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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

_Deus lo volt! Deus lo volt_!¹ Launched on November 27, 1095, the movement of the crusades (the expeditions from the West which went to medieval Syria—the _Levant_) brought forth a new “nation”: the Latin East.² In August 1291, Frankish Syria collapsed before the forces of Egyptian Sultan al-Ashraf Khalil. The Mameluk army systematically destroyed the coastal towns, and the castles of Acre, Sidon, Chastel Pèlerin and Tripoli were dismantled in fear that they be used as bases for another crusade.³ Arab chronicler Abu L-Fida writes “…the whole of Syria and the coastal zones were purified of the Franks, who had once been on the point of conquering Egypt and subduing Damascus and other cities. Praise be to God!”⁴ The Latin East survived. A central element of the post-1291 _Levant_—and of this study—the crusader kingdom of Cyprus (in the eastern Mediterranean Sea) was established in the 1190’s (this will be discussed thoroughly throughout chapter II). It continued to exist as “the most easterly” western possession until the Turkish conquest of 1571.⁵

The deeds and beliefs of the people of Frankish Cyprus inspired the authors of the repertory of an unusual musical collection which is receiving increasing scholarly attention: the manuscript J.II.9 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino.⁶ This beautiful artifact offers a point of contact between our world and that of those men and
women who embraced the extraordinary human adventure of the Latin East. Torino J.II.9 is the only known collection of medieval Western polyphony from the Levant (this will be discussed in chapter III under “The Origins of Torino J.II.9”). It is also the only collection of late medieval polyphony that houses exclusively French or French-derived repertory. Adopting the Ars Nova and Ars Subtilior idioms (side by side with earlier styles), Torino J.II.9’s repertory sings the epoch of French culture courtoise under the Lusignan kings in Nicosia (Cyprus), and specifically under King Janus I de Lusignan and Queen Charlotte de Bourbon (1398-1432).

In 1434, Anne de Lusignan (the daughter of King Janus and Queen Charlotte) married Duke Louis I de Savoie. It appears that Torino J.II.9 may have followed Anne to her new home in Savoie. The provenance of the manuscript is difficult to trace, but it seems reasonable to assume that once in Savoie, the codex probably remained close to the Duchess (Anne de Lusignan) who lived in Bourget, in Thonon, and in Ripaille. Unlike other books (which were dispersed through inheritance), Torino J.II.9 never left the court of Savoie, thus the impossibility of following its movements until it resurfaced in 1709, when Philibert Maria Machet was appointed by the Duke of Savoie to reorganize the Ducal library (10,000 books had escaped a fire in 1667). In 1749, Torino J.II.9 appears in the catalogue of the manuscripts of the Royal Library (Victor Amadeus II de Savoie was conferred the title of King of Sicily in 1718, meaning that the library’s title changed from Ducal to Royal Library) published by Giuseppe Pasini among the Latin manuscripts (Nr. 110, shelfmark d.IV.14). Torino J.II.9 avoided destruction one more time, in 1904, when a blaze ravaged the manuscript cabinet of the Biblioteca Nazionale in Turin. Since then, it has been restored and is kept at the Biblioteca Nazionale
Universitaria di Torino. A beautiful color facsimile of the Codex Torino J.II.9 was published by the Libreria Musicale Italiana in 1999.

The scope of this thesis is defined by the circumstances of Torino J.II.9 (and limited by the unevenness of available information). Using the codex and its content as a vantage point, my goal is to develop an outline of the musical life and culture of the society that shaped Torino J.II.9. The text unfolds in three sections. In the second chapter, I shall trace various historical and cultural threads woven into the fabric of Torino J.II.9’s context. Against this backdrop, the third chapter will discuss several questions and provide some answers concerning Torino J.II.9, its content, its origins and the people involved in its creation. This section will sketch in broad outline, concentrating on aspects touching the physical, scribal, textual and musical characteristics of the manuscript and its content. I have chosen to devote the fourth chapter to a selective and detailed exploration of some key issues which, if discussed in the previous chapters, would have hindered the process of establishing a general view.

In embarking upon a study of this manuscript, one cannot underestimate the value of absorbing the advice of a composer whose influence has been noted in the repertory of Torino J.II.9 and who appears to have been connected to the Frankish Lusignan House and its circumstances. I would like to share a most enlightening (and delicious) aside which was written more than six hundred years ago by Guillaume de Machaut. The passage (which begins with verse 8163) is extracted from La Prise d’Alixandre, a rhymed biography of perhaps the most illustrious crusader of his age: Pierre I de Lusignan, king of Cyprus.
Mieus vausist quil se fust teus
car cils est fols et deceus
qui des signeurs trop sentremet
ou qui a leur conseil se met
pour dire chose qui desplaise
et cils qui dit chose qui plaise
est honnoure et bien venus
sages · bons · et loyaus tenus
et cils qui dit ce qui desplait
bastist pour lui si mauvais plait
ja soit ce que verite die
quen grant peril est de sa vie
par cestui le poez savoir
qui fut honnis pour dire voir

(Better would it have served him had he kept silent,
For a man is foolish and deceived
Who involves himself too much with great lords
Or seeks to be their advisor
By saying something offensive.
But whoever says what pleases
Is honored and quite welcomed,
Though wise, virtuous, and faithful.
And the man who says what does not please
Embroils himself into such an unfortunate conflict,
No matter if he says the truth,
That he is in great peril of his life.
You can learn from this man,
Who was ruined by speaking the truth.
[Emphasis mine])

Machaut’s “readers beware” advice speaks to all who engage in the process of
exploring the middle ages via contemporaneous chronicles. It translates into a clear
invitation to think beyond the print, to bear in mind that a large proportion of what we
know of that slice of history is based on accounts written by men and women who for the
most part had to abide by those rules outlined by Machaut. It is from that perspective that
I set out to patch together Torino J.II.9’s history, based on what people did—and
sometimes did not—report.
CHAPTER II
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Introduction

When venturing past the two metal clasps of the Cypriot-French codex Torino J.II.9, the inquisitive mind begins to see, feel, smell, and sometimes even hear fragments of music that resonate from the olden times of the crusader kingdom of Cyprus. Gradually, this sensory experience summons a mosaic of mental pictures that act like a bridge between our world and that of a select group of people whose lives have been in some way connected to that of the manuscript through the centuries. This chapter will explore this peoplescape and trace the various historical and cultural threads woven into the fabric of Torino J.II.9’s context.

King Richard I Coeur de Lion of England

Torino J.II.9’s story begins with no less a figure than the valiant Coeur de Lion, King Richard I Plantagenet of England (see figure 2.1).\textsuperscript{11} Born at Beaumont Palace in Oxford, England on September 8, 1157, Richard was the third legitimate son of King Henry II Plantagenet of England and Queen Éléonore of England and Duchess of Aquitaine. Richard was raised in Poitiers (Aquitaine) by Éléonore. Consequently, the future English King was educated exclusively in French and grew to regard France as his
home. When King Henry II died on July 6, 1189, Richard succeeded him on the throne. He was officially crowned King Richard I of England on September 3, 1189, in Westminster.

![Figure 2.1 Richard Coeur de Lion. Detail of an illustration from the codex Abbreviatio Chronicorum Angliae, by Matthew Paris (England: St. Albans, 1250-59).](image)

Described as the epitome of French chivalric culture, the larger-than-life Coeur de Lion was a dashinglly handsome and well educated man. Perhaps the most brilliant military mind of his time, Richard is remembered for his exceptional physical strength, his vast courage, and his excellent poetry. The Coeur de Lion’s sheer charisma is sensed when contrasting the singular admiration bestowed on him throughout English history with how very little he actually did for his subjects. Indeed, Richard I Plantagenet of England spent the greater part of his life—and his kingdom’s money—outside of
England living the adventurous life of a crusader King. Richard died in Aquitaine on April 6, 1199 from a wound inflicted by an arrow during a minor combat.

In response to the *Audita Tremendi*, a bull issued by Pope Gregory VIII on October 29, 1187, the *Coeur de Lion* was swift to join the efforts of the Third Crusade. The army of Egyptian Sultan Saladin had devastated the Frankish forces led by Guy de Lusignan, King of Jerusalem at the battle of Hattin on July 4, 1187. In the process, the “True Cross” had fallen in the hands of the infidels. The crushing victory over the Levantine Christians had cleared the Sultan’s way to the Holy City, and Jerusalem capitulated on October 2, 1187 (see figure 2.2). In the end, Tyre, Tripoli, and Antioch were the only seaports to remain under Christian control.

![Figure 2.2 Saladin’s troops ravaging the Holy Land. Miniature from the codex *History of the Crusades* (book XXII) by Guillaume de Tyr (France, between 1250 and 1259).](image)

The news of this catastrophe jolted the conscience of the Western Christians who, for many years, had ignored King Guy’s repeated calls for help. Pope Gregory instructed
all Christians to repent; their sins had provoked the wrath of God, and not only was Jerusalem at stake, but perhaps more importantly, their souls. A seven-year truce was imposed [Audita Tremendi] in order to allow European rulers to concentrate their energies on recovering Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{17}

After years of careful preparation, King Richard I of England, who had spent the winter in Sicily with King Philippe II Auguste de France, finally set sail for Acre—in full regalia—on April 10, 1191.\textsuperscript{18} After many years of bitter hostility that had permeated into their preparation for the crusade, the two monarchs had made relative peace and chosen to take the sea route.\textsuperscript{19} Philippe, who had left Sicily eleven days prior to Richard’s departure, reached Acre on April 20. Richard’s arrived months later, on June 7, just in time to capture Acre from Saladin (see figure 2.3).\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure23.png}
\caption{Third Crusade. Surrender of Acre to Philippe Auguste and Richard Coeur de Lion (1191). Miniature from the codex Grandes Chroniques de France (Paris, 14\textsuperscript{th} century).}
\end{figure}
Shortly after embarking for Acre, King Richard’s fleet made a brief halt on the islands of Crete and Rhodes to get fresh supplies. Almost immediately after leaving Rhodes, the English convoy was dispersed by a storm. Three of Richard’s smaller vessels, including one of the treasure ships, were thrown on the coast of Cyprus at Amathus, near Limassol. Despot Isaac Komnenos, the self-appointed Emperor of Cyprus since 1184, captured the survivors of the wreck and looted what was left of the ships. After a short time, another group of the English fleet reached Amathus. Richard’s sister, Princess Joanna Plantagenet, and his fiancée, Princess Berengaria of Navarre were aboard one of the ships. As soon as Komnenos was made aware of their royal presence, he tried to mend the situation and invited Joanna and Berengaria to come ashore. Well informed of Isaac’s dubious character, the women declined his offer. Luckily, before long King Richard’s ship was in sight.

In a letter dated May 7, 1191, Richard demanded that Komnenos promptly release his captives, and requested the return of all the supplies that had been taken from the wreck. Komnenus refused to comply and ordered his men to get ready to defend the island. Outraged, Richard attacked at once. Realizing on sight that they were no match for Richard’s men, the Cypriot troops scattered, forcing Komnenos to retreat to his castles. The Coeur de Lion proceeded to seize the island and crowned his victory by placing Isaac Komnenos in chains of gold, graciously complying with the despot’s request not to be put in irons.

Jean Richard describes Richard Coeur de Lion’s conquest of Cyprus as “essentially a product of chance circumstances, in which the passionate and brutal temperament of the Plantagenet was given free play.” At the same time, one cannot rule out the possibility
of premeditated strategic considerations regarding the island’s usefulness to the crusading movement. In any case, besides fulfilling Richard’s desire to retaliate, the capture of Cyprus represented an opportunity to establish a base for the crusade’s operations. The island was ideally situated (two days from the Egyptian coast and no more than a few hours from Syria) besides offering an invaluable source of men, money, victuals, and other supplies.

On May 12, 1191, Richard Coeur de Lion and Berengaria of Navarre were married at Limassol (Cyprus); the same day, Berengaria was crowned Queen of England by the bishop of Évreux. Shortly thereafter, the royal couple embarked for Acre, and Cyprus was left in the hands of English garrisons placed under the authority of Richard of Camville and Robert of Tornham.

As noted by Nicolas Coureas, the issue of whether or not the acquisition of Cyprus was integral to the strategy of the Third Crusade remains problematic. Nonetheless, Richard Coeur de Lion’s appreciation of Cyprus for its usefulness to the crusading movement comes through clearly in the Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I. Richard certainly did not hesitate to take a great deal of treasure from Isaac Komnenus when he embarked for Acre. Ultimately, and regardless of the exact circumstances behind Richard’s conquest of Cyprus, the island developed into a central component of practically all Christian operations in the Holy Land and proved to be one of the most important captures in the history of the crusades.

The Coeur de Lion was one of the first to take the cross after the battle of Hattin (1187); his heroic deeds in connection with the Third Crusade have been immortalized in several troubadour songs. The Cypriot-French Manuscript’s story could hardly have
begun with a more imposing figure than Richard I Plantagenet of England (see figure 2.4).

Figure 2.4  A mounted knight, bearing the royal arms of England (possibly Richard Coeur de Lion), unseats a Saracen (Possibly Saladin) from his horse with a lance. Detail from the lower margin of folio 82 in the codex Psautier de Luttrell (East Anglia, circa 1325-35).

The Rule of the Knights Templars (1191-92) preceded by a brief history

Figure 2.5  Two Templars. Detail from the lower margin of page 371 in the Sherborne Missal by John Whas (Sherborne, co. Dorset: circa 1399-1407). Illustration by John Siferwas and others.

The Knights Templars, together with the Knights Hospitalers and the Teutonic Knights, were brethren of the three most distinguished Christian military orders to have
emerged in the context of the crusade movement during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries (see figure 2.5). Christian military orders were created to protect the relatively small—hence vulnerable—Frankish settlement in Jerusalem after the triumphant First Crusade (1096-1102) and to escort the multitude of Christian pilgrims who flocked to the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{37} Ironically, evidence suggests that the Christian military orders were modeled after the legendary Islamic military order known as Hashishiyin, or “Assassins” (see figure 2.6). A close adaptation of their “infidel” model, Christian military orders integrated monastic discipline and chivalric culture. In embracing these two hardly reconcilable Western medieval ideals, the brethren of those institutions embodied the quintessence of the crusade movement’s spirit.\textsuperscript{38}

![Figure 2.6](image)

Figure 2.6  Alâ Al Dîn Muhamad giving drugs [possibly hashish] to his disciples. Miniature from the codex \textit{Devisement du Monde} by Marco Polo (circa 1410-12). Illustration by \textit{Maître} d’Egerton and others.

The first authentic Christian military order to be established was the Order of the Temple.\textsuperscript{39} It was formed during the reign of King Baudouin II of Jerusalem (1118-31), under the initiative of Hugues des Payens, an idealistic knight from Champagne. Together with Godefroi de St. Omer, Hugues and seven other companions began to travel throughout the Holy Land, inspired by “the desire to devote their lives to Christ and turn
their swords to acts of pious chivalry.” The newly formed group adopted the name, “Order of the Poor Knights of Christ.” Upon their arrival to Jerusalem, Patriarch Gormond of Jerusalem bestowed upon the pious knights four vows, and King Baldwin II granted them headquarters in the Temple of Solomon (the former mosque of al-Aqsa). Soon, the nine companions became known as Knights Templars, after the Christian name of their new home. In 1128, the Order of the Temple was officially sanctioned by the Pope at the cathedral of Troyes. Their official rule is believed to have been created by St. Bernard himself at the Council of Troyes in the same year.

In time, as people began to notice the practices of their Order’s internal financial and transfer systems, the Templars became notorious for their usurious banking policies. “Minus a service charge,” pilgrims could deposit money, jewels, or documents at a Templar convent in Europe either for safekeeping or to be conveniently retrieved in the Levant. As one might expect, this business brought the Templars much wealth and influence, which, as resentment mounted, ultimately led to their downfall. Following the collapse of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187, the Knights Templars moved their center of operations from Jerusalem to Acre until its fall in 1291, at which point they took refuge in Cyprus. When the Templars moved to Cyprus, they had no military role per se, and began to concentrate solely on their banking business. The Order of the Temple was officially dismantled in 1312 by Pope Clement V.

As mentioned in the previous section, the capture of Cyprus had proven to be extremely advantageous. Before long, Philippe II Auguste of France, Richard Coeur de Lion’s crusade companion, demanded that the King of England concede half of the island. Notwithstanding their previous agreement specifying that all conquests made
during their joint expedition would be shared evenly, Richard paid no heed to Philippe’s request.\textsuperscript{48} This was hardly out of character: neither did he give any sort of consideration to Isaac Komnenos’ family ties in the West nor to the rights of the Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{49} Indeed, Richard’s entire occupation of Cyprus was rash and ill organized. Consequently, soon after the King’s departure for Acre, the Cypriot population—mostly Greek peasants—began to mount a rebellion against the English garrison left on the island by Richard.\textsuperscript{50} The potentially inflammatory situation was brought to the attention of Robert Tornham (Richard’s lieutenant) who at once attacked and defeated the Cypriot insurgents before their plan had had a chance to develop. Following this aborted rebellion, Richard began to consider Cyprus a burden. He could not spare enough men to hold the island by force in order to use it as a base, and besides, he was in great need of money to invest in the crusade.\textsuperscript{51}

Within the first year of Richard \textit{Coeur de Lion}’s capture of Cyprus, he sold the island to Robert de Sablé, the Grand Master of the military order of the Temple, for a total of 100,000 Saracen bezants. Richard collected an initial payment of 40,000 bezants, the remaining 60,000 bezants to be paid in future installments with revenues that were to be raised by imposition of taxes.\textsuperscript{52} Failing to consider the consequences of their actions, the Templars enforced levies that bordered on extortion. In despair, the Cypriot peasants planned for a second rebellion on Easter day (Orthodox) of 1192. Although the projected insurrection was poorly organized, rumor of the plot reached the attention of Knights Templars, who immediately offered to leave the island in exchange for their lives. The proposal was turned down by the Cypriot rebels. Irate and desperate, the Templars took the Cypriots off guard and engaged in a massacre, sparing no one. Following this violent
affair, the Templars no longer felt capable of ruling in Cyprus and returned the island to Richard *Coeur de Lion*.\(^{53}\)

The Rule of Guy de Lusignan (1192-94)

As soon as King Richard recuperated Cyprus from the Templars, he resold the island to the dispossessed King of Jerusalem, Guy de Lusignan (see figure 2.7).\(^{54}\) Initially, Guy paid 60,000 bezants to Richard *Coeur de Lion* with the promise that he would pay the remaining 40,000 bezants in the future.\(^{55}\) In May 1192, Guy de Lusignan did homage to King Richard and officially took possession of Cyprus.\(^{56}\)

![Figure 2.7  Richard *Coeur de Lion* and Guy de Lusignan.  Miniature from the codex *De Casibus* by Boccace (translation by Laurent de Premierfait), (second quarter of 15\(^{th}\) century).](image)

Guy was never crowned King of Cyprus; his title was Lord of Cyprus.\(^{57}\) A relative of the powerful Lusignan family of Poitou in France, Guy already possessed a wealth of experience living in the Latin East at the time he settled in Cyprus. Consequently, he was
acutely aware of the aversion of the Cypriot-Greeks toward the incoming Latin rulers; the
two violent rebellions of the previous year had brought this issue to the forefront of
Guy’s list of priorities.  

With the visionary attitude that characterized his rule, Guy de Lusignan immediately
put forward aggressive methods in an attempt to build diplomatic relations with the
Cypriot-Greek community, to mend the damage caused by Richard Coeur de Lion’s
impetuous invasion followed by the massacre of Nicosia by the Templars, and to remedy
the poverty that plagued the Cypriot population as a result of Isaac Komnenos’ fiscal
oppression. Guy’s first measure was to encourage the repatriation of those Cypriot
nobles who had fled the island because of the chaos created by Isaac Komnenos’
tyrrannical rule, Richard Coeur de Lion’s invasion, and the rebellions of the Templars’
rule. Cypriot aristocrats were offered their former estates on the condition that they
return to Cyprus and place a request within a set period of time. This initial effort
produced minimal results. Subsequently (according to Frankish chroniclers), at the
recommendation of Egyptian Sultan Saladin, Guy de Lusignan attracted numerous Latin
settlers—mainly ruined nobles, widows and orphans who had lost their inheritances, and
bourgeois who had been dispossessed by Saladin in the Latin East. Guy did so by
distributing fiefs, land, and in some cases dowries to unmarried women. On one hand,
Guy’s somewhat excessively liberal policy depleted the royal reserves considerably. But
on the other, Guy’s strategy allowed the establishment of a Frankish aristocracy in
Cyprus which, along with the introduction of a Norman feudal system, provided a solid
foundation enabling the future Lusignan Kings and Queens to build a flourishing court—
shaped closely on the French model—in Nicosia.
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Upon Guy de Lusignan’s death in 1194, the nobles of the island chose his brother Aimery as their seigneur. In September 1197, Aimery de Lusignan had himself formally crowned King of Cyprus by Bishop Conrad of Hildesheim (chancellor to German Emperor Henry VI); hence a scion of the Poitevine Lusignan family became the first of a line of hereditary kings and queens of Cyprus, and Cyprus a Western Christian Kingdom. That same year, Aimery (widower of Eschive d’Ibelin) acquired the title of King of Jerusalem when he married Queen Isabelle I of Jerusalem.

The Reign of King Pierre I de Lusignan (1359-69)

“Per queste ti ha morto la tua gente” (With this thing you killed your own people). These are the recorded words of Jacques de Nores, one of the most trusted lieutenants at the service of King Pierre I de Lusignan, as he chopped the penis off the cadaver of the man he had loyally served for several years. As Peter Edbury has summarized, “here is a king, who, despite possessing all the chivalric virtues—fortitude, prowess, devotion to the Christian faith and so on—died violently in a palace coup d’état.”

Of the seventeen Lusignan monarchs who ruled Cyprus between 1192 and 1489 King Pierre I de Lusignan is by far the most celebrated figure. Pierre was the second son of King Hugues IV de Lusignan and Marie d’Ibelin; he is believed to have been born in 1329. In 1342, he married Eschive de Montfort (daughter of Honfroy de Montfort, constable of Cyprus); unfortunately Eschive died sometime before 1353. Pierre married a second time, in 1353, to Éléonore d’Aragon (daughter of Pedro d’Aragon, count of Ribagorza and Jeanne de Foix, granddaughter of King Jacques II d’Aragon) with whom he had three children: Pierre II, Marguerite and Eschive de Lusignan.
King Pierre I’s reign is often regarded as the most glorious period of the Lusignan dynasty. In fact, Pierre’s fame as a crusader king has reached legendary stature. However, as Peter Edbury points out, it is important to keep in mind that by the time Pierre succeeded his father King Hugues IV in 1359, the golden age of prosperity of the Lusignan kingdom was already in decline. The economy of the island had suffered a sudden setback due to the plague of 1347-48, which had afflicted and seriously diminished the Cypriot population. This already financially difficult situation was exacerbated by the effects of a shift—away from Cyprus—in trading routes between Western Europe and the East as a result of recent (mid-fourteenth century) changes in papal policy. Unfortunately, upon his accession to the throne, King Pierre began to strain his declining kingdom by choosing—in contrast to his father’s relatively peaceful rule—to return to a regimen of continuous warfare against the Turks and Saracens. Still, although Cyprus’ economy did not benefit from any of his ventures, the rule of Pierre I de Lusignan is undeniably marked by impressive military expansion and the blossoming of social and artistic life in the court of Nicosia.

