CHAPTER 1

THE 'LUXEMBOURGNESS' OF THINGS: MACHAUT C, GLAZIER 52, AND DYNASTIC PRESENCE IN EARLY FOURTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE[1]

URI SMILANSKY

Dynastic presence, feudal allegiances, and military cooperation between the house of Luxembourg and the late Capetian and early Valois kings of France are easy to demonstrate. Influence and individuals' identities, however, are much harder to substantiate, as they go beyond familial affiliation. Tags are often misleading. Indeed, this contribution characterizes as anachronistic the notion of a dynastic, genetic, definable 'Luxembourgness' which circulated across Europe with the movement of single family members. It is engaged with here as a means to consider the importance of affiliation and influence beyond the body of the ruler, and as applicable also to the agendas of rivals, courtiers, cultural creations,

1 This text was written at the University of Oxford in the context of the ERC project 'Music and Late Medieval European Court Cultures' (malmecc.music.ox.ac.uk). The project received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant no. 669190). I would like to thank Karl Kügle and Jana Fantysová-Matějková for their advice regarding earlier versions of this contribution.

and even objects.[2] It is also tempting to use such tags for marking out certain materials and relationships as 'othered' or exotic. For those of us interested primarily in the Kingdom of France, for example, discussing 'Luxembourgness' can become part of a strategy to contain and manage materials or influences perceived as foreign, or perhaps as code for value judgements relating to the relationships between centre and periphery. My essay takes a wider, Francophone focus, and discusses the projection of communicable identities during the process of exchange as a coming together of categories, not as independent or isolated occurrences. It considers Guillaume de Machaut – and by extension, his cultural output – as a French-speaking retainer of a Luxembourg court. His activities are thus examined as part of larger geopolitical processes, in relation to contemporary Valois cultural production, and most importantly, through the prism of material engagement. Following a presentation of some historical background, the heart of the chapter offers a case study involving two coupled manuscripts used to probe the assumptions and mechanisms we often associate with ownership, influence, and the projection of (self-) identity. In particular, I will combine the examination of literary and book dedications and ownership with the cultural necessities surrounding inter-dynastic mingling, movement, and familial relationships. To what degree do patrons' personal, linguistic, familial, or geographic differentiators allow them to mould their hereditary or newly acquired social roles and functions? Was greater loyalty demanded by past or by present circumstances, to birth or marriage? How do courtly

2 Such constellations of meaning form the focus of many 'post-human' theories, including Latour's Actor-Network Theory and Barad's Agential Realism. As I deem the adoption of their terminologies more prohibitive than useful in this case, I have refrained from doing so. For examples of their applications, see John R.W. Speller, *Bourdieu and Literature* (Cambridge, 2011); Rita Felski, 'Latour and Literary Studies', *PMLA* 130:3 (2015), 737–42; Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, *Stimmungen lesen: Über eine verdeckte Wirklichkeit der Literatur* (Munich, 2011); Stephen Ahern (ed.), *Affect Theory and Literary Critical Practice: A Feel for the Text* (London, 2019); or Marilynn Desmond and Noah D. Guynn (guest eds of special issue: *Category Crossings: Bruno Latour and Medieval Modes of Existence*), *Romanic Review* 111:1 (May, 2020). A recent, relevant exposition of the related notion of 'multimodality' (applied more to the current context of reading than to historical ones) can be found in Kate Maxwell, 'A Multimodal Reading of MS **C**: Order, Decoration, Mutation', in Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 133–53. See also Jane Gilbert, 'The Manuscript as Property and as Apparatus: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 264, and its Networks', in Karl Kügle (ed.), *The Networked Court: Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Late Medieval European Court Cultures* (forthcoming). Historiographic anachronisms relating specifically to Luxembourg are discussed below.

cultural artefacts perform within this field? What difference does changing our understanding of their early history make to that of wider politics and culture? What could 'Luxembourgness' mean beyond direct contact and presence? How should we engage with the blurred and shifting borderlines of political, linguistic, cultural, and dynastic affiliation?

My first object of interest comprises fols 23r–58v of the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 1586, known to Machaut scholars as manuscript **C**.[3] I will differentiate this section from the manuscript as a whole by referring to it as **RemC**. The second artefact is the manuscript New York, Morgan Library, Glazier 52 (henceforth, **G52**).[4] **RemC** contains the earliest surviving version of Guillaume de Machaut's (1305–77) *Remede de Fortune* (henceforth, *Remede*), copied – like all other *dits* in **C** – on a physically separable set of gatherings.[5] It stands out from

3 The fully digitalized manuscript is available at https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8449043q. Its structure, contents and history are discussed (among others) in Lawrence Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research* (New York, 1995), 77–9; 'Scribal Practice, Manuscript Production and the Transmission of Music in Late Medieval France: The Manuscripts of Guillaume de Machaut' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1983), 131–42, 371–3; Uri Smilansky, 'Creating MS C: Author, Workshop, Court', *Early Music History* 39 (2020), 253–304; and Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021).

4 Images of the 29 pages of this manuscript that contain an illumination (about a quarter of the total) are available at http://ica.themorgan.org/manuscript/page/1/76994, along with a partial bibliography (http://ica.themorgan.org/manuscript/description/76994). A particularly pertinent discussion appears in Lisa Daugherty Iacobellis, '"Grant peine et grant diligence": Visualizing the Author in Late Medieval Manuscripts' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio State University, 2017), 127–34, 313.

5 For the *Remede* and its analysis, see its two current editions and bibliographies therein: James I. Wimsatt and William W. Kibler (text eds) with Rebecca A. Baltzer (music ed.), *Guillaume de Machaut: 'Le Jugement dou roy de Behaigne' and 'Remède de Fortune'* (Atlanta, GA, 1988); and R. Barton Palmer (text ed. and trans.), with Domenic Leo (art ed.) and Uri Smilansky (music ed.), *The Boethian Poems*, in R. Barton Palmer and Yolanda Plumley (eds), *Guillaume de Machaut: The Complete Poetry & Music*, vol. 2 (Michigan, 2019), along with its central position to many of the contributions in Earp and Hartt, *Poetry, Art, and Music*. Central contributions on Machaut's biography include, Earp, *Guide*, ch. 1; Roger Bowers, 'Guillaume de Machaut and his Canonry of Reims, 1338–1377', *Early Music History* 23 (2004), 1–48; Elizabeth Eva Leach, *Guillaume de Machaut: Secretary, Poet, Musician* (Ithaca, NY, 2011), 7–33; and Lawrence Earp, 'Introduction', in Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 21–55, building upon new discoveries subsequently detailed in Andrew Wathey, 'Guillaume de Machaut and Yolande of Flanders', in Jared C. Hartt, Benjamin Albritton and Tamsyn Mahoney-Steel (eds), *Manuscripts, Music, Machaut: Essays in Honor of Lawrence Earp* (Turnhout, 2022), 111–25. Important

the other contents of this lavish luxury book due to its even more elevated visual and material presentation.[6] While sharing a scribe with other sections of **C**, its illuminator, decorator and pen-flourisher – all the best in the collection – worked only on this section. **G52** is a shorter manuscript of 56 leaves, containing a single work, yet again, in its earliest surviving copy. This is Jean de Vignay's (c. 1282/5–c. 1350?) *Livre de la moralité des nobles hommes et des gens du peuple sus le gieu des eschés* (henceforth, *Eschés*), a translation and amplification of Jacobus de Cessolis' (c. 1250–c. 1322) *Libellus de moribus hominum et officiis nobilium ac popularium super ludo scachorum*.[7]

---

further context for its discussion is provided in Jana Fantysová Matějková's contribution to this volume, including a justification of Machaut's revised birth date given here.

6 For the visual impact of the *Remede* in **C**, see François Avril, 'Les manuscrits enluminés de Guillaume de Machaut', *Actes et Colloques* 23 (1982), 117–33, at 119–20; Sylvia Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry* (Ithaca, NY, 1987), at 242–73; or more recently, Anne Stone, 'Made to Measure: On the Intimate Relations of Song and Parchment in Guillaume de Machaut's *Remède de fortune* in MS C', in Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 93–131, and Lenka Panušková, 'Machaut's *Le Remède de Fortune* und die höfische Gesellschaft in Bild', in Dana Dvořáčková-Malá, Kristýna Solomon and Michel Margue (eds), *Über den Hof und am Hofe: Literatur und Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Dresden, 2021), 81–96.

7 Both author and work are much less studied in this case. The most detailed study of Vignay and his output remains Christine Knowles, 'Jean de Vignay, un traducteur du XIVe siècle', *Romania* 75 (1954), 353–83, based on Christine Knowles, *The Life and Work of Jean de Vignay* (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of London, 1953), with updates in Mattia Cavagna, 'Jean de Vignay: actualités et perspectives', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* 27 (2014), 141–9. See also Claudine A. Chavannes-Mazel, *The Miroir Historial of Jean le Bon: The Leiden Manuscript and its Related Copies* (Leiden, 1988), vol. 1, 167–72, 195–211. A critical edition of the *Eschés* appears in Carol S. Fuller, *A Critical Edition of* Le Jeu des Eschés Moralisé (unpublished PhD dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1974), using three other early manuscripts, not this one (see historiographical discussion below). To this day, a certain degree of confusion exists between the Latin original, Vignay's translation, and that of Jean Ferron (1347), a situation only compounded by the existence of a manuscript tradition that conflates both versions and was subsequently used by Caxton in his English version of 1476. See Christine Knowles, 'Caxton and His Two French Sources: The "Game and Playe of the Chesse" and the Composite Manuscripts of the Two French Translations of the "Ludus Scaccorum"', *The Modern Language Review* 49 (1954), 417–23. All these very popular and widely circulating works (along with other translations) were and are often referred to as the *Échecs moralisé*, not to be confused with the poetic *Échecs d'amours* (c. 1380) and its follow-up, the *Eschez amoureux moralises* by Evrard de Conty. For the wider cultural and behavioural importance of chess in the Middle Ages, see

It has long been recognized that the two sources share visual and material characteristics, having been created within the same Parisian, mid-century workshop.[8] These include folio size, layout, scribal hand, decorative flourishing, elevated use of colour (the use of alternating blue and gold for initials, and of blue rather than red *tituli*), shared models for their illuminations, and, perhaps, shared artists.[9] **Figure 1.1** presents both their opening pages, allowing for a direct comparison. The degree of 'Luxembourgness' of these books relies on the biographies of the authors whose works they contain; on their dedicatees and owners; on the works themselves; on their use as part of courtly and political performance; and finally, on their relationship with each other. Not all these questions can be answered here, yet in order to use these books in considering what any notion of 'Luxembourgness' might mean in this period, I will first introduce the dynastic intertwining of the houses of Luxembourg, Capet, and Valois, along with other personalities surrounding the manuscripts in question.

Emma Cayley, *Debate and Dialogue: Alain Chartier in his Cultural Context* (Oxford, 2006), 162–88, and more widely, Marilyn Yalom, *Birth of the Chess Queen: A History* (New York, 2004).

8 François Avril, 'Un Chef-d'œuvre de l'enluminure sous le règne de Jean le Bon: La Bible Moralisée manuscrit français 167 de la Bibliothèque Nationale', *Monuments et Mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Piot* 58 (1973), 91–125, at 100, rehearsed in Earp, 'Introduction', 25–7, and in more detail in Kyunghee Pyun, 'The Master of the *Remede de Fortune* and Parisian Ateliers c.1350', in Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 195–216. On the notion of 'workshop', see Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, *Manuscripts and their Makers: Commercial Book Producers in Medieval Paris, 1200–1500* (London, 2000); John Lowden, 'Beauty or Truth? Making a *Bible Moralisée* in Paris around 1400', in Godfried Croenen and Peter Ainsworth (eds), *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400* (Leuven, 2006), 197–222, and in the current context, Smilansky, 'Creating MS C', 263–7.

