The Medieval (Music) Book: 
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In this chapter I explore the idea of a medieval manuscript book as a cognitive artefact. With this term, I assert that the manuscript book is a product of a cognitive ecology and an example of embedded creative cognition, both of which involve the reader in an active role in recreating the text. Through a multimodal analysis of an opening from the Livre de Fauvel (Paris, BnF fr. 146) presented in the light of these notions, together with medieval theories of memory and consumption, I show that the medieval manuscript book is both multimodal and cognitive, and that the present-day reader has much to gain from taking an active part in the book’s recreation.

You beat back the weakness of my vision; your light shone upon me in its brilliance, and I thrilled in love and dread alike. I realized that I was far away from you. It was as though I were in a land where all is different from your own and I heard your voice calling from on high, saying, ‘I am the food of full-grown men. Grow and you shall feed on me. But you shall not change me into your own substance, as you do with the food of your body. Instead you shall be changed into me.’¹

In this quotation, Augustine describes his realisation that the consumption of the word of God changes the body that is consuming it. This communion with the text is an idea that prevailed throughout the Middle Ages, and is essential for an understanding of medieval reading and composition practices, which are closely entwined as we

¹ Augustine, Confessions 7.10: 147; translation from Brown 2000: 561. Translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own, and all dates are given in new style. An earlier version of this chapter was presented at the Leeds International Medieval Congress, 4–7 July 2016. My sincere thanks to the organisers of the session, Sara Ellis Nilsson and Steffen Hope, as well as to the panellists and audience, for the feedback and discussions. Thanks are also due to Steffen Hope, Lilli Minter and Narve Fuchs, who read and commented on drafts of this chapter. The reviewers of the History of Distributed Cognition project, and the patient editing of Miranda Anderson, did much to clarify my thinking, and specific thanks are due to Miranda Anderson and Michael Wheeler for the supply of references and work pre-publication.
shall see. The structure of the medieval book (much of which is still the same in books today) is itself cognitive, in that it reflects contemporary thought about the memory. This was established by Frances Yates (1966), advanced by Mary Carruthers (1990, 1998), and embellished with relation to music by Anna Maria Busse Berger (2005). I have argued elsewhere that the manuscript page is a site of multimodal performance (Maxwell 2009; Maxwell et al. 2013; Maxwell 2015), and here I shall further develop that premise with reference to the extended (creative) mind.2

The chapter is divided into two principal sections. First, I will elucidate the theory behind my approach. In this section I draw not only on distributed cognition and multimodality, but also on related material from the Middle Ages, particularly Augustine and ideas about the consumption of the text. In the second section, I put the theory into practice through a detailed case-study analysis of a single opening from a multimodal medieval manuscript: the beast enthroned in the Livre de Faune. Through this active reading in which I recreate this multimodal text as a modern reader, I both reveal and take part in the cognitive ecology of authors, compilers, readers and book. I end with a consideration of the relevance of such an approach, and such a book, to our own time, and how the consumption of old texts continues to change those who take the time to learn.

Theory

In the Middle Ages both writing and reading were intrinsically linked to memory (Carruthers 1990): one did not ‘know’ a text unless it was, in fact, memorised, internalised in the mind. A text was typically composed in the mind, dictated to a secretary, and then learnt by a reader.3 In this chapter I will demonstrate how the network created of author, scribe, reader and book – the meeting of (at least three) minds, parchment, ink, quill and other technologies of writing and knowing that all contributed to the writing and thinking process – can be considered a cognitive ecology. A cognitive ecology can be defined as follows:

A cognitive ecology is a structured setting in which individuals or groups remember, create, imagine or engage in other flexible, intelligent action. Cognitive ecologies are often multidimensional, involving physical, technological, and social resources all at once . . . The unit of analysis, then, is the whole shifting and dynamic system seen as an interacting whole, rather than a single individual. (Sutton and Keane 2016: 48)

The interplay between the book, the body and the mind is far from straightforward in the later Middle Ages. In the case study in this chapter, I will show how

2 ‘Performance’ as a term is here understood as encompassing the theatrical as well as the theoretical. In brief, readers of a medieval manuscript take part in the ongoing performance of the page (Maxwell et al. 2013).

3 For examples see Carruthers 1990: 9–8, 10–11.
the cognitive ecology functions with particular regard for the role of the readers' memories. In the Middle Ages, the design of the book (and other artefacts) reflected the medieval art of memory, but it would be deceptively simple to claim that the book is an extension of the mind. The extended mind theory (Clark 2014) is here enacted in reverse: rather than information being stored in a medieval book in order to be retrieved at a later date, the information in the book is laid out in such a way as to enable it to be efficiently memorised (Carruthers 1990: 11). Clark's assertions that we are 'natural born cyborgs' (Clark 2003) and that 'brains like ours trade access against on-board storage' (Clark 2014) therefore need some unpacking for the medieval manuscript book. The medieval book was less a way to extend the mind by storing information outside of the body than a physical creation based on contemporary understandings of the mind's memory storage so that the information presented in the book could be consumed and recreated in the mind of the reader.

