



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**Imaging Dreams in the Middle
Ages: The *Roman de la Rose* and
Artistic Vision, c.1275-1540**

Jennifer Owen

Volume I

**History of Art Ph.D.
The University of Edinburgh
2016**

Abstract

This thesis constitutes an investigation into the depiction of dreams in imagery accompanying the late-medieval manuscripts and printed editions of the *Roman de la Rose*. It reflects on the changing approaches to depicting dreams during the 250 years of the *Rose's* popularity in central France, as well as discussing the historical theoretical understanding of the concept of dreams, and its expression in a specific *Rose* context. It examines the representation of dreams in a number of *Rose* manuscripts – in particular their prominent dreamer incipits – alongside other relevant miniatures of both a secular and religious nature.

Furthermore, the alteration of trends for depicting the dream space in *Rose* manuscripts during the fifteenth century are also considered, as well as a case-study of the luxurious Valencia manuscript, which contains a variety of dream subjects. This is followed by a discussion of the methodology of manuscript production in the medieval period, gleaned from a number of extant *Roses*. This chapter underscores the important role played by artistic originality and intention in the processes of manuscript making – addressing the ‘artistic vision’ indicated in the title of this thesis. An outline of the printed editions of the *Rose* and their resurrection of earlier tropes of dream depiction is also included. Finally, the appendix contains a Catalogue of the *Rose* manuscripts studied in preparation for and throughout the production of the thesis.

Contents

Volume I:

Introduction	p.1
Chapter One: Theoretical, Literary and Artistic Medieval Dreams	p.17
I: The Attitudes of Antiquity: Pagan Authorities on the Dream	
II: Late Antiquity: The Transitional Neoplatonists	
III: The Biblical Position: Old and New Testament; Apocrypha; Early Christian	
IV: Dreambooks	
V: Later Medieval Attitudes	
VI: The Literary and Poetic Dream	
VII: The <i>Roman de la Rose</i>	
VIII: Literary Successors to the <i>Rose</i>	
IX: Postscript: Attitudes of the Present Day	
X: Reconceptualising the Rose: The Importance of Dream Theory	
XI: The Historical Artistic Representation of Dreams	
Chapter Two: Representing Dreams in the <i>Roman de la Rose</i> and its Contemporaries in the Fifteenth Century:	p.77
I: Prominent Dreamers: The <i>Rose</i> Incipits	
A: The First Dreamers: Urb. Lat. 376 and the Development of the Dream <i>topos</i>	
B: Replacing ‘Author’ with ‘Dreamer’	
C: Quadripartite Incipits and the Extension of the Dream	
D: Croesus and Phanie	
II: The Brussels-Lyon Family: Evolution of the Visual Dream	
III: Nature’s Discussion of Dreams and its Prominent Visual Omission	
Chapter Three: Representing Dreams in the <i>Roman de la Rose</i> and its Contemporaries in the Fifteenth Century:	p.119
I: Continuity and Development of the Dream	
II: Dreams in the Valencia Manuscript	
A: The Multiscenic Incipit	
B: The Dream of Socrates	

	C: Croesus and Phanie	
	D: The Waking Dreamer	
III:	Erroneous Perspective	
IV:	Resurgence of Authority? Rejection of the Dream <i>Topos</i>	
Chapter Four:	Production Methods from Complete and Incomplete <i>Roses</i>	p.150
I:	The Initial Stage: Scribes, Rubricators and the Implications of Gaps in Manuscripts in the First Decades of <i>Rose</i> Production	
II:	Scribes, Rubricators and the Implications of Gaps in Manuscripts During the Later Fourteenth Century	
III:	The Second Stage: The Illuminator's Tasks During the First Decades of <i>Rose</i> Production	
IV:	Alternative Planning Methods in the First Decades of <i>Rose</i> Production	
V:	Multiple Methodologies, and an Unfinished Copy: The Late Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries	
VI:	Artists for Hire, c.1325-50: The Lyon-Brussels Group and their Extended Family	
VII:	Atypical Illumination Cycles of the Fourteenth Century and Beyond	
VIII:	Continuity of Process in the Fifteenth Century	
Chapter Five:	Dreams in the Printed Editions, c.1481-1530	p.196
Conclusion		p.218
Bibliography		p.231
<u>Volume II:</u>		
Appendix:	Catalogue of <i>Roman de la Rose</i> Manuscripts and Incunables Consulted in this Study	p.247
List of Illustrations		p.352
Images		p.356

Introduction

Dream narrative, encyclopaedia, love quest, or amatory handbook: the *Roman de la Rose* was once the epitome of medieval French literature. The narrative focuses on the retelling of a dream-quest and survives in over 300 complete and fragmentary manuscript copies, as well as around 20 printed incunabula editions, produced between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. The sheer size of the corpus alone therefore makes it worthy of study for any scholar interested in the representation and development of dream imagery during the Middle Ages. Yet it is not simply the vast quantity of these manuscripts that makes them ideal for investigation, but the flexibility, innovation and variation that characterises the group.

Written during the thirteenth century, amid the expansion of vernacular literature in central Europe, it quickly became a best-seller.¹ Image cycles appear in a large proportion of the manuscripts; around two-thirds of the surviving copies contain some form of figurative visual imagery, from single historiated initials to illuminated series featuring over 100 vignettes. The printed editions, both on paper and vellum, also featured woodcut accompaniments which were often coloured or illuminated by hand after printing.

One of the most interesting factors of the *Rose* is that it has been subject to scholarly discussion and criticism from a very early stage. For this reason, a review of the relevant literature must also incorporate near-contemporary works, including the

¹ Ernest Langlois, *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose* (Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1891), v; Felix Lecoy, ed., *Le Roman de la Rose* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1965); Heather Arden, *The Romance of the Rose* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987), 1-19. The dates of completion are typically accepted as c.1225-40 for Guillaume de Lorris' section, and c.1270-75 for Jean's substantial conclusion. Langlois originally suggested c.1225-40 and c.1275-80, while Lecoy revises these to c.1225-30 and c.1269-78. As Heather Arden points out, however, the only definitive termination date for the whole poem is 1305, the year Jean de Meun died (1987), 1. The use of the term 'best-seller' requires some contextualisation; comparatively speaking, the *Rose* exists in far greater numbers than contemporary vernacular narratives. Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, a story often described as a medieval 'blockbuster', survives in only 83 complete or partial manuscripts. A more pertinent comparison may be made with the Old French *Lancelot-Grail Cycle*, which according to Alison Stones appears in around 175 manuscripts (cf. Stones et al., *The Lancelot-Graal Project*, last modified 2009, <http://www.lancelot-project.pitt.edu/lancelot-project.html>). Certainly, it does not match the overwhelming popularity of *Books of Hours*, which survive in many hundreds of copies; though as this was a practical, devotional text, it cannot be exactly compared with a vernacular romance narrative. However, it clearly had a considerable presence in the thirteenth to sixteenth-century book market, and I believe fully merits the term 'best-seller'.

documents of the *Querelle de la Rose*, which occurred in the early fifteenth century. These have been made accessible primarily through Hicks, who reproduced the extant letters and treatises in Modern French.² Additional work on this subject has been done by McWebb et al, in a volume that provides further context for the *Querelle* documents, illuminating the occasionally combative positions of the major participants, their forebears and successors, as well as providing English translations of the documents.³ Badel also provides a very useful overview of the reception of the *Rose* in the fourteenth-century, drawing attention to the ways in which it was transmitted and used as inspiration for a variety of works.⁴ Other studies have also stressed the poem's reliance on earlier vernacular and Latin textual models, as well as an awareness of the poem's novelty.⁵ The scholarly and authorial discussion of the *Rose* however tailed off during the sixteenth century, as the poem ceased production in both manuscript and printed editions. After this, the next major consideration of the poem was during the eighteenth century, when new editions appeared. However, this interest was largely concerned with recapturing an authorial or authentic copy of the poem, reconstructing Guillaume and Jean's original 'intention' through consultation with several copies, or recovering a single manuscript's version of the text. It was Langlois' seminal study in the early twentieth century that marked a return to scholarly investigations into the *Rose* and its manuscript corpus.⁶

Notably, however, Langlois' edition of the poem and analysis of the language is accompanied by a rather subjective catalogue of the manuscripts, meaning while it currently stands as the most complete study of the manuscript corpus, it also lacks comprehensive treatment of the imaged copies of the *Rose*, being sporadic at best, and misleading at worst.⁷ Just some of Langlois' variable 'terminology' used to describe the miniatures present in the manuscripts include: 'sans intérêt' (BnF fr. 802); 'une belle miniature' (BnF fr. 804); 'miniatures sans grande valeur' (BnF fr. 1576, as well as some

² Eric Hicks, *Le Débat sur le Roman de la Rose* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1977).

³ Christine McWebb, ed., *Debating the Roman de la Rose: A Critical Anthology* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

⁴ Pierre-Yves Badel, *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe Siècle, Etude de la Réception de l'œuvre* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980).

⁵ Constance Hieatt, *The Realism of Dream Visions: The Poetic Exploitation of the Dream-Experience in Chaucer and his Contemporaries* (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1967), for example, focuses on the poem's influence on Chaucer.

⁶ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits du Roman de la Rose: Description et Classement* (Lille and Paris: Tallandier and Honoré Champion, 1910).

⁷ It is partly to address this lacuna that the present study includes a Catalogue of the extant imaged manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose*.

others); and the rather unhelpful comment, 'miniatures', applied to a number of copies including BnF fr. 1559, an important early copy of the poem.⁸ While one might find these amusing, particularly as they betray Langlois' preferences for miniatures produced in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, they offer no real assistance when seeking to examine the corpus of *Rose* miniatures, especially as he even omits or incorrectly discusses the visual content of some manuscripts.⁹ Yet while Langlois' methodology is variable, it also provided a useful starting point for the catalogue included in the present study, which follows a similar categorisation system (i.e. Country, City). Additionally, his work on the 'families' of manuscripts sharing peculiarities of script, language or content also informed this thesis' identification of groups of manuscripts sharing visual components. A more up-to-date index of the *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts appears on the online resource www.romandelarose.org, which provides an even more extensive list of copies, though even this is now proving out of date. This further emphasises the need to include an updated catalogue alongside this thesis.¹⁰

The general focus of scholarly studies since Langlois' poetic analysis and catalogue has typically been thematic, or concerned with single or small groups of manuscripts. The field is typically dominated by literary studies, though the two major authors of *Rose* 'bibliographies' – Arden and Luria – do incorporate references to the sporadic artistic considerations of the poem.¹¹ Both artistic and literary studies were consulted in preparation for this thesis. Of these, some have served more contentious aims – such as Fleming's assertion that the *Rose* represents an allegorical rendering of the Christian 'Fall' narrative.¹² While his study provokes interesting ideas, its methodology is largely flawed (isolating images from manuscripts to serve an idea when others, indeed the general corpus of *Roses*, would prove his theory incorrect) and the book has now been

⁸ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 9, 11, 34, 16.

⁹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 140. In several catalogue entries, Langlois comments on manuscripts he never saw, yet still presents his findings in an authoritative manner without referencing his sources. This occurs with Versailles BM 153, which he erroneously dates to the fifteenth century.

¹⁰ See Appendix One. The catalogue also incorporates pertinent bibliographic sources alongside each entry.

¹¹ Heather Arden, *The Romance of the Rose*, and *The Roman de la Rose: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1993); Maxwell Luria, *A Reader's Guide to the Roman de la Rose* (Connecticut: Archon Books, 1982).

¹² John Fleming, *The Roman de la Rose: A Study in Allegory and Iconography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

superseded both by Fleming's own clarifications, and other rebuttals of its content.¹³ Hult's *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies* provides a more nuanced conception of the *Rose* as a whole, and is particularly influential on the present study given its recognition of the ambiguity inherent in the poem.¹⁴ While several authors have tried to pin down an overarching meaning or purpose, Hult offers a welcome assertion of the poem's complexity that does not try to produce an ill-fitting holistic solution.

Some interesting studies have received less scholarly consideration, such as Jager's discussion of the Dream of Croesus, which is of great relevance to the topic discussed in this thesis.¹⁵ Furthermore, Stakel's *False Roses* also provokes interesting reflection on the poem's 'falsity', stressing the prevalence of the figure of Fraud, which also partly informed my own attitude to the poem.¹⁶ Even the briefest perusal of the extant literature will reveal a major omission from the topics singled out for analysis in *Rose* studies: with the exception of Jager, and to some extent König via a short 1989 study, no major scholar has considered the dream theme as expressed in the text of the *Rose* – an omission I will argue is inconceivable considering the evidence of the narrative itself.¹⁷

In terms of visual analysis, the earliest author to consider the visualisation of the *Rose* in miniatures was Kuhn in the early twentieth century, as while interventions in manuscripts allude to the responses of readers to visual content, no specific discussions of the imagery accompanying the poem appeared in the medieval period.¹⁸ Kuhn's

¹³ David Hult, *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Readership and Authority in the First Roman de la Rose* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 75-77; Michael Camille, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 319-320. Both authors offer perspectives on Fleming's interpretation of the *Rose*.

¹⁴ Hult, *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies*.

¹⁵ Eric Jager, "Reading the *Roman* Inside Out: The Dream of Croesus as a *Caveat Lector*", *Medium Ævum*, Vol. LVII (Oxford: The Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature, 1988): 67-74.

¹⁶ Susan Stakel, *False Roses: Structures of Duality and Deceit in Jean de Meun's Roman de la Rose* (Saratoga: Anma Libri, 1991).

¹⁷ Eberhard König, ">>Atant fu jourz, et je m'esveille<< Zur Darstellung des Traums im Rosenroman" in *Träume et Mitellalter. Ikonologische Studien*, ed. Agostino Paravicini Bagliani and Giorgio Stabile (Stuttgart and Zurich: Belser, 1989). This article is a short, largely descriptive discussion of the dreamer incipits in a handful of disconnected manuscripts, and does not go into greater detail about what these depictions might mean for the overall narrative of the *Rose*, or indeed within the larger context of dream theory and development in the Middle Ages.

¹⁸ The authors involved in the *Querelle*, whom one might expect to have responded to the at-times erotic or sensational imagery of the *Rose*, do not consider arguments based on the perceived content of the images, solely the poem. This is discussed in Meradith McMunn, "Was

study unfortunately shares characteristics with the contemporaneous Langlois catalogue, incorporating much speculation and an attempt to impose a chronological hierarchy on the accompanying incipits, moving from the simplest to the most complex form.¹⁹ The overview of the existing incipits undertaken for this thesis shows Kuhn's picture is too basic, as forms of incipit interrelated and overlapped, instead of moving in a linear fashion from one mode to the next.²⁰ However, Kuhn does identify some interesting potential visual relationships in terms of connected manuscripts, suggesting a link between images of the Dreaming Jesse (a religious iconographical trope) and those of the *Rose* dreamer depicted alongside the rosebush.²¹ The problematic nature of such connections will be discussed in greater detail during Chapter One.

A further artistic study of *Rose* manuscripts appeared with König's 1992 description and analysis of the manuscripts held in the Vatican Library.²² This analyses the manuscripts partly in relation to one another, but is largely concerned with an exposition of the likely date and provenance for these manuscripts. A similar approach appears in Blamires and Holian's 2002 study regarding *Roses* in the National Library of Wales, which also considers several manuscripts of variable date.²³ While these studies do relate *Roses* to contemporaneous imaged manuscripts, they both overlook the prevalence of a dream element in the imagery of the *Rose*, and the relevance of this subject to the history of illuminated *Roses* and its simultaneous comprehension by readers of the time. It is my opinion that to truly understand the *Rose*, far larger proportions of the manuscripts need to be considered in studies before a nuanced discussion of the copies can occur; not just consideration of manuscripts 'accidentally' paired based on the caprices of individual library collections. Indeed, the wide-ranging research undertaken in preparation for this thesis – looking at 190 illuminated manuscripts, and additional unimaged copies – provided the opportunity to see

Christine Poisoned by an Illustrated Rose?", *The Profane Arts/Les Arts Profane* 7:2 (1998): 36-151, a study of Christine de Pisan's hypothetical access to illuminated *Roses*.

¹⁹ Alfred Kuhn, *Die Illustration des Rosenromans* (Freiburg im Breisgau: C.A. Wagner, 1911).

²⁰ Incipits of the poem are discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis.

²¹ Kuhn, in *Die Illustration des Rosenromans*, also suggested a relation between *Rose* incipits and contemporaneous *Nativity* depictions, though this study disagrees with his assumptions in this respect. This will be discussed at greater length in Chapter Two.

²² Eberhard König, *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose: Die Handschriften des Rosenromans in der Vatikanischen Bibliothek* (Stuttgart: Belser, 1992).

²³ Alcuin Blamires and Gail Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated: Manuscripts at the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth* (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002).

connections between *Rose* copies that have, to the best of my knowledge, never been noticed before.

One study that stands out is Peruzzi's 1986 study of the Laurenziana Acq e Doni 153 manuscript, which attempts to catalogue all the images in an atypical early manuscript of the *Rose* with detailed descriptions of the scenes.²⁴ Few considerations of single or group manuscripts (e.g. Blamires and Holian, or the studies of Ost on the Valencia copy) go into such detail, preferring instead to merely list the scenes.²⁵ While such a detailed undertaking is ill-suited to the general thematic approach to the *Rose* as is presented here, Peruzzi's approach provides an example of an alternative methodology that contrasts with those typically found in *Rose* illumination studies. It is for this reason that during the preparatory stages of this study, I produced a collation of the characteristics of the most common subjects depicted in *Rose* manuscripts, allowing for the identification of themes prevalent across the entire corpus.

The various studies of McMunn into thematic aspects of the illuminated *Roses* also discuss a number of relevant points regarding artistic expression of the poem.²⁶ However, the short nature of these studies often means they are unable to provide a full picture of the *Rose* and its development in terms of imagery. Additionally, I believe their omission of a major factor – i.e. the dream theme – means these tend to overlook one aspect that might link these thematic aspects together. Nonetheless, as a proponent of

²⁴ Simonetta Mazzoni Peruzzi, *Il Codice Laurenziano Acquisti e Doni 153, Del 'Roman de la Rose'* (Firenze : Casa Editrice le Lettere, Libreria Commissionaria, Sansoni, 1986).

²⁵ Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*; Heidrun Ost, "Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose* in the Time of the Debate: The Manuscript of Valencia" in *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400*, ed. Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen (Louvain and Dudley: Peeters, 2006) 405-35, and "The 'Mythographical Images' in the *Roman de la Rose* of Valencia (Biblioteca Historica de la Universitat, MS.387)" in *De la Rose: texte, image, fortune*, ed. Catherine Bel and Herman Braet (Louvain: Peeters, 2006), 141-81.

²⁶ Meradith McMunn, "Notes on Representations of the Erotic in Some Illustrated Manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Romance Languages Annual*, Vol. 4, accessed online through the RLA Archive (1993); "The Iconography of Dangier in the Illustrated Manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Romance Languages Annual*, Vol. 5 (1994): 86-91; "Animal Imagery in the Text and Illustrations of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Reinardus* Vol. 9 (1996): 87-108; "Was Christine Poisoned by an Illustrated *Rose*?"; "A Fragment of an Unknown MS of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 60 (1999): 276-303; "Reconstructing a Missing Manuscript of the *Roman de la Rose*: the Jersey Manuscript", *Scriptorium* 53 (1999): 31-62; "Programs of Illustration in *Roman de la Rose* Manuscripts Owned by Patrons and Friends of Christine de Pizan" in *Au Champ des Escriptions: IIIe Colloque International sur Christine de Pizan*, eds. Eric Hicks, Diego Gonzalez and Philippe Simon (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998), 737-53.

artistic investigation into the *Roman de la Rose* corpus, these are important precedents for the present study.

A number of scholars have, as noted, tackled the placement of the *Rose* in the wider context of later medieval literature, such as Allen in *The Art of Love*, which considers the *Rose* in terms of love poetry and the *ars amatoria* tradition, or Gaunt's consideration of the poem in relation to authorship and continuation.²⁷ A particularly useful example of one such study is Huot's *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers*, which was influential on the present thesis in terms of emphasising the importance of page design and decoration on reader experience.²⁸ Other studies of medieval visionary literature from the mid-1960s also incorporate reference to the *Rose*, such as Hieatt's study on the use of dreams in Chaucer, Tuve's *Allegorical Imagery* or Lynch's consideration of medieval dream visions.²⁹ Given the proximity to – and potential confusion with – medieval visionary poetry, such as Apocalypse narratives, a number of sources on visionary literature were also consulted, such as the recent volume edited by Hourihane, *Looking Beyond*.³⁰ Perusal of such volumes revealed that while the depictions of the Apocalypse in art have been granted a great deal of attention, the depiction of dreams – specifically secular dreams – has not had the same attention.³¹ While Carolyn Carty's PhD thesis declared its intention to study dreams in

²⁷ Peter Allen, *The Art of Love: Amatory Fiction from Ovid to the Romance of the Rose* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992); Simon Gaunt, *Retelling the Tale: An Introduction to Medieval French Literature* (London: Duckworth and Co., 2001).

²⁸ Sylvia Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, Manuscript Transmission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

²⁹ Hieatt, *The Realism of Dream Visions*; Rosemond Tuve, *Allegorical Imagery: Some Mediaeval Books and their Posterity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966); Kathryn Lynch, *The High Medieval Dream Vision: Poetry, Philosophy and Literary Form* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988).

³⁰ Colum Hourihane, ed., *Looking Beyond: Visions, Dreams and Insights in Medieval Art History*, (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State Press, Index of Christian Art and Princeton University, 2010).

³¹ See for example the various articles by Richard Emmerson on visualising the Apocalypse, "Introduction: The Apocalypse in Medieval Culture" in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992) 293-332; and "Visualising the Visionary: John in His Apocalypse" in *Looking Beyond*, ed. Hourihane; Peter Klein, "Introduction: The Apocalypse in Medieval Art" in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Emmerson and McGinn, 159-99; "Visionary Experience and Corporeal Seeing in Thirteenth-Century English Apocalypses: John as External Witness and the Rise of Gothic Marginal Images, in *Looking Beyond*, ed. Hourihane, 177-201; Suzanne Lewis, "Exegesis and Illustrations in 13th Century English Apocalypses", in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Emmerson and McGinn, 259-75; or John Williams, "Purpose and Imagery in the Apocalypse Commentary of Beatus of Liebana", in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Emmerson and McGinn, 217-33.

medieval art, it was nonetheless limited to ecclesiastical, religious and largely monumental examples.³²

This lacuna is even more pronounced when one considers the vast corpus of medieval dream theory and literature accessible today. Classical and medieval sources referenced in preparation for the thesis include, but are not limited to: Alain of Lille's *Plaint of Nature*; Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*; Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*; Augustine's *De Genesi ad Litteram*; Berriot's 1989 study of the medieval *Songes Daniel* Dreambooks; Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*; various poems by Chaucer; Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*; John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*; Lucian's *The Dream, or Lucian's Career*; Macrobius' *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. A variety of secondary studies considering this topic also exist, such as Petersen's expansion of the *Dialogues*, or Bodenham's study of dreams in late medieval French literature.³³ A number of studies have also attempted to untangle the complex relationship between Macrobius and the *Roman de la Rose*, such as those by Peden and Dahlberg.³⁴ Several overviews of medieval dream theory also proved particularly useful, including the 1992 outline offered by Kruger, and the near-exhaustive collation of dream, mystical and vision theory by Thorndike.³⁵ Nevertheless, with the exception of the Dahlberg, Peden and Bodenham studies, few scholars have given much attention to the theory of dreams as expressed in the *Rose*; while many recognise its presence, the effect this theme has on the narrative has largely been ignored. Needless to say, the visualisation of the dream theory in the *Rose* has not received much, if any, attention.