9 Domenic Leo, 'The Pucellian School and the Rise of Naturalism: Style as Royal Signifier?', in Kyunghee Pyun and Anna D. Russakoff (eds), *Jean Pucelle: Innovation and Collaboration in Manuscript Painting* (London, 2013), 149–70 (esp. 154–5; 167), associates the artist responsible for the opening illumination of **G52** with that responsible for **RemC**'s illumination, dating the former source to 1348. This, however, is not universally accepted. For an overview of relevant artistic identifications, see also Pyun, 'The Master of the *Remede de Fortune*', 199.

Figure 1.1. MS C, fol. 23r (above) and G52 fol. 1r (opposite) compared.

Ci commencent les chapitres du livre de la moralite des nobles hommes et des gens du peuple sus le gieu des esches translatee de latin en françoys par frere Jehan de Vignay hospitalier de lordre de haut pas.

Sous quel roy le gieu des esches fu trouve.

Qui trouva le dit gieu.

Des .iij. causes pourquoy il fu trouve.

De la fourme du roy et de ses meurs et de son estat.

De la forme de la royne et de ses meurs et de la maniere dicelle.

De lestat et de loffice des aufins

De loffice et des meurs des chevaliers et de lordre de chevalerie.

De loffice et des meurs des roz qui sont vicaires du roy

Ci commencent les autres chapitres de lestat et des condicions des gens du peuple qui sont devisez en ce livre selonc les offices de toutes les gens de tous mestiers et de toutes marcheandises et sont apliques as .viij. paonnes.

De la forme et de la maniere de ceulz qui labourent les terres et nourrissent les bes-tes.

De loffice de tous ceulz qui for-gent et de leur oeuvres.

De loffice et du mestier de ceulz qui euvrent de linge et de lange

De loffice des marcheans et des couste-liers.

De loeuvre et de loffice des mi-res des medecins et des espiciers.

CAPET–VALOIS–LUXEMBOURG RELATIONS, 1288 TO 1346

Had he stopped to take stock of his family's fortunes in early June 1288, prospects would have seemed bleak to the nine-year-old Henry of Luxembourg (c. 1278–1313), soon to be installed Count Henry VII. On 5 June, his father and three uncles perished during the Battle of Worringen, which marked the culmination of the War of the Limburg Succession.[10] With the Holy Roman Empire in a weakened state – the King of the Romans being preoccupied in the south and no emperor since the days of Fredrick II – the power struggle on its north-western edge eventually required the arbitration of the French king, Philip IV ('the Fair', 1268–1314). The Luxembourgs not only suffered a grave dynastic loss, but were fighting on the losing side: having not long hence bolstered their claim on Limburg by buying Reinald of Guelders' (1255–1326) claim to it,[11] both land and title were given in 1289 to the battle's victor, Duke John I of Brabant (1252/3–94). French preference for John was, perhaps, unsurprising. After all, John's first wife, Margaret of France (1254–71), was the king's aunt, and John's sister, Mary (1254/6–1321/2), was the French dowager queen and the king's stepmother (see genealogies). Both Philip IV and his father (Philip III, 1245–85) maintained a long-standing policy of opportunistic encroachment on the imperial border, ranging from the patient building of local allegiances to repeated attempts to offer French candidates for election as King of the Romans.[12]

With Henry's mother, Beatrice of Avesnes (c. 1260?–1321), acting as regent, both French influence and the smoothing of Luxembourg-Brabant relations were bolstered by offering tutelage to the young count within the French royal household.[13] This move was extremely effective. By the time

10 See Vera Torunsky, *Worringen 1288: Ursachen und Folgen einer Schlacht* (Cologne, 1988), with many relevant documents available in the 700-year anniversary exhibition book published as Werner Schäfke (ed.), *Der Name der Freiheit, 1288–1988: Aspekte Kölner Geschichte von Worringen bis heute* (Cologne, 1988). The most detailed English discussion to date can be found in Jan Müller, *The Battle of Worringen, 1288: The History and Mythology of a Notable Event* (unpublished MA thesis, University of Alberta, 1993). See also Bouko de Groot, 'The Battle of Worringen: The Charge of Six Thousand to Decide the Fate of Limbourg', *Medieval Warfare* 2:2 (2012), 42–6.

11 See attestation of sale in Schäfke, *Der Name der Freiheit*, 2.

12 See Fritz Kern, *Die Anfänge der französischen Ausdehnungspolitik bis zum Jahre 1308* (Tübingen, 1910). During the period discussed in this essay, the most important French candidacies included those of Philip III in 1273, Charles of Valois in 1308, and Charles IV of France in 1324.

13 See Welvert Eugène, 'Philippe le Bel et la maison de Luxembourg', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 45 (1884), 180–8. For the wider aristocratic practice of educating

of Henry's coming of age around 1293–4,[14] he married Margaret of Brabant (1276–1311), John I's daughter, and had affiliated himself with both French politics and culture. Indeed, having been knighted by the French king, one of his first acts as a major was to swear a pact of allegiance to France and offer military aid in its war against England in 1294–7.[15] Though extensive French-Luxembourg relations can be demonstrated earlier, 1288 can nonetheless be considered a step change in their personal intensity, one that was bolstered and institutionalized in 1294.[16] The following half century, however, did not see a unipolar focus to Luxembourgian political and dynastic attention. In 1308 Henry was elected King of the Romans as a compromise candidate, and was subsequently crowned Holy Roman Emperor in Rome in 1312. His son, John of Luxembourg (1296–1346, later 'the Blind'), was married in 1310 to Elizabeth of Bohemia (1292–1330), the Přemyslid heiress of that kingdom. These events shifted the political focus within the Luxembourg family back towards the Empire,

children in the courts of their feudal superiors, see Shulamith Shahar, *Childhood in the Middle Ages* (London and New York, 1990), ch. 10, and within a specifically royal context, Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066–1530* (London, 1984), 28–9. On attitudes to childhood and emotionality in general, see the overview provided in Albrecht Classen, 'Philippe Ariès and the Consequences: History of Childhood, Family Relations, and Personal Emotions: Where do we stand today?', in Albrecht Classen (ed.), *Childhood in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: The Results of a Paradigm Shift in the History of Mentality* (Berlin and New York, 2005), 1–65. Both this episode and the lasting relationship between Henry's son and a succession of French kings is usefully summarized in Philippe Contamine, 'Politique, culture et sentiment: Jean l'Aveugle et la royauté française', in Michel Pauly (ed.), *Johann der Blinde, Graf von Luxemburg und König von Böhmen 1296–1346* (Luxembourg, 1997), 343–61.

14 For the problem in assigning a specific date for this, see Georgina R. Cole-Baker, 'The Date of the Emperor Henry VII's Birth', *The English Historical Review* 35 (1920), 224–31.

15 Technically, Luxembourg remained an imperial fief, though the promise to protect France against any external aggressor undermined this. Such arrangements caused tension between France and the Empire. See Jörg K. Hoensch, *Die Luxemburger: Eine spätmittelalterliche Dynastie gesamteuropäischer Bedeutung 1308–1437* (Stuttgart, 2000), 25–8.

16 While the Romance vernacular later called 'French' had long been a major language in Luxembourg, it should be remembered that language borders – to the extent those existed within multilingual societies – did not match those of political units, especially not within the Empire. See Harald Völker, 'Altfranzösisch in deutscher Feder? Sprache und Verwaltung in der Grafschaft Luxemburg im 13. Jahrhundert', in Wolfgang Dahmen, Günter Holtus, Johannes Kramer, Michael Metzeltin, Wolfgang Schweickard and Otto Winkelmann (eds), *Schreiben in einer anderen Sprache: Zur Internationalität romanischer Sprachen und Literaturen* (Tübingen, 2000), 35–52. For ties between Henry V of Luxembourg (1216–81) and Louis IX of France (1214–70), see Hoensch, *Die Luxemburger*, 22–3.

specifically Central Europe, and, in a new development, to northern Italy.[17] Nevertheless, both Henry's son and grandson were sent to spend their formative years in Paris, and the first half of the fourteenth century saw a number of intermarriages, military cooperations and exchanges of personnel.[18] For example, in 1322, Henry's daughter, Mary of Luxembourg (1304–24), married King Charles IV of France (1294–1328) shortly after the latter's accession to the throne (see genealogies). Her brother, John of Luxembourg, took a French princess, Beatrice of Bourbon (d. 1383), as his second wife in 1334, four years after the death of Elizabeth of Bohemia.[19] Two of John's children followed suit, with Wenceslas/Charles of Luxembourg (1316–78, later Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV) marrying Blanche of Valois (1317–48), sister of the future King of France, Philip VI (1293–1350), in 1323, and Jutta/Bonne of Luxembourg (1315–49) wedding the then heir-apparent John of France, Duke of Normandy (1319–64, later

17 For Henry's punishing itinerary through the Empire following his election (and its practical and symbolic meaning), see Ellen Widder, 'Orte der Macht: Herrschaftsschwerpunkte, Handlungsräume und Öffentlichkeit unter Heinrich VII. (1308–1313)', in Ellen Widder and Wolfgang Kraut (eds), *Vom luxemburgischen Grafen zum europäischen Herrscher: Neue Forschungen zu Heinrich VII.* (Luxembourg, 2008), 69–145. For the securing of the Kingdom of Bohemia, see Robert Antonín, 'Der Weg nach Osten: Heinrich VII. und der Erwerb Böhmens für die Luxemburger', in Sabine Penth and Peter Thorau (eds), *Rom 1312: Die Kaiserkrönung Heinrichs VII. und die Folgen: Die Luxemburger als Herrscherdynastie von gesamteuropäischer Bedeutung* (Cologne, 2016), 9–22. For the complexity of discussing influence, western and eastern relations in this context, see Martin Kintzinger, 'Politische Westbeziehungen des Reiches im Spätmittelalter: Westliche Kultur und Westpolitik unter den Luxemburgern', in Joachim Ehlers (ed.), *Deutschland und der Westen Europas im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 2002), 423–55.

18 For the notion of an educational tradition, see Johannes Fried, *The Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA, 2015), 393–4. Charles' upbringing in Paris is much better documented than John's, with the latter's presence there relying heavily on supposition. See, for example, Contamine, 'Politique, culture et sentiment', 346. On the unnecessary association of John's close ties with the Kings of France with prior acquaintance, see Michel Margue and Jean Schroeder (eds), *Un itinéraire européen: Jean l'Aveugle, comte de Luxembourg et roi de Bohême, 1296–1346* (Brussels, 1996), 57–8. Indeed, they discern a cooling relationship between France and Luxembourg following Henry's accession to the imperial throne, followed by a rekindled cooperation following John's failure to become emperor and distancing from the running of Bohemia. In particular, this took place in the context of political strife involving Luxembourg, Bar, and Verdun. As we shall see below, all these locations are also significant in relation to Machaut. See 55–66.

19 On John and Beatrice's marriage in the context of French-Luxembourg relations, see Jana Fantysová-Matějková, *Wenceslas de Bohême: Un prince au carrefour de l'Europe* (Paris, 2013), 18–24.

King John II), in 1332.[20] Both John and his son Charles joined the French against the English at the Battle of Crécy (1346), where John met his heroic death and Charles – only elected King of the Romans the previous month – escaped from the field wounded.[21] The personal and cultural exchanges that followed such (and other) movements fill the pages of this volume. The one most pertinent here relates to Guillaume de Machaut's extended service to John of Luxembourg and his presumed attachment to Bonne when seeking new patronage within the French fold, be that as early as the 1330s or following John's demise in 1346.

