object of music thus becomes its conditions of realization, as these are made manifest in and through the encapsulated real-time structuration of composition / rehearsal / listening. [...] There can be no compromise in the search for origins, the tracing-back of notational conventions to the unformed "material" (itself a supreme fiction), shot-through as it is with *self*-notation as precondition of its thinkability. This is where a work (the work), in all its specificity, begins.⁴²

As the majority of scholars post-1800 have accepted the work-concept as applied to medieval composers, so too have they sought to accept and demonstrate the concept of originality. Ferneyhough's rallying cry to the origin-hunters is nevertheless shot through with failure, for even though he is considering twentieth-century works by living composers who can presumably discuss their motivation, he admits that the ultimate original is a "supreme fiction". Machaut too appears to tackle this fictionality of inspiration, for his "matiere" is presented in the prologue to *A* as the allegorical characters Amours, Douce Penser,

⁴¹ Roman Ingarden, *The Work of Music and the Problem of its Identity*, trans. by Adam Czerniawski (London, MacMillan, 1986), p. 150.

⁴² Brian Ferneyhough, "Aspects of Notational and Compositional Practice" in *Brian Ferneyhough: Collected Writings*, ed. by J. Boros and R. Toop (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995), pp. 2-13, p. 5.

Plaisance, and Esperance. I will return to the notion of the original towards the end of this chapter. However, first I would like to give fuller consideration to a concept which is common both to Machaut and to his current readers: that of authority, as already defined.

The Machaut manuscripts present authority-seekers with a wealth of treasure to find in the works themselves, including Machaut's intriguing use of anagrams.⁴³ Hiding a name in an anagram was more than merely a fashionable authorial game in the later Middle Ages, for the very solution of the anagram invites and challenges readers to take an active part in the work and "discover" the author's identity, which they probably already know in order to take part (although not essential, the fore-knowledge is certainly helpful). The site of an anagram is therefore a mock battlefield on which fake authorial jousts are held between author and reader. It is "fake" as the "battle" is a game without end, as Laurence de Looze has observed:

The text is not complete until "signed" with the author's name, not by the author but by the reader cum author. The reader, in the act of "solving" the anagram, completes and closes one text while at the same time creating a new one, at the very minimum the author's name. In this sense the reader's "response" is more concrete and more active than in many contemporary, even "postmodern" literary works. Assuming a role that is both recreational and re-creational, the reader must author the author, though the author authors the text which endows the reader with this power. Indeed, the complete work is a kind of literary Möbius strip: the reader authors the author who authors the text that authorizes the reader to author the author who authors the text - and so on.⁴⁴

As is well known, Machaut's instances of self-naming as author are particularly interesting, ranging from the non-encrypted version in the *Jugement Navarre* (requiring no decoding by the audience or reader) to the "unsolvable" anagrams (possibly less challenging to Machaut's contemporaries) including the one in the *Dit de la Harpe*, which evidently do not reveal simply the poet's name.⁴⁵ More interesting still is

⁴³ Appendix 2 provides a summary of the anagrams in Machaut's works, together with details of those in the *Remede de Fortune* and the *Voir Dit*.

⁴⁴ Laurence de Looze, "Signing Off in the Middle Ages: Medieval Textualities and the Strategies of Self-Naming", in *Vox intexta: Orality and Textuality in the Middle Ages*, ed. by A. N. Doane and Carol Braun Pasternack (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 161-78, p. 170.

⁴⁵ For a detailed discussion of anagrams in Machaut see de Looze, "'Mon nom trouveras': A New Look at the Anagrams of Guillaume de Machaut - the Enigmas, Responses, and Solutions" *The Romanic Review*, 79 (1988), pp. 537-57. De Looze includes the outright naming in *Navarre* as an "anagram" despite there being no

the (apparent) anagram in the *Remede de Fortune* which claims to reveal the author's name, but which does not. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 show how it is introduced and presented in manuscript C. The anagram passage itself is highlighted in italics in the transcription and translation of fig. 1.2.

<i>Figure removed due to copyright reasons</i>	<p>Mais en la fin de ce traitié Que j'ay compilé et traitié Weil mon non et mon seurnom mettre Sans sillabe oublier ne lettre Et cilz qui savoir le vourra De legier savoir le porra Car le quart ver ci com je fin, Commencement moyen et fin Est de mon nom qui tous entiers Y est sans faillir quart ne tiers</p> <p>Mais il ne couvient adjouster En ce quart ver lettre n'oster Car riens y adjousteroit Mon non jamais ni trouveroit Qu'il ni eust ou plus ou moins</p>
--	---

Figure 1.1: Manuscript C, fols. 58-58v (detail)

The anagram directions from the *Remede de Fortune*

[I wish to put my name and surname at the end of this treatise which I have compiled and treated, not omitting a syllable or letter. And anyone who wants to know it can easily do so, for the fourth line from the end contains the beginning, middle and end of my name in its absolute entirety. But no letter in this fourth line must be changed or erased, for if anything were changed, no trace of my name would ever be found.]

<i>Figure removed due to copyright reasons</i>	<p>Mon cuer si doucement resjoie Qu'en grant se[n]te et en grant joie <i>Li change mal u tu me dis</i> Que pris en gre sera mes dis Or doit diex quen bon gre le prengne Et qu'en li servant ne mesprengne</p>
--	--

Figure 1.2: Manuscript C, fol. 58v (detail)

The end of the *Remede*, including the anagram passage

puzzle to solve. See also Appendix 2.

[My heart is so sweetly glad that its great health⁴⁶ and great joy are unalloyed *and changed from sorrow when you tell me* that my composition will be welcome. Now may God grant that she [my lady] will like it and that in her service I make no mistake.]

This naming survives in every copy of the *Remede*. Although Machaut was not the first to use anagrammatic authorial signatures in his time, he does appear the most consistent, or perhaps insistent, in signing his longer works (his individual songs do not generally contain signatures). Whereas rubrics, added by scribes, could vary greatly from manuscript to manuscript, the text, while by no means unchangeable, is somewhat less prone than rubrics to scribal intervention. Thus, by not relying on scribal rubrics, Machaut takes care to preserve his name: he is aware of his identity, his status as creator of the work.⁴⁷

Despite Machaut's instructions about keeping every letter intact, the key line in the *Remede* contains one letter too many but doesn't render enough a's or u's to give any of the various spellings of "Guillaume de Machaut" used in the sources, although any near-"solution" is close enough for us to know whose name we are supposed to find (an example is offered in Appendix 2). Of course, we do not know what Machaut's first audience or readers would have made of this, but it certainly seems as if he is playing games. Indeed, by seeming to help us play his game by pinpointing the location of his name, Machaut has the last laugh.⁴⁸ We are left in frustrated admiration but in no doubt that he is the author. Nevertheless, the disparity between the normal forms of Machaut's name and the form that results here from our attempts at decryption is one of the factors which lead us to doubt that the author is really the first-person "Guillaume" of the text

⁴⁶ Manuscripts A, Vg, B, E and F-G all give the reading "sante" (or "santte").

⁴⁷ This is one of a number of techniques Machaut employs to represent himself as creator within his texts. Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, discusses several others, including, for example, the incorporation of the incipit of the *Dit du Vergier* into the preceding *Prologue* and the explicit into the poem itself (p. 36); the portrayal of the protagonist of the *Jugement du roi de Navarre* and the *Voir Dit* as a professional writer (pp. 15-16); and the composition of the *Prologue* as a self-conscious introduction to a "complete-works" manuscript (pp. 16-18). All of this contributes to that which Brownlee elsewhere so eloquently calls "the theatre of the page" (Kevin Brownlee, "Authorial Self-Representation and Literary Models in the *Roman de Fauvel*", in Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey, eds, *Fauvel Studies: Allegory, Chronicle, Music and Image in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS français 146* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 73-103, p. 80).

⁴⁸ de Looze, " 'Mon nom trouveras' ", especially p. 547.

(Laurence de Looze calls this "pseudo-autobiography"⁴⁹). Therefore the reader's job is far from complete, since, "even after solving the anagram," reasons de Looze, "the reader must, of his own initiative, still bridge the gap between the two names with no sanction whatsoever from the text. [...] The 'complete' solution is only a partial answer."⁵⁰

Some readers, however, have resorted to more than simply "bridging the gap". Like the *Remede de Fortune*, the end of the *Voir Dit* (in all manuscripts which transmit the whole work) contains an anagrammatical signature. Unlike the *Remede*, however, the *Voir Dit* anagram purports to contain two names, that of the lover and of his lady Toute Belle, as shown below from manuscript A. Once again, the anagram passage is highlighted in italics in both the transcription and the translation.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Laurence de Looze, " 'Pseudo-autobiography' and the Body of Poetry in Guillaume de Machaut's *Remede de Fortune*" *L'Esprit Créateur* 33:4 (1993), pp. 73-86. See also Brownlee's discussion of the *Remede* in *Poetic Identity*, pp. 37-63.

⁵⁰ de Looze, " 'Mon Nom Trouveras' ", p. 547.

⁵¹ Manuscript *E* presents a slightly different passage for the anagram; this is shown in Appendix 2 and is discussed in Chapter 5.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Or est raison que je vous die
Le nom de ma dame jolie
Et le mien qui ay fait ce dit
Que l'en appelle le voir dit
Et s'au savoir volés entendre
En la fin de ce livre prendre
Vous couvenra le ver .IX^e.
Et puis .VIII. lettres de l'uitisme
Qui sont droit au
commancement
La verrés nos noms clerement
Vesci comment je les enseigne
Il me plaist bien que chascuns
teinge
Que j'aim si fort sans repentir
Ma chiere dame, et sans mentir
Que je ne desire par m'ame
*Pour le changier nulle autre
fame*
Ma dame le savra de vray
Qu'autre dame jamais n'avray
Ains seray siens jusque a la fin
Et après ma mort de cuer fin
La servira mes esperis
Or doint dieus qu'il ne soit peris
Pour li tant prier qu'il appelle
Son ame en gloire toute belle.

Amen.

Explicit le livre dou voir dit

Fig. 1.3: A, fol. 306 (detail)
The anagram passage from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

[I tell you truly that you will find the name of my fair lady, and mine who wrote this dit known as the *Voir Dit*, and if you want to know and decode them, you will need to take the ninth line from the end of the book and then eight letters from the eighth which are at the very beginning. There you will see our names clearly for that is where I have signposted them and it pleases me well that everyone should appreciate that I love my dear lady well and without regret, as without lying, by my soul I would not desire *to change her for any other woman*; my lady will know *this* to be true. I will never have another lady and I will be hers until the end, and after my death my spirit will serve her with a pure heart. Now God grant that it may not have perished as a result of making such impassioned prayers to her whom it hails as its glorious and all-beautiful (Toute Belle) soul-mate. Amen. Here ends the book of the True Tale.]⁵²

⁵² See Appendix 2 for a comparative transcription with manuscript F-G.

Who could resist such a challenge? Indeed, several "solutions" have been put forward since the eighteenth century.⁵³ (It is worth noting, however, that no records have been found of "solutions" to the anagram contemporary to Machaut, whose first reader-performers, for the *Voir Dit* perhaps more than any other work, may very well have known the names of both Machaut and his lady, since there are references in the story to the affair being well-known.) Toute Belle has been variously identified as Agnès of Navarre, Peronelle d'Armentière, and Perronne. Two of the more recent – and not entirely complimentary – "solutions" have come from Paulin Paris and Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet. Paulin Paris, the nineteenth-century editor of the *Voir Dit*, in order to arrive at his "solution", not only changed a letter in Machaut's text (emending *fame* to *dame* to allow him an extra *d*), but also added one more letter in the solution (an extra *e*), despite his own instructions to keep every letter intact:⁵⁴ "Pour li changier nulle autre dame / Madame le" – "Guillaume de Machau, Peronelle d'Armantier". "Swept up by his own solution," says de Looze, "by the near-naming which with a little nudge became naming, Paris let himself take slightly more liberty than is customary. If it was a sin, it was only a venal sin."⁵⁵ Although not the first (or last) to object to Paris's "little nudge",⁵⁶ Cerquiglini-Toulet offered the following "solution", based on the format of "solutions" to Machaut's other anagrams: "Guillaume de Machaut, Perronne fille a amer".⁵⁷ Indeed, this option is reasonably safe, if not entirely satisfactory for those seeking a name-and-surname for the lady, since "dix et sept", the *rondeau* which Machaut claims contains Toute Belle's name, spells out the letters "RENOP" (= Peron). But while Toute Belle's name may contain the letters RENOP, any anagram "solution" which proposes more than this is at best hypothetical. In any case, whatever may be the "solution", assuming indeed that there is one, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and Barton Palmer's suggestion that any identification of

⁵³ For a fuller discussion of the various solutions see Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and R. Barton Palmer, "Introduction", in Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Livre dou Voir Dit*, trans. by R. Barton-Palmer and ed. by Daniel Leech-Wilkinson (New York: Garland, 1998), pp. i-cxiv, especially pp. xxxix-xl, n. 5. These are summarised in Appendix 2.

⁵⁴ See Cerquiglini-Toulet, "Un Engin si subtil", pp. 235-28, cited in de Looze, "Signing Off", pp. 551-52.

⁵⁵ de Looze, " 'Mon nom trouveras' ", p. 550.

⁵⁶ de Looze, " 'Mon nom trouveras' ", p. 550.

⁵⁷ Cerquiglini-Toulet, "Un engin si subtil", pp. 235-238.

Toute Belle and her family will come primarily from references within the text seems to be the most reasonable.⁵⁸

Paris's (self?)-deception is a clear example not only of the play of authority in which Machaut's readers have been engaged for centuries, but also of the inherent self-deception needed to play the game: finding the answer and then altering the question to fit. After all, "by exploiting the vagaries of medieval spelling and cheating a little, one can make almost any anagram say almost anything".⁵⁹ All that is clear from "solving" an anagram is the *identity* of the person whose name is revealed: any *authority* which is present does not belong fully to the reader, nor to the author, and this can easily result in (self-) deception. It is not only anagrams, however, which invite such (self-) deception when dealing with Machaut and authority, as we shall see.

In another case of ambiguous authority, I would like to suggest that the idea of performance can be used as a means to understanding.⁶⁰ Figure 1.4, taken from earlier in the manuscript C version of the *Remede* (folio 26), appears to be an image of Machaut the composer at work:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 1.4: C fol. 26 (detail)

Guillaume composing (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

⁵⁸ Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, "Introduction", pp. xxxix-xl, n. 5.

⁵⁹ Margaret J. Ehrhart, "Machaut's *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse*, the Choice of Paris, and the Duties of Rulers", *Philological Quarterly* 59 (1980), pp. 119-39, p. 122. It should be added that some medieval scribal hands lend themselves to misinterpretation, particularly if parchment is rubbed or damaged.

⁶⁰ Here I acknowledge inspiration from Leonard W. Johnson, *Poets as Players: Theme and Variation in Late Medieval French Poetry* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990). Although Johnson's book focuses on poets as players of games rather than performers, nevertheless my proposed performative approach to Machaut's works took root following my reading of this book.

In *C* the *Remede de Fortune* is presented with a large number of miniatures drawn by an artist whom François Avril believes to have been the head of the illuminators at the scriptorium.⁶¹ Various reasons have been put forward for this preferential treatment of the *Remede* in the manuscript, the most reasonable in my view being the suggestion by James Wimsatt and William Kibler that manuscript *C* was intended for the household of Jean and Bonne of Luxembourg, and that Bonne can be identified with the lady of the *Remede*, which then received special treatment (perhaps as a result of Bonne's sudden death soon before or during the manuscript's production). The miniature shows the rural setting of the story, typical of courtly romance. (Indeed, the *Remede* opens with the usual hyperbolic catalogue of courtly requirements: the birds are singing, more beautifully than ever before, there's an orchard, the most beautiful that ever there was, the trees are blossoming, more beautifully than ever before, there's a lady, more beautiful than any in the world...). The *Remede* contains no great surprises in its courtly context except — and it is a major exception — that the very composition of this first-person narrative together with the interpolated music is an integral part of the action, which is itself didactic: and since Machaut (unusually for his time) represents himself in one of his real-life occupations, namely as a poet-composer, it is a story about artistic creation. Figure 1.4 therefore presumably shows the principal character, the creator, the lover, the "I" at work.

Or does it? Is this really Guillaume writing the lay in the *Remede*, as the rubric states? A theme which runs throughout the series of miniatures which accompany the *Remede* in manuscript *C* is the extent to which characters are shown reading or singing from parchment, or, in this case, writing. Yet Machaut himself, or at least his character, in the *Remede* maintains that, for greater accuracy and sincerity, he

⁶¹ François Avril, *Manuscript Painting at the Court of France*, trans. by Ursule Molinaro and Bruce Benderson (London: Chatto and Windus, 1978), pp. 26-27, and "Les Manuscrits enluminés de Guillaume de Machaut: Essai de chronologie" in *Guillaume de Machaut: Colloque - Table Ronde Organisé par l'Université de Reims Reims, 19-22 Avril 1978* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1982), pp. 117-133, p. 119. See also the editorial commentary by James I. Wimsatt and William M. Kibler in *Guillaume de Machaut, Le Jugement du Roy de Behaigne and Remede de Fortune*, ed. and trans. by James I. Wimsatt and William M. Kibler (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988), p. 449.

memorises rather than writes things down, since his memory is more reliable than writing:

Et par maniere de memoire
Tout le fait de li et l'ystoire
Si com je l'ay devant escript,
Estoit en mon cuer en escript
Par vray certain entendement
Mieus .c. foys et plus proprement
Que clers ne le porroit escripre
De main en parchemin ne en cire.

[And to fix the memory of everything about her and her story, just as I've written it out above, it was inscribed in my heart by true and certain understanding a hundred times more accurately and exactly than any clerk could write it out by hand on parchment or wax tablet.]⁶²

Indeed, despite the fictional setting, it seems that in the fourteenth century this practice of committing to memory was still extremely common, more so than is usually acknowledged, as later chapters will show. How do we know the figure in the miniature is Machaut? Authority rears its head again: this figure has the symbols of authority; he has the pen and the parchment. It is the same lover in the story as in the other images and whom Machaut calls "I", and the background foliage of the orchard is the setting of the story – the miniature is not of a scribe in a scriptorium. Therefore, we assume, it must be Machaut himself, or at least the first-person lover Guillaume.⁶³ The presence of the scroll is particularly symbolic. Usually a symbol of aural discourse (as it will be at the performance of the lay before the lady later in the story),⁶⁴ here it is shown as part of the process of composition. Together with the quotation above about memory, this image plays on a juxtaposition of sight and sound, of the written and the heard, a contrast which is found throughout the *Remede* (and the manuscripts, and even throughout Machaut's works) by the combination of narrative and music. While this image is no doubt more symbolic than real, I propose that in this miniature it is better here to think of Guillaume/Machaut as performing, rather than composing: in conceiving

⁶² Wimsatt and Kibler, eds, ll. 2939-46, pp. 332-33.

⁶³ The relationship between Machaut the author and Guillaume the lover in the *Remede* is discussed more fully in Chapter 2.

⁶⁴ Huot, *From Song to Book*, pp. 78-9 and 250-51. See also Michael Camille, "Seeing and Reading: Some Visual Implications of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy", *Art History* 8:1 (1985), pp. 26-49, pp. 28-9, 38 and 43, and Emma Dillon, *Medieval Music Making*, p. 92.

the story, in taking part as a character in the story, and in the act of writing it down (or having it written down) in manuscript form. This image, the *Remede de Fortune*, and indeed the whole manuscript, forms part of that elaborate performance.

The play of authority is not confined to details within individual works, for the manuscripts themselves show an acute awareness of the issues. This raises the much-rehearsed question of Machaut's own involvement in the compilation of those that appear to have been produced in his lifetime. Of these, manuscript C seems to be as securely datable to pre-1377 as anything can be.⁶⁵ Vg, B, and A are widely accepted as contemporary too. And, although doubtful, E might be also; for despite the fact that scholarly opinion accepts Avril's c.1390 dating of the illuminations, it has been suggested that this element may have been added later and that the core manuscript dates from earlier.⁶⁶ Out of the six extant "complete-works" manuscripts, therefore, at least one (C), and perhaps up to four others, may be co-eval with Machaut. Each therefore offers the tantalising possibility of authorial supervision.⁶⁷

One of the areas where the issue of authorial supervision seems most secure is the index to manuscript A with its famous rubric "Vesci lordenence que G. de Machau vuet quil ait en son livre" ("Here is the order that G. de Machaut wants his book to have"). This is an important rubric: it occurs on an unnumbered folio at the beginning of the manuscript, and since titles as we know them do not introduce the Machaut manuscripts, this is the first mention of Machaut's name. Since there is a strong possibility that A was produced during Machaut's lifetime,⁶⁸ this rubric is often cited as evidence of intervention by Machaut in the manuscript's production. Lawrence Earp, for example, writes that the inclusion of the interpolated songs from the *Remede* in the music list "suggests special intervention by the author".⁶⁹ This is possible, but far from proven, especially since the book does not in fact follow the order given in the list, though it is close — certainly close

⁶⁵ See Avril, *Manuscript Painting*, pp. 26-27.

⁶⁶ Margaret Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts Vg, B, and E", *Musica Disciplina* 37 (1983), pp. 53-82, pp. 75-6.

⁶⁷ For a proposition that Machaut's hand may be discernible in some of the miniatures in manuscript A see Domenic Leo, "Authorial Presence in the Illuminated Machaut Manuscripts", (unpublished doctoral thesis, New York University Institute of Fine Arts, 2005).

⁶⁸ Avril, *Manuscript Painting*, p. 36.

⁶⁹ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 82.

enough to rule out disorderings during frequent rebinding, as Earp has demonstrated.⁷⁰ Earp suggests that the reason for the mismatching between the index and the manuscript is because the index — or, should we say, any archetype upon which it may have been based? — was drawn up first.⁷¹ Though reasonable, this proposition cannot, of course, be proved. What I am interested in here, however, is the fact that Machaut's identity is given in the rubric to the index. Given that the index does not actually reflect the order of the manuscript, it is possible that, rather than invoking the authorial intervention which has been so eagerly sought since the revival of Machaut scholarship in the nineteenth century, Machaut's *identity* as author is flagged in the rubric in order to highlight the *authority* which the scribe wanted the manuscript to have. After all, it would have been unnecessarily fastidious and convoluted to say: "Here is the order that G. de Machaut wants his book to have; we are including this table for your information because it turned out that we couldn't quite follow it owing to copying difficulties but we know it's definitely what he wanted." In the index to manuscript A the *identity* of the poet-composer is not in doubt, though the meaning of his invoked *authority* cannot be ascertained.

Can we say that Machaut did indeed oversee the production of any of his works? This question cannot be answered for certain, despite the efforts of some scholars (such as Earp, as we have seen) eager to attribute the presentation of at least one of the extant manuscripts to, or close to, Machaut himself. Avril suggested that manuscript A, the main part of which was not produced in Paris, may have been produced in Reims. However, he presents no evidence as to why this may be, other than the fact that Reims is where the author is thought to have lived at the time of its production.⁷² Yet this proposal, together with the tantalising rubric in the index, has made manuscript A front-runner in terms of possible authorial intervention. Textual inconsistencies, however, seem to imply that, if Machaut was involved in its production, he at least was not involved at any correcting stages (if indeed there were any).⁷³ Indeed, for the *Jugement du roi de Behaigne* and, to a

⁷⁰ Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 52-83.

⁷¹ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 52.

⁷² Avril, *Manuscript Painting*, p. 36.

⁷³ Wimsatt and Kibler, pp. 12-13.

lesser extent, the *Remede de Fortune*, Wimsatt and Kibler see such a deterioration between their grouping of manuscripts containing C on the one hand, and that containing A on the other, that they feel justified in stating that "it is clear that the text tradition of neither poem indicates that Machaut revised the texts nor oversaw directly the copying of the manuscripts".⁷⁴ Earp has written several important contributions to this debate, which look in vain for concrete evidence, and therefore opinion must remain inconclusive on this point.⁷⁵

Much of the evidence which we do have comes from the *Voir Dit*. The "truthfulness" or otherwise of the *Voir Dit* has been debated since Paulin Paris's (near) unravelling of its anagram in the nineteenth century. His conclusion that Peronnelle d'Armentières was *Toute Belle* was well-received by some scholars and is echoed in some library catalogues which list her as a co-author.⁷⁶ Other scholars, including William Calin, believe her contributions to the story were entirely invented by Machaut.⁷⁷ Most recently, Barton Palmer and Daniel Leech-Wilkinson's extensive research into the *Voir Dit*'s letters has gone a long way to refute this widely-held opinion.⁷⁸ Perhaps a useful comparison can be made with many popular writings today (for example many of the works of Bill Bryson), which sit somewhere between autobiography and fiction. In other words, the *Voir Dit* can be seen as a work apparently based on real-life events, but nevertheless allowing for a significant, but unspecified degree of artistic licence. The key to this understanding is *performance*, in particular on the part of the creator, who takes part in the work not just as an author, but as a first-person character who is much more than a fictional narrator. Despite the fact that the allegorical passages in the tale (such as the encounter with the lady Hope on the road) cannot have literally taken place, the first-person protagonist nevertheless invites us to read it in the light of "truth". The *Voir Dit* is certainly "voir" ("true") in a way in which Machaut's other *dits* are not.

⁷⁴ Wimsatt and Kibler, p. 44.

⁷⁵ Lawrence Earp, "Machaut's Role in the Production of Manuscripts of his Works", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 42 (1989), pp. 461-503, p. 492. See also Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut* and "Scribal Practice".

⁷⁶ See Sarah Jane Williams, "The Lady, the Lyrics and the Letters" *Early Music* V (1977), pp. 462-68.

⁷⁷ Calin, *A Poet at the Fountain*, pp. 169-70, following Georg Hanf, "Über Guillaume de Machauts *Voir Dit*" *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 22 (1898), pp. 145-96.

⁷⁸ Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, "Introduction".

When in letter 33 of the *Voir Dit* Machaut mentions his "livre ou je mets toutes mes choses" ("book where I keep/put all of my things"), therefore, I am inclined to accept that he did indeed mean a book, or some kind of written repository, which contained a copy of all or most of his works. The purpose of this book is not clear, however, for it could mean anything from a complete bound illustrated manuscript to a scrapbook-like *aide-mémoire*. Furthermore, I see no reason to presume that this book must have been perfect in every regard simply because Machaut owned it. For, if we are to accept that there is at least this much "truth" in the *Voir Dit*, we must bear in mind that we have already seen how, in the *Remede*, memory could be considered more reliable than writing. Therefore Machaut's own memory, or that of his contemporaries, may well have been more accurate than his *livre*. Since in the *Voir Dit* Machaut is concerned about his works being circulated before he was happy with them, then surely the place to keep incomplete and unfinished works would be safe at home, away from a busy scriptorium where works by a well-known author might go astray. (Earp has speculated that "unscrupulous individuals" might be responsible for the apparently hastily-copied manuscript *B*, although he does assume that Machaut kept control of the "original".⁷⁹ Whether or not he did, Machaut surely did not have control of manuscripts once they were copied and in the hands of patrons.) In fact, if this book had been "perfect", or if Machaut and his contemporaries really shared our desire for proof-reading, then perhaps the extant manuscripts would have far fewer differences.⁸⁰

We have evidence in the *Voir Dit*, then, that Machaut had some kind of book. We do not know what kind of a book it was, nor its purpose, and it does not appear to have survived the years. Yet none of this has prevented scholars from trying to trace stemmata from the extant manuscripts to this holy grail, the supposed lost original. Closely associated with this notion of the "original" is that of the "best" – and implicit here is the assumption that the "best" version must be the "original". This idea has led to the extant manuscripts, the sources themselves, being assessed, praised, debased, sometimes dismissed as

⁷⁹ Earp, "Machaut's Role", p. 477.

⁸⁰ A full discussion of the implications of the variants in the "complete-works" manuscripts containing the *Voir Dit* will take place in Chapter 5.

"unreliable", while their creators are "corrected" and castigated in print for their sloppiness in their "mistakes" and errant variants. I am not alone in wondering whether this has perhaps been at the cost of the works themselves:

[W]here – or what – is the "true" text? Is there, in fact, such a thing as an Ur-Text in medieval literature? The answer to this question, conditioned by ideas emanating from both the Romantic conception of the absolute individuality of an author and from the Germanic beginnings of modern Romance philology in the nineteenth century, has always, at least until recently, been a resounding "Yes", with the resulting cataloguing of every known manuscript for any given literary artefact, of the construction of stemmata or manuscript "families", of the reconstruction, even, in some cases of a hypothetical "original" form. But the (re)construction of a fixed Text, it seems to me, can profoundly alter the nature of what was a much less consecrated form, a text subject to variation and to reshaping at the hand of a scribe or by the voice of a performer. I do not mean in any way to disparage the extreme usefulness of the immense philological labor that, since the middle of the nineteenth century, has provided so many editions of medieval texts, printed often with infinite care for indicated variants; I suggest, however, that the Text, hypothetically perfect and thus perfected, may often hide the text(s), and so may constitute, albeit unwittingly, a real series of obstacles to reading.⁸¹

Writing nearly two decades after Johnson, I will dare to go further, for I have frequently felt that scholars have displayed – and continue to display – a tendency to be curiously dismissive of their medieval forebears' intelligence and seem keen to revert to some perceived state of original perfection, free from the foibles and whims of the blundering scribal performers whose errors stand between them and the "pure" work, fresh from the mind of its creator. An exaggeration, perhaps, but nevertheless the following are but a few examples among many: Earp states that in parts of manuscript *B* the staff-ruler "was ignorantly filling in blank space on the page"; David Maw appears to congratulate the medieval scribes when he declares that "all cadences of the song are correctly accented"; Margaret Bent writes that neither of *B*'s music scribes "ranks very high in terms of musical intelligence or experience", and Avril comments that in the opening miniature to manuscript *A* "the spatial arrangement of the different elements which compose the scene

⁸¹ Johnson, pp. 15-16.

do not match the artist's ambitions".⁸² This is not to assert that the essence of what the four scholars have to say is in any way flawed, but rather to suggest that the prevalent scholarly tradition is to describe manuscripts and their variants in terms of our perception of their faults. Earp's "Scribal Practice" is surely a case in point. Its wealth of typographical inconsistencies may one day render it an example of the teething troubles of word processing: yet it is a vitally important piece of Machaut scholarship, Earp presumably had control over its production, and it is probably a reprint of what was, at some point, Earp's very own *livre ou il met toutes ses choses*.

I would like to dwell on the idea of "errors" and their "correction" here, for it is closely bound in with the notions of "original" and "best" which have been running throughout this chapter. The idea of a "lost original" in medieval works, an original which sprung fully-formed from the author's hand but which, due to the vagaries of reproduction in the pre-print era, has been corrupted to varying degrees ever since, has now generally fallen out of vogue in medieval studies.⁸³ Nevertheless, in the specific case of Machaut, the idea has held currency for longer than might be expected, in part due to his description of "le livre ou je mets toutes mes choses" in the *Voir Dit* which we have already seen. In the majority of cases, the notion of a lost original is implicit. It is implicit in any discussion of composer intention, any attempt to "correct" the sources, and, no matter how scrupulous the editing and commentary, our societal conditioning today means that it is invariably subconsciously present at the back of any reader's mind when holding a modern printed edition. This, together with the authorial representation within the manuscripts and within the works themselves, means that it should be no real surprise to find, for example, that critical apparatus is limited, difficult to access, and poorly presented in the most recent edition of Machaut's musical works.⁸⁴ While this is an extreme case, it is

⁸² Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 187; David Maw, "Words and Music in the Secular Songs of Guillaume de Machaut" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1999), p. 94; Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts Vg, B, and E", p. 59; Avril, *Manuscript Painting*, p. 96.

⁸³ For a concise history of editorial policies and theories, including the role of the modern editor in retrieving this perceived "original" text (known as the "Lachmannian" method of editing), see Alfred Foulet and Mary Blakely Speer, *On Editing Old French Texts* (Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1979), pp. 1-39.

⁸⁴ de Machaut, Guillaume, *The Works of Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. by Leo Schrade, *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* vols 2-3 (Monaco: Editions de L'Oiseau-

nevertheless a highly pertinent one. A more nuanced view is offered by Elizabeth Eva Leach, who, whilst maintaining that the idea of "original" should be kept in mind, returns to medieval training which would have been subconsciously available in the memory of a " 'native speaker' like Machaut". She also states:

The different reading of different sources belong on a continuum from patent errors to viable variants – with compositional reworking an elusive and infrequent diversion. [...] Like one of Escher's impossible buildings, a starting premise that counterpoint and musical pieces are mutually informing, leads to a certain degree of circularity in the argument. However the instances of non-congruence between theory and practice which could arguably represent an exceptional compositional moment, are remarkably few. 'Explaining away' such moments as manuscript errors and correcting them, as I shall do here, may raise objections from those modernists who believe that rules exist to be broken. This objection itself, however, rests with an arguably anachronistic notion of the composer as a genius working 'beyond his time'. I prefer instead to see counterpoint as in part a codification of practice, and in part a didactic advocacy of a specific approach. In this way it does not limit, but rather enables, the composer.⁸⁵

This standpoint, which allows for some "errors" (which are of course to be expected in anything created by an imperfect human being) yet which does not assume scribal indifference or incompetence, needs to be taken into account when dealing with the manuscript sources.⁸⁶

Absolutely fundamental to all my thinking presented here is that very little can be definitively proved when dealing with long-past history. Unfortunately, the line between fact and assumptions from the available evidence, however plausible they may be, is often crossed without acknowledgement. Even in a source as reputable as Grove Music Online entry on Machaut assumptions are presented as facts. As Daniel Leech-Wilkinson indicates, since we all know that little or nothing can be proved when it comes to dealing with the distant past, many

Lyre, 1956). Although the carefully annotated edition by Ludwig is generally preferred by scholars now, when it was published Schrade's edition was unanimously hailed for its high quality and lack of errors when it first appeared (see reviews by Willi Apel, *Speculum*, 33 (1958), pp. 433-34, Richard H. Hoppin, *Notes*, 15 (1957-8), pp. 472-74, David G. Hughes, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 11 (1958), pp. 240-43, and Jeremy Noble, *Musical Times*, 100 (1959), p. 22).

⁸⁵ Elizabeth Eva Leach, "Counterpoint in Guillaume de Machaut's Musical Ballades" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)", pp. xi-xii.

⁸⁶ Much of Leach's work purports a similar view. See, for example, her recent comments on manuscript writing and composition in Elizabeth Eva Leach, *Sung Birds: Music, Nature and Poetry in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), pp. 112-14.

writers see no point in the wearisome highlighting of assumptions; and yet once this necessary fastidiousness is neglected, these assumptions soon become seen as facts.⁸⁷ Before we know it, we find ourselves accepting unquestioningly the affirmation in Grove Music Online that the reason there are so many extant Machaut complete-works sources is "thanks to the composer's own efforts".⁸⁸ (There is not even a "perhaps" in sight to redeem this statement.) And now that this state has been reached, many scholars are floundering to explain away the variant readings contained within these apparently "authoritative" sources.

Nevertheless, I find it intriguing that there seems to be a need to re-create this perceived original in printed editions of Machaut's works. However, let me make it absolutely clear that I do not deny that there is many a good reason for turning variants into a single edition, and that these editions of course serve their purpose and have their place, offering a convenient source of reference to those wishing to compare Machaut's compositions with those of other writers or composers of any period. Although many are printed as stable entities that are devoid of miniatures and music and which more often than not are supposed to represent an infallible *Urtext*, an increasing number are showing acute awareness of the difficulties of rendering the wealth of beauty and information contained in even a single manuscript into a printed edition. (See for instance James Wimsatt and William Kibler's edition and translation of the *Remede de Fortune* and *Jugement du roi de Behaigne* and Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and R. Barton-Palmer's edition and translation of the *Voir Dit*.) As the advent of electronic publishing brings the possibility of click-comparison, it is to be hoped that this trend of respect for variance and *mouvance* will continue.

Yet the approach at which I have been hinting throughout this chapter – that of performance – can be applied to all readers of Machaut throughout all centuries. Following Small's definition of *to music*, if we consider each of Machaut's works, however presented (manuscript, edition, oral rendition), as a performance featuring an author-performer and one or more reader-performers (scribes, artists, editors, musicians), then there is room to accommodate side by side across the centuries

⁸⁷ Leech-Wilkinson, *The Modern Invention of Medieval Music*.

⁸⁸ Art, "Machaut [Machau, Machault], Guillaume de [Guillelmus de Machaudio]".

the author and the editor, the scribe and the scholar, the singer and the saxophonist. In making and reading Machaut's works, including modern printed editions, we are all inevitably drawn into taking part in the elaborate performance which started with Machaut himself and which has been played out by our fellow scribal and reader-performers through the centuries since the works were first conceived.

Therefore, if that which we consider "best" is not necessarily "original", and "authority" can have so many meanings that it becomes virtually meaningless, how are we to reconcile the differences we observe in the Machaut manuscripts? My answer, which will govern the following chapters, is to return to the less problematic concepts of identity and performance. Of course we must highlight problematic variants - but we must not dismiss them, or seek to explain them away using even more problematic concepts. Only then can we, the present-day performers of compositions by a man named Machaut, be free to bring in our own interpretations (whether they be coloured by the concepts of authority and originality, or the pop group Franz Ferdinand deciding to perform one of the lays), provided that we are aware of our role in the continuing performance. For the attraction of the performative approach proposed here is that, like Small's "musicking", it is descriptive, not prescriptive: it allows present-day performers of works by Guillaume de Machaut to join with the author, scribes, and other readers, in the performance of reconstructing the manuscripts, and the works they contain, in all their glorious plurality.

Chapter 2

Education and Performance in the *Remede de Fortune*

Cilz qui veult aucun art aprendre
A .xii. choses doit entendre.⁸⁹

Anyone who wants to learn any art
Must pay attention to 12 things.

The importance of the *Remede de Fortune* to Machaut and his contemporaries is evident from the conspicuous manner in which it is presented in all the manuscript sources, especially in the early manuscript C. Yet while it has been the subject of a fair volume of literature, scholars have tended to view it as precursor to the still more impressive *Voir Dit*, which, being compiled in Machaut's later years, has understandably commanded much more attention. Such studies as address the *Remede* on its own terms tend to confine themselves to particular aspects of it. In the present chapter I attempt a holistic approach to the work, examining the narrative, iconography, and music, with special emphasis on page layout. Indeed manuscript presentation is perhaps the key to understanding how the reception of the *Remede* developed during Machaut's lifetime and afterwards. In this chapter I will consider how far the presentation of the *Remede* in each of the "complete-works" manuscripts reflects and affects this reception. I will also outline what this can in turn suggest as regards to the different aims and reasons behind each manuscript's production.

In this and the other central chapters, rather than focus in turn on each of the three elements of the work as displayed by the manuscripts, the text, the images, and the music, I will consider each of the manuscripts in approximate chronological order in terms of their tripartite nature.⁹⁰ The analyses of the *Remede* will focus on the

⁸⁹ Guillaume de Machaut, opening of the *Remede de Fortune* (transcription from C, f. 23).

⁹⁰ The order I have chosen is loosely based Avril's chronological order, discussed in *Manuscript Painting*, and "Les Manuscrits enluminés". Avril does not discuss the miniature-less *B*, and his dates for *A* and *Vg* are too close to call, except for the presence or otherwise of the *Voir-Dit* (in *A* but not *Vg* or *B* which would lend *A* to a later date). I have chosen to consider *A* before *Vg* and *B* as, along with *C* with which it poses many interesting contrasts, I feel it serves as a suitable point of comparison and departure for the remaining "complete-works" manuscripts.

presentation of education and performance, two of the themes demonstrated in the manuscript *mises en page*. My conclusions will thus be drawn from the manuscripts as individual works of art in their own right rather than as off-key variants upon a central, harmonious "original".

Manuscript C (1350-1355)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale fonds français 1586 contains 225 vellum folios, and measures 30 x 22 cm.⁹¹ Its provenance and purpose cannot be ascertained for certain, although Wimsatt and Kibler have argued convincingly that it may have been composed for the household of Bonne of Luxembourg, daughter of King Jean of Bohemia and wife of the dauphin Jean.⁹² The manuscript does not contain Machaut's later works, particularly the *Voir Dit*, and this, together with Avril's art-historical analysis, has tipped the balance in favour of it being the earliest of the "complete works" manuscripts.⁹³ While the dating of the actual composition of the *Remede* is difficult to ascertain (Hoepffner places it c. 1340, Poiron suggests 1350);⁹⁴ Wimsatt and Kibler suggest that, whenever it was conceived, it may well have been revised and finalised in honour of Bonne in the form in which it appears in C.⁹⁵

Textually, C holds a strong position for the *Remede*. While Hoepffner preferred A due to its apparent closer proximity to the author (as will be discussed in more detail later), Wimsatt and Kibler chose C as the basis for their 1988 edition and translation, believing it to have the "best" readings of variants in the majority of cases.⁹⁶ Departing from Hoepffner's stemmata, Wimsatt and Kibler prefer to regard the tradition of the *Remede* in two distinct groups which they have termed "early" and "late". Of the "complete-works" manuscripts under consideration here, the "early" tradition consists of C and E, while A, B, F-G, and Vg fall into the "late".⁹⁷ Wimsatt and Kibler state that while the differences between the two traditions are "negligible" due to the lack of competing

⁹¹ See Appendix 1 for more details of the manuscripts.