The magnitude of Pierre’s renown can be measured by the imposing poetic vita, *La Prise d’Alixandre*, written by the great Guillaume de Machaut (see figure 2.8). This 8887 line rhymed chronicle relates the life of the Cypriot monarch with a particular emphasis on the King’s spectacular taking of the Egyptian city of Alexandria on October 10, 1365, an event that thrust King Pierre into crusade legend. The many surviving luxurious manuscripts of *La Prise*, some handsomely illuminated, are a clear indication of the popularity of Machaut’s work among aristocrats as well as of the esteem bestowed on crusader King Pierre I de Lusignan. Moreover, Edbury suggested that “the poem
[La Prise] could be seen as Guillaume’s posthumous recognition of the patronage he had received from him [Pierre de Lusignan], and perhaps as an argument that that patronage was more extensive than is otherwise realised.”

In late 1362, King Pierre embarked for Avignon with the mission of obtaining papal approval for a crusade; his alleged goal was to reclaim Jerusalem. After all, Pierre was the king of the Holy City—in theory. Pope Urban V gladly endorsed Pierre’s crusade. By coincidence, King Jean II le Bon de France (heir of famous crusader King St. Louis de Toulouse) was a guest in Avignon during the Cypriot king’s visit. Without delay, Pope Urban urged the French monarch to lead the crusade. In the spring of 1363, King Pierre officially took the cross and set out on a tour of both Western and Eastern Europe in an effort to gather financial and military assistance. Over the next two years, Pierre I de Lusignan and his retinue were repeatedly received with magnificent feasts and tournaments in the most important centers of Europe.
On April 8, 1364, Jean le Bon passed away unexpectedly. As a result, the responsibility of leading the crusade fell to Pierre de Lusignan. The Cypriot monarch received the formal honors in Rheims, following the coronation of King Charles V le Sage de France (son of Jean le Bon) on May 19, 1364. Despite Pierre’s efforts, recruiting proved dishearteningly difficult. Fortunately, and thanks to the diligent work of Philippe de Mézières (King Pierre I’s chancellor and advisor of King Charles V) and Peter Thomas (the eastern legate of Pope Urban V), one hundred and eight ships from Cyprus joined King Pierre’s fleet of thirty-one vessels in Rhodes. Pierre I de Lusignan finally embarked for the city of Alexandria on October 4, 1365, having previously disclosed his actual destination only to an elite circle of advisors.

Did Pierre ever believe in his “original” crusade propaganda? The debate is open, but it is likely that Pierre never truly intended to capture Jerusalem to begin with, or if he did, that his religious considerations were at least matched by commercial ones. As mentioned earlier, the plague epidemic of 1347-48 and the gradual decline of papal bans forcing Western European merchants to pass through Cyprus when trading with Asia was hurting the economic prosperity enjoyed by Famagusta (Cyprus’ foremost port). Taking into consideration what is known of peace negotiations and given the change of pattern in trading routes (Famagusta was losing trade to Alexandria during the 1360’s), it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Pierre had intended all along to either occupy or at least destroy the rival city, restoring his kingdom at the center of Eastern Mediterranean trade routes. In the end, regardless of Pierre’s original intent, one sad point emerges: Pierre’s heroic venture accomplished absolutely nothing for the good of his kingdom.
The conquest of Alexandria was nothing short of spectacular; no one had managed to invade the heavily fortified city in centuries, let alone with such a small army. According to Thomas F. Madden, the crusaders’ arrival in the harbor of Alexandria on October 9, 1365 was so wholly unforeseen (Pierre’s army was expected in Palestine) that the Alexandrian merchants just opened the gates of the city, presumably to trade. The great Egyptian city collapsed in only one day, and to quote R. Barton Palmer, “what followed was an orgy of looting and wanton destruction that lasted for some days.” To Pierre’s utter distress, the Christian army soon began to falter. Most of the barons categorically refused to risk their lives in an attempt to defend Alexandria against the elite Mameluk regiments that were on their way from Cairo to counterattack. Ultimately, the crusaders retreated to Cyprus “with a full load of booty and prisoners.” Pierre was thus forced in turn to abandon Alexandria and retreat to Cyprus.

The final period of Pierre’s reign was one of abortive peace negotiations with the Mameluks and repeated raids on the coast of Syria. Pierre’s attacks on Syria were sometimes devastating, but ultimately, nothing significant was achieved. Moreover, Pierre’s costly operations gradually began to overburden the Cypriot population. In due course, this financial strain, combined with the king’s frequent absences from the island, generated bitter resentment among his people. To make matters even worse, the important commercial losses suffered by Venice and Genoa following the 1365 attack on Alexandria had severed the relations between Nicosia and the two republics. This already volatile situation was greatly exacerbated by Pierre’s arrogance and brutal disposition. On January 16, 1369, Pierre I de Lusignan was assassinated in his own
apartments by a group of nobles—thanks to the assistance of the king’s brothers (Jean and Jacques) (see figure 2.9).  

(On the very day of January 16th, Around the fifteenth hour Of the night, he was at Nicosia With his closest family And some nobles of his land; There the noble King of Cyprus Was killed in his bedroom, inside the curtains, Lying naked beside the queen. And they dealt him more than forty Wounds, truly more than fifty.)
The Reign of King Janus I de Lusignan (1398-1432)

The reign of King Janus I de Lusignan was marked by unrelenting misfortune (see figure 2.10). However, it is also celebrated as the golden age of French musical and courtly culture in Nicosia. Janus was the first child of King Jacques I de Lusignan (King Pierre I’s brother) and Héloïse de Brunswick-Grubenhagen (daughter of Philippe Welf de Brunswick-Grubenhagen, constable of Jerusalem, and Héloïse de Dampierre). He was born around 1374 while his parents were held hostage in Genoa, a city that was to be his home until 1392. Janus succeeded his father Jacques I in 1398 and was formally crowned King Janus I of Cyprus, Jerusalem and Armenia in November 1399.
Janus and Héloïse Visconti (daughter of the despot Bernabò Visconti, Duke of Milan) were married in 1401. Unfortunately, Héloïse passed away in 1406, and in 1407, King Janus delegated Raymond de Lesare to travel the West and find him a suitable second wife. Following a sequence of failed attempts in Genoa (the Genoese had been occupying Famagusta—the largest and wealthiest Cypriot port—since the war of 1373), Janus was finally married by proxy to Charlotte de Bourbon (second cousin of Duke Louis II de Bourbon) at the Cathedral of Melun on August 2, 1409. In June 1411, Charlotte and her sumptuous retinue journeyed to Cyprus. Janus and Charlotte held their final marriage ceremony on August 25, at Nicosia. This union quickly proved to be a
cornerstone in the revitalization of French culture in the Lusignan court that characterized Janus’ rule.

Following their marriage, Charlotte and Janus set in motion a dynamic plan to establish a healthy *société courtoise* at Nicosia. The effort was noticeably deliberate but effective: Andrew Wathey suggested that, for the most part, it was precisely this effort that captured the attention of contemporaneous chronicler Leontios Makhairas and prompted him to publish a detailed list of Queen Charlotte’s retinue.\(^{100}\) Charlotte and Janus’ aggressive French cultural/political campaign is also evidenced by the existence of a bull, sanctioned in December 1414 by antipope Jean XXXIII, in response to King Janus’ request (November 23, 1413), obtaining permission to institute a distinct Office (and calendar) for the Lusignan family church at the royal monastery of St. Dominic in Nicosia and for the Cathedral of St. Sophia.\(^{101}\) An extract from this document was copied onto the flyleaf of Torino J.II.9, thus intimately connecting the creation of the Cypriot-French manuscript to Charlotte and Janus’ initiative.

In contrast with this optimistic wave of cultural development at Nicosia, misfortune continued to afflict the Lusignan kingdom. Between 1409 and 1422, the population of Cyprus was dramatically reduced by the plague, and to make matters worse, the island was also infested by locusts numerous times.\(^{102}\) The royal family was not spared; both Charlotte de Bourbon and Héloïse of Brunswick-Grubenhagen died of the plague in 1422.\(^{103}\) Adding to King Janus’ predicament, from 1424 onwards the Mameluk army attacked Cyprus repeatedly in retaliation for a chain of assaults led by King Janus on the Egyptian coast, and the Genoese on the Syrian coast.\(^{104}\) The Mameluk campaign in Cyprus culminated in 1426: on July 7, King Janus was defeated at the battle of Khirokitia.
Nicosia fell on July 11; the Mameluks pillaged and burned the entire city. The King was imprisoned and for the most part, Latin nobles were killed or captured to be sold as slaves in Alexandria. In exchange for a huge ransom, King Janus was liberated in May 1427. The ensuing peace carried a dear price tag for the King of Cyprus, who from then on was required to pay an annual tribute to Egypt and to recognize the Sultan as his suzerain.

When Janus I de Lusignan died in 1432, his kingdom was ruined. ¹⁰⁵

...And on the tenth of June 1432 the king fell very sick and had a stroke, and God’s will was done on our good lord King Janus... [...] And he was a year in his bed paralysed hand and foot, and men were saying that the Saracens had poisoned him. [...] And he was wise, and strong and handsome man, and good. [...] And before the report had gone out that he [King Janus] had rendered up his soul, all the lords went in and took the oath to his son King John, to serve and guard him as their lord. And afterwards they made a proclamation and published the death of King Janus. And they shouted out at once: ‘Long live King John.’

And on the thirtieth of June they buried good King Janus in St. Dominic. [...] And on the twenty-fourth of August 1433 after Christ,) [sic] King John de Lusignan was crowned by the hand of Brother Solomon of the order of St. Dominic, Bishop of Tortosa, in Santa Sophia...(see figure 2.11). ¹⁰⁶
King Janus I de Lusignan and Queen Charlotte de Bourbon had one daughter, Anne, who is believed to have been born in Nicosia on September 24, 1419 (see figure 2.13).\textsuperscript{107} Anne’s brother Jean (Janus and Charlotte’s first-born) succeeded his father as King Jean II de Lusignan (1432-58). On February 8, 1434, Anne de Lusignan married Duke Louis I de Savoie, the son of Duke Amédée VIII de Savoie and Marie de Bourgogne (see figure 2.12).\textsuperscript{108} This long awaited alliance between the court of Nicosia and the House of Savoie had been planned since 1431 when Anne de Lusignan was engaged to be married to Amédée de Savoie (brother of Louis). However, Amédée died within one month of their engagement and Louis (next in the order of succession to the duchy of Savoie) became Anne’s new fiancé on January 12, 1432. The union was first celebrated by proxy on October 4, 1433, in Nicosia; the wedding proper was celebrated with great magnificence, four months later, in the newly erected Sainte Chapelle in Chambéry, the capital of the duchy of Savoie (February 7, 1434).\textsuperscript{109}
Figure 2.12 Fresco in the Notre-Dame-de-l’Assomption church (Evian-les-Bains, Haute Savoie, France) representing a young prince wearing a feathered hat, holding a horse by the lead (left), and welcoming a young princess wearing a bonnet (right). Some archeologists have tentatively identified those two individuals as Louis de Savoie and Anne de Lusignan. Anne and Louis were frequent visitors in Evian.

Fifteenth century chroniclers celebrate Anne de Lusignan’s exceptional beauty along with her great religious inclination. But nearly all also regard her as unpredictable, selfish, and stubborn—a woman devoid of conscience known to manipulate her weak husband. In counterpoint to this unfavorable perspective on Anne’s character, Isabella Fragalà Data notes that the lack of political inclination demonstrated by Duke Louis I de Savoie—corroborated by his father’s reluctance to resign—may actually have forced Anne to assume control of the affairs of the duchy. Indeed, according to fifteenth century humanist scholar Enea Silvio de Piccolomini (secretary to Antipope Felix V [Amédée VIII de Savoie] from 1439), Duke Louis I de Savoie was “more suitable to obey than to give orders.” On the other hand, I am inclined to believe that Louis’ lack of inclination for politics may perhaps have been balanced by superior discernment in
artistic patronage. As noted by David Fallows, is it not “one of the ironies of cultural history that many of the great and discriminating patrons are recorded by political commentators as weak or ineffectual?” Indeed, Fragalà Data notes that if Louis “hardly distinguished himself in politics itself, some of his enterprises—such as the definitive establishment of the University of Turin—would today be defined as significant ‘cultural operations.’” He is also remembered for his acquisition of the Holy Shroud in 1453. Everything considered, I consider it more plausible that Anne’s confident character and flair for politics were given the opportunity to blossom in Savoie than to accept Fragalà Data’s proposition that the Cypriot princess was merely forced to take over power of the duchy due to her husband’s weakness of character.

The arrival of Anne de Lusignan and her Cypriot retinue at Chambéry (Savoie’s capital) in 1434 coincides neatly with a period when the Grande Chapelle of the Savoyard court entered what Robert Bradley described as a formative stage. In fact, as noted by Karl Kügle, “it may be wise not to underestimate the catalytic role played by Anne in this display of patronage [the development of the Grande Chapelle].” This “catalytic role” will be explored in more detail in chapter IV under “The Marriage of Anne de Lusignan and Louis de Savoie.” However, in a nutshell, with Torino J.II.9 in her luggage and excellent musicians in her retinue (almost certainly including Jean Hanelle), Anne de Lusignan’s arrival in Savoie is reminiscent of that of her mother Charlotte de Bourbon in Cyprus.

Anne de Lusignan died in Savoie on November 14, 1462. Five and a half centuries later, she emerges as a strong and very accomplished woman who played an active role in
the expansion and increasing renown of the House of Savoie for a substantial part of the fifteenth century.

Figure 2.13  Princess Anne de Lusignan. Detail from an illustration entitled *Le Couronnement de la Vierge* on folio 64 v of the codex *Le Livre d’Heures du Duc Louis de Savoie* (Savoie, between 1445-50 and 1460).
CHAPTER III

TORINO J.II.9

Introduction

At present, Torino J.II.9 is too enigmatic an artifact for anyone to entertain much hope of reconstructing its circumstances (or identity) with any kind of satisfying accuracy. Regardless, I believe it worthwhile to engage in the process of exploration, if for nothing else, than that the attempt to map such an intimidating gap in knowledge will reveal my outlook. Against the historical context outlined in chapter II, this chapter will discuss several questions and provide some answers concerning Torino J.II.9, its content, and its milieu.

Physical description of Torino J.II.9

During the night of the 25 to the 26 of January 1904, a fire broke out in the Manuscript Cabinet of the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria of Torino in Italy. An estimated 2000 manuscripts were destroyed and more than half of the 2500 rescued codices suffered significant damage. A remarkable survivor of this inferno is the Cypriot-French codex (shelf marked J.II.9). This manuscript is the only known extant source of late medieval Western polyphony from the Levant. Predictably, Torino J.II.9 was partly disfigured in the blaze. Whole leaves from the front and back of the manuscript along with the ends of staves along the inner margins were severely burned and shriveled. Moreover, the joint effect of intense heat and water used to extinguish the
blaze caused ink from the decorated initials and from the music (in particular the red
notes) to stain the facing parchments; it also caused the edges of the folia to shrink. 121

Finally, while all of the margins sustained some degree of fire damage, the flames
virtually annihilated all the central ones, separating the original bifolia and destroying the
original gathering structure. 122 Fortunately, though, almost all of the music and text of
Torino J.II.9 have reached us unharmed. 123

Karl Kügle describes Torino J.II.9 as the coalescence of three otherwise independent
types of manuscripts—a chant manuscript, a liber motetorum, and a chansonnier
(described below)—in one cohesive, if atypical, collection. 124 He also hypothesizes that
this somewhat unusual integration of a variety of manuscripts was the original intention
of Torino J.II.9’s compiler. Kügle’s conception is substantiated by a remarkable
consistency in the organization of the content of the collection, the use of similar
illuminated initials and decorations in the margins throughout the codex, and a general
agreement among Torino J.II.9 scholars that the manuscript is the creation of one main
scribe (with the assistance of a team of text copyists).

We know of no foliation contemporary to Torino J.II.9’s original compilation.
However, the pages have been numbered on two occasions in relatively recent times. In
the upper right corner of each recto, there is a brownish-black ink, handwritten foliation
(in eighteenth century script), and in the middle of the lower margin of each recto there is
a stamped foliation in black ink, which probably dates from one of the restorations
(twentieth century). 125 Where both are present, the two numerations match, but the
handwritten one ends on folio 158. The two foliators used Arabic numerals. Neither
placed a number on the first illuminated folio although it is accounted for in both
instances. The numeration begins on the second folio. During the restoration process, the first folio was numbered in pencil, and the handwritten numbers that had been lost as a result of the damage caused by fire to the edges of the manuscript were replaced by pencil numbers in the upper right corner.\textsuperscript{126}

The Cypriot-French codex gathers one hundred and fifty-nine parchment folios organized in five fascicules separated by one or several blank folios (see table 3.1).\textsuperscript{127} The first fascicule—the chant manuscript portion, as described by Kügle—holds a collection of original monophonic chants including an Office and a Mass for St. Hylarion, an Office for St. Anne, and six Mass ordinaries. The following section—the \textit{liber motetorum}—encompasses the second and third fascicules: the second contains several polyphonic mass settings including seven Gloria-Credo pairs and three Glorias, and the third comprises thirty-three Latin and eight French motets. The two remaining fascicules—forming the chansonnier segment of the manuscript—comprise one hundred and two French ballads, which constitute the largest division of the codex (fourth fascicule), followed by twenty-one virelais and forty-three rondeaux (fifth fascicule).

Some evidence suggests that the cantus firmus mass cycle inserted at the end of the fourth fascicule was added after Torino J.II.9’s initial period of production. It was copied—seemingly by a Savoyard hand (apparently external to the original team of scribes)—starting at the bottom of folio 139v, immediately following the last ballad.\textsuperscript{128} Significantly, this mass cycle is the only work of the collection (apart from one Gloria at the end of the second fascicule) that was not illuminated. Moreover, as noted by Hoppin, there is a strong possibility that folios 140 and 141—on which the greater part of the cantus firmus mass was copied—were added to the manuscript precisely to incorporate
the mass cycle since the parchment appears to be of lower quality than that of the rest of the volume.\textsuperscript{129}

Table 3.1 Sections and Content of the Cypriot-French Codex Torino J.II.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fascicule</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Chant Manuscript”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Monophonic Chants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office and Mass of St. Hylarion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of St. Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 complete cycles of Ordinary of the Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 short Masses: Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Polyphonic Mass Movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Gloria – Credo pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Glorias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Liber Motetorum”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>102 French Ballads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polyphonic Mass Cycle (without Agnus Dei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>French Secular Chansons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Virelais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 Rondeaux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is the synthesis of Kügle’s description of Torino J.II.9 combined with a table created by Hoppin. It does not account for the blank folios found between fascicules and for folio 159, which is also blank.\textsuperscript{130}
Figure 3.1 Extract from the bull sanctioned on November 23, 1413 by antipope Jean XXXIII, copied on the front flyleaf of the Codex Torino J.II.9.
An extract from the bull granting King Janus I de Lusignan permission to have an office composed in honor of St. Hylarion, sanctioned on November 23, 1413 by antipope Jean XXXIII, was copied on the verso of the original front flyleaf (which is smaller than the codex) of the Cypriot-French manuscript (see figure 3.1). Fortunately, this essential element of the collection, which was believed to have been lost during the fire of 1904, was recovered in 1984. It is currently stored in a card folder under the same call number (J.II.9) as the main body of the codex at the Biblioteca Nazionale. Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson noted that Torino J.II.9’s front flyleaf was never part of the first gathering (quinternion) of the codex. However, since it shares the frame ruling of section I of the manuscript, they also concluded that it was intended as an integral part of the codex. This folio was illuminated at the same time as the rest of the collection.

There are two historiated initials in Torino J.II.9; one prefaces the Office of St. Hylarion (folio 1r) and the other, that of St. Anne (folio 14r). The first historiated initial portrays St. Hylarion as a white-bearded man, dressed in brown (see figure 3.2). He is shown in a sitting position, holding a book. The name, “Sanctus Ylarion” is spelled in gold letters below this miniature. The decoration of Folio 1r also contains four reproductions of an unidentified crest, possibly Italian, arranged in the shape of a cross (see figure 3.3). The second historiated initial portrays St. Anne (see figure 3.4). The holy woman is identified by the rubric “In festo beate anne matris virginis marie,” and is depicted as an elderly woman, also in a sitting position, and holding a book. Kügle notes that the miniature of St. Anne was executed in a progressive style. He substantiates this claim with an analysis of the quality of the draperies in the coat of St. Anne (which is
characteristic of the beginning of the second quarter of the fifteenth century). Kügle also remarks that the miniature of St. Hylarion was executed in a more archaic style, and that one must therefore consider the possibility that a second, and perhaps older artist may have been involved in the decoration of the manuscript.¹³⁸

Figure 3.2 St. Hylarion. Historiated letter from folio 1r of the Codex Torino J.II.9.

Figure 3.3 Reproduction of an unidentified crest, possibly Italian. Detail from the lower margin of folio 1r from the Codex Torino J.II.9.
In 1908, and again in 1970-73, the Restoration Laboratory of the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria of Torino undertook the massive task of restoring the manuscripts rescued from the blaze of 1904.  Torino J.II.9 was nicely repaired. The collection’s original bifolia, which were separated when the inner margins were ruined by the flames, were mounted as individual leaves onto guards of heavy paper, two modern parchment endpapers were added to the front and back of the manuscript, and the manuscript was rebound in a modern board cover of light brown leather—safely fastened with two metal clasps.

The copying of Torino J.II.9

A common thread unites the various studies of the copying of Torino J.II.9: the sense that the process involved an unusually small team of scribes. Most of what we
know in that area is indebted to the efforts of Heinrich Besseler and Richard H. Hoppin, two scholars who devoted years to unearth invaluable information pertaining to this question—Besseler’s pioneering study of the 1920’s laying the groundwork for Hoppin’s extensive research during the 1950’s and 1960’s. According to Hoppin, the polyphonic portion of the Cypriot-French manuscript was copied by a team of seven scribes—two copyists for the music, and five for the text. He also proposes that a different group of scribes produced the monophonic chant section. Essentially, Hoppin’s findings complement Besseler’s work. For the most part, he develops his predecessor’s perspective by making a distinction between the two music scribes involved in the production of Torino J.II.9 on the basis of how they rendered the custos and by noting that the Gloria on folio 56v was copied using a distinct script form. However, in regard to the Mass cycle copied at the end of the fourth section of Torino J.II.9, Hoppin’s conclusion diverges from Besseler’s. He proposes that this particular Mass cycle may have been a later addition, and also that it may have been copied by a scribe external to the group who originally copied the Cypriot manuscript.

Since the time Besseler and Hoppin did their research, paleographical studies have demonstrated that not only does the hand of any given scribe evolve with time but also that a single scribe can use a variety of scripts. In the light of these findings, Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson propose that the compiling of Torino J.II.9 is most likely the work of no more than three text scribes: two experts (one of them Italian, the other French), and a copyist (in fact a music scribe), using a mixed Italian-French script (in which Italian elements are dominant and French elements appear to increase gradually during the production). The possibility that an additional music scribe was
employed exclusively for the production of the monophonic chant section was also considered. However, the authors emphasize that the latter hypothesis is uncertain due to the fact that differences in the layout and notation of that portion of the manuscript may simply derive from certain variations in the conventions of copying monophony as opposed to polyphony. Finally, based on the observation that the style in the illumination of initials shows remarkable consistency throughout the whole manuscript, Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson propose that one professional illuminator, a contemporary of the music scribe, is responsible for the decorating of Torino J.II.9 which took place most likely late in the compilation process, before its binding (their study predates that of Kügle’s, in which he proposes that the miniature of St. Hylarion on folio 1r of the codex might have been executed by an older artist than that of St. Anne on folio 14r).