IDENTITY FORMATION BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL AND DYNASTY

For me, the essential parameter for contextualizing this assortment of data is a pattern that emerges when considering the reception, acceptance or rejection of members of the houses concerned following changes in their physical circumstances. This separates those who opted for assimilation (and were accepted by their peers and subjects alike) from those who decided against it – at times even ostentatiously so – and were resented and resisted. Interestingly, this separation crosses both gender and dynastic affiliation. For example, for about a decade between the mid 1330s and mid 1340s, Bohemia had both a Luxembourg king (John of Luxembourg) and heir-apparent (Charles of Luxembourg), both of whom were married to French princesses (Beatrice of Bourbon and Blanche of Valois respectively, both being of a similar age). The behaviour and acceptance of the two generations, however, was remarkably different. John and Beatrice – who did not speak Czech and spent the least amount of time possible in Prague – were treated with indifference or hostility; Charles and Blanche – who made a point of learning Czech and got involved in civic and institutional matters – were adopted and celebrated.[22] In the

20 For a wider context, see Amelie Fössel, 'Die Heiratspolitik der Luxemburger', in Sabine Penth and Peter Thorau (eds), *Rom 1312: Die Kaiserkrönung Heinrichs VII.*, 427–44. For a specifically French orientation, see Carl D. Dietmar, *Die Beziehungen des Hauses Luxemburg zu Frankreich in den Jahren 1247–1356* (Cologne, 1983).

21 See Walther Rose, 'König Johann der Blinde von Böhmen und die Schlacht bei Crécy (1346)', *Zeitschrift für historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde: Organ des Vereins für Historische Waffenkunde* 7 (1915), 37–60, with many necessary updates and further sources of testimony in Michael Livingston and Kelly DeVries (eds), *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook* (Liverpool, 2015).

22 This is, of course, a crass simplification. Another (arguably more important) difference was that of blood: only Charles, through his mother, was linked directly to the Přemyslid dynasty. However, John's throne was not challenged upon the death of his Přemyslid wife, Elizabeth, allowing us to see this emphasis, too, as a cultural

other direction, John and Beatrice's son was born in Prague, and named Wenceslas (1337–83) after the patron saint of the Přemyslid dynasty. He remained in Prague as his French mother left for Luxembourg shortly after his birth, and inherited the County of Luxembourg only in 1353.[23] Nevertheless, and without demonstrating himself as a particularly effective or successful count or duke, his assimilation into the cultural melting pot of his Luxembourg-Low Countries-French charge saw him accepted as the 'local' feudal authority. Likewise, his half-sister Bonne (originally Jutta) was also born in Prague. Evidence concerning her upbringing is sparse, although scholars have suggested that up to the age of 11 she experienced a peripatetic education, for the most part away from both her parents. This likely included protracted periods spent in two different convents in and around Prague, and a year in Wartburg Castle at the house of a betrothed's family, before the arrangement fell through.[24] She spent the next five years in Luxembourg, likely at the Dominican nunnery of Marienthal. There she renewed her marriage preparations, originally expecting to wed the heir to the County of Bar (Henry of Bar, 1315–44, subsequently Henry IV; see genealogies), and finally marrying John of France. The military alliance to which her marriage contract was appended was signed in Fontainebleau in January 1332, some six months before the wedding itself.[25] Nevertheless,

---

construct designed to elevate one couple and denigrate another. It does not explain the different treatment of their two French wives.

23 This is not to say that he was not being prepared for his inheritance of Luxembourg in the intervening years, as the county was promised to the offspring of John's second marriage within its marriage contract. For his inheritance and relationship with his half-brother emperor, see Fantysová-Matějková, *Wenceslas de Bohême*, ch. 2, and Michel Pauly, 'Karl IV. und sein Halbbruder Wenzel: Das Herzogtum Luxemburg und Karls Politik im Westen des Reiches', in Amelie Bendheim and Heinz Sieburg (eds), *Prag in der Zeit der Luxemburger Dynastie* (Bielefeld, 2018), 13–36.

24 The convents suggested here are the Cistercian monastery of Königsaal/Zbraslav (1319–22) and the Benedictine convent of St George in Prague Castle (1323–5). See William G. Land, *The Prayer Book of Bonne of Luxembourg: A Personal Document* (Washington, 1984), 2–4; Joni M. Hand, *Women, Manuscripts and Identity in Northern Europe, 1350–1550* (Farnham, 2013), 12–13; Annette Ingebretson Lermack, 'Fit for a Queen: The Psalter of Bonne of Luxembourg at The Cloisters' (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Iowa, 1999), 40–4. All, to varying degrees, rely on Raymond Cazelles, *Jean l'aveugle: comte de Luxembourg, roi de Bohéme* (Paris, 1947). Some of these monastic locations are inferred rather than recorded, and may well be problematic. See Michel Margue, '*Regum de stirpe*: Some aspects of the Monastic Policy of John of Luxembourg, King of Bohemia and Count of Luxembourg', in Klara Benešovska (ed.), *A Royal Marriage: Elisabeth Přemyslid and John of Luxembourg 1310* (Prague, 2011), 262–76, as well as Jana Fantysová-Matějková's contribution to this volume.

25 See Contamine, 'Politique, culture et sentiment', 349–52.

cultural, linguistic, and ideological assimilation allowed her to become integrated into the French queen's retinue and successfully assume the role of royal-consort-in-waiting.[26]

Accepting this pattern has clear implications for the question of personal and dynastic identity. It seems that pre-hereditary or pre-nuptial personal histories offered – and were understood as – but one of a range of anchor points on which an eventual, often cross-cultural identity was to be constructed. While personal circumstances would make their mark upon an individual's psyche, successful mastery of the duties of subsequent social and political roles often required such marks to be suppressed, even erased. Many of the nobles mentioned here – especially the women, but also Henry VII before 1308 and John before 1310 – could have had little confidence in predicting their final geopolitical and cultural environment, or gain the freedom to choose it. On the one hand, familial association was of central importance in marriage politics: it would have shaped not only a potential bride's dowry, but the political access and genealogical authority established by any union.[27] On the other, it is clear that privileging biological parentage above all other considerations in assigning 'Luxembourgness' and viewing it as a prime qualifier of identity is an anachronistic construct of later nationalistic historiography.[28] For example, before becoming Queen of France, Mary of Luxembourg was first engaged (aged four) to Ludwig (1297–1311), heir to the Duchy of Bavaria. Any preparations undertaken for this union were forsaken when Ludwig died, at which point she was sent to reside at Marienthal in the County of Luxembourg. In 1318, she and her sister were summoned to the monastery of Zbraslav outside Prague, so that the representatives of King Charles I

26 See Lermack, 'Fit for a Queen', ch. 3.

27 See Fössel, 'Die Heiratspolitik der Luxemburger'.

28 See, for example, Dušan Zupka, 'Medieval Dynasties in Medieval Studies: A Historiographic Contribution', *Forum Historiae* 13 (2019), 89–101, and with specific focus on Luxembourg, Pit Pérporté, *Constructing the Middle Ages: Historiography, Collective Memory and Nation-Building in Luxembourg* (Leiden, 2011); 'When "Jan Lucemburský" meets "Jean l'Aveugle": a comparison of King John of Bohemia's representation in the Czech lands and Luxembourg', *Husitský Tábor* 17 (2012), 29–49; 'Les débuts de la médiévistique au Luxembourg? L'oeuvre de Jean Schoetter (1823–1881) et la construction de la nation luxembourgeoise', in Isabelle Guyot-Bachy and Jean-Marie Moeglin (eds), *La naissance de la médiévistique: Les historiens et leurs sources en Europe au Moyen Âge (XIXe - début du XXe siècle)* (Geneva, 2015), 453–72; Jana Fantysová-Matějková, 'Der Pater Patriae und der Vater der luxemburgischen Geschichtsschreibung? Jean Bertholet über Johann von Luxemburg', in Lenka Bobková and Jan Zdichynec (eds), *Geschichte - Erinnerung - Selbstidentifikation, Die schriftliche Kultur in den Ländern der Böhmischen Krone im 14.-18. Jahrhundert* (Prague, 2012), 51–71, and the ample other studies referred to there.

of Hungary could choose one of them as their new queen.[29] Her younger sister having been chosen, Mary then remained in Prague. Cazelles asserts that following the rift between John of Luxembourg and Elizabeth of Bohemia in 1319, Mary was charged with taking care of her brother's children, although Peter of Zittau places her in Elizabeth's company for the years 1318–22, that is, until her short-lived marriage and queenship of France.[30] None of her pre-nuptial contexts necessitated engagement or association with local culture, or took heed of Mary's cultural preferences. While her familial background and dynastic position within the web of elite European aristocratic society marked her out as a potential queen, any previously learnt behaviours that came with her earlier experiences can be thought of as close to irrelevant to fulfilling her role, beyond the acquisition of cultural flexibility and the seemingly contradictory skills of dynastic representation and assimilation. The system was thus rather impersonal in terms of the positioning of the individuals within it, though character (together with health, ability, and chance) shaped their success or failure in inhabiting their allotted roles. The trumping of function over individuality seeped back into the personal and familial, as can be illustrated by the first will of Joan of Burgundy (1293–1349), Queen of France, dated 1329.[31] In it she bequeathed her coronation crown and best diadem to her daughter-in-law (that is, the future queen), whomever that was to end up being (her son, John, married Bonne of Luxembourg only in 1332). As the reuse of queens' coronation crowns was not common in France at this point, this act can be read as an attempt to transform a personal object to one of dynastic significance.[32]

29 See Cazelles, *Jean l'aveugle*, 106–10. For the context of the alliance with Charles I of Hungary, see Renáta Skorka, 'De Luxembourg à Oradea: Histoire de la reine Béatrice de Hongrie', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome – Moyen Âge* 129:2 (2017), <http://journals.openedition.org/mefrm/3663>, accessed 16 March 2023.

30 For Mary's childcare responsibilities, see Cazelles, *Jean l'aveugle*, 74. For Peter of Zittau's text, see Josef Elmer (ed.), *Chronicon Aulæ Regiæ—Excerpta de Diversis Chronicis Additis Quibusdam Aulæ Regiæ Memorabilibus—Chronicon Francisci Pragensis—Chronicon Benessii de Weitmil, Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 4 (Prague, 1884), 261.

31 This Joan of Burgundy was the wife of King Philip VI of France, with the will written shortly after her coronation. She should not be confused with the Joan of Burgundy who was queen to Philip V, or with their daughter, Joan of France, Countess and Duchess of Burgundy, both of whom also figure in this essay. For their familial relationships, see the genealogies.

32 See Murielle Gaude-Ferragu, 'Les dernières volontés de la reine de France. Les deux testaments de Jeanne de Bourgogne, femme de Philippe VI de Valois (1329, 1336)', *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France, 2007* (2007), 23–66, at 34–5. The uniqueness and specificity of crowning rituals were embedded into the identity of each medieval kingdom. Some, therefore, placed more emphasis

Naturally, this tendency affected actors throughout the social spectrum: the contrast between Machaut's single use of one word with Germanic origins and his repeated references to Central European occurrences has long been noted.[33] Linguistically and stylistically, he was unabashedly 'French'. Considering that his poetic career may well have begun outside France while on itinerant service to John of Luxembourg, should this be read as reflecting his personal prejudices, or those of his patron? A tolerant interpretation would see Machaut's output as a direct outcome of his courtly function, him being a French poet catering for the Francophone faction of his patron's court. After all, and regardless of his personal preferences, John of Luxembourg's feudal domains included a number of Francophone areas, and he held fiefs also from the counts of Hainaut and the King of France.[34] For example, in association with his marriage to Beatrice of Bourbon in 1334, John was given Mehun-sur-Yévre (in the environs of Bourges, now in the department Cher in central France) by Philip VI.[35]

---

on the queen's reuse of crowns than others. For an exploration of the concept of individuality in relation to the Middle Ages, see Franz-Josef Arlinghaus (ed.), *Forms of Individuality and Literacy in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods* (Turnhout, 2015).

