This substantial book, totalling 737 pages in addition to numerous photographic plates, significantly enriches the literature on medieval saints’ offices, and particularly scholarship on their music. In the first part of this two-volume book, after a lengthy historical introduction, Goudesenne offers a detailed analysis of the chants of several offices; the second part consists of editions and transcriptions, supplemented by no fewer than 47 beautifully produced illustrations, almost all of them full-page (including fifteen in colour). The offices that are the focus of the study were composed within the ecclesiastical province of Reims. Most of them were previously unpublished; some of their texts are printed in the Analecta hymnica, but not in a critical edition. The book is based on Goudesenne’s doctoral thesis, completed at the University of Tours in 1996, which in turn developed out of a thesis for the Diplôme d’études approfondies, also from Tours.¹

The first section of the study presents the historical context for the saints whose offices are edited in the second volume. In the first chapter Goudesenne traces the history of the ecclesiastical province of Reims (which emerged from the imperial Roman province of Belgica secunda), extending from Boulogne in the west to the diocese of Châlons in the east, and from the dioceses of Tournai and Cambrai in the north to that of Senlis in the south. This area encompasses many of the important cultural centres of France in the early and central Middle Ages, such as the abbeys of Saint-Amand, Saint-Bertin, Saint-Riquier and Saint-Vaast of Arras, in addition to several important cities with cathedrals and collegiate churches, including Amiens, Laon, Soissons, Tournai and, of course, Reims itself. Reims occupied an intermediary position between Austrasia and Neustria, and played an important role when they were unified in the Frankish kingdom. Goudesenne stresses that the liturgical cults of

*This review was already in press when Goudesenne’s article appeared in PMM 13: 1.
the principal saints of the province of Reims were developed in both monastic and
cathedral environments as well as under the influence of royal patronage. Detailed
tables list the churches and monasteries that were the sites of these saints’ cults.
Goudesenne sees the development of offices for the saints of Gaul particularly
venerated by the Franks as a defining characteristic of the Romano-Frankish liturgical
synthesis established by the Carolingian reforms. He notes the fundamental political
and religious role played by the cult of saints in the ecclesiastical institutions of the
eighth and ninth centuries.

The second chapter reviews the hagiographic evidence for the cult of saints in the
province of Reims, drawing information from martyrologies and other liturgical
books on the feasts of the saints, and from their appearances in litanies. Goudesenne
outlines the principal offices and their diffusion, turning in the following chapter to
the relationship between the offices and the saints’ passiones and vitae, a discussion in
which he shows that chant texts of saints’ offices blend excerpts from hagiographic
sources with biblical echoes and borrowings from other feasts. The development of
these textual corpora is situated in the historical context of the Merovingian and
Carolingian periods.

In the second section of the monograph Goudesenne introduces the manuscripts
used in the study, placing them in the context of the institutions and scriptoria that
produced them (and sometimes repeating historical background presented in
previous chapters). The chapter devoted to the musical notation of the sources
includes six detailed tables representing all the neume forms used in the manuscripts,
which include Paleofrankish, French and Messine neumes as well as various
admixtures of these styles. Goudesenne presents clearly both the typologies of the
neumes and the vicissitudes of their nomenclature and localisation.

In the third section Goudesenne analyses the music of the antiphons and
responsories in separate chapters. Having found close melodic correspondences
between the Old Roman and Gregorian office chants for several feasts (albeit with
some modifications), he concludes that the earliest offices for martyrs from the
province of Reims were modelled on the Old Roman ones for widely venerated saints
such as Lawrence and Paul. However, since the Carolingian offices show no evidence
of archaic modality, they were not based directly on the Old Roman chants
themselves but rather on their Gregorian derivatives. In addition to chants modelled
on Roman ones, Goudesenne cites several antiphons that seem to be of Gallican origin,
including some in the type of protus that Jean Claire has interpreted as a vestige of the
corde-mère D, and others with three reciting tones. Goudesenne acknowledges
the difficulty of isolating the Gallican elements in offices that have already been
assimilated and transformed in the extant repertory.²

A major theme of the study is the revision (‘remaniement’) of offices over time.
Goudesenne reconstructs distinct chronological strata by identifying features that

² Keith Falconer made the same point in a recent study of one of the offices edited by Goudesenne: ‘Zum
Offizium des hl. Medardus’, in Die Offizien des Mittelalters: Dichtung und Musik, ed. Walter Berschin and
David Hiley (Tutzing, 1999), 69–85.
signal rewriting and/or adaptation from a secular to a monastic cursus, which could disrupt the close relationship between the chant texts and the hagiographic narrative. For instance, the use of two different versions of a saint’s vita or passio in the chant texts is usually a sign that the office has been revised. An example is the office of Saint Denis, which Goudesenne recently published in the Historiae series, and which he views as a model for many offices composed in the ecclesiastical province of Reims, although it itself comes from the province of Sens. According to Goudesenne, the office of Saint Denis originally followed the secular cursus and adhered closely to the narrative order of the passio on which it was based. In the 830s Hilduin interpolated passages from the passio he had written for the saint, adding six new antiphons and verses for several of the pre-existing antiphons. Adaptation to the monastic cursus further transformed the office. Goudesenne also identifies textual and musical evidence for remaniement in Hucbald’s office for Saint Thierry (Saint Theodericus). In the monastic version of the office, the texts of the responsories draw upon two different vitae, and two of their melodies, evidently later interpolations, disrupt what was apparently a modal ordering in the original, secular version of the office.

Among the most interesting sections of the book are the two chapters on responsories (‘Analysis, typology, classification’ and ‘Melodic and modal structures’). Goudesenne points out that the responsories in his sample are later compositions than the antiphons, and that they feature a greater diversity of structures. As David Hiley and others have remarked, the responsories of the night office constitute the chant genre about which we know the least, because so little of the repertory is available in modern transcriptions, and one must still rely upon the typology developed by Frere in his introduction to the Sarum antiphoner. Goudesenne divides the responsories into several chronologically distinct layers. The earliest group (750–850) is composed of chants from the base Gregorian tradition and chants adapted from it. A slightly later corpus, composed between roughly 850 and 900, derives from the Gregorian repertory but exhibits a ‘relatively significant structural and ornamental evolution’ (p. 167). The third group, dated 900–1030, consists of responsories that are not based on Gregorian models. Cast either in a recitative structure or a more melodic style, they reflect the development of modality in the increasing polarisation of final and recitation tone. Goudesenne establishes typologies of mode and formula for all the responsories and verses in his sample, and presents a list of pieces drawn from all the groups that do not reflect modelling on the standard formulas, perhaps indicating a distinctive Gallican or Frankish compositional idiom.