In order to create a foundation for understanding debates over who composed the music of Torino J.II.9, I shall pursue the scribal issues a little further. Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson note that the complex working order of the music scribe in sections II, III, IV, and V (the sections of polyphonic settings) of the manuscript indicates that this person was both on hand and in charge of the manuscript production for a substantial period of time. Following the same notion, they add that the remarkably precise insertion of the music within the texts of the offices in section I implies the uninterrupted presence of a musician during the entire production of that section; possibly the same person as the music scribe mentioned above who was “both on hand and in charge” for the rest of the manuscript. Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson’s analysis also provides evidence that the music scribe received the music in bunches and at different
times, and furthermore, that some of it may have been composed during the copying process.\textsuperscript{152}

Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson made another convincing point by creating a tentative “round number” outline of the chronology of compilation of Torino J.II.9, from which emerges the possibility that there might have been preset objectives regarding the number of settings to be included in each form.\textsuperscript{153} For example, seventy ballads were copied in section IV of the manuscript by a professional text scribe who clearly took care to leave extra room for future additions. Significantly, the saved space accommodates exactly the thirty ballads that were added later, bringing the total to an even one hundred piece collection (one hundred and two ballads were compiled in Torino J.II.9; the remaining two ballads were included earlier on a separate bifolium).\textsuperscript{154}

In revealing the possible “preset objectives,” Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson’s “round number” analysis also indicates that the manuscript may have grown beyond those pre-established structural limits. Significantly, it seems that every “extra” piece (except for Motet I, which was composed possibly to use up the empty folio 59r) was entered by the music scribe/supervisor. Taking this into consideration, the possibility that this music scribe/supervisor may have also been the author of these additional works, and perhaps even of some of the works that were copied by one of the professional text scribes, becomes very real.\textsuperscript{155}

In 1999, Kügle published a comprehensive study of the text and music scripts used in Torino J.II.9.\textsuperscript{156} In his analysis, he identifies eleven text scripts and three music scripts. Kügle concludes that the first fascicule was copied by two scribes: one for the text, and the other for the music and for proofreading. For the preparation of Fascicules
II-V, he proposes the possibility that the music scribe/supervisor may have copied the music throughout Fascicules II-V, copying Fascicule V in its entirety (text and music). According to Kügle, the same individual may also have been responsible for proofreading and completing Fascicules I-IV, including the likely addition of a few settings toward the end of the production of Fascicules II-IV. Kügle observes that the cantus firmus Mass cycle, which was added at the end of the fourth fascicule after the initial period of production, was almost certainly copied on a newly inserted bifolium, probably by a Savoyard hand. In regards to Torino J.II.9’s decoration, Kügle agrees with Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson that it is most likely the work of a single artist. To this conclusion, he adds the possibility of the involvement of an additional artist for the miniature of St. Hylarion (as mentioned in the previous section). Kügle also notes that the style displayed by the illuminations indicate an Italian origin (possibly from the Veneto or Tuscany regions).\footnote{157}

The origins of Torino J.II.9

Torino J.II.9 has persistently eluded generations of scholarly efforts to ascertain its precise origins and dating. In an article published in 1925 by the Archiv für Musikwissenschaft, Besseler concluded that Torino J.II.9 was probably created at the court of King Janus I de Lusignan (1398-1432) in Nicosia, Cyprus, and that it found its way to the Savoyard court at the time of Anne de Lusignan and Louis I de Savoie’s nuptials.\footnote{158} If Besseler is correct, the Cypriot-French Manuscript is no less than the only repository of medieval Western polyphony from the Levant.\footnote{159} About forty years later, Hoppin embraced Besseler’s view on Torino J.II.9’s origins as a foundation for his
research on the Cypriot-French codex. From his contribution, which is massive, emerges a sense of tradition in Torino J.II.9 scholarship. In 1981, Reinhard Strohm wanders slightly from the beaten path. To what Besseler and Hoppin established, he adds a “passing hint” at the possibility that the origins of Torino J.II.9 might be connected to the court of Savoie. More recently (since about fifteen years ago), Kügle has been exploring in more detail some of Torino J.II.9’s Savoyard connections, and also, to a lesser extent, the possibility that the manuscript may have been compiled on the continent, for an Italian patron with close Cypriot connections. Still, eighty years after the Archiv für Musikwissenschaft published his Torino J.II.9 article, Besseler’s proposition remains essentially the one generally accepted among scholars—notwithstanding the scarcity of solid evidence substantiating the theory. Most of this section will be devoted to the exploration of the Cypriot origin hypothesis. Its last portion will touch upon Kügle’s thoughts on possible Savoyard or Italian connections.

In 1995, Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson published an article that integrated their respective findings spanning over ten years of scholarship on the structure and copying of the Cypriot-French Manuscript. By combining their results (discussed in a previous section of this chapter) the three musicologists reached the conclusion that the production of Torino J.II.9 must have involved an extremely limited number of people. In light of their findings, the possibility that Torino J.II.9 was compiled in Cyprus is a logical assumption, and should be seriously considered.

To begin with, one can reasonably argue that King Janus I de Lusignan and Charlotte de Bourbon clearly possessed the means and the stature to have had at their service two professional text scribes and at least one music scribe and/or musician in
residence at Nicosia. Besides, as pointed out by Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, the production of the Cypriot-French Manuscript does not need to have happened with all of the scribes and musician (or musicians) having been in Nicosia at the same time.\textsuperscript{165} Substantiating this view, chronicler Leontios Makhairas’ \textit{Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus} indicates that at the time she joined her husband Janus in Nicosia, Charlotte de Bourbon brought an entourage that included musicians skilled enough to have composed and performed the works compiled in Torino J.II.9.\textsuperscript{166} It thus seems realistic to assume that at least some of the musicians who came to Cyprus with Charlotte were involved in the creation on Torino J.II.9. For that reason, and because of the probable chronology of the origins of the Cypriot-French Manuscript, Charlotte de Bourbon’s arrival in Cyprus in the summer of 1411 is often interpreted as the chief event that prompted the establishment at the court of Nicosia of a strong center of \textit{Ars Nova} and \textit{Ars Subtilior}—as demonstrated in Torino J.II.9. This scenario is very plausible, especially since Charlotte, who was educated in one of the most powerful families of France, would have been keenly aware of the value of a policy of active patronage of refined polyphonic music as an essential ingredient of the duties of one with political prestige and power.\textsuperscript{167}

Dating the music and production of the Cypriot-French manuscript presents a daunting challenge; the collection does not fall comfortably into any existing category. One cannot deny a certain \textit{air de famille}, and yet Torino J.II.9 still emerges as an unusual creation among contemporaneous codices. The manuscript’s complex and unique identity has steered inquisitive minds outside of the norm, to a peculiar place where seemingly disparate characteristics have converged—so much so that I have come to
wonder if this strangeness might actually reflect the “transplanted” Frankish society in
Cyprus more accurately than has been previously considered. Clearly, the issue begs for
some open-minded exploration.

So far, available data on the Cypriot-French Manuscript stands out for its scarcity.
Scholars are dealing with a corpus of musical works that, in Hoppin’s words, appears
determined to remain anonymous and unique. With so few unveiled pieces of
evidence, one is left trying to decipher the picture from a mosaic of information that
exhibits far more “in between” space than tiles. However, sooner or later, the interplay of
these few and far between “tiles” of reliable data begins to claim the observer’s attention,
initiating the process of creating new questions, new hypotheses, and ultimately new
knowledge, a challenging and therefore somewhat distressing business. At the same
time, there is no doubt in my mind that to one who possesses patience, curiosity, and
perhaps above all, a healthy amount of humility, Torino J.II.9 offers a most exciting
opportunity to examine some of the medieval repertory from a fresh perspective.

An extract from a bull issued to King Janus I de Lusignan by antipope Jean XXXIII
in response to Janus’ request on November 23, 1413 was copied on the original front
flyleaf of Torino J.II.9 (see figure 3.1). The document, which was sanctioned in
December 1414, grants the king of Cyprus the privilege of having a separate Office (and
calendar) created exclusively for the Lusignan family church at the royal monastery of St.
Dominic in Nicosia, and for the Cathedral of St. Sophia also in Nicosia. This
particular antipope-approved Office was composed to honor the patron saint of Cyprus:
St. Hylarion. Known as a holy man who worked miracles, Hylarion (291–371) is
traditionally believed to have spent the end of his life as a hermit in the desert near Paphos on the island of Cyprus.¹⁷⁰

According to Barbara Wiemes, the extract from the bull issued to King Janus I by Jean XXIII not only clearly confirms that the manuscript Torino J.II.9 is connected to Cyprus, but also provides the basis for dating it.¹⁷¹ Following the same thread, Kügle proposes that the first performance of the Office for St. Hylarion could plausibly have occurred on October 21, 1414, on the day of the feast of St. Hylarion that immediately followed the pontifical sanction of the Office. Kügle also suggests that the Office could perhaps have been composed as soon as King Janus received the papal authorization.¹⁷²

By general consensus (although with different degrees of commitment), musicologists have adopted the period of time immediately following the date of sanction of Janus’ request by Jean XXIII as the most likely time for the Office for St. Hylarion to have been composed. Challenging this view, Giulio Cattin writes:

The presence of a French court in Cyprus, intent on celebrating solemnly the feast of the island’s patron saint in accordance with the canons of the great mainland feasts, could not but bring about the creation of a rhymed Office in honour of St. Hylarion. There is no specific chronological evidence [...] it could date back to the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth century. If this conjecture were legitimate, more surprising is the fact that the compilation of a rhymed Office for a patron saint took so long.¹⁷³

Cattin’s perspective is very compelling since many signs indicate that St. Hylarion may have been a particularly important devotional figure in the Lusignan House. Indeed, the Lusignan family who had adopted the castle of St. Hylarion (built by the Byzantines in the eleventh century) as a summer residence as early as 1232, also used it as a refuge during the plague of 1349-50. Moreover, we know that King Jacques I de Lusignan (Janus’ father) built some additions to the existing fortress in 1391.¹⁷⁴ Adding substance
to this standpoint, the fourteenth century chronicle *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* claims that “in the castle of Amours [St. Hylarion] lieth the body of Saint-Hilarion, and men keep it right worshipfully.”\(^{175}\) Of course, one must keep in mind that *The Travels* was probably conceived as a travel romance rather than as an authentic record, and that it was most likely based on the work of previous authors. However, J.R.S. Phillips notes that the author of *The Travels* seems to have reserved his most extravagant accounts for extremely remote places, where they would have been safe from contemporaneous scrutiny.\(^{176}\) Cyprus was at the heart of the crusading movement, and the author of *The Travels* obviously knew better than to locate such creatures as headless men whose face was on their chest in the Lusignan kingdom. From this perspective, this short excerpt about the relics of St. Hylarion seems to at least confirm that the saint was particularly important to the people of the “castle of Amours [St. Hylarion]”: the Lusignans.

Importantly, substantiating Cattin’s view, *The Travels* indicates that this devotion predates Antipope Jean XXIII’s bull. Regardless, the Office could still have been performed on October 21, 1414, and, for that matter, could have been composed and compiled in the period immediately following the papal sanction. However, from this viewpoint, Cattin’s statement begs scholars to re-examine the dating of the composition of the Office for St. Hylarion.

The Cypriot-French manuscript comprises another work—*Magni Patris magna mira / Ovent Cyprus Palestina* (Motet 17)—which, according to Kügle, may have been composed for the above-mentioned celebration of the feast of St. Hylarion. Kügle speculates that Motet 17, a work dedicated to St. Hylarion, could have been created as a companion to the Office for St. Hylarion for the celebration of the Saint’s feast.\(^{177}\) His
theory rests on the possibility that the Maistre de chapelle of King Janus I de Lusignan may have wanted to emulate the celebrations of the canonization of St. Louis de Toulouse (nephew of King Louis IX de France [St. Louis]) in 1317, when the memory of the crusader King was honored by the performance of a newly composed rhymed Office together with that of a motet believed to have been composed for the same occasion.  

Kügle presents another compelling hypothesis pertaining to Torino J.II.9’s origins and dating. It involves the likelihood that the Office for St. Anne (adjacent to the Office for St. Hylarion in the first fascicule of the codex) might have been created in connection to Princess Anne de Lusignan’s first name day. Based on this premise, the Office could conceivably have been composed in Cyprus shortly before a presumed first performance on July 26, 1420, or possibly, as suggested by Kügle, in a subsequent year.

In his analysis of the chronology of the development of the cult of St. Anne in Cyprus, Kügle emphasizes that “it remains unclear whether Anne [de Lusignan]’s name was chosen in deference to a pre-existing cult of St. Anne, or, rather, whether the cult of St. Anne was intensified as a result of Anne’s birth.” Using a different perspective, musicologist Giulio Cattin gives us additional insight into the circumstances that shaped the cult of St. Anne in Cyprus:

The cult of [St.] Anne, if we ignore dynastic motives [...], was active for a long time in the East before reaching the Western-Latin Church, and [...] the period in which the Cypriot manuscript was produced coincides with the era of the development of her cult in the West.

By momentarily excluding the Lusignan family from the picture, his statement greatly enhances the reader’s perception of the two currents regarding the cult of St. Anne that
converged in Cyprus at the turn of the fifteenth century. Echoing Kügle, Cattin acknowledges that the Cypriot population had already been cultivating a special devotion to St. Anne for generations prior to the production of Torino J.II.9. Then, against this background, he emphasizes that, regardless of the Lusignan dynasty’s agenda, the intensification of the cult of St. Anne in Cyprus—suggested by the inclusion of an Office for St. Anne in the Cypriot-French repertory—was essentially consistent with the contemporaneous development of the cult of St. Anne in Western Europe. Ultimately, the superimposition of Cattin’s and Kügle’s observations illuminates the interplay of influences embodied by Torino J.II.9’s Office for St. Anne. The development of the cult of St. Anne in the West, the intensifying of an already established cult of St. Anne in Cyprus, and the christening of Anne de Lusignan (perhaps to honor St. Anne) coincide neatly—each aspect adjusting to the others—in mutual harmony.

The adoption of this somewhat unusual and challenging vantage point in regards to the prominence of the cult of St. Anne in Cyprus propels medieval Nicosia out of the backwater. It is important to remember that this traditionally under-acknowledged manifestation of Levantine influence on Western culture (the cult of St. Anne) was already well established in Cyprus prior to reaching Western Europe. Meanwhile, if undeniably in step with the Levantine tradition, the marked devotion to St. Anne manifested by the Lusignan family also reveals their awareness of Western European developments (where the cult of St. Anne was expanding as a result of Levantine influence). From this perspective, I speculate that the Cypriot-French codex may have been one of the many vehicles by which the cult of St. Anne spread to the West in the late middle Ages. Naturally, the birth and christening of Anne de Lusignan must have
contributed significantly to the intensification of the cult of her name patron on Cyprus. However, considering the particular circumstances created by the combination of the fundamental need for the expatriate Lusignan dynasty to stay in touch with the West and the wave of devotion to St. Anne traveling west from the Levant with merchants and returning pilgrims, the choice of Anne de Lusignan’s name ultimately emerges as an expression of those circumstances, perhaps more so than as a catalyst.

Moving beyond circumstantial concerns, I would like to bring up an important point noted by Kügle, pertaining to the significance of the insertion of the rhymed Office for St. Anne at the very beginning of the Cypriot-French manuscript. During the late medieval period, there was a customary practice in Western Europe of compiling luxurious collections of musical works—termed *miroirs musicaux*—that followed edifying and/or admonitory programs in order to promote young monarchs at the dawn of their career. Manifestly shaped by such a program, Torino J.II.9 could plausibly have been conceived as a *miroir musical*, possibly for Princess Anne de Lusignan, considering the obvious place of honor reserved for the Office to St. Anne at the beginning of the collection. Substantiating this hypothesis, Kügle observes that since there are no signs of wear or use in the manuscript, Torino J.II.9 was probably conceived as an object of luxury.

Let us shift our attention toward the *liber motetorum* section of the manuscript. Adopting an original perspective, Kügle observes that the distinctive characteristics of the motets of the Cypriot-French collection may simply be the result of circumstances unique to the Lusignan court in Nicosia during the first quarter of the fifteenth century. His view is particularly important in that not only does it provide the Torino J.II.9 motets with a
plausible context, but perhaps more significantly it also challenges the validity of the

notion that a lack of knowledge of Western developments is responsible for their

idiosyncrasies. For example, according to Kügle, the unusual absence of purely
ceremonial motets (prominent in Western Europe during the second quarter of the
fifteenth century) in the Cypriot-French collection might be explained by a lack of
diplomatic visitors of sufficient consequence between 1411 and 1435. He also points
out that some ceremonial elements, which are found in several Torino J.II.9 motets, seem
to indicate that those works were composed primarily for celebration within the Lusignan
household rather than as projections of prestige toward outside powers. Kügle then
draws our attention to the fact that the extensive use of four-part settings and isorhythm
(all forty-one motets except for Motets 11, 12, and 14, use a contratenor; and all settings
besides that of Motet 9 are isorhythmnic) by the Torino J.II.9 composer(s) is consistent
with the physiognomy of the late medieval French motet repertory. Finally, giving a
serious blow to the widespread preconception that the musician(s) involved in the
creation of Torino J.II.9 had been oblivious of the continental avant-garde, Kügle stresses
the close stylistic correlation (musical and textual) of the Torino J.II.9 motets (allusions
to the French motet repertory of the early fourteenth century and choice of themes) with
compositions by Carmen, Cesaris, or Tapissier—three musicians known to have been
active either in Paris or at the courts of the dukes of Bourgogne, Berry, and possibly
Anjou, at the turn of the fifteenth century.

Tentative dating for the two Torino J.II.9 motets Gemma florens militie /Hec est dies
gloriosa (Motet 8) and Hunc diem festis celebremus hymnis /Precursoris verdi solennia
(Motet 15) are proposed by Kügle. As both compositions are dedicated to St. John the
Baptist, the patron saint of Prince Jean de Lusignan (son of Janus I, heir to the Cypriot throne), he suggests that they may have been composed for the Prince’s birth (May 16, 1418), for his baptism, or perhaps for subsequent celebrations of the feast of St. John the Baptist. Textual allusions to Prince Jean’s birth (which will be discussed in the next paragraph) lead Kügle to propose the second quarter of 1418 as a probable period for the composition of Motet 8. Meanwhile, in the case of Motet 15, which is less specific textually, Kügle concludes that it might have been composed in 1419 or later, to celebrate the feast of Prince Jean’s patron saint (June 24). At the same time, Kügle points out that since the name “Janus” was in fact a nickname, and that King Janus I’s real name was in all likelihood Jean, the royal cult of St. John the Baptist—also the patron saint of King Janus—possibly predates the birth of Prince Jean. Conversely, he notes that in all of the Torino J.II.9 motets other than Motets 8 and 15, King Janus I is referred to in the nickname form as opposed to “Johannes” (as in Motets 8 and 15), thus weakening this hypothesis. I agree with Kügle that the cult of St. John the Baptist at the court of Nicosia may well have been established before Prince Jean’s birth. After all, regardless of the Lusignan dynasty’s agenda, the feast of St. John the Baptist was of particular importance to the Catholic French. Indeed (borrowing Cattin’s approach), it would be surprising if the thriving société courtoise established by Queen Charlotte and King Janus did not celebrate the feast of St. John the Baptist before the birth of their son Jean. In view of this, I speculate that Motet 15 could predate the Prince’s birth, even in the absence of allusions to King Janus in the text.

The text of Gemma florens militie /Hec est dies gloriosa (Motet 8) alludes to “the blessing of puerperium” granted to St. Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist. In
further support of his theories regarding dating, Kügle observes that the motet’s emphasis on Elizabeth (and by implication, her husband Zachary) can be understood as a reference to the situation of Charlotte de Bourbon and her husband Janus at the birth of Prince Jean. Like Elizabeth and Zachary, Charlotte and Janus had no children until several years after their marriage. In addition to many textual allusions to Charlotte de Bourbon, Motet 8 also praises her husband Janus, referring to him explicitly as king of Jerusalem, Armenia, and Cyprus. Finally, the name “Urania” at the close of the triplum subtly evokes the island of Cyprus. According to Kügle, in Motet 8, the name Urania—goddess of spiritual love—refers to the Holy Virgin by drawing a parallel between Aphrodite Urania and the Virgin Mary. Because of that, and also because since antiquity Cyprus was celebrated as the birthplace of the goddess Aphrodite, he concludes that “the double entendre implicit in the use of the appellation Urania would be especially suited for the birth (after all, the fruit of a sexual union) of a Cypriot prince.”

I would like to mention two additional motets that appear to link Torino J.II.9 (if indirectly) to the court of Nicosia: Personet Armonia Dulcis Cantus Melodia/Consonet Altisonis Laudes Notulis Katerine (Motet 14), and Flos Regalis Katerina/Maxentius Rex Propere (Motet 32). The two settings are dedicated to St. Catherine of Alexandria, a saint who was venerated in Cyprus, particularly by the Lusignan family. In 1421, the small Lusignan Chapelle Royale Ayia Ekaterina was built in the village of Pyrga (between Nicosia and Limassol, Cyprus). The coat of arms of the kingdom of Cyprus appears on the arches of a vault and, on the eastern wall, King Janus and Queen Charlotte are portrayed, kneeling at the foot of the cross, in a large fresco (see figures 3.5 and
I suspect that Motets 14 and 32 may be contemporaneous with—and perhaps even connected to—the inauguration of the *Chapelle Royale Ayia Ekaterina*.

---

**Figure 3.5** The coats of arms of the kingdom of Cyprus. Detail of a fresco in the Lusignan *Chapelle Royale Ayia Ekaterina* in Pyrga, Cyprus.

**Figure 3.6** King Janus I de Lusignan and Queen Charlotte de Bourbon. Detail of the Crucifixion fresco in the Lusignan *Chapelle Royale Ayia Ekaterina* in Pyrga, Cyprus.

Regarding the rich collection of secular music preserved in sections IV and V of Torino J.II.9, Kügle notes that the inclusion of a chansonnier section in the codex is
clearly in accord with contemporaneous ideals of princely propriety. Indeed it is, according to a passage from a fourteenth century treatise on chivalry and government titled *Grace Entiere* quoted by Kügle:

> It is good for a king or a prince to amuse himself after he has deliberated and pondered upon matters of the realm; let him enjoy himself in the company of decent and honest young people who know how to play and to amuse themselves in a becoming fashion, as it is fitting to do in the presence of the prince.\(^{202}\)

*Amour courtois* is the theme of choice for the majority of the Torino chansons. Kügle observes that while this preference was predictable, it is important to note that almost all of the fifteen ballads that were copied first on the fourth fascicule (the opening fascicule of the chansonnier) favor admonitory subject matter since it suggests a deliberate choice by the compiler to begin the chansonnier section with a group of edifying settings.\(^{203}\)

This view brings us back to the previously introduced possibility of the Cypriot-French manuscript having been conceived as a *miroir musical*.