⁹² Wimsatt and Kibler, p. 34.

⁹³ Avril, *Manuscript Painting*, pp. 26-27.

⁹⁴ Guillaume de Machaut, *Oevres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. by Ernest Hoepffner (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1908-21), 1:lxiv-lxv, 2:i-iii, and Poiron, *Le Poète et le prince* pp. 194, 201 (cited in Wimsatt and Kibler, p. 33). See also Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 213.

⁹⁵ Wimsatt and Kibler, pp. 33-34.

⁹⁶ Their reasons are set out in full in Wimsatt and Kibler, pp. 12-13.

readings, they are nevertheless "impressively uniform" between the two groups.⁹⁸ It should be stressed, however, that Wimsatt and Kibler state unequivocally that a single stemma for the Machaut manuscripts cannot be drawn up, and that each work must be considered separately.⁹⁹ This is a stance which has also been put forward by Margaret Bent for the music in the manuscripts,¹⁰⁰ and it has important ramifications for our notions of manuscript copying and transmission as later chapters will show.

In terms of iconography, the *Remede* contains more miniatures in *C* than in any of the other manuscripts (it has thirty-four in *C* compared to twelve in *A*, three in *Vg*, two in *E* and *F-G*, and, of course, none in the unilluminated *B*), and within *C* it is the work which contains the most miniatures (the work with the next closest number is the *Dit de la fonteinne* with twenty-six).¹⁰¹ This, together with Avril's conclusion that the miniatures in the *Remede* were the only ones undertaken by the chief artist at work on the manuscript (as discussed in Chapter 1), implies that this work was given special treatment in this manuscript.¹⁰² It is therefore worth spending some time considering the implications of the iconography of the *Remede* as presented in *C*.

Each of the illuminated manuscripts has an image which heads the *Remede*. Figure 2.1 shows the opening miniature from manuscript *C* (fol. 23).

⁹⁷ This division is also supported by Elizabeth Eva Leach's analysis of the two *balades* (the *balade* and the *baladelle*) in the *Remede* in "Machaut's Balades with Four Voices", *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 10 (2001), pp. 47-79, pp. 71-75.

⁹⁸ Wimsatt and Kibler, pp. 41 and 42.

⁹⁹ Wimsatt and Kibler, p. 43

¹⁰⁰ Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*", pp. 62-63 and 75-76.

¹⁰¹ For a comparative table of all the miniatures see Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 382-89, and *Guillaume de Machaut*, pp. 152-57.

¹⁰² Avril, *Manuscript Painting*, pp. 26-27.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.1: C fol. 23 (detail)

The lady's castle (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

Its most striking feature is the castle, which takes up approximately the right-hand two-thirds of the image, and protrudes out of the image into the upper margin, thus imposing its domination over the entire page. It is an elaborate castle, and its interior hall can be seen, giving the impression of internal spaciousness in keeping with the outer splendour. Standing elevated on the steps of the castle is a richly-attired lady, and her extended left index finger implies that she is teaching the three (symbolically) smaller ladies standing below her to her right. These three ladies have their attention focused on the lady on the steps, with their backs turned to the world outside of the castle, and the raised hand of one of them implies that she is engaged in questioning her teacher. The elevated lady, on the other hand, whilst communicating with her ladies, appears to have caught sight of the two male figures in the left third of the image. The castle is clearly enclosed, with a bar across the front of the image and a wall on either side, yet there is a dark but apparently unguarded doorway in the turret closest to the male figures (perhaps implying that the way to his lady's heart was open to the lover from the beginning, although in his uneducated state he did not realise). The taller of the male figures is positioned so that he could be facing out of the page, but instead he has his attention focused on the elevated lady; his arms are crossed and his stance is one of rapt contemplation. He features in the vast majority of the miniatures which

follow, and he is clearly the lover of the story. The smaller male figure is also looking towards the lady, though his reverence is not as acute. This figure does not appear again in the miniatures nor in the story: is he the lover's servant? Or perhaps another of the lady's suitors? Or even a representative of the implied audience to the tale (for the miniatures in C are more populated than those in the other manuscripts)? The elevated lady's distinctive hat marks her out in other images as the lady of the poem, the object of love. The three ladies being instructed by her appear in the following miniatures as members of the lady's circle: they are not characters in the story.

Thus the opening miniature sets the scene for what will follow: the lady and her surroundings take centre stage, the sole object of the lover's attention. She is all-knowing from the start (possibly, it seems, even of the lover's suit which he dares not speak and of which he believes she is ignorant), and others admire her and learn from her also. The emphasis on learning in the opening miniature will become an essential feature of all three elements of the manuscript: the story (indeed the first rhyme word of the *Remede* as quoted at the opening to this chapter is "aprenndre", "to learn"), the iconography, and the music, as we will see.

If his lady is the first character in the story to teach the lover anything, then the second is Love, personified in manuscript C as female. Her pose in the second miniature (fol. 24, fig. 2.2) is very similar to the typical pose of the lover's next teacher, Hope, who will appear later.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.2: C fol. 24 (detail)

Guillaume and Love (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

The lover, however, stands in rapt attention to Love, again with his arms folded, whereas once his education with Hope is well underway he is able to respond to her teachings (see, for example, the miniature on fol. 44v, fig. 2.3):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.3: C fol. 44v (detail)

Guillaume and Hope (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

Love appears in only this one miniature, and I think it is no accident that both the lover's and her stance reflect the previous miniature of the lover and the lady's castle. Indeed in the story the lover's heart is enflamed by the sight of his lady, Love then teaches him his first lessons, before the lady takes over in her turn. After this, then, Love and the lady are one in the miniatures and in the story, for, after Love's brief lesson, it is the lady who teaches by example (Wimsatt and Kibler ed., II. 167-356).

The central didactic relationship, however, is between Hope and the lover. Iconographically, this is portrayed in an uninterrupted series of fourteen miniatures which, together with their captions and the music, more-or-less tell this part of the story on their own without the need for the narrative. While this may seem an exaggeration, to someone familiar with the story the miniatures here serve a mnemonic purpose in highlighting key points both in the story and in Hope's teachings. In all, Hope appears in exactly half of the thirty-four images: after being absent for only one she quickly returns to the lover for a further two after he has left the park of Hesdin to speed him on his way to his lady, and she is finally present in the exchange of rings. After

achieving this goal with Hope's help, the lover is left on his own in his lady's court, in the story, in the miniatures, and in the music.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.4: C fol. 37v (detail)

Guillaume and Hope (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

A feature through all of the miniatures which show the lover receiving instruction is his apparent subordination to the teacher. This is shown either by a lower body position (e.g. with Hope standing and the lover sitting, such as on fol. 37v, fig. 2.4), by a submissive stance such as one or both arms across his chest (e.g. fig 2.1), or by his lowered hands while those of his female teacher are raised (e.g. fig. 2.3). (The only exception to this is the miniature on fol. 45v, where the lover's hands are raised in order to receive a scroll from Hope.) It is only at the exchange of rings (fol. 56, fig. 2.5) that the lover seems to be allowed equality, bestowed upon him by his lady's request (Wimsatt and Kibler ed., ll. 4044-4048, C f. 56).

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.5: C fol. 56 (detail)

The exchange of rings (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

In the final miniature (fol. 58, fig. 2.6), however, the lover once again appears subordinate to his lady's typical finger-pointing pose, although now his hand positions suggest his testing of his new status as equal.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.6: C fol. 58 (detail)

Guillaume and his lady (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

The ending of the poem is not entirely happy and satisfactory for the lover – he is not yet used to his new status, reacts badly to the lady's ambiguous glance, and surely in need of further tuition.

The music supports this didactic theme in a remarkably simple yet effective manner – each of the seven interpolated songs represents one of the *formes fixes* in fashion at the time (*lay, complainte, chant roial,*

baladelle, *ballade*, *chanson balladee/virelai*, and *rondelet*). These are presented in descending order of virtuosity: the tortured and untutored youth manages to write a lay and a *complainte*, whereas the educated lover, perhaps in his joy, manages only the simpler, but often livelier and more melismatic polyphonic forms of *ballade*, *virelai* and *rondelet*. The *chant roial* and *baladelle* are sung by Hope – and here I think is the key to the ordering of the music. For, although the songs are all woven into the story and form an integral part of the action, we the readers know that whole is written by Machaut the poet-composer not Guillaume the lover and his tutor Hope – or, if we do not know this already, we are taught it through the descending order of difficulty in relation to the lover's increasing education, and finally our own learning is completed by the anagrammatic puzzle at the end. In this puzzle, as discussed in Chapter 1, we must ourselves act independently of the author to make his name fit, in the same way that the lover learns to act independently from Hope. (We, too, are left facing the ambiguous consequences of our actions – have we solved the puzzle or not? Was the lover's situation improved by his final independent approaching his lady?). Therefore, while we admire the performance of the miniatures, the characters, and the story, we are nevertheless made aware of the fiction, and we are reminded, or taught, that there is an author at work. This is, after all, a manuscript which contains works by only one author whose name was well-known to the manuscript's probable commissioners and who has already hidden his name in an anagram at the end of the preceding (and opening) work in the manuscript, the *Jugement du roi de Behaingne*. Yet the performative aspect in *C* runs not only through the miniatures, the story, and the fact that music is contained within it, but also through the actual *mise en page* of the music.

As a demonstration of the close intertwining of the three elements of manuscript *C*, it is worth noting that every one of the musical interpolations is accompanied by at least one miniature representing its performance (this, according to the broad interpretation of performance offered in Chapter 1, includes the *complainte* and the *ballade*, which are not performed orally in either the story or the iconography but which are composed in both). The music is extremely clearly presented in *C*, and those "errors" which have been identified are covered by Rebecca

Balzer as a detailed appendix to Wimsatt and Kibler's edition (pp. 413-47). Indeed, the focus of my analysis for all of the manuscripts will focus not on the music itself (which has been ably covered by Ludwig¹⁰³ and Schrade¹⁰⁴ for all the complete-works manuscripts as well as Balzer for C), but on page layout and the word-music relationships demonstrated in the manuscript presentations. In my analyses of word-music layout of the *Remede's* music in each of the manuscripts I am not looking to see whether the sources agree with each other (or how far they are followed in the modern published editions¹⁰⁵). Instead I take each manuscript individually in order to see how far it is possible for a reader who is not familiar with the music to be able to tell from the word-music presentation which syllables should be sung to which notes according to the manuscript in question. In this I take as a starting point Earp's research which proposes that the order of song copying in the "complete-works" manuscripts was to enter the text first before overlaying the music above.¹⁰⁶ This focus on word-music relations will highlight an area of music manuscript studies which, although acknowledged as important, has generally been overlooked in terms of its significance for manuscript production, purpose, and, of course, performance.

A reader's first impressions of the music upon opening manuscript C are of visual beauty, in keeping with the beauty of the whole manuscript. This is especially the case in the lay which is unusually laid out, with four lines of text between each stanza of music as opposed to two as may be expected, and which is the case further on in the manuscript where the rest of the lays set to music are presented (ff. 168v-191). While the four-line layout clearly works due to the repetition of the music in this lay,¹⁰⁷ it is at first reading slightly confusing, and indeed the other "complete-works" manuscripts follow the more usual manner of presentation. Similarly, the last three musical interpolations,

¹⁰³ Guillaume de Machaut, *Guillaume de Machaut, Musikalische Werke*, ed. by Friedrich Ludwig, vols 1-3 (vol. 4 ed. by Heinrich Besseler) (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1926-43, repr. 1954).

¹⁰⁴ Guillaume de Machaut, *The Works of Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. by Leo Schrade, vols 2-3 of *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* vols 2-3 (Monaco: Editions de L'Oiseau-Lyre, 1956).

¹⁰⁵ For a discussion of this see Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 222-27.

¹⁰⁶ Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 150-71 and 190-96 (a summary is given on pp. 170-71).

¹⁰⁷ For a discussion of the *Remede's* lay see William Calin and Lawrence Earp, "The Lai in the *Remede de Fortune*", *Ars Lyrica* 11 (2000), pp. 39-75.

the *ballade*, *virelai* and *rondelet*, seem to prefer economy of space over clarity of word-music relations. In the case of the *virelai*, more emphasis seems to be placed on the famous miniature of the dance on fol. 51 than on the accompanying music sung by the lover (see fig. 2.7):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.7: C fol. 51

The *virelai* from the *Remede de Fortune* in C

The presentation of the opening of the *Chanson roial* likewise could easily have been clearer, especially for the second line of text, given the space available (see fig. 2.8, fol. 39):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig 2.8: C fol. 39

The *chanson roial* from the *Remede de Fortune* in C

Finally, C does not label textless lines other than the tenor (e.g. in the *baladelle*), and in the *ballade* it has two voices whereas the other manuscripts under consideration have four. (This does not necessarily

represent a mistake: it could be that the version in *C* is earlier than that of the other manuscripts, as Balzer suggests;¹⁰⁸ it could have been the preferred version of *C*'s patron; or it could have been a conscious, space-saving decision.) However, it must be stressed that none of these observations render the music "unperformable", or even constitute "errors": if *C* was the only source of music for the *Remede* then these observations would be little more than interesting diversions. Nevertheless, their significance to this discussion will become clearer when compared to the presentation of the music in the later manuscripts.

As can be seen from the figures presented already in this chapter, the miniatures in manuscript *C* are characterised by a richly decorated background, active characters, and a generally lively atmosphere. They complement the story, and through them we are able to watch the characters, including the author and protagonist, perform their parts. Sylvia Huot has aptly compared the "graceful, stylized gestures" of the characters in the miniatures to "the movements of a dance",¹⁰⁹ and I would add that it is a dance in which we the readers also take our turn: the liveliness of the miniatures, the performative presence of the music, and the anagram, all invite us to take our own, active part in the work.¹¹⁰

Manuscript A (early 1370s)

As discussed in Chapter 1, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale fonds français 1584 has long been seen as a candidate as the manuscript produced closest to Machaut. From the rubric introducing the index (which I argue in Chapter 1 could represent a scribe highlighting Machaut's identity in order to lend more authority to the collection) to Avril's assertion that the miniatures may have been produced in Reims (for no other reason than the fact that Machaut was canon there), *A* certainly tantalises those in search of a manuscript overseen by Machaut. As I concluded in Chapter 1, I do not think that authorial oversight can be definitively

¹⁰⁸ Wimsatt and Kibler, p. 442.

¹⁰⁹ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 249.

¹¹⁰ Huot compares the frequent rubrication of the *Remede* in manuscript *C* to that of the *Roman de la Rose*: "the impact of these rubrics is such that the *Remede* evokes the *Rose* not only poetically but also visually as a written document." Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 250.

ascertained for any of the manuscripts, however *A* is certainly interesting for the authorial presence which seems to pervade the volume, whether this came from the author himself, from a scribe, team of scribes, a patron who wished to lend authority to the collection, or simply as representative of fashions in the place and time of its production. In manuscript *A* this authorial presence makes itself seen in the *Remede de Fortune* from the very beginning.

The opening miniature is on fol. 49v, fig. 2.9, and like its equivalent in *C* it plays on the theme of education.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.9: *A* fol. 49v (detail)

The opening miniature to the *Remede de Fortune* in *A*

It features two male figures of different ages: the elder is seated on a large chair and his raised right hand suggests that he is instructing the younger figure, who is standing with his hand also raised in debate. The younger figure is nevertheless in a position of subordination: he is portrayed as smaller than the older man even though he is standing, and his hand is not raised as high. The feet of the younger man protrude over the edge of the frame of the miniature, as if they are about to step out and into the story. This is indeed what they are about to do, for I concur with Sylvia Huot that the figures represented here are not characters in the story as such – indeed they can't be, as there is no old-man character in the *Remede* – but that they represent the now-older author addressing his youthful self, the youthful narrator, and/or youth in general.¹¹¹ In addition, the older figure is carrying the emblem of

¹¹¹ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 279. For a slightly different interpretation of this image, which involves "the power dynamics that distinguish vernacular authors and their public", see McGrady, p. 35.

Grammatica, the switch: he is represented as supremely authoritative.¹¹² From the very beginning of the *Remede* in *A*, therefore, the miniatures remind us that there is an author at work.

This theme is continued through the rest of the sequence. Whereas in *C* the miniatures were lively, with detailed backgrounds and peopled with recognisable characters, in *A* they become sparser, giving way to abstractions rather than people. This is seen especially in the image of the arms of love: in *C* it is portrayed between Hope and the lover, on a lively background with Hope in a typical instructing pose (fol. 38, fig. 2.10); whereas in *A* the figures and decorative background are gone, and we are left merely with the shield (fol. 62, fig. 2.11).¹¹³

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.10: *C* fol. 38 (detail)

The arms of love from the *Remede de Fortune* in *C*

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.11: *A* fol. 62 (detail)

The arms of love from the *Remede de Fortune* in *A*

¹¹² I am grateful to Domenic Leo for pointing this out to me (private communication).

¹¹³ This is also discussed by Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 277: I include it here for purposes of comparison with manuscript *E* later.

The person of the lady is also diminished in the iconography of A, to the extent that on fol. 72, fig. 2.12 she is reduced to her symbol, her castle.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.12: A fol. 72 (detail)

Guillaume and the lady's castle (from the *Remede de Fortune* in A)

Otherwise, she appears only when necessary and stripped of her elevated didactic role (for example fol. 78v, fig. 2.13):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.13: A fol. 78v (detail)

Guillaume and the lady (from the *Remede de Fortune* in A)

As Huot summarises, "the lady is a referent point, a component of the lyric configuration; beyond that, she is not important."¹¹⁴ While Hope remains an important figure in the iconography in A, she appears only in an uninterrupted sequence of four miniatures out of a total of twelve – she is not given pride of place as in C, nor is her stance of instructor highlighted to the same degree.

¹¹⁴ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 277.

There is a further general difference between the iconography in *C* and in *A*, a difference which is so simple that it almost passes unheeded: whereas *C* contains five large miniatures which take up over a column in width and sometimes dominate an entire folio, in *A* all of the miniatures are "normal" sized (that is, they are square by the width of a single column), and therefore appear subordinate to the surrounding text. This, together with their lower number, means that they cannot tell the story on their own as could be seen in *C*. It also means that the role of the artist is subordinate to that of the author.¹¹⁵

The final image on which I would like to dwell from *A* is, appropriately enough, the final image of its presentation of the *Remede* (fol. 80, fig. 2.14), showing the lover worshipping the god of love.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.14: *A* fol. 80 (detail)

Guillaume and the god of love (from the *Remede de Fortune* in *A*)

We saw in figure 2.2 that *C* follows the narrative in presenting Love as a female personification, and in situating the meeting between her and the lover at the beginning of the story, which is as it is described in the narrative. As in the opening miniature to the *Remede*, here *A* departs from the story again, for, although at the end of the story the narrator does declare that he will pay homage to love, in the narrative he does not in fact do so in person to a character. Here, then, we have the young narrator-author dedicating his life and works to love, as, by the time of the production of manuscript *A*, he had already done. The older author-figure in the opening miniature (fig. 2.9) has performed his piece

¹¹⁵ Taking into account Domenic Leo's proposition that, for manuscript *A*, "Machaut himself may have illuminated the manuscript" ("Authorial Presence", p. 88), then this observation would imply that, if this was the case, Machaut saw his role of miniaturist as subordinate to that of author.

to his younger self through the *Remede*, and through the learning presented in the manuscript, we see that the young lover-author has learnt the craft which he will come to master by the time the manuscript is produced. When this is considered in the light of the prologue to manuscript A, which tells of and shows the mature author (this time, performing his real-life role) being charged with writing about love and being presented with the virtues to help him on his way, the authorial significance of this final image is even more striking. Huot writes that the sequence of miniatures A's presentation of the *Remede* "locate[s] the *Remede* in a context of didacticism and devotion to love as a literary abstraction". To this I would add that the miniatures serve as a framework in which the author, as director, performs to the now-more-passive audience the story of his younger self learning: the iconography, in particular the first and last miniatures which frame the narrative, clearly shows that an author is at work.

Wimsatt and Kibler find the text of the narrative in A to be of a slightly lower quality in its variants than that of C. Although this opinion (for, ultimately, the weighing up of two or more variant phrasings amounts to opinion) differs from other editions,¹¹⁶ there is certainly one indisputable difference between the presentation of the text in A and C: the index. The index in manuscript A gives a structure to the whole manuscript which is not present in C. As the index separates and individually names the lyrics in the *Remede*, it makes them "a product of the poetic authority that is responsible for everything else in the book".¹¹⁷ Whether or not this authority is that of Machaut was discussed in Chapter 1, however, it is nevertheless significant that it is invoked so thoroughly for the *Remede*. It also has implications for the musical interpolations which are listed separately in the index in the music section: as if reminding any searching reader that seven of Machaut's musical poems are to be found in the *Remede* rather than in the music section of the manuscript. (This is not the case for the *Voir-Dit*, as will be discussed in Chapter 5).¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Wimsatt and Kibler differ from the earlier Hoepffner edition with their choice of readings based on manuscript C. For a listing of the reviews of the Wimsatt and Kibler edition see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, pp. 613-14.

¹¹⁷ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 277.

¹¹⁸ Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 62-63 (and n. 141, same pages), notes that the *Remede's* lay is listed in the index with the other lays as well as in the *Remede* section, although it is not given a folio number in the first entry. Earp wonders whether

Moving on to the word-music layout, the outstanding quality of A is its exceptional clarity. Whereas the layout in C was certainly clear enough, in A there are very few, if any, points of doubt as to which notes should carry which syllables in the songs. In addition, the manner in which the music is arranged in relation to the words suggests that both text and music scribes were familiar with the music, perhaps even internally performing it as they notated it. For comparison in this chapter, I will offer the single-folio *rondelet* as presented in all the manuscripts. As the last, and therefore most simple, of the *Remede*'s musical interpolations, the *rondelet* is particularly appropriate for comparison due to its comparative lack of text and its short musical length. Although the differences between A and C may appear to be of the smallest detail (for instance, this is not the *ballade* in which there are additional voices in A), their importance increases when they are considered in terms of the shift in emphasis of the iconography from illustrating the story to illustrating the author's achievement.

Figures 2.15 (C fol. 57) and 2.16 (A fol. 78v) show the last interpolated song in the *Remede* as presented in the two manuscripts in question. It can be seen that in C, although there are three voices notated (two are untexted), the upper triplum is not labelled (as it is in A). In manuscript C the presentation of the musical parts appears quite compressed: although this is a highly melismatic *rondelet*, the melisma notes in all voices are cramped, making the note values more difficult to work out. Finally, in manuscript C the syllable "re" of "remant" is texted twice, which, whether or not it represents an undeleted double-writing, would cause problems when a reader unfamiliar with the music tried to perform it. In A (figure 2.16) there is no shortage of space – there are even empty staves – and every voice starts on a new stave (whereas in C the tenor begins immediately after the cantus – the texted voice – ends). The alignment of notes to syllables in A leaves no doubt as to which note should be sung to which syllable (whereas the extra texting of the "re" in C only becomes clear when compared to A).

this was an attempt to list the "lyrical interpolations in the *Remede* within the regular music sections, [...] [h]owever, this was not carried out for any of the other musical pieces in the *Remede* and there is some question as to where the unique setting of the *complainte* and *chanson royale* could have been taken up. In any case, the idea is implicitly rejected in the final section of the index, where each of the lyrical interpolations in the *Remede* is listed separately" (n. 141).

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.15: C fol. 57

The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in C

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.16: A fol. 78v

The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in A

To my mind, these differences in word-music layout display two important points. Firstly, it appears that the presence of the music in C is as much for visual beauty as for detailed individual reading. Secondly, a familiarity with the music is displayed on the part of the scribal-performers working on A that extends beyond visual copying. Instead of jumping to the conclusion of authorial oversight, however, I instead

posit the notion that the scribes in both manuscripts were performing the songs as they notated them, as indeed all involved with the manuscript project were engaged in a performance according to my interpretation of the term given in Chapter 1. What is significant about *A*, however, is the possibility of the presence in the scriptorium not of an imposing author-figure directing the proceedings, but of a familiarity with the material, an internalised performance, which manifests itself, possibly through memory, in the word-music layout of the lyrics. In other words, what is demonstrated in the music in *A*'s presentation of the *Remede* is perhaps much more than verbatim copying, it is rather the scribes' highly-cultivated memories coming into play. While this will be discussed further in following chapters, here it suffices to indicate that the word-music presentation demonstrated in the "complete-works" manuscripts may go some way towards overturning perceived notions of scribal ignorance and scriptorium procedures.

In the light of this, it is significant that the degree of performance shown in the miniatures differs greatly between *C* and *A*. Whereas in *C* every lyric interpolation is accompanied by a miniature showing its performance, in *A* this is only the case for Hope's *baladelle*, the work which the lover memorises, and the miniature shows Hope singing while he listens intently. There is an irony here. Despite the fact that here Hope is apparently the lead performer in both the image and the narrative, the lover, who in *A* at least is also portrayed as the author, is performing the memorisation of his own composition, while the narrative assures us that memory is superior to writing (as quoted in Chapter 1). Here Hope may be singing the lead role, but the author is ever-present.

Once again, it is performance which categorises the two manuscripts discussed so far. In *C* we, the reader-performers, are invited to watch the performance of the characters, to admire the beauty of the manuscript, and to join in with the story. In *A*, while the text has not significantly changed, the iconography nevertheless shifts the emphasis from the performance of the fictional characters to that of the real-life author and scribes. The invitation to the reader to take part in manuscript *A* is coupled with the understanding that we do so under the direction of the author. Even the anagram, that site of play of

authority, is rendered ever-more game-like, for A's prologue and index ensure that we can be under no doubt as to who has granted us the opportunity to unveil his name. It is no wonder that A has been repeatedly posited as the most likely of the surviving manuscripts to have direct authorial control, yet we can in fact only be certain of the *identity* of author – the *authority* which is doubtless present in the manuscript comes to us through the scribes whose achievement is easily as great as the author's. What is clear, however, is that the shift of emphasis between A and C is from reader-performer to author-performer, albeit through the medium of the scribal-performers who created the manuscript.

Manuscript Vg (early 1370s)

Wimsatt and Kibler situate Vg firmly in their "late" tradition of transmission of the *Remede de Fortune*. Indeed, out of the seventy-four significant textual variations they identify between the early and late traditions, Vg is consistently in accordance with the late tradition in all but two cases (compared with all but three for A, all but two for F, and all but one for B).¹¹⁹ I therefore concur with Wimsatt and Kibler, that, for the text of the *Remede de Fortune* these manuscripts represent a distinct group, yet one which is nevertheless bears a strong resemblance to the "early" tradition.

Vg contains three miniatures for the *Remede*, although none of them can definitely be said to continue the didactic theme established in the text. The opening miniature, shown in fig. 2.17, is, according to Earp, "G[uillaume] standing; woman holding child's hand".¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ Wimsatt and Kibler, pp. 41-42 (although they do not specifically discuss any of the manuscripts of the late tradition, they do provide a complete set of these variations which makes counting easy).

¹²⁰ "Scribal Practice", p. 395. In *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 152, Earp gives the description of this miniature as "A lady, holding a child's hand, stands before a clerk, who is instructing the child."

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.17: *Vg* fol. 90 (detail)

The opening miniature to the *Remede de Fortune* in *Vg*

However, looking at this miniature closely, whilst the figure on the right holding the male child is definitely female, it is difficult to tell whether the other is really the lover. Covered in a long cloak, with indistinct facial features, this figure's raised hands nevertheless indicate some kind of active conversation, whether or not didactic. The presence of the woman and child is also interesting: while an adult-child relationship may imply education, the delightfully squirming child whose gesture is familiar to anyone brings a lively "real-life" aspect to the miniature which is not shared to the same active extent either by other manuscripts' presentations of the *Remede* or by the other miniatures in *Vg*'s.

The second miniature in *Vg* (fig. 2.18) is equally unrelated to the action of the story. Earp's description of it as "King and courtiers seated on a bench" ("Scribal Practice", p. 396) is entirely accurate.¹²¹ It appears on f. 95v at the point of the story where the lover, having performed his lay, runs away from his lady to the park.

¹²¹ In *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 152, Earp describes this miniature as "A king and some courtiers sit on a bench (the game of 'le Roi qui ne ment')" [the king who does not lie].

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.18: *Vg* fol. 95v (detail)

A king and courtiers (from the *Remede de Fortune* in *Vg*)

A comparison could be drawn here with the miniature in *C* which shows the lover performing the lay in front of the lady and her society (shown in Chapter 3, fig. 3.5), although the only real common element here is the fact that these two miniatures are the only ones in the *Remede* in the manuscripts under discussion which include a king. While perhaps a didactic element could be claimed that the king may, due to his high status, be the one from whom his courtiers learn by example, this is perhaps pushing the didactic theme a little too far, as in the *Remede* the lover learns from his lady rather than from a king, and the source of the lady's knowledge is not mentioned. (Nevertheless it is true that kings can receive knowledge-giving status in Machaut's writings, as is shown in the *Jugement du roi de Beheinge* and the *Jugement du roi de Navarre*.) Perhaps the best conclusion to be drawn from these two miniatures is that they represent courtly society. This could represent the high society of the lady of the story, but more likely the courtly society of the manuscript's readers: through these miniatures, it seems, *Vg* is appealing directly to its reader-performers, perhaps asking them to see in the story their own personal situations. While this could be seen as itself didactic, it is in a more subtle manner than the other manuscripts: here *Vg* relies neither on the characters of the story nor on the author figure to portray its message, but appeals to the reader-performers themselves to actively find their own interpretation.

The final miniature in *Vg*'s presentation of the *Remede* occurs on fol. 111 after Hope's departure, when the lover prepares to return to his

lady by writing a *ballade*. According to Earp, it comprises of "G[uillaume] kneeling before Hope with open book".¹²²

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.19: *Vg* fol. 111 (detail)

Guillaume and Hope (from the *Remede de Fortune* in *Vg*)

Although Hope has departed by this stage in the narrative, as this is the only miniature which features her in *Vg* it is perhaps significant that she is presented as the devotee, or even as the source, of the lover's creativity. It is thanks to her that he has learnt how to return to his lady, and now he offers his work to her. However, there is nothing in the previous iconography, nor in the absent rubrics, to imply that the female figure here is actually Hope. Indeed, the fact that she is holding a dog, an animal not mentioned in the *Remede* but which was popular among courtly ladies in the Middle Ages, may imply that this figure is not Hope but either a patron or a representation of ladies in general. The fact that the male kneeling figure is holding a book seems to be the only indication that he is "G[uillaume]", and, as he is not a tonsured cleric, his status seems nearer that of courtly lover than learned author. The book is a book of music, and this in turn adds a new angle to the image. If, as Earp suggests, this is the lover and Hope, then it would appear that he is offering her the notation of her *ballade*, which he had "tout recordé par ordre" (l. 2965). However, given that the miniature's positioning within the story and the presence of the dog would both seem to suggest that the figure is not Hope, together with the courtly theme of the previous two miniatures, perhaps the most likely explanation for this scene is a courtly gift, not necessarily from author to patron, but rather from lover to beloved (in a scene which brings to

¹²² Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 398. In *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 155, Earp describes this miniature as "the narrator kneels with an open book before Hope, who holds a dog".

mind the exchange of lyrics and music in the as-yet unwritten *Voir Dit*). It is tempting here to speculate whether this miniature represents the purpose of either the manuscript or the *Remede* itself, yet speculation is all it can remain. What can be said of the miniatures in *Vg* is that none of them show a performance of the story: they appear to be highlighting a courtly theme which is not presented in the other manuscripts. They appear to portray not the author, the characters, or the story, but the reader-performers, who in this way are asked to take an active part in the tale by seeing themselves, and their own lives, within it, and perhaps, like the lover, learning to act on the *Remede*'s teachings.

Can a similar claim of reader-participation be made for the text and for the music presentation in *Vg*? The word-music layout in *Vg* is, like in *A*, extremely clear to the eye, with very few instances where syllable-note alignment would be unclear even to a reader-performer unfamiliar with the music.¹²³ (It should also be noted that, while Ludwig chose *Vg* above any of the other manuscripts considered here as the basis for his edition of the music, there is one large-scale issue of presentation of the *baladelle* which will be discussed below with reference to manuscript *B*.) However, unlike *A*, the miniatures in *Vg*'s *Remede* do not constantly remind us of the guiding presence of the author: although there is an author-portrait at the head of the manuscript, the authorial images seen in other manuscripts are not in evidence. Instead, the focus of the miniatures on the reader-performers means that the ease of coupling the words and music invites us to join in the performance actively. For the text, this makes the site of play which is the *Remede*'s anagram even more open than in *C*: the much more subtle authorial presence in *Vg* means that the (near-) solving of the anagram is more dependent on the reader-performers' initiative than in any of the other manuscripts seen so far. With the iconographical focus no longer on the characters as in *C* or on the author as in *A*, in *Vg* reader-performers are invited to enjoy the work of the author and scribes (who, for the same reasons as discussed above for the very clear *A*, may also have been internally performing that which they were notating), whilst at the same time taking an active part in the performance of the

¹²³ The only instance I found where syllable-note distribution was slightly unclear is in the *complainte*, f. 97, 1st stave, second text. Nevertheless, the intended distribution can be ascertained from that of the first text.

work. In manuscript *Vg* the focus is on the reader-performers who are asked to recognise the authorial achievement not through the iconography but through the clarity of the *mise en page* of the text and music.

Manuscript *B* (early 1370s)

Neither [music] scribe [of *B*] ranks very high in terms of musical intelligence or experience, and both are subject to the verdict of having copied, uncomprehendingly and probably in haste, musical symbols of which they had little understanding and to which they could apply no trained instincts with respect to lateral or vertical spacing or to the resolution of ambiguities.¹²⁴

The irregular entry of the music over the words in MS *B* is one of the primary reasons that *B* is such a poor source for music. Purely by considering the relationship between text and music, it is possible to differentiate the two different music scribes: scribe one is often indifferent and negligent about the relationship of text and music; scribe two is concerned and careful.¹²⁵

For the purpose of our edition, however, an indirect knowledge [of *Vg*] would have been entirely adequate [...] a thorough study of *B*, the exact replica of *Vg*, closed the gap in the knowledge.¹²⁶

Manuscript *B* (Paris, B.N. fr. 1585) is a much-maligned manuscript, the ugly duckling of the "complete-works" sources. It is copied on paper, without miniatures or indeed much decoration at all beyond large unadorned initial letters, by a large number of scribes (Earp identifies nine text scribes and two music scribes), and, Earp believes, in "extreme haste".¹²⁷ Its most distinguishing feature in terms of relationships to the other manuscripts is its extremely close relationship to *Vg* – so close, in fact, that it is generally considered to be a direct copy of the more elaborate codex.¹²⁸ Yet *Vg* is a highly respected source, considered accurate in terms of both text and music, so why, therefore, has *B* earned its bad-boy reputation? It appears that the answer to this question lies in the manuscript's presentation of music,

¹²⁴ Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*", p. 59.

¹²⁵ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 212.

¹²⁶ Schrade, vol. 2.2, p. 12.

¹²⁷ Earp's analysis of hands in *B* is in "Scribal Practice", pp. 196-211; the quotation is taken from p. 212.

¹²⁸ In addition to the quotation above from Schrade, Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 102, describes *B* as "for the most part a direct copy of *Vg*". In both cases, the scholars are concerned primarily with the musical content, and secondarily with the text: both authors have no choice but to disregard *Vg*'s miniatures in comparison as they are simply absent in *B*.

for as a textual source, *B* has not suffered such criticism. To judge from the *Remede de Fortune* at least, *B* does not in fact fare as badly as may be expected in the light of Bent's and Earp's scathing comments quoted above. Nevertheless, Schrade's comment that it is an "exact replica" of *Vg*, although they are very close, will be shown to be somewhat exaggerated.

Of the two music scribes Earp identifies in manuscript *B*, the *Remede* was copied by first. Earp describes him as "often indifferent and negligent", although he does admit that "at first, the overlay of the notes was carried out with reasonable care". (However, Earp does go on to state, and to give details of how, this changes as the manuscript progresses following the *Remede*.)¹²⁹ The scribe who wrote the text to the music in the *Remede* is identified by Earp as text scribe F, who was responsible for almost all of the song texts throughout the manuscript. Is this scribe therefore also one of the music scribes? Earp wonders whether music scribe two may have been also been a text scribe, "since he was concerned with following the text and yet not well practiced in the formation of the symbols of musical notation".¹³⁰ It therefore seems to me likely that he and text scribe F could be one and the same person. If this is the case, then this could have ramifications for the layout of much of the music throughout manuscript *B*, and this should be borne in mind.

It is certainly true that the alignment of syllables to the notes that bear them in the *Remede*'s songs are not as clear in *B* as in *A*, *C*, and *Vg*. However, this is not the same as saying that the alignment is indecipherable in *B*. Returning again to the example of the *rondelet*, *B*'s presentation of it is shown in fig. 2.20, fol. 119v:

¹²⁹ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 212.

¹³⁰ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 214.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.20: *B* fol. 119v

The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in *B*

Here can be seen some features typical of the presentation of the *Remede's* music in *B*. For example, in the last stanza of the first column the syllables "que de vous me depar" are not aligned exactly under their notes other than the "vous me", however from this anchor point it is easy to work out where the others should be placed. Another feature of the *rondelet* is the characteristic placement of the music of the final syllable before the actual word: here this is demonstrated by the "te" at

the end of the first stanza of the second column. This does not cause a problem in terms of syllable-setting for the reader, however, as it is common for the final syllable to sound on the final note of a piece.¹³¹ Together with the *rondelet*, the *complainte* and *ballade* are similarly generally easy to read throughout in manuscript *B*.¹³²

When *Vg* is brought into play with *B*, however, one thing becomes immediately apparent: while one may not be an "exact replica" of the other, they are nevertheless extremely closely related, not only in terms of overall layout of works and folio numbers, but also in the layout of the miniatures (which are matched by blank spaces in *B*), the positioning of the illuminated letters (which are vividly decorated in *Vg* and simply large in *B*), and the page layout of the music. This latter is seen especially in the *baladelle* on fols. 109v-110 (of both manuscripts) which in relation to *B* Schrade calls an "odd arrangement".¹³³ Comparing *B* with *Vg* at this point it is difficult to contest that the two manuscripts were made concurrently. In *Vg* it seems that this opening was laid out with extra voices in mind from those which are in fact portrayed (in this or other manuscripts), for the headings *contratenor* and *duplum* have been deleted, and the initial "T" of "[T]enor" on fol. 109v was not entered (there are still a tenor and *contratenor* notated on fol. 110, although there is no *duplum*). The second text of *Vg*'s unlabelled *cantus* on fol. 109v now appears written over the first empty "[T]enor" stave, with the remaining staves on fol. 109v left blank. There are also three blank staves at the top of the left column of fol. 110, and these are undertexted with the (apparently space-filling) words "vin as" two or three times per stanza. These are followed by the actual tenor, and then the resumption of the *cantus* which had begun on the previous folio. This continues to the first three staves of the next column, followed by four staves of *contratenor*, and then a final blank stave. In *B*, however,

¹³¹ This feature seems to be a habit of the *Remede*'s music in *B*. Habits such as this are not unknown in the Machaut manuscripts: Earp points out that "the scribe of MS A would often place a note slightly to the right of the syllable to which it belonged" ("Scribal Practice", p. 196). Consistent habits such as this pose no problems to the reader unfamiliar with the work, for, just like getting used to someone's handwriting (be they a fourteenth-century scribe or a twenty-first century friend), such features quickly become automatically recognised and unobtrusive.

¹³² In the *complainte* it should be noted that the second text on the second stanza of fol. 103v is unclear, but its placement can be deciphered from that of the first by syllable count.

¹³³ Schrade, vol. 2.2, p. 121.

whereas the overall layout appears the same, matters are slightly different, for the second text of the cantus on fol. 109v is written directly under the first, the initial "T" of "Tenor" on fol. 109v is present, although the titles of "duplum" and "contratenor" are not, and nor are their empty staves. On fol. 110 the final empty staff of the contratenor is also absent. Therefore it seems that when these folios of *B* were made at least some of the unusual aspects of *Vg*'s layout of the *baladelle* were recognised and amended, although the overall layout was not. This would imply that *B* was made from *Vg* at least before it was bound (otherwise the cantus could have been reconnected using the empty spaces on fol. 109v) and possibly before it was decorated (the added "T" for "[T]enor" in *B* could be the result of the filling-in of an assumed space for decoration). Yet the fact that the actual page layout is so similar between the two manuscripts, and that *B* moves the second text of the cantus on fol. 109 to its expected position, implies that the copy was made after the text and notation had been entered. Despite the unusual features of the *baladelle*, however, it should be acknowledged that it is still far from indecipherable in both manuscripts.

Perhaps most significantly for the present analysis, the similarities between *B* and *Vg* extend as far as details such as the same words and music in the same staff in the same position on the page. Where the similarity stops, however, is in the clarity of the note-syllable setting which, in certain works in *B*, is significantly less clear than in *Vg*.

