

# *Irony and audience: What machaut did not borrow from the Roman de la Rose*

Article

Published Version

Ehrhart, M. J. (1997) Irony and audience: What machaut did not borrow from the Roman de la Rose. Reading Medieval Studies, XXIII. pp. 3-33. ISSN 0950-3129 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/84745/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

**CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

# Irony and Audience: What Machaut Did Not Borrow from the *Roman de la Rose*

Margaret J. Ehrhart  
Fairleigh Dickinson University

Guillaume de Machaut's debt to the *Roman de la Rose* is well known.<sup>1</sup> Like the *Rose*, his *dits* use dream visions, gardens, allegory, and personifications to analyze love. The *Rose*'s real distinction in terms of literary history, however, is its radical irony - the source of much of its humor and the means by which it makes its point. This paper will argue that Machaut, while understanding this irony, purposely avoided it because of his differing purpose, audience, and era.

The *Rose* hands the task of evaluating courtly love over to its audience. Both Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun use a text-based irony that depends on exaggeration, self-contradiction, and gaps in logic.<sup>2</sup> The poem proceeds by contraries, hinting at a meaning that is never stated.<sup>3</sup> As definitions of courtly love unfold, each initially captivates with its charm or sways with its apparent reason. But each is finally sabotaged when one of those gaps that is a hallmark of irony opens at our feet.

The crucial ironic strategy in the poem is that Amant is an unreliable narrator.<sup>4</sup> Poised on the edge of sexual awakening, he is naive, shallow, and cocky. His superficial value system makes him a likely candidate for induction into the courtly world. Observing the carolers in the garden of Deduit, for example, he speaks as if good qualities are by definition physical qualities (e.g., vv.1017-1106). He equates the garden with the terrestrial paradise and sees the life it offers as equivalent to the life of the blessed (vv.633-40). He promises a key to his dream, but we suspect he is interested in its meaning only because it seems to forecast a sexual conquest (vv.28-30, 983-84, 2063-64). His gloss of Narcissus sees his own obsession: ladies should not neglect their sweethearts.<sup>5</sup>

A second dimension of the ironic strategy is the creation of two audiences, a key ironic technique, as Booth has noted (pp.36-37, 76). One is a fictional audience that follows Amant in his foolishness; it

consists of lovers eager for advice. After the battle for the rose takes shape, Amant says,

Si vos pri, seigneur amoureux,  
par les geus d'Amors saveurs,  
que se vos i trouvez paroles  
semblanz trop baudes ou trop foles,  
par quoi saillent li medisant  
qui de nos aillent medisant  
des choses a dire ou des dites,  
que courtaisement les desdites. (vv.15129-36)

The 'medisant' are those who oppose the love the poem extols - those outside the fictional audience. Though as we shall see, the poem's real audience was likely a university audience, the fictional audience is addressed as if *it* was composed of members of the aristocracy. Aspiring to be a courtly lover, one would by necessity aspire to be courtly.

Jean calls attention to the split between those in his audience who believe Amant and those who get the joke. In a passage that refers to Faus Semblant, Amant says his intent is to criticize only 'les desloiaus genz, les maudites,/ que Jhesus apele ypocrites' (vv.15233-34). His statement has broader application too:

*... je ne puis nullui ferir  
qui du cop se veille garder,  
s'il set son estat regarder.*  
Neïs cil qui navré se sant  
par le fer que je li present,  
gart que plus ne soit ypocrites,  
si sera de la plaie quites. (vv.15254-60; my italics)<sup>6</sup>

Here, as Calin has noted, Jean looks out from behind the mask of Amant ('The Poet', p.180).

The garden itself provides the poem's first definition of courtly love: an exclusive pursuit of a privileged class and, despite its claim to refinement, a quest for sex. All the allegorical details point to a larger meaning,<sup>7</sup> beginning with the images portrayed on the garden's outer wall. The series starts with morally repugnant characters such as Haïne and Felonie, but when we meet Povreté (vv.139-460), we recognize a

gap in logic. The garden's doorkeeper, Oiseuse (v.580), shows that courtly love is the province of those with time to spare. And the God of Love's arrows, Biauté and the rest (vv.935-56), show that it has little to do with inner qualities. Booth's image of meaning as an edifice that dissonance destroys, forcing us to reconstruct on a new basis, is useful here (p.38).

As Amant selects the rosebud of his choice, Guillaume's allegory continues to enhance his irony. A young man embarking on a love affair would not want a small, tight bud (v.1637), and certainly not one 'overtes et lees' (v.1643), soon to become blowzy. And sexual innuendo pervades the passage. The God of Love shoots his first arrow, Biauté, as Amant stares at the fragrant red bud (vv.1657-66).

The God's commandments reveal more gaps in logic. Avoid villainy, and we assent, though even here we are reminded that courtly love is indeed courtly. Then, slowly, the list leaves behind qualities appropriate to a love that mirrors the joy of the blessed. The contradiction between avoiding pride and dressing elegantly - in tight boots - opens a large gap, and we scramble to accommodate this dissonance. Then we reach the part about generosity and recall that Povreté was excluded from the garden. A definition of courtly love is indeed emerging.

Jean's continuation involves another strategy as well, the dramatic monologues that offer perspectives on love. In a satiric portrait marked by what Pelen calls 'comic reductionism' (p.40), each speaker pursues his or her position to its logical conclusion. As Tuve has observed, Jean 'choos[es] just such details for his long monologues as will nail the speaker to a monstrous inadequacy, and pierce through him to nail his interlocutor to an equally monstrous acceptance' (p.259). And Booth has noticed the link between irony and dramatic monologue (pp.150-51).

The advice of Amis at first seems blameless, at least within the garden's scheme. Amant should continue to serve the God of Love (vv.7253-76). But Amis soon reveals the selfishness of the love he promotes. Amant should manipulate the rose's gatekeepers with gifts and weep even if tears have to be coaxed with an onion (vv.7401-32). Amis observes that a woman's sexuality is like a lantern: 'qui mil en i alumeroit,/ ja meins de feu n'i troveroit' (vv.7381-82), and notes that the gatekeepers would relinquish the rose's virtue except that overgenerous suitors have driven up the cost (vv.7579-94); sex is worth whatever price it brings. Amant should take the rose by force if

all else fails (v.7660); thus Amis even contradicts one of the God of Love's tenets.

Amis's meditation on the Age of Gold celebrates free love and equality between the sexes (vv.8325-9510) - because he sees all in terms of his own obsession. He has no money but believes women are won by wealth. His nemesis is the Jaloux, but marriage would not exist if love was free. And if the sexes were equal, women would not have to obey their husbands.

The Jaloux also undermines his sincerity by talking too much. With his jealousy, his belief that his money gives him control over his wife, and his obsession with her clothing, he exemplifies the man who thinks money buys love.

La Vieille offers a woman's-eye view of the sex-money equation. Sex is inevitable - 'vos baignerez en l'estuve/ ou Venus les dames estuve' (vv.12721-22). But those wise in the games of love pursue monetary advantage (vv.12731-70). Like Amis, she believes in free love - a woman's freedom to love many men (vv.13845-68). She explains how to deal with two lovers at once (vv.14191-14250), and how to deceive husbands (vv.14307-50). Yet we recognize the blindness that is the key to irony. Young men no longer flock to her door, but she does not see that her choice of what to value has caused her sorrow. Nor has she taken her own advice. She could not resist the man who took all *her* wealth and mistreated her (vv.14441-14516). Venus and Nature were her undoing.

Nature and Genius move the poem into a cosmic context. Nature shows what sex based *only* on natural considerations would be like. Her aim is to perpetuate the species, so anything that furthers reproduction is good, anything that hinders it, bad. She notes, for example, that men should value women because women are the means by which men reproduce (vv.16596-98). Her lament that she has created man stems first of all from his evil nature (vv.19195-96). We assent, but are pulled up short when her harshest words are reserved for those who do not strive to reproduce.

Genius, too, makes us reevaluate his position by pushing it to its logical extreme. The fact that the God of Love supplies Genius with chasuble, ring, crosier, and miter makes the outfit suspect, but it is his speech that travesties his garb. His praise of Nature at first seems valid, but then he condemns those who do not use their tools for Nature's purpose and observes that since God created the organs of procreation, *He* must want them used. When Genius laments the end

of the Age of Gold, his chief concern is that Jupiter castrated Saturn; in his scheme, castration is the greatest evil.