33 See, for example, Earp, *Guide*, 12–14, or Uri Smilansky, 'Machaut and Prague: A Rare New Sighting?', *Early Music* 46 (2018), 211–23. A specific locus of interaction is considered in Albert Prioult, 'Un poète voyageur: Guillaume de Machaut et la "Reise" de Jean l'Aveugle, roi de Bohème, en 1328–1329', *Lettres Romanes* 4 (1950), 3–29. For the intersection between poetics and politics in Bohemian-French relations, see Martin Nejedlý, 'Deux poètes français du quatorzième siècle en Bohême. Rencontres et confrontations', *Prague Papers on the History of International Relations* 1 (1997), 30–53; 'La Bohême et ses habitants vus par quatre auteurs français du Moyen Age (Guillaume de Machaut, Eustache Deschamps, Jean Froissart, Jean d'Arras)', *Listy filologické / Folia philologica* 128 (2005), 21–34. See also the contributions by Claude Gauvard, Waldemar Voisé, Malgorzata Wozna, Vaclav Černy, Jitka Snízková and Ladislav Vachulka in Jacques Chailley, Paul Imbs and Daniel Poirion (eds), *Guillaume de Machaut, poète et compositeur: Colloque–table ronde organisé par l'Université de Reims (Reims, 19–22 avril 1978)* (Actes et colloques, 23) (Paris, 1982).

34 In this context, it should be remembered that (after Latin) French acted as an international *lingua franca*, and that the French monarchy enjoyed great transnational prestige at this time. John's behaviour, therefore, can be seen as cultivating ties with the most powerful kingdom around following his failure to secure the emperorship for himself, rather than as a petulant disinterest in Bohemian affairs. See also Karl Kügle's and Jana Fantysová Matějková's contributions to this book, as well as Uri Smilansky, 'The *Ars Subtilior* as an International Style', in Stefan Morent, Silke Leopold and Joachim Steinheuer (eds), *Europäische Musikkultur im Kontext des Konstanzer Konzils* (Memmingen, 2017), 225–49.

35 See Earp, 'Introduction', 33 and Margue and Schroeder, *Un itinéraire européen*, 69, 71, who contextualize the donation within the wider financial dealings between the two kings. The castle was confiscated from Robert III of Artois in 1332, and was

Indeed, as discussed in Jana Fantysová Matějková's contribution, Machaut seems likely to have been stationed primarily in John's western areas of influence, also looking after his interests there when the King of Bohemia was occupied elsewhere. A less kindly and perhaps more sensationalist view might interpret Machaut's output as the performance of difference from his patron's Bohemian environment, its language, and its culture, in support of a king often at loggerheads with his subjects, and who chose to spend much of his time outside his kingdom.[36] Either way, analysis of his actions, attitudes, and artistic output (or anyone else's, for that matter) has to be tempered with awareness of both the habits of his locus and the external expectations relating to his role, including the implied appropriateness of cultural engagement.

While such a view of poets' positions can be considered divisive, culture also offers a unique locus of performance in smoothing over the contradictions and transitions of role and geography. A luxury book, for example, performs beyond economic power, projecting also aesthetic, cultural, linguistic, intellectual, and genealogical authority through a combination of its materiality and binding, illumination, content, and use. Before delving into my case study, however, it is also worth noting that cultural influence often resulted from subtler relationships operating on a completely different level. For example, the French, royal 'Pucellian' school of manuscript illumination – upon which the naturalistic, 'Post-Pucellian' style of **RemC** and **G52** depends – is characterized by an integral Italianate influence.[37] This, however, has little to do with the biographical histories of any of the royal patrons who commissioned books from workshops

reintegrated into the royal holdings following John of Luxembourg's death. It later became part of the Duchy of Berry, created in 1360 for John of France (1340–1416), son of John II and Bonne. Thereafter, it soon became the site of a famous princely and royal residence. For that incarnation, see Harry Bober, 'André Beauneveu and Mehun-sur-Yèvre', *Speculum* 28:4 (1953), 741–53.

36 For John and Elizabeth's relationship, his inheritance and status as an absent ruler, see Michel Pauly (ed.), *Die Erbtochter, der fremde Fürst und das Land: Die Ehe Johanns des Blinden und Elisabeths von Böhmen in vergleichender europäischer Perspektive = L'héritière, le prince étranger et le pays: le mariage de Jean l'Aveugle et d'Elisabeth de Bohême dans une perspective comparative européenne* (Luxembourg, 2013). Perhaps as a middle way – and in my eyes less convincingly, considering the linguistic constellation of John's holdings – scholars have used this characterization of Machaut's output to support a distancing between the poet and John himself, and for Machaut's early affiliation with the French royal court. See, most recently, Earp, 'Introduction', 21.

37 On Pucelle, see Kathleen Morand, *Jean Pucelle* (Oxford, 1962); Kyunghee Pyun and Anna D. Russakoff (eds), *Jean Pucelle: Innovation and Collaboration in Manuscript Painting* (London, 2013). Leo, 'The Pucellian School and the Rise of Naturalism', is perhaps most relevant here.

promulgating this fashion.[38] It was these commissions that established the reputation of 'Pucellian' visual tropes, not their geographic, temporal, and political point of origin, or, for that matter, their actual artistic content.

BOOKS, POLITICS, IDENTIFYING PATRONAGE

All this leads us back to the careers and activities of Guillaume de Machaut and Jean de Vignay, their patrons, and their books. Both the *Remede* and the *Eschés* are likely the product of the early 1340s.[39] By this point, Vignay was well into his sixth decade, and having completed a number of large-scale royal commissions, was closely associated with the intellectual endeavours of Philip VI and his first wife, Joan of Burgundy. Reconstructing Machaut's whereabouts during this time has created more difficulties. Nevertheless, a growing body of opinion suggests his continued service to John of Luxembourg up to the latter's death in 1346, with a recent discovery of a subsequent direct employment

38 Such workshops served many members of the French royal family. Particularly important books are linked to Joan of Évreux, Joan of Burgundy, Charles IV, Philip VI, John II, and Bonne of Luxembourg.

39 In dating the *Eschés*, Knowles, 'Jean de Vignay', combines stylistic grounds and the dating of other translations to place it after 1335. Her association of the work with John II while still Duke of Normandy and his mother, Joan of Burgundy, provided a *terminus ante quem* of 1349 (Joan's death) for the commission, and 1350 (John's inheriting the crown) for its presentation. While some of these associations are challenged below, the dating of the work is not affected. An annotation to the manuscript Lunel, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 8 supplies the date 1340, though this source's own late date and general unreliability problematizes this (reasonable) assertion. For the *Remede*, see Yolanda Plumley, *The Art of Grafted Song: Citation and Allusion in the Age of Machaut* (Oxford, 2013), 197–318, where Plumley demonstrates that Machaut began writing ballades c. 1339, meaning the *Remede* (which contains two) could not have taken the form in which it came down to us before this point. The suggestion that the *Lyon* – intrinsically dated to 1342 – post-dates the *Remede* would give at least a tentative end-date for composition, although its reliance on manuscript order representing chronology and the treatment of certain poetic themes is problematic. See Wimsatt and Kibler, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 33–4. On the importance of copying practicalities on dating this source and its components, Smilansky, 'Creating MS C'. Fantysová Matějková's somewhat later chronology of Machaut's *dits* places the *Remede* between 1346 and 1349, chiming with Earp, 'Introduction', which revises his earlier view. However, as both rely to a large degree on the *dit*'s association with Bonne, their arguments are of lesser weight within my discussion. On the possibility of musical revision (now invisible) taking part before MS C was created, see Karen Desmond, 'Traces of Revision in Machaut's Motet *Bone Pastor*', in Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 397–432.

being dated 1349, that is, comfortably later than his association with John.[40] It is by now clear that he did not choose to reside in Reims immediately after obtaining his canonry there in 1338. Still, it is likely that at least the later services Machaut provided to John had to do with the latter's western interests and took place on both sides of the border between France and the Empire. These may have been undertaken within John's entourage during periods he spent in that area, or more independently when he was away, or where the services required were more ambassadorial in nature.[41] For example, while no direct evidence of this survives, it is possible that following the recall of John's eldest son, Charles of Luxembourg, from Paris in 1330 or in preparation for John's daughter Bonne's arrival there in 1332, Machaut was tasked with furthering Luxembourg interests at the French court.[42] Lawrence Earp (among others) relied on this evidential ambiguity to suggest a close association with Bonne during this period (and through her, also with her husband), relying mostly on literary conflations between her and

40 See Bowers, 'Guillaume de Machaut'; Leach, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 12–26; and Jana Fantysová Matějková's contribution to this volume. See, however, Earp, 'Introduction', which advocates a separation from John from as early as 1338. Wathey, 'Guillaume de Machaut', provides evidence of Machaut's direct employment between 1349 and 1353 at the service of Yolanda of Flanders (1326–95), Countess of Bar.

41 Some interesting parallels are offered by a courtier whom we now recognize as the owner of one of Machaut's 'collected works' manuscripts. Aubert de Puychalin's stated duties at the court of Aragon – associated with the representation of the interests of John of Berry (Jean de Berry, 1340–1416) and his nephew, Charles VI of France (1368–1422) – ranged from the safeguarding of financial interests, through the provision of military assistance, to ensuring that a royal relative was well treated (in this case, Yolanda of Flanders' granddaughter and the king's cousin, Yolanda of Bar = Violant de Bar, 1365–1431, following her widowhood in 1395). See Yolanda Plumley and Uri Smilansky, 'A Courtier's Quest for Cultural Capital: Notes on the Early Ownership of the Machaut Manuscripts F-G' (forthcoming). It is worth noting that the courtiers discussed there operated as practical enablers, not as part of the performance of staged diplomacy, where official emissaries from the highest echelons of the aristocracy were required. The latter were usually dispatched for formal ratification at the conclusion of a political process, not for open-ended, extended durations of representation or negotiation. Machaut, having no high aristocratic pedigree, could therefore suitably operate as a functional representative of John's interests on the ground.

42 John of Luxembourg spent nearly all of 1332 in France, allowing for a smooth hypothetical transition of Machaut's from service within John's itinerant retinue to more distant service within a defined geographical and cultural orbit. See Fantysová Matějková, *Wenceslas de Bohême*, 18–19, or Contamine, 'Politique, culture et sentiment', 349–52.

characters within Machaut's *dits* (including the *Remede*).[43] It is thus often taken for granted that following her father's death, she 'inherited' Machaut's services and became his next major patron.

Considering Bonne as Machaut's first port of call when searching for patronage in France may seem to us natural, indeed, rather tempting.[44] It would also be easy enough to imagine how Machaut's, Bonne's, and John of France's agendas – while operating on different social strata and independently from one another – could have converged around the object of a luxurious copy of the *Remede*. The performance of **RemC** is, after all, rather extreme. The *Remede*'s interpolation of multiple musical works proclaiming novelty and sophistication is matched in **RemC** with the use of exceptionally expensive materials and the highest quality illuminations, a number of which are over-sized. Indeed, Anne Stone recently proposed that the work was composed with the layout of this specific manuscript in mind.[45] Its contents offer a new 'art of love' and tuition in courtliness and etiquette.[46] Regardless of the level of actual interaction, such an object would have had great potential as a prop in the performance of cultural capital.[47] As we have seen, by the late 1330s and early 1340s, all three were

43 See, for example, Daniel Poirion, *Le poète et le prince: L'évolution du lyrisme courtois de Guillaume de Machaut à Charles d'Orléans* (Paris, 1965), 194, 201; Wimsatt and Kibler, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 33–6, 53; and Lawrence Earp, 'Genre in the Fourteenth-Century French Chanson: The Virelai and the Dance Song', *Musica Disciplina* 45 (1991), 123–41, and 'Introduction', which states explicitly (32) that 'what I seek, first, is grounds to positing a term of service to Bonne of Luxembourg.' In relation to the *Remede*, I hope to expand on the current analysis and revisit many of these associations and perceived dedicatory techniques in a monograph, *Cultural Performance and the* Remède de Fortune*: Events, Texts, Books* (forthcoming).

