

Collecting Trouvère Lyric at the Peripheries

The Lessons of MSS Paris, BnF fr. 20050
and Bern, Burgerbibliothek 389

Christopher Callahan

ABSTRACT

In order to offer an argument for the role that material philology should play in future editions of medieval lyric, this article examines the evolution of compilational practices between the earliest and latest trouvère chansonniers, covering the period 1230 to 1310. Though the argument focuses on “peripheral” codices—from geographical and temporal points of view, it touches on pivotal manuscripts that articulate the transition from one set of compilational values to another. The analysis concludes with suggestions for future text editors in their quest for editions that capture the variance and vagaries of trouvère performance and transmission throughout the thirteenth century.

ENCOUNTERING MEDIEVAL TEXTS IN THEIR MANUSCRIPT CONTEXT has become an indispensable component of their study. Scholars of Old French lyric, who in this post-Lachmanian world accept the lyric text as both performance event and written artifact, and lyric transmission as open-ended and variable, have been further inspired by K. Busby’s “codex in context” approach to narrative verse (BUSBY 2002) to recover medieval readings of the trouvères which print editions have traditionally obscured. These insights perforce raise provocative and tantalizing questions for text editors, as they attempt to offer modern readers something of the medieval experience of intertextuality. In order to formulate a prolegomena to the most urgent of these, i.e., what role material philology should play in shaping future lyric editions, it will be our task here to examine the role it does play in our understanding of the evolution of lyric compilation. For *chansonniers* were in no way static, but rather their format, contents and purpose were continuously reshaped, in response to changing conditions and aesthetics of reception, over the century-and-a-quarter that trouvère song was recorded.

The two codices receiving the most careful scrutiny here, Paris, BnF fr. 20050 (trouvère MS *U*) and Bern, Burgerbibliothek 389 (trouvère *C*), are significant milestones in the practice of lyric compilation because of their central marginality. Both are Messine in origin, and exemplify opposite ends of the compilational chronology: while MS *U* represents the fledgling stages of *chansonnier* production, MS *C* is characteristic of practices at the close of the tradition. MS *U*, as the oldest *chansonnier* we possess—its earliest gatherings have been dated to 1231 (LUG 2001)—reflects, quite naturally, a still-developing consensus regarding the trouvère canon. For the principles visible in the major *chansonniers* of the 1250s and 1260s with respect to poets featured, the use of identifying rubrics, and the *compilatio*, within the codex, of both poets and their works, are not yet operative here. In addition, melodies are recorded primarily for the songs of past generations of poets, both French and Occitan, indicating a reliance on written transmission of music and a certain remove from current centers of lyric performance.¹ MS *C* for its part dates from the end of the 13th century, and by its principles of organization, indicates a clear evolution away from the author-centered collections of mid-century. While ruled for music throughout, moreover, not a note has been entered. This much-regretted lacuna appears less accidental when one looks to a nearly contemporary Messine codex, Oxford, Bodleian, Douce 308 (trouvère MS *I*). The organization of this *chansonnier*, its complete lack of musical staves, and its attention to new lyric forms native to Lorraine (DOSS-QUINBY ET AL. 2006) strongly indicate that this “peripheral” duchy was nonetheless on the cutting edge of lyric compilation, though accorded such a status by the decline of the Arrageois (UHL 2008).

MS Paris, BnF, fr. 20050

MS *U*'s 172 chartae, containing 305 trouvère and 29 troubadour songs, are written in three distinct hands, each responsible for one of the principle sections discerned by early-twentieth century scholars and confirmed more recently (TYSENS 1991).² Unit 1, which runs from chartae 4–91 and comprises the first twelve gatherings, contains not only the entirety of the melodies transcribed—in Messine neumes—but all of the Occitan songs,

1. See HAINES 2010 for a discussion of the circulation of Old French “written-out song” in twelfth- and early thirteenth-century Europe.

