Illumination and Interpretation: The Depiction and Reception of Faus Semblant in *Roman de la Rose* Manuscripts

By Timothy L. Stinson

The past seven centuries of scholarly attention to and debate over the *Roman de la Rose* bear strong witness to the fact that the allegorical figure Faus Semblant presents us with an interpretive crux—one of many such in the poem—that we are not likely to resolve in the coming centuries. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that a character who so embodies paradox—a profane friar who is openly honest about his intent to deceive—should be so difficult to pin down; it is his singular talent, after all, to dissemble and confuse. The last century has seen a significant increase in criticism centered upon Faus Semblant that seeks to understand what he signifies within the larger allegory of the poem and how he relates to Jean de Meun's purported satire and antifraternalism. But this struggle to understand and explain the character began centuries earlier and, like him, has taken many forms. As early as the thirteenth century, the passage of Jean's poem in which Faus Semblant explains his craft and guile had begun to attract a diverse group of revisers: scribes, who added or deleted passages in order to shape a reading of the poem or avoid offending readers; *remanieurs,* such as Gui de Mori, who substantially rewrote the passage in efforts to reshape the poem into a more cohesive (or perhaps morally suitable) form; readers, whose marginal inscriptions and *notae* often accompany the passage; and illustrators (and thus bookmakers and buyers), as images of Faus Semblant are frequently included in illuminated copies of *Rose* manuscripts. Even Jean himself seemed to feel the need to gloss and contain Faus Semblant, offering an apology and clarification in lines 15213–30.[1]

I wish to thank several institutions and individuals for assistance provided in the course of researching this article. A generous grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation allowed me to travel to the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris to consult manuscripts related to this study. Although I have been able to study most of the manuscripts mentioned here in situ, my research would not have been possible without the *Roman de la Rose* Digital Library. Stephen Nichols made a number of thoughtful suggestions on an early draft of this article; Beatrice Radden Keefe patiently answered many questions about manuscript illumination and iconography; and Jeanette Patterson supplied the translation of the Collins gloss. C. Michael Stinson first suggested a link between the Walters miniatures and Thomas Aquinas, and Marie-Thérèse Gousset of the Bibliothèque nationale de France shared her extensive knowledge of Parisian manuscript workshops, and of the manuscripts of the Montbastons in particular. Benjamin Albritton provided valuable assistance in preparing the online edition of this article. Finally, I am grateful to the Walters Art Museum and the Philadelphia Museum of Art for providing access to their manuscripts and permission to reproduce portions of them in this article.

[1] Line numbers and citations from the poem are from Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le roman de la rose,* ed. Félix Lecoy, 3 vols., Les classiques français du Moyen Âge 92, 95, 98 (Paris: H. Champion, 1965–75), hereafter cited as Lecoy.

The character's deceitfulness and protean talents are augmented by the fact that he is not alone in providing multiple conflicting versions of himself, for the poem was in a state of constant flux almost from the moment of its inception. Even in its most canonical state, the *Roman de la Rose* has two authors, with Jean de Meun acting both as coauthor and as reviser and interpreter of Guillaume de Lorris. Furthermore, as Sylvia Huot has argued, even if the "notion of the *Rose* as a poem with two (and only two) authors was already well established in the fourteenth century," scribes and *remanieurs* continued to create and re-create it into the sixteenth century, and manuscript copies of the poem present unique manifestations of it that demand study in their own right.[2] Like Huot, I am here concerned with "individual versions of the *Rose*" and with "its afterlife, with its history as a text."[3] In particular, I will discuss how Faus Semblant is depicted, altered, and received in individual manuscript copies and how illustrations of him shaped subsequent readings of the poem.

Backgrounds

In order to contextualize Faus Semblant's depiction and transmission in manuscript copies of the poem, it is useful to review the historical events and literary precursors that gave rise to the character. Faus Semblant's famous critique of the mendicant orders, which he delivers in a speech before Amors and his assembled barons prior to the attack on the castle of Jalousie, is rooted in the spread of the mendicant orders during the thirteenth century, and particularly in quarrels between those orders and the theology faculty of the University of Paris during the 1250s, a fact that has been widely discussed elsewhere and thus will only be briefly recapitulated here.[4] The mendicant orders—which include the Augustinians, Carmelites, Dominicans, and Franciscans—first appeared early in the thirteenth century and experienced enormous success and growth; within a period of sixty years, more than a thousand convents had been established throughout Europe, four hundred of which were in France.[5] But in spite of, or perhaps largely because of, this phenomenal success, the orders also met with sharp opposition from a number of groups. The secular clergy saw their former monopoly on preaching and confession ended by a series of papal orders that extended those rights to the mendicants, and hence the seculars faced a reduced ability to control and profit from these ecclesiastical duties. The established monastic orders, meanwhile,

[2] Sylvia Huot, *The "Romance of the Rose" and Its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, Manuscript Transmission,* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 16 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 4.

[3] Ibid., 8.

[4] For a concise summary of these events see the textual notes in *The Romance of the Rose,* trans. Charles Dahlberg (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1983), 395, hereafter cited as Dahlberg. For a more detailed discussion see Penn R. Szittya, *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), chapters 1 and 2. Guy Geltner, ed., *De periculis novissimorum temporum* (Paris: Peeters, 2008), discusses the quarrels in his introduction, 1–27, and also provides a bibliography, "Studies on William of Saint-Amour and the University Quarrels," 30–32.

[5] Geltner, ed., *De periculis novissimorum temporum,* 4.

saw the mendicant friars as "intruders upon monastic ideals—and territories" and periodically resisted their spread and influence.[6] Although this antifraternal sentiment was to persist throughout the next century and beyond, the quarrels between the groups were rarely expressed as sharply as at the University of Paris during the middle of the thirteenth century. The faculty there comprised both secular clergy and mendicants, and several decades of tension and disagreements between them came to a head in 1253, when the mendicants refused to join the rest of the faculty in a strike initiated in response to charges of violence by the city's constables against students.[7] As a result, the secular faculty attempted to expel the mendicants from the university entirely, a move that was successfully countered when the friars, whose powerful allies included Louis IX, managed to receive a papal order demanding their reinstitution into the university. During this time, Guillaume de Saint-Amour emerged as the most prominent spokesman for the secular clergy, and his antifraternal work *De periculis novissimorum temporum* became the most famous text to articulate the perceived dangers of the emergent friars, whom he depicted as the Antichrists foretold by the Bible, and thus as a sign of the end times. Although Guillaume was banished from Paris as a result of his role in the debates, *De periculis* was to have profound influence on subsequent works of theology and literature in France, England, and beyond.

The literary character Faus Semblant was created in direct response to these historical events, and he first appears in the poetry of Rutebeuf, a Parisian contemporary of Jean de Meun. Rutebeuf's works include *Du Pharisien,* which features a character named Iypocrisie and characterizes friars as wolves in sheep's clothing, and *De Maistre Guillaume de Saint-Amour,* wherein a similar character is given the name Faus Semblant in the context of a poem that supports the side of Guillaume in the university quarrels.[8] As such, Jean's decision to include a character by this name, one who also compares friars to wolves in sheep's clothing, connects his fiction directly to recent historical events in the controversy over mendicants in Paris. From there, Faus Semblant went on to have wide influence, spreading within a few years to Italy, via *Il fiore,* a loose translation and recomposition of the poem into sonnets that has been attributed to Dante; and to England in the following century, via Chaucer's translation of the poem as well as in his other works that owe a clear debt to Jean's character, including the "Summoner's Tale," the "Pardoner's Prologue," and the "Wife of Bath's Prologue." Echoes of Guillaume de Saint-Amour, meanwhile, may readily be found in the works of Richard FitzRalph, Wyclif, and others in fourteenth-century England, although these writers also had their own local debates over mendicancy to draw

[6] Szittya, *The Antifraternal Tradition,* 100.

[7] For a summary of these events see Szittya, ibid., 11–17.

[8] These poems are printed consecutively in *Œuvres complètes de Rutebeuf,* ed. Edmond Faral and Julia Bastin, 2 vols. (Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1959–60), 1:249–66. For a discussion of the relationship of Rutebeuf to Jean de Meun and Guillaume de Saint-Amour see M.-M. Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne, 1250–1259* (Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1972), which deals with the topic in detail; Szittya, *The Antifraternal Tradition,* 184–86; and G. Geltner, "*Faux Semblants*: Antifraternalism Reconsidered in Jean de Meun and Chaucer," *Studies in Philology* 101 (2004): 357–80, esp. 363–69.

upon by that time. As Guy Geltner summarizes, "From Rutebeuf to Rabelais, from Cecco Angiolieri to Boccaccio, from Chaucer to Marlowe, the apparent perseverance of antifraternal sentiment from medieval to early modern literature has helped perpetuate the notion of a Devil-serving friar as a popular, if disturbing, representation of medieval mendicants,"[9] and Rutebeuf's and Jean's creations helped to shape many of these subsequent characters.