The poetry of the Torino ballads reveals very little of their author or origin. Hoppin observes that in fact, only one ballad—*Par Doulceur refrener m’ire* (Ballad 11) reveals a direct relationship with Cyprus in the text of its refrain, *Pour leaulté maintenir*, which is the motto of the Cypriot Order of the Sword.\(^{204}\) Perkins proposes that the use of the Cypriot motto constitutes in itself a fair indication that Ballad 11 was composed in Cyprus.\(^{205}\) In fact, as discussed later in chapter IV, Nicolò III d’Este (Signor of Ferrara), while visiting the court of King Janus I de Lusignan in Cyprus in 1413 was, along with other Ferrara nobles, decorated with the Order of the Sword.\(^{206}\) It seems reasonable to suppose that a setting similar to Ballad 11 was created for such an event—perhaps the Signor of Ferrara was even treated precisely to *Doulceur refrener m’ire* during that visit.
In reference to the texts of the sixty-four virelais and rondeaux preserved in Torino J.II.9, Perkins notes that with the exception of the text of *Puis que sans vous querons nostre plaisir* (Rondeau 11), “the poetry of the collection [rondeaux and virelais] is highly conventional——[and that] one is tempted to say in the present context, distressingly so.”²⁰⁷ Perkins’ expression of dismay in relation to the apparent generic quality of this corpus of works is very much the prolongation of Hoppin’s statement that besides Rondeau 11, “all the rest [the remaining sixty-three virelais and rondeaux] might have been produced at any French court by any French poet or poets in the early years of the 15th century.”²⁰⁸ At the same time, the inclusion of Rondeau 11 in Torino J.II.9 demands that, at the minimum, one considers the possibility of a Cypriot origin. Although silent on the identities of both its author and its patron, Rondeau 11 clearly reveals its connection to the French kingdom in Cyprus via its text, which speaks of the regret felt in the absence of an anonymous someone from the amusements of the court of Nicosia and of the fervent longing for the prompt return of that person.²⁰⁹ Perkins in fact notes that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that at least the text of Rondeau 11 was written in Cyprus. He also proposes that considering the difficulties and delays which certainly characterized communication between Nicosia and other centers of French culture in the middle ages, it is reasonable to speculate that Rondeau 11’s musical setting was a Cypriot creation as well.²¹⁰

Now that the Cypriot origin hypothesis has been explored in some depth, I will touch upon some alternative views noted by Kügle in regard to the compilation and patronage of Torino J.II.9. Since some dating questions are related to these different perspectives, some of them will also be discussed as they arise. As mentioned earlier, the
Cypriot-French codex is believed in the main to have been compiled in Cyprus and to have made its way to the court of Savoie when Anne de Lusignan married Louis de Savoie in 1434. However, Kügle notes the presence of a crest on folio 1r that appears to be of Italian origin.\textsuperscript{211} Because of that, and because the codex shows characteristic Italian features in its text scripts and illuminations (the style of the illuminations appears to date from circa 1430), he brings up the possibility that Torino J.II.9 may have been prepared for an Italian patron (with close ties to Cyprus) around 1425-35, conceivably on the continent. Kügle also considers that the cantus firmus mass added at the end of the fourth fascicule indicates that the Cypriot-French manuscript reached the Savoyard court at an early stage. In view of that, he notes the possibility that Torino J.II.9 may have been compiled under the supervision of Jean Hanelle (this view will be discussed thoroughly later in this chapter, under \textquotedblleft Jean Hanelle\textquotedblright), a musician who followed Anne de Lusignan from Cyprus to Savoie. Kügle proposes that if indeed Hanelle supervised the compilation of the manuscript, its dating should be placed close to 1420, perhaps as late as 1433-34 or even slightly later, and that in that case, some or all of its copying might have occurred on the continent, in Savoie.\textsuperscript{212} Obviously, there is still a long way to go before the problem of the origins of Torino J.II.9 is solved. However, the process of speculating keeps shedding light on our understanding of the French-Cypriot repertory, and that is very exciting.

The musician(s) of the Cypriot-French repertory—practitioner(s) of \textit{Ars Subtilior}

In her article \textquotedblleft Some aspects of the Motets in the Cyprus Manuscript,\textquotedblright Margaret Bent draws the reader\textquotesingle s attention to the problem of anonymity in musicological research and
how it has hindered scholarly exploration and understanding of the repertory gathered in Torino J.II.9 and of the musicians involved in its creation. Bent states that “the absence of composers’ names and of links through concordances with other repertories have [sic] conspired to leave them [the Torino motets] with the appearance of a self-contained repertory, perhaps influenced by but not seminal to other European collections.” From a similar perspective, Kügle notes that if Torino is the most neglected major source of late medieval polyphony, it is also one of the principal collections of *Ars Subtilior*, and the only known early fifteenth century codex devoted exclusively to French (or at least French-derived) repertoire.

If a majority of scholars seem to think of the label-resistant Cypriot-French repertory as having developed in a vacuum, the approach adopted by Ursula Günther is most refreshing. Rather than being satisfied with traveling the beaten path, she chooses to wander the speculative byways of this collection. Consequently, she glimpses at music history from perspectives unavailable to others. For example, in her article “Some Polymetric Songs in the Manuscript Torino J.II.9,” she reaches the conclusion that:

Many polymetric songs of I-Tn 9 and especially the seven songs [Ballads 3, 26, 67, and 81; Rondeau 5; Virelais 5] studied in this paper, which apply all *quatre prolations* or rare proportions, demonstrate that one cannot postulate the end of the *Ars subtilior* before 1410 to 1420.

As we see her doing here, Günther takes great pains to integrate the repertory of Torino J.II.9 into broader developments. The musician(s) who wrote the Cypriot-French polymetric songs did not belong to a sub-species that merely emulated a passé style, but rather, legitimately practiced *Ars Subtilior*. 
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*Ars Subtilior* is a term that was coined by Günther. It refers to an extremely refined musical style developed in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century. According to Leech-Wilkinson, *Ars Subtilior* is the stylistic amalgam that resulted from the frequent exchange of music and ideas between “the many musicians [...] who visited Avignon in the entourages of dignitaries [such as] the kings of France, Navarre, Sicily, Spain and Portugal, the dukes of Anjou and Burgundy and the Count of Savoy.”216 Leech-Wilkinson observes that with the regular interfacing of such a wealth of musical talents, “song styles were bound to evolve rapidly,” and that the resulting development of *Ars Subtilior* (as we know it) brought about “some of the most rhythmically complex works conceived before modern times.”217

Nors S. Josephson divides the evolution of *Ars Subtilior* into four “successive and roughly chronological stages.” Josephson’s first group of *Ars Subtilior* composers—the so called Post-Machaut generation—was mostly concerned with the development of the classical ballade style of Guillaume de Machaut. These composers wrote in a style close to Machaut’s more innovative works, using syncopated decorations of single chords and eccentric harmonies. The settings of the second generation display a more ornate style, which is essentially an extension of the Post-Machaut generation style. Second generation *Ars Subtilior* music is remarkable not only for the “growing contrapuntal independence of the contratenor” but also “for an admirable tonal and motivic cohesion;” it announces the early fifteenth century chanson. The contribution of third generation *Ars Subtilior* composers (an extension of the same style) consists of settings characterized by “lavish minim displacement and Italianate sequential patterns.” The fourth and final group of *Ars Subtilior* practitioners pushed rhythmic complexity, proportional devices
and tonal experimentation to extreme limits. As Leech-Wilkinson remarks, composers of this fourth generation developed an unconventional style which “has hardly lost the power to shock six centuries after its creation.” Unfortunately, the complexity of fourth generation *Ars Subtilior* settings has been misunderstood to such an extent that it has engendered the enduring misconception that *Ars Subtilior* music is fundamentally dissonant—and mostly absurd. For that reason, it becomes imperative to keep in mind Leech-Wilkinson’s observation that, “however complex the rhythmic ingenuities, and however unconventional the contrapuntal displacements, the underlying progressions always prove, when correctly transcribed, to be entirely logical.”

Shocking qualities notwithstanding, *Ars Subtilior* did not constitute a new style *per se*; it was essentially an extension of the concept of *Ars Nova*’s notational innovations. *Ars Nova* notational techniques emerged in the first quarter of the fourteenth century to accommodate music which, for the first time “required that the length of every sound be precisely determined so that the different voices could proceed on schedule and fall precisely into the combinations of sound and rhythm determined by the composer.”

Based on what we know—via codices—of *Ars Subtilior* soundscape, it appears that by the time this prolongation of *Ars Nova* emerged, there was a reversal in process. By then, the notational progress originally created to serve sound had become a driving force for compositional experimentation—the toy of choice for the so-called *Ars Subtilior* composers who, in Leech-Wilkinson’s words, invented “new notations (including several kinds of colour, variously decorated tails and new signs for reduction or augmentation of the written note lengths) to produce complex durations or whimsically irregular proportional relationships between different voices.”
Acknowledging the reality that *Ars Subtilior* sounds are transmitted to us via manuscripts, Marcel Pérès points out that “one must always keep in mind that the goal of our research is a sound artifact.” In agreement with Pérès, Shai Burstyn suggests that it might prove profitable to “relate to the notation really as a primitive or early tape recorder,” to approach the music preserved in manuscripts in terms of “examples of performance traditions rather than of pieces [...] the status of the notes that we have in written form is not that of a composition but rather the status in which certain scribes thought it could be done—having perhaps heard the piece done that way.”

Significantly, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, those early “tape recorders” (codices) tended to be made in Italy and had a proclivity to record French polyphony: in Nicoletta Guidobaldi’s words, “most of the polyphony preserved in Italian manuscripts is of French origin [...] most of the major sources of Burgundian-French repertory was copied in Italy.” This manifestation of the “journey to Italy” phenomenon captured by early fifteenth codices (a trend that would last for 150 years) is a good reminder of how central the notion of interrelation is to the *Ars Subtilior* musician, a concept that entails the circulation of people, knowledge and artifacts. Torino J.II.9 and its content evidence the participation of its creators in this process.

As noted earlier, many polymetric songs in the Cypriot-French codex apply rare proportions (*quatre prolations*). As a matter of fact, the author(s) of Torino J.II.9 pushed their experimentation to the point of inventing proportions and rhythmical complexities that had never been used before. *Puis que Aimé Sui Doucelment* (Ballad 26) is a fine example of this interest in the development of unusual proportions. In her analysis of Ballad 26, Günther notes the presence of customary Pythagorean ratios found
in continental sources, such as 4:3, 3:2, and 2:1.\textsuperscript{231} She also observes that unusual proportions like 5:2, 7:3 and 8:3, which are not found in any continental sources, are used as well.\textsuperscript{232} Günther further remarks that even if Ballad 26 is less polymetric than other settings of Torino J.II.9, it is exceptional in that it uses proportions in fully eleven measures of its contratenor.\textsuperscript{233}

Example 3.1 Torino J.II.9, \textit{Je Prens d’Amour Noriture} (Virelai 17). Transcription by Ursula Günther. The accelerando discussed below occurs between measure 17 and 22.\textsuperscript{234}
Je Prens d’Amour Noriture (Virelai 17) is another song from the Cypriot-French collection that is noteworthy for its rhythmical complexity. In fact, Perkins calls its use of nine proportions (all restricted to the cantus) a “dizzying display of proportional pyrotechnics” (see example 3.1). This setting is remarkable mostly because of the presence of an accelerando effect in its first part. Importantly, Günther considers that this work contains “the first precisely calculated and notated acceleration in the history of music.” Technically, this accelerando is achieved by using progressively faster proportions in sequence. Changes occur gradually and consistently in each measure, leading the listener from three equal notes to twenty four equal notes.
According to Paul Van Nevel, the anonymous *Ars Subtilior* composer(s) of the Torino J.II.9 codex seem to have delighted in extremely complex rhythmic compositional technique: “ample use was made of rhythmic novelties [...] and new note symbols [that] permitted the representation of note values that had previously defied graphical rendering.” 238 Meanwhile, Planchart notes a melodic grace found in the Torino J.II.9 songs such as is found in the work of the young Dufay or in that of some very late fourteenth century composers. 239 The third verse of *Pour Haut et Liement Chanter* (to be sung high and legato) (Ballad 21) indicates that its author aimed at merging these two seemingly mismatched characteristics; it is concerned with rhythmical interpretation and the art of *fleuretis* (vibrato embellishments). 240 Very much like a message in a bottle for future generations, it is the musical setting of its composer’s view on compositional technique and interpretation of *Ars Subtilior* works.

Les acors tres bien moderer,
Sincopant en maniere lie,
Veuillant des fleuretis user,
Non pas en tout mais en partie,
Metant peinne toute sa vie
De savoir proporcionner
Ses chans par gracieuse envie,
Parfaitement, sans oublier.

(Moderate the chords well,
Syncopating in legato fashion,
Deigning to use *fleuretis*,
Not to excess but in good measure;
Striving all one’s life
To learn proportion
One’s songs with graceful ardor,
Perfectly, never lapsing.) 241
The arrival of Charlotte de Bourbon at Nicosia in August 1411 clearly coincides with the beginning of a period of renewed optimism vis-à-vis the efforts to establish a strong French cultural center at the court of Janus I de Lusignan. As mentioned earlier, evidence suggests that there were excellent musicians amongst Charlotte’s sixty retainers. In fact, the name of a certain Τζιλετ Βελιουτ—identified by Hoppin as French composer Gilet Velut—appears in a comprehensive inventory of Charlotte’s retinue recorded by chronicler Leontios Makhairas in his *Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus*. In further support of the possibility that Velut accompanied Charlotte to Nicosia, a papal document dated June 2, 1411 (releasing Velut from excommunication) indicates that he was taken into Charlotte de Bourbon’s service shortly prior to her departure for Cyprus. Based on the premise that Torino J.II.9 was created by musicians in service at the court of King Janus I de Lusignan, Velut emerges as a possible candidate for the supervision of its compilation.

In order to make better sense of the Torino J.II.9 songs’ distinctive “impression of sameness,” Leech-Wilkinson did a comparative analysis of Ballads 5, 12, 15, and 37. He extracted each song’s melodic “skeleton” and revealed that the four settings share the same model of “recurring melodic descents from the upper fifth [...] interspersed with rising melodic links.” He applied the same method to Ballads 8 and 10, and noted such remarkable basic melodic similarities that he became convinced that coincidence could hardly be the cause of his findings. He proposes that any composer writing at this level of sophistication must have deliberately used a single mental model to create the
two songs. Continuing his analysis, Leech-Wilkinson also observes that Ballads 8 and 10 are extraordinary for their extensive exploitation of the system of mensuration (Ballad 8 in duple tempus, and prolation, and Ballad 10 in triple). In view of these findings and taking into consideration that a single melodic model was ostensibly used for both ballads, Leech-Wilkinson suggests that their composer(s) must “have been making a point about the independence of mensuration and melody,” and that this sort of technical experimentation was possibly a means of easing the tedium of writing a great deal of music “quickly and to order.”

As a matter of fact, according to Leech-Wilkinson, the use of this “formulaic, model-based approach to composition,” when considered side by side with the remarkable narrowness of taste that characterizes the repertory of the Cypriot-French codex, suggests that the music preserved in it was created “to order, and for a patron happy to buy by the meter as it were.” What is more—admitting the unconventionality of his conclusion—Leech-Wilkinson explains that, due to the degree of consistency in style, technique, and material that distinguishes the settings in Torino J.II.9, he has developed the opinion that only one musician—one who brings to mind composer Gilet Velut—was involved in the composition of the ballads, virelais, rondeaux, possibly the motets, and some of the mass music preserved in the collection.

According to David Fallows, “what Velut shows in his works is an endless fascination with technical problems and their solution—a preoccupation that is often characteristic of Dufay’s work and seems lacking in most other composers of the time.” The resemblance between Fallows’ idea of Velut and Leech-Wilkinson’s “very competent, inventive but not outstanding” hard-worked Torino J.II.9 codex composer is
striking. So much so that it lead Leech-Wilkinson to consider the possibility of Velut having authored all of the secular music and possibly the motets of the Cypriot-French collection.\textsuperscript{253} Indeed, in order to carry on such a grueling assignment, this musician (like Fallows’ Velut) must have valued the challenge “of being inventive through ever-different uses of a small amount of material.”\textsuperscript{254} If this does not prove Velut’s authorship, it does at least support that theory. And substantiating this view, Perkins notes that the mensural proportions utilized in \textit{Je Prens d’Amour Noriture} (Virelais 45) involved groups of five and seven notes which “must have been particularly difficult in performance, and [that] one is inclined to suggest that the piece was intended either as an impressive demonstration of compositional—and of course performance— skills or as a didactic exercise—or perhaps both at once.”\textsuperscript{255} Once more, Fallow’s Velut with his “endless fascination with technical problems and their solutions” is brought to mind.

Leech-Wilkinson mentions another attribute which appears to connect Torino J.II.9’s repertory to composer Gilet Velut; it consists of the generous use of descending thirds and of decorated descending sequences in a significant portion of the manuscript’s songs collection.\textsuperscript{256} At the 1992 International Musicological Congress in Paphos (Cyprus), Leech-Wilkinson presented a series of examples (extracted from sixteen Torino J.II.9 songs) which demonstrate the use of this technique.\textsuperscript{257} At the end of his lecture, he presented what he considered the ultimate example of “such imitating chains of thirds” of the main repertory of early fifteen-century polyphony. Significantly, it was a ballad by Velut: \textit{Jusqu’au Jour d’Uy pour Apprendre à Parler}.\textsuperscript{258} Leech-Wilkinson emphasized that this composition by Velut sounds considerably different from its Cypriot counterparts because of a more extensive use of imperfect consonances. However,
returning to his initial view, he proposed that Velut might have come in contact with this descending third technique in Cyprus and that he would have developed it later, possibly having returned home to mainland Europe. He also speculated that Velut could have inspired other continental composers to use the same practice.\textsuperscript{259}

During the same congress, Günther presented her own set of examples in relation to this descending third technique which characterizes the songs of Torino J.II.9. Using a different approach than that of Leech-Wilkinson’s, she emphasized that out of the eight works know to have been composed by Velut, only two (number 3 and 4) use descending chains thirds.\textsuperscript{260} According to her, this technique was widespread in fourteenth century repertoire.\textsuperscript{261} Some examples Günther presented include the \textit{Amen} from a \textit{Gloria} by Bosquet (\textit{d} before November 30, 1406) from the codex I-Bu 2216, which uses a chain of five descending thirds in a sequential hocket that involve three voices; perhaps closer to the technique used in Torino J.II.9, she also mentioned \textit{Le Sault Perilleux}, a ballad by Johannes Galiot (\textit{fl} 1380-95) which uses sometimes three, four or five thirds in syncopation, and \textit{Inclite Flos}, a ballad by Matheus de Sancto Johane (\textit{d} by June 10, 1391), which uses three descending thirds.\textsuperscript{262} Günther’s conclusion differs from Leech-Wilkinson’s in that she did not consider the chains of descending thirds a probable signature of Velut but rather the proof that the Cyprus composer(s) were in touch with the style and works of late fourteenth century Avignon and of the court of Duke Jean de Berry (\textit{d} 1416).\textsuperscript{263} From Günther’s perspective, it appears that mainland composers may have inspired Velut (or the anonymous Torino J.II.9 composer[s]) to use this descending third technique. This does not render Leech-Wilkinson’s hypothesis impossible; it simply indicates that the problem of the relationship between the author(s) of the music
preserved in Torino J.II.9 and European musical conventions is probably far more complex than anticipated.

Perkins also discussed the possible involvement of Velut in the production of Torino J.II.9 during the 1992 International Musicological Congress in Paphos. While noting that one can hardly pretend to make a meaningful comparison between the works credited to Velut and the repertory of Torino J.II.9—they are too few in number—Perkins remarked that “were any one of the four to have been included in the Torino manuscript, it would not have jarred in the least with the other pieces in the repertory.” Indeed, Perkins’ analysis shows that the treatment of the text in the four chansons by Velut preserved in Oxford 213 (1 rondeau, 3 ballads) is consistent with the practice followed for those of Torino J.II.9. It also indicates that, similarly to the practice followed for the Torino J.II.9 songs, the four Oxford 213 songs attributed to Velut are in the Dorian mode (two finish on D and two on G with a B-fa signature), and in three of them, the tenor is in the authentic ambitus while the cantus uses the complementary plagal.\(^{264}\)

With Leech-Wilkinson, Günther and Perkins’ views in mind, I speculate that there might have been a more mutual give-and-take between the musicians of Nicosia and those of mainland Europe than one can establish at present. After all, many European nobles owned property in Cyprus, and it appears that a visit to the King of Cyprus may have been de rigueur for European monarchs in pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Moreover, one ought to keep in mind that during the middle ages, musicians were often diplomats, and that an important kingdom such as that of Cyprus must have sent musicians to the main centers of Europe on a regular basis.
Leech-Wilkinson describes the Torino J.II.9 composer(s) as well versed in *Ars Subtilior* works from southern France and the court of Duke Jean de Berry. He notes that the composer’s familiarity with the recent developments in the north (Lebertoul and Loqueville) indicates that he was a northerner (without excluding the possibility that he worked in Italy). This seems to indicate a connection between the Torino J.II.9 composer(s) and some musicians of the Cambrai cathedral (in northern France) (Lebertoul was at Cambrai in 1409-10, Loqueville in 1413-18, and Velut presumably in 1409-11). He proposes that the Torino J.II.9 composer went to Nicosia around 1411 (importing his style and his compositions) and that he was asked to create the content of the manuscript in Cyprus. Perhaps significantly, Velut arrived in Nicosia in August 1411 (he was one of Charlotte de Bourbon’s sixty retainers), and his profile matches that of Leech-Wilkinson’s Torino J.II.9’s composer(s). Leech-Wilkinson completed his description of the Velut/Torino J.II.9 musician by noting the possibility that Velut might have died of the plague during one of two outbreaks that occurred in Cyprus (1419-20 and 1422), which could explain why his name does not appear in records. If Leech-Wilkinson’s claim that Torino J.II.9 was created “to order, and for a patron happy to buy by the meter as it were” is correct, it seems almost impossible that Velut would have been excluded from this gigantic production; especially since besides its obvious French connections, the Cypriot-French manuscript shows some Italian characteristics, and more particularly some Veneto links. Significantly, we know of Velut’s work exclusively from Veneto manuscripts.

As tantalizing as all these clues are, though, it is not so clear that Velut was the main musician behind Torino J.II.9. A colleague of Velut’s from Cambrai also followed
Charlotte de Bourbon to Nicosia: his name was Jean Hanelle. And considering the ambitious scale of Torino J.II.9, it seems unrealistic to consider the possibility that King Janus and Queen Charlotte would not have used as many musicians as they could for its production. This leads me to speculate that both Velut and Hanelle were employed; and as far as the supervision of its compilation, I am inclined to consider the following possibilities: either Hanelle rather than Velut was in charge all along, or perhaps both Velut and Hanelle supervised the compilation at different times. If in fact Velut did die of the plague, it appears logical that Hanelle would have inherited Velut’s position. The following section will discuss possible links between Hanelle and the Cypriot-French codex; in many ways, it will explain how (at least in my mind) Hanelle gained the position of musician/supervisor of Torino J.II.9.

Jean Hanelle

Excerpts from fifteenth century Savoyard court records—Archivio di Stato in Turin—which were published by Robert Bradley indicate the presence of a certain Hanelle, cantor Regis Chippra, at the court of Chambéry on August 16, 1434. The same musician resurfaces in the Archivio on November 16, 1436, this time logged as Hannelle, mestre de Chapelle du Roy de Chippres. Kügle speculates that this singer Jean Hanelle, whose name is found twice in the records of the court of Savoie (once as early as six months after Duke Louis I de Savoie’s wedding to Anne de Lusignan on February 7, 1434), is probably the same person as the Τζουαν Κανέλλε (Jean Kanelle, retainer of Charlotte de Bourbon) who, according to contemporaneous chronicler Leontios Makhairas, landed in Cyprus on August 25, 1411. This theory is supported
by Kügle, who notes that Makhairas’ Τζουαν Κανέλλε was almost certainly a musician, given how closely the name was recorded to that of Τζιλετ Βελιούτ (Gilet Velut) in the chronicler’s *Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus*. Kügle found additional support for this statement in the *Archives Départementales du Nord*, Lille, where both Hanelle and Velut are recorded as *petits vicaires* at the Cambrai Cathedral between June 24, 1410 and June 24, 1411. Indeed, not only does the idea of Τζουαν Κανέλλε being a musician make perfect sense, but Kügle’s claim that he may be the same person as the *cantor Regis Chippra/Hannelle, mestre de Chapelle du Roy de Chippres* recorded in the *Archivio di Stato* in Turin fits neatly with what we know of that slice of history.