2. A fourth hand, visible as a corrector throughout the codex, is also responsible for cc. 169–172.

Table 1. Provisions for music in sections of gatherings in MS U

UNIT I	PROVISION FOR MUSIC
II (cc. 4–11)	Music notated throughout
III (cc. 12–19)	Music notated throughout
IV (cc. 20–27)	3/16 pieces notated
V (cc. 28–35)	Empty staves throughout
VI (cc. 36–43)	9/18 pieces notated
VII (cc. 44–51)	16/18 pieces notated
VIII (cc. 52–59)	Music notated throughout
IX (cc. 60–67)	Music notated throughout
X (cc. 68–75)	1 partial stanza out of 16
XI (cc. 76–83)	5/8 pieces notated
XII (84–91)	Music notated throughout (troubadour songs)
XIII (cc. 92–93)	Empty staves; 2 trouvère, 1 troubadour song
UNIT II	
XIV (cc. 94–101)	No space left for staves
XV (cc. 102–109)	No space left for staves
UNIT III	
XVI (cc. 110–117)	Space left for staves throughout
XVII (cc. 118–126)	Space left for staves throughout
XVIII (cc. 127–135)	Space left for staves throughout
XIX (cc. 136–143)	Space left for staves throughout
XX (cc. 144–152)	Space left for staves throughout
XXI (cc. 153–160)	Space left for staves in 7/14 pieces
XX (cc. 161–162)	Space left for staves in 1/6 pieces
XXIII (cc. 163–170)	Last piece notated; no space for staves in first 19
XXIV (cc. 171–172)	Space left for staves in 1 piece out of 3

with music provided for 100% of the latter. While musical notation in unit 1 is not systematic—the staves in gathering V (cc. 28–35) are empty, while empty and notated staves alternate in gatherings IV (cc. 20–27) and XI (cc. 76–83)—melodies nonetheless accompany 64% of the poems.³ Indeed, music was planned for the entire codex, for in gatherings XVI–XX

3. Thus Tyssens conjectures that melodic exempla were not as available as textual exempla, and that visibly, they derived from a different source (2007, 27). It is equally plausible that the workshop did not always have the services of a skilled music scribe.

(cc. 110r–152v)—the majority of Unit 3, space was left for staves, though these were not ruled in the end. It is thus only the two gatherings of Unit 2 which make no provision for music.

These lacunae suggest that the transmission of troubadour and trouvère lyric in the early thirteenth century relied as much on written exempla as on oral tradition if not more so. For the first twelve gatherings are devoted primarily to poets of the generation 1180–1220, including the troubadours. The majority of these names, with the exception of Gace Brulé, are found only in this section of the codex. U1 thus recorded 13 songs of the Châtelain de Couci, 6 of the Vidame de Chartres, 3 of Guiot de Provins, 2 of Chretien de Troyes, and single songs of a handful of other poets. Deceased trouvères recorded both here and later in the manuscript include Gace (22 songs in U1, 4 in U2, 8 in U3); Blondel de Nesle (3 songs in U1, 2 in U2, 4 in U3); Conon de Béthune (2 songs in U1, 3 in U2, 1 in U3); Guiot de Dijon (3 songs in U1, 3 in U3); and Hugues de Brégi (2 songs in U1, 3 in U2, 2 in U3). These gatherings also feature the most notable living trouvères, among them Colin Muset, Gautier de Dargies, Gautier d'Espinal, Guillaume le Vinier, and Thibaut de Champagne, as well as poets such as Geoffroi de Chastillon and Robert de Reims whose status as active or deceased in 1230 is difficult to determine.⁴ The concentration of melodies here is thus attributable to more than just whether a given poet's corpus was finite or open. For the four deceased trouvères cited above resurface in section 3 without music, and the entries for active poets in section 1 are notated for music there but not elsewhere.⁵ The unfinished quality of section 3 and the lack of concern on the part of scribe U2 for including music, remain among the most puzzling features of MS U.

But as the following table demonstrates, more salient and significant than U's haphazard notation of melodies is its lack of clear organizational principles. For while the former results in regrettable gaps in our knowledge, the latter reflects the state of the art of *chansonnier* compilation in 1230. Though pride of place is indeed given, in section 1, to recent generations of poets, this is by no means systematic, as is visible from the scattered appearance of Gace Brulé throughout the codex. Beyond this, poems

4. These gatherings also include 46 anonymous songs, whose dating is not possible.

5. The concentration of these trouvères in sections 2 and 3 make the lack of melodies all the more regrettable for poets such as Colin Muset et Gautier d'Epinal, who appear to enjoy special status among the active trouvères, owing to their prestige as "local" artists.

Table 2. Trouvères in the first twelve gatherings of MS U, with the number of songs recorded for each. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of songs outside of U1.