44 For my own recent succumbing to this temptation, see Smilansky, 'Creating MS C', 298–304.

45 See Stone, 'Made to Measure'.

46 See Douglas Kelly, *Machaut and the Medieval Apprenticeship Tradition: Truth, Fiction and Poetic Craft* (Cambridge, 2014), 23–7. For an interpretation centred on the art of memory, see Jody Enders, 'Music, Delivery, and the Rhetoric of Memory in Guillaume de Machaut's *Remède de Fortune*', *PMLA* 107:3 (1992), 450–64. For one providing an 'art of rhetoric', see Jordan Stokes, 'In Search of Machaut's Poietics: Music and Rhetoric in *Le Remede de Fortune*', *The Journal of Musicology* 31 (2014), 395–430. For its status as a psychological 'art of wellbeing', see Tamsyn Mahoney-Steel, 'From Socially Distant to Socially Engaged: Exploring the Soundscape and Material Environment of Guillaume de Machaut's *Remede de Fortune*', *Digital Philology* 10:1 (2021), 64–94. These interpretations are discussed, evaluated, and expanded in Smilansky, *Cultural Performance*.

47 Important here is the notion of a 'rhetoric of ornament', where the external ornamentation of a text – in this case, musically, visually, and materially – acts as both surrogate and guarantor of the authority of its content. See Margaret Goehring, 'Artifice and Ornament in the *Dit de lyon* Garden Miniature', in Lawrence Earp

well established in their respective positions: John, as the first natural heir to the French throne after the crises of the early fourteenth century; Bonne, as future queen and producer of the next generation of male heirs (having given birth to four sons between 1338 and 1342); and Machaut, as a well-respected and sought-after retainer, enjoying independent means through a service career at the court of Bonne's father.[48] Nevertheless, John of France – now in his late teens and early twenties and already having overcome a number of bouts of serious illness – had to contend with the constant tensions between the Tancarville and Harcourt factions within his personal holdings as Duke of Normandy and Count of Anjou and Maine, as well as with the first battles of the Hundred Years' War.[49] Like any heir-apparent, his courtly performance would have been measured against that of his father, as well as those of other ducal courts. As the intended second Valois king, he had an important role in establishing the new dynastic identity, balancing tradition and continuity with newness and uniqueness. His book-commissioning and acquisitions have long since been associated exactly with this kind of cultural positioning.[50] Bonne, of course, would have been integral to the dynastic performance. Beyond the bearing of sons, it would have been expected of her – and vital to her Valois family – to assimilate culturally, in terms of both linguistic and institutional environments. Neither her preparation nor her previous circumstances were conducive to this. We have already noted her predominantly Empire-oriented upbringing and periods of residency in convents. With John of France often absent and Bonne's near-constant state of pregnancy from 1336 onwards (including periods of confinement), she spent most of her time alongside other royal ladies at the court of her mother-in-law, Joan of

---

and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 217–37, esp. 221–6.

48 See overviews in Raymond Cazelles, 'Jean II le Bon: Quel homme? Quel roi?', *Revue historique* 251 (1974), 5–26; and Lermack, 'Fit for a Queen', ch. 3 and 6. For Machaut's reputation and the circulation of his works at the point of the creation of **C**, see Elizabeth Eva Leach, 'Machaut's First Single-Author Compilation', in Helen Deeming and Elizabeth Eva Leach (eds), *Manuscripts and Medieval Song: Inscription, Performance, Context* (Cambridge, 2015), 247–70, revised and updated in Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 59–91 (to which subsequent page numbers refer).

49 See François Neveux and Claire Ruelle, *La Normandie royale: des Capétiens aux Valois, XIIIe-XIVe siècle* (Rennes, 2005), 491–7; François Neveux, *La Normandie pendant la guerre de Cent ans (XIVe-XVe siècle)* (Rennes, 2008) ; and Françoise Autrand, *Charles V, le Sage* (Paris, 1994).

50 See, for example, Léopold Delisle, *Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la bibliothèque Impériale* (Paris, 1868), 15–18.

Burgundy, either in Paris or Vincennes.[51] This context diminished (though not entirely) her opportunities for both independent courtly performance, and for being seen as acting in the traditional role as intercessor to her husband. Any external opportunities to assert dynastic and personal authority would have been attractive. Pressure was likely increased by her need to contend with the memories of her aunt Mary's and brother Charles' earlier residences at the royal court.[52] Regardless of their precise position, poets were always on the lookout for opportunities to project their credentials, especially when moving between courts and offering literary and musical novelties. It is even possible to read John and Bonne's patronage of Machaut as an intentional counterbalance to the association of other notable cultural figures (for example, Vignay, or Philippe de Vitry) with the courts of Charles IV and Philip VI: the up-and-coming generation asserting their identity, sophistication, and courtliness by promoting an independent source of cultural capital.[53]

Before succumbing to the allure of this image, however, it is worth noting that if such tenuous grounds suffice for suggesting a long-standing relationship, it is possible to propose many other patrons for both the *Remede* and **RemC**.[54] For example, Wimsatt and Kibler emphasize the mention of the Park of Hesdin in the *Remede* as the 'one undisguised – and very suggestive – proper name in the work', but discuss it only in relation to royal visits there, and not in relation to its actual owners at the time.[55] Joan of France (1308–47), Duchess of (French) Burgundy through marriage (which also made her sister-in-law to Philip VI's queen, Joan), but in her own right Countess of (Imperial) Burgundy and Artois, was the

51 See Lermack, 'Fit for a Queen', 44–56.

52 Mary was at the French court in 1322–4, Charles in 1323–30, with Bonne arriving in 1332. Margue and Schroeder, *Un itinéraire européen*, 71, however, claim Charles could still be considered a resident there when Bonne arrived.

53 Such a notion is weakened by evidence of John's later ties with Vitry, but could still have contributed to courtly optics in the 1330s and 1340s. See, most recently, Andrew Wathey, 'Philippe de Vitry, Bishop of Meaux', *Early Music History* 38 (2019), 215–68. For more details on Vitry's earlier career, see, for example, Andrew Wathey, 'The Marriage of Edward III and the Transmission of French Motets to England', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 45 (1992), 1–29. Furthermore, there is much potential for anachronism in our privileging of novelty as an unquestionably positive signifier. For a reappraisal of the source of authority and relationship with the past in relation to the poetic *formes fixes*, see Yolanda Plumley, 'Guillaume de Machaut and the Advent of a New School of Lyric *c.*1350: The Prestige of the Past', in Lawrence Earp and Jared C. Hartt (eds), *Poetry, Art, and Music in Guillaume de Machaut's Earliest Manuscript (BnF fr. 1586)* (Turnhout, 2021), 315–40.

54 Especially if we accept the idea that the work was composed with this version in mind, as suggested in Stone, 'Made to Measure'.

55 Wimsatt and Kibler, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 35.

daughter of Philip V (c. 1293–1322) and (yet another) Joan of Burgundy and Artois (1292–1330).[56] She inherited Hesdin as a personal holding from her maternal grandmother, Mahaut of Artois (1268–1329), a famous cultural patron who greatly enhanced Hesdin's prestige.[57] Any visitor there between 1330 and 1347 would have known who the lady of the castle was, and reference to the County of Artois had particular political implications in this period: Philip VI assembled his army in Arras – including a contingent sent by John of Luxembourg – before embarking on his first military campaign as king in 1328. He also presided over the contested inheritance of the county between Mahaut and her nephew, Robert III of Artois (1287–1342; the dispute lasted some 30 years), which was seen by contemporaries to have eventually led to the outbreak of war with England.[58] Likewise, a number of the ensuing campaigns and battles took place in Artois and its immediate surroundings, involving Philip VI, John of Luxembourg, and Joan's husband, Odo IV, Duke of Burgundy (1295–

56 As the tags suggest, the neighbouring Duchy and County of Burgundy did not share feudal allegiance, the duchy being a fiefdom of the Kings of France and the county of the Holy Roman Empire. Joan of France's own daughter-in-law's second marriage was to John II of France following Bonne's death (1350). See genealogies. I consider these relationships and their implications for the *Remede* more fully in my forthcoming monograph.

57 Mahaut has already been a focus for scholarly interest since the nineteenth century. See Jules-Marie Richard, 'Une petite nièce de saint Louis: Mahaut, comtesse d'Artois et de Bourgogne (1302–1329)', *Étude sur la vie privée, les arts et l'industrie, en Artois et à Paris au commencement du XIVe siècle* (Paris, 1887); 'Les Livres de Mahaut, Comtesse d'Artois et de Bourgogne, 1302–1329', *Revue des questions historiques* 40 (1886), 135–41. See also Régine Page, 'The Patronage of Mahaut d'Artois and Three Fourteenth-Century Altarpieces', in Paul Binski and Elizabeth A. New (eds), *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2012), 199–215; or Susan Groag Bell, 'Medieval Women Book Owners: Arbiters of Lay Piety and Ambassadors of Culture', *Signs* 7 (1982), 742–68. For Hesdin more specifically, see Anne Hagopian Van Buren, 'Reality and Literary Romance in the Park of Hesdin', in Elisabeth Blair Macdougall (ed.), *Medieval Gardens* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1986), 115–34; Sharon Farmer, 'Aristocratic Power and the "Neutral" Landscape: The Garden Park at Hesdin, ca. 1291–1302', *Speculum* 88 (2013), 644–80; Elly R. Truitt, 'The Garden of Earthly Delights: Mahaut of Artois and the Automata at Hesdin', *Medieval Feminist Forum* 46 (2010), 74–9; *Medieval Robots: Mechanism, Magic, Nature, and Art* (Philadelphia, 2015), esp. 122–40; or more recently Goehring, 'Artifice and Ornament'.

58 See William H. TeBrake, *A Plague of Insurrection: Popular Politics and Peasant Revolt in Flanders, 1323–1328* (Philadelphia, 1993); and Dana L. Sample, 'Philip VI's Mortal Enemy: Robert of Artois and the Beginning of the Hundred Years War', in Andrew Villalon and Donald Kagay (eds), *The Hundred Years War (Part II): Different Vistas* (Leiden, 2008), 261–84.

1349, Queen Joan's brother).[59] It would perhaps have been more natural to associate a poem from this period set in this estate with its feudal lady, rather than with a visitor, however illustrious.

