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The *Roman de Fauvel* which survives today in no less than thirteen manuscripts, has long been celebrated as an important literary, visual and musical document of the early fourteenth century.\(^1\) One version of the text in F-Pn 146 (hereafter referred to as fr. 146) has attracted attention due to its numerous notated musical *addicions* ("additions") by a certain individual "Mesire Chailllou de Pesstain." The poem comprises of two halves (Books I and II), probably written by Gervais de Bus ("Gervès de Bus" in some modern editions),\(^2\) a royal notary (*notaire*) of the Northern French Capetian court who served between 1313 and c.1345. While Gervais’ version (most likely completed in 1314) contains 3280 octasyllabic lines of poetry in rhyming couplets,\(^3\) *Fauvel* in fr. 146 expands Gervais’ text by nearly 2877 lines,\(^4\) as well as interpolating some 169 notated musical items and numerous lavishly illuminated miniatures. Today, fr. 146 is the only surviving version of the *Roman de Fauvel* to contain musical interpolations.

---

4 Dillon, following Långfors, counts 1808 as the number of additional lines of poetry in the interpolated *Fauvel*. However, Långfors’ edition did not include all of the textual “addicions;” a further 1069 lines of omitted text in Långfors was published by Emily Dhank in *L’Hérésie de Fauvel* (Leipzinger romanistische Studien, Literaturwissenschaftliche Reihe, 4: Leipzig & Paris, 1935). See Dillon, *Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel*, 19.
and has since been regarded as a crucial compilation of repertory, as well as a
historical evicence for musical innovations in the early fourteenth century.
Furthermore, a selection of motets within fr. 146 are important exemplars of the
burgeoning *Ars Nova*, which saw the maturation of the late-medieval polyphonic
motet (discussed in chapter 3), and a more nuanced, “moderenized” system of
mensural notation for the older *grand chant courtois* tradition of the trouvères.

Gervais’ textual work narrates the tale of a lowly stable horse Fauvel who,
under the blind auspices of Lady Fortune (*Dame Fortune*), rises in power and
influence to become the king of France. Fauvel, the ultimate symbol of evil and
worldly vices, is described in Book I as the (mock) etymological composite and
literary manifestation of six vices (the emphases in bold are mine):

\begin{verbatim}
Ausi par ethimologie
Pues savoir ce qu’il senefie
Fauve lest de Faus et de vel [=voile]
Compost, quer il a son revel
Assis sus faisseté velee
Et sus tricherie meslee
Flaterie si sien derrive
Qui de nul bien n’a fons ne rive
De Fauvel descent Flaterie
Qui du monde a seignorie
Et puis en descent Avarice
Qui de torchier Fauvel n’est nice
Vilanie et Variété
Et puis Envie et Lascheté
Ces siex dames qui j’ai nommeees
Sont par fauvel signifiee:
Se ton entendement veus mestre
Pren un mot de cescune lettre
\end{verbatim}

5 This was, in no small way, catalysed by Leo Schrade’s 1950 attribution of nine *Fauvel* motets to
the famed *Ars Nova* composer Philippe de Vitry, though more recent scholarship has contested the
validity of this attribution. See Leo Schrade, “Philippe de Vitry: Some New Discoveries,” in
*Musical Quarterly* XLII (1956), 330-54; also see Edward H. Rosener, François Avril and Nancy
Freeman Regalado, *Le Roman de Fauvel in the edition of Mesire Chaillou de Pesstain: A
reproduction in facsimile of the complete manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fronds
Français 146* (New York, 1990), 40.

6 Christopher Page, “Tradition and Innovation in BN fr. 146: The Background to the Ballades,” in
*Fauvel Studies*, 353-94.

Fauvel the horse is both Faus-vel (false-veil) and the acrostic product of Flattery (Flaterie), Avarice, Villany (Vilanie), Variability (Variété), Envy (Envie) and Lechery (Lascheté), representing the allegorical embodiment of pure beastly evil. In addition, Fauvel’s colour brings a further symbolic dimension to the work, his reddish-brown “fauve” shade representing the colour of Vanity, as well as that of evil and deceit. In the Roman de Fauvel, Fauvel’s absurd ascension to kingship further reflects a world turned on its head, where the evil are permitted to reign and the good put to plightful suffering. A cynical fin-de-siècle tone of social, moral and historical degradation permeates the work’s microcosm in which the logic of reversal stands as the (fictive) norm: a power-hungry horse wields a sceptre over humanity, while man crawls on the earth like a beast. Greedy to extend the girth of his newfound empire, Fauvel proposes to Lady Fortune, who rejects his suite and offers him the hand of her sister Vain Glory instead. The deceitful pair consummate their nuptial celebrations, birthing an army of miniature “fauveaux nouveaux” (“new fauvlets”), which populate and terrorize the rest of France.

Taking Gervais’ grisly description of Fauvel as my starting point, this thesis considers the relation between themes of “beastliness” in Gervais’ and Chaillou’s Fauvel and “beastliness” in Chaillou’s interpolated items themselves, with special emphasis on music and its interactions with text and image. More specifically, I analyze how late medieval ontologies of “beastliness” inform the

---

8 Ibid., vv 178-224, 10-1.
10 Långfors, Le Roman de Fauvel, vv 11-12, 4.
11 Ibid., vv 337-9, 15.
12 Ibid., vv 1977-2108, 74-5.
13 Ibid., vv 3157-84, 113.
14 Ibid., vv 3220-4, 115-6.
representation of Fauvel in fr. 146, as well as acts of musical representation in the manuscript through considering its epistemological significance as both visual sign and sonorous object. By attempting to show how “beastliness” affects the signification of music in the Roman de Fauvel and, inversely, how certain musical insertions contribute to an aesthetic of Fauvelian “beastliness,” I hope to broaden our appreciation of Fauvel’s ingenious beastly aesthetics, and its capacity to inform musical ontologies of the later Middle Ages.

**Fauvel and Authorship**

There is a complicated history to the authorial attribution of the Roman de Fauvel. Currently, it is still not possible to conclude with full certainty the author(s) of the poem or the compilers of fr. 146 due to its esoteric and veiled nature. Like an intricate literary puzzle, Fauvel camouflages the identities of its producers even as it obscures its satirical targets through the use of ambiguous symbols and allegories, perhaps legible only to readers “in the know” who could conceivably fathom its hidden meanings. It is with great difficulty that historians speculate the identities of Gervais or Chaillou, the former’s attribution to Book II of the Roman de Fauvel seemingly affirmed by “mesire Chaillou de Pesstain’s” reworking of Gervais’ epilogue in fr. 146. Notably this episode of “literary-
takeover” (presumably modelled after Guillaume de Lorris’ and Jean de Meun’s *Roman de la Rose*) on folio 23v, is the only instance where Gervais and Chaillou are mentioned in close proximity of one another, and the only textual attribution linking “mesire Chaillou de Pesstain” with fr. 146 (see fig i).\(^{18}\)

Fig. i. Literary-takeover, detail of fo. 23v, (Photo: Wesleyan University Special Collections).

---

17 The superscript “v” indicates the “verso” face of the bifolio (that is, the left-hand face-up side in the double-page book format, or the “back” side of a folio). Correspondingly, superscript “r” will indicate the “recto” (right) side of the bifolio.

18 Two clues to the authorial provenance of *Le Roman de Fauvel* (as the original textual work) found on this folio point to Gervais de Bus: despite the absence of illuminated capitals, a scribal prompt “g” can be seen to the left-side of the first capital indentation, most likely a cue provided by one scribe to the illuminator to furnish the empty space with the indicated, ornamented capital. Secondly, <g> is identified as a clerkly subject in service to the French King. Gervais, as already noted, had undertaken notary duties in 1313 under the authority of Philip IV. In addition, research undertaken by Andrew Wathey has recast Gervais’ role in a larger community of political players, serving as private secretary to both Michel de Maucondit (canon of Rouen) and Philippe Le Convers (alias de Villepreaux, godson and personal favourite of Philip IV) – both royal councillors to the king. The positioning of Gervais within intimate political circles of the court could have indicated his clerky importance within the French monarchy, also suggesting a deep familiarity to the courtly goings-on explicitly satirized in *Le Roman de Fauvel*. See Andrew Wathey, “Gervès de Bus, the *Roman de Fauvel*, and the Politics of the Later Capetian Court,” in *Fauvel Studies*, 602.
<g>  a clerk of the French King, with the words he has invented in this book which he has composed, has well and clearly demonstrated his quick wit, his mental alacrity; for he speaks very appropriately: do not look for lies in this book. God save it/him! Amen.

Hereafter follow the additions that messire Chaillou de Pesstain has put in this book, not counting the musical pieces found above.20

Apart from the authorial handover paragraph detailed above, nothing else is mentioned of “messire Chaillou de Pesstain,” whose identity still remains a mystery despite numerous efforts, past and present, to unmask this medieval enigma.21 Nonetheless, musicologists largely agree that the Roman de Fauvel in fr. 146 was most likely completed no later than 1317, based on the manuscript’s

---

21 Numerous attempts to identify Chaillou have been made by scholars over the years; Leo Schrade, following Langlois, identified Chaillou de Pesstain as Raoul Chaillou, chevalier and member of a family which frequented the late Capetian court. See Langlois, La vie en France au Moyen Age, and Schrade, Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century; The Roman de Fauvel; The Works of Philippe de Vitry; French Cycles of the Ordinarium Missae: Commentary to Volume I(Monaco: Editions de l’Oiseau-Lyre, 1956), 19. The most recent attempt to identify Chaillou has been made by Élisabeth Lalou, suggesting that Chaillou could have referred to Geoffroy Engelor (who signed himself as “Chalop”), a royal notaire of the Capetian court who served from 1303 to 1334, signing to a large number of political acts from c. 1307. See Élisabeth Lalou, “La Chancellerie royale à la fin du règne de Philippe IV le bel,” in Fauvel Studies, 307-20. Engelor’s close links to the court of Charles de Valois and his clients after 1314 places him as a likely candidate: it is possible that “Chaillou” (Geoffroy?) and Gervais were well acquainted with each other, or had even collaborated on the compilation of fr. 146 together. Even if the true identity of Chaillou may never be unveiled with indisputable certainty, it is very likely that fr. 146 originated from the circle of count Charles de Valois, Philip IV Le Bel’s brother, further supported by a highly (and unusually) favourable review of Charles de Valois in the Chronique Métrique (Metrical Chronicle) bound within the same volume. See Jean Claude Mühlethaler, Fauvel au pouvoir: lire la satire médiévale (Paris: Nuovelle Bibliothèque du Moyen Âge 24, 1994), and Bent & Wathey, “Introduction,” in Fauvel Studies, 14. In Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel, Dillon identifies Chaillou as scribe C/E, who partook in the physical making of fr. 146.
other numerous contents,\textsuperscript{22} as well as datable, musical concordances between items in the \textit{Roman de Fauvel} and other manuscript musical repositories.\textsuperscript{23}

The “Bestorné” Aesthetics of Fauvel

At first glance, Chaillou’s interpolated \textit{Roman de Fauvel} strikes us as elaborately ornate. “Excessive” is Emma Dillon’s word of choice to describe a sense of ordered chaos that sprawls over the folios:\textsuperscript{24} text, image and notated music jostle for the reader’s attention at every turn of the page, shuttling between a two and three columnar scribal layout (henceforth indicated from left to right as columns a, b and c) and other unconventional \textit{mise-en-page} formats. Like the hybridized half-human, half-horse Fauvel, the \textit{Roman} is a luxurious \textit{Gesamtkunstwerk} hybrid of text, image and music, instantly appealing to a deluxe, ocular aesthetic.\textsuperscript{25} Instead of any single dominating page structure, the arrangements of its visual elements seem to shift restlessly across successive folios, parodying – even \textit{reproducing} – the topsy-turvy universe of Fauvel in

\textsuperscript{22} The \textit{Chronique Métrique} also bound within the same volume has been used as point of reference with regards to the dating of fr. 146. Formerly attributed to Geffroy de Paris who authored several well-known Latin \textit{dits}, the poem describes actual events in France between 1313 and 1316, suggesting that the final bound state of fr. 146 had to be compiled after 1316. See Armel Diverrès, \textit{La Chronique métrique attribuée à Geoffroy de Paris} (Strasbourg : Faculté des lettres de l'université, 1956). It must be noted that this hypothesis does not necessarily imply that Chaillou’s interpolated \textit{Roman de Fauvel} was completed at the same time as the \textit{Chronique Métrique}. This simply means that Chaillou’s Fauvel could not have been copied later than the latest indicated event recorded in the contents of fr. 146.

\textsuperscript{23} Certain musical items in the interpolated \textit{Fauvel} also confirm a later date of completion than that of Gervais’s text. A reference to “Philippe qui regne ores” could not have been introduced before the coronation of Philip V at Reims on 9 January 1317. The motet found in fr. 146, \textit{O Philippe prelustris francorum}, likewise bears testimony to Philip V’s reign, while the expanded tournament section of Chaillou’s text describes the shield of the Virtues as bearing the date 1316. Given that the French year of 1316 extended from April 1316 to April 1317, there is strong evidence for 1317 as a historical \textit{terminus} for the compilation of fr. 146, while serving as a working chronological limit for its contents. See Bent & Wathey, “Introduction,” in \textit{Fauvel Studies}, 16.

\textsuperscript{24} Dillon, \textit{Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel}, 7.

which, much to the chagrin of its author, chaos usurps stability, beast (horse) rules man, men become beasts.

Aside from the literary, “inverted” (“bestorné”) quality of Fauvel’s world,26 musicologists have expressed increasing interest in the “fauvelization” of Chaillou’s musical “addicions,” noting how some of these items exhibit queer, strange atypical behaviours as if paralleling a Fauvelian universe turned on its head. Susan Rankin’s work on chant snippets in Fauvel reveal that numerous pieces were newly-composed amidst older, more familiar liturgical works, blurring the line between “legitimate” chant (traceable to extant repertory) and “illegitimate” mimetic works (probably composed for fr. 146).27 These distinctions may now be unperceivable to the modern unacculturated ear, but may have creatively signalled an aural or visual shift in perceptual registers to contemporary readers/listeners encountering the items in the Roman. Like “Fauvel,” such pseudo-chant types hide under the guise of chant-species and parade as legitimate liturgical works, its veil of “falsity” only lifted and exposed by those with intimate knowledge of traditional chant repertory.

The identity of the refrain-genre, as pointed out by Ardis Butterfield, is likewise placed under pressure through cycles of citations in fr. 146, as the nature of melodic refrain citations “mutate” by being enveloped in different host

26 “Mès or est du tout bestorné/Ce que Diex avoit atourné,/Que hommes sont devenus bestes.” (My emphasis). Långfors, Le Roman de Fauvel, vv 335-7, 15.
genres. Numerous other refrains with musical concordances in other contemporaneous sources are “Fauvelized” in fr. 146, with words altered to match the themes posed by the central narrative. While cases of textual reworking have been noted by scholars in genres such as the contrafacta, the sheer degree of “Fauvelization” in fr. 146 is staggering, affecting chant genre-types, secular chansons and even motets. Given the unpredictability and fluctuation(s) of musical ontology in fr. 146, its strange “reworkings” and mobile musical types which seem to exist between genres, Chaillou’s Roman de Fauvel seems to musically “perform” the fluid, bestial hybridity of Fauvel himself. In and through corruptive acts of “Fauvelization,” the Roman appears to fashion an aesthetic of “beastliness” which figuratively and literally invades the manuscript’s interpolated items.

A fuller understanding of Fauvel’s beastly, “bestorné” figuration in the book (and therefore its musical items), however, cannot be fully appreciated without taking into full account the complexities of late medieval ontologies of “beastliness.” Such work has already been undertaken by musicologists such as Elizabeth Eva Leach, who combine intellectual history and medieval music theory to expose and interrogate the marginal place of the nonhuman Other in figuring “human” music. By considering Fauvel’s place amongst other discourses of the

---

30 This theme will be expanded in chapter 2.
31 Elizabeth Eva Leach does this with great panache in Sung Birds: Music, Nature, and Poetry in the Later Middle Ages (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007). Non-musicological studies in medieval “beastliness” include Jeffrey J. Cohen’s numerous works on medieval beasts and monsters such as Medieval Identity Machines (Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota
“beast,” I believe we may come to a more nuanced comprehension of how and why certain musical “addictions” are “Fauvelized,” as well as to consider how the Roman de Fauvel, as an intriguing unica (unique example), responds to such discourses by articulating its own particular “aesthetic” of beastliness. To do so is to construe the Roman de Fauvel as a discursive cross-junction where concepts of music and beastliness intersect, while recognizing Fauvel as an important contributor (hence, interpretation) of “beastliness” in its fascinating, multiple manifestations.

“Beastliness” in the Later Middle Ages

The “beast” as a figuration of the nonhuman Other has been long noted by literary scholars, appearing frequently in Bestiaries, literary works and the genre of the Beast Epic. In such works, beasts commonly figured as metaphorical tropes or exemplars serving moralizing purposes. In addition, theological and
philosophical constructions of the “beast” often marked its difference from humans by underscoring the latter’s exclusive access to and exercise of reason and, consequently, self-discipline over the body’s instinctual, sensuous drives. Animals and nonhuman creatures were thought to be utterly devoid of rationality, operating by instinct or sensory faculties which substituted as centers of cognition. Navigating the world purely through their five senses, beasts were thought to be in closer proximity to the realm of the “body” and the senses than humans, who were able to use reason and rationality to overcome their baser corporeal desires. However, since all humans, as rational animals, were susceptible to the same “animal” appetites as that of beasts, the exercise of reason was the only guarantee of their transcendence over bodily “beastly” existence. Correspondingly, neglecting the faculties of reasoned judgment was akin to forfeiting one’s humanness and embracing a base, “beastly” existence ruled by the senses and the body, instead of exercising one’s God-given capacity for rational thought.

34 This theme has been explored with great success by Judith A. Peraino, who analyses the ways in which the disciplining of sexuality and musical discourse often corroborate. See “Listening to the Sirens: Music as Queer Ethical Practice,” in GLQ, Vol. 9, No. 4 (2003), 433-70, and Listening to the Sirens: Musical Technologies of Queer Identity from Homer to Hedwig (Berkeley & London: University of California Press, 2005).


37 As Joyce E. Salisbury points out, metaphors for beastliness were strongly linked to uncontrollable sexual urges and prurient desires. It was thought that animals copulated noisily and were more lustful because they lacked the discipline of rationality and reason. Salisbury, The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages (New York & London: Routledge, 1994), 77-101.

38 Medieval “theories” of the inner sensory organs through thinkers such as Avicenna, Anglicus and Aquinas were understood to be shared by humans and animals alike; only humans could intellectually abstract Universals from sensed Particulars through the mind, a faculty which was not associated with any “fleshy” organ, but was thought to be of divine provenance. See Simon Kemp and Garth J. O. Fletcher, “The Medieval Theory of the Inner Senses,” in The American Journal of Psychology, Vol. 106, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), 559-76.
The symbol of the horse as a proximate metaphor of carnality also surfaces in the sermons of the Dominican preacher and theologian Guillaume de Sauqueville, active in Paris during the first decades of the fourteenth century:

\[ \text{Aliquando puer ponitur super equum et licet deberet eum regere, hoc sentiens equas eum regit et proicit in lutum. Sic frequenter qui deberent alios regere per alios reguntur; ideo totum precipitator. Per equum caro assignatur, per puerum inferior racio; et quando illa est sola super carnalitatem, accipit frenum cum dentibus et precipitator racio inferior, quia non potest bene regere sola sine racione superiori.} \]

Sometimes a boy is set on a horse, and although he should rule him, the horse, feeling this, rules him and throws him in the mud. So frequently those who should rule others are themselves ruled by others, and so all is cast down. By the horse is signified the flesh, by the boy inferior reason; and when that [reason] is alone over carnality, it takes the rein in its teeth and inferior reason is cast down, since it cannot rule well alone, without superior reason.\(^{39}\)

Sauqueville’s sermon explicitly connects the image of equine domestication with the disciplining (suppression) of the body’s carnal desires. Through the exercise of reason, humans rise above beastly existence, becoming masters of their own corporeal fallibilities. In contrast, Fauvel’s grisly universe inverts the logic of Sauqueville’s sermon. Carnality usurps human rationality from its rightful estate in a double act of “beastly” metamorphosis: Fauvel’s “transformation” from horse to humanlike ruler mirrors the inverse, degenerative, metaphorical “transformation” of man to beast. This figural connection is made explicit by Gervais in a passage which neatly summarizes Sauqueville’s themes:

\[ \text{Pour ce di je certinement} \\
\text{Qu’ommes sont bestes rëaument} \\
\text{Quant il vivent bestïaument;} \\
\text{Et pour ce par droit pouon dire} \\
\text{Que Fauvel est du monde sire,} \\
\text{Que il est par tout honorés} \\
\text{Et com Dieu en terre aorés.} \\
\text{Raison a perdu roiauté} \\
\text{Quant nous voion bestïautei} \\
\text{Sus les hommes si haut assise} \\
\text{Et resons est au dessous mise.}^{40} \]


\(^{40}\) Långfors, Le Roman de Fauvel, vv 346-56, 16.
That is why I firmly declare that men are in reality beasts when they live in beastly fashion; that is also why we can rightly say that Fauvel rules the world, for honour has shown him everywhere and he is worshipped like God on earth. Reason has lost sovereignty when we see beastliness set so high above mankind and reason laid so low.\footnote{Translation by Rankin, “The Divine Truth of Scripture,” 206-7.}

For medieval music theorists, sensory danger was not merely confined to the desires of the body, but pervaded the entire realm of the sensory. Audible music, or what Boethius termed \textit{musica instrumentalis},\footnote{For Boethius, \textit{musica instrumentalis} referred to both vocal (sung) music, and music that was sounded on instruments. See Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, \textit{Fundamentals of Music}, Trans. Calvin M. Bower, Ed. Claude V. Palisca (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989).} was viewed (and heard) with suspicion because of its propinquity to sensuousness. Envoiced (sung) music, in particular, exhibited a Fauvelian hybrid-like quality: the logical, mathematic ratios of harmony and the rational \textit{logos} of the word were inevitably sutured to \textit{sensuous} sound (\textit{phonos}) perceived. As a result, both singers and listeners were in danger of falling prey to music’s sensuous aural component rather than its (textual) contents. Thus, while sound was an indispensible vehicle for sung text, the listener (the singer or an audience member) was always in danger of eliciting sensuous pleasure by privileging music’s \textit{sonorous} component over the cold, hard reason of \textit{logos}. In Boethius and later medieval epistemologies of \textit{musicus/cantor}, the \textit{cantor} was frequently parodied as a dumb beast for failing to grasp the redemptive \textit{logos} of musical learning, falling prey to its inherent aural seductiveness, while it was the \textit{musicus} that reaffirmed his humanness by using the tools of musical knowledge (reason) to shield himself from the auditory, metaphysical excesses of envoiced song.\footnote{For a fuller discussion, see chapter 1.} “Beastliness” in music was thus not so much construed as an intrinsic quality of sound as it was a barometer for its \textit{affect} on the listener.
Inasmuch as aforesaid ontologies of aural beastliness referred to the perils of audition, sensory beastliness applied just as well to the visual nature of textual, pictorial and musical notation via acts of signification. Like auditory theorists, optical theorists in the later Middle Ages debated over the nature of visual perception, and its fallible dependency on sensory operations. While “clear sight” was often used metaphorically to describe accurate modalities of ocular perception and cognition, thinkers understood the possibility of misunderstanding or misperceiving visual signs (photos). Sense perceptions were thus to be mistrusted; only the determining powers of reason and rationality could distinguish between reality and illusion, truth and deception, sign and signified. Indeed, could we ultimately not conceive of the Roman de Fauvel as a dense cluster of visual signs (photos) demanding to be interpreted? Acts of misinterpretation (the failure to properly decode the signs on a given page) could then be construed as a “beastly” deficiency on the part of the illiterate or handicapped reader/singer, for whom all visual signs appear to be no more than titillating visual stimuli. Failure to partake in acts of signification (through reading or singing by decoding visual signs) itself can be taken as a symptom of an insufficiency of one’s mental grasp of logos, and hence the cognitive incapacity to “transform” the sign from its sensuous, visual form to its intellectual form (figure ii).


45 This theme is centralized in two noteworthy publications on medieval “sight,” which stresses the alteration of subjectivity by engaging in acts of “seeing.” Subject and object are blurred when the perceiver is drawn into (and influenced by) the field of the perceived. See Suzannah Biernoff, Sight and embodiment in the Middle Ages (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), and the book of essays in Troubled Vision: Gender, Sexuality, and Sight in Medieval Text and Image, Ed. Emma Campbell & Robert Mills (New York & Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
The dotted line reflects a dualistic understanding of signs as hybridized entities, composed of a sensuous component and a rational component to be apprehended or abstracted through mental cognition. To reach into the dimension of the signified (logos) vis-à-vis the sign, it was paramount that the perceiver extracted the sign’s intellectual factor from its sensuous appearance. Acts of “human” cognition perform this operation whereas “beastly” acts of sensory apperception fail to move beyond the sign’s sensuous form into the realm of logos, as indicated by the black arrows. Music, both in its visual notational form (photos) and as aural object of audition (phonos) is hence doubly prone to mis-perception. As a menagerie of visual signs demanding to be interpreted/read/sung/realized, Fauvel challenges its readers to intelligibly “mutate” its beastly, inky markings into meaningful and significant mental “objects of contemplation,” and, in doing so, reverse the adverse effects of

46 Elizabeth Eva Leach, Guillaume de Machaut: Secretary, Poet, Musician, forthcoming. I thank Dr Leach for sharing her chapter with me: her construal of musical compositions as “objects of contemplation” is the most compelling description of “intellectual music” I have encountered.
Fauvel’s “bestourné” kingdom. Chaillou’s interpolatory gesture thus can be seen as a double metaphor for Fauvel’s hybrid-like quality, and beastly sensuous danger, carefully weaving musical episodes into a thick signifying network of words and images. By paying attention to the *mis-en-page* of Chaillou’s “addicions,” I will suggest how he addresses the nature of musical “beastly,” sensory danger in the *Roman de Fauvel*, showing how identifying its “musical aesthetics of beastliness” can lead us to a thicker (though not necessarily “truer”) understanding of Fauvel’s ingenuity.

### Beyond the “Book”: Towards a Multisensory Aesthetic of Fauvel

Within the past decade, the scholarship of the “book” as an epistemological site of inquiry has risen to the forefront of medieval studies.47 Central to this “sociology of texts”48 is the methodological belief that the material culture in which historical objects were made exerted an economy of meaning (a historical *psychology* if you like) through which the “book” was read, circulated, perceived and understood. As a result, studies in watermarking, codicology, foliation practices and even page numbering are highlighted as important constituents of the late medieval book’s ontological constellation, bearing heavily on modes of medieval reading and knowledge-production. For Jessica Brantley, the study of the medieval *codex* is also an inquiry into the methods by which our predecessors organized, structured and *codified* thought, “for codify ultimately derives through *code*, from *codex*. Scholars of book history are eager to excavate

---

the codes that are embedded within the codex ... [and] the systems of thought that are both revealed and created by the physical structures through which ideas are expressed. As historians such as Eric Jager have demonstrated, the late fourteenth century book served as both a physical and psychological model for medieval interiority; the medieval codex, for example, shaped the understanding of subjective interiority inasmuch as it organized the book’s physical layout.

Two of the most recent full-length studies of Chaillou’s Fauvel (and fr. 146) rehearse precisely the parameters opened up by the material reality of the “book.” The arrival of Fauvel Studies marked an important chapter in reassessing the ways in which musicologists and medievalists approach Chaillou’s Roman de Fauvel not simply as an autonomous, extractable “book within a book,” but as a participant bonded to the physical attributes of fr. 146. Fauvel Studies offers a breathtaking panorama of intertextual readings between the interpolated Fauvel and its surrounding texts, reconfiguring its ontological limits to the literal, material horizon of the book, thus including “auxiliary” works as crucial parameters for understanding fr. 146 and the interpolated Fauvel. In the same vein, Emma Dillon’s Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel proceeds to ask a different question via similar methodological strategies: how is meaning in the Roman de Fauvel made through non-sonorous ontologies of music? How do the constraints of visual, written (notated) music (photos) inflect our construal of the sonorous (phonos), and vice-versa? How does the physical attributes of fr. 146 affect the meanings decipherable from its text? In this way, Dillon returns the

51 Fauvel Studies, Ed. Margaret Bent & Andrew Wathey.
52 Dillon, Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel.
“extracted” music to a corporeal (textual) body, giving its “voice” a palpable texture. Her approach also indirectly addresses the problematic epistemological contradictions of the “work” concept argued with great force notably by Lydia Goehr in the ‘90s, criticizing musicologists of imposing their understanding of music as individual, autonomous works of art backwards into history.\textsuperscript{53}

Privileging the individuality of the physical object over the extrapolative tendencies of musicologists to locate the musical contents against musical-historical narratives, Dillon’s project successfully engages with a dialogue with a curious past vis-à-vis a curious artefact:

I believe that the tried and tested philological approach to the physical object can bring our understanding of the work into sharper relief. […] But these facts are the starting point: they are strands in the ‘narrative’ of the book – a narrative that, nonetheless, demands to be interpreted.\textsuperscript{54}

Put another way, Dillon’s strategy can be seen as encompassing a two-pronged approach to historical interpretation, suggesting the role of the fourteenth century reader in piecing together possible paths of meaning-making, while reinvigorating fr.146 for the modern reader through a historically responsible methodology, articulating alternative pathways for enjoying the visual traces on the parchment. This methodological shift bears witness to a shift in perspective – one that moves away from plumbing fr.146 for information about the “musical cultures exterior to it” (an etic-centric viewpoint), to an emic-centric one that celebrates how the book and its interdisciplinary genesis explores “music as a way of writing about … culture.”\textsuperscript{55} While Dillon’s generous exploration of the shifting “song space” makes room for a visual understanding of musical interpolation in


\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 6.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
the genre of the songbook, her ocular-centric approach eschews the actual musical content, or what Margaret Bent calls the “knowledge of the music” as compared to “knowledge about the music.” Dillon uses codicological details and the cultural consequences of medieval readership, but is less concerned here with the notated musical contents. Her project to recover aspects of “medieval music-making” thus exhibits a strong visual bias, offering an ocularly-governed ontology of “song-space” in fr.146, without addressing how listening to the songs (as an auxiliary act of reading) may participate in meaning-making, or how the elements of music may proffer additional information about the text. As one critic puts it:

Dillon’s book [and its] reference to “music-making” ... undercuts expectations, for Dillon’s concept of music-making is far removed from the idea that such an activity brings forth sound from silent notes on the page; her sense of music-making is a more obviously physical activity: the subtle balance between poetry, music, scribal practice, codicology and what might be called the sociology of the book.

Both publications discussed above begin with the valid, material assumption that the Roman de Fauvel was undeniably meant to be read. But there is no evidence to refute the possibility that the Roman de Fauvel was also a blueprint for singing or music-making, in which visual musical notation was realized into its sonic form. By slightly shifting the “bookish” ontology of the Roman de Fauvel to a multi-sensory phenomenology of the Roman de Fauvel approximating what Sylvia Huot calls an “audiovisual poetics,” could we also not consider how “visual” acts of reading may be epistemologically congruent to acts of listening? Too quickly differentiating between orality and textuality risks

56 Ibid., see Chapter 6 on the “Poetic use of song space.”
imposing contemporary polarizations of “silent” reading and “sounded” realization; historians have shown that not all acts of medieval reading were necessarily “silent.”

To this extent, it is possible that the fluid identity of the “book” mediated between sight and sound, between visual signs (photos) and aural realization (phonos). Dillon’s approach may make perfect sense to the modern scholar; indeed, it is easy to see how innovative (visual) musical notations in fr. 146 may influence intertextual “readings” of the Roman de Fauvel, but conversely, it is equally possible that sonorous realizations of fr. 146’s musical “addicions” can also influence cross-sensory “readings” of the book not immediately apparent in its visual layout.

The threat of sensuous “beastliness,” I hope to show, acknowledges this fluidity between sight and sound as a common denominator between visual signifiers (notational photos) and envoiced signifiers (phonos), informing a multisensory interpretation of sensory “beasty” danger in the musical interpolations of the Roman de Fauvel. Moving from an ontology to a phenomenology of Fauvel may help us overcome (albeit, make space for another hermeneutic vantage) some of the “beasty” incomprehensibility of Chaillou’s ciphers, orienting Fauvel towards innovative reconsiderations of its “addicions.” For our modern, scholastic gazes, the ontological multiplicities generated by re-imbuing the “silent” book with the aura of sound may seem too much of an unsettling epistemological sight-sound “hybrid,” taking us far from the comfort-material-zone of the manuscript.

But, as the figure of Fauvel suggests, are our contemporary intellectual, hermeneutical beliefs and methods of exegesis not already “bestorne” in the eyes (and ears) of our medieval forefathers?

**Thesis Structure**

Chapter 1 of this thesis investigates the presence of “beastliness” in numerous late medieval ontologies of music, and how notions of the “beast” came to be associated with sensuous carnality. By examining how Boethius’ distinction between the knowledgeable *musicus* and the lacking *cantor* came to be superposed onto notions of *man/beast* in later theoretical writings, I suggest how mutating definitions of the *musicus* eventually came to describe, amongst other things, the ability to correctly “read” and “realize” notated music. In contrast, the *cantor* was thus considered a dumb beast before the image of the (notated) sign, unable to meaningfully partake in notation’s web of signification by transforming it into sounded *logos*. Chapter 2 identifies the ways in which these tropes are articulated in Chaillou’s interpolated *Roman de Fauvel*. Fauvel is both a *sign* of the beast, and the (figurative) *embodiment* of the sensuous “beastly” dangers of signification gone awry. Oft presented as an unlearned *cantor* who defiles the good grammar of music, I discuss how certain musical items “sung” by Fauvel’s voice reveal the beastliness of the *cantor*, and how the “beastly” behaviour of the masked revellers in the *Roman’s* famous Charivari sequence recapitulates episodes of “beastly” singing.
Chapters 3 and 4 closely analyses two interrelated folios (44v and 45r) facing each other. In chapter 3, I suggest how the motet *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* capitalizes on atypical motet behaviour to powerfully convey a sense of beastly *mutatio* (mutation). I discuss how vertical sonorities in the motet which sound alike undergo internal *mutatio* of voice-parts, proposing the possibility the motet was structured with such vertical *mutatio* in mind from the very beginning. Next, I investigate the composer’s ingenious use of voice-crossing and registral exchange to purposefully “veil” the voice’s sung words from the listener, as if commenting on music’s deceptive sensuality to mislead and cloud the clear apperception of text. Chapter 4 discusses a strange group of Goliardic “drinking songs” on folio 45r arranged around its textual core in a strange manner. There I provide an alternative reading of the page to Emma Dillon’s arguments by interpreting it through the lens of the old medieval *integumentum*. Like signs, the *integumentum* was a fictional layer that had to be un-husked or “penetrated” in order to reach its hidden kernel of (figurative) truth; the failure to do so was to engage in beastly acts of “carnal reading,” which sought to appease the body’s prurient desires rather than the appetite of the mind. Taken together, I propose how both pages problematize the boundaries between sight and sound, between visual signs and its beastly sensuous (aural/visual) component. Finally, chapter 5 suggests how the threat of the “beastly” is still prevalent amongst contemporary musicological circles, which tends favour “text” over “sound.” By interrogating the power-politics of medieval “beastly” epistemology, I propose that we may move “beyond the beast,” showing how the privileged authority of the text as master-signifier (*logos*) is just as arbitrary as the alleged inferiority of modern performances of medieval works (*phonos*). This, hopefully, would lead us to
better appreciate the ontological heterogeneity and ingenuity of *Fauvel* reconstructions today, every bit worth our attention as fr. 146.
CHAPTER 1
BEASTLY ONTOLOGIES OF MUSIC: THE DANGERS OF SENSATION

Introduction

This chapter examines various ontologies of “beastliness” in musical writings of the later Middle Ages. By using one of Chaillou’s interpolated items Clavus pungens acumine as an exemplar, I focus on how theorists often referred to the threat of aural sensuality in sounded music, and the beastly metaphors often invoked to describe its vice. The transmission of Boethius’ Musicus/Cantor concept, in particular, served as a focal point for music-theoretical figurations of the beast. For Boethius, the musicus (learned musician) overcame the dangers of audition by filtering musical sound through the sieve of rational thought, while the cantor, deprived of such learning, was often guilty of sullying of musical grammar, falling prey to the “beastly” metaphysical excesses of sensuous pleasure.