DECEASED

Renaut de Beaujeu – 1
 Conon de Bethune – 2 (+4)
 Thibaut de Blaison – 3 (+2)
 Jehan Bodel – 1
 Hugues de Brégi – 2 (+5)
 Gace Brulé – 22
 Vidame de Chartres – 6
 Châtelain de Couci – 13
 Guiot de Dijon – 3 (+2)
 Jocelin de Dijon – 1
 Pierre II de Molins – 1 (+1)
 Gautier de Navilly – 1
 Blondel de Nesle – 3 (+ 6)
 Guiot de Provins – 3
 Chrétien de Troyes – 2

LIVING

Moniot d'Arras – 3 (+ 2)
 Garnier d'Arches – 2
 Simon d'Authie – 1
 Bestourné – 2
 Thibaut de Champagne – 2 (+9)
 Andrieu Contredit – 1
 Chardon de Croisille – 2
 Gautier de Dargies – 4 (+2)
 Colin Muset – 4 (+3)
 Robert de Reims – 3
 Aubin de Sézanne – 1 (+1)
 Guillaume le Vinier – 2 (+1)

STATUS UNCERTAIN

Gautier de Brégi – 1
 Muse en Bourse – 1
 Geoffroi de Chastillon – 1
 Gautier d'Espinal – 9 (+8)
 Guiot – 1
 Chapelain de Laon – 1
 Pierre de Beaumarchais – 1 (+1)
 Anonymous – 46 (+37)

are placed at random rather than grouped by author, as table 2 shows clearly, nor is there any visible hierarchy among poets such as that which characterizes the major *chansonniers* some three decades later. The collection opens with the Châtelain de Couci, which is striking considering the prominence of Gace, whose songs run throughout the codex and whose œuvre is more extensive than that of any other poet featured in MS U.⁶

6. The châtelain's position of primacy can perhaps be justified on chronological grounds, as he preceded Gace in death. According to a long-disputed entry in the *Grandes Chroniques de France*, Gace was Thibaut de Champagne's actual mentor in the poetic arts rather than simply his model.

Following the opening *chanson*, to consider just the first fifteen entries, we find single pieces by Guiot de Provins, the Châtelain again, Gace, Geoffroi de Châtillon, Hugues de Bregi, Gace, the Châtelain, Gace, Anonymous, Gace, the Châtelain, Pierre de Molins, then two songs of Blondel de Nesle, another by Gace, and three songs of Gautier d'Epinal. Gautier is one of the rare poets, along with Colin Muset, whose songs are entered in pairs or threes, in what I interpret as a very cautious gesture of recognition of these native trouvères.

The relative primacy accorded to Gace and the Châtelain in MS *U* must have been extended to Thibaut soon after his death in 1253, for in MS *U* he does not appear until folio 119v, with four more of his songs placed between cc. 121r and 125v, and a final four between cc. 142v and 166r.⁷ Notably, Thibaut's poems are preserved less frequently in *U* than Gautier d'Epinal's, and only as frequently as Colin Muset's, indicating that his reputation in this region was less secure than that of his eastern contemporaries (CALLAHAN 2012, 56). That is what changed radically in the following decades.

Authorship as Organizational Principle

It is in the domain of authorship that *chansonnier* compilation takes its next great step forward. By the 1250s, when the next major *chansonnier*, MS Paris, BnF, fr. 844 (*M*) was compiled, not only were entries grouped by author, but a consensus had been reached, followed by scriptoria over the next two decades, regarding membership and positioning in the pantheon of lyric poets. For the assessment is operative that the reigning king of lyric poets was Thibaut de Champagne, followed by Gace Brulé and the Châtelain de Couci, an ordering found in all of the major *chansonniers* of the next generation: Paris, Arsenal 5198 (trouvère MS *K*), Paris, BnF, fr. 845 (trouvère MS *N*), Paris, BnF, fr. 844 (trouvère MS *M*), Paris, BnF, fr. 847 (trouvère MS *P*), Paris, BnF, fr. 1591 (trouvère MS *R*), Paris, BnF, fr. 12615 (trouvère MS *T*), Paris, BnF, fr. 20050 (trouvère MS *V*), Paris, BnF,

