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Abstract

Based on original archival and codicological research, this paper investigates the transformations and negotiations between manuscript and printed versions of fifteenth-century poetry through the specific example of one surprisingly complex debate poem, *Le Songe de la Pucelle* (The Dream of the Virgin). Our debate relates the choice that a female narrator must make between the respective appeals of two personifications, Love and Shame, who appear to her in a dream vision. The manuscript tradition invariably collects the poem with other fifteenth-century debates and moral texts while the early printed copies tended to have experienced a prior separate circulation and often remain as monotextual pamphlets. Manuscript and printed copies of the same poem seem, then, to target different audiences. My paper investigates this curious divergence in the transmission pattern of the manuscript and printed versions of the *Songe*, and seeks possible answers in the very different sets of images accompanying the text in manuscript and printed versions.
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1 Introduction

¹ ‘The Dream of the Virgin.’
In fifteenth-century French debate poetry, there is an intertextual reservoir of vocabulary and expressions which relate to night, sleeplessness and visions, and sleep and dreaming. This is frequently played out both in text and image, and across manuscripts and printed editions. Dream and sleep motifs can be observed throughout the oeuvre of the court poet and diplomat Alain Chartier (c. 1385–1430), and the literary quarrel that became known as the Querelle de la Belle Dame sans mercy (The Quarrel of the Beautiful Lady without pity), after his celebrated poem, La Belle Dame sans mercy of 1424 (Hult and McRae 2003). Late fifteenth-century debates return obsessively to these themes, taking as their constant intertext Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun’s Roman de la Rose (Strubel 1992). The dream becomes the arena in which desires may be satisfied, where metaphor is disambiguated. However, this desire for fulfilment and understanding is constantly frustrated by the interruption of the dream: from the simple awakening of the homodiegetic narrator-dreamer (a narrator who participates in his/her own narration) at the textual close of the poem to the more comical instances of the outside world intervening. One such instance occurs in Jean de Werchin’s Songe de la Barge (dated to between 1404 and 1415, Grenier-Winther 1996). Here, a barge collides with the dreamer’s boat (vv. 3430–34) and awakens him so that he is unable to put his case before the Court of Love to which the dream has transported him; nor do we discover the outcomes of the other cases he has witnessed.

Following this tradition, Alain Chartier’s debate, Le Debat Reveille Matin (1423–24) takes its inspiration from the notion of what one might call the ‘entre-somme’: the wakeful moment between two periods of sleep when sleepers are awoken (often involuntarily) and listen to friends tormented by thoughts of their ladies. The organization of the night into two segmented periods of sleep, known as the first and the second sleep, is attested to in the literature

---

2 At the time of the Ming period in China.
of the ancient, medieval, and early modern world. There would have been a brief period of one or two hours of wakefulness in between the two, with the second sleep ending at dawn (Ekirch 2001 and Ekirch 2005; Koslofsky 2011). In Chartier’s debate the homodiegetic narrator lies awake in the same room as two lovers — the two interlocutors of the debate — respectively Lover and Sleeper, and overhears their debate. He later introduces himself to both men, and offers to copy out what he has heard.

Apres myenuyt entre deux sommes,
Lors qu’Amours les amans esveille,
En ce païs cy où nous sommes,
Pensoye où lit, ainsi qu’on vueille
Quant on a la puce en l’oreille;
Si escoutay deux amoureux,
Dont l’un à l’autre se conseille
Du mal dont il est douloureux.

(After midnight between two sleeps, when Love wakes up lovers, in this region where we live, I was awake thinking in bed, as you do when you have a ‘flea in your ear’; and I overheard two lovers, one advising the other about the suffering he was going through.)

(vv. 1–8)³

Later debate poems parody or adopt these motifs, and it is clear that the ubiquitous dream-vision form — or rather certain of its characteristics — influenced fifteenth-century poetry, poets, and illuminators, whether or not a dream setting per se was actually constructed as part of the narrative framework.⁴

³ For editions of the poem, see Laidlaw 1974, pp. 305–19; Hult and McRae 2003, pp. 439–71; and Cayley 2015. For the expression ‘avoir puce en l’oreille’, see Cayley 2011. All translations into English in this chapter are mine unless otherwise stated.

⁴ Spearing 1976, p. 3: ‘It is unlikely, then, to be possible to establish the dream-poem as a completely “distinct literary kind”; but this is not to say that the dream-framework was merely a gratuitous or optional component of a wide range of kinds of medieval literature. For one thing, the authors of medieval dream-poems themselves seem to have been conscious of writing within a distinct literary tradition of dreams and visions.’ For examples of parody on this theme, see Le Debat de Mars et du Cul: Van Hemelryck 2004, vv. 1–8; Chartier’s Excusacion: Hult and McRae 2003, vv. 9–12; or Achille Caulier’s L’Ospital d’Amours: Hult and McRae 2003, v. 209.
Many of our dream-vision poets espouse the notion of the veracity of the dream and the dream as spiritual or personal quest, directly influenced by the Roman de la Rose, and ultimately by the classification of dreams derived from Macrobius’s Commentary on the Dream of Scipio, an intertext for Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, as for Chaucer and countless other medieval authors (Stahl 1990).

Maintes genz cuident qu’en songe
N’ait se fable non et mençonge.
Mais on puet tel songe songier
Qui ne sont mie mençongier,
Ainz sont après bien aparant.
Si em puis traire a garant
Un auctor qui ot non Macrobes,
Qui ne tint pas songes a lobes.

(Many people believe that in dreams there is nothing but fiction and lies. But it is possible to dream dreams that are in no way false, and reveal themselves to be true afterwards. I could cite Macrobius as an example here: he did not take dreams for illusions, Strubel 1992. vv. 1–8. Lecoy 1965–75.)

The female narrator of the anonymous fifteenth-century French debate poem, Le Songe de la Pucelle (The Dream of the Virgin), makes the same tentative claim for the veracity of her dream-vision in the closing stanzas:

---

5 On dream-vision poetry and dreaming in the Middle Ages and more broadly, see also Spearing 1976; Paravicini-Bagliani and Stabile 1989; Kruger 1992; Shulman and Stroumsa 1999; Boffey 2003; and Schmitt 2003.