In his discussion of the responsories, as elsewhere, Goudesenne emphasizes the characteristics that enable one to discern successive rewritings or revisions. One of these features is the use of a different textual source for a responsory or group of responsories than for the rest of the office, a divergence that is usually reflected in the musical setting as well. A disturbance of the modal order in a series of responsories
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3 L’Office romano-franc des saints martyrs Denis, Rustique et Eleuthère: composé à Saint-Denis à partir de la Passio du Pseudo-Fortunat (VIe–VIIIe s.): remanié et augmenté par l’archichancelier Hilduin vers 835 puis au Xe s. (Ottawa, 2002).
can indicate later revisions or interpolations. Analysing the whole corpus of responsories yields several observations on their stylistic developments. New melodic types, with more frequent articulation into shorter phrases, appear at the same time that rhyme and rhythm begin to permeate the texts of the offices. Verses not constructed around recitation tones tend to indicate composition after the Carolingian period. Goudesenne also traces the development over time of the *neumae* as a distinctively Frankish element of the responsories in the Carolingian and post-Carolingian office.

In the fourth section of the study Goudesenne divides his corpus into four groups, summarises their principal characteristics, and discusses the specific historical circumstances of their composition. The first group consists of Carolingian offices with prose texts adapted from late antique and Merovingian hagiography, and exhibiting a close relationship between the chant texts and the hagiographic source material. Some betray stylistic influence from tropes or antiphons with verses, the latter of Gallican origin. All these offices were composed in places close to the centres of royal and imperial power. In the second group are prose offices for martyrs of late antiquity and bishops of the sixth and seventh centuries, which Goudesenne interprets as the products of endeavours within emerging dioceses to assert legitimacy by honouring the founding saint or otherwise enriching the local sanctoral. While these offices resemble the earlier ones, they present variations upon established melodic models as well as manifesting more systematic application of the modal system. Some of their elements may be of Gallican origin. Goudesenne places in a third category the offices attributed to Hucbald of Saint-Amand and his contemporaries, compositions that are characterised by the interpolation of passages of rhymed verse and by an increasingly systematic modal ordering of antiphons. The fourth group, consisting of offices composed around the year 1000, exemplifies the diversification of melodic structures, resulting in a new heterogeneity in the genre of the responsory.

In the final chapter of the study Goudesenne synthesises his conception of the rewriting and revision of saints’ offices from the eighth to the eleventh centuries, placing these transformations in the context of the ‘evolution of a saint’s hagio-liturgical corpus’ (p. 265). The study concludes with several useful appendices. Goudesenne translates six texts relating to the cult of saints Amand, Cornelius, Thierry and Bertin, documents ranging in age from the ninth to the eleventh centuries (some of the Latin texts are provided as well). Two tables summarise the typologies and characteristics of the offices and relate their chronology to historical events. A stemma shows the relationships among the offices divided into four groups, and maps indicate the principal centres in which the offices were composed and received, both inside and outside the ecclesiastical province of Reims.

The second volume of the book contains the textual and musical transcriptions, including excerpts from some offices as well as several offices edited in their entirety (the first versions of the offices for Saints Cornelius and Cyprian, Amand, Cyricus and Julitta, and Thierry). The introduction to each office lists the manuscripts used, any previous editions, and editions of the hagiographic textual sources, and provides tables showing differing orderings of the chants within offices as transmitted by
various manuscripts. The text of each chant is followed, when possible, by a quotation of the relevant hagiographic sources, and also by important textual variants and scriptural sources. The antiphons are grouped separately from the responsories, in part because the chants are presented this way in many of the earlier sources. In the transcriptions of both text and music, the length of the lines reflects the structures of texts in verse or rhymed prose.

Following the text editions, the chants are presented with musical notation. Both the texts and the chants are assigned numbers according to the order in which they appear in the edition, but these numbering systems differ because Goudesenne does not include musical transcriptions for all the texts he edits. Consequently, each chant has two different reference numbers; each musical transcription is identified first by its reference number within the musical section of the edition, then by its incipit, followed by its reference number in the text edition and by the mode of the chant. (In a few offices, the second reference number is not the number of the text but rather one relating to the liturgical position of the chant.) Fortunately, an alphabetical index of the chants lists the pages on which their texts and musical transcriptions can be found.

Throughout the book, including the editions, the presentation of melodies is quite varied. In the first part, some musical examples are handwritten while others are formatted in modern square notation. As Goudesenne explains in the preface, his approach to the editions changed during the preparation of the volume, so that in some cases he copied the neumatic notation of the manuscripts by hand, while in others he rendered it in modern square notation. While eclectic, this inconsistency need not impede the specialist reader; on the contrary, it offers an array of notational details that would otherwise be lost in transcription. However, the presentation of the transcriptions may pose a challenge to novices in medieval musical notations, because of multifarious combinations of notational systems and editorial conventions. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this complexity. In the first version of the office of Cornelius and Cyprian, the first seven antiphons, presented as neumes taken from Utrecht, Rijksuniversiteit 406, are copied on the staff, with neumes from an adiastematic manuscript (Verdun, BM 108) copied above. For the next three antiphons only the neumes from the Utrecht antiphoner are provided. In the next series of eight antiphons the base version, from the antiphoner of Saint-Denis (Paris, BNF lat. 17296), is transcribed in modern square notation. The responsories appear in the same double neumation as the first seven antiphons, with melodic variants from the Saint-Denis manuscript provided for the conclusion of the fourth responsory and the entirety of the fifth. In the edition of the office of Gervasius and Protasius, Goudesenne employs up to six sources at a time. The base version comes from the thirteenth-century breviary, Amiens, BM 112, with neumes from Benevento, Archivio Capitololare 21 copied on the staff above. Isolated variants from Piacenza, Duomo 65 are also provided. Parallel melodies are copied in neumes from Laon, BM 107, Ivrea, Biblioteca Capitolare 106, and BAV, Vat. Reg. Lat. 466. The melodies of these manuscripts sometimes agree and sometimes diverge; as in any diplomatic edition, the interpretation of these differences is left to the reader.
Goudesenne’s desire to stratify and separate out successive chronological layers of the offices can produce some dubious results. What he identifies as the first version of the office for Crispin and Crispinian does not survive with musical notation, except for one antiphon to which neumes were added in the antiphoner of Charles the Bald (BNF lat. 17436). The transcription presents this office in the form of incipits for nine antiphons and two responsories, given in modern square notation on the basis on the later version of the office edited some hundred pages further on in the volume. For the one notated antiphon, the entire text is underlaid, and the adiastematic neumes from BNF lat. 17436 are copied above the staff, with the first few phrases reconstructed from a later manuscript. Since the full texts for the first version of the office are evidently identical to those in the later version (Goudesenne does not print them with the first version), the perceived stratification of these offices could have been communicated less laboriously by comparing all the manuscript sources in one table.