7. As an illustration of the point just made, a song of disputed attribution (RS 306—*Quant fine amor me prie que je chant*) appearing on c. 60r of MS *U*, ascribed variously to *li rois de Navarre* in *KNX*; *messire Gaces* in *MP*; and *Robers de Dommart* in *C* was consigned to the appendix of A. Wallensköld's 1925 edition of Thibaut. The song has since been admitted to the canon of authentic Gace songs in LINKER 1979 and ROSENBERG, DANON, and VAN DER WERF 1985.

n.a.f. 1050 (trouvère MS X), Siena, Bibl. Com. H.X. 36 (trouvère MS Z). Even in Paris, BnF, fr. 846 (trouvère MS O), a late thirteenth-century Burgundian manuscript organized alphabetically by incipit, each letter begins with Thibaut followed by Gace, with third place shared among Blondel de Nesle, the Châtelain de Couci, and Thibaut de Blason.⁸ These codices not only highlight the works of individual poets, but the *ordinatio* of their songs reflects a fluid conception of generic boundaries. The regular alternation between love songs, crusade songs, debate songs, devotional songs, and *pastourelles* stages an ongoing intertextual dialogue which highlights shared themes and terminology rather than the rhetorical strategies which distinguish among genres.⁹

As one of the earliest datable *chansonniers* (HAINES 2013), Paris, fr. 844 (M) stands out among its contemporaries for three notable reasons. First of all, its inserted *libellus* (Mt) devoted to Thibaut de Champagne served as a model for the presentation of the latter's corpus in subsequent collections.¹⁰ The trouvère-king's songs in MSS K VX closely follow the selection and ordering of those in MS Mt.¹¹ Secondly, MS M offers the most complete picture of contemporary lyric practice of any *chansonnier*, notating—in addition to its featured trouvères—sixty-one Occitan songs,¹² three lyric *lais*, fifty two- and three-voice motets in French, some thirty *rondeaux* in French, Occitan and Latin, and finally, the oldest extant selection of instrumental pieces—*estampies* and dances—notated in the blank spaces of chartae 5r and 103r–104v. Thirdly, MS M constitutes a turning point in the evolution of *chansonnier* compilation. The trouvères featured

8. Blondel trumps Gace on occasion, but this is much more likely due to misattribution by medieval scribes than to design. As lyric poets constantly cited each other, both textually and musically, and the lack of rubrics in MS U suggests that early exempla did not offer them, this confusion is only too understandable.

9. These are of three principle types: purely lyric textuality, dialogic textuality, and narrative textuality (PICKENS 2000, 219–226), though finer rhetorical distinctions must be made for hybrid discourses featuring multiple genres.

10. Huot argues for recognition of MS Mt as an early author codex whose compilation would have been overseen by the royal trouvère himself (1987, 64–66), proposal strongly supported in HAINES 2004, 35.

11. Further scrutiny will be necessary in order to determine whether MS M served in like manner as a model for these manuscripts' treatment of all of their contents.

12. Fifty-one of these are notated with melodies. As thirty-one of MS M's troubadour melodies are *unica*, moreover, it constitutes, along with MS U, an indispensable source for troubadour music.

in the second half of the codex are all Artesian, signaling a shift away from seigniorial courts as loci of lyric performance in favor of prosperous urban centers like Arras, famous for its poetic competitions, or *puys*. More significantly, genre begins to surface as an organizational concern. Following the author-centered collection comes a gathering comprised uniquely of *pastourelles*. Similarly the *lais*, *motets*, and *rondeaux* mentioned above are recorded in blocks, and though their rubrics offer an occasional title, such as *Lai Markiol*, author identifications are notably absent. In this way, these gatherings look forward to the next major advancement in *chansonnier* compilation: organization by genre, which comes into its own in the last quarter of the thirteenth century.

