Plainsong and Medieval Music, **18**, 2, 91–112 © 2009 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S0961137109990027 Printed in the United Kingdom

Machaut's peer, Thomas Paien

ELIZABETH EVA LEACH*

ABSTRACT. *One of the texts of Machaut's double balade,* Quant Theseus/Ne quier *(B34) is ascribed in Machaut's* Voir dit *to a certain Thomas Paien. The present article suggests that this Thomas was one of Machaut's peers, being like him a canon of Reims and a court secretary. Figures with similar names (and the pervasive idea that a character cited in a work of fiction might not be a real person at all) have confused earlier attempts at identification. A possible occasion for the composition of B34's texts – also involving a balade on the same refrain by Jehan Froissart – can be found in a shared patron–client link between Machaut and Thomas, both of whom had associations with John, Duke of Berry.*

Machaut's double balade, *Quant Theseus/Ne quier* (B34) is unique in his output both generically and in being the only known musical setting by Machaut of a poem by someone else. The identity of the 'Thomas Paien' to whom one of the upper-voice texts of this balade is ascribed in Machaut's *Voir dit* has occasioned much speculation. The present article reviews earlier proposals and collates new sources to argue that this Thomas can be identified with a figure who was, like Machaut, a canon of Reims and a court secretary. In the process it will be necessary to exclude other figures with similar names whose presence in the documentary evidence has confused earlier attempts at identification. Evidence not formerly considered now offers several roles, functions and relationships with historical individuals that are shared between the biographies of Machaut and Thomas, potentially offering them meeting points. Ultimately I propose an occasion for the composition of B34's texts, an occasion that fits their exemplification of homosocial poetic exchange, supporting recent analyses of so-called courtly love lyrics ostensibly directed at ladies as a pretext for male–male poetic competition. First of all, however, I offer a brief resumé of the traces of Thomas Paien in Machaut's poem, *Voir dit*.

Quant Theseus/Ne quier (B34) in the *Voir dit*

Quant Theseus/Ne quier (B34) is one of the few works of fourteenth-century music for which the composer's own discussion of its composition survives, albeit in a fictional context.[1] The composition of B34 occurs near the beginning of the second part of

*elizabetheva.leach@music.ox.ac.uk

I am extremely grateful to Roger Bowers for his generous help disentangling the Thomases in an earlier draft of this paper; the translations of Latin presented here are largely based on his. I would also like to thank Giuliano Di Bacco, Christina Story, and the anonymous reader for other suggestions.

[1] See extracts in the Appendix. The composition of other works in the *Voir dit* is also discussed; see Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, '*Le Voir Dit*: A Reconstruction and a Guide for Musicians', *Plainsong and Medieval Music,* 2 (1993), 103–40.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Machaut's long verisimilitudinous poem, *Le livre dou Voir dit* (*The Book of the True Story*). The first part of this poem – written mainly in Machaut's standard narrative verse format of octosyllabic rhyming couplets, but including prose letters and lyrics in the so-called *formes fixes* – is action-packed. At the outset of the story the protagonist (an aging poet called Guillaume) is revived from sickness by the letter of a young girl, whom he calls only Toute Belle. He undertakes to give her an epistolary education in poetry, which evolves into a love dialogue, and ends up with the two of them meeting naked in bed while they are supposedly on pilgrimage.

Guillaume first sees his beloved after just over 2,000 lines and last takes his leave of her only a couple of thousand lines later. Ten letters are exchanged before they meet and eight in the period of their three meetings. The entire poem is over 9,000 lines long, with forty-six letters, which means that just over half the lines and nearly two-thirds of the letters take place at a point when they will never meet again.[2] The narrative of the larger second part involves no further personal contact and becomes more densely filled with classical exempla and Guillaume's clerkly interpretations of them as pertaining to the situation between him and Toute Belle. Plans for further meetings continue, however, and it is the delaying of these that sparks Guillaume's most serious doubts about his lady's fidelity, culminating in his letter 31, the letter that initiates the sequence surrounding the composition of B34. Letter 31 and subsequent letters, together with other passages relevant to the current discussion, are summarised and excerpted in the Appendix on pages 109–112.

In letter 31 Guillaume recounts a dream in which the image of Toute Belle that she had sent him much earlier in the poem dresses in green and turns its head away from him.[3] Meanwhile, Toute Belle's brother (identified as 'T.') has arrived and is staying in Guillaume's house; Guillaume plans to send Toute Belle's book (that is, the *Voir dit* itself, at least as much as he has written up to this point in the narrative) with her brother's confessor, and also mentions having composed a rondeau encoding her name (*Dix et sept* (R17)). Meanwhile, Guillaume returns 'the things of hers' that he has used in writing her book, together with an older rondeau, now with new tenor and contratenor parts.[4]

In letter 32, her reply to Guillaume's letter 31, dated 5 May (the year is, implicitly, 1363), Toute Belle recounts how she found in the packet from Guillaume a sealed

[2] Line numbers are those in Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and R. Barton Palmer, eds., *Guillaume de Machaut: Le livre dou voir dit (The Book of the True Poem)* (New York, 1998), which is, however, missing three lines in Guillaume's complaint (after ll.6123, 6141 and 6167). Paul Imbs, Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet and Noël Musso, eds., *Guillaume de Machaut: Le Livre du Voir Dit (Le Dit véridique)* (Paris, 1999) has different lineation because it does not expand the formal repetitions of the lyrics in full. Letters are omitted from the line number count in both editions, since they are written as prose (and thus have different lineation in different sources). The first meeting between Guillaume and Toute Belle occurs between letters 10 and 11; the last occurs between letters 18 and 19.

[3] This incident becomes the inspiration for the last musical piece interpolated in the dit, *Se pour ce muir* (B36), whose refrain is 'Quen lieu de bleu dame vous vestez vert' (Since instead of blue, lady, you are wearing green).

[4] Leech-Wilkinson hypothesises that this is *Puis qu'en oubli* (R18); see Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, eds., *Le livre dou voir dit*, 737, n. 10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

letter that should have gone to him, which she is now returning. It is 'a balade that you'd been sent'. This balade, as it will turn out, is that of T. Paien. Two letters follow that make no reference to this poem, but in his reply dated 17 October (letter 35) Guillaume not only repeats his promise (made on 9 October in letter 33) to send the *Voir dit* itself soon, but says that he is sending the balade by T. Paien and a 'response' that he has done for it, modelled on the same rhymes and versification. He stresses that because Paien went first, he had the advantage and 'took all the fat from the pot'; Guillaume, however, plans to write music for both poems.

The texts of the double balade are not immediately interpolated. First follows Toute Belle's reply (letter 36, 28 October), in which she says that she has had a good look at what he wrote to her about Thomas, now using only the other poet's first name, even though this hasn't yet been given to the reader.[5] She promises to tell Guillaume her thoughts about it either when God pleases that she should see him again, or using as an intermediary, Guillaume's friend Henri (to whom Guillaume has sent a letter via her, which she cannot deliver because she does not currently know where Henri is).

A narrative passage follows, which initiates the promised 'subtives fictions dont ie le pense a parfaire' (subtle fictions with which I think to perfect it [the *Voir dit*])[6] with a string of summaries of the plights of lovers including Pyramus and Thisbé, Leander and Hero, Lancelot and Guinevere, the son of Peter Toussac and his sweet lady, Paris and Helen, and the chatelaine de Vergy.[7] The section ends with a general discussion of metamorphosis, which parallels that which the poem itself is undergoing at this point. Guillaume's reflection on these exemplars leaves him miserable, since they offer no proof that he might see his lady again. This desire to see her – felt acutely early in the poem before the lovers meet, expressed in the interpolated musical balade *Nes com porroit* (B33) and its long epistolary genesis, and partly assuaged by the gift of Toute Belle's *image*[8] – is expressed repeatedly in the absence that follows their meetings, and amply by the shared refrain of the two balades that comprise B34, which considers the sight of the lady more sufficient than a hyperbolical list of classical wonders.[9]

Guillaume's narrative reiterates a point made in letter 35, noting again that T. took all the fat from the pot, explaining that this gave him the advantage of being able to make his soup better. By pointing out the other poet's advantage, Guillaume stresses his own poetic prowess in deploying the same rhymes and metres as the other poet, but he additionally emphasises his musical prowess in making the pair of poems

[5] An early strand of commentary understands the 'Thomas' named in this letter to refer to Toute Belle's brother, who is elsewhere designated by the initials 'Th.' or 'T.' (see the comments about Tarbé's view in Georg Hanf, 'Über Guillaume de Machauts *Voir Dit*', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 22 (1898), 145–96, at 156), although there seems to be no compelling evidence for this.

[6] Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, eds., *Le livre dou voir dit*, 436.

[7] *Ibid.*, ll.6344–6463.

[8] On the genesis of B33, see Ardis Butterfield, 'The Art of Repetition: Machaut's Ballade 33, *Nes qu'on porroit*', *Early Music*, 31/3 (2003), 347–60.