6 The date of this poem is likely to be c. 1450–55. It has a terminus ad quem of 1474 when one of the earliest of the manuscript versions was copied (Sion, Médiathèque Valais-Sion, bibl. Supersaxo MS S 97 bis, fols 136r–45r). It is possible that Brussels, BR, MS 10994–998 is the earliest exemplar. Bayot n.d., pp. 194–95 lists the Brussels MS as sixteenth-century, but the Bibliothèque Royale places the manuscript c. 1450, because of the watermarks: Briquet 1923: var. 8525 (att. 1453), and var. 13009 (att. 1453–56). For my discussion of the poem in its Sion manuscript context, see Cayley 2004 and Cayley 2006b. For editions, see Montaiglon 1856, pp. 204–31; Aebischer 1961; also Vogel 2007 (this is an online version, rather than an edition, and based only on one imprimé (early printed version)). See also my new edition of the poem in Cayley 2015. All quotations and English translations of the Songe de la Pucelle are from my own edition unless otherwise indicated.
(And when I was properly awake I thought about what I had heard; I dreamed about it a lot the next evening, as I walked along the road, and as I was accustomed I glanced around a couple of times to check: because dreams are true sometimes.) (vv. 449–55)

The relative sense of the authenticity of the dream-vision for the reader/viewer is, of course, greatly enhanced by an appreciation of the poem in its material context, and particularly by the illuminations and woodcuts we find in manuscript and early printed editions. It is to the material context of fifteenth-century dream-vision poetry that I now turn, taking the example of the Songe de la Pucelle to attempt to elucidate further the workings of desire and authority across the debate poem and its paratext. I investigate in particular a curious divergence in the transmission pattern of the manuscript and printed versions of the Songe, and seek possible answers in the very different sets of images accompanying the text in manuscript and printed versions.

2 The Manuscript and Early Printed Tradition of the Songe

Building on earlier editorial work, I have now identified a total of ten manuscripts that contain or contained the Songe: seven fifteenth-century manuscripts;7 two later copies;8 and one fifteenth-

8 These are: 1/ Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 556, fols 17v–30v; pp. 33–60, which is dated 1826 and probably copied from one of the early printed versions; and 2/ The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 71. G. 75 (a
century manuscript that contained the *Songe* but is now lost. The *Songe*, sometimes entitled the *Songe doré de la Pucelle* in the early printed tradition, continued to be an extremely popular piece, and is recorded as appearing in seven separate French early printed editions (Pettegree et al 2007), and a number of later collected editions. Julia Boffey notes that the *Songe* was also translated into English by Christopher Goodwyn in 1513, as *The Maiden’s Dream*, and possibly printed in an early edition by Wynkyn de Worde, as well as the edition that survives from 1542 by Robert Wyer (Boffey 2013, esp. pp. 323–24). The 1542 edition is preserved in the Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino. We learn on fol. 8 v that it was printed by Robert Wyer, for Richard Bankes in 1542. Crucially, Julia Boffey notes that Goodwyn has added a prologue to his version of the debate and an envoy in which he makes clear the audience at which the debate, and the edition, is targeted: ‘yonge ladyes and maydens of eche astate’ (Boffey 2013, p. 324). The copy of the Brussels MS in n. 10 above, dating between 1760–94, fols 25r–42v (*explicit*), fol. 43r–44t ‘Vous qui avez voz jonnes ans passé’).

9 This is Turin, Biblioteca nazionale universitaria, MS L. IV. 3, fols 41r–48t. None of the French library or IRHT catalogues, the current printed or online resources I have consulted, agrees on a full list of manuscripts; many omit the Turin manuscript and the later copies; none identifies all the editions except Pettegree et al. 2007, p. 699; see also the ISTC, and USTC hosted at St Andrews [http://www.ustc.ac.uk/](http://www.ustc.ac.uk/) [accessed 9 July, 2013]. I have revised the number of manuscripts and printed editions from work I published which mentions the *Songe de la Pucelle* in 2004 and 2006: see Cayley 2004; and Cayley 2006b. My edition presents the most complete current record with seven earlier manuscript versions (the ten manuscripts I cite above include the two later copies and the lost Turin copy), and seven French early printed sources: see Cayley 2014.

10 This later version of the title was inspired by the first line, ‘A l’eure du songe doré’ (At the hour of golden sleep), and used by Montaiglon in his 1856 edition, which he established solely from two early printed editions, one of which bears this title (the Lyon 1488 exemplar). None of the manuscripts I have identified bears this title.


12 These are: *Conservateur* 1758; Michel 1831; *Poésies des XVe et XVIe siècles* 1830–32; Montaiglon 1856; Brunet 1865; Le Moyn de La Borderie 1878.
manuscript tradition invariably collects the poem with other fifteenth-century debates and moral texts while the early printed copies tend to be monotextual, and enjoy a separate circulation as individual pamphlets (although these may have been collected into Sammelbände — fifteenth- and sixteenth-century collected volumes of individual printed editions — at some point: Gillespie 2006; and Robinson 2014). Of the seven fifteenth-century manuscripts where we find the Songe, five collect the poem with debates by Alain Chartier, including the Debat Reveille Matin, cited earlier, and three of these additionally collect the debate with poems connected to the Querelle de la Belle Dame sans mercy. One such manuscript is Paris, BnF, MS will fr. 1661, which is the base manuscript for my critical edition (Cayley 2015). Of the two manuscripts that do not collect the Songe with either Chartier’s texts, or those directly connected to the Querelle, one, Paris, BnF, MS fr. 25553, also collects the fifteenth-century debate known variously as the Debat des deux seurs or the Embusche Vaillant, by Tourangeau poet Jean Vaillant (Deschaux 1982; Cayley 2015). Though this latter debate is not one of the pieces of the Querelle, it frequently appears in its manuscript tradition with other Querelle pieces, thus entering into a wider intra- and inter-codical dialogue with these debates. Of the eleven manuscripts of the Embusche, seven belong to the tradition of the Querelle, and an additional manuscript also contains works by Chartier; three manuscripts contain both the Ambusche and