Generic Considerations as Organizational Principle

The debate and the *pastourelle*, with their dialogic and narrative textualities, and the Marian song, with the peculiar teleology of its love service, become separated from love songs in this new generation of *chansonniers*. The debate song must have been an extremely popular entry at the *puys* of Arras, for in the “ecumenical” Artesian *chansonniers*—those not exclusively devoted to Adam de la Halle—MSS Rome, Vat. Reg. lat. 1490 (trouvère MS *a*) and Arras, Bibliothèque municipale 657 (trouvère MS *A*), *jeux-partis* are the most frequently notated genre after love songs. MS *a*, from the end of the 13th century, thus features 215 love songs and 78 debate songs which bookend the collections of *pastourelles*, *motets*, monophonic *rondeaux* and *virelais*, presented in that order.¹³

Dated 1278, MS *A* offers a focus mid-way between that of MSS *a* and Rome, Vat. Reg. 1522 (trouvère MS *b*), as it features solely love and debate songs. But its lyric collection is confined to cc. 129–160 and is framed by didactic and moralizing texts of various types, most immediately by Richard de Fournival’s *Bestiaire d’amour* and a Marian miracle story. This kind of intertextual dialogue initiates new modes of reading: the limited repertoire of the *chansonnier*, focused on *fine amor* and love debates, meshes closely with the didactic function of the surrounding texts, indicating that love poetry has become more than courtly entertainment. Stripped of its more ribald genres, particularly the *pastourelle*, the lyric collection in MS

13. Another Artesian *chansonnier* housed in the Vatican, MS Rome, Vat. Reg. 1522 (trouvère MS *b*) is an elaborate collection of 66 *jeux-partis*, with rubrics bearing the names of both debate partners, miniatures, decorated initials, and—regrettably—empty staves.

A is able to serve as an exemplar of proper behavior, a kind of *miroir des princes* that complements the lessons taught by the surrounding treatises.¹⁴ As we shift to from Picardy to Lorraine and turn to MS Bern, Burgerbibliothek 389 (C), the generic principle becomes combined with the alphabetic principle to create a new way of organizing the corpus of trouvère song.

MS Bern, Burgerbibliothek 389

The work of three scribes, Burgerbibliothek 389 shows a graphic and linguistic unity which belies the multiplicity of sources from which it was compiled. One hand (C1)¹⁵ is responsible for all but five of the codex's 524 lyric pieces, with a single song (#460) the work of CII, while CIII is the author of the rubrics and transcriber of four songs (#143, #144, #185, #412). Our three compilers appear to have proceeded, as was also noted for MS U, "par accumulation, en essayant de collectionner le plus grand nombre de textes" (MORENO 1999, 24).

First of all, MS C shows strong stemmatic connections to MS U, compiled three generations earlier, for they shares 211 between them.¹⁶ In addition, MS C contains 45 religious compositions (Marian songs, Crusade songs, pious contrafacta), 24 of which are found in one other *chansonier*, Paris, BnF, fr. 24406 (trouvère MS V).¹⁷ These constitute in fact a driving force in the compilation of MS C, lending it not only its dominant ideological color, but serving as its central organizing principal. For each alphabetically-organized section begins with one or more devotional songs, while eight sections—A B D I L Q R T—conclude with pious songs as

14. An even more striking example of lyric poetry as didactic mirror, the late thirteenth-century MS Paris, BnF, fr. 12581 (trouvère MS S), lies outside of the scope this discussion due to its Champenois origins (BARBIERI 2006), its nearly exclusive focus on Thibaut de Champagne, and the unusual *ordinatio* of the latter's songs.

15. My nomenclature.

16. Moreno postulates that U is a "sister manuscript" to C's source text, which she calls C', both of which stem from a putative source v (1999, 28).

17. MS V cannot be the direct source of MS C's pious songs, however, for not only is it later, but it contains six pieces not found in C, which certainly would have been included had they been available. This discrepancy prompted Schwan to propose a closely-related model, which he called Vg (SCHWAN 1888).

well.¹⁸ Thus Marian lyric, a genre then in full bloom, trumped love lyric as the public face of trouvère art.

In its ordering of songs by incipit, C adopts the practice of one other *chansonnier*—Paris, BnF, fr. 846 (trouvère MS O), but its preference for grouping entries by genre supersedes O's adherence to the hierarchy of trouvères characteristic of mid-century *chansonnier* organization. For subsequent to the pious songs which begin each letter, one consistently finds debate songs, love songs, and *pastourelles*, in that order, which ignore the distinctions previously made between major and minor trouvères. Earlier compilational practices can nonetheless be glimpsed on occasion in the secular songs, where two or more pieces by the same poet can be found contiguously, thus suggesting a multiplicity of sources, some as old as MS U, some as recent as MS O, and others in between.¹⁹ Additional sources must be postulated for the 15 *unica* among the devotional songs, as well as for four songs which are recorded twice.