In recent years, many critics have grappled with what Kevin Brownlee calls "Faux Semblant's uniquely problematic status,"[10] producing a diverse body of literature that is too large and divided to be usefully summarized here. The significant majority of this literature focuses on Faus Semblant as he comes down to us in canonical, textual form, that is, in the editions of major editors, including Ernest Langlois and Félix Lecoy, and in translations by Charles Dahlberg, Harry Robbins, and others.[11] In order to address the interpretive problems presented by the character—including whether his antifraternalism is parodic or directly represents Jean's own dislike of the mendicants, and whether his speech represents a digression from the plot or is central to it—critics have largely based their arguments on the textual evidence found in critical editions, and hence on the products of nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship. As fundamental as these editions have been to our collective ability to study and understand the poem, and as much as this body of scholarship has enriched our understanding of the character, there remains a need to reconsider Faus Semblant in light of the extensive body of manuscript evidence, evidence that has received only scant attention to date. This is the case for several reasons. First, although more than three hundred manuscript copies of the *Rose* survive—in part or in full—only a few of them are represented in critical editions; Langlois based his edition on Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS fr. 1573 (although he provided extensive lists of variants), as did Lecoy, who also used four other manuscripts to correct his base text.[12] Second, the corpus of surviving manuscripts provides us with much noncanonical textual material, including revisions, glosses, marginal comments, and interpolations, that are important for understanding the reception of the poem but that often are not considered in scholarly literature. Finally, we have inherited a rich tradition of illustration in *Rose* manuscripts, and many contain miniatures or marginal drawings depicting Faus Semblant that provide evidence of how the character was received and envisioned, including some illustrations that are quite early in date. Although a few scholars have considered the variety of

[9] Geltner, "*Faux Semblants,*" 357. Geltner argues at 357–58, however, that defining these works as antifraternal "obscures the true diversity of friar-characters and their functions within their respective fictional contexts."

[10] Kevin Brownlee, "The Problem of Faux Semblant: Language, History, and Truth in the *Roman de la Rose,*" in *The New Medievalism,* ed. Marina S. Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 253–71, at 254.

[11] See Ernest Langlois, ed., *Le roman de la Rose,* 5 vols. (Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie., 1914–24); and *The Romance of the Rose,* ed. Charles W. Dunn, trans. Harry W. Robbins (New York: Dutton, 1962).

[12] The other manuscripts are Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 526, and Paris, BnF MSS fr. 1559, fr. 12786, and fr. 25523. See Lecoy, 1:xli.

ways that Faus Semblant is depicted—Huot, for example, discusses marginalia and miniatures featuring him, and John Fleming briefly considers "iconographic suggestions of his moral postures"[13]—there has been nothing like the long tradition that debates his representation in the text of the poem.

Guillaume de Lorris's portion of the poem received disproportionately more attention from illustrators than Jean's much longer continuation; the scenes most frequently found in manuscripts are an opening miniature depicting the lover in bed and the personifications on the wall outside of the Garden of Deduit. But many manuscripts feature extensive illustrations of Jean's text as well, with Faus Semblant joining portraits of the author, the story of Pygmalion, and the confession of Nature and sermon of Genius as favorite subjects for miniatures. Thus the total number of surviving miniatures depicting Faus Semblant is quite high; although an all-inclusive count is not available, this abundance is attested by the fact that in the course of this study I consulted eighty-five illustrated manuscripts and found 163 illustrations of Faus Semblant. As Richard and Mary Rouse have pointed out, guidelines for illustrating sacred and liturgical works "were implicit in the text itself: a Latin Bible required an elaborate frontispiece of the seven days of Creation; in a book of hours, a Crucifixion scene would precede the Hours of the Cross, and a Madonna and Child would serve for the *Obsecro te*."[14] But no such tradition or obvious guidelines existed for new works of literature in the vernacular, and thus *Rose* manuscripts feature considerable diversity in both the number and the subject matter of illuminations. As with other characters and scenes, which are handled with great variety in illuminations and accompanying rubrics across the corpus of manuscripts, this diversity is reflected in the tradition of illustrating Faus Semblant. Such miniatures may be absent entirely, even in manuscripts that have a fairly large number of illustrations depicting other scenes from the poem, or he may be the subject of as many as a dozen illuminations.[15]

Before examining in detail how Faus Semblant was depicted in illuminated manuscripts, it is useful to consider the options that readily presented themselves to artists and to the patrons or *libraires* who hired the illustrators and dictated the number, location, and subject matter of a manuscript's miniatures. He has been depicted as a friar, as a young nobleman, and as a priest, among other

[13] Huot, *The "Romance of the Rose,"* 282–88; and John V. Fleming, *The "Roman de la Rose": A Study in Allegory and Iconography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 169.

[14] Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers: Commercial Book Producers in Medieval Paris, 1200–1500,* Illiterati et uxorati 1, 2 vols. (Turnhout: Harvey Miller, 2000), 1:248.

[15] For example, Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS 3338, features 36 miniatures, but none of Faus Semblant, whereas New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.948 features 12 (out of a total of 107) miniatures depicting him. Given the length of the poem and the range of subjects that might be illustrated, the percentage of miniatures devoted to Faus Semblant is in some instances quite high: 4 of the 35 miniatures in BnF fr. 12593 depict him, as do 5 of the 51 miniatures in BnF fr. 25526. Digital images of these manuscripts, as well as all other *Rose* manuscripts in this article for which I discuss specific miniatures, are available via the *Roman de la Rose* Digital Library (http://romandelarose.org), and citations to specific folios correspond to the foliation used there.

roles, and, as we shall see, his appearance sometimes changes throughout a series of illuminations within one manuscript. Such variance in how illuminators chose to handle Faus Semblant may or may not be motivated by, but is certainly mirrored in, the character's talent for shifting appearances and changing clothing in order to mislead others, a tactic of which he is evidently proud and that he describes in detail:

> Trop sé bien mes habiz changier,
> prendre l'un et l'autre estrangier.
> Or sui chevaliers, or sui moines,
> or sui prelaz, or sui chanoines,
> or sui clers, autre heure sui prestres,
> or sui deciples, or sui mestres,
> or chateleins, or forestiers:
> briefment je sui de touz mestiers.
> Or resui princes, or sui pages,
> et sai par queur trestouz langages;
> autre heure sui vieuz et chenuz,
> or resui jennes devenuz;
> or sui Roberz, or sui Robins,
> or cordeliers, or jacobins.
>
> (Lines 11157–70)

[I know very well how to change my garment, to take one and then another foreign to it. Now I am a knight, now a monk; at one time I am a prelate, at another a canon; at one hour a clerk, at another a priest; now disciple, now master, now lord of the manor, now forester. Briefly I am in all occupations. Again I may be prince or page, and I know all languages by heart. At one hour I am old and white, and then I have become young again. Now I am Robert, now Robin, now Cordelier, now Jacobin. (Pp. 196–97)][16]

Despite the potential variety that this passage suggests, Faus Semblant most often appears as a Dominican (the Jacobin mentioned above), a Franciscan (Cordelier), or a nondescript friar (that is, one whose habit does not seem to represent a particular order). These are logical choices due to the fact that while Faus Semblant never actually appears as a knight, prince, or forester in the narrative, he does inform us that his favored disguise is that of a humble religious garment:

> Briefment je me vois hosteler
> la ou je me cuit mieuz celer,
> s'est la celee plus seüre
> souz la plus umble vesteüre.
> Religieus sunt mout couvert,
> seculer sunt plus aouvert.
>
> (Lines 10981–86)

[16] The Old French text and line numbers are from Lecoy; the English translation and page numbers are from Dahlberg's translation unless otherwise noted. Note that Dahlberg keys his translation to line numbers from Langlois and thus they do not correspond exactly to those from Lecoy. Dahlberg supplies a concordance of line numbers from the two editions as an appendix at p. 427; in this portion of the poem, one can usually subtract thirty from a Langlois line number to derive Lecoy's.