Genius believes paradise is the reward for those who follow his and Nature's advice (vv.19901-5). He draws on Christian images, but his view of paradise is hedonistic. If it is better than the garden of the rose, in that sex aimed at reproduction is better than sex aimed at self-gratification achieved by hypocrisy, it is still a limited view. And soon we realize that the ideal fountain in *his* garden looks like a giant penis: 'uns carboncles merveillables/ seur toutes merveilleuses pierres,/ tretouz roonz et a .iii. quierres...' (vv.20498-20500). Jean's bawdry offers the perfect antidote to the pretensions of the world he mocks. As Quintilian noted, irony is often present when the nature of the subject matter is out of keeping with the words.<sup>8</sup>

The social function of the *Rose*, to use Jauss's phrase, springs from its context in the intellectual life of the thirteenth century.<sup>9</sup> Guillaume de Lorris's part is dated 1230-35, Jean de Meun's about 1275. Both writers are associated with Orleans, noted for humanistic studies in the first half of the thirteenth century, and Jean was probably also connected with the University of Paris. Besides the *Rose*, his output featured a series of translations.<sup>10</sup> These facts suggest a clerkly orientation. And though the fictional audience of the *Rose* is addressed as 'seigneur vallet' and the like - skewering the aristocratic pretensions of courtly lovers, Amant is presented, at least in Jean's portion, as a university student; Raison prefaces one of her remarks to him with the phrase 'si con dient vostre mestre' (v.5015).

The *Rose*, in fact, contains evidence that Jean's intended audience was a university audience - witty, learned, and familiar with university life. Inside jokes abound, as when Raison observes that it would be a great service if someone were to translate the *Consolation of Philosophy* (vv.50005-10). Jean, of course, did just that. Other humor derives from seeing all of life in university terms. Speaking of her experience in love, La Vieille says, 'Mes tant a que je ne finé/ que la sciance en la fin é,/ don bien puis en chaire lire' (vv.12785-87; also vv.11749-52,13467-86,18243-48,19881-88). And of course the antimendicant material suggests the viewpoint of the university.

Whether we can say anything certain about Guillaume's part scarcely matters because of the *Rose*'s reception history. Around three hundred manuscripts survive, but, according to Badel, only two contain Guillaume's part alone (p.55), and the work did not become well known until Jean's continuation. Thus whatever Guillaume's

milieu or audience, his work was subsumed into Jean's scheme - though I believe that Guillaume's portion of the poem sets up the ironic structure that Jean exploits and develops. Badel sees Jean's continuation as responsible for the work's popularity (p.62); in the fourteenth century, he notes, it was the whole *Rose* that was read and Jean was credited with the whole work (pp.62,68).

External evidence too links the *Rose* with the university. Jean's immediate audience is not known, but clues to the work's fourteenth-century audience exist. Judging from allusions to the *Rose*, Badel believes most who read it were trained as clerics and had careers in either the church or 'affaires' (p.73) and that nearly everyone saw in it a religious-philosophical dimension (p.74). He notes that Gilles le Muisis, for example, said it 'saintement font les gens vivre' (p.78) and that goliardic clerks read it too (p.116); Jean's readers were marked by 'humanisme, clergie, antiféminisme' (p.172). Badel points out that the *Rose*'s defenders refer to its 'mystère', or truth hidden under a veil of fiction (p.419).<sup>11</sup>

A further clue to audience - and to the genre in which readers placed it - is found by observing the works it shares space with. Badel points out that from the end of the thirteenth century through the first half of the fourteenth, it is juxtaposed with moral and satiric works or pious poetry; in the second half of the fourteenth century, religious poems and material from the Boethian tradition are added. Courtly literature is absent (p.63). This reception tradition suggests that the *Rose* was believed to have a religious-philosophical dimension and to deal with issues of deep significance.

Finally, an *explicit* from a manuscript dated 1390 sees correct reading of the poem as proof that one is a 'sages hons'. It suggests that only a clerk could *read* the *Rose* as it was meant to be read - that is, leave behind the fictional audience for the 'real' audience - and that the style of the *Rose* is inherently clerkly:

Qui ce rommans voudra entendre  
Et les raisons en bon sens prendre,  
Noble science y trouvera  
Dont sages hons se prouvera;  
Et qui ou droit sens l'entendra  
Pour vaillant clerc l'ateur tendra.<sup>12</sup>

If the *Rose's* milieu was the university and if it was a serious work with a religious-philosophical orientation, what was its social function? Jauss sees social function in terms of the question a work answers (*Toward an Aesthetic*, p.28). What question does the *Rose* answer, and how did its social milieu make that question significant?

Guillaume's Amant is a generic lover whose social class is not specified though he stems from a milieu that could aspire to courtliness: as Raison chastises him, she recalls that no matter what a man's calling, love will distract him from it (vv.3028-32). Jean's Amant is a university student, though he addresses his fictional audience as 'biau seigneur' and the like, suggesting that would-be lovers take on aristocratic pretensions.

Guillaume asked whether courtly love was a selfless devotion that improved a lover's character. Jean broadened the question to examine the relationship between sexuality and human destiny. In order to ask and answer these questions, the poem used novel formal strategies arising out of what Jauss has called the 'horizon of expectations' that it evoked for its audience (*Toward an Aesthetic*, p.23). According to Jauss, a work acquires meaning based partly on the meaning of works it resembles (*Toward an Aesthetic*, p.103).

Jauss himself has discussed the *Rose* in terms of genre and horizon of expectations, but he reads it straight: 'Guillaume de Lorris . . . lay claim to the same allegorical truth for the poetry of courtly love that the spiritual tradition of textual exegesis had reserved for itself...' (*Toward an Aesthetic*, pp.103-4). In his view, Guillaume's *Rose* claimed the authority of a religious literary tradition to give insight into the material of a secular literary tradition. Guillaume, then, chose a preexisting genre, the religious-philosophical vision. That form had shown how personified abstractions and symbols could explore religious and philosophical themes. The vision or dream authorized an allegorical surface because medieval dream lore believed dreams presented truth under a veil of allegory.

I cannot, however, read the *Rose* as a secular work that elevates courtly love to the status of a serious theme and thus competes with religious works in a parallel literary universe. But if we consider the *Rose's* irony, we see an even more interesting relationship between its form and its social function, between the new work and the horizon of expectations.

Guillaume's formal innovations relate to the poem's structure and its narrating voice. As Jauss has observed, Guillaume altered the



horizon of expectations for the allegorical dream vision when he took love as a theme (*Toward an Aesthetic*, p.104). Moreover, he did not write a straightforward art of love or examination of love psychology. He stayed within the philosophical tradition of the genre he adopted but introduced a narrator who is explicitly a persona. Amant is not a clerkly figure from romance and edifying works in the allegorical tradition, though he is based on these figures.<sup>13</sup> The poem plays against an expected form: a religious-philosophical allegory whose meaning is either clear or elucidated at the end, like the *Four Daughters of God*,<sup>14</sup> with a clerkly narrator who is a reliable reporter. Amant's promise to furnish a key plays with the generic expectations of his audience. This distinctive narrator intersects with the poem's new form to break through the audience's horizon of expectations. Formal innovation in the *Rose*, then, lets the poem handle courtly love in a new way. The *Rose* questions the value of courtly love, but its open-ended structure and unreliable narrator make the audience responsible for the answer. Irony was not yet linked with the genre, and, as Booth notes, generic expectations can be important in determining whether irony is present (p.100).

The manuscript history of the *Rose* suggests that the work was successful. But, given the audience, the theme was not expected or predictable since the courtly romance theme implied a courtly audience. I believe the work was successful because of the ironic treatment of its theme and the audience's perception that it departed from the horizon of expectations in a brilliant and effective way.

Machaut had a different relationship with his audience. He came from the middle class, but his education - probably a master of arts degree - made him welcome in a courtly milieu.<sup>15</sup> In essence a clerk, he was likewise a courtier. Machabey has noted that among his patrons were Jean, the king of Bohemia, whom he served as clerk and secretary from 1323 to the late 1330's (pp.19-20,23), and Charles, the king of Navarre (p.43). I am not convinced that the *Remede de fortune* was written for Bonne of Luxembourg<sup>16</sup> or, as I have argued elsewhere, the *Fonteinne amoureuse* for the Duc de Berry,<sup>17</sup> but he indeed wrote for noble patrons.

Badel believes that court poetry - a world in which he sees Machaut as a major figure - derives from the *Rose* (p.82); court poets of the fourteenth century were 'fidèles ... à la doctrine de Guillaume de Lorris' - in other words, bent on elucidating courtly love (p.85). I cannot agree. But Machaut's work cannot be studied apart from the

*Rose*, though it is not just an imitation. Writers copy a genre only if the genre still connects its audience to the concerns of the era. The allegorical dream-vision form was uniquely suited to raise philosophical questions about courtly love. That form was still valid for Machaut. It connected his audience with concerns important to them: How is love to be integrated into the aristocratic life? Is courtly love the answer?