Finally, in any study considering the artistic depiction of a theme or subject, it is necessary to consider the prior work of scholars working in manuscript research. A number of studies proved particularly useful when preparing this thesis, such as the numerous articles by Alexander written during the late 1980s and early 1990s considering models, preliminary drawings, and artistic methodologies in the Middle

³² Carolyn Carty, *Dreams in Early Medieval Art* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1991).

³³ C.H.L. Bodenham, "The Nature of the Dream in Late Medieval French Literature", *Medium Ævum*, Vol. LIV: 74-86.

³⁴ Charles Dahlberg, "Macrobius and the Unity of the 'Roman de la Rose'", *Studies in Philology*, 58:4 (1961): 573-582; Alison Peden, "Macrobius and Mediaeval Dream Literature", *Medium Ævum*, Vol. LIV (1985): 59-73.

³⁵ Steven Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1923-1934).

Ages.³⁶ Additionally, the comprehensive overviews of both Avril *et al.* and Stones also provide a solid background against which the developments of the *Rose* and their contextual partners can be set in relief.³⁷ The Rouses also provide useful insights into their perceived ‘Montbaston’ workshop, and while the present study disagrees with some of their findings, their approach – attempting to discern manuscript ‘families’ – was nonetheless useful when undertaking research³⁸.

While this overview does not refer to all studies consulted in preparation for the thesis, it does reveal a few major scholarly ‘blind spots’ when it comes to the *Roman de la Rose*.³⁹ Rather than having a strong focus on the dream – especially considering the wealth of medieval material that survives regarding the theoretical and philosophical consideration of dreams – most scholarship has skimmed over the dream aspect of the *Rose*. For a manuscript that opens with a defence of prophetic dreams, and most commonly was illustrated with a depiction of a dreamer (the most popular subject included in illuminated *Roses*), this seems highly unusual. It is therefore a primary aim of this thesis to redress the balance by spending time on the dream aspect which is, as evident in the textual and visual evidence, an integral element of the *Rose*.

It is the contention of the present writer that the dream aspect defines the entire experience related in the tale and illustrated in the accompanying imagery, and should not be treated as a supplementary, accidental or inconsequential aspect of Guillaume or

³⁶ Jonathan J.G. Alexander, “Facsimiles, Copies and Variations: The Relationship to Model in Medieval and Renaissance European Illuminated Manuscripts” in *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, ed. Kathleen Preciado (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1989), 61-74; “Preliminary Marginal Drawings in Medieval Manuscripts” in *Artistes, Artisans et Production Artistique Au Moyen Age, Colloque International*, ed. Xavier Barral I Altet, Vol. III (Paris: Picard, 1990), 307-19; *Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

³⁷ François Avril, *Manuscript Painting at the Court of France: The Fourteenth Century (1310-1380)* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1978); *L’enluminure à l’époque gothique: 1200-1420* (Paris: Bibliothèque de l’image, 1995; with Nicole Reynaud, *Les manuscrits à peintures en France, 1440-1520* (Paris : Flammarion, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1995) ; and with Danielle Gaborit-Chopin, *1300...L’Art au Temps de Philippe le Bel* (Paris: École du Louvre, 1998); Alison Stones, “Sacred and Profane Art : Secular and Liturgical Book-Illumination in the Thirteenth Century” in *The Epic in Medieval Society: Aesthetic and Moral Values*, ed. Harald Scholler (Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 1977); “Indications écrites et modèles picturaux, guides aux peintres de manuscrits enluminés aux environs de 1300” in *Artistes, Artisans et Production Artistique Au Moyen Age*, ed. Xavier Barral I Altet, Vol. III (1990), 321-49; “The Illustrations of BN, Fr. 95, and Yale 229: Prolegomena to a Comparative Analysis” in *Word and Image in Arthurian Literature*, ed., Keith Busby (London: Garland Publishing, 1996); *A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in France*, Vol. I (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2013).

³⁸ Richard and Mary Rouse, *Illiterati et Uxorati: Manuscripts and Their Makers. Commercial Book Producers in Medieval Paris, 1200-1500*, Vol. I (Belgium: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2000).

³⁹ See the Catalogue and Bibliography for details of the sources consulted.

Jean's narrative. Investigation into the dream imagery accompanying the poem – in relation to contemporary dream theory and the development of this theme throughout the *Rose* – reveals that the dream topic can offer a solid means of considering the concepts, reception and development of the poem, and attitudes towards dreaming, during the Middle Ages.

Dream imagery is a field with a long visual and textual history in central Europe, yet the explosive popularity of the *Rose* contributed to something of a 'boom' in dream iconography during the Later Middle Ages. Subjects from the *Rose* migrated into tapestries, and may also have been related to ivory casket decorative motifs.⁴⁰

Following on from my previous study of dream representation in copies of another medieval French text, René d'Anjou's *Le Livre du Coeur d'Amour Épris*, this thesis will consider the development of dream imagery in the seminal dream-related text of the medieval period.⁴¹

The visualisation of the dream in *Rose* manuscripts touches upon a number of different areas of interest. Primarily, it provides a space for the examination of the changing state of dream representations accompanying one text in almost 200 illuminated copies over a time span of three centuries. This requires the consideration of many variables, from art and literary history, patterns of readership, to literary and visual engagement. It offers insights into manuscript production methods, the differing attitudes to one text over a substantial period of time, the evolution of artistic cycles, and changing approaches to the dream material.

⁴⁰ While no surviving *Rose* tapestries exist, we do know that a tapestry of '*L'Histoire du Roman de la Rose*' was sold in 1386 for 100 francs to Philip of Burgundy - described in Jules Guiffrey, *Histoire de la Tapisserie depuis le Moyen Age jusqu'à nos jours*, (Tours: Alfred Mame et Fils, Editeurs, 1888). Regarding caskets, an atypical depiction of the besieging of the Rose in Cologny Bodmer 79 may have provided the inspiration for, or been borrowed from, the oft-repeated *Siege of the Castle of Love* motif appearing on a group of ivory caskets produced c.1310-40, three examples of which are held in the Victoria and Albert Museum (146-1866), the Metropolitan Museum of Art (17.190.173) and the Walters Art Museum (71.265). These caskets all feature a siege scene on the lid where the principal antagonists and defenders throw roses at one another. These caskets were brought to my attention during a session at the 2015 Leeds International Medieval Congress during a talk by Dustin Aaron, a student at the Courtauld Institute of Art, who is studying these ivory pieces.

⁴¹ René's text was something of an homage to the *Rose*, similarly dealing with a dream narrative. *The Book of the Love-Smitten Heart* was transmitted in two contemporaneous illuminated copies, one of which specifically evidences interest in the representation of dreams as distinct from waking reality – a methodology that appears to have first arisen in *Rose* iconography and illumination.

With regard to the specific artistic representation of dreams, a major change evident within the *Roses* is a shift away from the typical cause-and-effect format visible in earlier imagery. While originally it reflected traditional motifs, dream imagery in *Roses* by the fifteenth century encompassed a number of formulas, some linked to the physical experience of dreaming, others using it as a vehicle for alternative ideas and themes. Such developments, inaugurated in *Roses* as well as contemporary manuscripts featuring other dream representations, had repercussions which are evident up to the present day.

The dream imagery of the *Rose* manuscripts also offers the best means of understanding the meaning of the poem, and how it was interpreted in the eyes of planners and artists illuminating the copies. One major feature evident in the breadth of recent and medieval interpretations of the *Rose* is its ability to mean different things to those who read it. I believe the visual interpretations of the poem contribute to and reflect such variable readings, but on another level, the dream structure itself also offers some justification for its ambiguities, especially when considered in the context of medieval comprehension of the dream state.

The reasons for the omission of studies of the dream represented in the *Rose* are unclear. While some authors do admittedly pay slight attention to it, often it recedes into the background. One thing emerging clearly from this study into the attitudes and theories prevalent before and contemporary with the *Rose* manuscripts is that dreams were considered with the same suspicions – and superstitions – in the Medieval period as they are today. Furthermore, the same hesitation to give credence to the subject as appears in the accounts of modern times is prevalent in the discussions of dreams dating from the Middle Ages. There is recognition of similar reservations on the part of the audience when some writers announce they will be discussing a dream (cf. Lucian, for example), or the same dismissal when one links a later event tenuously to a dream they had three months earlier.⁴² Although it is difficult to speculate on the individual motivations of medieval scholars, it is possible that the lacuna in dream discussions – especially when contrasted with the attention granted to their more unusual waking cousins, ‘visions’ – simply is a result of a belief that dreams are uninteresting clutter, an unfortunate by-product of sleeping that is still misunderstood. While I cannot say I will

⁴² Lucian, “The Dream, or Lucian’s Career”, in *Lucian*, trans. A.M. Harmon (London: William Heinemann, 1921), 213-233.

be able to completely convert those who dismiss the meaning or symbolism of dreams (nor is this my intention) I do aim to reveal that in fact, not only are dreams integral to understanding the medieval *Roman de la Rose*, but that the subject has a fascinating, daunting and illuminating historical context worthy of revisiting in the modern era.

Beyond offering insights into the medieval circumstances of the poem, its illumination, and its reception, the study of dreams in the *Rose* also offers a new means of investigating the circumstances of other medieval illuminated manuscripts. The prior survey of the extant literature reveals that this study is novel in its approach, appearing in a field largely dominated by attempts to identify manuscript makers, tracing practical realities in the medieval period, or exploring the iconographies of isolated copies. This study of dream representations across almost the entire breadth of *Rose* manuscript copies reveals interrelations, divergences, and shared conceptions of the poem between manuscripts, as well as a never-ceasing urge to incorporate novelty into representations of the tale. This aspect has often been overlooked in studies focusing on the extent to which artists reused previous models in the illumination of new manuscripts.⁴³ As a result, I will be exploring the representation of the dream in *Rose* image cycles, investigating how they present this subject in comparison to earlier imagery, how this was affected by external factors such as production practices, and how it developed over time.

As the field of art historical research moves away from generalisations on the visual characteristics of particular eras, or the imagery that accompanies single texts like the *Rose*, the recognition of multiplicity in what was previously construed as homogenous has enlivened the discipline. It would appear that this is no more evident than in the *Rose* manuscripts, the sheer scale of which reveal the rarity of a united, 'typical' approach to the poem. Single scene manuscripts, luxury copies carefully preserved in prestigious collections, fragmentary leaves, those bearing multiple readers'

⁴³ In addition to Kuhn and König, much of Alison Stones' work has focused on the identification of where motifs 'originated'. As will be expressed throughout this thesis, while the idea of an origin point for iconographies is of some interest when viewing how imagery developed, extended focus on this aspect misses the meanings provided by the variations and developments of the motifs in subsequent visual re-workings of the imagery, even (and especially when) these were produced by the same artists. Though motifs may have originated in either secular or religious settings, there is little evidence that readers encountering such scenes would be able to recognise the 'original' point of use, or attach its older significance to the developed version viewed in copies of the *Rose* or other manuscripts. In many instances, the way in which motifs alter and change is more revealing than the single point of emergence in the manuscript tradition.

annotations, neglected versions, printed editions: all these forms contribute to the variety of the *Rose* manuscript corpus.

In order to extrapolate on these ideas, the thesis is divided into five chapters, each considering a different aspect of *Rose* manuscripts and incunabula. Chapter One, *Theoretical, Literary and Artistic Medieval Dreams*, provides a contextual background for the dream topic as expressed in literature, theory and art during the Middle Ages. A section on the particular representation of dreams in the *Rose* is also incorporated. While this exposition is influenced by *Rose* interpretations from both medieval and modern periods, it avoids definitive pronouncements on the poem, as these are largely impossible to extract from the text; arguably, their absence in fact supports the prevalence of the dream aspect in the poem and its imagery. A brief consideration of how our understanding of dreams in the present day may differ from that of the medieval period is also included in order to reveal any potential conflicts. This chapter is designed to both inform and back up themes and attitudes revealed through investigation of *Rose* imagery, such as the dreamer incipits, erroneous perspectival scenes, or authorial portraits discussed throughout the thesis. These examples will therefore be revisited in the following chapters.

Chapter Two, *Representing Dreams in the Roman de la Rose and its Contemporaries in the Fourteenth Century* offers an overview of arguably the most important dream depictions in the extant manuscripts – the incipit Dreamers. While each manuscript differs from the next, several groups of incipit recurred consistently during the three centuries of *Rose* production, representing both developments from and recourse to particular models over this period. The studies of other authors, most notably Kuhn, identified manuscript families based on these incipits, and while they are useful for categorical proceedings, the significance of these images also extends to the meanings they convey regarding dreams in the medieval period.⁴⁴ A consideration of how these supplant the previously common ‘authorial’ images, depicting poets or writers seated at their writing desk or preaching to assembled audiences will form a secondary theme discussed in this chapter, one particularly related to the narrative of theoretical and literary dream discussions of the Later Middle Ages. A third section will consider a case study of the interrelated quadripartite incipits and depictions of the *Croesus and Phanie* subject, while a final subdivision will consider a narrative subject that was never

⁴⁴ Kuhn, *Die Illustration des Rosenromans*.

treated visually in the manuscript corpus but has significance for the poem overall: Nature's Discussion of Dreams. Each topic will be related to literary or visual predecessors and contemporaries, in order to offer a full picture of how the dream subject was treated in the *Rose* during the first hundred years of its circulation, and how it diverges from preceding and contemporary representations of the dreams.

Chapter Three, *Representing Dreams in the Roman de la Rose and its Contemporaries in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, will consider some of the important moments in the fifteenth-century-development of the dream aspect through a major case study of the lavishly illustrated Valencia manuscript. This significant copy of the *Rose* features the full spread of *Rose* dream subjects depicted within its miniatures, such as an incipit Dreamer, the Dream of Socrates, Croesus and Phanie, and an exceptionally rare depiction of the 'Waking Dreamer', a subject scarcely included in the corpus – only three examples of the subject were found in the 190 manuscripts investigated during preparation for the thesis. Further sections consider the development of more dream-specific visual forms, such as the short-lived trend for erroneous, somewhat dreamlike perspective during the early century, and its subsequent rejection in the later luxury manuscripts of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The imagery discussed from these centuries reveals a general trend for emphasising varied subject matter from the poem, the mutability of attitudes towards the *Rose*, and the wide-ranging visual expression in the *Rose* corpus. These will be considered in the context of contemporaneous debates, particularly the *Querelle de la Rose*, the possible difficulties in reading and illuminating the *Rose* long after its original composition (as with the altering attitudes of Guillaume de Deguilleville), and other illuminated secular and religious manuscripts featuring dream scenes. Chapters Two and Three constitute the primary focus of the thesis, and reveal the extent to which *Roses* represent a decisive turning point in the history of dream representation and imagery.

Chapter Four introduces the second major point being made in this thesis. In *Production Methods from Complete and Incomplete Roses*, manuscript production methods are discussed in order to demonstrate that artistic variations were a conscious, not inadvertent factor, as well as to contextualise the dream material discussed in the earlier chapters. Without justification, the idea that planners and artists consciously altered their visual formulas could easily be dismissed as coincidence, as implied in some studies that relate *Rose* iconography to past traditions or compositions, or suggest that their interpretive value was somehow accidental.

Blamires and Holian are two of the most recent scholars to tackle the concept of 'accidental meaning', and will be discussed accordingly below.⁴⁵ The chapter thus examines codicological and practical evidence that relates to the degree of intended interpretation in the images of Rose manuscripts, and supplements discussion of the meanings of the dream imagery dissected in the previous chapters. The issues of manuscript planning, production, and the factors involved in deciding the nature of the image cycles in *Roses* has a far greater sphere of influence in the field of manuscript studies; while it offers a model for the comprehension of a variety of subjects visualised in the *Rose*, this strategy also applies to other vernacular manuscripts more or less loosely tied to traditional schemes of illustration. Overall, this chapter will demonstrate that the picture of manuscript production recently painted of an organised, strict procedure with little or no room for individual interpretation or imagination is far too simplistic, and that the true image may be discerned through methods applied during this chapter.

The final chapter, *The Printed Editions, c.1485-1540*, covers the short production period of *Rose* incunabula which inherently depart from earlier medieval practices of manuscript making. These editions codified the visual sequence of the *Rose*, initially in a nostalgic manner that hearkened back to fourteenth century traditions. The printed editions flourished as manuscript production retreated into one-off, luxury copies, although a number of these prints did crossover with other aspects of traditional illumination. These copies reflect the ways in which the dream element was reconsidered in a bold new media, revisiting much earlier modes of representation, though they unfortunately represent something of a swan song, as *Rose* production would swiftly cease in the 1530s. While the reasons for the abrupt cessation of *Rose* manuscript or incunabula production at this time are still unclear, investigation of these printed editions does provide some insight into the final nature of dream imagery in *Rose* cycles, the changing attitudes to this dream and its textual and visual expression, and perhaps even why they ceased to be as popular in the early 1500s.

The conclusion serves to strengthen the main focal points of this study, and the Catalogue (Appendix One) further backs up the issues discussed in the primary chapters. This provides details of date, origin, key features, bibliography and identification of related copies, which may be used to complement points made in the

⁴⁵ Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxxvi.

body of the thesis. To incorporate this within the body of the text would have obscured the major issues at stake in this discussion, although the Catalogue in itself is an original contribution, as no scholar since Langlois has attempted to provide a full catalogue of the extant manuscripts.⁴⁶ While the entries are necessarily brief, aimed at providing an introductory overview to copies either ignored in previous scholarship or studied only from the perspective of the text and not the imagery, this is designed to both facilitate further study into select copies as well as complementing the proposals of this thesis.

Above all, the thesis will demonstrate the importance of the dream subject to the *Rose* narrative and its interpretation, and the significance of dream imagery in visual cycles accompanying the poem. Furthermore, it will reveal the substantial changes in the representation of the dream that occurred in *Rose* manuscripts, in contrast to prior modes of depicting dream episodes, as well as the fact that artistic intentionality was built in to the processes of producing *Rose* manuscripts. While the dream competed with other subjects for precedence in illuminated *Roses*, I believe it emerges ahead of the rest, offering the best chance to not only decrypt this ambiguous dream of the *Rose*, but also shed some light on the historical development of dream representation, an extremely rich field of continuity and change, but also one long neglected by art historians and scholars.

⁴⁶ While Langlois' study of 1910 was invaluable to me in beginning the process of structuring a catalogue, it is clearly outdated. As noted above, a number of manuscripts detailed in his study were described in very subjective terms, while others were 'dated' despite Langlois never having seen them. Speculative references are mixed with concrete ones in a manner that therefore casts some doubt over Langlois' methods. Furthermore, it remains an inconsistent resource for those seeking to investigate only those with images, as the information provided in each entry is often inconsistent or absent.

Chapter One: Theoretical, Literary and Artistic Treatment of Dreams in the Medieval Period

This thesis seeks to place the dream imagery of the *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts in the context of literary and visual representations of dreaming during the Middle Ages. Consequently, this requires comprehension of the prevailing attitudes towards dreams in both the theoretical and visual arts. This chapter will therefore provide a preliminary discussion of the philosophical studies of dreams, 'dreambooks', and the literary tradition of dream narratives, as well as an introduction to the visualisation of dreams in the medieval artistic tradition. This will allow for some conclusions to be drawn regarding the consequences of this literature for texts like the *Rose*, and the images that accompanied them. An in-depth synopsis of the poem will also be included here, to round off the contextual picture. Then, some brief remarks on contemporary literature from the twentieth century to the present day will reveal any major differences from the medieval perspective, as a prelude to the exploration of how the *Rose* altered the conventional representation of dreams in both text and image during the Middle Ages.

As the evidence below will reveal, based on Antique and early Medieval texts, authors within later periods had a specific, traditional conception of dreaming. Theologians and philosophers constructed a hierarchy, allowing them to categorise dreams according to source or the type of content being presented. This hierarchy incorporated a wide range, from inconsequential or false dreams, up to those dreams that were of vital importance to their dreamer, and may reveal portents of future events. Dreambooks, on the other hand, posited a more direct route from dream to future event or meaning, providing a clear translation of the imagery for the reader. The literary tradition of dream narratives, however, resulted in an unprecedented approach – using the 'dream' framework as a means of exploring absent or forthcoming truths. While literary accounts of dreams by everyday men and women were scarce throughout the period in question, there was much material on their origin, function and use which at the very least reveal the cultural reception of the medieval perspective on dreams. The lack of reports on the dreams of everyday people likely stems from a number of factors, not least the theoretical conception of the phenomena by this period, and coincides with other reasons for the lack of records by commoners of the period, such as illiteracy, or

potential disinterest in keeping or maintaining personal accounts of everyday men and women.⁴⁷

The paucity of first-hand dream accounts is also reflected in the issue of the availability of some of these texts in modern editions or translations. Given the time constraints of this research, and a desire to focus on the visual representation of dreams in *Rose* manuscripts, it was decided that access to the theory and literature that forms the context of these representations should be through modern editions and/or translations. The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, modern studies offer the benefit of incorporating passages of analysis, discussion and interpretation that prove particularly useful when dealing with texts of ambiguous narrative or motivation, such as Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*, which go into more detail than this overview could hope to. Secondly, the access to translations of sources not written in Latin or French also meant this discussion could consider a number of additional areas that influenced the overall state of medieval dream theory and literature. Nonetheless, not all material was accessible through such means, so for this reason it was deemed necessary to incorporate some reference to second-hand sources, such as Kruger or Thorndike, in order to provide a full picture of the state of medieval dream theory.

This chapter is designed to explore and then consider the consequences of this settled hierarchy of dream theory and literary development. While Carolyn Carty provided some discussion of artistic dream depictions with particular spiritual or ecclesiastical functions, largely appearing in monumental sculpture, more work is required on the oft-neglected subject of dream representations wherein the *dreamlike* element is exposed, or otherwise drawn attention to.⁴⁸ As such, this chapter will incorporate an overview of dream imagery in manuscripts – both secular and religious in nature – to contextualise the novel scenes appearing in the first *Roses* of the late thirteenth century. Further examples of related imagery will be included in future chapters when examining specific dream examples in *Rose* manuscripts and printed editions, though an introduction to visual examples – and its relation to dream theory – will be presented here initially.

