

Canadian University Music Review Revue de musique des universités canadiennes

Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey, eds. *Fauvel Studies: Allegory, Chronicle, Music, and Image in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 146*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. xix, 666 pp. ISBN 0-19-816579-X (hardcover)

Brian E. Power

Volume 23, Number 1-2, 2003

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1014529ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1014529ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Canadian University Music Society / Société de musique des universités canadiennes

ISSN

0710-0353 (print)

2291-2436 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Power, B. E. (2003). Review of [Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey, eds. *Fauvel Studies: Allegory, Chronicle, Music, and Image in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 146*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. xix, 666 pp. ISBN 0-19-816579-X (hardcover)]. *Canadian University Music Review / Revue de musique des universités canadiennes*, 23(1-2), 227–232.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1014529ar>

Whittall's erudition gleams through his elegant language and fluid writing style. The text moves seamlessly between the cultural and the technical, between the general and the specific, and the illustrative musical examples are models of clarity. The notes for each chapter are presented collectively at the end of the book, a format, while tidy, that creates some awkwardness for the reader who seeks to benefit frequently from these wonderfully informative accompaniments. The comprehensive bibliography includes most major contemporary books on twentieth-century music and its composers, and many significant journal articles.

In short, although twenty years have passed since my first encounter with Arnold Whittall, I can think of no more stimulating, persuasive and experienced a guide for an exploration into the world of twentieth-century music.

Brenda Ravenscroft

Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey, eds. *Fauvel Studies: Allegory, Chronicle, Music, and Image in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 146*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. xix, 666 pp. ISBN 0-19-816579-X (hardcover).

This enormous collection of essays combines the work of 27 authors, including ten musicologists, seven literary scholars, and ten historians, four of whom specialize in the history of art and architecture. Few musical manuscripts would warrant the breadth of attention and scholarly scrutiny found here, but *Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS français 146* (henceforth *Fauvel*) is an indisputable exception. Dating from the first decades of the fourteenth century, this is the oldest and largest (93 folia, measuring 33 x 46 cm) of the thirteen extant manuscripts containing an interpolated version of the *Roman de Fauvel*, written by Gervés du Bus. A satirical allegory, the *Roman* encapsulates the last decades of the reign of the French king, Philip the Fair (d. 1314), and the downfall of his finance minister, Enguerran de Marigny, using the mocking image of a horse called Fauvel, whose name (an acrostic) and nature is representative of the vices: *flaterie*, *avarice*, *vilanie*, *variété*, *envie*, and *lascheté*. This grand literary creation, written in Old French and intended for a sophisticated audience, is richly decorated with both highly detailed illuminations and interpolated music. It includes settings of both French and Latin poetry, in the form of motets, conductus, and monophonic songs, early examples of the *formes fixes*. Also included in the manuscript are the complete works of an otherwise obscure composer, Jehannot de Lescurel, a verse chronicle of French history (1300–1316), and several French and Latin narrative *dits* (moralizing poems) by Geffroy de Paris. A modern edition of the Latin examples, by Leofranc Holford-Strevens, appears for the first time in the present volume (“The Latin *Dits* of Geffroy de Paris: An *Editio Princeps*”); this article alone is an unquestionably valuable contribution to the existing literature.

Any musical scholar approaching this extremely complex manuscript for the first time would do well to begin with a detailed reading of this volume, which not only handily summarizes all relevant scholarship to date (and provides a valuable introduction to the source by the volume editors) but also considerably