Even if a visiting royal dedicatee is preferred to the owner of Hesdin, other ladies with direct links to John of Luxembourg can be suggested. His second wife, Beatrice of Bourbon, left Prague for good some two weeks after her coronation on 18 May 1337, and spent the remaining 46 years of her life in Luxembourg and France.[60] A *dit* by her husband's retainer representing her as the figurehead of an ideal court would have been useful both as a gift within the royal couple, and for propaganda value towards outsiders. Alternatively, the reigning French monarchs, Philip VI and Joan, shared many contextual elements with the situation described above regarding their son John of France and his Luxembourg wife, Bonne. John of Luxembourg was on very good terms with Philip VI and his predecessor, Charles IV, and may well have spent more time in their company than in that of his own daughter.[61] Also, Philip VI and Joan had already demonstrated interest in consuming and commissioning vernacular literature, while the younger John and Bonne were still an unknown cultural quantity.[62] As a result, Machaut – as a member of John's inner retinue – may have had better access to the personnel and institutions of the French royal court than to those of the ducal court of Normandy. In this context, it is important to note that during periods of conflict, numerous separations could develop between the administrative running of feudal institutions, geography, and the physical body of their figureheads. For example, I have mentioned the regular residency of Bonne at her mother-in-law, Queen Joan's, court, resulting primarily from the political and military instability in the north of the Kingdom of France. Especially when John was also at the royal court, the administration of

59 For the early events and politics of the war, see Jonathan Sumption, *The Hundred Years War I: Trial by Battle* (London and New York, 1990). As a Peer of France and close ally of Philip VI and John II, Odo also took part in the 1328 campaign and was involved in the Artois dispute.

60 See Fantysová Matějková, *Wenceslas de Bohême*, 37.

61 See Margue and Schroeder, *Un itinéraire européen*, 62–86; summarized in Earp, *Guide*, 8–16 and more fully in Contamine, 'Politique, culture et sentiment'.

62 See Plumley, *The Art of Grafted Song*, part II, which discusses, for example, Watriquet de Couvin and Jehan de Le Mote. Vignay's commissions have already been mentioned. Lermack, 'Fit for a Queen', 224–30, traces a pattern from Joan of Burgundy to John II of France by which serious book collecting and commissioning only began after being crowned, and thus considers the preoccupation an element of royal duty. For the queen's books in particular, see Claudine A. Chavannes-Mazel, 'De boeken van Jeanne de Bourgogne, koningin van Frankrijk (r. 1328–1349)', in Robert W. Scheller (ed.), *Representatie: kunsthistorische bijdragen over vorst, staatsmacht en beeldende kunst* (Amsterdam, 2004), 84–110.

their Duchy of Normandy would have operated from beyond its borders. Furthermore, active campaigning would separate many courtly functions from its male ruler. In 1338, Philip VI officially invested Joan with all royal powers and responsibilities (other than waging war) during his frequent military absences.[63] At such times, the wider institutions of the royal court would have officially focused on her person, rather than his.

If Machaut wrote the *Remede* while still in the service of John of Luxembourg, its dedication likely represented his patron's interests first, and his own second. Indeed, a dedication of either *dit* or book may just as easily have been offered on the instruction of John as patron rather than on Machaut's own initiative. Such presentations could then be considered a tool in the patron's demonstration of 'soft power', akin to other forms of gift-giving.[64] Its target was as likely to be an external power capable of furthering John's cause as it was a relation already under his familial authority. Securing the allegiance of a queen holding temporal power may have been a more pressing need than supporting his daughter's position as expected spouse of the future monarch. From Machaut's point of view, continuing employment with John and income from multiple benefices divorces the act of dedication from a search for new patronage, or from an expectation that it would result in a long-term association. Furthermore, there is no compelling reason for the conflation between the *Remede*'s subject matter and the recipients of a book containing it. Why should a royal patron familiar with, even fond of, Hesdin not appreciate receiving a book purportedly about the place and its owner (especially if this is a close family member)?[65] Any reciprocating gesture from the recipient could just as well be directed solely towards John of Luxembourg rather

63 See André Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency: The Genesis of a Vocation', in John Carmi Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (London, 1998), 93–116 (esp. 112–13).

64 See Uri Smilansky, 'Texts on the Move: Book Presentations Between Social Networks, European Politics, and Literary Performance', in Karl Kügle (ed.), *The Networked Court: Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Late Medieval European Court Cultures* (forthcoming), especially the discussion of the social appropriateness of such gifts, suggesting that the use of the author (or some other book-practitioner) as an intermediary in the presentation was an essential part of the performance. See also Brigitte Buettner, 'Past Presents: New Year's Gifts at the Valois Courts, ca. 1400', *The Art Bulletin* 83 (2001), 598–625; Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner and Bernhard Jussen (eds), *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figurations of Exchange* (Göttingen, 2003).

65 Another example within Machaut's output would be the *Prise d'Alexandre*, which chronicles Peter I (1328–69), King of Cyprus' crusading efforts. As it also describes Peter's assassination, it could not have been presented to (and was likely not even commissioned by) its subject.

than to Machaut as poet.[66] Of course, weighing the likelihood of these (and other) possibilities can in itself be problematic, as the evidence relied upon is often not only partial, but also unspecific.[67] Knowing authors' momentary locations or administrative contacts does not limit their wider, contemporaneous literary relevance, and fame as a literary patron does not in itself raise the likelihood that single works with no (or ambivalent) internal dedication should be associated with this or that patron.[68]

JOINT MATERIALITY? LINKING VIGNAY AND MACHAUT

In what follows, I continue this thought experiment only in the direction of Philip VI and Joan as potential alternative recipients of the *Remede*, as this is where the relationship between **RemC** and **G52** can make an interesting contribution, and where a change in our historical narrative may have the potential to affect the perception of the *Remede*'s 'Luxembourgness'. On the face of it, the coupling of the two texts contained in these sources seems to enhance the association with the younger Valois, as the prologue to Vignay's translation dedicates the work to John of France as Duke of Normandy. Thus, John's coronation in 1350 is often taken as the *terminus ante quem* for the *Eschés*.[69] However, not all is as it seems. The said prologue does not appear in **G52**. Instead, the text concludes with a unique epilogue which specifies Philip VI as its intended recipient.[70] This association does

66 It should be remembered here that not all presentations and dedications resulted in the acceptance of service and subsequent patronage. See, for example, Smilansky, 'Texts on the Move', which considers Froissart's use of both book-giving and literary reading to facilitate momentary access rather than ongoing employment or patronage.

67 For example, Wathey's recent discovery of the substantial patronage of both Guillaume and Jean de Machaut by Yolanda, Countess of Bar opens the possibility of earlier links with her as patron as well. See Wathey, 'Guillaume de Machaut'. The County of Bar straddled the border between France and the Holy Roman Empire just south of Luxembourg and, like it, was elevated to a duchy in the early 1350s. As a result, and especially during her widowhood 1344–53, Yolanda's position as an independent female figure of political authority with established, regular dealing with John of Luxembourg, Philip VI, and their heirs cannot be in doubt. See Michelle Bubenicek, *Quand les femmes gouvernent. Droit et Politique au XIVe siècle: Yolande de Flandre* (Paris, 2002).

68 See, in this regard, the temptations of a 'Great Court Theory', challenged in Andrew Tomasello, 'A Footnote on Aragonese Mass Manuscripts and the Decline of the Great Court Theory of Music History', *Musica Disciplina* 49 (1995), 95–119.

69 Some qualifiers to this are discussed below.

70 He is not described by name, but as the royal nephew of Philip the Fair, that is, Philip IV. The **G52** epilogue is transcribed in Iacobellis, '"Grant peine et grant

not require an adjustment of the dating of the work, but it brings the *Eschés* into line with all of Vignay's other known dedications, and makes sense of his most substantial divergence from the Latin original. At the beginning of the section dedicated to the queen, Vignay adds a set of historical anecdotes on the foundation and independence of the Kingdom of France, preparing it with a justification of male primogeniture.[71] As this was the basis for Philip VI's claim to the throne, such references would have been more urgent for the king than for his son.

G52 was late to resurface. It was purchased by William Simon Glazier in 1958, to later be loaned (1963), then gifted (1984), to the Pierpont Morgan Library. The lasting influence on Vignay scholarship of Knowles' work from the early 1950s resulted in the awareness of this source's unique textual features remaining minimal.[72] Their implications have not yet been fully considered. But what should we make of the *Eschés*' double dedication? We do possess evidence of the creation of multiple luxury manuscripts of single works within a similar temporal and geographic context.[73] Indeed, two copies of another of Vignay's translations, the *Miroir historial*, were apparently created (at least partially under his supervision) for and presented to both Joan of Burgundy and her son John of France around 1333.[74] The two sources even contain discrepancies in the text of their prologues. In that pair, however, it is John's copy that carries a textual association of the work with his mother, a specification that is missing

diligence'", 313, and is discussed in 132–4.

71 This section is discussed in Fuller, 'A Critical Edition', 78–81, as are other changes which support a political, pro-Valois interpretation. On Vignay's special treatment of the chapter on the queen and its association with Joan of Burgundy, see Knowles, 'The Life and Works', 30–1. This is strengthened by the dedication of **G52** to Joan's husband, a fact Knowles could not have known.

72 For example, it seems likely that the absence of **G52** from Fuller's 1974 edition was the outcome of her being unaware of its existence rather than a decision to ignore it. While discussing this source and quoting Iacobellis, Earp, 'Introduction', 25–7 does not refer to the epilogue or the specific dedication it contains. Stone, 'Made to Measure', 126–7 acknowledges this (fn 37), yet only after emphasizing the association of the translation with John. For similar historiographical influence on the reception of **C**, see Leach, 'Machaut's First', 59–62.

73 For a detailed case study, see Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and their Makers*, ch. 7. The books discussed there, however, are not of new works, and the differences between them relate to presentation, not text. They do not include personal dedications, let alone conflicting ones.

74 See Claudine A. Chavannes-Mazel, 'Problems in Translation, Transcription and Iconography: The *Miroir historial*, Books 1–8', in Monique Paulmeir-Foucart, Serge Lusignan and Alain Nadeau (eds), *Vincent de Beauvais: intentions et receptions d'une œuvre encyclopédique au Moyen Âge* (Montreal, 1990), 345–74.

from her own.[75] Nevertheless, both contain frontispiece-illuminations that make Joan's role as the commissioner clear. While the books were dedicated to different patrons, the dedication of the translation itself did not change. It was clearly not a problem to present John of France with a new book of a new translation that was commissioned by and dedicated to his mother. Indeed, it is likely that she initiated both translation and gift as an educational coming-of-age present to her son. To this familial relationship should be added proximity, as the royal and ducal households mostly cohabitated at Vincennes.[76] In this context, it is easy to imagine how the presentation of duplicate books where each object was dedicated to a different generation of the family was considered unproblematic. Conversely, it problematizes any attempt at claiming that the contents of such duplicated items – that is, the texts themselves – were individually commissioned by two different patrons sharing the same space.[77] I am, therefore, not convinced by Iacobellis' suggestion that **G52** had a lost double which included the dedication to John of France, and on which all subsequent copies of the *Eschés* relied.[78] Such a textual difference, in the context of cohabitating father and son, would have to be considered a transparent fabrication on Vignay's part, instead of celebrating a joint cause or project shared by both generations. After all, Philip and John would have known who initiated the translation.

Rather, I contend that it would have been politically risky for Vignay to remove the dedication to Philip VI while the king was still alive. Thus, I consider the re-dedication to have occurred later, probably at a few years'

75 Perhaps establishing dynastic prestige and authority was more important for the non-commissioning younger generation. Joan, after all, knew about and expected the translation. For the dynastic parameter of book-collection and presentation, see Deborah McGrady, *The Writer's Gift or the Patron's Pleasure? The Literary Economy in Late Medieval France* (Toronto, 2019), ch. 1, and Joan A. Holladay, 'Fourteenth-Century French Queens as Collectors and Readers of Books: Jeanne d'Evreux and Her Contemporaries', *Journal of Medieval History* 32 (2006), 69–100. For a mirroring of unspecified dedications in the visual language of books, see John Lowden, 'The Royal / Imperial Book and the Image and Self-Image of the Medieval Ruler', in Anne J. Duggan (ed.), *Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe* (London, 1993), 213–40. Here, Lowden understands the avoidance of portraiture as a suggestion of intimacy rather than distance.