⁴⁷ For a useful introduction to the topic of dreams in the Middle Ages, see Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*. Thorndike's several volumes, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, also provide references to the many hundreds of examples of medieval dream-related works (see Introduction, fn. 35).

⁴⁸ Carty, *Dreams in Early Medieval Art*.

A major issue to consider is whether the different attitudes to dreams – i.e. a firm belief in the actuality and truth of dreams in the Bible, opposed to more ambiguous trust in the dreams of everyday men and women – may have necessitated alternate approaches when illustrating dreams of one type, as opposed to another. With dreams in an explicitly fictional mould, such as the *Roman de la Rose*, the situation is even more complex, as this narrative appears to undermine the idea of there being any truth present in the dream being described. The present author intends to demonstrate that this potentially lent artists a greater level of freedom to interpret the *Rose*, as the text went to such lengths to undermine its own authority that a new one – that of the image(s) – was required.⁴⁹

I: The Attitudes of Antiquity: Pagan Authorities on the Dream:

While there is evidence of dream accounts in Ancient Egyptian, Babylonian and Mesopotamian cultures, the first comprehensive attempts to understand dreams occurred in Ancient Greece and Rome, laying the groundwork for later medieval attitudes.⁵⁰ The major issues considered by Antique authors were the origins of dreams, whether divine or physical, and their potential meaning. Different perspectives exist regarding the antique approach to dreams and other visionary phenomena. Dodds, for example, holds that the Greeks moved towards a sceptical position, while the Romans ‘regressed’ towards a belief in their divine significance.⁵¹ Harris, on the other hand, proposed a more pervasive ambivalence in attitudes concerning dreams.⁵² Nevertheless, it is clear the debate on dreams had one source in Ancient Greece, garnering attention from major philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, who prepared the way for the vibrant discussions in later centuries.

Plato’s treatment of the topic is rather scattered. He expresses a negative view on consulting ‘diviners’ (a term encompassing those who consult dreams) in the *Laws*, potentially for their ability to side-step the will of the gods and fate, but in the *Timaeus*

⁴⁹ The consideration of the authorial aspect in *Rose* and other imagery will be discussed at length in Chapter Two.

⁵⁰ For notes on the earliest recorded dreams, see François Berriot, *Exposicions et significacions des Songes et les Songes Daniel* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1989), 12; Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. 1, 13.

⁵¹ E.R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), 102-34.

⁵² William Harris, *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2009), 24.

deals with a more physical aspect, assigning divination from dreams to the liver.⁵³ In article 71e of *Timaeus*, he proposes a link between divine and human realms, suggesting the gods may reveal information to those whose understanding is 'bound', either in sickness or in sleep.⁵⁴ According to Morgan, Plato's work was influenced by aspects of Greek religion that asserted the presence of divine power but also asserted their separation from humanity.⁵⁵ This idea assists us in reconciling his seemingly divergent positions – that he would not consult diviners who 'cheated' the gods, but accepted the reality of divination when the gods chose to reveal truths to man in dreams. This duality of positions was retained by many later theoreticians of dreams, whether or not they directly related themselves to Platonic thought.

In Gallop's view, Aristotle reacted to the divine aspects of Plato's theories when constructing his own discussion of dreams.⁵⁶ Unlike his predecessor, Aristotle attempted a coherent examination of dreams in the *Parva Naturalia*. In *De somniis* and *De divination per somnum*, he draws some conclusions about the origins of dreams and the possibility of divination from them. A clear indication of his position is shown in this statement: 'it is the very same faculty by which we are deceived during illnesses, even when awake, that produces the affection during sleep.'⁵⁷ By associating dreams with hallucinations, Aristotle introduces the idea that dreams are fundamentally misconceptions, and therefore untrue. He attacks the idea of god-sent dreams, citing the seeming futility of sending dreams to non-rational creatures, such as animals.⁵⁸ Gallop interprets this as evidence of Aristotle's 'intellectualist bias', but nevertheless concurs with his assertion.⁵⁹

As Harris notes in his introduction, the general reception of Aristotelian dream theory has focused on his denial of divinely sent dreams.⁶⁰ Yet Aristotle did recognise man's propensity to assign significance, often of a divine nature, to dreams. In *De divination*, he noted: "The fact that all or many people suppose dreams to have some significance

⁵³ Plato, *Laws*, trans. T.L. Pangle (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Plato, *Timaeus*, trans. D.J. Zeyl (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2000), 65.

⁵⁴ Plato, *Timaeus*, 65.

⁵⁵ Michael Morgan, "Plato and Greek Religion" in *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*, ed. Richard Kraut (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 227-47.

⁵⁶ David Gallop, "Plato's Legacy" in *Aristotle on Sleep and Dreams* (Warminster: Aris and Phillips Ltd, 1996), 11-19.

⁵⁷ Aristotle, *On Dreams*, trans. David Gallop, in *Aristotle on Sleep and Dreams*, 87.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 111.

⁵⁹ Gallop, "Notes on Divination through Sleep", in *Aristotle on Sleep and Dreams*, 163.

⁶⁰ Harris, *Dreams and Experience*, 1.

inspires belief in it, as deriving from experience.⁶¹ Similarly, his rationalist assertion that dreams relate to their causes and may reveal things about the dreamer or his external circumstances shows that he did not consider them altogether inconsequential.⁶²

Both Plato and Aristotle clearly assigned some meaning or function to dreams, though they disagreed on the details. While it is easier to track Aristotelian theory during the Middle Ages – likely due to its coherence – aspects of Plato also survived in later dream philosophy. The major reason for this retention was the assimilation of Greek philosophy into Roman Republican and Empirical thought, where questions on the divine or natural origins of dreams were also discussed.

Cicero's discussion of dreams in the *De re publica*, for example, was based on Platonic precedent, incorporating a digressional vision episode. In Cicero's text, he surrenders a large part of the narrative to recounting a dream, the *Somnium Scipionis*, in which important information concerning the divine realm is conveyed to a main character (in Plato, the information is described by a resurrected man). Cicero's decision to move this passage to the dream realm therefore reveals a positive attitude to the idea of revelation through dreams, though he admittedly had to modify his Platonic source. However, these statements are qualified in an Aristotelian manner through the speech of Scipio: 'The following dream came to me, prompted, I suppose, by the subject of our conversation; for it often happens that our thoughts and words have some such effect in our sleep.'⁶³

Harris considers this dream as an example of the 'epiphany' dream form, in which an authority figure reveals information to a dreamer – common in Antiquity, but nearly non-existent in modern accounts of dreams. He surmised that dreamers of Antiquity desired information from external sources, and consequently dreamt according to this form, leading to its becoming a cultural convention.⁶⁴ Whether or not the *De re publica* account was true, or merely a literary trope responding to a series of cultural beliefs, it is clear that by Cicero's time, the idea of imparting truths through dreams was well-established.

⁶¹ Aristotle, *On Dreams*, 107.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 113.

⁶³ Cicero, *On the Republic*, trans. Clinton Walker Keyes (London: William Heinemann, 1953), 263.

⁶⁴ Harris, *Dreams and Experience*, 62.

In *De divinatione*, however, Cicero took a more antagonistic, anti-divinatory stance. While his brother Quintus provides the reasons for believing in divination, Cicero is negative, elaborating both an argument from probability – we dream so much that something is highly likely to come ‘true’ – and notes their relation to waking events, much like Scipio in the *Somnium Scipionis*.⁶⁵ Cicero summarises in a wholly negative manner: ‘the fact remains that men in sleep assume many false apparitions to be true.’⁶⁶

Though the two positions of Cicero appear irreconcilable, Schofield reinterpreted the assumption that Cicero was anti-divination, stating that his expression of both sides of the argument shows we are dealing with an experimental dialogue, designed to explore the topic fully.⁶⁷ Beard similarly concludes that there are too many ambiguous authorities in *De divinatione* to allow us to assume Cicero is speaking of his own personal views.⁶⁸ Consequently, one can only guess at Cicero’s ultimate position on dreams, and divination – something in common with many later theoreticians of dreams, who seem to hold both positive and negative opinions simultaneously.

A more explicitly negative view is found in Lucretius, who in Book III of *De rerum naturae* considers dreams from an Epicurean standpoint – one which tends to deny significant dreams. Lucretius also incorporates Aristotelian ideas, comparing dreams to illusions and false appearances.⁶⁹ Yet this strictly rationalist approach is generally anomalous in the context of later Roman thought, as most discussions tended to assume that information could be imparted through dreams. Lucian’s witty tale of a dream from his youth that inspired him to pursue philosophy instead of a career in sculpture reveals this particular attitude to dreaming.⁷⁰ The credulity of this tale may be doubted if one accepts Harris’ criteria for ‘believable’ dreams – this dream, directly serving the narrator’s purpose, is certainly suspect.⁷¹ Lucian’s dream is also didactic, as he points out the personal significance of his dream and its usefulness to those who

⁶⁵ Cicero, *On Divination*, trans. William Armistead Falconer (London: William Heinemann, 1923), 371-539.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 507.

⁶⁷ Malcolm Schofield, “Cicero For and Against Divination”, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 76 (1986): 47-65.

⁶⁸ Mary Beard, “Cicero and Divination: The Formation of a Latin Discourse”, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 76 (1986): 33-46.

⁶⁹ Lucretius, *On the Nature of Things*, trans. Martin Ferguson Smith (Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2001), 71.

⁷⁰ Lucian, “The Dream, or Lucian’s Career”, 213-33.

⁷¹ Harris, *Dreams and Experience*, 105.

hear it.⁷² Yet whether or not this dream occurred, like Cicero's *Somnium*, Lucian's tale grants dreams significance for both dreamer and listener, suggesting that some moral or meaning can be gleaned not only from the dream itself, but the account of it.

As a whole, the attitudes of Antiquity discussed above make clear that while some authors were sceptical of dreams and their meaning, by the time we reach the Roman Empire, the idea of the capability of dreams to impart information was well-established. Additionally, the variable ways in which these authors used dreams – as part of theories of physical or mental conditions, discussions of divination, or for fictional didactic purposes – may also be witnessed recurring in later eras, whether or not those authors directly cited their Antique sources.

II: Late Antiquity: The Transitional Neoplatonists

While one may wonder at the relevance of late-antique thought in the context of a thesis on a thirteenth-century illuminated poem, the fourth to sixth centuries witnessed several important dream theoreticians, whose influence was to last both directly and indirectly up to the *Roman de la Rose*. The first late-antique author we must discuss is Iamblichus, a Neoplatonist who in the *De Mysteriis* suggested that divination from dreams is possible, but only through divine agency.⁷³ Iamblichus also suggested that while sleeping, the mind is more receptive to divine messages, being unencumbered by the intellect.⁷⁴ Both these points were adopted by Christian theologians who also struggled to combine dream divination and physical experience with divine presence, placing Iamblichus in a significant position between antique and early medieval thought.

Two other writers during this ambiguous philosophical transition from pagan to Christian thought are Macrobius and Calcidius, both of whom wrote on dreams. While their religious status is still up for debate, these authors were immensely useful to later Christian writers discussing this topic, and indeed writers of secular dream fictions, like the *Rose*.⁷⁵

⁷² Lucian, "The Dream, or Lucian's Career", 231.

⁷³ Iamblichus, *On the Mysteries*, trans. Emma C. Clarke, John M. Dillon and Jackson P. Hershbell (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 123.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 125.

⁷⁵ See Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages* for a comprehensive breakdown of citations of Macrobius and Calcidius by later medieval writers, especially Chapter IV, 57-82.

Calcidius' study on dreams partakes of a larger commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*. As Kruger notes, Calcidius' discussion incorporates two diametrically opposed positions on dreams – that they are entirely mundane, or may provide a link with divinity – in order to bridge them through a Neoplatonic hierarchy.⁷⁶ While his five-fold classification gained less attention than the Macrobian system, it does represent an early attempt to combine several assertions about dreams into a coherent theory. Calcidius' system extends from common dreams reviving the anxieties of daily life, to those sent by divine powers to reveal the future or punish wrongdoing.⁷⁷ In this sense, Calcidius draws together ideas stretching back to Plato and Aristotle, assigning both a place in his theory and ruling out neither.

Macrobius also presented his hierarchy within a commentary – in this case, on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*. While Macrobius' *Comentarii in Somnium Scipionis* does not restrict itself to dreams, Stahl reflects the fact that this was recognised as a major topic in the commentary by later readers, who placed marginal glosses or titular additions like *ornicensis* (likely a corruption of Greek *oneirocrites*, or 'interpreter of dreams') alongside copies of the text.⁷⁸ Stahl surmises that this shows that Macrobius was understood as an expert on dreams in the late medieval period.⁷⁹

This direct association of Macrobius with dreams is likely due to the fact that he opens the *Commentarii* with a justification for using the dream framework for the presentation of truths.⁸⁰ He approves the use of truth being revealed through fiction or allegory, and implies that Cicero's migration of Plato's dialogue into a dream setting in the *Somnium Scipionis* would incur less censure than Plato's original use of the testimony of a dead man.⁸¹

In Chapter III he commences his classification of dreams, which Stahl recognises as deriving from an earlier scheme of Artemidorus (discussed below in the section on dreambooks).⁸² The 'lowest' two – *insomnium* (nightmare) and *visum*, the apparition of phantoms in the state between sleeping and waking, relate back to physical causes. The

⁷⁶ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 24.

⁷⁷ Calcidius, paraphrased in Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 30.

⁷⁸ William Harris Stahl, "Introduction" in *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), 42.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, 81.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 83.

⁸² Stahl, "Introduction", 13.

higher three – *somnium*, an enigmatic dream where truths are revealed through allegory, *visio* (prophetic vision) and *oraculum*, where truth is revealed by an authority figure – clearly relate to external, potentially divine sources.⁸³ Macrobius asserts that Scipio’s dream stems from all three of the highest dream types, and in Chapter IV restates his faith in using fictions to present philosophical truths, this time with reference to dreams:

Once again we must affirm, as we did at the opening of this discourse, that the purpose of this dream is to teach us that the souls of those who serve the state well are returned to the heavens after death and there enjoy everlasting blessedness.⁸⁴

This conception of the dream as both beneficial to the dreamer and those who hear it may recall Lucian, but the implications of the Neoplatonists go further than this. For both Macrobius and Calcidius, dreams may reveal information about a number of things: the dreamer’s body, something illusory, or of the future, or of divinity. Truth is therefore present or not present in dreams, and may or may not be accessed by the dreamer. Rather than having one specific status, dreams are multi-faceted, complex concepts, and as Kruger states, this ambiguity was directly transmitted during the Middle Ages.⁸⁵

However, not all scholars agree on Kruger’s positive reception of Calcidius and Macrobius. Somfai notes that the study of Calcidius’ *Commentarii* only evolved over time, initially considered within the context of the *Timaeus* and only later considered for its own merits in the eleventh century, suggesting it only had a deferred relevance for medieval readers.⁸⁶ And yet while Pickens argues that Macrobius’ *somnium* category is key to the structure of Guillaume de Lorris’ *Roman de la Rose*, Peden and Bodenham warn against granting too much influence to Macrobius on the later poem, suggesting Guillaume merely knew his name, not his theories.⁸⁷

⁸³ Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, 88.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁸⁵ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 58. Macrobius’ position here is particularly interesting when one considers Guillaume’s ‘transformation’ of it within the first verses of the *Roman de la Rose*, which is discussed later in the chapter.

⁸⁶ Anna Somfai, “The Eleventh-Century Shift in the Reception of Plato’s ‘Timaeus’ and Calcidius’ ‘Commentary’”, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 65 (2002): 1-21.

⁸⁷ Rupert T. Pickens, “Somnium and Interpretation in Guillaume de Lorris”, *Symposium*, 28:2 (1974): 175-86; Bodenham, “The Nature of the Dream”; Peden, “Macrobius and Mediaeval Dream Literature”.

While these remarks will be considered in more depth when considering the textual treatment of dreams in the *Rose*, it is sufficient here to note the link – if only an indirect one – between Macrobian dream theory and later medieval texts. As Lecompte’s study makes clear, the amount of references to this author and the testimony of the extant manuscripts reveals that Macrobius was consistently valued as a philosopher and a dream theoretician.⁸⁸

Iamblichus, Calcidius and Macrobius certainly relate to attitudes of the Later Middle Ages in spirit if not directly. Their desire to classify dreams, dividing their origin between earthly and divine realms, was by no means their only legacy. It was also the equivocal nature of their approach, by incorporating seemingly opposing attitudes to dreams, that lasted through the centuries. The affirmation that foresight was to be gained through divine intervention, and the availability of truth in dreams – but only within certain types - modified the work of their antique predecessors and filtered through to the writings of the early church fathers into later medieval Christian thought, and from there into such dream fictions as the *Rose*.

III: The Biblical Position: Old and New Testament; Apocrypha; Early Christian Literature

In slight contrast to the theoretical overviews of Late Antique scholars, the Bible provided both literary and visual representations of dreams that would also shape later medieval attitudes and imagery of dreams. These subjects formed a large percentage of the artistic corpus of dream images, with such episodes from the Bible being depicted in monumental sculpture and manuscripts from as early as the sixth century, if not before.⁸⁹

As noted by Le Goff, dreams are more predominant in the Old Testament than in the New, and tend to incorporate a number of variables, such as anecdotal or analytical examples.⁹⁰ However, while there are differences, on the whole the Bible treats dreams in a unified manner. The tales of Joseph and the Pharaoh or David and Nebuchadnezzar firmly declare the actuality of revelation through dreams, and the necessity of God’s

⁸⁸ Stéphanie Lecompte, *La Chaîne d’Or Des Poètes. Présence de Macrobe dans l’Europe humaniste* (Genève: Librairie Droz S.A., 2009), 13.

⁸⁹ See for example the dream episodes depicted in the sixth- or seventh-century *Ashburnham Pentateuch*.

⁹⁰ Jacques Le Goff, “V: Les Rêves” in *Un Autre Moyen Age*, (Manchecourt: Maury-Eurolivres, 1999), 687-752.

involvement in this process.⁹¹ In these instances, dreams are conceived of as transparent vessels through which knowledge can pass to a chosen subject. Further examples of this are Jacob's dream of the ladder, or where God instructs Abimelech to return Sarah to Abraham.⁹²

Biblical dreams may also be symbolic in nature, as with those of Nebuchadnezzar, or the Butler and Baker in prison with Joseph, alongside more directly informative dreams. Consequently, there is room for the misinterpretation of some dreams – something that may relate to the passages condemning the consultation of dreams.

Rather than contradicting the prophetic dreams of the Bible, these injunctions emphasise God's involvement in the process. Both Deuteronomy 13:3 and Leviticus 19:26 declare one should not heed false prophets or dreamers, nor observe one's own dreams, suggesting a similar approach to Plato or Iamblichus, who ascribed these abilities to God(s) alone. This idea of disregarding common dreams is reiterated in Isaiah 29:8, which describes the physical causes of dreams and the falsity of what they promise, as with hungry men who dream of eating, yet awaken unfulfilled.

Both prophetic dreams and the injunctions against them coexist harmoniously with revelatory and apocalyptic literature, both in the Bible and the Apocrypha. While the Revelation of St John is the only sanctioned apocalyptic visionary episode in the Bible, there is evidence that the apocryphal apocalyptic treatises of Saint Paul and Saint Peter were also referenced by later medieval writers.⁹³ While these are visions, not dreams – presumably occurring when awake, not asleep – much of their content relates to Biblical descriptions of dreams. There is a similar use of bizarre or highly symbolic literature, such as in the Ethiopic text of the Apocalypse of St Peter.⁹⁴ The Apocalypse of St Paul, on the other hand, remains ambiguous about the type of vision being received, leaving it open to speculation if the event was in fact a dream.⁹⁵

An implied hierarchy of visionary states also appears in the Bible. When discussing Moses, God declares:

⁹¹ (Joseph) Genesis 37:5, 37:40, 41; (Daniel) Daniel 1:17, 2, 4. All Biblical quotations refer to the Douay-Rheims Bible, for its relevance to the late-medieval material discussed in this thesis.

⁹² (Jacob) Genesis 28:12; (Abimelech) Genesis 20:7.

⁹³ J.K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 593 and 616.

⁹⁴ Quoted in Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 605: 'And the milk of their mothers flowing from their breasts shall congeal and from it shall come beasts devouring flesh.'

⁹⁵ Quoted in Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 620.

Hear my words: if there be among you a prophet of the Lord, I will appear to him in a vision, or I will speak to him in a dream. But it is not so with my servant Moses who is most faithful in all my house. For I speak to him mouth to mouth: and plainly, and not by riddles and figures doth he see the Lord.⁹⁶

This passage clearly subordinates truth revealed through dreams and visions to that received directly, without recourse to symbolism. It is suggested, then, that 'lesser' recipients must make do with ambiguous dreams or visions, relying on God's interpretation to understand them – as with Daniel or Joseph. Nevertheless, whether disguised or direct, the notion of there being an inherent truth in dreams and visions is pervasive throughout the Bible, so long as God sent them.

All of the above positions, from ancient philosophers to the Bible, are present in the writings of the early Christian authors. Tertullian in *De anima* incorporates the opinions of the early Stoics alongside Biblical examples, noting that sleep combined with ecstasy – often from God – results in dreams.⁹⁷ However, one of his most important assertions is that the fictional content of dreams doesn't affect reality: 'In these dreams, indeed, good actions are useless, and crimes harmless; for we shall no more be condemned for visionary acts of sin, than we shall be crowned for imaginary martyrdom.'⁹⁸ Yet Tertullian does accept a level of truth in dreams. He states, in reference to Joel 3:1, that: 'almost the greater part of mankind get their knowledge of God from dreams'.⁹⁹ Tertullian then appears to perceive great power in dreams, though he tempers this with the ideas that they may occur naturally, or through demonic forces. This all-round approach was to become traditional in later medieval writing on dreams, principally through Saint Augustine.

Somewhat prior to Augustine, however, we have Eusebius' account of the dream of Constantine, which incorporates several key ideas concerning the Christian conception of dreams. It is also notable as this narrative was depicted in manuscripts during the period of the *Rose's* circulation, providing a contextual exemplar for images of the secular poem. In Eusebius' narrative, dreams are portrayed as vehicles through which God may send information, and may point the way to victory for dreamers if they

⁹⁶ Numbers 12:6-8.

⁹⁷ Tertullian, *De Anima*, translated in *The Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Vol. XV: The Writings of Tertullian, Vol. II*, eds. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869-70), 512.

⁹⁸ Tertullian, *De Anima*, 513.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 518.

follow the instructions correctly.¹⁰⁰ Harris considered this dream to be a prime example of the literary dream convention, wherein authors describe dreams they *wish* had been dreamt, and doubts if it actually occurred.¹⁰¹ Yet regardless of its veracity, his description of Constantine's vision and its subsequent elaboration through a dream (once more reliant on divine interpretation) reveals much about its author's conception of what is – or what would seem – feasible to his readers.