13 These are Paris, BnF, MS fr. 1661; Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 3523; Sion, Médiathèque Valais-Sion, bibl. Supersaxo MS 97 bis; Turin, Biblioteca nazionale universitaria, MS L. IV. 3; and Vatican, MS Reg. Lat. 1323.
14 These are Paris, BnF, MS fr. 1661; Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 3523; and Turin, Biblioteca nazionale universitaria, MS L. IV. 3.
16 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS Phillipps 1928, fols 2r–32v.
the *Songe*. The staging of the *Songe* in its manuscript context, then, is concerned to match it with other texts, and primarily debate poems; the emphasis is on the ‘debate’ itself, and the contradictions and oppositions that genre supposes. The codex perpetuates intertextual dialogue, and seeks to find a continuation of the debate, and a possible resolution beyond the bounds of the discrete text. Investigation of some of the individual manuscripts can yield fascinating insights into their reception. The Sion manuscript, for example, associates the *Songe* with a number of pieces that problematize courtly love, women’s role within society, and the emptiness of courtly discourse (Cayley 2004; 2006b).

The Paris manuscript which contains the only miniature we have to accompany the *Songe*, BnF, MS fr. 25553, cannot be dated with any certainty, but it is unlikely to be as late as the sixteenth century — the dating supposed by the BnF catalogue. The manuscript is a mixture of paper and parchment and contains 70 folio pages; its language localizes it in Picardy (Deschaux 1982, pp. 113–57). The *Songe* is written in a different hand from the first few items on paper, however the manuscript itself does not appear to be a composite. Folios 50r–68v contain the *Songe de la Pucelle* and the ‘ballade à propos’ (the ballad of options, fol. 67v) which was copied with the *Songe* in many of its manuscript appearances, though not as often in the early printed tradition. This ballade forms a response from the Pucelle to her interlocutors in the debate, though does not give us much indication of her decision or her possible future conduct. In some of the extant manuscripts where this ballade does appear, it is included as part of the *Songe*, with the *explicit* coming after the end of the Ballade, as in this BnF copy (fol. 68v);

---

17 Paris, BnF, MS fr. 25553; Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 3523; Turin, Biblioteca nazionale universitaria, L. IV. 3.
18 On the non-ending of the debate poem, see Reed 1990; Armstrong 1997; and Cayley 2006a. On irresolution in medieval literature more generally, see Perret 1998.
19 The BnF catalogue dates the manuscript erroneously from an *ex libris* which shows that it belonged to a François de la Mothe in the sixteenth century.
20 I have included an edition of the ‘ballade à propos’ in the Appendix here.
in others the ballade follows as the next item. The refrain highlights her dilemma, ‘Amours le veult, mais Honte le déffent’ (Love wishes it, but Shame forbids it). This ballade seems, then, to have been intended to be read with the *Songe*, and as well as this version in BnF, MS fr. 25553, it is copied after the *Songe* in Brussels, BR, MS 10994–998 (probably the oldest copy of our debate), in Vatican, Reg. Lat. 1323, and in two later copies, Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 556, and The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 71. G. 75. It does not appear in Paris, BnF, MS fr. 1661, BnF, MS fr. 12789, Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal MS 3523, or Sion, Médiathèque Valais-Sion, bibl. Supersaxo MS S 97 bis. In the Besançon manuscript the ‘ballade à propos’ is followed by the *explicit* to the *Songe*, effectively including it as part of the debate. In the Brussels manuscript (probably the oldest of our witnesses), the *explicit* is on fol. 27, followed directly by the ballade on fol. 27. However, the fact that it is found copied in the versions we list, and always directly after the end of the *Songe*, suggests that it was intended to be read with the poem in the manner of a moral or epilogue. It is of note that the early printed editions often include this ballade (though the Wyer edition does not), and here we also find a further ballade not present in the manuscript tradition, the ‘ballade faite à la rescription de sa dame’ (ballade written at the command of his lady). This second ballade distances us from the Pucelle and the *Songe*, since it is voiced by a male lover who is, as he laments in the refrain, distraught at the thought that he must leave his lover (‘Puys qu’il me fault de ma dame partir’).

---

21 In BnF, MS fr. 25553, the Pucelle’s name appears in the margin, introducing the ballade. I am unable to check its presence in Turin, Biblioteca nazionale universitaria, MS L. IV. 3 as the Pasinus catalogue is not explicit on this, and the manuscript is now lost, though there are other ballades listed after the *Songe* in the Pasinus catalogue, from fol. 49 to 50*, where the next item is listed as *Le desloyal amour*. Jeanroy and Droz identify this manuscript as containing the *Songe de la Pucelle* in their 1932 facsimile; and it is listed in the Pasinus catalogue: Pasinus 1749, II, p. 489, column 2, codex CXXL: L. V. 30 (later L. IV. 3).

22 We find this second ballade in the 1826 manuscript, Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 556, copied on fol. 29* (p. 58) after the ‘ballade à propos’ and a blank folio. The copyist of this manuscript was Guillaume, a bibliophile and judge (d. 1848). The Besançon manuscript was therefore copied directly from one of the early *imprimés* (Lyon, 1488), as was Montaiglon’s 1856 edition. For an online edition of this ballade, see Vogel 2007. While Vogel’s online edition has a recent version of the *Songe*, it is based solely on the Lyon 1488 *imprimé*. 
3 The Visual Tradition of the Songe

The *Songe de la Pucelle* unfolds as the Pucelle, the first-person narrator of the debate, falls asleep at dawn only to be approached in a dream by two ‘semblances’ (apparitions), whom the Pucelle discovers to be Love and Shame from looking at their ‘habits’ (clothing), and from piecing together the visual clues from their ‘devises’ (mottos):

Je prins aux lettres espellir  
Ainsi que femme mal lisant  
L’une apres l’autre recueillir.

(I started to spell out the letters as a woman who cannot read well. One after the other I collected them.) (vv. 57–59)

There is an emphasis here, as in many debate poems of the period between debating women, on appearance and the visual, in direct conflict with the written or textual (Cayley 2010; 2013). The scene is familiar: it is the first of May, the Pucelle is ripe and ready for love, and requires guidance. Love and Shame present themselves as willing moral guides through the fraught negotiations of love service and reputation that the Pucelle must embark upon.