As a representative of the songs in the *Remede* which are less easy to read in terms of note-syllable alignment, I will concentrate on the lay. The presentation of the lay in *B*'s *Remede* is interesting. It is clear from first glance that the two lines of text are carefully aligned in terms of their syllables. Also striking is the fact that stanza breaks in the text are clearly marked by starting on a new line, exactly as in *Vg* (except that *B* does not include *Vg*'s decoration in the text space under the staves), as opposed to relying on illuminated letters as in the other sources. Both of these aspects render the music-setting of the lay in *B* quite easy to make out, yet there are still some difficulties which are not present in *Vg*. Fig. 2.21 shows fol. 93:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.21: *B* fol. 93

Extract from the lay from the *Remede de Fortune* in *B*

There are two particular difficulties in the second column of this folio. Firstly, in the second stave, the music for "pensee / en" (second text: "louee / crain") is placed behind the words: this is clear from the line through the staff indicating a line end, together with the dots in the text. With these, then, the positioning of the notes to the syllables can actually be worked out, though not without thought, especially given the placing of the note over "moi" (second text: "te") at the end of the

stanza. The second difficulty for me in this column occurred at the end of the penultimate stanza with the text "voy / le" (second text: "doy / se"). Here, again, the music is notated behind the syllables, yet once again the positioning can be worked out, this time by the careful grouping together of melismatic note clusters, and secondarily with the dot following the long in the music which corresponds to the dots in the text.¹³⁴ Nevertheless these issues which are personal to me may not necessarily have posed problems for the manuscript's first readers who, as I am about to put forward, may have been scribes themselves.

It can therefore be seen that the presentation of the music in *B* not only differs from that in *C* which seemed primarily concerned with beauty, and that in *A* which preferred clarity, but also with *Vg*, which would appear to be its close model. Largely due to its lack of miniatures it is difficult to see in *B* any of the features displayed in *C*, *A* and *Vg* which seemed to be centred on the themes of education, performance, and the court. I propose that instead of performing or teaching the song, the presentation of the *Remede's* music in *B* assumes its reader-performers already have a familiarity with the pieces it represents in a way that *C*, *A*, and *Vg* do not. This notion can fit in with Earp's and Bent's claim that *B* was copied from *Vg* to serve as an exemplar for other manuscripts with the same layout¹³⁵ if we take into account two things. Firstly, there may well have been considerable use in preserving the layout of *Vg* for making future manuscripts according to this same layout.¹³⁶ Secondly, I would like to propose the idea that the scribes who copied *B* may well have counted on their own (or on other scribes') familiarity with the music in order to transmit further copies, and, I suspect, this familiarity was more likely to come from memory than from other written sources. For, to a reader familiar with the music of the *Remede*, the word-music layout as presented in *B*, with its characteristic grouping of melismatic notes, would pose no problems in interpretation. This could well also explain Schrade's acceptance of it as

¹³⁴ The other difficulties I identified in the lai are: folio 93v, in the penultimate staves of both columns, the syllables of the second text are not aligned to the first as would be expected; this also happens on folio 94, sixth stave of first column and fourth stave of second column. I had similar problems on fol. 103v of the *chanson roial* (second stanza) and on fol. 115v of the virelai (first column, staves six to eight).

¹³⁵ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 103; Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*", p. 71.

¹³⁶ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 103.

an "exact replica" of *Vg* without mentioning its inaccuracies which Bent and Earp find so galling. Schrade, as an editor of Machaut's complete musical repertory, would surely be as familiar with Machaut's music as anyone, and is perhaps echoing the aims and opinions of *B*'s scribal-performers, and indeed scribal-reader-performers, with this claim. This is a feature of *B* which will be investigated further in relation to its presentation of music in later chapters, and it may carry important implications for our knowledge of its copying techniques, which may well have involved more use of scribal-performers' memories than previously acknowledged.

Manuscript E (late 1380s or early 1390s)

Paris, B. N. fr. 9221 is a parchment manuscript containing five flyleaves and 283 folios, and, the largest of the "complete-works" manuscripts, measures 40.6 x 30 cm. It is the only one of these sources whose commissioner is (almost certainly) known: it was apparently prepared for Jean, duke of Berry, one of Machaut's patrons, whose erased signature can be made out on fol. 283r.¹³⁷ Were it not for Avril's identifying of the artists of the miniatures and subsequent dating,¹³⁸ *E* would have been thought to date from within the poet's lifetime, as Jean is the protagonist of the *Fonteinne amoureuse* and it would not have been unexpected for him to have wanted to commission his own copy (Machaut states in the *Voir-dit* that he did, but in the form of an individual work).¹³⁹

Textually, Wimsatt and Kibler have placed the presentation of the *Remede* in *E* securely within their "early" tradition of manuscripts, together with *C*. One difference which they do not mention, however, is the opening rubric given in *E*: "Ci commence l'ecu bleu" ["Here begins the Blue Shield"] (fol. 22). It is also the title given to the *Remede* in *E*'s index.¹⁴⁰ This alternative titling of the *Remede* appears unique to *E*,

¹³⁷ Wimsatt and Kibler, p. 17; signature details taken from Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 120 n. 224 and *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 93. The signature was presumably erased following a change of ownership.

¹³⁸ Avril, "Les Manuscrits enluminés", p. 128.

¹³⁹ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 121 and n. 225. Earp also notes here that Daniel Poirion in *Le Poète et le prince*, p. 195, gives the date of *E* as 1371 for no other reason than records showing that Jean owed Machaut money that year. See also Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 93.

¹⁴⁰ *E* is the only "complete-works" manuscript apart from *A* to have an index, however, unlike *A*, the index appears to have been drawn up after the manuscript was complete,

however it may be a reference to the blue shield of love which is discussed by Hope and the lover in the text (the miniatures of this shield, which only appear in manuscripts A and C, are discussed above). It may also be a personal name of Jean's who may well have been familiar with the work. This title, however, removes the emphasis from the act of love to the arms of love, love's abstraction, and is therefore in keeping with the distancing of the performative aspects of the story demonstrated in the manuscripts later than C.

E's iconography is unique among the manuscripts under discussion here. The opening image shows a man walking in a forest holding a flower, and its only other miniature, which comes just after Hope's appearance, shows Hope and the lover in a walled garden. In this image the wall is the most prominent feature, for it takes up almost the entire left and bottom portions of the miniature. It seems to me that these two images serve to highlight the *Remede*'s relation with the highly popular *Roman de la rose*, itself set within a walled garden and tracking the wooing of a lady with the help (or indeed hindrance) of allegorical figures. In this sense, then, the short iconographical sequence in *E* does not reflect the performative and didactic themes seen in *C*, *A* and *Vg*.

The music in *E*'s presentation of the *Remede* seems to plough a similarly independent furrow. Schrade's notes to his edition of the music in the *Remede* lists the variants he has found throughout the manuscripts, and, in the majority of cases, *E* is independent, or at least not tied in with the bad-boy *B*, as it is for much of the musical repertory.¹⁴¹ It is also the manuscript in which Schrade finds the most "errors" and variants in the *Remede* music, far more than in *B*.¹⁴²

Schrade is not alone in being wary of *E*, for Balzer warns against its "misleadingly neat appearance" and its "contamination" from the later tradition (her comment on "contamination", however, is the addition of the two extra voices in the *baladelle*).¹⁴³ Certainly, *E* appears at first glance to be outstandingly "neat" and beautifully presented,

and so lists items in the correct order. See Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 122, n. 230.

¹⁴¹ See Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*".

¹⁴² Schrade, vol. 2.2, pp. 72-73 (lay), p. 73 (*complainte*), p. 74 (*chanson roial*), pp. 121-23 (*baladelle*), p. 123 (*ballade*), pp. 147-48 (*virelai*), p. 135 (*rondelet*). Schrade, as mentioned earlier, does not appear to take account of differences in the music overlay in the manuscripts in his edition.

¹⁴³ Wimsatt and Kibler, p. 414.

even when, as on fol. 35v, fig. 2.22 (the *rondelet*), there are issues of spacing involved:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.22: *E* fol. 35v

The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in *E*

Here, unlike in all the other manuscripts under discussion, the text for the second stanza of the music is not written out in a separate column on the same folio, but is instead written, very small in size and very heavily abbreviated in comparison to the rest of the manuscript, under the otherwise untexted tenor part. Similarly, it is difficult to see where *E*'s presentation intends the syllables "me mon cuer" and the final "te" to be placed.

The majority of the *Remede*'s lyric interpolations are similarly difficult to make out in *E*. For the sake of comparison with *B*, fig. 2.23, fol. 23v, is from the lay:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.23: *E* fol. 23v (detail)

Extract from the lay from the *Remede de Fortune* in *E*

Looking at only the first four staves on this folio, it can be seen that the first and second time endings on the first stave are notated in the music, but the text underneath was not positioned to allow for this eventuality. This becomes extreme between staves three and four, where the first and second time endings lie across a staff division but the words were not written out to allow this: in this case clarity is helped by the fact that the music is repeating a section immediately before with the same first and second endings (and even a reader unfamiliar with the piece would by now have grasped the repeating structure). On

the second stave, after the large initial "M", the spacing of the second text is unusual, for the syllables between the two lines do not match up until the fourth (first text - "voy"; second text - "loy"). Looking further through the lay, it can be seen that instances such as these are frequent in this piece. Indeed, there are at least some spacing issues all of the musical interpolations in *E's Remede*.¹⁴⁴

According to my analysis, then, *E*, although aligned with *C* for its text, follows an independent route for both its iconography and its music presentation. Like *B* it appears to require familiarity on the part of the reader in order to interpret its note-syllable placements, however unlike *B* it does not take such care in the music to group notes into syllable blocks. Whereas *B* appeared to rely on the memory of its scribes and readers, *E*'s text scribe at least does not appear to be notating from memory, for many of the spacing issues stem from the music being compressed into a smaller space than needed for clarity. It is interesting that, despite this, the music in *E* is rarely cramped: clarity of syllable-note relations appears less of a concern than a visually attractive presentation. *E* therefore takes its own stance on the performative nature of the presentation: whereas *A* and *Vg* are laid out primarily for clarity, *C*'s visually appealing presentation still affords a great deal of clarity, and *B*'s more workaday layout nevertheless portrays much accuracy to the trained reader-performer, *E* appears to rank visual beauty above all else. To a much greater extent than in *C* the music appears to represent music's visual presence more than its sounding performance, either because of assumed familiarity with the music on the part of the reader, or, perhaps more likely twenty years after Machaut's death in a large and elaborate manuscript commissioned by a wealthy patron, because visual beauty was paramount. In this way, *E*'s presentation of the music in the *Remede de Fortune* is the most visually performative of all the manuscripts under consideration.

¹⁴⁴ The *ballade* (fol. 32) and *complainte* (fols 25-26v) are the easiest to read in terms of syllable-music layout, although they are not without difficulty. In the *chanson royal* (fol. 28v) an interesting alignment of "plaisance" (first text) and "plusieurs" (second text), even though they don't match on syllable count, seems to have come about through the fact that the words look visually similar. In general the alignment of *E*'s second line of text is more difficult to make out than the first; this is also the case for the *baladelle* (fols 31-31v). The *virelai* (fol. 33v) only has one line of text, but the syllable placement is difficult to ascertain between the third and fourth staves.

Manuscript *F-G* (1390s)

B. N. fr. 22545 (manuscript *F*) is a large parchment manuscript, measuring 36 x 41 cm, the second largest of the "complete-works" sources after *E*. It is closely related – in fact almost certainly part of – B. N. fr. 22546, manuscript *G*, for not only are they the same size and have complementary contents, but the imprint of the miniature on the first folio of *G* can be seen on the last folio of *F*, and were therefore bound together at one time.¹⁴⁵ They are currently bound in two parts: *F* contains most of the dits (including the *Remede*), and *G* contains the *Prise d'Alexandrie*, the *Louange des dames*, and all of the music section (excluding those pieces contained in the *Remede*). Although the patron of *F-G* is not known, a coat of arms appears several times in the miniatures.¹⁴⁶ Like *E*, without Avril's art-historical dating, *F-G* would have been thought to date from the 1370s, and, like Bent with *E*, Earp has pondered in print whether the illuminations could have been added to an earlier manuscript.¹⁴⁷

Wimsatt and Kibler present *F-G* as part of the "late" tradition for the *Remede*'s textual transmission, and its close relationship to *A* at least is attested by Earp.¹⁴⁸ Its opening miniature on fol. 40 certainly draws on *A*'s theme of education:

¹⁴⁵ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 97, n. 188. In n. 194 on the next page, Earp also identifies some of the imprints of miniatures which cross the current binding boundary: this shows not only "the disorder in which a MS could pass through suring production", but also the fact that *F* and *G* were almost certainly illuminated – and probably produced – together. As a result, I consider them to be one manuscript, *F-G*. As the folios are not through-numbered, however, I will refer to them separately when required for clarification.

¹⁴⁶ A fuller description of manuscript *F-G* is given in Appendix 1. For details of the coat of arms and other unidentified marks of ownership see Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 98-99, n. 194.

¹⁴⁷ Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 98-99, n. 194. This would be an unusual practice at best, and I feel that the chances of it being the case in even one, let alone two, of the surviving "complete-works" manuscripts are very low.

¹⁴⁸ Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 98-99, n. 194.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 2.24: *F* fol. 40 (detail)

The opening miniature to the *Remede de Fortune* in *F-G*

Here a figure is clearly instructing, or reading to, a group of people. The figure at the desk dominates the frame, and the desk itself frames him. He has a book, whereas his listeners do not (this is unlike the image of Fauvel teaching in Paris, B. N. fr 146 fol. 8v, where Fauvel is pictured in a similar stance in relation to a group of listeners, but is, significantly, bookless).¹⁴⁹ The book and lectern designate authority, and knowledge. Whereas in *A* we saw an image that was of the older author instructing his younger self, here we seem to have a representation of an author-figure instructing a group of people, his readers. In addition, he is behind the book and they are listening rather than reading. Like the lover's scroll in *C* which marks him out as a poet in the miniatures in the same way that a king's crown represents his kingship, here the book surely marks out the author, holding a position of authority over his audience. This opening miniature in *F-G* therefore culminates the sequence of didactic opening miniatures which started with the lady tutoring the lover in *C*, moved on to the author tutoring himself in *A*, to finally the author addressing his audience directly in *F-G*. In this image there are no characters or landscape from the story represented: it is just us in the revered presence of the author.

The only other miniature in the *Remede* in *F-G*, which is placed, like the second miniatures in *A* and *Vg*, just after the lover takes his leave from his lady, also does not portray a scene from the story. It

¹⁴⁹ For a discussion of this image in *Fauvel* see Emma Dillon, *Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 95. Pp. 89-108 discuss the significance of the presence or otherwise of books and lecterns in manuscript iconography before and after *Fauvel*.

features the lover washing his hands in a fountain. In this image, neither theme of education nor performance is explicitly present, however, the image of the fountain, a spring, with its baptismal overtones, could be construed as a source of life-giving knowledge. Is the lover beginning a new life with his lady in the light of Hope's teachings? Although not mentioned in the story, the walled garden in the *Remede* is of the type that may well have contained a fountain, just as does that of the walled garden in the *Roman de la Rose*. In the *Rose* the story of Narcissus is written on the fountain; perhaps in this image the relationship between Guillaume the lover as the "reflection" of the author Machaut is implied.

Moving on to the word-music presentation, it can be seen that once again *F-G* follows *A* in its outstanding clarity.¹⁵⁰ It is even more generous with space than *A*: the *baladelle* has empty staves; and much of fol. 56 is left empty to allow the *ballade* to begin on a new opening on which it can fit in its entirety. In this case, the triplum makes use of the handy space left by the shorter tenor part so that, unlike *E*, clarity is not sacrificed for visual beauty. As with the other manuscripts, the short *rondelet* will be used as an example to demonstrate *F-G*'s clarity (fol. 62v, fig. 2.25):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

¹⁵⁰ In the lay, *complainte* and *chanson roial* there are slight discrepancies with *F-G*'s second line of text, but in all cases the syllable alignment with the first text is close enough that the intended syllable-note pairings can be easily worked out.

Fig. 2.25: *F* fol. 62v

The *rondelet* from the *Remede de Fortune* in *F-G*

Unlike *E* and *B*, reader-performers need no previous encounter with the music in *F-G* to be able to grasp its presentation of the syllable-note relations; like *A* and *Vg* (and, to a slightly lesser extent, *C*), *F-G* relies on no prior knowledge on the part of the reader, and may well represent an internal performance by the text scribe when writing out the words for the music to be overlaid.

Conclusion

It has been shown in this chapter that the presentation of the *Remede de Fortune* in the six "complete-works" Machaut manuscripts demonstrates a wealth of thematic and practical similarities and differences. Visual beauty seems to have been foremost in the minds of the compilers of *E* and *C*, whereas *A*, *Vg*, and *F-G* are remarkable for the clarity of their word-music layout. *B* and perhaps *E* seem to rely on readers' prior knowledge to reconstruct the word-music relations which they present: in this respect they are perhaps more of a mnemonic aid than a guide to performance. The iconography of *C*, *A*, and *F-G* demonstrates a reliance on the theme of education, in which the author becomes ever-more present as the chronological order progresses. The analyses presented in this chapter have shown that when each

manuscript is considered as a stand-alone performance of an individual work, much can be learnt about the manuscript's purpose and production, and, by eventual comparison with other manuscripts, its relationships to them can be re-assessed. This performative approach to the Machaut "complete-works" manuscripts will now be followed for the remainder of the central chapters, with far-reaching results.

Chapter 3

The Lays and the Performance of Love

J'ai pris et veu le lai qui estoit encloz en vostre douce lettre, et vous promet que je le saurai au plus tost que je porrai, et ne chanterai autre chose jusques a tant que je sache le dit et le chant, car c'est chose de dit et de chant qui onques plus me plaist.

[I have received and seen the lay which was included in your sweet letter, and I promise you that I will learn it as soon as I can, and that I will not sing anything else until I have learnt both the words and the melody, for it is words set to music which I always like most of all.]¹⁵¹

It is generally agreed that, as a genre, the lay reached its apex at the hands of Guillaume de Machaut. The anonymous fifteenth-century author of the much-quoted "Regles de la seconde rhetorique" called Machaut "le grant rethorique de nouvelle fourme, qui commença toutes tailles nouvelles et les parfaits lays d'amours" [the great artist in the new fashion, who worked with all lengths of note and made perfect lays of love]. In more recent times, David Fallows asserts in *Grove Music Online* that "Machaut's lais must be regarded as the highpoint of the form's history".¹⁵²

The history of the lay as a genre is at best disputed (and at worst vague).¹⁵³ Apparently Breton in origin, Gilbert Reaney reminds us that the etymology of that adjective does not confine the early form to Brittany, or even the Breton language, but it in fact includes the whole geographical area often defined as "Celtic".¹⁵⁴ The first appearance of the genre in French seems to have been in the twelfth century with

¹⁵¹ Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Livre du Voir Dit*, ed. Paul Imbs (Paris: Livre de Poche lettres gothiques, 1999), letter 22 (de la dame).

¹⁵² David Fallows: "Lai", *Grove Music Online* (Accessed 12 August 2008), <<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/15841#S15841.4>> §4: The lai after 1300.

¹⁵³ The most comprehensive treatment of the history of the lay with relation to Guillaume de Machaut is by Armand Machabey, *Guillaume de Machaut 130?-1377: La Vie et l'oeuvre musicale*, 2 vols (Paris: Richard-Masse-Editeur, 1955), pp. 98-130.

¹⁵⁴ I use this term mindful of Ann Buckley's warning that it "is inappropriate except in the strictly linguistic sense": Ann Buckley, "Introduction", in *French Lyric Lais, Vol. 1* (Newton Abbot: Antico Edition, 1992-4), pp. i-ii, p. ii. See also Gilbert Reaney, "Concerning the Origins of the Medieval Lai", *Music & Letters* 39:4 (1958), pp. 343-46, p. 343, where he in addition discusses and dismisses the possibility of a Latin origin. A recent discussion of the etymology can be found in David Fallows: "Lai", §1: Terminology and Origins.

Marie de France (who is likely to have worked in England), and the genre at this stage has been compared to that of the *chanson de geste*: made up of long strophes, almost certainly sung, but with no surviving music.¹⁵⁵ In the hands of the troubadours and trouvères in the late-twelfth and thirteenth centuries the form was fluid. The only surviving fourteenth-century lays before those of Machaut, which occur in the *Roman de Fauvel*, show a new regularity which may be indicative of a genre which had already emerged and was gaining popularity.¹⁵⁶ Machaut's lays, which span his entire career, display several apparently new innovations such as the (virtually) uniform twelve-strophe structure, the changing of register for the final strophe, and the use of polyphony.¹⁵⁷ It is this structure which Eustache Deschamps would use to describe the lay in his *Art de dictier*, and it is difficult to tell how far this was influenced (or simply reflected) by his mentor Machaut. In any case, Deschamps described the lay as "une chose longue et malaisée à faire et trouver" ("a long and difficult thing to write"),¹⁵⁸ and although later poets such as Deschamps, Christine de Pizan, and François Villon would continue to compose lays, very few examples of lays whose verse and music were written by the same artist have survived after Machaut.¹⁵⁹

Machaut's lays are challenging both verbally and musically. In most cases each of the twelve strophes features its own distinctive line lengths and rhymes apart from the first and the last, which share the same ones. In addition, each strophe is set to a different melody (apart

¹⁵⁵ Reaney, "Concerning the Origins", p. 345. The Northern French lay also seems to be closely related to the Southern French *descort*: see for example Gilbert Reaney, "The 'Lais' of Guillaume de Machaut and their Background" *Proceedings of the Royal Musicological Association* 82nd session (1955-1956), pp. 15-32, pp. 115-16, and Richard Baum, "Le Descort ou l'anti-chanson" in *Mélanges de philologie romane dédiés à la mémoire de Jean Boutière*, 2 vols (Liège: Soledi, 1967) vol. I, pp. 75-98. The most recent treatment of the relationship is contained in the introduction to Dominique Billy, *L'Architecture lyrique médiévale: analyse métrique et modélisation des structures interstrophiques dans la poésie lyrique des troubadours et des trouvères* (Montpellier: Section Française de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Occitanes, 1989), pp. 1-71.

¹⁵⁶ Fallows, "Lai", §4: The lai after 1300.

¹⁵⁷ Reaney, "The 'Lais' of Guillaume de Machaut", pp. 23-24. Jean Maillard considered that Machaut had established his form of the lay single-handedly for future generations of poets on the basis of a structure evolved during the thirteenth century: Jean Maillard *Évolution et structure du lai lyrique des origines à la fin du XIVe siècle* (Paris: Centre de Documentation Universitaire & S.E.D.E.S. réunis, 1963), p. 378.

¹⁵⁸ Cited in Fallows, "Lai", §2: Poetic Form.

¹⁵⁹ The two examples which do survive are detailed in Fallows, "Lai", §4: The lai after 1300, who suggests that "they were not entirely isolated but rather examples of a larger tradition that happens to have been lost".

from the last, usually a transposition of the first).¹⁶⁰ A total of twenty-five lays are found in the "complete-works" manuscripts, of which nineteen are set to music.¹⁶¹ (Not every manuscript, however, transmits every lay, as will be discussed for individual manuscripts below.)

That Machaut considered his lays to be important works is evident from the elevated position they are given both in the manuscripts and in his two narrative works with music. In the *Remede de Fortune* we have seen how the lay takes pride of place as the lyric whose performance sets the story in motion and whose placement at the head of the didactic lyric sequence signifies its position as the most challenging of the *formes fixes*. In Machaut's other extended work combining both narrative and lyric, the *Voir Dit*, which is analysed in Chapter 5, the "Lay d'Esperence" ("Longuement me sui tenus") comes at the central pivotal point in the story, and is apparently commanded by Hope as a suitable atonement for her perceived neglect in the tale. Similarly, a lay plays a linking role between the two judgment *dits* (*Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne* and *Le Jugement du roi de Navarre*) as the poet's penance for telling the former of the tales which does not end in the lady's favour. Finally, in the same way that the lay opens the *Remede de Fortune*, it once again takes its place at the head of *formes fixes* by being featured as the opening genre of the music section in most of the "complete-works" manuscripts.

Perhaps more than any of the other musical pieces, the lays serve to demonstrate the complexity of Machaut's art as a poet-composer. It is therefore appropriate that I should now turn to the analysis of the lays in the music section in each of the "complete-works" manuscripts.

Manuscript C

Of all the "complete-works" volumes, it is manuscript C which contains the most elaborate presentation of the lays in the music section. Starting on fol. 165, the section contains fifteen lays, of which nine are set to music, a lower proportion than in the other manuscripts, almost

¹⁶⁰ The only exceptions for this are the first two lays. See Reaney, "The 'Lais' of Guillaume de Machaut", pp. 23-24.

¹⁶¹ Lists of the lays are given in Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. xvii, and Maillart, pp. 339-40.

certainly owing to C's position as the earliest "complete-works" manuscript.

Manuscript C is the only one of these manuscripts which does not place the lays at the head of the music section. It is possible, however, that they were intended to complete it, since a break in the music section has been noted after the "Lay mortel", which, with its description of the death of the lover-poet-protagonist, would have made an appropriate end to the manuscript, in keeping with others at the time.¹⁶² If this were the case, then the order of the first part of the music section in manuscript C (*virelais* - *ballades* - *lays*) would mirror in reverse that of the *Remede de Fortune*, therefore implying a didactic ascent ending with the death of the protagonist. As Earp has demonstrated, the structure of manuscript C is such that the positioning of the only genre not to occur in the *Remede*, the motet, was flexible until a late stage in the manuscript's production, and was probably first intended to form a separate gathering after the lays.¹⁶³

If, however, this theoretical plan for the music section of manuscript C was ever devised, it was not in fact followed. The most likely reason for this would seem to be the availability of new works between the manuscript's inception and completion. Another factor might be the possible change of patron, from Bonne of Luxembourg to her father Jean on her death.¹⁶⁴ This could have delayed completion of the manuscript and opened up the possibility of new demands to be met.¹⁶⁵ This in turn might explain why between the lays and the motets there is a sequence comprising a *ballade*, followed by more lays, then mixed *ballades*, *virelais* and *rondeaux*.¹⁶⁶ The order of the first seven of the fifteen lays in manuscript C is the same as that of the other "complete-works" manuscripts with the exception of manuscript E, and this should be borne in mind when considering the relationship of the lays to one another in C, even if in the other manuscripts these

¹⁶² Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 266 (especially n. 21). For an account of the debate over the possible division of the manuscript at this point, see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 78.

¹⁶³ For details see Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 138-142.

¹⁶⁴ This is discussed in Chapter 2, and more details are given in Appendix 1.

¹⁶⁵ Although, as Huot has noted, any break or time increase cannot have been too great, since the same scribes and artists also worked on this section. *From Song to Book*, p. 265, n. 20.

¹⁶⁶ A table is given in Earp "Scribal Practice", p. 139.

relationships are not illustrated through miniatures. Whatever the reasons for the final layout of the lays in manuscript C, they nevertheless make a coherent whole, bound together on stylistic grounds, as shall now be shown.

Despite being split into two groups, the lays are decorated by the only illuminations to be found within manuscript C's music section. Each lay, regardless of whether or not music is present, has a miniature, so that the collection as a whole is as lavish in its iconography as the lyrical insertions set to music in the *Remede de Fortune*.¹⁶⁷ Sylvia Huot has studied in detail the iconographic sequence of C's miniatures for the lays, and during my analysis I will dwell and expand on hers. The order of miniatures has important implications, of course, for the interpretation of the lays by the reader-performer:¹⁶⁸

Each [lay] stands on its own as a performance piece and was no doubt regarded by contemporary audiences as an independent unit. [...] Because of the simultaneous presence of all lays in the book, we are encouraged to look upon each individual piece as part of an ordered whole. Within this textual space, independently composed poems can function together to create a model of poetic inspiration, composition, and performance.¹⁶⁹

As Huot demonstrates, the placement of the first four lays, together with their miniatures, creates a kind of "extended prologue" to the rest of the lay section.¹⁷⁰ The first lay and its miniature (fig. 3.1), in which the protagonist takes his inspiration from the allegorical figure Loyalty (whose scarf bears a striking resemblance to that of Hope in the *Remede de Fortune*, as Huot points out¹⁷¹), shows his devotion to both love and his métier: "Car ma vie et mon lay define" ("for I end both my life and my lay").¹⁷²

¹⁶⁷ It should be noted, however, that the artist for the miniatures of the lays is not the Maître de la *Remede de Fortune*, although the miniatures are clearly related and serve to unify the codex, as we shall see.

¹⁶⁸ Huot, *From Song to Book*, pp. 260-73.

¹⁶⁹ Huot, *From Song to Book*, pp. 263-64. Of course, "poetic inspiration" and "composition" are part of "performance" in my broad interpretation of the word, and thus I would emphasise that Huot's use of the term here implies aural rendition.

¹⁷⁰ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 263.

¹⁷¹ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 272. For a miniature of Hope and her scarf, see chapter 2, fig. 2.4.

¹⁷² Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 262 (translation mine: Huot offers "terminate" in place of "end").

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.1: C fol. 165 (detail)

Miniature to the first lay in manuscript C ("Loyauté qui point ne delay")

The next three lays continue to chart the process of creating a work, describing a sequence already demonstrated in the *Remede de Fortune* and which would later be further expounded by Machaut in the *Voir Dit*, as we shall see in Chapter 5. After *inspiratio* comes *meditatio*, and an image of the protagonist in a garden accompanies the second lay, "J'aim la flour". Next follows the lay "Pour ce qu'on puist" on the creative act, which is reflected in the miniature showing the protagonist in the garden writing on a scroll:¹⁷³

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.2: C fol. 170 (detail)

Miniature to the thrid lay in manuscript C ("Pour ce qu'on puist")

¹⁷³ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 263, miniature reproduced on p. 264.

This image can be compared to that of the lover composing - surely it is not a coincidence - his lay in the *Remede de Fortune*:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.3: C fol. 26 (detail)

Guillaume composing (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

In both of these instances, the protagonist is portrayed with a scroll which, I would argue (as in chapter 5 with reference to the process of composition and the *Voir Dit*), is less a representation of "written composition",¹⁷⁴ than a symbol of the protagonist taking part in the act of creation, and of the compilation of the book.¹⁷⁵

In a similar way, the fourth lay "Aus amans" appeals clearly to a group of people (lovers). Thus it is not surprising that it is illustrated by a miniature portraying the lay's aural performance, again inviting comparison with the lay in the *Remede de Fortune* which the lover unwillingly sings for his lady:

¹⁷⁴ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 263, my emphasis

¹⁷⁵ The scroll is symbolic here, as discussed in Chapter 1. Once again, it plays on the juxtaposition of the oral (the scroll) and the writerly (the fact that the protagonist is writing). See Huot, p. 251.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.4: C fol. 173r (detail)

Miniature to the fourth lay in manuscript C ("Aus amans")

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.5: C fol. 28v (detail)

Guillaume reading his lay to his lady (from the *Remede de Fortune* in C)

Within manuscript C, the young lover of the *Remede* has learnt his lesson well. Whereas in the *Remede* he was ashamed to sing his lay to his lady, here in the fourth lay of the music section of the manuscript the first-person protagonist openly addresses his audience both in the miniature and in the verse itself. The scroll further links the two images. In the *Remede* the protagonist held his scroll and sang his song with his head lowered in shame; here he looks at his audience directly as he sings from the scroll and from the page. It is a fitting image to complete

the "extended prologue" to the lays, and we should not be surprised that this fourth lay, despite its lack of music, is presented among those set to music. There is no other whose subject matter of the first-person protagonist addressing an audience would be as appropriate within the portrayed process from composition to performance.¹⁷⁶ Indeed, the lack of music for the fourth lay provides an interesting visual contrast to the first, "Loyaute", which has staves for music but no music entered. (In all the other "complete-works" manuscripts the first stanza is set to music.) This is a striking start to a musical genre, and whether deliberate or not provides an interesting symmetry with the end of the collection, as we shall see.

Other than in the first lay, there is very little variation in the presentation of the lays set to music in *C*. Unlike the lay in the *Remede de Fortune*, which has four lines of poetry to every line of music, the lays here only have two. Where there is internal musical repetition within each half of each stanza it is written out so that the reader-performer, when arriving at an initial letter designating a new stanza, has to return only once to the start of the stanza in order to follow the music. As with the music in *C*'s *Remede*, however, the syllables in the two lines of text do not necessarily line up, and in each case of doubt the music scribe has naturally set his notes to the text of the upper line. The only exception to this is in the "Lay de plour", where music is provided for only the beginning of the twelfth and final stanza whose continuation is without staves. Given that the twelfth stanzas are almost always direct transpositions of the first, it is remarkable that this space-saving technique is not employed more often in the manuscripts. (The lack of parsimony elsewhere may attest to the scribes' or patrons' recognition of the status of the lay as a virtuoso piece to be attempted by only the ablest poets or poet-musicians.) All of these features can be seen in fig. 3.6:

¹⁷⁶ Although the arguments given by Huot in *From Song to Book*, p. 263, on the rhymes and rhyme scheme are of course valid, I feel it is the subject matter of this lay which is more important for its placement.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.6: C fol. 188v

Extract from the tenth lay in manuscript C ("Lay de Plour")

The first two lays after the "extended prologue" re-affirm the poetic figure, the "I", for the protagonist speaks as a poet justifying his choice of an elegiac tone. As Huot says, "these [lays] are appropriately placed at a point where the lyric persona has indeed been established as lover and poet".¹⁷⁷ Yet in manuscript C, although the lays speak of an author figure, the miniatures do not portray him as such. I am therefore

¹⁷⁷ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 265.

inclined to disagree with Huot's notion that these lays "offer the illuminator little possibility for visual interpretation",¹⁷⁸ for surely the illuminator could have highlighted the authorial aspects of the lays if he had so desired, for example with the clerical teaching motifs seen in manuscript *F-G*. Nevertheless, such illustrations would of course not be in keeping with the rest of the iconography in manuscript *C*, and thus the illuminations chosen serve to highlight the first-person protagonist as subservient lover rather than all-powerful author. In any case, it is significant that the illuminator of manuscript *C* does not exploit the authorial aspects of the lays which will come to the fore in other manuscripts. I do concur with Huot's suggestion that in manuscript *C* these lays, central though they are to the corpus, are illustrated because they are lays, rather than because of their subject matter:

It is in itself significant that the poems would have been illustrated even though there was, so to speak, nothing to illustrate except the voice itself. The idea of having the lays illuminated, rather than any visually suggestive aspect of the poems themselves, clearly motivated the work.¹⁷⁹

This is of course not to say that the illustrations are in any way boring. They are clearly essential to the collection for they designate the poems as lays, perhaps because in manuscript *C* they are, as a genre, considered worthy of illustration as *tours de force*, and they serve to influence the reader-performer by indicating at the very least the voice behind the "I".

After two lays which are both "a pure articulation of love",¹⁸⁰ "Amours doucement" and "Amis t'amour", the ninth lay in manuscript *C* is the "Lay mortel" ("Mortal Lay"). In this lay, as the title would suggest, the protagonist tells how he is soon to die from love. In the accompanying miniature the protagonist is shown looking towards a bush in which there is another face which Huot suggests is Mesdis (Slander).¹⁸¹ If the lay section in *C* had ended here, then we would have come full circle: from inspiration of poetic discourse from Loyalty to the death of the protagonist through Slander. Nevertheless, although a break in the lay section is indeed plausible here (as has already been

¹⁷⁸ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 264.

¹⁷⁹ Huot, *From Song to Book*, pp. 264-65.

¹⁸⁰ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 265.

¹⁸¹ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 265.

discussed), it seems to me unlikely that the collection would have ended on such a distressing, indeed *mortel*, note.¹⁸² Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to expand upon Huot's comparison with the death of Guillaume de Lorris at the end of the first part of the *Roman de la rose*.¹⁸³ For the first part of the lay section of manuscript C, like that of the *Rose*, ends with the apparent death of its author-protagonist, here treated in a short ballade on the theme of death caused by love, before the work resumes. In the case of the lays of manuscript C, however, there is no new author, although the lay which opens the second section is none other than the "Lay de plour", the lay which Machaut is commanded to write (in a female voice) in the *Jugement du roi de Navarre* as penance for having wronged ladies in the *Jugement du roi de Behaigne*. Whether or not the "Lay de plour" predates *Navarre* (or whether *Navarre* was omitted from C because of its overturning the judgment of the *dit* which opens the manuscript that was most likely commissioned for this family), the imagery of the miniature which accompanies it, that of a man and woman conversing, recalls the central debate of both *dits*.¹⁸⁴ Add to this the question of the death of C's likely patron, Bonne of Luxembourg, sometime during the manuscript's production, and it may be that the theme of death disrupting - although not destroying - the collection of lays is more significant than first appears.

Indeed, it is before the "Lay mortel" that the other manuscripts depart from C's ordering of the lays, and it is in the two lays following the "Lay de plour" that C's iconography, for the first and only time in the manuscript, grabs attention by extending into the margins of the page. In the miniatures accompanying these lays, the first of which is in a male voice and the second a female, it is not the protagonist but the object of her/his love that is portrayed; the protagonist her/himself is

¹⁸² Unless, of course, Machaut had in fact died, although speculation as to whether or not he was suffering from any illness - lovesickness or not - at around the time manuscript C was produced would surely be futile. Guillaume de Lorris's reported death in the *Roman de la rose* may likewise have been no more than a literary fiction.

¹⁸³ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 266, n. 21: "Also relevant in this regard is Jean de Meun's statement that Guillaume de Lorris's portion of the *Rose* breaks off because of the death of its author. This principle reflects the lyric identification of singer and song, extended to the lyrical writer and his corpus."

¹⁸⁴ See Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 266 and n. 22, for a discussion which suggests that the recent composition of *Navarre* may also have had an effect on the illustration programme here. Huot also notes here that the "Lay mortel" and the "Lay de plour" are listed together in A's index, a detail which will be discussed in more detail when considering the lays in manuscript A.

depicted in the margin. In addition, the flower held by the male figure accompanying both lays "endows him with a distinctive identity: we cannot help but feel that it is the same man in both cases and hence the same couple".¹⁸⁵

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.7: C fol. 189r (detail)

Miniature to the eleventh lay in manuscript C ("Ne say comment")

Thus the "new", post-death arrangement of the lays in manuscript C seems to focus less on the lover-protagonist than on her/his audience. From the couple represented in the lays "Ne say comment" and "Se quanque Diex" we move in the thirteenth lay, "Maintes fois", to a miniature of the male protagonist addressing an audience on the proper way to love. Unlike the performer in the miniature for the third lay (fig. 3.2), he is not depicted with a scroll: despite his didactic tone he is exclusively a lover rather than the lover-poet-composer featured in C's presentation of the *Remede de Fortune*. The next lay, "On parle de richesses", is the only one to change voice within the poem. The structural implications of this are visible in the steadily decreasing line-length before a return to the opening alexandrines in the final stanza.¹⁸⁶ The first half is written in a male voice, a "clerkly" figure who writes grand, long lines of verse with measured, even syllable counts; the second in a female voice whose lines are shorter, more courtly, and

¹⁸⁵ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 268. The points made in my discussion can be found on pp. 267-68. On p. 268 Huot adds that this iconographical linking of the last lay set to music with the first of the concluding series serves to unite the collection.

¹⁸⁶ Maillard, p. 350.

tend towards odd syllable counts and fluidity.¹⁸⁷ The miniature supports this, for it depicts a courtly lady in her castle and a clerk writing:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.8: C fol. 194v (detail)

Miniature to the fourteenth lay in manuscript C ("On parle de richesses")

The miniature, whilst sharing some of the iconographical features of the *Remede de Fortune* (the lady, the castle, the scroll), also departs from it, as Jean de Meun departs from Guillaume de Lorris's standpoint in the continuation of the *Rose*. Here in C the male figure and the lady in the castle are not (necessarily) in love with each other; rather they represent two different registers for the declaration of love, the one being courtly, the other clerkly. The courtly lady's stanzas are shorter and lighter, whereas the clerkly man's stanzas, the first three of which consist of alexandrines, are longer, sober, and unique in Machaut's works.¹⁸⁸ Thus the significance of the last appearance of both the male protagonist and the scroll in manuscript C is different from that in our previous encounters with them. Here, the scroll does not elevate the protagonist to the status of author; rather, like with its appearance in the iconography of the lay in the *Remede* (fig. 3.5), the scroll functions almost as a weight which restricts him to long lines of verse in this long

¹⁸⁷ Huot, *From Song to Book*, pp. 269-271. Huot implies that the odd-even syllable counts simply serve to differentiate the two voices rather than portraying any intrinsic meaning in themselves as do the line lengths, however, odd-syllable lines have varied internal stress, which can also imply greater naturalness or spontaneity.

¹⁸⁸ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 269.

genre, and alienates him from the courtly world of the lady in her castle.¹⁸⁹

The fifteenth and final lay in manuscript *C* is accompanied by the last of the manuscript's miniatures, depicting a lady addressing three other ladies. Although there is nothing in the poem to indicate a female voice, the miniature forces the reader-performer to interpret it as such. The suggestion is that, following the death of the lover-protagonist in the "Lay mortel", now it is time for the male author-figure, normally concealed behind the former persona and barely present in manuscript *C*, to be completely effaced, just as the music of the first lay has vanished from its empty staves. The author is present behind his works, of course (it is after all a single-author collection), but he is invisible, speaking only through his creations, the various poetic "I"s, themselves brought to us by others. He is present in neither the first nor the last miniatures of the manuscript, and there is no index or introductory prologue. Even the music, which guides reader-performers so carefully for the first line of text, leaves us somewhat to our own devices where there is a second or further text to be sung. At the end of manuscript *C*, which contains neither the mass nor the *Voir Dit* (to be discussed in the following chapters), whatever Machaut's — probably active — role in the manuscript's scrupulous production, it is the creation, rather than the creator, which we admire.