Synesius of Cyrene's *De somniis* is another notable early-Christian discussion of dreams, more clearly linking to his Neoplatonic predecessors than the likes of Tertullian, though it has been argued that he was more influential on Byzantine than Western thought.¹⁰² Like Iamblichus, he considers the divine element of dreams and their moral consequences, but, more importantly, he also recognised the idea of an 'art' of interpretation – that dreams may be understood through skill, not just divine revelation.¹⁰³ While this artfulness was officially condemned in ecclesiastical circles, it does allude to the popular 'dreambooks', which are discussed below.

The most influential early Christian writer – not only on the subject of dreams, but on the whole field of Western philosophy – was however Saint Augustine, who considered divination and things envisioned during sleep – both meaningful and meaningless – in his *De Genesi ad litteram*.¹⁰⁴ This duality provides justification for his assertion (like Tertullian before him) that men are not culpable for impure dreams, so long as they do not act on them.¹⁰⁵ Augustine's enquiry typically considers dreams to be a form of spiritual vision, at least when truths are being revealed, though his comments do sometimes approach a more mundane Aristotelian position. In Book XII 32:61, he notes that lovers may dream of being separated from their sweethearts, and may be affected by this experience – a narrative not unlike that of the later *Rose* and numerous other dream or generic late-medieval fictions.¹⁰⁶ However, Augustine's reliance on Scripture

¹⁰⁰ Eusebius, *Life of Constantine the Great*, trans. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961), Vol. I, Chapters 28-29, 490.

¹⁰¹ Harris, *Dreams and Experience*, 94.

¹⁰² Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. I, 544.

¹⁰³ Synesius of Cyrene, "De Insomniis" in *The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene*, trans. A. Fitzgerald (London: Oxford University Press, 1930), 326-59.

¹⁰⁴ Eleonore Stump and David V. Meconi, *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

¹⁰⁵ Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, trans. John H. Taylor (New York: Newman Press, 1982), 198-99.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 224.

prevents him assigning all dreams to earthly causes, citing Joel 3:1 like Tertullian, and remarking on the episode in the New Testament when an angel warns Joseph to flee to Egypt.¹⁰⁷ Subsequently, he concludes:

I do not believe, then, that the spirit of a man is taken up by a good spirit to see these images unless they have some special meaning. But when the body causes the human spirit to direct its gaze intently upon them, it must not be thought that they always have a meaning. However, they have a meaning when they are inspired by a spirit that reveals something, whether it is to a man in sleep or to one who is afflicted with some bodily ailment that takes him out of his senses.¹⁰⁸

This last allusion to hallucinations and illnesses sheds some light on Augustine's overall theory – while dreams may be mundane, or illusory, they may also take one out of oneself, allowing the spirit to receive truth. This assertion allows Augustine to allow for Biblical precedents, but also account for dreams that are non-revelatory – something Aristotle's system lacks, but which may be found in the hierarchies of Calcidius and Macrobius.

Augustine's system was adopted by later writers, providing some basis for discussions of dreams by authors such as Isidore of Seville, in his encyclopaedic *Etymologiae*. Isidore included dreams within his discussion of visions and prophecies, and in Book VII concurred with Augustine on dreams only revealing truth through God, summarising:

...for God sometimes wants to indicate what is to come through some defects in newborns, and also through dreams and oracles...as is indeed proved by abundant experience.¹⁰⁹

The sixth-century *Dialogues* of St Gregory the Great – a collection of hagiographical tales regarding Italian saints - however, considered dreams in a more anecdotal manner, and it was in this context that he expanded upon Augustine's idea of true (i.e. prophetic) or false dreams.¹¹⁰ In response to a question as to whether we should heed dreams, Gregory summarises their origins:

¹⁰⁷ Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 209.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies*, trans. S.A. Barney, W.D. Lewis, J.A. Beach and O. Berghof (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 244.

¹¹⁰ Joan M. Petersen in *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great in their Late Antique Cultural Background* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984) noted much scholarly derision towards the *Dialogues*. However, her study argues that it is misleading to apply standards of historical accuracy or superstition to a work designed to inspire, rather than recount facts. Taken in this sense, its usefulness as a literary text revealing specific attitudes to dreams remains unimpeded.

...dreams come to the soul in six ways. They are generated either by a full stomach or by an empty one, or by illusions, or by our thoughts combined with illusions, or by revelations, or by our thoughts combined with revelations.¹¹¹

He notes that the first two we know through personal experience, while the last four have Biblical precedents. In order to provide a well-rounded account, however, Gregory does note the Biblical injunctions against dreams too. He also demonstrates how difficult it could be to tell if dreams originated from divine or demonic sources. He in fact ascribes this ability only to saints, and provides a cautionary tale about a man deceived by dreams – a position in line with Augustinian thought.¹¹²

Gregory's most interesting inference however comes in his account of Saint Benedict, where he appears to equate dreams with concrete, waking reality. In Book II, Gregory tells the tale of two men ordered by Benedict to build a monastery.¹¹³ Having left the men to await further instruction, Benedict arranges to return on a specific date with more details. On the eve of the assigned day, Benedict appears in a dream to the men, revealing his plans for the monastery. Rather than follow the dream, the two men await Benedict, who does not come. After they bemoan his absence, the saint admonishes them, stating that he came as promised – in a dream. Gregory backs this up with the Apocryphal tale of Habbakuk visiting Daniel in the lion's den, equating Benedict's spiritual act with a physical one.¹¹⁴

The implications of this episode are expressed clearly by Gregory, suggesting a direct link between waking and dream instructions. The validity of the information is not reduced by the frame in which it is presented, and while this is no ordinary dream – Benedict would after all become a saint – it is clear that there was no perceived distinction between his being present in a dream or in physical reality. While this anecdotal tale may be subject to the overall aim of Gregory's *Dialogues* – a practical inspirational guide for clergymen, according to Joan Petersen – it provides a context for the application of antique and medieval dream theory in a literary framework.¹¹⁵ Medieval attitudes to dreams did not arise in a vacuum, but fused dream theory and practical experience with other functional purposes. While in this instance they serve the purposes of Gregory's hagiography, this and other texts shaped the background of

¹¹¹ Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, trans. Odo John Zimmerman (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press and Consortium Books, 1977), 261.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 262.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 89-91.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹¹⁵ Petersen, *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great*.

later dream narratives such as the *Rose*, and contextualise their textual and visual expression.

After these early Christian discussions of dreams, there appears to be a major gap. It is difficult to trace any author considering the dream in a conceptual or theoretical sense until the twelfth century. The one exception to this trend is however the popular literary 'dreambooks' which emerged in Antiquity and circulated during the Middle Ages. These materials also fed into the cultural attitudes regarding dreams, and so will be discussed below.

IV: Dreambooks

Dreambooks were a form of manuscript designed to provide readers with a system for interpreting dreams. These books survive in many copies, and were often bound with other treatises on divination, such as moon-books, or astronomical guides.¹¹⁶ Of the different types, the *Somnia Danielis* (*Dream-Book of Daniel*) was the most popular form, containing descriptions of dream images with simplistic interpretations. A printed *Somniale Danielis* from c.1500, for example, stated that seeing roses in one's dream could signify danger, or great joy, and that those who dream of accepting a rose from another signifies the Cross.¹¹⁷ While such literature was shaped as much by convention as personal experience, these books do claim to have their basis in the personal dream experiences of their writers, and may provide clues as to the type of dreams dreamt by the general populace, as well as how they were understood. Berriot notes evidence of such books in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, the earliest surviving dreambook is Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*.¹¹⁸ Notably, one may see strong echoes of these forms of text in the contemporary 'dream dictionaries', most commonly relegated to the 'lifestyle' section of modern bookstores. It is interesting to consider the credence (or lack thereof) granted to these 'dreambooks' in the modern age, and speculate as to whether or not the comparable medieval literature was also viewed variably by the public that received it, though one may only guess at the degree of overlap here.

According to Berriot, the dream symbols and interpretations were drawn together from many sources in order to provide a comprehensive manual for understanding

¹¹⁶ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 8; Steven R. Fischer, *The Complete Medieval Dreambook: A Multilingual, Alphabetical Somnia Danielis Collation* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982), 7.

¹¹⁷ Quoted in Fischer, *Complete Medieval Dreambook*, 124.

¹¹⁸ Berriot, *Exposicions et significacions*, 12-15.

dreams.¹¹⁹ It provides an early reference point against which we can consider both the later medieval dreambooks, as well as some of the writers who condemned this literature.¹²⁰ As well as Artemidorus' list of dream imagery, he also considers the types of dreams one may encounter. He is strictly in favour of divination, stating in Book I that he aims to counter the arguments of those who disparage dreams, as well as provide a guide for practitioners.¹²¹ He also addresses those who don't believe in dreams, and Aristotle's point regarding their origins. While Artemidorus can be evasive, his pronouncements on the ability of dreams to reveal something significant to the dreamer make clear his opinion that they contain inherent truths.

While the direct influence of Artemidorus is hard to trace in the West, it is reflected in Macrobius, as well as the Latin tradition for dreambooks such as the *Somniale Danielis*. The precedent for this latter text appeared in fifth-century Constantinople, and began circulating in Latin during the seventh century.¹²² The attribution of such texts to Biblical dreamers like Daniel was, according to Kruger, a means of appropriating Christian authority for these spurious texts, and certainly despite the Church's official condemnation of the books, they proved very popular.¹²³

The Western tradition of dreambooks also reveals links to the Arabic scholarly tradition of the Middle Ages, as the later forms of these books also relate to the likes of the Pseudo Achmet's *Oneirocriticon*, from the ninth century.¹²⁴ Commentaries and translations of this dreambook appeared in the twelfth century, in the writings of Pascalis Romanus and Leo Tuscus.¹²⁵

These dreambooks circulated outside clerical circles, revealing an undercurrent of thought on dreams in popular culture, though Kruger does believe their transmission

¹¹⁹ Artemidorus' *The Interpretation of Dreams: Oneirocritica*, trans. Robert J. White (New Jersey: Noyes Classical Studies, Noyes Press, 1975) opens with a statement that the book has been compiled with reference to books, practitioners, and his own experience.

¹²⁰ Kruger's *Dreaming in the Middle Ages* and Thorndike's *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. II both contain in-depth information on dreambooks. The aforementioned studies of Berriot and Fischer provide more general notes, as well as example texts from medieval dreambooks.

¹²¹ Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica*, 13-66.

¹²² Berriot, *Exposicions et significacions*, 32-34.

¹²³ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 7-16. Dreambooks were often bound with astronomical or other pseudo-scientific texts.

¹²⁴ Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. II, Chapter I, 290-302.

¹²⁵ Roger A. Pack, "Pascalis Romanus and the Text of Artemidorus", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 96 (1965) 291-95.

must have depended on the collusion of the literate clergy, at least to some degree.¹²⁶ Alongside the ambiguous interpretation of dreams by theologians and philosophers, the dreambooks suggest a more direct link between symbol and future event. The circulation of these manuscripts in the popular sphere furthermore suggests a widespread attitude that firmly believed in the availability of truth in dreams – an attitude that persists into the present day. They reveal that a sizeable group in society, ignoring Biblical injunctions against dream divination, were unable to ignore the possibility that dreams might reveal truths to the dreamer.

VI: Later Medieval Attitudes

Despite the lack of extended theoretical discussions on dreams between the seventh and twelfth centuries, Kruger's study identifies a strong level of continuity between early and late medieval attitudes.¹²⁷ He notes that the theories of Gregory the Great, Macrobius and Calcidius remained prevalent, and provides a list of those citing these three writers in the later period.¹²⁸ Thorndike also reveals the consistent presence of this topic in later medieval theory.¹²⁹ Certainly tracking the 'influence' of any one work is complicated for this period, but as Southern notes, information was often imparted through itinerant scholars.¹³⁰ As such, the origin of any one writer does not necessarily limit their influence to their immediate locale.

Adelard of Bath was one such travelling scholar who remarked upon the topic of dreams in his twelfth-century *De eodem et diverso*. During this discourse, as part of a discussion on how the senses may deceive us, Philosophia proposes that: 'in sleep the soul, because it is then in some way freer from the harassment of the senses, sharpens its wit and sometimes grasps the truth or something like it even concerning future events.'¹³¹ Adelard then repeats Tertullian's idea that dreams at the end of the night, after digestion is complete, are more accurate. These two points suggest a positive attitude to dreams, as through them the soul may come to understand future truths.

¹²⁶ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 14.

¹²⁷ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 57-82.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*.

¹³⁰ R.W. Southern, "The Schools of Paris and the Schools of Chartres", in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, eds. R.L. Benson and G. Constable (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 113-17.

¹³¹ Adelard of Bath, "On the Same and the Different" in *Conversations with his Nephew*, trans. Burnett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 27.

However, Adelard's near-contemporary, the nun Hildegard of Bingen, provides a counter to this position. Hildegard produced several works inspired, as she tells us, by waking visions, and expressly denied that they were dreams.¹³² In one of her visionary works, her *Liber vitae meritorum*, she describes it as a 'true vision', inserting contemporary details to root her vision in temporal reality.¹³³ According to Kruger, in her *Causae et curae*, Hildegard also stated that dreams were more likely to come from the devil, and often solely relate to the emotions of daily life.¹³⁴ Hildegard's approach then clearly aims to distinguish her 'true' visions from the ambiguous, 'false' imagery found in dreams, a statement that seems to relate back to God's hierarchy of vision outlined in the Biblical passage regarding Moses' relationship with the Lord. However, the subtlety of Hildegard's language is in line with other uncertain vision accounts, and based on contemporary literary sources, it appears the distinction between waking and dream experiences simply relied on the presence or absence of a reference to the visionary being asleep at the time of the vision. While this does not appear to inflect upon the topic at hand, these perceived or underlying distinctions between the dream and the visionary did have an effect on the visual representation of dreams, and will be discussed further in the section on images of dreams.

Also active in the twelfth century, John of Salisbury remarked on dreams in a treatise relating to the popularised attitudes of his courtly milieu. His *Policraticus* was published in 1159, with several of the books dealing with what he viewed to be the 'frivolities of courtiers'; and it is in this context that he deals with dreams.¹³⁵ In Book II, John notes 'Who is ignorant of the various meanings of dreams which experience approves and the authority of our forefathers confirms?'¹³⁶ This acknowledgement further demonstrates his awareness of both Biblical precedent and contemporary practices.

Despite accepting their meanings, he is more negative when discussing the causes and types of dreams. He observes that troubled dreams occur through insobriety or

¹³² Sabina Flanagan, *Hildegard of Bingen, 1098-1179: A Visionary Life* [2nd Edition] (London: Routledge, 1990), 188.

¹³³ Hildegard of Bingen, *Book of the Rewards of Life (Liber vitae meritorum)* (Hozeski translation, 1997).

¹³⁴ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 77.

¹³⁵ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, trans. Joseph B. Pike in *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers: Being a Translation of the First, Second, and Third Books, and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the Policraticus of John of Salisbury* (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis, 1938).

¹³⁶ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 75.

turbulent sensations, and links these dreams to immoderation.¹³⁷ He also notes that dreams disguise the truth in a manner analogous to the work of artists imitating nature.¹³⁸ This appears to reverse the Macrobian standpoint, where both dreams and fiction are defended as appropriate vehicles for truth. John also attempts to categorise dreams along Macrobian lines, noting, as did his predecessors, that they may be affected by diverse factors.¹³⁹

From this he considers the barriers to interpretation, such as the allegorical nature of dreams, which can lead to misunderstandings, and he is critical of the dreambooks circulating under the name of Daniel, as they insist upon a single meaning for dream images.¹⁴⁰ His hostile stance is clearest when he states: 'But all who are credulous enough to put faith in dreams have patently wandered not only from the orbit of pure belief but also from that of reason.'¹⁴¹

Despite these condemnations, however, he does discuss the Biblical dream interpretations, which *are* true, despite Old Testament injunctions. His remark: 'If there be any who enjoys such special favour let him join Daniel and Joseph and like them attribute it to the Lord', particularly illuminates his overall position, and links him to his predecessors.¹⁴² As with the Bible, or Augustine or Gregory, John only allows for divination through divine agency. Much like the earlier position of Synesius, he recognises that an 'art' of interpretation has developed, though in his opinion it is defunct and to be condemned, as it functions without divine involvement.¹⁴³

Along with the testimony of philosophers and visionaries, the twelfth century also saw the influence of Eastern sources on Western thought, primarily through translations of Arabic, Greek, or Hebrew texts. The aforementioned author Pascalis Romanus and his *Liber thesauri occulti* falls into this category, and is indicative of the increasing amounts of source material available to twelfth-century writers.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁷ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 76.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 81-82. This allusion is particularly interesting when one considers the representation of dreams by artists expressed in the *Rose* and other manuscripts, and will be discussed again during the section on 'authorial' imagery of the *Rose* in Chapter Two.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 75-81.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 84.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 84.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 86.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 'But for him who the spirit of truth has not illumined it is vain to place trust in the art, since every art has its source in nature and its development in experience and reason.', 86.

¹⁴⁴ Pack, "Pascalis Romanus".

In line with this discovery of foreign sources and translation was something Knowles termed the 'rediscovery of Aristotle'.¹⁴⁵ Prior to this era, Aristotle was often patchily received in the West through Arabic interpretations. Later translations from his original texts led to a greater acceptance of his ideas in the universities, which also extended to the dream topic.¹⁴⁶

The preeminent thirteenth-century theologian Saint Thomas Aquinas provides some proof of the renewed taste for Aristotle in his treatment of dreams in his comprehensive *Summa Theologiae*. Preceding his general discussion of dreams, one of his first pronouncements on the topic – that human intelligence relies on the senses, and that sleep impedes these senses – provides an overture to the rest of his discussion.¹⁴⁷

The major thrust of Aquinas' argument on dreams appears, significantly, in his section on superstition. He notes that while Augustine did not oppose divination, both Deuteronomy and Gratian prohibited it, making it sinful.¹⁴⁸ However he does state that both the Bible and our own experience provide the truth of it, making it lawful.¹⁴⁹ He then lists the causes of dreams – some internal, some external. When caused by an internal force relating to waking thoughts and actions, any link between the dream and future events is coincidental – a position in line with Aristotle.¹⁵⁰ He also repeats the Aristotelian idea that dreams may reveal signs of a future illness, one that is as-yet undetectable to the waking mind. However, when discussing external causes, Aquinas is forced to depart from Aristotle, as his predecessor paid little attention to this factor. Instead, Aquinas distinguishes two types that relate to Tertullian's theories – dreams from God and the angels, and those from demons.¹⁵¹

In his summary, Aquinas states that divination from dreams is lawful when there is a natural, bodily cause, or when they are sent from God. Consequently, it is unlawful when dreams have a demonic source. As such, Aquinas is repeating the assertions of

¹⁴⁵ David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* [2nd Edition] eds. D.E. Luscombe and C.N.L. Brooke (London: Longman, 1988) Part III, 139-98.

¹⁴⁶ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 83-122.

¹⁴⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, trans. Durbin (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1968), Vol. 12, 45-47.

¹⁴⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, trans. O'Meara and Duffy (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1968), Vol. 40, 39.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 57.

¹⁵⁰ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*. Vol. 40, 57.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 59.

John of Salisbury or Gregory the Great, that dreams are only acceptable when sent by God. On the other hand, his incorporation of Aristotelian thought elsewhere in his overall theory admits that the divine realm cannot be solely responsible for the sending of dreams.

These authors were primarily linked to the Church and Universities, but as the thirteenth century wore on, and as secular learning took off, there was increased tension between theological and secular philosophies.¹⁵² The Church's response varied, but the Parisian Condemnations of 1277 provide an interesting case study. One of the 219 condemned articles read: 'That raptures and visions are caused only by nature.'¹⁵³ While Lerner and Mahdi noted that the content of these prepositions tackled new literature in general, this particular condemnation appears to be specifically directed at the Aristotelian idea that visions and dreams were bodily, not revelatory, phenomena.¹⁵⁴

Scholars continued to consider dreams into the fourteenth century, such as Nicolas Oresme. As Grant says, Oresme was particularly distrustful of dreams and divination from them, and emphasised the relation of this to occult arts.¹⁵⁵ Yet as Kruger remarks, in Oresme's *De commensurabilitate vel incommensurabilitate motuum celi*, Oresme resorts to a dream narrative to conclude his discussion.¹⁵⁶ Divine figures and personifications appear to direct Oresme towards a conclusion, which appears to be implicitly unachievable in the 'waking' realm of the rest of his treatise. Kruger states that this is an attempt to underscore the complexity of attaining knowledge, frustrating the promise of revelation through dreams.¹⁵⁷ However, it is more significant that Oresme's dream does not provide a conclusion. Despite suggesting that the dream may contain the truth, his overall attitude appears to be that dreams are not suitable for imparting information.

Thorndike's remarks on the authors of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries reveal a scattered trail of remarks on dreams, but it is clear that in-depth discussions of the

¹⁵² Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought*, Chapter Four, 201-61.

¹⁵³ A full list of the condemnations appears in Ralph Lerner and Muhsin Mahdi, *Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook* (Canada: The Free Press of Glencoe and Collier-Macmillan Ltd, 1963), 335-54.

¹⁵⁴ Lerner and Mahdi, *Medieval Political Philosophy*, 335.

¹⁵⁵ Edward Grant, ed., *A Source Book in Medieval Science* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1974), 489-90.

¹⁵⁶ Kruger, *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*, 140-49.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p.145.

topic were becoming less frequent.¹⁵⁸ Many of Thorndike's references are to Italian authors who recycled earlier ideas and concepts. One example is the *Lumen animae*, which offered a mixture of magical and scientific practices, and has much in common with the often-arbitrary dreambook compilations.¹⁵⁹ One exception is Jean Gerson, who incorporates contrasting positions. In his *Opera* (IV, xiii, M-X) he states that interpretation from dreams is not feasible, given their dual true-or-false nature.¹⁶⁰ However, Gerson was not afraid to utilise the dream-vision form when constructing his own treatise against the *Roman de la Rose*, in 1402. In this narrative, Gerson 'while barely awake' experiences a dream vision where the *Rose* is put on trial in a heavenly court presided over by such virtues as Reason, Prudence, Theological Eloquence, and Memory.¹⁶¹ In the end, the court decides that the offense of Jean de Meun's *Rose* is great, and that it contains many errors and should be forbidden. The dream ends when they notice the time, and Gerson returns to his study at vespers. Despite his suggestion that interpretation from dreams is not possible, his placement of a quasi-divine pronouncement on the *Roman de la Rose* within a dream seems to militate against this idea, as his argument in the treatise is designed to persuade his reader of the flaws within the *Rose*. As such, Jean Gerson embodies an ambiguous position on dreams – much like his predecessors – though one that may also have felt the additional influence of the dream poem of the *Rose*.

The increasingly scattered treatment of dreams in treatises and philosophical works may be partially explained by its proliferation in the genre of the fictional literary dream. The extended treatment of dreams in narrative form, cropping up in romances and epics, provided a more accessible forum for the exploration of the dream state in a less strictly theoretical, more experiential manner. These texts also did not go unnoticed by the scholastic community, as the example of Jean Gerson's treatise on the *Rose* suggests.