The absence of Jean Hanelle’s name from European records between June 24, 1411 and August 16, 1434 (with the exception of an August 4, 1428 record at the Vatican that indicates that he lived in Cyprus) also coincides with Kügle’s hypothesis. Jean Hanelle/Κανέλλε could plausibly have joined the retinue of Queen Charlotte de Bourbon in 1411 and remained at her service in Cyprus until she passed away in 1422. Of course, we know of no record (besides Makhairas’s *Recital*) that would indicate that Hanelle was taken into Charlotte de Bourbon’s service in 1411. However, that does not prove that such a document never existed, or that every person at the retinue of a monarch always appeared on the record. It appears that after Charlotte’s death Hanelle may have stayed in Cyprus (or at least spent much time on the island) until the fall of 1433, at which point Τζουαν Κανέλλε—the *cantor Regis Chippra* recorded in the *Archivio di Stato* in Turin—most likely came to Savoie with Princess Anne de Lusignan (October 1433).

According to the Vatican’s records, Pope Martin V wrote a letter to Jean Hanelle on August 4, 1428, recommending him for the office of *scribendaria* at the Nicosia
cathedral. Importantly, the document indicates that Hanelle was based in Cyprus at the
time.\textsuperscript{275} I am inclined to speculate that a \textit{scribendaria} (scribe)—possibly Jean Hanelle—
was hired by King Janus I in order to supervise the production of a manuscript—Torino
J.II.9—that would speak of the greatness of the \textit{société courtoise} that flourished at his
court in Nicosia (in spite of all the misfortunes that plagued his kingdom, or perhaps even
to conceal their extent). King Janus, who had been taken hostage by the Mameluks in
July 1426 (in the battle of Khirokitia, Cyprus), was liberated in May 1427. Back at the
court of Nicosia (which had been pillaged and burned by the Mameluks during the 1426
war), he must have been acutely aware of the precariousness of his kingdom’s existence.
Meanwhile, he was faced with the responsibility of finding a suitable husband for his
daughter Anne and rebuilding his kingdom for his son Jean who would succeed him on
the Cypriot throne. Pope Martin V’s letter (recommending Hanelle for the \textit{scribendaria}
position) was written approximately ten months after King Janus’ release. The timing
seems right. The compilation of a luxurious collection of Cypriot-French repertory
would have been a logical first step in restoring the prestige of the Lusignan house. And
if some of the original repositories of the Lusignan’s music collection were lost or
severely damaged when the Mameluk army razed Nicosia in 1427, it would have been
imperative for someone who had that music stored in their memory to copy it in order to
save all of that wealth from oblivion. This could explain (in part) Kügle’s view that “the
repertorial analysis of the manuscript suggests that the book may well have been copied
retrospectively.”\textsuperscript{276} The idea of saving one’s musical heritage when one is faced with
rebuilding a kingdom might seem exaggerated, but as pointed out by Fragalà Data, in
King Janus’ time, manuscripts and illuminated codices were in the category of luxury
goods that formed the State Treasure, “the so-called ‘monetary reserve’ for times of financial crisis, which the princes willingly offered in pawn when the necessity arose.”

From that perspective, for King Janus, not only would the creation of Torino J.II.9 have fulfilled artistic and political needs: it would also have meant putting money in the bank. With this much at stake, Jean Hanelle would not only have been a candidate of choice (possibly the candidate of choice if indeed Velut died of the plague during the 1419-20 or 1422 outbreaks) for the task; he would most likely have been a key person in reviving the kingdom of Cyprus.

More elements suggest that Jean Hanelle might have supervised the compilation of Torino J.II.9. For one, some evidence suggests that the cantus firmus mass cycle inserted at the end of the fourth fascicule was added subsequently to Torino J.II.9’s initial period of production and appears to have been copied by a Savoyard hand (external to the original team of scribes). If we assume that Charlotte de Bourbon’s Τζουαν Κανέλλε is the same person as the cantor Regis Chippra / Hannelle, mestre de Chapelle du Roy de Chippres recorded in the Archivio di Stato in Turin, it seems logical that Hanelle would have approved the addition of this work once he was in Savoie—thus the Savoyard characteristics of the script. Indeed, the composition of this work may even have been a part of his responsibilities, since Du Fay’s absence from the Duchy of Savoie corresponds to the time when Hanelle is recorded in the Archivio di Stato.

Did the grandiose performance of the Burgundian Chapelle at the wedding ceremony of Anne de Lusignan and Louis de Savoie possibly inspire Hanelle, or another Cypriot musician, to compose this mass?
There is still much to be discovered about the identity of Torino J.II.9’s supervisor/musician. Until more knowledge is revealed, we can only speculate. Meanwhile, even if we do not know exactly how Jean Hanelle fits into the picture, it appears that he is likely to represent a very important piece of the Torino J.II.9 puzzle.
CHAPTER IV

THE MANUSCRIPT AND ITS MILIEU: CONTEXT AND ELABORATION

Introduction

Now that a broad outline has been established, we have the luxury of exploring some key issues which, had they been discussed in the previous chapters, would have hindered the process of establishing a general view. This chapter will examine the patron-artist relationship of King Pierre I de Lusignan and Maistre Guillaume de Machaut, the musical scene at the court of King Janus I de Lusignan and Charlotte de Bourbon, the marriage of Anne de Lusignan and Louis de Savoie, and the potential influences of Duke Amédée VIII de Savoie and Guillaume Du Fay on Torino J.II.9.

King Pierre I de Lusignan and Maistre Guillaume de Machaut: a patron-artist relationship, followed by some examples of Machaut’s influence in Torino J.II.9

R. Barton Palmer proposed that King Pierre I de Lusignan may have commissioned Maistre Guillaume de Machaut to compose some works in his honor during his stay in Avignon in 1363 (see figure 4.2).282 We know of no record substantiating this hypothesis, but it is likely that this particular visit in Avignon afforded Pierre de Lusignan the occasion to acquire some pieces by the famous poet/musician, especially since Pierre’s 1363 sojourn at the court of Pope Urban V (Avignon, France—one of the
greatest centers of musical activity of his time) was marked by extraordinary events. Indeed, the King of Cyprus (also the titular King of Jerusalem) obtained the Pope’s full support for a crusade. He then officially took the cross. Moreover, King Jean II le Bon de France (the heir of crusader King St. Louis de Toulouse and patron of Guillaume de Machaut), who coincidentally was a guest in Avignon during Pierre’s visit, was bestowed with the honor of leading Pierre’s crusade. Surely, this was a time when the court of Pope Urban V must have been particularly festive. It appears logical to assume that Machaut (in the retinue of Jean II de France) was involved in a number of performances. From this perspective, it seems almost inevitable that Pierre I de Lusignan, now a crusader King, would have sought the opportunity to commission some works by Machaut—especially since, as noted by Claude Gauvard, compositions by Machaut were so admired among nobles that in his case, “the true client was less the poet than the prince.” There is no doubt that Pierre de Lusignan would have appreciated the value of such an acquisition: the excellence of the band of musicians that toured Europe with him confirms his remarkable sensibility to the political value of high-quality artistic patronage. Moreover, the acquisition of some pieces by Machaut would have been invaluable to the King of Cyprus, who was on the point of setting out on a promotional tour of the most important centers of Europe in order to assemble financial and military assistance for his crusade. From this perspective, it seems unlikely that the transaction did not occur. (Would that King Pierre had saved his receipt!)

There is another occasion at which Machaut and Pierre I de Lusignan are almost certain to have been in contact: at the coronation celebrations of King Charles V le Sage de France (son of King Jean le Bon), in Reims (May 1364). Again, Machaut, who had
made Reims his home since 1340, must have been involved in a number of performances. And given the importance of this particular one, it seems safe to presume that Pierre de Lusignan, among Charles V’s entourage, would have been in attendance. Immediately after assisting Charles V’s coronation festivities in Reims, King Pierre spent nearly a month in Paris. As observed by Palmer, these two visits to the King of France amount to enough time for Pierre de Lusignan and Guillaume de Machaut to have developed a fairly close acquaintance. Indeed, a significant number of scholars believe that two of Machaut’s poems—Le Dit de Marguerite and the Complainte, Mon Cuer, M’Amour, Ma Dame Souveraine—were composed for King Pierre around the time of his stay in Paris. Palmer proposes that Le Dit de Marguerite (The Tale of the Daisy) was written to commemorate the romance between Pierre and a French lady named Marguerite, while Edbury speculates that both poems may have been composed in order to help the King of Cyprus to obtain the support of Marguerite de Flandres (wife of Duke Philippe le Hardi de Bourgogne) for his crusade.

Figure 4.1 Pierre I de Lusignan and his Lady. Miniature from the codex Le Dit de la Marguerite by Guillaume de Machaut (Reims, France, 14th century).
In codex MS BN fr. 1584 (the most authoritative of Machaut’s omnibus manuscripts), the illumination accompanying *Le Dit de Marguerite* depicts a man wearing a golden crown kneeling before a lady. Many scholars believe that Pierre de Lusignan is the ardent lover in the text and on the picture (see figure 4.1).²⁸⁸

Pursuing his exploration of Pierre de Lusignan and Guillaume de Machaut’s patron-artist relationship, Palmer proposes that Machaut may have accompanied Pierre on his Eastern European tour (during the second half of 1364, following his visit to Paris).²⁸⁹ As pointed out by Palmer, Machaut’s account of King Pierre’s Eastern European tour in *La Prise d’Alixandre* is conspicuously more detailed than that of Pierre’s earlier part of his European expedition (France, Low Countries, and England). It may seem at first logical to attribute this characteristic to Machaut’s familiarity with that region.²⁹⁰ On the other hand, perhaps the remarkable detail exhibited by Machaut’s account of King Pierre’s Eastern European tour is a sign that, for that portion of *La Prise*, the poet got his information first hand.²⁹¹ In fact, Machaut’s close acquaintance with Eastern Europe together with his great fame would have made the poet/musician the perfect travel companion for King Pierre for the last segment of the promotional tour for his crusade. On a more personal level, Palmer notes that Pierre de Lusignan, who was possibly the best joust of his time, must have reminded Machaut of Jean l’Aveugle de Luxembourg, King of Bohemia (1296-1346), a former patron whom he had dearly loved.²⁹² Perhaps an affinity in character facilitated the development of some degree of friendship. Importantly, if Palmer’s hypothesis that Guillaume de Machaut and King Pierre I de Lusignan traveled Eastern Europe side by side is true (and it certainly seems plausible),
the relationship between the two men would have been closer than has generally been assumed.

Figure 4.2 Guillaume de Machaut. Miniature from the codex *Jugement du Roi de Behaigne; Remède de Fortune; Dit de l’Alerion; Dit du Vergier; Dit du Lion; Louange des Dames; Lais, Motets, Ballades, Rondeaux, Virelais* by Guillaume de Machaut (France, Paris, circa 1350-55).

Alejandro Enrique Planchart observes that the texts of the secular works and of eight of the motets (Motets 19, 35-41) of Torino J.II.9 reveal an acquaintance on the part of the composer with the work of Machaut and his contemporaries.²⁹³ Hoppin indirectly supports Planchart’s claim when he notes that Rondeau 42 of the Cypriot-French collection, *Amour me Tient en sa Douce Prison*, suggests a “possible relationship with Machaut.” He observes that the text of Rondeau 42 presents the same rhymes as an ostensibly very popular rondeau by Machaut *Tant Doucement me Sens Emprisonné* (albeit in reverse order), and emphasizes that this correlation is particularly meaningful because of the length (two and three syllables) of the rhymes and their interrelation (*prison* and –*prisoné*). He also points out that the texts use the same play on the words *enprisonné* and *en celle (ceste) prison né*. On these premises, Hoppin concludes that Machaut’s *Tant Doucement me Sens Emprisonné* and Torino J.II.9’s *Amour me Tient en*
sa Douce Prison could hardly have been conceived independently. In fact, he proposes
that the author of Rondeau 42 actually intended for that poem to be recognized as a
variation on a familiar model (see example 4.1).

Example 4.1 Comparison between the texts of Machaut’s Tant Doucement me
Sens Émprisonnés and Torino J.II.9’s Amour me Tient en sa Douce Prison.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tant Doucement me Sens Émprisonnés} & \quad \text{Amour me Tient en sa Douce Prison} \\
\text{Machaut (Ludwig and Shrade Nr. 9)} & \quad \text{Torino J.II.9, Rondeau 42 (Nr. 63)} \\
\text{Tant doucement me sens emprisonés} & \quad \text{Amour me tient en sa douce prison} \\
\text{Qu’onques amans n’ot si douce prison;} & \quad \text{Tres liement et [soef] emprisoné,} \\
\text{Jamais ne quier estre desprisonnés,} & \quad \text{Coume son tres obeissant prison,} \\
\text{Tant doucement me sens emprisonés} & \quad \text{Amour me tient en sa douce prison,} \\
\text{Car tous biens m’est en ceste prison néz} & \quad \text{D’u ne veuil point partir que moult prise on,} \\
\text{Que dame peut donner sans mesprison.} & \quad \text{Com ce je fusse en celle prison né.} \\
\text{Tant doucement me sens emprisonés} & \quad \text{Amour me tient en sa douce prison} \\
\text{Qu’onques amans n’ot si douce prison.} & \quad \text{Tres liement et [soef] emprisoné.}
\end{align*}
\]

Before proceeding to the next section, I would like to share two examples of what
Kügle terms “reverberations” of fourteenth century courtly repertoire. These examples
refer to textual allusions between Torino J.II.9’s Qui de Fortune Atende Asses Avoir
(Ballad 35) and Se l’Aîmant de sa Propre Nature (Ballad 84), and two works by
Guillaume de Machaut: a motet, Qui es Promesses/Ha Fortune, and a virelai, Plus Dure
que un Dyamant. These “reverberations” may not prove a direct link to Machaut but they
certainly indicate a close acquaintance with some of his works (see example 4.2).

Example 4.2 Comparison between the texts of Torino J.II.9’s Qui de Fortune Atende Asses Avoir and Machaut’s Qui es Promesses/Ha Fortune; and between Torino J.II.9’s Se l’Aîmant de sa Propre Nature and Machaut’s Plus Dure que un Dyamant by Kügle [Emphasis mine].

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Qui de Fortune Atende Asses Avoir} & \quad \text{Qui es Promesses/Ha Fortune} \\
\text{Torino J.II.9, Ballad 35} & \quad \text{Motet by Machaut} \\
\text{Qui de Fortune atende asses avoir} & \quad \text{Qui es promesses} \\
\text{Et de ses dons aulcunement se fie} & \quad \text{de Fortune se fie}
\end{align*}
\]
Music at the court of King Janus I de Lusignan and Charlotte de Bourbon

French musical culture at the court of Nicosia is believed to have reached its golden age during the reign of King Janus I de Lusignan (1398-1432). And it is almost certainly to the patronage of King Janus and his wife Charlotte that we owe the creation of Torino J.II.9, the sole repository of all we know of the music heard at the Lusignan court in Nicosia. Indeed, regardless of the many political and material difficulties encountered by the Lusignan kingdom at the turn of the fifteenth century, the repertory of the Cypriot-French codex evidences that the court of Nicosia was a flourishing center of *Ars Nova* and *Ars Subtilior*—so much so that F. Alberto Gallo believes that the avant-garde music cultivated at the Lusignan court is linked to the introduction of French polyphony at the court of Ferrara (Emilia-Romagna, Italy).

Gallo writes that “French music became familiar [at the court of Ferrara] subsequently to two journeys taken abroad by Nicolò III d’Este [Signor of Ferrara].” One of those two voyages was a pilgrimage to St. Antoine de Vienne in Dauphiné (France) during the summer and fall of 1414. The other journey, more relevant to the purpose of this study, was a pilgrimage to Jerusalem during the spring and summer of 1413, a trip that afforded Nicolò III the occasion to visit King Janus I de Lusignan in
Cyprus on his way back from the Holy city. During his stay at the court of Nicosia, Nicolò III was entertained with great honor: he was a guest at many musical events and was decorated with the Order of the Sword by King Janus. Gallo proposes that these musical events may be some of the first contacts that Nicolò III d’Este had with the *Ars Nova* and *Ars Subtilior*. Taking one additional step, I speculate that the Signor of Ferrara was almost certainly treated to some of the music collected in the Cypriot-French manuscript. Perhaps, as mentioned in chapter III (under “The origins of Torino J.II.9”), the Signor of Ferrara even heard *Doulceur refrener m’ire* (Ballad 11) during his visit of 1413. From this perspective, the possibility emerges that some of the music of Torino J.II.9 may have had a seminal role in the development of French polyphony in northeastern Italy.

Margaret Bent notes the possibility of another northeastern Italian connection, one with the Veneto region. To support her point, she emphasizes that trade and communications flourished between the Kingdom of Cyprus and Venice at the time when Torino J.II.9 was most likely conceived. She also notes that composer Gilet Velut, who is often suggested as the composer of all the ballads, virelais, rondeaux, possibly the motets, and some of the mass music preserved in the Cypriot-French collection, is known to us exclusively via manuscripts from the Veneto region. Significantly, both Hoppin and Kügле note similarities between Torino J.II.9’s *Aurora Vultu Pulcrior/Ave Virginum Flos et Vita* (Motet 4) and Velut’s *Benedicta Viscera/Ave Mater Gratie*. Bent remarks that while those findings may not provide enough of a basis to attribute Motet 4 from Torino J.II.9 to Velut, it appears that “the style of the generation of Velut, Cesaris and
Carmen must be close to the point at which ingredients of the Cyprus techniques, French and Italian, were borrowed and exported.”306

In his study of Torino J.II.9’s polyphonic mass movements, Francesco Facchin adopts a perspective similar to that of Bent: “the anonymous author on the Cypriot manuscript might be identified in those compositions, largely of French origin, which enjoy wide circulation in the Po Valley area of Northern Italy around the end of the Trecento and beginning of the Quattrocento.”307 I prefer his approach because it excludes the concept of Torino J.II.9 being the product of borrowed techniques that would have been applied in an artificial context:

The variety of motifs and stylistic reminiscences, the wide diffusion of the musical materials, and the graphic heterogeneity of scribal models all suggest that Torino J.II.9 belongs to a ‘borderland,’ ‘intermediate’ or ‘transit’ area in which many different elements could have come together in the evolution of new forms and manners.308

Facchin’s view allows the repertory of Torino J.II.9 to emerge as a Levantine expression of musical and cultural convergences from the dawn of the fifteenth century. It also leaves more room for the concept of interaction between its author(s) and the context in which he/she/they evolved.

Indeed, several cultural currents appear to have so strongly converged at the court of King Janus that I am inclined to suggest that the flow of ideas and knowledge must have been exceptionally rich. For one, the period of Janus’ reign coincides with an acceleration of the process of fusion of French and Greek cultures in Cyprus.309 Moreover, this was a time when the Lusignan House was connected to that of the Visconti via two marriages: the union between Janus and Héloïse Visconti (his first marriage) and that of King Pierre II (Janus’ cousin) and Valentina Visconti (Héloïse’s
sister). This strengthened both the relations between Nicosia and Venice and their alliance against Genoa. Although Nicosia’s connections to the Visconti House were not as strong as those with the Bourbon House, it appears that they may have afforded the musicians of the court of Cyprus some access to the cultural centers of the duchy of Milan. Against this background, Queen Charlotte and King Janus earnestly developed their *société courtoise* (which they wanted to present as more French than the French)—in a predominantly Greek-speaking environment—and entertained several noble pilgrims who brought their own share of influence to the mix.

A musical example (which I believe might be contemporaneous to King Janus and Queen Charlotte) that illustrates this rich cultural context is Torino J.II.9’s *O Adonay Domus Israel/Pictor Eterne Syderum* (Motet 24). The names of both St. Michel and the Archangel Raphaël are mentioned in its text. According to general belief, St. Michel’s role is to assist the dying and escort their souls to heaven. However, in medieval Cyprus, it appears that St. Michel had assumed the attributes of Thanatos (an evil demon who caused death), whom ordinary Cypriots identified with Charon. Expressions such as “the Archangel Michel is knocking at his door,” or “Michel is seeking him,” meant that someone was wrestling with death. Wiemes notes that the triplum of Motet 24 describes Michel and Raphaël as standing at the side of God, the Creator, and that throughout its entire text, praises to God alternate with pleas of the faithful to save humanity from the fires of hell. She proposes that this may be interpreted as a reference to the ancient Cypriot conception of St. Michel. As we know, Queen Charlotte died of the plague in 1422, and King Janus died in 1432 after a long illness following a stroke. Considering the two outbreaks of the plague (1419-20 and 1422) that affected Cyprus, this
isorhythmic motet (which displays both French and Italian characteristics) could plausibly have been composed while either Charlotte or Janus were wrestling with death, or perhaps created for a relative or a noble who died during one of the two outbreaks of the Black Death. This is a tentative claim; however, I see nothing that makes it impossible.

This section will conclude with two musical examples that were possibly performed at Nicosia at the dawn of Queen Charlotte and King Janus’ société courtoise: Bien Ha Choisi Mon Euil Quant Vous Amay (Virelai 11) and Bien Soit Venu le Mois Tres Gracieus (Rondeau 19). Perkins notes that Virelai 11 uses “B” as the initial letter for each of its sixteen verses and that the song is “a joyful louange for the lady whom the poet has vowed to serve,” a noble lady who, according to the text, is beautiful, courteous, cheerful and fresh (like the month of May).312 Perkins describes Rondeau 19 as a lyrical greeting for the month of May which also uses “B” systematically as an initial letter, this time for fourteen of its sixteen verses. Perkins observes that the “B” might be a subtle reference to the name “Bourbon” and proposes that the two songs (with their “B” signature) might have been composed to honor the newly arrived Charlotte de Bourbon.313 If this is true, one may imagine the emotion felt by the young French princess when she set foot on Cyprus.

The Marriage of Anne de Lusignan and Louis I de Savoie

On February 7, 1434, Anne de Lusignan and Louis de Savoie celebrated their wedding ceremony at the newly-erected Sainte Chapelle in Chambéry, the capital of
Anne and Louis’ union was the first significant alliance to occur at the House of Savoie since Duke Amédée VIII (Louis’ father) had assumed control of “the crucial area covering the main Alpine crossings between France and Italy as well as the cities of Lausanne, Geneva, Nice, Turin, and Chambéry.”\textsuperscript{316} The cream of Europe was at the ceremony and, as evidenced by chronicler Jean Le Fèvre de Saint-Rémy, the wedding celebration was absolutely magnificent.\textsuperscript{317}
Indeed, it appears that this nuptial mass and the following four days of festivities were an extravagant musical display of politics. Duke Philippe III le Bon de Bourgogne had brought along a most extraordinary retinue that included no less than the entire Burgundian Chapelle (see figure 4.4).
In view of Amédée VIII de Savoie’s relatively recent titular promotion from count to duke (granted in 1416 by Holy Roman Emperor Sigismond), Duke Philippe’s effort to make an impression could hardly have come unexpectedly—and it substantiates Fallows’ interpretation of Emperor Sigismond’s decision to raise the county of Savoie to the rank of duchy, which he views as an “attempt to acknowledge and establish a power in the south of France comparable with that of the Duke of Burgundy in the north” (see figure 4.5).  

![Gold ducat from Savoie portraying St. Maurice giving a standard to Duke Amédée VIII.](image)

Taking Fallows’ perspective into consideration, and given the fine artistic reputation of the court of Bourgogne, it is reasonable to assume that Amédée VIII must have felt tremendous pressure not to let his distinguished northern visitor eclipse the house of Savoie from the moment he learned about Philippe de Bourgogne’s intention of bringing along such an entourage. In this light, the celebrations of Anne and Louis’ wedding emerge as an ideal arena for the establishment of a new equilibrium between the two
medieval superpowers, hence the need felt by Philippe de Bourgogne and Amédée de Savoie to display the full extent of their respective political and economic strength, which translated into an extravaganza of *culture courtoise*.