Next, I discuss how later works such by Arnulf de St Ghislain and Alan de Lille employ such “beastly” beings to articulate the dangerous metaphysical excesses of embodied song (phonos), which explicitly pair sexual deviance with sensory seduction, suggesting how such “beastly” modes of entrainment may been relevant to the articulation and cognition of late medieval signs. The beastly cantor can thus be interpreted as a deficient transmitter/perceiver/realizer of musical signs (notation), attending to its “excessive” sensorial component rather than its intellectual content.
Clavus pungens acumine: The Use and Abuse of Claves

Fig. 1.1. Clavus pungens acumine, fr. 146 fo. 5r, (Photo: Emma Dillon, Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel, 243.)
A long, five-versed conductus, \(^{61}\) *Clavus pungens acumine* (“As the nail puncturing with its sharp point”)\(^ {62}\) takes up columns *a* and *c* (the first and third columns) on folio 5\(^ r \) of fr. 146.\(^ {63}\) The textual layout of text and notated music on the page in column *b*, however, splits *Clavus pungens acumine* into opposing halves, divided vertically down the middle by Gervais’ text, as if the conductus was meant to be read as a gloss or in counterpoint with its poetic, nonmusical core. At this point in Gervais’ poetry, the clergy dominating Fauvel’s kingdom-to-be have turned against Christian charity and moral uprightness, caving in to temptation, bribery and political corruption. The text of *Clavus pungens acumine* reads as a hefty admonitio against religious corruption, warning pastoribus (“pastors”) to be careful with the sacred claves (“keys”) to which they have been entrusted, lest by misuse, they transmogrify or transform the claves into clavus (“nails”), mindlessly repeating the crucifixion of Christ:\(^ {64}\)

\begin{verbatim}
| 1.1 Clavus pungens acumine,       | As the nail, puncturing with its sharp point, |
| Dum carnem Christi perforat,      | Pierces the flesh of Christ,                  |
| Ex vulnerum foramine              | It commemorates the passion                   |
| 1.4 Passionem commemorat;         | From the opening of the wounds.              |
\end{verbatim}


\(^ {63}\) In the analysis that follows, I give excerpts of the score. A full transcription can be found in Appendix 1 on page 208-9.

\(^ {64}\) For an intertextual reading of *Clavus pungens acumine* involving the interaction between text, image and notated music, see Emma Dillon, *Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 240-6. While she examines the iconographic complicities between each three elements, I consider the musical implications through the use of wordplay on claves/clavos.
As it drips with his blood,
Pouring over us with sweetness,
It embodies in Christ
Those shaped in the image of the cross.

In those openings,
Like a dove making its nest,
Build yourself a home
Which you may enter through those doors.

With this new drug of healing
Claim salvation from the welts,
Healing from the wounds,

[and] life from death.

Oh, fixing of the hands
And piercing of the feet
By which Christ is impaled!
While his flesh is gashed
And by the mystery of the nails
The kingdom of heaven is opened,
By the celestial craftsman’s zeal
The nail is turned into a key.

What is the loss of the nail,
If not that the passion of Christ
Slips from memory?
What is this fashioning of the key
Which is made from its opposite, a nail,
If not the wickedness of sin
Or the affection of good
Limping along as justice?

I speak to you, pastors,
You who carry the keys,
You who because of the luxuries of life
Reject the keys of Christ.
Having become wolves to your flocks,
You nail down the limbs of Christ
And, misusing the keys,
You turn the keys into nails. 65

Several episodes of transmutation take place in these verses – the transformation of Christ into man as ultimate sacrifice is metamorphosed into a metaphor by which the clavos (“nail”) representing his crucifixion transfigures into the claves (“key”) by celestis fabri (“celestial fabrication,” B1.7). By submitting to the risen Lord, earthly sinners can be redeemed, acquiring divine claves through which one gains access to heaven by memorializing (memoria,

---

B2.3) the significance of Christ’s sacrifice. To pastors who abuse their religious power and submit to the *vite luxibus* (C3) instead of Godly wisdom, they too undergo a mutation into beastly *lupi* (“wolves,” C5), and devolve the righteous *claves* into *clavos*, becoming, as it were, present-day Roman barbarians who (re)cruify Christ. The Christological significance of *lupi* has a further meaning for leaders entrusted by religious authority to lead the “flock” of sheep – the *lupi* both preyed on the susceptibility of church members as well as “the lamb of God” who absolved man’s corrupt nature by “taking away the sins of the world.”

Apart from its theological warning for pastors to keep watch over their earthly desires, *Clavus pungens acumine* may also serve as a secondary metaphor for the disastrous outcomes of the abuse of music. The text of the *conductus* playfully revolves around the assonance and pun of *claves* and *clavos*, but by the later Middle Ages, *claves* was used to denote the letter-names of pitches divided arithmetically through determined ratios on the medieval monochord. Stefano Mengozzi has very recently re-examined the semiotic “renaissance” of articulating hexachordal space, and he notes that by the thirteenth century, a long tradition of linking the letter-names of pitch space to *claves* existed in medieval theoretical writings.

The A-G letters [indicating successive steps of the mathematically divided monochord] were also known as *claves* (“keys”), because they were used as “clefs” positioned at the

---

66 The importance of the “lamb of God” was, of course, figured by “Agnus Dei,” usually sung or recited after the consecration of the host.
beginning of the musical staff to indicate unequivocally the notated pitches (thus they allowed the reader to “unlock” staff notation in the same way as a key opens a lock, as many medieval theorists pointed out). Occasionally, in a number of late authors, the term clavis refers to the combination of a letter and a [Guidonian] syllable.69

This concept of “unlocking” is succinctly demonstrated in the Lucidarium of Marchetto of Padua, a fourteenth century Italian theorist:

Clavis est reseratio notarum in cantu quolibet signatorum, nam sicut per clavim reseratur ostium ad conservanda que intra ostium sunt, sic per clavim in cantu ipse reseratur cantus et conservantur notarum nomina et ab invicem esse distinct cognoscimus.70

The clef [clavis] is the [means for] disclosing the notes written in any piece of music. Just as a key [clavis] opens a door to preserve what is behind the door, so in melody does a clef [clavis] disclose the melody and preserve the names of its notes; and it is through the clef that we recognize notes as distinct from one another.71

Just as the abuse of religious power could transform the clavis of sacred authority into a wounding clavos in the flesh of Christ, the misapplication of musical clavis could spell potential corruptive disorder for liturgical chant, wrecking its sacred implications by perverting musical grammar. In particular, clerical authorities were wary of the dangers of chant’s long, melismatic sections (extended wordless music passages held on an intoning syllable known in the conductus as cauda or “tails”)72 in a discourse of anxiety that partially demonizes the sensuous melodic vehicles for ecclesiastical words (prefigured by an Augustinian suspicion of music’s sensuous qualities, later discussed in chapter 4). As Bruce Holsinger demonstrates, the sensuous misuse of singing and listening within religious musical circles was often linked to sexual misconduct and unnatural sodomitic impropriety.73 For example, Robert of Courson, a thirteenth

71 Ibid., 539.
72 Yudkin, Music in Medieval Europe, 379.
73 Bruce W. Holsinger, Music, Body, and Desire in Medieval Culture: Hildegard of Bingen to Chaucer (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2001), 137-90.
century Parisian master, reprimands the aural-arousing proclivities of these *cantors* (singers) in sexually explicit, unreserved terms:

*Ante conspectum Domini in ipsis penetralibus sanctuarii lasciuentis uocis luxu, quadam ostentatione sui, muliebribus modis notularum articulorumque caesuris, stupentes animulas emollire nituntur. Cum praecinentium et succidentium, concinentium et decinentium, intercinentium et occidentium praemolles modulations audieris, Sirenarum concensus credas esse non hominum ... sic acuta uel acutissima grauibus et subgrauibus temperantur ut auribus sui iudicii fere subtrahatur auctoritas ... Cum haec quidem modum exasserint, lumborum pruriginem quam devotionem mentis pterunt citius excitare.*

In the very sight of God, in the sacred recesses of the sanctuary itself, the singers attempt, with the lewdness of a lascivious singing voice and a singularly foppish manner, to feminize all their spellbound little followers with the girlish way they render the notes and end phrases. Could you but hear the effete emoting of their before-singing and their after-singing, their singing and their counter-singing, their in-between singing and their ill-advised singing, you would think it an ensemble of Sirens not of men ... The high or even the highest notes are mixed together with the low or lowest ones to such an extent that the ears are completely divested of their critical power ... Indeed, when such practices go too far, they can more easily occasion an itching of the loins than a sense of devotion in the mind.\(^{74}\)

Lacking the knowledge of *claves* with which to unlock the notated score or to correctly realize a piece of music, these perverse *cantors* transform the *claves* into a sexually-charged phallic *clavos* with which to penetrate the passive, pleasure-seeking ear, while using the same *clavos* to perforate the unblemished purity of religion. The duplicity of sung text as a hybridized word-music object is rehearsed in the *conductus*, especially in its numerous florid melismas stretching the audibility and autonomous integrity of a single word, as if the undulating melody threatens to overtake and drown out the text which it carries. The following analysis imagines what it might have been like to hear *Clavus pungens acumine* sung from the *Roman de Fauvel*, considering its presentation in fr. 146 as a possible blueprint for sonic realization.

---

\(^{74}\) Quoted in Holsinger, 158.
Clavus pungens acumine (A in fig. 1.2) begins with a melismatic cauda, pairing music with the phoneme “cla-” of “clavus” (“nail”), and imbuing it from the outset of the chant with a lengthy 87-breve aurally-distracting passage, which delays the onset of the syllable “–vus,” needed to differentiate between clavus and claves (“key”). This withholding of verbal resolution is repeated in the fourth verse of (B2.1) where “cla-” of “clavi” (“nail”) is given similar melismatic treatment, again delaying the crucial end syllable “–vi,” placing the semantic identity of the phoneme in doubt for the duration of the 32-breve cauda (fig. 1.3): Has the sensuous “speech” of music so enraptured the listener that he fails to later distinguish between clavus and clavis?

75 Transcription adapted from Rosenberg & Tischler, The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel, 24-6. The following analysis assumes the veracity of Rosenberg & Tischler’s transcription, even though only the second and fourth verses are not immediately inscribed beneath the notation, but written in without notation after the first and third verse respectively.
Similarly, the denotative, appellative *vobis* (“to you”) in the third musical segment (C) is stretched out over 108 breves (fig. 1.4), perhaps playing on these deviant pastors’ inability to respond to divine “hailing,” the call all but drowned-out by melismatic augmentation. Predictably, “*clavibus*” in “*Et abutentes clavibus*” (“and, misusing the keys,” C7) is also melismatically set to 30 breves (fig. 1.5), parodying the perverse cantor’s affixation on sensory pleasure as a form of *claves* abuse.

Rather than put to “work” as a textual vehicle, *claves* serve as a (masturbatory?) sodomitic gratifying end unto itself, consuming the word which it was meant to carry. The final *cauda* set to the last word “*vertitis*” is the longest (132 breves), stressing the corruptive transformation of the word of God through
lascivious singing. *Vertitis* is further broken up by rests planted into the length of the melisma, fracturing the rational word and its apprehension into sensuous, melodic fragments, as if to destroy any identifiable semblance of the word by the listener.

Inasmuch as the listener was always in danger of falling too deep into the sensuous spell of sound, the fleshy earth-bound cantor who took more delight in the sonorities of plainchant than its religious function was also susceptible to psycho-sexual misconduct, fornicating his ears with the phallus-like clavus of music rather than heeding its textual address. Right up to the later Middle Ages, vocal music was often viewed as a double-edged sword in the church: while the clergy acknowledged its emotional potency in stirring up passions for Christian piety, they were also aware of its ability to lead singers and listeners away from the messages it carried. A polarization between mind and body found theoretical gravity in early music theory’s distinction between the scientifically structured knowledge of music and its non-rational dimension, that is, its pleasurable metaphysical excess complicit with the “beastly” passions and (often sexual) drives of the body. In an oft quoted statement of *Regulae Rithmicae*, Guido of Arezzo issues a stern warning:

> Musicorum et cantorum magna est distancia
> Iste dicunt illi scunt que componit musica
> Nam qui facit quod non sapit definitur bestia.

From the musician to the singer how immense the distance is; The latter’s voice, the former’s mind will show what music’s nature is; But he who does, he knows not what, a beast by definition is (My emphasis).\(^7^6\)

---

The qualification of the unlearned cantor (singer) as dumb beast as compared to the knowledgeable musicus would prove to be a tenacious one, a distinction persisting into the fourteenth century to parody the brute thoughtlessness of sensuous musical pleasure cast against the redemptive feature of knowledge, learning and intellectual speculation. This division between learned and unlearned was not only important to music theorists; a tradition of philosophical speculation transmitted from antiquity would distinguish between the rational capacity of human beings, and its dangerous counterpart, irrationality and sensory entrainment, a faculty which had to be policed (if not suppressed) in service of the former. Put differently, the faculty of “reason” was philosophically pivotal in establishing man’s difference from mere animal, a being which, according to Aristotle, was incapable of rational judgment. In the Moralia in Job, Pope Gregory the Great set forth the distinction between men governed by reason and deviant sinners who abandoned reason for sensuous animal-like behaviour though the concept of the beast. Commenting on Job 33:27, Gregory lectures:

Nonnum quam tamen homines dicit eos quos a bestis ratione distinguit, id est quos non attiri bestiali passionum motu demonstrat ... quia illos nimium Dominus pascit quos voluptas carnis iumentorum more non afficit. At contra hi qui carnali affectioni succumbunt, non iam homines, sed iumenta nominatur; sicut de quibusdam in peccato suo morientibus ...

[The scripture] calls those ‘men’ whom reason distinguishes from the beasts, that is, who it shows to be unaffected by the bestial influence of passions ... For the Lord in truth

---

feeds them, whom carnal pleasure does not affect as it does the beasts. But, on the other hand, they who yield to the desires of the flesh, are no longer called men, but beasts.\textsuperscript{79}

This vigorous dialectical trope distinguishing rational man and his irrational beastly counterpart was so over-rehearsed that, by the twelfth century, writers were explicitly aware of an inner-beastly dimension, or what Joyce Salisbury calls “the beast within,” which constantly had to be suppressed and foreclosed in order to champion the cause of reason.\textsuperscript{80} In the tradition of theoretical and speculative music writing, a series of linguistic binaries mapping rational/irrational onto humans/beasts eventually became further superimposed upon Guido’s musicus/cantor distinction, initially deriving from the transmission of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius’ philosophical concepts in early medieval times. In particular, Boethius’ originating musicus/cantor definitions were especially complementary to figurations of “humanness” and “beastliness” in the later Middle Ages, the implications of which will become clearer by discussing the premises upon which this preliminary differentiation was built.

The Cantor and the Musicus: Negotiating the Rational and Irrational in Boetius’ De Institutione Musica

Through the fourteenth century, the words of the revered philosopher Boethius probably rang in the ears of students in the halls of learning at the universities of Paris.\textsuperscript{81} Boethius, the highly regarded fifth century philosopher, was already well read for his Consolation of Philosophy, a principle allegorical

work well-established in the liberal arts curriculum, and students tackling the mathematical logics underpinning De Institutione Musica (“The Fundamentals of Music”) would have noted his stern definition of the musicus (“musician”) as compared to other practitioners of the musical arts:82

[A] musician is one who has gained knowledge of making music by weighing with the reason, not through servitude of work, but through the sovereignty of speculation (My emphasis).83

For Boethius, the ability to simply produce sound was insufficient to qualify one as a learned musicus; music as a philosophical mode of inquiry was meant to be a vehicle through which the inquisitor apprehended modes of truth beyond the realm of sensory perception.84 Music as a liberal art was a propaedeutic exercise in flexing the muscles of intellectual abstraction, strengthening the seat of rationality in overcoming the fallibility of sensuous perception and the disorienting effects of irrationality:

For just as in seeing it does not suffice for the learned to perceive colours and forms without also searching out their properties, so it does not suffice for the musicus [musician] to find pleasure in melodies without also coming to know how they are structured internally by means of ratio of pitches.85

In order to qualify as a musicus, one had to abstract the apprehended qualities of sound through the senses, turning raw aural material into food for thought and, eventually, understanding. Boethius’ investigation into the matter of harmony performs that operation of abstraction, accomplished through a thorough

---

84 Boethius, Fundamentals of Music, See introduction by Claude Palisca, 2.
85 Ibid., 8.
understanding of musica mundana ("music of the spheres"), musica humana ("human music") and musica instrumentalis ("instrumental music"), of which only the last was audible music. Another feature of intellective apprehension was the active nature of reasoning as opposed to the passive nature of sensual enjoyment, an engagement of the reasoning faculties indispensable in understanding the logical intricacies of music. Boethius lays out his arguments clearly by defining the knowledge of harmonics not as a properly "musical" (that is, sonorous,) but rather the cultivation of a learned “faculty” that “weighs the differences between high and low sounds using the sense of hearing and reason.” Sense and reason, for Boethius, were literally “instruments for the faculty,” perhaps suggesting that a knowledge of the harmonious laws that govern natural and cosmic phenomena could be “played” by the subject to aid the apperception of truth. This was especially important since the senses as a “window” to the perceptible world was to be mistrusted:

The sense perceives a thing as indistinct, yet approximate to that which it is; reason exercises judgment concerning the whole and searches out ultimate differences. So the sense discovers something confused, yet close to the truth, but it receives the whole through reason. Reason itself comes to know the whole, even though it receives an indistinct and approximate likeness of truth. For sense brings nothing whole to itself, but arrives at an approximation. Reason makes the judgment.

Of the “three classes” of musicians Boethius discusses, only the individual who “acquires an ability for judging” is rightly considered a musicus, since he “is totally grounded in reason and thought,” and not “natural instinct” or senseless,

---

87 Ibid., 163.
88 Ibid.
performative mimesis.\textsuperscript{89} Only through the exercise of reason can the \textit{musicus} escape the confines of his sensuous, corporeal body, standing lord over the sensory instead of caving in its unintelligible demands:

> How much nobler, then, is the study of music as a rational discipline than as composition and performance! [i.e. activities in the realm of \textit{musica instrumentalis}] It is as much nobler as the mind is superior to the body; for devoid of reason, one remains in servitude. Reason exercises authority and leads to what is right; for unless the authority is obeyed, an act, lacking a rational basis, will falter.\textsuperscript{90}

But why should the faculty of reason be so highly regarded over the mere enjoyment of music? Should not sensory pleasure be praised as an amiable affect of music in the first place? For Boethius, although sounded music invariably shares an umbilical link with sensory pleasure, it is the uncontrollable \textit{metaphysical} nature of musical sound which needs to be policed either by the performer or the listener, since music exerts a transformative, even hypnotic spell, upon its listeners. Citing Plato and his concerns for the metaphysical implications of music upon impressionable youth, Boethius recounts the former’s worry about the ability of music to inspire and control behaviour, even encouraging activity outside the limits of socially-acceptable norms. “Indeed,” he claims, “music extends to every endeavour; moreover, youths, as well as the aged are so naturally attuned to musical modes by a kind of voluntary affection that no age at all is excluded from the charm of sweet song.”\textsuperscript{91} The arousing quality of music causes “radical transformations in [the] character” of the listeners, serving as a kind of affective mirror to which different modes of human behaviours arise by resonating with different qualities of music:

\textsuperscript{89} Instrumental performers fall into the latter category; Boethius explains that such individuals are “slaves” to the regiment of their instruments and not lord over their reasoning faculties. Ibid., 50-1.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 50.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 2.
A lascivious disposition takes pleasure in more lascivious modes or is often made soft and corrupted upon hearing them. On the other hand, a rougher spirit finds pleasure in more exciting modes or becomes aroused when it hears them.92

That is to say, music exhibits an intrinsic metaphysical quality which may either reinforce the character predispositions of individuals, or mould their actions according to its likes. “Indeed,” Boethius warns, “no path to the mind is as open for instruction as the sense of hearing ... [through which music may] affect and reshape that mind to their particular character.”93 An ability to immediately cognize, rationalize and judge the kind of music being heard would therefore serve as guard to the gates of the impressionable soul, an intellective watchman to keep one’s morality in check by censoring received sensuous material accordingly. What emerges from a Boethian neo-Platonic construal of the musical-metaphysical is a logic of control to displace the fear of “losing” the self in the face of music’s hypnotic powers, guided by reason. Only by knowing, understanding and recognizing different forms of music can the listener protect himself from music’s affective influence, rejecting the seduction of undesirable musical-metaphysical qualities. Likewise, knowledge grounded in reason would enable individuals to control the production and circulation of music, censoring certain musics to preserve the equilibrium of a well-ordered society.

Sirens, Sodomites and the Metaphysical Excesses of Song

An auxiliary musical discourse to sensual danger was music’s capacity to enrapture animals and soothe the rage of savage beasts, most likely due to

---

92 Ibid.
93 Ibid., 3.
animal’s imagined proximity to the sensuous body. Cassiodorus wrote approvingly of music’s medicinal nature, as well as modal power to “compose distraught minds and ... attract the very beasts ... to listen to their melody.” Similarly, the great etymologist and encyclopaedist Isidore of Seville quotes directly from Cassiodorus in his *Etymologies*, bespeaking song’s peculiar ability to inspire combatants or console the weary. In affirming music’s capacity to move and inspire both the human and animal soul, Cassiodorus and Isidore reaffirm man’s animal-like nature, and his openness of subjectivity to internal transformation through the passive reception of music. At the same time, it is the intellectual who, firmly grasping an understanding of musical metaphysics, is able to intelligibly manipulate the production of tones for such purposes, recapitulating the *musicus* as active contemplator over unthinking listeners devoid of appropriate judging faculties. Insofar as the beast figured the unlearned, inactive musical subject, incapable of protecting his sensibilities by the exercise of reason, the “beastly” aspect of song came to denote the metaphysical danger of sensuous excess threatening to undo the seat of rationality.

In late medieval Bestiaries and Animal Epics, the Siren came to embody precisely this “beastly” aspect of sonic danger. Part sea-creature, part woman, the

---

97 Isidore of Seville, “Etymologiarum,” in *Source Readings in Music History*, 94.
98 The aspects of “passivity” and “activity” have also been relegated to the spheres of the “Masculine” and the “Feminine,” bringing the female identities into closer relation with sensuousness and the body. For a study on gendered divisions based on medieval essentialist constructions, see Joan Cadden, *Meanings of Sexed Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
feminine Siren derives from the Homeric myth of Odysseus, a creature who lurks beneath oceanic waters and lures sailors to their deaths with irresistible siren-songs. Numerous manuscript illuminations visualize the transitory nature of the Siren’s transmogrified womanly body, incorporating animal features such as fins (in aquatic versions) or wings (in avian versions). The beastliness of the Siren Song as a placeholder for death, as it were, “taints” the bounded sanctity of the human body, transforming it into a hybridized being as if to emphasize the monster’s complicity with animal sensuality. An early fifteenth century treatise on musicians *Tractatulus de differentiis et gradibus cantorum* attributed to Arnulf de St Ghislain revives Boethius’ fundamental *cantor/musicus* polarization, but provides additional warning against the figure of real, lived “sirens” lurking amidst the waters of humanity such as harlots, gypsies and other medieval “femme fatale” tricksters, reinforcing the proximity between beastliness and sensuousness.

Arnulf, like Boethius, berates the beastliness of unlearned laymen thoroughly incapable of musical knowledge, who “bray with the din of their brawling bark louder than an ass, and ... trumpet more terribly than the clamour of

---

99 For more details, see Leofranc Holford-Strevens, “‘Sirens in Antiquity and the Middle Ages,’” in *Music of the Sirens*, Ed. Linda Phyllis Austern & Inna Naroditskaya (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 16-104.


102 Brunetto Latini’s late thirteenth century *Livres dou tresor* describes such “modern” Sirens as “harlots who deceived all the passers-by and made them poor.” See Holford-Strevens, “Sirens in Antiquity and the Middle Ages,” 34-5.
a wild animal.”¹⁰³ Out of a total of four “classes” of musicians, the second class of musicians Arnulf enumerates may be best likened to a community of unknowledgeable listeners, inept in the musical arts but nonetheless drawn to music for the sheer pleasure of song. Devoid of intrinsic musical knowledge, “frequent practice ... [and] natural industriousness ... can make good their deficiency in art,” although their exclusion from the rational constellation of musical knowledge condemns them to a similar (though less harsh) beastly fate of existence in musical communities.¹⁰⁴ Though not fully identical to the first class of musicians, these unlearned individuals are described as less-than-human “animals follow[ing] the sweet-smelling panther” of music, or bees “buzzing towards the sweetness of the honey,” reaffirming the dimension of sensuous instinct through which these individuals pursue their participation in musical activities.¹⁰⁵ By far, the most interesting (if contested) group of singers Arnulf describes is the proficient musicus, armed with both knowledge and the fine craft of an experienced cantor, fourth in Arnulf’s categorization, but “first in honour.”¹⁰⁶ Despite being blessed with the felicitous gifts of natural instinct, technical excellence and captivating voices, Arnulf makes a noteworthy distinction:

E quibus pars altera, favorosi videlicet sexus feminei, que quanto rarior tanto preciosior, dum in dulcinomi gutturis epigloto tonos librate dividit in semitonia, et semitonia in athomos indivisibles garritat, ineffabili lascivit melodiomate quod magis putares angelicum quam humanum. Hinc mulieres – decret, imo verius syrene terrestres – incantatas aures incarminantes audientium quorum corda, pleraque tali ebrietate sopra, invisibili furto subripiunt subreptaque et voluntari facta sue servituti subiungant terrestremque perducunt naufragantes sui, heu! Gratia carceris, in Caribdim in qua nullum redemptionis genus vel precium locum tenet.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ “Prima plebescit in illis, ut convenit, qui artem musice prorsus ignari … et in sue corrixationis latratu dum clamore rudient altius asino et brutali clangore terribilius intubant…” Page, “A Treatise on Musicians,” 16.
¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 19.
¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 18.
¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 20.
¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 17.
Among these there is a second group – that is to say of the favoured female sex – which is so much the more precious the more it is rare; when it freely divides tones into semitones with a sweet-sounding throat, and divides semitones into indivisible microtones, it enjoys itself with an indescribable melody that you would rather deem angelic than human. So it is that these women – goddesses, or indeed rather earthly Sirens – enchant the bewitched ears of their listeners and they steal away their hearts, which are for the most part lulled by this kind of intoxication, in secret theft, and having snatched them and made them subject to their will, they then will enslave them and lead them, shipwrecked by the beauty, alas! Of their prison, into an earthly Charybdis in which no kind of redemption or ransom is of any avail.108

These “earthly sirens,” though well instructed in *ars*, radically turn knowledge into sensuous ammunition, “enchanting” and “bewitching” the ears of listeners into a prison of sensory enrapture. Moreover, by defiling the proper monochordal division of regular *claves* (“keys”) and further dividing “semitones into indivisible microtones,” Arnulf’s Sirens *pervert* the legitimacy of tone-steps in service of creating sensual pleasure. Indeed, the “semitone” in the late Middle Ages was not conceived as exactly half a tone as understood by today’s standards of equal temperament, but an *imperfect* fraction of the whole tone step,109 an unequal division which came to accrue feminine properties.110 In other words, the musical Siren purposefully “imperfects” regular scale divisions through lascivious subdivision, elevating sensory delight above the cool, mathematical reason of Boethian harmonics.

---

108 Ibid., 20.
As both Leach and Holsinger have separately shown, Arnulf’s treatise cites extensively from Alan de Lille’s De Planctu Naturae, an allegorical twelfth century Latin poem likening the corruption of grammatical rules to sodomitic sexual perversion. Arnulf’s act of citation explicitly links the “perversion” of musical grammar to Alan’s description of sodomites defiling the grammar of nature and reason. In particular, the protagonist of Alan’s allegorical interlocutor, Lady Nature (based upon Boethius’ Consolation of Philosophy), laments the denigration (denigrat) of mankind into effeminacy by transforming the “fair name of his sex” into the opposite gender:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Actui generis sexus se turpiter horret} \\
&\text{Sic in passium degenerare genus,} \\
&\text{Femina uir factus sexus denigrat honorem,} \\
&\text{Ars magice Veneris hermafroditat eum.} \\
&\text{Predicat et subicit, fit duplex terminus idem.} \\
&\text{Gramatice leges ampliat ille numis.} \\
&\text{Se negat esse uirum, Nature factus in arte} \\
&\text{Barbarus. Ars illi non placet, immo tropus.} \\
&\text{Non tamen ista tropus poterit translatio dici.} \\
&\text{In unicum melius ista figura cadit.} \\
&\text{Hic nimis est logicus per quem conversio simplex} \\
&\text{Artis nature iura perire facit.} \\
&\text{Cudit in incude que semina nulla monetat.} \\
&\text{Horret et incudem malleus ipse suam.} \\
&\text{Nullam materiam matricis signat ideae} \\
&\text{Sed magis in sterili littore uomer arat.}
\end{align*}
\]

The active sex shudders in disgrace as it sees itself degenerate into the passive sex. A man turned woman blackens the fair name of his sex. The witchcraft of Venus turns him into a hermaphrodite. He is the subject and predicate: one and the same term is given a double application. Man here extends too far the laws of grammar. He denies that he is a man, becoming barbarian with respect to the grammar of Nature. Grammar does not find favour with him but rather a trope. This transposition, however, cannot be called a trope. The figure here more correctly falls into the category of defects. The man, in whose case a simple conversion in an Art causes nature’s laws to come to naught, is pushing logic too far. He hammers on an anvil which issues no seeds. The very hammer itself shudders in
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112 Elizabeth Eva Leach, “‘The Little Pipe Sings Sweetly while the Fowler Deceives the Bird’: Sirens in the Later Middle Ages,” in Music & Letters, Vol. 87, No. 2 (May, 2006), 187-211, and Holsinger, Music, Body, and Desire in Medieval Culture, 137-90.
113 It is noteworthy that Johannes, the eleventh century glossator of Guido of Arezzo indirectly associated the semitone with another form of effeminating transformation, that of “cross-dressing.” See Leach, “Gendering the Semitone.”
horror of its anvil. He imprints on no matter the stamp of a parent-stem: rather his ploughshare scores a barren strand.\textsuperscript{114}

Here, the sodomitic subject, like the sirenic subject, is portrayed as one who forfeits the rational, reasoned logic of nature (in this case, natural reproduction), attending to alternative non-productive logics as means of pleasure. Such contrary activities confound both the logic of nature \textit{and} the logic of grammar through which Alan’s poem is read: in “transposing” into a “hermaphrodite,” – another form of hybridized pseudo-human monster – the “grammar” of man shifts uneasily between “subject” and “predicate,” a monstrous, illegible fusion under the gaze of normative grammatical rules. Like the dangerous metaphysical excesses of sound unbounded by laws of harmonic ratios, this grammatical “defect” escapes being firmly ‘pinned down’ and understood for what it is. Inasmuch as the grammatical sodomite confounds the laws of grammar, it confuses a reader’s ability to securely understand its nature or meaning within the universe of a sentence, existing only as meaningless cluster of signs without stable signifieds. Semantically, the sodomitic beast of grammar denies the creation of stable meaning via the art of grammar, hammering on “an anvil which issues no seeds.”\textsuperscript{115} Sodomitic vice mirrors the vice of pride (in the bare sign), in which productive “seeds” of meaning previously generated through regular grammatical use are usurped for the pure sensory pleasure of signs-in-themselves: the result of such activities score “a barren strand,” instead of impregnating text with meaning vis-à-vis grammatically sound signification.

\textsuperscript{114} Quoted in Noah D. Guynn, \textit{Allegory and Sexual Ethics in the High Middle Ages} (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 106.
\textsuperscript{115} The image of “hammering on an anvil” also recalls the well-circulated medieval myth of Pythagoras’ discovery of music from hearing the striking of the anvils. I thank Dr Jane Alden for pointing this out to me. See Elizabeth Eva Leach, \textit{Sung Birds: Music, Nature, and Poetry in the Later Middle Ages} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 16-20.
From Beastly Cantors to the Beastly Impotency of Signification

What was worse than irresponsible “beastly” grammarians/musicians who turned their art into meaningless clusters of signs, effectively abandoning its roots of reason for mere sensory pleasure? For Alan de Lille and a growing group of intellectuals in the late Middle Ages, tampering with the rules of (musical and literary) grammar meant destabilising the economy of the written sign, opening signification to ambiguity and, above all, the possibility for misunderstanding. As already noted, the growing literary culture of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century gave rise to an increasing population of readers. As books and textual documents became more readily available, intellectuals began to direct their attention to the interrelated conditions of writing, reading and signification. The later Middle Ages saw not only a proliferation of texts but, correspondingly, a proliferation of signs demanding to be read and interpreted.

Brigitte Bedos-Rezak’s work on seals and insignias reveals a culture of identity heavily mediated by and through such signs which could ‘stand in’ double for real, lived individuals. While the novelty of these textual “doubles” were met with initial enthusiasm by their users, they also constituted a “radical [effect] on the notion of the individual,” the cultivation of “a semiotic system” which relied on the “practice of sign interpretation ... that fostered representation of a person as a category.”118 Seal and subject shared a near-umbilical relation to each other, implicating the writer into the “mark” of the sign. Consequently, the notion

117 Ibid., PARA 59.
118 Ibid., PARA 61.
of the author appeared to be indelibly etched into the economy of the text which signified that which was other than the author, affixing the identity of the writer firmly to the (textual) body produced. At the same time, there was growing concern over forgery and the false fabrication of signs which confused the link between imagined author and written word, preying on the apparent likeness of the icon or sign to the identity of its bearer in order to deceive its readers. The referent of particular signs were also lost upon readers who lacked the background knowledge to interpret them as such, suggesting that although signs were an important component in the constellation of Medieval epistemology, they exhibited a degree of opacity to certain readerly classes, becoming “transparent” only through a “correct” method of interpretation.