76 For the joint residency, see, for example, Françoise Lehoux, *Jean de France, Duc de Berry: sa vie, son action politique (1340–1416)* (Paris, 1966–8), 7.

77 Conflicting simultaneous dedications seemed to have become more common only later in the century, a process in which Christine de Pizan apparently took an important lead. See J.C. Laidlaw, 'Christine de Pizan: A Publisher's Progress', *Modern Language Review* 82 (1987), 35–75.

78 Iacobellis, '"Grant peine et grant diligence"', 133.

remove and after Philip's death in August 1350.[79] At this point, it would have made little sense to reproduce the earlier dedication to Philip VI. This, along with the uniqueness of **G52**'s epilogue, suggests a copying date before John's coronation to be more likely.[80] In addition, Vignay's involvement in manuscript production would have offered flexibility and dexterity in revising works for new patrons. I therefore conclude that the original dedicatee and commissioner of the translation is more likely to have been Philip VI, not John of France. John only conferred the Duchy of Normandy on his son, Charles of France (1338–80, the future Charles V), in 1355, so referring to him as duke remained viable until that date.[81] As the mention of Normandy was important to Vignay in setting out his own Norman roots (and thus, his feudal affinity with John of France as patron), this could have been retrospectively engineered using a technique not dissimilar to that used by Machaut when dating his *dits* or dedicating the *Navarre*, and despite the availability of a higher, royal title.[82] Thus, the procedure makes sense even after John's ascent to the throne, and I can think of no reason why Vignay would have undertaken a re-dedication in the other direction, even without considering the relative dating of the *Eschés*' surviving sources. Vignay enjoyed established ties with Philip VI, and there is no reason to believe that the prologue would have offended the king, or that he would have resented receiving a copy of a work commissioned by and dedicated to his son and heir.

At this point it is important to assess the meaning we assign to the **RemC**-**G52** link. It is, of course, entirely possible that it is but an accidental by-product of a temporally close production history. The noticeable

79 On the practicalities and cultural context of presentation and re-presentation, see Smilansky, 'Texts on the Move'.

80 My implied earlier date for **G52**'s illumination chimes with the recent conclusions in Earp, 'Introduction', and Pyun, 'The Master of the *Remede de Fortune*', that **C** was likely mostly decorated already in the 1340s, as opposed to the suggestion in Avril, 'Un Chef-d'œuvre', 99, 114–18, that both these sources were illuminated between 1350 and 1356.

81 See Autrand, *Charles V*, 166–7. It should be remembered that Vignay's date of death is a conjecture based on the dedicatees of his translations and the dating of some of his manuscripts. We have no secure date for him later than 1333, although that marker is associated with a 'middle period' translation, which was followed by a number of others, including the *Eschés*. He may thus still have been active in the early 1350s. See Knowles, 'Jean de Vignay', 356.

82 See overviews in R. Barton Palmer (text ed. and trans.), with Domenic Leo (art ed.) and Uri Smilansky (music ed.), *The Debate Poems: Le Jugement dou Roy de Behaigne, Le Jugement dou Roy de Navarre, Le Lay de Plour*, in R. Barton Palmer and Yolanda Plumley (eds), *Guillaume de Machaut: The Complete Poetry & Music*, vol. 1 (Michigan, 2016). On the dating and re-dating of this work, see Bowers, 'Guillaume de Machaut', 10–13, and Lawrence Earp, *Introductory Study* in *Guillaume de Machaut, The Ferrell-Vogüé Machaut Manuscript* (Oxford, 2014), 35–7.

differences between **RemC** and the rest of its host manuscript, however, problematize this suggestion.[83] The thematic combination of the two works also makes sense, suggesting that their shared visuality, if not denoting actual joint presentation, was intended to link them in their owner-viewer's mind. Vignay's own contributions to the *Eschés* strengthen the moralistic qualities of his Latin original, emphasizing its essential quality as a 'mirror of princes' and weakening its already minimal usefulness as a playing manual.[84] The royal and regal game of chess becomes but a pretext for the provision of moral and behavioural advice appropriate to the social strata represented by each of the various playing pieces. As a result, just as the *Remede* teaches etiquette and courtliness, the *Eschés* teaches morals and government, with the two working in a complementary manner as a pair.[85] Stereotypically, the latter befitted the role of a male ruler, while the former that of his female consort.[86] The two manuscripts had, therefore, the potential for a double-presentation to a royal couple.[87]

83 Potential explanations for these differences range from an attempt to highlight this section of the manuscript as a commemoration to Bonne (subsequently undermined by the manuscript's final ordering), to a realization that maintaining such a high material standard for the whole collection would be unaffordable. None are externally substantiated. See overview in Smilansky, 'Creating MS C'.

84 See Fuller, 'A Critical Edition', 77–89.

85 At the very least, the emphasis on literary piety and improvement would have allowed the linking, and to portray **RemC** as more than indulgent secular entertainment. On the usefulness of this association for creating aristocratic appeal, see Hélène Haug, 'Fonctions et pratiques de la lecture à la fin du Moyen Âge. Approche sociolittéraire du discours sur la lecture en milieu curial d'après les sources narratives françaises et bourguignonnes (1360–1480)' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Université de Louvain, 2013) and summary in '*Ains les lisoie entre mes dens*. Figures d'auteurs-lecteurs (XIV^{e}-XV^{e} siècles): une réaction face au succès mitigé des *nouvelletez* littéraires en contexte curial?', *Fabula* (2014) <http://www.fabula.org/colloques/document2402.php> [accessed 16 March 2023]. See also Smilansky, *Cultural Performance*.

86 See, for example, Murielle Gaude-Ferragu (trans. Angela Krieger), *Queenship in Medieval France, 1300–1500* (London, 2016). In my forthcoming monograph, I hope to offer a more detailed discussion of these stereotypes as role-specific rather than necessarily person- or gender-specific; of the gendering and non-gendering of chess, courtliness, and governance treatises; and an exploration of the flexibility of gendered association with regards to both these works. For considerations of female political power and its associated stereotypes, opportunities, and dangers from a Luxembourg angle, see Julia Burkhardt's contribution to this volume. A relevant analysis of the French context is available in Poulet, 'Capetian Women and the Regency', and wider contextualizations in Heather J. Tanner (ed.), *Medieval Elite Women and the Exercise of Power, 1100–1400: Moving Beyond the Exceptionalist Debate* (London, 2019).

87 The gendering suggested here would not necessitate a separation into different audiences. After all, women often assumed governance responsibilities, making

This, however, requires an understanding of **RemC** as existing independently, before **C**, with the larger collection being constructed around **RemC** at its core. To date, commentators – myself included – have only used the links between **RemC** and **G52** to date manuscript **C** and bolster its association with both Parisian production and the patronage of John and Bonne. To my knowledge, none have yet to engage seriously with the separability of **RemC** from its host manuscript. For my part, I have previously argued that the copying of *dits* in **C** on independent gathering-structures was a practical solution for an author approaching the creation of his first 'collected works' manuscripts.[88] While that argument holds, it does not contradict (and I did not seriously entertain) the possibility that the differences between **RemC** and the rest of **C** arose from an independent early history. Doing so, however, has some considerable advantages. For example, seeing **RemC** as the first presentation copy of the newly composed *Remede* designed for independent circulation makes more sense of the unusual elements in its presentation and organization as discussed by Stone.[89] Indeed, we *must* assume this state of affairs if we want to treat the coupling of **RemC** and **G52** as going beyond their production history to also encompass their presentation.[90]

RemC's subsequent incorporation into the 'complete works' manuscript **C** can then be imagined as either a change of plan before a presentation occurred, or as a reciprocal gesture by the recipient following a successful presentation. For current purposes, the latter option offers more interesting narratives: viewing **RemC** as a post-1346 attempt at securing patronage, whereby Machaut was attempting to 'piggy-back' on Vignay's established connections at the royal court, would see such a reciprocation as directed towards Machaut as author. While tempting, this scenario implies that, for whatever reason, the completed manuscript **C** did not result in the

---

relevant advice particularly useful. Likewise, even didactic works specifically written for a queen could be more useful when listened to by the king and his advisors than by the dedicatee herself. For both these elements, see Rina Lahav, 'A Mirror of Queenship: The *Speculum dominarum* and the Demands of Justice', in Karen Green and Constant J. Mews (eds), *Virtue Ethics for Women, 1250–1500* (Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London and New York, 2011), 31–44; or Kathleen Ashley, 'The *Miroir des Bonnes Femmes*, Not for Women Only?', in Kathleen Ashley and Robert L.A. Clark (eds), *Medieval Conduct* (Minneapolis, 2001), 86–105.

88 Smilansky, 'Creating MS C', 273–8.

89 Stone, 'Made to Measure'. These relate to the matching of the work's interpolated music with the placement of over-sized illuminations in **RemC**, and to its wider gathering-structure. On the independent circulation of new *dits* before the collation of **C**, see Leach, 'Machaut's First', 59–62.

90 One can go so far as to suggest an original intention to bind **RemC** and **G52** together as one book, but I cannot offer any evidence for this, and the possibility does not affect the rest of my argument.

hoped-for royal patronage, with Machaut instead establishing an affiliation with the Duchess of Bar by mid 1349 at the latest (that is, before both Bonne's and Joan's deaths). Alternatively, viewing **RemC** as an offering from within John of Luxembourg's service allows its coupling with **G52** to become a political comment on the closeness of Valois-Luxembourg relations. The cultural reciprocation of turning it into a larger collection of text and music associated with Luxembourg patronage can then be seen as an homage directed towards the King of Bohemia (or his children, if undertaken in commemoration after John's death). Manuscript **C** becomes a physical manifestation of a much-valued political relationship and a focus of dynastic memory.[91] It need have little to do with personal patronage of the author or his future career prospects. Nevertheless, once the decision to transform the single-work book into a larger collection was made, it would have been only natural to return to that author for further materials, and to use the same workshop that made such a good job of **RemC** when commissioning the rest of the work, especially considering its existing links with royal patronage. Technically, there is little ground to rule out such a procedure.

We are thus placed at an interpretative crossroads. The privileging of the mentioning of Hesdin within the *Remede* can be taken literally as referring to the estate's owner (Joan of France), more loosely as referring to one of a number of royal visitors there, or as a geographical reference point which associated the story with the geopolitics of France's north-eastern border. Machaut's textual word play has often been interpreted (somewhat problematically in my opinion) to conflate the beloved lady of the *Remede* with Bonne of Luxembourg and, by implication, with Bonne as the intended recipient of the text.[92] Still, none of these readings necessarily anchors

91 For other cases of separation between textual content and books' usefulness as artefacts in social and political performance, see Smilansky, 'Texts on the Move'. Earp, 'Introduction', 26–8, recently hypothesized that **C** may have been a commission by Joan of Burgundy, intended for her daughter-in-law, Bonne, following a similar pattern of commissioning she applied in relation to her son.