The volume has some minor deficiencies that are worth mentioning, even though they do not significantly detract from the validity of Goudesenne’s conclusions or the quality of the study as a whole. On the cult of saints in Neustria a more recent publication than most of those cited is Felice Lifshitz, *The Norman Conquest of Pious Neustria: Historiographic Discourse and Saintly Relics, 684-1090* (Toronto, 1995). Gamber’s *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores* is listed in the bibliography but apparently not used in the study, where it would have been relevant to the discussion of early liturgical manuscripts. Some manuscripts are misdated in the second part of the volume, even though the dates provided at the beginning of the first part are correct.4 The brief allusion to prayers as sources for chant texts could have been developed further with reference to sacramentary concordances5 and the editions of prayers in the *Corpus orationum*.6

Given the large number of musical examples in this book, a few minor infelicities are inevitable. In the middle of the section on responsory verses, an example presents several responds (without their verses), followed by a sentence beginning ‘these new verses, shorter and simpler’ (p. 187). In the middle of table 22 (consisting of musical examples), a staff with text underlaid for the antiphon *Sanctissimi patris nostri Amandi* is left blank, an anomaly neither signalled or explained by the reference in the text to this example as illustrating the variation of the first phrase of the melody in the second phrase (p. 206). Although the chant does appear, complete with its melody, among the offices edited in the second part of the volume, the variation of the first phrase in the second is not evident. Goudesenne does not explain why he excluded the hymns by Hucbald from the purportedly complete edition of the office of Saint Thierry, even though plate 20 offers a colour reproduction of one of these hymns with diastematic
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4 For instance, Amiens, BM 115 (Corbie, twelfth century) is dated to the thirteenth century on 2: 91, and Ivrea, BC 106 (eleventh century) is dated to the twelfth on 2: 21.


notation (*Festiua Christo cantica*). As Goudesenne himself notes, the hymns are part of the original office.

The breadth of scholarly literature consulted by Goudesenne is not immediately apparent from the general bibliography on pp. 277–98 of the first part, which lacks several of the references that appear in the footnotes. In general, the bibliography is a bit thin on Anglo-American and German scholarship. In a book on chant in the ninth and tenth centuries, it is surprising to encounter the names of Kenneth Levy and Susan Rankin only once or twice in passing, and James McKinnon’s not at all. While Goudesenne draws extensively upon comparisons of Old Roman and Gregorian chant, he cites almost none of the recent literature on this subject. Since his preface is dated January 2001, some of the most pertinent studies (such as the series of articles by Levy in *Early Music History*, and McKinnon’s *The Advent Project*) evidently appeared after the book had gone into production, but articles of the 1990s should have been taken into account. Indeed, one cannot help noticing the absence of most scholarship since 1980 on the origins and early history of Gregorian chant. Goudesenne repeatedly invokes the two seminal articles by Leo Treitler and Helmut Hucke without much attention to later developments. The omission could be intentional; after all, the subject of the book is the office, not the Gregorian Mass Propers, and Goudesenne already had more than enough material to fill 737 dense pages without further broadening the scope. But even the literature on the office is not fully represented here. The introduction emphasises the importance of the renewed interest in local saints’ cults in the liturgical scholarship of the 1960s without fully acknowledging the veritable florescence of the field thereafter. Several newer studies of early medieval offices would have provided valuable context for Goudesenne’s conclusions, particularly Ritva Jacobsson’s analysis of the office for the feast of the apostle Andrew (perhaps not yet available when this book went into production) and a collaborative study of successive revisions in the office of Saint Otmar. The bibliography is more complete with regard to French scholarship, but does not include Philippe Bernard’s massive doctoral thesis, even though two of his articles are listed.

These reservations do not diminish the great interest this rich volume holds for historians of medieval liturgical music and hagiography, not to mention scholars of medieval religion, literature and politics. Goudesenne analyses the material with admirable thoroughness and ably contextualises it, demonstrating the important cultural functions of the offices. Not only did these compositions reinforce local liturgical identity, but they also enhanced the prestige of the Merovingian and

---


Carolingian literary tradition represented by the hagiographic texts, and communicated values important to Frankish society such as the apostolicity of the early medieval missionaries and the sacred character of the monarchy. Goudesenne has made a lasting contribution that will do much to generate and sustain interest in the saints’ offices of the earlier Middle Ages.

SUSAN BOYNTON
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Sylvia Huot, in her influential study From Song to Book: Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry (Ithaca, 1987), traced what she saw as a trajectory of increasing self-consciousness about the activity of writing, about creating coherent ‘books’ that reflect a single author’s subjectivity and that were designed by writers for readers. The trajectory begins with author groupings in thirteenth-century chansonniers; moves towards that century’s literary ‘masterpiece’, the first-person, but double-authored, narrative Roman de la Rose by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun; and culminates in the mid-fourteenth century with the carefully designed anthologies of Guillaume de Machaut and Jean Froissart. Huot was, above all, interested in the ‘movement from performative to writerly poetics’ (p. 2). Books, writing and reading are her endpoints, while music, performance and listening factor more as early developmental stages along the trajectory she outlined.