Machaut read the *Rose* like a university-educated clerk because that is what he was. As audience, then, he resembled the audience for which the *Rose* was written. He saw in the *Rose* important themes: How does romantic love shape the human personality? How can courtly love be integrated into a philosophy of life? Guillaume and Jean dealt with love in the lives of young men. The age-old conflict between the lives of pleasure and contemplation would make this issue a serious one in a university milieu. It would be relevant for Machaut's audience too, but they would sense a conflict between the life of pleasure and the active life. Works like the *Behaigne* and the *Navarre*, in which kings are flanked by courts of personifications, show Machaut's interest in the character of rulers while the *Navarre* and the *Fonteinne amoureuse* evoke the chaos that results if rulers neglect their duties.<sup>18</sup>

The *Rose* mocked the love associated with the aristocracy. It offered a free marketplace of ideas in which only a perceptive reader engaging fully in the poem's comedy would see a point. Machaut could hardly take this tack. A poet's role vis-à-vis a courtly audience would be one of deference; Spearing notes that deference is embodied in the popularity of the dream form itself (p.44). The line of demarcation between clerk/secretary and clerk/poet would not be that clear.<sup>19</sup> Machaut's audience would not expect to be mocked, challenged, or attacked; they might even expect to be flattered. Machaut focuses on the pain that courtly love causes and, later, offers a reasonable love in its place. Deschamps called him the 'vrai remede d'amours'.<sup>20</sup> This phrase implied that he spoke for moderate love. Yet given his audience, his approach would have to be carefully calculated. Machaut recognizes the didactic value of his work, but he also knows that his fortunes lie with those in power. Badel in fact sees a conflict between the demands of the court and the demands of his art (p.84).

Machaut presents himself as a self-conscious poet, a stance that derives from the *Rose*.<sup>21</sup> This concept of self as poet ties into his relationship with his audience. He is expected to have access to learned

materials, to be a repository and an interpreter, to choose what to emphasize, de-emphasize, omit. And so when we speak of the reflexive state of French literature and Machaut as self-conscious *poète*, we cannot overlook the close relationship between his audience and purpose and the persona that he creates for himself. And this self would not function in the poems if it were undercut by the radical irony that characterizes the *Rose*.

Moreover, Machaut's era contrasts with that of the *Rose*. The fourteenth century saw political unrest, the Black Death, and the Hundred Years War. Philosophy questioned the truths that had made medieval culture so stable for so long.<sup>22</sup> The irony that made the *Rose*'s audience responsible for meaning worked only against a background of belief. Guillaume's and Jean's voices were absent from the *Rose*, but Machaut's persona - clerkly, self-conscious, writerly - shares much with Machaut himself. Rychner has observed that Amant is an invented narrator, in contrast with Machaut's narrators,<sup>23</sup> and Machaut's poetic persona in fact works against the creation of irony like that in the *Rose*. The *poète* figure was one of moral and ethical authority.<sup>24</sup>

The *Dit dou vergier* was Machaut's first long poem; the *Remede de fortune*, though not written immediately after the *Vergier*, is similar to the *Vergier*.<sup>25</sup> In these poems, courtly love is undercut not through irreverence and bawdry but by emphasizing that only in a visionary state does it offer comfort or hope.

First, whereas in the *Rose* everything happens in the dream, in the *Vergier* and the *Remede*, the vision is framed by scenes from the narrator's life. Thus the validation of courtly love that the visions offer is qualified by the fact that they are visions. In the *Vergier*, the narrator awakens on an April morning, enters a garden, and wanders to the site of his vision. In the *Remede*, he flees to a park where he laments his lovesickness, thus bringing on his vision. In each poem, the vision results from a trance caused by love longing, not a dream as in the *Rose*. And in the *Remede*, the narrator falls asleep within his trance as Esperance sings him a song of comfort, later referred to as a siren song.

The visions are set apart in space as well. If the garden in the *Rose* was the court, Machaut recognizes that since he writes for the court, he must further isolate his narrators. In the *Vergier*, the vision occurs in a field within a *vergie*r within a garden. In the *Remede*, the vision occurs near a fountain in a park; the narrator approaches the fountain

*despite* the fact that there is no path. The implication is that courtly love is not a typical courtly activity, but a conscious choice, probably ill-considered.

In content, the visions in the *Vergier* and the *Remede* contrast with the vision in the *Rose*. As a romance, the *Rose* is a quest, and it has a happy ending. The protagonist plucks the rose and impregnates the rosebush. The visions in the *Vergier* and the *Remede* are static. The narrator receives advice from an allegorical figure, the God of Love in the *Vergier* and Esperance in the *Remede*. He is urged to persist in his unrequited love, to try harder to serve, and to be loyal and secret. The only action is psychological; he feels momentarily comforted.

Each poem emphasizes the static quality of its vision by conflating into a central image material that the *Rose* makes part of the allegory's dynamic flow. In the *Vergier*, the God of Love sits atop a bush and holds a dart in one hand and a torch in the other. The bush suggests the rosebush; putting the God of Love atop it certainly implies a relationship between courtly love and love's more basic impulses - but dominated by the god's message that sublimation is the key to joy. The dart evokes the arrows of the God of Love in the *Rose*, while the torch recalls Venus's aid at the *Rose*'s climax. But in the *Vergier*, these attributes are not put into play; they are simply displayed - controlled by the god. In a subtle touch, the God of Love is blind, a feature that Panofsky has noted tends to undercut romantic love.<sup>26</sup>

In the *Remede*, we get the shield of hope, a static image conflating much that is presented dynamically in the *Rose*. On an azure background appears a heart of gules pierced by an arrow of fire with five silver tongues; it is sprinkled with tears. These are the arms of a loyal lover, and the meaning is suffering (vv.1863-78). The image is meant to inspire the narrator to persist in his hope - a hope that should *not* include desire. On the shield, the pain of love is transmuted to art. There is even a reconciliation of opposites: tears coexist with fire. But nothing happens, and that is just the point.

In emphasizing process in loving rather than result, the visions have a lyric thrust. Their link with song further undercuts the comfort they offer. In the *Vergier* the narrator is rejoiced by birdsong, especially the song of a nightingale. The God of Love's message fills him with joy too, but then the god flies away - like a bird. And his message of comfort is fleeting.

In the *Remede*, Esperance's message of comfort is literally a song - but it is compared to a siren song (v.2106). A lover should be content

with no return for his love: 'Si ne doit plus demander/ Cilz qui a bonne Esperance,/ Doulz Penser, Joye, et Plaisance...' (vv.1998-2000). This theme of unsatisfied desire suits the lyric mentality. Such a message could bring comfort only if the rational faculties were suspended: in a sleep within a trance, lulled by a woman's voice.<sup>27</sup>

Moreover, though Machaut's narrators are lovers, they are also clerks, and thus differentiated from his audience. They do not try to enlist the complicity of that audience. Thus the poems do not depend, as did the *Rose*, on the premise that some members of the audience will take the narrator seriously.

The emotional state of Machaut's narrators differs from that of Amant as well. Amant falls in love during the poem; Machaut's narrators are chronic unrequited lovers - already in love when the poems begin, hopeless cases with whom no one would want to identify. In the *Vergier*, the narrator says that he is 'pleins d'amoureuse maladie' (v.19). Brownlee notes the contrast between Amant and the narrator of the *Vergier* (*Poetic Identity*, p.31). In the *Remede*, the narrator says 'tousdis enclinoie/ Mon cuer et toute ma pensee,/ Vers ma dame' (vv.52-54). Machaut is not interested in the process of falling in love but in whether courtly love helps a lover survive the pains of love. Therefore his narrators must be in love before they have the visions that seem to offer comfort.

Machaut's narrators remain unrequited after their visions, though still committed to love. In neither case does the vision's advice bear fruit. In the *Vergier*, once the vision is dispelled, the narrator feels confused and afraid. In the *Remede*, the narrator offers his love to his lady, and she accepts it. Yet almost immediately she explains that their love must be hidden and she will treat him as she treats everyone else.

Finally, in each poem the vision's end emphasizes its fruitless content and the narrator's inertia. In the *Rose*, just before he awoke, Amant penetrated the shrine in which the rose was enclosed, scattered his seed over the rose, shook the rosebush, and plucked the rose. The event that awakens the narrator in the *Vergier* inverts this episode. The bush in the *Vergier* recalls the rosebush in the *Rose*, and its link with the narrator's beloved is further suggested when he calls her his flower (v.126). The narrator awakes when the God of Love's departure shakes the bush and sprinkles him with dew. He emerges from his trance, confused, afraid, and bereft of joy.