One of the important notions at work here is creativity, particularly its relation to the cognitive ecology of the medieval book and the role of the reader in what I have elsewhere called the performance of the page (Maxwell et al. 2013). This fits with what Michael Wheeler has termed creativity's 'entangled, inside-and-outside logic', in which cognitive creative processes are in constant dialogue with contexts, bodies and spaces, and are thus both internal and external (Wheeler 2018: 231). As we will see from the case study of the Livre de Fauvel below, the reader of a medieval manuscript is heavily involved in this process; indeed, the reader is required to complete the text. For without reading (and memorisation), composition cannot take place. Mary Carruthers explains it thus:

Medieval reading habits are based upon a model of craft mastery, the 'courses' of one stone or brick or other materials which a master mason may make in building a wall, with concomitant emphasis upon preparation (the ground), routines of exercise (discipline), and stages in a way towards making a finished artifact, a mastery that affords pleasure. (Carruthers 1998: 20–1)

Thus medieval reading and creative practices can be linked as 'embedded creative cognition', for the medieval book is 'an external technological element [that] may account for some of the distinctively creative aspects of an artwork' (Wheeler 2018: 240). Indeed, the attentive reader of a medieval book, recreating the text in their mind, has a dynamic relationship with this external resource that then becomes 'a partner or participant in the creative process' (241). Thus the medieval book is more than memorial scaffolding, or off-site storage. It is a cognitive artefact that is at once external and public (an object that has survived the centuries) and internal.

---

4 The active role of the reader is to be found in various medieval texts in addition to my case study here, particularly those containing anagrams, a device in which the intertwined roles of reader and author are exploited sometimes humorously, sometimes frustratingly (De Loof 1991).
and private (recreated according to the individual knowledge of each reader). And this cognitive artefact is multimodal.

While it could be argued that all medieval manuscripts are multimodal, in that they all employ various semiotic modes to make meaning, some exploit this to a greater extent than others. My case study in this chapter is the interpolated *Livre de Fauvel*, a manuscript book containing music combined with text, image and manifold other semiotic modes for meaning-making. It is therefore inherently multimodal. The use of the framework of multimodality for the analysis of medieval texts is relatively new, and here I draw on the model developed in Maxwell 2015. This means that I understand the individual modes in use to fall into three categories that are dependent on the context of the analysis: the first category is that of 'cultural practices' (for example, reading and writing, as discussed above), the second is 'semiotic resources' (for example, page layout, the use of Latin or vernacular), and the third is 'elements' (for example, rhythm and colour). In the section below I undertake a multimodal analysis of a single opening from the *Livre de Fauvel* in order to demonstrate how each mode contributes to the complex performance of that opening, and how the reader’s realisation of this contributes to their understanding of the book as a whole, and thus they become part of the cognitive ecology.

Perhaps learning is the closest modern understanding of the cultural practice of reading in the Middle Ages. But this learning was not rote memorisation, nor was it pedagogical per se. It is instead a learning which changes the learner from within, a consummation which transforms the one who consumes. This is a notion that was current at the start of the Common Era, and is found in Judæo-Christian writings including those found in the Old and New Testaments (see, for example, Ezekiel 2–3, 1 Corinthians 11, Revelations 10 and, most famously, the opening to the gospel of John). Thus something enters the mind via the body (ears, eyes, mouth), where it enacts creation and change – where it can be built upon to bring the soul closer to the truth. The book itself embodies the moral imperative to change the reader who reads 'well'.

It is therefore not surprising that a trope of medieval music theorists was that music was ‘scientia bene modulandi’ – the science of modulating well. This phrase is from the first book of Augustine of Hippo’s *De musica*, and was current throughout the period, even if reference to Augustine (or his source Varro) was not usually made (Östrem 2012: 222). It does not simply imply a case of good singing; rather, ‘modulandi’ refers to the orderly arrangement of sounds, and the ‘bene’ invokes ethical considerations (Östrem 2012: 226, 231). While Augustine wrote some centuries before the development of music notation, it is notable that the resurrection of his incomplete treatise on music took place after the changes widely referred to as the *ars nova*,6 and indeed his words were often used in debates about the ethically

---

5 This can be compared to the concept of musicking (Small 1999, discussed in relation to medieval music manuscripts in Maxwell 2009 and to the musically extended mind in Krueger 2014a).
6 The *ars nova*, to put it simply, allowed musical rhythm to be notated. In the early fourteenth
dubious state of music in religious services (Ostrem 2012). If music was to be permitted, then a good song or singer was not enough: the music, however it was received, also had to nourish the soul.