advances our knowledge of compositional technique and manuscript organization in early *Ars nova* France. Several articles are essential reading for an analytical understanding of the music of this period. Wulf Arlt (“Jehannot de Lescurel and the Function of Musical Language in the *Roman de Fauvel* as Presented in BN fr. 146”) shows *Fauvel* not only as a substantial early source of the separate genres of *rondeaux*, *ballade*, and *virelai*, but also as a previously unrecognized exemplar of new compositional methods in these monophonic songs. Joseph C. Morin (“Jehannot de Lescurel’s Chansons, Geffroy de Paris’s *Dits*, and the Process of Design in BN fr. 146”) posits a credible theory that the works of Geffroy and Lescurel, like the *Roman*, were manipulated carefully by the compilers of the manuscript in order to best reflect its political focus. Included as evidence is a useful appendix of column widths and ruling markings, showing the careful design of the copyists. Christopher Page shows the manuscript as an early source for an innovative new genre, the *ballade*, which had only recently appeared on the scene in Paris, some time between the writing of the treatise of Johannes de Grocheio (c. 1300) and the compiling of *Fauvel* (“Tradition and Innovation in BN fr. 146: The Background to the Ballades”). This volume also provides a new catalogue, by Susan Rankin, for all the short plainchants of the manuscript (“The ‘*Alleluys, antenes, respons, ygnes et verssez*’ in BN fr. 146: A Catalogue Raisonné”). Anne Walters Robinson (“Local Chant Readings and the *Roman de Fauvel*”), contributes a comprehensive study of variants for several *Fauvel* chants in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century French manuscripts (most of which are Parisian). Lorenz Welker addresses the substantial additions and changes made in *Fauvel* to numerous pre-existent conductus found in the Notre-Dame manuscript “F” (“Polyphonic Reworkings of Notre-Dame Conductus in BN fr. 146: *Mundus a mundicia* and *Quare fremuerunt*”). For those readers who are intrigued by the details of composers’ biographies, Mary and Richard Rouse (“Jehannot de Lescurel”) have put paid to the notion, first asserted by C. V. Langlois,¹ that the obscure Lescurel in *Fauvel* can be easily identified.

Perhaps the strongest musicological studies of the manuscript are those by the volume’s editors, Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey. Bent’s enlightening examination of several motets (“*Fauvel* and Marigny: Which Came First?”) deals with the captivating issues of chronology and parody in the form of reversal, which is not only a musical characteristic, but also the main essence of the *Fauvel* allegory and of the manuscript structure as a whole. The beast *Fauvel*’s world is one of inversion, as befits the Antichrist: here, king reigns above pope, women over their husbands, and even the moon over the sun. The narrative structure of at least three of the motet texts found in *Fauvel* (those linked directly to Marigny: *Aman novi/Heu Fortuna/Heu me, Tribum que non abhorruit/Quoniam secta latronum/Merito, and Garrit gallus/In nova fert/Neuma*) seems to present a reverse chronological account of the historical events thus depicted. Caution must be observed, however, when

¹Charles-Victor Langlois, “Jean de Lescurel, poète français,” *Histoire littéraire de la France* 36 (1927): 109–15.

attempting to date the works according to narrative structure alone. Bent's findings, ably demonstrated, refine and supersede established views that the motets in the collection, many of which are attributable to Philippe de Vitry (and have thus served to aid in the dating of his compositional activities), were composed essentially at the same time as the events they portray.² Rather, Bent suggests that many, and possibly most, of the motets were composed specifically for this manuscript, and thus serve as a historical account of recent events. In summary, Bent applies the Wagnerian term *Gesamtkunstwerk* to this remarkable manuscript, which, though anachronistic, is an appropriate description, given *Fauvel's* magnificent fusion of music, poetry, and visual spectacle.

Andrew Wathey's essay, referencing many of the same motets discussed by Bent ("Gervès du Bus, the *Roman de Fauvel*, and the Politics of the Later Capetian Court"), helps to coalesce our views of the purpose of their texts. Those which chronicle the downfall of Enguerran de Marigny, for example, are not only commentaries on the decadence of Philip's court, and specifically the contemptuous conduct of his chamberlain, but also serve as an elaborate *admonitio* to the future King Philip V, who is warned, by the example of Marigny, against employing evil counsellors. Wathey's in-depth discussion of the motet texts, coupled with a minutely detailed exploration of the political climate surrounding the succession of the throne, sheds considerable light on our current picture of the early fourteenth-century French court.

Musico-textual analysis, however, is far from the only aspect of study afforded by the contents of this manuscript. Accordingly, the remaining articles, which approach this source from several different angles, can provide a rich context for a musicological study, but are equally accessible to readers interested in literary construction, medieval languages, political satire, patronage in the arts, and social history, among other subjects. Among these non-musical investigations, those likely to be of greatest interest are Michael Camille's iconographic study of the beast *Fauvel's* transformations in relation to more ancient literary perceptions of animal hybridity ("Hybridity, Monstrosity, and Bestiality in the *Roman de Fauvel*"), Michael T. Davis's engrossing exploration of the architecture of Desespoir Palace, the setting for *Fauvel's* evil court ("Desespoir, Esperance, and Douce France: The New Palace, Paris, and the Royal State"), and Élisabeth Lalou's historical study of the Royal chancery of Philip the Fair ("La chancellerie royale à la fin du règne de Philippe IV le Bel"), which helps us sort out some of the many personages and personalities who held influence over the authors of the manuscript.