In the *Remede*, too, the narrator is awakened by an incident that inverts the *Rose*'s climax. As her song ends, Esperance puts her ring on his finger, and the cold metal brings him back to himself. The gesture parodies the *Rose* in two ways. Just as Amant's penetration and impregnation of the rose signify his union with her, so Esperance's gesture - later referred to as a marriage (v.2364) - signifies her union with the narrator. Yet *she* is the aggressor - and putting his finger into her ring imitates Amant's penetration of the shrine that lodges the rose. And he is wed only to hope - a hope that urges he renounce desire.

Part of the *Remede*'s strategy, then, requires taking the *Rose* at face value, recognizing that Amant is, in fact, successful. His success involves a recognition that courtly love has sexual conquest as its goal. Thus the joke when he assails the fortress is that courtly love's claims of refinement are undercut. The *Rose* glosses the *Remede* since the *Remede*'s meaning derives from its being a response to the *Rose*. In the *Remede*, the lover-narrator remains faithful to courtly love, allowing himself to be tutored by Esperance, whose advice is the traditional 'be patient and suffer'. At the poem's end, he has nothing to show.

Thus though the *Vergier* and the *Remede* depend on the *Rose* in featuring garden settings, dream visions, allegory, and personification, their overall effect is different. Rather than being made to draw its own conclusions about courtly love - and rejecting a narrator with whom it might have once identified, Machaut's audience is led to question courtly love by seeing how poorly it serves the poems' narrators and how little it connects with the real life that Machaut delineates.<sup>28</sup>

In the *Jugement dou roy de Behaigne* and the *Jugement dou roy de Navarre*, we see a different strategy.<sup>29</sup> Both poems pick up the debate aspect of the *Rose*. But the *Rose* offered no conclusion to its debate, leaving to its audience the task of evaluating Amant's love. In the *Behaigne* and the *Navarre*, Machaut gives the king final say. He flatters John of Bohemia and Charles of Navarre by implying their wisdom and justice, and he suggests that right decision in love has societal import and should thus concern the ruling class.

In the *Behaigne*, Machaut's clerkly narrator intercedes in a debate between a knight and a lady about whose sorrow is greater: the knight's beloved has been unfaithful, but the lady's has died. Then the King of Bohemia decides for the knight. The narrator proposes the king of Bohemia - whom Machaut had served as secretary - because he

knows more about love than Ovid (vv.1324-27), and we recall that Ovid wrote not only the *Ars Amatoria* but also the *Remedia Amoris*.

Calin has noted that the *Behaigne* splits the *Rose's* Amant into two characters: the clerkly narrator and the knight ('The Poet', pp.183-84; 'Problèmes', pp.133-34). Like Amant, the narrator arises on a spring morning, adorns himself as a lover would, and wanders through a pastoral landscape to the site of his adventure. But his love is unrequited - though he insists that love itself is sufficient reward. Since he is a lover, he is blind to the excesses to which lovers are prey, but any irony in the poem is at the expense of a foolish clerk, not an aristocratic lover, and the business with the lady's dog certainly portrays him as comical (vv.1202-66). The knight, in contrast, is dignified and refined, but he too has succumbed to the allure of courtly love. His description of how he fell in love reads like a first-person account of the process described by the God of Love in the *Rose* (vv.261-667). And Machaut employs the striking image of a lover as a bird of prey (v.1097).<sup>30</sup>

The segment of the poem that takes place at the king's court alludes to the *Rose*. Durbui is a place apart, like the garden of Deduit. It is surrounded by water and *vergiers*; the air is filled with birdsong; the courtyard has a fountain. A porter admits the party, and they are greeted by personifications and led to the king, who is surrounded by more personifications, obviously indebted to the personifications in the *Rose*. As the personifications in the *Rose* presented Amant with the pros and cons of his love, the personifications in the *Behaigne* take sides in the debate about whether knight or lady has suffered more.

Raison recalls her counterpart in the *Rose*. She says the lady will forget her beloved because love is carnal; it needs a physical body to love. The knight is suffering because he fell in love without her advice. His love imperils his life and soul. He should have stopped loving when his lady was unfaithful. He clearly has the greater sorrow. Amour is the very love against which Raison argues: the knight should continue to love and serve his lady. Faith or hope would cure his sorrow. Loyauté's position contradicts her name: if the knight's lady forgets him, he should dance as she dances. But since he persists in being loyal, he has suffered the most. Joinece agrees with Amour: the lover who listens to Raison is a fool.

The debate enlarges on the opposition between love and reason in the *Rose*, but Machaut calls on a judge to make the poem's position clear. The king says the point is not to decide whether the knight



should love - though that is just what Raison and the other personifications considered. Thus Machaut veers away from the question the *Rose* asked. Unlike the *Rose*, too, Machaut does not show courtly love as a pose that masks the quest for sex - though Raison hints at this view when she says love is carnal. We see instead the knight's suffering. When the king concurs that the knight is unhappier than the woman whose beloved has died - and this in the century of the Black Death - the poem points up the suffering caused by slavish adherence to courtly love.<sup>31</sup>

Whether the *Jugement dou roy de Navarre* is truly a response to controversy over the *Behaigne* we will never know.<sup>32</sup> It seems to reverse the *Behaigne*'s conclusion, but it does not contradict that poem's points. In reopening the debate, the *Navarre* abstracts courtly love's selfishness and makes this personality characteristic responsible for the political, natural, and social disorder of the mid-fourteenth century.

It is the ninth of November. The narrator broods over the chaos around him. Avarice has killed justice and truth; lords pillage their subjects. Marvels in the heavens presage wars, well-poisonings, parading flagellants, storms, and finally the Black Death. But one day he hears music, learns that the plague has ended, and emerges to hunt rabbits. A woman accosts him and takes him to task for the decision reached in the *Behaigne*. (At the poem's end she is identified as Bonneürté.) When he requests a judge, she proposes the king of Navarre, and they journey to the king's court to debate the issue anew. Bonneürté and the king are on intimate terms; twelve more personifications - all virtues - attend the king as well. Bonneürté and the virtues claim that the lady had more sorrow than the knight, though the debate evolves into an argument for unselfish love.

The *Navarre*, like the *Behaigne*, picks up the debate aspect of the *Rose*.<sup>33</sup> Personified abstractions argue positions consistent with what they represent, supporting the arguments with exempla. The truth emerges not as an audience reconstructs it from the shambles left by irony, but rather as the king announces his decision.

In a departure from his other *dits*, Machaut creates a narrator who is not a lover - perhaps, for two reasons. First, this narrator is identified with the 'real' Guillaume de Machaut; he is the author of the *Behaigne*. Second, the *Navarre* abstracts from courtly love a personality disorder that the narrator exemplifies in other ways. By upholding the knight's position, he becomes a scapegoat who subsumes what courtly love



means and more. Machaut implies that he himself, a clerk, will not give overt advice though he sees the cause and effect relationship between the chaos around him and the actions of the great lords.

The poem's prologue reveals that what is wrong with the narrator - and, by extension, the knight - is precisely what is wrong with society as a whole: 'justice et verité/ Sont mortes par l'iniquité/ D'avarice' (vv.41-43), and 'li signeur leur subgiez pillent,/ Roubent, raembent et essillent/ Et mettent a destruction...' (vv.63-66) Thus the destructive weather and all that follows result from avarice.

Guillaume embodies the *clerkly* equivalent of what courtly love is for a lover and what avarice is for the nobles; as Calin has noted, the poem upholds the ideal of measure (*A Poet*, pp.114-15). Imagery connected with courtly love links his extreme character with the extreme of courtly love. As he locks himself in his house to avoid the disorder around him, he says he is enclosed like an *esprevier* being trained. The *Dit de l'alerion* uses the *esprevier* to imply a rapacious approach to love. And when he emerges, it is to hunt rabbits - the image evoked in the *Rose* just as Amant sees that his success is assured (v.15110).

Then he is so intent on his hunt that he does not notice Bonneürté riding ahead of him (v.548). When the squire who summons him says she is three days' journey away, Guillaume is eager to set out. The joke is on him, for had he looked up he would have seen her. Bonneürté chides Guillaume for having become 'trop sage/ ... ou trop alentis,/ Mausaigneus, mautalentis' (vv.764-66). As the king summarizes what the conduct of the trial is to be, he too links Guillaume with excess (vv.1623-27; and see vv.3587-89). Guillaume's arguments in the debate also show he admires extreme positions. Note his exemplum of the clerk of Orleans, told to prove that a man whose lady is unfaithful suffers the greatest sorrow, and observe that the unhappy lover is not a knight, but a clerk. When the clerk learns that his beloved is married and pregnant, he goes mad (vv.2272-2300).