[9] 'Je voy assez puis que ie voy ma dame' (I see enough, because/when I see my lady).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

into 'les chans a .iiij.' (melodies in four parts). It is at this point that both texts of the balade are presented in full. The manuscript copies introduce the first poem, *Quant Theseus*, with *Balade . et ya chant / . Thomas,* or *Balade . Thomas*, confirming that Thomas is indeed Paien's full first name, as was implied in Toute Belle's letter 36.[10] The second poem, *Ne quier*, is preceded by the rubric *Response . G . de Machau*, or *Response par guill~e de Machaut*, which similarly notes the name of the narrator, usually called 'lamant' (the lover) in rubrics, and gives him his full toponym.[11]

In his next letter, number 37 (3 November), Guillaume regrets that Toute Belle has not said anything about his book or judged the two balades, reiterating (for the third time!) that the other poet went first in writing his balade. Guillaume tells her what the audience already knows from the earlier narrative section: that he has had both balade texts put into writing and has set them to music in four parts. He comments further that he has heard these many times and they please him well. He asks her to learn them because he has written them for her. On 5 November (letter 38) Toute Belle replies that she has read his book twice and has ideas for its improvement that she will communicate with him when they next meet; the balades, however, were so good that no improvement could be imagined. What Guillaume makes, says Toute Belle, pleases her more than that which others do, and she is sure that others think the same.

Guillaume's constant restatement of how the pair of balade poems came about – stressing the priority of Thomas's text and thus the difficulty of his own task – together with his proud setting of them both in four voices and his repeated calls for Toute Belle's judgement (which is eventually given), all draw attention to the importance of this exercise and its status as a song competition. But who is the Thomas Paien with whom Guillaume is competing?

[10] The former in **A** and **F**; the latter in **Pm**. The full shelfmarks for the manuscripts here denominated by the standard Machaut sigla are given in Lawrence Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research*, Garland Composer Resource Manuals, 36 (New York, 1995).

[11] The former in **A**; the latter in **Pm**. The rubricator of **F** substitutes the far more usual rubrication 'Rondel' for the word 'response', bizarrely prefacing this with the word 'Balade', but is otherwise similar to **A**. In the music section of the manuscripts the order of the texts is somewhat different. In the earliest copies (**Vg** and **B**) the song is copied across an entire opening, with *Ne quier*, the tenor, and the text residuum for stanzas 2–3 of *Ne quier* on the verso, and *Quant Theseus*, the contratenor, and stanzas 2–3 of *Quant Theseus*'s residuum on the recto. Manuscript **G**, which is in a two-column format, has a similar layout: *Ne quier*, then the tenor, followed by the rest of *Ne quier*'s text, and then *Quant Theseus*, the contratenor, and the rest of *its* text. **A** has a slight variant, with *Ne quier*, the tenor, and contratenor on the verso, and *Quant Theseus* on the recto, followed by the text of stanzas 2–3 for *Quant Theseus*, and then those of *Ne quier*. However, the two legible sources outside the Machaut manuscripts (**Ch** and **PR**) copy the poems in the same order as they are presented in the narrative: *Quant Theseus* first (followed by the tenor), and then *Ne quier* (followed by the contratenor). These sources lack the rest of the text, but this layout is also found in **E**, which then copies the second and third stanzas of the poems in the same order (Thomas's before Machaut's). And, as noted above, this is the order of the text residuum in the music section of **A**, even though *Ne quier* is copied first in the music. These differences in order are intriguing given Guillaume's emphasis in the *Voir dit* on *Quant Theseus* having been written first.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thomas Paien, canon at Reims

The earliest editor of the *Voir dit* mistakenly called Guillaume's competitor–poet *Thibaut* Paien, despite the clear rubrication of the manuscripts.[12] The earliest and best editor of Machaut's musical work has a brief footnote identifying him as a famous Breton jurist at the Sorbonne from the third quarter of the fourteenth century, but without any indication of how Machaut might have been linked to such a man.[13] In a publication from the 1980s, by contrast, Jacqueline Cerquiglini glosses parenthetically that Thomas Paien is 'perhaps Eustache Deschamps', although she gives no reason for this tentative attribution.[14] I have to admit to having formerly doubted that Thomas Paien was a real person at all – his poem is full of pagan references and Thomas is a biblical twin, so I imagined Machaut was simply joking. In this I was dismissing James I. Wimsatt's observation that the two poems exhibit palpable stylistic differences, although he undercuts his own argument by wrongly ascribing the poems, giving *Quant Theseus* to Machaut and *Ne quier* to Thomas.[15] He then comments that *Ne quier* exhibits list-like anaphora and short phrases that are seldom found in Machaut's lyric works. However, it is *Ne quier* that is the *Response . G . de Machau*, so this analysis disproves the very point Wimsatt is trying to make (and, although uncommon in Machaut's lyrics, the use of anaphora in lists can readily be found in his narrative works).[16] Nevertheless, stylistic differences may still be present, and the identification of Thomas Paien with a real historical personage lends weight to Wimsatt's basic assertion.

It is tempting to seek for the identity of Thomas Paien among the denizens of the spheres of influence and employment that Machaut is known to have inhabited. However, not much is known about Machaut's employment history or his residential whereabouts (far less than is commonly thought, in fact).[17] But we do know

[12] Paulin Paris, ed., *Le livre du Voir-dit de Guillame de Machaut: où sont contées les amours de Messire Guillaume de Machaut & de Peronnelle dame d'Armentières, avec les lettres & les réponses, les ballades, lais & rondeaux du dit Guillaume & de ladite Peronnelle* (Paris, 1875), 274. Paris comments that these poems are a 'lutte poétique dans laquelle Machaut avoit bien voulu laisser à son concurrent tout l'avantage' (poetic combat in which Machaut allowed his opponent all the advantage). Asking who this 'Thibaut' is, he notes only that the Rules of the Second Rhetoric treatise does not name him among the poets who flourished at this time (p. 275).

[13] Friedrich Ludwig, ed., *Guillaume de Machaut: Musikalische Werke* (Leipzig, 1926–1954), 2: 69*, note to 57*. This is, in fact, my Thomas B; see n.32 below.

[14] Jacqueline Cerquiglini, 'Le nouveau lyricisme (XIVe–XVe siècle)', in *Précis de littérature française du Moyen Âge*, ed. Daniel Poirion (Paris, 1983), 275–92, at p. 288: 'Thomas Paien (peut-être Eustache Deschamps)'.

[15] James I. Wimsatt, *Chaucer and his French Contemporaries: Natural Music in the Fourteenth Century* (Toronto and Buffalo, 1991), 181–2. The imitation of Machaut's poem by Jehan Froissart and Froissart's by Chaucer (see *ibid*., 182–4) might hint at a more developed competition (see below).

[16] Machaut either decided to sound mischievously un-Machauldian or perhaps even reattributed the poems in the *Voir dit*, generously ascribing his own to Thomas and Thomas's more list-like effort (much closer rhetorically to Froissart's balade on the same refrains; see below) to himself. Decent readings of the effect could be made in either case.

[17] See the corrective to the common assumption of Machaut's residency in Reims before 1358 or 1359 in Roger Bowers, 'Guillaume de Machaut and His Canonry of Reims, 1338–1377', *Early Music History*, 23 (2004), 1–48.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about some of his benefices. Machaut held a canonry at Reims for nearly the last four decades of his life. He was collated (by proxy) to prebend no. 40 at Our Lady of Reims on 28 January 1338, having held the canonry in expectation since 1333.[18] He occupied this dignity until his death in 1377, although he is only known to have been resident in Reims for the single chapter year that started in August 1351, and in 1372, when he is listed as residing in a canonial house outside the cloister.[19] However, if the *Voir dit* is as verisimilitudinous as it seems, it is likely that he had lived there in semi-retirement from around 1360, often lodging royalty, noblemen, and their entourages with whom his former employment had made him familiar.[20]

The Chapter of Reims cathedral, therefore, provides one possible meeting point for Machaut and Thomas, since Pierre Desportes lists one 'Thomas Pagani (Payen)' as no. 287 in his 1998 prosopography of medieval Reims, cross-referring this entry to a man of the same name in the series volume on Rouen, edited in the same year by Vincent Tabbagh.[21] On 5 March 1359, this Thomas Paien, a deacon, was received into the Chapter of Our Lady of Reims, collated to a canonry and (unlike Machaut, simultaneously) to a prebend (no. 22).[22] He disappears from the records in this capacity after 3 February 1364. (Desportes lists additional information for this person after this date, but for reasons given below, I do not think it pertains to the holder of the canonry between 1359 and 1364.) This Thomas Paien, occupier of prebend no. 22, was thus Machaut's contemporary and colleague in the period of, and immediately before, the time in which the *Voir dit* takes place. It seems highly likely, therefore, that this man was the poet who authored *Quant Theseus*. To argue this more fully, it is necessary in what follows to link him to, and differentiate him from, other men of the same name.