This volume is essentially the culmination of a series of seminars in Oxford (1992–95) and the proceedings of a conference held in Paris at the Université de Paris-Sorbonne (July 1994). The results of this wide-ranging symposium are understandably not always in perfect accord. According to

²See for example: Ernest Sanders, "The Early Motets of Philippe de Vitry," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 28 (1975): 24–45; also: Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, "The Emergence of *Ars Nova*," *Journal of Musicology* 13 (1995): 285–317.

the editors, some attempt was made to reconcile differences of opinion, although absolute consistency was not mandated. The sheer number and variety of essays in this book, qualities which point to its inherent difficulties of consistency, are also the source of its greatest strength, i.e., it serves as a truly comprehensive exploration of a complex musical, poetic, and artistic manuscript. As such, readers should not be surprised to find contributions by practically all living leading scholars in the subject areas represented therein. One very noticeable lacuna in this respect (nonetheless noted appropriately by the editors) is the absence of any essay by Edward Roesner, whose earlier work, particularly on the reprinted edition of *Fauvel in Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century*, and on the recently published facsimile, is vital reading for anyone interested in studying the music, and which in fact provides the launching point for many arguments in this collection.³

As might be expected in a volume with 27 separate essays (three of which are in French), writing style is not wholly consistent throughout the book. Consistency of formatting and citation, however, would have aided in creating a more unified whole. Footnotes, for example, are not absolutely uniform in format. Translations of Latin and French texts are not always present, and when they are provided, there is no consistently applied method for this in footnotes or in the text. Some tables and example numbers are awkwardly placed or lead to confusion or interruption in a straight reading of the text. Notwithstanding these small criticisms, the work of Bent and Wathey in editing such an extensive collection deserves admiration.

One point not addressed by the editors is the rationale for the arrangement of the essays, which is clearly alphabetical by author. This choice certainly places every scholar on an equal footing, and one may argue that the chapter titles, to a trained eye, are sufficiently descriptive to make the overall contents of the volume quite clear. Nevertheless, some attempt to delineate the essays by broad general approach (e.g., Musico-textual analysis, political and social commentary, etc.) might have made the task of assessing the full scope of the scholarship easier for the reader, without necessarily imposing an order of importance on the contributions. The effect of the alphabetical arrangement is to make the essays somewhat non-sequential in terms of focus, with only a few thematic coincidences (e.g., Leofranc Holford-Strevens follows Jean Dunbabin, both discussing Geffroy de Paris).

This book represents the most up-to-date scholarship on almost every aspect of *Fauvel*, with only a few exceptions. Studies of the motets in the manuscript, always a source of insight into the early *Ars nova* style, have been advanced slightly since the publication of this volume, although the new work generally builds upon the scholarship already represented here.

³ *The Roman de Fauvel*, ed. Leo Schrade, with new introduction by Edward Roesner, *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* 1 (Monaco: L'Oiseau-Lyre, 1984); see also: *The Roman de Fauvel in the Edition of Mesire Chaillou de Pesstain: A Reproduction in Facsimile of the Complete Manuscript*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds français 146, introduction by Edward Roesner, François Avril, and Nancy Freeman Regaldo (New York: Broude Bros., 1990).

Andrew Wathey (who, in addition to his work on this book, is also the author of the *New Grove* article on the *Roman de Fauvel*) and Edward Roesner have both recently contributed substantial articles on motet topics,⁴ while at least one recent doctoral dissertation also takes up the cause, positing that Philippe de Vitry's motets in *Fauvel* represent a continuation, not an innovation of style, and that the *Ars nova* proper is a late thirteenth-century phenomenon, thus predating this manuscript.⁵ The contribution of Emma Dillon, a junior scholar at the time of the Oxford seminars and the Paris conference ("The Profile of Philip V in the Music of *Fauvel*"), is a well-constructed argument, lending credence to the notion that the motet texts contain direct admonitions and advice to the newly crowned King Philip (who endured a succession crisis in 1316), and that one of the main instigators of the copying of the manuscript was likely Charles, Count of Valois (who jealously guarded his central position in Philip's court). However, it does not add significantly to the essays already broaching this subject (particularly those by Lalou and Wathey). Nonetheless, Dillon's subsequent publications, following on her completed doctoral dissertation, put forth a more seasoned view; these represent the only remaining new scholarship on *Fauvel* which post-dates the present book.⁶