Bonneürté, in contrast, represents the happiness that lies in moderation. When she summons Guillaume, she says she does not *pray* him or *command* him, but sends for him 'entre le vert et le meür' (v.663). She is between green and ripe in age (vv.1145-47). The twelve virtues with which she is surrounded refer to the *Nicomachean Ethics*.<sup>34</sup> The list ends with Souffissance - an antidote to the avarice that caused the chaos in the prologue.

The journey to the court recalls Amant's journey to the garden. But like the king of Bohemia, the king of Navarre is an inversion of Deduit. His relationship with the virtues suggests he is an ideal king. To aid him in the debate, he chooses Congnoissance, Avis, Raison, and Mesure. Bonneürté is his consort. Her relationship with him is an idealized one in which neither has sovereignty over the other. When the king enters, Bonneürté rises and goes toward him. The king observes that she should remain seated. She hesitates as he takes his seat. He insists that she accompany him: 'Encor fais je trop', he observes (v.1486).

Bonneürté is identified only at the end of the debate when we are given a key, unlike the procedure in the *Rose*. Raison says, 'La dame a nom Bonneürté/ Qui tient en sa main Seürté/ En la partie de Fortune' (vv.3851-53). She is the happiness, based on moderation, that sustains one against Fortune. In the *Remede*, love and fortune were linked, but hope was the solution to the lover's plight. Here the solution is more lasting: Bonneürté is in lovers when they show courtesy and trust. She is in chivalry, not the greed of the nobles in the prologue. She is in *clergie*, but only when the contemplative and active lives are balanced (vv.3900-64). Guillaume erred in his singleminded inwardness.

The debate articulates the poem's position vis-à-vis courtly love. Love is a civilizing force; only the possessive love of the knight in the *Behaigne* is condemned. The centerpiece of the debate is Charité's argument for selfless love: a rich man who owns a *vergier* is pleased that his favorite tree is no longer an *ente* - 'elle' - but a grown tree that bears fruit - 'il' (vv.2434-70). The exemplum refutes Guillaume's story of the clerk who went mad when he discovered his lady had married a lord and was pregnant.

With the *Dit dou lyon* and the *Dit de l'alerion*, Machaut picks up another dimension of the *Rose*: its sustained allegory.<sup>35</sup> In the *Lyon*, the narrator visits an island *vergier* - purportedly a terrestrial paradise open only to loyal lovers - and is surprised when he wanders into a thorn field and encounters a lion. But the lion becomes his guide and leads him through a host of savage beasts to the court of a beautiful woman. A beast with two horns cries out. When the lady looks toward it and the other beasts, the lion wants to die. But when she looks toward the lion again, he becomes calm. A knight explains that once the *vergier* was open to all lovers, but then a king enclosed it with a river and provided a magic boat that rejects unfaithful lovers. The lady adds that envy makes the beasts mistreat the lion. Her power over him

stems from the fact that she fed him when he was young. Fear is a sign of love, so he must love her and defend himself from the beasts with the knowledge that he who suffers conquers.

As in the *Rose*, the adventure begins on a spring morning. The *vergier* is a paradise frequented by lovers (vv.101-12). On the island, the narrator follows a grassy path sprinkled with dew; all the trees are of equal size; birdsong is everywhere. The narrator and the lion follow a stream to the lady's court. The court features a fountain. The catalog of lovers now excluded from the island recalls the figures on the wall in the *Rose*.

Most important, like the *Rose*, the *Lyon* features a symbolic landscape whose surreal elements tease us to look for a key: How does the magic boat operate? Why, if the island is so ideal, are there thorn fields? What are the savage beasts? What is the two-horned beast? Why do the beasts threaten the lion? What is the source of the lady's power? Who was the king that made the island exclude all but the loyal? Who is the lady?

The unperceptive narrator and the allegory whose details point up the nature of courtly love indeed recall the *Rose*. The *Lyon*, though, does not use the *Rose*'s radical irony to show its audience a mirror for lovers. Since the lover-narrator is a clerk rather than an aristocrat, the meaning of his lack of success in love can be presented more ambiguously. Is he unsuccessful because the premises of courtly love are flawed or because clerks are not lovers? It is true that, like Amant, he refuses to learn from what he experiences in the garden - in his case, to see that as unrequited lovers he and the lion are kindred spirits, as Deschaux (pp.14-15) and Brownlee (*Poetic Identity*, p.178) have noted, and that he too must be content with the thought that he who suffers conquers. But since the narrator in the *Lyon* is an unrequited lover even at the poem's start, the poem does not chronicle his love.

In the *Rose*, we recall, Amant promises a key, but the key never comes. In the *Lyon*, a key is provided, as Brownlee has remarked (*Poetic Identity*, p.183) - and by authority figures, the knight and the lady. The knight explains that a king caused the *vergier* to be surrounded by the river and provided the boat that accepts only loyal lovers. The lady explains that envy is the reason the beasts want to harm the lion, and that he does not revenge himself because he fears he will die if she withholds his food. But no one explains why there are thorns on the island if it is a place of ideal love, why the beasts are there, who the two-horned beast is, or why a place that is supposedly

an improvement over how things were before has such negative features. The narrator never presses for further explanation, and we wonder: Can't he see the ambiguous nature of love if admission to the island of lovers reveals such puzzling pain? Yet this irony is directed against a character who is explicitly differentiated from Machaut's audience.

The *Dit de l'alérion*, in contrast, leaves no detail of its allegory unglossed. The poem is blatantly didactic; the narrator aims to show the qualities of rational love. The poem is, in a sense, a debate among kinds of love. But, unlike the *Rose*, it gives an answer. By thinking well, speaking well, doing well, and avoiding the contrary, one can live a good life, the narrator explains; he will tell three stories that exemplify the three stages through which all must pass. The stories, however, deal with hunting birds: how he got them, what it was like to hunt with them, and how they were lost.

Allegory heightens irony; both are puzzles. Allegory can destroy a pretense: Amant claims his love is pure, but he seeks a bud neither too tight nor too loose. But allegory also leads us, in the *Rose*, to that 'central other meaning'. The *Alerion* does not operate like this, though it has, indeed, a kinship with the *Rose*. The *Rose* claimed an exemplary purpose - to show the whole art of love. Our narrator proposes to illustrate the good life. But instead of trusting his audience to see that birds are really women, Machaut has his narrator supply the gloss. And as the poem proceeds, the narrator genuinely does advance in the art of living - that is, loving - well.<sup>36</sup>

The first hunting bird is a sparrow hawk. The episode represents a love affair shaped by courtly love. To study the life he wishes to lead, the narrator frequents those who have hunting birds. But he hides the fact that he wants a bird. Were it not for his gloss, his secrecy would provide material for irony. What legitimate undertaking demands that one disguise one's interest? Thus, he would be unmasked. But when he explains outright that his time with bird enthusiasts images a lover who wants to learn from other lovers without revealing that he is a lover, we see that he has nothing to hide - from us at any rate - and the irony vanishes.

He hesitates among three birds in various states of training, finally choosing the newly taken one so that he can enjoy its 'juene revel', its 'moien temps', and 'la noble conclusion/ De sa haute perfection' (vv.312-18). Again, if left to supply our own gloss, we would laugh at a lover who wants an inexperienced partner so he can enjoy her

sexual development. But his gloss shows how his problems with the sparrow hawk reflect those of young lovers (vv.337-98).

The love affair imaged by the sparrow hawk is shaped by courtly love. In seeking the bird, for example, he repairs to a place that seems a sly allusion to the *Rose*, a garden of which he says that he first contemplated giving a long description, but contents himself with remarking 'il n'est rois, duz ne contes/ A qui li lieus ne fust plaisans' (vv.456-57). Moreover, details suggest a cruel dimension to this love: the narrator falls in love with the sparrow hawk while watching it eat its prey; he captures it with a trap; it clutches a small bird in its feet all night to warm them; it is suddenly lost when it molts. The narrator does not acknowledge the cruelty implied by these details, but the fact that he himself glosses the episode as an image of his love affair removes our triumphant discovery of meaning.

His next love represents a step forward. One day he hears the allerion praised. The bird is rare, hard to get, and rarely obtained without work. And he raises the question of whether things obtained with difficulty are more pleasing than those obtained easily. A young woman motivated by reasonable abstinence might withhold her favors for a long time - or she might bestow them right away. Both loves are valid. Obviously this conclusion violates an important tenet of courtly love.