Ardis Butterfield’s Poetry and Music in Medieval France: From Jean Renart to Guillaume de Machaut might well have been called From Book to Song, for she sees narratives that have inserted lyrics as the overarching context for the forging of song forms and genres, including the formes fixes, and for representing performance during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. She also sees these narratives, their characteristic of lyric ‘citation’ and their hybrid nature, as a means of exploring authorship and authority. Butterfield’s argument is bold and complex; it deserves serious consideration by historians of music and literature alike. My comments here are offered in the spirit of respectful engagement and reflection.

Although Butterfield contends with many scholars of French secular song, she seems most in dialogue with Huot’s book, as is revealed in both direct and indirect references throughout her text. In the summarising pages of the Epilogue, for example, she criticises what she calls ‘the traditional view of a linear change “from song to book”’ that seems to promote the idea ‘that books gradually replace the art of performance’ (p. 294). Butterfield wants to tell a different story, namely that changes in song forms are worked out and recorded in these hybrid narrative-lyric contexts because these contexts are exactly where formal and generic boundaries are played up and played with. On page 29 she maps out the trajectory of the story she wants to tell:
Broadly, the thirteenth century begins with the creation of anthology narratives, containing a mixture of higher and lower style songs. This is followed by a shift in practice towards the large-scale citation of refrains, interspersed with a few works citing grand chants (usually single stanzas), and then a radical generic change from the turn of the century in which narrative authors start to include the new formes fixes with renewed emphasis on diversity.

To this end, she sees Jean Renart’s *Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole* as just as important, if not more so, in the history of literary writing than the much more celebrated *Roman de la Rose* of Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun. She writes that ‘it is Renart’s work, rather than Guillaume’s, which sets the pattern for the great majority of love narratives from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, in which formal distinctions between lyric and narrative are both consistently maintained and ceaselessly examined’ (pp. 220–21). Similarly, Butterfield finds in Machaut’s formes fixes and his self-citation in his narratives, not the ‘writerliness’ that Huot sees affecting song, but rather a crystallisation of the performativity that has always been part of narratives with lyric citations (see pp. 8–9).

The revisionist move of considering Renart’s *Rose* as more foundational than the double-authored *Rose* makes sense only within the parameters that Butterfield carefully sets for her study. She is unapologetically (though at times a little defensively) a formalist:

‘Form’ is perhaps a key word. The ‘formalism’ of the 1950s and 1960s has had a well-documented (and, in part, well-justified) period of decline in favour of new research into social history, the composition of audiences, manuscripts as evidence of contemporary reading practices, feminism and psychoanalysis . . . Considerations of form have been so successfully superseded that we have few means left of distinguishing different types of ‘lyric’ writing from ‘narrative’ writing, or from writing that combines the two. This book tries to put form back on the agenda . . . and uses it as a starting point for thinking about all the different ways we might try to approach thirteenth-century writing. (p. 5)

By ‘the “formalism” of the 1950s and 1960s’ (as opposed to Russian formalism of the 1920s) Butterfield is probably referring to the brand of formalism associated with Anglo-American ‘new criticism’, which approaches each text as a closed, autonomous unit, and structuralism and semiotics, which seek to explain the meaning of language, texts, and other cultural products in terms of a structure of differential relationships among elements. Philosophically, these schools of criticism are anti-essentialist; they ‘decentre’ the human subject in favour of a priori systems, and eschew humanistic investigation into historical contexts. A prime example of a structuralist and semiotic study of medieval literature is Paul Zumthor’s *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris, 1972).¹

As for the ‘new research into social history, the composition of audiences, manuscripts as evidence of contemporary reading practices, feminism and psychoanalysis’, Butterfield gives us no references in the notes, though several books readily

¹ Structuralism can be understood as a critique of historicism, of its determinism and metaphysical presumptions. Newer forms of historicism, however, can be anti-deterministic in their consideration of meaning as historically contingent. In so doing, historicism runs the risk of radically isolating one point in time from another.

The antagonism presented here between ‘formalism’ and other modes of investigation or interpretation is unfortunate. I believe Butterfield overstates the case that ‘modern interests’ (p. 241) have robbed us of the ability to deal with forms and genres. For scholars of medieval music, formalism is still the foundation of our work. It is hard to talk about music in any detail without recourse to analysing forms, since one of the things that music does is to impose a form on time through sound.²

I will venture to say that these days most musicological studies of medieval lyric, including Butterfield’s, combine aspects of formalism with historicism. They present what we might call historically informed structuralism—the elucidation of differential relationships in forms and genres that encode systems of meaning that pertain to the historical epoch.³ Butterfield’s critiques of ‘modern interests’ are aimed more at literature scholars than musicologists, at scholars who pay little attention to thirteenth-century musico-poetic hybrids, let alone contemplate that hybridity (see her comments on pp. 241 and 294).

Why are narratives with lyric insertions important to the history of writing songs? Butterfield answers this question first by grounding her study in empirical evidence. ‘Part I: Text and performance’, which encompasses Chapters 1–3, examines the chronology of the sources for secular songs. According to the surviving sources, thirteenth-century narratives with lyric insertions are some of the earliest witnesses to the recording of secular song (see Chapter 2, esp. p. 26). Later, in Chapter 13, Butterfield makes a parallel argument concerning the written record of the formes fixes: fourteenth-century narratives are some of the earliest witnesses to the rise of this ‘radical rethinking and regeneration in French song’ (p. 221).

Butterfield admits that establishing the priority of narrative sources over the song anthologies, the chansonniers, is not a sure thing. Her key witness in the thirteenth century, Jean Renart’s Roman de la rose ou de Guillaume de Dole, survives only in one late-thirteenth-century source (without provision for music), fifty or more years after the Roman’s composition, which is itself variously dated as 1202, 1218 or 1228. A second narrative, Gerbert de Montreuil’s Roman de la violette, survives in a manuscript

² For example, see Mark Everist, French Motets in the Thirteenth Century: Music, Poetry and Genre (Cambridge, 1994). Everist even makes use of Russian formalism.