For the musical scholar, this book is an invaluable source of information. Still, unless the reader is already an *Ars nova* specialist, certain conventions of vocabulary will have to be quickly assimilated. One conspicuous example is the ubiquitous adjective "fauvelized," used throughout the volume (e.g., in the articles by Arlt, Bent) without explicit definition. Context eventually reveals that this word refers to the process employed by the authors of the manuscript of altering text and/or music to create a parody of the original. Possibly the only reader who might be disappointed with this collection of essays is the student of music notation practices, a subject which the volume does not address in depth, offering no new comment, for example, on the early attentions paid to *Fauvel* by Apel in his fundamental textbook.⁷ Nonetheless, some aspects of the manuscript's notation are least touched upon by Welker and Arlt (whose article is the only one to include samples of original notation along with the musical examples).

⁴ Andrew Wathey, "Myth and Mythography in the Motets of Philippe de Vitry," *Musica e Storia* 6 (1998): 81–106; Edward H. Roesner, "Labouring in the midst of wolves: Reading a group of *Fauvel* motets," *Early Music History: Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Music* 22 (2003): 169–245.

⁵ Catherine Ann Lloyd, "Ars antiqua–ars nova" (PhD diss., King's College, London, 2002).

⁶ See: Emma Dillon, "Music 'bien escriptez et bien notez' in Bibliothèque nationale, fonds français 146" (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1998); also: "The Art of interpolation in the Roman de *Fauvel*," *Journal of Musicology* 19, no. 2 (2002): 223–64; and: *Medieval music-making and the Roman de Fauvel* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

⁷ Willi Apel, *The Notation of Polyphonic Music 900–1600* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1953, repr. 1961), see especially part 3, chapter 5, section C, "The Roman de *Fauvel*," 325–37. Apel acknowledges that certain notational oddities in *Fauvel* (e.g., the so-called *semibreves caudatae*) are actually later additions to the manuscript.

The overall value of this book to the literature of manuscript studies cannot be disputed or underestimated. Its distinguished production details (including numerous facsimile reproductions, detailed illustrations, and eight superb colour plates), along with the number of meticulously prepared catalogues and new editions of textual material, make the volume absolutely essential secondary literature on *Fauvel*. Even more impressive than its individual contributions, however, is the larger effect of the collection, which brings together advanced scholarship in multiple sub-disciplines to an extent rarely seen in a single volume. This approach to the compilation of *Fauvel Studies* certainly befits and does ample justice to its subject matter, the *Gesamtkunstwerk* which is *Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS français 146*.

Brian E. Power

Adrian Williams, ed. *Franz Liszt. Selected Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. xxxix, 1063 pp. ISBN 0-19-816688-5 (hardcover).

Klára Hamburger, ed. *Franz Liszt: Briefwechsel mit seiner Mutter*. German translations by Renate Mugrauer. Eisenstadt: Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, 2000. 544 pp. ISBN 3-901517-22-7 (hardcover).

Serge Gut and Jacqueline Bellas, eds. *Franz Liszt—Marie d'Agoult, Correspondance*. Paris: Arthème Fayard, 2001. 1344 pp. ISBN 2-23-61010-5 (paperback).

Among a host of similar messages in Liszt's over 8,000 *published* letters, three samples below reveal the reasons for the great difficulty in accessing the wealth of his exceptionally broad and far-flung correspondence: "You're a good one, asking how I'm spending my evenings: so you've forgotten that I know 30,000 people in Paris and that like it or not I really must put up with a few of them,"¹ wrote Franz Liszt from there on 11 July 1834 to Countess Marie d'Agoult in Touraine. On 20 November 1875 from the Villa d'Este he complained to Baroness Olga von Meyendorff in Weimar:

For the last couple of weeks I have been gloomily writing quantities of letters. I get nearly fifty a week, not counting shipments of manuscripts, pamphlets, books, dedications, and all kinds of music. The time required to peruse them, even casually, deprives me of the time needed to answer them.

Up until now it has been impossible for me to concentrate steadily on my musical work because of this too flattering and steady harassment by my correspondents in various countries.²

¹"Vous êtes bonne de me demander comment je passe mes soirées: vous oubliez donc que je connais 30 000 gens à Paris et que bon gré mal gré il faut bien que j'en endure quelques-uns," in *Franz Liszt—Marie d'Agoult: Correspondance*, eds. Gut and Bellas, no. 86. Unless otherwise attributed, translations are my own.

²*The Letters of Franz Liszt to Olga von Meyendorff, 1871–1886*. Trans. William R. Tyler; introd. and notes Edward N. Waters (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University, 1979), 212.