Musical notation, like alphabetical signs, were visual, “photographic” documents (photos) which needed to be “interpreted” in order to be realized into sound. To be an effective musicus, one could not simply display an understanding of harmonic ratios or tonal modes – one had to be able to read notated music against the yardstick of one’s musical education, exercising reason as a bulwark to faulty musical transcriptions and erroneously constructed pieces. Musicus was hence both interpreter and censor, a class of musicians who could correctly realize textual music into aural reality, imbuing or embodying deadened ink with meaningful sound. The ineffective musician who could not translate the written into the sonorous was no better than an uneducated illiterate, a dumb “beast” staring hopelessly into the visual traces on parchment. As Christopher Page notes, by the later Middle Ages, the definition of the cantor come to embrace the
deficiencies of musical reading. Referencing the thirteenth century *Summa Musice* supposedly authored by Perseus and Petrus, Page writes:

A cantor, in contrast [to the musicus], does not know any of these things, and, most important of all, he cannot read musical notation. Indeed, the cantor is unable to learn a chant unless it is repeatedly sung to him first by one who knows it already. He is, in short, a fool: the kind of hopeless cleric that is often to be encountered in Visitation records where bishops report on what they find in their dioceses: ‘an idiot who cannot sing’; ‘an imbecile who can neither sing nor read’.

Like Alan’s reproductively-challenged sodomite, the musically illiterate cantor was a sterile coitus partner in relation to musical text, unable to corroborate/copulate in hopes of birthing productive, intellective musical “seeds.” To him, any attempt to translate notation to music would inevitably result in a “perversion” of musical grammar, betraying the rational histrionics of interpretation: any predetermined musical sign would be intrinsically ambiguous due to his lack of mental alacrity, visible only as sensuous, visual entertainment rather than latent musical symbol.

As we shall see in the next chapter, the inability to correctly translate a musical sign (and thus participate in the “reproductive” level of musical signification process) would figure prominently in Chaillou’s interpolated *Roman de Fauvel*. Fauvel’s beastly universe inverts the logic of Sauqueville’s sermon previously discussed in the introduction, in which the horse of sensuous carnality rules over the humane lighthouse of reason: “Car homes sont devenus bestes /...
Devers terre portent les testes,"[122] as does the uneducated, musically illiterate cantor over the well-learned musicus, on whom the formal wisdom of notated music can but fall upon “deaf ears,” consigned to subsist in the circular ignorance of his sensual prison. In terms of colour symbolism, as Michael Camille notes, the colour black (commonly used to symbolize “sickness, decay, and contempt” in late medieval colour semiotics) envelops, pervades and invades the entire bodily corpus of fr. 146 as an ominous inky presence “that holds all together, text, music, [and] outlines of figures.”[123] Whether the reader uses the admonitio of fr. 146 as claves with which to unlock its latent rational mysteries, or transforms it into clavos – the phallic stylus which spills its black, inky “seed” into notational neumes – is a matter of hermeneutics, the moral uprightness of the reader, and the sharpness of his intellectual wit. Both signified and sin, however, share two sides of the same signifier.

CHAPTER 2
THE SIGNIFICATION OF BEASTS AND THE BEASTLINESS OF SIGNIFICATION IN *FAUVEL*

Introduction

This chapter discusses the ways in which late medieval concerns over “beastly” acts of signification inform the figurations of Fauvel in fr. 146, where he is represented visually as a beastly, slippery, sensuous sign which resists pinning down. Expanding on Gervais’ description of Fauvel as faus-vel (“false-veil”), I show how, as a sign resisting full assimilation into systems of signification, Fauvel can be understood as both a beast signified, and the beastliness of signification gone awry. I suggest how Gervais and Chaillou cast Fauvel as a non-clerky, illiterate individual by comparing illuminations juxtaposing Fauvel and the author, and how such beastly figurations may come to implicate the reader/consumer of the *Roman de Fauvel*.

Furthermore, I will examine how musical (re)presentations of Fauvel depict him as an unlearned *cantor* who ruthlessly and mindlessly defiles the legitimacy of proper musical grammar. In particular, Fauvel’s beastlike braying is humorously likened to the illogical linguistic nonsense characterized by various medieval grammarians as literate but inarticulate *vox* (voice), aligning Fauvel’s amorous crooning to Lady Fortune with the senseless twittering of irrational birds. Following the “breakdown” of *motetus* melody’s notation across the pages of the *Roman de Fauvel*, I suggest how “Fauvelian” acts of (mis)signification may cast
light on the “beastly” activities of the Charivari as a beastly “inverted” version of Fauvel himself.

**Fauvel as a Slippery, Sensuous Sign**

At the beginning of *Le Roman de Fauvel*, Gervais’ description of Fauvel advises his intended audience to “read” the character of Fauvel as both symbol and loose signifier, rather than a pure fictive character. Indeed Fauvel is presented as a cluster of meanings, the very embodiment of worldly vices: his name consists of an acrostic of biblical sins, and Fauvel himself is described as a “signifier,” laden with the connotations of the aforesaid significance.124 Even as a signifying locus, Fauvel’s semantic integrity is problematized by his ability to mean more than what he simply ‘is.’ As a sign, Fauvel is slippery and ambiguous, a knotty bundle of semantic pathways leading to numerous possibly signifieds, denying any single, stable final referent:

```
Fauve lest beste appropriee  
Per similitude ordence  
A signifier chose vaine,  
Barat et fauseté mondaine.  
[...]  
Fauvel beste est nient raisonnable,  
Chose apparent et non estable,  
Plaint de fauseté, vui de voir,  
Figure pour gens dechevoir.  
Fauve lest beste voirement,  
Que il ne porroit autrement  
Sus beste seignorie avoir.125
```

Indeed, Gervais warns us, the very origins of “Fauvel” is “Faus-vel” or “false-veil,” hinting that as a symbolic “veil,” an act of intelligent reading is necessary to penetrate the beastly disguise of the horse to reveal its concealed

---

125 Ibid., 12-3.
referents. Several characteristics Gervais describes of Fauvel reveal his duplicitous nature, his semiotic status as a sign distanced from the signified. Like the pure sensuous symbol, Fauvel “est nient raisonnable,” devoid of reason and meaning. Its similitude to vanity and falsity also suggests mistaking the pure “symbol” to be complete unto itself – by misreading Fauvel as a non-signifying sign sufficient unto itself, equally “false” readers short-circuit Fauvel’s signifying potentiality, causing Fauvel-as-sign to collapse into Fauvel-as-referent. By doing so, such acts of reading reduce Fauvel into semiotic tautology (Fauvel is Fauvel... etc.), ignoring the more important signified truths hidden beneath Fauvel’s semantic veil of falsity. Furthermore, by failing to appreciate Gervais’ hermeneutic reading of Fauvel as Faus-vel, misguided readers fall short of making the leap between “Fauvel” as a sonorous name and “Faus-vel,” its intelective implications.

As Michael Camille has pointed out, illuminations portraying Fauvel in fr. 146 are themselves slippery and unstable. Fauvel is represented visually as a hybridized half-horse, half-human beast throughout the manuscript, but the physical features of humanness and horseness in Fauvel transform and mutate across successive illuminations. In folio 26v of fr. 146, Fauvel is depicted nearly side-by-side in two illuminations wedged in columns a and c, though exhibiting dissimilar physical features (fig. 2.1). The Fauvel in column a sprouts the head of an equine head and human body, while its pictorial neighbour in column c presents Fauvel courting Lady Fortune with a human’s head and horsey thighs.

---

126 I refrain from distinguishing between “modern” readers and “medieval” readers to avoid the assumption that the field of “medieval” reading was homogeneously uniform.
hidden beneath his garb. Even as an illumination imbued with the capacity to visualize “invisible” mental concepts,\textsuperscript{128} the visual sign of Fauvel is hard to pin

\textsuperscript{128} For Richard de Fournival, illuminations were meant to illustrate textual, mental concepts as a register of representation to aid the reader’s comprehension. In particular, he stresses the need for pictorial glossing: “cis escris est de tel sentence k’il painture desire” (this writing is on a topic that
down, escaping full, stable disclosure under the gaze of the reader. Throughout the manuscript, Fauvel’s form continues to shift unpredictably. He seems to betray any notions of intrinsic essence, as if transience and metamorphosis are his sole defining features. As a visual sign meant to signify, the morphing aspect of Fauvel balances between the fixity of the sign and its signified, and the confounding, slippery impossibility of determining a single signifying pathway secured through Fauvel.

To this extent, Gervais’ play of rhyme between “Fauvel” and “Faus-vel” encapsulates the dialectic between sensuous apperception and rational judgment. The name of Fauvel, like Sodomite or the Siren, is a hybridized monstrosity, vacillating between its sensual, sonic component and its readerly implications, as if inseparably sharing different sides of the same coin. To appreciate Fauvel as a proper sign which signifies, the educated reader has to read Fauvel allegorically, that is, reading past the sonic novelty of family-resemblance between “Fauvel” and “Faus-vel” to grasp its semiotic significance. If not, the reader reproduces – indeed performs – Fauvel’s own “vanity”: Fauvel-the-sign is transformed into a mirror for Fauvel-the-signified, a semiotic Narcissus gazing into the sensuous beauty of its own reflection without penetrating beyond its tautological mirror of surface appearances. The reader becomes the vain Fauvel himself through his strategy (or lack thereof) of interpretation.

Even as the insightful reader penetrates the sonorous trappings of Gervais’
assonance to embrace Fauvel’s signifying potentials, the task of ascertaining
precisely what or whom Fauvel signifies is made difficult for the average reader,
who had to effectively recognize Fauvel’s litany of learned allusions and citations
from numerous external sources of auctoritas (figures of authority) in order to
make intelligent sense of the text and its extra-textual corroborators. Allusions, for
example, are made to the popular beast epic tales of Renart the Fox (in Roman de
Renart), as well as learned citations from Guillaume de Lorris’ and Jean de
Meun’s thirteenth century Roman de la Rose. The chansons and motets
contained in fr. 146 also quote liberally from authors such as Ovid whose Ars
Amatoria (Art of Love) was highly read and glossed, Lucan and Horace, no doubt
greatly expedited via the late Medieval presence of numerous “quote book”
compilations such as the Florilegium Gallicum and Disticha Catonis. Following
Jean-Claude Mühlethaler, Emma Dillon writes that these instances of
citation:

[Serve] to authorize Gervais’ text; but evocation of stock academic convention, in which
the author speaks directly in Prologue form, also serves as a vital shorthand, cuing them
into a particular literary frame of reference, and thereby setting up a specific expectation
about the text to follow.

For the “setting up” of such “expectations” about the text to be operative,
however, it was assumed that the reader would have had the ability to recognize
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129 Allusions to Renart the Fox appear in the description of Fauvel’s castle walls. See Långfors, Le
Roman de Fauvel, vv 1357-8. Also see discussion by Jean-Claude Mühlethaler, Fauvel au
Pouvoir: lire la satire médiévale, Nouvelle Bibliothèque du Moyen Âge, 26 (Paris: H. Champion;
130 Kevin Brownlee, “Authorial Self-Representation and Literary Models in the Roman de
Fauvel,” in Fauvel Studies, 73-103.
131 Leofranc Holford-Strevens, “Fauvel Goes to School,” in Citation and Authority in Medieval
and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned, Ed. Suzannah Clark & Elizabeth
132 Emma Dillon, Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel (Cambridge: Cambridge
the extratextual sources of citation, or else the subtleties of aforesaid references would be lost. Failure to recognize the citational “cues” proffered by *Fauvel* seems to rehearse the translucent nature of “Faus-vel,” transparent only to individuals of sufficient education while opaque to the uneducated (even illiterate) layman. “The reader,” writes Dillon, “is thus faced with a double challenge”: 

[He or she has to] unravel political allusion in the components [of the book]; and to reconnect such allusion to the allegorical context of the surrounding narrative, thus resolving the problem of narrative disjunction. Thus, the very challenge of making sense of the interpolation takes on a new moral imperative in light of the political context of the individual components: access to political meaning now becomes entirely dependent on how one reads these folios. In other words, what is at stake is not just the political and moral message of the folios, but the very nature of reading itself.133

Indeed, the problem of illiteracy as exclusion from the realm of educated reading amongst book-owners of the later Middle Ages quickly became topical material for satire amongst writers, book-makers, illuminators and the educated elite. While the fourteenth century saw a marked increase in the rate of literacy and a great proliferation of books and devotional literature (in part augmented by a flourishing lay devotional culture),134 literacy and book-ownership did not necessarily go hand-in-hand. Lavishly decorated books containing biblical passages such as Books of Hours were commonplace amongst the aristocratic and wealthy in the later Middle Ages, irrespective of a patron’s actual level of literacy,135 due to the status of books as expensive luxurious items worthy of collecting or owning. Seen this way, books were signifiers of another type, monetary signs reflecting the wealth or prestige of their owners in addition to asserting their ability to read, or intelligibly cognize its contents. To enable these

133 Ibid., 89.
books to be read in a non-literary manner, book-makers often resorted to the use of illuminations and images to provide a visual register of image-reading rather than a textual one.¹³⁶

Michael Camille’s study in the uses of manuscript marginalia proposes a practical use for the strange hybridized monsters and chimeras lurking in the margins of devotional texts.¹³⁷ According to Camille, such monsters served as visual cues for the text contained on its page: beastly chimera would thus serve as gruesome (though effective) visual shorthand for the meaning of the text sketched onto the mis-en-page of the parchment, mediating the reader’s capacity to memorize the text by associating it with an easily recallable image.¹³⁸ As Maureen Kupstas notes, the ubiquity of these monstrous beasts populating marginalia could have also provided illiterate bookish patrons with a “visual” register of reading, independent of actual written text:

Images in medieval manuscripts were meant to help the reader remember the nearby texts; they also triggered the reader to recall visual and verbal images already in his or her memory. The more unusual or surprising the image, the more effective it might be at those tasks.¹³⁹

¹³⁶ Pope Gregory the Great famously announced that the pictures were the “books” of the illiterate. For an extended discussion of picture-level “reading,” see L. Gougau, “Muta praedicatio;” in Revue Benedictine, xlii (1930), 168-71, and Michael Camille, “Seeing and Reading,” in Art History, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Mar., 1985), 26-49. I thank Dr Jane Alden for bringing these sources to my attention.
¹³⁸ On the grotesque nature of images facilitating mental recollection, see Mary Carruthers, The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 221-57.
Apart from books, scholars have long noted the mystery of monstrous entities carved onto the walls of Gothic cathedrals. Some have speculated that the walls of cathedrals were surfaces that could be “read” like books; in both cases, the image of the beast performed instructional roles translating the textual to the realm of the visual as aides to theological memoria and learning for the illiterate. For some church members, the presence of monstrous signs as visual cues for memorization produced counterproductive effects. In Saint Bernard of Clairvaux’s *Apologia* of 1125, he opines:


[What] is that ridiculous monstrosity doing, an amazing kind of deformed beauty and yet beautiful deformity? What are the filthy apes doing there? The fierce lions? The monstrous centaurs? The creatures, part man and part beast? The striped tigers? The fighting soldiers? The hunters blowing horns? You may see many bodies under one head, and conversely many heads on one body. On one side the tail of a serpent is seen on a quadruped, on the other side, the head of a quadruped is on the body of a fish. Over there an animal has a horse for the front half and a goat for the back; here a creature which is horned in front is equine behind. In short, everywhere so plentiful and astonishing a variety of contradictory forms is seen that one would rather read in the marble than in books, and spend the whole day wondering at every single one of them than in meditating on the Law of God.141

The vice which Saint Bernard refers to is that of *curiositas*, an undesirable offshoot of an ambiguous image’s ability to cause mental *confusio*, dependent upon the medieval art of memory (*ars memoria*). “Wondering” at the spate of ghastly images upon cathedral walls inadvertently distracts the Christian from
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pious meditation, causing the mental pathway linking (visual) signifier and signified to go awry. Mnemotechnical *curiositas*, Mary Carruthers explains, both represents “wondering” and mental “wandering” from centred, religious psychology:

Being *curiosus* is the opposite state of being *attentus*, “attentive” and “concentrated.” It is what happens when you lose track of what your images are cues for ... [One curbs] *curiositas* by finding one’s “stable place” to attend to the wandering and wantonness of “mental fornication.”142

The loss of the “stable place” of the signifying process dislocates the sign from its referent, throwing the sign into random association, “wandering” and free-play. Once a cue for embedded meaning, the surface image becomes no more than a sign signifying itself, and the mind entertains itself with the sensuous veil of the sign rather than the meaning to which it was supposed to gesture. In this vein, “Faus-vel” can be read as a warning that all signs – textual, image or notated music – could be potential “false veils,” *mis*-leading the reader from the locus of stable meaning to mental *confusio* and un-Christian *curiositas*. The danger was all the more pronounced for illiterate members of the clergy and elite, for whom accurate theological knowledge was a powerful antidote to the disconcerting effects of sensuousness and sin. Unable to read, illiterate subjects were unable to discern truth and falsity of a written text, relying only on good faith that they were correctly interpreting the words heard or images perceived.

Reading Beasts Reading: An Illiterate Fauvel?

Marginal beasts also played a satirical role in caricaturing illiterate readers’ senseless *simulation* of reading without intellectually engaging with its words. Laurel Amtower’s investigation of the images of books in late medieval illuminations shows beasts often were used to poke fun at illiterate or unintelligent readers. The presence of a cow reading a manuscript in the marginalia of the *Bohun Psalter* (folio 46v) and assorted animal “readers” in the *Hours of Mary of Burgundy*, for example, appear to differentiate “meaningful” modes of reading from deviant, unfocussed characteristic of readers prone to *curiositas* (fig. 2.2).

Fig. 2.2. A Reading Cow. *Bohun Psalter*, London, British Library MS Egerton 3277, fo. 46v. (Picture: Laurel Amtower, *Engaging Words*, 56.)

143 Laurel Amtower, *Engaging Words: The Culture of Reading in the Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave, 2000).
For Amtower, “the interior state of the reader, and the quality of his or her intimacy with the book, separates meaningful activity from the [sensuously motivated] behaviour of trained beasts.” More importantly, she argues, using beastly signs to denote non-intellective acts of reading:

[Satirizes] both the process of reading ... [and] the estates that abuse reading in their professions. Though clergy appear throughout the manuscripts in their proper roles, singing from their books and delivering the Eucharist or rites for the dead, lone clerics ... display a proclivity for error – whether intentional or not. Such parody may signify an attempt to undermine the clerical estate that sought to control religious thought.

Interestingly, nowhere in fr. 146 are we presented an illumination of Fauvel as a reader. On the other hand, illuminations such as that found on column a of folio 26 (refer to fig. 2.1 above) present Fauvel as a beastly singer, relying on his natural musical instinct (or lack thereof) to woo Lady Fortune. The singerly persona of Fauvel is intensified by Chaillou’s addicions, especially in the second half of the expanded Roman. Fauvel and Lady Fortune spar on numerous occasions in and through song, eschewing learned models of argumentation and persuasion via literary citation. However, the author of Fauvel is typically represented several times throughout fr. 146 as reading aloud from his book to an audience of listeners. Two noteworthy illuminations found in columns b and c of folio 10 of fr. 146 portray the author reading from his own work (see fig. 2.3).

144 Ibid., 57.
145 Ibid., 60.
146 Such cases of “musical sparring” is used to great comic effect in Douce dame debonaire, found in column b of folio 16, in which both Fauvel and Lady Fortune take turns singing to each other. Fauvel expresses his desires for Fortune’s love, but she constantly insults his advances, repeating the refrain “Ja m’amour ne te leirai” (I will never give you my love) at the end of each successive strophe. This chanson is also important as the sole unica in fr. 146 whereby two vocal “je’s” are locked in dialogue within the same song. A transcription of the piece can be found in The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel, Ed. Samuel N. Rosenberg & Hans Tischler (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1991), 56-8.
147 It is unclear whether the authorial illuminations in fr. 146 refer to Gervais or to Chaillou. In all likelihood, the image of the author could have been a mere symbolic placeholder for the imaginary position of authorship. See Dillon, Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel, 147-72.
The image in column $b$ figures a typical authorial dedication, with the author kneeling before his (Godly) patron. Gervais’ original text concluding the first book of *Fauvel* is preserved in Chaillou’s expanded version beneath the second author portrait in column $c$, resonating with Gervais’ dedicational gesture to God and men of religious importance:

\[
\begin{align*}
Ici\ vui\ fere\ arrestement, \hfill \\
M’es\ a\ tous\ pri\ devotement, \hfill \\
Se\ Fauvel\ ai\ trop\ pres\ tailli\acute{e}... \hfill \\
Et\ Dieu\ am\acute{e}\ et\ sainte\ Yglise, \hfill \\
A\ soupli,\ ainz\ que\ me\ tese, \hfill \\
Que\ cest\ petit\ livret\ li\ plese, \hfill \\
Qui\ fut\ complectement\ edis \hfill \\
En\ l’an\ mil\ e\ trois\ cens\ e\ dis. \hfill
\end{align*}
\]

Here I wish to make an end, but pray devoutly to all that if I have trimmed Fauvel too close ... and beloved God and the holy church implored, before I cease, that this little book pleases them, which was completely written in the year 1310.

Figure 2.3. Fr. 146, fo. 10r. (Photo: Emma Dillon, *Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel*, 85.)
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149 Långfors, *Le Roman de Fauvel*, vv 1205-7 and vv 1222-6, 47-8.

A similar illumination of the author reading to a listening public is found at the turn of the page on folio 11r, just as Chaillou announces the continuation of the *Roman*, anticipating Fauvel’s scheme to marry Lady Fortune and his eventual nuptials with Vaine Glorie (see fig. 2.4).

Fig. 2.4. Fr. 146, fo. 11r. (Photo: Emma Dillon, *Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel*, 86.)

Adjacent to the readerly figure of the author in column \(a\) is the beastly figure of Fauvel in column \(b\), swathed in royal robes and fully horse-like in his appearance. The contrast between both images on the same page is arresting: the
author sits and reads, directs his energy towards an audience displaying the same visual gestures as those found in column c of folio 10r, while Fauvel, also seated, basks in the proud magnificence of his power upon a throne furnished with the heads of two beasts, as if generating a beastly triumvirate of power, a perverse, distorted version of the (un)Holy Trinity. While the author’s gaze scans the wordy surfaces of the book, a bookless Fauvel stares out of the frame of the illumination straight into the reader’s eyes. As our attention meanders from the inky scrawling on the parchment to meet the hypnotic gaze of Fauvel, one wonders if this image of Fauvel was but a mirror of our readerly motivations, reflecting our beastly, lapsed moments of curiositas from pious attentus.

On the interpolated folio 28 bis recto, we encounter yet another image of Fauvel, not dissimilar to that of the author reading as represented on folio 10r or 11r (see fig. 2.5). This time, Fauvel is seen addressing an audience visually similar to that found in column c of folio 10r (refer to fig. 2.3). While scholars like Jean-Claude Müthlethaler and Emma Dillon have examined the role and social function of these illuminated groups of listeners as well-to-do consumers of the books, it should be further pointed out that the parity and degree of similarity between the clerky-readerly image of the author juxtaposed against the this speakerly image of Fauvel invites us to closely scrutinize the critical difference between both images: that is, the presence or absence of the book. In particular, the striking absence of the book in the image on folio 28 bis recto emphasizes Fauvel’s mastery of orality, while it deprives him of textual mastery. On the other
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hand, the images of the reading author in folios 10r and 11r reassert the literacy of the author as a learned cleric through the symbol of the book, while his act of public reading confirms him as a masterful orator. Does this suggest the possibility that Fauvel is a dumb, illiterate beast, or even a thoughtless, irrational cantor deficient in the learned trappings of the musicus?

Fig. 2.5. Fauvel the orator, fr. 146 fo. 28 bis recto. (Photo: Wesleyan University Special Archives.)

On folio 23v of fr. 146, Fauvel laments his failed proposition to Lady Fortune, who marries him off to Vaine Glorie. Distraught, the text on column c of fo. 23v anticipates Fauvel’s lament in song by cuing the audience “Lors a Fauvel ceste balade / Mise avant de cueur moult malade” (“Then Fauvel, sick at heart, came forth with the following ‘balade’”).153 However, instead of singing an actual, formal ballade,154 the notated section of music Providence, la senee

154 In the early fourteenth century, the Ballade usually consisted of three structurally identical stanzas each concluding with the same (melodic and textual) refrain in the general form “aab.”
following the incipit turns out to be a three-strophe *virelai* composed of 8 rhyming lines of poetry, flanked at the beginning and ending of each strophe by a four-line heptasyllabic refrain:

\[
\begin{align*}
Providence, \text{ la senee} \\
A \text{ poinnes m’a encliné} \\
A \text{ savoir que destinee} \\
M’a desques ci destiné.
\end{align*}
\]

Providence, the wise, has with effort led me to realize that destiny has destined me for this state.

Thoroughly dejected by his rejection, Fauvel forgets the metrical and rhyming particularities of song genres, confusing the *virelai* for the *ballade*. One could conceivably argue that the Chaillou or the scribe simply made a copying error, mistaking one genre for the other, but the strong poetic assonance between “*balade*” and “*malade*” seems to suggest that this misassociation was contrived, if not purposeful. If deliberate, Fauvel’s genre-confusion introduces a rupture between the word of the author and the performative agency of Fauvel who, under the apparent fictive control of the Gervais/Chaillou author figure, performs the *virelai* contrary to the authorial incipit cueing. Already a slippery, indistinct signifier, Fauvel even manages to escape containment by the anticipative word of the author, singing his *virelai* “nient raisonnable.” The educated (musical) reader would have immediately grasped the generic disjuncture between the *ballade* and *virelai* by judging the poetic and tonal contents of *Providence, la senee*, whereas

---

Within each stanza, the rhyme used for the couplet is repeated for the second; both equi-rhyming stanzas are sung to the first section of music (a) ending with a musical *ouvert*, and, on the second time, to the musical *clos* (closure), the second section of music (b) carrying the remaining lines. See Peter Davies & Alison Bullock, “Ballade,” in *The Oxford Companion to Music*, Ed. Alison Latham. *Oxford Music Online*. Accessed 12 Apr. 2010, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/opr/t114/e551>.

155 The *formes fixes* of the Ballade differs from that of the Virelai by the structural position of the Refrain and poetic rhyming scheme.

the Fauvel-like cantors would have failed to spot the inconsistency without a thorough knowledge of genre-specific structural features.

**Inarticulate but Literate Vox: Fauvel as Irrational Cantor**

The ability to sing, as we have seen in chapter 1, does not necessarily make Fauvel a learned musicus. Far from being musically proficient, Fauvel’s amorous crooning without the aid of reasoned thought reduces mellifluousness to senseless braying; the illumination of Fauvel amidst a flock of birds in column \(a\) of folio 26\(^v\) (see above, fig. 2.1) specifically positions him in the company of another form of “beastly” twittering. Elizabeth Eva Leach has recently shown that medieval avian ontologies of music were often used to criticize inexpert musicians, lauded for their naturally sweet voices but devoid of reason.\(^{157}\) In the fifth century, St Augustine of Hippo stressed the semantic meaninglessness of birdlike chatter in *De Musica*, staged as a dialogue between a master and his disciple:

M: But don’t you think art is a sort of reason, and those who use art use reason? Or do you think otherwise?
D: It seems so.
M: Do you think that dumb animals, which are called irrational, can use reason?
D: Not at all.
M: Then, either you would be forced to say *magpies, parrots, and crows* are rational, or you have been pretty rash in calling imitation by the name of art. For we find that these birds sing and make many sounds because of their intercourse with human beings, and that they utter them only by imitation.\(^{158}\) (My emphasis)


Late Medieval grammarians such as Priscian and Marius Victorinus, in addition, tended to classify birdsong according to its writeability or, in short, its fitness to operate and be reproduced as a meaningful sign. In his Ars Grammatica, Marius Victorinus opines:

\[\text{Vocis} \text{ formae sunt duae, articulata et confusa. Articulata est quae audita intellegitur et scribitur et ideo a plerisque explanata, a nonnullis intellegibilis dicitur ... Confusa autem est quae nihil aliud quam simplicem vocis sonum emittit, ut test equi hinnitus, angius sibilus, plausus, stridor et cetera his similia.}\]

There are two forms of the voice, distinct [articulata] and indistinct [confusa]. The distinct is that which, when heard, is understood and written and therefore explained to many and is said to be understandable to many ... The indistinct however is that which is nothing but the single sound of a voice cast out, as is the neighing of a horse...

Later in the thirteenth century, the Roman Catholic preacher Thomas of Cantimpré similarly writes:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Omnis autem vox articulata est aut confusa: articulata hominum, confusa animalium. Articulata est, que scribi potest ut a, e; confusa, que scribi non potest ut gemitus infirmorum et voces volucrum aut bestiarum.}
\end{align*}\]

For all voices are either distinct [articulata] or indistinct [confusa]: the human voice is distinct, and animal indistinct. A distinct voice is one that can be written such as “a” or “e”; an indistinct voice is one that cannot be written, such as the moaning of the sick of the voices of birds and beasts.

Both Victorinus and Thomas’ texts reflect the confusa quality of beastlike patter to resist encapsulation by signs, its refusal to signify, and its slippery, unintelligible excess to the boundaries of well-disciplined, regulated human speech. Marchetto de Padua’s explication in the mid fourteenth century

---

159 See Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis institutionem grammaticarum libri XVIII (Lipsiae: Teubner, 1855).
161 Marii Victorini Ars grammatical: Introduzione, testo critic e commento a cura di Italo Mariotti (Firenze: F. Le Monnier, 1967).
*Lucidarium* confirms the inarticulate and meaningless nature of beastly speech in categorizations of *vox* (the voice), but posits that even unintelligible beastly glossia may be represented in writing, or be legible as a “literate” sign. However, birdsong for Marchetto is non-articulate and linguistically impoverished of signification,\(^{165}\) recapitulating Augustine’s senseless, onomatopoeic ontology of beastly *vox*. Later in the century, theorist Jacques de Liège would recast the *cantor/musicus* dialectic in terms of *usus* (habituated use) and *ars* (art), commenting that “A beast is not a singer if he that sings not by art (*ars*) but by experience (*per usum*), / It is not the voice that makes the singer but proof of art (*ars*).”\(^{166}\) Understanding birdsong as literate but non-articulate again draws focus to “Fauvelian” acts of signification: positioning Fauvel within a flock of twittering birds, fr. 146 seems to poke fun at Fauvel’s own imitative capacities as *usus* rather than *ars*, hinting at the vacuous semantic emptiness behind his birdlike singing.

Indeed, the very musical content of folio 26’ (see above, fig. 2.1) caricatures Fauvel’s abilities as *cantor*, and not *musicus*. Scattered about the page are refrain-like snippets of melodies, “stuffed” between paragraphs of text producing a strange text-music hybrid version of the motet-ente. At first glance, the reader is prompted to read folio 26’ against a very similar mis-en-page layout of poetry and refrains stretching from folio 24’ to 26’. Refrain-citation has long been noted and pondered over in the scholarship of late Medieval music as “tiny lyric pieces of a type … that circulate independently,” often appropriated “at fixed intervals into the melody and text of larger compositions” such as *pastourelles*

\(^{165}\) Leach, *Sung Birds*, 36-9.
It has been noted that while their quotational status magnified their popularity in the public sphere, refrains themselves as independent semi-lyric slivers were semantically liminal, acquiring meaning only through its host genre. As Ardis Butterfield notes, the refrain thus “represents a form of utterance which is anonymous and general: it belongs to no one since it belongs to everyone,” teetering uneasily between its status as a collaborative vehicle for meaning and an independently meaningless entity.

The vast collection of refrains “grafted” between folios 24\(^r\) and 26\(^r\) in Fauvel’s long response to Lady Fortune test this boundary. Here, refrains are not cited within longer musical genres, but sung independently, woven into speech. Fauvel’s dexterous recollection of popular refrains locate him as a master of imitation, but his \textit{ars} leaves much to be desired. The refrains are non-musically motivated; Fauvel stands outside the tradition of host-genre citation, punctuating his non-musical speech with said quotations, perhaps cueing us in to his inability to compose a sensible, structurally sound musical host. Furthermore, Fauvel seems to choose his moments of musicality at random; his refrain quotations occur at irregular, unpredictable intervals after as few as thirty or as much as fifty-nine line of octasyllabic poetry, lacking in any overall structural consistency or unity. Instead, the citations seem to be chosen for their rhyme features. The first refrain inserted on folio 24\(^r\), \textit{J'ai amé et touz jourz amerai} (I have loved and shall

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{167} Rosenberg & Tischler, \textit{The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel}, 90. \textsuperscript{168} Ardis Butterfield, \textit{Poetry and Music in Medieval France: From Jean Renart to Guillaume de Machaut} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). \textsuperscript{169} Ibid., 131. \textsuperscript{170} On issues of grafting, see Nancy Freeman Regalado, “Grafting Verse to Music: Two Semi-Lyric Pieces in the BN Ms. Fr. 146 \textit{‘Roman de Fauvel,}” paper read at the annual meeting of the Medieval Academy of America, Toronto, April 1986. \textsuperscript{171} For refrain concordances outside of fr. 146, see Ardis Butterfield, “The Refrain and the Transformation of Genre in the Roman de Fauvel,” in \textit{Fauvel Studies}, 142-6.}
always love) rhymes with the last word of the preceding text, chanterai, and so on and so forth. This choice seems to suggest that Fauvel’s strategy of citation usurps reason and rational structure for random, irruptive moments of sonorous pleasure, punctuated by rhyme rather than structural (musical and poetic) order. The pitch content of individual refrains vary wildly from piece to piece, creating a jarring sense of tonal disjunction for the listener/reader, while reducing the semantic status of each individual refrain to near-nonsense. What results is precisely structural dis-order: his final word-refrain hybrid composition to Lady Fortune is an incomprehensible mass of unintelligibility, lacking form and tonal coherence.

This sense of structural cacophony mirrors the interior wandering wantonness of medieval curiositas, linked by sensory likeness rather than well-measured structural craftsmanship. As if this instance of citation were not enough, Fauvel reappears in the company of birds on folio 26, continuing his tirade of citation to impress Lady Fortune. This time, however, Fauvel appears to have grasped a sense of poetic structure. On this page, refrain citations flank a regular enunciation of six-line octasyllabic strophic blocks. The worded content of each citation further mirrors the thematic content of its framed poetic strophe, creating the appearance of ideational unity. Fig. 2.6 below shows the first two verses; where musically notated melodic refrain-citations appear above, I have given them in bold, and have underlined the pieces of text in each proceeding strophe which mirror or cite the sung texts. While Fauvel seems to be exercising the ars of a learned musicus in this section, closer inspection of the refrain’s musical

172 The first refrain citation “J’ai amé et touz jourz amerai,” for example, revolves around an F-ut hexachord; two refrain citations later, “Tout le cuer m’en rit de joie quant la voi” suddenly leaps into the vicinity of a G-ut hexachord, while the next refrain “Sons dous regart m’a mon cuer emblè” circles about a C-ut hexachord.