[18] Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 19, item 1.6.1g gives the date as 1337. This is corrected in Bowers, 'Guillaume de Machaut', 7 (see especially n. 16), to 1338 NS. Problems of dating are beset by the difference in the start of the year, which was reckoned differently in Reims than at its cathedral; see ibid., 7–8, n. 17.

[19] See Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 50, item 1.18.1a.

[20] This is argued with conviction in Bowers, 'Guillaume de Machaut'. The probable size of Machaut's house as identified in the document from 1372 would have made it ideal for lodging and entertaining nobles and their retinues, but whether he was living there a decade earlier is unknown. In letter 35 in the *Voir dit* Guillaume complains to Toute Belle that he has been prevented from working on her poem (the *Voir dit* itself) because of the comings and goings, late nights and early mornings caused by the presence of the Duke of Bar and several other lords who are staying in his house. Commentary in the early seventeenth-century *Mémoires* of Jehan Rogier refers to Charles, Duke of Normandy meeting with the aldermen of Reims at Machaut's house to attempt to resolve a dispute between the archbishop, Jean de Craon, and Gaucher de Chastillon, the captain of Reims. See Lawrence Earp, 'Machaut's Role in the Production of his Works', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 42 (1989), 461–503, and *Guillaume de Machaut*, 44, item 1.15.1a.

[21] Pierre Desportes, *Diocèse de Reims*, Fasti Ecclesiae Gallicanae: Répertoire prosopographique des évêques, dignitaires et chanoines des diocèses de France de 1200 à 1500, 3 (Turnhout, 1998), 544, no. 287. Vincent Tabbagh, *Diocèse de Rouen*, Fasti Ecclesiae Gallicanae: Répertoire prosopographique des évêques, dignitaires et chanoines des diocèses de France de 1200 à 1500, 2 (Turnhout, 1998), 379, no. 392.

[22] Desportes, *Diocèse de Reims*, 544.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thomas Paien, ducal secretary

The published historical record provides a few other traces of someone who can clearly be identified with the Thomas Paien who held canon prebend no. 22 from 1359 to 1364 (hereafter 'Thomas A'), in a role that links him further with Guillaume de Machaut. Papal supplications made on behalf of a Thomas Paien survive from John, Duke of Berry, a known patron of Machaut.[23] In the first of these, addressed in French to the Roman Curia on 26 August 1361, the beneficiary is referred to as 'our beloved secretary, Master Thomas Paien' and seems destined for a benefice at Rouen.[24] A Latin petition appended to this letter asks that he also receive a canon prebend at Thérouanne, vacated by the death of Gilles Vaguel, notwithstanding any other benefices that might be issued to him.[25]

Neither of these texts offers a link to the canon at Reims, but a third petition by John and his wife Joanna links this same ducal secretary Thomas firmly to the canon of Reims. On 28 December 1362 the Duke and Duchess petitioned the subsequent pope, Urban V, on behalf of Thomas, who is called a favourite and secretary of the Duke.[26] This document refers again to the benefice at Thérouanne and to one at Senlis also granted in expectation under the previous pope but not realised.[27] John and Joanna ask that Thomas be granted instead a canonry in expectation at Cambrai; a grant of one at the church of the Holy Cross is duly recorded.[28] The 'non obstante' clause, in which petitioners generally asked for exceptions to be made to the rules against excessive accumulation of benefices, lists a number of other benefices already held by Thomas. Significantly, the list is headed by the mention of a canonry and prebend in the cathedral church of Reims, thereby proving that the Duke of Berry's secretary is the same Thomas Paien who held prebend no. 22 at Reims

[23] D. Ursmer Berlière O.S.B., *Suppliques d'Innocent VI (1352–1362): textes et analyses*, Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, 5 (Paris, 1911), 714–15, nos. 1764–1765; and Alphonse Fierens, *Suppliques d'Urbain V (1362–1370): textes et analyses*, Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, 7 (Paris, 1914), 139, no. 466. On Machaut and John, Duke of Berry see Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 40–2.

[24] 'suppliant … que luy plaise pourveoir a nostre amé secrétaire maistre Thomas Paien de la prouvende et chancellerie de Rouen, que renoit maistre Benoit Caillemouton nostre clerc, dont il n'a point encore ordené' (supplicating … that it please him to provide to our well-beloved secretary, Master Thomas Paien [some benefit] from the revenues and chancellorship of Rouen, which Master Benoit Caillemouton our clerk has resigned, of which there has not yet been the re-assignment'); Berlière, *Suppliques d'Innocent VI*, 714, no. 1764.

[25] 'Dignemini sibi providere de canonicatu et prebenda ecclesie Morinensis, reservatis et vacantibus per obitum Egidii Vaguel in Romana curia defuncti; non obstantibus beneficiis quibuscumque in vestra vicecancellaria exprimendis' (that upon [Thomas Paien] there be conferred the canonry and prebend of the [cathedral] church of Thérouanne, reserved [to papal collation] and vacant by the death of Gilles Vaguel, deceased within the Roman Curia, notwithstanding whatever other benefices are to be issued [to him] of your vice-chancery); ibid., 715, no. 1765.

[26] 'dilecto suo Thome Pagani, dicti ducis et sui secretario', Fierens, *Suppliques d'Urbain V*, 139, no. 466.

[27] 'cui de canonicatu et prebenda ecclesie Morinensis tunc in curia vacantibus necnon de canonicatu sub expectatione prebende ecclesie Silvanectensis per Innocentium predecessorem vestrum intuitu dicti ducis fuit provisum, licet non venerit ad effectum'; see *ibid.*, 139, no. 466.

[28] *Ibid.*, 139, no. 466.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

between 1359 and 1364.[29] The man who was Machaut's fellow canon was thus also in the same line of business that Machaut himself had pursued in his most recently attested job – a court secretary. Of Thomas A, nothing more is known at present, although given the link with Machaut via both Reims and John, Duke of Berry, a hypothetical situation for the composition of poems set as Machaut's Balade 34 will be advanced at the end of the present article. For now, it is necessary to document other individuals of the same name who must be distinguished from Thomas A if the confusion surrounding his identity is to be cleared up decisively.

A later canon at Reims

Desportes includes under his listing for person no. 263 (that is, as if they pertained to the same individual) details of a Thomas Paien who was collated to a canonry and prebend no. 28 at Reims Cathedral on 15 April 1373. However, by connecting disparate aspects of the documentary record it can be shown decisively that this Thomas (hereafter Thomas B) cannot be the same person. Desportes's entry thus conflates Thomas A and Thomas B.

As mentioned above, Desportes cross-refers his entry to a man of the same name who was collated as a canon at Rouen Cathedral on 24 January 1369. It seems likely that the part of Desportes's entry that pertains to my Thomas B *can* be thus linked, since the death dates in both cases are similar: the listing for him at Rouen notes that their canon Thomas Paien died in December 1374 and at Reims he is absent from records after 17 December 1374.[30] The published prosopography for Reims assumes that the holder of both canon prebends at Reims (no. 22, between 1359 and 1364, and no. 28 from 1373 to 1374) is one man. However, Thomas A is a deacon at Reims in 1359, whereas Thomas B is only a subdeacon at Rouen in 1369. The extreme implausibility of regression from a higher order to a lower one makes it clear that the Reims canon prebend no. 22 and the canon at Rouen are not the same man. As, on the basis of their shared death date, Reims canon no. 28 and the canon at Rouen *are* the same man, this forces the conclusion that the Reims canon-prebends no. 22 and Reims no. 28 were held by two separate individuals of the same name, falsely conflated in Desportes's list.

Further evidence for the career of Thomas B confirms that he could not be the same person as Thomas A. Although this evidence has to be inferred, it is possible to do so with conviction given the post that Thomas B occupied at Reims and the fact that he was collated simultaneously to his canonry and his prebend. Most canons of Reims (including Machaut and his brother) were appointed to a nominal canonry in expectation of a prebend becoming available. They typically waited years. Thomas B,

[29] Thomas A is also listed as in possession of canonries and prebends at the collegiate church of Saint Pierre of Gerberoy in the diocese of Beauvais, the collegiate church of St-Sauveur of Hérisson in the diocese of Bourges, and the rectory of the parish church in Ypreville in the diocese of Rouen ('Remensi, de Gelboredo et de Hericione, Belvacensis et Bituricensis diocesum, ecclesiis canonicatus et prebendas ac parrochialem ecclesiam de Yprevilla, Rothomagensis diocesis, noscitur obtinere'), *ibid.*, 139, no. 466.