³ This mixture should not be confused with various streams of post-structuralism, which is not a rejection of structuralism; it is a more intense reflection on structures, calling attention to structure as dynamic and pluralistic rather than stable and monolithic.
that dates before 1250, and may be roughly contemporary with the earliest surviving chansonnier, Paris, BNF fr. 20050 (trouvère MS U).

Butterfield does not see this pattern of survival as an accident of history, but rather as a ‘pattern of influence’ (p. 38) that flows from narratives with inserted lyrics, for which she coins the term *romans à chansons* (p. 17), to chansonniers. Indeed, she unequivocally states that ‘[o]nly after this anchoring in narrative does song come regularly to stand on its own as a written form’ (p. 35). Renart’s *Rose* functioned as a lyric anthology – perhaps the first; it conveys a clear sense of the songs as authored by historical personages, and within the story the different genres of songs (dance-songs, *grands chants*) are given social meaning (dance songs are anonymous, public expressions; *grands chants* are authored, private expressions; see Chapter 3). These three attributes – anthology, attention to authorship and ‘social calibration’ – describe the majority of the thirteenth-century chansonniers (see p. 38). Butterfield argues that ‘it is the hierarchical ranking of authors in several of the chansonniers which most corresponds to Renart’s highly developed consciousness of the social location of *grands chants*’ (p. 38). This flow of influence is plausible; but it is also plausible that narratives and song anthologies represent two separate responses to more general intellectual and scriptorial practices. The thirteenth century was the era of the great *summae* and *specula*, encyclopaedic collections of intellectual and cultural products. Scholastic debates and concerns with *auctoritas* were also at their height. Butterfield notes these contexts in her interpretation of Guillaume de Machaut’s narratives with lyric insertions (see pp. 8, 217 and 270), but, curiously, not for the earlier sources, for which they would be more appropriate.

The conceptual, if not chronological, priority of narrative contexts for the written history of song is central for Butterfield. She sets out to show that narrative served as a laboratory for creating, testing and crossing generic boundaries. Indeed, genre is, for Butterfield, a means of articulating boundaries of all sorts:

> [many thirteenth-century] authors are interested not just in creating hybrid genres, but in developing a keener recognition of the kinds of boundary that enable generic distinctions to be made, such as the sung and the spoken, verse and prose, forms, registers (popular, courtly, clerical), the visual and the aural. (p. 199)

The chief tool in this exploration of boundaries is the refrain. Refrains are autonomous, lyric aphorisms that appear in all kinds of poetic and musical compositions. They were inserted into narratives, attached to songs, embedded in polyphonic and monophonic motets. Refrains also served as a structurally repeating element in dance songs, and the fourteenth-century *formes fixes* derived from those songs. The argument that Butterfield unfolds in the course of her study is that refrains both cut across genres and registers, and, paradoxically, define them. The latter function reaches a developmental endpoint with the fourteenth-century *formes fixes*, where the different, standardised patterns created by ‘the relation between the refrain and its strophic context’ distinguish one fixed form from another (p. 277). In the thirteenth century, refrains most frequently appear as independent quotations in
narratives, inserted as representations of singing. Butterfield asks the very good question, how are these two deployments of refrains connected?

Butterfield begins her investigation of refrains by examining their appearance in the earliest layers of dance songs in Renart’s *Rose*, the *rondets de carole*. Here she makes an important observation: there are only two types of strophe, one describing Bele Aeliz, and the other a pastoral scene ‘la gieus’ [‘over there’] in which there is either an olive tree or a fountain. Each type is ‘fixed’ in the sense that it contains its own formula of words, which remains constant from *rondet* to *rondet*. The refrains, on the other hand, while they are repeated within each *rondet*, are not repeated among the group of *rondets* (although they are often used in other contexts). (p. 48)

Given this inverse relationship, Butterfield concludes that ‘[t]he refrain acts as the distinguishing semantic feature of each *rondet*, just as it also acts as the *rondet*’s primary structural characteristic’ (p. 48).

If it is the refrains that ‘generate’ the *rondets* (see p. 57), that define one *rondet* from another, then we might expect them to have a generating or defining role in other contexts as well. But what do refrains define when they appear by themselves within a narrative? Butterfield shows how they can generate plot (as in the *Roman de la violette*, pp. 57–58); but mostly she sees refrains in narratives as generating an awareness of boundaries and difference. Refrains mark and blur the lines between speech and song, oral performance and written description, and internal and external audience (see her discussion of *Le Tournoi de Chauvency*, pp. 64–71). Above all, in answer to Huot’s ‘movement’ from performance to writing, Butterfield sees refrains as indicating a movement, or at least a gesture, in the opposite direction: ‘they enable the poet to show the very process of performance, that is, to show the dynamic of oral relations being constructed through, and by means of its textual representation’ (p. 63).

The second and third parts of the book explore the many different contexts and meanings behind thirteenth-century refrain citation. Chapters 4–6, grouped under the heading ‘Part II: The boundaries of genre’, build on the argument that refrains are generative, that it is they that ‘motivate and structure’ the surrounding texts, whether it is a narrative, a *chanson avec des refrains*, a motet, or the *contrafacta* of Gautier de Coinci in his *Miracles de Notre Dame*, which Butterfield argues is a direct response to Renart’s *Rose* (see especially her remarks on pp. 101–02, 114 and 118). We are also introduced to a key property of the refrain, namely its mobility across genres.

Chapters 7–9, grouped under the heading ‘Part III: The location of culture’, build on this idea of mobility, and the ways in which this mobility points towards the refrain’s mediating role between secular and sacred, and especially between different social registers. The designation of certain medieval lyric genres as ‘popular’ (common) and others as ‘courtly’ (aristocratic) has been in place since the work of philologists such as Alfred Jeanroy in the 1920s. Subsequent generations of scholars have generally accepted these polar categories as operative; some, such as John Stevens, filled in the continuum with genres deemed ‘courtly-popular’ (see pp. 6–7).
Here in Part III, Butterfield enters into new historicist and intertextuality theories (both are associated with post-structuralist currents of thought). In Chapters 8, ‘Urban culture: Arras and the puys’, and 9, ‘The cultural contexts of Adam de la Halle: Le Jeu de Robin et de Marion’, Butterfield attempts to ground her interpretation of refrains as mediating boundaries – literary and otherwise – in the social history of the musical societies, the bourgeois confrérie and the more selective puy, based in Arras. This community was likely responsible for many of the narratives at the heart of her study, and so she pursues the question of how refrain composition reflects or encodes the cultural and social situation of the writers, among them the celebrated Adam de la Halle.