173 Adapted from Rosenberg & Tischler, The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel, 97-8.
makeup reveals that Fauvel is not citing melodic refrains, but quotes the motetus voice (the second voice above the tenor) of a four-voiced Fauvel motet, *Ve, Qui Gregi Deficiunt/Trahunt in precipicia/Quasi non ministerium/Displicebat ei*, appearing earlier on folio 6’ of fr. 146.¹⁷⁴

Fig. 2.6. *Han, Dieus!* On folio 26v.

The authorial passage on folio 26’ which anticipates Fauvel’s alleged spate of refrain citations on folio 26v refers to Fauvel’s following act of enunciation as a “motet,” clueing us into the concordance between Fauvel’s “refrains” and the motetus-voice of the motet on folio 6’. The word “motet” usually referred to the polyphonic multi-voiced genre in the later middle ages (see chapter 3 for an extended discussion), and also denoted the second polyphonic voice constructed over the fundamental tenor. In this instance, the motetus voice *Ve, Qui Gregi Deficiunt* is viciously “torn” into fourteen musical segments, reconstituted as

¹⁷⁴ A full transcription of *Ve, Qui Gregi Deficiunt/Trahunt in precipicia/Quasi non ministerium/Displicebat ei* can be found in Appendix 2 from page 209-112.

82
melodic refrain-like material for the musical skeletal backbone of Fauvel’s improvised *chanson*. Fauvel thus sings a different “motet” of sorts: instead of composing in a polyphony of voices as in *Ve, Qui Gregi Deficiunt / Trahunt in precipicia / Quasi non ministerium / Dissemblebat ei*, Fauvel assembles a bricolage of textual and musical counterpoint, recalling (albeit dessicating) the *motetus* melody while altering its con-text. This highly unusual treatment of music and text has led scholars like Ernest Hoepffner to call it a “motet farci” (a “stuffed” motet, “farcī” deriving from “farcīr,” or “to stuff”), while others such as Friedrich Gennrich and Nico H.J. van den Boogaard have catalogued these musical items independently as refrain pieces.

On folio 26v, however, Fauvel re-quotes all the musical material of *Ve, Qui Gregi Deficiunt*, except for the second Fauvelized phrase, “*Conseil, confort n’ailegement.*” (see fig. 2.7a and b below). Only “*Conseil*” is notated; the rest of the notes are absent from the folio – not even blank staves are inscribed for the remainder of the melodic citation, and an unfilled space for the capital “C” has been left blank. The musical notation for “*Conseil,*” in fact, is preserved at the top of folio 26v, three noteheads “squashed” in after the notes inscribed for “*Han Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver.*” This apparent glitch could have been deliberate: has Fauvel once again messed up his game of *Contrafacta* by ill-informed text-

---

175 Ernest Hoepffner, “Chanson français du XIIIe siècle,” in *Romania*, 47 (1921), 367-80. I thank Jane Alden for clarifying the etymology of “farcī.”

setting,\textsuperscript{177} or has he even momentarily forgotten the melody of the \textit{motetus} he was citing due to a lack of \textit{attentus}?\textsuperscript{178}

Fig. 2.7a. Transcription of \textit{Han, Dieus!} (fo. 26\textsuperscript{v}), same melody as \textit{motetus} on fo. 6\textsuperscript{r}.\textsuperscript{179}

![Transcription of Han, Dieus! (fo. 26\textsuperscript{v})](image)

Fig. 2.7b. Detail of fo. 26\textsuperscript{v}.

![Detail of fo. 26\textsuperscript{v}](image)


\textsuperscript{178} See Butterfield, “Refrain and Transformation of Genre,” 147.

\textsuperscript{179} The \textit{Han, Dieus!} citation is presented in its full, deduced \textit{contrafacta} form, as “extrapolated” from the \textit{motetus} voice on fo. 6\textsuperscript{r}. As noted in footnote 42, the “refrain” is not cited in full on fo. 26\textsuperscript{v} (although the textual refrain is fully incorporated in Fauvel’s poetic banter). It is possible that the reader would have been assumed to complete the act of full citation by comparing it with the previous \textit{motetus} voice.
The confusion over the identity of these musical pieces, I believe, is precisely the point: Fauvel’s feigned attempt at refrain citation corrupts the genre-identity of the motetus, degrading its form to a liminal, hybridized in-between object poised between the motetus (itself severed from the full motet) and the refrain. Like his avian counterparts, Fauvel mindlessly parrots – and destroys – the melody of *Ve, Qui Gregi Deficiunt*, turning it into a near-meaningless counterpoint of words and music, illegible under the gaze of traditional genre types. Chaillou could have also been playing on the duplicitous meaning of “motet,” which derives from French *mot* (word). Fauvel chops up the linear integrity of the motetus into discrete word-like particles and, in doing so, breaks up the grammatical flow of musical language. In short, he reduces the sentence to individual constituent signifiers, fracturing composite meaning for particular signs. This mutates the motetus from that of reasoned musical language to literate, though inarticulate *vox*: under disguise of the sweet, generic discourse of *fin’amours*, Fauvel’s braying reveals him to be a clumsy cantor, inconsiderate to the rules of genre familiar to the learned musicus. Far from utilizing musical reason to construct elaborate gifts of musical exchange, he can only mimic melody in interrupted spurts at a great semiotic cost. Fauvel short-circuits the musically signifying process, building a thematic network out of rhyming couplets rather than musical ideas and, in doing so, deprives each individual refrain-like sliver its fuller contextual meaning previously embedded as a secondary voice to the earlier motet.
Charivari and the Dissolution of Meaningful Signification

Only a few folios after this episode, the devolving, disorienting effects of Fauvelian semiotic disorder reaches its most radical effect. From folios 34r to 36r, Chaillou dramatizes the wedding of Fauvel and Vaine Gloire, accompanied by several lavish illuminations of their beastly, illicit nuptial procession, paired with two lower tiers of a rowdy Charivari brawl (see fig. 2.8). Historically, scholars have shown that the wedding celebrations were most likely based on Grant Feste events in 1313 to mark the knighting of Philip IV’s sons and his son-in-law Edward II, as well as their assumption of the cross, while the behaviour of Fauvel who oversleeps his wedding day could be likened to Edward II as portrayed in the Chronique métrique in the later pages of fr. 146. According to Nancy Regalado, members of the Charivari wreaking (un)musical havoc at the scene of Fauvel’s wedding were masked figures acting out the fête royale. In addition, Malcom Vale has further linked the disguised features of the Charivari to faux visages (falsis visagis), activities which were commonplace in the later court of Edward III of England as evidence for medieval tomfoolery.

---

For Camille, the close visual relation between Fauvel and members of the offending Charivari invite us to speculate on the similarities of their bestial natures:

It is important that [Fauvel’s] true bestial nature be revealed on this page, since all those around him are depicted in false animal masks enacting folk rituals that are also found in the margins of contemporary manuscripts. But Fauvel’s head is not a mask. He is a horse.
When he has a man’s face he is pretending to be man; the disguise is, by an odd reversal, human rather than animal.\textsuperscript{185}

As the Charivari advances Fauvel’s castle, fr. 146 explodes into a fury of notated musical activity, quite literally displacing the authorial text for a heavy-handed musical invasion of the \textit{mis-en-page} (fig. 2.9):

Fig 2.9. The Charivari: Visual and Musical Chaos on fo. 34\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{185} Camille, “Hybridity, Monstrosity, and Bestiality,” 171.
Text, image and notated fragments of music jostle ferociously for the reader’s attention, visually “performing” the rowdiness and disconcerting effects of the Charivari. The entire Charivari episode occupies three whole folios, containing a smorgasbord of twelve “sotes chançons” refrains, as well as one complete secular lai, *En ce dous temps d’esté* (“In this mild time of summer”).

For the first two *sotes chançons*, *An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver* (“Oh, God! Where can I find”) and *En non Dieu, agace, agace*, (“In God’s name, magpie, magpie”), additional stanzas are written beneath the staves (fig. 2.10). Otherwise, the musical snippets seem to call for repetition *ad infinitum* (or until one reaches the last verse), heightening a sense of musical circularity and boisterous nonsense figured by its meaningless texts:

Fig. 2.10. Detail of fo. 34v.

---

186 The ambiguity of these terms directing musical and poetic structure will be further discussed later in this chapter.

187 Adapted from Rosenberg & Tischler, *The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel*, 131-42.
Most notably, the disfigured *motetus* voice we previously encountered above on folio 26\(^v\) returns on folio 34\(^v\) in an even more reduced form: the first fragment of Fauvel’s “refrain-ized” melodic fragment *An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver* (the first line in bold in fig. 2.10) is further broken down into two musical units of eight syllables each, and made to “sandwich” nine newly added lines of poetry alternating between eight and nine syllables each (fig. 2.11):

Fig. 2.11. Text “sandwiched” by music on fo. 34\(^v\).

A comparison between the Fauvel’s “refrain” on folio 26\(^v\) and this split *sote chançon* further reveals that the latter musically quotes imperfectly from the former – subtle notation differences exist between the two sets of “refrain” quotations (though the overall melodic contour is very similar), as if musical signs themselves are exposed to corruption by this chain of citation. Fig 2.12 below compares the “quotation” in its three repetitions as the Motetus voice on folio 6\(^r\), as part of Fauvel’s song/speech wooing on folio 26\(^v\), and as sung by the Charivari on folio 34\(^v\). The black boxes mark out the melodic quotations in question which
differ slightly with the Charivari’s (re)statement. Both the notations on 6 r and Fauvel’s piecemeal version on 26 v confined by the black box in the diagram contain a \[B(d) + B(e) + SB(e) + B(d) + SB(c) + B(d)]\] pattern, where B stands for “breve” and SB stands for “semibreve,” with the respective pitches given in parentheses. Filtered though the voices of the Charivari on folio 34 v, however, the pattern preserved by the motetus voice and Fauvel is noticeably (and audibly) truncated into a five-note \[SB(d) + SB(c) + SB(d) + B(e) + SB(e)]\] pattern, as if diminishing – indeed deteriorating – the “original” musical phrase’s rhythmic and pitch content through faulty quotation. As the reader turns the page, he or she literally witnesses the “breakdown” of musical signification strongly evoking a “broken telephone” effect, tarnished by beastly voices (Fauvel), and the Charivari’s rambunctious mimesis of beastliness.

Fig. 2.12. Comparison of different statements of the “refrain” melody on fo. 6 r, 26 v, and 34 v.
Besides further effacing the individual semantic properties of the “refrain” by slicing the fragment down its middle, the melodic “double strands” are given a set of new meanings in their reattachment to a complementary rhyming core, constituting a new, sensuous structure of assonance. Or, one could say more precisely, the fragments are deprived of their last traces of original semantic content: it’s new, constituent text, though grammatically sound, borders on the precipice of pure nonsense to great comic effect, even at the expense of precisely notated pitches.

Fauvel’s discourse of fin’amours on folio 26v from which this fragment originates, turns here into a quirky, nonsensical search for “the man who offered to demonstrate that God has nothing in the firmament.” Instead of the lover who longs achingly for confort, secours n’alegement, we encounter a divinely ordained “rooster named Clement” (another beastly being with anthropomorphic qualities) threatening to inflict torture upon the offending man, que nus ne li pourra donner confort, secours n’alegement. Thus, from the motetus’ originating identity as a participative voice in a complex polyphonic motet, this final, near-meaningless version of An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver is twice removed from its source, corrupted beyond musical recognition. Sung through the playful voices of the Charivari, the resultant musical object is stripped of its serious, semantic properties, undergoing a form of “beastly” mutation into a chaotic mass of sonorous, consonant signs which, conceived as a whole, fails to signify anything meaningful. Instead, individual word-units (signs) when thrown into nonsensical play (such as the “broom,” the “crack” and the “oven of Gagny”) signal towards sexually explicit imagery by gesturing outside the boundaries of local
signification, reinforcing the relation between the sensuous metaphysical excesses of signs and the lascivious desires of the corporeal body.

Musicologists are still undecided as to how this altered form of An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver was sung in the fourteenth century. The table of contents in fr. 146 preceding the Roman de Fauvel in fr. 146 refers to these fragments as “sotes chançons,” very possibly related to the fatras – a “burlesque genre derived from fatrasies, short nonsense poems fashionable in Picary and Artois in the thirteenth century.” Patrice Uhl extends the poetic structures particular to Sottes Chansons and the Fatras to that of the sote chançon, a decision supported by Rosenberg and Tischler when preparing their transcriptions of these short fragments. Based upon this model, Rosenberg and Tischler’s version of the sotes chançons sets all the stanzas between notated halves to music according to the following formula: a two line-refrain + the first line of the refrain + nine-line stanza + the second line of the refrain, which submits the non-set portions of text to alternating halves of the music. In her catalogue of fr. 146’s refrains, Butterfield likewise seems to conflate the poetic structure of the fatras with the sote chançon, treating aforesaid fragments as independent refrains inserted into (or grafted onto) the host genre of the fatras. While it is possible that singers encountering An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver would have performed a version similar to Rosenberg and Tischler’s transcription, it is also equally possible that

188 Butterfield, “Poetry and Music in Medieval France,” 298.
190 Rosenberg & Tischler, The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel, 126.
the textual portion sandwiched by either half of *An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver* could have been *recited* instead of sung.\textsuperscript{192}

If we accept the latter interpretation, *An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver* reads as a kind of perversely inverted *integumentum*:\textsuperscript{193} instead of “wrapping” the savoury kernel of truth within a rhetorical integument, the core of *An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver* is pure semantic disorder, clothed by a decaying *mot* no longer attached to the “sentence” of its parent motet. When we penetrate the outer husk of notated music, all we are left with is the naked, undulating *vox* devoid of musical *ars*, totally lacking a sense of *claves* or precise pitches. In other words, we are left with a close approximation of literate but inarticulate *vox* sounded by the Charivari’s mimesis of beastliness, so much so that disguised beast and anthropomorphic horse mirror each other perfectly through the medium of sound:

\begin{verbatim}
Onc chalivali si parfaiz
Par disguiser, par diz, par faiz,
Ne fu com cil en toutes choses:
N’avoient pas de bouches closes
De bien crier et de fort braire.
A qui qu’il en deüst desplaire,
Semblant n’en fist onques Fauveaus.\textsuperscript{194}
\end{verbatim}

In disguises, words, and deeds, in every way, no charivari had ever been so perfect as this one: their mouths were always open, shouting and braying.\textsuperscript{195}

In the following *sotes chançons*, acts of signification continue to breakdown into their composite sensuous elements. The ludicrous repetition of “agace” in *En non Dieu agace* turns the Charivari revellers into a flock of obscene parrots, its grotesque lyrics punctuated by the insipid repetition of a melody built

\textsuperscript{192} Rosenberg & Tischler acknowledge this possibility in the endnotes for *An, Dieus! Ou pourrai je trouver*. See *The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel*, 126.
\textsuperscript{193} On the medieval rhetorical concept of the *integumentum* and its incarnations in fr. 146, see Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{194} Långfors, *Le Roman de Fauvel*, vv 761-7, 167.
\textsuperscript{195} Rosenberg & Tischler, *The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel*, 141.
out of only three pitches F, G and A. After *En non Dieu agace*, the length of the insertions grow considerably shorter, usually presented as a brief nonsensical snippet, heightening the sonorous quality of the music over the (non)meaning of its text. *En Hellequin*, for example, chants the mythological name of the Germanic Erlking repeatedly, each repetition further emptying the word of its semantic contents, transforming it into a mere sonic trace. In these melodic slivers, the word is obliterated, made subordinate to the raucous jubilance of aural pleasure. Reason, under the influence of Fauvel, takes flight in his topsy-turvy microcosmic, bookish-kingdom, while a beastly ontology of irrational “music” colonizes both the *mis-en-page* of fr. 146 and the landscape of the reader’s *attentus*, testing the tenacity of its patron’s moral fibre and strength of mind. Fauvel as both a sign of the beast and a metaphor for the sensuous beastliness of signification, prompts the medieval reader/listener to guard the chambers of rationality, reminding him to keep watch over the *curiositas* of his senses.
CHAPTER 3

OBSCURING THE WORD: BEASTLY “MUTATION” IN [VITRY’S?] GARRIT GALLUS/IN NOVA FERT

Introduction

In the previous chapters, I discussed how Fauvel stands as both a sign, and metaphorically embodies the “beastliness” of signification through an understanding of the sign as an intrinsically duplicitous object, itself a hybridized figura part fleshy, part rational. The transformation, fragmentation and ultimate devolution of musical grammar casts the fictional personae of Fauvel as beastly cantor, proximate to the fleshy desires of the body and sensuous listening. Pared down from the clerky-Latin motetus voice of a polyphonic motet to imperfectly cited “refrain” followed by a risqué pseudo-nonsensical literate but inarticulate vox-like particles, the danger of (mis)construing musical material as aural objects of sensory desire haunts the musical signs in Fauvel.

This chapter analyzes the aesthetics of “beastly mutation” in Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert (attributed to ars nova composer Philippe de Vitry), the last of three “Marigny” motets contained in Chaillou’s expanded Roman de Fauvel, explicitly dealing with the theme of metamorphosis. I will explore how the composer ingeniously fashions an aesthetic of transformation by playing with like-sounding sonority-types in which multiple statements of complementary sonorous “bodies” undergo internal “mutation,” thematically linking the motet to

196 I thank Dr Jane Alden, Dr Elizabeth Eva Leach and Anna Zayaruznaya for their comments and opinions on earlier versions of this chapter.
Fauvel’s own hybridized “beastly” dimension. Also, by articulating the concept of “difficult listening,” I wish to consider how Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert’s use of voice-crossing serves as a device precisely to confound the listener’s apperception of the word, thus testing his susceptibility to “beastly” forms of sensual entrainment.

*Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert and the Late Medieval Motet*

The origins of the late medieval motet have been much debated.197 Arguments have been put forth construing the motet as the direct descendent of twelfth century Notre Dame polyphonic discant or clausula,198 although this view has been shown by others to be inconclusive.199 Some musicologists have attributed Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert to the ars nova composer Philippe de Vitry200 (although more recent scholarship has challenged this attribution’s degree of certitude),201 the motet being heralded as an exemplary case-study of

---

isorhythmic\textsuperscript{202} (or “isoperiodic”) behaviour in the tenor line. Other musicologists, in general, have been perplexed by the genre of the motet for its polytextual properties (in which different texts sung by different voice parts are placed in simultaneous counterpoint with each other), seemingly “obscuring” the listener’s ability to make heads or tails of its logical content.\textsuperscript{203} In her literary study of motets, Sylvia Huot examines the juxtapositional character of French motets, which often overlaps liturgical chant (in the tenor voice) with amorous or even sexually explicit texts musically set in the upper voices.\textsuperscript{204} For Huot, such cases of juxtaposition highlights the slippery relations between contrapuntally linked words, which play on the ambiguity of textual signs existing in radically different contextual universes. The motet is hence:

\begin{quote}
...susceptible of simultaneous allegorical and parodic readings; motet composers play with the very boundary between allegory and parody, texting the limits of figurative correspondence.\textsuperscript{205}
\end{quote}

In other words, the “braiding” of words together through musical counterpoint sets up the possibility for juxtapositional reading operations which generate meanings contingent upon the pitch and rhythmic properties of the motet. Additional readings may be developed at the points of interaction between counterposed voices, which tap into the significatory excesses of the sign taken out of its syntactical constellation and put into play.


\textsuperscript{205} Ibid., 11-2.
Of all the motets contained in fr. 146’s interpolated *Roman de Fauvel*, *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* has received the most scholarly attention for several reasons. It is the last of three alleged “political” motets, containing texts allegorically referring to historical players in the history of French politics (especially the downfall of the minister of finance Enguerran de Marigny), and, within the makeup of the *Roman*, is both the last motet inscribed in the book as well as the penultimate musical item preceding the “drinking songs” later described in chapter 4.

Besides unleashing the slipperiness of signification via intertextual acts of interpretation (*between* voices rather than *within* a single voice), *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* stands out as the only motet in fr. 146’s collection of thirty-four which deals explicitly with animalized, “beastly” subjects and the subject of beastly mutation:

---

**Triplum**

*Garrit Gallus flendo dolorose*  
Laget quippe Gallorum concio  
Que satrape traditur dolose,  
Ex cubino sedens officio.  
Atque vulpes, tamquam vispilio  
*In Belial vigens astucia,*  
*De leonis consensus proprio*  
Monarchisat, atat angaria.  
*Rursus, ecce Jacob familia*  
*Pharaone altero fugatur;*  
*Non ut olim lude vestigia*  
*Subintrace potens, lacrimitur*  
*In deserto fame flagellator,*  
*Adiutoris cares armatura.*  
*Quamquam clamat, tamen spoliator,*  
*Continuo forsan moritura.*

**Triplum**

The cock babbles, lamenting sorrowfully,  
For the whole assembly of cocks  
Mourns because, while serving vigilantly,  
It is trickily betrayed by the satrap.  
And the fox, like a grave robber,  
Thriving with the astuteness of Belial,  
Rules as a monarch with the consent  
Of the lion himself. Ah, what slavery!  
Lo, once again Jacob’s family  
Is exiled by another Pharaoh.  
Not, as formerly, able  
To escape to the homeland of Judah, they weep.  
Stricken by hunger in the desert,  
Lacking the help of arms.  
Although they cry out, they are robbed;  
Perhaps speedily they will die.

---


207 This discovery was first made by Philipp August Becker, *Fauvel und Fauvelliana* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1936). On other Marigny associations, see Roesner et al., *Le Roman de Fauvel*, 51.
Several literary tropes are reproduced in the triplum and duplum voice of the motet, describing the “bestorné” ambience of Fauvel’s kingdom of inverted logic. The figure of the “fox,” in particular, would have been familiar to medieval readers through the beastly epic of Renart the fox, a cunning figure renowned for his sly trickery of authority, also alluded to in an earlier paragraph of Gervais’ text.²⁰⁹ Read together, both the triplum and the duplum elaborate on a severe state of “beastly transformation” which has befallen the microcosm of the motet. Like deviant pastors who covertly double-up as bloodthirsty wolves, the figure of the

²⁰⁹ Fauvel’s castle walls are described as being painted with the story of Renart the fox (vv 1357-8). See Arthur Långfors, Le Roman de Fauvel (Paris: F. Didot et cie, 1968), 53.
“evil dragon” ("draco") which simultaneously stirs up Christian images of the antichrist,\textsuperscript{210} mutates into numerous predatory forms, feeding on the “blood of sheep” and “chickens.” The image of the chicken also resonates with the babbling of the cock in the first line of the \textit{triplum}; as numerous scholars have noted, the word for rooster/cock – \textit{Gallus} – was also a medieval nickname for the Gauls, or Frenchmen.\textsuperscript{211} Gallus, as Nicholas Mann has also argued, was Petrarch’s name for Philippe de Vitry in the former’s \textit{Bucolicum Carmen},\textsuperscript{212} perhaps casting the opening \textit{triplum} line of \textit{Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert} as a camouflaged authorial inscription. Manipulating his slippery, transmutative quality (not unlike Fauvel’s own status as “ungraspable” sign), this devious case of beastly metamorphosis mirrors the reduction of the body politic into a stupid mass of babbling cocks. The “fox” achieves power by deceiving even “the lion himself,” the latter most likely referring to a bestialized version of Philip IV the Fair, who seems to be diminished into a lower form of animal life; \textit{Gallus} may even refer to the future king Philip V, represented in \textit{Un songe}, one of the French \textit{dits} contained in another section of fr. 146.\textsuperscript{213} Furthermore, the quality of beastly mutation is given an ominous spin in the textual makeup of the motet voices, which take up the entire span of folio 44\textsuperscript{v} (see fig. 3.1 below). The first line of the \textit{duplum} voice “In


\textsuperscript{213} Walter H. Storer & Charles A. Rochedieu, \textit{Six Historical Poems: Written in 1314-1318, Published in their Entirety for the First Time from MS. Fr. 146 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris} (Chapel Hill, 1950).
"nova fert animus mutates dicere formas" (My mind is inclined to speak of forms changed into strange things) directly quotes Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*, well-known in the later middle ages as a literary *auctoritas* concerning transformations between the gods, humans and animals.214

The position of *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* amidst the other three “Marigny” motets has been well examined by musicologists especially Margaret Bent, who discerns numerous Ovidian thematic and musical citations between the motet and one of its sister motets *Tribum que non abhorruit/Quoniam secta latronum/Merito hec patimur* on folio 41\(^v\) – 42\(^r\).215 Each motet contains snippets of melodic citations from the other, which undergo subtle “transformations” when transplanted onto a different voice part of its new host motet from its former motet.216 Together with the *Aman novi/Heu Fortuna/Heu me* (the first of the three “Marigny” motets located on folio 30\(^r\)), Bent has excavated an ingenious “reversal” of the orders of the motets in fr. 146 which, when read as textual documents referring to Marigny’s trial, execution and burial, seem to run “backwards” in counterpoint with the *forward* movement of turning the page,217 as if alluding to the counterintuitive “bestorné” quality of Fauvelian time: the “real,” lived time of experiencing the order of the motets in fr. 146 turns out to be a devious reversal of “historical” time as suggested by the allegorical contents of the motets. The ensuing analysis will not seek to amplify the meta-structural qualities between the three “Marigny” motets, but will attempt to examine how
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215 Ibid., 84-100.
216 Ibid., 96.
the composer maintains an aesthetic of “beastly transformation” in Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert as an independent musical item on the page.
“Imperfecting” the [Neuma] Core of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert and the Metaphysics of Late Medieval Mensuration

In the later Middle Ages, Franco of Cologne’s *Ars cantus mensurabilis* (c. 1280) revolutionized the rhythmic possibilities of composition by articulating a system of notation which determined the metrical properties of ligatures by their position within a group of ligatures. Franco’s organizing system was built upon four basic notational signs (the duplex long, long, breve and semibreve) which could exhibit perfect (triple time) qualities or imperfect (duple time) qualities, depending on their horizontal position in relation to each other on the stave. In the hands of later theorists such as Marchetto de Padua (*Promerium in arte musice mensurata*, c. 1318-9), Johannes de Muris (*Notitia artis musicae*, c. 1312) and the anonymous author of *Libellus cantus mensurabilis*, the possible subdivisions of the breve multiplied nearly ad infinitum, leading to the period which musicologists broadly term the *ars nova*, and the sophistries of the later *ars subtilior*.

---

Apart from its Ovidian borrowings, *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* contained in fr. 146 is also visually striking as one of the earliest known motets to employ red coloration in the tenor line, signifying the temporal “metamorphosis” of perfect time (*modus perfectus*) to imperfect time (*modus imperfectus*).\(^{224}\) The device of coloration was surely novel for the late thirteenth and fourteenth century, which saw the evolution of radically alternative forms of mensural and temporal divisions, giving composers a larger vocabulary of metrical units to play with.\(^{225}\)

The treatise *Ars nova* originally attributed to Philippe de Vitry distinguishes between *modus perfectus* (perfect mode) and *modus imperfectus* (imperfect mode) explicitly as metrical modes with three and two breves respectively in relation to the long;\(^{226}\) red coloration is used to signify the “imperfection” of notes that would otherwise be perfect. In other words, a group of breves colored in red would indicate that the colored section would be realized in imperfect (duple) time as opposed to perfect (triple) time, measured against the breve. For *modus perfectus*, each long is divisible into 3 breves (i.e. \(L = 3B\)) while each long is divisible into 2 breves for *modus imperfectus* (i.e. \(L = 2B\)). Figure 3.2 below shows instances of tenor coloration in the motet, indicated by square brackets:

---

224 Bent, “Polyphony of Texts and Music,” 96.
226 *Modus* should not be confused with *tempus* in [Vitry’s?] treatise. *Modus perfectus/imperfectus* describes the division of the long into breves, whereas *tempus perfectus/imperfectus* relates to the division of the breve into semibreves. See Herlinger, “Music Theory of the Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries,” 286, for other notational details.
Fig. 3.2. Detail of fo. 44v: Coloration in the *tenor* voice (identified in brackets).  

In the case of the *Neuma* melody (a generic “stock” melodic formula in liturgical chant) employed as the *tenor* for Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert, the melody is split into three equal parts of 22 breves each, which comprises three equivalent *talea* (rhythmic) statements. Each *talea* component comprises an “imperfected” core of 10 breves, constructed around the kernel of a long rest. Altogether, the *talea* is repeated six times while the *color* is stated twice over the length of the motet, as demonstrated in figure 3.3 below:

Fig. 3.3. *Color* and *Talea* in the [Neuma] *tenor* of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert.

---

227 The *tenor* voice begins on the penultimate staff on the right and continues on the last staff on the left. The stave on the upper left hand corner of the image is the ending of the *triplum* voice. Since this is a black-and-white facsimile of fr. 146, the red coloration is not as easily distinguishable. However, it can be faintly discerned for its lighter quality of ink. Photo: Wesleyan University Special Collections.
This “imperfected” core is further framed on both ends by 6 breves in perfect time notated as such by conventional black ink, revealing a carefully engineered palindromic structure in its talea (rhythmic pattern), repeated three times in a single color (melodic pattern) as shown below in fig. 3.4. The resultant effect is both visually and aurally prominent – singers attempting to realize the tenor melody would recognize the metrical “gear shift” from modus perfectus to modus imperfectus signalled on the page by the red notation. Similarly, listeners might perceive conspicuous modifications in the metrical consistency of the tenor melody during the switch from modus perfectus to imperfectus and vice versa. This unsettling – even disorienting – effect of metrical shift is repeated not only once or twice, but a total of 12 times across the length of the piece (modus perfectus \(\rightarrow\) imperfectus \(\rightarrow\) perfectus x 6 total statements of the talea), giving the overall impression of metrical instability and transitory disorientation.

Why should the composer of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert go to such lengths, reengineering the Neuma melody as to emphasize aforesaid cases of metrical dissonance? Is the composer merely showing off the dazzling new

---

228 B = Breve; L = Long (which is equivalent to 2 breves for imperfect time, and 3 breves for perfect time). The midpoint of the talea is in bold while the italicized items in parenthesis designate the use of coloration. The italicized notes in the parenthesis are colored, indicating imperfect time (L = 2B) whereas the notes flanking the parenthesis are in perfect time (L = 3B). The middle Long (in imperfect time) is in bold, indicating the midpoint of the talea statement. Each talea statement is repeated 3 times over the course of a single color statement; since the color repeats, there are altogether 3 x 2 = 6 talea statements in total over the length of the motet.
possibilities afforded by mensural innovations, or is there a subtler rhetorical point at play beyond the novelty generated via metrical “transformation”? I suggest that the “imperfection” of the Neuma melody over which the motet was constructed was a deliberate reference to the Aristotelian understanding of “imperfection” and its relation to “perfection,” deriving from his writings about physical motion. As David E. Cohen points out, the “Aristotelian principle” which arises out of his philosophy in *Physics*, consists of five basic principles:

Beginning with (1) a basic distinction between “imperfect” and “perfect” things, the principle states that (2) imperfect things “tend toward” or “seek” their “perfection”; (3) they do so because they are imperfect; (4) imperfect things possess this tendency “by nature.” The fifth constituent idea is not stated explicitly within the usual verbal formulations of the principle itself, but is logically entailed by the first four ideas as understood within their native intellectual context of Aristotelian-scholastic physics; it is that (5) the imperfect thing strives by nature toward a particular specific perfect thing; more precisely, it strives toward, or seeks the state of being that represents its own perfection with regard to some specific imperfection.229 (My emphasis).

Largely owing to the “rediscovery” and impassioned translations of Aristotle in the twelfth century, Cohen focuses his essay upon the ways in which the notion of “imperfection” seeking “perfection” in Aristotelian physics came to bear strongly in late medieval dyadic progression theory in the fourteenth century, especially in the works of Marchetto de Padua. Elsewhere, Elizabeth Eva Leach discusses how the “semitone” as an “imperfect” tone can be conceived of as a gendered improvisation on the same Aristotelian tune.230 Although both Cohen and Leach restrict their scholarship to medieval notions of the sonic “directed progression,”231 Aristotle’s asymmetric polarization of the “perfect” and the

---

“imperfect” came to inflect mensural theory with equal (if not greater) force. 232 Franco of Cologne’s late thirteenth century treatise *Ars cantus mensurabilis*, for example, rehearses the notion of “perfection” as self-sufficiency and “imperfection” as a lack-of-being in his discussion of the long:

The perfect long is called first and principal, for in it all the others are included, to it also all the others are reducible. It is called perfect because it is measured by three “tempora.”

the ternary number being the most perfect number because it takes its name from the Holy Trinity, which is true and pure perfection. Its figure is quadrangular, with a descending tail on the right, representing length.

The imperfect long has the same figure as the perfect, but signifies only two “tempora.” It is called imperfect because it is never found except in combination with a preceding or following breve. From this it follows that those who call it “proper” are in error, for that which is “proper” can stand by itself. 233

Franco goes one step ahead of Aristotle, pairing the notion of “perfection” with the theological metaphor of the Holy Trinity. In contrast, “imperfection” can never “stand by itself,” perhaps retroactively pairing “imperfection” with man’s own sinful, corporeal “imperfection” when read reciprocally with the “perfection” of the Holy Trinity. 234 Moreover, Franco emphasizes that it is erroneous to conceive of the imperfect long as “proper;” could “imperfection” be thus read allegorically as “improper”? In Marchetto de Padua’s *Pomerium*, “imperfect time” is described as an essential deficiency, indeed a corrupt, lacking “version” of “perfect time”:

In the first place we say that imperfect musical mensurable time is that which is a minimum, not in fullness, but in semi-fullness of voice. […] It is certain that just as the perfect is that which lacks nothing, so the imperfect is that which lacks something. […] It


234 It is also notable that Jean de Muris’ *Ars Nova Musicae* (c. 1319) similarly pairs *perfectus* with the Christological metaphor of the Holy Trinity.
The of discourse of perfect and imperfect time in Jean de Muris’ *Ars Novae Musicae* (c. 1319) assigns “imperfection” as a hierarchically lower position in the chain of mensural being in relation to “perfect time.” The “binary number” composition of “imperfect time,” for Jean, “is thus of lower rank” since “it falls short of the ternary.” Jacob of Liège’s reactionary *Speculum musicae* of the later fourteenth century turns the tables on mensural theory by using the lesser status of “imperfection” to question the need for “imperfect” divisions of time in the first place:

For the new art, as we have seen, uses manifold and various imperfections in its notes, modes, and measures. Everywhere, as it were, imperfection enters into it: not content with this imperfection in notes, modes, and measures, it extends the imperfection to the time. For the new art has what it calls imperfect time, a thing unknown to the old art, and it applies an imperfection arising from time to the notes of the individual degrees.

Not content with simple, duplex, and triplex longs and with breves, and some not content even with semibreves, the practitioners of this art are still inventing new ways of corrupting what is perfect with many imperfections.

In a recent paper delivered at the 2009 American Musicological Society conference (Philadelphia), Karen Desmond proposed that Jacob’s attack on Johannes de Muris’ systemization of mensural theory can be further traced to an ongoing metaphysical debate about the relationship between form and matter.