[Briefly, I am lodged where I think that I am better hidden. The safest hiding place is under the most humble garment. The religious are very covert, the worldly more open. (P. 194)]

Moreover, when Faus Semblant appears before Male Bouche with the intention of killing him, the narrator suggests specifically that he appears in the garb of a Dominican:

Semblant ravoit il mout veü,
mes faus ne l'ot pas conneü.
Faus iert il, mes de fausseté
ne l'eüst il ja mes reté,
car li semblant si fort ovroit
que la fausseté li covroit;
mes s'avant le conneüssiez
qu'en ces dras veü l'eüssiez,
bien juressiez le roi celestre
que cil, qui devant soloit estre
de la dance le biaus Robins,
or est devenuz jacobins.
Mes sanz faille, c'en est la some,
li Jacobin sunt tuit preudome
—mauvesement l'ordre tendroient
se tel menesterel estoient—
si sunt Cordelier et Barré,
tout saient il gros et quarré,
et Sac et tuit li autre frere.

(Lines 12089–12107)

[Foul Mouth had certainly seen Seeming also, but he did not recognize him as false. He was false, but he had never been convicted of falsity, for he worked so hard on his appearance that he covered up his falsity. But if you had known before you had seen him in these clothes, you would have indeed sworn by the king of heaven that he who before had been used to being handsome Robin in the dance was now become a Jacobin. But without fail, and this is the sum of it, the Jacobins are all worthy men—they would maintain their order badly if they were such minstrels—and so are the Cordeliers and the barred friars, no matter how large and fat they may be, and the friars of the sack and all others. (P. 211)][17]

Prior to appearing before Male Bouche, Faus Semblant attires himself in preparation for the encounter, suggesting that he had been wearing something different up until that point. As such, an illustrator had a couple of obvious choices. The first, and the one chosen by a large majority, was to depict Faus Semblant as a friar throughout, thereby emphasizing his preference for this garb and rendering him easily recognizable in terms of both iconography and allegory. The second was to emphasize his mutability by depicting him in a variety of garments and, perhaps, to draw attention to his act of changing garments at

[17] Dahlberg notes that "[t]he barred friars are the Carmelites, the friars of the sack the Frères de la Pénitence, both so called for the appearance of their habits" (398, note to lines 12135–37). The emphasis on the fatness of the friars satirizes their supposed poverty.

lines 12052–54.[18] Within these options, of course, there remains quite a bit of flexibility. For example, if the character is always depicted as a friar, the artist may choose to show him wearing the robes of an identifiable order, wearing robes from different orders in successive miniatures, or wearing a nondescript robe, all of which we find examples of in illustrated *Rose* manuscripts. My goal for the remainder of this essay is to use two manuscripts—Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, MS W. 143; and Philadelphia Museum of Art, MS Collins 1945-65-3—as case studies in order to demonstrate how these choices, when combined with textual variations and marginal commentary, work together to shape readings of Faus Semblant that are highly specific to individual manuscripts and also to show how considering the variety of ways in which Faus Semblant is depicted in manuscript contexts can enrich our critical discussions of the character.

Walters W. 143

Walters Art Museum, W. 143, is a Parisian manuscript from the mid-fourteenth century and is in many ways a typical example of the large number of *Rose* manuscripts being turned out of Paris workshops around this time. In her detailed description of the manuscript in *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Walters Art Gallery,* Lilian Randall observes that "[t]he Walters codex shares many artistic features with *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts completed in Paris under northeast French influence towards the middle of the 14th century."[19] As examples she notes the "typical four-part miniature assigned by Kuhn to Group 1" and cites a number of parallels to "the border festooned with inhabited medallions on the opening page."[20] The Rouses have attributed the forty-two miniatures in the manuscript to Jeanne de Montbaston,[21] an illuminator believed to have worked with her husband Richard, a *libraire* and illuminator, on a number of *Rose* manuscripts; working either separately or together, the two have been credited with the miniatures in a total of nineteen extant copies of the poem.[22] Walters 143 strongly resembles the artistic style and layout of most other copies of the *Rose* produced by the Montbastons, including books on which Jeanne

[18] An example of this emphasis on changing clothes is found in BnF fr. 24392, where Faus Semblant is depicted in secular clothes at fols. 84v and 88r, then holding a robe at fol. 98r in preparation for getting dressed, and attired as a Dominican at fol. 98v.

[19] Lilian M.C. Randall, *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Walters Art Gallery,* 5 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989–97), 1:175.

[20] Ibid. Randall here cites Alfred Kuhn, "Die Illustration des *Rosenromans,*" *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 31 (1912): 1–66.

[21] Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers,* 2:203. Randall argues conversely for multiple artists in W. 143, describing the miniatures as "[w]orkmanship of routine quality by several hands; better work intermittently, mainly in second half of volume," ibid., 1:174. As evidence of the "close correspondence between the several collaborating artists," Randall cites at 1:175 "two comparable renderings of Reason and the Lover by different hands" on fols. 21r and 29r.

[22] Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers,* 1:242.

Fig. 1. Walters Art Museum, MS W. 143, fol. 69v.
Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance stand before Amors.
(Figs. 1–5 are reproduced by permission of the Walters Art Museum.
All figures may be viewed in color in the online edition of this article.)

worked alone (for example, BnF fr. 802),[23] those on which Richard worked alone (for example, BnF fr. 19156 and fr. 24389), as well as those on which the two collaborated (for example, BnF Smith-Lesouëf 62).[24]

Three of the forty-two miniatures in Walters 143 feature Faus Semblant. On fol. 69v he appears with his companion Contreinte Atenance before Amors, who is winged and crowned (Fig. 1); to the left of the group stands an unidentified woman.[25] Faus Semblant stands at the center facing Amors and is clad in a Dominican's garb of a black cloak over a white habit. Contreinte Atenance, who is referred to in the text as female and often (although not invariably) depicted as a nun, is here depicted as a tonsured friar and wears a brown robe and rope

[23] The miniatures also resemble those that Jeanne supplied in BnF fr. 25526, which is discussed further below, p. 488. The extensive marginalia that Jeanne provided for that manuscript set it apart from the remainder of the Montbaston corpus of *Rose* manuscripts, however.

[24] Attribution of the miniatures to Jeanne or Richard or both is provided by Rouse and Rouse in appendix 9A, 2:202–6.

[25] Ordinarily, one might assume that a female character accompanying Faus Semblant was intended to be Contreinte Atenance, but the other two miniatures indicate that we are intended to understand Contreinte Atenance to be the male Franciscan. Jeanne used the same combination of one Dominican friar and one Franciscan friar in BnF fr. 25526.

Fig. 2. Walters Art Museum, MS W. 143, fol. 72v.
Faus Semblant enters into the service of Amors.

belt that identify her as a Franciscan. These features and personifications resemble many other illustrations of this portion of the poem, but two things make this miniature exceptional. First, Faus Semblant is depicted as much larger, and particularly much wider, than the other characters in the miniature, and he has an oversized head. Second, at some point Faus Semblant's face was rubbed out and subsequently redrawn by another hand. A very similar miniature is found on fol. 72v; once again Contreinte Atenance and Faus Semblant, attired as in fol. 69v, face Amors, and once again an oversized Faus Semblant with a large head has been defaced and later redrawn (Fig. 2). The third miniature occurs on fol. 81v, where Contreinte Atenance and Faus Semblant, still dressed as a Franciscan and a Dominican respectively, are speaking to Male Bouche while a fourth figure, partially obscured, looks on from the background (Fig. 3). In this miniature, however, Faus Semblant is depicted in the same tall, thin proportions as the other characters, does not have an unusually large head, and has not been defaced.

Fig. 3. Walters Art Museum, MS W. 143, fol. 81v.
Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance address Male Bouche.