Amédée’s answer to Philippe’s challenge was to appoint a new *Maistre de chapelle*—no lesser a figure than Guillaume Du Fay—on February 1, 1434, just six days before Anne and Louis’ wedding ceremony. At the time, Du Fay’s curriculum vitae consisted of five years of service at the court of Popes Martin V and Eugenius IV in Rome. It also included an impressive record of distinguished commissions in an extraordinary range of compositional styles. Clearly, the new Savoyard *Maistre de chapelle* was a superstar, and thus the Duke Amédée’s best possible pick. What survives on records indicates that Chambéry was a flourishing musical center prior to Du Fay entering the picture. Indeed, both Marie de Bourgogne and her husband Amédée VIII de Savoie had already been renowned music patrons for several years before his appointment in Savoie. Still, there is no doubt that the brilliant appointment of Du Fay to the Savoyard *Chapelle* increased the quality of musical culture at the court of Amédée VIII, and, as a result, its prestige.

It is almost certain that Guillaume Du Fay and Gilles Binchois—respectively the leading musicians of the courts of Savoie and Bourgogne—made their first acquaintance in Savoie during the festivities of Anne and Louis’ wedding. A 1451 copy (prepared at Arras, the capital of Pas-de-Calais and the historic capital of Artois, France) of the allegoric novel *Le Champion des Dames* by Martin le Franc (a famous French poet and secretary of Amédée VIII de Savoie) displays a miniature of the two musicians carrying on a conversation (see figure 4.6).
In the fourth volume of his *Champion des Dames*, Le Franc gives an account of Du Fay and Binchois listening to two blind minstrels at the service of Duchess Isabel de Bourgogne—almost certainly Jehan Ferrandez and Jehan de Cordoval—with a noticeable mixture of admiration and envy.  

Tu as les avugles ouy  
Jouer a la court de Bourgogne,  
N’as pas certainement ouy  
Fust il jamais telle besongne:  
J’ay veu Binchois avoir vergongne  
Et soy taire emprez rebelle  
Et Dufay despite et frongne  
Qu’il n’a melodie si belle.

(You have heard the blind  
Play at the court of Burgundy,  
For sure it was never heard  
That such nice work ever existed  
I saw Binchois feeling shame  
And stay quiet, over-attentive, exhibiting anger  
And Du Fay disappointed and frowning  
That he does not have such a beautiful melody.)
This account by Le Franc allows us to glimpse at the interface between two medieval musical trends, one practiced by northern composers based on complex compositional techniques and notated, and another, generally more simple and based on improvisation, which was cultivated mostly in Italy and was not notated until the 1480’s. It is an excellent reminder that the notated medieval music familiar to us through surviving manuscripts represents only a small fraction of its contemporary musical universe. The fact that the minstrels were brought from Bourgogne for an occasion so important that Duke Philippe had deemed it necessary to bring his entire Chapelle musicale, and that musicians of the stature of Du Fay and Binchois were this impressed with their performance, speaks for itself; it begs for scholars to adjust their perspective from the customary (and comforting) notation-based (so-called objective) approach. Nino Pirrotta has a cogent point: “the fact that we have little hope of reconstructing what music existed beyond it [written music] is no justification for ignoring the gap that exists in our knowledge.”

The efforts deployed by the rival duchies of Savoie and Bourgogne are eloquent, and the intensity of this north/south political contest enhances our grasp of the importance of the union of Anne de Lusignan and Louis I de Savoie. Indeed, a union of secondary importance would not have been the stage of such demonstrations, and certainly Duke Amédée would not have concluded an alliance with a second-rate kingdom: there was too much at stake. From this perspective, and considering the time and effort that were invested by both sides in the making of this union, it is reasonable to assume that both Duke Amédée VIII and King Janus I de Lusignan were absolutely au fait of the magnitude of the political potential in this alliance. From the Lusignan kingdom’s
perspective, there is no doubt that striking a marriage deal with the House of Savoie meant getting much-needed political support from the mainland. Support from such a strong family was almost certainly essential to the survival of the kingdom of Cyprus, which was then clearly in jeopardy. Indeed, during King Janus I’s reign, Famagusta (the most prosperous Cypriot port) was controlled by the Genoese, and to make matters worse, the King of Cyprus had become a vassal of the Egyptian Sultan since Janus I’s liberation in May 1427 (Janus had been captured by the Mameluks at the battle of Khirokitia in July 1426). Meanwhile, on the Savoyard side, it appears that Duke Amédée VIII (perhaps influenced by his grandmother Bonne de Bourbon) had developed an active interest in extending his power to the Levant for several years before his son Louis married Anne de Lusignan (possibly since Charlotte de Bourbon was married to King Janus in 1409, or even before). We know that in 1426 Amédée went so far as to send troops into Cyprus to support King Janus I, who was at war with Egypt—a gesture that some historians believe led King Janus to give his daughter Anne to the son of Amédée. Importantly, because of Anne and Louis’ union (combined with a set of fortunate circumstances), the title-hungry dukes of Savoie would eventually inherit the rights to the throne of Cyprus (see figure 4.7).

Evidence indicates a marked convergence of political interests between the Houses of Savoie and of Lusignan during the third and fourth decades of the fifteenth century. This political affinity is verified in Anne de Lusignan’s biographies and those of Cardinals Hugues and Lancelot de Lusignan (respectively Anne’s uncle and cousin). Moreover, as noted by Kügle, it appears significant that during this period, both Lusignan Cardinals joined the council of Basle and supported the papacy of Duke Amédée VIII
(antipope Felix V, elected in 1439) and that the enabling event for this was Anne and Louis’ wedding. 333

Figure 4.7 The will in which Queen Charlotte de Lusignan (1458-60) cedes her rights to the throne of Cyprus to the Dukes of Savoie.

While Anne and Louis’ union advanced the Savoyard expansionist policies effectively (as well as it served the Lusignan kingdom), it also appears to agree with Amédée VIII de Savoie’s characteristic cultural policy of arranging marital unions within a network of renowned patrons of the arts. 334 As evidenced by contemporaneous records, the artistic renown of the court of Nicosia in Europe predates King Janus I de Lusignan and Charlotte de Bourbon’s efforts to develop French musical culture in Cyprus. For example, we know that during a three-year tour (1363-65) of the most important centers
of Europe (in order to assemble financial and military assistance for his crusade), the
musicians in the retinue of King Pierre I de Lusignan raised great enthusiasm, so much
that King Charles V le Sage de France recompensed the Cypriot band with a bursary of
eighty francs in gold for their services during Pierre’s stay in Paris in 1364. Rooted in
an obviously rich Frankish tradition, culture courtoise at Nicosia is believed to have
reached its halcyon days during the reign of King Janus I and his wife Charlotte.
Substantiating this widely accepted claim, Khabil Dhabeir, the chronicler of Mameluk
Sultan Al-Malik al-Ashraf Barsbay, recorded his patron’s impressions following a visit to
the court of Nicosia: “The palace was richly furnished with costly beds and with
particularly tasteful and expensive furniture. [...] However, what my master admired
most was a large organ that produced the most wonderful tones whenever its keys were
pressed....” Meanwhile, if the cultural life of the itinerant court of Savoie never
received the level of artistic recognition enjoyed by the court of Bourgogne, the
patronage practiced by Amédée VIII and his successors during the fifteenth century is
known to have been the source of a distinguished microcosm of the best European
artists. One can hardly help speculating that the court of Nicosia must have been a
distinguished (or at least particularly promising) cultural center—and known as such—to
have attracted the attention of the culturally inclined Amédée VIII when the time came to
find a suitable wife for his first-born son (Anne was originally promised to Louis’ brother
Amédée). It seems unlikely that the Duke of Savoie would have concluded this crucial
alliance outside of the network of high profile patrons of the arts.

Kügle observes that the creation of the Cypriot-French manuscript appears to serve
“both Lusignan political objectives, and Savoyard tastes.” He notes that “the internal
structure of the codex belies [sic] a program that suggests not only that the compilation was intended to take stock of most, if not all the Lusignan repertory, but also that the volume was shaped by an edifying and/or admonitory agenda.339 Surely, the creation of Torino J.II.9 would have boosted the prestige and influence of the Lusignan Dynasty in Savoie. And considering that Du Fay was the Maistre de chapelle at Chambéry at the time, Anne could hardly have come to Savoie without such a manuscript in her dowry (and a retinue of sixty that almost certainly included the remarkable Jean Hanelle, and possibly the singer Jehan Augustin dit du Passaige).340 After all, she was the worthy daughter of Charlotte de Bourbon and Janus I de Lusignan. At the same time, as noted by Kügle, the particularly handsome Torino J.II.9—with its “edifying and/or admonitory agenda”—seems almost tailored to please Duke Amédée VIII de Savoie (Anne’s father-in-law), a most pious man and passionate bibliophile with a predilection for luxurious manuscripts with devotional contents.341

Significantly, the arrival of Anne de Lusignan and her Cypriot retinue at Chambéry (the capital of Savoie) in 1434 coincides neatly with a period when the Grande Chapelle of the Savoyard court entered what Robert Bradley described as a formative stage.342 Kügle remarks that “it may be wise not to underestimate the catalytic role played by Anne in this display of patronage [development of the Grande Chapelle]”343 He notes that “one of the fringe benefits of compiling Torino J.II.9 may [...] have been to generate a large amount of quickly accessible repertory for the Savoyard court chapel while a trusted musician [Jean Hanelle] to supervise its performance was at hand.”344 Significantly, Guillaume Dufay, who had been appointed Maistre de Chapelle by Duke Amédée VIII (seemingly just in time for Anne and Louis’ wedding) was absent from the
duchy from August 1434 until an unspecified date in 1437. Meanwhile, Jean Hanelle, who ostensibly came to Savoie as Anne’s retainer, appears in the Savoyard records on August 16, 1434, on February 7, 1434, and on November 16, 1436. Clearly, the presence of the cantor Regis Chippra [Jean Hanelle] in Savoie was very timely. Was Hanelle in charge of the Savoyard Chapelle during Du Fay’s absence (see figure 4.8)? If so, the effect of Anne de Lusignan’s arrival in Savoie appears not unlike that of her mother, Charlotte de Bourbon in Cyprus.

In fact, it appears that the period of Anne’s arrival in Chambéry may have left its mark in Torino J.II.9. Kügle proposes that the cantus firmus mass, which was added at the end of the fourth fascicule (folios 139v-141v) of Torino J.II.9 by what seems to be a Savoyard hand, might have been inspired by the performance of the Chapelle of Bourgogne at Anne and Louis’ wedding ceremony. If this is true, the Cypriot-French codex contains a musical snapshot of the interface created by the venue of Anne and her musicians in Chambéry.

Figure 4.8 The Chapelle of the Dukes of Savoie singing at the Sainte Chapelle of the castle of Chambéry. Detail from an illumination from the codex Très Riches Heures du Duc de Berry (Chantilly, France, circa 1411-16).
Duke Amédée VIII de Savoie

Duke Amédée VIII *le Pacifique* de Savoie is remembered for his exceptional gift of diplomacy. Burgundian chronicler Olivier de la Marche describes Amédée as one who governed “so wisely [...] that he was the richest and the most successful among his neighbors.” Amédée *le Pacifique* was born in Chambéry (Savoie’s capital) in 1383 to Bonne de Berry (the daughter of Duke Jean *le Magnifique* de Berry and a niece of King Charles V de France, she was referred to as *Madame la Jeune*) and Count Amédée VII *le Rouge* de Savoie (the son of Amédée VI *le Vert* de Savoie and Bonne de Bourbon). Succeeding his father at the tender age of eight, Amédée was placed under the regency of his grandmother Bonne de Bourbon until 1393. That same year, he and Marie de Bourgogne were married. In 1416, Amédée VIII became the first duke of Savoie when his county was elevated to the rank of duchy by Holy Roman Emperor Sigismond de Luxembourg. On November 7, 1434, Amédée entrusted his son Louis I with the lieutenancy of the duchy, founded the chivalric Order of St. Maurice, and retired with a small group of nobles to Château Ripaille where he lead a quasi-monastic life (although he was still much involved in the politics of the duchy). Amédée was elected antipope on November 15, 1439 by the council of Basle; he reluctantly accepted the position, chose the name Felix V and moved to Basle. In 1449, Amédée gave up his papacy, made peace with the Roman Pope Nicholas V and returned to Ripaille (see figure 4.9).

A worthy descendant of a lineage of renowned patrons of the arts, Amédée VIII is remembered as a particularly generous benefactor, a fine amateur of arts, music, and above all, a most passionate bibliophile. The Savoie family library was already a
noteworthy collection at the time it was passed on to Amédée. For instance, Amédée inherited part of Duke Jean of Berry’s (Amédée’s maternal great-grandfather) magnificent library.\(^{352}\) Amédée subsequently built extensively on this already superb heritage, earning the reputation of the true architect of the magnificent collection of illuminated manuscripts, which through the centuries has remained a symbol of pride of the House of Savoie.\(^{353}\) By the time Amédée VIII’s title was raised to that of duke (1416), the Savoyard book collection was unrivaled except, perhaps, by those of France and Bourgogne.\(^{354}\)

David Fallows notes that “it is one of the ironies of cultural history that many of the great and discriminating patrons are recorded by political commentators as weak or ineffectual.”\(^{355}\) Amédée VIII, for instance, is often depicted as “a colourful man who in 1434 irresponsibly abandoned his duties as duke to retire to a small monastic community on the edge of Lake Geneva where he later contrived to be elected one of the least successful antipopes.”\(^{356}\) Nevertheless, historical preconceptions notwithstanding, the evidence speaks clearly: Amédée VIII greatly enhanced the geopolitical value of his duchy, managing to gain full control over the main *Porte des Alpes* (the primary Alpine crossings between France and Italy), annexing the Genevois in 1401 and the Piémont in 1418.\(^{357}\) Amédée also extended his influence in the Levant, adding three titles—King of Cyprus, Jerusalem, and Armenia—to the House of Savoie, when he struck a deal with the King of Cyprus and married his son Louis to Princess Anne de Lusignan.\(^{358}\)

Against this background, it appears that Amédée VIII de Savoie may have had a more influential role on the creation of Torino J.II.9 than first meets the eye. That he cared enough about the kingdom of Cyprus to send troops to the island (1426) and
support King Janus I who was at war with Egypt caught my attention. In fact, it appears that Amédée had proven to be such a great ally to the King of Cyprus, especially during his captivity by the Mameluks (1426-27), that Janus I had agreed to marry his daughter Anne to Amédée’s son. Back to the issue of the compilation of Torino J.II.9, the Vatican’s records indicate that Pope Martin V wrote to Jean Hanelle on August 4, 1428, recommending him for the office of scribendaria at the Nicosia cathedral. As discussed in the previous chapter (under “Jean Hanelle”), the Archivio di Stato in Turin indicates the presence in Chambéry of a certain Hanelle cantor Regis Chippra, on August 16, 1434, and the same name resurfaces in the Archivio on November 16, 1436, this time as Hannelle, mestre de Chapelle du Roy de Chipres. Given the course of recorded employment of Hanelle, and considering that Janus I (and after 1432, his son Jean II) was a financially ruined King during that period, I entertain the suspicion that Amédée VIII might have (directly or indirectly) contributed to finance Torino J.II.9’s creation, or at least its completion. Indeed, perhaps the production of a codex that spoke of the greatness of the société courtoise that flourished at Nicosia suited his ambition to extend his power to the kingdom of Cyprus. It seems logical to assume that Amédée was aware of just how precarious the position of the kingdom of Cyprus was, especially after the 1426-27 war with Egypt. Meanwhile, perhaps his desire to extend his duchy’s power had become so intense that helping King Janus to boost his kingdom’s image became a priority. From this perspective, one advantage (among others) of compiling Torino J.II.9 might have been to act as a musical smoke screen to the kingdom of Cyprus’ difficult situation, especially since it seems that Duke Amédée had long term plans for Nicosia. Indeed, Queen Charlotte de Lusignan ended up ceding her rights to the throne of Cyprus.
to the Dukes of Savoie (1458-60). However far-fetched this view may appear, it does not contradict what we know of Torino J.II.9.

Figure 4.9   Peace between Nicholas V and Felix V. Miniature from the codex *Vigiles de Charles VII* by Martial d’Auvergne (Paris, 1484).

Guillaume Du Fay

In 1433, Duke Amédée VIII de Savoie offered Guillaume Du Fay the leadership of his *Chapelle musicale* in Chambéry. Du Fay, who was then in the service of Pope Eugenius IV, must have welcomed Amédée’s invitation with great relief, as it came during a period when Rome’s political climate was extremely volatile.\(^\text{361}\) Moreover, since the council of Basel (1431) had severely depleted Pope Eugenius’ coffers, his *Chapelle* was in crisis by the time Machaut obtained his leave of absence (1433). We know that Guillaume left Rome by August 1433. However, there is no known trace of his whereabouts until his name resurfaces in Savoyard records as *Maistre de chapelle* on February 1, 1434.\(^\text{362}\) It is almost certain that the composer reached Chambéry sometime
before this February 1 entry since the festivities of Louis de Savoie and Anne de Lusignan’s wedding began on February 7 (only a week later).  

None of Du Fay’s compositions can be dated from the period of his first stay at the court of Savoie (the first half of 1434). At the same time, the thought of a newly-appointed Du Fay (Maistre de Chapelle at the court of the father of the groom) not having composed anything for the celebrations of Anne and Louis’ nuptials, or even the idea that no example of such works (provided they exist) would have been preserved does not seem logical. Providing some ground for speculation, Alejandro Enrique Planchart notes that “a number of works by Du Fay that are mentioned in 15th and 16th century records are no longer extant; [and that] others probably survive anonymously and are unidentifiable.” He also remarks that “his [Du Fay’s] music was copied and performed virtually everywhere that polyphony was practiced.”  

Traveling the byways of speculation, my attention was captured by Fallow’s description of composer Gilet Velut: “what Velut shows in his works is an endless fascination with technical problems and their solutions—a preoccupation that is often characteristic of Dufay’s work and seems lacking in most composers of the time.” As mentioned in chapter III, under “Gillet Velut,” Leech-Wilkinson notes that Fallow’s Velut brings to mind the composer of the Cypriot-French manuscript’s songs (possibly the motets, and even some of the mass music). Indeed, Fallow’s idea of Velut coincides neatly with Leech-Wilkinson’s hard-worked “very competent, inventive but not outstanding” possibly-Velut/Torino J.II.9 composer. Meanwhile, when I superimpose Fallow’s view of Velut, Leech-Wilkinson’s Torino J.II.9 musician, and the image I formed of a young Du Fay (nowhere to be found in records between August 1433 and
February 1434), leaving a precarious position in Rome and getting ready for a prestigious position in Savoie (beginning with a most important assignment: Anne de Lusignan and Louis de Savoie’s wedding), it appears reasonable to speculate that some of this “not outstanding” Torino J.II.9 music might be the creation of a young, overwhelmed, and pressed-for-time Du Fay. As noted by Planchart, was his work not copied and performed almost everywhere polyphony was cultivated? Providing some support for this idea, Margaret Bent writes:

In addition to features usually associated with French notation and motet technique, there are, in addition, strikingly numerous instances of the features I have identified as characterising the distinctive Italian motet style of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries [...] These features were much cultivated by Dufay and post-Ciconian composers from the north.  

If indeed at least some Torino J.II.9’s compilation occurred in Savoie, it seems reasonable to consider that Torino J.II.9—the creation of a transplanted society trying to be more French than the French, and one indirectly connected to Du Fay’s appointment as Maistre de Chapelle in Savoie—might include some examples of his music, veiled by anonymity.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

And from the time of her [Charlotte de Bourbon’s] coming the damage done by the locusts (began to) abate. And from that time much good befell Cyprus owing to the luck of the queen, a lady who brought good luck, as we have just said [Emphasis mine].

Leontios Makhairas

*Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus* (1458)

If we are to believe Leontios Makhairas, it appears that Charlotte de Bourbon had a most remarkable influence on Cypriot locusts (and of course, Cyprus), owing to her luck. Along with this luck, the French princess brought a retinue that included accomplished musicians to the court of Nicosia. Indeed, it seems that thanks to Τζιλετ Βελούτ and Τζουαν Κανέλλε (among others), much good befell Nicosia’s *culture courtoise*. Would Torino J.II.9 exist if Charlotte had not married King Janus? Six hundred years later, my thoughts are with Charlotte (and Janus). Driving down the Ohio Turnpike (from Toledo, eastbound to Akron) with a color facsimile of the codex Torino J.II.9 safely tucked on the back seat of my air-conditioned green Saturn (charmed by the sound of the Huelgas Ensemble playing Torino J.II.9 music [Sony Classical D128328]), I have become a guest at Nicosia.

The manuscript J.II.9 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino is an enigmatic artifact—and why should it be otherwise? It sings an epoch when Queens
were endowed with locust-chasing powers, and possessed the kind of luck that influenced the destiny of entire kingdoms (before dying of the plague). As this expedition into Torino J.II.9’s world is reaching its end, I stand in awe of the Queen Charlottes, of the men and women of Cyprus—of the intensity of their aspiration, the scale of their venture, and perhaps above all, their sheer vulnerability. I also marvel at their capacity to retain their ability to care and cultivate highly refined artistic sensibilities in the process of navigating exceedingly complex (and hostile) circumstances. Thanks to the people who shaped the musical scene at Nicosia, we have inherited a collection of musical pieces that put a beating heart in the bosom of some greater-than-life individuals whom we know via chronicles.

Once more, I glance at my Torino J.II.9 mosaic (so much “in-between” space and so few tiles) and my awareness is grabbed by an array of unresolved issues: origins, authorship, and patronage among others—a gap in knowledge that keeps questioning my every thought. Would there be a Torino J.II.9 had Charlotte not married King Janus? It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Charlotte could well be the foremost figure in terms of Torino J.II.9’s creation (or at least its repertory). At the same time it becomes obvious that this impression doesn’t ensue from there being so many “Charlotte” tiles in the mosaic; rather, it appears that Charlotte’s influence seems to affect so many of the tiles. And the study of these tiles reveals the interrelation between the Houses of Lusignan (Cyprus), Bourbon, and Savoie.

When tracing Charlotte throughout this study (textual references, Τζίλετ Βελιούτ and Τζουαν Κανέλλε, the exclusively French nature of the repertory, Charlotte’s excellent education [Ars Nova, Ars Subtilior], and other things of the sort), I believe,
from my exploration of Torino J.II.9, that the Lusignan-Bourbon-Savoie interrelation predates the manuscript by generations. Indeed, Charlotte’s great aunt, Marie de Bourbon, was married to Guy de Lusignan (the half brother of King Pierre I de Lusignan), and could have been Queen of Cyprus had Guy not died so young (Guy was the first-born son of King Hugues IV and his first wife Marie d’Ibelin). In fact, it might be worthwhile to investigate the possibility that some of the musicians at the retinue of King Pierre I de Lusignan may have originally come to Cyprus with Marie de Bourbon. One may also consider exploring the cultural interfacing (however brief) created by this union and its effect on Torino J.II.9. The historically unconsidered implications of Marie and Guy’s union also sheds a different and new light on Charlotte de Bourbon’s union with King Janus I de Lusignan. Indeed, from this perspective, it appears that Charlotte’s marriage to Janus may conceivably be interpreted as a second attempt by the House of Bourbon to extend its power to the kingdom of Cyprus (Jerusalem and Armenia).