Manuscript A

The opening image to the twenty-two lays - and to the music section - in manuscript *A* reaffirms a theme frequently found in Machaut's works, that of honouring ladies:

¹⁸⁹ This iconographical icongruity between clerkly author and courtly lover we will see again in the *Voir Dit* in manuscripts *A* and *F-G*, discussed in Chapter 5.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.9: A fol. 367 (detail)

The opening miniature to the lays in manuscript A

The lay itself, too, expands on this:

Loyauté,
Que point ne delay,
Vuet sans delay,
Que face un lay;
Et pour ce l'ay
Commencié [...]
Riens qui ne soit pour moy deffaire,
Qui, sans meffaire,
Vueil toudis faire
Vo service, en dit et en fait. (A, fol. 367)

[Loyalty, who never waits, wants me to write a lay straight away, and so I have begun ... nothing could stop me doing so, I who, without doing wrong, always want to serve you in word and deed.]

Sylvia Huot has analysed the opening to this lay as follows:¹⁹⁰

This poem occupies first place among the lays [...] and serves to introduce the lays as a special collection within the codex. The generic designation is given in the third line [que face un lay: that I write a lay] and emphasized by the series of four rhymes on the syllable *-lay*. [...] Participating in the same alliterative field is the first word of the poem, *Loyauté*, identified as the primary motivation for the poet's activity. From the word chain *loyauté-lay-lie-amours* developed in the opening lines, there emerges an image of the poetic "I" as the persona in whom the parallel activities of love and poetic activity are conjoined in exemplary

¹⁹⁰ I find a slightly different rhyme scheme in this lay from Huot (a rhyme between *Loyauté* and *commencié* necessitating a line division after each), which means that Huot's "third line" is in fact my fourth.

fashion, through his loyal commitment to each. The complete fusion of poem and persona is achieved in the closing line, "Car ma vie et mon lay define" (For I terminate my life and my lay).¹⁹¹

Although manuscripts *A* and *C* both emphasise aspects of love and service in their opening miniatures, they nevertheless differ in their interpretations. In *C*, we saw that the focus was on the command from Loyalty, and on the act of composition. In *A*, the lover is depicted without any accompanying symbols of composition, nor is there any indication that the female figure is in fact Loyalty. The image expresses therefore less Loyalty's command in the first lay than the general service to love which is repeated in all of the lays. This broader implication is of course fitting given that this is the only miniature in the lay section. The identification of the male figure with Machaut's poetic "I" may be a natural step but it is nevertheless one which we must take ourselves. Where this image differs significantly from those in *C*, however, is that the male figure worshipping the female figure introduces all the lays, even those in a female voice, and thus serves as a reminder that the lays are, in fact, the work of a single author. The male figure here, unlike his counterparts in *C*, is portrayed neither as writing nor singing his work, yet he is implicitly offering it to the female figure. Given the presence in manuscript *A* of the full Prologue, in which Machaut as an author is bestowed with gifts to honour love and ladies, this image can also be read as the fruition of this promise: an offering to the reader-performers in a scenario reminiscent of the *Voir Dit* where Machaut the author and Guillaume the lover are combined in the service of the beloved reader-performer Toute Belle. All of this, of course, reminds us that the lays which follow are his to give.

The authorial presence is also additionally felt in manuscript *A* because of the index. Whether or not the famous rubric is true to its word, it undeniably contributes to the interpretation of the author-performer from the outset of manuscript *A*. The index casts its shadow over the lays insofar as it prescribes their order. This sequence, which is different from that of manuscript *C*, is not in fact entirely followed in the manuscript itself. Manuscript *A*, its index, and manuscript *C* are all in agreement for the first six lays, thus keeping intact the "extended

¹⁹¹ Huot, *From Song to Book*, pp. 260 and 262 (p. 261 is taken up with a picture of the opening miniature for the lays in *C*).

prologue" to the lays observed in manuscript *C*. At the seventh position, however, *A*'s index lists the lay from the *Remede de Fortune*, although the manuscript in fact follows manuscript *C*'s choice of seventh lay, "Amours doucement". It is from this point on that manuscripts *A* and *C* diverge completely. Between manuscript *A* and the index there is one further point of disagreement: the "Lay de plour" is placed at the end of the group rather than in thirteenth position as prescribed by the index.¹⁹² Earp suggests that this displacement was caused by the lay being "initially forgotten" because it was not in this position in the exemplar (which he assumes also happened in manuscript *F-G* where it is completely absent), and is appended at the end of the section in a different hand.¹⁹³ Whether or not this scenario took place, it is worth bearing in mind that this is the "Lay de plour", which, like the "Lay mortel", has death as its theme, conveyed in this case by a lady mourning her dead lover, is far from inappropriate as a lay to complete the section.

If the ordering of the lays in manuscript *C* is stylistic, in manuscript *A* it appears to be chronological (at least in the index, since the "Lay de plour" would not come at the end of a chronological sequence).¹⁹⁴ The presence of empty ruled staves completing the gathering, and not cut out, is also interesting, for it suggests the possible addition of future lays (as may have happened with the "Lay de plour"). A chronological - or nearly chronological - order, whether or not it was set by the author as the index claims, nevertheless further attests to his presence in the collection: a chronological ordering highlights the collection as containing his "life's work", rather than a suggested order for pleasurable reading. Even in a culture which welcomed lengthy oral performances of epics and romances, it cannot be denied that the number and individual length of the lays mean that reading or singing

¹⁹² Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 62-65 gives an overview of the lay sections, including a comparative table of the positioning of the lays (p.64) in the "complete-works" manuscripts. It should be noted that manuscript *A* also labels its nineteenth lay, "Malgre Fortune", as "le lay de plour". Neither "Lay de plour" is entitled as such in the index, which gives their opening words.

¹⁹³ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 63. Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 266, n. 22 also attributes the splitting of the "Lay mortel" and "Lay de plour", which would otherwise form a pair in both *A* and *C*, to "scribal oversight". It is also worth adding that the "Lay de plour" in manuscript *A* is the only lay whose initial letter is written over staves, also suggesting a later addition.

¹⁹⁴ For more details on the likely chronological order, see Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 62-65.

all twenty-two exclusively in the order presented would take an extraordinary amount of time, particularly if they were consumed in one session, although even a performance over several sessions would mean a lengthy diet of nothing but lays. It is at least - if not more - likely that they would be read or sung individually or in groups, according to the reader-performer's inclination. This is reflected in manuscript A where the reader-performer is not so much presented with a series of lays ordered so as to tell a story, peppered with images to mark divisions and to maintain interest, but rather faced with a lifetime achievement to be admired.

The presentation of the music is similarly sober. Sober, that is, in that it allows the reader-performer very few liberties in interpretation: as with the *Remede de Fortune*, the reader-performer approaching manuscript A with or without prior knowledge is left in no doubt as to the word-syllable relationships in the lays. The music for the lay section is generally laid out in one staff across the page, except when the folio is shared between two lays, of which only one has music. On such pages the lay with music is exceptionally presented in columns since the lays without music are written in two columns. After the first lay, new lays are introduced with large illuminated initials, drawn over blank spaces left in the staves (except for the "Lay de plour" which is shown in fig. 3.11 below). New stanzas feature smaller illuminated initials also drawn into spaces left at the appropriate point in the staves.

The key factor at play in A's clarity is once again the second line of text. Unlike in manuscript C, where the inconsistent alignment of the two lines of text syllable-for-syllable obliged the music scribe to opt to match his notes to the first, in manuscript A no such decision was needed. The first line of text has been entered taking account of the space required for the music scribe to enter melismas where necessary, and the second line of text has then been entered so that its syllables almost always fit exactly under the corresponding syllables in the first text, thus ensuring that both texts are aligned for the music when it is entered. Occasionally the second text is slightly to the left of the first, but never so much as to affect the clarity. Virtually any folio would serve as an example here, but I have chosen fol. 373v (the end of the third lay, "Pour ce qu'on puist") because of its large number of melismas, and

its rare variation from this rule in the penultimate staff ("pite ne accort" over "de vous nos confort"), which is soon clarified by the punctum and the rhyme.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.10: A fol. 373v

Extract from the third lay in manuscript A ("Pour ce qu'on puist")

The only consistent exception to this clarity and matching alignment is the final lay, the "Lay de plour". As already mentioned, this composition may have been added to the manuscript after the lay section was otherwise complete. In addition, the scribe who entered the

text of the other lays did not do so for this one. A comparison of the opening words of the “Lay de plour” and the previous example will illuminate this disparity better than words:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.11: A fol. 410v (detail)

Extract from the twenty-second lay in manuscript A (“Lay de Plour”)

As can be seen by following the syllables in the two lines of text in the above example, only at the beginning and around the rhyme (and puncta) do the two texts align; elsewhere the syllables of the second line are not aligned with the first and the music scribe has entered the music according to the first line of text.¹⁹⁵ This scenario, which is very similar to that found in manuscript C, by no means renders the lay indecipherable; rather, it serves to highlight the exceptional clarity of the preceding lays in manuscript A. Whether or not Machaut was in fact party to A's production, the compilers of the manuscript clearly took care to ensure that the aural reconstruction of their collection of lays

¹⁹⁵ According to the variations listed by Ludwig, *Musikalische Werke*, p. 266, there are no more musical variations in this lay than in other lays.

was as trouble-free as possible even for a reader-performer unfamiliar with the works.

Manuscript Vg

Manuscript *Vg* is similar to manuscript *A* in many ways, yet with some important differences. Firstly, in terms of layout, as with both *A* and *C* its general format is one column of music stretching across the page. Unlike the procedure followed in *A*, however, this pattern remains even in the presence of lays not set to music, which are entered in two columns and never share a column with music. Blank space is left where necessary. This, together with the lack of blank or cut folios at the end of the gathering which completes the section, may suggest that the lays to be entered were already assembled before the planning of the manuscript began, and thus that the overall planning was more rigorous.

Like manuscript *A*, *Vg* begins every lay with a large initial letter, and every stanza with a smaller initial letter. Unlike their equivalents in manuscript *A*, however, these smaller initial letters are drawn over staff lines: no space was left for them at the ruling stage, although their positioning of course serves to unite them further with the music to which they belong. *Vg* has no miniatures in its music section, despite the fact that the spaces left for the initial letters beginning each lay would have been big enough to accommodate miniatures. Not surprisingly, the largest of these spaces is at the head of the opening lay. While there may be no miniature, the large amount of coloured marginal decoration of the page leaves the reader-performer in no doubt that something new has begun. To judge by the condition of this folio, it seems likely that it in fact began a new volume for at least some period in the history of the manuscript.¹⁹⁶ The placement of the lays at the head of the music section, as well as their order, is the same as is found in manuscript *A*, except that *Vg* only contains the first eighteen. Another difference is with the “Lay de plour”, which is placed in *Vg* not in the lays section but after the *Jugement du roi de Navarre*.

Nevertheless the two manuscripts closely resemble each other in sharing one of their most significant features, namely the clarity of their

¹⁹⁶ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 84.

word-music relations. A first glance at *Vg* shows that the music is carefully laid over the first text, and once again the "second-text test" reveals that the second line of text is also aligned to the first. A single example will suffice. Figure 3.12 is taken from "Je ne cesse de prier", which alternates between monophonic and polyphonic strophes (marked "chase"). Even when the two text lines diverge slightly due to some lengthy words that have to be negotiated in the second text at the end of the first staff, *Vg*'s word-syllable relations are clear to any reader-performer.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.12: *Vg* fol. 251 (detail)

Extract from the sixteenth lay in manuscript *Vg* ("Je ne cesse de prier")

We can see, then, that, as for the *Remede de Fortune*, *Vg*'s *mise en page* of the lays relies not on visual appeal but on clarity of the text-music presentation to attract the reader-performer. While the iconographical sequences in manuscript *C* for both the *Remede* and the

lays add undeniable nuances and delight to the whole, they do relegate the text-music relationship into second place. This is not the case in either *A* or, especially, *Vg*. With no miniatures in the lay section, *Vg*'s only appeal to the eye of the reader-performer must, and does, come from its exceptional clarity.

Manuscript *B*

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.13: *B* fol. 249 (detail)

Extract from the sixteenth lay in manuscript *B* ("Je ne cesse de prier")

The most immediately obvious feature of the lays section in manuscript *B* is, unfortunately, the loss of its opening folio. Although a miniatureless manuscript, given the marginal decoration on the corresponding folio in *B*'s close neighbour *Vg*, we can only speculate whether the missing folio may once have been illuminated with some basic decoration and was wantonly excised by an avid collector of illuminated pages. In any case, it is conceivable that the folio opening the lays, and the music section, of manuscript *B* may have been the most beautiful folio of the manuscript.

Otherwise, the structure and layout of the lays in manuscript *B* are identical to those in *Vg*, as we would expect. The level of accuracy, however, is not consistent. The two lines of text are aligned to each other more often than not: figure 3.13 shows how they are mostly

aligned, as is typical, though they do drift apart at the end of the first and third staves. In general, too, the spacing of the music - if not always its actual overlay - allows a reader-performer to reconstruct which notes are intended for which syllables. The process of cerebral reconstruction is of course much longer than in the other manuscripts, but since *B* seems to have been intended to serve as a means to producing other manuscripts its perceived reader-performers were a specialised group: scribal-performers. Here in the lays, as we have already seen for the *Remede de Fortune* and as we will see to a greater degree in the Mass, the reconstruction of the sonic performance, whether external or internal, is not problematic for reader-performers who know what to expect. As always, when the two versions are conflated, either through collation of the same texts in *Vg* and *B* as in figures 3.12 and 3.13, or through memory (as was surely intended once the two manuscripts were separated), many of the problems that *B* poses for today's reader-performers disappear.

Nevertheless some anomalies in the lays section of manuscript *B* mentioned by Earp can be discussed here in the light of the idea that *B* may have been only intended for use as an exemplar, or perhaps more of an *aide-mémoire*, by those scribes who were already familiar with *Vg*. Earp is irritated by the principal music scribe's "lack of any regard for the relationship of notes to syllables", which he attributes to his "extreme haste".¹⁹⁷ One of the principal reasons for this judgment occurs in the lays section, where on fol. 246 the text for the third staff was skipped, and written instead in the final staff, with guiding letters indicating the order of *Vg*.¹⁹⁸ The music, however, is nevertheless entered in the staff order of *Vg*. Rather than dismissing this merely as a long lapse of attention by the music scribe who "remained unaware that two of the lines of text he was overlaying with music were not even the corresponding texts",¹⁹⁹ we must at least entertain the possibility that the music scribe made a conscious decision to preserve the music layout of *Vg* even in the presence of what is presumably an error on the part of the text scribe. This explanation would not seem implausible, given that the other divergences from *Vg* mentioned by Earp were then

¹⁹⁷ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 212.

¹⁹⁸ Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 212-13.

¹⁹⁹ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 212.

corrected.²⁰⁰ In addition, we have seen from the spacing issues in the lays, as well as in the *Remede de Fortune*, that the music in *B* can be reconstructed without reference to the written words, which suggests that in this manuscript the apparent separation of words and music may have been subconscious: in other words it occurs in the *mise en page* of the manuscript rather than in the minds of the scribal-performers. In the lays as throughout (other than in the *Prise d'Alexandrie*), *B* is dependent on *Vg*, perhaps to the extent that it was not intended to be used without a thorough knowledge of either Machaut's works or their presentation in the more formal manuscript. In any case, the likelihood that *B* served as an exemplar for parts of the later manuscript *E*, probably without either *Vg*'s physical or memorial presence, shows that, whatever the intention of the compilers of manuscript *B*, a generation later it had begun to circulate independently, and as a result to acquire its "bad-boy" reputation.

Manuscript E

In its presentation of the lays, manuscript *E* once again stands apart from its fellows. The most striking example of this is in the order of the lays, which do not follow the sequence of any other extant manuscript. Whereas in other parts of the music section, notably the motets and rondeaux, the order of the works seems to be derived from the layout requirements of the manuscript,²⁰¹ the same cannot be said for the lays. With their considerable length and generally monophonic character, these did not require any particular planning on the part of the manuscript production team other than the division into those lays which were text-only, presented in *E*'s usual three-column format, and those which have music, written in staves which run the whole width of the page. In *E* the text-only lays are presented in two sections, both of which are evidently carefully planned: the first follows straight on from the strophes of the first lay (in which only the first strophe is set to music) and moves seamlessly back to music halfway down fol. 110; the second section of text-only lays begins on fol. 127 after a short blank

²⁰⁰ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 213 and n. 174. While corrections are essential to determining a scribal-performer's practice, it is my opinion that the finished, corrected version best shows his intentions and priorities, which are under consideration here.

²⁰¹ See Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 126-129, and Bent "The Machaut Manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*", particularly p. 78.

space at the end of a lay set to music on fol. 126v and also moves seamlessly back to music towards the end of fol. 128. The two breaks between gatherings, before fols 115 and 123, occur midway through lays set to music.²⁰²

The increase in decoration for the lays, together with their position at the head of the music section, implies that they form an important part of manuscript *E*. Their initial letters, in colours which include gold leaf, are more ornate than any others in the manuscript. Their opening miniature is also the only miniature in the music section, and should surely be ascribed all the prestige that such uniqueness entails. It is shown in figure. 3.14:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.14: *E* fol. 157 (detail)

The opening miniature to the lays in manuscript *E*

Despite the five colourful figures, the walled garden and the trees, it is the book that is clearly the centre of attention both of the characters portrayed and of the reader-performer. The fact that the book is bound, rather than a scroll or a rotulus, and that it clearly contains music, is also of note. The figure to the left holding the book in his right hand and raising his left index finger is portrayed as the group's leader, despite the fact that the man to his left is also touching the book. The mouths of at least three of the men are open: they are either engaged in an animated discussion or they are singing. Two of the men are looking at

²⁰² For a concise tabular representation of the gatherings of manuscript *E* see Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 123-124.

the book, while the two on the right appear to be looking at the leader figure. This reading, this performance, is clearly a group activity in which the participants engage with each other, under the guidance of the book. It is a fitting image for a manuscript, especially a music manuscript.

The same could be said for the miniature accompanying the *rondeaux* in the *Louange des dames*. These *rondeaux* are not set to music, yet the miniature shows a group of figures apparently singing from a scroll:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.15: *E* fol. 16r (detail)

The opening miniature to the *rondeaux* in the *Louange des dames* in manuscript *E*

In both miniatures the presence of a circle of singers collectively music-making symbolically reminds us of the circular poetic and musical structure of the *rondeau* (and indeed the lay) despite its lack of staves here. (Notice that the second man from the left in Fig. 3.15 has his arm around his companion's shoulder as does the man on the right in Fig. 3.14, suggesting a closed circle of friends that we are invited to join as reader-performers.)

Notably absent from both images, however, is an authorial figure. Even the men holding and facing their books with raised index fingers show no sign of being the authors. They have no pens. Do they have the

books because they are the leaders? Or are they the leaders because they are holding the books? There is no way to tell.

This absence of an authorial figure in the presentation of the lays can perhaps also be seen in the order in which they are presented. Whereas the other "complete-works" manuscripts have a clear ordering for the first seven lays (after which manuscript *C* diverges from the others which remain in agreement), *E* follows its own order from the start.²⁰³ The index to manuscript *A*, whether or not it was indeed the product of the author's real intention rather than of his fictitiously invoked authority, nevertheless claims to portray Machaut's preferred order of his works. Sylvia Huot clearly believes that Machaut was (also?) behind the ordering of the lays in the earlier manuscript *C*.²⁰⁴ Although manuscript *E* is entirely independent in its ordering of lays, and, as it was produced after the author's death, has virtually no claim to insight into his wishes, I believe it nevertheless follows its own carefully structured order where the lays are concerned, as I hope to show in the following discussion.

Like all of the other "complete-works" manuscripts, *E* opens its lay section with "Loyauté que point ne delay", which as we have seen is a highly appropriate opening for both the lays and the music section of the manuscript. The remaining eighteen lays fall into two distinct groups of nine, each comprising four pairs followed by a concluding lay. The first of the pairs in the first group, "Aux amans" and "Amours se plus", are both declaimed to an audience: the former from the masculine point of view; the latter from the feminine.²⁰⁵ Mirroring these exactly is the following pair, this time declaiming love privately, first from feminine perspective ("Ne quanque tant"), then the masculine ("J'aime la fleur").²⁰⁶ The third pair of lays in this first group, "Nuls ne doit" and "Amours doucement", are both composed from the masculine standpoint. They

²⁰³ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 263, n. 19.

²⁰⁴ Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 263. See also p. 260: "Machaut clearly wanted to give these striking examples of poetic virtuosity an important place in his book" and p. 273: "Machaut has created not merely a lyrical narrative but a lyrical codex."

²⁰⁵ Although I am the first to analyse the order of the lays in manuscript *E*, I draw much from Huot's analysis of those lays which are also in manuscript *C* to propose my reasons behind *E*'s ordering. Huot discusses the public nature of this pair of lays in *From Song to Book*, p. 263 ("Aux amans") and p. 271 ("Amours se plus").

²⁰⁶ "Ne quanque tant" is briefly mentioned by Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 271; "J'aime la fleur" she describes on p. 263 as "a classic declaration of love, for which the illustration of solitary meditation in the garden is entirely appropriate".

are a pair of laments, and in the first the lover is a poet figure, who explains why he must lament his lady.²⁰⁷ The final pair of lays in the first group, "Pour ce qu'on puist" and "Amis t'amour", are similar to the third: in "Pour ce qu'on puist" the speaker is once again a lamenting male poet, however, in "Amis t'amour" it is a lady who expresses sorrow. Completing this first group of lays is "Un mortel lay", which in manuscripts *A* and *F-G* is given the title "Le lay mortel". Thus in this first group of lays we move from lovers addressing an audience to poet-figures lamenting, and end with the apparent death of the protagonist. As in manuscript *C*, the "Lay mortel" serves as a fitting point of division.

The second group of lays in manuscript *E* starts with a lay whose opening lines are appropriate to the opening of a new group: "Ne say comment commencer un tresdoulz lay" ["I don't know how to begin a sweet lay"]. The lay, which is entitled the "Lay de l'ymage" (the lay of the image/portrait) in *E*, *C*, and *A*, is a lament from the masculine standpoint. Following it is a Marian lay, "Contre ce dous mois de may", entitled in *E* only as "Le Lay de Nostre Dame" (the Lay of Our Lady). This sequence of masculine lament followed by Marian devotion is repeated in the next pair of lays, "S'onques doulereusement" (entitled "Le Lay de confort" - the lay of comfort - in *E* and *F-G*)²⁰⁸ and "Je ne cesse de prier". Whilst a Marian lay, "Je ne cesse de prier" is only entitled as such in manuscript *E* ("un lay de nostre dame", a lay of our lady), in *F-G* it is entitled "Le lay de la fonteinne" (the lay of the fountain). This highlighting of the Marian aspect of this lay in manuscript *E* underlines the parallel with the preceding pair. The third pair of lays in this second group ("De trois raisons" and "Pour ce que plus"), like the pair in the same position in the first group, features a lamenting masculine poet. The latter, entitled "Le Lay de consolation", appears only in manuscript *E*, and is an *opus dubium*.²⁰⁹ The final pair of lays in this group consists

²⁰⁷ Huot describes "Nus ne doit", together with "De trois raisons" which follows it in manuscript *C*, as "appropriately placed at a point where the lyric persona has indeed been established [...]. They contribute to the equation of these two identities by explaining the content of the poems as a function of the poet's experience" (*From Song to Book*, p. 265).

²⁰⁸ The "Lay de confort" has provoked some debate since it appears to reference both the *Remede de Fortune* and the *Confort d'ami*. See Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, pp. 371-72 for a summary of the arguments.

²⁰⁹ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 357, and "Scribal Practice" pp. 310-26. Earp notes that, unlike himself, Bent, in "The Machaut manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*" (pp. 72-73) supports the ascription to Machaut.

of "On parle de richesses", where, as we have seen, a serious, clerkly, masculine voice converses with a courtly, feminine one, and "Maintes fois", a feminine didactic lay addressed to an audience.²¹⁰ In this second group of lays, then, we have moved from love and comfort in Marian devotion, through lamenting, and back to singing to an audience and particularly the court. The final lay in manuscript *E*, "En demantant", continues the courtly theme. It is unique to this manuscript, and, like the "Lay mortel", closes both the group and the lay section with the theme of death — in particular, the death is of a king who was "valiant" and "hardi". This could be a reference to Machaut's early patron, John of Luxembourg, the epitome of chivalry and grandfather to the patron of manuscript *E*, Jean de Berry. If this is indeed a lay in his honour, it certainly makes a fitting conclusion to the series of lays in this manuscript.²¹¹

Turning to the layout of the music, it is clear from a first glance that, even more than *C*, manuscript *E* is for a large part concerned with aligning only the first line of text. The position of the second text can of course be ascertained from the syllable count in relation to the first, as well as from its spacings and puncta, but it is not always written clearly like it is in *A* and *Vg*. This can be seen from the first few words to the second text at the opening of the lay "Pour ce qu'on puist":

²¹⁰ These two lays also occur together in manuscript *C*. "On parle de richesses" is discussed above and in Huot, *From Song to Book*, p. 269; "Maintes fois" pp. 268-69.

²¹¹ The ascription of this lay to Machaut has also been questioned by Earp ("Scribal Practice", pp. 309-10, 326). As it is only featured in the late manuscript *E* it has been dated towards the end of Machaut's life, yet has also been associated with the battle of Poitiers where King Jean II, father of Jean de Berry, was taken captive (Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, pp. 25-26, 318). If the death of the king to which the lay alludes does in fact refer to John of Luxembourg at Crécy, then it would be the only time in Machaut's poetry that this is mentioned (Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, pp. 25-26, states that "not a single line of poetry mentions the disaster at Crécy, where John of Luxembourg fell in 1346".) If Machaut is indeed the author, then it begs the question as to whether it was written with a patron of the house of France (and perhaps even this particular manuscript) in mind.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.16: *E* fol. 113v (detail)

Opening of the eighth lay in manuscript *E* ("Pour ce qu'on puist")

Finally, it should be noted that the two *unica* lays in *E* ("Pour ce que plus" and "En demantant") are both polyphonic — a point which was overlooked by Machaut's two principal music editors, Ludwig and Schrade, though both works have been subsequently identified as polyphonic in more recent years.²¹² This discovery links them thus to Machaut's two canonic lays, and has served to weaken the argument that they were perhaps not in fact composed by him.²¹³ Whether or not we will ever know their authorship for certain, their inclusion in manuscript *E* at least indicates that in some milieux they were circulating as Machaut's lays after his death, their polyphonic nature fitting in well with the lays section's opening miniature.

Manuscript F-G

With manuscript *F-G*, the presence of the author, already visible in manuscript *A*, becomes ever more imposing. This is especially apparent in the opening miniature to the lays - and to the music section - shown in fig. 3.17:

²¹² Richard Hoppin, "An Unrecognized Polyphonic Lai of Machaut", *Musica Disciplina* 12 (1958), pp. 93-104, and Margaret Hasselman and Thomas Walker, "More Hidden Polyphony in a Machaut Manuscript", *Musica Disciplina* 24 (1970), pp. 7-16.

²¹³ Put forward by Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 326. Their authorship is discussed in the two sources cited above as well as Virginia Newes, "Turning Fortune's Wheel: Musical and Textual Design in Machaut's Canonic Lais", *Musica Disciplina* 45 (1991), pp. 95-121. Newes does not reach any firm conclusion, however.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.17: *G* fol. 74 (detail)

Opening miniature to the lays in manuscript *F-G*

Like the opening miniature to the lays in manuscript *E*, this image should be understood as an introduction to the music section. There can be no doubt that this miniature represents an authorial figure. His pen, the chair, the tonsure, the habit, and most of all, the writing in the book which is the first line of the opening lay, all urge us to conclude that it is a portrait of the author-performer himself. There are no protagonists, as found in the other miniatures in *F-G*'s music section, as well as in *C* and *E*, and there is certainly no submission as in *A*. In this image the author-performer is not portrayed as the lyric lover, the poetic "I"; he is presented to us as nothing but a creator, and we are invited to respect him. Behind him the background represents the coat-of-arms so often featured in the miniatures of manuscript *F-G*, perhaps representing the contribution of a patron (or, since we do not know otherwise, perhaps even the arms of Machaut himself).²¹⁴ The open curtain suggests — to this reader-performer at least — that we are being offered a privileged glance, which could be withdrawn, of the author at his private work. To the modern reader-performer the presence of a curtain also speaks of the theatricality of the manuscript, a concept which returns to the idea of it as a controlled viewing area where much goes on "behind the scenes". And indeed it does. Yet theatrical or not, the curtain represents the division between private and public, the miniature apparently giving

²¹⁴ The unidentified coat-of-arms can be seen as a shield in Chapter 5, fig. 5.25.

us a glimpse of the private whilst of course it in fact all along remains public. All of this affects our interpretation of the lays as works by an author-performer, who is here portrayed as playing his part in the manuscript performance, just as we too must play ours.

As we might expect, the author-performer's presence is also felt in the presentation of the music of the lays, for in this section of manuscript *F-G* the reader-performer is once again carefully guided through the musical interpretation. A single example, the "Lay mortel", will suffice:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 3.18: *G* fol. 87v (detail)

Extract from the twelfth lay in manuscript *F-G* ("Lay mortel")

Here, as with all the lays in *F-G*, we do not need to employ our memories, as we do in *B*, nor do we need to count our syllables to the second lines of text, as in *C* and *E*. Like *A* and *Vg*, manuscript *F-G* leaves no room for doubt in interpretation. Unlike *A* or *Vg*, however, through its opening miniature it leads us to believe that this certainty is due to the presence of the author-performer.

Conclusion

This analysis of those sections of the "complete-works" Machaut manuscripts that present the lays has shown that the *mise en page* of the music is in keeping with the themes observed in the iconography. Manuscript *C* is primarily concerned with staging the manuscript performance as portrayed by the characters depicted in the miniatures, and this is borne out by a musical *mise en page* which relies to some extent on the reader-performer's initiative for the re-creation of the

sonic event. On the other hand, manuscript *F-G* has the author-performer as its focus, and both the miniatures and the *mise en page* represent his presence. Between these two stands manuscript *A*, where the authorial presence is portrayed more through the music than through the miniature. Manuscript *E* is principally concerned with visual beauty and clarity of layout, fusing visual reception with aural considerations to create what could be described as a sounding image. Its unique ordering of the lays means that it stands out further from the other manuscripts. Turning to the manuscripts without miniatures for the lays, we find that *Vg* by its *mise en page* of the music prioritises both the author- and reader-performers, whereas *B* is concerned with the scribal-performers who seem to be its intended reader-performers. These observations are in keeping with those from the *Remede de Fortune*, however it now remains to consider whether they hold true for the *Voir Dit*, and firstly, for the Mass.

Chapter 4

Performing Memory in the Mass

"Good music is that which penetrates the ear with facility
and quits the memory with difficulty."²¹⁵

Today Guillaume de Machaut is perhaps most remembered for his Mass, which occupies a unique place in Western cultural musical memory as being the first known setting of the ordinary of the Mass to have been written by a single composer. In two seminal studies from the early 1990s, Anne Walters Robinson situated Machaut's Mass firmly in the context of Notre Dame cathedral in Reims, and with Machaut's concern for his (and his brother's) soul in the afterlife.²¹⁶ Parts of Robinson's argument, however, were challenged by Roger Bowers in 2004,²¹⁷ and as the evidence is not decisive either way, all three studies need to be considered together.

There are two essential points of disagreement between the scholars. The first concerns the point after his appointment as a canon at Reims cathedral when Machaut began to spend most of his time in Reims: Robinson argues that Machaut arrived there very soon after his appointment in 1338,²¹⁸ whereas Bowers argues for a significantly later date at the end of the 1350s.²¹⁹ Bowers certainly argues convincingly that, for canons below the rank of priest, "not residence but non-residence was the norm",²²⁰ that "residence was indeed the exception",²²¹ and, in case we are left in any doubt:

Among ecclesiastical historians it has long been recognised that for such appointees it was not residence that was the rule but formal non-residence, and in reality there is little reason to believe

²¹⁵ "Beecham, Thomas", *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Quotations*. Ed. Elizabeth Knowles. Oxford University Press, 2002. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. 29 July 2007 <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t93.e126>

²¹⁶ Ann Walters Robinson, "The Mass of Guillaume de Machaut in the Cathedral of Reims", in *Plainsong in the Age of Polyphony* ed. by Thomas Kelly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 100-39, *passim.*, and *Guillaume de Machaut and Reims*, especially Chapter 9.

²¹⁷ Roger Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims".

²¹⁸ Robinson, *Guillaume de Machaut and Reims*, p. 52.

²¹⁹ Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims", p. 2.

²²⁰ Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims", n. 2, p. 2.

²²¹ Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims", p. 5.

that during his working life, to c. 1359, Machaut represented any departure from that general provision.²²²

While both scholars, noting the survival of the Mass in all the principal "complete-works" manuscripts save *C*, agree that Machaut composed the work in the early 1360s, after settling finally in Reims, their second point of disagreement is whether the performing of the Mass on Saturdays, as once commemorated in a plaque in the cathedral, was insinuated by Machaut himself in his lifetime (Robinson) or after his death by those who knew him (Bowers). The plaque itself no longer exists, and both scholars necessarily rely on the memory of two third parties, who transcribed the text - or a close approximation of it - in the eighteenth century.²²³

The Mass does not survive complete in any manuscript outside of the central core group of "complete-works" manuscripts.²²⁴ While this narrow transmission history could of course be an accident of survival, the likely circumstances of its composition for the private use of Reims cathedral invite speculation as to why it is now preserved in these manuscripts.²²⁵ Whilst it is listed as "La Messe" in the indices to manuscripts *A* and *E*, together with the introductory catchword "missa" on *A* f. 437v, only manuscript *Vg* gives the Mass its longer title, so often used by scholars today: *La Messe de Notre Dame*.

²²² Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims", p. 4. In addition to careful archival evidence for Machaut's general non-residence at Reims until the late 1350s throughout the article, Bowers provides specific evidence that Machaut was in the service of John of Bohemia until the latter's death in 1346 (pp. 8-10), and that his description of the plague in 1349 at the opening to the *Jugement du roi de Navarre* was actually in Navarre, rather than Reims, since the illness reached Reims in 1348, and, to judge from the spread north through Spain, likely reached Navarre in 1349 (pp. 10-12).

²²³ For full sources and transcriptions see Robertson, "The Mass of Guillaume de Machaut in the Cathedral of Reims", p. 101, n.1, and Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims", pp. 24-25 (including notes 66, 67, and 68). It can be noted wryly in passing that whoever contributed the money for the establishment of the sung Mass, still sung hundreds of years later in the eighteenth century, at least got her/his/their money's worth.

²²⁴ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 344. The *Ite missa est* is found in one fragmentary source, thought to date from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, and there is one lost manuscript recorded in the fifteenth century. Both are likely to have at one time transmitted the whole Mass.

²²⁵ There have been several attempts to pinpoint the circumstances of the Mass's composition and performance, none of which have been entirely successful. A complete list and summary up to 1995 is found in Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 344. In particular see: Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Anne Walters Robinson "The Mass of Guillaume de Machaut in the Cathedral of Reims" and *Guillaume de Machaut and Reims*; and Roger Bowers, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims".

The Mass is unique among the case studies here discussed in that the words to which Machaut sets his music are not his. Rather they form part of a prescribed liturgy already familiar not only to him but to the educated scribes and singers involved in the transmission and performance of the work, to say nothing of the hearers. In analysing the manuscript presentation of the Mass, then, we should bear in mind that scribal- and reader-performers, as well as the author, would not look to the Mass in order to appreciate a new piece of poetry set to music, as they might for, say, a *rondeau*, but to appreciate a new musical setting of an already-familiar text.

The Mass is presented without miniatures in all of the manuscripts. The music, therefore, is the central attraction both visually and aurally. There is no question here of order of prominence in the layout of the page: with no miniatures and relatively little text for some of the movements the music is clearly to the fore. The Mass consequently offers a unique opportunity to glimpse the musical workings of the page and its performers.

My analysis of the layout of the Mass will, as in previous chapters, be undertaken for each manuscript in turn. As there are two distinct types of word-music relationships on display in the Mass (melismatic and syllabic settings), within each analysis I will focus first on the melismatic movements, particularly the Kyrie, followed by the syllabic movements, with emphasis on the Credo. Striking layout features of the other movements will also be highlighted where appropriate.

Manuscript A

Although the Mass lacks miniatures in all of the manuscripts, Manuscript A offers the most highly decorated presentation of Machaut's setting by virtue of its ornate initial letters that are evident from the very first K of the opening Kyrie (see fig. 4.1). The layout of the page is not set for the whole Mass but changes slightly between movements: although a two-column format is always employed, for shorter movements, such as the Kyrie, there are two voices per column giving four voices per page, whereas for the longer movements, such as the Gloria, there is only one voice per column, which results in two voices per page and the entire opening is required to fit all four voices.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.1: A fol. 438v, the opening of the Kyrie
The opening of the Kyrie in manuscript A

All four voices are labelled in the Kyrie, the tenor and contratenor only in the Gloria, Credo, and Sanctus, the contratenor only in the Agnus, and no voices are labelled in the *Ite missa est / Deo gracias*. It is interesting to note that in the Gloria the labelling of the tenor and

contratenor is reversed according to our expectations as well as the layout of the rest of the Mass. Leech-Wilkinson offers the convincing suggestion that this is to do with the pitch of the voices in this movement (the part carrying the chant which we normally call Tenor is here unusually pitched below the voice we would call Contratenor), implying that the scribal-performers of manuscript A - and perhaps even the composer - considered part names as a guide to pitch rather than function.²²⁶

Overall it seems as if the broad page layout in manuscript A has not been as scrupulously planned as we will see that it is in manuscripts Vg and especially E. This is particularly evident in the Kyrie. Here, in addition to blank staves (generally avoided in the other manuscripts, which appear to favour blank space), there is a floating syllable whose music has occurred and finished in a previous staff (Kyrie 1, tenor, visible in fig. 4.1, sixth staff of the left column). This implies that in manuscript A, in the melismatic movements at least, the text-music relationship is not strongly displayed. Furthermore, there seems to be no consistency in the practice of illuminating initial letters, this feature being variously found in the first letter of the part names and in that of the first word to be sung: this again implies that the text is, if not superfluous, at least not the most important part of the setting. While none of these observations has any bearing on the aural performance of the work, the somewhat less-than-scrupulous presentation of the Mass in A must surely nevertheless influence the reader-performer at a subconscious level and reflect the situation in which the manuscript was compiled. Was it that the scribal-performers planning the page were not entirely familiar with the music? Were they working from an exemplar that was not scrupulously planned but was perhaps unfinished or simply did not transmit the subtleties of texting in the melismatic movements?

The Kyrie is a movement which is not entirely texted in any of the manuscripts.²²⁷ The intriguing question therefore arises as to why the text is laid out sometimes as if to be texted (as, for example in the "eleyson" tenor part shown in fig. 4.1) and sometimes not, as in the triplum part above it. In both cases, it is debatable whether or not the

²²⁶ Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, p. 131.

²²⁷ For a useful tabular summary of texting in manuscripts A, Vg and G see Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, pp. 107-108.

music is actually conceived to be fixed to the words, or whether the word-setting is left comparatively free. One reason for this juxtaposition of styles not only in the same movement but also on the same page could be that the aim of the manuscript, and perhaps of the composer, was to transmit the music rather than the words. After all, as has already been implied, the text for this movement is hardly difficult to memorise, and the majority of both scribal- and reader-performers would almost certainly have been familiar with it since childhood. Therefore, the principal purpose of the presence of the Mass in all the manuscripts is surely to transmit the music, and indeed the work does not appear in any of the sources which do not contain music. It is perhaps also another indication of the composer's methods: how much attention did Machaut really pay to the text in the melismatic movements of the Mass? While it is inconceivable that he could have ignored it, the lack of specific texting in the melismatic movements in all of the manuscripts surely suggests that, like the copyists of the manuscripts, the composer was primarily concerned with the musical setting of the Mass rather than with the liturgical texts themselves.