92 Wimsatt and Kibler, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 34–5. Earp, 'Introduction', 22–4, strengthens the reliance on this word play by comparing it to the opening verses of the *Arbre d'amours*, dated internally to 23 April 1345. In that context, however, the word play appears as part of an opening exultation of a patron, and is made specifically in relation to a lady of that name who takes a position external to the narrative (and alongside the mentioning of other external figures, such as her father, John of Luxembourg). This is not the case in the *Remede*. Earp goes further and suggests that the date cited in the poem affects the likely time of Machaut's use of the pun (and by implication, delaying the composition date of the *Remede*). To my eyes, this pun is not subtle or unique enough to require a joint context or linear poetic inspiration. Even if this was the case, Machaut could well have had other sources for the pun. For example, Peter of Zittau's chronicle uses a Latin variant of

the recipient of **RemC** as the identified female protagonist of the story. An alternative privileging of visuality and materiality enables an original association between **RemC** and **G52**. While in itself precarious, such an association – combined with Vignay's biography and the new reading of the *Eschés*' dedication – suggests that the first recipient of this copy of the *Remede* may not have been Bonne, but her mother-in-law, Queen Joan. Yet, the two are not inherently contradictory. Just as we have seen Bonne's husband accepting a book containing a new work commissioned by and dedicated to his mother, why should we not accept Joan of Burgundy, reigning Queen of France, as the first recipient of a book containing a story relating to either her son's or her brother's wife? Indeed, if we consider the *dit* as representing John of Luxembourg's interests rather than Machaut's emotions and as didactic rather than (pseudo-auto-)biographical, it would not be a problem for the unnamed lady in the story to conflate elements of both these close relatives.

***

I wholeheartedly admit that the materials presented here fall far short of constituting proof. Nevertheless, I consider the ideas they contain worth entertaining for two primary reasons. First, they act as a reminder of how shaky the foundations are of nearly every interpretation we impose on our surviving evidence, as well as of the advantages and dangers of combining literary, material, and historical evidence. Second, the central role assigned to Machaut in the crystallization of Francophone poetic, narrative, musical, and notational practice means that any adjustment to the reconstruction of his biography, or to the patronage networks that supported and consumed his work, has considerable implications for our wider cultural-historical narratives. The emphasis given here to Philip VI and Joan of Burgundy as the major players in the Valois-Luxembourg cultural exchange (rather than it being symbolized by Bonne's marriage to their son) is a case in point. Perhaps due to a subconscious collective historiographical preference to characterize Machaut as the voice of a new, vernacular, younger art (one which links to both literary and musical production of the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), or due to a need to separate Machaut from the sphere of influence of his more established

---

the same pun when lamenting the death of Bonne's grandmother, Guta (Judith) of Habsburg (1271–97). See Jana Fantysová Matějková, 'Guillaume de Machaut und die Königsaaler Chronik', in Dana Dvořáčková-Malá and Kristýna Solomon (eds), *"Über den Hof und am Hofe": Geschichtsschreibung und Literatur* (Dresden, 2021), 147–62 (esp. 161). The gap between Machaut's use and Chaucer's adaptation of this technique some decades later (discussed in Wimsatt and Kibler, *Guillaume de Machaut*, 33–5) also warns against relying on such similarities for the purposes of dating.

and near contemporary, Philippe de Vitry, this royal generation has, until recently, been conspicuous mostly by its historiographical absence within Machaut scholarship.[93] Also in terms of book ownership and commissioning, while we know both Philip and Joan were active in this sphere, their efforts are usually consigned to a footnote in comparison with the activities of their grandson Charles V.[94] The gap in musical survival between the interpolated Fauvel manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 146) and manuscript **C** has relegated the intervening years to vague obscurity, even when evidence of musical and poetic activities in this period abounds.[95] Only in the area of research into queenship and gender politics has Joan featured since early on in the discipline.[96] Despite

93 Earp, *Guide*, for example, mentions Philip VI a number of times, but for the purposes of historical background and for his early links with John of Luxembourg, Philippe de Vitry and Guillaume de Trie, not as a patron of literature and music. He does not appear in the index of Leach, *Guillaume de Machaut*, and neither mention Joan of Burgundy. As the footnotes here attest, the beginnings of a transition become evident in a number of contributions in Earp and Hartt, *Poetry, Art, and Music*, although as a whole, analyses remain very much Bonne-oriented.

94 This is a feature of, for example, Deborah McGrady, *The Writer's Gift*, where this royal couple's bookish activities are noted (twice), but only in passing. However, Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and the Makers*, 194, counter the Charles V 'orthodoxy', exemplifying the existence of a royal book collection already in the late Capetian period. Lermack, 'Fit for a Queen', ch. 6, discusses early Valois book patronage as a self-aware and intentional continuation of earlier practices, and offers overviews of the habits of Philip VI, Joan of Burgundy, John II and Bonne of Luxembourg. See also Holladay, 'Fourteenth-Century French Queens'.

95 For the centrality of this Fauvel manuscript to modern musicological narratives, see Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey (eds), *Fauvel Studies: Allegory, Chronicle, Music and Image in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Français 146* (Oxford, 1998); or Emma Dillon, *Medieval Music Making and the Roman de Fauvel* (Cambridge, 2002). For the notion of a 'lacuna' here, see Wulf Arlt, 'Machaut in Context', in Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet and Nigel Wilkins (eds), *Guillaume de Machaut 1300–2000* (Paris, 2002), 99–114, or more recently Desmond, 'Traces of Revision'. A number of scholars have attempted to fill this musical gap; for example, Plumley, *The Art of Grafted Song* or Felix Diergarten, *Komponieren in den Zeiten Machauts: Die Liedsätze des Codex Ivrea* (Würzburg, 2021).

96 See, for example, Catharine Mary Charlton Bearne, *Lives and Times of the Early Valois Queens: Jeanne de Bourgogne, Blanche de Navarre, Jeanne d'Auvergne et de Boulogne* (London and New York, 1898). On Joan's negative image, see Aline Vallée-Karcher, 'Jeanne de Bourgogne, épouse de Philippe VI de Valois: une reine maudite?', *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 138 (1980), 94–6. Especially when considering literary patronage, however, she is still often eclipsed by figures such as Joan of Evreux. See, for example, Holladay, 'Fourteenth-Century French Queens'. A more even-handed assessment of the literary patronage of the two queens as they relate to a single book can be found in Anna Russakoff, 'Portraiture, Politics, and Piety', *Studies in Iconography* 37 (2016), 146–80.

their known interest and patronage in the production and collection of vernacular works, minimal attention is paid to Philip VI and Joan. Instead, multiple attempts have been made to associate John and Bonne with such activities, even where a relative dearth of supporting materials necessitates increasing levels of creativity in interpretation. To me, this suggests a re-evaluation of royal patronage patterns in the 1330s and 1340s may be due, and that Machaut (and by extension, his patron, John of Luxembourg) may have paid more attention to the King and Queen of France than to the daughter of the King of Bohemia.

Although the linking of Joan of Burgundy and **RemC** (and by extension, with Machaut and the *Remede* text) is presented here as a thought experiment undertaken within an examination of Valois-Luxembourg cultural links, its acceptance or rejection would offer more than a biographical footnote. For example, this scenario suggests a greater cultural continuity in the first half of the fourteenth century than is currently allowed for, literary as well as musical. The appealing notion of a break – between this and the next generation of royal patrons and consumers; between Vitry and Machaut – has long seemed more illusory than actual.[97] The alternative would only tie strands together, joining 'older' patrons with 'newer' production as a counterbalance to current trends pushing chronologically later the dates at which 'new' practices have become established, and create a smoother, multilayered and mixed contour to mid-century cultural consumption and meaning.[98] This does, however, diminish somewhat the link between Machaut, the *Remede*, or at the very least **RemC**, and Bonne. Does this reduce Machaut's, the *dit*'s or the book's 'Luxembourgness'? Do Machaut's continued association with John of Luxembourg, the extensive cohabitation of Joan and Bonne at Vincennes, and Bonne's need to perform a French rather than a Luxembourgish or Bohemian identity suggest any Luxembourg

97 See, for example, Wathey, 'Philippe de Vitry', and the above discussion of royal living arrangements during this period.

98 For the notion of musical development and the dating of various elements within it, see Wulf Arlt, 'Aspekte der Chronologie und des Stilwandels im französischen Lied des 14. Jahrhunderts', *Basler Beiträge zur Musikgeschichte* 3 (1982), 193–280, with recent developments discussed in Karen Desmond, *Music and the Moderni, 1300–1350: The Ars nova in Theory and Practice* (Cambridge, 2018); 'Traces of Revision'; and Anna Zayaruznaya, 'Old, New, and Newer Still in Book 7 of the *Speculum musice*', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 73 (2020), 95–148. An example of the still diverging opinions on this matter can be found in the neighbouring articles by Karen Desmond, '"One is the loneliest number…": The Semibreve Stands Alone', *Early Music* 46 (2018), 403–16; and David Catalunya, 'Insights into the Chronology and Reception of Philippe de Vitry's Ars Nova Theory: Revisiting the Mensural Treatise of Barcelona Cathedral', *Early Music* 46 (2018), 417–37.

associations not to have been affected by an alternative recipient for this book? Would an association with Joan reduce our notion of Bonne's independent cultural contribution to the Valois image? Perhaps. Would this impact on the Luxembourg contribution more widely? In my eyes, not necessarily. After all, Machaut's own Luxembourg affiliation can make a dedication or presentation to Joan be understood as an extension of his role as the King of Bohemia's representative, and so, as politically Luxembourgish as can be. It can, therefore, demonstrate the continuous strengthening of Luxembourg-French diplomatic and cultural ties at the highest levels. Similarly, would the new first dedication of the *Eschés* make it less relevant for Luxembourg cultural consumption despite its subsequent reworking for John of France as Duke of Normandy? Would the cultural performance of the coupled manuscripts **RemC** and **G52** be intrinsically different according to which choice we make? Would their joint performance have changed, were they to be inherited by any subsequent princely couple? Is it more important to discern which royal couple acted as patron here, or whether the similarities between the two sources were – or were perceived as – intentional rather than accidental?

I suggest that the overarching problem here is actually that of approach, that is, with our need to construct a narrative based on either geographic or dynastic focus. Our differing emotionality with regard to medieval attitudes to familial relationships (through blood or contract), and medievals' propensity to move around and adjust their behaviour to role and place, should act as warning signs in this endeavour. We have seen multiple examples of enmities ameliorated through marriage, or of education within one context in preparation for one cultural-political affiliation being seemingly cast aside with a change of circumstance as wedding plans are revised, appointments made, or inheritances received. Taking on the role of 'Queen of France-in-waiting' trumps personal, familial, geographic, and linguistic history. Still, it does not invalidate them, which is where cultural performance comes in. Books, with their intrinsic multilayered visual, material, textual, and linguistic performativity, can perhaps demonstrate both inclusion and difference more easily than other objects. As such, they can be used to smooth the process of transition. The resulting image requires us to concentrate on momentary influences, needs and choices – good and bad – of members of an exclusive yet dynamic and flexible elite. Rather than seeing the Valois, Luxembourgs, or indeed, Brabants, Bars, Burgundys, and many others as nuclear families in the modern sense, they can be seen as loose factions or groupings within a larger aristocratic clan, each focusing on the cultural, linguistic, and military needs and opportunities available within their shifting

geographical network of influences.[99] Individuals' transitions between such factions can cause rupture and friction, bring them closer together, or remain invisible due to successful assimilation. Viewing the creation and consumption of cultural objects within this framework may help us to characterize their meaning as they change through time and movement, both as material artefacts, and as conveyers of textual and musical content.

While 'Luxembourgness' is offered as a porous entity operating within a network of shifting individual and collective agendas, it is clear that its relevance reverberated beyond the presence of family members or the borders of personal holdings. As a result, Luxembourg power and politics – both soft and hard – needs to be integrated also into what we may consider to be French or English culture, as do the influences of its other neighbours and interests, from its immediate borderlands, via the papacy, to Angevin territories around Europe.

99 For similar approaches, see, for example, Juan José Carreras and Bernardo García García (eds) (English version by Tess Knighton (ed.) and Yolanda Acker (trans.)), *The Royal Chapel in the Time of the Habsburgs: Music and Court Ceremony in Early Modern Europe* (Woodbridge, 2005), or more recently, Karl Kügle (ed.), *The Networked Court* (forthcoming).