[30] Tabbagh, *Diocèse de Rouen*, p. 379 no. 392.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

however, like his earlier namesake, stepped straight into a prebend, thereby receiving both a seat on the Chapter and the right to prebendal and other income. An indication of why this might have been the case – an index of Thomas B's importance and influence – can be gleaned from the fact that when Thomas B assumed his canon prebend he was already occupying the highly prestigious office of 'vidame' (a French contraction of the Latin 'vice-dominus'), the principal lieutenant and deputy of the archbishop of Reims in the diocese.[31] As *vidame*, Thomas B would have had his office headquarters and residence in the Archbishop's palace, immediately adjacent to the cathedral. He resigned on 19 October 1374 and is absent from records after 17 December 1374, by which time he must have died (see above).

The office of *vidame* required very specific qualifications and experience, including a superior qualification in canon law, experience in its application, and knowledge of ecclesiastical administration. Despite its seeming proliferation here, the name 'Thomas Paien' is not common, which means that a single candidate for Thomas B can be advanced. Records of benefices for this individual are given in the entries for the conflated Thomas AB in the prosopographies of Rouen and Reims. And Friedrich Ludwig's complete edition of Machaut's musical works effectively puts Thomas B forward as the candidate for Machaut's Paien in the notes to *Quant Theseus/Ne quier* (B34), pointing to the presence of a man of this name in the published Charters of the University of Paris.[32] Although Ludwig was probably wrong to imagine that the author of *Quant Theseus* was this jurist, one of the documents to which he refers points to a man who is readily identifiable as Thomas B.

A text, published in the third volume of *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis*, documents a legal case between the decretalists of Paris and *magister* Amelius de Brolio (Aymé Dubrueil), which dates from 1386. One 'Thomas Payan' is cited twice in similar lists of 'the most worthy men' who in 'times gone by' read the morning lecture when they were bachelors and not when they proceeded to the doctorate (the qualification necessary for the reading of the morning lecture is the point at issue in the case).[33] The implication from the listing of Thomas's name is that he is now deceased, but still remembered well enough to provide a point of reference with legal and historical force. This Thomas Payan must therefore have been, within living memory, an eminent canon lawyer at Paris, who had proceeded to the degree of Doctor of Laws, and had remained so prominent in his field that his fame endured after his death.

It thus seems reasonable to identify this Thomas Payan with the *vidame* of Reims and canon of Rouen (that is, with Thomas B), who must have been a prominent

[31] Roger Bowers (private communication) notes that the remit of the diocesan 'vidame' was so broad and all-encompassing that in England his equivalent was called simply 'the bishop's Official'.

[32] Ludwig, ed., *Guillaume de Machaut: Musikalische Werke*, 2: 69*, note to p. 57*, contains a typographical error: he cites volume two of the *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis*, but the publication date and page number he gives seems to relate to volume three, which covers the dates 1350–94. He clearly meant to cite Henri Denifle O.P. and Émile Chatelain, *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis* (Paris, 1894), 3: 433 and 438, alongside P. Fournier, 'Harangues d'apparat des Écoles de Droit', in C.V. Langlois, ed., *Suite du Quatorzième siècle*, Histoire littéraire de la France, 36 (Paris, 1927), 521–31 at 526, n. 1.

[33] Denifle and Chatelain, *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis*, 3: 344–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lawyer to occupy such a post and who died in 1374. And given that the Rouen canonry petition gives his surname in the spelling of its Breton form ('Pagani'), it seems also reasonable to identify him with the Thomas Pagani who is cited as doctor *in utroque jure* and lecturer in law at the University of Paris in a number of papal letters pertaining to further benefices.[34] In particular, a document of 24 January 1369 (italics mine) conferred upon

> Thomas *Pagani*, doctor in both laws, *who in the University of Paris read the morning lecture in canon law*, on the recommendation of Guillermus [de la Jugié], cardinal-priest of San Clemente, whose officer and lieutenant in the district of Rouen he is, a canonry and a prebend of the [cathedral] church of Rouen, [both] vacant by the death, without the Roman Curia, of Hugo de Castenea, chaplain of the Holy See, notwithstanding that he holds [the rectory of] the parish church of Nort, in the diocese of Nantes, and – on the authority of letters apostolic – a canonry with expectation of a prebend in the [cathedral] church of Angers, and [notwithstanding] the fruitless letter apostolic by which he holds a canonry in the [cathedral] church of Nantes, and expects a prebend.[35]

It seems likely that Thomas Payan, cited in 1386 as one who had read the morning lecture in law at the University of Paris, is the same man as this Thomas Pagani, who in 1369 is also listed as having 'read the morning lecture in canon law' there, but has now proceeded to the doctorate of both laws. And it has already been argued that because both this canon of Rouen and the canon of Reims with the same name died in December 1374, they are also the same. Therefore, in this plausibly reconstructed career, Thomas Pagani/Payan/Paien (my Thomas B) progressed from being a memorable lecturer in law at Paris, to being the district deputy for a high-ranking cleric and renowned jurisconsult Guillaume de le Jugié in Rouen, to then fulfilling a similar role for the Archbishop of Reims.[36]

[34] Les membres de l'école française de Rome and Marie-Hyacinthe Laurent, *Urbain V (1362–1370): Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, Lettres communes des papes du XIVe siècle, 1: Fascicules I–V (Paris, 1954–1958), 440, no. 3902; Les membres de l'école française de Rome and Michel Hayez, *Urbain V (1362–1370): Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, Lettres communes des papes du XIVe siècle, 2: Fascicules I–IV (Paris, 1964–1972), 348, no. 7533; Michel Hayez *et al.*, *Urbain V (1362–1370): Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, Lettres communes des papes du XIVe siècle, 6 (Rome, 1980), 292, no. 20141; Michel Hayez *et al.*, *Urbain V (1362–1370): Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, Lettres communes des papes du XIVe siècle, 9 (Rome, 1983), 42, no. 23206; 469, no. 27514; 352, no. 27016; 77, no. 25824; 476, no. 27545; 99, no. 25930; Anne-Marie Hayez *et al.*, *Grégoire XI (1370–1378): Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, Lettres communes des papes du XIVe siècle, 1 (Rome, 1992), 369, no. 4201. In subsequent citations here, references to these documents will be cited by Pope and volume number.

[35] *Urbain V*, 9: 42, no. 23206: '*Thome Pagani* utruisque jur. doct., qui in studio Parisien. in jure can. actu de mane legit, consideratione Guillermi, s. Clementis presbyt. card., cujus familiaris et procurator in partibus Rothomagen. existit, canonicatus et prebenda ecc. Rothomagen., vac. per obitum ext. Rom. cur. Hugonis de Castanea, capellani Sed. Apost., conferuntur. non obst. quod parroch. ecclesiam de Norto, Nanneten. dioc., et in eccl. Andegaven. canonicatum sub expect. preb. auctoritate litt. apost. obtineat, cassis litt. apost. per quas in eccl. Nanneten. canonicatum obtinet et prebendam expectat.'

[36] Guillermus de la Jugié (ca. 1317/1318–1374), nephew of Pope Clement VI, was trained as a lawyer. See http://www.fiu.edu/~mirandas/bios1342.htm#Lajugie, which lists its sources.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Various other instances of patronage may now be associated with Thomas B, the earliest of which by sheer chance adds a further proof that Thomas B and Thomas A are distinct. On 28 December 1362 there was conferred upon Thomas Pagani (that is, Thomas B), 'canon of Nantes, licentiate in both laws and a lecturer in decretals at [the University of] Paris, a canonry of the [cathedral] church of Nantes, with reservation of a prebend, notwithstanding that he was known to hold [the rectory of] the parish church of Nort, in the diocese of Nantes'.[37] This prebend was duly conferred on 22 November 1368 and the canonry and prebend were resigned by 25 June 1370.[38] The date of the original petition, 28 December 1362, is also the exact day that another document records Thomas A as being the secretary of the Duke of Berry. The serendipitous coincidence of the dates makes it impossible that Thomas A and Thomas B are the same man, since one is secretary to the Duke of Berry while the other is lecturer in decretals at the University of Paris, jobs which could not realistically be discharged simultaneously by the same man.[39]

Other Thomas Paiens

One other candidate who has been advanced as Machaut's Thomas Paien can also be differentiated from both Thomas A and Thomas B. In their edition of the *Voir dit*, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and R. Barton Palmer report Ludwig's proposal that Paien is a teacher of law at the Sorbonne in the third quarter of the century (my Thomas B) and then add that:

> since it is a relatively unusual name he may also be the Thomas Paien referred to in an order of Pope Urban V, dated 24 February 1364. That Paien enjoyed benefices from the Benedictine monastery of St Stephen at Fontenailles, north of Bayeux, and died on 30 December 1363.[40]

[37] *Urbain V*, 1: 440, no. 3902 '*Thome Pagani*, can. Nanneten., in utr. jure licent., Parisius decretales actu legenti, canonicatus eccl. Nannenten., cum reserv. prebende, conferatur, non obst. quod parroch. eccl. de Nort, Nanneten. dioc., noscatur obtinere'.

[38] *Urbain V*, 9: 469, no. 27514. This correctly notes Thomas B as a subdeacon.