With this prioritisation in mind, some, though not all, of the variations in page layout become clear. Sometimes at a first glance there appears to be too much or too little music for the given text. Manuscript A displays two particular instances of this phenomenon in the Mass, shown in the contratenor parts in figures 4.2 and 4.3:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.2: A fol. 447 (detail)

Tenor and Contratenor from the Credo Amen in manuscript A

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.3: A fol. 448 (detail)

Tenor and Contratenor from the Sanctus in manuscript A

While in the first of these, fig. 4.2 from the Credo Amen, the intended performance of the contratenor is easily reconstructed with or without familiarity with the work, that mediated by fig. 4.3 from the Sanctus requires more thought.²²⁸ In the contratenor part the casual viewer's first impression may be that there is insufficient music for the words provided. This, however, is not necessarily the case for, looking at the text and music separately, we see the possibility of a deeper understanding of the scribal (and reader) processes at play. If the page is imagined without the music, the words are generally evenly spaced (with the exception of the word "dominus"). The music, on the other hand, appears in the first three staves to follow the words, whereas in the final two it seems to be positioned more according to ligature length (and therefore perhaps visual appeal). Again the spacing around "dominus" is the exception, resulting in unusual prominence given to the preceding accidental. What may be on display here is a variation in scribal procedures: the music scribe at first following the words, then, perhaps subconsciously, writing the music independently of his colleague's word placing. Why this change? I think the answer lies with the scribal-performers' memories, so that over-familiarity with the words may have resulted in less attention being paid to their exact placement as the movement progressed. This is a question to which we will return in the conclusion to this chapter.

It is also noteworthy that both of these examples in manuscript A occur in the contratenor, the only voice which is frequently untexted. Indeed in the remainder of the Sanctus following the extract in figure 4.3 the contratenor is no longer texted at all in any of the manuscripts. Whilst it is fair to say that the contratenor carries neither the chant line of the tenor nor the principal melodic interest of the triplum and motetus, it would be incorrect to suggest that its word placing is any less important than the other parts. Nevertheless, it is the voice which relies most on the tenor for its existence. Without entering into the instruments-or-voices debate,²²⁹ the indication of the opening text to the contratenor even in the untexted portions of the Mass is enough for

²²⁸ Daniel Leech-Wilkinson has discussed this passage in *Machaut's Mass: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, repr. 1992), p. 155.

²²⁹ For a summary see Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, pp. 114-115, together with the bibliographical pointers indicated in notes 12 and 13.

reader-performers to know which words to sing to the part if they are indeed singing it. In this case the question which does remain open, however, is where they should place the remainder of the words. Two answers come immediately to mind: either it didn't matter to the author-performer (which seems unlikely), or reader-performers would be able to make an informed judgment based partly on their memories, partly on the text placing within other parts, particularly the tenor, though perhaps primarily on their ears.

Indeed this hypothesis seems to hold true for the entire Mass in manuscript A. Even in the syllabic movements, the Gloria and Credo, the word-music presentation seems to be built into the very structure of the work, decided according to musical intuition, memory, or indeed a combination of all three. The general page layout of the Credo reflects its status as a longer movement than the Kyrie, with two voices per page (resulting in four per opening). Two musical passages stand out from the page, like "anchor points" for the eye. The more obvious of these is the passage of longs over the words "ex maria virgine". Together with the similarly emphasised "et in terra pax" from the Gloria, this has been interpreted as a reflection of the possible emphasis on the Virgin in the Mass (as its title in manuscript *Vg* would suggest), as well on its presumed desire for peace during the Hundred Years War.²³⁰ The opening shown in figure 4.4 contains manuscript A's presentation of the two musical figures which I would like to discuss. Fol. 444v transmits the triplum in the left-hand column with the motetus on the right, while fol. 445 transmits the tenor in its left-hand column and the contratenor on the right. The overall effect of this layout on the manuscript page is, of course, an orderly progression of voices across four columns: triplum, motetus, tenor, and contratenor.

²³⁰ For a list of bibliographical references to discussions of possible inspirations for the Mass, see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 344.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.4: A fols. 444v-445: Extract from the Credo in manuscript A

As well as providing a striking aural point in the music, the passage of longs carrying the words "ex Maria virgine" is a resting point for the eyes, even more striking in colour, and in some ways resembles

a stepping-stone for the reader-performer. In front of the manuscript, a reader-performer with even a minimum of musical literacy, whether alone or with others, whether performing silently (perhaps remembering a performance, even listening to others vocalising one or all of the parts) or out loud (at any volume), can easily locate this passage, in all four parts, and use it as a navigation tool within the movement and between the parts. This passage, together with the following discussed below, will also provide us with a navigation point between the manuscripts in this discussion. Indeed, the following cross-manuscript analysis will show that these passages may well have served as anchor-points for the scribal-performers, whether they were working from an exemplar, from memory, or a combination of the two.

Even in the extremely clearly presented manuscript A, the knowledge that the words "ex maria virgine" are sung to the passage of longs is helpful in recreating the word-music setting. In the rare cases where there would otherwise be room for doubt as to the syllable placement, for example in the fourth stanza of the tenor part (fol. 445), this knowledge provides the necessary clarity, without the need for guiding lines drawn in the manuscript.

The other passage from the Credo on which I will focus, and which is also shown on the opening in question from manuscript A, is the wordless rhythmic passage in the tenor and contratenor occurring after the word "patris" (fol. 445, at the beginning of penultimate stanza in the tenor, and at the end of the third stanza from the end in the contratenor).²³¹ This passage is less visually striking than the "ex Maria virgine", and it also requires more from the reader- and scribal-performers. Whether or not words should be sung to this passage is not the question here, although it can be seen that no words are provided for it. In manuscript A the text scribe has not been generous in his provision of space for this passage, with the effect that in the contratenor it strays into the margin of the page. Rather than explain this away as a fault on the text scribe's part, it is worth considering that it was a conscious decision (even if perhaps this decision was only not to change the layout once the problem was realised): for which other part

²³¹ Leech-Wilkinson has identified this as one of the "link" passages in the Credo, which, together with the page turns in all the manuscripts except *F-G*, serve to highlight the textual divisions of this long movement. *Machaut's Mass*, pp. 40-42.

of the entire Credo could be placed in the margin without causing problems with the text setting? It is certainly an effective way of demonstrating that this passage does not have words set to it, and, in the miniatureless Mass, provides a slight degree of frivolity to the page. Like the flourishes added by the music scribe at the end of each stave in the contratenor, here the escape of the music itself into the margin is reminiscent of the marginal decorations which pervade the rest of the manuscript.

Manuscript *Vg*

Manuscript *Vg* is the only manuscript to give the Mass the title of "la messe de nostre dame" (as seen in fig. 4.5). Despite being commonly used as the title of the Mass today, we cannot know whether Machaut even conceived of a title for his Mass, even if it does place emphasis on the words "ex maria virgine" as we have seen (after all, similar emphasis is placed on "Jhesu Christe" and "Et in terra pax" in the Gloria), and despite Our Lady being the dedicatee of Reims cathedral. Nevertheless, the fact that the title is present in *Vg* implies that at least in some places the Mass was known in this way. However, whether this title was confined to the local workshop and patron of manuscript *Vg* or whether it was such a widely recognised appellation that the other manuscripts had no need to repeat it, we will never know. The fact that the title is not present in *B* is intriguing though ultimately unenlightening, although it may imply that it was unusually added to manuscript *Vg* at the request of a patron out of fondness for Machaut, for the Virgin, or for Reims and its cathedral.

Whereas manuscript *A* employs a two-column format throughout for the Mass, manuscript *Vg* adopts such an approach only for the opening which shows the Gloria Amen. Otherwise, the staves run interrupted from one side of the page to the other. In the shorter movements all four voices are displayed on one page in the order triplum-motetus-tenor-contratenor (as in fig. 4.5); for the longer movements the voices are displayed across a single opening with the triplum above the motetus on the reader-performer's left, and the tenor and contratenor, in either order, on the right (shown in fig. 4.6).

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.5: *Vg* fol. 283v

The opening of the Mass in manuscript *Vg*

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.6: Vg folios 288v-289: The opening of the Credo in manuscript Vg

A striking feature of Vg's layout of the Mass is its use of space. Fig. 4.6 shows the planning involved in the page ruling: not only was space left for an initial to be drawn within the staff on fol. 289 (fifth staff), but an additional short staff was drawn on the tenor and contratenor folio in anticipation of the extra music and to maintain the same page turn across all four parts. Apart from in the Kyrie, blank staves filling a page are not seen, although it is not unusual to see a blank staff followed by

blank space after the end of a piece or before a page turn, probably ruled as part of the planning and then in fact not needed. (Indeed, it is quite plausible that the two extra staves in the Kyrie were drawn to allow two staves per part, although in the end the tenor and contratenor needed just one.)

Another striking feature of *Vg* which is shown in figure 4.6 is *Vg*'s clarity of layout. In the busy Credo, the untexted rhythmic figures in the tenor and contratenor can clearly be seen by their lack of words on fol. 298 after "invisibilium" (second staff from top in the tenor, and sixth staff from top in the contratenor) and after "secula" (third staff from the top in the tenor, and seventh staff from the top in the contratenor). Here, no prior knowledge of the music is required to understand the intentions underlying the manuscript, the layout being clear enough for the sonic implications to be understood at a glance and reconstructed entirely from the manuscript.

The naming of parts in *Vg* appears at first irregular. All three sections of the Kyrie have part names, as does the Gloria Amen, whereas only the contratenor is labelled in the Sanctus, again in the Osanna / Benedictus, and the third part of the Agnus. There does seem to be some underlying consistency in this labelling, however, in that none of the syllabic movements — or, in the case of the Agnus, Sanctus, and Osanna, none of the texted voices — have part names. In fact, the only melismatic movement not to bear part names is the Credo Amen. While this could of course be due to a matter as simple as available space on the page, given the skill of the scribes it is perhaps more indicative of the way in which they conceived the work as a whole: in those movements (and/or voices) where specified text setting was not considered a vital part of the work there would be no reason not to add a part name. Indeed, in those movements where only the contratenor is labelled, the repeated "or"s after the part-name filling the space under the staff adds to the symmetry of the page, avoiding an otherwise uniquely empty voice part. In each of the movements in which they occur the repeated "or"s take up more space than their music, perhaps because space provided for the staves was based on the amount needed to accommodate both music and words, yet the music in fact

would take up less space when the words are not present.²³² The movement which is the most interesting here is the Agnus, for, in its first section the contratenor is texted, yet the music is not set to this text. The opening concerned is shown in fig. 4.7:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.7: Vg fols 294v-295: Extract from the Agnus Dei in manuscript Vg

²³² For a summary and discussion on how the text was entered before the staves in all of the "complete-works" manuscripts see Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 170-194 (summary on pp. 170-71).

Here it can be seen that, in the contratenor of the second section of the Agnus (fol. 295), the text is not completed, nor is the part named. In the contratenor of the first section of the doxology (fol. 294v), text has been laid out, although the music was then entered as if the text was not present (the music is complete in one staff, whereas the text is written under two). For the reader-performer, the progress from complete text to no text is graduated; the layout of music in the first section of the Agnus makes it clear that it was not conceived, at least not by the music scribe, as having a rigid position with regard to the set words.

Manuscript B

The layout of the Mass provides interesting insights into the relationship between the *mises en page* in both manuscript *B* and *Vg*. Although the two are undeniably close throughout, perhaps nowhere more so than in the Mass do their differences suggest the subconscious workings and assumptions of the scribes, both in these and in the other manuscripts.

Before embarking on a selective comparison with *Vg*, some comment should be made about *B* as a source for the Mass in its own right. It is always worth bearing in mind with *B* that if it were the only extant complete-works manuscript, it would be an even-more-valuable resource: it is only in comparison with the other "complete-works" manuscripts that the problems *B* raises come to the fore. Its opening to the Mass is shown in fig. 4.8:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.8: *B* fol. 281v

The opening of the Mass in manuscript *B*

B's text-music layout — or, it must be acknowledged, its lack of it — in the opening to the Kyrie make it clear that the movement is freely texted. This in turn allows the work of the music scribe to come to the fore. Despite deep criticism of the first music scribe, who is at work here, in terms of text setting, Lawrence Earp acknowledges that his

actual notation is "adequate".²³³ Indeed it is: without detailed knowledge or analysis of accuracy, any reader-performer can clearly see the downward progressions in the tenor and contratenor, and the sequence of ligatures and cadence at the end of the motetus. Here the reader-performer, seeing this first music scribe removed from the constraints of the text (which, as Earp comments and as we will see, he tends to neglect), can acquit him of at least some of the charges of carelessness so often laid against him. In fact, one of the aspects highlighted by the *mise en page* of the Mass in *B* is the apparent divorce of text and music, at least in the mind of the music scribe.

This separation is evident from contrasting the *mise en page* of the Kyrie with that of the syllabic movements, and here, for consistency with the other manuscripts, I will consider an extract from the Credo.

²³³ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 212.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.9: B fols 287v-288: Extract from the Credo in manuscript B

Although it is true that on this opening the word-syllable alignment is not always consistently clear, what can be seen in the music are the melismatic groupings of notes, especially in the triplum and motetus, and the longs of the "ex Maria virgine" in all the parts. The characteristic

wordless rhythmic features between the tenor and contratenor are also visible, at least to an eye which knows approximately where to find them. For while the first music scribe appears here, as Earp says, to do his work "without any regard for the relationship of notes to syllables",²³⁴ the question to be considered is, of course, why? As with *B*'s presentation of the music in the *Remede de Fortune*, here there are no major problems in reconstruction for the reader-performer already familiar with the work. Indeed, for the Mass we can go further: here, there are few problems for the reader-performer already familiar with the words. The layout of the music is such that, without reference to the written text but with reference to memory, the generally careful groupings of notes in syllable blocks allows a reader-performer to reconstruct a sonic impression of the work, whether aloud or in silence.²³⁵ Conversely then, a possible reason for the lack of "regard" for the words shown by the music scribe becomes apparent: whether he was copying the musical notation directly from *Vg*, from "the book of memory", or from a combination of the two, here at least the music scribe had no need to record the words, for they had been entrenched in his memory since childhood. The result is, of course, not as aesthetically pleasing as in a manuscript where the alignment is observed, but aesthetic niceties are never to the fore in manuscript *B*. If, as Earp suggests, *B* was produced in haste from *Vg*, then surely if any text-setting could be neglected in order to save time it would be that of the Mass.

When *Vg* is brought back into the equation for the Credo, it is easy even for us, so far removed today from the work of scriptoria and from the concept of memory training, to see how a knowledge — a memory — of *Vg*'s presentation of the Mass renders void many of the perceived problems in *B*. It is easy to see how scribes with the advantage of a

²³⁴ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 212.

²³⁵ This even holds true for the opening "Patrem" of the Credo in the tenor and contratenor parts, where the word is not sung (although it is written with an initial) as there are rests. As Earp points out ("Scribal Practice", pp. 180-182, especially n. 343), only manuscripts *Vg* and *F-G* present this with the clarity we expect today: that is with no music, only rests, entered above the word "Patrem". *A* has guidelines drawn, *E* leaves a space in the contratenor only and adds notes above "Patrem" in the tenor, and *B*, according to Earp, is "as usual, inaccurate" (p. 180, n. 343) as it leaves no spaces at all. To a reader-performer working from memory, the presence of these rests, together with the motetus and triplum reaching the word "omnipotentem" by the time of the entry of the tenor and contratenor, would likely be enough to permit a reconstruction of the sonic performance represented.

trained memory, having seen *Vg* and knowing by heart the words to the Mass, could have conceived *B* to serve as an exemplar.

No analysis of the *mise en page* of the Mass in *B* can overlook the third folio of the Kyrie, folio 282v, shown in fig. 4.10, alongside the corresponding folio from *Vg*, folio 284v (fig. 4.11):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Perhaps nowhere else is the relationship between the two manuscripts, as well as that between the words and music in the Mass in manuscript *B*, more clearly demonstrated than on this folio. Here, *B* follows *Vg*'s music presentation staff by staff, and although its text is

copied exactly, it is copied one staff lower than in *Vg*. The result is, of course, that in *B* the music and the words — here, even the parts — do not correspond. Earp places the blame for this "error" squarely on the shoulders of the music scribe who "copied the model without realising that there was a slight irregularity here in *B*", but who then goes on to attempt to correct his mistake by re-entering one of the part names and some of the text incipits.²³⁶ If there is indeed an error in *B* — and it is hard to see how there could not be — is it necessarily attributable to the music scribe? Given that his work was done after that of his colleague the text scribe, the only way for the music scribe here to preserve the layout of the music in *Vg* and to avoid an empty staff at the beginning was to start the music, as he did, at the top of the page. A future scribal-performer, approaching this page as a reader-performer, would be able to use the work of the music scribe here to reconstruct the layout of *Vg*. If *B* was indeed intended as an exemplar for future manuscripts based on *Vg*, then here, thanks to the efforts of the music scribe, it does not fail in its duty. Moreover, as we have seen, the exact text-setting of the Kyrie, if the composer even conceived of it, is not preserved in any of the manuscripts, so here the impact of any "error" in manuscript *B* is minimised.

²³⁶ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 213.

Manuscript E

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.12: E fols 164v-165: The opening of the Mass in manuscript E

The most immediately striking feature of manuscript *E*, which can be observed in fig. 4.12, is its apparent efficient use of space — apparent, because, although sometimes all four parts are fitted onto a single folio

in one column, there is also a large amount of blank space, including an entire blank folio (167) during the Credo.²³⁷ There are two readily discernable reasons for this. The first is the size of the manuscript, which is significantly larger than the others considered here.²³⁸ The second is the design to permit page turns only between movements or, in the Credo where this was not possible, at breaks within the movement. In fact, as noted earlier and as Daniel Leech-Wilkinson has observed, the page turns in the Credo in manuscript *E* (apart from the Amen which is depicted on the same page as the final section) are, despite its size, the same as those in all the manuscripts except *F-G*, and fall at section breaks in the both the text and the music.²³⁹

It is worth noting here that in all of the "complete-works" manuscripts transmitting the Mass except manuscript *F-G*, page turns occur at the same point in each voice across the manuscripts, even if in the middle of a movement. However, it is particularly interesting that, in the one instance where the page turn in manuscript *A* differs from that of *Vg*, *B*, and *E*, in the Credo (where *A* turns before "cuius regnum non erat finis" and the other manuscripts before the immediately following "Et in spiritum sanctum"), the text scribe has missed out the words "cuius regnum non erat finis" in the tenor and contratenor parts. In manuscript *A* these were added, with their music (and quite likely by the music scribe, since the hand is different) at the end of the page, with correction marks to guide the reader-performer.

The fact that *A*, *Vg*, *B*, and *E* are so similar in their page turns, and that in the one instance where they are not confusion appears to have occurred, raises interesting questions about their transmission processes, especially as three of these manuscripts were produced during the composer's lifetime. It is possible that the layout of the Mass witnessed in these early manuscripts produced relatively soon after its composition reflects more than merely a common exemplar somewhere in the tradition. *Vg*, *B*, and *E* could easily have been laid out quite differently since their use of space is very different from that of *A*, yet

²³⁷ It is no doubt significant that this blank folio is also the start of a new, short gathering, containing only the end of the Mass (the Hoquet is not transmitted in manuscript *E*) before the start of the *Voir Dit* at the beginning of the next gathering, as shown in the diagram in Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 369.

²³⁸ For details see Appendix 1.

²³⁹ Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, pp. 40-41.

still the page turns remain. I would therefore like to raise the possibility that the layout which we see in *A*, *E*, *Vg*, and *B* is representative of the conception of divisions in the work in the mind of scribal-performers and possibly of the composer. When these divisions occur between movements of the Mass this is indisputable, yet it is the breaks within movements which are particularly interesting. These breaks seem to principally follow natural divisions in the text. In the shorter movements, such as the Kyrie, they also follow natural divisions in the music, although in the Credo and Gloria the musical divisions are less clear-cut. While it is tempting here to explain the more problematic musical divisions by drawing an image of Machaut's "desk" covered in papers (an image which will be discussed more critically in Chapter 5), it is perhaps more profitable to consider whether these breaks are not more representative of memory at work: the memory not only of the scribes, but of all those involved in the production process, including the author himself.

It is difficult for us, in the twenty-first century, steeped in the post-printing culture of writing in the developed world, to envisage the feats of memory which were commonplace in medieval times (and which are still commonplace in some cultures today). We should be especially wary, as Leo Treitler warns, of "making *a priori* judgements about the nature and limits of the human mind's creative and retentive capacities without the support of writing".²⁴⁰ One of the basic concepts of medieval memory training was the use of *divisio*, that is, the breaking down of material into small segments which could be stored in the memory and retrieved in any order.²⁴¹ This process of *divisio* is the same as "chunking", the term devised by the twentieth-century neuro-psychologist George Miller to describe how information is contained in the apparently limitless human memory (also known as the rule of "seven-plus-or-minus-two").²⁴² The *divisio* memorization technique could be applied to both prose and verse, sacred and secular. And in an age

²⁴⁰ Leo Treitler, "The Early History of Music Writing in the West", in *With Voice and Pen: Coming to know Medieval Song and how it was Made* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 316-64, p. 318

²⁴¹ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, pp. 104-13.

²⁴² George A. Miller, "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on our Capacity for Processing Information", *Psychological Review* 63 (1956), 81-97, also discussed in Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, pp. 104-5.

where the distinction between sung and spoken lyric was blurred, it is not surprising to find that these procedures also hold true for music, for both singers and composers.²⁴³

If, then, a writer such as Julius Caesar could simultaneously compose in his memory four or five different, unrelated, letters,²⁴⁴ why would it not be possible for a composer as skilled as Machaut to conceive four related parts of a movement with little or no writing involved in the process? Perhaps here in the consistent distribution of page turns in manuscripts *A*, *Vg*, *B*, and *E* we can see some of the larger segments, or divisions, in the construction of the Mass which may be representative of the poet-composer's own conception of the work. The fact that we have the six "complete-works" manuscripts at all suggests not only Machaut's renown, but also his ability to visualise his orally-conceived and transmitted works, including his musical works, as part of a broad, written tradition. Similarly, the absence of the music from later collections of Machaut's work only serves to indicate the rarity of this ability: his fifteenth-century successors were either poets or composers, but not both. While we can never know the depths of Machaut's own faith or his motive for composing the Mass, its construction, layout and sound show a highly-skilled composer was at work, even if its lack of mention in the Prologue (where Machaut expresses his devotion to the god of Love and his vocation as a courtly writer rather than as a churchman) indicates that it was not part of his central artistic mission.

Another immediately apparent feature of manuscript *E*, again visible in fig. 4.12, is the arrangement of the parts. For the melismatic movements (Kyrie, Sanctus, Agnus and *Deo gratias*) the parts are arranged in the order Triplum, Tenor, Motetus, Contratenor, and, except for the Sanctus, they are labelled. Only in the syllabic movements (Gloria and Credo) are the parts arranged in the order generally followed by the other manuscripts (Triplum, Motetus, Tenor,

²⁴³ This is discussed by Anna Maria Busse Berger, *Medieval Music and the Art of Memory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), especially chapter 2, (pp. 47-86), and p. 253, as well as Leo Treitler, "Homer and Gregory: The Transmission of Epic Poetry and Plainchant", in *With Voice and Pen*, pp. 131-85. An example of the blurred lines of speech and song, together with the inadequate nature of alphabetic letters for denoting music, from pre-colonial South America, is provided in Gary Tomlinson, *The Singing of the New World: Indigenous Voice in the Era of European Contact* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), chapter 1, especially pp. 37-39 and 42-49.

²⁴⁴ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 7.

Contratenor; in *E* they are not labelled). It is also worth noting that, in the Agnus and Sanctus, the text is complete under the tenor part only (as opposed to under all parts except the Contratenor in the other manuscripts). This may reflect the scribal-performers' interpretation of the construction of the Mass, especially the chant basis which is carried in the tenor part in the syllabic movements.²⁴⁵

The text of the tenor Agnus in manuscript *E* is particularly interesting. Transmitted in three sections in the other manuscripts (where the first two sections of course share the same text and the music of the third is identical to that of the first although the text is different), the Agnus only has two sections in *E*, which indicates that the first section is to be repeated. The text for the third section of the Agnus in the other manuscripts is in *E* placed under the music which in the other manuscripts is for the second section. The music for the third section of the Agnus in the other manuscripts is not transmitted at all in *E*, except that in the other manuscripts it is the same as that for the first Agnus section.²⁴⁶ This may reflect a different, perhaps freer, later performance tradition, as is proposed by Leech-Wilkinson for *E*'s treatment of accents:

[*E*'s] numerous changes to the *A/G* text (removing most sharps and several of Machaut's more piquant dissonances) offer interesting evidence of the taste of a later generation but contribute nothing to the reconstruction of Machaut's preferred readings.²⁴⁷

While this may be the case, the importance of the differences portrayed in manuscript *E*, especially given its unclear relations to the other manuscripts,²⁴⁸ should not be overlooked as evidence that the Mass was still well-known in the 1390s when *E* was produced. The idea of continuing oral performance and the effect this may have had on *E*'s scribal-performers should be taken into account when establishing what transmission history *E* shares with the other manuscripts. In any case, even from these observations of the general *mise en page*, we can see that in the Mass manuscript *E* once again stands apart from its fellows.

²⁴⁵ For a detailed discussion of the construction of the Mass, including chants and possible sources, see Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, Chapter 2 (pp. 14-53).

²⁴⁶ This is noted briefly by Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, p. 160.

²⁴⁷ Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, p. 97.

²⁴⁸ For a detailed discussion of the relationship between *Vg*, *B*, and *E* see Bent, "The Machaut manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*".

If we now turn to the details of text-music layout in the Credo, fig. 4.13 shows the "Qui propter" section which contains both the longs of the "ex maria virgine" and two of the untexted rhythmic passages in the tenor and contratenor:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.13: Vg fols 167v-168: Extract from the Credo in manuscript E

On this opening can be seen the characteristic clarity of the text-music placement of the Mass in manuscript E. The passage in longs "ex maria virgine" is immediately striking to the eye in all four parts. The untexted rhythmic passages in the tenor and contratenor after "factus

est" and "patrem" (tenor, fol. 167v, tenth and eleventh staves; contratenor, fol. 168, second and third staves) pose no problems for the reader-performer, even one who is not already familiar with the Mass. In fact, wherever there is text underlay in the Mass in *E*, in the syllabic movements and in the tenor of the Sanctus and Agnus, it is always clear, although it is, however, clearer in the Gloria and Credo than in the tenor of the melismatic movements. Leech-Wilkinson's statement that *E* offers us no help in deciphering the composer's intentions may therefore be slightly too harsh a dismissal, for *E* may in fact be a witness to the extent to which the next generation knew and respected the composer's wishes. In the Mass *E* maintains its carefully planned and executed *mise en page*. By its differences with the earlier traditions (the texting of the Agnus and Sanctus tenors, the order of the Agnus, the accidentals), as well as by its similarities (the careful *mise en page* of the syllabic movements, where there is a lack of texting in the melismatic movements) it can offer clues as to which aspects of the composer's intentions were and were not considered to be integral parts of the work. Given that *E* was produced for the duke of Berry, a patron of Machaut who already owned, and presumably knew, individual works by him, the Mass as presented in this manuscript may represent its tradition outside of Reims. If, however, the similarities and differences of the presentation of the Mass in manuscript *E* suggest that Machaut's setting was known to scribal- and reader-performers outside of the Reims circle, then in terms of understanding the composer's intentions, it may be more profitable for us to consider not why certain aspects have been changed, but rather why so many have remained the same.

Manuscript F-G

The Mass is presented with the rest of the music in the second volume of this manuscript, *G*. It follows a two-column format throughout, much like that of manuscript *A*. As in manuscript *A*, the opening Kyrie is laid out in the order Triplum - Tenor (first column), Motetus - Contratenor (second column). However, in manuscript *F-G* the Kyrie fits across a single opening, meaning that its sections are not perfectly aligned horizontally across the parts. This is illustrated in fig. 4.14:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.14: F-G fols 125v-126: The opening of the Mass in manuscript F-G

The only other movement in *F-G* to follow this ordering of parts is the *Ite Missa Est / Deo Gracias*, which is short enough to fit onto a single folio leaving blank staves allowing the parts to be horizontally aligned. Otherwise, the Mass is presented with one voice per column across the

opening, in the order Triplum - Motetus - Tenor - Contratenor. Apart from the Kyrie, the parts only are labelled between the Gloria and its Amen, in the Credo the tenor is labelled above the top staff,²⁴⁹ and in the Sanctus and Agnus the contratenor is labelled.

It has already been noted that *G*'s page turns are different from those in all of the other manuscripts. Where page turns occur at breaks between movements this is hardly significant, except to note that the 13-stanza-per-column format of *G* allows not only for the Kyrie and Agnus to fit on single openings, but also for the Sanctus as well as the *Ite missa est / Deo gracias* to fit on a single folio. Whereas manuscript *E* contains large amounts of blank space in order to maintain the page turns within the movements seen in the other manuscripts, manuscript *F-G* appears instead to divide the movements differently in order to make the most efficient use of space. Thus the only page turn in the Gloria occurs before "Qui sedes" (as opposed to two page turns in *A*, one before "Qui tollis" and the other before the Amen), and in the Credo the number of turns is reduced from three in *A* to two (before "Crucifixus" and "Confessor" in *F-G*, rather than before "Qui propter", "Cuius regnum", and "Amen" in *A*). In the Credo this has some repercussions for the text setting, for although the "ex maria virgine" longs are clear in all parts, the turn occurs just before the untexted rhythmic figure in the tenor and contratenor, as can be seen in fig. 4.15 which shows the progression of the tenor and contratenor parts over the page turn.

²⁴⁹ This is interesting in the light of the comments made above on the labelling of the Gloria in manuscript *A*. Given that the tenor part is below the contratenor in the Credo as well as in the Gloria, could this be evidence of a similar instinctive awareness on the part of the scribal-performer either of manuscript *F-G* or of a common exemplar?

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 4.15: *G* fols 129 (detail) and 130 (detail)
Extract from the Credo in manuscript *F-G*

The untexted rhythmic figure after "patris" can clearly be seen by the space left in the text in the fifth staff of fol. 130 in both parts. The similar figure which occurs on the page turn itself is less clear for the reader-performer to make out, however, since in the contratenor it occurs where we would expect it in the space left at the end of the last staff of fol. 129, while in the tenor it occurs at the beginning of fol. 130, above the text "Crucifixus". For the scribal-performer this represented

not only a page turn but a change of gathering, which perhaps explains why it was left unaltered. Although, as we have seen in other chapters, this manuscript usually lives up to its reputation as an "accurate" source due to its few variants, it does occasionally fall short of preserving clarity in its text-music relations. Earp has found three examples in the Mass (and one in a *rondeau*) where the music scribe found it necessary to change the text in order to better fit the music, and the text was then re-entered in the hand of the text scribe, presumably in order not to spoil the appearance of the page.²⁵⁰ In addition, given that at the opening of the Credo *G*, like *Vg*, transmits without correction the clearest possible texting of the rests in the tenor and contratenor under the word "Patris" (that is, there is no music entered above this word), we can conclude that *F-G* is a source which is concerned with appearance and is extremely accessible to any reader-performer, whether already familiar with the music or not. Its preference for efficiency of space over sub-dividing the longer movements according to their musical and textual coherence, however, implies more concern for space economy than supporting the underlying structure of the work. As with the music entry above "Crucifixus", this is perhaps a sign that those behind the production of manuscript *F-G* had reason — whether monetary, memory-related or otherwise — for not being quite as concerned with fine details in the Mass as in *A* or *Vg*.

Conclusion

In the preceding analysis, it has been shown that the *mise en page* of the Mass reflects the scribal-performers' conceptions of both the work and their task. This was surely influenced by the author-performer's conceptions of his work and task, and would in turn affect the reader-performers in theirs. Of course, the influence of one or all of these factors varies from manuscript to manuscript, though there are some points on which all, or most, of the manuscripts agree. I have dwelt at some length on the issues of texting in the melismatic movements and page turns in the syllabic movements, both of which I believe can offer us insight into the way in which Machaut conceived of the Mass.

²⁵⁰ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 194, especially n. 361.

Firstly, it should be reiterated that with the Mass the scribal-performers would have been very familiar with the words to which the music is set; so that we can be certain that they would have the texts in their memory. This means that what, if anything, was being copied within the text by sight was not the words themselves, but their placement. With regard to manuscript *B* the analysis showed a distinct separation of words and music in this respect. Even in the other manuscripts, the free texting of the melismatic movements may represent not only over-familiarity with the words on the part of the scribes, but also of the author. A similar phenomenon which can be seen in the melismatic movements of all the manuscripts, is that the final syllable sometimes appears to be "floating" after the end of the music. This observation, which can be seen not only in the Mass but also in other works, in other manuscripts, and with other composers, implies that the reader-performers of manuscripts would know instinctively where to place final syllables of lines. Given the distance in time at which today's reader-performers find themselves from the manuscripts, this instinct is more frequently questioned, yet ultimately it probably remains the same: sing the final syllable on the final note unless there are clear indications to the contrary. In other words, what we seem to be seeing in the melismatic movements of the Mass is not so much a detailed set of instructions for recreating aural performance, but rather as a guide, an *aide-mémoire* to informed reading and/or re-hearing. For, as we will see more clearly with *Toute Belle* in the *Voir Dit* in Chapter 5, manuscript transmission forms only part of the overall process from author-performer to reader-performer. In addition, as Leech-Wilkinson has also stated, is it highly unlikely that any of the manuscripts which contain the Mass would have been used during an oral performance by a large group of people.²⁵¹

Ultimately, my analysis of the *mise en page* supports Daniel Leech-Wilkinson's analysis of the internal structure of the Mass, concluding that Machaut conceived the melismatic movements horizontally, that is, part by part, and the syllabic movements vertically, that is in terms of whole sections, divided according to the text.²⁵² While

²⁵¹ Leech-Wilkinson, *Machaut's Mass*, p. 109.

²⁵² For the details of Leech-Wilkinson's analysis see *Machaut's Mass*, chapters 2 and 3.

the text may have governed the structure and pace of the syllabic movements, for the melismatic movements it is the music which is to the fore. Although governed broadly by the text structure of the Mass movements (for example "Kyrie eleyson" - "Christe eleyson" - "Kyrie eleyson" - "Kyrie eleyson"), the actual length of the movements is determined by chant melodies. It is almost as if in the Gloria and Credo we see Machaut the wordsmith bringing new inflections to the well-known texts through his musical setting, whereas in the melismatic movements Machaut the composer brings new meaning to his music by adding the texts.

In terms of the manuscripts, the Mass in manuscript *B* appears very much to have been set out for reader-performers who were scribes, and it is becoming ever-more apparent that they were expected to have a detailed knowledge of the works it contained in order to reproduce them — the purpose of *B* was to preserve the layout of *Vg* as much as its contents. *Vg* once again shows itself to be concerned with offering the reader-performer the easiest possible task in reproducing its musical contents which are nevertheless pleasing to the eye as well as to the ear. Manuscript *F-G*, whilst maintaining its reputation for careful reproduction, does not retain the *mise en page* of the Mass employed by the other manuscripts, and twenty years after Machaut's death to some extent foregoes what seem likely to be the composer's intentions in divisions within movements for a more efficient layout. More intriguing is manuscript *E*, which, as we have already witnessed, through its virtuoso *mise en page* is able to clearly set out a large amount of visual information in few pages, while simultaneously leaving blank spaces to preserve the layout of the earlier smaller, manuscripts, even while it nevertheless tweaks the contents of the music perhaps to reflect contemporary tastes. Although this may seem almost criminal to us in the copyright age of author-reverence, in the context of a Mass which was composed a generation before and not for the manuscript's patron or his family, this shows a remarkable interest in the actual music and provides prima facie evidence for the adaptation of its oral performance according to tastes as they evolved over time, and this should not be downplayed. Finally, manuscript *A* seems to contain nothing to contradict the idea that it was produced close to the composer; to the

modern eye it combines clarity, beauty, and accuracy, but it continues to withhold its ultimate secret.

I would like to finish this chapter with a return to the issues raised at the beginning regarding the origin and purpose of the Machaut's Mass and a suggestion as to how the manuscripts may fit into the picture. While I offer no attempt to resolve the dispute over the historical evidence, which lies essentially in a matter of translation from the Latin and in a knowledge of legal terms, I would contend that the question of ways of remembering the composer and his brother through the Mass is a significant one. Each of the "complete-works" manuscripts could be said to commemorate the poet-composer in one way or another. The compilers of the manuscripts produced during Machaut's lifetime would have been aware that he was neither young nor immortal, and those who worked on his oeuvre after his death would have been even more aware of the monumental value of their task. It is tempting to speculate on the relationship of the manuscripts, especially A, to the singing of the Mass in memory of the Machaut brothers, since the visual memorials stand so neatly alongside the oral one, whoever their commissioners were. The Mass stands apart from Machaut's other works for its inherently religious nature, for although some of the motets treat religious subjects and have voices in Latin, their grouping in the manuscripts alongside the love motets serves to highlight the uniqueness of the Mass. It is likely that it is for this reason that Machaut's ability to compose the Mass is not mentioned in the Prologue as a result of his gifts from Nature: it was, of course, a product of his God-given talents, and thus a gift from God, and therefore ultimately to God. Perhaps the words of scripture should not be too far from the reader-performer's mind when considering the lack of mention of the Mass in the Prologue: "Render unto Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and unto God what belongs to God" (Luke 20:25).

Whether the Saturday singing of the Mass in Reims was set up by Machaut himself or in his honour, whether the Mass was composed as a ticket through Purgatory or as a commission to the cathedral (or both), whether its use was intended as exclusive to Reims or available to all of Machaut's patrons, whether the memory on display in the Mass in the manuscripts is that of the scribal-performers for the music as well as the

words, what is incontrovertible is the achievement of the Mass for which Machaut is today justly remembered.

Chapter 5

Scribal Memory and Authorial Performance in the *Voir Dit*

Des autres choses vous diray
Se diligemment les querés
Sans faillir vous les trouverés
Aveuques les choses notees
Et es balades non chantees
Dont j'ay mainte pensee eü
Que chascuns n'a mie sceü
Car cilz qui vuet tel chose faire
Penser li faut ou contrefaire. (*Voir-Dit*, ll. 521-29.)²⁵³

[I tell you that you will find the other pieces if you look carefully among those set to music and the ballades which have no music and with which I have been much preoccupied (which not everyone has been aware of), for those who would like to make such pieces must think carefully or else pretend.]

Machaut's *Voir Dit* is the most famous, and perhaps the most subtle, of all of his works.²⁵⁴ Whilst its literary achievement has long been acknowledged, this chapter, in focusing on its *mise en page* in the three extant "complete-works" manuscripts in which it is transmitted (A, E and F-G), will consider what may be read not only in the story, but also in the manuscripts' presentations of the whole work: text, miniatures, music. As with previous chapters, the manuscripts will be considered individually and in approximate chronological order, and their differing interpretations of the work, as well as their differing expectations of their reader-performers, will be shown.

First, however, it may be helpful to give a very brief plot outline of the *Voir Dit*. Debate has continued for some time as to the level of "truth" in the story, and the illuminating discussion by Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer has done much to show that the basic plot, as described in the letters, has at least some historical foundation.²⁵⁵ The story is told in

²⁵³ For consistency across the manuscripts, quotations from the *Voir Dit* in this chapter are taken from the 1999 edition by Paul Imbs. The translations into English are my own.

²⁵⁴ This claim is made on the outside back cover of Imbs' edition – "Le *Voir Dit* (Dit véridique) est son œuvre la plus célèbre et la plus émouvante" – and is in keeping with the revealing title of Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet's study of writing in general, albeit with a particular focus on the *Voir Dit*, *'Un engin si subtil': Guillaume de Machaut et l'écriture au XIV^e siècle* (Paris: Champion, 1985, repr. 2001).

²⁵⁵ The concept of the "truth" or otherwise of the *Voir Dit* is discussed in Chapter 1. For a detailed and thorough analysis of the truth (or otherwise) of the letters, which comes to the conclusion that they did form (at least part of) an actual exchange, see Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, "Introduction", especially pp. xxii-xxxii.

the first person, and opens with a dedication first to love, and then to the lady, and thirdly to Hope. Soon we find out that the lady is to be called Toute Belle, and that she brought the narrator out of his melancholy by sending him a *ballade* declaring her love. Thus begins the exchange of letters, lyric poetry, and song for which the *Voir Dit* is so well-known. This exchange leads up to and away from the pivotal (apparent) consummation of the union, and includes Toute Belle's sending of her portrait before the consummation and Guillaume's sending of the book after. The story, which contains within it its own composition, is therefore of the writing of writing, as we shall see.²⁵⁶ Like the *Remede de Fortune*, the story demonstrates the ascent of the lover, consoled by love, from his sorry state. Yet in the *Voir Dit*, unlike the *Remede*, the attainment of physical union heralds the decline of love, and by the end of the tale the circle becomes complete as the central amorous relationship descends into a somewhat more uneasy friendship. As Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet has demonstrated, this pattern is a textual reconstruction of traditional visual representations of Fortune's wheel, such as the one shown in the miniatures in each of the manuscripts (which will be discussed further later in this chapter).²⁵⁷ With a work whose structure can be conceived in such visual terms then, it is surely relevant to consider the presentations of the three elements each manuscript contains: text, image and music.

Manuscript A

Manuscript A is the earliest surviving "complete-works" manuscript to contain the *Voir Dit*. Textually, it is generally considered an excellent source, and was the basis for the edition and translation by Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and R. Barton Palmer published in 1998, and it is with the textual presentation that I will begin my analysis. Like the *Remede*, the *Voir Dit* is presented in a two-column format, interspersed with miniatures. In order to compare the basic layout of each of the manuscripts, I include a figure of the presentation of the first letter at this point in each discussion. In manuscript A the letter can clearly be

²⁵⁶ For an overview of the complex structure of the *Voir Dit*, see Cerquiglini-Toulet, 'Un engin si subtil', chapter 2 (pp. 51-89).