This Lusignan-Bourbon-Savoie interrelation seems to have reached a full circle with Anne de Lusignan’s union with Duke Louis I de Savoie. Bonne de Bourbon, la Grande Comtesse de Savoie, was married to Count Amédée VI le Vert de Savoie (1355) in order to seal an agreement between the count and King Jean le Bon de France (treatise of Paris).371 She governed the County of Savoie in the capacity of regent for both her son Amédée VII le Rouge and her grandson Amédée VIII le Pacifique. In fact, it appears that she made sure not to share any of her power with her daughter-in-law, Bonne de Berry (mother of Amédée VIII, nicknamed la Jeune), and is known to have influenced her grandson Amédée VIII for years after her regency. Was Amédée VIII’s interest in Cyprus inspired by his grandmother? Regardless, the choice of Anne de Lusignan
(Charlotte de Bourbon’s daughter) as a suitable wife for the heir of the Savoie duchy appears as more than a just Lusignan-Savoie deal. Indeed, Anne, having been a descendant of the House of Bourbon, may have had more importance than meets the eye. After all, Bonne de Bourbon (Louis’ great-grandmother) was the cousin of Charlotte de Bourbon’s father and perhaps more importantly, the niece of Marie de Bourbon (wife of Guy de Lusignan).

Would there be a Torino J.II.9 had Charlotte not married King Janus? Possibly, but not this Torino J.II.9. I am glad that Charlotte married Janus, because even if there had been one, it probably would not have been more French than the real French manuscripts of late medieval polyphony, and because it means that King Philippe II Auguste de France got revenge on King Richard I Coeur de Lion for breaking their agreement.372

There is much more to be discovered before Torino J.II.9’s voice can be heard clearly. Meanwhile it might be wise to apply Okakura Kakuzo’s observation that “a vacuum is there for you to enter and fill up to the full measure of your aesthetic emotion.”373 And perhaps this late medieval voice that sings a French adventure in the Eastern Mediterranean sea simply ought to be experienced.
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Severis, 12.
26 Severis, 13.

27 Madden, 89; Richard, 224.


32 Coureas, 11.


34 “Cyprus under Richard I.”

35 Jonathan Phillips, 125.


37 David Miller, Brassey’s Book of the Crusades (Washington, D.C.: Brassey’s, 2001), 8, 53.

38 Miller, 48. The geographical partition into provinces and the hierarchy used by Hugues des Payens, the original Grand Master of the Knights Templars, were practically the same as that of the Assassins. Miller, 55. Assassin: [ML assassinus, fr. Ar hashshāshīn, pl. of hashshāsh one who smokes or chews hashish, fr. hashīsh hashish] one of a secret order of Muslims that at the time of the Crusades terrorized enemies by secret murder committed under the influence of hashish. Merriam-Webster’s, “Assassin.”

39 Miller, 52. Authentic Christian military orders had to be recognized by the Church and the State, and its members had to vow to an established code of discipline. Together with the Order of the Temple, those of the Knights Hospitalers and the Teutonic
Knights were the most distinguished authentic Christian military orders that emerged in the context of the crusade movement (11th-13th centuries). A scion from the Hospital of Saint-John (founded in Jerusalem prior to the First crusade), the Order of the Knights Hospitalers are believed to have assumed military functions from the mid-1130’s. The Order the Teutonic Knights originated in Acre, during the Third Crusade (1189-1192). It emerged from the transformation and fusion of the German hospital (founded in Acre during the Third Crusade) and the Order of St. Thomas of Acre (house of regular canons). Alan Forey, “The Military Orders,” in The Oxford History of the Crusades, 176-78.

40 Madden, 49.

41 Madden, 49. The four vows granted to Hugues des Payens and his companions by Patriarch Gormond of Jerusalem included three monastic vows: poverty, chastity and obedience; combined with a fourth vow to protect Christian pilgrims who traveled from the port of Jaffa to Jerusalem. Madden, 49.

42 Richard, 120.

43 Forey, 191; Madden, 50. During most of the Thirteenth century, the Temple monastery in Paris was the treasury of the French Kings and many nobles held regular accounts with the Templars. Forey, 192.

44 Miller, 55.

45 Forey, 207.

46 Miller, 55.

47 Richard, 224.

48 Madden, 90; Richard, 223.

49 Richard, 224.

50 Coureas, 11-12; Richard 224.

51 “Cyprus under Richard I.”

52 Wiemes, 55.

53 Coureas, 12; “Cyprus under Richard I.”
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the Court of Cyprus,” in The Cypriot-French Repertory of the Manuscript Torino J.II.9, 
45.

98 Wathey, 35-36. In 1402, Janus I unsuccessfully tried to recapture Famagusta from 
the Genoese. The Lusignan house did not recuperate Famagusta until 1466. Coureas, 
18-19.

99 Wathey, 35-36. Among many advantages brought by this marital union were the 
hope of heirs and the resolution of an old issue regarding the right of Louis II Duke of 
Bourbon to claim the throne of Cyprus. Wathey, 36-37.

100 Wathey, 35.

101 Kügle, “The Repertory,” 154; Wathey, 36. Antipope: one elected or claiming to 
be pope in opposition to the pope canonically chosen. Merriam-Webster’s, “Antipope.” 
Notwithstanding the simplified approach of this twenty-first century definition, it is 
important to keep in mind that to the schismatic popes’ contemporaries (who did not have 
the advantage of hindsight), it was very difficult to differentiate between the popes and 
the antipopes. Jean XIII (1410-15) was the successor of Alexander V (1409-10) who had 
been elected at the General Council of Pisa in an attempt to end the Great Schism. 
Gregory XII (Rome) and Benedict XIII (Avignon) were deposed as schismatics and as 
heretics. However, predictably, they opposed the authority of the Council and 
excommunicated Alexander V (Pisa). The Council did not bulge and the result was the 
addition of a third pope. Ellis L. Knox, “The Council of Pisa,” History of Western 

102 Coureas, 18-19.

103 Kügle, “The Repertory,” 73.


105 Coureas, 19; “The Reign of Janus.”


Fragalà Data, 83. Louis de Savoie was born in Geneva in 1413. Amédée VIII de Savoie was the son of Count Amédée VII le Rouge de Savoie and Bonne de Berry. Marie de Bourgogne was the daughter of Duke Philippe II le Hardi de Bourgogne and Marguerite III de Flandres.


Shortly after her arrival in Savoie, Anne de Lusignan rewarded her own people, mostly Cypriot nobles—recorded as “a court full of exploiters and adventurers”—with privileges and gifts. This contributed largely to Anne’s terrible reputation. Fragalà Data, 84.

Francesco Cognasso, *I Savoia* (Milano: Dall’Oglio, 1971), 275, quoted in Fragalà Data, 84. Born in 1405, Enea Silvio de Piccolomini was elected pope in 1458 as Pius II; he died in 1464.


Data, 70. The University of Turin dates back to 1404 (bull from Antipope Benedict XIII, followed by sanction by Emperor Sigismund). In 1427, it moved to Chieri and in 1434, in Savigliano. On October 6, 1436, Duke Louis de Savoie signed a decree for the university to definitively return to Turin. Data, “Anne of Cyprus,” 70.
Louis acquired the famous relic from Marguerite de Charny. It arrived in Savoie on March 22, 1453. The Shroud was housed at Chambéry (Franciscan Church, Sainte Chapelle, after 1467) until 1578, when Duke Emanuel Philibert de Savoie transferred it to Turin (where it is still preserved). Data, “Anne of Cyprus,” 70.


For a comprehensive description of Anne de Lusignan’s journey to Chambéry, see Data, 68.

Fragalà Data, 91.


Widaman, Wathey and Leech-Wilkinson, 96-97. Despite the destruction of Torino J.II.9’s inner margins during the fire of 1904, its gathering structure can be recreated with reasonable accuracy by paying attention to catchwords at the bottom of some pages and to interruptions in the hair side/flesh side sequence of pages. Both Besseler and Hoppin have reached the conclusion that the majority of the gatherings were quinternions (groups of five bifolia). Besseler, 211; Hoppin, vol. 1, iv.

Hoppin, vol. 1, i; Widaman, Wathey and Leech-Wilkinson, 95.


128 Hoppin, vol. 1, vi; Hoppin and Kügle. By challenging the collection’s general sense of unity, the distinct characteristics of the hand that copied this mass cycle (the form of the custos and the decoration of all final longs are found nowhere else in the manuscript), which appear to be Savoyard, point toward the probability that Torino J.II.9 found its way to the Savoyard court at a relatively early stage. Hoppin, vol. 1, vi; Hoppin and Kügle.

129 Hoppin, vol. 1, vi; Hoppin and Kügle; Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 97, 104.


131 Hoppin, Cypriot Plainchant of the Manuscript Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale J.II.9 (Stuttgart: American Institute of Musicology, 1968), 12; Kügle, “Some Notes,” 26. The front flyleaf of the manuscript was found among fragments of parchment which were dispersed during the blaze and remained to be identified. Angelo Giacarria, Manoscritti Danneggiati Nell’Incendio del 1904: Mostra di Recuperi e Restauri: Torino, Febbraio-Marzo, 1986, Quaderni Della Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino, ed. Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino (Torino: Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino, 1986), 62. On the recto of the flyleaf, there is an entry in Italian referring to the history of Cyprus and to the pontificate of Antipope Jean XXIII. The extract of the bull (verso) appears contemporary to the rest of the manuscript but the entry on the recto is copied in a Humanist cursive that indicates that it was added sometime at the end of the fifteenth century or during the sixteenth century. Kügle, “Some Notes,” 26.

132 Wathey, 36.

133 Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 96. Unlike the rest of the codex, the front flyleaf, on which Antipope Jean XXIII’s bull is copied, was not restored and thus is difficult to read. Fragalà Data, 91.

134 Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 98. The offset of a nineteenth-century library stamp (in pink) is visible on the recto of the flyleaf (and on fol. 158v). This indicates the previous existence of a preceding leaf (ostensibly destroyed in the fire), likely connected in a bifolium and possibly pasted to the binding. Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 98.
A historiated initial is a large letter containing a miniature that illustrates a text.


Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 106; Wiemes, 59.


Fragalà Data, 91.


The polyphonic portion of Torino J.II.9 comprises the \textit{liber motetorum} and the chansonnier sections (as described by Karl Kügle). It occupies four out of the five fascicules that compose the manuscript.

Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 96. A custos is the symbol placed at the end of the staff (or page) to indicate the first note of the next staff. It is found in musical sources from the eleventh century onward. It is the equivalent of the “catchword” in literary works. Richard Rastall, “Direct,” in \textit{Grove Music Online} (Accessed July 8 2004).

In fact, they consider that based on their findings, the compilation of Torino J.II.9 could be the work of as little as one musician (perhaps two, in succession) collaborating with two text scribes and one illuminator. Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 106.


Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 106.
After reading “Peintres et Ménétriers à la Cour de Savoie sous Amédée VIII (1391-1451): Salaires, statuts et entregent” by Guido Castelnuovo and Marie-Aude Deragne, I believe it worthwhile to raise the question of gender for at least some of the scribes or even composer(s)/music scribe(s) involved in the production of Torino J.II.9. Perhaps it seems unlikely for a medieval woman to be a composer, or a scribe (especially, in the case of a leadership position like that of composer/music-scribe/supervisor proposed by Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson). On the other hand, we are aware that some medieval women were in fact involved “in the sphere of their husbands.” I am inclined to believe that this is generally true of most medieval women, including professionals, whose work was rarely ever acknowledged as their own. For example, both Jean Bapteur and his wife worked as artists for Amédée VIII de Savoie and his son Louis I (husband of Anne de Lusignan). Jean appears on the record of the court by name while his wife was cited as “femme” de Jean Bapteur. I think that, by medieval standards, Jean Bapteur’s wife may have been rather privileged to be mentioned at all. Consequently, I am inclined to suggest that some of the Torino J.II.9 works which are labeled “anonymous” may not come from as masculine a hand as we previously assumed. Castelnuovo and Deragne, “Peintres et Ménétriers à la Cour de Savoie sous Amédée VIII (1391-1451): Salaires, statuts et entregent,” in Regards Croisés, ed. Nicoletta Guidobaldi (Paris: Minerve, 2002), 50.

Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 105-106. After reading “Peintres et Ménétriers à la Cour de Savoie sous Amédée VIII (1391-1451): Salaires, statuts et entregent” by Guido Castelnuovo and Marie-Aude Deragne, I believe it worthwhile to raise the question of gender for at least some of the scribes or even composer(s)/music scribe(s) involved in the production of Torino J.II.9. Perhaps it seems unlikely for a medieval woman to be a composer, or a scribe (especially, in the case of a leadership position like that of composer/music-scribe/supervisor proposed by Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson). On the other hand, we are aware that some medieval women were in fact involved “in the sphere of their husbands.” I am inclined to believe that this is generally true of most medieval women, including professionals, whose work was rarely ever acknowledged as their own. For example, both Jean Bapteur and his wife worked as artists for Amédée VIII de Savoie and his son Louis I (husband of Anne de Lusignan). Jean appears on the record of the court by name while his wife was cited as “femme” de Jean Bapteur. I think that, by medieval standards, Jean Bapteur’s wife may have been rather privileged to be mentioned at all. Consequently, I am inclined to suggest that some of the Torino J.II.9 works which are labeled “anonymous” may not come from as masculine a hand as we previously assumed. Castelnuovo and Deragne, “Peintres et Ménétriers à la Cour de Savoie sous Amédée VIII (1391-1451): Salaires, statuts et entregent,” in Regards Croisés, ed. Nicoletta Guidobaldi (Paris: Minerve, 2002), 50.

Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 105-106.


For additional details on this “round number” outline, see Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 107-108, 110.


Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 108. The copyist I identified as “one of the professional text scribes” is Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson’s “ABCE” scribe. For more details, see Widaman, Wathey, and Leech-Wilkinson, 103-108.

For more details on Torino J.II.9’s text and music scripts, see Kügle, “Some Notes,” 29-42.


Hoppin and Kügle.

Hoppin and Kügle; Kügle, 151.


Perkins, 437-38.

Perkins, 437.

Hoppin, vol. 3, x.

Kügle, “The Repertory,” 154; Wathey, 36. The leaf bearing the copy of this extract was originally believed to have been lost in the fire of the Manuscript Cabinet of Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria of Torino (January 1904). Fortunately, it was restored to the manuscript in 1984. The full text of Jean XXIII’s bull to King Janus is found in the *Rome, Archivio Segreto Vaticano*. Giulio Cattin, “The Texts of the Offices of Sts. Hylarion and Anne in the Cypriot Manuscript Torino J.II.9,” in *The Cypriot-French Repertory of the Manuscript Torino J.II.9*, 253; Wathey, 36.

Wimmer and Melzer, 368.

Wiemes, 58.


Cattin, 251.

Wiemes, 59.

John Mandeville, “The Travels of Sir John Mandeville,” translated by Project Gutenberg, *Project Gutenberg*, (Accessed June 2, 2005) <http://www.gutenberg.org>, chapter V. The issue of *The Travels*’ authorship remains unresolved. The text claims that Mandeville was an English knight from St. Albans (Hertfordshire). A number of scholars think that “Mandeville” is in fact a pseudonym adopted to cover literary borrowings. Some speculate that *The Travels* was written by Jean à la Barbe de


179 Anne is the daughter of King Janus I de Lusignan and Charlotte de Bourbon.


182 Cattin, 253.


184 Kügle, “The Repertory,” 175.

185 Kügle, “Some Notes,” 27.

186 Kügle, “The Repertory,” 160. This can be explained by Cyprus’ geographical isolation and perhaps in part by the plague epidemics that struck Cyprus between 1409 and 1422. Coureas, 18; Kügle, “The Repertory,” 160.


Kügle, “The Repertory,” 160. Kügle notes that of all the settings preserved in *Oxford, Bodleian Library, Cano. misc. 213* (probably copied in Venice during the 1430’s and 1440’s) and *Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, Q 15* (probably originally copied at Padua in 1420-1425, partly reconstructed and expanded in 1430-1435), the motets composed by Carmen, Cesàris, and Tapissier are by far the closest match with the Torino motets. Richard Hamm and Jerry Call: “Sources, MS: Renaissance Polyphony, 15th Century Sources from Northern Italy (and Southern Germany),” *Grove Music Online*, (Accessed January 21 2005); Kügle, “The Repertory,” 164.


The feast of St. John the Baptist originated from a pagan celebration of the summer solstice that was later Christianized by King Clovis I, Merovingian King of the Franks (485-511), and became a religious celebration of the birth of St. John the Baptist, precursor of Jesus. This religious festival was particularly important for the Catholics of France. The date of the feast of St. John the Baptist is June 24. “Holidays and Festivals: St. Jean Baptiste Day,” *Globalseek, North America*, (Accessed on July 7, 2004), <http://www.globalseek.net>.

Kügle, “The Repertory,” 166. After Charlotte’s arrival on Cyprus, seven years elapsed before the birth of her first child, Prince Jean de Lusignan.

Hoppin notes that the fact that the long melisma on Janum in the *duplum* accompanies the list of his titles in the *triplum* can hardly be a coincidence. Hoppin, vol. 2, ix. Wiemes mentions that in addition to Hoppin’s example, in both *Nate Regnantis Super Astra Patris/Maria Proles Regia* (Motet 6) and *Magni Patris Magna Mira/Ovent Cyprus Palestina* (Motet 17), references to King Janus’ name “can be considered as a final climax of the piece.” Wiemes, 64. This substantiates Besseler’s hypothesis that Torino J.II.9 was created at the court of King Janus I de Lusignan.


Aphrodite “Urania” is the goddess of spiritual love as opposed to Aphrodite “Pandemos,” the goddess of sexual union. Kügle, “The Repertory,” 166.

Wiemes, 66. The texts of the two motets refer to St. Catherine of Alexandria. This contradicts Hoppin’s information that Catherine was born in Cyprus. Hoppin, “The Cypriot-French Repertory,” 101; quoted in Wiemes, 67; Wiemes, 66-67.

The date 1421 was recorded by Camille Enlart, who was able to decipher a French inscription on the church in 1896. The inscription no longer exists. Wiemes, 66.

Wiemes, 66.


Kügle, “The Repertory,” 167. The admonitory settings Kügle refers to are Ballads 1-5, 7, 10-11, 13-14, 17, 19, and 20.

Hoppin, vol. 3, x. Hoppin also mentioned two ballads which are based on acrostics: Ballad 19, spelling the word JUSTICE in its first stanza, and Ballad 98 which is based on “Tota pulchra es Mater pia Virgo Maria.” Unfortunately, neither work discloses any information regarding its author or place of origin. Hoppin, vol. 3, x. The Cypriot Order of the Sword was founded in 1192 by Guy de Lusignan. One hundred and fifty years later, King Pierre I de Lusignan (1359-69) revived the old order of chivalry which survived until the Turkish invasion (1571).

Perkins, 439.


Hoppin, vol. 4, viii.

Perkins, 439.
Perkins, 439.

See page 36, figure 3.3.

Hoppin and Kügle; Kügle, “The Repertory,” 175-76.


Ursula Günther, “Some Polymetric Songs in the Manuscript Torino J.II.9,” in *The Cypriot-French Repertory of the Manuscript Torino J.II.9*, 484. The late middle ages French system of mensural notation can be summarized as follows. The four principal levels of note value, the long, the breve, semibreve and minim, were visually distinct. The relationships between these four levels of notes value were given names: *modus* (‘mode’ or ‘mood’) for the long-breve relationship, *Tempus* (‘time’) for the breve-semibreve, *prolatio* (‘prolation’) for semibreve-minim. Each of these relationships might be binary or ternary. The four combinations of *Tempus* and *prolatio* were attributed to Vitry as the “quatre prolacions.” Bent, “Polyphonic Mensural Notation, c 1260-1500, (iii) French 14th century Notation,” *Grove Music Online*, (Accessed July 8 2004).


Leech-Wilkinson, “Ars Antiqua,” 238-39. Unfortunately, this confusion was spread by several musicologists and performers whose errors in interpreting the notation resulted in “disharmonious” re-creations. Leech-Wilkinson noted that similar problems must have occurred when the music was first composed since the notation would have been mastered only by an elite group of musicians. Leech-Wilkinson, “Ars Antiqua,” 238-39.


David Fallows, “Ars Nova,” *Grove Music Online*, (Accessed July 8 2004). The concept of Ars Nova is based on the enormous new range of musical expression made
possible by the notational techniques explained in Philippe de Vitry’s treatise *Ars Nova* (c1322). Fallows, “Ars Nova.”

223 Nino Pirrotta, “Ars Nova e Stil Novo,” RIM, i (1966), 3-9; quoted in Fallows, “Ars Nova.” Pirrotta is referring to musical developments in France and Italy around 1320.


226 Meyer, and Trottier, 207.


228 Throughout the fifteenth century and for the first half of the sixteenth century, numerous musicians trained in *grandes maîtresses cathédrales* such as Cambrai, Tournai, Bruges and Liège migrated south to work for Italian nobility or for the Pope. Guidobaldi, 13.

229 See endnote 215.

230 Günther, 484.

231 Günther, 478-79. Pythagorean numbers are numbers which are divisible by 2 or 3. In the Torino J.II.9 codex, Greek expressions are used to indicate the following proportions: 4:3 (*epitrita*), 3:2 (*emyola*), and 2:1 (*dyapason*). Günther, 478-79.

232 Günther, 479.

233 Günther, 478.

234 Günther, 486-87.

235 Günther, 481; Perkins, 449.

236 Van Nevel, 10.
In Günther’s opinion, the only Ars Subtilior composer to have attempted similar accelerations was Hasprois (Johannes Symonis). The accelerations are found towards the end of two of his works: *Ma Doulce Amour* and *Puisque je Sui Fumeux*. Because of Hasprois’ use of syncopated rhythms and because of some interruptions in the melodic flow, the changes in Hasprois’ songs are less regular and less obvious than those in Torino J.II.9’s Virelai 17. Günther, 481.

Van Nevel, 9.


Perkins, 437.


J’ai Maintes Foi Oÿ Conter (Ballade 5), *En un Biau Vergier Mon Euil Ha Choisir* (Ballad 12), *Qui Cuide Amer Sans Loiaute Avoir* (Ballad 15), and *Je Ne Qui Pas Que Cil Ait Faint Corage* (Ballad 37). Hoppin, vol. 3, v-vi.


Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 404. Mensuration is a system of notation that was in use between about 1250 and 1600. It governed the metrical relationship between note values, in particular between the value of one note and that of the next smaller degree. “Mensuration.” *Grove Music Online*, (Accessed July 13 2004). For a definition of “tempus” and “prolation,” see endnote 215.

Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 406-407. Discarding the possibility that a team of musicians may have composed in this narrow a style, Leech-Wilkinson emphasizes that a patron possessing the musical skills necessary to communicate such strong and partial tastes to the musicians he employs is very unlikely to have cared for this kind of monotony. Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 406-407.

Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 406, 408. According to Leech-Wilkinson, such consistency cannot be found anywhere else in medieval music, not even within the works of one composer. Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 406, 408. Günther’s preferred example of Leech-Wilkinson’s varied repetitions of a melodic “skeleton” (“a good model for the sequential patterns mentioned by Leech-Wilkinson”) is a fourfold sequence stretching over twelve measures in Fortune faulce, a composition by Matheus de Sancto Johane found in both the manuscripts Ivrea and Chantilly. This does not render Leech-Wilkinson’s view impossible; however, it weakens it significantly. Günther, 472.


Leech-Wilkinson, 408-409.

Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 407-408. J’ai Maintes Foi Oÿ Conter (Ballad 5), En un Biau Vergier Mon Euil Ha Choisi (Ballad 12), Qui Cuide Amer Sans Loiauté Avoir (Ballad 15), and Je Ne Qui Pas Que Cil Ait Faint Corage (Ballad 37).

Perkins, 450.


Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 404, 426-29. The event was organized by the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Cyprus, Günther, University of Göttingen, and Finscher, University of Heidelberg, in collaboration with the Società Italiana di Musicologia and the Associazione Piemontese per la Ricerca delle Fonti Musicali.

For details, see Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 405. Leech-Wilkinson notes the possibility that Velut may have become acquainted to this “imitating chains of thirds” technique in Cyprus. He would have taken it home, developed it, and inspired others to use it. Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 405.

Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 405. Kügle mentions the possibility that Gilet Velut may have returned to Europe before Anne de Lusignan left Cyprus (1434). He notes that the survival of his works in Oxford 213, bologna Q 15 and Trent 87 may
indicate that he may have left Cyprus to enter the service of another patron. Kügle adds that otherwise, all his known works would have been composed before 1411. Kügle, “The repertory,” 173. I am inclined to speculate that Velut might have been an ambassador for the king of Cyprus and that his works do not necessarily need to have been composed before he left for Cyprus (1411).


261 Günther, 471.

262 Günther, 471. According to Günther, Torino J.II.9’s Moult Fort Me Plaist et d’Assés N’Ay Pas Cure (Ballad 3), if more complex than its model, could not have been composed without the knowledge of Inclite Flos by Matheus de Sancto Johane. De Sancto Johane was an influential Ars Subtilior composer. Stylistically, he belongs to the second generation of Ars Subtilior composers as described under “The Musician(s) of the Cypriot-French Repertory—practitioners of Ars Subtilior” in this chapter. Günther, 472; Josephson. The word “hocket” is a medieval term (13th-14th centuries) for a contrapuntal technique of manipulating silences as a precise mensural value. It can occur in one voice, or, most of the time, in two or more voices, “displaying the dovetailing of sounds and silences by means of the staggered arrangement of rests.” Ernest H. Sanders, “Hocket,” Grove Music Online, (Accessed June 14, 2005).

263 Günther, 472.

264 Perkins, 452. In medieval treatises the term “B fa” was used for the notational symbol of the round B (B “rotundum” or B “mollis”) or “fa” sign; this symbol was the forerunner of the modern flat sign. “B fa [Befa],” Grove Music Online, (Accessed June 13, 2005). In this case, “ambitus” means the range of scale degrees attributed to a given mode (e.g. Dorian, one octave). Harold S. Powers, Richard Sherr, and Frans Wiering, “Ambitus [cursus, processus, processo, medium, modulus],” Grove Music Online, (Accessed June 13, 2005). The term “plagal mode” refers to the four even-numbered modes of Gregorian chant (2, 4, 6 and 8). Each of these takes its name from its corresponding odd-numbered mode (or “authentic mode”), with the addition of the prefix “-hypo” (e.g. Hypodorian). The ambitus of a “plagal mode” is about a fourth lower than its corresponding “authentic mode” (Hucbald’s De harmonica (c. 880) definition: descends a fourth below its “final” and rises as high as a fifth above). Powers, “Plagal mode,” Grove Music Online, (Accessed June 13, 2005).

265 Leech-Wilkinson, “The Cyprus Songs,” 407. This description was formulated by Leech-Wilkinson in response to Günther’s presentation at the 1992 International Musicological Congress in Paphos (Cyprus).


Torino, Archivio di Stato, Inv. 16, 79, fol. 473v, published in Bradley, 535. At the time, the Rex Chippra (King of Cyprus) was Jean II de Lusignan (1432-1458), the son of Janus I de Lusignan and Charlotte de Bourbon.

Torino, Archivio di Stato, Inv. 16, 81, fol. 207v, published in Bradley, 535.

Kügle, “The Repertory,” 170. Upon Charlotte de Bourbon’s arrival in Cyprus (to marry King Janus I de Lusignan), Makhairas published an inventory of her retinue in his Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus. Makhairas, vol. 1, 627; quoted in Wathey, 34.

“...Τζουαν Κανέλλε [Jean Kanelle], τόν Τζάκο τε Παζέ [Jacques de Rase], και τόν Τζίλετ Βελιούτ [Gilet Velut]...” Makhairas, 627; quoted in Wathey, 34.


Fragalà Data, 81.

As mentioned earlier, Kügle suggests that Velut may have died of the plague during the 1419-20 or 1422 outbreaks. Kügle, “The Repertory,” 173.
Hoppin, vol. 1, vi; Hoppin and Kügle. This cantus firmus mass is copied immediately after the last ballad, starting at the bottom of folio 139v. By challenging the collection’s general sense of unity, the distinct characteristics of the hand that copied this mass cycle (the form of the custos and the decoration of all final longs are found nowhere else in the manuscript), which appear to be Savoyard, point toward the probability that Torino J.II.9 found its way to the Savoyard court at a relatively early stage. Hoppin, vol. 1, vi; Hoppin and Kügle.


Kügle notes that this cantus firmus mass may have been written by a musician influenced by Du Fay, Hanelle, or the Burgundian Chapelle. Kügle, “The Repertory,” 177.

Palmer, 9.

Palmer, 5.


Wulf Arlt, “Machaut [Machau, Machault], Guillaume de [Guillelmus de Machaudio],” Grove Music Online, (Accessed February 24 2005); Palmer, 8. Machaut’s biography and documentary evidence indicate that the poet took up the Reims Cathedral canonicate “per procuration” on January 30, 1137. On April 13, 1340, Machaut’s name appears on record, for the first time, as being present in Reims. Arlt.

Palmer, 8.

Edbury, Introduction to The Capture, 9.

Edbury, Introduction to The Capture, 9; Palmer, 8-9.

Edbury, Introduction to The Capture, 5; Palmer, 8.

As a young man, Guillaume de Machaut traveled extensively throughout Eastern Europe in the retinue of Jean l’Aveugle de Luxembourg, King of Bohemia (1296-1346). Palmer, 8. Documentary evidence and Machaut’s biography suggest that he was at the service of Jean de Luxembourg from around 1323. Arlt.

Planchart, Notes, 2. Motet 19, Certes mout fu de grant necessite/Nous Devons Tres Fort Aimer; Motet 35, Toustans Que Mon Esprit Mire/Qui Porroit Amer; Motet 36,
Coume le Serf a la Cler Fontaine/Lune Plainne d’Umilite; Motet 37, Pour ce que Point fu de la Amere Espine/A Toi Vierge me Represente; Motet 38, Par Grant Soif Cler Fontaine/Dame de Tout Pri; Motet 39, Mon Mal en Bien en Plaisir ma Doulour/Toustens je la Serviray; Motet 40, Amour Trestout Fort me Point/La Douce Art m’Estuet Aprendre; Motet 41, Se je di qu’en Elle Tire/Tres Fort m’Abrasa.

294 Hoppin, vol. 4, viii-ix.
295 Hoppin, vol. 4, xxv.
296 Hoppin, vol. 4, xxv.
298 Van Nevel, 8.
300 Gallo, 174-75.
301 This was recorded by an anonymous chronicler. Luigi Simeoni, ed., Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, XX/2, Bologna: Zanichelli, 1936, 51-52; quoted in Gallo, 174.
302 Campo, 132, 138; quoted in Gallo, 174. One of those musical events was a call to the Cypriot queens, Charlotte de Bourbon and her mother, Catherine de Vendôme. There was also the baptism of one of Sire Perino de France’s daughters (adviser of the King of France). Campo, 132, 138.
303 The text of the refrain of Par Doulceur refrener m’ire (Ballad 11) is: Pour leaulté maintenir, the motto of the Cypriot Order of the Sword.
308 Facchin, 336.
Coureas, 19. The war with Genoa (1373-74) and the Great Schism in the Catholic Church (1378-1417) are some of the events that accelerated this process. The war with Genoa caused political instability and economic hardship while the Great Schism split the Latin Church (Nicosia supported Avignon and Genoa, Rome), allowing the Orthodox Church to strengthen its position. Coureas, 19-22.

Wathey, 45.


Perkins, 445.

Perkins, 445.

Louis was the third child of Duke Amédée VIII de Savoie and Marie de Bourgogne.

Data, “Anne of Cyprus,” 70.

Fallows, Dufay, 37.

Dignitaries who were present for the wedding include: Duke Philippe de Bourgogne, René d’Anjou, Duke of Bar, and Louis’ sisters, Queen Marguerite de Sicile and Duchess Marie de Milan. Data, “Anne of Cyprus,” 70.

Jean Le Fèvre de Saint-Rémi, Chronique, edited by François Morand, vol. 2, 293. (Paris : Renouard, 1876-1881) ; quoted in Bouquet-Boyer, “Profil Européen et Musical de la Savoie au XVe Siècle,” in Regards Croisés, 20; my translation. I would like to point out that this description actually pertains to a performance by the Burgundian Chapelle. Le Fèvre de Saint-Rémi’s position as chronicler of the court of Bourgogne explains the emphasis on the Burgundian Chapelle rather than that of Savoie. Political allegiance notwithstanding, this excerpt from de Saint-Rémi’s chronicle allows us to appreciate the magnificence (and therefore importance) of Anne and Louis’ wedding ceremony. Fallows, Dufay, 41.

Fallows, Dufay, 37.

Fallows, Dufay, 37.

Fallows, Dufay, 37.

Fallows, Dufay, 40. This piece of information is based on a Savoyard payment record of March 1434. Savoyard records are somewhat unclear about the exact time of
arrival of Dufay’s in Savoie; however, it seems reasonable to presume that he arrived in Chambéry sometime in the early fall of 1433. Fallows, *Dufay*, 40.

323 Fallows, *Dufay*, 37.

324 Fallows, *Dufay*, 40.


326 Fallows, *Dufay*, 41. The name of Jehan Ferrandez and Jehan de Cordoval (two blind minstrels from Portugal) appear in Burgundian accounts of the year prior to Anne de Lusignan and Louis de Savoie’s wedding. The only time when Du Fay, Binchois, Martin le Franc, and the blind vielle players at the service of Duchess Isabel de Bourgogne (Isabel de Portugal) are known to have been present all at once for one event is during the festivities of the wedding of Anne de Lusignan and Louis de Savoie. There is a special payment recorded for their service. Of the music that Dufay must have composed for the event, no information survives. Fallows, *Dufay*, 41-42, 248-49; Alejandro Enrique Planchart, “Du Fay [Dufay; Du Fayt], Guillaume,” *Grove Music Online*; Mary Remnant “Fiddle: Feasts and Dancing,” *Grove Music Online*; Wright, Craig and Sean Gallagher, “Martin le Franc,” *Grove Music Online*.


328 Guidobaldi, 14.


332 Louis de Savoie, the second son of Anne de Lusignan and Duke Louis I de Savoie, married his cousin Charlotte de Lusignan, daughter of King Jean II de Lusignan (Anne’s brother). The agreement entailed that Louis (the son) would acquire the title of King of Cyprus as opposed to merely becoming a prince consort to Charlotte. It also stated that by virtue of the royal blood of his mother Anne de Lusignan, he would be the legal heir to the Cypriot throne if Charlotte was to pass away. On September 26, 1460, Jacques de Lusignan, brother of King Jean II took control of Nicosia which was delivered without a fight. Charlotte spent the next decade trying to recover her ancestors’ kingdom while her husband retired in Château Ripaille at Thonon in Savoie. Louis died before his wife, in April 1482. Charlotte finally willed her rights to the throne of Cyprus to the Dukes of Savoie on November 23, 1483 and the royal arms of Cyprus, Jerusalem and Armenia were added to the coat of arms of Savoie. Severis, 115, 118, 122, 124.

333 Kügle, “The Repertory,” 175.

334 Castelnuovo and Deragne, 35. Amédée VIII de Savoie was married to Marie de Bourgogne (daughter of Duke Jean Sans Peur de Bourgogne). His daughter Maria was married to Filippo Maria Visconti in Milan, and his sister Jeanne de Savoie to the Marquis Jean-Jacques Paléologue de Monferrat (Piémont). Both the courts of Bourgogne and Milan were major artistic centers and the court of Monferrat, if less renowned, had great artistic potential. Castelnuovo, and Deragne, 35.

335 Palmer, 22. In the spring of 1363, King Pierre I de Lusignan officially took the cross and set out on a tour of both Western and Eastern Europe in an effort to gather financial and military assistance. For two years, Pierre and his retinue enjoyed the continual honors of being received with magnificent feasts and tournaments in the most important centers of Europe. During that tour, he visited King Charles V Le Sage de France (1364), it is during that stay that King Charles rewarded King Pierre’s musicians. Palmer, 22.

336 Van Nevel, 8. A Mameluk Sultan of Caucasian descent, Barsbay ruled Egypt between 1422 and 1438. He became famous for his capture of Cyprus in 1426 and for forcing the Kings of Cyprus (and Jerusalem) to pay him tribute.

337 Arlettaz.

Kügle, “The Repertory,” 175.

According to the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, singer Jehan Augustin dit du Passaige was at the service of King Jean II de Lusignan on June 7, 1433. Du Passaige was at the service of King Charles VI de France until 1419. The same year, he also appears as chaplain of Duke Jean Sans Peur de Bourgogne. He was back at the service of the French Chapelle Royale in 1422. He subsequently worked for Pope Martin V in Rome from 1426 until 1430, at which point, it seems that du Passaige was sent to Nicosia. From 1436 until 1455, he reappears in the records of the duchy of Bourgogne. Kügle proposes that du Passaige might have left Cyprus with Anne, like Jean Hanelle. Archivio Segredo Vaticano, Introitus et Exirus (Henceforth: IE) 383, fol. 170v; IE 383, fol. 77v; IE 385, fols. 118r, 121r, 124r, 126r, 129r, 131r, 134r, 138r, 141r, 143v, 146r-v, 148r-v, 151r, 153r, 156r, 158v, 160r, 164r, 167r, 170v; IE 387, fols. 70v, 72v, 75r, 77r, 79v, 83v, 86v, 88v, 91r, 94r, 96r, 98v; IE 389, fols. 93r, 97r, 99r, 103r, 106r, 108r, 110v; information made available by Professor John Nàdas; quoted in Kügle, “The Repertory,” 172; Data, “Anne of Cyprus,” 69; Kügle, “The Repertory,” 172.


In August 1434, Dufay was granted a leave of absence from his duties at the court of Savoie in order to visit his mother in Cambrai. It appears that Dufay was absent from Savoie until an unspecified date in 1437, when a payment for Dufay’s clothing appears in Savoyard records. This payment, and also a record of another payment for the composition and performance of a motet, Magnamine Gentis, for the occasion of a peace treaty (Berne, May 3, 1438) between Duke Louis I de Savoie and his brother Philip, evidence that Dufay was working for the court of Savoie at the time. Fallows, 42, 49-50.


My translation. “...si sagement [...] qu’il estoit le plus riche et le plus plantureux de tous ses voisins.” Olivier de La Marche, Mémoires, (Lyon: Guillaume Roville, 1562), 108; quoted in Castelnuovo and Deragne, 32. In order to appreciate the full meaning of this statement, one must keep in mind that it was written by a chronicler from the duchy of Bourgogne, a direct rival of the duchy of Savoie.

Marie de Bourgogne is the daughter of Duke Philippe II le Hardi de Bourgogne. Marie and Amédée were children at the time of their union. She was seven years old and he was ten.

Castelnuovo and Deragne, 44; Gardet, 12. Château Ripaille is situated close to Thonon-les-Bains by Lake Léman.

Castelnuovo and Deragne, 35. Amédée’s interest in books was nurtured from an early age, in particular during the years of his regency. Savoyard records show that Johannes de Bettens (Amédée’s tutor) purchased two collections of Aesop for the young count and his half brother in 1394. Sheila Edmunds, “The Medieval Library of Savoy,” In Scriptorium XXV (1971), 258; quoted in Bradley, 173.

Fragalà Data, 79. Amédée inherited this prized collection through his mother Bonne de Berry. Bonne’s father, Jean de Berry, was known as the medieval world’s greatest connoisseur of arts (and patron of Guillaume de Machaut). Fragalà Data has gathered evidence (spanning the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) which testifies of a marked interest in collecting books at the court of Savoie. The first solid piece of data indicating the existence of a library in Savoie dates back to 1297. This information is recorded in the first roll of the series comptes des receiveurs et trésoriers généraux de Savoie. Moreover, several documents attest to books having been manufactured, decorated, repaired or bought for the Savoyard counts for more than fifty years preceding the promotion of the county of Savoie to the rank of duchy. Bradley, 170; Fragalà Data, 78-79.

Castelnuovo, and Deragne, 35. When Amédée retired to Ripaille in October 1434, his collection comprised about 50 books. Fragalà Data, 80. The Savoyard library grew noticeably faster after 1398; the year when Amédée reached his majority. More than sixty archival documents from throughout his reign refer to books. Bradley, 174.

Bradley, 170.

Fallows, Dufay, 36.

Fallows, Dufay, 36-37. According to Castelnuovo, when Amédée VIII retired to Chateau Ripaille, a sort of institutional cohabitation established itself. On one hand, Amédée remained involved in the political decisions of the duchy (from Ripaille) while his son Louis I became increasingly present in the Piémont (Louis was Prince of the
Piémont). This situation appears to disprove the claim that Amédée VIII “irresponsibly abandoned his duties.” In fact, Fragalà Data noted that Amédée’s reluctance to resign completely may be explained by a sense of responsibility that did not allow him to abandon the Savoyard duchy to a son who showed no political inclination. Fragalà Data, 85.


358 Severis, 115, 118, 122.

359 Gardet, 14.


361 Planchart, “Du Fay.” Pope Eugenius IV (Gabriele Condulmieri) was elected pope in March 1431. His reign was characterized by unrelenting chaos as he was in direct confrontation with both the Colona (family of two of Du Fay’s former patrons) and Malatesta families. Attacks on Rome (by the Colona family) began as early as April 23, 1431. Significantly, while there were twelve singers in Eugenius’ chapelle in April 1433; by October of the same year, there were only five. Fallows, Dufay, 33, 36.

362 Fallows, Dufay, 36; Planchart, “Du Fay.”

363 Planchart, “Du Fay.”

364 Planchart, “Du Fay.” Records indicate that in August 1434, Du Fay was granted leave from the court of Savoie to go visit his mother in Cambrai (Planchart).


366 Planchart, “Du Fay.”

367 Fallows, Dufay, 15.


Both Jean Hanelle and Guillaume de Machaut were at Cambrai in 1410-11. Fallows, *Dufay*, 7; Kügle, “The Repertory,” 171. It seems reasonable to assume that they knew each other relatively well from their “choir boy” days. If Hanelle was in charge of compiling Torino J.II.9, perhaps the closeness of his acquaintance with the Savoyard *Maistre de Chapelle* eliminated the need to identify those works as Du Fay’s. Moreover, since both were educated in Cambrai, their work could hypothetically be compiled side by side without jarring.

“Amédée VI dit le Comte Vert (1334-1383),” *Origine de la Maison de Savoie*, (Accessed July 21, 2005), <http://www.comtevert.ch>. Shortly after acquiring the Faucigny in exchange for some enclaves he possessed in the Viennois (treatise of Paris), Amédée VI de Savoie married Bonne de Bourbon (King Charles IV le Bel de France’s granddaughter) in order to seal the agreement. “Amédée VI dit le Comte Vert (1334-1383).”

I am referring to the fact that Richard I Coeur de Lion had refused to concede half of Cyprus to King Philippe II Auguste de France, thus breaking their agreement that all conquests made during their joint expedition would be shared evenly. See chapter II, “A Brief Historical Introduction Followed by The Rule of the Knights Templars.” Charlotte de Bourbon was a descendant of Philippe Auguste, see appendix B.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

SELECTIVE GENEALOGY OF THE HOUSE OF LUSIGNAN IN CYPRUS

Guy $\infty$ Sybille d’Anjou-
(1192-94) Jérusalem (1175) (1194-1205) $\infty$ 2. Isabelle I d’Anjou-Jérusalem (1198)
Hugues I $\infty$ Alix de Champagne (1210)
(1205-18)

Isabelle $\infty$ Henri de Poitiers
Henri I $\infty$ 1. Alix de Montferrat (1229)
(1218-53) $\infty$ 2. Stéphanie de Barberon (1237)
$\infty$ 3. Plaisante d’Antioche (1250)
Hugues III $\infty$ Isabelle d’Ibelin (1264)
(1267-84) (1252-82)
Hugues II $\infty$ Isabelle d’Ibelin (1264)
(1253-67) (1241-1324)

Jean I
(1284-85)

Henri II
(1285-1324)

Guy $\infty$ Eschive d’Ibelin

Hugues IV $\infty$ 1. Marie d’Ibelin (1308)
(1324-59) $\infty$ 2. Alix d’Ibelin (1318)

Pierre I $\infty$ 1. Eschive de Montfort (1342)
(1359-69) $\infty$ 2. Éléonore d’Aragon (1353)
Jacques I $\infty$ Héloïse de Brunswick-
(1382-98) Grubenhagen (1365)

Pierre II $\infty$ Valentina Visconti (1376)
(1369-82)
Janus I $\infty$ 1. Héloïse Visconti (1401)
(1398-1432) $\infty$ 2. Charlotte de Bourbon (1411)

Jean II $\infty$ 1. Amédée de Montferrat (1440)
(1432-58) $\infty$ 2. Hélène Paléologue (1442)

Anne $\infty$ Louis I de Savoie (1434)
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APPENDIX B

SELECTIVE GENEALOGY
FROM KING PHILIPPE II AUGUSTE DE FRANCE,
TO DUKE LOUIS I DE SAVOIE AND ANNE DE LUSIGNAN,
VIA THE BOURBON HOUSE

King Philippe II Auguste de France ∞ Isabelle de Hainaut (1180)
(1180-1223, Capetian Dynasty)

├───────────┘
King Louis VIII le Lion de France ∞ Blanche de Castile (1223)
(1223-26, Capetian Dynasty)

├───────────┘
King Louis IX de France (St. Louis) ∞ Marguerite de Provence (1234)
(1226-70, Capetian Dynasty)

├────────────┘
Count Robert de Clermont ∞ Béatrix de Bourgogne (1272)
(Capetian Dynasty) (heiress of Bourbon)

└──────┘
Duke Louis I le Boiteux de Bourbon ∞ Marie de Hainaut (1310)
(First Duke of Bourbon)

Duke Pierre I de Bourbon ∞ Marie de Bourbon ∞ Jacques de Bourbon ∞
∞ Isabelle de Valois (1337) Guy de Lusignan (1330) Jeanne de Chatillon (1335)

Bonne de Bourbon ∞ Jean de Bourbon ∞
Amédée VI le Vert de Savoie (1355) Catherine de Vendôme (1364)

Amédée VII le Rouge de Savoie ∞
Bonne de Berry (1377)

Amédée VIII le Pacifique de Savoie ∞
Marie de Bourgogne (1393) Charlotte de Bourbon ∞
King Janus I de Lusignan (1411)

Duke Louis I de Savoie ∞ Anne de Lusignan (1434)
The island of Cyprus. Detail from the Near East section of *The Catalan Atlas* (Spain: Majorca, 1375).

156
This map was first issued in 1560 by a certain B.F., in Rome. Re-engraved by M. Kartaro (Rome), it was published by Bertelli (Venice) in 1562. I marked Nicosia with a blue cross, Famagusta, with a red cross, and Limassol, with a green cross. Bertelli, “Isola di Cipro”—“Cyprus Insula olim Macharia...Romae M.D.LXII, Ferandus Bertelli Exude,” (182x250mm), Rome, 1562; Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation (ΠΟΛΙΤΙΣΤΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΤΡΑΠΕΖΗΣ ΚΥΠΡΟΥ), (Accessed August 1, 2005), <http://kypros.org>.
APPENDIX D

THE BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALE UNIVERSITARIA DI TORINO
AFTER THE FIRE OF 1904.