[39] A further piece of evidence records on 14 January 1363 the conferral, 'following examination, upon Thomas Pagani, rector of the parish church of Nort, in the diocese of Nantes, licentiate in laws, bachelor of canon law and a student of the university of Paris, a canonry of the [cathedral] church of Angers, with reservation of a prebend', *Urbain V*, 2: 348 no. 7533; 'Episcopo Belvacen. mandatur ut, post examinationem, *Thomas Pagani*, rect. parroch. eccl. de Norco, Nanneten. dioc., licent. in leg. in jure can. bac. et in studio Parisiensi studens, de canonicatu eccl. Andegaven., cum reserv. prebende, provideatur'. The prebend was duly conferred on 1 April 1368; see *Urbain V*, 9: 476, no. 27545. Thomas B is almost certainly the individual mentioned in Ludwig's other cited authority (Fournier, 'Harangues d'apparat', 526, n. 1) as the author of *repetitiones* contained in manuscripts of legal teaching materials and 'harangues' associated with the University of Paris in the latter half of the fourteenth century.

[40] Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, eds., *Le livre dou voir dit*, 740, n. 15, referencing François Avril *et al.*, *Urbain V (1362–1370): Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, Lettres communes des papes du XIVe siècle, 3, Fascicules I–II (Rome, 1974–1976), 98. Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer cite the only entry for Thomas Paien listed in the *Lettres communes* index for this Pope on p. 541 of vol. 11. They appear to have overlooked the many more listings on the previous page for Thomas Pagani, from whom the editors of *Lettres communes* have very sensibly differentiated Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer's Paien.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Given that the jurist and later canon of Reims (Thomas B) died in December 1374 and the ducal secretary and earlier canon of Reims (Thomas A) is still alive and attested up to 3 February 1364, the Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer Thomas is clearly neither man, but a third figure about whom nothing else is known (Thomas X).

One further candidate can also be excluded, despite scholars' attempts to link him to Thomas B. In their notes to the 1386 reference to Thomas B's reading of the morning lecture at Paris, the editors of the *Chartularium* cross-refer the reader to one 'Thomas Paganni' in document no. 703 of the preceding volume (covering the earlier years 1286–1350).[41] This document lists 'Thomas Paganni' among a string of names of masters and scholars of the University of Paris who were appealing to the Holy See for more time to make tender of an extraordinary payment, equivalent to each individual's officially sworn full burse, that was required by the University within one week of its published appeal for funds on 1 May 1313.[42] Ludwig, perhaps deliberately, silently excluded this cross-reference from his footnote attempt at identifying Machaut's Thomas Paien with the lawyer in the document from 1386. It does indeed seem unlikely, despite the *Chartularium*'s attestation, that the Paganni who is already at Paris in 1313 and the Payan who is recently dead in 1386 are the same person. If they were, it would imply that the archdiocese of Reims had appointed a *vidame* who was already in his seventies. As the discharge of such wide-ranging duties would require vigour, energy, and good health, this possibility seems remote. It seems likely, instead, that the 1313 reference is to another, older Thomas Paien/Paganni ('Thomas C'), possibly an older relation of Thomas B, and, like him, a Breton lawyer.

If one further documentary trace may be associated with this Thomas C it would prove that he is distinct from the Thomas B who is cited in the 1386 document. On 18 April 1335 a benefice in the cathedral church of Dol in the custody of Jean, the Bishop, and of the Chapter was collated upon 'Magister Thomas Pagani, doctor of laws and licentiate in decrees, born of persons most loyal and most noble, rector of the parish church of Pleine-Fougères in the diocese of Dol'.[43] As this individual already held a doctorate in 1335, he cannot be the same man as Thomas B, who was still only a Bachelor in 1363, but he might easily be the same person who is named in the list of masters and students at Paris in 1313. If this is so, Thomas B and Thomas C are even more clearly generationally distinguished from one another.

[41] Denifle and Chatelain, *Chartularium universitatis parisiensis*, 2: 161–6. A more recent edition is given in William J. Courtenay, 'Foreign Scholars at Paris in the Early Fourteenth Century: The Crisis of 1313', *History of Universities*, 15 (1997–1999), 47–74, at 59–74.

[42] Such collections were generally organised to offset costs arising from legal defence of university privileges. However, both the reason for this particular payment and the result of the appeal are unknown. 'Thomas Paganni' is first in the list of signatories on the last day, 11 May 1313; see Courtenay, 'Foreign Scholars at Paris in the Early Fourteenth century', 64.

[43] J.-M. Vidal, *Benoit XII (1334–1342): Lettres communes analysées d'aprés les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, 1 (Paris, 1903), 77, no. 755: 'In eccl. Dolen., obtentu Joannis, ep. i, et capit., *mag. Thomae Pagani*, L.D. et in decr. lic., de fidelissimis et nobilibus procreato, paroch. eccl. de Plenafilgeria, Dolen. di., (50 lib. tur.) rectori'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Whether Thomas C might also be the Thomas Paien who died in 1364 (Thomas X) is more difficult to assess. The geographical area is roughly right, and 1364 is a plausible death date for someone who must have been born at the end of the thirteenth century to have been at Paris in 1313, but there is no more concrete evidence than that. Regardless of whether Thomas X is Thomas C, it seems likely, however, that the lawyers Thomas B and Thomas C were related. Thomas C was a lawyer and nobleman; Thomas B's more illustrious legal-administrative career would certainly have been facilitated if he were also noble.

Of the two Thomas Paiens who overlapped with Machaut as canons at Reims, only Thomas B is known to have resided in Reims when Machaut was also resident (in the early 1370s – a period well after the composition of the *Voir dit*). However, Thomas A appears to be a far better candidate for the authorship of *Quant Theseus* because he and Machaut had another potential arena in which they might have met. Moreover, this was an arena in which poetry and music would have been positively nurtured: the court of John, Duke of Berry. John was to become one of the most artistically inclined members of the French royal house in this period, and Paien is cited as his secretary at dates close in time to the setting, and probably not long before the composition, of Machaut's *Voir dit*.[44]

Machaut's employment history after the death of his only securely known employer, John, Duke of Luxembourg and King of Bohemia, in 1346 is sketchy.[45] Although a good case can be made for service with Charles of Navarre until around 1358, no firm evidence for Machaut's employment after this date has come to light. However, many of his patrons (as distinct from his employers) are known from references to them in his works. Although there is some scholarly dissatisfaction with the anagram that supposedly names the dedicatee, the patronage of the Duke of Berry in regard to Machaut's poem *Le dit de la fonteinne amoureuse (The Book of the Fountain of Love)* is widely accepted.[46] And the story the poem depicts mirrors a historical situation concerning John, Duke of Berry in 1360.

The *Fonteinne* depicts a noble lover whom the poet–narrator overhears sleeplessly complaining in an adjacent room. Ultimately the narrator forges an intimate relationship with this lover in order to comfort him in the face of his impending exile overseas away from his beloved. At the end of the poem, the narrator accompanies the lover to a seaport, reciting poetry and singing songs on the way. After distributing alms, the lover embarks for captivity, singing a final rondeau, leaving his land and jewels to the narrator, who has written everything down.[47]

In June 1360, when the nineteen-year-old John, Duke of Berry married Jeanne d'Armagnac, he already knew that he would be required to travel to London as a

[44] See Françoise Autrand, *Jean de Berry: l'art et le pouvoir* (Paris, 2000); Marcel Thomas, *The Golden Age: Manuscript Painting at the Time of Jean, Duc de Berry* (London, 1979); and Léopold Delisle, *Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907), vol. 2, which is subtitled 'Inventaire des livres ayant appartenu aux rois Charles V et Charles VI et à Jean, duc de Berry'.

[45] See Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*; and Bowers, 'Guillaume de Machaut'.

[46] See Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 40, n. 157 and 220–2.

[47] See the edition of the text and translation in R. Barton Palmer, ed., *Guillaume de Machaut: The Fountain of Love (La Fonteinne Amoureuse) and Two Other Love Vision Poems* (New York and London, 1993).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hostage under the terms of the treaty of Brétigny. Accordingly, he travelled to Calais for the final conferences held there between 9 and 24 October, eventually signing the treaty and leaving for London, where he remained for over four years.[48] John's situation and that of the lover in the *Fonteinne* are clearly intended to be parallel, and Machaut's typically verisimilitudinous first-person narrator figure makes it tempting to speculate that Machaut was at least in John's entourage at this period, if not directly in his service.