VII: The Literary and Poetic Dream

While literary fictions could naturally present moral points much like more strictly philosophical texts, the couching of such arguments in a narrative structure does affect

¹⁵⁸ Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vols. III and IV.

¹⁵⁹ Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. III, 555.

¹⁶⁰ Summarised in Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, Vol. IV, 121.

¹⁶¹ Jean Gerson, "Traite contre le Roman de la Rose" in *Le Débat sur le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Hicks, 59-88; discussed in McWebb, *Debating the Roman de la Rose*, 272-306.

the way that the ideas are received by the reader, with less overt didacticism. Consequently, this section will consider the attitudes implied by more literary representations of dreams, i.e. works not explicitly conceived as theoretical or philosophical, but ones in which a story is told.

Dreams as a literary *topos* were not new in the Middle Ages, but it was certainly at this time that the form flourished. Antique precedents appeared in Homer's *Odyssey*, dividing dreams between the gate of ivory or the gate of horn – those coming from the former false, of the latter true – one of the earliest examples of a metaphorical, literary consideration of dreams. They also crop up in Ovid, as in the *Metamorphoses*, where in his tale of Ceyx and Alcyone the sanctuary of Sleep is described in a manner which suggests the multiplicity of useless dreams.¹⁶² The dream in this particular story also assists the plot, as it reveals the death of Ceyx to Alcyone, and contributes to its tragic conclusion. With both authors, however, dreams do not take over the narrative, and they often avoided in-depth analysis of the dream state.

With authors in the Roman period, however, dreams were given larger roles, as with Lucian's aforementioned full dream account. In that narrative, we can see early elements of what would later become commonplace in later medieval literary dreams – an assertion that the dream actually occurred, and that some meaning is present in the dream, though it may need explanation. Certainly, as Harris noted, the actuality of any one dream is nearly impossible to ascertain.¹⁶³ With literary dreams, however, this is rather beside the point: the fact that the author uses the dream framework in itself reveals the level of truth or meaning they require us to take from it, depending on our own attitudes to dreams.

Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* also contain tales akin to literary dream narratives. The 'fictional' label one might apply retrospectively to these stories is complicated by their hagiographical context, but once more it is clear that Gregory's tale of Benedict and the monks at Terracina uses a narrative form to imply that truth received through dreams is equal to that received when awake.

¹⁶² Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. A.D. Melville (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 267: 'Whereon the god, relaxed in languor, lies. Around him everywhere in various guise/Lie empty dreams, countless as ears of corn/At harvest time'.

¹⁶³ For an extensive discussion on these types of dreams, see Harris, "Greek and Roman Dreams that were Really Dreamt" in *Dreams and Experience*, 91-122.

However, it is not until the rise of more vernacular literature around the tenth and eleventh centuries that the dream-narrative becomes really popular. Prophetic dreams ascribed to Charlemagne crop up in the eleventh-century *Chanson de Roland*, and from this point onwards appear with more frequency as we advance towards the twelfth century.¹⁶⁴

Spearing's study, *Medieval Dream-Poetry*, notes several factors he reads into the dream as narrative structure in the Later Middle Ages. He states that increasingly, the form relates to a greater understanding of poem as construction, with authors aware of working in a tradition and artfully shaping their creations.¹⁶⁵ Whether or not this intent can be read into all poems, it is true as Spearing suggests that the dream framework – alongside the visionary narrative – was used systematically when constructing narratives at this time.

Boethius' sixth-century *De consolatio philosophiae* was identified as an important precedent for dream narratives by Spearing. While it was not explicitly a dream or vision narrative, it introduces several of the characters, forms and ideas used by later writers of dream tales.¹⁶⁶ The next major narrative in this vein is Alain de Lille's *De Planctu Naturae*, but it is notable that the author only loosely claims it is a dream. Initially, Alain describes himself as between a state of life and death, which could be any number of things.¹⁶⁷ At the end, however, he abruptly introduces the idea that this may have been a dream:

Accordingly, when the mirror with these images and visions was withdrawn, I awoke from my dream and ecstasy and the previous vision of the mystic apparition left me.¹⁶⁸

Alain therefore not only attempts to make his tale many things – vision, dream, ecstasy, apparition (all of which occupy different categories in the Macrobian hierarchy) – but also alludes to it having been brought to him, something he could not control. While it thus only loosely relates to later dream narratives, it does provide a link between

¹⁶⁴ *The Song of Roland*, trans. Gerard Brault in *The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition: II: Oxford Text and English Translation* (London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978), *Laisses 56 and 57*, 46-47.

¹⁶⁵ A.C. Spearing, *Medieval Dream-Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 4.

¹⁶⁶ Boethius, *The Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. S.J. Tester (London: Loeb Classical Library and William Heinemann Ltd., 1973).

¹⁶⁷ Alain of Lille, *The Plaint of Nature*, trans. James J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980), 116.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 221.

Boethius' more ambiguous experience, and later fictional dreams such as the *Roman de la Rose*. Similar characters appear in Boethius, Alain and the *Rose*, and Jean de Meun in particular borrowed heavily from the *De Planctu Naturae*. This in itself establishes the importance of the former authors in the evolution of the medieval literary dream *topos*, even if the texts themselves are ostensibly unsure of their own positions as 'dream' narrative.

By the thirteenth century, dreams were more frequent in popular romances, cropping up in texts relating to the Grail cycle in France and Germany. Bachorski's study of dreams in medieval literature traces the evolution of such narratives through a selection of German texts.¹⁶⁹ Bachorski questions whose dream is being related in such tales – the author's or the character's – and describes the evolution from plot device, to personal experience linked to overall plot, to finally an expression of the dreamer-character's internal thoughts. Yet what is clear throughout the examples is that all the dreams are treated as significant, whether this meaning is designed for the internal character, or an external (implied) reader.¹⁷⁰

Several studies have also considered what Nolan termed the Gothic 'visionary perspective'.¹⁷¹ These authors agree that a particular attitude is expressed within dream and vision narratives of the Later Middle Ages, set within the prescribed boundaries of the genre. In all these studies, however, not only the prevalence of dream visions in literature is noted, but also the implication that these narratives had become acceptable vehicles for imparting knowledge, either to dreamer or reader.

Robert de Boron was another author who utilised dreams as plot devices to reveal the future in a symbolic manner, much like the Biblical precedents of Joseph and the Pharaoh. Indeed, Robert's rendering of *L'Estoire del Saint Graal* is of particular importance in the pre-*Rose* literary dream tradition: several manuscripts of the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle featuring this tale depicted the dream episodes in the narrative, and thus provide an early example of dreams illustrating vernacular French texts.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁹ Hans-Jürgen Bachorski, "Dreams that Have Never Been Dreamt at All: Interpreting Dreams in Medieval Literature", trans. Pamela E. Selwyn in *History Workshop Journal*, No. 49 (2000): 95-127.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 100.

¹⁷¹ Barbara Nolan, *The Gothic Visionary Perspective* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977); Paul Piehler, *The Visionary Landscape: A Study in Medieval Allegory* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971); Lynch, *The High Medieval Dream Vision*.

¹⁷² Medieval manuscript illustrations of this text are discussed below.

The most popular literary dream of the period was undoubtedly Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun's *Roman de la Rose*, but it is interesting to note that this narrative appears to directly attack the idea of dreams as vessels of meaning. It is necessary, then, to apply Spearing's ideas of poetic exploration to the concept of a visionary tale as bearer of truth when considering the *Rose*, as it strikingly combined the dream narrative with a marked scepticism of dreams. In order to aid further discussion of the poem, its influence and dissemination in illuminated manuscripts, a synopsis of the poem will now be provided.

VIII: The *Roman de la Rose*

In the history of secular dream narratives, the *Roman de la Rose* occupies a unique position. Its popularity, the number of copies it was disseminated in, and characteristics of the text itself all coincide to make it impossible to consider the trajectory of dream discussion and elaboration without it. As this text and its illuminations are also the primary focus of this study, it is necessary to consider in some depth the actual plot of the poem, as the events of the narrative are particularly important to the meaning and visual depiction of the *Rose* at the time. The plot provides the basis for many individual scenes, whether depicting characters, events, or allegorical interpretations of the narrative. Images also elaborate on the poem by emphasising, selectively presenting or indeed analysing the textual storyline. It is for this reason that an outline of my understanding of the narrative as a *dream* plot – distinct from attempts to exemplify its 'meaning' – will be included here prior to discussion of other theoretical and literary dream narratives, or indeed the imagery of the dream. Furthermore, while the opening lines of the poem particularly support the extended analysis of the dream aspect that appears in this thesis, I would argue that this element is also contextualised within the narrative plot, as will be discussed during the following chapters regarding the interrelation of dreams and other themes in the poem.

While the text naturally varies in each of the 190 manuscripts considered in this study, due to the handwritten methods of each copy's production, it would be impossible (and largely unhelpful in the context of this study) to reproduce each variant script in this thesis. As the images typically relate to specific plot episodes, I decided extended dissection of the multitude of minor textual variants was less important than garnering a general overview of the plot. Busby makes a very strong case for continual reference

to medieval manuscript exemplars when studying Old French texts as opposed to reliance on modern editions; this overview is constructed with his warnings regarding de-contextualised texts in mind.¹⁷³ Although notable distinctions or variant textual versions proximate to images discussed in the thesis will be highlighted, this overview will present the general structure of the narrative found in the majority of manuscripts, and which aligns with the most common reading available to medieval audiences. It has been composed in reference to both medieval examples and modern editions in Old French, Modern French and English, in order to present as unbiased an introductory overview as possible, referring to multiple sources for use as a reference for readers during the thesis.¹⁷⁴

One particular angle emphasised in this synopsis is episodes that were subsequently given visual expression in extant manuscripts. However, as this overview is designed to be brief as well as informative to allow prompt access to the investigation of the dream topic within the *Rose*, it is inevitable that certain subjects had to be omitted. I believe my purpose – as a complementary illustration of the narrative alongside its dream-narrative context and an art historical study – has inflected upon the overview, as awareness of the image cycles and dream context has motivated focus on moments of action or plot over more theoretical subjects. Jean's discussion of conceptual subjects, for example, did not always receive extended visual treatment in the manuscripts.

Nevertheless, in the context of this thesis which will concentrate on the representation of the dream, I feel I am justified in focusing on subjects that received visual form in manuscripts, and which elucidate the major start, middle and end points of this dream narrative.

Before commencing, it is necessary to address issues of the anglicised titles of characters used in this synopsis. The titles conferred in the translation of the Old French texts into Modern French and English are problematic, and often appear to depend on the personal whims of critics and commentators of the poem, which typically lead to inconsistencies. For the purposes of clarity, the variations presented here will be justified in the footnotes alongside the alternative translations of these

¹⁷³ Keith Busby, *Codex and Context: Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002).

¹⁷⁴ Old French: various manuscripts and *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Félix Lecoy; Modern French: *Le Roman de la Rose*, trans. Armand Strubel (Paris: Livre de Poche, 1992); English: *The Romance of the Rose*, trans. Harry W. Robbins (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1962), and *The Romance of the Rose*, trans. Frances Horgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

figures. Although one cannot escape the fluid meanings of terms in Old French, particularly when used over such a long period of time, these translations have attempted to match the character names with the definitions provided in *Le Dictionnaire de l'Ancien Français* to provide the closest (and least capricious) titles for these characters.¹⁷⁵

While the *Rose* is typically considered to be the work of two authors writing several decades apart, its narrative structure is largely cohesive. As noted in the Introduction, the poem was written by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun in the thirteenth century; the former an unknown poet, the latter a documented scholar and translator who died in Paris in 1305. While the dual authorship was accepted by medieval scribes and commentators, some modern scholars have suggested that Guillaume may in fact be a construct of Jean's invention, as there is no external evidence as to his existence.¹⁷⁶ The name Guillaume de Lorris only appears in the *Rose* during an internal authorial 'prophecy', and appears to have only been circulated through copies of the poem after Jean's completion.¹⁷⁷ However, it is generally accepted that Guillaume and Jean were in fact two distinct personages, given the variation in style and language used in the expression of the narrative. This study follows the latter view, as while the appropriation of a false identity may have been Jean's original intention, the transmission history in manuscripts, imagery and rubrication strongly suggest that it was largely considered the work of two authors in the medieval period in question.

The *Rose* opens with a short preamble by the first writer, Guillaume de Lorris, wherein the author justifies his retelling of a dream as an educational or illuminating device.¹⁷⁸

Aucunes gens dient qu'en songes
N'a se fables non et mençonges
Mes l'en puet tex songes songier
Qui ne sont mie mençongier.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁵ Algirdas Julien Greimas, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Ancien Français* (Paris: Editions Larousse, 2012).

¹⁷⁶ Hult considered this issue in Chapter One of his *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies*, 1-9. However, while Hult suggests medieval readers were less aware of the two authors, many fourteenth and fifteenth century scribes did insert a rubric between the sections referring to the Guillaume and Jean as distinct personages, though this is not present in some earlier copies.

¹⁷⁷ Numerous *Rose* scholars, including Hult, have recognised that copies circulating without Jean's continuation are extremely rare, suggesting Jean's completion was partly responsible for the popularity of the poem if indeed Guillaume's section were to have existed separately before the 1270s.

¹⁷⁸ It is important to note, however, that at no point does Guillaume name himself during his section of the poem.

¹⁷⁹ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.1-4. As Daniel Poirion points out in "From Rhyme to Reason: Remarks on the Text of the *Romance of the Rose*'

Guillaume states here that while some see nothing but fables or lies in dreams, it is possible to have dreams which are not deceitful, and will later come true. As well as relying on his own assertions, Guillaume (inaccurately) 'cites' the late-antique philosopher Macrobius, who accepted the possibility of truthful dreams.¹⁸⁰ However, Guillaume appears to ignore Macrobius' original context, wherein true dreams were included in a hierarchy that also included meaningless and untrue dreams, as discussed previously.¹⁸¹

The narrator then provides the background to his dream account. Aged 20, he lay down to sleep and had a pleasant dream which later came true. He has been instructed to recount it in verse to please 'Love', and also for the delight of one who deserves to be called 'Rose'. He then titles it the *Roman de la Rose*, declaring that it contains the whole art of love.

At this point the prologue ends and our author slips into the guise of the protagonist, describing his dream in the first person. At times this pretence falls as the narrator sporadically interjects with additions and addresses to the reader, but on the whole we follow the Dreamer.¹⁸² He 'awakens' in the dream during May, washes, dresses, and sets off into the countryside. After refreshing himself by a stream, he approaches a high garden wall, on which are painted a number of disagreeable personifications such as Hate, Envy and Sorrow. Beyond this wall, he can hear birds singing, and expresses a desire to enter the garden. Eventually he is admitted by Idleness, and joins the dance of the companions of the God of Love.¹⁸³

in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose*, eds. Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press), 65-66, one of the most major textual changes traceable in the *Rose* manuscript tradition is the substitution of the first word of the poem, 'Aucunes' (some) with 'Maintes' (many). For Poirion, this equates to the substitution of a more specific saying, perhaps traceable to particular individuals, with a more general one. This variation, however, little affects our understanding of the author's own position that dreams are capable of containing truth. Further quotations from the *Rose* will appear at relevant points throughout the thesis.

¹⁸⁰ Guillaume erroneously refers to Scipio Aemilianus, the protagonist of Macrobius' narrative, as a king when in fact he was a Roman general.

¹⁸¹ Including, notably, the false dreams of pining lovers.

¹⁸² All prior studies of the *Rose* refer to this figure as 'Amant' or 'Lover', based on the terms used to describe this figure in manuscript rubrics. However, this study will refer to this figure as 'Dreamer', as this term carries fewer implications for the elusive meaning of the poem, as well as more accurately describing the figure in the moments prior to his encounter with the Rose, and distinguishing him from the author or narrator persona.

¹⁸³ Blamires and Holian in *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xx, suggested the title 'Ease' as more appropriate for this figure. For the purposes of clarity, I will retain the translation Idleness here, as it corresponds most directly with the characterisation of this figure in the poem.

While exploring the garden alone, the Dreamer finds the Fountain of Narcissus, allowing the narrator to digress into this classical narrative.¹⁸⁴ However, Guillaume reworks the tale, stressing a more specific moral for women – to avoid spurning their lovers – rather than the more common warning against self-adoration Narcissus typically represents.¹⁸⁵ He is transfixed by two crystals in the Fountain, each of which reflects one half of the garden, and through which he sees the forthcoming object of his affection: the roses.

Unbeknownst to the Dreamer, but conveniently described by our omniscient narrator, the God of Love has been stalking the protagonist around the garden. Once the Dreamer discovers the rosebush and becomes entranced by a particular bud, Love attacks him with a number of arrows, metaphorically replicating the stages of falling in love. Once the Dreamer is overcome, Love forces him to become his vassal, explains a number of commandments he must uphold, and locks his heart with a key.¹⁸⁶

After this, Love departs, leaving the Dreamer yearning for the Rose. Subsequently, he is joined by Responsiveness, commonly understood as a personification of the Rose's feminine reaction to courtship, though the figure itself is grammatically male.¹⁸⁷ While

¹⁸⁴ The typical tale (from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*) narrates how Narcissus, a beautiful but self-involved youth, spurns the advances of Echo who loves him. She prays that he will suffer the pain of being ignored by the one he loves, and dies. Narcissus then pauses by a pool in which he sees his reflection, and is so moved by his own beauty that he falls in love with himself. Eventually realising this, and that he can never be with his love physically, he commits suicide (or, in some retellings, drowns) in the pool.

¹⁸⁵ Guillaume's rewriting of Narcissus and his use of this exemplar have been much discussed by *Rose* scholars. Hult in *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies* considered ambiguities in the language, while other critics have attempted to extrapolate some meaning regarding the whole poem from Guillaume's rendition of Narcissus (for example, in the studies of Claire Nouvet, "A Reversing Mirror: Guillaume de Lorris' *Romance of the Rose*" in *Translatio Studii, Essays by his Students in Honor of Karl D. Uitti for his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000), 189-205; and "An Allegorical Mirror: The Pool of Narcissus in Guillaume de Lorris' *Romance of the Rose*", *The Romanic Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (2002): 353-374). Certainly the episode is important – the mirror-like nature of the Fountain facilitates not only a major plot point (allowing the Dreamer to see the Rose for the first time), but also calls into question the reality of this occurrence. The Rose is encountered initially as a reflected image, without corporeal form: when one considers that this occurs within the fluid landscape of a dream, occasionally theorised as a mirror or reflection of waking life in the Middle Ages, this moment gains additional ambiguity and significance.

¹⁸⁶ Guillaume promises further clarification of both arrows and commandments at the end of the tale after the dream, but never does explain them. These promises will be discussed in the following section on the interpretation of the *Rose*.

¹⁸⁷ This character has one of the more variable titles in French to English translation. Typically referred to as 'Fair Welcome' – a literal translation of 'Bel Accueil' throughout twentieth-century scholarship, Blamires and Holian in *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxi, argued for a re-designation as 'Responsiveness', which likely stems from the common conception that this is a reactive character. This study concurs with their analysis and concurrent rejection of the

Responsiveness initially allows the Dreamer to touch the rosebush, Responsiveness takes offence at the Dreamer's request to take the Rose he covets. At this point, they are assailed by Danger, who chases them away.¹⁸⁸ Reason then appears, rebuking the Dreamer for his folly in subscribing to Love's commandments, but the Dreamer remains unconvinced by Reason's arguments and sends her away. She is replaced by the more worldly and congenial companion Friend, who advises the Dreamer to overcome Danger by flattery. When this fails, Generosity, Pity and finally Venus are sent to woo both Danger and Responsiveness, the latter of which eventually grants the Dreamer a kiss.¹⁸⁹

This is witnessed by the scandalmonger Slander, who rouses Jealousy with his account, and who in turn summons Shame and Fear to chastise them for neglecting the Rose.¹⁹⁰ Shame and Fear then admonish Danger who is currently sleeping (having been subdued by Venus), literally awakening him to the threat posed by the Dreamer. Jealousy takes action, ordering a fortress to be built around the roses, as well as imprisoning Responsiveness away from the Dreamer, who is left to mourn his separation from his companion.

Here, at line 4,028 (of 21,750) there is a decisive break in the tale – though it is not mentioned explicitly within the poetic narrative until much later. According to the later passage, everything up to that point was the work of Guillaume de Lorris, while all that

misleading 'Fair Welcome', which suggests the character is universally open to the Dreamer's advances (which s/he is not).

¹⁸⁸ In Greimas, *Le Dictionnaire de l'Ancien Français*, the entry for the Old French term 'Dangier' primarily connotes terms concerning force and power, as well as an element of refusal. Blamires and Holian, in *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxi, refer to him as 'Refusal', stating alternative terms from other scholarship such as 'Reserve' and 'Aloofness' as underestimating the fear this figure provokes. Within this study, the straightforward title Danger is used, as this figure's appearances in the narrative are primarily as a direct or potential agent of fear and/or danger.

¹⁸⁹ Generosity again is referred to by a number of terms in current scholarship, including Openness (Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xx). This character's willingness to step in for others is a primary trait, which is deemed adequate justification for the designation 'Generosity' used here.

¹⁹⁰ Blamires and Holian, in *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxi, refer to Shame and Fear by different terms: Modesty and Timidity. In the context of this study, they are named according to the older translation as these titles better reflect their actions within the poem. Shame and Fear's primary roles are after all to reproach Danger for neglecting the Roses, and inspire him to take up his post again. Such terms also manage to avoid the complicated connotations of traditional 'feminine virtues' that Modesty and Timidity suggest. Slander is also renamed here in place of early twentieth-century translations (for example, Evil Tongue) as it is primarily his verbal interjections that affect the Rose and Dreamer, unlike the generic 'Scandal' Blamires and Holian suggest (*The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxii).

followed (ll. 4,029–21,750) was by another, Jean de Meun. Poetically speaking, however, Jean does not yet interrupt the narrative to explain this; instead he picks up directly with the Dreamer's lamentations.¹⁹¹

Jean next reintroduces Reason, who returns with an extended version of her arguments in Guillaume's section, reproving the Dreamer for following Love and ignoring her advice. Here her arguments are much longer, focused around her definition of love as a paradoxical state, the vicissitudes of Fortune, and with frequent recourse to classical and historical examples. With specific relation to the dream topic, she recounts the tale of King Croesus who had a prophetic, ambiguous dream, interpreted it incorrectly (though his daughter Phanie surmised its meaning) and was eventually hanged.¹⁹² Again, however, the Dreamer restates his loyalty to Love and sends her away. Friend then reappears to give more practical – albeit deceitful – advice on capturing the Rose, and with his encouragement sets out to seek aid from Wealth. When she dismisses him, claiming he has never sought her favour, Love returns to check that he has remained loyal. Additionally, Love organises his barons for a siege on the castle of Jealousy.