In summary, then, it is my contention that the medieval book is a multimodal cognitive artefact that sees the reader as part of a cognitive ecology. This can be understood in medieval terms through architectural metaphors (Carruthers 1998), or through an Augustinian understanding of the changing power of reading. It is also a creative process that displays the clear ‘inside-and-outside logic’ of embedded cognition (Wheeler 2018: 231). The medieval book may reflect composition and reading practices that were based on memory, but the book is much more than a temporary storage space for information to be later taken into the mind. Rather, the book is a site of performance between producers and readers, and that performance requires that the readers play their part, and play it ‘well’, so that they are changed from the inside. Since without such reader engagement the medieval book is incomplete, we must now turn to a case study to demonstrate the cognitive ecology in action. In so doing we shall recreate for our own society a 700-year-old text through a multimodal analysis of a single manuscript opening. Through this analysis, which relies on active reading, I simultaneously reveal and take part in the cognitive ecology of the medieval book.

Theory in Performance: The Livre de Fauvel

The interpolated Roman de Fauvel as it is preserved in fr. 146, the manuscript known as the Livre de Fauvel, is an example par excellence of a cognitive ecology working to produce a multimodal book.7 It is a book that is lavishly yet tastefully presented with muted greens, purples and golds: it is designed to be sweet as honey when tasted by the reader, but its message is bitter in the belly (Revelations 10: 10), a stark warning of impending disaster should political change not occur. It is a tour de force of music, image and text, but more than this: it uses every semiotic resource available to make its message of change visible and audible to anyone seeking it.

The Livre de Fauvel measures 46 cm × 33 cm when closed, and contains over 100 parchment folios; as a physical artefact it is large, heavy, imposing. Its contents at first seem disparate: it opens with a lament which is followed by the index, then follow the two books of the Roman de Fauvel written by Gervais de Bus in 1310 with their abundant new additions (a lengthy musical and pictorial scheme, together with significant textual additions). Following the roman are a series of political dice in French and Latin by Geoffroy de Paris, then thirty-four songs by Jehannot de l'Est-

cord, and finally a rhymed metrical chronicle of events in France between 1300 and 1316 (Bent and Wathey 1998: 6–7). The whole is flanked by blank flyleaves and is now enclosed in a red leather binding dating from the seventeenth or eighteenth century (Dillon 2002b: 12).

To the modern reader this motley crew of genres and arts is bewildering, even assuming a working knowledge of Middle French and of fourteenth-century textual and musical writing. Yet the manuscript is undoubtedly attractive and amusing even to the untrained modern eye, and it teaches some important lessons. The law can be devoutly self-indulgently for entertainment only, or it can be nobly and devoutly understood as placing a moral imperative on the reader to employ their Augustinian rhythms of judgement and to bring about change. What is most intriguing for our purposes here is that these lessons must be learnt through the reader’s cognitive engagement, which can take place on a multitude of levels – something that Nancy Freeman Regalado has termed ‘reciprocal reading’ (1998, 122). And, as Emma Dillon has pointed out, the term ‘reader’ here includes the producers of the manuscript, who, perhaps more than anyone, produced the book at the same time as they consumed it (Dillon 2002b: 7–8). As demonstrated above, the format of the medieval book was such that it reflected contemporary reading and memorisation practices. When we read the Livre de Fauvel, therefore, we enter into a dynamic cognitive space in which the reader’s mind interacts with the tool of the book, and through it, with the minds of its creators. The construction of the book, and of the opening I will analyse in the case study below, is such that the multimodal literacy required to engage with it and its message can take place on a number of levels, and across time and space. The book itself, and its layout, was therefore a tool that plays an active part in both the creation and the reading processes which are here entwined. The livre is thus a cognitive ecology in full swing.