²⁵⁷ Cerquiglini-Toulet, 'Un engin si subtil', p. 57.

seen as prose in the right-hand column, standing in contrast to the narrative verse surrounding it, as shown in fig. 5.1:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.1: A fol. 224

The first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

Of particular interest in A's textual transmission of the *Voir Dit* is the behaviour of the manuscript's index. We may recall that for the *Remede de Fortune* it isolates the musical items in their own separate section. By contrast, for the *Voir Dit* it integrates the "choses notées" among the other musical items it lists, according to genre and without any indication of the work to which they belong. Not even their folio numbering gives this away for, in its presentation of the *Voir Dit*, as opposed to the *Remede*, manuscript A segregates words and music, so that the main text reproduces only the words, denoting those lyrics whose music is provided elsewhere in the manuscript with the rubric "et y a chant" rather than providing the notation for these lyric interpolations within the work itself. In order to find the musical setting, the reader-performer must look in the music section of the manuscript, as instructed at the start of the work (ll. 521-525):

Des autres choses vous diray
 Se diligemment les querés
 Sans faillir vous les trouverés
 Aveuques les choses notees
 Et es balades non chantees

[I tell you that you will find the other pieces if you look carefully among those set to music and the ballades which have no music]

In manuscript A, the reader-performer also has the option of referring to the index for their placement.

The index, in fact, contains some anomalies (or what seem such to modern-day reader-performers, at least) which are specific to the *Voir Dit*. Firstly, we saw from the discussion in Chapter 1 that the index in A was likely drawn up before the manuscript's production, and therefore reflects the intended, rather than actual, order of the manuscript. Secondly, where the *Voir Dit* is concerned, its entry in the index appears to fall to one side of those of the other *dits*, with its folio number written underneath it as opposed to alongside (visible in fig. 5.2 towards the bottom of the left-hand column):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.2: A fol. B (detail)

The entry of the *Voir Dit* in the index to manuscript A

The reason for this, as Lawrence Earp has demonstrated, is that this index entry was subjected to an erasure and replacement (which can be seen in fig. 5.2 where the writing appears paler).²⁵⁸ The erasure, which covers the three lines which now read "Les balades [...]", "Les chansons roiaus [...]", and "Le dit de la marguerite", was made at the time that the manuscript was written, and the new entry is in the same hand as the rest of the index. Earp suggests that the erased items were (in the following order) "Le dit de la marguerite", "La prise d'alexandre" and "Le voir dit". Among the possible reasons he proposes for the change are: a re-structuring of the *Loange* portion of the manuscript; that the *Loange* "was originally forgotten"; that new *dits* available during the manuscript's production; and, of course, the short title of the *Voir Dit* which would have made it easier to reposition within the index than any of the surrounding items.²⁵⁹

The current (re-)placement of the *Voir Dit's* entry in the index is somewhat paradoxical visually, for it is both highlighted and hidden: an eye scanning entries of titles looking for a "V" will not find the *Voir Dit*, yet a curious glance would be drawn towards its unusual location, ink

²⁵⁸ This, together with the discussion which follows, owes much to Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 59-62. On p. 61, n. 140, Earp offers a reconstruction of the index before the erasure.

²⁵⁹ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 61, especially n. 140. Earp does not actually suggest that Machaut himself might have been behind the changes, but given the authority invoked by manuscript A it is a possibility which cannot be ignored.

hue, and underlining.²⁶⁰ As has already been intimated, the reader-performer of the *Voir Dit* looking for the "choses notees" would be likely to regularly consult the index, which for the *Voir Dit* functions as more than a recalling of authority (as discussed in Chapter 1). It therefore seems fitting, although probably unintentional, that it is this entry in the index which should be unusually placed.

If we now turn to the iconography of manuscript A, which in its presentation of the *Voir Dit* contains thirty miniatures, one of its most striking aspects, visible from the very first miniature, is the fact that the ailing, aged poet-lover described in the text is presented in the miniatures not as a tonsured cleric but as a young beardless man, perhaps not as young as the lover in the *Remede de Fortune*, but nevertheless younger than the male protagonist in the tale. This, as Domenic Leo has noted, forms a link between the lover of the other first-person *dits* and the character in the "*Voir*" *Dit*, which thus "takes the reader away from specifics of Machaut's 'true' poem to the bittersweet, compromised positions that the poet's intratextual alter egos occupy in his other narrative works".²⁶¹ The stylised Guillaume in the miniatures of the *Voir Dit* is therefore not so far removed from the young, hapless lover in the *Remede de Fortune* whose fate he will more-or-less follow.

²⁶⁰ This is also discussed in McGrady, p. 102: "the *Voir Dit* emerges from its murky surroundings to claim a central and meaningful role in the compendium."

²⁶¹ Domenic Leo, "The Program of Miniatures in Manuscript A" in Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, introduction, pp. xci-xciii, p. xciii. See also Leo, "Authorial Presence", p. 200, n. 431.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.3: A fol. 221 (detail)

The opening miniature to the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

This opening miniature is worth examining in further detail, as its position at the head of the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A means that it influences the reader-performer's interpretation of the story. The image clearly portrays the receipt of a letter addressed "a guillem" by the figure on the left, brought by the figure on the right who is doffing his hat on bent knee in greeting, and the scene takes place outdoors. Although the reader-performer's eye is drawn to the letter (in curiosity at wanting to read the writing on it), the two men are looking at one another, whilst each holds the letter. Thus the image has a double focus, presenting the two forms of exchange, through writing and through speaking (in this case, greeting) that we are about to see contrasted throughout the story. Indeed, as I will discuss in more detail later, this particular written offering (a *rondel* from the lady as we find out in the text) relies on the messenger's discourse to elucidate its message. The visual motif of the unopened letter is one that will recur in

the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*, and indeed all the manuscripts, and its presence here in the opening miniature serves to highlight its importance as a representation of the central exchange of the story.

Perhaps surprisingly, however, despite the exchange of forty-six letters in the *Voir Dit*, the motif of the letter in the iconography of manuscript *A* only appears four times in the series of thirty miniatures (the same number as for the portrait which will be discussed later).²⁶² Of these, three represent the lover receiving a letter, and one the lady receiving a letter, and in keeping with her apparent anonymity, her letter is addressed "a ma dame". The focus in the miniatures is clearly more on receiving than on writing, and this is a focus which is reflected in the narrative, which concentrates more on reactions to letters than on the act of their composition. (The miniature showing the composition of a *ballade* will be discussed later.) Nor do the miniatures portray the act of reading: where a letter is present it is the act of transmission which is consistently shown.

This leads me on to my final point about the imagery of the letters: the iconographical programme is such that, while the characters in the story receive the letters, it is the reader-performers who do the reading. More important for the motif of the letter than the miniatures are the letters themselves, which are recognisable in the manuscript by their being written in prose, a choice of medium which, although the two-column format is respected, nevertheless stands out for its very lack of eye-catching illuminated initials and for its use of space. The mere presence of the correspondence on the page serves to highlight its existence and central importance to the story, as can be seen, for example, on the page displaying the first communication (fig. 5.1). In order to follow the story, we reader-performers have no choice but to read the letters, letters which are (were) apparently private, apparently true. Thus the visual representation of the letters in manuscript *A* solicits the voyeurism of the reader-performers, tempting us to take part in the story by flatteringly suggesting that no other readers are so

²⁶² This is noted by Julia Dobrinsky, " 'Peindre, pourtraire, écrire': le rapport entre le texte et l'image dans les manuscrits enluminés de Guillaume de Machaut (XIV^e-XV^e siècles)" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne, 2004), where she calls it "le motif privilégié de la lettre" ("the privileged motif of the letter"), p. 93.

privileged. This is not the case for manuscripts *E* and *F-G*, as we shall see.

Another iconographical theme present in manuscript *A* is that of the portrait. Perhaps unsurprisingly given upper-class courtship practices in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, its first appearance in the sequence of miniatures sees it in a very similar position to the letter in the miniatures which show deliveries of mail: the messenger and receiver are looking at each others' eyes, whilst each is at the same time holding the portrait. Indeed, once we have seen the portrait there is only one further miniature showing a letter: the portrait becomes the letters' – and *Toute Belle's* – substitute.²⁶³ This is particularly shown in figure 5.4 which significantly departs from the textual description of the handing-over of the portrait (in the narrative, the messenger does not know what is in the parcel which Guillaume then opens in private).²⁶⁴

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.4: *A* fol. 235 (detail)

The delivery of the portrait from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

The portrait takes on a life of its own in the story which is reflected in the miniatures. Of the three further instances where it appears, two depict the action of its imprisonment and freedom more-or-less as described in the narrative.²⁶⁵ Although unfortunately damaged in the manuscript, the miniature depicting the portrait in the dream is particularly interesting, as is Leo's description of it:

²⁶³ Leo, "The Program of Miniatures", pp. xcii-xciii.

²⁶⁴ Leo, "Authorial Presence", pp. 202-203.

²⁶⁵ Leo, "Authorial Presence", p. 203, notes that the coffer in which the portrait is imprisoned is simplified in both miniatures from a smaller coffer placed inside a larger one to just one large one.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.5: A fol. 293 (detail)

The portrait in the dream from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

It is literally an image of an image. In relation to the other three miniatures of the portrait, the artist renders the portrait here in greater detail. He adds a decorative background of delicate scrolling vines and a more ornate frame. The presentation, frontal and sized to fit the frame, further enhances this miniature's status in relation to the other three. This miniature operates on a different visual level than the others: here the reader is forced to actively unite, even though only momentarily, with the narrator rather than passively watching his actions. The reader now dreams.²⁶⁶

As with the shield of love in the *Remede de Fortune*, here A's iconography once again does away with intermediary characters and speaks directly to the reader-performers, who fulfil their duties as active performers under the direction of the author. The fact that here we are seeing as if with the eyes of the author-protagonist makes the function of this image all the more striking: here, by looking through his eyes, we are invited to play at identifying (with) the author, as we are in "solving"

²⁶⁶ Leo, "Authorial Presence", pp. 203-04.

the anagram, but ultimately we know that it is only a game, since we are in fact under his control, admiring his work, his creation.

The idea of creation is indeed intrinsic to the portrait imagery, the *Voir Dit* and of course the manuscripts themselves. Leo describes the Machaut character in the *Voir Dit* as a "failed Pygmalion",²⁶⁷ for his beloved creation is not the subservient statue. Or is she? After all, the Tote Belle which Machaut creates in the *Voir Dit* is almost certainly not the Tote Belle of real life, whoever she may have been. Indeed it could be said that there are at least four Tote Belles: one real, shown in the letters; one the poetic figure, whether created by her or by Machaut, writing in the first-person in her lyric works; one in the portrait which is worshipped by the lover; and lastly one which is fashioned throughout the text and ultimately shown in the image of Fortune. It is this final image which is the most overpowering, which draws in the reader far more than can the pleading portrait, and which appears in some form in all three manuscripts:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.6: A fol. 297 (detail)

The portrayal of Tote Belle as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

²⁶⁷ Leo, "The Program of Miniatures", p. xciii.

This is an image which draws the reader-performer's eye and invites contemplation.²⁶⁸ It does this in two ways. Firstly, through its size, which spans both columns of the page, and it is approximately four times the size of all the other images save the corresponding one of the lover. Secondly, its use of text brings it in absolute relation to the narrative around it which acts as a gloss, itself a well-known form of medieval contemplation and learning.²⁶⁹ This is the image of *Toute Belle* ultimately created by the text, and, as the last image of her in the sequence, the one which stays in our minds.

Perhaps, then, it is too hasty to label Machaut a "failed Pygmalion".²⁷⁰ He is, after all, portrayed as a creator, as Leo has demonstrated for the miniature of the (apparent) consummation (fig. 5.7), which he interprets as "a thinly veiled reference to Genesis iconography", thus making the *Voir Dit* "a timeless commentary on the author's power to create, which, in part, means that his text can become an arena for revenge".²⁷¹

²⁶⁸ Leo, "The Program of Miniatures", p. xciii, offers a commentary on the sexuality of this image.

²⁶⁹ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 245.

²⁷⁰ Leo also expands on this argument in "Authorial Presence", pp. 212-213, by discussing the contrast of Machaut the cleric and author with Guillaume the would-be courtly lover and Pygmalion: "As an ecclesiastical figure, the gulf between his world and that of his noble lady is too deep for any love to span. The story is a metaphor for Machaut's own situation as a respected poet-composer who participates in the aristocrat's world of courtly love only vicariously, through writing. [...] The narrator's *ymage* of *Toutebelle* [*sic.*] is fundamentally different from Pygmalion's statue of Galatea: Guillaume is not the *artist*, he is the *author* who conceived this story. In this respect, the story is a timeless commentary on the author's power to create. He fashions the character of the beloved from text."

²⁷¹ Leo, "The Program of Miniatures", p. xciii.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.7: A fol. 255 (detail)

Venus and the lovers from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

The iconography for the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A does not let us forget who the creator of our text really is. On the one hand the author uses this power for praise, as the narrative claims, and on the other for what Leo calls "revenge" but is perhaps better understood as manipulation. He is shown in the allegory of the lover as Fortune, as described by Toute Belle through her confessor (fig. 5.8). It is the final miniature of the work, and is as large as the equivalent (and preceding) image of Toute Belle allegorised as Fortune.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.8: A fol. 301v (detail)

The lover as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

This image of the lover is indeed accurate. He has two faces, one for what might best be called "real life", the other for the characters he portrays as himself in his texts. He has (at least!) five different songs, those sung by the virgins depicted in the background: of truth, of joy, of sweetness, of anger, and of bitter emptiness.²⁷² Here the image of Fortune (the lover, Machaut) has no sexual overtones, but the hub of her wheel is placed over her heart, the inspiration for the poet's work, which, as is made clear at the start of the *Voir Dit*, is linked to his circumstances, willed or otherwise. For, in the end, the lover is not a failed Pygmalion at all: he has created his object of desire, it takes shape and form and has come to life. It is, of course, the book, and Machaut is its master.

²⁷² Leo, "The Program of Miniatures" suggests that this miniature has suffered at the hands of an artist unrefined enough to be able to execute this image properly, since the last virgin is cut off and the water fountains become ever more "cramped" (p. xcii). While this may be the case, it is also worth considering that the impact of this image as presented is, after all, in keeping with the narrative: the water in the fountain becomes less and less as the five virgins sing to the extent that the final virgin is cut off in her song by a lack of water.

A discussion of *A*'s presentation of the music in the *Voir Dit* must reasonably begin with the elementary observation that it is simply not present, at least not within the confines of the narrative. The lyric insertions that have musical settings are presented exactly as those which have not, save for the rubric "et y a chant". An example of this is shown in fig. 5.9, the presentation of "Pleurez dames", a *ballade* set to music:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.9: A fol. 226

The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript A

This rubric, which appears for every musical interpolation with only one exception,²⁷³ links in with the *Voir Dit*'s general comments on narrative quoted at the opening to this chapter. This passage, and these rubrics, may indicate that the *Voir Dit*, at least in manuscripts *A* and *F-G*, was conceived from the outset as belonging in, or at least close to, a "complete-works" manuscript. In addition, this same indication could suggest that the reader-performer should look in her or his memory for the music, and this implication should be borne in mind when considering the music for the *Voir Dit* which is visually transmitted outside of the confines of the narrative text.

Apart from the written rubric "et y a chant", there is at least one other indication, outside of the narrative, of the (visual) presence of music. This is shown in fig. 5.10:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.10: A fol. 242 (detail)

The lover composing in the lady's presence from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*

This miniature is the first of the uninterrupted series of the only four miniatures in manuscript *A* showing the lover and Tote Belle together (the other three are: "Guillaume looking out of a church as Tote Belle and two female companions approach on horseback", fol. 245, "Guillaume, his secretary, and Tote Belle sit next to each other

²⁷³ The *rondeau* "Se mes cuers" is labelled in both *A* and *F* with the rubric "et y a chant", however there is no music. Conversely, the *rondeau* "Sans cuers dolens" has music in the music sections of both *A* and *F-G*, but does not have the rubric.

outdoors", fol. 248,²⁷⁴ and fig. 5.7). The second and third miniatures in this sequence both evoke the two moments where the lovers kiss, and the fourth miniature is, as we have seen, the apparent consummation of the union. Fig. 5.10 therefore takes its place at the head of a series of physical contact between the lover and Toute Belle, and serves to highlight the important role played by musical and literary composition even during the brief times in their relationship when the lovers are physically close.²⁷⁵ Fig. 5.10 therefore evokes the important role of music in the physical (as well as the platonic) aspect of the central love relationship, even if the music itself is not otherwise to be seen within the *Voir Dit* as presented in manuscript A.

If the music is not to be found within the page boundaries of the *Voir Dit*, does its consideration have a place in this chapter? I think the answer has to be yes, not just because of the instructions in the narrative cited above, but also because of the reaction of at least one (presumed) reader-performer, Toute Belle, who, delighting in Machaut's music perhaps even more than his writing, repeatedly requests it, as shown in the following extracts:

Je ai eu les .IIII. balades que vous m'avés envoies, et en ai envoiee (l')une, ainsi comme celle qui se fait fort de vous. Mais il me fait grant mal de vostre paine; si vous pri mon tresdoulz cuer que vous ne prengniés pas tant de painne que vostre corps en vaille pis, car par Dieu, il m'en feroit trop mal; et il me souffiroit bien toutesfois que vous m'escrisiés, se vous m'envoies une petite chanson ou aucun rondel, mais quil fust notés, car je n'en veuil nulz chanter que des vostres [...]. Si vous pri, mon tresdoulz cuer, que vous m'en envoies mains, si les envoyiez notés; et, s'il vous plaist, que vous m'envoiez le virelai que vous feystes avant que vous m'eussies veue, qui s'apelle, *L'Ueil qui est le droit archier*, ou *Plus belle que le biau jour*, car il[s] me semblent tresbons. (letter 28)

[I received the four ballades that you sent me, and I am sending you one of mine as one who thinks highly of you, but I suffer when you suffer. So please my very sweet heart do not work so hard that your body weakens for, by God, this would make me very unhappy and suffer greatly. And it would be enough for me if each time you write to me if you send me just one little song or *rondeau*, as long as they are set to music, for I don't want to sing

²⁷⁴ The descriptions are taken from Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research*, p. 178.

²⁷⁵ For a discussion as to how this image serves to relegate the lady from active reader to passive muse, and the corresponding elevation of the narrator from submissive artis to commanding author, see McGrady, pp. 70-1.

anything written by anyone but you. [...] Please my very sweet heart I ask you to send me less but to send me things set to music. And please send me the *virelai* that you wrote before you saw me which is called *L'Ueil qui est le droit archier*, or *Plus belle que le biau jour*, for I like these very much.]

J'ai eu un rondel noté que vous m'avez envoié mais je l'avoie autre fois veu et le sai bien. Je vous pri que vous me veilliez envoyer des autres; et se vous avez nulz des virelais que vous feystes avant que vous m'eussiés veue, qui soient notés, si men veillés envoyer, car je les ai en grant desir de savoir, et par especial *L'ueil qui est le droit archier*. (letter 32)

[I received a *rondeau* set to music which you sent me but I have already seen it and know it well. So please send me others and if you don't have any please send me those *virelais* you wrote before you saw me, as long as they are set to music. Please do send me them, for I very much want to know them, especially *L'Ueil qui est le droit archier*.]

Toute Belle, surely, would look in the music section, either of a manuscript or in her memory, in order to find the "choses notées" and learn them, and therefore so should we. As we don't have access to Toute Belle's memory, we will use the manuscripts.

The immediately striking feature of A's presentation of the musical lyric interpolations in the *Voir Dit*, in comparison to those presented in the *Remede de Fortune*, is their relative lack of clarity in syllable-note alignment. This is not to say that they are unreadable or unperformable, but that the supreme care in presentation observed in the *Remede* is not present to quite the same extent. This is shown in fig. 5.11, the *ballade* "Pleurez dames":

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.11: A fol. 470v

The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the music section in manuscript A

Here it can be seen that for the opening music, the placement of syllables for the second line of text "corps et desir" is somewhat unclear, even taking into account the difficulties posed by the initial

letter, the "et" falling under the notation presumably (that is, in relation to the first text) intended for the syllable "de". Likewise in the fourth stave, the syllables "diex et vous" are somewhat ambiguously placed, and the reader-performer must make her or his own decision as to exactly where these should fall.²⁷⁶ It should be emphasised, however, that none of these observations, which to modern-day reader-performers appear as minor discrepancies and are easily solvable from the syllable-count of the first text, would have posed problems for medieval reader-performers whether or not they were already familiar with the *ballade*. Once again this raises the question of the role of medieval reader-performers' memories, and whether the music presented in manuscripts is better understood as a source for memorisation, as a mnemonic aid, or both. This is a discussion to which I will return in the conclusion to this chapter.

Manuscript E

For the *Voir Dit*, the layout of manuscript *E* returns to the three-column format it employs in the *Remede* and the greater part of the manuscript, except for the startling but important difference that the correspondence and the musical lyric insertions (which are consistently presented with notation) are written out across the entire page, with no separation for columns. The correspondence is also written in a more cursive, *bastarda* hand, rather than the formal Gothic *textura* hand employed for the narrative. This, since most letters were written in cursive hand, makes them look more like "real" letters, and also serves

²⁷⁶ For the other lyrics set to music found in *A*'s music section, the singly texted "Dame se vous n'avez" (fol. 479) poses similar problems at the beginning. "Nes qu'on pourroit", presented in *A* as "Ne que on pourroit" (fol. 471), is interesting for its extra syllable at the outset: the second line of text is also arranged to fit the extra syllable, although the music has been overlaid as if the first-line text were written "qu'on", thus making the second text note-syllable alignment harder to make out. The short, single-text "Sans cuer dolens" (fol. 476v) is not as clear in its note-syllable alignments as might be expected for such a relatively simple piece. Although "Dix et sept" (fol. 475v) is clearly laid out, the visual effect is somewhat marred by the fact that the second stanza of text has had to be written over (presumably) pre-ruled staves, which goes against Earp's order of manuscript production (Earp "Scribal Practice", p. 186, n. 347). "Ne quier" (fol. 471v) and "Quant Theseus" (words by Thomas, fol. 472), make an interesting comparison, as "Ne quier" is clearer in its syllable-note alignment than its fellow, which almost seems to suffer from lexical complexity. The second text of "Dame de vous mestes" (fol. 473v) is particularly difficult to read, it being substantially longer than the first in places. Finally, the lay is in keeping which these observations, for its first text is generally clearer than the second, though still showing some discrepancies.

to make them look more "true". This is shown in fig. 5.12 which, as in fig. 5.1 for manuscript A, shows the first letter.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.12: *E* fol. 172

The first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*

Manuscript *E* is the only "complete-works" manuscript other than *A* to contain an index, and the *Voir Dit*'s entry here too is of interest.

Unlike that in *A*, *E*'s index was drawn up after the manuscript's completion and it is a reflection of the manuscript's contents in the order in which they appear. The structure of manuscript *E* is unique among the "complete-works" manuscripts, as Earp demonstrates:

Among the large Machaut MSS [manuscripts], *E* presents an extreme example of a certain structural type. No other MS [manuscript] is as consistent in the physical separation of each section. Except for a group of poems near the beginning copied as a single unit (Prologue-Louange-Vergier-Remede-Behaigne), and the joining of the Confort and the short poem Harpe, all parts of the MS are separable from one another. The final order of the parts was open to the greatest possible flexibility; indeed, there are no catchwords between poems. Further, an irregular number of leaves appear in some gatherings, and blank pages were even bound into the MS at the ends of sections, without being cut. These blanks were later foliated. Thus, decisions about the overall order of the MS were left to a very late stage.²⁷⁷

As Earp shows, the position of the *Voir Dit*, at the end of the manuscript, was a decision which could have been made at any stage of its production. What Earp does not explain, however, is why the index of *E* does not assign folio numbers either to the entry of the *Voir Dit* or to that of the *Prise d'Alexandrie*, as shown in fig. 5.13:

²⁷⁷ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 122. Earp does not note that the "group of poems near the beginning copied as a single unit" also contains the index, which follows immediately after the *Prologue*. As the index reflects the order of works in the manuscript and was therefore presumably drawn up last, then either this gathering was made towards the end, or space was left for the index which was added once the order of contents had been decided.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.13: *E* fol. Er (detail)

The entry of the *Voir Dit* in the index to manuscript *E*

Whereas in manuscript *A* the unusual entry in the index for the *Voir Dit* was particularly interesting in the light of the fact that it would have to be consulted by the reader-performer wishing to find the music for those lyric insertions which are "notées", in *E*, which transmits the music within the poem, this is not the case. Yet, in the case of the *Voir Dit*, the lack of folio number does not hinder the reader-performer wishing to find it in the manuscript using the index, since the layout of the *dit* is such that it is instantly recognisable, especially in relation to the mass which precedes it. The *Voir Dit*'s opening miniature and narrative verse, together with its letters which are set out as prose across the three-column format of the manuscript, are in complete contrast to the preceding mass. Whatever hypotheses may be conceived regarding

copying possibilities (for example, that the index was written out once the manuscript order was decided but before it was known how many folios would be required for the mass and perhaps also for the *Voir Dit*, and that for some reason the final numbers were never entered in the index retrospectively), the fact remains that it is still possible to find the *Voir Dit* using the index in *E*.

One aspect of *E*'s presentation of the *Voir Dit* which is particularly significant occurs at the end of the work and affects the anagram, which was discussed in the form it appears in manuscripts *A* and *F-G* in Chapter 1. *E*'s textual variants in this passage are such that the anagram text itself is different from that presented in *A* and *F-G*. *E*'s anagram passage is shown in fig. 5.14. The variants from manuscripts *A* and *F-G* are highlighted in bold in the transcription and translation; those variants which are in spelling only are shown within bold parentheses:²⁷⁸

²⁷⁸ For a transcription of this passage in manuscript *A*, *E* and *F-G* see Appendix 2. A figure of the equivalent passage in manuscript *A* is shown in Chapter 1, fig. 1.3. The variants which are in spelling only are not included in the variant totals which are discussed later in this chapter.

Or est raison que je vous die
 Le nom de ma dame jolie
 Et le mien qui **a** fait ce dit
 Que l'en appelle le voir dit
 Et **se** au savoir (**voulés**) entendre
 En la fin de ce livre prendre
 Vous (**couvendra**) le ver .IX^e.
 Et **une** lettre de (**l'uittiesme**)
 Qui **est** droit au **commencement**
 La verrés **vos** noms clerement
 (**Vescy**) comment je les enseigne
 Il me plaist bien que (**chascun**)
 (**tieinge**)
 Que j'aim si fort sans repentir
 Ma chiere dame et sans mentir
 Que je ne desire par m'ame
Pour le changier nulle autre
femme
 Ma dame le savra de vray
 Qu'autre dame jamais n'avray
 Ains seray (**sien**) (**jusques**) **en** la fin
 Et après ma mort de cuer fin
 La servira mes esperis
 Or doint dieus qu'il ne soit **pis**
 Pour li tant prier qu'il appelle
 Son ame en gloire toute belle.
Amen [not present]
 Explicit le livre (**du**) voir dit.

Fig. 5.14: *E* fol. 210 (detail)

The anagram passage from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*

[I tell you truly that you will find the name of my fair lady, and mine who wrote this dit known as the *Voir Dit*, and if you want to know and decode them, you will need to take the ninth line from the end of the book and then **one letter** from the eighth which **is** at the very beginning. There you will see **your names** clearly for that is where I have signposted them; and it pleases me well that everyone should appreciate that I love my dear lady well and without regret, as without lying, by my soul I would not desire to *change her for any other woman; my lady will know this to be true*. I will never have another lady but I will be hers until the end, and after my death my spirit will serve her with a pure heart. Now God grant that it may not have perished as a result of making such impassioned prayers to her whom it hails as its glorious and all-beautiful (Toute Belle) soul-mate. Here ends the book of the True Tale.]

This prolonged series of variants cannot be explained away as "errors", for they are extremely carefully placed and consistent. The appeal to the reader-performer is especially interesting, with the implication that we the readers will find "your names" (perhaps best understood as "the names that you are looking for") in the altered anagram text. None of the proposed "solutions" to the *Voir Dit*'s anagram have considered manuscript *E*, seemingly dismissed for its large number of variants, yet it is surely worth consideration.

The text which *E* designates as containing the anagram is "pour li changier nulle autre femme / m". This, too, contains a variant: the spelling of "femme" which contains a second "e" rather than an "a" together with an extra "m" which is provided by a diacritic not present in the other sources. From this passage can be found the letters to spell "Guillume de Machaut": although there are not enough a's to provide the expected spelling, we are by this point in the manuscript (and this is true for all of the manuscripts under consideration here) not only getting good at solving anagrams but also in no doubt as to who the author is. Left over are the letters P-O-R-N-I-E-R-N-L-E-R-E-F-E-M. From these can easily be found "RENOP" as well as Cerquiglini-Toulet's "Perronne", which would leave the letters "I-L-R-E-F-E-M". These could be re-arranged in a number of ways, none of which are satisfactory, as we should probably expect: "lire fem[e]"; "li feme r"; "le fremi", "lire fem" etc. *E*'s anagram, therefore, still leaves the question of names open, though not quite as open as those in *A* and *F-G*. Given that *E* was created for Jean the duke of Berry, it is possible that the anagram presented here reflects an example of the early reception history of Machaut's anagrams, perhaps even a 14th-century Paulin Paris who, frustrated at not being able to find the answer he was looking for, changed the question. It could also reflect the possibility that the lady in the *Voir Dit* was so well known that the purpose of the anagram is in fact *not* to reveal her name, whether as a nodding attempt to conceal a badly kept secret or in fact to protect her reputation.

Whatever the reason, it is clear that the anagram in the *Voir Dit* as it presented in *E*, *A*, and *F-G*, like that of the *Remede de Fortune*, invites the reader-performer to take part in the work and complete the text. The difference with the *Voir Dit* is that we have not followed the

allegorical teachings of Hope as in the *Remede de Fortune*, but have witnessed a "real" love-affair, from its beginning to its end. This time we are not completing our education (and facing the consequences) by solving the anagram. Instead, we are picking up the incomplete pieces of a broken relationship, the scattered embers of the ardent fire. We thought we had been empowered to complete the text but have been left frustrated and confused, seeking outside means of satisfaction. Therefore the anagram in the *Voir Dit*, as an invitation to join the story, is also an invitation to experience the pain of incomprehension. By the end of the tale the lovers have countered the pain of dwindling love by falling more in love with the text than with each other; we who are in love with the text find that it is unfaithful and turn back to reality, from the "True Tale" to true life.

Manuscript *E*, with its four miniatures for the *Voir Dit*, has the shortest iconographical programme of the three manuscripts which transmit the entire work.²⁷⁹ Given that the subjects of its four miniatures are common to those in *A* and *F-G*, *E* may plausibly be considered as a possible "basic outline" programme for an illuminated manuscript of the complete work.²⁸⁰ Fig. 5.15 shows its opening miniature:

²⁷⁹ It should be noted that, apart from the miniatureless manuscript *B*, *E* has the fewest miniatures of all the "complete-works" manuscripts. The maximum number of miniatures in *E* in any single work is only five (the *Dit de l'alerion*). Other works which have four are the *Dit du Lyon*, *Le Confort d'ami*, *La Fontaine amoureuse* (whose patron, as for manuscript *E*, was the duke of Berry), and the *Complaintes*. The short Prologue has two.

²⁸⁰ Manuscripts *J* (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 5203) and *K* (Berne, Burgerbibliothek, 218), which transmit only a portion of the text, both have images of the two allegories of Toute Belle and then Guillaume as Fortune.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.15, *E* fol. 171 (detail)

The opening miniature to the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*

Like the opening image to the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *A*, this miniature clearly highlights the themes of the letter (here unaddressed, but sealed). It could also be said to show, like *A*, the *meditatio* stage of composition referred to in the text (and discussed further below), since the poet is reclining in a walled garden. Again, the (soon-to-be) lover is not shown as the old man portrayed in the narrative, but as the younger figure seen in the iconographical programs of the other *dits*.

The other miniatures which figure in manuscript *E* are the image of True Love, and the two portraits of Fortune. Notable by her complete absence is Toute Belle: in *E* we have no option but to see her as Fortune, for this is the only image we are presented, and of course it is the image on which the text seems to settle at the end of the story.

Manuscript *E* is the only manuscript containing the *Voir Dit* to transmit the music for those lyric insertions which are "notées" within the work itself (which goes against the *Voir Dit*'s instructions to its reader-performers cited at the opening of this chapter). This is another feature which sets it apart from manuscripts *A* and *F-G*, but it is also a feature which is closely tied in with its rather sparse iconographical programme. As with the *Remede de Fortune* in *E*, so again with the *Voir Dit* visual beauty is an important consideration in the presentation of the music

which, like the correspondence, is arranged across three columns, clearly visible on the page, and evidently carefully planned. This presentation removes the need for the rubric "et y a chant", which is not found in the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*. Fig. 5.16 shows a folio containing all three elements of the page:

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.16: *E* fol. 198v

The *rondeau* "Dix et sept" and letter 36 from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*

It is worth pausing here over the complex design of the page. We read first the text on the short, two-line columns at the top of this folio, then the *rondeau*, then the letter, and finally each of the three columns of text at the bottom. The space economy – and planning which must have gone with it – is of the highest magnitude, especially considering that this is but one page in a long work. There are two easily visible features which indicate the extent of this planning. Firstly, the three two-line columns at the top have four lines of narrative verse and two rubrics. Secondly, the second text for the *rondeau* is written out to leave precisely enough space for the rubric "La dame" to introduce the letter (not to mention that the text, entered first, was calculated to leave the correct amount of space for the music²⁸¹). This, taken in conjunction with the textual matters discussed earlier, invites speculation as to the precise nature of *E*'s source relations. Margaret Bent concluded that *E* has close ancestors in several sources (including manuscript *B*).²⁸² It is also tantalizing to note that Jean of Berry had various Machaut items already in his possession at the time of *E*'s production.

Perhaps as a result of transmitting the music within the narrative, manuscript *E* shows a tendency, not seen in *A* and *F-G* (for obvious reasons), not to reproduce the musical lyrics of the *Voir Dit* in its music section. Of the seven musical interpolations presented within the *Voir Dit* in *E*, only one ("Dame se vous avez aperceu") is also found in the music section in a presentation which, in terms of the text setting under consideration here, is virtually identical. It is therefore intriguing as to why this *rondeau*, apparently composed at the time of the *Voir Dit*, should be the only one included in *E*'s music section, when others, even those composed earlier, are not.²⁸³ In addition, of the four *Voir Dit* lyric interpolations which are found in the music section of manuscripts *A* and *F-G* (and indeed *Vg* and *B*) although they are not set to music ("Cilz ha bien fole pensee", "Je ne me puis saouler", "L'Ueil qui est le droit archier", and "Plus belle que le biau jour"), only "Cilz ha bien fole

²⁸¹ Earp, "Scribal Practice", pp. 170-71.

²⁸² Margaret Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts *Vg*, *B*, and *E*".

²⁸³ For the dating see Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, "Le *Voir Dit* and *La Messe de Notre Dame*: aspects of Genre and Style in the Late Works of Machaut" *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 2, pp. 43-73, pp. 49-50.

pensee" is found in the music section of *E*. Again, we can only speculate on the reason for this, but it is worth noting that this *virelai* is presumably the earliest of the group as it is the only one to appear in manuscript *C* (also in the music section), and that in *E* it is headed by a single empty staff (fol. 162v). On this, and the other similarly empty staff in *E* on fol. 163v (which interestingly occurs at precisely the same point on the page – the very bottom), Earp offers the following explanation: "The text scribe had only intended to set off the text from the preceding piece, but the staff-ruler, not having access to the exemplar, drew a staff in the blank space."²⁸⁴ While this implication of miscommunication is possible, it may also have been deliberate: a single blank staff indicating an unsung piece included in a music section is an effective visual highlight, and had the text scribe wished to avoid it he could have ensured that the space left was too small to fit such a staff.

Another important difference between *E* and the other manuscripts is that it avoids the anomaly whereby the designation "et y a chant" is applied to "Se mes cuers" rather than "Sans cuer dolens". "Se mes cuers" is given in *E* as a lyric insertion without music, and "Sans cuer dolens" is presented with music.

Finally, an analysis of the syllable-note alignments of the music presented in the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*, like that conducted for the other works, shows that here, too, *E*, whilst being both readable and reconstructable, is nevertheless not always as clear as it could be for the reader-performer. This is seen especially in pieces where there are two texted lines set to the same music, for example in the *ballade* "Pleurez dames pleurez vostre servant" (fig. 5.17):

²⁸⁴ Earp, "Scribal Practice", p. 186, n. 347. However, this sequence of events did not occur in the case of *A* fol. 475v (*Dix et sept*), as we have seen. A reference to this conjecture is also given in Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 299, n. 42. The information on the lyric insertions in the music sections is taken from Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, table 5.3 (pp. 224-27) and section 7.3 (pp. 289-386).

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.17: *E* fol. 173 (detail)

The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*

Here it can be seen that, while the intended syllable placement for the first text on the first two staves is clear, for the second text recourse is needed to the first in order to find the intended syllable placement, though not to the same extent as required in manuscript *A*. This is not a difficult action, and it by no means renders the piece unperformable. It is also worth pointing out that, especially at the opening of the second text "cuer et desir et", a perfect alignment would have necessitated a more cramped arrangement of the words on the page. In addition, the words for the second and third stanzas are presented on the verso of the folio, and thus cannot be read at the same time as the music. Given that this *ballade* does not appear in manuscript *B*, which Margaret Bent has argued served partly as an exemplar for *E*,²⁸⁵ and in view of the careful page presentation required for the *Voir Dit*, we may need to reconsider the transmission process from author to manuscript *E*, an

²⁸⁵ Bent, "The Machaut Manuscripts *Vg*, *B* and *E*".

attempt at which will be made in the conclusion to this chapter. In any case, it can be said here with reference to the *Voir Dit* as to the *Remede de Fortune*, that it seems likely that in *E* a careful balance was struck between syllable alignment, clarity, and beauty.²⁸⁶ I will leave the last words on manuscript *E*'s music layout and its meaning to Deborah McGrady:

It [manuscript *E*] reshapes the codex and redefines the *Voir Dit* in such a manner that approaching Machaut's poetic works without acknowledging the presence of his songs becomes impossible. This new rendition encourages a reading of his corpus that would combine a tactile and visual experience with an aural encounter of the work. Even without a multimedia reception that would combine material reading with public performance, MS *E* assures that every material encounter includes a consideration of sound because of the visual display of song on the page and that every performance acknowledges the graphemic richness of the written word because of its inspired layout.²⁸⁷

Manuscript F-G

In terms of the basic *mise en page* for the *Voir Dit*, manuscript *F-G* remains consistent with its general two-column format. In some ways it is visually similar to manuscript *A*, both with the prose letters visible within the two-column format, and with the music being transmitted separately in the music section. As for the other manuscripts, the presentation of the first letter is shown in fig. 5.18.

²⁸⁶ Other observations can be made on the syllable alignment of the music of the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *E*. "Dame se vous n'avez" (fol. 176) is extremely clear except for "decevoir" in the second stanza: this is clarified in its presentation on fol. 141. "Ne com pourroit" (fol. 178) (generally known today as "Nes quon porroit") is extremely clear on both texts, and "Sans cuer dolens" (fol. 182) is also very clear, although it only has one text. The lay "Longuement me sui tenus" (the Lay d'Esperance) (fol. 188-198v) generally poses more problems, especially in the second text (e.g. fol. 189, first stanza), although in some instances it is clear in both (e.g. fol. 188v third, fourth, sixth, seventh and tenth stanzas). The rondel "Dix et sept" (fol. 198v) is very clear (see fig. 5.15), and "Se pour ce muir" (fol. 203v-204) is clear for the first text, less so for the second on fol. 203v. The setting for "Quant Theseus" (fol. 199v, words by Thomas) is unusually difficult on both lines of text when there are two, perhaps because of its use of long words, which seems to be a style not generally employed by Machaut.

²⁸⁷ McGrady, p. 133.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.18: *F* fol. 140

The first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

With its thirty-seven miniatures, manuscript *F-G* has the longest iconographic programme of all the manuscripts transmitting the *Voir Dit*, and it is also the longest programme for any of the works within the manuscript. Its programme has some important differences from

manuscript A, which can be seen straight away from the opening miniature (fig. 5.19):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.19: *F* fol. 137v (detail)

The opening miniature to the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

The most striking feature of this miniature in comparison to the opening miniatures from *A* and *E* is that there is no letter: the emphasis appears to be on the conversation. It is surely significant that the conversation shown here is between two men: even if the conversation concerns her, Toute Belle, or her representation in the letter, is nowhere to be seen in this opening image, she must be found in the narrative. Another striking difference is that the narrator figure in this image is presented as a tonsured cleric, reflecting the ambiguous love situation and indeed the profession of the author himself, although he is still not portrayed as old. (It is perhaps worth noting that a hairline instruction to the artist of the *Voir Dit*, visible on *F* folio 173, reads "ung roy assis et Machaut a genoulx devant lui" ["a king seated and Machaut kneeling before him"]²⁸⁸, thus showing that, at the time of *F-G*'s illumination, the clerical narrator was certainly – and probably subconsciously – associated with Machaut, just as he is today.) Finally, the background to this miniature is the same background to the unidentified coat of arms featured regularly in *F-G*'s iconography: the heraldic fur ermines (also known as reverse ermine). *F-G* therefore departs from the other manuscripts in the themes presented in the opening miniature.