New historicism, a style of literary criticism developed in the 1980s, sees literary texts as not merely representing social realities, but constituting them as well. Historical documents, institutions, and other cultural products and formations are, in turn, read as if they were narrative texts; in other words, literature and historical records participate in the same web of allusions and references, and have the same force of stabilising or destabilising structure.

The theory of intertextuality, associated with Mikhail Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva’s interpretations of Bakhtin, sees any given text as in dialogue with all other texts (which can encompass new historicism’s broad notion of texts), and with its audience. Meaning, then, obtains in a text through a network of perceived citations from other contexts. Thus multiple contexts are mobilised within a single text, and so are multiple meanings. This theory seems tailor-made for medieval refrains, given their widespread citation. Especially important for Butterfield is the fact that one refrain can appear in a literary or lyric genre associated with aristocratic writers and audiences, and then again in another associated with the bourgeoisie or peasant class.

In interpreting and describing the social meaning of the refrain, Butterfield refers to both Bakhtin and Kristeva (see pp. 129, 131), though she avoids an explicit reference to ‘intertextuality’. Their inherent mobility of register . . . allows [refrains] to create liaisons between the different worlds of the aristocrat and the peasant . . . What characterizes them is a variability of exchange: having not a single but a multiple frame of reference, each refrain sets up new connections in each of its citational appearances. (p. 147)

In sum, Butterfield understands the refrain, its ability to ‘slide between registers, and to liaise between different generic strands’, to be analogous to the poets and the puy, specifically to their own situation on a boundary: ‘The puy provides a natural arena for [quoting refrains] because it itself falls between the cultural and the social’ (p. 150). Refrains and poets also mediate between class boundaries and tensions. Concluding her discussion of Adam’s Jeu de Robin et de Marion, Butterfield remarks, ‘Refrains give formal expression to the failures of communication between the

---

4 Later (pp. 244–45) Butterfield explicitly criticises a version of intertextual theory (stemming from Roland Barthes) that considers all texts as comprised of the ‘already read’. She sees this approach as an attempt to smooth over differences in language that she (along with Bakhtin and Kristeva) sees as meaningful.
aristocrat and the ‘‘vilein’’ through the formal anarchy of their migration between different styles and registers’ (p. 168). Although refrains are not particularly disruptive within Adam’s Jeu, it is the other texts that the refrains allude to that bear upon the Jeu and create ‘formal anarchy’.

I enthusiastically support new historicist and intertextual approaches to medieval lyric in order better to understand how forms and genres participate in larger social discourses. Yet, I feel that something is missing in Butterfield’s formulations. She intends to show connections between ‘the formal and generic with the linguistic and the social’ (p. 125), and that composers like Adam use refrains for ‘exposing yet also blurring social difference’ (p. 132). But she does not fully invest in the theories she invokes; she stops short of thinking through the implications of the nexus of the social and the literary. How do the formal disturbances of refrains pertain to the social disturbances of poets? Do refrains have a constituting force, or are they merely representational? Why did Adam de la Halle want to prod at the tension between social groups? What does ‘blurring social difference’ do? Why this fascination with boundaries?

Theory could add to the discussion. Foucault might see the play with boundaries as strategic deployments of power, reflecting exclusionary practices; Derrida might see examples of différance, of the perpetual deferral of meaning and its ultimate instability; Kristeva might see attempts to represent the unsayable, radical otherness that disrupts meaning and allows for new, even revolutionary ways of understanding.

These questions lie outside the formalism within which Butterfield works. I do not wish to criticise her for not answering these questions, but I do wish to point out the limits of formalism. The social ‘liaisons’ that Butterfield draws from intertextual readings, are, for her purposes, important for their effect on genre and form, namely, the collision and the mutual absorption of courtly and popular forms (p. 147). This sets up her argument that refrain citation in thirteenth-century narratives leads to the fourteenth-century formes fixes.

What can be understood as the second half of Butterfield’s study, Chapters 10-16, has two objectives: (1) to connect thirteenth-century practices of refrain citation to fourteenth-century formes fixes, and (2) to continue the argument about the priority of narrative in the history of written song forms. The three chapters grouped as ‘Part IV: Modes of inscription’ set out ideas that will be in play later, in Part V. The descriptive Chapter 10 discusses the increasing interest by manuscript designers to designate lyric genres and the ways in which refrain citations ‘[provoke] the greatest ingenuity of design’ in manuscripts (p. 190). Butterfield also concludes the reverse, that ‘new forms of composition and interpretation are made possible and brought into being by new forms of mise-en-page’ (ibid.). This point does not follow from the evidence she presents in the chapter, but it looks forward to Chapter 12, where she discusses the ‘semi-lyric’ pieces at the centre of the Roman de Fauvel. It also links up with the observation that the visual setting out of songs from the main body of the narrative resembles the relationship of authoritative texts to glosses (pp. 184-89). This point will resurface later, in Chapter 15.
Chapter 11, which concerns the generic innovation of the unique *cantefable*, *Aucassin et Nicolette*, lies outside the main foci of the book, since neither refrains nor lyric insertions are involved. Rather, the narrative is told in sections that alternate prose and verse, the latter sung to a two-part melodic formula (*laisse*). Most scholars agree that *Aucassin et Nicolette* parodies the *chanson de geste*. Butterfield speculates that *Aucassin et Nicolette* is ‘a puy production’ (p. 195), and sees its hybrid nature as serving a similar purpose to refrains in the narratives discussed in the first half of her book – the marking and ‘questioning’ generic categories (p. 196). This reassertion of the centrality of questioning and crossing categories provides the framework for her approach to the *Roman de Fauvel* in Chapter 12.