There are both historical and textual reasons why the artist—or whoever provided instructions to the artist—would have chosen a Franciscan and a Dominican for these miniatures. Both orders are mentioned more than once in the poem, and both were prominent and populous when the poem was written as well as a century later when Walters 143 was created. Both orders were targeted by Guillaume de Saint-Amour, albeit not equally or for identical reasons. The Franciscans had agreed with the university's statutes by 1254, the year when *De periculis* appeared, but the Dominicans had not, making them more direct targets in the quarrels at the university.[26] But Guillaume calls attention to the *Evangelium Aeternum* (as does Faus Semblant at line 11772), a heretical work by the Franciscan Gerard of Borgo San Donnino, "who had gleaned from the writings of Joachim of Fiore what he took to be a prophecy of the overthrow of

[26] Geltner, ed., *De periculis novissimorum temporum,* 2–3.

the Gospel by a Third Testament, the Eternal Gospel (*Evangelium aeternum*) of the Holy Spirit, which would be administered by new orders of religious, that is, the friars."[27] And, as Brownlee has demonstrated, we may observe "two discursive modes" in Faus Semblant's lengthy speech: "1) the new dialectic mode of late-thirteenth-century philosophical debate, associated with the Dominicans; and 2) the new self-revelatory mode of late-thirteenth-century spiritual narrative, associated with the Franciscans."[28] The reversal of the gender of Contreinte Atenance in Walters 143 and other manuscripts, meanwhile, not only offers the possibility of depicting these two prominent fraternal orders side by side but also suggests that a false appearance and a failure to adhere to vows of chastity are failures specific to the mendicant friars. Of these reasons for depicting the two orders, we are obligated to accept the simplest explanation—that the Franciscans and Dominicans were well known and mentioned directly in the poem—for the fact that they seem to be the default choice in a large number of illuminated *Rose* manuscripts. In most instances, we have no way of ascertaining how much later artists and *libraires* knew about the theological and political upheavals of the thirteenth century, or even if they had read the poem, much less discovered in it the intricate connections to the two mendicant orders that Brownlee articulates. Indeed, as will be discussed more below, there is reason to believe that Jeanne de Montbaston rarely, if ever, paid careful attention to the text that she was illustrating beyond following the instructions with which she was provided, and the Rouses even suggest "the possibility that she did not read with ease."[29] In short, the roles of these two orders in the university quarrels and in the *Rose* itself may be complex and at times problematic, but their coexistence in illuminations of the poem generally is not.

There remains, however, something very unusual about the oversized Faus Semblant in the Dominican habit depicted in the first two miniatures discussed above. One might suggest that his girth is a result of a professed gluttony and love of food and wine (see, for example, lines 11529, 11710–25). Furthermore, in comparing Jeanne's figures with those of her husband, the Rouses note that Jeanne's "are normally shorter and squatter, frequently with large heads."[30] But Faus Semblant is almost invariably depicted the same size as other allegorical figures in *Rose* manuscripts, including those painted by the Montbastons, and one need only compare him with the other figures rendered by Jeanne in this manuscript to see that he is far wider and has a much larger head than anyone else. Moreover, gluttony could not explain the large head. One explanation for his girth, the size of his head, and the fact that only the two miniatures depicting

[27] Szittya, *The Antifraternal Tradition,* 15. See also Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, MS Ludwig XV7, fol. 76r, where a devil is depicted facing the reader and holding an open copy of the *Eternal Gospel,* with friars on one side of him and secular clergy on the other. Both a Franciscan and a Dominican are clearly depicted, but the Franciscan is the only individual who stands close to the devil, almost touching him. This miniature is also reminiscent of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Parker Library MS 180, fol. 1r, which Szittya uses for his frontispiece; there friars are shown surrounded by devils.

[28] Brownlee, "The Problem of Faux Semblant," 257.

[29] Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers,* 1:250.

[30] Ibid., 240.

these oversized features, and not the one on fol. 81v, were targeted for defacement is that the miniatures were meant to represent a specific Dominican, namely, Thomas Aquinas, for he famously possessed these physical features:

> The appearance or bodily presence of St. Thomas Aquinas is really easier to resurrect than that of many who lived before the age of portrait painting.… His bulk made it easy to regard him humorously as the sort of walking wine-barrel, common in the comedies of many nations; he joked about it himself. It may be that he, and not some irritated partisan of the Augustinian or Arabian parties, was responsible for the sublime exaggeration that a crescent was cut out of the dinner table to allow him to sit down. It is quite certain that it was an exaggeration; and that his stature was more remarked than his stoutness; but, above all, that his head was quite powerful enough to dominate his body. And his head was of a very real and recognisable type, to judge by the traditional portraits and the personal descriptions. It was that sort of head with the heavy chin and jaws, the Roman nose and the big rather bald brow, which, in spite of its fullness, gives also a curious concave impression of hollows here and there, like caverns of thought.[31]

While it is impossible to know for certain whether Jeanne intended this portrait to represent Aquinas, or whether she acted on her own in creating it or was following the instructions of someone else, the potential for readers of the manuscript to interpret it as a portrait of the famous Dominican is clear. There are, moreover, good reasons for positing both an intentional depiction of Aquinas and a reader's reception of it as intentional. Aquinas's own admission to the faculty at the University of Paris had been delayed by the quarrels there and the efforts of Guillaume de Saint-Amour and his allies, and Aquinas was actively involved in defending the mendicant orders against the charges articulated by the secular clergy. Soon after the appearance of *De periculis,* Aquinas composed *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem,* a defense of the mendicant orders that directly counters Guillaume's charges against the friars, and the debate persisted even after Guillaume's banishment.[32] Both the equation of Aquinas with Faus Semblant, an allegorical embodiment of fraternal excess and corruption, and the later defacement suggest that the controversy still had currency a century later and that it was being played out in this manuscript copy of the *Rose*. Defacement is not uncommon in other *Rose* manuscripts; in BnF fr. 12595, for example, we find that Dangier (fol. 23v), a person participating in Seneca's execution (fol. 47v), and Jalous (fol. 69v) have all had their faces marred, and in BnF fr. 12593 such defacing is so extensive as to seem indiscriminate (for example, defacing of both Male Bouche and Faus Semblant, his murderer, on fol. 91r). Here, however, the defacement is unusual in that it unites the reader and the creator of the manuscript in a specifically anti-Dominican reading of Faus Semblant's section of the poem, as becomes clear when we examine other visual and textual evidence from the manuscript.

In addition to the three miniatures discussed above, two marginal paintings, added not much later than the original artwork, reinforce the anti-Dominican

[31] G.K. Chesterton, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: "The Dumb Ox"* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1933; repr., New York: Image Books/Doubleday, 2001), 97–98.

[32] Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., *Saint Thomas Aquinas,* trans. Robert Royal, rev. ed., 1: *The Person and His Work* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press 2005), 82–84.

Fig. 4. Walters Art Museum, MS W. 143, fol. 69v, marginalia. A seated Dominican embraces a kneeling woman.

agenda of Walters 143. In the lower margin of fol. 69v, directly below the first miniature depicting Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance speaking to Amors (Fig. 1), is a depiction of a seated friar embracing a woman (Fig. 4). The pigments are somewhat faded and have flaked away in some areas, but one can still clearly see that the friar wears a black cloak over a white habit. The friar is seated in a wooden chair, and there appears to be a woman in a red gown kneeling before him; the friar's hand is on her back, her hand is in his lap, and the two lean toward one another, with her head entirely obscured by the capacious folds of the friar's black cloak. This marginal addition is placed beneath a column that ends with line 10446 but is reminiscent of details about Contreinte Atenance revealed later in the poem, when we are told that she has received paternosters from a friar and that he visits her more often than anyone else in the convent to confess her:

> Je por Faus Semblant nou lessast
> que souvent ne la confessast,
> et par si grant devocion
> fesoient leur confession
> que .II. testes avoit ensemble
> en un chaperon, ce me semble.
>
> (Lines 12029–34)

Fig. 5. Walters Art Museum, MS W. 143, fol. 72v, marginalia. A large dog in a Dominican habit is followed by three smaller dogs beneath an inscription reading "Veni mecum."

> [He never omitted, on account of False Seeming, to confess her often, and they made their confession with such great devotion that it seemed to me that they had two heads together under a single headpiece. (P. 210)]

The hypocrisy apparent in this "confession," and the one depicted at the bottom of fol. 69v, goes well beyond the implied sexual relationship between friar and nun,[33] for the assumption of the duty of confession by the friars, a duty once belonging exclusively to the secular clergy, was one source of the animosity directed at the mendicants by their secular opponents.

While the anti-Dominican message of depicting a friar in a Dominican habit engaged in such activity is clear enough, the message of the other marginal addition is even more pointedly directed at the order. On fol. 72v—the same folio with the second miniature that I have suggested depicts Thomas Aquinas (Fig. 2)—most of the lower margin is taken up with a drawing of four dogs (Fig. 5). A large dog facing left wears a black robe and is followed by three smaller dogs; above them is written "Veni mecum" (come with me). As Randall has noted, the fact that the largest dog wears a black robe and is placed on the same folio as a miniature depicting a Dominican suggests that this was intended as a visual version of the well-known pun "Domini canes," or "dogs of God," which has for centuries been used to refer to the Latin meaning of the name "Dominicans."[34] The image of a canine wearing a cloak also evokes Faus Semblant's repeated comparison of the mendicants to foxes and wolves (for example, at lines 11096, 11103, and 11493). As Dahlberg notes, "the traditional metaphor for a hypocrite, the wolf in sheep's clothing, goes back to Matt. 7:15, a text much used by

[33] Just prior to this passage, Contreinte Atenance has disguised herself as a beguine, a member of a lay religious community and not a nun. She is often depicted as a nun, however, meeting with her friar in a unspecified "convent." Although we have no evidence that the marginal additions in W. 143 are Jeanne's work, it is worth calling attention here to the famous sequence of sexual escapades between a friar or monk and a nun drawn by Jeanne in the margins of BnF fr. 25526 on fols. 106r, 106v, 111r, and 111v. These miniatures are discussed by Huot, *The "Romance of the Rose,"* chap. 8, and by Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers,* 1:256–59.