For 12 of the *unica*, a lost *libellus* of Jacques de Cambrai is the most plausible source: the rubricator carefully records the attribution to Jacques in each case, and most unusually, in the case of his eight *contrafacta*, their secular model is duly indicated.²⁰ In the case of the four repeated songs, by Jacques d'Amiens, cc. 264 and 475; Guiot de Brunoi, cc. 266 and 428; Guiot de Provins, cc. 297 and 504; and Thomas Etrier, cc. 339 and 351, the second occurrence of each song shows both graphic and textual variants of a sort which strongly suggests different sources for each.²¹ Out of the multitude of sources and compilational traditions, the scribes of MS C imposed a remarkable unity on their material, at the same time investing trouvère lyric with a new teleology. The combination of alphabetical-generic organization with the predilection for pious song makes MS C a particularly

18. Moreno notes the survival, at the beginning of thirteen alphabetical sections, of a thin strip of parchment glued to the verso of the opening folio, which was designed to facilitate the reader's navigation of the codex (1999, 19).

19. This is the case, for example, with two songs of Bestourné and three of Gace Brulé in the A section, and six of Gace under the letter I.

20. Discussion of the chronology and purpose of these rubrics is to be found in O'SULLIVAN 2005, 74–75.

21. For example, the incipit of Jacques d'Amiens' 'Sospris d'amors fins cuers ne se puet taire' (RS 189) is missing on c. 118, but recorded on ch. 224. Guiot de Brunoi's 'Kant lit res douls tens d'esteit' (RS 451) is known in two sources—MSS C and O, but only the first version (c. 119) is closely related to O's. In the second (c. 196), the refrain, in a departure from standard practice, is preceded by the same verse in each stanza.

innovative codex. If the music scribe had only taken it in hand, it would be a most valuable resource for scholars of medieval lyric, as it features so many songs not recorded elsewhere.

We thus note, over the 80 years of lyric compilation separating MSS *U* and *C*, the development of precise notions of genre separating purely lyric from dialogic from narrative textualities, with a further subdivision of lyric textuality distinguishing pious from secular song. These theoretical constructs increasingly affect the organization of *chansonniers* after 1270 (CALLAHAN 2010), evincing both the author-centered codices of mid-century and musical notation. Eastern scriptoria appear to have always been somewhat removed from the centers of lyric practice, as empty staves and pages not ruled for music dominate in codices from this region.²² Indeed, Eastern *chansonniers* such as MSS *C* and *I*, written in the decades just before Philippe de Vitry's *Ars Nova* changed compositional practices forever, mark the *terminus ad quem* both of the trouvère tradition and of *chansonnier* compilation. But to begin one's study of the trouvères with the establishment of precise generic categories, organizing the corpus of individual trouvères into genres, and above all neglecting music, is grossly anachronistic, as it generalizes as characteristic of the entire century what is only applicable to the last few decades of *chansonnier* construction.

Editorial Considerations

It is our task as specialists of medieval lyric to bring the interested readership—amateur and professional, literary and musicological—to an understanding of the *variance* of courtly performance and the complexities of its transmission. This desideratum is of course not new, as some excellent early 20th century editions (BÉDIER and AUBRY 1909) attest. But even today, lyric editors are caught between opposing concerns: those of presenting a “clean” performable *chansonnier* and of respecting the inherent messiness of the manuscript tradition; the proper balance must always be struck anew with each editorial project. For whether critical editions focus on individual trouvères or offer a representative sampling of poets and genres across time, they usually do not go far enough in creating a different *habitus* for *variance*, treating it, despite the best intentions, as an inconvenient break-

22. These are of course not the only *chansonniers* to exhibit stemmatic isolation. MSS *R* and *V* are noteworthy for their large numbers of melodic *unica*, posing tantalizing questions about lyric transmission which may never be satisfactorily answered.

down in communication. Some readings are necessarily superior to others, for linguistic and metrical reasons, while others are disregarded simply because they are isolates; in either case, they are relegated to the *apparatus criticus*, in essence to the editorial trash bin, where they can be ignored.²³