Knowledge of the possible identity of Machaut's co-author Thomas Paien makes the homosocial poetic competition of B34 especially clear, since Machaut and Thomas are peers. Notwithstanding their different posthumous reception as poets, Machaut and Thomas were in many ways parallel figures: both were clerics, secretaries to the highest nobility, writers and sometimes poets in receipt of ecclesiastical benefices, specifically cathedral canonries. Machaut was employed by King John of Bohemia as successively an almoner, notary and secretary; he possibly served Charles of Navarre in a similar capacity after John's death in 1346 until some time in the 1350s. In fourteenth-century royal courts these ostensibly dryly administrative functions were in reality distinctly cultural. As almoner, Machaut would have been responsible for a wide range of duties, including gift-giving, counsel and perhaps also the organisation of religious services.[49] As Malcolm Vale has pointed out, court culture in this period seems paradoxically to cherish lavish display, cultural artefacts and pleasure, yet to revere austerity.[50] The court almoner – Machaut's initial job description – was responsible for the intersection of culture and religion at court in so far as cultural artefacts were frequently commissioned as part of charitable giving – whether to serve as purses for monetary gifts or as gifts of charity in their own right (such as silverware, vestments, or furniture).[51] Purposeful rejection of extravagant display in response to the rhythm of the liturgical year was connected to the frequent appointment of mendicants or austere religious as royal confessors and chaplains. Mendicancy's asceticism was given meaning by the

[48] During this period, John was given safe conduct to travel back to France on a number of occasions and minstrels from his court also travelled between France and England to aid in the administration of his estates. See Andrew Wathey, 'The Peace of 1360-1369 and Anglo-French Musical Relations', *Early Music History*, 9 (1989), 129–74, at 136; Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 41; and Françoise Lehoux, *Jean de France, duc de Berri: sa vie, son action politique (1340–1416)*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1966–1968), 1: 160ff.

[49] Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 17, item 1.6.1b. For a recent study of the function of French royal almoners, see Xavier de la Selle, *Le service des âmes à la cour: confesseurs et aumôniers des rois de France du XIIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris, 1995). Malcolm Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe 1270-1380* (Oxford, 2001), 258–9, points out that court culture's diversity in this period means that it 'has as much to do with the use and function of textiles, plate, and jewellery, the role of ritual and ceremony, and the distribution of alms and oblations, as with books, panel and wall paintings, music, and the other arts. "High" art was so often an integral part of these activities that it makes little sense to consider it apart from them'. The centrality of Largesse in Machaut's courtly doctrine seems, to me, a reflection of the formative role of the almoner in his thinking. See Elizabeth Eva Leach, 'Guillaume de Machaut, Royal Almoner: *Honte, paour* (B25) and *Donnez, Signeurs* (B26) in Context', *Early Music*, 38 (forthcoming, 2010).

[50] Vale, *The Princely Court*, 168–9.

[51] See la Selle, *Le service des âmes*. An almoner's purse is pictured in Vale, *The Princely Court*, before p. 271 as plate 37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

presence of material affluence, because by rejecting it for specific periods at court the making of vows or the observance of penitential periods of the church year could be given extraordinary truth value.[52] Machaut is not the only almoner from this period known to have written vernacular poetry and nor is he the only rather literary secretary.[53] Given that both Thomas and Machaut were employed in highly literate roles within court circles, it seems plausible that their employer(s) (or they themselves) might have had the idea of making a noble entertainment out of a poetic competition.

A song competition of 1360?

Guillaume's constant emphasis on Thomas having gone first (which he says three times) and taken all the fat from the pot (twice) is a thinly veiled (and probably parodic) example of the male–male striving ordinarily inherent in the poetics of courtly love: ostensibly about the lady whom the poems praise, the poems and their setting are actually an all-male competition, addressed back and forth between two men.[54] Simon Gaunt has commented on the way that the assertion of masculinity in the context of courtly literature leads men to brandish poems like swords, and he notes that this kind of competition tends to focus specifically, as here, on lyric exchanges.[55]

At the beginning of the *Voir dit*, Guillaume receives rondeaux by Toute Belle and instructs her in the art of poetry by producing rondeaux on the same rhymes and using the same verse structure. In B34 Machaut has done the same with the much more challenging form of the balade, showing his poetic superiority to a more accomplished versifier than Toute Belle, Thomas Paien (both poems are given in Fig. 1). Thomas's poem mentions Theseus, Hercules and Jason in its first line as a way of setting up the basic hyperbole: that to see the lady is better than the wide world seen by its most famed adventurers. In response, Guillaume adorns *all three* stanzas with evidence of his education, listing Absalom, Ulysses, Samson, Delilah, Argus, Pygmalion, Solomon, Phoebus, Venus, Menon and Jupiter. Guillaume's allusions are wider in terms of sources (biblical as well as classical), provide comparisons to things other than the world (Absalom's beauty, Samson's strength and so on), and are simply greater in number.

[52] *Ibid.*, 168–9.

[53] *Ibid.*, 236 notes precedents for almoners being involved in the court's literary life; on the specific case of Nicole de Gavrelle, see Janet F. van der Meulen, 'De panter en de aalmoezenier: Dichtkunst rond het Hollands-Henegouwse hof', in *Een zoet akkoord: Middeleeuwse lyriek in de Lage Landen*, ed. Frank Willaert (Amsterdam, 1992), 93–108 and 343–8. For a later fourteenth-century example, see Guy Ouy, 'Le songe et les ambitions d'un jeune humaniste parisien vers 1395', in *Miscellanea di studi e richerche sul Quattrocento francese*, ed. F. Simone (Turin, 1967), 357–407.

[54] See Ruth Mazo Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2003), 20–66 ('Mail Bonding: Knights, Ladies, and the Proving of Manhood').

[55] Simon Gaunt, *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature* (Cambridge, 1995), 149–50, notes that 'the poem is a symbol of virility which enables the poet to assert his masculinity' and that 'linguistic prowess as a sign of masculinity is associated particularly with the lyric'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THOMAS PAIEN
Quant theseus **hercules** et **iason**
chercherent tout et terre et **mer parfonde**.
Pour acroistre leur pris et leur renom
et pour veoir bien **tout** lestat **du monde**.
Moult furent dignes donnour
mais quant ie voy de beaute lumble flour.
Assevis sui de tout si que **par mame.**
Je voy assez puis que je voy ma dame.

Car en veant sa biaute sa facon
et son maintieng qui de tout bien seuronde.
Je y preng assez pour en devenir bon
car le grant bien de lui en moy redonde.
Par la grace de fine amour
qui me contraint a hair deshonnour
et tout vice si puis dire sanz blasme.
Je voy assez puis que je voy ma dame.

Veoir ne quier la doree toison
ne les Yndes ne de rouge **mer onde.**
Naux infernaux penre guerre ou tenson
pour esloingnier le regart de **la blonde**.
Dont me vient ioie et baudour
et doulz penser; mais tieng pour le meilleux
qua tout compter et bien peser a drame.
Je voy assez puis que je voy ma dame.

When Theseus, Hercules and Jason travelled everywhere on land and across the deep sea, to increase their worth and their renown and to see clearly the state of all the world, right worthy were they of honour. But when I see the beauty of the humble flower, I have everything I need, by my soul, *I see enough, because I see my lady.*
For, seeing her beauty, her manner and her bearing which with sweetness overflows, I bear in me the imprint that can make me good for the great good which in her abounds by the grace of true love which obliges me to hate dishonour and all vice; so I may say without blame, *I see enough, because I see my lady.*
I do not care to see the golden fleece nor the Indies nor a wave of the Red Sea, nor wage war nor quarrel in the world below, if I thereby lose sight of that fair blonde from whom comes all joy and glee and sweet melancholy. No, I hold it for the best that, all counted out and weighed dram by dram, *I see enough, because I see my lady.*

GUILLAUME DE MACHAUT
Ne quier veoir la biaute dabsalon
ne dulixes le sens et la faconde.
Ne esprouver la force de sanson
ne regarder que dalida le tonde.
Ne cure nay par nul tour
des yeux argus ne de ioie greignour
car pour plaisance et sanz aide dame
Je voy assez puis que je voy ma dame.

De lymage que fist pymalyon
elle navoit pareille ne seconde.
Mais la belle qui ma en sa prison.
.C. mille foiz est plus bele et plus monde.
Cest uns droiz fluns de doulcour
qui puet assez garir toute doulour.
Dont cilz a tort qui de dire me blasme.
Je voy assez puis que je voy ma dame.

Si ne me chant du sens de salemon,
ne que phebus en termine ou responde.
Ne que venus sen mesle ne mennon
que iupiter fist muer en aronde.
Car je dy quant je laour
aim et desir sers et craing et honnour
et que samour sur toute riens men flame.
Je voy assez, puis que. [je voy ma dame.]