As the debate develops, Love predictably encourages the Pucelle to take a lover and enter into the courtly sphere: ‘Choisiz quelque beau compaignon’ (Pick a good-looking partner) (v. 110), whereas Shame cautions chastity – ‘Pour Dieu, garde toy, Belle dame, | De perdre ta virginité: | Pucelle est de grant dignité’ (For God’s sake, preserve your virginity, Beautiful Lady, for a maiden is very worthy) (vv. 103–05) — and silence, ‘Qui trop parle mensonge y mect’ (She lies who talks too much) (v. 329). After the introductory eleven stanzas framing the debate, the Pucelle remains silent throughout the exchanges of Love and Shame, in deference to her
advisors, and retains the habitual guise of hidden narrator. She resurfaces only in the final five stanzas to reinstate the narrative framing of the debate. The poetic exchange totals sixty-eight octosyllabic septains (476 lines), and the debate is framed by the Pucelle, who upon waking, goes to find a male clerc (scribe) to copy out the debate for her. As we see from the quotation above, the Pucelle’s literacy is apparently limited. Other than one instance of apostrophe, the scribe himself never appears in the text, unlike many debates narrated by men in the period, in which the narrator-participant is synonymous with the copyist who transcribes the debate:

Je allay d’aventure trouver  
Ung qui savoit lire et escripre  
Et m’essaie de l’esprouver  
S’il vouldroit mon songe descripre;  
Il m’accorda. Je lui dis, ‘Sire,  
Pour Dieu que voz mains s’esvertuent,  
Escripts les choses perpetuent’.

(‘So I went and found someone who knew who to read and write, and I approached him to ask whether he would write out my dream. He agreed. I said, ‘Sir, God speed your hands as they copy. Things that are written down have permanence.’’) (vv. 456–62)

The Pucelle is thus substituted or usurped in her authorial/narratorial role by an anonymous male clerc in the narrative frame of the debate, and she is effectively recast as impotent participant in her own narrative. Similarly, in the paratext of one of the nine extant manuscripts of the Songe, Paris, BnF, MS fr. 25553, a further gender substitution or disruption is observed (see Figure 1). As previously mentioned, this is the only manuscript miniature that survives for this poem. The Songe, like many of the debates of this later period, is infrequently illustrated, and the images are typically liminal, introducing the whole poem, often as part of a title page (especially in the case of woodcuts). This may have been linked to the earlier
manuscript circulation and reception of these particular poems, frequently found in large poetic anthologies, perhaps responding to other poems, or acting as continuations or imitations. Around such conceits as the *Querelle de la Belle Dame sans mercy*, or the *Concours de Blois*, readerly excitement comes from the individual text and its interactions with other texts, often located in the same material space. There is a distinctly different pattern of circulation and reception for the *Songe* in its printed copies, as evidenced by the woodcuts, as I will discuss later on.

In our miniature we observe the Pucelle foregrounded in the centre of the image with her hand on her cheek and eyes closed, in a typical medieval sleep pose, framed by the two figures of Love and Shame. As I suggested earlier, the *Rose* provides a constant literary and visual intertext for writers and illustrators of amatory poetry of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The anonymous author of the *Songe* negotiates the literary context via fifteenth-century love poetry such as that of the *Querelle de la Belle Dame sans mercy*. Yet visual cues persistently lead us back to the *Rose*, since much of the debate poetry of Chartier’s circle remains unillustrated. Figure 2 is a wonderful example of a sequential miniature from the *Rose*.

---

23 On the development of the *Concours de Blois* and other literary contests see Taylor 2001, p. 59. See also Mühlthaler 1992; Cayley 2006; Mühlthaler 2007; Taylor 2007a; Taylor 2007b; Arn 2008; Mühlthaler 2010, Armstrong 2012.

24 For Taylor’s concept of ‘participatory poetics’, and the notion of the polyphonic codex, see Taylor 2001; and Taylor 2007b.

25 For the iconography of pose and gesture in medieval manuscript illuminations and early printed books, see Garnier 1982; Schmitt 1990; and Garnier 2003.

26 For a brief discussion of this image in the context of Butlerian ‘gender trouble’ and Derridean ‘citationality’, see Cayley 2013. See also Butler 1990; and Derrida 1972.

27 On the *Rose* as intertext for Alain Chartier’s *La Belle Dame sans mercy*, see Taylor 2003.

28 We know of thirty-two out of over 200 surviving manuscripts collecting Chartier’s works that were illuminated, however miniatures were largely reserved for the French or Latin prose works, *Le Livre de l’Esperance*, *Quadrilogue invectif*, *Dialogus familiaris*, *De vita curialii/Le Curial*, or for certain of the French poems, *Le Livre des Quatre Dames*, *Le Breviaire des nobles*, *La Belle Dame sans mercy*, one illuminated copy of *Le Debat des deux fortunes d’Amours*. See Serchuk 2014 for further details; see also Gathercole 1976; and Brown 1999. Fifteenth-century illuminated copies of Chartier’s *Le Livre de l’Esperance* (1428–30) may provide an interesting visual intertext, however, with frequent depiction of the homodiegetic narrator asleep or awake in bed, both surrounded and addressed by the personifications that arise from his dream-vision: Serchuk 2014. The majority of the *Querelle de la Belle Dame sans mercy* manuscripts were not illuminated: see McRae 2004; and Cayley 2006. As Serchuk 2014 remarks, ‘it seems likely that Chartier’s works found more readers than viewers.’ This is probably true of the *Querelle* texts also, in common with other late debates.
tradition, compartmentalized into four consecutive narrative moments.\textsuperscript{29} Taken from Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS fr. 5226, an early fourteenth-century parchment manuscript illuminated by Richard and Jeanne de Montbaston (Rouse and Rouse 2000, II, pp. 204–5), this is a double-column panel miniature depicting the Lover asleep in the top left, while the narrator (the older Guillaume de Lorris) observes his younger self as he narrates the dream. The three subsequent panels show Guillaume as his younger self enacting the narrative as it is recounted. The posture and hand gestures of the seated Pucelle in Figure 1 are a near copy of the semi-recumbent Guillaume figure here, and both are modelled on a long visual tradition of sleeping or dreaming figures which has biblical as well as literary avatars (Ringbom 1980; Carty 1991; and Schmitt 2003).