In order to offer a reasoned answer to this problematic, it is essential for consumers of medieval lyric to grasp the nature of individual *chansonniers*: as amalgamations of “snapshots” of lyric practice that originally captured the shape of a given song at a particular moment and in a particular locale. In principle, an electronic edition that offers multiple readings in hypertext format is the best means of appreciating the complexities of the trouvère manuscript tradition. But even this image-rich, multi-textual format is not the best way to capture the medieval experience of trouvère song. For courtly and urban listeners alike, this poetry was an aural event, very localized, and pre-*chansonnier* transcriptions would have been equally tied to local performance traditions. So to whom does the modern textual scholar/musicologist owe allegiance? The audience of 2014 is in some ways similar to, though much smaller than, its thirteenth-century counterpart: the concerns of those committed to performing this lyric are still quite separate from those who collect and study it, and both constituencies can legitimately be considered informed listeners. The relationship between performance and written artifact, however, is substantially different for thirteenth- and twenty-first-century audiences, and modern scholars and medieval enthusiasts cannot hope to recreate for themselves the experience of those for whom this culture and language were native.

Textual editors must write for a contemporary readership, of course, and bring that readership to a non-judgmental appreciation of the age-long practice and longer-lived legacy of trouvère song while not overwhelming it with the truly dizzying complexity of the trouvère manuscript tradition. Any edition devoted to celebrating variance must thus be a compromise, one that must satisfy a multitude of audiences, each with its own legitimate interests.²⁴ It is in the realm of music that productive overtures can be made immediately. For it is in the editing of trouvère poetry as song that the least attention has been given a) to treating text and melody as

23. The table of variants is nonetheless an essential component of the scholarly edition and the difficulties associated with navigating it are in no way an argument for its elimination. Efforts in the future must be made to make this element more legible, better integrated into the text itself.

24. Of course this leaves ample room for the digital edition, despite the caveats proffered above.

an integral whole, and b) to notating melodic variants.²⁵ Indeed, trouvère editions stand everything to gain by creating tables of melodic variants to accompany the indices of textual variants which now occupy the critical apparatus, as well as by notating melodic *unica* in their entirety. An argument is to be made for not placing these with the variants, but including them in the edition proper, as they represent distinct, legitimate performance options (CALLAHAN 2013).

While digital editions are making rapid inroads into the scholarly consciousness, academic institutions are slower in creating structures for the evaluation of digital scholarship. At the same time, university archivists raise legitimate and as yet unanswered questions concerning the preservation of digital materials for future generations. As a means of satisfying both digital and print enthusiasts, meanwhile, it is to be hoped that presses can be persuaded to accompany print editions with a CD-ROM containing manuscript facsimiles and full transcriptions of all variant readings. Editors could then offer both a clean, performable, fairly compact edition, and an acceptably complete critical apparatus.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the practice of collecting trouvère song evolved throughout the thirteenth century in keeping with the shift of lyric performance from courtly to urban settings, from aristocratic to bourgeois sensibilities. It also evolved along with scholastic tastes, as the university shared with society at large its predilection for the encyclopedic: for the categorization and systematization of all knowledge. For this influence is clearly active in the both the increasing (and at times excessive) rigor of poetic treatises from the early to the late thirteenth century (PICKENS 2000), and the consequent shift away from melody as a defining characteristic of genre (AUBREY 2000) in favor of strict generic categories that operated at the expense of music. Twenty-first-century critical editions must embrace this evolution, focusing either on change as a constant, or on given moments in the history of lyric compilation, acknowledging a chosen codex's place in that history. While for the moment, lyric editions don't look all that different from their predecessors, they must begin to frame themselves in

25. The first concern has been regularly addressed since the early 1980s, with ROSENBERG and TISCHLER 1981, while the second is accessible in only a handful of sources, among them VAN DER WERF 1977–79, limited to love song, and BAHAT and LE VOT 1996.

new, holistic ways that acknowledge their editorial program as one among many possible.