For Desmond, Jacob’s position on mensuration ventriloquizes what she terms “succession theory,” which hypothesized that a change of form did not occur

---

through the addition or subtraction of elements (which the alternative “addition theory” proposed), but necessarily signalled the destruction of the old form in the process of assuming it’s new form. The transformation from perfection to imperfection, for Jacob, did not therefore merely signify a shift in metrical schema, but also represented the debasement or destruction of “perfection” in music writ large:

Secundo dicendum quod perfectum per amotionem tertiae suae partis, si illa sit de essentia sua, non iam imperficitur sed destruitur et corrumpitur ut domus, si fundamentum, parietes vel tectum tollatur; triangulus, si alter atrium linearum vel trium angulorum; ternaries, si unitas. Similiter si a longa perfecta sui tollatur tertia pars, ipsa destruitur et in longam mutatur imperfectam.

Second, it must be said that if a third part is removed from something which is perfect, it is removed from its essence, and it is not “imperfected,” but rather destroyed and corrupted, just as a dome [is destroyed], if its foundation, or its walls, are removed; or a triangle, if one of its three lines or three angles [is removed]; and a ternary [is destroyed], if unity [is removed]. Similarly, if a third is removed from a perfect long, it is itself destroyed and is changed [mutatur] into an imperfect long.239

For Jacob, the mutation [mutatur] of modus perfectus to modus imperfectus was philosophically charged with heavy connotations of destruction, decay and corruption. Could we not then read the “imperfection” of the tenor Neuma of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert as a kind of “corruption” of the lofty ontology of mankind? As the triplum and duplum texts echo the terrors of beastly mutation in the upper voices, the tenor mensural treatment (following Marchetto’s figure of speech) vacillates between “man” and “not-man” (beast). According to Jacob’s metaphysics of the “succession theory,” it could also be interpreted that mensural mutation involved the corruptive destruction of man’s original humanized form; read against theorists’ invocation of Christological “perfection,” could we not also compare this case of “imperfection” as an abandonment of

man’s religious salvation, which retroactively threatens to demolish the dome/dwelling place [domus] of Christ’s church? Like the beastly pastors we encountered in chapter 1, a subtle mutation from modus perfectus to modus imperfectus could signal the ghastly transformation of claves into clavus, gesturing towards the fall of man from the estate of heaven to the sinful dimension of the beast.

Furthermore, if we consider the horizontal enunciation of each talea on the staff as an independent rhythmic unit, each block may be interpreted as a visualization of the medieval integumentum (integument) when read against the other visual integumentum of folio 45r located right across the page (later discussed in chapter 4). The rhetorical concept of the integumentum was commonly used to “wrap” moral lessons and truths in an “outer” fictional or mythological envelope; in this case, the “truth” which is supposed to be sheltered by the outer husk of fiction is paradoxically “imperfect,” while the outer, dispensable integument is “perfect,” perhaps once again creatively mimicking the inverted (“bestorné”) quality of Fauvellian existence. The tenor part, which usually constituted the backbone of motet composition process, is itself “imperfected” at its (theological and mensural) core. The theme of “corruption” also sits comfortably with Gervais’ description of Fauvel’s devilish microcosm; an “imperfection” of the Neuma tenor melody could echo the Fauvel’s own corrupt clergy who delight more in power than religious redemption.

As Edward Roesner has pointed out, the Neuma melody itself is subtly divergent from conventional plainchant formula of the fifth mode Neuma, and has been tweaked specially to (potentially) embed references to Fauvel.\footnote{Roesner, “Labouring in the Midst of Wolves,” 230.}

Pitched on fa, $f$, it may be one more example of ‘F’ being thrown into relief as emblematic of Fauvel. Furthermore, the tenor color spans a hexachord, $f$ to $d$, from $fa$-ut to $la$ (re-sol), outlining the name of Fauvel and even including the same number of elements, six.\footnote{Ibid., 229-30.}

On folio 44\textsuperscript{v}, the tenor incipit is left unfilled by the scribe (see figure 3.1);\footnote{The scribe left a space for the tenor capital on the penultimate staff on the right in column $b$, but it is debatable as to whether “Neuma” was intended to be written here.} to recognize the Neuma melody would take the critical intelligence of a learned, clerkly musicus and not a dumb cantor. Identification of the tenor’s chant association would bear testimony to the perceiver’s knowledge of liturgy, and consequently serve as a measure of his proximity to God. In a similar vein, the incapable cantor unlearned in the significance of red coloration might reduce the signifying component of the sign to its sensual, visual element: failure to recognize coloration as a sign for modus imperfectus could potentially lead to a chaotic rendition of the motet. Once the discerning reader/musicus recognizes the Neuma tenor chant formula beneath its metrical “disfigurement,” another facet of the motet’s rhetorical ingenuity emerges – the association of “Neuma” with “neumatic” notation (using neumes) shares the same etymological roots of the Greek word “Neuma” (meaning “spirit,” “sign” or “gesture”)\footnote{Carl Parrish, The Notation of Medieval Music (New York: Norton, 1957), 4.} and “pneuma,” denoting the life-giving breath of the Holy Spirit, linking this musical phrase to a quasi-divine act of creation.\footnote{I thank Dr Jane Alden of Wesleyan University for pointing this out to me. See John Haines, “From Point to Square: Graphic Change in Medieval Music Script,” in Textual Cultures, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Autumn, 2008), 31.} In Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert, however, the
composer’s use of *ars nova* coloration techniques does not result in “divine creation,” but rather a menagerie of sacrilegious, “imperfect” beastly beings. The poet/composer is paradoxically at once a terrifying Frankensteinish creator who breathes “pneumatic” life into red-colored “neuma”-tic notation, and the dexterous *musicus* who forges this complex motet through his mastery of the latest compositional techniques. On the other hand, the successful realization of the motet relies on the learned *musicus’* ability to correctly transform notation (*neumes*) into sonorous breath (*pneuma*), while a thoughtless *cantor* unable to decipher the mensural signs further disfigures the tightly constructed tonal balance of the motet by falling out of sync with his fellow singers. The fate of the motet between euphonious performance and beastly, chaotic noise therefore rests on the degree of acquisition of good musical learning with which to accurately decipher mensural-notational codes.

**The *Mutationes* of Sonorous “Bodies”: Vertical Structures of Transformation**

On folio 30r of fr. 146, the very last line of the *triplum* voice of *Aman novi/Heu Fortuna/Heu me* (the first of the three “Marigny” motets) quotes a line contained in the anonymous *Catonis Disticha* (“The Distichs of Cato”), a medieval textbook widely popular in the Middle Ages: “*Non eodem cursu respondent ultima primis*” (“End and beginning often are unlike”).246 Given that this “first” motet corresponds with the “last” episode in its Marigny commentary, scholars have generally taken this quote to refer to Marigny’s inglorious downfall

---

from his initially promising career.\textsuperscript{247} Taken into the context of this group of three “Marigny” motets, the citation could also be taken as a strategy for reading or hearing \textit{Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert}, the last of the “Marigny” motets. If we consider the Cato quotation in relation to \textit{Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert}, we discover that the “end” of the motet is indeed unlike its “beginning”: although the first and last sonic triad\textsuperscript{248} (F-c-f) of the motet is the same,\textsuperscript{249} its pitch constituents are deviously altered by swapping the voices which constitute the F-c-f tonal triad (see fig. 3.5 below). In the first F-c-f triad of the motet, c is taken by the \textit{triplum} voice while f is sustained by the \textit{duplum} voice. By the end of the piece however, both voices have swapped pitches; the \textit{triplum} voice now sings the f while c is taken by the \textit{duplum} voice.

![Comparison of the first and last triad in Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert.](image)

By swapping the internal voices of the triad, the composer of \textit{Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert} preserves an apparently similar tonal “body” between the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[247] Leo Schrade’s translation of this line (“The end of a \textit{career} does not always match its beginning”) makes this connection particularly explicit, although the text may be translated without strictly referring to a “career” as such. An online source of Schrade’s translation may be found on La Trobe University’s Medieval Music database at \url{<http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/MMDB/composer/H0028002.htm>}.\textsuperscript{248}
\item[248] I use the term “triad” not in the contemporary diatonic sense of the term, but as a term which refers to a tonal compound comprised of three pitches.\textsuperscript{249}
\item[249] Here I use the \textit{claves} designation based on Pseudo-Odo’s division of the monochord. See Charles M. Atkinson, \textit{The Critical Nexus: Tone-System, Mode, and Notation in Early Medieval Music} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 212.
\end{footnotes}
opening and closing triad of the motet, yet the two sonorous entities are unlike, having undergone a “mutation” of its internal, intervallic properties. Such an internal rearrangement of the triad’s sonorous makeup also bears remarkable resemblance to Macrobius’ literary concept of *mutatio* (mutation) as a form of descriptive re-writing. Douglas Kelly explains:

Macrobius uses similar terms that identify two distinct stages in descriptive imitation: *mutuatio* and *mutatio*. *Mutuatio* refers to the lifting of material from a source in order to locate and rewrite it in a new work. The realigning and rewriting of such material is *mutatio*. With these two terms, then, Macrobius articulates two stages in rewriting: the extraction and transfer of matter (*mutuatio*) and its relocation and transformation in a new work (*mutatio*).

Out of Macrobius’ four species of literary *mutatio* (*adiecio*, *detraction*, *immutatio* and *transmutatio*), *transmutatio* (transmutation) referred to the act of rearranging the elements of the whole in order to form a new (literary) “being.”

Like Macrobius’ concept of *transmutatio*, the vertical, sonorous “bodies” of the F-c-f triad in *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* undergo a type of beastly “transmutation” of sorts through the rearrangement (voice-exchange) of its constituent voices, resulting in sonically similar but non-identical musical objects. The technique of *mutatio*, Kelly further asserts, also can indicate the “rearrangement of a sequence of events in an antecedent work” from which the new work departs. Seen this way, could we also not conceive the “inverted” orders of the “Marigny” motets as a similar form of *mutatio*? By reversing the order of “natural” time in fr. 146’s sequence of motets, Chaillou’s interpolated “addicions” in the *Roman de Fauvel* perform an act of *mutatio* upon historical time itself, perverting – indeed inverting – the forward motion of history in presenting it as flowing backwards.

---

251 Ibid., 71.
252 Ibid., 72.
“Mutation” and “transmutation” were not alien concepts in the medieval imagination. The celebrated lais of the twelfth century Marie de France, for example, employ the common trope of shape-shifting humans who morph between animal and human bodies. Montague Summers’ study of werewolf folklore and superstition revealed a culture where the boundaries between fact and fiction were often blurred; religious authorities repeatedly attempted to debunk the “speciem transmutari” (transmutation in species) between man and beast, despite the widespread belief in werewolf existence. In the later Middle Ages, clerical circles conflated with debate over the “mutative” particulars of the Eucharistic holy sacrament. While authorities pondered over the mutation of bread, other intellectual skirmishes ensued over the subject of alchemy – the art (ars) which boasted of its ability to “transform” or “mutate” worthless alloys into precious metals. Around the mid thirteenth century, changes in opinion regarding alchemy saw a class of intellectuals who appraised its ars as a means of

254 Caution has to be taken as to the medieval meaning of “species,” which is quite different than its biological classificatory schema today. “Species” as a term deriving from Aristotelian Natural Philosophy can be generally taken to mean “type” or “kind,” but by the thirteenth century, the semantics of “species” came to be used broadly, even representing “sensory rays” emitted by the eyes by extromission optical theorists. See Pierre Michaud-Quantin, “Les champs semantiques de species. Tradition latine et traduction du Grec,” in Études sur le vocabulaire philosophique du Moyen Age, Ed. Pierre Michaud-Quantin, avec la collaboration de Michel Lemoine (Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1970), 133-50. On the use of “species” in optical theory, see Suzanne Conklin Akbari, Seeing through the veil: optical theory and medieval allegory (Toronto & London: University of Toronto Press, 2004).
“perfecting” nature,258 which partially reoriented discussions towards the role and impact of *ars* in/upon the natural world. Like the trained alchemist who performs “*speciem transmutari*” upon metals, the deft compositional *ars* of the learned *musicus* transmutes one sonorous “species” into another in the medium of sound.259

The example enumerated in fig. 3.5 above is not the only case of voice-swapping in the F-c-f triad; an analysis of the entire motet reveals that the F-c-f triad is articulated a total of eight times. Fig. 3.6 below is a modern transcription of *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert*; where iterations of the F-c-f triad occurs, I have identified them in boxes. For purposes of clarity, I will refer to triads that sound the same (regardless of voice-pitch designation) as like “Sonority types,” and different iterations of the same sonority types (i.e. sonority types differing in their internal intervallic relationships while preserving the same sounding triad) as “Intervallic types.”

---

Fig. 3.6a: F-c-f iterations in *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert*.\(^{260}\)

Altogether, there are two distinct sonority types which contain pitches F and C (see fig. 3.7 below). For both Sonority types, the tenor takes the lowest F, indicated in figure 3.7 by the square unfilled notehead. Correspondingly, the round unfilled notehead indicates the duplum voice while the round filled
notehead indicates the *triplum* voice. Sonority type one (S₁) consists of the aforementioned F-c-f triad, whereas Sonority type two (S₂) consists of F-f-c. Each of the two Sonority types can be further divided into two recurring *transmutatio* Intervallic types; S₁ exhibits two mutational sister Intervallic types, namely Intervallic type A (S₁A) in which the *triplum* voice carries the c and the *duplum* voice carries the f, and Intervallic type B (S₁B) in which the *triplum* voice carries the f and the *duplum* voice carries the c. Similarly, S₂ can be further subdivided into S₂A in which the *triplum* takes the c and the *duplum* the f, and S₂B in which the *triplum* takes the f and *duplum* the c.

Fig. 3.7. FC Sonority and Intervallic types in *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert*.

![Fig. 3.7](image)

Fig. 3.8. Large-scale structure of FC (S₁ & S₂) type transformations.

![Fig. 3.8](image)
Extracting these “transforming” sonorities onto a structural graph reveals a tight, coherent inner “structure” based on Sonority and Intervallic types. In figure 3.8, crossed arrows indicate cases of voice-swapping between successive iterations of like Sonority types, while large X’s are used in the letter-reductions below the staves to represent the same. Sonority type S₁ flanks the inner structure of transformative triads, with both the first and last Sonority type exhibiting differing intervallic types (i.e. S₁A X S₁B). The “core” of the FC transformative structure comprises of three statements of S₂, which undergo intervallic restructuring at every statement, followed by three statements of Sonority type S₁, also subjected to intervallic transformation at every consecutive reiteration. Between types S₂A and S₁B on either side of the dotted dividing line is measure 29, merely one measure shy of the midpoint of the entire motet (between measures 30 and 31), strongly suggesting that this “division” between Sonority types S₂ and S₁ in both halves of the motet was most likely deliberate, or contrived from the very start. The anticipation of the motet’s midpoint, it seems, is “marked” by the transmutatio of type S₂A to S₁A, announcing the commencement of a spate of S₁ type transformations. If we apply the same analytical principles to Sonority types based on variations of DG sonorities, we obtain a different, though similarly coherent inner structure of mutatio (see fig. 3.9).

Like the FC transformations presented in fig. 3.8, the DG transformations in fig. 3.9 below consist of eight statements of a G-d-g mutating “body.” Two outer iterations of the S₃ Sonority type (G-d-g) flank an inner group of S₃ members which may be further divided into two classifications of
transformational operations which mirror each other, demonstrated below by the dotted dividing line.\textsuperscript{261}

Fig. 3.9. Large-scale structure of DG (S\textsubscript{3}) type transformations.

Interestingly, the organization of Intervallic types S\textsubscript{3A} and S\textsubscript{3B} yield a palindromic structure, as if echoing the rhythmic palindrome present in the tenor voice (refer to fig. 3.4 above). In the diagram, I have deliberately omitted the final two statements of type S\textsubscript{3A} which occur after this transformational palindrome, which appear in measures 56 and 58 respectively. The reason for this omission is due to a conspicuous change in the voice-crossing behaviour of the motet. For reasons which I will discuss later, both types fall under what I call the motet’s “zone of clarity” from measure 52 to 59, in which the density of polytextuality exhibited by the motet significantly clears up, allowing the hypothetical medieval listener to better ascertain the texts articulated by the duplum and triplum voice. Two other sonorous “bodies,” AE (S\textsubscript{4}) and CG (S\textsubscript{5}) triadic Sonority types, are

\textsuperscript{261} In this case, the dotted dividing line does not correspond to the motet’s midpoint in measure 30, but is displaced earlier between measure 14 and 26.
worth mentioning for exhibiting relational transformative structures across the length of the motet (see fig. 3.10 and 3.11).

Fig. 3.10. Large-scale structure of AE (S₄) type transformations.

Fig. 3.11. Large-scale structure of C-G (S₅) type transformations.

As in the diagram for S₃ (DG) transformations in fig. 3.9, I have likewise omitted the A-E type S₄B in fig. 3.10 above (occurring in measure 52) because of its proximity to the “zone of clarity.” A comparison of the S₄ and S₅ type transformational structures shows that they both exhibit very similar patterns of transformative statements. In each case, a “B” Intervallic type sonority forms the centre of the iterative core (in both cases, the *duplum* voice takes the highest
pitch), flanked on either side by an “A X B” transformational pair. In the extreme, this could potentially be interpreted as a micro palindrome “echoing” the palindromes found in the tenor line and between S₃ types earlier discussed.

Another noteworthy observation which may be elucidated from all four structural figures above is a consistent decreasing transformational “bandwidth” from figures 3.8 to 3.11, except for S₄ and S₅ types which share the same measure-bandwidth count of 30 measures each. That is, the number of measures over which complimentary Sonority types are “spread” decreases in sizeable increments. Consequently, the average rate of change between Intervallic types of successive classes of Sonority types increases from S₁ to S₄/₅. Fig. 3.12 below gives a rough visual estimate of the “bandwidth” of the spread of Sonority types over all 59 measures, each measure represented as a single rectangular unit. The boxes marked in black denote the “stretch” of the Sonority types, defined by first and last measures which the types are found.

Fig. 3.12. Sonority type bandwidths over all 59 measures of the motet.

This, of course, is a general observation; there are exceptions to the rule. In fig. 3.9, for example, S₃ types generally exhibit a steady rate of Intervallic type iterations with the exception of measures 9 and 39 (both mirror images of the dividing line). Likewise, for type S₅ (fig. 3.11), measures 21 and 51 exhibit a high
rate of Intervallic change from $S_{5A}$ to $S_{5B}$. However, given the high degree of internal structuring of Sonority types in *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert*, it seems unlikely that these deep-level schemas were merely coincidental. Based on this evidence, there is good reason to posit that, intertextual quotations from related motets aside, the composer of this motet had carefully planned the “structure” of Intervallic type *mutatio* beforehand. If this was truly the case, then could we not also consider the novel possibility that *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* was, in fact, “structured” by sonorous “beastly transformation”?

Before proceeding, there are certain ontological concerns of the motet that need to be addressed. If, as I have suggested, the composer’s arranging of metamorphosing sonorous bodies was indeed rigorously contrived as an important structural feature of the motet, then *who* was privy to such knowledge? Nothing of the notational layout on folio 44v emphasizes these “vertical” sonority types (refer to fig. 3.1); instead, the *mis-en-page* presents *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* as three separate voices, possibly to aid the realization of the motet by three singers overlooking the same book. It is only by transcribing the motet onto today’s contemporary “stacked” stave notational system that the structures are made visible, ruling out the possibility that the composer’s transformational structures were meant to appeal to an ocular aesthetic. Could the transformation of complementary Sonority types then have been meant to be discerned by the listener (or performer)? The problem with the latter argument is that complementary Sonority types sound exactly the same pitch-wise, since the overall intervallic relationships between different Intervallic types of the same Sonority type remain the same. It is the *voices* that “swap” the constituent pitches
of the Sonority type, leading to different Intervalllic type permutations. However, our examination of the motet thus far has only considered the tonal elements of the work – by considering how text and polyphonic voice parts interact in the piece, I wish to suggest how the listener (as a performer or audience member) may, with great difficulty, conceivably perceive the subtle changes in Intervalllic types with every reiteration of a Sonority type.

“Difficult Listening”: Voice-Crossing and Musical Obscura of the Word

Addressing the perceptibility of the motet’s mutative Sonority types inevitably has to address the weighty problem of listening to the motet, an oft recurring musicological theme which has drawn much opiniated consternation over the past few decades. In particular, musicologists have argued over the intriguing polytextual nature of the motet, that is, the audibility (and thus degree of transparency) in making out different texts which are declaimed simultaneously. Would the medieval listener have been able to discern each text independently, or was the resultant sonorous mess meant to convey the simulation of intelligibility without being actually (textually) distinguishable? For Christopher Page, the complication of polytextual subtilitas (“subtlety”) leads him to conclude that “hearing” the motet intelligibly was a near-impossible task for the medieval listener:

[Polytextuality] … was surely not taken to involve a sacrifice of meaning but rather a gain of pleasure that was ‘intellectual’ in this sense: it produced the exhilaration of knowing that a piece contains more than one can ever hope to hear. It might also be maintained, as a general observation, that word-bearing melody has the power, through its purely musical logic and pattern, to busy the mind in a way that cancels some of the
attention and vigilance that is normally brought to language when it is read on the page or heard.\textsuperscript{262}

To this extent, Page ventures the possibility that the intricacy of music/word hybridity in the motet was meant more for the ears of the performers themselves than audience members, since such musical “effect[s] would have been lost upon any who had not cultivated a musical memory.”\textsuperscript{263} As director of the esteemed performance group \textit{Gothic Voices}, Page draws upon his experience to lament his impotency in making sense of the motet’s polytextual chaos, extending it to the possible \textit{confusio} experienced by the modern listener:

There will be many modern listeners who, when they hear the recorded performance which accompanies this article … will find themselves unable to follow the conversation between the three speakers that I have just paraphrased, however diligently they study the texts and translations. I confess that I cannot follow it; indeed, I am not sure that I can follow very much.\textsuperscript{264}

Since the publication of Page’s views in \textit{Discarding Images} (1993), other scholars have attempted to revise the motet’s degree of transparency with respect to a listening audience. Bent, in particular, argues that the motet’s complexity would have been porous at least to a group of highly educated listeners bearing informed and prepared listening.\textsuperscript{265} Elsewhere, she reinforces this view with respect to listeners who have acquired the skills of musical knowledge, and the (very valid) possibility of repeated listening:

Such things as are pointed out here cannot all be heard in a single performance of by an unprepared listener. But the experience listener who, like Boethius’s \textit{musicus}, ’exhibits the faculty of forming judgments according to speculation or reason,’ will be drawn to

\textsuperscript{263} Ibid., 102.
considerations and reflections outside the time it takes to perform the music [...] As with all informed listening … discovering what subtleties have been planted by the composer may increase understanding and pleasure when the piece is heard as an entity.\textsuperscript{266}

It is worth emphasizing that Bent implies that “informed listening” is a privilege enjoyed by the learned \emph{musicus} as conversely compared to the “surface,” sensual “carnal” listening of the \emph{cantor}. Would the \emph{musicus} then have been able to call the composer’s bluff and apperceive the devious \emph{mutatio} of Sonority types, and would the \emph{cantor}, unable to penetrate beyond the sonorous likeness of Intervallic types, correspondingly fail to aurally distinguish the difference between two mutated bodies? In a fairly recent article, Suzannah Clark turns the tables on the debate, arguing that certain musical features of the motet can, on the contrary, increase the comprehensibility of text;\textsuperscript{267} polytextual and polyphonic text setting therefore becomes an opportunity for the composer to highlight and juxtapose key textual phrases between voices through intricate musical detailing.

For Clark:

\begin{quote}
[The] musical material and interaction between the voices served to focus the listeners’ attention. Given the dictum that what one hears depends on what one listens for, I shall argue the case that the music serves as an ingenious means of signalling what there is to be listened for. In this sense … distinct musical gestures assist in word projection.\textsuperscript{268}
\end{quote}

Clark’s analysis is certainly possible, revolving around the musical highlighting of an interpolated refrain in one motet drawn from another motet, which stresses the complicity between both motets while availing an inter-motet generation of meaning. While I agree with Clark, I would also like to consider the other side of Clark’s thesis. That is, inasmuch as the musicalized “interaction

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{268} Ibid., 35.
\end{flushright}
between the voices” helped to “focus the listeners’ attention” and aid comprehensibility of certain sections of the motet, I would like to propose how such musical details can also be used to deliberately obscure the listener’s sense of the text by exacting a further study of voice-crossing episodes within Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert.269

The issue of voice-crossing is highly relevant to our discussion of the motet, as well as to the degree of auditory transparency of the motet’s mutating Sonority types. Hypothetically, if a highly discerning listener were somehow able to follow the registral coordinates of each voice by pairing it with the enunciated text, he or she would have conceivably noticed that, at times, the duplum and triplum swapped registers. Even if the listener were to attentively focus on the text of a single voice, successful entrainment of that one voice through its register manoeuvring would reveal that the voice-relationships between successive statements of like Sonority types had undergone internal mutatio. The failure to perceive the difference between different Intervallic types of the same Sonority class then suggests that the listener has lost the allocation of text to voice part, correspondingly suggesting listening confusio rather than attentus. As discussed above, Intervallic types should not be construed as ontologically uniform: though

269 Through personal conversations, Anna Zayaruznaya (Harvard University) has rightfully pointed out that frequent registral exchange is common in motets usually attributed to Philippe de Vitry, and some earlier Ars nova motets. While it would be possible to argue that since registral exchange was a commonly observed feature (by modern musicologists), and thus subtractive of the uniqueness of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert beastly rhetorics, I wish to consider instead the semantic potential of voice-crossing and registral exchange in the context of the Roman de Fauvel. If, as recent scholarship has asserted, the motet was composed specially for the Roman de Fauvel, then why should one consider such ‘common’ strategies in the composer’s toolkit as less potent in fleshing out Fauvelian themes? I consider what features in the motet could say in the background of the Roman de Fauvel (its local, meta-physical environment) and not what it ‘uniquely’ says in relation to motets supposedly originating from the same composer, that is, not what the motet could ‘tell us’ about the composer. See Bent, “Fauvel and Marigny: Which Came First?” for a discussion of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert as part of several “Marigny” motets specially composed for Fauvel. I thank Anna for her insightful and pertinent criticism.
like Sonority types may fool the listener into assuming identical Intervalic-types, such a distinction is the driving force between the motet’s rhetoric on transmuting (sonic) bodies. Despite the likeness of two similar Sonority types, the intervallic relations between the “inner” voices are deliberately altered; any assumption that identical sonority types exhibit identical intervalic types would cause the listener to lose track of the simultaneously declaimed texts, causing imminent confusion.

Following the texts by pairing it with a motet voice, however, is easier said than done. One method of voice-text pairing as a listening strategy would be to follow the highest vocal register of the motet and assume it is the *triplum*. This was usually the case for late thirteenth and early fourteenth century motets; the *tenor* voice was often understood to be the lowest registral voice of the motet, followed by the *duplum* and *triplum*.270 Doing so would enable the listener to maintain a coherent sense of the *triplum’s* text simply by following the highest voice to distinguish it from the lower *duplum* voice, and the lowest *tenor* voice. Despite this convention, *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* subverts all expectations by continually switching the registers of the *duplum* and *triplum* voice via voice-crossing. In fact, the motet is atypical from the onset: at the very beginning, the *duplum* voice is unusually pitched above the *triplum* voice in the first statement of S₁A, continuing to dominate the upper register until measure 9. By the end of the piece, the “wrong” registral makeup of S₁A has reverted to the “right” arrangement of S₁B (measure 59), with the *triplum* voice appropriating the high f. If the listener had planned on following the text based on register, he would have inevitably

---

mixed up the *triplum* text and *duplum* text by the end of the piece, resulting in a *confusio* of textual sense. The unusual pitching of the duplum over the triplum is not merely confined to the opening sections of the piece. Out of a total 147 breves, the *duplum* dominates the upper registers of the motet with a rough estimate of 90.5 breves over the *triplum*’s 56.5 breves.

Fig. 3.13. Tabulation of the number of breves a voice dominates the upper register.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>DOMINATING VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1-9     | DDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDDD
the *triplum* voice; each capital letter roughly accords to half a breve (i.e. semibreve), which enables us to make sense of the density of register-swapping visually. The results are particularly astounding: not only does the *duplum* voice dominate the upper register for about 61.5% of the piece (with the *triplum* voice at 38.5%), but the motet, as a whole, contains 19 episodes of registral exchange, which averages to an exchange occurring as often as every 7.7 breves. Although the *duplum* voice dominates the motet’s upper register by breve count, it also severs expectations by dipping *below* the *tenor* in measure 49 (refer to fig. 3.6b), disrupting the registral conventions of all three voices!

Nancy van Deusen’s scholarship on the theological metaphors employed in the construction of the thirteenth century medieval motet uncovers a discourse which paired the registral levels of the motet’s voices with an understanding of religious *firmamentum* (firmament), stressing a hierarchy of order reproduced by voice registers. 271 In the writings of theologian Robert Grosseteste and music theorist Anonymous IV, the concept of *firmamentum* recapitulated in the motet depended on the harmonious musical unity of its differing registral components. The model of the *firmamentum* can be summarized as being:

[Created] by a creator, consist[ing] of many levels or planes: the sky/heavens *in superiora*, the middle level, *in medio*, or *tenor*, and the inferior level. Each level or plane was filled with various and diverse figures within modes of motions *according to the level on which they were placed*, and with which they participated. […] Together, all three constituted a *firmament*, an ordered, organized, simultaneously-functioning creation, in which pre-existent material was informed, shaped, and formulated by the creator. 272 (My emphasis).

272 Ibid., 168.
The treatment of voices in Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert can thus be seen as desiccating the ordered, theological hierarchy of Grosseteste and Anonymous IV’s firmamentum, by intermingling the registers of the tenor, duplum and triplum voice. Such confusio of firmamentum also resonates with the “bestorné” quality of Fauvel’s universe, which upsets the conventional order of things through a “beastly” inversion of the ladder of being. Registral exchange disrupts the listener’s ability to separate each voice into its rightful plane on a musical firmamentum, at the same time turning the comprehension of the word (the text declaimed by each voice) into chaotic confusio, threatening to reduce the word’s ability to signify to the condition of beastly, sensuous musicality. The composer’s use of voice-crossing further obscures successful comprehension of the voice’s text. In most cases in the motet, the voices of the duplum and triplum approach each other stepwise and swap pitches, making it difficult for the listener to discern which text was held by which voice. One instances of such voice-swapping is given below in figure 3.14 below, which occurs over measures 11 and 12.

Sections where voice-crossing occur are boxed up, with crossed arrows indicating swapping. In figure 3.14, the triplum voice approaches the duplum voice, landing briefly on the shared pitch a (measure 11). After which, the triplum moves downwards beneath the duplum voice while both voices declaim the text at the same rate in the second half of measure 11, increasing the difficulty of comprehension. Only a few breves later, the voices cross again in measure 12, sharing an f “pivot” pitch, after which the triplum voice returns to its upper register while the duplum voice continues in a lower register. Identifying which words belong to which text is made more confusing by the sonorous echoing of
the “i” vowel within a short span of time, which I have identified in the diagram in circles.

Fig. 3.14. Voice-crossing in measures 11 and 12.273

In measure 11, the duplum sings “-bi-” (of “mi-ra-bi-li”), which is promptly echoed by the “vi-” and “spi-” in the triplum voice. Both voices then intone a “li-” phoneme on the shared a pitch during the operation of voice-crossing, greatly reducing the listener’s ability to discern between voices by vowel sounds. In measure 12, this echoing “doppler effect” continues with the triplum voice singing “-li” again on the shared f pivot pitch of their second voice-crossing episode, followed by an assonant “-ci-” echo by the duplum voice (of “po-ten-ci-a”), and a “vi-” (of “vi-gens”) in the triplum voice. Given such explicit echoing of vowel sounds on crucial voice-crossing pivot pitches, there seems to be a deliberate attempt on the composer’s part to sonically “fog” the comprehensibility of the words through voice-crossing and the manipulation/multiplication of vowel sounds.

273 Unless otherwise indicated, the staves correspond to the triplum, duplum and tenor voice respectively from top to bottom. The triplum and duplum voice is here transcribed in treble clef, where as the tenor is transcribed in an octave below the treble clef. The same applies to figure 4.17 below.
assonances. Measures 36-39 also contains a dense sequence of voice-crossing incidents, as shown in figure 3.15 below:

Fig. 3.15. Voice-crossing in measures 36-39.

In measure 36, the triplum voice leaps unexpectedly from $c$ to $g$, the pitch that was previously held by the duplum voice, the latter moving down to an $f$. Such trickery could lead the listener to believe that the $g$ sung at the end of measure 36 belonged to the duplum voice instead of the triplum voice. At the beginning of measure 37, following the textual content of each individual voice becomes increasingly difficult due to the tonal behaviour of the duplum and triplum lines: both voices intone on a similar “o” vowel, but both voices also sing the descending pattern $f-e-d$ in unison, which makes distinguishing the two challenging. Two more episodes of voice-crossing (measures 38 and 39) occur after the aforesaid unison sequence, deceiving the senses of audition, as it were, to which voice bore which text.

Perhaps it is significant that both the duplum and triplum text refer to the “fox” at this moment of voice-exchange. The triplum voice laments the trickery of the fox who “like a grave robber ... rules as a monarch with the consent of the lion himself,” while the duplum text speaks of the mutating fox who dupes the lion,
“deprived of sight,” worships its tail as the former reigns. Both texts resonate with similar ideas in this point in the motet, using voice-crossing as a tool to “deceive” the listener’s entraining capacities, perhaps as an ingenious way of presenting the fox’s (and, correspondingly, Fauvel’s) deceptive proclivities.

The composer’s devious use of compositional techniques to mask or obscure declaimed text does not stop at the use of voice-crossing. In fact, instances can be seen where the composer deliberately feigns a moment of voice-crossing by stepwise approach of the duplum and triplum voice, but fails to completely enact the “crossing” of the voices.

Fig. 3.16. “False” voice-crossing in measure 45.

In figure 3.16 given above, measure 45 exhibits an example of precisely such a case. The duplum and triplum voice approach each other stepwise, corresponding on an $f$ pivot pitch. Instead of crossing voices, the pitches “deflect” away from each other resulting in an aural simulation of voice-crossing whilst keeping the preceding registral planes of both voices intact. Immediately after this feigned episode of “false” voice-crossing, the duplum voice comes to rest on an intoning “-ret” phoneme, which allows the text of the triplum voice to be heard.
clearly reciting the word “obscura” (“obscure”), as if teasing the listener on the “obscurity” of textual comprehension! Trickery and deception ensue from measures 50 to 52, shown below in figure 3.17:

Fig. 3.17. Measures 50 – 52.

Between measures 50 and 51, the triplum and duplum voice approach each other anticipating voice-crossing procedures. Unlike the “false” voice-crossing simulation in measure 45, this does occur on the very last semibreve on measure 50, on the phoneme “-stus” in the triplum voice and “ve-” in the duplum voice. On the very next note (measure 51), however, both voices “deflect” and return to their previous registral assignments, essentially “negating” the previous episode of registral exchange, obfuscating any attempts to connect voice and text by carefully anticipating voice-crossing operations. In measure 51, the duplum voice returns to a g on the phoneme “pul-” while the triplum voice leaps up to a c on “sus-”. Without the score in front of a listener, it would be very difficult to follow this sudden leap.