I don't seek to see the beauty of Absalom, nor Ulysses' guile and eloquence; I don't want to test the strength of Samson or watch Delilah as she trims his locks, nor yearn by any trick for Argus' eyes or for greater joy – because for pleasure and without any aid, *I see enough, because I see my lady.*
The statue that Pygmalion made had neither like nor peer; but the beauty who holds me in thrall is a hundred thousand times more beautiful and pure; she is a very river of sweetness who knows the cure for every ill. Hence he is wrong who blames me for saying this *I see enough, because I see my lady.*
I don't give a fig for the wisdom of Solomon or whether Phoebus stands mute or responds or whether Venus gets in the act, or Menon, whom Jupiter changed to a swallow. For I say of her whom I adore, love and desire, serve and fear and honour and whose love above all else envelopes me in flame, *I see enough, because I see my lady.*

JEHAN FROISSART
Ne quier veoir Medee ne **Jason,**
Ne trop avant lire ens ou mapemonde,
Ne le musique Orpheüs ne le son,
Ne **Hercules** qui **cerqua tout le monde,**
Ne Lucresse qui tant fu bonne et monde,
Ne Penelope ossi, car, par Saint Jame,
Je voi assés, puis que je voi ma dame.

Ne quier veoir Vergile ne Platon,
Ne par quel art eurent si grant faconde,
Ne Leander qui tout sans naviron
Nooit en **mer** qui rade est et **parfonde,**
Tout pour l'amour de sa dame **la blonde,**
Ne nul rubis, saphir, perle ne jame:
Je voi [assés, puis que je voi ma dame.]

Ne quier veoir le cheval Pegason
Qui plus tost ceurt en l air ne vole aronde,
Ne l'ymage que fist Pymalion,
Qui n'eut parel premiere ne seconde,
Ne Oleüs qui en **mer** boute l'**onde.**
S'on voelt savoir pour quoi, pour ce, **par m ame**
Je voi [assés, puis que je voi ma dame.]

I don't seek to see Medea or Jason, read more about the map of the world, or the music of Orpheus and its sound, or Hercules who travelled the whole world, or Lucretia who was so lovely and virtuous, or Penelope either, because, by St. James, *I see enough, when I see my lady.*
I don't seek to see Vergil or Plato, or [know] what art gave them eloquence, or Leander who without a row-boat swam the sea that is deep and turbulent, all for the love of the blonde [Hero], nor [do I seek to see] rubies, sapphires, pearls or [other] gems; *I see enough, when I see my lady.*
I don't seek to see the horse Pegasus who runs quicker through the air than a swallow flies, or the peerless and matchless image that Pygmalion made, or Aeolus who blows the waves on the sea, and if anyone wants to know why not, it is because – by my soul – *I see enough, when I see my lady.*

Fig. 1 Shared text between the balades of Guillaume de Machaut, Jehan Froissart, and Thomas Paien on the refrain, 'I see enough, because I see my lady'.

The musicalisation of the pair of poems, however, tops off their competitive ranking, not just in the fact of it alone (Paien's was only a spoken poem before), but in the way in which the counterpoint of the setting ranks the two texts. Machaut usually deployed the setting of different verbal texts simultaneously in a musical context – polytextuality – in motets, where the layering of secular and sacred references forms inter- and intra-textual dialogue.[56] His use of the technique in songs is much rarer (although still more frequent than in those of his contemporaries). In his earliest polytextual balade, *Sans cuer/Dame/Amis* (B17), the three parts sing the same melody, staggered as a *chace*, the polytextual nature staging a dialogue whose enactment is spatialised by the canon. Like B17, B34 is a dialogue, but more of a writerly than a performative one, with a hierarchy implied between the two poems that is nevertheless only evident in their musical setting.[57]

Guillaume places Thomas's poem in the top voice, a voice which is highest in pitch but fourth (that is, last) in importance in the contrapuntal hierarchy.[58] So the voice carrying Guillaume's poetry might lie 'humbly' beneath that of Thomas's at major cadences, but Thomas's is a triplum-type voice in terms of its contrapuntal function, whereas Guillaume's is the true cantus: it carries the octave sonority at major cadence points and has a slightly larger overall range. A three-part performance that excluded Thomas's text would be theoretically possible; a three-part performance that excluded Machaut's wouldn't. Machaut's text could stand alone but Thomas's requires all three other vocal parts – Machaut's poem and his music – for it to be sung at all. All musical and textual phrases end together, and much of the syllabic declamation is aligned so that, almost syllable for syllable, Guillaume's text effaces and sonically obscures that of his rival. What can be heard in performance is very little of either man's verbal dexterity, but rather a consonant four-part musical structure by Guillaume de Machaut.[59]

There is evidence that the poetry competition that Machaut musicalised as a way of winning it went beyond the two poems here, and might indeed have had a historical occasion at its inception. A balade by Jehan Froissart, *Ne quier veoir Medee ne Jason*, shares the same refrain as both texts in B34 and its incipit combines the

[56] On the meanings of the polytextuality of the motets, see Jacques Boogaart, '"O Series Summe Rata": De Motetten van Guillaume de Machaut: De Ordening van het Corpus en de Samenhang van Tekst en Muziek', Ph.D. diss., University of Utrecht (2001); Thomas Brown, 'Another Mirror of Lovers? Order, Structure and Allusion in Machaut's Motets', *Plainsong and Medieval Music,* 10 (2001), 121–34; and Anne Walters Robertson, *Guillaume de Machaut and Reims: Context and Meaning in his Musical Works* (Cambridge, 2002).

[57] I consider the meanings of polytextuality in Machaut's songs in more detail in Elizabeth Eva Leach, 'Music and verbal meaning: Machaut's polytextual songs', *Speculum* (forthcoming).

[58] The start of the refrain is a case in point; the voice carrying Thomas's poem is in a contrapuntal relation with the third voice, the contratenor, rather than with the tenor. For a more thorough exposition of these points, see Elizabeth Eva Leach, 'Machaut's Balades with Four Voices', *Plainsong and Medieval Music,* 10/2 (2001), 47–79, at 58–65.

[59] Machaut's contemporaries noticed Machaut's own promotion of his poetic prowess in this piece, despite the pose of humility. Many of its features recur in the only other double balade in four parts to have survived from this period and which is clearly based on it, the *déploration* of Machaut's death by F. Andrieu and Eustache Deschamps.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opening of Guillaume's poem with the first rhyme word in Thomas's. Moreover, its entire text continues this fusion so that it seems that Froissart is almost certainly responding to both poems at once. (Fig. 1 shows text shared between Froissart and Thomas in bold and between Froissart and Guillaume underlined.) Of course, Froissart could have come across these texts together in their musical setting, but he might also have known them from an earlier occasion when he, Machaut, and Thomas might conceivably have been at court together. My suggestion for this occasion relies once more on the Berry connection between Machaut and Thomas, and the situation that might have prompted Machaut's composition of the *Fonteinne* for John. This connection forges a link to Froissart, who not only wrote a poem using the same refrain as the two set in B34, but also wrote a poem modelled jointly on Machaut's *Fonteinne* and *Voir dit*.

Jehan Froissart's poem *Espinette amoureuse (The Hawthorn Bush of Love)* is widely recognised to have two principal Machauldian models: the *Voir dit*, which also presents a verisimilitudinous love affair, and the *Fonteinne*.[60] Most of these similarities are based on the narrative events and overall conceit of the poem, but some are lexical. In particular, Froissart's *Espinette*, like Machaut's *Fonteinne*, uses the unusual word 'avolés' (foreigners, refugees) to describe the people populating the seaport from which the lover (in Machaut's poem) or lover–narrator (in Froissart's) departs. James I. Wimsatt has suggested that this conscious imitation of Machaut points to both Froissart and Machaut being at Calais with John, Duke of Berry in October 1360.[61] Although the evidence dates only from 1362–3, it is entirely possible that Thomas Paien might well already have been in John's service in 1360 and, if so, as secretary would have been in his immediate entourage.[62] If the situation in *Fonteinne* is factual as well as verisimilar, it would indicate that Machaut, too, accompanied John to Calais. The conferences at Calais prior to John's actual departure lasted three weeks, plenty of time for serious (morally efficacious as well as entertaining) recreational competition between those royal servants with verbal facility; the *Fonteinne* documents a fair amount of poetry, both said and sung, on the way to the lover's final embarkation point. Thomas's and Froissart's poems have references to journeying over the sea, which would have been of direct relevance to John and his court. Moreover, the lover in *Fonteinne* learns the quintessential Machauldian courtly love lesson: that one can 'see' the lady when one is absent from her by imprinting her image in memory – the 'Souvenir' – so as to produce 'souffissance' – loving (self-)sufficiency. This situation is neatly summarised by the refrain that all three balades share: 'I see enough because I see my lady' and would

[60] An edition and translation of Froissart's poem can be found in Kirsten M. Figg and R. Barton Palmer, eds., *Jean Froissart: An Anthology of Narrative and Lyric Poetry* (New York and London, 2001), 103–265. See also Wimsatt, *Chaucer and his French Contemporaries*, 180–1.

[61] *Ibid.*, 180–1.