The figure of Love, though often male in medieval literature, is decidedly female in the written versions of the \textit{Songe}, as we discover early on:

\begin{quote}
Je treuve que l’\textit{une} avoit nom
Amours richement \textit{attournee}
Comme \textit{dame} de grant renom
A bien porter son \textit{attournee}.
\end{quote}

(I found out that one of them was called Love, \textit{her} clothes were sumptuous, as becomes a very noble \textit{lady}, and \textit{she} knew how to wear them.) (vv. 64–67; emphasis mine)

Here, however, the illustrator has chosen (or been instructed) to depict Love as resolutely male, dominating the scene with his sparrowhawk, tool of his trade and symbol of the courtly hunt, wherein women are the prey and not the hunters. His dress is typically that of a young nobleman, his impressive \textit{poulaines} (pointed slippers) encircling and directed toward and around the

\textsuperscript{29} On the iconography of the \textit{Rose}, see Fleming 1969; for a bank of images from the illuminated manuscripts of the \textit{Rose}, consult the Roman de la rose digital library at http://romandelarose.org/ [accessed 20\textsuperscript{th} February 2013]
Pucelle; his red *cote hardie* (jacket) is cut jauntily with a high collar,\(^{30}\) and drawn in by a belt which accentuates his slim waist. The red of his *cotehardie* perhaps alerts us to the potential risk to the Pucelle of Love’s game; while she is dressed simply in virginal and modest blue. The gesture that Love makes with his right hand is of interest. There seems to be a deliberate focus on the Pucelle’s genital area since Love points to it, and the Pucelle covers it with her left hand. Shame is dressed austerely, as befits her role in the debate, head to toe in black. In this period, her clothing can be read either as religious in character: a nun, for example, or that of an older woman or widow. Certainly this is an older woman, well versed in the ways of the world, if not the ways of Love. Her gesture is one indicating discussion or debate (Garnier 1982; 2003), and she raises her hand upwards to contrast with Love’s hand which points down. If we were in any further doubt as to which figure represented which character, we can read their names in the partially rubricated titles accompanying the miniature to the left and to the right of the frame which encloses our scene. It is interesting to note here that the inks used for these titles differ: the Pucelle and Love have their identities confirmed in red ink; Shame’s identity is written in black ink, perhaps indicating an affinity between Love and the Pucelle in this manuscript version.\(^{31}\)

This depiction of the female Love in men’s clothing, masquerading as a man, might be read as a simple error on the part of the illustrator, but it provides us with an example of what Judith Butler might term ‘gender trouble’.\(^{32}\) An alternative explanation is that of a more deliberate spectacular staging of the ‘debate’. Debates of this period more habitually pit the genders against one another, and therefore this visual accentuation of opposing sides and opposing genders may

\(^{30}\) The *cotehardie* was an outer garment worn by both sexes covering the upper half of the body. This may have been a *courtepy* or *jaquette* which was a later, and much shorter version, as we see here, with an upstanding collar, and worn by high-ranking fashionable men: see Norris 1999, pp. 221, 245–46.

\(^{31}\) The hand for the titles appears to be different from that penning the main text, though the hand of all rubrics/titles appears to be the same. These may have been added later.

\(^{32}\) For Butler, gender is performative. Feminine or masculine gender identities may be performed through a variety of external performances including cross-dressing. Therefore gender is not necessarily linked to biological sex. See Butler 1990; and Cayley 2013.
be seen to be more satisfying on this level. We note the conflation here of two levels of debate: visual and verbal frames circumscribe the Pucelle’s dream, and both framing devices emphasize the authenticity of the debate. The verbal account seems so real to the Pucelle upon waking that she looks around to check that the two figures are not still there (see the earlier quotation at vv. 449–55). In the visual frame too, the personifications of Love and Shame, while clearly part of the allegorical fiction of the debate, become part of the ‘truth’ of the narrative events for the reader, since they are represented alongside the Pucelle in this manuscript miniature, with no separation. In identical fashion, allegorical figures are represented alongside the dual figure of the narrator-lover Guillaume in the illuminated manuscripts of the *Rose* (see Lady Idleness outside the Garden of Pleasure in Figure 2), or in the manuscript tradition of Alain Chartier. The choice made by the illustrator of the *Songe* in Paris, BnF, MS fr. 25553 to foreground the debate framework by depicting the narrator physically within the dream sequence landscape, flanked by the two interlocutors of the debate, seems a deliberate one. The choice of Love as a male rather than female figure serves (whether intentionally or otherwise), to emphasize the conflictual nature of the debate, as I mentioned earlier.

From the manuscript miniature and tradition, we now move to the early printed editions of the *Songe*, and to a series of woodcuts (Figures 3–8) that introduce six of the eight printed editions recorded (one English), including a woodcut that introduces the English translation of the poem by Christopher Goodwyn. I have not selected for analysis all the woodcuts from these editions, since of the remaining two editions, one has no woodcuts (the Fouquet and Crès edition of 1485), and one follows Figure 3 in its depiction of a bedchamber with a sleeping Pucelle and a

---

33 My critical edition concentrates on single-sex debates such as the *Songe*: see Cayley 2015.
34 This feature is typical of medieval manuscript miniatures accompanying debates and multiple-voiced texts: see Serchuk 2014.
35 See n. 11 for a list of these editions.
female Shame looming beside the bed (Paris, 1530). As we shall see, however, the undated Chantilly edition (XI. D. 54: Figure 5) presents a quite different scene, and the Wyer printed edition of Goodwyn’s translation of the Songe (Figure 6) is similarly both unusual and intriguing in its composition.