In particular, the previous tonal sequence of the triplum voice of g followed by and inflected f# (that is, f-mi) should resolve onto a g by ficta voice-leading convention. Instead, it is the duplum voice which sings the corresponding
g rather than the triplum, deliberately short-circuiting the traditional grammar of ficta resolution in order to confuse the listener’s apprehension of text. Measure 51 exhibits two further cases of registral exchange. The first (immediately following the previously discussed “double exchange”) occurs during the triplum voice’s declamation of the word “erroris” (“error”): could this be the composer’s “insider’s joke” acknowledging the high degree of listening “errors” made by the listener? This text is paired by the duplum voice which sings “ve pullis mox” (“woe now to the chickens”), the “chickens” referring to Frenchmen or the fox’s unfortunate victims, which playfully rein the “errors” made by the listener and his listening “woes” into the same musical-conceptual schema. In measure 52, the potextuality of the voices slackens, enabling the triplum voice to be heard singing “alias labitur” (“being or will be lost”), perhaps lamenting the listener’s steady “loss” of textual comprehension by deliberate musical trickery.

Fig. 3.18. The “zone of clarity,” measures 52 – 59.
Just when all comprehension seems “being lost,” however, the density of polytextuality between measures 53 and 59 of the motet suddenly “clears up” (fig. 3.18). Beginning in measure 53, the *duplum* and *triplum* take turns to declaim their texts without overlapping with each other. Rather than obscure text, the last few measures of the motet appear to release the listener of his entraining misery in a passage I have arbitrarily termed the “zone of clarity.” In this zone, the previous density of polytextuality vanishes, leaving a band of clear textual declamation: the *tenor* voice sings the altered *Neuma* melody slowly, followed by the *duplum* voice who slows down its rate of text declamation in juxtaposition with the fast-moving *triplum*. By measure 58, the triplum has (re)assumed its position as the highest voice with the fastest rate of text declamation while the duplum has also returned to its “conventional” register and slower rate of declamation. As previously discussed, the final sonority $S_{1B}$ “corrects” the inverted opening sonority of $S_{1A}$ in the first measure, as if the entire motet has suddenly fallen into traditional order. Has Fauvel’s “bestorné” finally been rectified? A clue as to the behaviour of this unusual “zone of clarity” may be gleaned from the *duplum* voice which sings “*coram Christo tandem ve draconi*” (“in the presence of Christ, finally, woe to the dragon”): significantly, the presence of the word “Christo” initiates the motet’s sequence of self-rectification, and hence, of clear (theological) vision. It is only through holding fast to the word (of Christ, *logos*) which penetrates beyond the *musical*, sensory *confusio* of transmuting beasts (*draconi*), resulting in the clear comprehension of meaning. For this reason, Sonority types located within the “zone of clarity,” too, exhibit atypical behaviour and cease their transformational activities, finally relieving the listener of sensory confusion.
“Beastly” Listening: Towards an Aesthetic of the (In)Comprehensibility of the Word

Voice-crossing (registral exchange) and the transmutatio quality of complementary Sonority types can be regarded as two sides of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert’s compositional coin. Inasmuch as the composer’s structural treatment of Sonority and Intervallic types give rise to an aesthetic of “beastly mutation” informed by theories of textual mutatio, registral exchange can be seen as a technique which enables such mutatio to arise in the first place. By playing with the adventurous crossings of voices between the triplum, duplum and tenor, such exchanges in register prepare the voices for the articulation of successive Intervallic types based on a well-planned large-scale structure. At the same time, these instances of voice-crossing (and feigned, “false” voice-crossing) acknowledge the deliberate engineering of musical elements to confound the listener’s apperception of the word. As we have seen in measures 11 and 12, the usage of like-sounding phonemes based on an “i” vowel mirror the use of like-sounding Sonority types, which throw the listener off the voice’s (textual) “scent,” so to speak. For this motet, it would not be too farfetched to suggest that the composer purposefully equates the confusion of the word with the mutation of beastly (sonorous) bodies, which still leaves our question of the listener hanging.

Why should the composer go through intricate lengths to deliberately obscure the word from the listener rather than, as Clark posits, “guide” the perceiver’s listening activities? Rather than centre the question about the psychology of the listener, could the composer’s use of music to confuse text be instead demonstrative of music’s intoxicating sensuousness and its ability to
impair logic, reason and signification? The very fact that scrupulous effort is made to obscure the discernment of the text suggests (at least to me) that one of the goals of listening to the motet was, indeed, to comprehend such texts, or at least the composer’s recognition of such a goal. I do not disagree with Bent or Page – I have no desire to articulate a homogenous, monolithic historical “identity” of the listening subject and his capabilities, let alone assert that such an identity may have existed in the first place. Instead, following the studiousness of a medieval musicus, I have attempted to excavate the very difficulties of attempting to intelligibly listen to the motet. Through the example of Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert, I believe that Bent’s notion of “informed listening” is indeed possible, but I also wish to reconsider the agency of the composer in creating obstacles for “informed listening.” Let me clarify: I do not claim to offer a step-by-step topographical map of the composer’s intentions in composing the motet; I can only hypothesize what the motet conceivably does within the complicated psychology of listening.

If the listener successfully manages to conform his listening experience to either the duplum or triplum text, text then serves as a sonic “marker” of the voice’s position in the spectrum of like Sonority types, and the listener may have appreciated the rhetorical subtlety of the composer’s mutating sonorities. If, however, successive statements of like Sonority types were used by the listener as points of textual “reorientation,” then the listener was likely to have allocated the wrong text to the wrong voice-part, given the deceptive quality of differing Intervallic types. In short, by following the music, the listener was most-likely going to be deceived. Following the text (and thus returning the sign into its
constellation of signification) is not easy either, considering the composer’s stealthy treatment of deceptive voice-crossing episodes, and the use of sonorously complementary phonemes in either voice part. The use of voice-crossing, as Anna Zayaruznaya has very recently demonstrated, may cause certain psychological consternation to both the singer and the listener, which I quote at length:

The result [of voice-crossing] is more than symbolic: it is palpable. A singer or a listener used to the sound of the motets would instinctively feel that something was wrong … [with the motet]. The reversal of voices … could even inspire some measure of audience discomfort.

And for the singers, who must certainly have been part of the motet’s intended audience (and would have been the only listeners present during rehearsals) the effect may have been even more alarming. I think that a modern singer and a medieval one might well agree that there is nothing as uncomfortable as a voice-crossing. If one has been singing motet [i.e. duplum] and listening to the triplum above in order to stay in tune, a voice-crossing inevitably feels like a mistake. […] And even after the singer ascertains that she is in fact singing the parts correctly, something still feels distinctly off. The usual point of reference has been moved, leaving her sounding exposed and vulnerable.

…By their precise and unusual voice-crossings, the [Machaut] motets powerfully evoke a world that has been turned upside down for … the triplum, for the motetus, and for the listener.274

To this long list, we might add that the nature of voice-crossing in *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* operates to throw the listener (performer or audience member) off the textual track, rehearsing the sensuous, “beastly” danger of music to overwhelm, obscure and ultimately confound the perception of text. Even the learned musicus would have great difficulty with this motet, whose novel tonal experimentation topple the stability of even the sharpest mind, overturning the ship of attentus into the chaotic waters of confusio. For the blunt cantor, a series of notational trappings lie in the way of a successful realization of the motet such as the use of red notation and deceptively like-sounding Sonority types. Furthermore, the notationally challenged cantor who anticipated melodies via

274 Anna Zayaruznaya, “‘She has a wheel that turns …’: Crossed and Contradictory Voices in Machaut’s Motets,” in *Early Music History*, Vol. 28 (Oct., 2009), 229-30.
stock musical convention would have been duped by misleading tonal behaviours such as the triplum voice’s averted *ficta* resolution in measure 51. In a way, the successful realization of the motet demands that the singers exhibit a blind faith in the composer’s overall musical design and function by correctly translating the signs on the page into signified sound. For listeners, the experience would have been equally bewildering – not to mention potentially chaotic – as word is ceaselessly interred into the motet’s complex (musical) tonal makeup, its polytextual intricacy momentarily “clearing” (in cases such as measures 46 and 52) only to proclaim the composer’s teasing words (“obscura,” “alias labitur”) which reinforce the theme of auditory incomprehension. Faced with the overwhelming intoxication of the word by music, *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* threatens to metamorphose all who attempt to hear the word into a menagerie of helpless, “beastly” sensuous listeners.
CHAPTER 4

CHAILLOU’S “ADDICIONS,” BEASTLY “READING” AND THE OLD MEDIEVAL INTEGUMENTUM

Introduction

This chapter explores the visual-performative dimension of Chaillou’s interpolated Fauvel, suggesting how the dangers of “beastly listening” (devoid of rational judgment) turns Chaillou’s Fauvel into a litmus test differentiating between the knowledgeable, clerkly reader and the illogical cantor, serving as a mirror with which to reflect the perceiver’s inner mental state of attentus or curiositas. In doing so, I will examine the theoretical continuity between words and music, arguing that a tradition of Augustinian semiotic theory which survived into the fourteenth century acknowledged the dangerous, excessive “musicality” intrinsic to envoiced words. By considering the medieval concept of the integumentum and the power politics of reading acts, Chaillou’s “addicions” may be read as musical or semiotic “husks” which need to be intellectually penetrated in order to unveil the “sweet,” hidden kernel of allegorical meaning, accessible only to knowledgeable musicus with appropriate claves.

The Intoxicating End of Fauvel: Betwixt the Church and Tavern

The very last page of Chaillou’s interpolated Roman de Fauvel presents contemporary readers with a perplexing puzzle, perhaps even a riddle obfuscating any clear understanding of narrative termination. On folio 45r of fr. 146, we encounter Chaillou’s final words on the subject of Fauvel, bordered off on three
three sides of notated music forming a “U” shape framing the poetic text (see fig. 4.1 on page 148).

As both Kevin Brownlee and Emma Dillon have noted, Chaillou’s rewritten closing statement departs significantly from Gervais’ original poetic conclusion, deliberately altering the intent of the author-narrator voice. A comparison Gervais’ and Chaillou’s endings is given below, with like words underlined:

**Gervais**

Ferrant fina aussi fera
Fauvel, ja si grant ne sera,

Car il ne peut pas tous jours vivre,
Ici finnit secont livre
Qui fu parfait l’an mil et iij.
.xcc. et x., sans rien rabatre,
Trestout droit, si com il me membre,
Le .vje. jour de decembre.
Ge rues doi .v. boi .v. esse
Le nom et le sournom confesse
De celui qui a fet cest livre.
Diex de cez pechiez le delivre.

**Chaillou**

Ferrant fina, bien deust finer
Fauvel, qui n’a a qui finer
En ce monde, car tuit obe-
issent a lui, tout a robé.
Robé nous a tout en lobant,
Et lobe en nous desrobon.
Il finera, car tout jourz vivre,
Ne pourra pas. Ci faut mon livre

Secont, Dieu en gré le receive
J’ai sef, il est temps que je boive.

Ferrant came to an end, so also will Fauvel, he will not be so great for he cannot live for ever; here finishes this second book, which was completed in the year 1314, without any reductions, fully completed, as I recall, the sixth day of December, ‘Ge’ ‘rves’ ‘du’ ‘bus’ the name and surname I confess of him who made the book. God deliver him from his sins.

Ferrant came to an end, Fauvel must come to an end, Fauvel, who does not need to fine anyone in this world, for all obey him, has stolen everything. He has robbed us by deceiving, and deceived by robbing us. He will die, for he cannot live for ever. Here ends my second book, may God be pleased to receive it. I am thirsty – it is time that I drink.

---


Chaillou’s rewriting of Gervais’ ending is striking for several reasons. Firstly, the altered conclusion expands, or amplifies Fauvel’s deceptive character where none existed in Gervais’ text. Chaillou describes Fauvel’s “robbing” through deception, the implications of which will be discussed later in this chapter. Secondly, he takes what for Gervais was “this book” (cest livre) and makes it his own, (“my book,”) (mon livre), collapsing the distance between Chaillou the authorial-narrating figure and the real material product of the book.

Chaillou eliminates Gervais’ identification of himself (“Gerves du Bus”) as the author but does not substitute another name. Instead, he identifies himself by his state of being: someone ready for a drink, whereas Gervais presents the book as humble offering for the forgiveness of his sins; albeit that the subject matter of the book calls into question the sincerity of his gesture, Chaillou’s closing words dramatically move the discursive locale of the book away from a religious context. In doing so, Chaillou’s conclusion veers dangerously close to narcissistic self-gazing by refocusing the final lines around the author figure rather than God. “Jai sef,” he exclaims, and announces that “il est temps que je boive,” which plays cleverly on the meaning of the word “boive” under different situational contexts. Firstly, “boive” draws attention to Chaillou’s oral, narrativistic act which so exhausts the declaiming poet that he wishes a drink to alleviate his thirst. By centralizing speaking and orality, Chaillou once again emphasizes the mediatory role of sonorous, embodied vox as an indispensible vehicle for speech and reason. Chaillou’s thirst may further signify the breakdown of mediation, the physical limitations of vocality as a mode of giving voice to reasoned, poetic thought. Inasmuch as signs signify, their non-transcendental
fleshy, corporeal vehicles are imperfect and weighed down by earthly demands. Chaillou’s appeal for a drink emphasizes the bodily dimension of signification, mediating the gap between reader/listener and signified.

Emma Dillon’s creative interpretation of Chaillou’s closing paragraph performs a theological *amplificatio* (amplification) on the concept of thirst, linking Chaillou the author figure to the crucified Christ, which, she claims, invites the reader to participate in the active creation of meaning beyond Chaillou’s textual *corpus*:

> The metaphor of crucifixion demands that we, too, play a role: our communion with the makers of fr. 146 is open to the book, to make the mid-point visible, the script evident, the text apparent; within the Christological metaphor at play there, we need to engage in the final act of bodily violation [through readerly interpretation] – to inflict the fifth and final wound to the ‘heart’ of Chaillou’s textual body.²⁷⁷

Dillon’s adventurous speculation may have held true for certain medieval readers, yet I would like to venture another possibility based on the late medieval ambivalence about signification: what if, instead of inviting the reader to participate in the creation of meaning, Chaillou’s closing paragraph was precisely meant to warn the discerning reader about the dangers of *confusio* through faulty aural perception and defective reading strategies? While Dillon’s affixation on the paragraph’s surrounding motet serves for her as a metaphor of sublime communion with the makers of fr. 146, perhaps her insistence on the musical properties of the polyphonic motet (as a divine or secular mode of transcendence by the unification of diverse voices) draws her into the same vortex of aural danger Chaillou explicitly warns us against. Indeed, Dillon ignores the very *textual content* of the polyphonic motet which surrounds (threatens?) Chaillou’s linguistic

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 215.
“heart” which talks not of a Christological mode of thirst, but answers it in a vulgar manner, attending to the matter of wine-drinking, merriment, and drunkedness! Figures 4.1 and 4.2 below compares folio 45r and Dillon’s textual transcription, demonstrating the curious way in which notated music conforms and contorts to concepts delineated by written text:

Fig. 4.1. Fo. 45r, fr. 146. (Photo: Wesleyan University Special Collections).

Fig. 4.2. Lyric Repetitions on fo. 45r. (Photo: Emma Dillon, Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel, 209).
Three columns of notated music containing a Goliardic drinking song motet and a single line refrain flank the central text, which “glosses” (or amplifies) Chaillou’s last word “boive” in each musical verse. Chaillou’s “Boive” moves firmly into the vicinity of drunkenness and bawdy intoxication, echoed by the words “vin” and “boire” in the surrounding musical examples, playing with the sonorous assonances between “boive” and “boire” as well as the conceptual assonance between a Christological notion of “boive” and the secular vice of “boive” oriented towards intoxication by “vin” (“wine”). In short, the musical items surrounding Chaillou’s central text continue to destabilize the meaning of Chaillou’s words – it lifts “boive” out of its grammatical context, spinning it into a playful chain of relations based on aural-likeness rather than semantic continuity.

This sense of play is further heightened by a strange scribal explicit at the end of the poetic text which exclaims “Explicit expliceat / Lud(e)re scriptor eat” (“It ends, let it end; let the writer go and play”), as if caving in to the promise of drunken ecstasy figured by the drinking motet after the completion of the work. Responding to the explicit’s call for playfulness, the entire musical composition surrounding the textual conclusion can be seen as an isolated case of sonorous wordplay on “boive,” straddling the precipice between its sacred, Eucharistic connotation and the profanity of soused wantonness. Far from the Christological implications Dillon suggests the concluding text invokes, the motet so strongly linked to the act of drinking and intoxication seems to suggest an interpretation counter to “a collective call to drink” and “a lyrical desire to partake in

communion.” The very lyrics of the motet as an sonorous *amplificatio* of Chaillou’s “boive” performs the playfulness which the *explicit* describes when “boive” is stripped of its significative stability and thrown into a play of rhyme and consonance, resulting in intoxicated *confusio*:

\[\text{Triplum}\]
Quant je le voi ou voirre cler,  
Volentiers m’i veul accorder;  
Et puis si chante de cœur cler:  
Cis chans veult boire.

\[\text{Duplum}\]
Bon vin doit l’en a li tirer  
Et li mauves en sus bouter.  
Puis doivent compagnons chanter:  
Cis chans veult boire.

\[\text{Tenor}\]
[C]is chans veult boire.

\[\text{Triplum}\]
When I see it clearly with its clear appearance, willingly I want to be in agreement with it; and with a clear heart is sung: this song wants to drink.

\[\text{Duplum}\]
One should pour out the good wine and throw out the bad. Then good companions should sing: this song wants to drink.

\[\text{Tenor}\]
This song wants to drink.

The refrain which underscores the *Explicit expliceat* likewise corrupts the Christian resonances of “boive,” and God as the proper dedicatee of the work, reading “Ci me faut un tour de vin: dex! Quar le me donnez!” (“I must have a round of wine: God! Let it be given to me!”). Thus, a “proper” sense of bookish closure establishing God as the ultimate patron of the book is overturned by the musical toying of the refrain: God (*dex*) is reduced to a profane exclamation by the singerly “je” (the cantor?) who demands that he be given a drink of wine.

---

280 A transcription of the motet and its neighbouring refrain can be found in Appendix 3a and b respectively.
282 Ibid.
Instead of the scene of holy-communion favoured by Dillon, the Eucharistic set-up suggested by Chaillou’s closing dedication is deviously inverted. The holy wine of God becomes the sacrilegious vehicle for sensuous intoxication, and the name of God itself is transformed into a signifier without a signified – that is, an expressive utterance leached of its previous theological significance, brought under the service of the sensuous pleasure of intoxication. In addition, the formal *mis-en-page* of folio 45 of the “vin” of text, perhaps suggesting the level of intoxication and confusion which ensues when the word is consumed as aurally sensuous liquor rather than a chalice for meaningful signification.

The last page of fr. 146’s *Roman de Fauvel* hence seems to teeter uneasily between sacred and profane, clarity (“cler”) and obscurity, the locus of the Church and the sensory trappings of the Tavern, in which the musical qualities of poetry threatens to overwhelm the reader’s clear rational judgment, diverting his attention from the subject matter it presents. In Andrew Cowell’s study of tavern literature, he notes how the site of the Tavern was often used to connote the breakdown of semiotic stability, the deception of the word, and the sensory dangers of the sign. Goliardic poetry, he notes, often used metaphors of drinking to denote the “shifting and revaluation of signs,” in which the grammatical propriety of signification is often put at (creative) risk:

The tavern piece, as defined by the goliard poets, could be defined as a thematic genre that features action occurring at least implicitly in or near a tavern with the characteristic

---


284 Ibid., 115.
actions including the drinking and playing at dice. The resultant behaviours typically result in the loss or threatened loss of the cloak of some character [...]. Both economic and ludic transactions are characterized by fraud ..., as are linguistic transactions. Sexual desire and prostitution are sometimes ... present. [...] And finally, the scenes almost always explicitly thematize the idea of poetic production, representing their own illicit, “usurious” poetics in terms of either economic usury or morally illicit drinking, gambling, and theft [...]. More generally, the poems underline the amoral nature of the tavern, often via oppositions to the church.285

Like the poor protagonists of Goliard poetry who lose their cloaks to risky (semiotic) dice games, Fauvel’s victims are “robbed” and cheated at the “musical” locale of the Tavern. It is revealing that Chaillou’s amplificatio of “boive” encircling the contained text is set to notated music, as if to emphasize the dangers of the musicality of the word: by treating Chaillou’s poetry as “vin” to be enjoyed by the senses, readers reduce the textual signifier to the condition of the “musical” which so “intoxicates” the rational mind that the text’s central meaning is all but lost. Being intoxicated by the musicality of the word was not just a vice denounced by clerical authorities; musical theorists also warned against drunkenness as a fallibility of licentious cantors who perverted the good reason of music through a loss of reasonable judgment. In the Summa Musice, a thirteenth-century manual for singers, its author identifies drinking as one of the culprits of chant perversion:

Cum sepe cantus proprietas non observetur ab omnibus,
Videndum est quot et quibus modis error fiat in cantu. [...] 
Ex negligentia male cantatur ab ebris et ab illis qui
Pigrituant vel contemptunt cantum diligentius usitare, et
Etiam ab illis excusantur qui totum a parte iudicant
Improviše; et isti autem vix excusantur aut omnino venia
Non sunt digni. De primis horum dicit Aristoteles "ebrius
Duplici pena punietur." 286

Since it is often the case that the integrity of chant is not respected by all, one should consider the number of ways – and the kind of ways – in which error can arise. [...] Chant is performed badly through negligence by drunkards, by the indolent, and by those who scorn to perform their chant in a more diligent manner and who are also excused by those

285 Ibid., 121.
who judge everything from an ill-considered point of view. Concerning the first of these, Aristotle says “let the drunkard be punished with a double penalty.”

In *Les Miracles de Nostre Dame*, Gautier de Coinci further caricatures a deficient class of *cantors* who fall from the grace of God through their penchant for a hard drink, characterizing the proper (sober) “tuning” of the body as a well-tempered *vïele*:

... quant la bouche bien s’esforce,  
   Li cuers se doit si resforcier  
   Et si les cordes renforcier  
   De sa vïele et si estendre  
   Que li clerz sonz sanz plus atendre  
   Au premier mot s’en voist et mont  
   Em paradys lassus amont.  
   Lors est a Dieu leur chançons bele.  
   Mais plusieur ont tele vïele  
   Qui tempre et tart est destempree  
   Se de fort vin n’est atempree.

... when the mouth is working hard the heart should so strive, and so press upon the strings of its *vïele*, and so tune them up, that with the first word the bright sound ascends without delay to Paradise. Then their singing is pleasing to God. But there are many [liturgical singers] who have such a *vïele* that will go out of tune all the time unless it is tuned up with strong wine.

Drunkenness unsettled the clear, autonomous judgment of reason by muddying it with the pleasures of the flesh. The intoxicated body sought *confusio* over *attentus*, turning the envoiced signifier into a chalice of intoxicating liquor to titillate the senses rather than to provoke uncluttered thought. But for other poets, the metaphor of drinking also served as a shorthand for the process of artistic creation and consummation. In the later fourteenth century, as Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet notes, the metaphor of wine denoted a liminal space between

---
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that of celebrated Bacchic artistic creation and bodily disability (the propensity for inebriation).289 As a result, the poet:

...occupied a space somewhere between an Orpheus figure and a Bacchus figure; a figure of harmony and one of disorder and lack of measure, especially of sexual imbalance (sexual excess or deficiency).290

Cowell’s study of Jean le Marchant’s *Le livre des miracles de Notre-Dame de Chartres* reveals yet another dimension of the “beastly” perceiver in Jean’s association of the wanton jongleur with the “lechor” as both an “illicit consumer of wine and illicit consumer of verse:”291

The term [“lecheor”] ... derives from Germanic sources and most immediately from the Frankish *lekkon*, meaning “to lick.” The term nicely combines the orality of gluttonous consumption with the orality of medieval poetry and gives deeper resonance to Jean’s concentration on the mouth, eating, drinking, and the sense of taste on the tavern. Thus the carnality so characteristic of the tavern extends not just to the enjoyment of the body but also to the enjoyment of the sign...292

Chaillou’s reworked ending of the *Roman de Fauvel* can thus be read as an indirect warning against the foolish consumption of poetry as alcohol for the ears, by performing the breakdown of signification (“boive”) into a sensuous network of musical family resemblances as if the reader himself was experiencing the disorienting effects of inebriation. The desire of Chaillou’s “thirst” to relieve his arduous act of oral recitation under the gaze of God is appropriated by the motet which repeats “cis chans veult boire” in all three voice parts *ad absurdum*, turning Chaillou’s “thirst” into a narcissistic, circular “thirst” of the *chans* itself. In the motet, it is the *chans* (and not Chaillou) that desires vin to feed its own intoxication, which, in turn, fuels the desire to produce song. Like the signifier

---
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enjoyed in its own image (that is, a signifier which signifies itself), the musical items on folio 45r challenge the reader to make a choice between the sensuous consumption of language as music, or to recognize and avert the threat by taking heed of the Roman’s admonitory – textual – contents, returning the sign’s capacity to signify outside of the book itself. Attending to the latter would demand that the reader remain clear-headed, acknowledging the ars of poetry without succumbing to its intoxicating dimension. Choosing the former route would be quite literally to bring “Fauvel” upon oneself, “robbing” the text of its significatory function.

The “Musicality” of the Word and the Legacy of Augustinian Sign Theory

Musicologists and scholars have long noted the close relationship between poetry (language) and notated music in the middle ages, especially the growing appreciation of the “musicality” of the word in the fourteenth century. Sarah Kay’s study of Boethius’ *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, for example, argues that by the later fourteenth century, poets tended to favour the erotic sensuousness of Boethius’ poetry rather than the “reasoned prose” of his literary interlocutor, Lady Philosophy. Guillaume de Machaut’s pupil Eustache Deschamps went so far as to consider poetry and verse as *musique naturele* (natural music), a subsidiary

---


form of music in contrast to musique artificiele (vocal or instrumental music), in his 1392 Art de Dictier et de Fere Chançons:

> Et est a sçavoir que nous avons deux musiques, don’t l’une est artificiele et l’autre est natural. [...] Et aussi ces deux musiques sont si consonans l’une avecques l’autre, que chascune puet bien ester appellée musique, pour la douceur tant du chant comme des paroles qui toutes sont prononcées et pointoyées par douçour de voix et ouverture de bouche; [...] Et semblablement les chançans natureles sont delectables et embellies par la melodie et les teneurs, trebles et contrateneurs du chant de la musique artificiele. Et neantmoins est chascune de ces deux plaisant a ouir par soy.296

It must be understood that we have two kinds of music: one is artificial and the other is natural. [...] Also these two musics are so consonant with one another that each may well be called “music,” as much for the sweetness of both the melody and of the words which are pronounced and articulated by the pleasantness of the voice and the opening of the mouth. [...] poems are made more delightful and embellished by the melody and the tenors, trebles and contratenors of music. However, each of these two [i.e. music and poetry] is pleasant to hear by itself.297

By attempting to define poetry as a subset of musicality, Deschamps acknowledges the sonorous properties of words-in-themselves as bearers of sensory pleasure, articulating an aesthetic of the “musical” word which would be later expanded in other contemporary poets such as Chaucer and Froissart.298

Despite an apparent appraisal of poetry’s sonorous “musical” beauty, a counter-tradition of (heavily religious) semantic philosophy persisted into the late fourteenth century, which continued to view the sensory dimension of versification with suspicion and mistrust. As early as the fifth century, the highly influential Saint Augustine of Hippo set forth a theological theory of semantics which construed all forms of signification as fallible and susceptible to corruption, since the word was inevitably envoiced by the sinful, earthly body.

297 Ibid., 7.
Through his various works such as *De magistro*, *De doctrina Christina* and *Confessions*, Augustine recapitulates his distrust of rhetoric and musical histrionics, as well as the frail, corporeal temporality of language.\(^{299}\) In *De doctrina Christina*, Augustine defines the sign as “a thing which causes us to think of something beyond the impression that the thing itself makes upon the senses,”\(^{300}\) indicating the ideal, *active* action of signification as a process which leads to mental intellection beyond the passive reception of sense-perceptions. Opposed to the soundless, incorporeal transcendence of God’s divine word (never requiring a corporeal medium to manifest itself), Augustine characterized human speech as that which was internally divided and arbitrary, obtaining significatory power only through social conventions.\(^{301}\) Poetry, on the contrary, falls into what Augustine deems to be “ratio” in the proper execution of its *ars*.\(^{302}\) What redeems poetry is not so much its sensuous content, but the demonstration of dexterity through which verse and poetry is structured; since the art of poets is that of giving order to speech, poetry is thus the “power of lying reasonably” ("rationabilim mendaciorum potestas"),\(^{303}\) capable of immoral exposition inasmuch as it is capable of reasoned measurement. Individuals who prefer the sensuous “material” of poetry above its intellectual form, however, are unreservedly admonished by Augustine:

> Some perverse persons prefer a verse to the art of versifying, because they set more store by their ears than by their intelligence. So many love temporal [earthly] things and do not look for divine providence which is the maker and governor of time. Loving temporal things they do not want the things they love to pass away. They are just as absurd as


\(^{302}\) Ibid., 44.

\(^{303}\) Ibid., 45.
anyone would be who, when a famous poem was being recited, wanted to hear one single syllable all the time.304

In another passage of De doctrina Christina, Augustine similarly berates perceivers who prefer a carnal, “literal” understanding of the sonorous, sensuous sign instead of the thing signified as a fall from (sanctified, sacred) humanness into the unintelligible domain of beastliness:

What the Apostle says pertains to this problem: “For the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth.” That is, when that which is said figuratively is taken as though it were literal, it is understood carnally. Nor can anything more appropriately be called the death of the soul than that condition in which the thing which distinguishes us from beasts, which is the understanding [intelligentia], is subjected to the flesh in the pursuit of the letter. He who follows the letter takes figurative expressions as though they were literal and does not refer the things signified to anything else. [...] There is a miserable servitude of the spirit in this habit of taking signs for things, so that one is not able to raise the eye of the eternal mind above things that are corporeal and created to drink in the eternal light.305

In these two abovementioned paragraphs, Augustine presents us with two complementary images of sensuous carnal reading as a destruction of the sign’s signifying capacities. The first chides lovers of verse as lust-seeking aural voyeurs who delight in the sounds of a single “syllable” above the art of versifying, paring the sign, as it were, to a self-sufficient musical sound. The second warns against “carnal” reading as an act of entrainment that fails to read the signified beyond the limits of the immediate letter, an act which reinforces the reader’s subservience to “the flesh” and bodily desire while turning away from the “eternal mind” of symbolic truths. In the latter, the carnal reader forgoes his opportunity to “drink in the eternal light” of theological truths; in our case, the illicit reader of Fauvel opts instead for the immediate “musical” pleasures of musical-ized text as a lascivious form of intoxicating liquor, ignoring the hidden dangers of Chaillou’s poetic

305 Quoted in Vance, Marvelous Signals, 29-30.
Carnal reading results in the “death of the soul,” a turning away from enlightened “figurative” meaning that points towards divine truths, an act perhaps as sacrilegious as the claves-impaired cantus who turn the claves of (musical) Christian learning into clavos. Augustine’s most well-read work Confessions restages the tropological dialectic between sensuous container and intellective content in a revealing passage about listening to plainchant worth quoting in full, in which Augustine weighs the pros and cons of liturgical song:

Voluptates aurium tenacius me implicaaverant et subiugaverant, sed resolvisti et liberasti me. Nunc in sonis quos animant eloquia tua cum suavi et artificiosa voce cantantur, fateor, aliquidum adeuisco, non quidem ut haeream, sed ut suram cum volo. Attamen cum ipsis sententiis, quibus vivant ut admitiantur ad me, quae erunt in corde meo numnullius dignitatis locum, et volo eis praebere congruenti. Aliquando enim plus mihi videor honoris eis tribuere quam decet, dum ipsis sanctis dictis reliosius et ardentius sentio moveri animos nostros in flamam pietatis cum ita cantantur, quam si non ita cantarentur, et omnes affectus spiritus nostri pro sui diversitate habere omnes modos in voce atque canto, quorum nescio qua occultam familiaritatem excitentur. Sed delectatione carnis meae, cui mentem enervandum non oportet dare, saepe me fallit, dum rationi sensus non ita comitatut ut patienter sit posteriori, sed tantum, quia propter illam meruit admitti, etiam praecurrere et leadere conatur. Ita in his pecco non sentiens et postea sentio.

Ita fluctuo inter periculum voluptatis et experimentum salubritatis magisque adducor, non quidem inretractabilem sententiam proferens, cantandi consuetudinem approbare in ecclesia, ut per oblectamenta aurium infirmior animus in affectum pietatis adsurgat. Tamen cum mihi accidit ut me amplius cantus quam res quaen cantitur moveat, poenalter me peccare Confiteor et tunc mallem non audire cantantem.306

The pleasures of the ear had a more tenacious hold on me, and had subjugated me; but you set me free and liberated me. As things now stand, I confess that I have some sense of restful contentment in sounds whose soul is your words, when they are sung by a pleasant and well-trained voice. Not that I am riveted by them, for I can rise up and go when I wish. Nevertheless, on being combined with the thoughts which give them life, they demand in my heart some position of honour, and I have difficulty in finding what is appropriate to offer them. Sometimes I seem to myself to give them more honour than is fitting. I feel that when the sacred words are chanted well, our souls are moved and are more religiously and with a warmer devotion kindled to piety than if they are not so sung. All the diverse emotions of our spirit have their various modes in voice and chant appropriate in each case, and are stirred by a mysterious inner kinship. But my physical delight, which has to be checked from enervating the mind, often deceives me when the perception of the senses is unaccompanied by reason, and is not patiently content to be in a subordinate place. It tries to be first and to be in the leading role, though it deserves to be allowed only as secondary to reason. So in these matters I sin unawares, and only afterwards become aware of it. [...] Thus I fluctuate between the danger of pleasure and the experience of the beneficent effect, and I am more led to put forward the opinion (not

as an irrevocable view) that the custom of singing in Church is to be approved, so that the weaker minds may rise up towards the devotion of worship. Yet when it happens to me that the music moves me more than the subject of the song, I confess myself to commit a sin deserving punishment, and then I would prefer not to have heard the singer.307

Like the incarnations of “aural danger” discussed in the previous chapters, Augustine struggles between the corrupting, sensuous clutches of chant’s metaphysical excesses, and its productive role in liturgical praise, so much so that he recommends that music be used as a manipulative tool or sensory bait to stir “weaker minds” to its religious content. On Augustine’s own account, however, he nonetheless raises awareness about the “physical delight” of liturgy’s musical component which topples reason and plays to the “perception of the senses.” While music may be a necessary evil to extend the reach of enthusiasm’s net, Augustine acknowledges the clear-and-present potential for the signifier to collapse into its sonorous vehicle, leading the devotional mind astray from the content of plainchant, and resulting in a “sin deserving punishment.” Even as the terms concerning the debate between sensuousness and rationality were subject to change in the later Middle Ages, Augustine’s logic of aural danger implicit in the word-made-flesh persisted in the teachings of later theologians. The twelfth century theologian Alan de Lille, who likened sodomy to perverse violations of grammar, made the following recommendation to preachers and religious orators in his *Ars praedicandi* (“Art of Preaching”):

> Preaching should not contain ... melodiousness or harmony which result from the use of rhythm or metrical lines; these are better fitted to delight the ear than to edify the soul.308

Less lenient than Augustine, Alan denounces “musical” preaching as a form of “effeminacy,” leading the mind astray from biblical truth. Another late twelfth century medieval preacher, John of Salisbury, explicitly pairs the aural danger of sensuous “wanton tones” with the intoxicating lust for poetry. The “liberty of the mind is enslaved,” he writes, “... if the ear be charmed by the organ’s tones and the notes of the human voice; the mind’s virility becomes effeminate as the result of poet’s verse ... and all sort of stuff that enters the mind by the ear.”309 These episodes of carnal listening – like Fauvel’s topsy-turvy kingdom – invert the logic of signification, turning sign into a vehicle for the enjoyment of the fleshy, effeminating pleasures of music, short-circuiting one’s ability to read “figuratively” rather than “literally,” at the surface level of phonetic musicality. Folio 45r can thus be read as a literal presentation of carnal reading – the inebriated Fauvel reader who loses control of his faculty of reason inflicts Augustine’s inverted logic upon the mis-en-page, musicalizing the word “boive” into a repetition of consonant offsprings. Ironically, the clearer (“cler”) the vin (as boisterously announced by the triplum), the muddier the resultant meaning of the text becomes through the musical intoxication of the word.