Nevertheless the letter is still an important theme in the iconography, and it appears in the second miniature which comes

²⁸⁸ Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 179, n. 176, which also provides the translation.

immediately before the *rondel* which the letter contains (fig. 5.20). The change in clothing of both of the male characters seems to disassociate the two images in the mind of this reader-performer at least, although the lover figure is portrayed once again in red robes in some of the later miniatures. This miniature, which occupies a position in the narrative in which neither *A* nor *E* have a miniature, identifies the symbol of the letter with direct written communication, thus further highlighting the difference between written and spoken communication as discussed above.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.20: *F* fol. 138v (detail)

The exchange of the first letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

The letter appears in a total of eight miniatures. In *F-G*, unlike *A*, the motif of the letter is not confined to delivery: although four of these images depict the lover (never Toute Belle) receiving a letter, there is one of each of the lover and Toute Belle reading a letter, a miniature of the lover dictating to a secretary (fig. 5.25, below), and one of the lover ill in bed handing his open will (a *ballade*) to a messenger. In each of these four miniatures, the letters appear to display symbols representing writing.²⁸⁹ Therefore *F-G*, unlike *A*, seems to place more iconographical emphasis on the representation of the acts of reading and writing a letter, of written transmission.

The portrait motif is likewise differently handled in *F-G*. From the outset, the portrait is depicted as a statue rather than a painting (fig. 5.21):

²⁸⁹ The letter in the miniature shown in fig. 5.26 is smudged, however I feel that it is extremely likely to have shown writing before the damage.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.21: *F* fol. 148 (detail)

The lover worshipping the portrait from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

This is the first miniature of the portrait/statue: we are not shown its delivery. There are a further five miniatures featuring the statue, and there is also the miniature depicting its imprisonment where we are shown the closed coffer and the statue is not to be seen. Its representation in the miniatures is perhaps best understood as a semi-living representation of *Toute Belle*, for the statue is able to move, its dress changes, it supplicates. Although much of this movement takes place within the lover's dreams, for the reader-performer the Pygmalion link is clear (surely it is no coincidence that the portrait is depicted here in the form of a statue): the lover is fashioning his image of his beloved, he has the power to imprison it and release it. The author is present in these images: the statue speaks to him rather than directly to us in manuscript *A*. He does not have such power over his "real-life" lover, but he does over her book and its reader-performers.²⁹⁰

This is shown in the two images of Fortune as portrayed in manuscript *F-G*. The first image is rubricated in all three manuscripts "comment Tytus Lyvius descript l'ymage de Fortune" ("how Titus Livius describes the image of Fortune").²⁹¹ The image in *F-G*, however, departs from those in *A* and *E* in two significant ways.

²⁹⁰ For a fuller – and slightly different – interpretation of the Pygmalion image, see Cerquiglini, "*Un engin si subtil*", pp. 204-10.

²⁹¹ In manuscript *A* the name is spelt "Titus Livius".

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.22: *F* fol. 192v (detail)

Toute Belle as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

Firstly, there is no writing on the wheels: this is only given in the narrative. (In *F-G*, as in *E*, this miniature is no bigger than the others in the *Voir Dit*; it is only *A* which invites additional contemplation through its size.) Secondly, the image here features a crowd of female onlookers. In the other manuscripts Fortune is on her own in this image, here she is accompanied by other members of her sex. Are these women her admirers? Is this an indication that all women may be compared to her, at least in the eyes of a bitter lover? Whatever their significance, the female onlookers direct our gaze, like theirs, at the figure of Fortune.

The other image of Fortune shown in *F-G* also stands apart from those in *A* and *E*. It is surely not insignificant that, in manuscript *F-G*, the image of the lover as Fortune (fig. 5.23) is rubricated "comment li paien figuroient l'ymage de Toute Bele" ("how pagans depict the image of Toute Belle") as opposed to "comment li paien figuroient l'ymage de Fortune" ("how pagans depict the image of Fortune") in *A* and *E*.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.23: *F* fol. 195v (detail)

The lover as Fortune from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

As Cerquiglini has pointed out, here "l'assimilation de la dame à Fortune est, pour le scribe, totale."²⁹² ("for the scribe, the assimilation of Toute Belle with Fortune is complete"). So it was for at least one of *F-G*'s scribal-performers, so it is for the manuscript's reader-performers, for this Pygmalion has succeeded in fashioning in our minds the image of his lady exactly how he wanted us to see it. Whereas for the lover in the story the statue or portrait serves as a substitute for Toute Belle, in the manuscripts the icon *is* Toute Belle.²⁹³ For all the debate about her identity (which may eventually be revealed as Perronne thanks partly to the "irreverent detail" in the letters²⁹⁴), she is immortalised both by Machaut's work and by the portrait/statue iconography of the miniatures. Writing and portraiture thus become one. The last words on this subject are from Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet:

L'art enfin est commémoration et magnification. Il fait passer à la perfection et à l'immortalité. L' "image" et la dame-en-littérature ont le même nom: *Toute Belle*. Car cette réflexion sur l'art à partir des "images" est aussi pour le poète une réflexion sur l'écriture. L'écriture dans le *Voir Dit* est art, voire artisanat, acte concret et dont la prise de conscience en tant qu'activité autonome est nouvelle; elle est substitut et métamorphose, née sans mère comme l' "image de Pygmalion"; elle est fixation.²⁹⁵

²⁹² Cerquiglini, "*Un engin si subtil*", p. 151.

²⁹³ Cerquiglini, "*Un engin si subtil*", p. 210.

²⁹⁴ Leech-Wilkinson and Barton Palmer, introduction, p. xxxi.

²⁹⁵ Cerquiglini, "*Un engin si subtil*", p. 210.

[Finally, art both commemorates and magnifies. It allows its subject to attain perfection as well as immortality. The "image" and the written lady have the same name: *Toute Belle*. For the poet's reflection on the art of images is also a reflection on writing. Writing in the *Voir Dit* is an art, even an industry, a concrete art which had only recently come to see itself as such; writing is both substitute and metamorphosis, like Pygmalion's statue not born of the body; writing is a fixation.]

Manuscript *F-G*, like manuscript *A*, does not present the musical notation for the "choses notées" within the *Voir Dit*. As with manuscript *A*, they are indicated by the rubric "et y a chant", and they are to be found in the music section (within manuscript *G*). They are not to be found as easily, however, since *F-G* has no index to which the reader-performer can refer. Perhaps more than either of the other manuscripts considered here, *F-G* relies on a reader-performer approaching the manuscript in the order in which it appears, either to first appreciate the *Voir Dit* as a non-musical work and recognise the musical pieces it contains when he or she arrives at the music section; otherwise to recall the musical settings already known as he or she is reading the *Voir Dit*.

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.24: *G* fol. 145v

The *ballade* "Pleurez dames" from the music section of manuscript *F-G*

In its syllable-note alignment, *F-G*'s presentation of "Pleurez dames" is indicative of all of the *Voir Dit* musical interpolations: in short, extremely clear.²⁹⁶ Nevertheless, there is a lacuna of the second text in

²⁹⁶ Manuscript *G* generally has extremely clear presentations of syllable-note alignments in the music for the *Voir Dit*. "Dame se vous navez" (fol. 152v), "Dix et sept" (fol. 152v), "Sans cuer dolens" (fol. 150v), and "Longuement me sui tenus" (fol. 96-97v) are all exceptionally clearly presented, even when there are two lines of text. "Ne que on porroit" (fol. 145v-146) ("Nes qu'on porroit"), like in manuscript *A*, seems slightly unclear at the start due to its extra syllable ("que on"). "Se pour ce muir" (fol. 147v-148) has slight unclarity at the start of the second staff, due to the unusual presence of a second illuminated letter. "Quant Theseus / Ne quier" (fol. 146v-147)

the third staff: it is supplied to the reader-performer of the *Voir Dit* within the poem, but for the reader-performer of the music section alone there is no indication that the text to this song can be found elsewhere. Of the three manuscripts considered here, however, it is the syllable-note alignments in manuscript *F-G* which are undoubtedly the clearest.

One aspect of the text presentation of the *Voir Dit* on which I would like to dwell is that of the variants between the manuscripts, which, owing to the prose letters which make up around 30% of the text, offers some interesting insights into the transmission processes involved in the compiling of each of the three manuscripts in question. For the purposes of this discussion, by "variant" I mean an instance where at least one manuscript is in disagreement with either or both of the others transmitting the *Voir Dit*.²⁹⁷

Of the total of 2,744 variants in the *Voir Dit*, *A* has 495 (18.04%), *E* has 1912 or 69.68%, and *F-G* has 337 (12.28%), the fewest textual variants for the *Voir Dit*. In *F-G*, the number of variants in the prose correspondence is approximately equal to the proportion of the text which is prose (32.05%). In other words, the number of variants found in the text is consistent across all three text presentations in the tale: narrative verse, lyric verse and prose. The number of prose variants in *F-G* is neither lower than expected (like *A*), nor higher (like *E*). In fact, the principal textual interest for my purposes here stems from *F-G* being a "normal" presentation of the *Voir Dit* in terms of its textual variants. *F-G* has no index, and its anagram is identical to that presented in *A*. It is considered an excellent source and, despite not having *A*'s possible claims to being close to the author, it has been chosen as the base

both have slight unclarities at the start of their second texts.

²⁹⁷ My calculations are based on the listings given in the edition by Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer. I counted only textual variants (excluding layout variants, as well as the spelling habits of the scribes which are not included in the lists for the reasons given on Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, "Introduction", p. 96). Although this edition is based on manuscript *A*, I have avoided both bias towards one manuscript and judgment of variants by counting all variants, whether or not chosen by the editors for their edition. Therefore my calculation of the total number of variants for manuscript *A* is a sum of all textual variants listed by Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer as "A" (where they chose the reading given by both manuscripts *E* and *F*), together with those listed as "EF" (where *A*'s reading was preferred despite being *unica*). Similarly, later in the chapter my total of variants for *E* will be based on the textual variants listed as "E" added to those listed as "AF", and my total for *F* will consist of "F" added to "AE".

manuscript for the most recent French edition of the *Voir Dit*, that of Paul Imbs. In other words, *F-G* can serve as a useful point of comparison for *A* and *E* when considering possible different methods of manuscript transmission.

In manuscript *A*, only 129 (26.06%) variants out of the total of 495 occur in the letters. This percentage for the letters in *A* is the lowest for any of the three manuscripts, and, when taken into account with the fact that approximately 30% to one third of the text consists of letters, we can see that in *A* the variants are not evenly distributed between verse and prose.²⁹⁸ This distribution could imply better exemplars for the letters than for the rest of the text. This is in itself intriguing: did Machaut copy the letters into the book before sending it to Toute Belle, did he include the letters themselves, or did he expect her to remember what they had contained (even though he himself did not and asked her to return his)? If *A* was copied in Reims as François Avril suggests, were the actual letters, or close copies of them, readily available? Did Machaut's secretary, who would be familiar with the contents of many of the letters having transcribed those dictated by Machaut and possibly by Toute Belle too, take part in the copying? In all of these cases it is tempting to conclude that manuscript *A*'s possible proximity to the author is at the root of the observation. Whether or not this is the case, it serves as a useful comparison with the other manuscripts, which we have no reason to think were copied in Reims, or indeed under any kind of authorial supervision, since they are posthumous.

Manuscript *E* is without doubt the manuscript with the most variants for the *Voir Dit*. This is a fact which, without necessarily reflecting on the quality of the manuscript as a whole, shows that *E* stands apart somewhat from *A* and *F-G* for its textual presentation of the work. Of *E*'s textual variants, 36.56% (699) are found in the letters, a higher proportion than would be expected if the variant distribution was even. Again, one possible explanation for this figure could lie in the exemplars for the letters (in this case containing more variants, or being harder to copy, than the exemplar for the rest of the *Voir Dit*).

²⁹⁸ This figure of 30% has to be approximate, and I use it merely as a guide. The principal focus of my discussion is the different percentages of variants in the letters between the three manuscripts.

The calculations for manuscript *F-G* do not call into question our perceived transmission process: it is related to *A* especially in terms of marginal *notae*, and the even distribution of variants across the narrative and the letters suggest that its transmission is principally one of copying by sight, as one (or more) exemplar(s) gave rise to another. However, *F-G*'s striking regularity does call into question the observations made for *A* and *E*, which may suggest that there are more variables in the textual transmission process for the "complete-works" Machaut manuscripts than have previously been taken into account.

In what ways could a manuscript's contents be transmitted, if not through copying? We can find some answers to this question in the *Voir Dit* itself. The first exchange between the lady and the lover comes not through letters, but through two *rondeaux*, the first of which is brought to the ailing poet by "un mien especial ami" ("one of my closest friends", l. 74), and the second is returned to the lady through the same messenger. Although these *rondeaux* are exchanged in written form, the message and the sentiments which accompany them are relayed orally by the messenger: the written artefact, whilst the crux of the exchange, is not the entire exchange. This is a theme which continues throughout the book. In letter 44, for example, the lady writes that:

Et pour ce que je ne vous porroie tant escrire, car ce seroit trop longue chose, je ai dit la plus grant partie de ma volenté au porteur de ces lettres, li quelz est bien mes grans sires et amis, et je sai bien aussi que il est li vostres. Et tout ce que je li ai dit je li ai dit en confession et chargié sur l'a(r)me de li que jamais ne soit dit a nulle persone que a vous.

[And because I could not write to you so fully, for it would be too long, I have told the larger part of my message to the bearer of these letters, who is a close lord and friend of mine and I know he is yours too, and everything I have told him I said in confession and I charged him on his soul not to tell anyone but you.]

By this time in the story, of course, the book is well under way, and it could be argued that this action of Toute Belle's is to stop her secrets being transcribed into the book. However, while she is sometimes concerned with discretion, the idea that the book will break the secrecy is something which is not an issue in any of her other letters. In any case, the message which the go-between, her confessor, apparently brings includes the depiction of the lover as Fortune, which is, as we

have seen, represented in all three manuscripts. In fact, the idea that the letters are not the only form of transmission between the lovers when they are apart is taken to the point where, as love begins to decline, the letters are transmitting one message (that of continuing devotion) while messengers are conveying another (that the lady is bragging of the affair). Thus within the framework of the very plot of the story is a mixture of written and unwritten transmission.

There are also details in the story and the letters which reveal, perhaps more unwittingly, the various means of textual transmission in use. Both Guillaume and Toute Belle habitually write using secretaries, and Machaut makes several references to this in the narrative.²⁹⁹ It is also shown in the following image from manuscript *F-G* (fig. 5.25):

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. 5.25: *F* fol. 181 (detail)

The lover dictating a letter from the *Voir Dit* in manuscript *F-G*

Indeed, not being able to find one is an excuse used by Toute Belle in the last letter for the brevity of the preceding ones (letter 46):

Mon tresdoulz cuer, vous m'avés escript piece ha en unes autres lettres dont je ne fis onques response que je vous escri plus briément et plus obscurement que je ne soloie. Et en verité vous dittes voir, mais c'est pour ce que je ne treuve pas tousjours cler en qui je me fye bien pour escrire par devers vous.

[My very sweet heart you wrote to me a while ago in another one of your letters, and I didn't reply, that I write shorter and less open letters than previously, and in truth you are right but this is because I cannot always find a secretary I trust to write to you.]

²⁹⁹ For a list and discussion of the various instances see Cerquiglini, "*Un engin si subtil*", pp. 215-217.

Here it is worth noting the use of the word "escrire" ("to write") in relation to the secretary – Toute Belle does not write her own letters, she composes them.³⁰⁰ This distinction can also be found in Machaut's well-known utterance in letter 27 (my emphases): "vostres livres *se fait* et est bien avenciés car j'en *fai* tous les jours .C. vers" ("your book is coming along well for I write [compose] 100 lines every day").

It is in this same letter (27) that Machaut asks Toute Belle to date her letters as he is having trouble finding (ordering) the earlier ones:

Mais j'ai trop a faire a querir les lettres qui respondent les unes
aus autres; si vous pri qu'en toutes les lettres que vous
m'envoierés d'ores en avant il y ait date, sans nommer le lieu.

[But I am having trouble finding the letters which reply to each other so I ask you that for all letters you send me from now on you write the date but not the place.]

This admission has been highlighted by Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, whose careful reconstruction of the dates and orderings of the earlier letters has found that the order of letters as presented in all of the manuscripts is not entirely chronological.³⁰¹ It also brings us on to the topic of Machaut's memory, which at first glance here appears to be going astray (and, indeed, Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer provide extremely plausible explanations as to why the letters could have been misordered, mostly to do with the fact that the decision to write the book was taken once the "true" events were well underway and many letters had already been exchanged, dateless). Machaut, as a trained clerk and experienced writer, would have had a highly skilled memory, and it seems extraordinary to suggest that it would have failed at this point. Yet Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer paint a convincing (and wry) picture of "Machaut's haphazard control of papers" ("Introduction", p. xxx, n. 2) which include the accidental sending of Thomas Paien's unopened ballade to Toute Belle. In such instances, including the ordering of letters, I think that putting the onus on Machaut's memory is misleading. The responsibility lies instead, I feel, with the very fact that he is dealing with paper and writing – not always his own – rather than memory. I demonstrated in Chapter 1 how the pen and book in

³⁰⁰ This is a distinction which is true throughout the Middle Ages as highlighted by Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 10.

³⁰¹ Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, "Introduction", pp. xxvii-xxx.

miniatures are signs of textual authority: here, in the complex process of composition in this, the most writing-based of Machaut's works, too much writing down too early apparently causes confusion. This, then, is in keeping with Mary Carruthers's assessment of composition in the Middle Ages, which is worth quoting at length as so much of it can be seen in the story of writing which is the *Voir Dit*:

[M]uch of the process of literary composition was expected to occur mentally, in mature authors, according to a well-defined method that had postures, settings, equipment, and products all of its own. The drafts that resulted were designated by different names, which do vary a bit according to the particular writer, but each of which denotes a fairly well[-]defined stage of composition. These are, first, *invention*, taught as a wholly mental process of searching one's inventory. It involves recollection primarily, and occurs with postures and in settings that are also signals of *meditatio*; indeed, it is best to think of invention as a meditational activity. It results in a product called the *res*, [...] the "gist" of one's composition, [...] fully formed enough to require no more than finishing touches of ornamentation and rhythm. [...] The post-invention stage is, properly, composition itself. Its products are called *dictamen*; it might, but need not, include writing instruments. [...] [T]he *dictamen* is most like what we now call a "draft"; a number of versions, each unfinished, could be involved. *Compositio* covers three closely-related activities: *formalization*, or taking one's *res* and giving it final form as a composed piece; *correcting*, both by adding and emending, but also by comparing and adjusting the revisions to make sure the words fit one's *res* in intention and accuracy as much as possible (changing one's *res* drastically at this stage would indicate a lack of proper invention); *polishing*, artfully adjusting one's expression to make it striking and memorable in all its details [...]. For *compositio*, a set of waxed tablets or other informal (easily correctable) writing support could be used, on which one might write down all or parts of one's *res* to make stylistic tinkering easier. But, depending on one's maturity and experience, this process could, like invention, be completely mental. When the *dictamen* was shaped satisfactorily, the composition was fully written out on a permanent surface like parchment in a scribal hand; this final product was the *exemplar* submitted to the public. (Usually [...] the scribal fair-copy was submitted once again for a final corrective collation by the author or author's agent before the exemplar was made available for further copying.) The word "writing" properly refers to this last inscribing process which the author might do himself, but usually did not.³⁰²

At the beginning of the *Voir Dit*, Machaut is portrayed as searching for inspiration, a subject to write about, in a meditative state that fits *inventio*:

³⁰² Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, pp. 194-95.

Il n'a pas un an que j'estoie
 En un lieu ou je m'esbatoie
 Qui estoit d'arbrissaus couvers
 Par tout, et si estoit tous vers
 Biaux et iolis et gracieus
 Et pour estre delicieus
 La n'avoit chose qui l'encombe
 Si m'estoie couchiés en l'ombre
 Par quoy la chaleur dou soleil
 Ne me grevast n'au corps n'a l'ueil
 Si que parfondement pensoie
 Par quel maniere je feroie
 Aucune chose de nouvel
 Pour tenir mon cuer en revel (vv 47-60)

[Less than a year ago I was relaxing in a certain place which was covered everywhere with trees; it was green and beautiful and full of delights, and nothing detracted from the pleasant scene. I sat down in the shade to protect my body and eyes from the sun, and I thought deeply to find a way of composing something new that would bring joy to my heart.]

This method of *inventio*, however conventional, does not result in the writing of the *Voir Dit*, which is of course inspired by the lady, and therefore from the very outset of the book it is made clear that its creative processes are unconventional. (An example of a more conventional method is perhaps given in the following introduction to the presentation of a *rondeau*: "Si fis ce rondel en alant / Pour s'amour et tout en parlant", "I composed this rondel aloud for love of her as I travelled".³⁰³) The *res* can be understood, I feel, as the letters, which form the gist of the tale, *formalization* as the adding of the narrative and allegorical passages, the *correcting* and *polishing* taking place with the help of Toute Belle after she has been sent the first copy of the book. In addition, the letters and lyric interpolations presented within the book also follow this structure. It can truly be said that the *Voir Dit* is a tale of the writing of writing.³⁰⁴ It can be seen, then, that compilation of the *Voir Dit* probably involved more writing than was usual for medieval authors, and it is this, I feel, rather than poor memory on Machaut's part, which may explain the apparent disorderings of the letters. It is with this question of the roles played by memory and writing in the

³⁰³ II. 3067-68.

³⁰⁴ For a discussion of this concept see Cerquiglini-Toulet, '*Un engin si subtil*', pp. 217-221.

transmission of the *Voir Dit* between memory and manuscript that I would like to conclude.

Conclusion

It can be seen from the analyses presented here that for the *Voir Dit* manuscript *E* once again stands apart from its fellows, both in its likely transmission history and in the format of the page. It departs from the apparent intention stated at the beginning of the work (and at the beginning of this chapter) that the music for the lyrics which are set can be found in another part of the manuscript (or the reader-performer's memory).

Yet although *A* and *F-G* are similar in their *mise-en-page* of the text and music, they differ substantially in their iconographical subtleties. In manuscript *A* the lover of the *Voir Dit* can be associated with that of the other *dits* by his youth and noble status, whereas in *F-G* he is a tonsured cleric. This apparent nod towards versimilitude in *F-G* is also surely a strong invocation of the author behind the work: the lover of the miniatures is closer to the Machaut remembered in the minds of the reader-performers of this posthumous manuscript. Manuscript *E* also invokes Machaut the author in its opening miniature, portraying the writer in a state of *meditatio* appropriate to the beginning of a new work. All three manuscripts also invoke the author through their miniatures of *Toute Belle*. By the end of the iconographical sequence, through the manipulation of the image of *Toute Belle*, Machaut the author has proved to be more powerful than *Pygmalion* the lover. Both the tale and the miniatures leave us with the impression of *Toute Belle* as *Fortune*, the loving devotion of her letters overshadowed by the reports of her fickle behaviour which is immortalised in the narrative and emphasized by the miniatures. This negative manipulation of whatever may have been *Toute Belle*'s real character, despite the praise lavished upon her at the opening of the work, is the most striking portrayal of her. The image of *Toute Belle* as *Fortune* lives on beyond the words of the narrative, beyond even her name which is not quite revealed by either the anagram or the *rondeau* "Dix et sept". Through this manipulation, itself a game, the author is once again guiding our thoughts, our interpretation, and we are left only in admiration.

Another area in which manuscript *E* stands apart from its fellows is in that of the variants, which offers tantalising speculation as to the transmission history of the tale, particularly of the letters. Is the high number of variants in the letters in *E* indicative of a transmission history which relied on memory as well as writing? Inversely, could the low number of variants in manuscript *A*'s letters suggest that this manuscript was copied closer to the actual letters exchanged? In the *Voir Dit* itself, a tale of the writing of writing, letters and writing are, as we have seen, merely appendages to the message which is passed from person to person via memory.³⁰⁵ This is also apparent through Toute Belle's eagerness to learn - from memory - Machaut's musical compositions, both through the letters and even when writing is taking place:

Quand j'eus ma balade finee,
 Ma douce dame desiree
 Dist: "C'est bien fait, se Dieus me gart."
 Adonc par son tresdoulz regart
 Me commanda qu'elle l'eüst
 Par quoi sa bouche la leüst,
 Car, en cas qu'elle la liroit,
 Assez mieulz l'en entenderoit.
 Et je le fis moult volentiers
 Et du cuer; mais endeme[n]tiers
 Que mes escrivains [l'escrisoit],
 [Ma douce dame] la lisoit,
 Si qu'elle en sot une partie
 Ains que de la fust departie. (ll. 2361-2374)

[When I had finished my *ballade*, my sweet lady said, 'God protect me, that is well composed.' And with her sweet look she asked me to give it to her so that she could read it out loud, for, in reading it, she could hear and learn it better. I did this willingly but she, meantime, while my secretary was still writing it, began to read it, so that she had already learnt some of it before she left that place.]

In using a combination of sight (reading) and sound (reading out loud), Toute Belle memorises according to what appear to be accepted standards in the Middle Ages.³⁰⁶ In this context it is therefore not so

³⁰⁵ Carruthers cites several examples of this in *The Book of Memory*, most notably the fourteenth-century English humanist Richard de Bury, who preferred his clerics to report to him new arguments through word of mouth, "immediately poured into our ears still fresh, unerased by any word-scatterer and uncorrupted by any idiot" (p. 161).

³⁰⁶ In *The Book of Memory* Carruthers gives numerous instances of manuscripts being used as an aid to memorisation throughout the Middle Ages, for example in the fifteenth century by Jacques Legrand (p. 9), in the twelfth century by Hugh of St Victor

surprising that, in the introduction to the *Voir Dit*, Machaut refers to music which is found elsewhere: either later in a manuscript containing music, in a reader-performer's memory, or indeed in both. The function of a manuscript is therefore twofold: a mnemonic aid for those reader-performers already familiar with the works, and a memorisation tool for those who were not. The separation of the music from the *Voir Dit* in manuscripts *A* and *F-G* is thus not yet the separation of words and music which is seen in the fifteenth century (both in the works of Machaut and in manuscript and creative production in general), although it may be a symptom of a bigger shift in consciousness which was already underway and which would, in time, herald the Renaissance.

(pp. 9, 93-95, and 125), in various richly illuminated bibles (pp. 215-17), and in the chapter devoted entirely to "Memory and the Book" (pp. 221-57).

Conclusion

Performance and the *Mise en page*

Car je vous envoie en cest escrit et peinture et parole, pour
che ke, quant je ne serais presens, ke cis escrits par sa
peinture si est en apert par chu ke[?] lettre n'est mie, s'on
ne le paint.³⁰⁷

[For I send you in this written piece both image and word so
that, when I am not with you, what is written by this image
will be visible [to you] because writing cannot be without
image.]

Figure removed due to copyright reasons

Fig. C.1: *F* fol. 75v (detail)

The opening miniature to the *Dit de l'alerion* in manuscript *F-G*

In the above quotation, the philosopher and trouvère Richart de Fournival (1201- c. 1261) speaks of two gateways whereby a manuscript may access the mind: *peinture* and *parole*. These can be translated as "image" and "word", but are perhaps best understood, as Carruthers suggests, as "sight" and "sound".³⁰⁸ Both are needed in order to *read* a work, that is, to internalise it, to understand it, to make it one's own in one's memory. *Peinture* and *parole* are each present in abundance in

³⁰⁷ Richart de Fournival, *Li Bestiaires d'Amour*, ed. by Cesare Segre (Milan: Riccardi, 1957), pp. 6-7. Cited in Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 341, n. 12 (the translation is mine).

³⁰⁸ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, pp. 223-24.

the Machaut manuscripts which have been considered here. In addition, although every mind contains these two gateways, every mind is of course different. Once an artefact becomes internalised, it takes shape in the mind of the receiver as the individual interpretation of the reader-performer.

We have seen in the *Voir Dit* how words, music, image, and even the book itself were passed from author-performer (Guillaume) to reader-performer (Toute Belle) through the media of letters, scribes, and messengers. We saw Toute Belle learning a new composition through both sight (the secretary notating it) and sound (Guillaume reciting it, and she reading it aloud as the secretary writes). In this situation, the scribal-performer, the secretary, undertakes the act of writing directly from the dictated performance of the author-performer, who, although present, does not himself wield the pen. Although without doubt adjusted to fit the narrative, this scene, in order to be credible within one of the non-allegorical episodes of the "true tale", surely retains a patina of reality. Toute Belle follows the accepted traditions of the time, where reading "is a complex activity involving both an oral phase, that of *lectio*, and a silent one, of *meditatio*, committing the substance of the text to memory, re-presenting it in order to make it one's own."³⁰⁹ Thus the image of Toute Belle, the author, and the secretary allows us a rare glimpse of the transfer of material, in this case musical in nature, from author- to reader-performer.

The preceding analyses have sought to consider six manuscripts, the types of material they contain (text, iconography, music), and the individuals or broad sets of individuals involved in their performance (author-performer, scribal-performers, reader-performers). We have seen that the interplay of sight and sound, of *painture* and *parole*, is both subtle and essential to creation, reception and transmission. The Machaut manuscripts are no more silent artefacts than they are invisible. Between the *meditatio* and *dictatio* of the author-performer and the vocalisation and visualisation of the reader-performer, who hears or imagines the text and music within a manuscript, stands the scribal-performer, himself a reader-performer, but one charged with the

³⁰⁹ Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 222. Her discussion of the difference between *lectio* (study) and *meditatio* (meditation) in reading can be found beginning on p. 162.

task of further reproducing the work. He is not a machine, and the work which passes through his eyes, ears, mind and hand will also bear his imprint.

Thus the visual presentation of a manuscript can tell us much about its effect on its reader-performers and how it was produced by its scribal performers. Manuscript *C* has shown by its *mise en page* that it is a manuscript primarily focused on beauty. It is a codex in which the author-performer is present but behind the scribal-performers and the reader-performers. The presentation of the music, especially, suggests the elevation of sight over sound, of *painture* over *parole*. Manuscript *Vg*, in contrast, evokes the author-performer not through miniatures but through its clarity of presentation, particularly of the music, and it draws in the reader-performer through *parole* more than through *painture*. Manuscript *A*, which has long fascinated today's reader-performers with its tantalising invocation of the author-performer, brings him to the fore, even as it claims that he remains subservient to the reader-performers. In the elaborate opening images to the Prologue, the author is portrayed as a servant to love, to nature, and to ladies, but his reader-performers are not depicted; we are outside the manuscript until we take part in its performance. This concept is taken one step further by manuscript *F-G*, which reveres the author-performer both in miniatures and in clarity of layout while also respecting the reader-performer in the same way. Its author-portrait miniatures and clarity of presentation suggest to a greater extent than the other manuscripts that we are easily capable of admiring and learning from the author-performer.

Standing to one side of these delicate performances are manuscripts *B* and *E*. Manuscript *B* is challenging for a reader-performer to approach, and although the author-performer's presence is felt, it is minimal. Here it is the scribal-performers who are the main players, and we have seen how a reception of this manuscript which takes into account a presumed familiarity with the works it contains eliminates many of its perceived disadvantages. Manuscript *E*, too, stands apart from its fellows in many ways. Its transmission, as we have seen, appears to combine memory and writing more fully than any of the other manuscripts under consideration. Its emphasis is on the beauty of the codex and of the work, rather than on the author-performer, whose

wishes - if indeed he had the intentions ascribed to him in the rubric to the index in manuscript *A* - are not necessarily followed. Manuscript *E* offers its reader-performers - in this case, a known patron - a new performance of what, by the time of its production, were songs already in circulation.

Whatever the role of the author-performer in the production of the Machaut manuscripts, whether he was involved to the extent of painting the miniatures (as Domenic Leo has argued for manuscript *A*) or whether he was unaware of their existence (as implied by Lawrence Earp's view that manuscript *B* is for the most part an unauthorised copy of *Vg*), his presence is attested to varying degrees throughout each. Perhaps ironically, the manuscript in which his presence is most strongly felt, manuscript *F-G*, was produced after Machaut's death and therefore cannot be said to have been overseen by him. Whether it is trying to recreate as fully as possible his perceived intentions a generation later, or whether it is trying to revere his memory, is a matter of interpretation, but in either case the effect of his presence is achieved. That, after all, is the purpose of producing a manuscript, as implied by Richart de Fournival: "so that, when I am not with you ..."

For indeed, Guillaume de Machaut is not with us, except through manuscripts. In a thesis which has throughout valued equally the contribution of all of the groups of performers identified, at whatever point in time they may find or have found themselves, it seems appropriate to finish with a look at the present. It is no exaggeration to say that, not only in manuscript studies but in society as a whole, we are living through a technological revolution which rivals and arguably surpasses the invention of the printing press. Across the globe the evolution of the internet has been rapid - there are people alive in the same culture today who have grown up with the internet living and working alongside those who have had to learn how to use it at a more advanced age or who are still not computer-literate - and it is having a profound effect on the way we view history. In the popular view, at least, if it isn't on the internet, it seems it didn't happen, and what's more, you can make it happen by putting it online yourself. If the phrase "on the internet" in the preceding sentence is changed to "in print", and

"putting it online yourself" is changed to "printing it yourself", then the modified wording could be used to describe the boom in printing in the Renaissance.

Yet moveable type did not kill writing; the two simply learned to co-exist. It may well, however, have dealt a severe blow to the art of memory, as society has found ever more ways to store information outside of the human mind, even if this process may have been already well under way when the printing press was invented. (One of the results of this and of the cheap production of writing materials, of course, is that we rely much more on manuscript in everyday use - think what happens when you go shopping without a list.) Printing allowed works of literature, art, and music to become much more widespread than previously, thereby increasing their readership and literacy levels in society; and it helped to standardise language, again a process that was already well under way, and arguably still is (despite the persistent vigour of certain counter-tendencies such as sociolectal and dialectal varieties, trade-specific jargon, etc.). Once more, change the word "printing" to "the internet" in the preceding sentence, and the new sentence may well be said in a few generations' time.

Hindsight is one thing, however, and the future is another. This is no place to predict how technology will turn in the years and centuries to come, but we can at least review where it has been so far. Manuscript images are now available online - I have made use of many of them - as are entire manuscripts sometimes. Digitisation offers huge possibilities for discovery and research, but at equally huge costs at least for the foreseeable future. Libraries worry about copyright, control, and especially conservation, not just during the digitisation process but because more people will want to see a manuscript that has been digitised than one which has not, just as was the case with text editions and facsimiles in the last century. As any scholar researching manuscripts will attest, it is usually far easier to gain access to a manuscript which has never been reproduced than to consult one which has been digitised.

Perhaps the logical next step for the methodology and interpretation offered in this thesis is to consider the effect that this new form of reception has on the reader-performers, how the new scribal-

performers, those involved in the production of digitised editions, consciously and subconsciously stamp the new presentation with their own priorities (whether they be to reproduce a single manuscript or several manuscripts together for comparison, to add translation or commentary, and so on), just as did their medieval forebears and every editor and translator in between, and how this process of editing and transmission, in turn, portrays the author-performer and their interpretation of his supposed desires. All this, of course, will have to wait for another instalment in both history and research, but it is a fascinating thought on which to end. It is tempting to think of Machaut, in whichever afterlife he may be, watching with amusement the various interpretations of his works and desires, whatever he may once have considered to be their proper formation. I hope he is chuckling.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Cambridge, Parker Library, Corpus Christi College (on long-term loan from a private owner), Codex Vogüé (*Vg*)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1584 (*A*)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1585 (*B*)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1586 (*C*)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 9221 (*E*)

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 22545-22546 (*F-G*)

Editions of Text and Music

de Machaut, Guillaume, "*Le Jugement du Roy de Behaigne*" and "*Remede de Fortune*", ed. and trans. by James I. Winsatt and William M. Kibler (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988)

de Machaut, Guillaume, *Le Livre dou Voir Dit* trans. by R. Barton-Palmer and ed. by Daniel Leech-Wilkinson (New York: Garland, 1998)

de Machaut, Guillaume, *Le Livre du voir dit*, ed. by Paul Imbs (Paris: Livre de Poche, 1999)

de Machaut, Guillaume, *Guillaume de Machaut, Musikalische Werke*, 4 vols, vols 1-3 ed. by Friedrich Ludwig, vol. 4 ed. by Heinrich Besseler, (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1926-43; repr. 1954)

de Machaut, Guillaume, *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. by Ernest Hoepffner (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1908-21)

de Machaut, Guillaume, *Guillaume de Machaut: Poésies lyriques. Edition complète en deux parties; avec introduction, glossaire et fac-similés publiée sous les auspices de la Faculté d'Histoire et de Philologie de Saint-Pétersbourg*, ed. by Vladimir F. Chichmaref, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1909)

de Machaut, Guillaume, *The Works of Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. by Leo Schrade, *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* vols 2-3 (Monaco: Editions de L'Oiseau-Lyre, 1956)

Secondary Sources

Apel, Willi, *The Notation of Polyphonic Music: 900-1600* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1942)

Art, Wulf, "Machaut [Machau, Machault], Guillaume de [Guillelmus de Machaudio]" in *Grove Music Online*, ed. by L. Macy, <http://www.grovemusic.com>

Attwood, Catherine, *Dynamic Dichotomy: The Poetic "I" in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century French Lyric Poetry* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: G. A. Rodopi, 1998)

—, "The Image in the Fountain: Fortune, Fiction and Femininity in the *Livre du Voir Dit* of Guillaume de Machaut", in *Fortune and Women in Medieval Literature*, ed. by Catherine Attwood, *Nottingham French Studies* 38:2 (Autumn 1999, special volume), 137-49

Aubrey, Elizabeth, "Sources, MS, III: Secular monophony 4. French", *Grove Music Online*, ed. by L. Macy, <<http://www.grovemusic.com>>

Avril, François, "Les Manuscrits enluminés de Guillaume de Machaut: Essai de chronologie" in *Guillaume de Machaut: Colloque - Table Ronde Organisé par l'Université de Reims, 19-22 Avril 1978* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1982), pp. 117-33

—, *Manuscript Painting at the Court of France* trans. by Ursule Molinaro and Bruce Benderson (London: Chatto and Windus, 1978)

Azéma, Anne, " 'Une aventure vous dirai': Performing Medieval Narrative" in *Performing Medieval Narrative*, ed. by Evelyn Birge Vitz, Nancy Freeman Regalado, and Marilyn Lawrence (Cambridge: Brewer, 2005), pp. 209-22

Baum, Richard, "Le Descort ou l'anti-chanson" in *Mélanges de philologie romane dédiés à la mémoire de Jean Boutière*, 2 vols (Liège: Soledi, 1967) vol. I, pp. 75-98

Bent, Margaret, "The 'Harmony' of the Machaut Mass" in *Machaut's Music: New Interpretations*, ed. by Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 75-94

—, "The Machaut Manuscripts Vg, B, and E", *Musica Disciplina*, 37 (1983), 53-82

—, "Some Criteria for Establishing Relationships Between Sources of Late-Medieval Polyphony", in *Music in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Patronage, Sources and Texts*, ed. by Iain Fenlon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 295-317

Berger, Anna Maria Busse, *Medieval Music and the Art of Memory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005)

Berger, Karol, "Roman Ingarden, *The Work of Music and the Problem of its Identity*" (review) *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 41 (1988), 558-65

Bétemps, Isabelle, *L'Imaginaire dans l'oeuvre de Guillaume de Machaut* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998)

Billy, Dominique, *L'Architecture lyrique médiévale: analyse métrique et modélisation des structures interstrophiques dans la poésie lyrique des troubadours et des trouvères* (Montpellier: Section Française de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Occitanes, 1989).