Illinois Wesleyan University

Works Cited

Printed Sources

- AUBREY, Elizabeth. 2000. "Genre as a Determinant of Melody". In *Medieval Lyric. Genres in Historical Context*. Edited by William D Paden, 273–296. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- BAHAT, Avner and Gérard LE VOT. 1996. *L'œuvre lyrique de Blondel de Nesle: mélodies. Edition des mélodies et étude des variantes*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- BARBIERI, Luca. 2006. "Deteriores non inanes. Il canzoniere S della lirica in lingua d'oïl". In *Convivio: Estudios sobre la poesía de cancionero*. Edited by Vicenç BELTRÁN and Juan PAREDES, 145–174. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- BEDIER, Joseph and Pierre AUBRY. 1909. *Les chansons de croisade*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- BUSBY, Keith. 2002. *Codex and Context. Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- CALLAHAN, Christopher. 2010. "Thibaut de Champagne and Disputed Attributions: The Case of MSS Bern, Burgerbibliothek 389 (C) and Paris, BnF fr. 1591 (R)". *Textual Cultures* 5.1, 111–131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2979/TEX.2010.5.1.111>.
- . 2012. "Pour une historique de la notion de genre dans le lyrisme de langue d'oïl: le témoignage des chansonniers". In *La chanson de trouvères—formes, registres, genres*. Edited by Marie-Geneviève GROSSEL, 51–61. Presses Universitaires de Valenciennes.
- . 2013. "A la défense des mélodies 'marginales' chez les trouvères. Le cas de Thibaut IV de Champagne". *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* 26, forthcoming.
- DOSS-QUINBY, Eglal, Samuel N. ROSENBERG, and Elizabeth AUBREY. 2006. *The Old French Ballette: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308*. Geneva: Droz (Publications Romanes et Françaises 239).
- HAINES, John. 2002. "The Transformations of the *Manuscrit du Roi*". *Musica Disciplina* 52, 5–43.
- . 2004. *Eight Centuries of Troubadours and Trouvères. The Changing Identity of Medieval Music*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . 2010. *Medieval Songs in Romance Languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- . 2013. "The Songbook for William of Villehardouin, Prince of the Morea (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fond français 844): A Crucial Case in the History of Vernacular Song Collections". In *Viewing the Morea: Land and People in the Late Medieval Peloponnese*. Edited by Sharon GERSTEL, 57–109. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

- HUOT, Sylvia. 1987. *From Song to Book. The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- LINKER, Robert White. 1979. *A Bibliography of Old French Lyrics*. University, Mississippi: Romance Monographs.
- LUG, Robert. 2001. "Katharer und Waldenser in Metz: zur Herkunft des ältesten Sammlung von Trobador-Liedern (1231)". In *Okzitanistik, Altokzitanistik und Provenzalistik. Geschichte und Auftrag einer europäischen Philologie*. Edited by Angelica RIEGER, 247–274. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- MORENO, Paola. 1999. C (Bern, *Burgerbibliothek* 389). *Chansonniers Français, Vol. 3. Intavulare. Table des chansonnier romans*. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres.
- O'SULLIVAN, Daniel E. 2005. *Marian Devotion in Thirteenth-Century French Lyric*. University of Toronto Press.
- PICKENS, Rupert T. 2000. "The Old Occitan Arts of Poetry and Early Troubadour Lyric". In *Medieval Lyric. Genres in Historical Context*. Edited by William D. PADEN, 209–242. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- ROSENBERG, Samuel N. and Hans TISCHLER. 1981. *Chanter m'estuet. Songs of the Trouveres*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- , Samuel DANON, and Hendrik VAN DER WERF. 1985. *The Lyrics and Melodies of Gace Brulé*. New York: Garland.
- SCHWAN, Eduard. 1886. *Die altfranzösischen Liederhandschriften*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- TYSENS, Madeleine. 1991. "Les copistes du chansonnier U". In *La lyrique romane médiévale*. Edited by Madeleine TYSENS, 379–397. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Lettres et de Philosophie de l'Université de Liège.
- . 2007. U (Paris, BNF fr. 20050). *Chansonniers Français, vol. 5. Intavulare. Table des chansonniers romans*. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres.
- UHL, Patrice. 2008. "Du Rebond parodique. Les pièces CLXXIV et CLXXV du *Recueil général des jeux-partis français*". *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes* 15, 129–143.
- VAN DER WERF, Hendrik. 1977–79. *Trouvères-Melodien*. Kassel: Bärenreiter. 2 vols.

Manuscripts

- A Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 675
 C Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 389
 I Oxford, Bodleian, Douce 308
 K Paris, Arsenal 5198
 M Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 844
 N Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 845
 O Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 846
 P Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 847
 R Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1591
 S Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 12581

- T Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 12615
- U Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 20050
- V Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 24406
- X Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 1050
- Z Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, H.X. 36
- a Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1490
- b Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. 1522