After Augustine, sign theory became increasingly complicated as scholars argued over the nature of the object of signification and perception.310 A full account of this debate is beyond the scope of this thesis; what is noteworthy is that philosophers tended to manipulate the diminishing distance between rational man

and his irrational beastly counterpart to champion intellective cognition as an anthropocentric mode of self-definition.\textsuperscript{311} The “rediscovery” of Aristotelian philosophy in the twelfth century led to an Aristotelian-neo-Platonic re-evaluation of epistemological theory, which reduced the distance between man and beast by stressing that all modes of knowledge were mediated through sensory perception.\textsuperscript{312} The twelfth century theologian Saint Thomas Aquinas, for example, distinguishes beastly, “sensuous” appetites from intellective modes of abstraction:

The name \textit{sensuality} seems to be taken from the sensual movement, of which Augustine speaks [De Trin., XII, 12; 13], just as the name of a power is taken from its act, for instance, sight from seeing. Now the sensual movement is an appetite following sensible apprehension. For the act of the apprehensive power is not so poorly called a movement as the act of the appetite; since the operation of the apprehensive power is completed in the very fact that the thing apprehended is in the one that apprehends, while the operation of the appetitive power is completed in the fact that he who desires is borne towards the desirable thing.\textsuperscript{313}

In the same century, the famous logician Peter Abelard would revise Aristotle’s insistence on the primacy of the senses for epistemological acts of signification. David Luscombe explains:
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[Abelard] distinguished between things, words and thoughts, and wrote that the human mind attaches words like labels to the physical objects that the body encounters, having first generated concepts \textit{[logos]}. It can then communicate those words in physical speech

\begin{footnotes}
311 Thomas Aquinas and Roger Bacon, for example, recast Aristotle’s cognitive faculties of the “agent intellect” and the “potential intellect” to describe the active mind’s abstraction of universals from raw sensory data. This view, as Sarah Kay points out, bifurcates the abstractive faculties of the mind into two factions “in order to relate … [the agent intellect] more closely to sensory operations, but keeps the beast/human inferences intact. The “sensible soul” (sense mechanisms) for Aquinas possessed “intelligence” but only the “rational soul” was capable of intellectual “judgment.” Beasts were deprived of the latter, and so were men who were incapable of exercising the faculties of the “rational soul.” See Sarah Kay, “Women’s body of knowledge: epistemology and misogyny in the \textit{Romance of the Rose},” in \textit{Framing Medieval Bodies}, Ed. Sarah Kay & Miri Rubin (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 1994), 228-9, John E. Hankins, “Caliban the Bestial Man,” in \textit{PLMA}, Vol. 62, No. 3 (Sep., 1947), 799, as well as Joseph Owens, “Faith, Ideas, Illumination, and Experience,” Z. Kusewicz, “The Potential and the Agent Intellect,” Edward P. Mahoney, “Sense, Intellect and Imagination in Albert, Thomas, and Siger,” in \textit{The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: from the rediscovery of Aristotle to the disintegration of scholasticism, 1100-1600}, Ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 440-59, 595-601 and 602-22 respectively.


\end{footnotes}
Since intellection was necessary to overcome the primacy of sense-perception as an ontological pre-requisite, the clear-and-present threat of falling prey to one’s sensuous appetites gave contemporaneous intellectuals reasons to strengthen the policing of boundaries between intellection and sensuous (beastly) knowledge precisely by cultivating fear and panic about the proximity of the beastly body. As Noah Guynn succinctly puts it:

Since for Aquinas intellection consists in the perception of sense data rather than the [Augustinian/Neo-Platonic] divine illumination of an essential reality beyond physical existence, there is indeed all the more reason for carefully regulating the body and sensory operations. In order to ensue conformity with the literal and figurative “truths” of Scripture [...], Thomistic psychology and naturalism must also guarantee that the reality apprehended through the body does not violate moral or revealed law about the body.315

Visual/Musical Intoxication on folio 45r

The “literal,” carnal word can then be seen as a sort of “beastly” construal of text-turned-music, as selfish, narcissistic and inescapable as the musical chalice which encroaches the boundaries of poetic text on folio 45r. By performing the “musicalization” of “boive” into a euphonious breakdown of the word’s form into its sensory matter, fr. 146 appears to visualize the (defective) mode of Augustinian carnal reading in operation, teasing the boundaries between sacred/profane, sobriety/drunkenness, church/tavern and human/beast. A further visual detail of folio 45r likewise seems to respond to the inebriating nausea which blurs the clarity of readerly vision. At first glance, the musical pieces present on

315 Guynn, Allegory and Sexual Ethics in the High Middle Ages, 23-4.
the page seem to present a single motet rather than two separate musical pieces (see fig. 4.3 below).

Fig. 4.3. Musical intoxication on fo. 45f. (Photo: Wesleyan University Special Collections).

Segment A appears to be the tripulum of the three-voiced motet, with section B as the duplum and section D as the tenor, a scribal layout common to most other motets inscribed in the other sections of fr. 146. Upon closer inspection, however, section D is not the tenor voice of the motet, but an independent non-related refrain which occupies the usual visual position of the tenor voice. Instead, the tenor voice of the motet is cleverly hidden within section B (which appears to be entirely the duplum voice), marked in fig. 4.3 as section C. Usually in the presentation of motets on parchment, each separate motet voice is distinguished with a large, ornamented initial. Such is the case for

sections A, B and D in fig. 4.3, giving the cantor or reader the impression that A, B and D are to be considered as one integral polyphonic unit. Section C – the true tenor voice of the polyphonic motet – is strangely left without an initial, a puzzling occurrence on folio 45r. Could this be a case of unintended scribal error? Fig. 4.4 below shows an enlarged detail of section C:

Fig. 4.4. Enlarged detail of C with possible scribal cueing. (Photo: Wesleyan University Special Collections).

While Kevin Brownlee’s transcription of the tenor voice of Cis chans veult boire (which is repeated 4 times along with the two other polyphonic lines) presents the capital “C” of “Cis” as unwritten, Ardis Butterfield’s refrain transcription remains ambiguous about the initializing of “Cis.” It is possible to argue that the capital of “Cis” was initially meant to be decorated: in a space next to the first (barely decipherable) inscription of “(C)is” is what looks like a tiny scribal cueing of “c,” perhaps to remind the illuminator to furnish the capital in the small space provided (indicated by the arrow in fig. 4.4), although we cannot

tell that this was so with any degree of certainty. On the other hand, the inscriptions in section C prior to the word “chans” bear some degree of curvaceous resemblance to the “cis” written in the duplum voice just above the tenor staff line (identified in the boxes), perhaps serving as visual shorthand for the word “cis” itself.

Furthermore, in the ruling in the parchment preparation, space was allocated for each of the decorated initials. However, no such provision was made for section C. There are several possible explanations for this discrepancy:

1. “Cis” of the tenor voice was not planned to be capitalized,

2. The scribe who etched the staff lines made an error, or

3. The staff lines for section B were meant to host just the duplum voice while section D was initially meant for the tenor voice.

If option (3) was the case, the notating scribe probably finished inscribing the duplum voice with space to spare, and decided to fill in the tenor voice on the last remaining staff of section B (i.e., in section C). This could also therefore mean that the refrain *Ci me faut un tour de vin* in section D was a later improvisatory addition, an afterthought given the notating scribe to fill out the last remaining stave. Following the logic of scenario (3), the initial plan concerning folio 45r may have been to echo the word “boire” in all the textually surrounding columns, creating a self-enclosed layout. We probably will never know the exact sequence of folio 45r’s genesis, but given the complicated web of textual, visual
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319 Scribal “cuing” of capitals is not unnoticed in fr. 146. As Emma Dillon has shown, there are numerous other cases of such cueing techniques in pages where capitals were left undecorated. See Dillon, *Medieval Music-Making and the Roman de Fauvel*, 76, 147-72.
and musical relationships on this spread, it seems highly unlikely that the scribe would have accidentally left an entire staff unassigned. It would have seemed illogical to allocate four full staves for the duplum as compared to merely three staves for the triplum. Also, given the brevity of the tenor voice in relation to the refrain and the other voices, there would not have been any good reason to allocate such a long stave in section D for its notation either.

With this in mind, I would like to venture hypothesis (1), which proposes that the non-initializing of the tenor voice was intentional, in order to playfully confuse the reader as to which voice made up the motet proper. Perhaps, like the deceptive inclinations of Fauvel, the makers of fr. 146 intended to deceive the reader into believing that the contents of folio 45r was a single musical item: any attempt to translate the piece into sound would inevitably arise in dissonance and cacophony. Like the carnal medieval reader who intoxicates himself through the literal sensuousness of the word, the visual layout of the musical items on the page “performs” the muddied, inebriation of the reader by blurring the boundaries between musical genres and two distinct, separate musical items, leading to soased confusio. Only a keen-sighted, knowledgeable musicus paying attention to the tonal behaviour of the notated piece would have recognized the “error” made by the (drunken) scribe, and would have made the necessary mental amendment. In fact, this confusing aspect of folio 45r has been so misleading that numerous scholars have been duped into believing that the item on the page was a four-

---

320 It is debatable as to the order in which the notated pieces on folio 45r were set to ink. There maintains the possibility that the staff lines were drawn first followed by the lyrics of the pieces, after which the ligatures were added, which serves to justify hypothesis 1 that the refrain insertion in section D was planned beforehand, and not simply an afterthought addition. A good example of this scribal order can be seen on folio 28-ter in column b, where the lyrics “Fols ne voit en sa folio se sens non” are given beneath blank staves, suggesting that – at least for this page – the musical notation was probably meant to be added after the lyrics were written beneath the staves. See Butterfield, “Refrain and Transformation of Genre,” 153.
voiced motet, themselves dragged into the warped visual performativity of beastly, readerly intoxication.\textsuperscript{321}

**Figurative vs. Literal Reading: The Integumentum of Music on folio 45\textsuperscript{r}**

In the introduction to his *Anticlaudianus*, Alan de Lille reinterprets an Augustinian gesture of literal versus figural reading in discussing the strategies for interpreting the content of his work:

In this work the sweetness of the literal sense will soothe the ears of boys, the moral instruction will inspire the mind on the road to perfection, the sharper subtlety of the allegory will whet the advanced intellect.\textsuperscript{322}

In the following passage, however, he addresses the sensuous, carnal reader who excavates the sensualities of text rather than the “sharper subtlety of allegory” as improper bestial readers harbouring prurient desires for poetic melody:

Let those be denied access to this work who pursue only sense-images and do not reach out for the truth that comes from reason, lest what is holy, being set before dogs be soiled, lest the pearl, trampled under the feet of swine be lost, lest the esoteric be impaired if its grandeur is revealed to the unworthy.\textsuperscript{323}

In this passage, the juxtaposition between intellective and carnal reading is directly displaced upon the distinction between man and beast. Carnal readers who “pursue only sense-images,” eschew the good moral instruction latent beneath said allegory, overstepping the arduous task of interpretation and study by


\textsuperscript{323} Ibid.
transforming the textual body into a stimulant for sensuous intoxication. As a result, they become transmogrified into “dogs” and “swine” under Alan’s unforgiving literary gaze, as an exemplar of defective reading to be avoided at all costs. Elsewhere, Alan describes veritable acts of reading as properly “penetrative” acts to avoid being caught up in the sensory allurement of poetry’s “musical” outer shell:

At, in superficiali litterae cortice falsum resonat lyra poetica, sed interius, auditoribus secretum intelligentiae altioris eloquitur, ut exteriore falsitatis abject putamine, dulciorem nucleum veritatis secrete intus lector invenit.

Poetry’s lyre rings with vibrant falsehood on the outward shell of a poem, but interiorly it communicates a hidden and profound meaning to those who listen. The man who reads with penetration, having cast away the outer shell of falsehood, finds the savoury kernel of truth wrapped within.324

Accessing the “truthfulness” within poetry, for Alan, required an interpretive act of *exegesis* which “penetrated” the “outer shell” of poetry’s sensuous falsehood; an act which ultimately demanded the incisive (pun intended) exercise of reason and judgment. What Alan ultimately describes is the need for *hermeneutical* propriety, a rational, learned strategy of unearthing the meanings behind allegory and metaphorical writings embedded in the text. Put another way, hermeneutical propriety stresses the importance of conferring the signifying function to the sensuous, literal sign, returning it to the productive orbit of signification and meaning-making. As we have discussed above, such measures were necessary to avoid canal forms of sensuous reading, which mistook the signifier as a self-enclosed, tautological entity. This was all the more important in the later Middle Ages, which saw the rise of allegorical and metaphorical works in

---

what M.D. Chenu calls the “Symbolist mentality” of the twelfth century and beyond. The use of symbols, he notes, was “treated as an instrument capable of penetrating truth, over and beyond any brief and incidental use in mere illustration.” The symbol, for Hugh of St Victor, was “a juxtaposition, that is, a coaptation of visible forms brought forth to demonstrate some invisible [conceptual] mater.” Chenu explains:

To bring symbolism into play was not to extend or supplement a previous act of reason; it was to give primary expression to a reality which reason could not attain and which reason, even afterwards, could not conceptualize.

Allegory or metaphors were such micro-examples of symbols employed textually. On a larger scale, extended use of symbolism such as the construction of narratives to embedded hidden moralizing messages was known as the rhetorical technique of integumentum or involucrum, means through which aforesaid messages were “wrapped” in the kernel of a fictional narrative. For Bernard of Sylvester, the integument was:

...the kind of demonstration that wraps the thing that is understood under a fabulous [fabulosa] narration [narratione] of the truth, and for this reason it is called an involucrum, or envelope.

Especially in the later Middle Ages, the logic of the integumentum was crucial to the understanding of numerous pagan authors incorporated into the medieval liberal arts curriculum such as Ovid and Homer; by construing such works as integuments, teachers and theologians were able to fashion the

326 Ibid., 112.
327 Quoted in Chenu, Ibid., 103.
328 Ibid.
329 Quoted in Chenu, Ibid., 110.
330 On the uses of Ovid in the medieval classroom, see Deborah McGrady, “A Master, a Vilain, a Lady and a Scribe: Competing for Authority in a Late Medieval Translation of the Ars Amatoria,” in *Poetry, Knowledge and Community in Late Medieval France*, Ed. Rebecca Dixon & Finn E. Sinclair (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008), 98-110.
production of Christian moralizing meaning by controlling the methods of reading, turning these secular works into teaching aids (instrumenta) which neutralized their pagan non-sacred contents.\(^{331}\) Derived from the philosophical suggestions of Macrobius, by the twelfth century, the concept of the integrumentum was so well established that it was deemed profane, even unethical, on certain discursive accounts, to utilize “naked” rhetoric without some form of narrativistic “covering”.\(^{332}\) Peter Abelard, for example, considered myth as a necessity for discussing mysterious realities while Alan de Lille thought of integrumentum as necessary “intellectual modesty” when dealing with the veiled mysteries of nature.\(^{333}\) Characteristic of integrumentum discourse was the portrayal of the integument as an ornamented sort of “dress” or piece of clothing to “cover-up” the immodest nakedness of truth. Macrobius writes:

> They know that Nature loathes an open, naked exposition of herself; just as she has withheld herself from the contemplation of crude men by covering herself in motley array, so too she has wanted prudent men to discuss her secrets only by way of fabled narratives.\(^{334}\)

While parading as a modest intellectual act of “covering,” Dronke also explains that the logic of the integrumentum served as a means of exclusion, an interpretive grid through which “correct” meaning was disclosed amongst its members, and foreclosed from less able (beastly) readers.\(^{335}\) The play between naked exposure and guarded covering finds a more vociferous form in William of


\(^{334}\) Quoted in Peter Dronke, *Fabula: Explorations in the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism* (Leiden & Köln: E.J. Brill, 1974), 47.

\(^{335}\) Ibid.
Conches, who unabashedly promotes integumentum as a device for maintaining a structure of power favouring the knowledgeable over the unlearned:

There is a reason why naked and open exposition is repugnant to the nature of the gods: namely that only the wise should know the secret of the gods, through the interpretation of integumenta. As for churls and foolish men, let them not know but only believe.  

Like the illogical cantor without the learned claves of the musicus, the sensuous, beastly reader is deprived of the textual claves with which to unlock the secrets of truth lying beneath the falsified integumentum. In the same way through which the sonic embodiment of the word serves as a fleshy kind of integument encasing the intellective, rational kernel of the word itself, could we not read folio 45r as a direct visual representation of a musical integumentum “clothing” its textual heart? Apart from the image of the chalice, the arrangement of the musical items on the page also resemble a partial “clothing” of the text, as if to cast an improvisation on ontology of the hybridized sonic-signifier unit as a deceptive, sonorous veil which has to be “penetrated” in order to access the “sweet, savoury kernel” of the text within. A hitherto unexplored feature of wordplay in Chaillou’s reworked ending also serves to reinforce this image of music-as-integumentum: in his discussion of Fauvel, Chaillou uses the words “robé” and “desrobant” to depict Fauvel’s larcenous proclivities. While both words have been commonly translated to mean “rob” or “steal” by Brownlee and Dillon, “robe” and “desrobant” also refer to the act of clothing and unclothing respectively. Furthermore, as Brownlee has pointed out, Chaillou’s reworked ending directly models a passage in Jean de Meun’s Roman de la Rose, in which Faus Semblant

---

336 Quoted in Dronke, Ibid., 48.
(“False Seeming”) describes his methods of deception. A comparison between both passages is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chaillou</th>
<th>Jean de Meun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fauvel, qui n’a a qui finir</td>
<td>Li plus fors le plus foible robe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En ce monde, car tuit obéissent a lui, tout a robé.</td>
<td>Mes je, qui vest ma simple robe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robé nous a tout en lobant,</td>
<td>Lobant lobez e lobeürs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En lobe en nous desrobant.</td>
<td>Robe robé e robœeurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fauvel, who does not need to fine anyone in this world, for all obey him, has stolen everything. He has robbed us by deceiving, and deceived by robbing us. The stronger rob the weaker. But I, wearing my simple robe, cheating the cheaters, rob the robbed and the robbers. 338

By wearing the “simple robe” of deceptive poetic language, Jean de Meun’s Faus Semblant achieves total deception through the slippery excesses of syntax paralleled by Jean’s own discursive wordplay.339 Here, the duplicitous “robe” of language as a sensuous-intellectual hybrid threatens to mislead the reader and “rob” his reading experience of the deeper meanings derived from textual play. In Chaillou’s paragraph, it is Fauvel who “robbed us by deceiving”; if we consider “robé” as the act of clothing the text beneath a musical garment, then the sensuous reader falls victim to Fauvel’s deception by failing to read beneath the integument of music into the truth of the text.

On the other hand, Chaillou also claims that Fauvel “En lobe en nous desrobant,” or has deceived through an act of “disrobing.” In old French, being disrobed by intended robbery literally equates to being raped,340 or the physical defiling of the victim’s outer clothes to access the sensuous flesh hidden beneath –

338 Ibid., 97-8.
339 For a reading of this passage, see David F. Hult, “Poetry and Translation of Knowledge in Jean de Meun,” in Poetry, Knowledge and Community in Late Medieval France, 38.
340 I thank Anna Zayaruznaya (Harvard University) for pointing this out to me.
another example of a carnal act fuelled by dangerous, uncontrollable sexual desires. Idolizing the sonorous *integumentum* of text rather than its signifi
catory functions, Chaillou appears to imply that the carnal reader is duped in two differing modes of clothing: the clarity (*cler*) of medieval reading is sullied by the *vin*-like properties of sensuous text as a musicalized “robe” which blindfolds the inebriated reader. Correspondingly, the licentious reader harbouring prurient desires enacted the illicit “rape” of the signifier, expressing pride in the sufficiency of the “naked” sign which fails to signify anything other than itself. The musical “cloak” on folio 45r may therefore serve as a metaphor for the dangerous encroachment of musicality upon the signifying word inasmuch as it also represents an intellectual symbol that has to be mentally disrobed through acts of learned hermeneutical exegesis rather than brutally “raped” by the carnal reader’s desires for the fleshy, naked sonorous sign.341

Indeed, the sinful pride in the naked signifier, Cowell argues, was a common trope of late thirteenth century literature “emblematic of the absence of an attempt to represent in any way.” While clothes figured as integumental metaphors for the sign, “dispensing with clothes becomes symbolic of the attempt to dispense with the imperfections [and metaphysical excesses] inherent in the use of all worldly signs.”342 In this context, carnal reading as a symptom of a lack of learning serves to mirror the reader’s own indecent unknowledgeable “nakedness.” Richard de Bury’s mid fourteenth-century *Philobiblon* (“On Books”) rehearses the discourse of the garment as the trophies of bookish study and scrupulous learning proffered by the reading of books:

341 One could also potentially re-read Fauvel’s treatment of the *motetus* voice as an act of musical rape, in which he rapaciously rips the *motetus* “garment” into fourteen segments. See chapter 2.

In sooth, while still untrained and helpless ye crept up to us, ye spake to us as children, ye thought as children, ye cried as children and begged to be made partakers of our milk. [...] We clad you with the goodly garments of philosophy, rhetoric and dialectic, of which we had and have a story, while ye were naked as a tablet to be painted on. For all the household of philosophy are clothed with [intellectual] garments, that the nakedness and rawness of the intellect may be covered. [...] Who are the givers of all these things, O clerks? Is it not the books? (My emphasis).

The late thirteenth century author of Summa Musice also devotes a lengthy section of his exposition to the metaphorical enumeration of the “symbolic garment of music” (“Integumentum Musice”), using musical principles as tropological devices to “gloss” theological meaning.\textsuperscript{344} The grammar of music itself becomes an integumentum through which to memorize biblical symbols in a clever reversal: intimate knowledge of the “music” serves as an allegorical text through which to elucidate divine meaning. While clerky learning may serve to clothe the shameful nakedness of the intellect, unlearned readers who defile the process of signification “tear” the garments of good learning. In Alan de Lille’s De Planctu Naturae, Lady Nature’s impeccable garment of natural order is desiccated by “unnatural,” counterintuitive sodomitic behaviour, while his Ars Praedicandi describes the tearing of Christ’s garments by false preachers who “pervert the scriptures”.\textsuperscript{345} In an even earlier source, Boethius’ Lady Philosophy of De Consolatione Philosophiae sports a ripped garment, supposedly torn by philosophical ruffians, the “ignorant mob” and “proud stupidity”.\textsuperscript{346} In all cases, unlearned ignorance results in the allegorical “raping” or “manhandling” of the fictional persona, whose “garment” of knowledge is ruined by the thoughtless lust of sensuous desire. In the case of folio 45\textsuperscript{f}, it is the beastly reader which translates

\textsuperscript{344} Page, The Summa Musice, 127-37, 203-11.
\textsuperscript{345} Quoted in Guynn, Allegory and Sexual Ethics in the High Middle Ages, 102.
the good sense of signification into an immoral act of mental rape by violently ripping out the sensory word from its proper chain of signification, that is, by failing to read beyond the sonic *integumentum* of the drinking songs, falling prey to the sensual vortex of the musicalized word.

Fr. 146 is not the only medieval musical document to cast notated music as a “cloak” or *integumentum* which has to be penetrated by the intelligible mind. Another musical-visual “essay” *En la maison Dedalus enfermee* survives in the early fifteenth century theory manuscript now at Berkeley,\(^{347}\) which presents a three-voiced canonic motet (with lyrics adapted from Machaut’s *Voir dit*) as a circular integument-like “maze” which has to be endured by the singers before reaching its core (see fig. 4.5 below). To successfully realize the work and reach the centre of the maze, the *triplum* singer must assiduously cooperate with the singer of the *tenor* through the convoluted layout of the song’s labyrinth, a feat which distinguishes the learned *musicus* from the deficient *cantor*.\(^{348}\) In either case, acquisition of the *integumentum* of musical learning provides the map (in the case of the maze) or key (*claves*) in which to overcome the outer notational *integumentum*.\(^{349}\) The “savoury kernel of truth” becomes the self-assured affirmation of the *musicus’* grasp of notation and musical knowledge over his less-able *cantor* counterpart, celebrating his triumphant victory over the

---

\(^{347}\) The Berkeley Theory Manuscript, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, University of California, Berkelett MS 0744, folio 317.


intoxicating, sensuousness of carnal reading – the consequence of the latter resulting in the cantor’s entrapment within the confines of the maze.350

Fig. 4.5. The integumentum of music in En la maison Dedalus enfermee (Anon.), from the Berkeley theory manuscript, (Photo: Anna Zayaruznaya, “She has a wheel that turns...,” 202.)

Both in fr. 146 and the Berkeley Manuscript, notated music is presented as a textual-visual object demanding to be read and intellectually “penetrated.” The doubling of notated music in fr. 146 as both barrier to sonic realization and aural danger threatening to overwhelm the reasonable word invites the medieval reader/singer to test his degree of intellection over his beastly, carnal body: either he succeeds, penetrating the integument towards poetic meaning, or succumbs to his bestial desires to reduce the word to the level of musicality, inadvertently tearing the good garment of musical learning in the process. Like the Berkeley Manuscript, fr. 146 may also be read as an architectural maze built with a clever assortment of musical, textual and visual elements; a bewildering and confusing integu-mental labyrinth full of obscure meaning and hidden traps only overcome by first transcending one’s beastly appetites and aspiring to grasp the penetrating claves endowed by knowledge.

Taken together with Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert on the opposing page, it is highly possible that the specific physical positioning of interpolated items on folios 44v and 45r was anything but random. Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert mirrors the themes of “beastly” intoxication and the trappings of the drinking songs’ sonorous integumentum. The vertical Sonority types exhibited by the motet, too, can be conceived of as a kind of musical “covering” susceptible to “carnal” acts of listening by assuming that complementary Sonority types are thoroughly identical. Both the motet and the drinking songs in their local textual and physical environment of the Roman de Fauvel reinforce themes of aural danger and auditory beastliness, challenging the reader/listener to intelligently “disrobe” its
sensuous *integumentum*, precisely by “robing” oneself with the garment of a learned *musicus*. 
CHAPTER 5

BY WAY OF A CONCLUSION: FAUVEL ALIVE AND WELL! BEASTS IN OUR MIDST

Introduction

The clerky fear of the beastly, sensuous body as embedded in Chaillou’s interpolations have far from disappeared from contemporary music-making circles. This final chapter examines modern ontologies of “beastliness” in its numerous (re)incarnations, and the strategies used by contemporary musicus to suppress its corrosive resistance against reason and hegemonic structures of normativity. I discuss modern versions of the musicus/cantor polarization in musicological scholarship today, through the lens of “authenticity” debates within the circle of the Historical Perfomance Movement, in which the studiousness of the musicologist's (musicus) hermeneutic insight trounces the “misleading” beastly sensuousness of sounded performance as a metaphysical marker of historical “presence.” By centralizing the ontology of the “text” as a privileged claves to gain access to historical knowledge, I suggest how musicology’s emphasis on the “original” source document is similarly an arbitrary designation and hence “beastly” in appealing to a (fantasmic) aesthetic of the manuscript’s historical “immediacy.” The epistemology of the integumentum is displaced onto the study of history itself, which, perhaps unfairly, capitalizes on the physical corporeality of the source manuscript as the privileged ontological version of the “work” in question.
Last but not least, I suggest how we may philosophically and methodologically move “beyond the beast” by freeing *Fauvel* scholarship from aforesaid arbitrary designations. History is shown to be itself a “beastly” mutative hybrid, in the sense that it is the product of a dialogue between modern scholastic interlocutors and trace documents coloured by contemporary methods of exegesis, and thus always open to “mutation” and change. Loosening our grip on any hegemonic ontology of the *Roman de Fauvel* enables us to consider the creative multiplicity of modern *Fauvel* ontologies in our midst, no less worthy of our scholastic attention than fr. 146.

**The Musicus’ Beastly Secret...**

In the previous four chapters, I demonstrated how the critical learning of the intelligent *musicus* may offer us precious insight as to how the beastly threat of sensuous musical signs constitute an important aesthetics of beastliness in the *Roman de Fauvel*. Only by “penetrating” Fauvel’s allegorical, semiotic and musical *integumentum* does the book’s audience overcome the threat of sensuous metaphysical excess, and feast upon the delicacies of Fauvel’s artistic subtleties. For the contemporary scholar, recourse to “historically-informed” hermeneutical methods of exegesis likewise unveils the *integumentum* of historical alienation. Up till this point, my study of Fauvel’s beastly aesthetics has followed a similar interpretive pathway: momentarily assuming the guise of the learned late medieval *musicus*, I have shown how a particular epistemology informing the aesthetics of significatory “beastliness” is possible using historically-appropriate *claves* to unlock its latent mysteries. However, if we reconsider Marchetto de
Padua’s poetic adage that the *claves* of appropriate (historical) knowledge “opens a door to preserve what is behind the door,” could we also not consider the possibility that the *claves* of exclusive musical knowledge could be used to *lock* the door? That is, could the *claves* of the *musicus* which “preserves” the purity of musical integrity also be used to keep unwanted subjects out of its enclosure of elitist knowledge? Correspondingly, by aligning the *cantor* with the figure of the beast, is it ultimately not the *musicus* who transforms his knowledge of *claves* into rhetorical *clavus* (nails) with which to crucify/punish the deviant *cantor*? Later in the *Lucidarium*, Marchetto expounds on his definition of the *musicus* through the *cantor*:

> Musicus enim cognoscit virtutem et rationem proportionem musicalium et secundum hoc iudicat et non solum per sonum. Cantor vero est sicut instrumentum quoddam ipsius musici; in quo instrumento operator, artifex; sed musicus practicando ea que iam per rationem cognovit. Est it a que musicus ad cantorum sicut iudex ad preconem, nam iudex ordinat et per preconem preconizari mandat.351

The musician knows the power and nature of musical proportions; he judges according to them, not according to sound alone. The singer is, as it were, the tool [*instrumentum*] of that musician – [the latter] who is an artisan in that he is occupied with a tool, but a musician inasmuch as he puts into practice what he has previously investigated through rational process. Thus the musician is to the singer as the judge to the herald. The judge sets things in order and commands the herald to proclaim them.352

While evocative, Marchetto’s text also seems to suggest that the disparity between the *musicus* and the *cantor* is a natural – even *necessary* – one, the *cantor* being an important foil to the *musicus*, enabling the latter to define and confine himself in the room of his elite knowledge. To this extent, the relationship between the *musicus* and *cantor* is ultimately an asymmetrical structure of power which forecloses the *cantor’s* access to knowledge by “keeping it behind locked doors,” so to speak. The *musicus* as the “judge” who “sets things in order”

352 Ibid., 549.
controls the ideologies sustaining the production of musical knowledge, reducing the cantor to mere “instrument” [instrumentum]. Correspondingly, the cantor, deprived of access to musical claves, is literally “commanded” to replicate the discourse of the musicus, forced to parrot the structures of linguistic oppression which prevent him from gaining access to power. The claves of the musicus is then both the “key” which locks and denies access to the warehouse of musical thought, and the clavus which securely nails the cantor in an ontological coffin of his “beastly” definition. In Prosdocimo’s early fifteenth century Contrapunctus (“Counterpoint”), he remarks:

... investigatio ad propositum non spectat, sed solius theorici musici est speculatio, cum simplex practicus propter quid rei inquirere non debet sed ad solum quia est rei debet contentus permanare.\textsuperscript{353}

An investigation of these properties [of semitones, major and minor], is not apposite to the matter at hand, but is the province of the musical theorist [musici] alone; the simple performer ought not to inquire after the wherefore of the thing, but ought to remain content with the what.\textsuperscript{354}

Like Marchetto, Prosdocimo’s advice to the “simple practitioner” (“simplex practicus”) is to explicitly ignore the “wherefore” of musical knowledge, and simply content himself/herself with merely parroting the good word of the omnipotent, all-knowing musicus. The epistemology of clavus ironically “locks” the cantor within a beastly enclosure of ignorance, suggesting that the province of the musicus is beyond his or her intellectual reach. If Prosdocimo’s advice to the simplex practicus dissuades one from criticizing the authority of the law of the musicus, then is the cantor, by his very definition as the opposite of the musicus, always and already condemned by the epistemology of the beast to remain beastly? In other words, what platform of enunciation outside

\textsuperscript{353} Prosdocimo de’Beldomani, Contrapunctus (Counterpoint), Trans. Jan W. Herlinger (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 56.

\textsuperscript{354} Ibid., 55, 57.
the musicus/cantor binary distinction can guarantee that the laws of the musicus are not in themselves beastly to begin with?

In his study of the power-relations through the use of allegory, Noah D. Guynn reminds the (modern) reader that the use of semiotic ambivalence in medieval literature may simultaneously serve to authorize “the production and enforcement of normative codes” while foreclosing the ways in which “those codes are themselves dynamic practices that generate meaning through slippage and play.”355 For Guynn, this despotic ideological operation is enabled precisely by emphasizing “the unmasterable play of differences in signs and the instability of all systems of political domination.”356 In other words, the use of allegory to demonstrate the slippery, metaphysical excesses of meaning outside stable signification justifies the use of powerful disciplining strategies via normative codes, at the same time exempting the codes themselves from being exposed as equally unstable discursive constructs:

By masking its own internal contradictions or pushing them to a point of near incoherence, allegory appears to throw its own representational and moral order into crisis. And yet it does so principally so it may eventually impose order through alternate, typically violent means and empower the ruling classes as agents of discipline.357

Construed as a beastly, sensuous integumentum which begs the “penetrative” interpretive skills of a learned musicus, can we thus not conceive the Roman de Fauvel as manipulating the play of sensuous signs so as to legitimate a single “learned” strategy of exegesis, namely one which privileges that of the musicus over the cantor? Indeed, the intoxicating “breakdown” of the word on
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folio 45’, Fauvel and the Charivari’s purposeful dissolution of meaningful signification, and the deliberate musical-masking of text in *Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert* skilfully demonstrate the sensory dangers implicit in signification, even as it may function as a creative *admonitio* warning against such practices. Casting Fauvel as beastly, unlearned *cantor* through the ingenious manipulation of musical signs, the *Roman de Fauvel’s* use of parody may consequently be extrapolated to *denounce* such behaviours amongst real, living musicians. Ironically, the apprehension of these embedded meanings requires the knowledgeable reader to read “between the lines” – in this case, at the interstices between the play of signs – but somehow redeems this form of reading as legitimate, even though it relies on the excesses of semantic play it so fastidiously demonizes to produce that meaning. That is to say, the privileged *clavus* used to unlock the latent meanings of the *Roman de Fauvel* is as much a “defective” form of reading as sensuous, somatic modes of Fauvelian exegesis.