[34] Randall, *Manuscripts in the Walters Art Gallery,* 1:174.

Guillaume de Saint-Amour."[35] These marginal additions, then, underscore the overarching anti-Dominican sentiment of this manuscript and link the miniatures they accompany to other points in the poem as well as to the historical debates of Guillaume and his allies.

This message is further reinforced by a textual interpolation that begins following line 11192 and runs for 152 lines. The interpolation, which was described by Langlois in *Les manuscrits du Roman de la Rose,*[36] is commonly found in manuscript copies of the poem; Langlois lists fifty-seven manuscripts in which he had seen it (he did not know of the Walters manuscript), and quite a few more have been identified since his study of the manuscripts was published in 1910.[37] The length of the interpolation varies. Langlois identifies eight versions of it, which range from 82 lines for group 5 to 152 lines for group 7, the group to which the Walters 143 interpolation belongs. Although early editors of the poem tended to include the interpolation as part of the text, Langlois and Lecoy omit it from theirs, and hence it is usually absent from translations as well, a notable exception being Robbins's.[38] The passage consists largely of Faus Semblant boasting that his right to hear confessions, which had been granted by papal order, means that he is largely able to supplant priests in the lives of their parishioners (and, as a consequence, to take their money as well). Dahlberg notes that Faus Semblant's mention of a bull from Rome likely refers to *Ad fructus uberes,* a bull of Pope Martin IV dated December 13, 1281, that "gave friars the right, with the permission of bishops or parish priests, to preach and hear confessions, provided that the parishioner confess at least once a year to his parish priest."[39] Faus Semblant takes his liberties further than this, of course, threatening to bring any priests who object to court and to have their churches taken from them. The passage also makes mention of a "frere leu," or "Brother Wolf,"[40] thereby linking it to the marginal addition on fol. 72v and the other mentions of wolves in robes discussed above.

As with most manuscript books, Walters 143 bears witness to complex intersections of authority and intentionality; many individuals, from the poem's authors to the scribes, artists, patrons, revisers, and readers who created and shaped the manuscript, could and did affect the outcome of the text, thereby influencing subsequent readings of it. And, as is usually the case, it is very difficult to discover clear evidence that connects any particular intentionality to any of these individuals. It is entirely possible, likely even, that the scribe copying the text had no idea that the 152-line interpolation was anything other than part of Jean's original poem and that he was unaware of how it would reinforce the anti-Dominican sentiment of Jeanne's miniatures. Likewise, we have no evidence

[35] Dahlberg, 393.

[36] Ernest Langlois, *Les manuscrits du "Roman de la Rose": Description et classement* (Paris: H. Champion, 1910), 426–30.

[37] See Geltner, "*Faux Semblants,*" 377, for additional examples.

[38] Ibid., 378, and Robbins. Geltner discusses the editions and translations that include the interpolation as part of the main text. Robbins signals that the passage is an interpolation and gives it the title "False Seeming explains how the friars outwit priests" at 228.

[39] Dahlberg, 395.

[40] In Walters W. 143 this line is found on fol. 75r.

that the artist knew of and understood the dispute between Aquinas and Guillaume de Saint-Amour. And, of course, it is almost certain that no one who had a role in planning and making the book—*libraire,* patron, scribe, artist—could foresee how the marginal additions and the defacing of the manuscript by subsequent owners would combine with the interpolation and the miniatures to create a remarkably consistent anti-Dominican message. Those caveats aside, however, this combination of text, image, and reader interaction is more readily explained by intention than accident. All the layers present—the interpolation, the miniatures featuring a Dominican bearing marked resemblance to Aquinas, the targeting of this figure (and only this figure) for defacement, and the marginal additions that directly connect the Dominican order to textual details in the poem—work together in a mutually reinforcing manner to put forth the same reading of Faus Semblant's speech as an indictment of a specific mendicant order. The Rouses have expressed strong skepticism of arguments that ascribe intentionality and careful interaction with the text to manuscript illuminators, and to the Montbastons specifically, arguing that their "illuminations usually manifest only the most superficial connection with the written words they accompany"[41] and that they and their collaborators "manifested neither depth of understanding nor even undue curiosity, with respect to the texts they illustrated."[42] Despite my assertions here that Jeanne's miniatures, if indeed these are her work, are very closely connected to the text and to historical events that informed it, the argument put forth by the Rouses is amply supported by many examples indicating that the Montbastons did indeed often work with haste or with a lack of understanding of the text being illustrated or both. Yet it is also clear that these miniatures in Walters 143 do manifest much more than a superficial connection to the written word that they illustrate. It is tempting to imagine a patron who requested the Aquinas-like miniatures but whose instructions were only partially fulfilled by the Montbaston workshop (which would thus explain the differences between the miniature on fol. 81v and the other two discussed above); this patron may later have had the marginal drawings added, but it is likely that we will never know. Regardless of this mixed evidence, however, the anti-Dominican message of the book is anything but uncertain. Walters 143 provides clear evidence that Faus Semblant and how he is read can be directly shaped by the context of individual manuscripts, a point that is also evident in the next manuscript that I wish to consider.

Collins 1945-65-3

The Philadelphia Museum of Art's MS Collins 1945-65-3 is a mid-fifteenth-century manuscript that contains the *Roman de la Rose,* Jean de Meun's *Testament* and *Codicille,* and several additional short works. It is a much more deluxe manuscript than Walters 143, containing seventy-six miniatures attributed to the workshop of Maître François, all but one of which illustrate the *Rose* (the

[41] Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers,* 1:254.
[42] Ibid., 1:259.

Fig. 6. Philadelphia Museum of Art, MS Collins 1945-65-3 (workshop of Maître François, by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, revisions by Gui de Mori), fol. 75v. Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance stand before Amors. (Figs. 6–10 are reproduced by permission of the Philadelphia Museum of Art.)

exception is found at the opening of Jean's *Testament*); the miniatures are accompanied by colorful foliate borders featuring extensive use of gold leaf. Faus Semblant is depicted in five miniatures: on fol. 75v he and Contreinte Atenance stand before Amors (Fig. 6); on fol. 79r Amors crowns him *roi des ribauds* as a group of barons looks on (Fig. 7); on fol. 79v he stands between Amors and the barons, presumably to deliver his speech (Fig. 8); on fol. 87r he and Contreinte Atenance are shown walking along a path en route to their confrontation with Male Bouche (Fig. 9); and on fol. 89v he is seated and is choking Male Bouche, who kneels before him (Fig. 10). In the first four miniatures, Faus Semblant is depicted wearing a solid black robe, his head hooded on fols. 75v, 79v, and 87r but uncovered on fol. 79r in order for him to receive the crown offered by Amors. The robe is reminiscent of that worn by the Benedictines; but since they are not a mendicant order and have no association with the poem, it is likely that we

Fig. 7. Philadelphia Museum of Art, MS Collins 1945-65-3, fol. 79r. Faus Semblant enters into the service of Amors.

are meant to interpret it as a nondescript friar's habit. These first four miniatures each depict one or more of the accessories mentioned in the passage (lines 12003–66) that describes how Contreinte Atenance and Faus Semblant attire themselves in preparation for their confrontation with Male Bouche. Contreinte Atenance is shown at both fols. 75v and 87r with her white cloth head covering, Psalter, and prayer beads (lines 12018–20). Faus Semblant has his Bible, bound with a cloth carrying strap, over his shoulder at fols. 75v and 87r and lying before him on the ground at fols. 79r and 79v; his crutch of treason (lines 12060–61) is depicted as a cane or walking stick at fols. 75v and 87r. In the fifth miniature (fol. 89v) Faus Semblant has changed from the black robe to the garments of a priest, wearing what appears to be a light red dalmatic.