Then we learn of how he gets his allerion. He knows that he cannot purchase it. On the other hand, he cannot request it for free because it is such a noble bird. He is like a lover who has not served long enough to deserve his lady's mercy. He decides to borrow the bird, and the point is that love grants things not otherwise obtainable. He can use it whenever he wishes, and it is given to him. Then he tells of a lover whose success parallels his.

Eventually, though, he loses the allerion. Following the advice of Avis and Bonne Amour, he once again joins the hawking enthusiasts. Amour tells him to approach an eagle, and it is immediately his. We are reminded that eagles can gaze directly at the sun, and the passage is glossed to explain that the clear sun of Bonne Amour cannot be regarded by a human understanding unless cleansed of error. Thus the love affair represented by the eagle is an exalted love - a step beyond the allerion.

This Bonne Amour is a love in which neither partner has sovereignty - like the relationship between the king and Bonneürté in the *Navarre*. The description suggests it is suited to the aristocracy, as

does the fact that in the hierarchy of birds the eagle parallels the king. The parallel between the eagle and the king is enhanced by the exemplum Machaut's narrator tells of the king who beheaded a hunting bird that killed an eagle.<sup>37</sup>

We have now had the three stories the narrator promised: beginning, middle, end, three good things to pursue and each a little better than the previous - sparrow hawk, allerion, eagle. But the poem is not over. We have not learned to avoid the contrary. The eagle is lost too, but the narrator takes the rational approach and seeks to replace it with another bird. Unfortunately he chooses a gyrfalcon, which turns out to be arrogant and proud, slow to return to him in the hunt. Immediately, though, we get the gloss that lets us see how he has grown in his understanding of love: the gyrfalcon images a woman who falls into dishonor when she leaves a lover for one of less stature. The lover is more grieved by his lady's loss of honor than his loss of her, feeling that if she left him for an honorable lover he would be eased. He loses the gyrfalcon when it hunts down a lowly bird, a horned owl, and refuses to return to him. He leaves the gyrfalcon like a lover who cannot draw his beloved from folly.

The poem's end bears out the significance of the three-part structure. The sparrow hawk was the beginning, the allerion was the middle, and the eagle was the end, a rarefied love more suited to the nobility. We saw in the *Navarre* that Machaut is drawn to the appeal of moderation. Now, as the narrator sits in a *vergier*, Raison rewards him by returning his allerion, the mean between the extremes represented by the sparrow hawk and the eagle.

The *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse* is Machaut's most complex poem and the most similar to the *Rose*.<sup>38</sup> The poem functions on two levels, and Machaut explicitly identifies an audience of the elect as which he aims a level of meaning beneath the courtly surface. The 'truth', however, does not emerge as it does in the *Rose*. The voice and tone of the *Fonteinne amoureuse* are very different from the radical irony of the *Rose*.

Visiting the court of a nobleman, Machaut's narrator is frightened by the sound of moaning in the night. The moaning becomes the *complainte* of a lover, lamenting that he must be separated from his beloved. The narrator transcribes the *complainte*, finishing at dawn, then he makes his way to a great hall where he meets the *complainte*'s author. The nobleman leads him to a garden dominated by a fountain decorated with mythological scenes, including the Judgment of Paris.

He confides that he must soon be separated from the lady he loves, and he asks the narrator to compose a poem expressing his feelings. The narrator hands him the transcription of his own *complainte*, explaining how he happened to transcribe it. Then the two fall asleep. They share a dream in which Venus appears and tells the Judgment of Paris story. She then presents the nobleman with his lady.

The *Fonteinne amoureuse* makes obvious allusions to the *Rose*. Its narrator is a lover - but as was the case in the *Behaigne*, the Amant figure is split between the lovelorn but clerkly narrator and a nobleman who is also a lover. It features a dream vision in which the lover wins his beloved thanks to Venus. It features a garden more beautiful than the terrestrial paradise (vv.1349-70) and established by an elegant aristocrat who spends his days enjoying its pleasures (*Rose*, vv.588-97). It features a fountain linked with Narcissus - his history is inscribed on its base (vv.1307-9) - and another mythological allusion, the Judgment of Paris and the Trojan War (vv.1313-40).<sup>39</sup> And the Judgment of Paris story then shapes our interpretation of the events in the poem, as I have shown, in a kind of typological allegory parallel with the function of the Narcissus and Pygmalion material in the *Rose*.<sup>40</sup>

But our interest here is the relationship between irony in the *Fonteinne amoureuse* and irony in the *Rose*. First of all, as mentioned, the figure of Amant has been split in two, with part of his function given to the clerkly narrator and part to the nobleman. The clerkly narrator is, obviously, a first-person narrator, as was Amant. Although the narrator is also a lover, the love-adventure analogous to that of Amant is experienced by the nobleman, who even wins his beloved at the end of his dream.

Amant was willful and unperceptive. The narrator of the *Fonteinne amoureuse*, on the other hand, has considerable self-knowledge. He is also almost too humble - the butt of his own humor rather than audience perception that he is not what he claims to be (vv.92-103). Further, he is not easily impressed and encourages his audience to be skeptical about the world with which the poem deals. Recalling his adventures in battle with the king of Bohemia, he observes

Mais cils fait honnourable chasse  
 Qui grace par honneur pourchasse  
 Sans flaterie, sans lober,  
 Sans pillerie et sans rober. (vv.177-80)

He then pulls back with a disclaimer:

Je parle tout en general  
 Sans rien dire d'especial;  
 Si est fols qui a li le tire  
 Et qui a mal faire s'atire.  
 Mais pluseurs sont, c'est chose voire,  
 Qu'on doit bien servir et mau croire:  
 Servir, pour faire son devoir;  
 Croire, qu'il vuelent decevoir. (vv.181-88)

In a passage on the beauties of the garden, he interjects the observation that sex does not always bring joy:

... Jupiter et Venus  
 Y sont par maintes fois venus  
 ...  
 ... pour le deduit ou nature  
 Mist plus son entente et sa cure,  
 Pour avoir plaisence et solas,  
 Comment qu'on en soit de po las  
 Car aucune fois il anuie  
 Plus qu'après biau temps longue pluie... (vv.1383-92)

When he is offered a drink from the fountain, he demurs on the grounds that the fountain could not make him any more amorous than he already is. And later, after he and the nobleman have slept, he washes his face in the fountain but notes that he was careful not to swallow any of the water (vv.2532-36).

As we have seen, meaning in the *Rose* emerges as successive misdefinitions of love are undercut by their ultimate illogicality. The poem speaks to two audiences, a fictional audience in complicity with Amant and an audience that sees the irony and savors the poem's humor. Much the same thing happens in the *Fonteinne amoureuse*. Machaut singles out an audience skilled in reading irony and tells them that the full import of his poem is available to them and them only:

Or pri a ceuls qui le liront  
 Qui le bien dou mal esliront,  
 S'il y est, qu'il vueillent au lire



Laissier le mal, le bien eslire,  
 Car quant la chose est bien eslite,  
 Par raison, homs plus s'i delite,  
 Et dames et cils qui le lit  
 Penre y doivent plus grant delit,  
 Et cils dont il sera leüs  
 Soit ou nombre des esleüs. (vv.13-22)<sup>41</sup>

This voice, however, is the consistent narrating voice that we hear through the entire poem - a clerkly, trustworthy voice, to be contrasted with the playful voice of Amant:

Si vos pri, seigneur amoureux,  
 par les geus d'Amors savoreus,  
 que se vos i trouvez paroles  
 semblanz trop baudes ou trop foles,  
 par quoi saillent li medisant  
 qui de nos aillent medisant  
 des choses a dire ou des dites,  
 que courtaisement les desdites. (vv.15129-36)

Amant is here telling his audience that they should defend any bawdy or silly speeches against those who might criticize the poem. Machaut's narrator speaks seriously to an audience that he hopes will see his irony, and he asks that audience *with him* to contemplate the notion that some will not get the joke. Only rarely do we see behind the mask of Amant - and only in Jean's section - for example when Jean momentarily steps away from the persona of Amant to remind his audience,

...je ne puis nullui ferir  
 qui du cop se veille garder,  
 s'il set son estate regarder. (vv.15254-56)

What then is this meaning that is clear to the elect? On the surface, the nobleman is a sympathetic character. Writing for an aristocratic audience, Machaut could hardly present him otherwise. And the narrator is clerkly, deferential, even a bit foolish. But immediately after the nobleman is introduced - and lavishly praised for his gracious

appearance (vv.1101-33) and his fine manner (vv.1134-56), in short, his nobility -