Who were the compilers of this extraordinary book? Much scholarly thought has gone into this very question, so I will merely summarise here.6 The recipient was almost certainly Philip V, on the occasion of his somewhat unlikely and not entirely secure succession to the French throne in 1316 (coronation January 1317). The compilers were equally likely to be clerks and notaries of the royal household of France, who included authors, composers and artists. They had witnessed the damaging rise and fall of Philip IV’s all-powerful favourite adviser Enguerrand de Marigny (hanged in 1315), the short reign of Louis X which was plagued with an adultery scandal and lasty remarriage, the birth and death of Louis’s posthumous son (the infant king Jean I (1316)), and the political manoeuvres of Philip (V) to secure first the regency and then the crown itself. The manuscript was therefore produced at a time of political upheaval, when a strong and wise leader was badly needed. Yet royal clerks, no matter how skilled, could not go about making a lavish manuscript such as fr. 146 on their own: someone had to pay for it, and that someone had to be sure enough of their own position to not incur certain retaliation for the manuscript’s bitter

message. I have demonstrated elsewhere (Maxwell 2004) that the elusive authorial naming in fr. 146 conceals the name of Charles de Valois, brother of Philip IV and uncle to Philip V. Valois was a major actor in the overthrow of Marigny (a likely model for the character Fauvel), and Philip (V) owed his successful negotiations for the regency and succession in large part to the support of Valois. While the manuscript was undoubtedly produced by a collective, if anyone had the financial wherewithal and political clout to back such a project, it was Charles de Valois.

Theory in Performance: A Multimodal Analysis of the Opening 10v–11r: A Reflection of Kings and Beasts

I will now turn my attention to a single opening in the *Roman de Fauvel* in order to demonstrate the cognitive ecology of authors, compilers (including scribes and artists), readers and book. A multimodal analysis of this opening requires the reader to recreate the text, and the reader’s cognitive engagement is itself dictated by the nature of the object under study – here, the manuscript book. In this way, I as a modern-day reader become part of the cognitive ecology that is revealed by my act of analysis.

The model I use for my multimodal analysis is that presented in Maxwell 2015, where the generic term ‘mode’ is refined into ‘cultural practices’, ‘semiotic resources’ and ‘elements’. I have already outlined much of what we can consider to be the cultural practices – here, reading and writing practices together with the sociopolitical context – surrounding the *Livre de Fauvel*; however, the opening I will consider here, fols. 10v–11r (Plate 6), employs these on a more detailed level. The opening shows the end of an extended authorial intervention that falls between books I and II of de Bus’s *Roman de Fauvel* from 1310. Fr. 146 marks this break by a rondeau and two motets (one introduced by a rubric), a series of author portraits, and a textual epilogue to the first book. Fol. 10v shows the end of the epilogue, the rubric, and the two motets (the second continues on to 11r, but the two voices presented on fol. 10v could stand alone, as could the two on 11r; see Dillon 1998: 220). Fol. 11r also contains the opening of the second book, together with its first additions: the introductory rubric, the author image, the conductus ‘O labilis fortis’, and the image of Fauvel enthroned.

The cognitive ecology is visible on this opening in the prominent physicality of the *livre* in the miniature of the tonsured clerk holding his book on folio 11r. Here is an author portrayed reading his book, mouth closed, legs crossed, eyes focused on the book. This authorial image symbolises the embedding of the physical object into the process of its own creation. The tonsured clerk’s garments are those of his profession which mark him as lower in social status than the glove-holding nobles, reaching impotently towards him across the arched divide that separates his world from theirs. The clerk is presented as larger, as tall seated as the nobles are standing. A symbol of the collective behind the *livre*, the clerk is presented as an educated reader, separate from the bookless ‘others’ outside of the cognitive ecology. The knowledge, the book, belongs to him and, by inference, to all readers who engage in the contemplative and cognitive reading he models.
Indeed, we can think of this clerk as our model for the embedded creativity that I propose is at work here. At once reader and compiler, he is pictured in active contemplation of the book. This book, the information it contains, is both inside and outside of his mind-body sphere — he is cradling it in his crossed limbs, turning the pages, and consuming it with his eyes. The mind-body-book relationship is dynamic and reciprocal. As reader, the information is helped to enter his mind, his memory, through both the structure of the individual folios and the divisions of the book as a whole. As a compiler of this (and other) texts, he builds on the knowledge thus accrued to create more, and so the cycle continues as long as the book is read and its information interpreted and recreated by attentive readers. This model does not present a fast boundary between the mind, the body and the book; rather, it shows how each of these are intertwined with the others in a cognitive ecology, where each reader recreates the text anew.

My recreation of the text proposes that folios 10v and 11r can be read as mirrors of each other. This interpretation is built on the premise that the book is part of the cognitive ecology, and that the physicality of the object that is the book is an external but essential part of the creative process. The mirror is imagined at the point where the folios meet, the centre of the opening. The device of the mirror is a literal interpretation of the medieval tradition of the mirror of princes, in which advice was given to newly crowned kings. Given the context of Faustel in the wake of the crisis of succession of the Capetian royal line, the Livre can indeed be considered as part of this tradition. This mirror, though, employs biting satire: the beast Faustel is not an image one wants to see reflected. In addition, the emerging Ars nova musical forms delighted in manipulating space and time. Examples of this include the frontispieces to the Chanuitly codex, where one song is presented in the shape of a hearth and another in a circle, and the word-layout-music networks of Machaut’s ‘Ma fin est mon commencement’. Asking readers to join in a complex game of multimodal interpretation is far from unique to Faustel.