Together, these miniatures present a very different conception of Faus Semblant from the one found in Walters 143. Instead of invoking a specific individual, as the large head found in the two Walters miniatures does, Faus Semblant here remains an allegorical symbol, and each miniature contains at least one

Fig. 8. Philadelphia Museum of Art, MS Collins 1945-65-3, fol. 79v. Faus Semblant speaks to Amors.

symbolic item: the Bible, the crutch of treason, a crown, sacerdotal garments. Rather than identifying or emphasizing a particular person, these props instead add to the theatricality of an allegorical character while pointing beyond any historical individual to convey a range of symbolic associations. And instead of presenting a consistent appearance throughout the series of miniatures, Faus Semblant's change of clothing at fol. 89v emphasizes his willingness to switch garments; whereas in Walters 143 we are always reminded that he is a friar, and moreover a Dominican, here we are reminded that he appears often as a friar, but that this is just one disguise of many and that he will use any costume and props that serve to bring about the desired effect. Although many manuscripts show Faus Semblant consistently as either a Dominican (for example, BnF fr. 9345 and Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, MS 1126) or Franciscan (for example, BnF Rothschild 2800 and BnF fr. 802), others, like Collins 1945-65-3, emphasize the mutability of his outfits, and sometimes those of Contreinte Atenance as well. For example, in BnF fr. 25526 (another manuscript that was illustrated by Jeanne de Montbaston) we first find Faus Semblant dressed in a manner indistinguishable from the other barons gathered by Amors (fol. 79r), then as a Dominican (fol. 87r), and later as a Franciscan (fol. 94r). Similarly, in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 57, we first see

Fig. 9. Philadelphia Museum of Art, MS Collins 1945-65-3, fol. 87r.
Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance, dressed as pilgrims, en route to Male Bouche.

Faus Semblant on fol. 71v dressed in a red robe, holding a pair of gloves, and conversing with Contreinte Atenance, who is dressed as a nun.[43] They are next found on fol. 76r, both of them depicted as friars, with Contreinte Atenance in a Franciscan's habit and Faus Semblant in a Dominican's. On fol. 82r Contreinte Atenance is once again dressed as a nun, and Faus Semblant is wearing a light red or brown robe, which perhaps is meant to represent a Franciscan robe but lacks the telltale rope belt worn by Contreinte Atenance at fol. 76r. All of these features emphasize the corruptness of Faus Semblant more than the corruptness of specific orders of friars, and they show that he can use many things—the robes of friars from any order, the garments of a priest, secular clothing, Bibles, a crutch—in order to fashion his appearance to suit any occasion.

[43] Fleming, *Allegory and Iconography,* 169, mentions this miniature, noting that Faus Semblant "carries the glove which in the iconography of the *Roman* is clearly associated with lechery."

Fig. 10. Philadelphia Museum of Art, MS Collins 1945-65-3, fol. 89v. Faus Semblant, dressed as a priest, confesses Male Bouche.

Like Walters 143, Collins 1945-65-3 contains a 152-line interpolation following line 11192; the interpolation begins on fol. 81r and, like Walters 143, corresponds to the version identified by Langlois as group 7. The depiction of Faus Semblant as a priest is very unusual; in the 163 miniatures consulted in this study, it is the only one that shows him attired in this manner. It is appropriate, then, that the miniature is found in a manuscript containing this interpolation given that text's focus on Faus Semblant's capacity to occupy priestly roles, particularly that of hearing confessions. The degree to which we can ascribe intentionality to the artist, *libraire,* or patron in creating such a message is unclear. It may simply be that the artist rather unreflectively associated confession with priests and thus assumed that someone wanting to use an act of confession to trap an unsuspecting victim would naturally attire himself in a priest's clothing. But the potential for these miniatures to shape reception is once again clear, as are the ways in which the series of miniatures found here would suggest a very different interaction of the reader with the text from that found in Walters 143. In that manuscript, when accompanied by images of Dominicans and, more specifically, of Aquinas, the focus of the interpolation on the intrusion of the friars into the duties of the secular clergy is paralleled by the historical battle over their

acquisition of positions on the theology faculty at the University of Paris during the thirteenth century. But the miniatures in Collins 1945-65-3 suggest a very different reading of the same passage, namely, that it is easy for Faus Semblant and others of his ilk to use even the most powerful external signs to convey misinformation and that this is problematic, since such hypocrisy may be as readily disguised under a priest's clothing as a friar's. The images show that it is Faus Semblant himself who is the fraud, and not any particular order of friars, for the suggestion here is that he moves in and out of garments and that no aspect of his exterior, whether sacerdotal vestments, fraternal robes, or the Bible he carries, reflects his interior so clearly as the act of murder that he commits in the course of "confessing" Male Bouche.

The Collins manuscript also offers very valuable evidence of one reader's reception and understanding of the poem in the form of a sixteenth-century gloss in the margins. The gloss is unusually extensive; more than 200 separate inscriptions are found on the 150 leaves of the manuscript that contain the *Rose*. Maxwell Luria, who has published a description and transcription of the gloss, argues that it constitutes "an impressive example of traditional allegorical exegesis" and contrasts it with the "idiosyncratic allegorizations to be found in the contemporaneous versions of Molinet and of Marot," whose early printed versions of the poem included allegorizing interpretations that seem wildly inappropriate to most readers today.[44] Luria disagrees with Fleming's assessment that the *Rose* "was no longer clearly understood" by 1500, suggesting instead that the Collins gloss demonstrates "authentic allegorical understanding" of the poem.[45] Luria characterizes the glossator as free "from the pedantries which might suggest an academic or ecclesiastical provenance" and as "learned, humanistic, sometimes eloquent."[46] The inscriptions perform a variety of tasks, including providing summaries of sections of the poem (for example, fol. 83r, "Under what circumstances a physically able man may beg") and referring the reader to other relevant texts (for example, fol. 81r, "Note: On the decretal *Omnis utriusque sexus* and on the privileges of mendicant friars to hear confessions").[47] Most of the paragraph-length entries offer both a summary of events and an allegorical interpretation of them. An overarching purpose of the glosses is to offer a moralizing commentary on the poem that emphasizes the protagonist's loss of reason and virtue and the dangers and dishonor of carnal love. For example, a gloss on fol. 16r notes that the lover "forsakes all virtues, even the service of God, and, having become traitor, idolator, a man of blinded understanding, he becomes a

[44] Maxwell Luria, "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss on the *Roman de la Rose,*" *Mediaeval Studies* 44 (1982): 333–70, at 335. For a discussion of the allegorical readings put forth by Molinet and Marot, see 337–40. An example of the sort of far-fetched readings discussed by Luria is Molinet's equation of the lover's plucking of the rose with Joseph of Arimathea's cutting down the body of Christ from the cross.

[45] Fleming, *Allegory and Iconography,* 6; and Luria, "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss," 340.

[46] Maxwell Luria, *A Reader's Guide to the "Roman de la Rose"* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1982), 72 (see also Luria, "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss," 341).

[47] For the connection of *Omnis utriusque sexus* to *Ad fructus uberes,* cited above (484), see Dahlberg, 395; and Luria, "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss," 357 n. 28.

slave of created things and of vices."[48] Meradith T. McMunn suggests a moralizing tone to the miniatures as well, citing in particular a depiction of Orgueil, an addition of the moralizing *remanieur* Gui de Mori that is illustrated in only a few manuscripts (here on fol. 3r), and an unusual depiction of Venus confronting Peur and Honte:

> On folio 143 Venus is shown aiming her flaming arrow at Fear (*Paour*) and Shame (*Honte*) as they walk on a road in the open country. This scene is unique in *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts, and in fact it probably results from a misreading or reinterpretation of the text. At this point in the poem Venus has just threatened to destroy Fear and Shame, who are described as standing on the ramparts of the Castle of Jealousy. In the miniature she aims her arrow at the two personifications, rather than, as in the texts, at the notch between the legs of the female statue over the castle gate. Thus the artist of the miniature, in keeping with the moralizing revisions of Gui de Mori, has reduced the eroticism of the scene and focused not on Jean de Meun's sexual symbolism but on the military imagery that runs throughout both the original and the revised versions of the poem.[49]

Thus the manuscript features three layers of moralizing intervention from three centuries: those of Gui de Mori, whose revisions date to the late thirteenth century; those of the fifteenth-century miniatures that illustrate the work; and those of the sixteenth-century commentator. This cluster of moralizing responses to the original work, like the cluster of anti-Dominican features of Walters 143, suggests a consistent response to the poem from a number of individuals who created and later altered the book, but we are left without any conclusive evidence of what motivated the actions of any individual artist, glossator, or reader.