... tant estoit de bel arroy  
 Qu'il sambloit estre fils a roy  
 Ou sires souverains naïs  
 De la terre et tout le pais (vv.1157-60)

- we encounter a passage very different in tone. It remarks on the great disparity between noble appearance and noble actions (vv.1161-98), implying that society is suffering because nobles do not live up to the responsibilities of their station. Then we are told that what we have just been hearing is the 'truth':

Or vueil laisser ceste matiere  
 Et retourner a la premiere,  
 Car aucune fois on empire  
 De bien et de verité dire. (vv.1201-4)

I have suggested elsewhere that the nobleman in the *Fonteinne amoureuse* parallels Paris of Troy. Scenes from the Trojan War are depicted on the fountain in the garden, beginning with a scene that shows Helen, inflamed by Venus's torch, being stolen from Greece and carried off to Troy in Paris's ship. When Venus appears in the dream shared by the narrator and the nobleman, she tells the story of the Judgment of Paris then presents the nobleman with his beloved. I have pointed out that the interpretation given the Judgment of Paris in Machaut's source, the *Ovide moralisé*, sees Paris's choice of Venus as the worst possible choice, a choice of pleasure over action or contemplation, and the cause of Troy's destruction.<sup>42</sup> This interpretation shapes our view of the nobleman who receives his lady from Venus at the dream's climax - then we recall the passage about the disorder in the kingdom and see a cause-and-effect relationship between that disorder and his devotion to his garden and the life of love.

Thus, like the *Rose*, the *Fonteinne amoureuse* questions the premises of courtly love, but the context here is the court. Is the nobleman being deflected from his rightful duties by his love-longing and his dalliance in his beautiful garden? The poem proceeds by indirection - but one might call it a *pointed* indirection, as opposed to

the *Rose*'s free marketplace of ideas in which the only idea left at the end is the unstated.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> William Calin, *A Poet at the Fountain: Essays on the Narrative Verse of Guillaume de Machaut*, Lexington 1974, pp.23-30,45-46,78-79, and passim; Kevin Brownlee, *Poetic Identity in Guillaume de Machaut*, Madison 1984, pp.27-32,39-42,96-98,158-59,194-95 and passim; Lawrence Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research*, New York 1995, p.xi.

<sup>2</sup> For useful summaries of *Rose* criticism, see Pierre-Yves Badel, *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe siècle: Etude de la réception de l'oeuvre*, Geneva 1980, pp.1-13 and Charles Dahlberg, ed., *The Romance of the Rose*, by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, Hanover 1986, pp.3-4. On the theory of irony, see Wayne C. Booth, *A Rhetoric of Irony*, Chicago 1974. Note especially, 'the mind leaps to an ironic interpretation whenever the dissonance produced by a straight reading becomes too great to bear' (p.35, n.2), the role of self-contradiction (p.63) and illogicality (p.75). On irony in the *Rose*, see Dahlberg pp.5-10, but cf. p.5; Marc M. Pelen, *Latin Poetic Irony in the Roman de la Rose*, Liverpool 1987.

<sup>3</sup> Near the end of the poem, just before Amant assails the sanctuary in which the rose is contained, he reflects, in an oft-quoted passage,

... qui mal essaié n'avra  
ja du bien guieres ne savra;  
...  
Ainsinc va des contreres choses,  
les unes sunt des autres gloses;  
et qui l'une an veust defenir,  
de l'autre li doit souvenir,  
ou ja, par nule antencion,  
n'i metra deffinicion;  
car qui des .ii. n'a connoissance,  
ja n'i connoistra differance,  
san quoi ne peut venir en place  
diffinicion que l'an face.

(vv.21533-52; all quotations from and references to the *Rose* use Dahlberg's edition, cited in n.2.)

As Jon Whitman observes in *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Cambridge, Mass. 1987), 'Instead of contrasting the two contraries in his mind, however, the lover enacts one of them in fact' (p.84), but the poem's 'dialectic ...exposes the deficiencies of such

behavior' (p.83). Pelen has referred to the poem's 'dialectical pattern of oppositions' (p.17) and its -unstated- 'thematic center' (p.30), noting that Jean, and I would add Guillaume too, 'seeks for a central other meaning beyond the literal contradictions of word and deed on the part of his speaker - a meaning that may influence the design of his poem as a whole' (p.17). Other critics have also noted the *Rose's* strategy of defining obliquely with contraries. Rosemond Tuve cites the poem's use of 'definition by unacceptable misdefinitions held up to scorn' (*Allegorical Imagery: Some Mediaeval Books and Their Posterity*, Princeton 1966, p.260). See also Winthrop Wetherbee, 'The Literal and the Allegorical: Jean de Meun and the "de Planctu Naturae"', *Mediaeval Studies* 33, 1971, 264-91 (281); Marc-René Jung, 'Jean de Meun et l'allégorie', *Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises* 28, 1976, 21-36 (30-31); A. C. Spearing, *Medieval Dream-Poetry*, Cambridge 1976, pp.33,39; William Calin, 'The Poet at the Fountain: Machaut as Narrative Poet' in *Machaut's World: Science and Art in the Fourteenth Century* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 314), New York 1978, p.181; William Calin, 'Problèmes de technique narrative au moyen âge: Le *Roman de la Rose* et Guillaume de Machaut' in *Mélanges de langue et littérature françaises du moyen-âge offerts à Pierre Jonin*, Aix-en-Provence 1979, p.131; Badel, p.29.

<sup>4</sup> On these types of narrators in irony, see Booth, p.55 and Maureen Quilligan, *The Language of Allegory*, Ithaca 1979, pp.132-33.

<sup>5</sup> On his shallowness see Wetherbee, 268 and Jung, 31.

<sup>6</sup> Jung notes that the reader is invited into the allegory while Amant is stuck on the surface (28); the Quarrel of the Rose is certainly a sign that many readers did not get the joke. On it see Badel, p.417-89.

<sup>7</sup> Tuve, p.281, and on the relation of allegory to irony, pp.220, 246, 259; Booth, p.25.

<sup>8</sup> *Institutionis Oratoriae*, 8.6.54 ed. Ludwig Radermacher, Lipsiae 1959.

<sup>9</sup> Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti, Minneapolis 1982, p.39.

<sup>10</sup> Biographical material is from Dahlberg, p.2.

<sup>11</sup> Paul Zumthor comments concerning Jean's approach in the *Rose*: 'le tout, témoignant d'une culture universitaire assez vaste, peu originale et déjà vieillote vers 1280; mais, en même temps, d'une rare puissance argumentative, sous-tendue par une sorte d'agressivité' (*Langue, texte, énigme*, Paris 1975, p.260).

<sup>12</sup> Badel, p.136.

<sup>13</sup> On these narrators, see Karl D. Uitti, 'From *Clerc* to *Poète*: The Relevance of the *Roman de la Rose* to Machaut's World' in *Machaut's World: Science and Art in the Fourteenth Century* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 314), New York 1978, pp.211-14 and Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.9.

<sup>14</sup> Hans Robert Jauss, *Genèse de la poésie allégorique française au moyen-âge (de 1180 à 1240)* (*Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, Bd. 6, Probekapitel), Heidelberg 1962, p.9.

<sup>15</sup> Armand Machabey, *Guillaume de Machaut: La Vie et l'oeuvre musical*, 2 vols., Paris 1955, pp.20,67.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. James I. Wimsatt and William W. Kibler, eds., *Le Jugement dou roy de Behaigne and Remede de Fortune* by Guillaume de Machaut, Athens 1988, pp.33-34.

<sup>17</sup> Margaret J. Ehrhart, 'Machaut's *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse*, the Choice of Paris, and the Duties of Rulers', *Philological Quarterly* 59, 1980, 119-39 (120-23).

<sup>18</sup> On Machaut and politics, see Claude Gauvard, 'Portrait du Prince d'après l'oeuvre de Guillaume de Machaut: Etude sur les idées politiques du poète' in *Guillaume de Machaut: Poète et compositeur* (Actes et Colloques 23), Paris 1982, pp.23-39; on the qualities of the ideal prince, Gauvard, pp.32-33 and Douglas Kelly, 'The Genius of the Patron: The Prince, the Poet, and Fourteenth-Century Invention', *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 20.1, Spring 1987, 77-97 (84-85).