Figure 3 is a woodcut which introduces one of the earliest printed editions of the Songe, and the one taken as the basis for both of the editions previous to my own, new edition (Montaiglon 1856; Aebischer 1961). From the larger stage of the manuscript, and the multiple — often anonymous — texts and voices that crowd its folios, the focus here is on a single text, often printed in a small book (the Chantilly, Seville, and Aix editions are small octavos), with fewer leaves, and a more limited number of interlocutors. Just the right size of book, one might suppose, for a lady (or gentleman) to carry about with them, though there is also evidence that some of these shorter texts were at some point bound together in Sammelbände.\footnote{Robinson 2014 discusses the uniformity of these early printed copies, and their possible circulation in Sammelbände.} We move, too, from the more public stage, depicted in manuscript copies, of the garden where the court of Love was traditionally held, to an altogether more personal and intimate space: that of the bedchamber. The booklet, printed in Lyon between 1488–92 by the printer known as the Imprimeur du Champion des dames (ICD),\footnote{Robinson 2014 cites Hillard 2003, p. 89, on the identity of the Lyon printer referred to as ICD. According to Hillard, Jean du Pré and the ICD are not the same printer, though they are often confused.} uses a woodcut which depicts the two figures of Shame and the Pucelle. Both are named in the margins, as with the manuscript image. Olivia Robinson has shown how the ICD ‘borrows’ the woodcut used for the Songe from Jean du Pré’s Pierre et la belle Maguélonne (1489). The ICD reuses Jean du Pré’s Pierre et la belle Maguélonne woodcuts in a series of three texts (Songe, La Belle Dame sans mercy, and La Belle Dame qui eut
mercy) which form part of a wider programme of vernacular debates this printer issued between 1489–92 in Lyon (Robinson 2014).

In the Lyon imprimé, the visual focus is solely on the two figures of Shame and the Pucelle, as Love is deliberately excluded. This choice of Shame as the solitary figure accompanying the Pucelle in these liminal images tends to point us towards a more moral interpretation and framework being imposed on the readership of the printed editions. Although the Pucelle never makes a final choice between her two advisors in the poem, she promises that she will ‘garderoye de mesprendre’ (be careful not to misbehave, v. 445). It seems that the audience of these early printed editions is being given more guidance, and more of a framework with which to interpret what is an ambiguous debate, than that of the manuscript copies. They are subconsciously driven by this framework towards the silent election of Shame as the victor of the debate, and therefore to chastity as the life-choice that the Pucelle will make. The frame or framework of the debate in its material context is thus at once the visual and verbal framing of the debates in text and image, and also the conceptual notion of a framework or guidance for the reader played out through its material reception. Yet it is clear that the images we have here and in the manuscript copy provide something that the text alone cannot: a titillating theatricality, a spectacular mise en scène of this debate about the choice between reining in one’s desires or giving free expression to them. In the early printed editions, this is a titillation which is clearly being contained or moderated. The visual and textual framing is an attempt to constrain and circumscribe desire, to control it. Like the inconclusive outcome of the debate, desire escapes its material and textual constraints, remaining unfulfilled, uncontrollable. In the Lyon woodcut, we observe the Pucelle eyeing her interlocutor soberly and with attention from her fully reclined posture on the bed. One of the two Seville imprimés (Figure 4) depicts a parallel scene with
identical facial expressions, though the Pucelle is somewhat propped up on pillows.\textsuperscript{38} The Pucelle looks at Shame directly in Figures 3 and 4, as the Pucelle in BnF, MS fr. 25553 does not. Shame’s hand gestures in both woodcuts show that she is dominating the conversation, indeed we suspect it may be more or less a one-way lecture (Garnier 1982; 2003). In Figure 3, Shame rests her right hand on the bed without touching the Pucelle, while in Figure 4 she appears to be grasping the Pucelle’s right elbow with her left hand for emphasis (suggesting her metaphorical guidance of the Pucelle). We also observe with interest the significance of Shame’s positioning in both woodcuts, literally barring the open door, suggestive of the Pucelle’s entrapment in a rigid and closed sexuality. The Pucelle herself is fully clothed on the bed. While in Figure 3, her clothes and headgear are more elaborate and more overtly body-hugging than those of her interlocutor, in Figure 4 there is a greater \textit{rapprochement} between the two figures where the near-identical presentation of the women enhances our sense that the Pucelle is in agreement with Shame’s overtures and will adopt her lifestyle as she wears her dress. Paradoxically the Pucelle is in the room and in the position where she runs the greatest risk to her virginity, and yet her passivity suggests she will not put up a fight against the verbal acrobatics of Shame. The very immediacy in the material present of what is allegedly an apparition, and the openness of the Pucelle to Shame’s approaches, also suggest the heavier moral focus of the early printed version of the \textit{Songe}.

A third French woodcut fronts a later edition of the \textit{Songe} now kept in Chantilly, Bibliothèque du château (Figure 5). This title-page woodcut depicts a wholly different scene

\textsuperscript{38} This \textit{imprimé} is not given a provenance by the Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina, however a note in Spanish on the rear flyleaf suggests this was bought in Montpellier on 6 July 1535. The second Seville \textit{imprimé} (Figure 7) has the printer’s mark of Jehan de Channey in Avignon, and a scribbled note on the rear flyleaf tells us it was bought in Avignon or Lyon in September 1535. There is a fascinating series of visual connections between Figures 3, 4 and 8. Figures 4 and 8 have an almost identical characteristic ‘L’, decorated with a rose. The ‘L’ in Figure 7 is similar but clearly not from the same printing block. Since Figure 8 is from a Lyon copy, it follows that Figure 4 may also have been, and possibly from the same printer: see Claudin 1915; and Hillard 2003.
from the more typical *Songe* woodcuts (represented by Figures 3 and 4).³⁹ Here a standing figure we assume to be the Pucelle is framed in the upper part of the image with two kneeling men. She extends her left hand gingerly to one of the two bareheaded men whose lances are raised in a clearly phallic gesture.⁴⁰ The design may be intended as an interpretation of the Pucelle’s naïve reception of courtship. A frieze of heads runs along the bottom part of the image; all are turned to watch the scene above. Like the manuscript miniature, here the scene is bucolic: a clump of grass is printed in the foreground. It is to be noted that this printed edition contains neither of the two ‘moralizing’ ballades often found with the *Songe*. One might assume then that here, unlike the Lyon *imprimé*, the Pucelle has chosen Love over Shame, and is being courted by not one but two lovers. However, the remarkable frieze of onlooking male and female heads tends to suggest that the moral framework of the other editions is not far away here either.⁴¹ If you take a lover, or indeed several, the woodcut seems to suggest, you must be careful of the gossips and *mesdisants* who will spread the rumours of your affairs abroad. We can perhaps find a visual echo here of Shame’s verbal advice to the Pucelle in the *Songe*:

```
Adonc Honte respond tout court:
Ma belle amye, non feras,
Car ung si tres mauvais bruit court.
Certes que trop te mesferas
Si tost que amoureuse seras;
Je te tiens pour toute esperdue:
Femme sans honneur est perdue.
```