It is in this section that Jean discusses the poetic history of the *Rose*, describing the two authors; however, he paradoxically sets this speech temporally between the death of Guillaume and the birth of Jean, which Love is 'foretelling'.¹⁹³ Love also re-titles the poem, suggesting that once Jean has completed the work it should be called the *Mirror for Lovers*.¹⁹⁴ He also introduces new characters such as Fraud and Constrained Abstinence, who dress in the clothing of religious orders, although their histories suggest they represent hypocrisy in general.¹⁹⁵ Fraud is urged to describe himself, and where he may be found, before Love accepts him into his company. Alongside

¹⁹¹ Despite this habit for concealing the dual authorship, as noted many copies did insert rubrication or imagery relating to this. Some early rubrics notably mistook Guillaume de Lorris for a second Guillaume mentioned by Jean in his section – Guillaume de Saint Amour (e.g. BnF fr. 1569) – while others merely reference the fact that Jean picked up the narrative at that point (e.g. BnF fr. 1559).

¹⁹² Croesus and Phanie imagery is discussed during Chapter Two.

¹⁹³ Authorial imagery linked to these comments is covered in Chapter Two.

¹⁹⁴ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll. 10,620–10,621.

¹⁹⁵ While most references to this figure in the scholarly literature refer to Fraud as 'False Seeming', as Blamires and Holian note in *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxii, this is rather an old-fashioned translation. This study thus follows Stakel's position in *False Roses* and Blamires and Holian in retitling him Fraud, which more aptly describes the words and behaviour of this character.

Constrained Abstinence, Fraud aids the Dreamer's quest by murdering Slander and the sleeping castle guards.

The narrative then switches position as we move away from the Dreamer's perspective to that of the imprisoned Responsiveness and his jailer, the Old Woman. She presents guidelines on love from a female point of view, lecturing Responsiveness – as if he were the female object of the Dreamer's quest – on how best to exploit the Dreamer's affection with a variety of deceptive tricks. The Old Woman also facilitates the temporary reunion of Responsiveness and the Dreamer, after which they are again separated, and the attempts to take the castle commence.

After a short apologetic speech by Jean de Meun on the content of his narrative and how it is expressed - specifically directed to the ladies he may have offended by the Old Woman's narrative - a series of individual battles begin between the major personifications, starting with Generosity versus Danger. Ultimately, the attack results in stalemate, and Love decides to send a messenger to his mother, Venus, for her assistance. She agrees and parts from her lover Adonis in order to assist her son in taking the castle.

Here we leave the Dreamer's entourage entirely, heading to the cosmic realm of Nature where she is busy creating new members of species at her forge in an attempt to defeat Death. She confesses to Genius her priest that she despairs of the human race because they refuse to produce offspring, unlike her other less-intelligent creations. She additionally discusses topics ranging from homosexuality to optics, incorporating within the latter an extended passage on dreams.¹⁹⁶ Genius absolves her, urges her to continue her work, and travels to the battle site in order to preach an unorthodox message of unrestrained procreative activity. If they should do as he wishes, he promises the assembled crowd entry to the paradisiacal 'Park of the Lamb' in his summative, quasi-religious moral at the end of his sermon.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁶ The visual omission of this significant digression is discussed during Chapter Two.

¹⁹⁷ The significance of this passage has often been debated by medieval and modern scholars. During the fifteenth-century *Querelle*, Pierre Col praised this passage for preaching a natural urge, though Jean Gerson seems to have considered it an animal impulse that ought to be subdued (for further information on the positions of the major participants in the *Querelle*, see Jillian M.L. Hill's persuasive analysis, *The Medieval Debate on Jean de Meung's Roman de la Rose: Morality Versus Art* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991). Fleming in *The Roman de la Rose*, 205-223, was an early proponent of the theory that Genius' description of Paradise was intended to contrast with Guillaume's Garden of Delight, and contribute to the poem's moralistic meaning by means of the parodic sermon. Pierre-Yves Badel in *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe*

Venus then arrives, and after one final digression for the tale of Pygmalion and Galatea, she sets the castle alight and guides the Dreamer through the last stages of capturing the Rose. In a series of thinly disguised sexual metaphors, he approaches and ‘plucks’ the Rose, before waking abruptly.¹⁹⁸

Since its completion, the poem has been subject to a number of interpretations. As noted in the Introduction, a number of twentieth-century scholars attempted to expound its overall meaning, or even just the significance of small passages. As Sylvia Huot’s studies have revealed, as well as the testimony of the numerous variant manuscript copies, this openness of interpretation was inaugurated almost from the moment of its first transmission in manuscript.¹⁹⁹

The wealth of modern and historical responses, scholarly or otherwise, seems unsurprising given the poem’s complexity. Beyond the major narrative plot points outlined above, the conflicting advice offered by the personifications encountered by the Dreamer, and the *Rose’s* consistent denial of explanation has left it open to varying interpretations. This is compounded by the fact that both Guillaume and Jean promise their readers several times that they will explain the meaning of the dream. Guillaume implies that the events of this dream, ‘covertly’ expressed during sleep, came true, and he furthermore stops at several points in his narrative to promise further information to his readers. He alludes to future explanations regarding the Arrows of Love, the mysteries of the Fountain of Narcissus, and the ending, where Love captures the Castle. This last point is particularly problematic, as Guillaume never reached his intended

Siècle, later expanded upon this theory. This study aligns more with the findings of Douglas Kelly, *Internal Difference and Meanings in the Roman de la Rose* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 132-133, wherein the question of who is ‘correct’ in Jean’s *Rose* – an issue he at one point reduces to Reason versus Genius – is ultimately destined to be discovered by the reader, given the multiplicity of meanings and positions present within the *Rose*.

¹⁹⁸ Despite the language – and a number of literal images interpreting the climax of the poem as a sexual encounter between the Rose and the Dreamer – some scholars have ignored the erotic implications of this section of the poem. Interestingly, it is largely scholars studying the images of the *Rose* who have drawn attention to its eroticism: McMunn’s “Notes on Representations of the Erotic” considered images of a sexual or erotic nature present in the poem, while Huot in *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers* devoted a chapter to the sacred and erotic imagery of BnF fr. 25526.

¹⁹⁹ See particularly Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers*, and *Dreams of Lovers and Lies of Poets: Poetry, Knowledge and Desire in the Roman de la Rose* (London: Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing, 2010).

ending, apparently (according to Jean de Meun) because he died before it was completed.

Certainly, Guillaume's reported death would be a definitive reason for a lack of further explanation, although not all scholars agree on his original intention for the finished poem. David Hult suggested that Guillaume may have always wanted to end his poem with the imprisonment of Responsiveness, unwilling to describe the allusive 'capture' of the Rose.²⁰⁰ While Hult makes a useful point with respect to the disjunction of modern and medieval assumptions that the poem was 'incomplete', the evidence of scribal additions and the large-scale work of Jean de Meun suggests that medieval readers did not see Guillaume's section as a finished work, and felt the need to finish it.²⁰¹ However, this speculation is rather a moot point: as it stands, Guillaume's section does not fulfil his promises to explain the mysteries of his poem, ending abruptly mid-dream and with no account of how it supposedly came true.

Those seeking closure will not find it in Jean's section either. Despite also promising to reveal his meaning during the authorial 'apology' just before the individual battles, where he references a forthcoming gloss, his curt and potentially post-coital awakening specifically avoids fulfilling his pledge.²⁰² Instead, it was left to later annotators to provide an interpretation for the reader, often in extended *explicit*s beneath the last lines of the poem, 'atant fu jours et mesveille'. A number of copies from the mid-fourteenth century in fact incorporated one popular 24-line conclusion that expounded on the truth of dreams indicated by Guillaume, suggesting that readers were also dissatisfied with the lack of explanation in Jean's continuation.²⁰³

While this study is not proposing a new 'meaning' for the *Rose*, it does adjust the typical reading of the narrative, as it draws attention to the importance of the dream to the narrative and accompanying imagery: the dream framework shapes the poem, and is

²⁰⁰ Hult, *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies*.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.* A 76-line anonymous conclusion also appeared in some of the earliest copies of the *Rose*, providing a swift conclusion to Guillaume's narrative, representing a further attempt to end the poem beyond that of Jean de Meun's.

²⁰² Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.15,105-15,272.

²⁰³ The presence of these 24 lines in several copies featuring a quadripartite incipit (e.g. Gray's Inn 10, Chantilly MS 481, Baltimore Walters W.143) appear to me to suggest that their transmission was in some way related to the workshops responsible for the production of *Rose* copies with quadripartite opening scenes. This could mean it was introduced during the mid-fourteenth century by a scribe and either reproduced in subsequent manuscripts by that worker, or by other scribes using that copy as a model. The Gray's Inn and related manuscripts are discussed during Chapters Three and Four.

referenced consistently throughout the poem. Dreams have a special position within the *Rose* corpus; while passages vary from manuscript to manuscript, the constituent textual opening and closing references to the dream were never omitted, and in illustrated versions the incipit lines were typically prefaced by an image of the Dreamer.²⁰⁴ Furthermore, its indebtedness to – and rejection of – a literary and theoretical corpus of manuscripts sites it clearly as an influential example of dream literature from the fourteenth century.

Although Guillaume de Lorris opens the poem with a citation from Macrobius, expressing the idea that dreams do not tell lies, as the narrative wears on there appear to be specific attempts to erode our faith in what occurs. As the Dreamer explores the Garden of Delight, fatefully stares into the Fountain of Narcissus, and is hunted down by the God of Love, we see the narrative degenerating into an amorous conquest. While Guillaume does not take us to the moment of conquest, the dreamer's incessant desire for his beloved clearly relates to Macrobius' *insomnium* category, a non-revelatory form, including the dreams had by lovers of their sweethearts.

Bodenham considers this fact (Guillaume's relation to the *insomnium*) as proof that he was ignorant of Macrobian theory, and only cited him as a known authority on dreams.²⁰⁵ Peden also is sceptical of Guillaume's understanding of Macrobius, and attempts to remove Macrobian influence from the poem almost entirely.²⁰⁶ However, there is another way to read Guillaume's misinterpretation of Macrobius – that he is intentionally evoking Macrobian dream theory *in order to* dismiss revelatory dreams, emphasising the *insomnium* nature of his dream and its subsequent lack of meaning.²⁰⁷ Whether or not one is familiar with Macrobius, it is clear through the dreamer's folly in

²⁰⁴ Possible exceptions to this are the compilation manuscripts, i.e, Arras 845, which contain only extracts thought to be of interest to the composer of the manuscript or their patron. However, such manuscripts form a tiny minority of extant *Rose* material, with the rest containing a complete version of the poem, incorporating the opening and closing references to falling asleep and waking. Other editions that represented more conscious attempts to 'rewrite' the *Rose*, such as Gui de Mori's *Remainement*, Jean Molinet's *Prose Moralisation*, or Clément Marot's *Recension* all retained the dream element, despite extensive changes made to the text.

²⁰⁵ Bodenham, "The Nature of the Dream".

²⁰⁶ Peden, "Macrobius and Mediaeval Dream Literature".

²⁰⁷ Charles Dahlberg, in "Macrobius and the Unity of the 'Roman de la Rose'" also supported the idea of a Macrobian influence in the *Roman de la Rose*, though for different reasons – specifically Macrobius' (and Guillaume's) faith in the power of dreams and allegorical fiction to convey truths.

Guillaume's section that this dream is unlikely to end with the spiritual elevation of our dreamer-narrator, and that we are being invited to deride him.

This is also evident in Jean's continuation, as he stretches the narrative to the boundaries of propriety in his infamous description of the conquest of the rose. In a passage which recalls Augustine's absolution of those who dream of impure things, Jean's thinly disguised metaphors come just prior to his rude awakening and the end of the poem, firmly denying any greater meaning to the dream. He also introduces, as Stakel notes in her study of the language, a firm construction of terms relating to the theme of deceit throughout his section.²⁰⁸ Jean's character Nature also expresses disbelief in the significance of dreams, rather bizarrely undermining her own authority, as she appears in a dream narrative.²⁰⁹ These factors, alongside the abrupt ending which concludes the tale without a gloss or explanation promised by both Guillaume and Jean, makes it clear that this dream, rather than unambiguously presenting an 'art of love', or prophetic tale, was designed more as an exploration into the nature of truth in dreams, as well as a reflection on the reception of meaning itself. These aspects are particularly intriguing when one considers the visual development of *Rose* iconography in the manuscripts, which supplant or consciously undermine the more traditional authorial portrait commonly included at the head of theoretical literary texts by including an image of the Dreamer (discussed at length during Chapter Two).

IX: Literary Successors to the *Rose*

The *Rose* proved not only popular but influential, and Arden's study notes the different ways later authors used the story to their own ends.²¹⁰ One of the first imitators was *Li Fablel dou Dieu d'Amors*, an anonymous thirteenth-century work that is so close to the *Rose* that for some time it was believed to have preceded it.²¹¹ Arden also notes the variations by authors such as Guillaume de Machaut, who wakes his dreamer with a sprinkling of dew – a motif that also appears in his dream just before he awakens.²¹²

²⁰⁸ Stakel, *False Roses*, 6-8.

²⁰⁹ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Roman de la Rose* ed. Lecoy, ll.18333-18337. This passage is discussed in greater depth later in the thesis.

²¹⁰ Arden, *The Romance of the Rose*, Chapter IV: "The Influence of the Roman de la Rose", 67-86.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 69.

²¹² Arden, *The Romance of the Rose*, 70.

Chaucer also incorporated and expanded the dream narrative later in his own poetry, and appears to have translated passages of the *Rose* itself.²¹³ His *Book of the Duchess*, *The Parliament of Fowls*, *The House of Fame*, and Prologue to *The Legend of Good Women* are all situated in dreams, and make reference not only to what inspired the oneiric experience, but also refer to the author's *literary* use of dreams for poetic purposes. For example, in the last lines of his *Book of the Duchess*, a dream inspired by reading Ovid's tragic tale of Alcyone and Ceyx, Chaucer states he was driven to write down his tale because it was such a curious dream.²¹⁴ So too the incompleteness of his dream in *The Parliament of Fowls* inspires the writer to seek his conclusion elsewhere, once he has awakened.²¹⁵

Such narratives appear to suggest that Chaucer considered dreams in terms we have already encountered, i.e. external factors contributing to dreams, such as reading a book. While Scipio does not read a book to dream of his grandfather, the stimuli are certainly similar, and indeed one of Chaucer's other characters reads the *Somnium Scipionis* prior to a dream, in the *Parliament of Fowls*.²¹⁶ So too established dream motifs crop up – wandering through a garden, meeting personifications and guides who impart information to the dreamer. And yet there is, perhaps, as Bachorski and Spearing suggest, an idea that the poet is more aware of his poem as construction when using the dream framework. By placing the dream as Chaucer does between falling asleep and waking, he is able to respond to the content of the dream in both a poetic and analytical, theoretical manner, as he ponders the 'reality' of his dream in literary terms.

While not all imitators of the *Rose* maintained this questioning attitude towards the truth presented in dreams, with some authors – like Chaucer – there does appear to be a different attitude to dreams expressed in literary, rather than theoretical works. While the theoreticians argued for a hierarchical conception of dreams, with non-revelatory and revelatory types, some writers of fictions used a purportedly truthful dream framework in order to describe dreams with no informative purpose. The exploration of this idea in literary form was certainly more accessible to the everyday

²¹³ Chaucerian quotations and references are from *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson [3rd Edition] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, *Book of the Duchess*, ll. 1330-31, 346.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, *The Parliament of Fowls*, ll. 695-699, 394.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, *The Parliament of Fowls*, l. 31, 385.

reader than the philosophical treatises of churchmen, and consequently it is likely this that greatly contributed to the later development of dream attitudes.

In Empson's study *Sleep and Dreaming*, he notes the direction of thought on dreams after the Enlightenment, highlighting the way in which dreams have become metaphors for unattainable goals, self-reflection, or unrealistic aspiration.²¹⁷ It is not too difficult to see the way in which the self-questioning narratives like the *Rose* contributed to the development of such attitudes.

X: Postscript: Attitudes of the Present Day

As the allusion to Empson suggests, attitudes have clearly moved on since the Middle Ages. In order to place the medieval conception of dreams within a meaningful framework for contemporary readers, it appears pertinent to include some indication of modern attitudes towards dreams, shaped largely by several twentieth-century studies. This will help prevent an ahistorical presentation, by highlighting any major differences in perspective, and perhaps explain why prior studies of *Rose* and other medieval material have neglected to consider the influence of dream contexts on the field of dream narrative and imagery from the Middle Ages.

Perhaps the most major study to have shaped the modern conception of dreams is the work of Sigmund Freud. *The Interpretation of Dreams* has had a profound influence on successive authors and thinkers, as it provides several hypotheses seeking to explain not only why we dream, but what meanings lie in our dreams. Through his study of 'hysterical' patients, Freud composed a 'wish-fulfilment' theory concerning dreams, i.e. that dreams present the desires of the unconscious to the dreaming mind, usually in disguise (a by-product of the mind censoring thoughts it considers to be unsettling or inappropriate).²¹⁸ Much of Freudian analysis comes down to sexual urges, but whether or not one agrees with this assumption, his overall study does have much general import.

Firstly, Freud took a firmly positive stance in the debate over the significance of dreams. While he appears to agree with Aristotle's idea that dreams are psychological, not divine, and may only foretell the future inasmuch as they themselves point to future

²¹⁷ Jacob Empson, *Sleep and Dreaming* [3rd Edition] (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002), 14.

²¹⁸ Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, trans. A.A. Brill (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1997).

action, Freud explicitly assigns importance to dreams.²¹⁹ He asserts that dreams can be decoded, traced back to their original content, and may hold a positive meaning for the dreamer. In this sense, Freud does relate to the dreambook tradition, and indeed some of his more general exemplars – that imagery of the King and Queen relate to one’s parents for example – have much in common with Artemidorius’ attribution of meanings to dream symbols.

While Freud rejects much that characterised the medieval perspective on dreams, such as divine or demonic origin, he does fuse two of the major attitudes of that era into his theory. He maintains confidence not only in the presence of meaning in dreams, but also its accessibility, provided that the right process is applied.²²⁰ This is not to suggest that his theory was flawless – his strict assumption that dreams stemmed from a single cause often necessitated an arbitrary approach to interpretation: some images in dreams were to be considered as direct symbols of latent content, while others were to be read inversely. This unwillingness to admit other causes of dreams was a further departure from the medieval position, wherein many kinds of dreams could coincide with one another.

Freud’s pupil, Carl Jung, followed his lead by producing his own studies in the 1930s. His theory is rather more variable and diverse, with dreams having multiple causes and origins (an unsurprising reaction to Freud’s strict theory). However, in many cases, the underlying unconscious does remain responsible for the content, even if an external cause is specified.²²¹ Jung also utilised Freud’s method of free association to get through the manifest dream content to the latent content underneath. In general, he emphasised a more personal approach to dream interpretation, rejecting Freud’s near-unilateral sexual approach. However, he did link several images or ‘archetypes’ to what he called the ‘collective unconscious’.²²² In this manner, his theories again relate to earlier considerations of dreaming, most specifically in the dreambooks.

One notable thread expressed by these two authors is the importance they placed on the dreamer, and the function of dreams relating to the individual’s life. Through allusions to their study of illness, they suggest a ‘healing’ capacity in the interpretation of dreams, which may affect the dreamer positively. This confidence of Freud and Jung

²¹⁹ Freud, *Interpretation of Dreams*, 452.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p.14.

²²¹ Carl Jung, *Sur l’interprétation des Rêves*, trans. A. Tondrat (Paris: Albin Michel, 1998), 13-50.

²²² Jung, *Sur l’interprétation des Rêves*.

did not go long unchallenged, and eventually found a strong contender in the flourishing scientific fields investigating the somatic causes of dreams.

For scientists, the biological function, not the psychoanalytic element drew them to the subject, and it was the experience rather than the content that drew their attention most. In 1953, Aserinsky and Kleitman elucidated the presence of 'Rapid Eye Movement', or REM sleep.²²³ Their study identified a higher propensity for vivid, memorable dreams in their subjects during this stage of sleep, as well as its cyclical occurrence throughout the night. The frequency of dreams, then, appeared to be far greater than previously suspected. This study led many others to consider what occurs in the brain while we sleep, and to hypothesise on the function of dreaming.

A number of theories have been proposed since the 1950s, for example: that dreams allow the brain to erase unwanted behaviours, or that it is an evolutionary device designed to allow us to 'rehearse' potentially dangerous situations, and formulate exit strategies.²²⁴ Other studies have sought to map the brain processes responsible for dreaming, such as that of Hobson, Pace-Schott and Stickgold.²²⁵

Yet despite the large amounts of scientific studies proliferating since the 1950s, there is still no universally acknowledged theory regarding the physical function or causes of dreams. Studies from other fields have been useful in filling this gap, such as Lincoln's study of dreams in primitive cultures, which raised some interesting ideas about dreams within society.²²⁶ One of the many points he notes, and admires, is the willingness of particular societies to consider the dream-world of as much importance as the waking one.²²⁷ He perceived this latter attitude to have been 'lost' by Western societies, as rationalism spread from the later Middle Ages.²²⁸

²²³ Eugene Aserinsky and Nathaniel Kleitman, "Regularly Occurring Periods of Eye Motility, and Concomitant Phenomena, During Sleep", *Science*, New Series, Vol. 118, No. 3062 (1953): 273-74.

²²⁴ Francis Crick and Graeme Mitchison, "The Function of Dream Sleep", *Nature*, Vol. 304 (1983): 111-14; Antti Revonsuo, "The reinterpretation of Dreams: An Evolutionary Hypothesis on the Function of Dreaming", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23 (2000): 877-901.

²²⁵ J. Allan Hobson, Edward F. Pace-Schott and Robert Stickgold, "Dreaming and the Brain: Toward a Cognitive Neuroscience of Conscious States", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23 (2000): 793-842.

²²⁶ Jackson Steward Lincoln, *The Dream in Primitive Cultures* (London: The Cresset Press, 1935).

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, xi.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

Philosophical studies of dreams have also returned, with one of the most controversial being Malcolm's assertion that judgements in sleep are impossible.²²⁹ Indeed, several of the authors in the *Philosophical Essays on Dreaming* compilation seek directly to refute his theory.²³⁰ While Malcolm's study on dreaming does interestingly highlight how our knowledge of the dreams of others relies on their 'report', several of his assertions appear to confuse the experiential nature of dreams themselves with the metaphorical conception of dreams in popular culture, with the former point being almost totally ignored.²³¹

Empson's comprehensive *Sleep and Dreaming* also reveals contemporary attitudes to dreams. While his assumption that, in scientific terms at least: 'The clerical domination of Western thought during the Dark and Middle Ages resulted in relative neglect of this subject until the sixteenth century' is rather simplistic, it does reveal the extent to which modern authors often consider themselves taking a fresh look at the topic through scientific enquiry.²³² His description of how dream metaphors, relating to Freudian wish-fulfilment theories, have entered everyday speech, is particularly illuminating. However, he concludes his introductory chapter by stating we are no more incredulous of dreams than our ancestors, and that we continue to attempt to assign them meaning.²³³

These aforementioned studies then do not appear to have drawn us too far from medieval attitudes towards dreams. Though attempts have been made to assign a function to dreaming, the only real advances have been made through an understanding of the brain's process during sleep, and as yet provide no answer for why this happens. Certainly it is important to note the two major shifts in our cultural attitude – that we no longer 'trust' our dream content in the same way Lincoln perceived it in non-western societies (perhaps best exemplified by the relentless scientific search for an origin within the body itself), and secondly, the modern association of dreams with the wish fulfilment of the dreamer, something only loosely considered in the Middle Ages.