[62] The evidence relating John, Duke of Berry and Thomas A is from the period of John's captivity and refers to Thomas as an established and well-loved secretary. It seems unlikely that John would have thought it wise to make a new appointment while abroad; those servants attested during his captivity would most likely have been those already in his employ.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have been a potentially useful form of comfort to give to a young man about to go into exile without his wife.[63]

In the *Voir dit*, written a short time after *Fonteinne*, Machaut's alter ego, the narrator–poet Guillaume, distinguishes between the verbal text of the two balade poems by himself and Thomas, which he says are old material, and his new four-voice musical setting of them together.[64] Perhaps the sealed and unopened copy that is misdirected to Toute Belle (letter 32) was sent in response to Machaut's own request for a written copy of Thomas's old poem during the period he was collecting materials for the *Voir dit*. It would then have been easy for Machaut to re-use its polyvalent theme of seeing the lady as part of his new poem, in the process capping his competitive poetic response with a musical one that – as far as we know – his rival could not match. That this betrays a mixture of adulation (treating Thomas's poem seriously, imitating its structure, and taking time to set it to music) and self-promotion (setting it inextricably with his own matching verse in a musical texture and notation of the utmost complexity and refinement), could not be more typical of Machaut's artistic persona.

Appendix

Passages surrounding the presentation of *Quant Theseus/Ne quier* (B34) in the *Voir dit*

Letter and line numbers relate to the edition of Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer (1998).

Letter 31 Guillaume 28 September [1363]

[Worrying that Toute Belle has forgotten him, Guillaume recounts a dream that her image dressed in green and turned its head from him. He says Toute Belle's brother has visited him after mass in the morning on St Michael's day, staying with his party in his house. He says he has composed the music for her name-rondeau and will send his book (three times as much as *Morpheus* [i.e. *Fonteinne*]) with her brother's chaplain. He sends back her chest with all the 'things' that he has now put in the proper place in her book: her brooch, beads, and balade – he will send its (the balade's) peer with the first person going her way and is sending a rondel composed some time ago with newly written tenor and contratenor parts.]

The lady's complaint follows.

Letter 32 Toute Belle 5 May [1363]

[Defends herself against charges of forgetting him. She knows the rondel with music well, having seen it before, and begs for others as well as virelays.]

[63] This specificity, however, would not have precluded the lady being interpreted allegorically so as to represent any range of people, things, places or abstract ideas associated with home for any number of the extended *familia* about to embark for England.

[64] Leech-Wilkinson and Palmer, eds., *Le livre dou voir dit*, l.6491: 'De ces .ij. dis lonc temps a fais'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jay trouve en la laiette que vous mavies envoie unes lettres clauses qui aloient a vous . si les ouvri pour ce que ie ne savoie pour quoy vous les avies envoies . et trouvay que cestoit une balade que on vous envoioit . si la vous renvoie pour ce que ie pense que vous ne la veistes onques . car elle est encores toute sellee.

I found in the container you sent me a sealed letter that should have gone to you. If I have opened it, it is because I did not know why you had sent it and I found that it was a balade that you'd been sent. If I send it back, it is because I think that you never saw it because it was still sealed.

Letter 33 Guillaume 9 October

Guillaume is with the king's people and the Duke of Bar and has not been able to attend to other things. He won't send her name-rondeau because he hasn't yet heard the music. Says he will soon send her the manuscript of the book so far.

Letter 34 Toute Belle 28 October

Toute Belle pardons Guillaume.

Letter 35 Guillaume 17 October

[The Duke of Bar and several other lords have been staying in Guillaume's house, which has prevented him working on the book. He is now sending her the book, which he wants back soon. It will be called *Le livre dou voir dit*. Sends her the music of her name-rondeau, which the strangers staying with him in Reims have already heard. Guillaume will be in St Quentin from All Saints and from there on to the Duke of Normandy, Charles the Dauphin.]

Je vous envoie la balade .T. paien et la response que ie li fais . la quele ie fis en present. Mais il fist devant . et prist toute la graisse dou pot a son pooir . et ie fist apres . si en iugerez sil vous plaist . mais vraiement il avoit lavantage de trop . et toute voie ie y feray chant . si ne les bailliez a nelui ie vous en pri .

I am sending you the balade by T. Paien and the response that I did for it, which I did just now. But he did it earlier and took all the grease from the pot that he could and I did it afterwards so judge if you please, but really he had the total advantage and anyway I am going to make it into a song as long as you don't give them to anyone, I beg you.

[Passages on Pyramus and Thisbe, Leander, Lancelot, Peter Toussac, Paris and Helen, Chastellain de Vergy]

Letter 36 Toute Belle, 28 October

Et si tost comme ie y seray ie lescrirai a mon frere qui le vous fera savoir . Et aussi vous pri ie que vous li escrivez de vostre estat et li mandes quil le me face savoir . Jay bien veu ce que vous mavez escript de thommas . Et quant il plaira a dieu que ie vous voie . ie vous

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

diray tout ce quil en fu . Et aussi le vous sara bien a dire .H. Jay receu . unes lettres . les queles vous envoiez au dit henri . Mais ie ne li envoierai mie pour ce que ie ne say ou il est .

And as soon as I'm there [at a new lodging], I will write it to my brother who will make it known to you. And also I pray you that you write to him of your state and ask him to make it known to me. I have had a good look at what you wrote me about Thomas. And when it pleases God that I see you, I will tell you all that there was in this. And also .H. will surely tell you about it. I have received a letter which you sent to the said Henri, but I cannot send it to him at all because I do not know where he is.

[She is not yet ready to send the book back to him.]

ll.6464-93

A toutes ces choses musoie	I was thinking on all these things
Et es exemples me miroie	(And from the examples that I have told
Que iay dit sont avenu	I wondered how they had happened
Et quon voit souvent et menu	As one sees time and again)
Mais rien ni povoie trouver	But nothing could I there find
Que pour bon peusse prouver	That I might take as good proof
Ad fin que ma dame veisse	That in the end I would see my lady.
Si me pensay que iescrisisse	So I thought that I would write
Et que devers elle envoiasse	And that I would send after her
Pour essaier sen li trouvasse	To try if I could discover in her
Par quelle y peust conseil mettre	That by which she might give me advice.
Si fis escrire ceste lettre	So I wrote this letter
Mais noubliay pas ces .ij. choses	But I did not forget the two things
Qui furent en ma lettre encloses	That were enclosed in my letter
Et furent mises par escript	And had been placed in writing.
.T. fist devant plus nen escript	.T. did his first but wrote no more of it
Et le mieus et le plus quil pot	And as well and much as he could
Prist toute la graisse dou pot	He took all the fat from the pot
Si quil ot dassez lavantage	So that he had quite the advantage
De faire millour son potage	Of making his soup better.
Et ie respondi par tel rime	And I responded in such rhyme
Et par tel metre comme il rime	And in such meter as he rhymed;
Et si ay fait les chans a .iiij.	And then I did the melodies in four parts
Pour elle deduire et esbatre	To please and delight her.
Ne homs vivans tant fust mes amis	No man living, however much my friend,
Nes avoit quant ie li tramis	Had these when I sent them to her
Car pour elle estoit ia li fais	Because I did them for her
De ces .ij. dis lonc temps a fais	From these two poems, written long ago.
Or ay fait le chant ci present	Now I have made the song presented here
Pour ce humblement li present	And I humbly present it to her.

Balade . et ya chant
Thomas (ll.6494–6517)
Response .G. de machau (ll.6518–6541)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Letter 37 Guillaume 3 November

[Did not go to St Quentin or the duke because of enemies at Beauvais.]

> *Mon tresdous cuer ma tres chiere suer . et ma tresdouce amour . vous ne mavez mie escript de mon livre . ne mes .ij. balades jugie que ie vous ai envoie . dont ie fis lemprise pour vous . comment que ie ordenasse qui li autres feist premiers*

My very sweet heart, my very dear sister and my very sweet love, you have not written anything to me about my book nor judged my two balades that I sent you, which I undertook for your sake even though I organised it that the other [poet] did his first.

[Mentions Pyramus and Thisbe, Leander, Lancelot, Peter Toussac, Paris and Helen, Chastellain de Vergy]

> *Mon tresdous cuer . Je vous envoie les .ij. balades que vous avez veues autre fois qui furent faites pour vous . par escript . Si vous suppli humblement que vous les weilliez savoir . car ie y ai fait les chans a .iiij. et les ay pluseurs fois ois . et me plaisent moult bien.*

My very sweet heart, I send you the two balades that I promised you another time that I have had done for you in writing. Thus I beg you humbly that you would get to know them, for I have done the melodies there in four parts and have heard them many times and they please me well.

Letter 38 Toute Belle 5 November

[She has read his book twice and has ideas for improvement.]

> *Les .ij. balades que vous mavez envoies sont si bonnes que on ni saroit trouver que redire. Mais ce nest pas comparison . car ce que vous faites me plaist trop mieux a mon gre que ce que li autres font. Et aussi suis ie certeinne que einsi fait il aus autres.*

The two balades that you sent me were so good that one cannot fault them. But this is not a comparison because that which you make pleases me more to my will than that which others make. And also I am certain that it strikes others thus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0961137109990027 Published online by Cambridge University Press