³⁹ I have not been able to establish a direct borrowing here, though the Chantilly image looks like a generic courtly scene, and is probably reused.
⁴⁰ Additionally, the two hanging ties of the lady’s belt present a visual echo of the lances and may gesture to a future deflowering.
⁴¹ It is difficult to make out the expressions on the faces depicted in the frieze, but they appear older than those of the characters they observe above, which may suggest a reflection on the folly of youth.
Then Shame replied quickly: ‘My sweet friend, don’t do this (give in to Love), because terrible rumours will start up. You will be doing wrong as soon as you fall in love; I think you’ve lost your way: a woman without honour is lost’. (vv. 85–91).

A woodcut taken from the English tradition of the Songe presents a particularly intriguing trio of reused figures (Figure 6). The poet, an authoritative older man carrying a scroll which we assume to be his poem, is flanked by two figures. These are either Love and Shame, or perhaps rather Love and the Pucelle. The identities of the figures remain ambiguous; banderoles flutter emptily above each. The central author-figure points towards the male figure to his right (our left), as if suggesting that the Pucelle should pay heed to his words. The most attractive identification of these anonymous figures is perhaps the following: one of the two men may represent the French author/copyist of the debate to whom the Pucelle has taken her verbal account of her dream-vision, while the central figure is the English translator-author, and the figure to the right is the Pucelle. This woodcut uses a technique employed by Antoine Vérard in his Therence en francoys (1500–03), and Jardin de plaisance (1501), which is discussed by Martha Driver, Adrian Armstrong, and Jane H. M. Taylor. Vérard, in common with fellow-printers, Pierre Le Rouge and Michel Le Noir, was at this time using interchangeable printing blocks which offered the printer a wide variety of permutations based on a series of assorted characters, architectural scenes, and greenery. Therefore these figures are most probably reused from the Therence tradition. Armstrong describes the grouping of the Therence figures in

---

42 I am extremely grateful to Julia Boffey who generously shared her work on the English version of the Songe with me prior to its publication (see Boffey 2013). She also most kindly directed me to this woodcut which she had located.


44 Of course Robert Wyer may be reprinting an earlier Wynkyn de Worde edition (see earlier, and Boffey 2013).
threes with scrolls which in some printed texts are left blank: in Jean Bouchet’s *Amoureux transi sans espoir* for example (Armstrong 2007, p. 99). Many English printers bought or rented continental woodcuts, and it is likely that Robert Wyer had acquired some French blocks from Vérard’s atelier, as we see from the identical blocks used for the figure of the author in Vérard’s 1501 *Jardin de Plaisance* in figures 9 and 10 (Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008). The print of the far-left figure in the Huntington woodcut is noticeably less clear-cut than the other two, lending weight to the theory of reuse. The English woodcut, therefore, would represent the most complex of the framing narratives we have seen across the *Songe* tradition, and a highly wrought and self-conscious relationship between author, translator, narrator, and participant. The frame of *The Maiden’s Dream* would then foreground more evidently the creative process, rather than the dream landscape — be it bucolic or domestic — which is the focus of the manuscript miniature as well as the woodcuts from the French tradition. The reader is in no doubt from the ‘Prohemye of the Authour’ (Author’s Prologue) which begins under the liminal image, that this version of the *Songe* is designed as a moral framework or mirror to guide young women:

```
Beholde you yonge ladyes of hyghe parentage
And younge virgyns, of eche degre
Here is a pamphlet, even mete for your age
Where as in a myrrour, you maye lerne and se
How vycious love, you shulde eschewe and fle
Havynge alway shamfastnes, in your maydenly face
Then can you never mysse, of vertue and grace.45
```

4 Conclusion

So we have shown how the separate circulation of the *Songe* in its French and English early printed editions would seem to target a somewhat different audience from the manuscript copies. These publics are targeted through divergent strategies of visual and verbal composition and

45 Transcribed from Huntington Library, Rare Books 81679.
framing, and through the questions of authority, ambiguity, and moral guidance that we have observed and discussed here. In the early printed tradition, copies of the *Songe* tended to be transmitted in single booklets at least for part of their circulation, and were not always associated with other texts as in the manuscript copies; desire is neatly contained within the bounds of one discrete text. In manuscript copies, as we have seen, the codex is a place of negotiation and encounter between multiple texts and multiple voices: desire is never fulfilled, and yet it is never contained either, but allowed to spill beyond the text into its responses, continuations, and imitations. In the Lyon woodcut (Figure 3), echoes of a courtly romance, *Pierre et la belle Maguèlonne* surface through reuse; similarly the story of reuse in Figure 6, the courtly scene in Figure 5, or the generic Pucelle figures depicted in Figures 7 and 8 point us to a (courtly) world in which the virginity of the Pucelle is in peril. The early printed material context of the poem, both visual and textual, therefore reinforces our sense that the Pucelle’s salvation (and that of the audience) lies within the pages of the debate if only she (and we) would be guided by Shame.

The framing — visual, verbal, and conceptual — of this surprisingly complex text in its various material contexts of reception foregrounds this fraught politics, and throws the spotlight on the creative process. While the poetic *je* continues to protest the authenticity of her or his tale, this spotlight inevitably reveals the complex artifice at the creative centre of the material ‘images’ and the narrative ‘imag[en]ings’ constructed in fifteenth-century debates. This is an artifice echoed in the reuse of woodcuts in the printed copies just as it can be observed in textual borrowings. Through the reused blocks, echoes of other images and other texts surface to disturb and trouble the narrative.