²²⁹ Norman Malcolm, *Dreaming*. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959).

²³⁰ C. Dunlop, ed. *Philosophical Essays on Dreaming* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), specifically Ayer, Canfield, Pears, Chihara, Siegler, Chappell, Landesman and Curley.

²³¹ Malcolm, *Dreaming*.

²³² Empson, *Sleep and Dreaming*, 10.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 18.

Shaped by the attitudes of our predecessors, as well as increasing amounts of scientific and psychological knowledge about how dreaming works, it is clear today that there is a wide variation in beliefs about dreams. However, it appears that beyond these discrepancies, there appears to be a trend towards the internalisation of the dream. While Aristotle and his companions argued for the causal relationship of dreams to the dreamer's state, the idea of dreams coming from divine or demonic sources persisted throughout the Middle Ages. Dreams could have external sources, with their interpretation dependent on an external figure or mode of interpretation.

Today, with the studies of Freud and later scientists, this external element has all but been lost. Yes, certainly, dreams may relate to the experiences of the prior day, yet it is only through our perception and memory of these that dreams are understood to arise – not from divine beings. Despite the more visible appearance of dreams in artworks, or turns of phrase, our era has seen an internalisation of the dream, with attitudes conditioned by this more subjective approach.

This is the main fact to take forth, then, when considering visual representations of dreams during the Middle Ages. While today one might imagine the representation of a dream to remain close to an individual's perception, and guided by all the subjectivity that entails, in the medieval period dreams bore some relation to an external sphere, be it demonic or divine. As such, while we can be sure that everybody at that time dreamed their own individual dreams, their attitudes and imagery was shaped by the potentiality – however much disputed – that an external cause was responsible.

X: Reconceptualising the *Rose*: The Importance of Dream Theory

Though further examples will be considered in reference to specific dream images, it is important to note several common aspects in medieval writings on dreams. With very few exceptions, they were regarded as ambiguous – whether explicitly described as such by the authors, or simply evident in their exemplars of both true and false dreams. Attempts to categorise or frame dream episodes were common in both literary and religious accounts, including the *Roman de la Rose*. The highly symbolic nature of dreams was also stressed in Dreambooks, but was also a standard feature of their appearance in Biblical writings, commentaries, theoretical hierarchies and literary tales.

These medieval approaches to dreams clearly shaped the text of the *Rose*. While Guillaume has typically been viewed as trusting in 'true' dreams, Jean appears to more explicitly undermine the idea of his predecessor's edifying dream experience – resulting in a poem that covers the two most extreme attitudes towards dreams in the Middle Ages.²³⁴ However, the actual poem is more complicated than this diametric opposition. Guillaume's Dreamer acts foolishly, ignoring the warnings of his surroundings (as when he recounts the tale of Narcissus, then looks into the Fountain), rebuffing Reason, and exposing himself to the vicissitudes of fate as he idly wanders through the landscape of his dream. The author's ultimate lack of explanation, whether intended or not – despite Guillaume's promises to the contrary – also means we are denied a final unambiguous interpretation of this apparently true dream. Guillaume's promises of revelation lack substance as he offers no external proof of the dream's veracity, unlike earlier examples from Robert's *L'Estoire*, wherein the dream's vision is confirmed by later events of waking experience.

Jean's section emphasises disbelief in dreams more so than Guillaume's, specifically in the astonishing assertion by Nature that dreams contain nothing but lies, a statement that totally undermines her in-dream authoritativeness. Yet this too is complex, as its presentation inside the dream introduces a flaw into the argument: as this statement on the falsity of dreams is told by a personification *within* a dream, how can we trust it? A logical interpretation of her negative assertion inside a dream would surely mean the statement is a lie, and consequently that dreams *do* contain truths. Furthermore, while Jean's abrupt ending may serve the theory that dreams do not contain anything of significance, it also avoids refuting Guillaume from a position outside the dream. Jean's only attempts to rebut Guillaume's assertions on its veracity during the prologue occur in-dream – a sphere he has apparently deemed unfit for the provision of truths.

The series of conflicting advisors also serves to suggest the complexity of deciphering the dream of the *Rose*, a problem compounded by the author's denial of an ultimate explanation. While the numerous extant copies attest to its continued popularity, and a vibrant tradition of poetic copying and citation suggests its ideas were deemed useful by others, the issue of its morality was a common problem.²³⁵ The first of Guillaume de

²³⁴ Jean's dismissal of dreams in relation to optical illusions and other tricks during the speech of Nature does point to a negative position regarding 'truthful' dreams. This passage is discussed during Chapter Three.

²³⁵ See Badel, *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe Siècle* for an introduction to the reception and transmission of the *Rose* during the fourteenth century.

Deguilleville's three *Pèlerinages* (1330), itself structured as a dream vision, includes a passage on the author's admiration for the *Rose*, stating a reading of it likely inspired his own dream and poem, while the *explicit* states emphatically that it was based on the *Rose*.²³⁶ However, by 1355 Deguilleville had evidently had a change of heart, and stated in his *Remainement* that the earlier version of the *Pèlerinage de vie humaine* had circulated without his agreement. The reference to the *Rose* in the opening lines was excised, and during the speech of Venus, she states that the *Rose* was an assault on Chastity authored by Venus and/or her clerk.²³⁷

Scholars disagree on the reasons for Deguilleville's edited version of 1355, suggesting that either he had experienced backlash for expressing such unadulterated admiration for a poem that denigrated the clergy and mendicant orders, or that the changes were simply a means of stressing the *Pèlerinage's* religious standpoint.²³⁸ Whatever the reasons for Deguilleville's revision of his own dream work in order to expunge positive references to the *Rose*, this apparent U-turn suggests that even for contemporary writers working in the century after the poem was written, the overall meaning or effect of the *Rose* was ambiguous enough to merit periodic re-evaluation.

The lack of a clear moral – though this time not surfacing in a dream context – reappeared at the turn of the fifteenth century with the *Querelle de la Rose*, when a group of intellectuals and clerks debated the poem in a series of public and private letters. The major figures were the royal secretaries, Jean de Montreuil and the brothers Gontier and Pierre Col, prolific court poet Christine de Pizan, and the Chancellor of the University of Paris, Jean Gerson. While the royal secretaries liberally praised the *Rose*, particularly the section of Jean de Meun, the latter writers largely opposed it on the basis of its inflammatory rhetoric and unclear morality, with Christine stating: 'I respond that he does not tell or teach us anything extraordinary whatsoever', and, most unequivocally:

²³⁶ Outlined in Hill, *The Medieval Debate on Jean de Meung's Roman de la Rose*, 5-6.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 7-9.

²³⁸ Badel in *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe Siècle* suggests the former, while Edmond Faral "Le Roman de la Rose et la pensée française au XIIIe siècle", *Revue des deux mondes*, 35 (1926): 430-57, and to some extent Hill in *The Medieval Debate on Jean de Meung's Roman de la Rose* represent the latter point of view.

I call it an exhortation to vice, encouraging immoral life, a doctrine full of deceit; the path to damnation; a public defamer. It gives rise to suspicion and idolatry, to shame for many people, and possibly to heresy.²³⁹

While it seems surprising that authors could take such opposing perspectives on the *Rose*, such ambiguity can be explained by its status as a dream. Long-standing medieval traditions considered dreams to be slippery, uncertain, and not necessarily true; like the opposing meanings presented for *Roses* in the early sixteenth-century Dreambook, evidently dreams could mean different things to different people. Even a single literary 'dream' could be interpreted in different ways – Guillaume de Deguilleville's vision began as a positive response to the *Rose*, but some 25 years later that ambiguous text was erased from the *Pèlerinage's* list of sources.

So what did this gamut of medieval philosophical and popular literature on dreams mean for imagery of the *Roman de la Rose*, or Biblical dreams? Although it will not be suggested that every artist was well-versed in the dream literature of their time, it is highly likely that the attitudes of the likes of John of Salisbury, the Parisian Condemnations, or Aquinas did spread into society at large. Alongside the popularised dreambooks circulating in the courts and spheres in which the artists worked, such philosophies may have had an effect on how artists tackled the subject of dreams.

As a means of making specific remarks on the extent to which such ideas are evident in images of dreams during the Later Middle Ages, the following section will consider examples of medieval dream imagery prior and contemporaneous to the illuminated *Roses*. This will thereby contextualise and support the idea that the *Roman de la Rose* represents a turning point in not only the literary treatment of dreams, but also its artistic representation.

It is one of the aims of this thesis to explore to what extent such attitudes are evident in the visual imagery of the *Rose* manuscripts – an issue that will be considered at greater length in the two chapters on 'Production' that appear later on – but what will become clear is that with the *Rose*, proclaiming its own ambivalence to its status as dream narrative, the 'freedom' allotted to artists dealing with everyday dreams was

²³⁹ From Christine's response to Jean de Montreuil's Treatise on the *Roman de la Rose*, June-July 1401. Reprinted in McWebb's *Debating the Roman de la Rose*, 118-33. Further references to the *Querelle* are made in future chapters regarding manuscripts produced around the time of the debate.

multiplied. That artists were familiar with the poem's own assertion of its truth is clear, as the poem opens with this very statement, backed up by a reference to Macrobius. The fact that this opening section is constantly illuminated in the extant manuscripts, means that artists were undeniably aware of at least one of the poem's internal references to its 'truth'.

For artists progressing through the poem, whether or not they gleaned the larger part of Guillaume or Jean's subtleties on the difficulty of ascertaining truth in such dream narratives, several of the images commonly depicted relate once more to a theme in which no truth is guaranteed – for example Narcissus and the Fountain, or the tale of Pygmalion. The idea of there being no inherent truth in dreams – or images of them – presents a difficult challenge for artists, though one may expect it was a liberating one. Without the necessity of pandering to a text which declared its own truth, such as scenes of Biblical dreams, artists were freer than ever to present their own vision of the dream through their own interpretation. However, as will be explored, the depictions of dreams prior to the *Rose* were tied to a formal layout that left little room for personal investigations of the dream phenomena in visual form.

XI: The Historical Artistic Representation of Dreams

In direct contrast to the ambiguous treatment of dreams in medieval textual sources, visual representations were dominated by one type of imagery: Biblical dreams. The following section will consider the visual conventions evident in images of dreams in manuscripts during the Middle Ages, as the tradition in general visual culture – particularly stonework and stained glass – has already been covered in Carolyn Carty's PhD thesis, *Dreams in Early Medieval Art*.²⁴⁰ In addition to recognising the difficulty of identifying 'dream' scenes in monumental art, Carty also summarises a number of dream-image characteristics, as well as a series of functions dreams had, as represented in medieval art. The study also included a large catalogue of dream images in stained glass, manuscripts, and stonework from the ninth to thirteenth centuries, overall providing a useful if narrowly focused study that does not question why images took their specific forms. As such, my overview of dreams in manuscripts will seek to address the omissions of Carty regarding the reasons behind the formal characteristics of dream imagery, as well as providing more specific examples from the period

²⁴⁰ Carty, *Dreams in Early Medieval Art*.

contemporaneous with the *Rose*. I will further provide evidence for how the theoretical literary representation of dreams was expressed in visual form.

Imagery of dreams appeared in a variety of manuscript genres, from Biblical texts, commentaries, moral and poetic treatises as well as romances. Each performed a function in its respective text, typically as part of a series illustrating key plot points, or as another didactic or decorative accompaniment to the script. Analysis of such imagery reveals major characteristics of dream imagery in the centuries just prior to the emergence of the *Rose* manuscript tradition.

Through representations of both religious and secular dreams, artists and planners, likely the elusively termed *libraire* figure, formed a convention for the depiction of dreams.²⁴¹ By the time the *Rose* was written and illustrated, several main elements were typically included in dream representations. These were the dreamer, the dream vision itself - whether allegorical symbol or literal event - and the dream's precursors or consequences. While geographical location, time period, and prevailing local styles or training all affected the external appearance of this convention, nevertheless by the thirteenth century this was the consistent method for depicting dreams. Their most striking feature, however, is that they did not differ substantially from methods of depicting waking reality. This tradition was one major aspect illuminators of the *Rose* would contend with, and expand upon, when illustrating the new text.

Firstly, it is necessary to clarify some points regarding this imagery. As noted by Carty, it can be difficult to identify dreams as opposed to visions, or simply persons reclining in beds who may have been sleeping, resting, or dying.²⁴² However, while her selections of imagery in monumental stonework and stained glass may have been more complicated to identify, as they typically occur in locations without accompanying text, I have found that the case of manuscript imagery has a more definitive indication of the scene, either through rubrics or nearby text in or around the images. According to my research manuscripts featuring these scenes were most often narrative, whether

²⁴¹ The primary studies consulted regarding the art historical background and manuscript illumination in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are: Alison Stones' *A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in France*, Vol. I (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2013); the Rouses' *Illiterati et Uxorati*; Alexander's *Medieval Illuminators*; Avril's *L'enluminure à l'époque gothique*; Robert G. Calkins' *Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1983). For other scholarship consulted see the Introduction and Bibliography.

²⁴² Carty *Dreams in Early Medieval Art*, 15.

Biblical, patristic or secular, meaning text was never too far from these images, providing a clear context for their comprehension.

Secondly, one must come back to the distinction between dreams and visions, discussed in the section above. While these categories could often be ambiguous textually, they received a different visual emphasis in imagery. The typical means of identifying a Dreamer was a side-on sleeping pose, often with one hand propping up their head and with closed eyes, while visionaries usually stand up, with their eyes open. Given the recurring vagueness of language terms relating to visions as opposed to dreams, the choice of whether a visionary reclined as a dreamer or stood with eyes open seems to have been more to do with visual traditions than details within the texts they illustrated. Nonetheless, once these traditions were established, the representations of particular figures as 'visionaries' or 'dreamers' seems to have been fairly stable in the later middle ages. Typical examples of these distinct types are for dreamers, Joseph, Daniel, or Nebuchadnezzar, as opposed to the visionaries Moses or John in the Book of Revelation.²⁴³ The Dreamer of the *Rose* – and the examples provided below – clearly conform to the dreamer *topos* established with such characters as Joseph.

However, it is important to note that visual categories for 'dreamers' could be fluid – the visionary Ezekiel, for example, was commonly depicted in a dreamer style. Ezekiel's vision of the four beasts occurred as he waited amid captives by the river Chobar, and the Biblical account makes no reference to night or sleep; a set of circumstances that suggest these were daytime visions, particularly as they occurred in the presence of others.²⁴⁴ However, in the artistic examples, Ezekiel is often shown reclining in a bed witnessing his vision either with eyes open or closed – appropriating the principal position and accessory of dream representations. One such example of this appears in the so-called *Bible of Charles V*, BnF Arsenal 590 (Figure 1), a thirteenth-century Latin Bible featuring small miniatures embedded in the text columns that are indicative of an

²⁴³ John is a further example where the Biblical language does not specify eyes open or closed; the representation of this figure as experiencing his vision awake, while standing or writing, thus appears to have been a conventional representation that developed over time. Indeed, as Emmerson in "Visualising the Visionary" and Klein in "Visionary Experience and Corporeal Seeing", in *Looking Beyond*, ed. Hourihane, demonstrate, some scenes even emphasised his role as witness, hearer and participant in his vision, as opposed to the reclining dreamer featured in 'dream' imagery.

²⁴⁴ Ezekiel 1.

origin in Paris. This example will be considered in conjunction with the discussion on *Rose incipits* during Chapter Two.

Somewhat rarer are the examples of dreamers represented as visionaries, in bed but with eyes open. This deviation may have been an intentional change from the tradition; such an alteration could have expressive or theoretical effects when one considers the perceived distinctions between dreams and visions that were current at the time. An example of this is the representation of the New Testament *Joseph's Dream of the Flight into Egypt* in a thirteenth-century English manuscript, Lansdowne 420 (Figure 2).²⁴⁵In this episode, Joseph is warned in a dream that Herod seeks to kill young male children in order to defy a prophecy in which he loses his throne; Joseph is instructed to take Christ into Egypt until it is safe. In this representation, Joseph is shown reclining in bed looking up at an angel, hands outstretched to receive the scroll the angel bears rather than being fully asleep. This may have been an attempt to link Joseph to other proactive or significant visionaries, such as John of *Revelation*, or simply a means of underlining that Joseph has seen and accepted the wisdom of the dream.²⁴⁶ As noted, however, such variations of Biblical dreamers were rare, as these tended to conform to the established prototypes.

My overview will be less strict than Carty's, specifically allowing for – even inviting – imagery like the *Tree of Jesse*, which was an ambiguous textual occurrence most often rendered in a Dreamer format. The application of dreamer-like frames to these vague experiences was not uncommon, and thus such scenes must be considered as contributing to the dreamer *topos* in medieval art. Wherever dreamer scenes are found, they reveal at the very least a desire to relate the episode to the well-known sphere of dreams. While reasons for this could vary, it is revealing that at times visions or other ambiguous visual experiences were cast in the image of dreams, with a specific sleeping 'viewer'. The ability of dreams to take different forms, and the fact that everyone experienced them may have made these more relatable than the sporadic 'visions' encountered in literature and Biblical narratives. It is thus possible that changes were

²⁴⁵ This manuscript is held in the British Library. Joseph's dream is described in Matthew 2:12.

²⁴⁶ Visionaries often were shown in artworks with their eyes open, possibly to draw attention to the fact that these visions could happen at any time, not just during sleep. The visionary John in *Revelations* is one of the few who actually interacted with his vision, and performs actions such as writing or pointing in visual imagery; the representation of Joseph 'receiving' the scroll from the angel may have been intended to relate him to the likes of John. For more information on this see the aforementioned study by Emmerson, "Visualising the Visionary".

made in order to make the experience more 'accessible'. However, it is also true that visual conventions typically did not stylistically differentiate vision and dream scenes from real-life participants - there were no hazy, atmospheric tones with which these were rendered, contrary to our modern-day, post-Surrealist artistic imagery of the dream space. As such, the dreamer form, with a recognisable trope in the form of a reclining figure, may also have been used as a visual shorthand for dreams, allowing viewers to easily recognise that these episodes were not occurring in waking life, nor physically present.

The frequency of dreams in visual art of the Middle Ages is also of interest. While this study focuses solely on dream images, in manuscripts other than the *Rose* it must be noted that these only formed one aspect of a complete and varied visual cycle. The relation of dream images to their specific context must not be forgotten; it is clear that the frequency of dream images was determined by the type of manuscript, and the dreams' relation to overall visual and textual narratives. With Bibles, dreams were naturally included alongside other waking events as they were a common occurrence in the Old Testament. The frequency was reduced in New Testament and Gospel books, as their textual counterparts became fewer. With patristic works, such as the *Orations* of Gregory of Nazianzus, their visual inclusion depended on references to dreams made by the authors.²⁴⁷ Increased references to dreams - as found in commentaries on the Apocalypse, such as the Spanish *Beatus* manuscripts dating from the eighth century onwards, or discussions of the Book of Daniel (which contains many dreams) - resulted in similar inflation in the number of dream images.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁷ For example, the representation of the *Dream of the Magi* in BnF Grec. 510 (a ninth-century copy of Gregory's *Orations*) relates to the author's tenuous references to the Magi during the 'Oration to Julian the Tax Collector'; cf. Sirarpie der Nersessian, "The Illustrations of the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus: Paris Gr. 510. A Study of the Connections Between Text and Images", *Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies*, 16 (1962): 195-228.

²⁴⁸ The *Beatus Commentary* enjoyed a long manuscript history in the Iberian peninsula; canonical manuscript cycles incorporated 108 scenes, 68 based on the Apocalypse narrative, 7 based on the commentary and 11 accompanying St Jerome's commentary. Traditional dream scenes were included as part of this schema in each copy, and dealt with subjects such as *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream of the Tree*. See John Williams, *The Illustrated Beatus: A Corpus of the Illustrations of the Commentary on the Apocalypse* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1994); and "Purpose and Imagery in the Apocalypse Commentary of Beatus of Liebana" in *The Apocalypse of the Middle Ages*, ed. Emmerson and McGinn (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), 217-33 for more information on the *Beatus Corpus*. Commentaries on the Book of Daniel, who was described as one who understood all visions and dreams, were also illustrated with representations of both his own dreams and his reigning king, Nebuchadnezzar.

While these traditions developed over hundreds of years, it is in manuscripts of the thirteenth century that we see the immediate context of the dream-image conventions that would influence the first *Rose* copies. One of the most renowned manuscripts of the period, the *St Louis Psalter*, datable between 1253 and 1270 contains several dream episodes as part of its cycle of full-page miniatures.²⁴⁹ The first major dream episode appears on fol. 13v, with a representation of the *Dream of Jacob* (Figure 3), incorporating a major compositional arrangement for contemporary and prior dream images.²⁵⁰ The dreamer is shown reclining, here witnessing the ascension of the angels in his dream. To the right, Jacob is shown marking the spot of his divinely inspired dream once he has woken. These represent the major instances of the dream and its outcome across one page, divided by a thin architectural column. This border decoration and architectural framework are common to all the images of this manuscript, not just those of dreams, and thus hold the 78 images of the visual cycle together through the repetitive (but individually variable) framing.

The second dream scene shows the *Dream of Joseph*, with another reclining dreamer and his dream occupying the left half of the page, while its outcome - Joseph telling the dream to his father and brother - is portrayed on the right.²⁵¹ The image on fol. 20r moves forward through the Joseph narrative to his imprisonment by the Pharaoh, and the scene where the Butler and Baker (his fellow prisoners) dream and relate their experiences to Joseph, who interprets for them. Once more, the picture space is divided up by the formulaic border decoration, architectural frame, and the half-page division between dream space and waking action.

The final dream-scenes represented on fol. 21v justify Joseph's interpretations depicted immediately beforehand, showing the baker hanging from a noose and the butler returning to the Pharaoh as servant - the outcomes Joseph indicated when interpreting

²⁴⁹ For information on the *St Louis Psalter*, see William Chester Jordan, "The Psalter of Saint-Louis (BnF MS. lat. 10525): The Program of the Seventy-Eight Full-Page Illustration," in *The High Middle Ages*, ed. Penelope C. Mayo (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1983), 65-91, and Robert Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis: A Study of Styles* (London: University of California Press, 1977), 132-134. The latest feast date included in the Calendar is from 1253, and Louis died in 1270; these facts provide the date range for the manuscript. Branner believed it was likely commissioned after Louis returned from crusade in 1254 and the marriage of his daughter (1255), stylistically dating it to the 1260s, which would allow for its completion prior to his death.