<sup>19</sup> On pictures of Machaut as a clerk in manuscripts, see François Avril, 'Les manuscrits enluminés de Guillaume de Machaut' in *Guillaume de Machaut: Poète et compositeur* (Actes et Colloques 23), Paris 1982, p.123; on Machaut's clerical role, Jacqueline Cerquiglini, 'Tension sociale et tension d'écriture au XIV<sup>ème</sup> siècle: Les dits de Guillaume de Machaut' in *Littérature et société au moyen âge: Actes du Colloque d'Amiens des 5 et 6 mai, 1978*, Paris 1978, p.112; Kelly, 'The Genius'.

<sup>20</sup> Eustache Deschamps, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 3, ed. Marquis de Queux de Saint-Hilaire, Paris 1882, Balade 447, v.4.

<sup>21</sup> Kevin Brownlee, 'The Poetic *Oeuvre* of Guillaume de Machaut: The Identity of Discourse and the Discourse of Identity' in *Machaut's World: Science and Art in the Fourteenth Century* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 314), New York 1978, pp.221-22.

<sup>22</sup> On fourteenth-century background, see Badel, p.94; Raymond Cazelles, *Société politique, noblesse et couronne sous Jean le Bon et Charles V*, Geneva 1982; Jacqueline Cerquiglini, *'Un engin si soutil': Guillaume de Machaut et l'écriture au XIVe siècle*, Paris 1985, pp.159-62.

<sup>23</sup> Jean Rychner, 'La flèche et l'anneau', *Revue des Sciences Humaines* 183, 1981, 55-69 (65-66).

<sup>24</sup> Brownlee, 'The Poetic Oeuvre', 219-22; Glending Olson, 'Making and Poetry in the Age of Chaucer', *Comparative Literature* 31, 1979, 272-90 (276-88); Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.9.

<sup>25</sup> I am following Calin on the order of Machaut's dits (listing only those I discuss): *Dit dou vergier*, *Jugement dou roy de Behaigne*, *Remede de fortune*, *Dit dou lyon*, *Dit de l'alerion*, *Jugement dou roy de Navarre*, *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse* (A Poet, p.15). Citations of the *Vergier* are to *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, éd. Ernest Hoepffner, vol. 1, Paris 1908. An edition of the *Vergier* also appears in *The Fountain of Love (La Fonteinne Amoureuse)*, and *Two Other Love Vision Poems*, ed. R. Barton Palmer, New York 1993. Line numbers are the same in both editions. Citations of the *Remede* are to Wimsatt and Kibler's edition; see n.16 above. An edition of the *Remede* also appears in *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, vol. 2, Paris 1911.

<sup>26</sup> Erwin Panofsky, 'Blind Cupid' in *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*, New York 1939, pp.104-8.

<sup>27</sup> As Hoepffner has noted, Esperance's message is strongly influenced by the *Consolation of Philosophy* (Hoepffner 2:xxiv-xxx). The figure herself is indebted to the God of Love's promise in the *Rose*, vv.2601-28, but in my view this link undercuts her value. Cf. Wimsatt and Kibler pp.38,495.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Douglas Kelly, who sees the *Remede* as exalting ideal love (*Medieval Imagination: Rhetoric and the Poetry of Courtly Love*, Madison 1978, pp.122,130), and Sylvia Huot, who sees the essence of the poem as exalting the role of poet, not lover (*From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry*, Ithaca 1987, p.258).

<sup>29</sup> Citations of the *Behaigne* are to Wimsatt and Kibler's edition; see n.16 above. An edition of the *Behaigne* also appears in Hoepffner, vol. 1, cited in n.25 above, and in *The Judgment of the King of Bohemia (Le Jugement dou roy de Behaingne)*, ed. R. Barton Palmer, New York 1984. Line numbers are the same in Hoepffner's and Palmer's editions. Citations of the *Navarre* are to the edition in Hoepffner, vol. 1. An edition of the *Navarre* also appears in *The Judgment of the King of Navarre (Le Jugement dou roy*

de Navarre), ed. R. Barton Palmer, New York 1988. Line numbers are the same in Hoepffner's and Palmer's editions.

<sup>30</sup> On this image, see Robert Deschaux, 'Le bestiaire de Guillaume de Machaut d'après les dits', *Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises* 31, 1979, 7-16 (11) and Alice Planche, 'Est vrais amans li drois oisiaus de proie: Sur une image de Guillaume de Machaut' in *Etudes de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offerts à Jules Horrent à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire*, Tournai 1980, pp.351-60.

<sup>31</sup> Calin says Machaut shows that people should not be fanatics (*A Poet*, p.46); Palmer sees a parallel, especially with Jean's *Rose*, as 'wry condemnation' (ed., *The Judgment of the King of Bohemia*, pp.xxvii-xxviii, cited in n.29) and notes 'the humor with which the extreme doctrines of the love religion are subtly undermined' (p.xxvii); Charity Willard says the *Behaigne* shows 'lovers should not become slaves to their passion' ('Concepts of Love According to Guillaume de Machaut, Christine de Pizan, and Pietro Bembo' in *The Spirit of the Court*, Woodbridge 1985, p.389).

<sup>32</sup> Calin, *A Poet*, p.21.

<sup>33</sup> R. Barton Palmer, 'The Metafictional Machaut: Self-Reflexivity and Self-Mediation in the Two Judgment Poems', *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 20.1, Spring 1987, 23-39 (31-32).

<sup>34</sup> Margaret J. Ehrhart, 'Guillaume de Machaut's *Jugement dou roy de Navarre* and Medieval Treatments of the Virtues', *Annuaire Mediaevale* 19, 1979, 46-67.

<sup>35</sup> Citations of the *Lyon* and the *Alerion* are to Hoepffner, vol. 2; see n.25 above.

<sup>36</sup> Kelly sees the *Alerion* as dealing with *reasonable* love (*Medieval Imagination*, p.141); Brownlee notes that it 'subverts fin' amors' (*Poetic Identity*, p.84).

<sup>37</sup> See Hoepffner 2:lxix on the origins of the story; Cerquiglini sees it as showing the evils of transgressing one's position ('*Un engin*', p.181).

<sup>38</sup> Citations of the *Fonteinne amoureuse* are to *Le livre de la Fontaine amoureuse*, ed. Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet, Paris 1993. I also consulted Palmer's edition, cited in n.25, and the edition in *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, vol. 3, Paris 1921.

<sup>39</sup> See Brownlee on Machaut's fountain and the fountain in the *Rose* (*Poetic Identity*, p.198).

<sup>40</sup> Margaret J. Ehrhart, *The Judgment of the Trojan Prince Paris in Medieval Literature*, Philadelphia 1987, pp.140-41. On typological allegory, see Stephen A. Barney, *Allegories of History, Allegories of Love*, Hamden, Conn. 1979, pp.31-33; Judson Boyce Allen, *The Ethical Poetic of the Later Middle Ages: A Decorum of Convenient Distinction*, Toronto 1982, pp.87,120,212. Cf. David F. Hult on Narcissus in the *Rose* (*Self-fulfilling Prophecies: Readership and Authority in the First Roman de la Rose*, Cambridge 1986, p.282; Jung on Pygmalion as a type, 24.

<sup>41</sup> Writing about an earlier period, Karl Uitti has cited passages in which authors single out from a wide range of potential listeners the particular category of listeners to which they wish to address themselves: "The *Thèbes* poet asks only that clerks and knights pay heed to his work, since "aussi pueent escouter/ Come li asnes al harper" any stray *vilains* in the audience, whereas in *Rou*, Wace states: "Jeo parouc a la riche gent,/ Ki unt les rentes et le argent,/ Kar pur eus sunt li liure fait/ E bon dit fait e bien retrait" ('Remarks on Old French Narrative: Courtly Love and Poetic Form' (I), *Romance Philology* 26, 1972, 77-93 [80, n.3]). Badel cites a passage from Drouart la Vache in which he asks his audience to take the good and leave the bad:

Mais, se vos parole i oez,  
 Qui soit digne d'estre reprise,  
 Je m'en met en vostre franchise  
 Et en vostre correction,  
 Car je n'ai pas entencion  
 De dire nule vilonie.  
 Et s'il avient que je li die,  
 Pour ce qu'elle a mon livre affiere,  
 Prenez vous en a la matiere,  
 Non pas a moi qui l'arai dite. (p. 152)

Also, here, from Jean de Condé, a passage implying that both wise men and fools can find what pleases them in his work:

Pour che a Jehans de Condé  
 Son dit en teil guise fondé  
 Qu'as sages et as fous puist plaire:  
 As sages por prendre examplaire  
 Et as fous pour iaus solachier. (Badel, p.122)

<sup>42</sup> Ehrhart, *The Judgment*, pp.139-40.