The presence of Gui's revisions in this manuscript is of potential relevance and interest to a study of Faus Semblant, as Gui extensively revised Faus Semblant's speech and "added hundreds of additional lines on the subject of mendicancy and monastic corruption."[50] Aside from the interpolation discussed above (which is not one of Gui's revisions), however, Faus Semblant's speech and the account of his murder of Male Bouche have not been altered in the Collins manuscript. The glossator did respond extensively to Faus Semblant, on the other hand; seventeen marginal inscriptions are found on the folios containing the passage of the poem from Faus Semblant's introduction through the murder of Male Bouche (fols. 75v–90r). (Translations of the passages, which range in length from a few words to several fairly long paragraphs, have been appended at the end of this article.) The gloss, like the miniatures, does not concern itself with any particular order of friars or historical figures, focusing instead on the potential for the corruption of religious individuals more generally. When Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance are introduced on fol. 75v, the accompanying gloss informs us that they are "gens [de] deuotion par apparence, ou gens de religion, lesquieux

[48] As translated by Luria in *A Reader's Guide,* 208, no. 17. Luria offers a transcription of the original passage in "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss," 345.

[49] From McMunn's description of Collins 1945-65-3 in *Leaves of Gold: Manuscript Illumination from Philadelphia Collections,* ed. James R. Tanis (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2001), 210–14, at 211.

[50] Huot, *The "Romance of the Rose,"* 39.

sont en cuer plus vicieux que les gens du siècle" (people who are pious only in appearance or people in religious orders who are, in their hearts, more wicked than people of the world).[51] Following this, the glossator offers not only summaries and brief allegorical interpretations of the characters and their actions, but also an alternative narrative that runs from fol. 77v through the death of Male Bouche. On fol. 77v we are introduced to a *voluptueux,* the glossator's name for Amans, who sends Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance to confront Male Bouche. On fol. 88r this parallel narrative is developed in such a way that Faus Semblant is depicted as a "man of religion" who is dispatched in order to limit the rumors and slanders circulating among the neighbors and relatives of the girl who is the object of the lover's desire:

> ce veult dire quil enuoye[52] quel que home de religion / au quel a narre son cas; lequel religieux / soubz dissimulation et faulx semblant de charite / en habit et gestes humbles / feignant / le temps pendant quil est auec eulz / viure coment Saint Iohan baptiste, les corrige de leurs goullees vitables en les preschant par parolles et paraboles feyntes / pour tapir et anichiller le bruit et la fame dicelles goullees, afin que le dit voluptueux vienge a ces fins.
>
> [That is, he sends a man of religion to whom he has told his case, who uses dissimulation and a false appearance[53] of charity, in religious habit and with humble mannerisms, pretending—as long as he is with them—to live like John the Baptist. He chides them for their vitriolic insults, preaching to them with affected words and parables, so as to cover up and stamp out the gossip and the bad reputation created by the insults, so that the philanderer can carry out his intentions.]

Following this, on fol. 89v, the confession of Male Bouche and the cutting out of his tongue are converted to a much less violent form of silencing:

> Apres / que Abstinence et faulx semblant a presche a mallebouche / faulx semblant le confesse / Et en le confessant Il luy couppe la langue dung coustel / Par ce puet estre entendu / que Apres que le religieux enuoye aux voisins / ou aux parans / de par le voluptueux / les a corrige de leurs goullees / ilz les contraint de eulz confesser, et en les confessant ilz leur couppe la langue; ce veult dire / que il leur donne en penitence que iamaiz ilz ne parlent de lamant / pour quelque choze que ylz voyent / car tout ce fait pour bien.
>
> [After Abstinence and Faus Semblant preached to Male Bouche, Faus Semblant confesses him and, as he is confessing, cuts off his tongue with a knife. This may be understood to mean that, once the religious has been sent to the neighbors or relatives by the philanderer and has chided them for their insults, he asks for their confessions, and as they confess, he "cuts off their tongue"; that is, he instructs them, as a penance, that they should never speak of the lover, no matter what they might see, because everything happens for a reason.][54]

[51] I am indebted to Jeanette Patterson for supplying the English translation of the Collins glosses found in the appendix and used in this article.

[52] "Quil enuoye" is followed by the repetitive "q[u]il envouie," which I follow Luria in omitting here.

[53] The phrase "faulx semblant" is here translated "false appearance" and not taken to refer to the proper name of the character.

[54] "Pour bien" literally is "for good."

The plot with the *voluptueux* and the *religieux* who aids him then concludes on fol. 90r with Faus Semblant taking gifts to La Vieille in order to allow the *voluptueux* to attain his final goal.

Although the Collins manuscript offers a very different interpretation of Faus Semblant from that of Walters 143, it, too, demonstrates a unity in text, image, and later marginal additions that strongly shapes a reader's understanding of Faus Semblant. The Collins gloss reinvents Faus Semblant in the course of offering a new, parallel narrative and an allegorical reinterpretation of the poem, and it does so in such a way that the resulting character both fits into the larger moralizing agenda of the gloss and mirrors the depiction of the character created a century earlier in the manuscript's miniatures. Just as the Faus Semblant depicted in the miniatures emphasizes the potential of outward signs and appearances to obscure truth, the *religieux* in the gloss "uses dissimulation and a false appearance," thereby directing criticism toward hypocrisy itself and bringing disgrace to himself rather than to any specific fraternal order or historical individual. This message is neatly summed up by the glossator in a brief inscription on fol. 80r, "Note que labit ne fait pas le Religieux" (Note that the habit does not make the religious).

Conclusions

In a number of ways, the two manuscripts presented here as case studies are exceptional, which explains in part why they were chosen for this study. In Walters 143, Jeanne's persistent use of a Dominican for Faus Semblant, the interpolation, the visual pun of the marginal addition, the defacement, and the possibility that readers are meant to equate Faus Semblant with Thomas Aquinas combine for an anti-Dominican message that goes far beyond that found in any other extant *Rose* manuscript. Collins 1945-65-3 is exceptional in that it contains a rare miniature of Orgueil, unusual, perhaps unique, depictions of Venus and of Faus Semblant, and a gloss that "is the first comprehensive MS. commentary on the *Roman de la Rose* to be reported."[55] As such, these manuscripts and their respective versions of Faus Semblant serve to remind us that for centuries interpretations of the character were strongly shaped by specific manuscript contexts and that we cannot understand the reception history of the character without returning to the diverse representations of him found in individual manuscripts. In addition to standing apart in a number of ways, these books also bear similarities to one another and to other groups of books. Both the Walters and the Collins manuscripts demonstrate that activities carried on by a variety of individuals involved in the production and reception of a manuscript, including artists, readers, glossators, and *remanieurs,* can combine to reinforce, comment on, or challenge aspects of the original text and that this dialogue can continue across centuries of alterations to an individual manuscript copy of the poem. In each of these manuscripts, we see these layers working together to reinforce a central

[55] Luria, "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss," 335.

reading of the poem, anti-Dominican on the one hand and moralizing on the other, although it would, of course, have been equally possible for the later additions to challenge or emend the earlier text, just as Gui's revisions altered the work of Guillaume and Jean. Each of these books is also typical of the workshop and milieu from which it originated. As discussed above, the Walters manuscript not only strongly resembles the other *Rose* manuscripts produced by the Montbastons, but is also more broadly representative of a larger corpus of mid-fourteenth-century manuscripts produced in Parisian workshops in substantial quantities, a world that the Rouses' two-volume work illuminates. The Collins manuscript, meanwhile, was likely the product of the workshop of Maître François, a very prominent Parisian illuminator in the latter part of the fifteenth century; it thus represents the milieu of elite manuscript workshops in Paris in the century after the Montbastons. These manuscripts are therefore unusual while simultaneously being very much products of their times. Together, groups of similar manuscripts offer the possibility of better understanding how earlier *Rose* manuscripts influenced the production of later books and how makers of manuscripts influenced their peers and followers; research into topics of this nature is greatly facilitated by the ever-expanding roster of new digital archives like the *Roman de la Rose* Digital Library.