46 A dialogue is established in the manuscript tradition between the *Songe* and other texts, and indeed, other images, collected in the same manuscripts. This is both an intra- and inter-codical dialogue: Taylor 2001; Cayley 2006; Taylor 2007; and Armstrong 2012.
Illustrations

Figure 1. Love and Shame appear to the Pucelle in her sleep. *Songe de la Pucelle*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 25553, fol. 50r. Photo reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 2. The Lover sleeps. Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Roman de la Rose*, Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 5226, fol. 1r. Photo reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 3. Shame appears to the Pucelle in her sleep. *Songe [doré] de la Pucelle*, Paris, BnF, Rés., Ye 837, fol. 1v. Photo reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 4. Shame appears to the Pucelle in her sleep. *Songe de la Pucelle*, Seville, Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina, 15-2-6 (19), fol. 1v. Photo reproduced by permission of the Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina.

Figure 5. The Pucelle is courted while onlookers observe. *Songe de la Pucelle*, Chantilly, Bibliothèque du château, XI. D. 54, fol. 3r. Photo reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque et archives du château de Chantilly.

Figure 6. The poet is flanked by two figures, possibly intended to represent Love and the Pucelle (alternatively Love and Shame, or the French author and the Pucelle). *The maydens dreme compiled and made by Chrystofer Goodwyn, in the yere of our Lorde. M.CCCCC.xlij*, San
Marino, CA, Henry E. Huntington Library, Rare Books 81679, fol. 1r. Photo reproduced by permission of the Henry E. Huntington Library.

Figure 7. The Pucelle asleep in a locus amoenus. [Les] Songe[s] de la Pucelle [Avec la Fontaine d’amours], Seville, Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina, 15-2-6 (15), fol. 1r. Photo reproduced by permission of the Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina.

Figure 8. The Pucelle holds flowers. Songe de la Pucelle, Aix-en-Provence, Fonds Bibliothèque Méjanes, Rés. S. 024, 08, fol. 1r. Photo reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque Méjanes.

Figure 9. The narrator encounters two lovers: one estranged and the other rejected by his lady. Le Jardin de Plaisance (1501), Le Debat de L’estrange et de l’escondit [anon], Paris, BnF, Rés., Ye 168-69, fol.129v. Photo reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Figure 10. The God of Love (left) holds court at which the character of the Belle Dame sans mercy (Beautiful Lady without pity) is to be judged. The narrator talks to the Belle Dame (right). Le Jardin de Plaisance (1501), Le Parlement d’Amours [The Court of Love, Baudet Herenc], Paris, BnF, Rés., Ye 168-69, fol. 139v. Photo reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.
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Ballade à propos

La pucelle:

Vous, qui avez vos ans jeunes passé
Et mains beaux jours a grant joye chassé,
Conseillez moy l’entrant de ma jeunesce.

Enfance m’a nagueres relaxé,
D’ynocence que j’ay jà trespassé,
Combien que suis plus lourde que une anesse;
Nature moulte de me poindre s’annexe
Tout autrement qu’a coustume n’avoie,
Et me semont quelque part que je soye
D’auoir amy donc le poure cuer me fent
Et me conduit je ne scay quelle voye:
Amours le veult, mais Honte le deffent.

Nature ung an de plaider n’a cessé
Le cas d’Amours donc de pres m’a pressé,
Mais puis Raison commande que je cesse
C’est l’advocat com on m’a confessé
De Honte qui m’a souvent bien lassé
De me prescher com ce fust une abbesse;
Franchise escoute et veult estre jugesse
L’une tire l’autre boute et me voie,
Tant que souvent se faire le savoie
Feroie ce que mon cuer me consent,
Cahin caha se mourir en devoie:
Amours le veult, mais Honte le deffent.

Dist Nature «je t’ay tant amassé
De tous mes biens et si bien compassé
Et chierement nourry, belle maistresse,
Mal l’auray mis et sans cause brasse,
Se ne m’en sers ce seroit trop farse;»
Beaulté pour neant est bien grant simplesce
Raison d’ailleurs me crie: «laisse, laisse,»
En rougissant tantost Honte m’envoie:
«Que feras tu, ma fille, or te desvoye
De ce chemin ou Nature t’atent;»
Et si fault il qu’a mon fait je pourvoie:
Amours le veult, mais Honte le deffent.

47 My English translation of the poem follows the Middle French version here.
Prince, jugez quant requise seroit
D’amer comme ont des autres plus de cent.
Le temps passe pour Dieu se j’oseroie:
Amours le veult, mais Honte le deffent.

[fol. 68v] Explicit sompnum cuiusdem puelle

The Ballad of Options

The Virgin:

You, who have spent your younger years
And many delightful days chasing after pleasure,
Please advise me as I begin life’s journey
Childhood has finally released me,
From the innocence that I have left behind,
And although I am duller than a donkey;
Nature has begun to excite me in ways
That are different from those I am used to,
And needle me wherever I go
To take a lover, so that my poor heart strains
And leads me I know not where:
Love wishes it but Shame forbids it.

For a year Nature incessantly pleaded
Love’s case and greatly pressured me,
But then Reason ordered me to stop
That’s Shame’s lawyer, Shame wore me out
With her prayers as she was an abbess;
Freedom listened and wanted to judge the dispute
One pushed the other pulled and guided me,
So much that if I knew how to
I would do what my heart bids me,
By hook or by crook though I may die from it:
Love wishes it but Shame forbids it.

Said Nature, « I have piled up
So much of my goodness and so neatly composed
And nurtured you, lovely mistress,
I would have done wrong and laboured without cause,
If I didn’t use you it would be a travesty;»
Beauty for no purpose is great stupidity
But then Reason calls to me: «Stop, stop,»
Meanwhile Shame, blushing, cries out:

48 (Here ends the Dream of the Virgin.)
«What are you doing, my daughter, step away
From that path where Nature lies in wait;»
And I must look to correct my behaviour:
*Love wishes it but Shame forbids it.*

Prince, please tell me when the time is right
To love, which hundreds have done before me.
Time passes, by God, that I might dare:
*Love wishes it but Shame forbids it.*