The end of the triplum to the motet ‘Servant Regnum / O Philippe / Rex Beatum’ reads as follows (fol. 10v, column c):

Bona terra cuius rex nobilis
set ve terre si sit puerilis.
Melior est pauper et sapiens
atque puér quam rex insipiens.
Rex hodie est et cras moritur;
juste vivat et sancteigitur.

Good [is] the land whose king is noble, but woe to the land if he be childish.
Better poor and wise and a boy than a foolish king. Today he lives and tomorrow he dies. Therefore let him live justly and holily.8

8 For this motet I use the edition and translation provided in Dillon 1998.
Due to the cultural practice of memory training, educated medieval scribes and readers (such as our clerk) would be able to supply from memory the reference to Ecclesiastes 10: 12–17:

Words from the mouth of the wise are gracious, but fools are concerned by their own lips. At the beginning their words are folly; at the end they are wicked madness – and fools multiply words. No-one knows what is coming – who can tell what will happen after them? The toil of fools wears them, they do not know the way to the town. Woe to the land whose king is a child, and whose princes feast in the morning. Blessed is the land whose king is of noble birth and whose princes eat at a proper time – for strength and not for drunkenness.\(^{10}\)

With this link, which relies on the cognitive ecology at work here to reveal its deeper meaning, the motet triplum becomes not just a warning to the new king from the safe ground of Ecclesiastes, but a lament that his nephew died so young. In my mirror reading, the empty staves over the last lines of the motet voices the authorial miniature: ‘the music, it seems, falls silent, not daring to sound the most controversial message of the piece’ (Dillon 1998: 223). For, as Dillon shows (1993: 221–4), the triplum and motetus voices juxtapose through their music and their texts the ‘rex sapiens’ (the infant Jean) and the ‘rex insapiens’ (Philip V). Reading this triplum with the mirror image in mind, we can take this contrast even further.

As well as the authorial image of the reading clerk, the reflection on 11r (column a) shows the tenor praising St Louis,\(^{11}\) and an authorial rubric. The rubric marks the divide between the two books of Fauvel and gives an overview of what is to come in the story. This is an example of the embedded creativity in action on this opening, in which the technology of the book itself is manipulated in such a way that it becomes an essential part of the creative (and recreative) process. Through a multimodal engagement with it, the reader learns what will befall the kingdom of France should its new king not be wise enough to consume the text presented in the book with the right intentions and at the proper time.

Yet there is more, for the most heretical message is still to come. Again, drawing on the cognitive ecology at work here, the educated medieval reader would know that the tenor of this motet, given at the bottom of folio 10v (column c), ‘Rex regum, dominus dominacium’ (‘King of kings, lord of lords’), is a quotation from the chant for the second Sunday of advent and from Revelation 19: 16 (Clark 1996: 128–9). This text refers to the second coming of the Messiah, in keeping with the apocalyptic theme running throughout Fauvel. In the mirror scheme I propose here, its presentation on fol. 10v reflects the opening of book II of the romanz, the

---

\(^{10}\) Noted in Dillon 1998: 222, citing Emilie Dauk's 1935 edition of the Fauvel interpolations.

\(^{11}\) The music to the tenor is presented twice, so that the motet can be considered as either a three-voice motet over two folios, or two two-voice motets, one on folio 10v and the other on 11r. The text is only given in the first presentation, at the bottom of 10v (column c).
...ual scribes and a reference to...

second coming of Fauvel. This second coming is then depicted in an image which was politically scandalous: Fauvel on the throne of France.\(^\text{12}\)

This image of Fauvel enthroned is placed at the very centre of fol. 11r, from which it stares out at and commands the attention of the reader. In the mirrored context, it reflects the motetus of the other motet on this opening, 'Se cuers / Rex beatus confessor / Ave'. This voice first sings the praises of St Louis, the 'rex beatus' ('sainty king'), the canonised Louis IX of France.\(^\text{13}\) It then appeals to a reader of the same name, presumably Louis X, Philip V's deceased brother (Brown 1998, 58-9). Reading even more closely, the head of the beast Fauvel is placed such that it is reflected in the mirror by the words 'conregnant in celi culmine / ergo nos' ('reigns with him in highest heaven / therefore we'). Here, 'ergo' marks the transition in the motetus from praising St Louis to his descendant of the same name. Normally, the 'nos' is presumed to be an error for 'ergo vos qui sub pari nomine': 'therefore you who share his name'. In the context of the reflection of Fauvel on the throne, letting 'nos' stand as 'we' brings Fauvel himself even further into the French royal line, into the communion of St Louis, the holy centre of the royal house of France.\(^\text{14}\) This idea is pursued under the image of Fauvel on fol. 11r, where we read in the text:

Un jour estoit en son palais
Fauvel, qui ne pert pas galloys,
Tout ait il eu pais de Gales
Chasteaux, chanjons, manoirs et sales,
Entour ly ait grant plente
De gens, tous de son parente,
Car il n'avoit de son mesnage
Nul qui ne fust de son lignage. (Lângfors 1914–19: 1245–52)

One day Fauvel, who had not lost the Gauls, was in his palace. He owned everything in the Gallic country, castles, donjons, manors, rooms. He was surrounded by people, all related to him, for he had no-one in his household who was not of his line.

These lines, which in the reflection take up the space of the rest of the motetus 'Rex beatus', could not be more damningly placed: the relation of St Louis's line

\(^{12}\) For an image of the French royal seal that was in use at this time, and a discussion of how the image on fol. 11r is a blatant copy, see Kauffmann 1998 (290 for the seal).

\(^{13}\) My translations and transcriptions for this motet are based on Brown 1998, Rose-Steel 2011 and Ricketts 1991.

\(^{14}\) The 'vobis' that occurs later in the motetus is not written as 'nobis', however. Similarly, although the written 'nos et vita' for 'vox et vita' does make some sense, it is probably explaining away errors a step too far; to pretend that 'night' is a better reading than 'voice' in this case. That the 'nos' is probably a scribal error does not mean that it cannot be interpreted, however; it was, after all, left uncorrected.
to that of Fauvel is clear. The reading continues into the tenor line, 'Ave'. Instead of praising (St) Louis, its mirror image details Fauvel's decor: 'semblant fin, mez ne le fut mie' ('seemingly fine, but was not at all'). The description of the fake glory of Fauvel's court is thus placed such that it is the mirror of the tenor (falsely?) praising St Louis.\(^{15}\) As if this were not enough, the text introducing the motet for Philip V is also placed here: 'Pour Phelippes qui regne ores / si metrez ce motet on quoques'. These lines, which emphasise Philip 'who now reigns', sit uncomfortably in the belly when consumed with the 'Ave' for St Louis reflected in the description of Fauvel's false court. Once again, this opening brings the reader firmly into the cognitive ecology, through the tool of the semiotic resource of page layout which this multimodal analysis shows was an essential part of the creative process. For it is not enough here to engage with only one of the book's modes - to read only the words, sing only the melody, look only at the pictures. In order for the cognitive ecology to function, the reader has to engage with the multimodality of the opening - embedded in the technology of the medieval book.

The triplum 'Se cuers' (fol. 10v, column a) has a less straightforward reflection. As one of only two bilingual motets in the entire manuscript, the imposition of French, the language of Fauvel, on to the very opening of this royal motet is a clear use of the semiotic resource of the vernacular.\(^{16}\) 'Se cuers' speaks of the delights and desires of youthful love. It therefore contributes to the cognitive ecology at work here by bringing in the common language of the land, and the common experience of love. In the context of the depiction on this opening of kings wise and false and foolish, we are here firmly in the domain of Louis X, whose hasty second marriage, following his first wife's adultery and convenient death, was well known (and is satirised at much greater length later in the manuscript, as well as mentioned in the authorial rubric on fol. 11r).

Reflecting 'Se cuers' in the mirror image on folio 11r is the conductus 'O labilis'. The speed of 'Se cuers' contrasts with the reverential pace of the conductus, a genre designed to be sung during the liturgy as the gospel was carried to the lectern - again, the layout of this folio draws on the common, cultural practices of the cognitive ecology. In contrast to the fast-moving, courtly French text and music of 'Se cuers', 'O labilis' is a solemn Latin poem on mortality and the dangers of luxury and excess. The levity of 'Se cuers' is seen even in the elements: the breve divides into two, rather than the more solemn (and religious) three of 'O labilis'. A multimodal reading of other elements in play allows us to see the alliteration in these two pieces. 'Se cuers' plays on 'ioans, ionnes, iollis' and 'gentil' (joyful, young, attractive' and 'noble') at repeated points. 'O labilis' uses the same emphatic device but with an entirely different focus: 'labilis', 'labitur', 'labori', 'laqueos', 'laberis', 'illicite', also 'lux', 'luxu', 'luxibus' (transient', 'toil', 'snares',

\(^{15}\) It has been claimed that the tenor 'Ave' comes from the office for St Louis, but no source has been found. See Clark 1996: 122–8.