We have inherited a great deal more evidence regarding Faus Semblant than what is available in a standard critical edition, evidence that comes to us in the forms of manuscript illumination, textual emendation, and the activities of subsequent readers, from marginal art to glosses to the defacement of that to which they objected. Although in the majority of cases it is wise to bear in mind the warning that the Rouses supply concerning the Montbastons, namely, that in these manuscripts an artist's "illuminations usually manifest only the most superficial connection with the written words they accompany,"[56] we should also be careful to recognize those manuscripts like Walters 143 wherein miniatures do seem to be used in a very intentional way. In our quest as critics to understand what Faus Semblant means, it is useful to take into account not only the words of other critics and editors who have grappled with this problem, but also the evidence left by *libraires,* artists, readers, and *remanieurs,* some of whom were quite close to the milieu of Jean de Meun himself. The prominence and frequent occurrence of Faus Semblant in illustrated copies of the poem attest to his importance to early readers, and the variety of these depictions bears witness to the fact that how he should be interpreted has been a consistent critical challenge since the poem was written. This challenge is also evidenced by the frequency with which the portion of the poem containing his speech has been altered by interpolations, additions, and subtractions and commented upon in inscriptions in later hands, practices that have been considered only briefly in this study. Faus Semblant is famous for his ability to dissemble and shift appearances, and the surviving manuscript copies of the poem not only depict the multivalence inherent in his character but also show how it has been amplified by centuries of active

[56] Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers,* 1:254.

illustration, revision, and interpretation, processes that seem entirely appropriate for his protean character and that hold much potential for advancing our understanding of him.

Appendix

Translation of the Collins Gloss (Philadelphia Museum of Art, MS Collins 1945-65-3, Fols. 75v–90r)

In order to facilitate cross-referencing, the numbering system here duplicates that used by Maxwell Luria in his transcription of the gloss.[57] The first number is the number of the inscription assigned by Luria; the folio number is followed by the Lecoy line numbers (L) and the corresponding page number of Dahlberg's translation (D).

106, fol. 75v (L 10440, D 186)
By Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance may be understood people who are pious only in appearance or people in religious orders who are, in their hearts, more wicked than people of the world. These types come to Cupid to serve him (that is, they promote debauchery).

107, fol. 77r (L 10657–69, D 189)
How Richesse refuses to give aid, or in other words, the debauched lover wants very badly to accumulate wealth while he pursues the Rose.

108, fol. 77v (L 10689, D 189)
The assault of the castle where Bel Acueil (that is, the beautiful girl) is, to whom access could not be obtained because of the gatekeepers (that is, because of the nasty rumors that they feared, and because of Dangier, Creynte,[58] and Honte, which young people have in the beginning); whereupon the barons of Amors's army (that is, all the vices by which one falls into carnal love), Oisiveté, Léesse, Franchise, Folle Largesse, Déduit, Beauté, Jeunesse, and Folle Hardiesse, come to an agreement, that is to convince the philanderer[59] to assault the castle where Bel Acueil is (that is, to find a way to appease those who prevent him from carrying out his foolish love). And the philanderer sends Faus Semblant and Abstinence Feinte[60] (who are two characters who wear religious habits and make outward gestures of piety) to Male Bouche, the first gatekeeper (who represents those who are talking about him), in order to keep him from talking any more. Once Male Bouche is appeased, Courtoisie and Largesse attack La Vieille, who guards Bel Acueil. (That is, once the lover has put a stop to the bad rumors, he is courteous to the old woman who guards the beautiful girl and corrupts her with gifts.) And when the philanderer has won over La Vieille, Délit and Bien Celer attack Honte. (In other words, the lover pleads with the beautiful girl out of foolish love and promises and swears to her that he will guard her honor above all else, and that is how the girl, who delights in seeing and hearing him,

[57] Luria, "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss," 342–70.

[58] Usually she is called "Peur" or "Paour"; both mean "fear."

[59] "Voluptueux," that is, a debauched or lustful man.

[60] Usually this character is called "Contreinte Atenance" (Forced Abstinence); here in the gloss she is "Feigned Abstinence," which does not appear in the main text (on this folio, it is abbreviated to simply "Abstinence"). Perhaps the moralizing glossator is slyly altering the name to make it more worthy of his criticism.

becomes bolder and loses shame.) Honte being won over, Creynte[61] and Dangier remain, to whom Franchise and Pitié are sent. (We can understand this to mean: when the young girl has lost shame, she permits and listens to the requests and gifts of the debauched lover, on account of which she has pity on him; that is, she gives him her consent.)

109, fol. 78r (L 10790, D 191)
Note the god of Love's response, namely, that Venus accomplishes many feats without him. In other words, many acts of debauchery are motivated by money, but they do not last long for lack of love.

110, fol. 78v (L 10865, D 192)
By the response of Amors's army—namely, if a rich man pays homage to Amors, etc.—is meant that when a rich man is enslaved[62] by foolish love, it consumes everything he has.

111, fol. 79r (L 10959, D 193–94)
Note that Faus Semblant is made King of the Bawds; this can be understood to mean that debauchery and deception remain under the cloak of piety and religion more than in secular society and that it is through them that the debauched arrive at their debauchery.

112, fol. 80r (L 11061–67, D 195)
Note that the habit does not make the religious.

113, fol. 81r (L 11093, D 195)
Note: On the decretal *Omnis utriusque sexus* and on the privileges of mendicant friars to hear confessions.

114, fol. 82r (L 11215–18, D 197)
The reason why religious do not want to visit poor sick people.

115, fol. 82r (L 11229–38, D 198)
The contrived reason why religious go to visit rich sick people.

116, fol. 82v (L 11257–64, D 198)
That no one should beg, no matter what his estate, so long as he has the means to earn a living.

117, fol. 83r (L 11345–52, D 199)
The meaning of God's commandment where he says, "Sell all that you have and follow me."

118, fol. 83r (L 11407–10, D 200)
Under what circumstances a physically able man may beg.

119, fol. 84v (L 11579–80, D 203)
The properties of religious hypocrites.

120, fol. 88r (L 12158, D 212)
Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance, sent by the god of Love, go to attack Male Bouche, who, as the first gatekeeper, guards Bel Acueil. By the arrival of Faus Semblant and Contreinte Atenance, sent by Cupid and his entourage to Male Bouche, may be understood the following: the debauched lover, who, for fear of rumors and slander spread

[61] Again, usually "Peur."

[62] The form "ébêté," translated here as "enslaved," seems literally to mean something like "made into an animal."

by the beloved's neighbors and relatives, was prevented from having access to her and having fun and making new discoveries in folly and vain love, sends Contreinte Atenance and Faus Semblant in order to accomplish his lustful desires. That is, he sends a man of religion to whom he has told his case, who uses dissimulation and a false appearance of charity, in religious habit and with humble mannerisms, pretending—as long as he is with them—to live like John the Baptist. He chides them for their vitriolic insults, preaching to them with affected words and parables, so as to cover up and stamp out the gossip and the bad reputation created by the insults, so that the philanderer can carry out his intentions.

121, fol. 89v (L 12375, D 216)
After Abstinence and Faus Semblant preached to Male Bouche, Faus Semblant confesses him and, as he is confessing, cuts off his tongue with a knife. This may be understood to mean that, once the religious has been sent to the neighbors or relatives by the philanderer and has chided them for their insults, he asks for their confessions, and as they confess, he "cuts off their tongue"; that is, he instructs them, as a penance, that they should never speak of the lover, no matter what they might see, because everything happens for a reason.

122, fol. 90r (L 12451, D 217)
Once Faus Semblant has cut off Male Bouche's tongue, he enters through the gate, accompanied by Courtoisie and Largesse, and they all go up to La Vieille who guards Bel Acueil, and Faus Semblant gives her a chaplet to give to Bel Acueil. This may be understood to mean that once the affected and hypocritical religious has mitigated the bad rumors about the philanderer's visits to the beautiful girl, then he takes gifts to the woman who guards the girl and persuades her with words, saying that [their][63] love is good and well intentioned,[64] whereby she will be committing a great sin in preventing them and that she should put aside all suspicions because he has extinguished[65] the bad rumors and defamatory insults. For this reason, the lovers should not encounter any jealousy, so you will present this little chaplet to the girl,[66] greeting her on behalf of the young man and telling her what you know, asking that they[67] might promise you that they will communicate together honorably. La Vieille allows it, exactly as Faus Semblant ordered.

[63] It is unclear whether love in general or the specific love between the lover and the girl is intended here. It cannot be the allegorical figure/god Amors, however, because there is a definite article.

[64] "Well intentioned," which is here understood to be referring to love, translates "sus esperance de bien."

[65] The translation from "has extinguished" to the end relies in part upon conjecture because of cropping along the right edge of the text.

[66] Probably "a s'amie" (to his [girl]friend), but the word is cropped.

[67] Presumably, the two lovers.

Timothy L. Stinson is Assistant Professor of English at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695 (e-mail: timothy_stinson@ncsu.edu).