The elaborate *Fauvel* manuscript, Paris, BNF fr. 146, brings all the streams of the written history of lyric forms together; the interest in marking and crossing boundaries that Butterfield has traced throughout her study even acquires allegorical significance in the figure of Fauvel, who is always depicted as half-horse, half-human. It is well known that the *Fauvel* narrative in BNF fr. 146 also preserves a record of the state of monophony and polyphony – both Latin and French – in the early fourteenth century. Butterfield newly observes how a central cluster of set-pieces that are essentially miniature narratives with inserted refrains corresponds with the introduction of a new authorial voice, that of Chaillou de Pesstain, who was responsible for adding the musical interpolations and about 3,000 lines of text to the *roman* as initially conceived (p. 204). Butterfield writes:

Chaillou, it seems, feels it appropriate to register his presence at this half-way point, perhaps because it draws eloquent attention to the kind of authorial changes he is making in the physical and material articulation of the satire. . . . Chaillou alerts the reader to the fact that the narrative has itself undergone a generic change from being a satiric allegory to a love narrative with inset verse. (p. 205)

Thus, at this central location, we see a textual hall of mirrors, the reflection of boundaries, transitions and hybridity on multiple visual fields – in the author, in the genre of the narrative, in the visual layout of the semi-lyric pieces, and, within those, in the mobilisation of refrains.

We are no longer in Arras with *Fauvel*, and Butterfield does not try to make any connections between her historical and social location of refrain usage in that particular milieu and refrain usage in this Parisian manuscript. Again, she is interested in this cluster of semi-lyric compositions for their formal significance. They seem to function, for Butterfield, in metaphorical ways, as a right of passage for an anthropomorphised refrain: ‘The wayward progress of the refrain through the central interpolated sequence in *Fauvel* finishes with it incorporated and contained within the *formes fixes*’ (p. 214). After *Fauvel*, the refrain no longer appears in narrative, except in the *Remede de Fortune*, where Machaut ‘sets it in amber’, without music.

The progress narrative that Butterfield constructs for the refrain is, in fact, far from ‘progressive’ if considered as a social metaphor. In the thirteenth century, the refrain floats as a free agent of anarchy, a disturber of generic categories, a liaison between the
elite and the common; in the fourteenth century, the refrain succumbs to the generic hegemony of the *formes fixes*, the triumph of artistic formalism.

Three chapters in ‘Part V: Lyric and narrative’ complete this study with an examination of the *formes fixes* as emerging out of refrain citation in narrative. Butterfield begins by asserting that ‘the citation of lyric in fourteenth-century narrative turns out once again to include some of the earliest known instances of formal change’ (p. 221). This is a problematic formulation. The forms of the *formes fixes*, rondeau, virelai and ballade, are not fourteenth-century constructions. All three forms appear in the thirteenth century; rondeaux and ballades in French chansonniers, rondeaux and virelais in voices of motets, and virelais in other repertories, such as Spanish *cantigas*. What is new about the refrain forms of the fourteenth century, as Butterfield herself states (also on p. 221), is the combined melismatic and polyphonic realization of these forms – what I would call a change in style. I will return to this point later.

I have noted at the beginning of this review that for Butterfield’s purpose, Renart’s *Rose* is far more important than the *Rose* of de Lorris and de Meun. Chapter 13, ‘The two *Roses*: Machaut and the thirteenth century’, essentially makes this statement. Her endpoint is the interpolated *formes fixes* in Machaut’s *Remede de Fortune* and *Le Voir Dit*. Chapter 14, ‘Rewriting song: Chanson, motet, salut and dit’, reasserts her focus, what she describes as ‘a keen sense of boundary, as well as an intense desire to redraw boundaries’ (p. 226), which she again traces in the various ways refrains are used in thirteenth-century compositions. This chapter adds little to the concepts and methods laid out in the first half of the book, rather extending them to the non-narrative genres of motets, chansons, the semi-lyric *dits* and *saluts d’amour*. Ultimately, this undercuts her argument for the continued priority of narrative contexts in the fourteenth century.

Chapter 15, ‘Citation and authorship from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century’, offers a fresh interpretation of refrain composition beginning with the idea that refrains represent ‘the image of another’s language’ (p. 243, quoting Bakhtin). Although Butterfield does not pursue a ‘poetics of writing’ as in Huot’s study, she does argue here that embedded in this play with generic boundaries in the context of narrative is a kind of contemplation of authorship and authority. In light of the history of citing pre-existing lyrics that have *auctoritas* either as the words of another person or as a representation of ‘the popular’, Machaut’s narratives, which cite his
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5 An early polyphonic chanson-motet hybrid, *Bien m’ont Amors entrepris* (R. 1532) appears in Paris, BNF fr. 846 (trouvère MS O), fol. 21r. This piece does not have a refrain, but does show the AAB form common to thirteenth-century chanson and fourteenth-century ballade. Similar examples can be found in collections of French two-voice motets. Adam de la Halle’s polyphonic dance songs, most of which are rondeaux, include some poetic forms that look more like virelais and ballades than rondeaux. Butterfield discusses these on p. 283, but considers them experiments with rondeau forms. The two upper voices of the motet *Li jalous par tout sunt fustat / Tuit cil qui sunt enamourat / VERITATEM* (fasc. 5, no. 169, fols. 218v−219r) of the Montpellier Codex use the melodic form of the virelai. The earliest examples of French *formes fixes* were collected, transcribed and discussed in the two-volume study by Friedrich Gennrich, *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen aus dem Ende des XII., dem XIII. und dem ersten Drittel des XIV. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols. [of an eventual 3] (Dresden, 1921 and Göttingen, 1927). Butterfield does not refer to this study.
own compositions, nevertheless look dialogic. Butterfield notes that Machaut ‘looks, as an author, not for seamless control, but for an increasingly intense ability to distinguish between different types of language, different modes of utterance’ (p. 270). This statement, again, seems directed at Huot’s From Song to Book and that study’s proposed movement towards writerly ‘seamless control’. Butterfield offers here a compelling way to hear multiple voices, and to read citational practices, in the single-authored works of Machaut.