\(^{16}\) For a discussion of the Fauvel motets in or including French see Rose-Steel 2011: 101–4 and Best 1998.
Instead of praising Philip V, unquotable in description into the text, this is. For it only the cognitive openness of a clear delightology at common wise is hasty was well as well as.

'O labilis' to the actices et and the damnements: tree of see the 'gentil' same abori', snare, as been.
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... and, 'licit', 'light', 'luxury', 'excess'). 'O labilis' contains contrasting imagery that is relentless and clear: 'Flens oritur, vivendo moritur / In prosperis luxu dissolvitur' (He arises weeping, he dies by living / amid prosperity is destroyed by luxury) in the first stanza; 'Ha, moriens vita, luxu sopita / Nos infectis, fellitis condita' (Ah, dying life, drugged by luxury / laced with gall, you poison us) is the refrain which is heard three times. Not only does this stand in contrast to 'Se curae', 'O labilis' is also a firm commentary on Fauvel's false court as described by the *roman* text in the adjacent column. In these signals to the attentive reader at the level of the smallest detail -- the 'elements' in a multimodal analysis -- the cognitive ecology is again at work.

It is at work on the larger scale too, where the external technology of the layout of the page is embedded into the creative process such that the reader meets a king surrounded by his courtiers on both of these folios. The layouts of 10v and 11r are planned so that the 'Rex beatus' (St Louis) lies in the middle of 10v, whereas on 11r it is the beast Fauvel who literally takes centre stage. St Louis is flanked by his kingly descendants -- the youthful and loving Louis X and the wise/unwise infant Jean I and Philip V. Fauvel is surrounded by Philip V, our clerkly author/reader and those who are reaching for his book, the call to learn about Fauvel (discussed below), the description of his court, and 'O labilis'. While the primary contrast in this distorted mirror of princes is of course that between St Louis and Fauvel, their entourages cannot be overlooked. These are busy folios with a clamour of different voices and a myriad of visual symbols fighting for the reader's attention, but, as this analysis shows, the mosaic of meaning is such that even the most cursory of readings could not fail to pick up the didactic tone. That two of the three musical items on the opening are motets, with plural voices singing together, is a further symbol of the cacophony: humans are adept at tuning in to one voice in the midst of others (the so-called cocktail-party effect), and, as Anna Zayaruznaya has shown, this also holds true for the polytextual motet (2010: 93–104). Indeed, it also holds true for this opening. The motets and the solemn warnings of 'O labilis' together make up a cognitive soundscape in which voices can be imagined sounding in isolation or together. The reader can choose to focus on one at a time or to listen to their overall clamour. The layout of the opening is therefore a fundamental part of the creative and receptive processes; the very format of the book is a tool that constituted a major part of its own creation.

There are two parts of this opening that this analysis has not yet covered, and they correspond to one another. The text that closes book I of the *roman* is found at the top of the first two columns on fol. 10v in what seems to have been a deliberate decision -- another example of embedded creativity where the creative process is influenced by the external technology of the book -- to make the *roman* text run over the top of both columns. This means that it serves to introduce the whole of this opening, relegating the 'Pour Phelippes' introduction to the bottom of the page where it can do more reflective harm, as we have seen. More significantly,
this means that this folio of motets starts with the line ‘Recitant de lui un motet’ (‘reciting to him a motet’). Who is the ‘lui’? The last name mentioned was St Louis, in the immediately preceding lines at the bottom of fol. 10r, yet these lines in fact focus on Philip IV. So, is ‘lui’ Louis or Philip? Margaret Bent raises the possibility that a third royal motet was planned to go here, for Phillip IV (Bent 1998: 49). In fact, I think that the ambiguity is deliberate, in keeping with the wealth of interpretations on this opening, and, of course, the wordplay lui/Louis. Philip IV and V, Louis IX and X: Fauvel sits opposite them all, ‘mocking them in royal majesty from their throne’ (ibid.).

Book II of the roman starts with the decorated initial under the author image on 11r, and its introduction is formed of these lines plus the text above the miniature of Fauvel on the French throne. The opening to the second book stresses the importance of the Fauvel story being known throughout history:

Mès pour ce que nesessité
Seroit a toute humanité
De Fauvel connoistre l’ystoire
Et bien retenir en memoire
Car il est de tout mal figure
Et, si com nous dit l’escription,
Nul ne peut bien eschiver vice
S’il ne connoist ainçois malice (Långfors 1914–19: 1229–36)

For this reason it is necessary that all humanity knows the story of Fauvel, and must keep it well in mind, for he is made up of all evil and, as scripture says, no one can avoid vice unless they can recognise malice.