“Unsound” Medievalism? Historical “Authenticity” and the Modern Musicus

Nearly six entire centuries have passed since Chaillou’s interpolated *Roman de Fauvel* was brought into completion. Today, the enclosed world of reading for whom fr. 146 was probably meant for is replicated under the strict surveillance of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, fully accessible only to a limited number of viewers at a time. Despite the restricted circumstances of *Fauvel* viewership, paradoxically, the musical components of fr. 146 have never been more accessible. Over the last decade, the publication of the colossal *Fauvel Studies* has ushered in a new wave of Fauvel interest, succeeded by Emma
Dillon’s *Medieval Music-Making and the* Roman de Fauvel, which both seek to relocate Chaillou’s interpolations within the epistemology of the “book,” and correspondingly, its intertextual relations with other items also included in fr. 146.

Acquiring a Fauvellian sound-byte has never been easier, thanks to new disseminative pathways made possible through technology. At the click of a button, almost every single musical item in the *Roman de Fauvel* can be purchased over i-tunes, Amazon, “ripped off” via file-sharing networks, or sampled on media-sharing sites such as imeem or youtube, attesting to the force of modern-day music reproduction technologies such as CDs, mp3s and I-pods to restructure entire social and international networks of listening.\(^{358}\) On the front of contemporary music-making, groups as diverse as the Clemencic Consort, Studio der Frühen Musik, Ensemble P.A.N., Boston Camerata, Ordo Virtutum, The Ensemble for Early Music and even community amateur groups have tried their hand at theatricalising *Fauvel*. Contrary to Gervais’ and Chaillou’s poetic predictions, Fauvel is far from deceased; his multiplied, sonorous musical forms permeate the far corners of contemporary reconstructions of medieval music-making.

Inasmuch as modern reincarnations of Fauvel are very much alive and well in musical communities today, the clerky fear of Fauvel (and the horrors of the self’s inner, sensuous beast) as presented in fr. 146 has likewise survived into ideologies governing contemporary Fauvel scholarship and performance. One only has to look no further than the heated debates and (eventual denouncement)

concerning Historical Performance Movements which, amongst other claims, portended to recreate more “authentic” musical reconstructions by utilizing “historically-appropriate” instruments and period performance “styles” (or, whatever information on performance was gleaned from historically relevant documentation). In the early years of the movement’s inception, the discipline of musicology was reined in to assist such “authentic” performance renditions: close historical analyses revealing clues about performance practice have instigated an entire industry of “historically-informed” performances, perhaps (mis)construing other performative interpretations as inferior or uninformed; by formulating the right “sound” of medieval music (whatever it may be or have been), proponents of the movement somehow believed they approximated a “truer” aesthetic of musical history. “Authenticity” (at least prior to the ‘80s) was a shiny badge to be worn with pride, a step up the ladder of teleological positivism, a beacon of a commitment to knowledge which casts a long shadow over performers and musicians who fail to step into its dazzling terrain. Or, as Joseph Kerman put it, a “baleful term which has caused endless acrimony” for it “resonates with unearned good vibrations.”

Of course, debates in the 1980s over authenticity in music concluded that such figments of accuracy are but pipe dreams, remnants of the great 19th century Hegelian progress-myth enabling us to approximate “truth” tangentially. Today, “Authenticity” has become a bit of a dirty-word, embarrassingly replaced by the
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benign term “historically informed,” denoting a principled system of musical production rather than a commitment to any single, latent historical truth. Calling the bluff on so-called “authentistic” recordings, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson asserts that:

[The] stylistic contrast between the earlier and the “authentic” performance is essentially the same. [...] In a nutshell, the difference is that between performer as “interpreter” and performer as “transmitter” [...] The remarkable uniformity of approach which dominates early music performance ... is nothing more than a reflection of current taste.

Richard Taruskin chimes in on the anti-authenticity camp with characteristic wit and insight, claiming that “It is the latter [historically “authentic” performances] that is truly modern performance ... while the former [“modern” performance] represents the progressively weakening survival of an earlier style, inherited from the nineteenth century, one that is fast becoming historical.” Because claims of “authenticity” resonated so strongly with notions of “sound” in various permutations of the Historical Performance Movement, musicologists tended to champion a “return to the source,” calling the bluff on the former as simply modern-day wolves parading under the sheep skin of historical “authenticity.” To summarize, modern reconstructive attempts to (re)produce medieval “sound” is seen as a historically misguided approach due to its inevitable proximity to contemporary performance practices. Consequently, or so the argument goes, a methodology which is closer to “history” must then be sought as close possible to the actual historical document itself. But could we also

363 In 1986, for example, the American Musicological Society used the term “historically-aware” in its guidelines for the Noah Greenberg Awards. See the AMS Newsletter 16/2, (August, 1986): 5, 14.
364 Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, “What we are doing with early music is genuinely authentic to such a small degree that the word loses most of its intended meaning,” in Early Music, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Feb., 1984), 14.
not consider the demonization of “sound” (as a metaphysical “marker” of historical “authenticity”) as a modern day repetition of the old, familiar musicus/cantor debate?

For medieval musicologists, the significant absence of an audible historical source material to test their hypothesis leaves a gaping hole in the history of early music; without recourse to such sources, musicologists have tended to foreground text to offer insights into the realization of early scores. “The sound of modern performances and recordings may beckon us into the realm of early music,” says Margaret Bent, “but it is only when we recognize performance sound to be a modern construction … that we may penetrate beyond it, to the intrinsic content of the music independently of the performance, and learn new ways of listening to unfamiliar [early] music styles” (my emphasis). For Bent, a corresponding gateway into appreciating early music, as earlier suggested, is dispensing with the interpretive gesture of performance (the beastly, sensuous variable) and focusing on the score (the textual authority of the sign), suggesting that abstract, “intrinsic” musical form can be separated from timbral content. One wonders whether Bent ventriloquizes the speakerly-position of the learned musicus, warning against the stupid, sensory trappings of “carnal listening” which inevitably leads to “misinformed” re-presentations of medieval music. Like Alan, Macrobius, William and rhetoricians of the integumentum, Bent seems to suggest that the pleasures derived from our entrainment of “medieval” music’s misleading, (contemporary) sonorous “cloak” is inferior to the intellectual pleasures derived from the studious penetrative insight of the musicus (or

---

musicologist). But does such “penetration” really result in a more “accurate” understanding of history? In short, is there really a “kernel” of truth to uncover, or is the musicologist’s strenuous de-husking simply well-meaning fantasy?

One of the dangers in attempting to “penetrate beyond” the mediated sound-world integumentum of performances to the “intrinsic content of the music” is that it risks simply replacing the interpretive liberties of performance with an assumedly more historically-filial object – namely, medieval source documents themselves such as treatises, scores and manuscripts. In other words, the mode of “presence” is shifted from the sonic immediacy of “performance” (the realm of the cantor) to the sphere of the “textual” (the realm of the musicus,) bestowing source documents with a quasi-religious aura not unlike the seductive call of “authenticity.” As Harry White points out, such musicological preoccupations “with the textual integrity of contemporary [early music] performance [becomes] an expression par excellence of the regulative force of [Lydia Goehr’s] work-concept,” leaving us trapped in a reductive circuit which accepts no more than the aura of the textual as a metaphysical substitute for “authenticity.” Consequently, elevating the “text” or the “book” as the privileged ontological point of exegesis risks homogenizing a logocentric, monolithic notion of “the Music” with a capital M, which ultimately forecloses modern performance’s own

---

367 One can draw an analogue between the auraticization of manuscript sources and Derridean “archival-fever” as what Dominick LaCapra calls a “fetish,” a “literal substitute for the ‘reality’ of the past which is ‘always already’ lost for the historian” and, as such, a condition privileged by fantasies of presence and authenticity. See LaCapra, History and Criticism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).
capacity to reshape our contemporary understandings of the “medieval.”

Furthermore, this universalizing view of Music works to reinforce the idea of an “original” distinguishable from disagreeing sources by scribal error and corruption along the disseminating chain; deeply Platonic in its conviction that proper historical work will reveal an essential, uncorrupted originating source, or even the “perfect language.”

The problem is the movement from the particular (the individual manuscript source) to the universal (historical concepts about music) – how can we fashion historically appropriate hermeneutic tools without subscribing to a musicus’ despotic “one-size-fits-all” ontology of early music?

Although this is not a problem with fr. 146 per se (since there is only one surviving copy of Chaillou’s interpolated Fauvel), its ontological status as a unica in medieval scholarship does not necessarily infer that the only proper means of exegesis should be undertaken vis-à-vis a purely material, bookish work-concept. We see the same tension of forces at work in modern performances of the Roman de Fauvel, where directors and performers lament over a loss of meaning by translating the work out of its “native,” textual ecosystem onto the locus of the

---

369 This is especially pertinent to music edition-making, in which various sources are collapsed into a single “authoritative” form. Disputes over the “correct” edition of a piece of music may take place when there are more than one surviving manuscript sources, a condition Lydia Goehr (1992) would ascribe to the late 18th Century “work-fidelity” concept that has survived into modern ontologies of music. More recently, the status of notated music has been given a materialist spin, teasing out the individualities of a piece of music preserved in more than one source. See Ardis Butterfield, Poetry and Music in Medieval France: from Jean Renart to Guillaume Machaut (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). For a concept of multiple musical ontologies, see Philip V Bohlman, “Ontologies of Music,” in Rethinking Music, Ed. Nicholas Cook & Mark Everist (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 17-34

370 This problematic aspect has been debated by musicologists with regard to the “work concept.” See Leo Treitler, “History and the Ontology of the Musical Work,” in The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 51, No. 3, (Summer, 1993), 483-97, in which he discusses specific musical examples which seem to fall outside the regulative hold of the “work concept.”

stage. In one of the earliest incarnations of *Fauvel* stagings in October 1975, Frederick Renz (then the director of the Ensemble for Early Music) explained the logic behind this endeavour, and the perils of crafting a truncated work suitable for traditional concert duration:

The aim of this collaboration ... was to evoke the cultural life of the French court during the second decade of the 14th century. [...] The entire manuscript contains some 6,700-odd verses and over 150 musical numbers. If performed in its entirety, it would span several hours. [...] With the initial problem of inflicting major cuts on the manuscript and then using the abridged version as a vehicle for a fully theatrical presentation, we proceeded with utmost caution.372

Renz’s tone is almost apologetic, seeking approval for his translation of fr. 146’s bookish epistemology into a performative, aesthetic object. At the same time, Renz acknowledges the modern physical limitations of the concert ritual: a full performance of the *Roman de Fauvel* would demand a vast amount of resources, not to mention superhuman listening abilities on the part of the spectator. His language is distinctly aware of the disservice “major cuts” inflict on the ontology of *Roman de Fauvel*, a disservice he tries to absolve by reassuring the public that his creative team “proceeded with utmost caution.” Renz’s collaborator, Frank Didishiem who prepared a full English translation of the poetic text, likewise expressed the difficulty in capturing the *Roman de Fauvel*’s full rhetorical integrity:

One difficulty encountered in translating this poem derives from its frequent use of words and phrases with double meanings, puns and linguistic twists which are necessarily robbed of part of their signification when transposed into English.373

This, it must be noted, comes without even broaching the loss of visual play between text, image and notated music through theatrical transcriptions. Joel

---

373 Quoted in Renz, 25.
Cohen, who directed the Boston Camerata and the Ensemble Project Ars Nova’s recording of *Le Roman de Fauvel* (1991) repeats these anxieties of ontological unfaithfulness in his sleeve notes which accompany the recording:

The illustrated Fauvel manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale intrigues the contemporary imagination. Its effervescent mixture of words, music, and image seem to prefigure the “multimedia” concerns of our latter 20th century. And yet, it is a difficult work to translate into contemporary terms. Attempts have been made in recent decades to create staged versions of Fauvel -- yet a poem whose only characters are metaphors is hard to translate into acted drama. In fact, the “theater” of the original Fauvel was probably not some public proscenium, but the theater of the mind. The big Fauvel book was, I think, an end in itself, intended for the delectation of those privileged few who got to see it. Paradoxically, and fortunately, the modern CD player or the VCR make it easier to approach the original, medieval experience than a public performance ever can.374

What Cohen fails to mention is the beastly opacity of historical distance separating the “original, medieval experience” from the solitary viewing experiences of the modern CD or VCR user. If, by “experience,” Cohen suggests a degree of intelligible understanding demonstrated by the medieval *musicus*, then he is surely mistaken. After all, how many people today still converse in medieval French and Latin, let alone fully understand the cultural connotations of different medieval musical genres? Also, by appealing to an imagined condition of solitary “medieval reading,” Cohen’s language privileges a corporeal, bookish ontology of the *Roman de Fauvel*, undercutting the renovative capacity of his own project to construct new Fauvelian ontologies, and with that, new epistemological structures of historical “dialogue” and “experience.”

In this way, the metaphor of the *integumentum* serves as double metaphor for the philosophy of history and the ideologies governing the spheres of musicological knowledge-production. A palpable gap divides modern day
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listeners from the exact conditions of the *Roman de Fauvel’s* genesis: we will never and can never fully appreciate the complex ecosystem out of which Fauvel derived. Like the medieval *integumentum*, a clear (*cler*) vision of historical “truth” always seems opaque, hidden beneath the riddles of time’s cloak, understandably generating panic about the possibility of “misreading” history’s mysterious codes. The frequent demonization of scholars not being fastidious enough in their scholarship is ultimately a battle of *power* which, measured by the barometer of the medieval *musicus/cantor* debate, implicates “lesser” scholars as inept *musicus*, indeed “beastly” error-prone *cantors*.

Performers crying “authenticity” have also been admonished for exhibiting narcissistic pride in the (sensuous) sign (of modern medieval sound), their detractors arguing that performing “medieval” music today resembles less a window into a past than a mirror in which the performer gazes at his contemporary performance techniques. However, the scape-goating of the beastly *cantor* cannot fully mask the equally arbitrary *metaphysical* valorisation of the *musicus’* vain “reason,” assigned to the status of the master signifier, regulating the myth of stable signification, and denouncing all other deviant “readings” (in our case, the translation of Fauvel into performance settings) as impoverished, degenerate “versions” departing from a more faithful point of historical origins. To this extent, musicological fervour of “the manuscript,” or, in this case, the “book,” turns out to be an equally *Faus-vel* of historical certainty, perhaps unfairly insinuating that only a single ontology of Chaillou’s interpolated Roman de Fauvel is permissible, and that by sticking to a material epistemology of the “book,” we approximate a “better” or historically “truer” interpretation of its contents.

---

Beyond the Beast: Multisensory Ontologies of *Fauvel*

What this little *excursus* reveals is the problems inherent in the project of medieval musicological archaeology when the sources seem opaque, refusing to speak back on clear, equal terms to their scholastic (or performative) interlocutors. Without clear “historical” guidelines articulating how the *Roman de Fauvel* should be performed, read or interpreted, how can we be sure that our historically-oriented musical activities are not always tautological contemporary monologues? How can we be sure that we are not, from the start, simply gazing into the mirror of a beastly sign of our own fashioning? For performers, such an uncertainty may offer a liberating opportunity for creativity and interpretation, although it may spell despair for the fact-seeking inclinations of the musicologist. Inevitably, the beastly sensuous *integumentum* of history is, to a large degree, opaque; historical uncertainty opens up a gap between the “historicism” desired from the musicologist and the “historicism” demanded by the fantasy of “historically-informed” performance practice, a clear-and-present “absence” that haunts our reception of the book or score-trace.

This beastly, ghostlike absence which comes back periodically to haunt the insufficiencies of modern transcriptions threatens to pull the thread, completely unravelling our epistemologically sound safety-net of the “work-concept.” In such cases, giving up (to) the ghost could mean abandoning the performance project altogether – indeed refusing to perform based on the conviction that “historically-informed” performances demand a degree of textual
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authenticity and accuracy, a conviction that is itself “fictitious” and illusory in the first place. In such cases the beastly ghost of historical absence terrifies the petrified musicologist/performer to inaction, and frazzled retreat. For a few philosophers of history following Derrida’s “Hauntology,” however, grappling with history’s blind-spots through the uncanny experience of the ghost may be an enabling function rather than disabling. This “blind spot” has been theorized in a number of fields as a vortex which resists our scholarly, analytic gazes: Roland Barthes’s photographic “punctum,” Michael Fried’s “anti-theatricalism” and the “stain” of the Lacanian Real as interpreted by Slavoj Žižek. This “stain” on the canvas of historical knowledge that reminds us of its failure to comply with our rules is but a feature of our own epistemological horizons, a condition of perspectival blindness on our part that makes the project of history possible (and valuable) in the first place.

Rather than recoil from the field of the vortex that threatens to render meaningless the historical project of the Roman de Fauvel, the “spectre” of the past “returns to remind us that the past is incomplete and therefore to come.” In this way, the beastly spectre of historical-absence gestures towards the future, opening up possibilities for renewal, renovation and imaginative innovation not so much in spite of absence, but in the face of absence-as-presence:
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379 This formula is elaborated widely in many of Žižek’s books, one of which is The Fragile Absolute: Or, Why is the Christian Legacy worth Fighting For? (London: Verso, 2008).
It is a proper characteristic of the spectre, if there is any, that no one can be sure if by returning it testifies to a living past or to a living future … A phantom never dies, it remains always to come and to come back … The thinking of the spectre … contrary to what good sense leads us to believe, signals toward the future.381

In the case of performing Fauvel, the spectral absence of certainty allows us to be open towards possibilities for coming to terms with a past irretrievably lost through ingenuity and invention. Indeed, we should bear in mind that as a “book” Fauvel itself is an ontological hybrid on many accounts, vacillating between the visual and the sonorous, between logos, photos and phonos.382 As we have seen in the previous chapters, the visual language of notation and intertextual play between the elements of Fauvel are laden with poetic, musical meaning, although other important interpretations cannot simply be gleaned by mere visual reading. The subtleties of transmutatio in Garrit Gallus/In Nova Fert, for example, are only evident upon sonorous realization, as is the chaotic rendition of folio 45r when the refrain is mistaken for the tenor voice of the motet. To fully polarize between the spheres of listening and reading in the ontology of Fauvel would be to risk substantial losses of subtleties by promoting either exegetical frame. In my analyses, I purposefully moved back and forth between the faculties of reading, singing and listening as a way of demonstrating the ontological multiplicities of Fauvel as a liminal hybrid poised between sight and sound.

382 For Bruce Holsinger, the act of making and consuming books through what he calls “the animalness of medieval writing” also constitutes a hybrid between the reader, the text, and the sacrificed body of the beast-turned-into-parchment. Holsinger re-envisions the beastly, corporeal origins of logos as one that is entirely dependent on “masking” the animality of parchment under the cover of “human” text. Allegory plays in to such deceptive maskings by serving as an “impediment to thinking critically ... about parchment qua animal [or transformed beast]. It is a tautology that arises from a will to transcend or reveal the literal, the material; yet in medieval allegorical thinking as in contemporary commentary, the literal sense elaborated through allegory subsists remarkably often at the animal level.” As with Guynn, the discourse the musicus’ logos masks its slippery “beastly,” animal origins qua allegory as a disciplined field of hermeneutics. See Bruce Holsinger, “Of Pigs and Parchment: Medieval Studies and the Coming of the Animal,” in PLMA, Vol. 124, No. 2 (Mar., 2009), 620.
While we may not be able to fully disengage ourselves from the epistemological confines of Goehr’s “work-concept” or the ontological hermeticism of the “book,” two alternatives come to mind. Firstly, we may concede to the intrinsic limitations of the “work-concept” warts-and-all. The “work-concept,” as Goehr attests, is also a “regulative concept,” one that helps to define the position of music (and musicology) and productively discipline the contours of “musicking”383 without falling into the bleak, deconstructive relativism of Leech-Wilkinson’s tautological dictum: “musicology is whatever musicologists do as musicologists.”384 Goehr explains:

Regulative concepts … provide the rules of the game … [guiding] the practice externally by indicating the point of following the constitutive rules. [They] do not make up the structure of the practice; rather, in their interrelations, they determine what the structure should be like. In their normative function, regulative concepts determine, stabilize, and order the structure of practices.385

To put it another way, the “regulative” rule-bestowing function of the “work-concept” confers meaning upon the spectrum of musical activities under its wing. It justifies the production of music-as-works by accepting that there is no prior, “purer” historical frame of reference by which we can relate to these early pieces of music. Transposing the Roman de Fauvel to the stage may necessarily result in “bestializing” the epistemological integrity of its ontology as a physical book but this is neither to assert that the epistemology of the “book” is a “truer,” “better” or more historically “faithful” object of scholarship either. Modern performance makes the historical trace complicit to its varying degrees of

383 Christopher Small’s preferred term to synthesize the heterogeneous messiness of music-related activity, see Small, Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening (Hanover & London: University Press of New England, 1998), Chapter 1.
disclosure by focusing on the presentness of the past’s trace, preserving the meaningful possibilities of historical musicology while acknowledging that we are subjective “fallible human beings.”

Secondly, we might seek to preserve the resistive dimension of historical blind-spots through acts of criticism, using, as Haydn White suggests, interpretive gestures “to create perplexity in the face of the real – not to clear it up.” But “perplexity” does not mean taking a postmodern attitude of relativistic free-play in the face of the void. What White means by “creating perplexity” is to transform the unresponsive resistive void of the historical into a productive force, a force to unsettle normative musicological concepts taken for granted, and a creative force to imagine other regulative possibilities for musical ontology. This approach foregrounds the importance of musicology’s affective orientation towards performance and criticism as a necessary “co-product” of performance-reception, reminding the listener of the levels of mediation and uncertainty in the medium of performance. The unsettling character of history’s beastly ghostlike character by nature already delimits “space for the bird to fly,” even though one may find such freedom of choice “uncanny” by the strict, logical demands of musicological standards. Transposing the effects of the “uncanny” into an opportunity for reinterpretation and critique, as Joan W. Scott writes, keeps us open to the future of performance-possibilities while being faithful to the trace’s ability to surprise and unsettle our expectations:

For historians, there is a double challenge here: to write the kind of history that will serve as a lever, unearthing the foundational premises upon which our social and political [and musical!] verities rest, in order … to clear the space for the operations of a history whose direction cannot be determined and whose end will never come.390

In conclusion, my study of the “sensuous dangers” present in Chaillou’s interpolated Roman de Fauvel has, until now, considered a possible interpretive pathway by momentarily stepping into the shoes of the learned musicus (however fallible this attempt may have been). This is not to favour my interpretation of the Roman de Fauvel over all other interpretations – I believe my reading/listening of the work successfully demonstrates medieval ontologies of “beastliness” in operation and ultimately coming to bear on the Roman’s own slippery ontological status, but this does not claim that such is all that Fauvel does. By flirting with the beastly resistive opacity of history’s integumentum-like character, I hope to have shown that imaginative filling-in of the gaps vis-à-vis musicological scholarship can lead to creative, thought-provoking analyses capable of grasping the reader and listener’s imagination. If the latter reason is precisely what draws us to music in the first place, then why should we let the void of uncertainty obscure our attempts to make music? As Leech-Wilkinson suggests:

Historical research may provide us with instruments, and sometimes even quite detailed information on how to use them; but the gap between such evidence and a sounding performance is still so great that it can be bridged only by a large amount of musicianship and invention. [...] But is that necessarily a bad thing? Might it not be argued that it is entirely desirable that performances of music from any period should operate within a sound-world which seems appropriate to the age in which the performances themselves are created?391

To add to Leech-Wilkinson’s evaluation, engaging with the historical trace in the face of absence throws into relief the contingencies by which our regulative

concepts control and discipline the rules of musical production and listening; creative interpretation makes room for the aggregation of other regulative possibilities, indeed other ontological work concepts – fictional (though meaningful) yardsticks to measure medieval musics yet-to-come. In her reconsideration of the “work-concept” project seven years after her book’s initial publication, Goehr writes:

Either we would seek a work-concept so thin that it could accommodate all descriptions given of it, or we would allow that descriptions could conflict, given our choice of very different prototypes. Again, I prefer, and have tried to argue for, the latter route, not least because it shows so well that how we think about music, how our musical discourses develop, depends in very interesting ways on the prototypes we employ and on the myths we construct. On the purest philosophical plane, our choice of examples perhaps does not matter. But I chose the route of philosophical impurity where our choices matter a great deal. That impurity symbolizes … the intersection between philosophy and cultural diagnosis.392

A quick glance at modern re-presentations of Chaillou’s interpolated Roman de Fauvel show that the musical “addicions” in Fauvel have, indeed, assumed different (albeit contemporary) ontological “bodies,” which multiply its “work concept” forms through modern techniques of musical reproduction. I would even go so far as to say that analyzing such modern “audiovisual” versions of Fauvel may help us to rethink the way we analyze historical manuscripts, enlarging our hermeneutical toolkit of making Fauvel meaningful for our day and age.

Take the 1972 Reflexe Stationen Europäischer Musik’s LP recording of the Roman de Fauvel, for example (fig. 5.1 below). The recording departs significantly from the full list of musical interpolations, presenting only twenty
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musical selections, interspersed with readings from select paragraphs of Gervais/Chaillou’s text.

Fig. 5.1. LP recording of Roman de Fauvel (Reflexe Stationen Europäischer Musik, 1972).

While one may argue that such “sampling” defiles the authority of Fauvel’s bookish ontology in fr. 146, I argue that this mode of musical reproduction effectively “recomposes” the Roman, producing a modern interpretation of the “book,” so to speak. This reappraisal only takes a shift in perspective to consider the makers of the recording as interpretive agents comparable to that of musicological exegesis or the argumentation laid out in this text, rather than faulty replica of the Roman’s imaginary (Platonic) ontological form. In fact, the entire material object of the recording is constructed as a book:
counting the front and back cover, this “book” consists of eight “foliated” sides combining text, image and (recorded) music, with the LP disc contained in a pocket sleeve between the penultimate page and the back cover. The pages of this “book” contain notes, texts and translations of its own musical selections in three different languages (medieval French, German and English), mimicking the polylinguistic nature of Chaillou’s Roman de Fauvel.

Could we not interpret the translations and introduction notes as form of medieval “glossing”? If, in the Roman de Fauvel, Chaillou’s musical “addicions” gloss the contents of the text, then the text of this recording likewise glosses the musical contents of the LP. Such interdisciplinary “glossing” also re-plays the ontological hybridity of fr. 146: one can imagine the consumer of the recording listening to the LP and reading the text at the same time, producing a hybridized phenomenological experience. Can one claim that the experience of reading the text accompanying the recording does not influence one’s experience of listening? Even though the product is materially structured within the epistemological parameters of the “book,” its form should not dissuade us from considering other ontological or phenomenological pathways of entrainment and enjoyment, however “beastly” they may sound appear (or sound) to the eyes (or ears) of traditional musicological methodology. To say that there is only one single mode of engagement possible with Europäischer Musik’s “recomposition” of the Roman de Fauvel is to metaphorically repeat our neat, analytical reduction of Chaillou’s Roman de Fauvel to either the spheres of reading or listening. Ultimately, what is “beastly” about this endeavour is that it restricts the creative panorama of the
scholarly gaze, which may consequently bring about repercussions as to how Fauvel “should be” re-presented, less performed.

In the last few decades, creative-interpretive “recompositions” of *Fauvel* has even seen the *dematerialization* of the book through innovative theatrical endeavours. A fine example would be The Clerks Group’s fascinating multimedia production of *Le Roman de Fauvel* at the 2006 South Bank Early Music Festival, London. Combining an onstage narrator (speaking in Latin, French and English translations), an a cappella vocal ensemble and visual projections of selected illuminations of *Fauvel* on a screen behind the performers, the fleshy, corpo-reality of fr. 146 sublimates into a modern cinematic language, producing a provocative synaesthetic-multisensory phenomenology of the work. Registers of reading and listening blur in a presentation that invites multiple levels of meaning-making; fr. 146 becomes an inspirational prism through which the creative spirit of the present is refracted, celebrating modern technology’s capacity to renovate semiotic codes, or invigorate old materials through fresh models of signification. More importantly, such Fauvelian “reimaginings” capitalize on the “presentness of the past” to critique contemporary themes. As one critic notes:

The satirical poem was brought to life in a multi-media event in which music and images from the same manuscript were interwoven with a new poem by Ian Duhig. This cleverly evoked the rhythm and the mixture of coarse bawdiness and learning of the original, while throwing in some references to Iraq for good measure. Between the verses we heard musical commentaries, superbly performed by the Clerks’ Group. This showed a new side of “early music” – less hung up on authenticity, unafraid to mingle with contemporary issues and the work of living artists.
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393 I believe that Joel Cohen and the Boston Camerata have even produced a “Fauvel” DVD, but I have been presently unable to locate copies.
Such performances transform the resistive historical codes of our medieval predecessors into a different set of claves with which to fashion contemporary acts of reading, “opening,” as it were, the doors of speech to enable the signification or narrativization of “beastly” modern topics (such as the Iraq war) vis-à-vis fr. 146. In this way, while performances by ensembles such as The Clerks restructure contemporary fields of musical-production and consumption, they also inevitably transform the field of the permissible with respect to ontologies of “early music,” treating their source materials not as sacred objects in need of museumification, but as present-day collaborators in the artistic process to help audiences create meaning out of the “beastly” realities of contemporary life.

In the end, even contemporary scholarship published on Fauvel may be seen as modern-day “performances” of the work; in my own study, I have effectively “recomposed” Gervais/Chaillou’s Roman de Fauvel by enacting a mutatio on the corpus of fr. 146 in selectively “composing” text, image and notation for my own “book.” Yes, this work is meant to be “read,” so to speak, but transitory “books” such as Europäischer Musik’s recording of Fauvel question the ontological hermeticism haunting medieval scholarship, which constantly tries to reposition the sensuous dimension of contemporary cantors beneath the penetrative insight of the learned musicus. However, by giving over to the partially veiled, resistive nature of historical integumentum, the desire to “know” can inspire textual and/or sonorous “performances” (interpretations/realizations) of Fauvel; both “musical” ontologies of Fauvel-performances and “textual,” musicological Fauvel scholarship have invention and creativity as common denominators which bear the potential of influencing one another. Hopefully, if
we continue to engage in dialogue with scholarship, performance and the “beastly” traces of history’s heirlooms we have inherited, we may potentially overcome the “beast”-ly remnants of our medieval forefather’s power asymmetries, equalizing this endlessly breathtaking field of production we call “music.”
APPENDIX 1: Transcription of *Clavus pungens acumine* (Conductus).
33. Vocisibus vespre bis loquor, pares.
34. Vocisibus qui claves geritis, 35. Vocisibus qui visetibus luxibus. 36. Claves Christi rei tis.
39. Et abutentes clavibus.
40. Claves in clavos veritis.
APPENDIX 2: Transcription of *Ve, Qui Gregi Deficiunt* (4-voiced Motet).
precinm et non cu­rant de o­vi­bus, de quo­rum sanguis o­vi­
noris sive one­re­pro­movent ad of­fici­a quis
da­polo Nee pen­sant, nec res­pi­ci­

rum est re­qui­ren­du­s ma­ni­bus.
deb­er­ent de pri­me­re prop­ter ver­ba
unt sub cu­lis pec­e­ant o­c­ulo, et

ver­rum i­re vi­ca­ri­um Chi­ri­um de­ce­ret pas­sibus,
du­pli­ca­que non abhor­rent se­re­re.
a­ni­mas sub­li­ci­unt gra­vi­ori
Christique
patrimonium
suis dare
stabiles insticiae
honest non
cessant de pele
periculum
et

paupe ribus
non

re
qui
malunt supplicium
a pati et

vo bis impo sunt
nunt movere
digit

vis parentibus
ac

ve ra dicerre
quam
ferre beneficii

Hinc est quod eos di
APPENDIX 3a: Transcription of *Bon vin doit* (3-voiced drinking Motet).

APPENDIX 3b: Transcription of *Ci me faut un tour de vin* (Refrain).

*Ci me faut un tour de vin.* Now I need a drink of wine.
*Deus! quar le me donnez!* God! let me have it!
BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

I. Manuscript sources of Le Roman de Fauvel.

Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 525.

Epinal, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 189.

Geneva, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, MS Bodmer 71.

Leiden, Bibliothèque Universitaire, MS Ltk 575.

Paris, BN fr. 146.


Paris, BN fr. 2139.

Paris, BN fr. 2195.

Paris, BN fr. 12460.

Paris, BN fr. 24375.

Paris, BN fr. 24436.

Paris, BN n.a.f. 4579.

St Petersburg, Natsional’naya biblioteka Rossi, MS fr. 5.2.101.

Tours, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 947.

II. Other manuscripts referred to.

Berkeley Manuscript, The, University of California Music Library, MS 744 (Olim Phillips 4450) (1375), US-BE.


Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, plut. 29. i.
PRIMARY SOURCES

I. Editions and facsimiles of the text and music in fr. 146.


II. Other primary texts and editions referred to.


*Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis institutionem grammaticarum libri XVIII* (Lipsiae: Teubner, 1855).


**SECONDARY SOURCES**


Amtower, Laurel, *Engaging Words: The Culture of Reading in the Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave, 2000).


*Boston Camerata* Homepage, 


Cowell, Andrew, At Play in the Tavern: Signs, Coins, and Bodies in the Middle Ages (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999).

Crane, Susan, The Performance of Self: Ritual, Clothing, and Identity During the Hundred Years War (Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002).


Diverrès, Armel, La Chronique métrique attribuée à Geoffroy de Paris (Strasbourg : Faculté des lettres de l'université, 1956).


“Music Theory of the Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries,” in *Music as Concept and Practice in the Late Middle Ages*, Ed. Reinhard Strohm & Bonnie J. Blackburn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 244-300.


Holford-Strevens, Leofranc, “Fauvel Goes to School” in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, Ed. Suzannah Clark & Elizabeth Eva Leach (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2005), 59-66.


Hult, David F., “Poetry and Translation of Knowledge in Jean de Meun,” in *Poetry, Knowledge and Community in Late Medieval France*, 19-41.


Leech-Wilkinson, Daniel, “What we are doing with early music is genuinely authentic to such a small degree that the word loses most of its intended meaning,” in Early Music, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Feb., 1984), 14.


Voices and Instruments of the Middle Ages: Instrumental Practice and Songs in France 1100-1300 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).


Varty, Kenneth (ed.), *Reynard the Fox: Social Engagement and Cultural Metamorphosis in the Beast Epic from the Middle Ages to the Present* (New York: Berghahn, 2000).


Zayaruznaya, Anna, “‘She has a wheel that turns …’: Crossed and Contradictory Voices in Machaut’s Motets,” in *Early Music History*, Vol. 28 (Oct., 2009), 185-240.