Butterfield’s climactic Chapter 16, ‘The formes fixes: From Adam de la Halle to Guillaume de Machaut’, presents a parallel to Chapter 2. In the earlier chapter, Butterfield argues there was ‘considerable continuity’ between refrains in rondets de carole and their independent citations in narrative (p. 62); here she argues that ‘the construction of rondeaux, ballades, and later, virelais in the fourteenth century takes place within the context of a fundamentally continuous, and broad-based practice of refrain-citation’ (p. 278). As I previously noted, the claim of a ‘broad-based practice’, which Butterfield sets out in Chapter 14, conflicts with her claims elsewhere that it is the narrower practice of citation within narratives that generates the ‘generic shift’ to the formes fixes (p. 289; see also the passage quoted above, from p. 221). The central portion of Chapter 16 examines Adam de la Halle’s polyphonic rondeaux in Paris, BNF fr. 25566 (see pp. 278–83). It is true that Adam’s rondeaux appear in a manuscript that also contains narratives with inserted lyrics, and that refrains are shared between the two groups of works, but in their local situation, the rondeaux (some of which look like ballade and virelai) are not surrounded by narrative.

It could be said that the same is true for Jehan de Lescurel’s monophonic, and single polyphonic, formes fixes in the Fauvel manuscript (see pp. 285–86). The songs themselves, strictly speaking, do not appear embedded in a narrative, though they are surrounded by narrative texts and semi-lyric compositions.

Nor does Butterfield actually examine Machaut’s music much at all in this chapter; Machaut’s rondeau 17, ‘Dix et sept, cinq, trese, quatorse et quinse’, receives about a page of discussion (stretching over pp. 287–88), with no mention of narrative. She does, however, make this remark about the aural effects of Machaut’s formes fixes:

As material continuously unfolds, it is regularly interrupted and halted by the refrain. . . . [Yet] the more we hear the same phrase, each time in a slightly different context, the more it offers up a plurality of meanings. This is the creative heart of refrain-citation, in both narrative and lyric composition . . . (p. 288)

Butterfield is stretching her formalist thesis well beyond its limits here. Considering the ‘great change’ in the fourteenth century as one of style rather than form would have helped to avoid this stretch. I do not hear Machaut’s refrains as interrupting and halting the flow of music in any of his formes fixes – quite the opposite, in fact. In the case of the rondeaux, the economy of music, the highly melismatic settings of the words, the weaving together of melody lines producing rich, fleeting harmonies smoothes over, even confuses, junctures between refrain and strophe. The effects of variously combining ‘A’ and ‘B’ phrases can be quite subtle. In the cases of the ballade and the virelai, the refrain ends or frames the couplet, marking the end of the strophes,
interrupting nothing. Furthermore, the intertextual plurality of meaning in refrain citations is not the same as a plurality of meaning accruing to a repeated section of music (better termed intratextuality). There may indeed be an intertextual effect, if the refrain has been cited elsewhere, but such an effect does not occur because the refrain repeats.

Despite the fact that narrative plays no real ‘generative’ role in the formes fixes discussed here, Butterfield asserts this conclusion:

The working out of these changes in the context of narrative means that the smaller, subtle adjustments in the relation between refrain and strophe are embedded within the larger generic dialogue between song and narrative text. (pp. 289–90)

In essence, her argument for connecting refrain citation with refrain forms, for both the thirteenth-century rondets de carole and the fourteenth-century formes fixes, boils down to an analogy: the refrain is to the strophe as song is to narrative. Elsewhere, as I have already noted (see the passage quoted from p. 199), she extends this analogy to other things: refrains are to strophes (or narratives) as performance is to writing, as one genre is to another, etc. The analogy rests on too basic an observation, that one set of differential relations is analogous to another set.

My criticism is much like the one Butterfield herself levels, by allusion, at Huot: the trajectory from ‘song to book’ relies too straightforwardly on the obvious point that authors in the period partake in a climate of increasing literacy’ (p. 294). Butterfield’s study could have benefited from a more serious consideration of that climate, especially of the troubadour and trouvère lyrics in chansonniers and the many experiments with refrain forms and writing formats contained in those sources. Certainly by the fourteenth century, the practices developed in these anthologies were influential in the writing of song. The lyrical interpolations in Machaut’s Voir Dit are mostly not notated in the narrative context; he relies on the reader to recover the music from the attached musical anthology. Latin monophony and polyphony played a significant part in the ongoing dialogue about genre, form and style as well; so, too, did early fourteenth-century motets, which tend not to cite refrains. This is certainly evident in Fauvel, where the monophonic vernacular forms exhibit the ornate melodic styles that one finds in the motets of Pierre de la Croix or Philippe de Vitry. Some motets attributed to de Vitry even include melismatic voice parts, as in the motet in Fauvel, Adesto, sancta trinitas / Firmissime fidem teneamus / Alleluia, Benedictus. The new style of Machaut’s polyphonic formes fixes can in part be ascribed to an interest in assimilating vernacular refrain forms to the complex rhythms, textures and delicate melodies of motets.6

Why refrain forms? The answer no doubt involves both cultural and formal factors. Ardis Butterfield’s book makes a significant contribution to the interdisciplinary and intermetholodogical discussion that a full answer to this question requires. She demonstrates how thoroughly refrains captured the imagination of writers, as
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6 She does acknowledge the connection between rhythmic innovations in fourteenth-century motets and formes fixes, pointing to the work of Lawrence Earp and Christopher Page (p. 287), but it is not integrated into her argument.
elements that repeat within a single form, and as elements that repeat across forms. In the latter capacity, best exploited in narratives, refrains break out of form and become something much more; they acquire a surplus of meaning. Butterfield’s general argument is that the surplus of meaning that refrains gathered in narrative contexts enriched the meaning and popularity of refrain forms over the course of the thirteenth century, making them attractive sites for musical innovation at the turn of the century and well beyond. This is an important observation, one that, in fact, challenges us to think about the *formes fixes* in terms other than form. Her rich study provides the groundwork for nuanced thinking about the relationships of form, genre, social registers and cultural meaning.
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