This stress on the cognitive act of remembering well (‘connoistre l’ystoire / et bien retenir en memoire’) is significant. Immediately before the image of the beast enthroned, we are reminded of the didactic purpose of the tale itself – a purpose that the multimodal additions serve and highlight. For the cognitive ecology of the medieval book includes the reader, who must properly digest and act upon the message of the whole livre. Without the reader, the cognitive ecology does not function. If the reader fails to use the book and their own embedded cognitive creativity to take the next step, the manuscript is nothing but decoration, and the beast Fauvel will remain on the throne.

**Conclusion: E(r)go nos**

Through my multimodal analysis of the manuscript opening shown in Plate 6 I have both revealed and taken part in the cognitive ecology of the Livre de Fauvel. The analysis has brought to light a host of meanings, and certainly not all of these can (or should) be considered as hidden secrets planted by the manuscript’s compilers, waiting to be found by the attentive reader. Rather, what I have shown is the
The author image above the mini-book stresses the reader’s embedded creativity in action through the cognitive ecology of the medieval book. It is on this that I, as a reader, have built my creative reading based on the internal factor of my prior knowledge (memory), together with the external factor of my reading of the book. Like the clerk on folio 11r, this has necessitated both internal, quiet contemplation and the use of external tools. I have not used the _livre_ as a temporary storage repository for excess information; rather, it has been the foundation for my own creative enterprise.¹⁸

I do not claim here that my reading is the same as that of a medieval reader. Rather, it is my contention that a multimodal analysis such as this one allows the modern-day reader to take part in the cognitive ecology on the terms of their own time. I did not have the references to Ecclesiastes or Revelations stored in my memory as the _livre_’s educated medieval audience would have done, but I did remember them mentioned in the work of other scholars, which I knew how to retrieve. Here, then, Wheeler’s ‘entangled inside-and-outside logic’ of embedded creative cognition again comes into play. My partaking in the cognitive ecology of the _Livre de Fauvel_ was deepened by the use of other books, which replaced, for me, fluency in Latin and the memorised Bible. In Andy Clark’s terms (2003), I was a ‘natural-born cyborg’, for I traded access to this information for its onsite storage. In return, I have contributed to the ecology’s dynamic dialogue by recreating the text from a new standpoint drawn from my own memory, that of the multimodal reading of the opening 10v–11r as a mirror of princes.

I therefore wish to finish by drawing some links between modern reading practices and the medieval artefacts we seek to understand with some thoughts on the further uses of this combined methodology. The detailed analysis and methodology I have presented here has covered, at some length, virtually every aspect of a single opening of a manuscript. I could not have done this without the technology that has opened medieval books to a much wider audience than ever before. This has broadened their readership and, as a result, seen the emergence of new cognitive ecologies surrounding medieval artefacts (for just a handful of recent examples see Bychowsk: 2014; Kim 2016; Ma 2012; Watt 2016; Whitaker 2015).

We cannot know for certain whether Philip V read fr. 146, but by its very existence we do know that it was made and preserved — and such a manuscript was not made, or preserved, for no reason. While it can therefore take its place in the wider scheme of manuscript production, _ars nova_ notation, textual repositories, art history, and all of the other historical narratives to which it belongs, the _Livre de Fauvel_ is also an object in and of itself which resonates meaning across the centuries. An understanding of the _livre_ as being part of a cognitive ecology serves to emphasise the concerns of the object’s makers and users over time. Indeed, while we cannot fully understand the very real concerns of the educated and noble servants of the

¹⁸ This enterprise has, of course, made extensive use of another tool: the computer. I consider more fully the status of the digital manuscript in Maxwell (forthcoming), but I will note here in passing that, were anyone to produce an author portrait of me writing this article in the style of that of our clerk on folio 11r, it would show me cradling not a book but a laptop.
French crown in 1316, we can nevertheless consume their texts and learn from what they have to say to us. As I write, 700 years on, there is a terrifyingly real prospect of Fauvel once again in power: a tan-coloured deceiver, who is lauded and courted by those who serve only their own self-interests and greed, has his eyes on one of the most important leadership positions in the world. The image in the livre of Fauvel's offspring washing in the fountain of youth is all too true, of this or any time in history. We humans are swayed by strong words and crave strong leaders in times of perceived trouble and change (Greenaway 2015). Fauvel's creators knew this as well as did Freud. E(p)go nos. We would all do well to consume the message of the Livre de Fauvel, and let it change us, so that we can better work to change our world.