Binkley, Thomas, "The Work is not the Performance", in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 36-43

Bloch, R. Howard, "The Medieval Text - 'Guigemar' - As a Provocation to the Discipline of Medieval Studies", *The New Medievalism*, eds Marina S. Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991), pp. 99-112

Bloch, R. Howard, and Stephen G. Nichols, "Introduction", in *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*, eds R. Howard Bloch and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), pp. 1-22

Boorman, Stanley, "A New Edition of Machaut", *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 495-98

Boulton, Maureen Barry McCann, *The Song in the Story: Lyric Insertions in French Narrative Fiction* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993)

Bowers, Roger, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry at Reims, 1338-1377", *Early Music History*, 23 (2004), 1-48

Brown, Cynthia. J., *Poets, Patrons, and Printers: Crisis of Authority in Late Medieval France* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995)

Brownlee, Kevin, "Authorial Self-Representation and Literary Models in the *Roman de Fauvel*", in Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey, eds, *Fauvel Studies: Allegory, Chronicle, Music and Image in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS français 146* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 73-103

—, "Fire, Desire, Duration, Death: Machaut's Motet 10" in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, ed. by Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 79-86

—, *Poetic Identity in Guillaume de Machaut* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984)

Buckley, Ann, "Introduction", in *French Lyric Lais, Vol. 1* (Newton Abbot: Antico Edition, 1992-4), pp. i-ii

Busby, Keith, *Codex and Context: Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript* (Amsterdam: Rudopi, 2002)

—, "Mise en texte as Indicator of Oral Performance in Old French Verse Narrative" in *Performing Medieval Narrative*, ed. by Evelyn Birge Vitz, Nancy Freeman Regalado and Marilyn Lawrence (Cambridge: Brewer, 2005), pp. 61-72

Butt, John, *Playing With History: The Historical Approach to Musical Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Butterfield, Ardis, "Articulating the Author: Gower and the French Vernacular Codex", *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 33 (2003), 80-96

—, *Poetry and Music in Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Calin, William, "Le moi chez Guillaume de Machaut", in *Guillaume de Machaut: Colloque - Table Ronde Organisé par l'Université de Reims, 19-22 Avril 1978* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1982), pp. 241-52

—, "Medieval Intertextuality: Lyrical Inserts and Narrative in Guillaume de Machaut", *The French Review*, 62 (1988), 1-10

—, *A Poet at the Fountain: Essays on the Narrative Verse of Guillaume de Machaut* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1974)

Calin, William, and Lawrence Earp, "The Lai in the *Remede de Fortune*", *Ars Lyrica*, 11 (2000), 39-75

Camille, Michael, "The Book of Signs: Writing and Visual Difference in Gothic Manuscript Illumination", *Word and Image*, 1 (1985), 133-48

Cape, Safford, "The Machaut Mass and its Performance", *Score*, 25 (1959), 38-57, *Score*, 26 (1960), 20-29

Carruthers, Mary J., *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990; repr. 2008)

—, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric and the Making of Images, 400-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

—, "Review of Leo Treitler, *With Voice and Pen: Coming to Know Medieval Song and How It Was Made*", *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 14 (2005), 225-45

Cerquiglini, Bernard, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology* trans. by Betsy Wing (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999)

Cerquiglini-Toulet, Jacqueline, *La Couleur de la mélancolie: la fréquentation des livres au XIVe siècle, 1300-1415* (Paris: Hatier, 1993)

—, "*Un Engin si subtil*": *Guillaume de Machaut et l'écriture au xive siècle* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1985)

Chaytor, Henry J. *From Script to Print: An Introduction to Medieval Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945)

Clark, Alice V., "Machaut Reading Machaut: Self-Borrowing and Reinterpretation in Motets 8 and 21", in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, ed. by Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 94-101

Coleman, Joyce., *Public Reading and Reading Public in Late Medieval England and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Collet, Olivier, "Les Collections vernaculaires entre diversité et unité: À propos d'une nouvelle recherche sur la mise en recueil des œuvres littéraires au Moyen Âge", in *L'Écrit et le manuscrit à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Tania van Hemelryck and C. van Hoorebeeck (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2005), pp. 57-66

Crane, Susan, *The Performance of Self: Ritual, Clothing, and Identity during the Hundred Years War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002)

Cullin, Olivier, *L'Image musique* ([n. p.]: Fayard, 2006)

—, "L'Œil de l'esprit: La Musique, la mémoire et l'écriture au Moyen Âge" in *La Place de la musique dans la culture médiévale: Actes du Colloque organisé à la Fondation Singer-Polignac le mercredi 25 octobre 2006*, ed. by Olivier Cullin (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 87-98

Demoris, René, *Le Roman à la première personne: du classicisme aux Lumières* (Geneva: Droz, 2002)

Dennerly, Anne, "Guillaume de Machaut: *La Messe de Notre Dame*" *Analyse Musicale* 34 (1999), 62-76

Dillon, Emma, *Medieval Music-Making and the "Roman de Fauvel"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Dobrinsky, Julia, "'Peindre, pourtraire, escrire': le rapport entre le texte et l'image dans les manuscrits enluminés de Guillaume de Machaut (XIV^e-XV^e siècles)" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne, 2004)

Dragonetti, Roger, *La Musique et les lettres: études de littérature médiévale* (Geneva: Droz, 1986)

Dunlop, Lynn M., "Cities Without Walls: the Politics of Melancholy from Machaut to Lydgate" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1997)

Earp, Lawrence Marshburn, "Declamatory Dissonance in Machaut" in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, ed. by Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), 102-22

—, *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research* (New York: Garland, 1995)

—, "Lyrics for Reading and Lyrics for Singing in Late Medieval France: The Development of the Dance Lyric from Adam de la Halle to Guillaume de Machaut" in *The Union of Words and Music in Medieval Poetry*, ed. by Rebecca A. Balzer, Thomas Cable, and James I. Wimsatt (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), pp. 101-31

—, "Machaut's Role in the Production of Manuscripts of his Works", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 42 (1989), 461-503

—, "Scribal Practice, Manuscript Production and the Transmission of Music in Late Medieval France: The Manuscripts of Guillaume de Machaut" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Princeton University, 1983)

Ehrhart, Margaret J., "Machaut's *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse*, the Choice of Paris, and the Duties of Rulers" *Philological Quarterly*, 59 (1980), 119-39

Enders, Jody, "Music, Delivery, and the Rhetoric of Memory in Guillaume de Machaut's *Remede de Fortune*" *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 107:3 (May 1992), 450-64

Fallows, David, "Guillaume de Machaut and his Mass: A Commemoration and a Review" *Musical Times* 118 (1977), 288-91

—, "Guillaume de Machaut and the Lai: A New Source", *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 477-83

—, "Lai", in *Grove Music Online*, ed. by L. Macy, <<http://www.grovemusic.com>>

Farquhar, James Douglas, and Sarah Hindemann, *Pen to Press: Illustrated Manuscripts and Printed Books in the first century of Printing* (Maryland: University of Maryland and John Hopkins University, 1977)

Ferneyhough, Brian, "Aspects of Notational and Compositional Practice" in *Brian Ferneyhough: Collected Writings*, ed. by James Boros and Richard Toop (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995), pp. 2-13

Foulet, Alfred, and Mary Blakely Speer, *On Editing Old French Texts* (Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1979)

Fournival, Richard de, *Li Bestiaires d'Amour*, ed. by Cesare Segre (Milan: Riccardi, 1957)

Fuller, Sarah, "Hidden Polyphony: A Reappraisal", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 24 (1971), 169-92

Gellrich, Jesse M., *The Idea of the Book in the Middle Ages: Language Theory, Mythology, and Fiction* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985)

Giachetti, André, "Une nouvelle forme du *lai* apparue à la fin du XIVe siècle" in *Etudes de langue et de littérature du Moyen Age offertes à Félix Lecoy par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1973), pp. 147-55

Goehr, Lydia, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, repr. 2002)

Göllner, Marie-Louise, "Interrelationships between Text and Music in the Refrain Forms of Guillaume de Machaut" in *Songs of the Dove and the Nightingale: Sacred and Secular Music c. 900 - c. 1600*, ed. by Greta Mary Hair and Robyn E. Smith (Sydney: Currency, 1994), pp. 105-23

Günther, Ursula, "Polymetric Rondeaux from Machaut to Dufay: Some Style-Analytical Observations" in *Studies in Musical Sources and Style: Essays in Honour of Jean LaRue*, ed. by Eugene K. Wolf and Edward H. Roesner (Madison: A-R Editions, 1990), pp. 75-108

Günther, Ursula and Gilbert Reaney, "Sources, MS, §VII: French polyphony 1300-1420", *Grove Music Online* ed. by L. Macy, <<http://www.grovemusic.com>>

Guthrie, Steven, "Meter and Performance in Machaut and Chaucer" in *The Union of Words and Music in Medieval Poetry*, ed. by Rebecca A. Balzer, Thomas Cable, and James I. Wimsatt (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), pp. 72-100

Haines, John, *Eight Centuries of Troubadours and Trouvères* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Hanf, Georg, "Ueber Guillaume de Machauts *Voir Dit*" *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 22 (1898), 145-96

Harden, Jean, "'Musica Ficta' in Machaut", *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 473-77

Hasselman, Margaret, and Thomas Walker, "More Hidden Polyphony in a Machaut Manuscript", *Musica Disciplina*, 24 (1970), 7-16

Hicks, Eric, *La Troublante proximité des chose lointaines: Études de littérature médiévale* (Geneva: Skatline, 2004)

Holford-Stevens, Leofranc, "Fauvel Goes to School" in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, ed. by Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 59-66

Hoppin, Richard, "An Unrecognized Polyphonic Lai of Machaut" *Musica Disciplina* 12 (1958), 93-104

David F. Hult, "Gaston Paris and the Invention of Courtly Love", in *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*, eds R. Howard Bloch and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), pp. 192-224

—, "Reading It Right: The Ideology of Text Editing", in *The New Medievalism*, eds Marina S. Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991), pp. 113-30

Huot, Sylvia, *Allegorical Play in the Old French Motet: The Sacred and the Profane in Thirteenth-Century Polyphony* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997)

—, "A Book Made for a Queen: The Shaping of a Late Medieval Anthology Manuscript (B.N. fr. 24429), in *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*, ed. by Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (n.p.: University of Michigan Press, 1996; repr. 1999), pp. 123-143

—, *From Song to Book* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987)

—, *The "Romance of the Rose" and its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, Manuscript Transmission* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 16 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Ingarten, Roman, *The Work of Music and the Problem of its Identity*, trans. by Adam Czerniawski (London: MacMillan, 1986)

Johnson, Leonard W., *Poets as Players: Theme and Variation in Late Medieval French Poetry* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990)

Kay, Sarah, *Subjectivity in Troubadour Poetry*, Cambridge Studies in French, 31 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Keitel, Elizabeth A., "The Musical Manuscripts of Guillaume de Machaut", *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 469-72

Kendrick, Laura, *Animating the Letter: The Figurative Embodiment of Writing from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Columbia: Ohio State University Press, 1999)

Kennedy, Elspeth, "The Scribe as Editor" in *Mélanges de langue et de littérature du moyen age et de la Renaissance offerts à Jean Frappier* (Geneva: Droz, 1970), pp. 523-31

—, "Going down on record", in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 30-35

Kibler, William W., and James I. Wimsatt, "Machaut's Text and the Question of his Personal Supervision", *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 20 (1987), 41-53

Koopmans, Jelle, "Un chacun n'est maître du sien: Auteurs, acteurs, représentations, textes" in *L'Écrit et le manuscrit à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Tania van Hemelryck and C. van Hoorebeeck (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2005), pp. 147-66

Laidlaw, James, and Charlie Mansfield, "Designing a Digital Version of British Library, Harley, MS 4431: The Making of the Queen's Manuscript" in *L'Écrit et le manuscrit à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Tania van Hemelryck and C. van Hoorebeeck (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2005), 183-88

Lanoue, David G. "Music Therapy and Guillaume de Machaut: Hope's *Chanson Royal* in the *Remede de Fortune*", *Romance Quarterly*, 31:4 (1984), 363-70

Lassahn, Nicole, "Signatures from the *Roman de la rose* to Guillaume de Machaut: The Beginnings of the Dream-Poem Genre in France", *Romance Languages Annual*, 10 (1999), 75-81

Leach, Elizabeth Eva, "Counterpoint in Guillaume de Machaut's Musical Ballades" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

—, "Interpretation and Counterpoint: The Case of Guillaume de Machaut's *De toutes flours* (B31)", *Music Analysis* 19 (2000), 321-51

—, "Machaut's Balades with Four Voices", *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 10 (2001), 47-79

—, "Singing More About Singing Less: Machaut's *Pour ce que tous* (B12)" in *Machaut's Music: New Interpretations*, ed. by Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 111-24

—, *Sung Birds: Music, Nature and Poetry in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2006)

Leech-Wilkinson, Daniel, *Compositional Techniques in the Four-Part Isorhythmic Motets of Philippe de Vitry and His Contemporaries* (New York and London: Garland, 1989)

—, "The Good, the Bad and the Boring" in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 3-14

—, "Le Voir Dit and La Messe de Notre Dame: Aspects of Genre and Style in the Late Works of Machaut" *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 2 (1993), 43-73

—, *Machaut's Mass: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990, repr. 1992)

—, *The Modern Invention of Medieval Music: Scholarship, Ideology and Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, repr. 2004)

Leech-Wilkinson, Daniel, and R. Barton Palmer, "Introduction" in Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Livre dou Voir Dit*, trans. by R. Barton-Palmer and ed. by Daniel Leech-Wilkinson (New York: Garland, 1998), pp. i-cxiv

Leo, Domenic, "Authorial Presence in the Illuminated Machaut Manuscripts" (unpublished doctoral thesis, New York University Institute of Fine Arts, 2005)

—, "The Program of Miniatures in Manuscript A" in Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Livre dou Voir Dit*, trans. by R. Barton-Palmer and ed. by Daniel Leech-Wilkinson (New York: Garland, 1998), pp. xci-xciii

de Looze, Laurence, " 'Mon nom trouveras': A New Look at the Anagrams of Guillaume de Machaut - the Enigmas, Responses, and Solutions", *The Romanic Review*, 79 (1988), 537-57

- , " 'Pseudo-autobiography' and the Body of Poetry in Guillaume de Machaut's *Remede de Fortune*", *L'Esprit Créateur*, 33:4 (1993), 73-86
- , "Signing Off in the Middle Ages: Medieval Textuality and Strategies of Authorial Self-Naming", in *Vox intexta: Orality and Textuality in the Middle Ages*, ed. by A. N. Doane and Carol Braun Pasternack (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 161-78
- Loysen, Kathleen A., "Late Medieval Representations of Storytelling and Story-Performance" in *Cultural Performances in Medieval France: Essays in Honour of Nancy Freeman Regalado*, ed. by Eglal Doss-Quinby, Roberta L. Kreuger and E. Jane Burns (Cambridge: Brewer, 2007), pp. 247-54
- Machabey, Armand, *Guillaume de Machault 130?-1377: La Vie et l'oeuvre musicale*, 2 vols (Paris: Richard-Masse-Editeur, 1955)
- Macé, Caroline, and Philippe Baret, "Une expérience de laboratoire en critique textuelle: Recherches stemmatiques sur une tradition manuscrite créée artificiellement" in *L'Écrit et le manuscrit à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Tania van Hemelryck and C. van Hoorebeeck (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2005), pp. 215-26
- Maddox, Donald, *Fictions of Identity in Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Maillard, Jean, *Évolution et structure du lai lyrique des origines à la fin du XIVe siècle* (Paris: Centre de Documentation Universitaire & S.E.D.E.S. réunis, 1963)
- Maw, David, " 'Trespasser Measure': Meter in Machaut's Polyphonic Songs", *The Journal of Musicology*, 21 (2004), 46-126
- , "Words and Music in the Secular Songs of Guillaume de Machaut", (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1999)

Maxwell, Kate, "Authoring the Author: Innovation and Enigma in Bibliothèque Nationale MS fr.146 the *Livre de Fauvel*" *eSharp 2* (spring 2004), <www.sharp.arts.gla.ac.uk>

McGann, Jerome J, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991)

McGrady, Deborah, *Controlling Readers: Guillaume de Machaut and his Late-Medieval Audience* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007)

Meconi, Honey, "Is Underlay Necessary?" in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 284-91

Miller, George A., "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on our Capacity for Processing Information", *Psychological Review* 63 (1956), 81-97

Minnis, A. J., *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Middle Ages* (London: Wildwood House, 1984, repr. 1988)

Mithen, Steven, *The Singing Neanderthals: The Origins of Music, Language, Mind and Body* (London: Phoenix, 2005, repr. 2006)

Moll, Kevin, "Texture and Counterpoint in the Four-Voice Mass Settings of Machaut and his Contemporaries" in *Machaut's Music: New Interpretations*, ed. by Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 53-73

Mortelmans, Jesse, "*Écrire et mettre par mémoire: La fausse objectivité dans les chroniques en moyen français*" in *L'Écrit et le manuscrit à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Tania van Hemelryck and C. van Hoorebeeck (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2005), pp. 239-50

Musso, Noël, and Gilles Roques, "Etude du vocabulaire de Guillaume de Machaut: Projet d'un lexique de ses oeuvres" in *Etudes de Syntaxe du Moyen Français*, ed. by Robert Martin (Paris: Klincksieck, 1978), pp. 189-92

Newes, Virginia, "'Qui bien aime a tart oublié': Guillaume de Machaut's *Lay de Plour* in Context" in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, ed. by Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 123-38

—, "Turning Fortune's Wheel: Musical and Textual Design in Machaut's Canonics Lais", *Musica Disciplina*, 45 (1991), 95-121

Nichols, Steven G., "'Art' and 'Nature': Looking for (Medieval) Principals of Order in Occitan *Chansonnier* N (Morgan 819), in *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*, ed. by Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (n.p.: University of Michigan Press, 1996; repr. 1999), pp. 83-121

—, "Modernism and the Politics of Medieval Studies", in *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*, eds R. Howard Bloch and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), pp. 25-56

—, "The New Medievalism: Tradition and Discontinuity in Medieval Culture", in *The New Medievalism*, eds Marina S. Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991), pp. 1-26

—, "Voice and Writing in Augustine and the Troubadour Lyric" in *Vox Intexta: Orality and Textuality in the Middle Ages*, ed. by A. N. Doane and Carol Braun Pasternack (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 137-61

Nichols, Stephen G. and Siegfried Wenzel, "Introduction", in *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*, ed. by Stephen

G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (n.p.: University of Michigan Press, 1996; repr. 1999), pp. 1-6

Oliver, Dennis, "Guillaume de Machaut: Art poétique/Art d'amour", *Substance*, 4 (1972), 45-50

Ong, Walter. J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London: Routledge, 1982)

The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, ed. by Elizabeth Knowles, *Oxford Reference Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004),
<http://www.oxfordreference.com>

Page, Christopher, "Machaut's 'Pupil' Deschamps on the Performance of Music: Voices or Instruments in the 14th-Century Chanson?", *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 484-91

Parrish, Carl, *The Notation of Medieval Music* (New York: Norton, 1959, repr. New York: Pendragon, 1978)

Parrot, Andrew, "Performing Machaut's Mass on Record" *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 492-95

Phillips, Helen, "Fortune and the Lady: Machaut, Chaucer and the Intertextual 'dit' " in *Fortune and Women in Medieval Literature*, ed. by Catherine Attwood, *Nottingham French Studies* 38:2 (Autumn 1999, special volume), 120-36

Phillips, Peter, "Beyond authenticity" in Tess Knighton and David Fallows, eds, *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music* (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 44-47

Plumley, Yolanda, "The marriage of words and music: *Musique naturelle* and *musique artificielle* in Machaut's 'Sans cuer, dolens' " in *Machaut's Music: New Interpretations*, ed. by Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 231-48

Poiron, Daniel, "Ecriture et ré-écriture au Moyen Age", *Littérature* 41 (1981), 109-18

—, *Le Poète et le Prince: L'évolution du lyrisme courtois de Guillaume de Machaut à Charles d'Orléans* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965)

Reaney, Gilbert, "Concerning the Origins of the Medieval Lai", *Music & Letters* 39:4 (1958), 343-46

—, "The Development of the *Rondeau*, *Virelai* and *Ballade* Forms from Adam de la Hale to Guillaume de Machaut" in *Festschrift Karl Gustav Fellerer*, ed. by Heinrich Hüschen (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1962), pp. 421-27

—, "The 'Lais' of Guillaume de Machaut and their Background" *Proceedings of the Royal Musicological Association* 82nd session (1955-1956), pp. 15-32

Riffaterre, Michael, "The Mind's Eye: Memory and Textuality", in *The New Medievalism*, eds Marina S. Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991), pp. 29-45

Roesner, Edward H., "The Emergence of *Musica Mensurabilis*" in *Studies in Musical Sources and Style: Essays in Honour of Jean LaRue*, ed. by Eugene K. Wolf and Edward H. Roesner (Madison: A-R Editions, 1990), pp. 41-74

Robinson, Anne Walters, *Guillaume de Machaut and Reims: Context and Meaning in his Musical Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

—, "The Mass of Guillaume de Machaut in the Cathedral of Reims" in *Plainsong in the Age of Polyphony*, ed. by Thomas Kelly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 100-39

Rosenstein, Roy, "Mouvance and the Editor as Scribe: *Transcittore Tradittore?*", *Romanic Review* 80 (1989), 157-71

Runte, Hans R., "The Scribe and Miniaturist as Reader" in *Essays in Early French Literature Presented to Barbara M. Craig*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy and Jerry C. Nash (York, SC: French Literature Publications, 1982), pp. 53-64

Salter, Elizabeth, and Derek Pearsall, "Pictorial Illustration of Late Medieval Poetic Texts: The Role of the Frontispiece or Prefatory Picture", in Flemming G. Andersen, Esther Nyhol, Marianne Powell, and Flemming Talbo Stubkjaer, eds, *Medieval Iconography and Narrative: A Symposium* (Odense: Odense Univeristy Press, 1980) pp. 100-103

Saulnier, Dom Daniel, "Le Verbe et la musique" in *La Place de la musique dans la culture médiévale: Actes du Colloque organisé à la Fondation Singer-Polignac le mercredi 25 octobre 2006*, ed. by Olivier Cullin (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 39-46

Schrade, Leo "Guillaume de Machaut and the *Roman de Fauvel*" in *Miscelánea en Homenaje a Monseñor Higinio Anglés* (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1958-1961), 843-50

Simpson, James R., *Fantasy, Identity and Misrecognition in Medieval French Narrative* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000)

Small, Christopher, "Musicking - A Means of Performing and Listening. A Lecture" *Music Education Research*, 1 (1999), 9-21

Smith, Robyn E., "Semantics, Structure or a Manner of Speaking?" in *Songs of the Dove and the Nightingale: Sacred and Secular Music c. 900 - c. 1600*, ed. by Greta Mary Hair and Robyn E. Smith (Sydney: Currency, 1994), pp. 124-44

Snyder, Bob, *Music and Memory: An Introduction* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2000)

Stevens, John, "The 'Music' of the Lyric: Machaut, Deschamps, Chaucer" in *Medieval and Pseudo-Medieval Literature*, ed. by Piero Boitani and Anna Torti (Tübingen and Cambridge: Gunter Narr Verlag and Brewer, 1984), pp. 109-29

—, *Words and Music in the Middle Ages: Song, Narrative, Dance and Drama, 1050-1350* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)

Stone, Anne, "Music Writing and Poetic Voice in Machaut: Some Remarks on B12 and R14" in *Machaut's Music: New Interpretations*, ed. by Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 125-38

—, "Self-Reflexive Songs and their Readers in the Late Fourteenth Century", *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 180-94

Strohm, Reinhard, "Unwritten and Written music" in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 228-33

Sturges, Robert S., *Medieval Interpretation: Models of Reading in Literary Narrative, 1100-1500* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991)

Switten, Margaret, *Music and Poetry in the Middle Ages: A Guide to Research on French and Occitan Song*, (New York: Garland, 1995)

—, "L'Œuvre poético-musicale de Machaut: Paroles sans musique ou de la musique avant toute chose?" in *Guillaume de Machaut 1300-2000 textes réunis par Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet et Nigel Wilkins* (Presses de L'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2002)

Teviotdale, Elizabeth C., "Music and pictures in the Middle Ages" in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 179-88

Tomlinson, Gary, *The Singing of the New World: Indigenous Voice in the Era of European Contact* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Travers, Emile, *Les Instruments de musique au XIVe siècle d'après Guillaume de Machaut* (Paris: Plon, 1882)

Treitler, Leo, *Music and the Historical Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989)

—, "Oral, Written, and Literate Process in the Transmission of Medieval Music", *Speculum*, 56 (1981), 471-91

—, "Regarding Meter and Rhythm in the 'Ars Antiqua' ", *The Musical Quarterly*, 65 (1979), 524-58

—, *With Voice and Pen: Coming to Know Medieval Song and how it was Made* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Tudor, Adrian P., "Preaching, Storytelling, and the Performance of Short Pious Narratives" in *Performing Medieval Narrative*, ed. by Evelyn Birge Vitz, Nancy Freeman Regalado and Marilyn Lawrence (Cambridge: Brewer, 2005), pp. 141-54

Turner, Bruno, "The Editor: Diplomat or Dictator?" in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), pp. 249-54

Vellard, Dominique, "La Messe de Machaut: Réflexions d'un interprète", *Analyse Musicale*, 34 (1999), 91-101

Verweij, Michiel, "Le Matérialité des manuscrits: Conséquences pour l'histoire et pour les éditions critiques" in *L'Écrit et le manuscrit à la fin*

du Moyen Âge, ed. by Tania van Hemelryck and C. van Hoorebeeck (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2005), pp. 367-76

Vitz, Evelyn Birge, "Erotic reading in the Middle Ages: Performance and re-performance of romance" in *Performing Medieval Narrative*, ed. by Evelyn Birge Vitz, Nancy Freeman Regalado, and Marilyn Lawrence (Cambridge: Brewer, 2005), pp. 73-88

—, *Medieval Narrative and Modern Narratology: Subjects and Objects of Desire* (New York and London: New York University Press, 1989)

—, "Variegated Performance of *Aucassin et Nicolette*" in *Cultural Performances in Medieval France: Essays in Honour of Nancy Freeman Regalado*, ed. by Eglal Doss-Quinby, Roberta L. Kreuger and E. Jane Burns (Cambridge: Brewer, 2007), pp. 235-46

Walters, Lori, "Le Rôle du scribe dans l'organisation des manuscrits des romans de Chrétien de Troyes", *Romania*, 106 (1985), 303-25

Wathey, Andrew, "Auctoritas and the Motets of Philippe de Vitry" in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, ed. by Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 67-78

Wilkins, Nigel, "A Pattern of Patronage: Machaut, Froissart and the Houses of Luxembourg and Bohemia in the Fourteenth Century", *French Studies*, 37 (1983), 257-84

—, *The Lyric Art of Medieval France* (Cambridge: New Press, 1988)

—, "Music and Poetry at Court: England and France in the Late Middle Ages" in *English Court Culture in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by V. J. Scattergood and J. W. Sherborne (London: Duckworth, 1983), pp. 183-204

Williams, Sarah Jane, "The Lady, the Lyrics and the Letters", *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 462-68

Wimsatt, James I., "Chaucer and Deschamps' 'Natural Music' " in *The Union of Words and Music in Medieval Poetry*, ed. by Rebecca A. Balzer, Thomas Cable, and James I. Wimsatt (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), pp. 131-50

—, *Chaucer and his French Contemporaries: Natural Music in the Fourteenth Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991, repr. 1993)

Wimsatt, James I., and William M. Kibler, editorial commentary in de Machaut, Guillaume, *Le Jugement du Roy de Behaigne and Remede de Fortune*, ed. and trans. by James I. Wimsatt and William M. Kibler (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988)

Zumthor, Paul, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris: Seuil; 1972)

—, "Intertextualité et mouvance", *Littérature* 41 (1981), 8-16

—, *La Poésie et la voix dans la civilisation médiévale* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984)

—, "Litteratus/Illitteratus: Remarques sur le contexte vocal de l'écriture médiévale", *Romania*, 106 (1985), 1-18

—, *Toward a Medieval Poetics*, trans. by Philip Bennett (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992)

Appendix 1

Manuscript Details

The purpose of this appendix is to provide a brief overview of the extant manuscripts that contain several works by Guillaume de Machaut. Of these, only the "complete-works" volumes are considered in the thesis. These manuscripts are listed first, with summaries of their contents. The fragmentary manuscript *W*, with its contents, follows, then there are brief notes on manuscripts that are text-only and that include works by other authors. Within each section, the manuscripts are listed in approximate chronological order. For more information on all of the sources, including manuscripts which contain few works by Machaut, see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, chapter 3.

"Complete-works" manuscripts

(C) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1586
Parchment, 29.9 x 22 cm. Early-mid 1350s. 107 miniatures. Decorated in Paris. It was perhaps destined for Bonne of Luxembourg and after her death finished for her husband king Jean II.

Contents: *Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne*, *Remede de Fortune*, *Le Dit de l'alerion*, *Le Dit du vergier*, *Le Dit du lyon*, *La Louange des dames* (198 texts), 23 *virelais* (3 without music), 16 *ballades*, 9 *lays* (2 without music), 8 *ballades*, 6 *lays* (4 without music), 5 *virelais*, 9 *rondeaux*, 19 *motets*.

(A) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1584
Parchment, 31 x 22 cm. Early 1370s. 154 miniatures. First two miniatures from the Prologue produced in Paris, the rest of the manuscript produced elsewhere (perhaps Reims). There is a contemporary index with the rubric "Vesci l'ordenance que G. de Machau vuet qu'il ait en son livre" ("Here is the order which G. de Machau wants his book to have").

Contents: Index, Prologue, *Le Dit du vergier*, *Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne*, *Le Jugement du roi de Navarre*, *Remede de Fortune*, *Le Dit du Lyon*, *Le Dit de l'alerion*, *Le Confort d'ami*, *Le Dit de la fonteinne*, *Le Dit de la harpe*, *La Louange des dames* (268 texts), *Le Dit de la marguerite*, *Complaintes*, *Le Voir Dit*, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, *Le Dit de la rose*, *Vesci les biens*, 22 lays (6 without music), 23 motets, the Mass, *Hoquetus David*, 37 ballades, 19 rondeaux, 38 virelais (6 without music).

(Vg) Cambridge, Parker Library, Corpus Christi College (on long-term loan from a private owner), Codex Vogüé
Parchment, 32 x 22 cm. Early 1370s. 117 miniatures. May have connections to the house of Navarre.

Contents: *La Louange des dames*, *Complaintes*, *Le Dit du vergier*, *Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne*, *Le Jugement du roi de Navarre*, *Le Lay de Plour*, *Remede de Fortune*, *Le Dit du Lyon*, *Le Dit de l'alerion*, *Le Confort d'ami*, *Le Dit de la fonteinne*, *Le Dit de la harpe*, 18 lays, 23 motets, the Mass, 36 ballades, 14 rondeaux, 29 virelais (3 without music), 1 ballade (without music), 3 virelais without music, *Hoquetus David*, 1 virelai, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*.

(B) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1585
Paper, 29 x 21 cm. Early 1370s. No miniatures. Mostly copied from Vg, except for the *Prise* which was copied into Vg from B.

Contents: *La Louange des dames*, *Complaintes*, *Le Dit du vergier*, *Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne*, *Le Jugement du roi de Navarre*, *Le Lay de Plour*, *Remede de Fortune*, *Le Dit du Lyon*, *Le Dit de l'alerion*, *Le Confort d'ami*, *Le Dit de la fonteinne*, *Le Dit de la harpe*, 18 lays, 23 motets, the Mass, 27 ballades, 3 rondeaux (1 without music), 9 ballades, 14 rondeaux, 28 virelais (3 without music), 1 ballade (without music), 3 virelais without music, *Hoquetus David* (incomplete), *La Prise d'Alexandrie*.

(E) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 9221
Parchment, 41 x 30 cm. Early 1390s. 38 miniatures. Copied for Jean, duke of Berry.

Contents: Index, Prologue (4 ballades only), *La Louange des dames* (237 texts), *Complaintes*, *Rondeaux* (without music), *Le Dit du vergier*, *Remede de Fortune* (called *L'Ecu Bleu*), *Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne*, *Le Jugement du roi de Navarre*, *Le Lay de plour*, *Le Dit du Lyon*, *Le Dit de l'alerion* (called *Dit des .iiii. oysiaux*), *Le Dit de la fonteinne* (called *Le Livre Morpheus*), *Le Confort d'ami*, *Le Dit de la harpe*, 19 lays (5 without music), 22 motets, 19 *rondeaux* (1 without music), 35 *ballades*, 29 *virelais* (3 without music), the Mass, *Le Voir Dit* (with music), 2 lays (repeated), 1 *rondeau*, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*.

(F-G) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français
22545-22546

Parchment, 36 x 26 cm, 2 volumes. Early 1390s. 148 miniatures. A coat of arms is visible in many miniatures, but it remains unidentified.

Contents (F): Prologue, *Le Dit du vergier*, *Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne*, *Le Jugement du roi de Navarre*, *Remede de Fortune*, *Le Dit du lyon*, *Le Dit de l'alerion*, *Le Confort d'ami*, *Le Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse*, *Le Dit de la harpe*, *Le Voir Dit*, *Le Dit de la marguerite*, *Le Dit de la rose*, *Vesci les biens*.

Contents (G): *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, *La Louange des dames* (225 texts), *Complaintes*, *Lis et Marguerite*, 21 lays (6 without music), 23 motets, the Mass, 39 *ballades*, 21 *rondeaux* (1 without music), 38 *virelais* (6 without music), *Hoquetus David*.

Possible "complete-works" manuscript

(W) Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 5010 C

Parchment, 29 x 19 cm, fragmentary. Mid 1350s. Illuminations missing.

Contents (all fragmentary): *La Louange des dames*, *Le Jugement du roi de Behaigne*, *Le Dit du vergier*, *Remede de Fortune*, *Le Dit de l'alerion*, lays (without music), 1 motet (with music).

Text-only manuscripts

(M) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 843
Parchment, 33 x 23 cm. c. 1400 (probably a copy of a manuscript from the late 1360s). No miniatures.

(D) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 1587
Parchment, 26 x 19 cm. c. 1430. 12 miniatures.

Manuscripts principally of Machaut but also containing works by other authors

(K) Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 218
Parchment, 30 x 21 cm. Dated 1371. 13 miniatures. Contains music.

(J) Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 5203
Parchment, 29 x 21 cm. Dated 1371. Patron: Robert d'Alençon, count of Perche.
35 miniatures (of which 24 illuminate works of Machaut). Space left for music but none entered.

(H) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 881
Parchment, 31 x 24 cm. c. 1400. Patron: Jean Martel. Space left for 1 miniature.

(Pm) New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M.396
Parchment, 33 x 25 cm. Late 1420s. Works by Machaut perhaps copied from manuscript A. 123 miniatures (of which 113 illuminate works of Machaut and are similar to those in manuscript A).

Appendix 2

Anagrams

The Remede de Fortune

The anagram directions (transcribed from manuscript C, fol. 58):

Mais en la fin de ce traitié
 Que j'ay compilé et traitié
 Weil mon non et mon seurnom mettre
 Sans sillabe oublier ne lettre
 Et cilz qui savoir le vourra
 De legier savoir le porra
 Car le quart ver ci com je fin,
 Commencement moyen et fin
 Est de mon nom qui tous entiers
 Y est sans faillir quart ne tiers
 Mais il ne couvient adjouster
 En ce quart ver lettre n'oster
 Car riens y adjousteroit
 Mon non jamais ni trouveroit
 Qu'il ni eust ou plus ou moins

[I wish to put my name and surname at the end of this treatise which I have compiled and treated, not omitting a syllable or letter. And anyone who wants to know it can easily do so, for the fourth line from the end contains the beginning, middle and end of my name in its absolute entirety. But no letter in this fourth line must be changed or erased, for if anything were changed, no trace of my name would ever be found.]³¹⁰

The anagram passage (transcribed from manuscript C, fol. 58v), highlighted in italics:

Mon cuer si doucement resjoie
 Qu'en grant se[n]te et en grant joie
Li change mal u tu me dis
 Que pris en gre sera mes dis
 Or doit diex quen bon gre le prengne
 Et qu'en li servant ne mesprengne

[My heart is so sweetly glad that its great health and great joy are unalloyed *and changed from sorrow when you tell me* that my composition will be welcome. Now may God grant that she [my lady] will like it and that in her service I make no mistake.]

Possible "solution": "GUILLAUME DE MACHT ISN"

³¹⁰ The transcriptions, translations, and solutions given here are all my own unless otherwise stated.

The Voir Dit

The anagram passage and directions in manuscripts A (fol. 306) and F-G (fol. 198-198v). The transcription is based on A. Variants in F-G are shown in bold after a slash (/); variant spellings (which are not included in the variant totals discussed in Chapter 5) are shown within bold parentheses. The anagram passage is highlighted in italics both in the transcription and the translation:

Or est raison que je vous die
 Le nom de ma dame jolie
 Et le mien qui ay (ai) fait ce dit
 Que l'en appelle le voir dit
 Et s'au / **se au** savoir volés entendre
 En la fin de ce livre prendre
 Vous couvenra le ver .IX^e.
 Et puis .VIII. lettres de l'uitisme
 Qui sont droit au commencement (**commencement**)
 La verrés nos noms clerement
 Vesci comment je les enseigne (**enseigne**)
 Il me plaist bien que chascuns teinge (**taigne**)
 Que j'aim si fort sans repentir
 Ma chiere dame, et sans mentir
 Que je ne desire par m'ame
Pour le changier nulle autre fame
Ma dame le savra de vray
 Qu'autre dame jamais n'avray (**n'avrai**)
 Ains seray siens (**sien**) jusque a / **jusqu'a** la fin
 Et après ma mort de cuer fin
 La servira mes esperis
 Or doint dieus qu'il ne soit peris
 Pour li tant prier qu'il appelle
 Son ame en gloire toute belle.
 Amen.
 Explicit le livre dou (**du**) voir dit.

[I tell you truly that you will find the name of my fair lady, and mine who wrote this dit known as the *Voir Dit*, and if you want to know and decode them, you will need to take the ninth line from the end of the book and then eight letters from the eighth which are at the very beginning. There you will see our names clearly for that is where I have signposted them and it pleases me well that everyone should appreciate that I love my dear lady well and without regret, as without lying, by my soul I would not desire *to change her for any other woman*; my lady will know *this* to be true. I will never have another lady and I will be hers until the end, and after my death my spirit will serve her with a pure heart. Now God grant that it may not have perished as a result of making such impassioned prayers to her whom it hails as its glorious and

all-beautiful (Toute Belle) soul-mate. Amen. Here ends the book of the True Tale.]

Possible "solutions":

(1.) Proposed by Paulin Paris: "Guillaume de Machau, Peronelle d'Armantiere". In order to arrive at this, however, Paris must have had to change the "f" of "fame" to "d" for "dame", and added an extra "e" in the solution.

(2.) Proposed by Paul Imbs: "Guillaume de Machaut amera fille Perronne".

(3.) Proposed by Jacqueline Cerquiglioni-Toulet: "Guillaume de Machaut, Perronne fille a amer".³¹¹

The anagram passage and directions in manuscript *E* (transcribed from fol. 210). Variants are shown in bold in both the transcription and translation, and variant spellings (which are not included in the variant totals discussed in Chapter 5) are shown within bold parentheses in the transcription. The anagram passage is highlighted in italics:

Or est raison que je vous die
 Le nom de ma dame jolie
 Et le mien qui **a** fait ce dit
 Que l'en appelle le voir dit
 Et **se** au savoir (**voulés**) entendre
 En la fin de ce livre prendre
 Vous (**couvendra**) le ver .IX^e.
 Et **une** lettre de (**l'uittiesme**)
 Qui **est** droit au **commencement**
 La verrés **vos** noms clerement
 (**Vescy**) comment je les enseigne
 Il me plaist bien que (**chascun**) (**tieinge**)
 Que j'aim si fort sans repentir
 Ma chiere dame et sans mentir
 Que je ne desire par m'ame
*Pour le changier nulle autre **femme***
 Ma dame le savra de vray
 Qu'autre dame jamais n'avray
 Ains seray (**sien**) (**jusques**) **en** la fin
 Et après ma mort de cuer fin
 La servira mes esperis
 Or doint dieus qu'il ne soit **pis**
 Pour li tant prier qu'il appelle

³¹¹ All cited in Cerquiglioni-Toulet, "*Un Engin si subtil*", pp. 233-239. For a full bibliography relating to the anagram in the *Voir Dit* in manuscripts *A* and *F-G* see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, p. 227.

Son ame en gloire toute belle.
Amen [not present]
 Explicit le livre (du) voir dit.

[I tell you truly that you will find the name of my fair lady, and mine who wrote this dit known as the *Voir Dit*, and if you want to know and decode them, you will need to take the ninth line from the end of the book and then **one letter** from the eighth which **is** at the very beginning. There you will see **your names** clearly for that is where I have signposted them; and it pleases me well that everyone should appreciate that I love my dear lady well and without regret, as without lying, by my soul I would not desire *to change her for any other woman*; my lady will know this to be true. I will never have another lady but I will be hers until the end, and after my death my spirit will serve her with a pure heart. Now God grant that it may not have perished as a result of making such impassioned prayers to her whom it hails as its glorious and all-beautiful (Toute Belle) soul-mate. Here ends the book of the True Tale.]

Possible "solution": "GUILLAUME DE MACHUT PERRONNE LIRE FEM"

Other works by Machaut which contain anagrams

Le Dit de l'alerion: numerical signature "Guillemins de Machaut".

Le Confort d'ami: anagram, "Guillaume de Machaut Charles roi de Navarre".

Le Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse: anagram, "Guillaume de Machaut Jeans duc Berry et Overgne".

Le Dit de la harpe: anagram, solution unknown.

La Prise d'Alexandrie: anagram, "Guillaume de Machaut Pierre roi de Chipre e de Iherusalem". Author also named outright within narrative.

Le Jugement dou Roy de Navarre contains no anagram but names the author outright within the narrative.³¹²

³¹² Anagram solutions and summaries taken from Cerquiglini-Toulet, "*Un Engin si subtil*", pp. 233-239, and the entries for each literary work in Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, chapter 5.