²⁵⁰ The *Dream of Jacob* is recounted in Genesis 28:10-18.

²⁵¹ Genesis 37 (*Joseph's Dream*), Genesis 40 (*The Dreams of the Butler and Baker and their Interpretation*), Genesis 41 (*Joseph and the Dreams of the Pharaoh*).

their respective dreams. On the right, we have the dream of the Pharaoh which was later correctly interpreted by Joseph, and allowed the Pharaoh to avoid drought and disaster in his lands; a feat Joseph is lauded and rewarded for, and which confirms the prophecy of his very first dream depicted on fol. 13v.

Aside from the common framing and decorative elements, each of these scenes depict a dream episode that eventually came true. Mostly symbolic, the dreams nonetheless bear truths for those that can understand them, offering a true view of the future or of the nature of a holy place. Furthermore, they also show a surprising level of proximity to the representation of other waking events in this sequence of images. Figure 4 shows the full-page miniature on fol. 2r of *Cain Killing Abel*, and *Cain Questioned by God*. The scene is once more divided up by the architectural framing, with a thin pillar dividing the sequential action. The rendering of clothes, figures and backgrounds is concurrent with the later dream scenes, with gold backgrounds and a restricted palette of reds, blues and yellow tones for the major elements of the scene. It is thus clear that, in terms of function and conception in this manuscript that the dream sequences are not visually differentiated from moments of waking life and action, nor indeed instances of divine encounter. On this last point, the same blue wave shapes are used to indicate the crossing of heavenly and earthly realms - it is shown at the head of the ladder on fol. 13v, and is where the angel originates on 2r during the Cain interrogation. The lack of differentiation may be due to the fact that both scenes share an exalted Biblical heritage, though as other examples will reveal, proximity of waking and dream scenes extended to all examples of the subject, not solely Biblical images.

While Charles Sterling in *La Peinture Médiévale à Paris* remarks that the *Psalter of St Louis* was 'exceptional' with respect to its full page miniatures removed from a textual context, it provides an example of how Parisian artists elaborated upon typical dream conventions when faced with luxury commissions.²⁵² The elements of additional embellishment for these and other full-page images likely reflect the interests of the royal patron of this manuscript. However, this does not render them ineffectual for considering the developmental background of the thirteenth-century regarding miniatures of dreams; while there is little evidence that the same artists worked on this *Psalter* and later *Rose* manuscripts, the first Parisian artists of the latter text would partake of a similar visual tradition to that which resulted in the *Psalter*. The luxury

²⁵² Charles Sterling, *La Peinture Médiévale à Paris, 1300-1500* (Paris: Fondation Wildenstein, Bibliothèque des Arts, 1987), 27.

expression of these motifs reveals simply the most elaborate rendering of a tradition that was by this point comfortably established.

However, the presence of these four dream images in the cycle is reliant on the terms of the commission, and as such do not appear together in other *Psalters* of the period. Unlike *Psalters*, which contained images at standard points, this manuscript is prefaced by a cycle of full-page images, four of which are dream subjects - both elements which are highly unusual for the period and manuscript type. Typically, dream scenes would appear in the expected place during the narrative, as is found with representations of the *Tree of Jesse*. The *Jesse* scene visually relates to some of the incipits of thirteenth and fourteenth-century *Rose* manuscripts, for example in the principal elements of a symmetrical tree alongside a dreamer figure. The *Tree of Jesse* was also depicted in stained glass decoration in addition to manuscript illumination, and in the latter often took the form of historiated initials. It was also typically found, as in BnF Lat. 16747 (Figure 5) bracketing the side of the text in order to allow for the motif's height, as the tree was typically shown extending upwards from the body of Jesse. The scene depicts the genealogy of Christ from its origins in Jesse, in fulfilment of a prophecy related in Isaiah 11:1.²⁵³ Such imagery was described by Kuhn and others as providing the base model for the representations of the Dreamer in some *Rose* manuscripts, many of whom recline with a tree extending upwards symmetrically behind their bodies.²⁵⁴ However, if true, it is clear the motif was significantly adapted into its new context, as there are no signs of stray floating figures in the rosebushes that accompany the *Rose* dreamers.

While this study does not fully concur with Kuhn's assertions regarding the migration of *Tree of Jesse* motifs into *Rose* incipits, it is a more likely source than his other suggestion, the *Nativity* composition. Given its direct dream relation, and the well-established nature of dream imagery by the time of the *Rose's* conception, the *Tree of Jesse* provides a visual prototype that would be familiar to artists and even readers, as it was widespread in monumental and miniature imagery by the thirteenth century.

²⁵³ This motif is a reflection of the Christian interpretation of the prophecy of Isaiah 11:1, that there would come forth a descendant of Jesse that would contain the spirit of the Lamb; several other episodes, such as the Isaiah 7:14 reference to a virgin conceiving a child were also interpreted as prophecies of Christ. In the prophecy, Jesse is characterised as the 'root' - hence his depiction at the base of the *Tree of Jesse* in typical representations of the scene.

²⁵⁴ Kuhn, *Die Illustration des Rosenromans*, 15, König in *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose*, 22 and others have adopted these assumptions about the origin of *Rose* dreamer and plant incipits. This connection is discussed at greater length in Chapter Two.

However, both Kuhn and König's assumptions about the direct lifting of compositions between religious and secular manuscripts ought to be tempered by the *Rose's* early popularity.²⁵⁵ By the time of the 'mass-produced' copies made by workshops in the second decade of the fourteenth century, it was far more likely artists could take their inspiration from other *Rose* manuscripts, not solely the Bibles and Psalters containing *Nativities* or *Tree of Jesse* scenes. Indeed, I believe such internal development in the *Rose* corpus more than adequately explains the iconographic variations that occurred during the fourteenth century. Chapter Four of this thesis goes into this topic in more detail by analysing the evidence of complete and incomplete manuscripts, an investigation which clearly reveals the trend for the localised development of *Rose* visual subjects throughout related manuscripts.

In addition to Biblical literature and manuscripts, dreams also cropped up in vernacular narrative texts, most prominently Arthurian literature. Interestingly, despite their non-Biblical textual status, the depictions of dreams in the corpus remained strikingly close to the models provided by illuminations in religious manuscripts. One possible reason for this proximity to earlier traditions may be their quasi-religiosity: the dreams described in the Grail cycle are after all tied to the quest for a holy relic, one which the authors trace directly (albeit fictionally) to the time of Christ.

The popularity of the Grail narrative in France and abroad led to a great number of manuscripts being produced, and in many ways the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle may be seen as a spiritual predecessor to the *Rose* in terms of manuscript history and illumination. The representation of dreams in these manuscripts was, like illumination in most narrative manuscripts, subject to the restrictions of the text, and consequently only occur when the text requires it. BnF fr. 95 is a copy of *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, dating c.1280-90 and originating from Northern France, and contains several such images of illustrative dreams.²⁵⁶ The image on fol. 43r (Figure 6) is the first of these, depicting the symbolic dream of Nascien on the so-called 'Turning Island', the prime motif of which is a white

²⁵⁵ Kuhn and König's theories on the migration of motifs, like Stones' (discussed in Chapters Two and Four) focus on the origin of the motifs, rather than the changes introduced during the later development of compositions. While the original source is of interest, it does not provide the whole story; the alterations made when jumping between secular and sacred are just as revealing in terms of meaning and visual expression.

²⁵⁶ Narrative references are to Jean-Paul Ponceau's edition of the text, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997).

bird. The image shows the Dreamer lying on the ground in a sleeping pose with one hand propping up his head. The bird of his vision appears too, one wingtip crossing the miniature frame, but united with the sphere of the dreamer by the gold background in a manner recalling the *Psalter of Saint Louis*. A comparison with the next scene in this manuscript serves to explain in part the importance of his dream, as well as how minimally the events of dream and waking lives have been differentiated. On fol. 44v, Nascien is shown being blessed by the hand of God, and then approaching the Ship of Solomon (Figure 7) – the latter also linked to a dream experienced by Solomon, depicted in BnF fr. 95 on fol. 52r.

Both narrative context and visual identifiers contribute to the sense of continuity between these episodes, as well as details of the landscape and water. This maintains a link between the place in which he dreams, and then performs waking actions – much like the walled-in space of *Joseph with the Butler and Baker* in BnF Lat. 10525. The gold background too is not exclusive to the dream, but a commonplace addition to imagery in the manuscript.

The image on fol. 44v also confirms the impression of shared visualisation between dream and waking realities through the hand of God, which emerges from a coral-like mass in the top right of the image, as if breaking through the gold background to appear to Nascien. This shares its form with the blue ‘waves’ present above the ladder or above Cain in the *St Louis Psalter*, indicating that this undulating mass was a commonplace motif used to designate a non-earthly realm. This is the only indication of a secondary plane of experience in these images, and it is notable that it is *not* used to divide the dream sphere from waking life. While the wingtip of the bird shown during Nascien’s dream might suggest an external realm, such transgressions of the miniature boundary are common both in this manuscript and other illuminations of the period for both waking and dream episodes (as shown again with the overlarge Nascien on fol. 44v, whose foot dangles across the internal border). The pronounced absence of visual differentiation in the dream episodes - especially when other distinctions of ‘space’ are present in the manuscript - thus suggests that the only truly distinct realm is that of God, not the world of dreams.

The final factor at play in BnF fr. 95 is the chronological sequencing, which is also in common with the *Rose*, the *St Louis Psalter*, and narrative illuminations accompanying other religious manuscripts. The outcome of Nascien’s dream is shown as it occurred

during the plot, and the consequence of his dream is depicted, visually confirming the truth of the dream. In this way, we are back in the authoritative sphere of Biblical dream representations, wherein the dream participated in a clear structure, often playing an important role and affecting the events of waking life that followed it.

Lest one suspect that this luxury vernacular manuscript with prolific illumination was an aberration from the norms of dream depiction for secular Arthurian texts of the later thirteenth century, it will be worthwhile to consider a less elaborate copy. BnF fr. 344 also contains versions of the Grail legends by Robert de Boron, but features only minimal decoration in the form of historiated initials. On fol. 63r, the depiction of the *Dream of Gaynor* (Figure 8) also partakes of the visual conventions for dream images produced contemporaneously. On the left, Gaynor sleeps half-sitting in bed beneath a canopy which harmonises with the shape of the initial, much like the aforementioned representations of Ezekiel 'dream' visions which often appeared in historiated initials. To his right, the symbolic dream vision is depicted which, when explained, resulted in his baptism. Once more, dreamer and dream coexist, united by a consistent background even in this restricted space. Comparisons with other historiated initials in this manuscript reveals the consistency of style across depictions of dream and waking realities, as well as other visions. The representation of Joseph of Arimathea's vision on fol. 60r, for example, is also depicted with recourse to the dreamer formula, i.e. through a reclining figure looking up to a visionary apparition, a composition which relates dreams not only to physical reality but to the more prestigious field of visions.

This short overview of some thirteenth and early fourteenth-century manuscripts obviously does not cover the entire gamut of dream episodes illustrated by artists, but it does reveal the compositional and conceptual approaches to such representations commonplace in other copies. The majority of images depicting dreams during the thirteenth century followed the traditions established in earlier eras: continuity in visual terms between dreams and waking life, the reproduction of dreams as part of a sequence (never forming standalone dream cycles), and the common inclusion of select elements, comprising the dreamer, dream, and consequence of the dream. Notably, even when these forms developed in different areas, originating in Paris, Northern or Eastern France, similar fundamental elements were retained. The Arthurian corpus discussed provides evidence of one group that featured homogenous attitudes to dream imagery across manuscripts, whether they were luxury Central-French copies or regional, less heavily illuminated examples.

Though one may believe that it was simply the narrative context of these dreams that necessitated their reproduction as part of a cycle of cause and effect, as Carty found with monumental examples, the visual tradition was overwhelmingly dominated by representations of *true* dreams.²⁵⁷ The visual homogeneity of Arthurian dream representations, following the traditional schema of depicting dreamer, dream and consequence suggests that they were exclusively linked to 'true' Biblical visual traditions. Though the Arthurian corpus discussed does lack textual equivalents for untrue or unfulfilled dreams, there is less excuse for the Biblical imagery these Grail manuscripts inherited from.

The Bible in fact provided many examples of both true and false interpretations of dreams: for each Old Testament Joseph, who divined dreams correctly, there was an injunction to everyday dreamers on analysing their dreams in search of truth. In contrast to this, manuscript images typically represented only those that showed the truth, not illustrating the arguments linking dreams to everyday causes, or the theological and scholarly warnings on the falsity of these types of visions. The reason for this exclusion of false dreams and interpretations is unclear. False dreams do in fact relate to the examples depicted in the St Louis Psalter discussed above: before consulting Joseph, the Pharaoh cannot find anyone to interpret his dream, while another prominent Old Testament figure, Nebuchadnezzar, famously misinterprets his dream of the metal and clay statue. Though Daniel interpreted this dream correctly as a sign of the eternal realm of God, Nebuchadnezzar has a golden statue made on account of the dream, and erroneously asks the kingdom to worship it.²⁵⁸ While some Spanish *Beatus* commentaries on the Apocalypse incorporated representations of his erroneous interpretation - i.e. the golden statue - these commonly appeared alongside accurate imagery of the dream and its intended interpretation (see for example the tenth-century Morgan *Beatus*, M.644, which features a number of illustrations from the Nebuchadnezzar dream narrative). Furthermore, the *Beatus* rendering of Nebuchadnezzar seems to have been restricted to regions within the Iberian Peninsula,

²⁵⁷ Carty in *Dreams in Early Medieval Art* focused on representations of dreams that served particular aims, for example confirmation of spiritual sanctity, or church construction. Consequently, her study is dominated by visual examples of dreams that did apparently come true, though she does note that she found very few representations of untrue dreams in the course of her research.

²⁵⁸ Daniel 2-3.

and did not inflect greatly upon French or English manuscript representations of dreams nor indeed the Apocalypse.

Explanations for this state of affairs are currently speculative. As Carty investigated representations of dreams with specific purposes - i.e. conversion, or church-building, it is understandable that those images referred to true dreams, as the images coincided with positive outcomes. The lack in manuscript miniatures may be due to a similar reason: as dream episodes could contribute to the progressive flow of the narrative, false dreams - red herrings, as it were - might impede the visual storyline. Nonetheless, this avoidance was not to last forever, and with the *Rose* we begin to see a move towards an acceptance of visually ambiguous dreams.

In general terms, this avoidance of untrue dreams was the inheritance of the *Rose* producers, who appear to have followed this primarily by indicating the dream by the insertion of a Dreamer figure at the head of the text, in addition to which several other Dreamers were sometimes incorporated. However, a fundamental problem was posed by the text of the *Rose*: the final element of prior visual schemes, the dream's consequence, was almost entirely absent from the text, with no description of the 'true' outcome after the event by either author - notwithstanding Guillaume's thin assertion that the dream 'came true' in his prologue. This would require one of the major facets of previous dream representations to be dropped, or otherwise dealt with, in that its outcome was unclear. In this sense, the *Roses*, by the very nature of the text, represented a crucial new step in the representation of dreams by its focus on a dream episode of uncertain meaning or ambiguous truth.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁹ As will be discussed in the following chapter, the omission of authoritative points in the text from which meaning can be gleaned was not only the cause of various revisions and additions to the text by later annotators, but a possible motivation for the startling trend for incipit dreamers, who appear to usurp the traditional position of scribe or poet at the head of the poem.

Chapter Two: Representing Dreams in the *Roman de la Rose* and its Contemporaries during the Fourteenth Century

The visual tropes that the *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts inherited were certainly well-established, but did not totally circumscribe the illuminations accompanying this new poem at the end of the thirteenth century. While the representation of a Dreamer would remain the most consistent element in *Rose* iconography throughout its 250-year presence in manuscripts and printed copies, the visualisation of these – and the rest of the dream – differed from preceding trends, not least in the depictions of a dream narrative of uncertain veracity. Images in these manuscripts point to differing interpretations of the narrative, attitudes to its perceived meaning, comments on the poem’s authorship, and approaches to sleep and dreaming. Even when only one image appeared in prime position at the head of the poem, these scenes played a key role in shaping the responses of readers of the poem. The imagery stems from and feeds back into the attitudes towards dreams expressed in theoretical terms during prior centuries, developing, reversing and editing the typical tropes of the visual traditions of manuscript illumination.

This chapter will consider some examples of *Rose* dream iconography from the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in relation to dream theory and contemporaneous manuscript illumination methodologies. One important feature is the predilection for a strong – occasionally solitary – incipit image at the head of the manuscript. These will be discussed with reference to other incipit scenes with alternative subject matter, for example tracing the relationship between authorial incipits, or the quadripartite *Rose* incipits and their formal cousins in other manuscripts, or the potential interrelation of these copies and the flourishing depictions of the Croesus and Phanie narrative. A case study will consider the development of dream subject material in one distinct ‘family’ of manuscript illumination (those related to the Urb. Lat. 376 manuscript), providing further insight into the topic’s visual development.²⁶⁰ Finally, the prominent omission of an enlightening exemplar – Nature’s discussion of dreams – will also be considered in relation to the visual themes in fourteenth-century *Roses* and related manuscripts.

²⁶⁰ Further discussion of the latter family, the Brussels-Lyon group, appears in Chapter Four.

Despite being one of the most consistent elements in *Rose* iconography, the dream images have been surprisingly neglected in scholarship. While the incipits have been recognised as a popular feature, the significance of recurring dream imagery in *Rose* manuscripts has been largely ignored.²⁶¹ The dream scenes reflect not only the external origins of dream theory and imagery, but also the radical transformation of older traditions in new contexts. *Rose* dream images represent an important shift in the development of this subject in art history, and in their sheer abundance offer an unparalleled opportunity to trace these changes over a large period of time. However, they also hold significance for interdisciplinary studies. They not only overlap with the theoretical and practical understanding of dreams, but also reflect changes in the way one poem was considered over 250 years. Furthermore, they also reveal traditions within the manuscript production process, as they demonstrate familial relationships between copies.²⁶² The format of dream images in *Rose* manuscripts also are useful in establishing a visual chronology, as certain types correspond with particular periods in history, and certain ‘trends’ in manuscript illumination. As such, the dream scenes are also useful for investigating chronological developments in *Rose* iconography and the effect of external changes of taste on illumination practices in the Middle Ages.

I: Prominent Dreamers: The *Rose* Incipits

Of the 190 manuscripts considered in this study, 167 feature the Dreamer in the first scene at the head of the poem, while a further 11 incorporate an alternative figure in the incipit, either replacing the Dreamer or in addition to it.²⁶³ Of the manuscripts lacking an incipit scene, several have lost one or more folios, including the incipit page, and may therefore have originally included an image of this subject.²⁶⁴ Only four

²⁶¹ For example, Blamires and Holian in *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, 31-42 describe the presence of Dreamers alongside their dream content as typical of medieval representations of dreams, and noted some of their visual conventions. However, the authors did not elaborate on the conceptual problem posed by such dream depictions, nor their relation to dream theory and visualisation, other than positing that the incipits reflect a growing interest in the narrator figure.

²⁶² This aspect is also considered in more detail in Chapter Four.

²⁶³ This information was compiled following a detailed collation of all the images in each of the manuscripts I accessed in preparation for the thesis.

²⁶⁴ The full list of those lacking incipits is as follows: Brussels 11187 [Cat. 8] (the incipit of which appears in Brussels 9577, which contains the rest of the miniatures from 11187), Copenhagen NKS 166.4° [Cat. 14] (missing folios), Arras 845 [Cat. 18] (extracts of the poem with a few scattered images, Dreamer incipit not intended), Lyon PA 24 [Cat. 30] (missing folios), Lyon 764 [Cat. 32] (sketches only), BnF nouv. acq. 9252 [Cat. 46] (missing folios), BnF fr. 799 [Cat. 73] (missing folios), BnF fr. 12592 [Cat. 82] (atypical image cycle, primarily ink sketches in margins), Augsburg I.4.2.3. [Cat. 105] (missing folios), Aberystwyth MS 5016D [Cat. 135]

manuscripts completely replaced the Dreamer with an alternative subject, one of which was a later replacement of the original folio, in BL Additional 42133 [Cat. 149].²⁶⁵ The rate of recurrence for Dreamer scenes is therefore extremely high, and was likely originally even higher when one accounts for the manuscripts lacking their opening folios.

These figures were included at the head of some of the earliest manuscripts of the *Rose*, including Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 [Cat. 116] (Figure 9), a copy believed by König to be one of the earliest and most significant surviving manuscripts of the poem.²⁶⁶ Additionally, it survived into some of the latest copies and printed editions, with a variation on the Dreamer theme featuring at the start of the 1515 Michel le Noir imprint of the *Rose* (Figure 108).²⁶⁷ These two examples reveal a degree of continuity with earlier representations of dreams, wherein a dreamer is accompanied by the content of their dream – in the Vatican example, the rosebush and a figure identifiable as Danger, while in the printed edition, the Dreamer and a well-dressed Danger wielding a sword is paired with a secondary dream image, that of the Dreamer kneeling before Idleness.

A brief glance at medieval manuscripts reveals that the tradition for a summative incipit was widespread during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, so in this respect the *Roses* appear to be merely following a well-established pattern. The presence of images at the head of manuscripts – and more specifically at the head of texts – makes some sense, as particularly in compilation codices where more than one text is contained within the book, images provide a striking indication that a new narrative or tale is being introduced.²⁶⁸ Incipit images from the thirteenth century could either take the form of standalone images (such as with the aforementioned *St*

(replaced first folio, no image), London Gray's Inn 10 [Cat. 143] (missing folio, but imprint on the flyleaf shows it was originally a quadripartite incipit), Columbia University Ellis Library Fragmenta 156 [Cat. 170] (fragment only), NY Columbia Plimpton MS 284 [Cat. 173] (missing first folio, believed by some to be Alde-Librairie Giraud Badin leaf [Cat. 190]), Charlottesville MS 6765 [Cat. 187] (fragment only).

²⁶⁵ The first eight folios of this manuscript were replaced, incorporating images with strict perspective, differing iconography and fashions that date from beyond the fifteenth century, contrasting starkly with the majority of original images which are from the third quarter of the fourteenth century. As noted in the Catalogue, it is unclear whether the replacement scenes followed the original, damaged versions of these folios, or were produced afresh when it was restored.

²⁶⁶ König, *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose*, 16.

²⁶⁷ Images of the printed *Roses* are discussed in Chapter Five.

²⁶⁸ Early *Roses* were often combined with other texts in manuscript codices, such as with the Dijon 526 copy, where the poem is accompanied by a wide range of poetry from authors such as Richard de Fournival, or Badouin de Condé.

Louis Psalter), truncated rectangular scenes, or historiated initials. These images often took the form of a visual summary of the narrative one was about to read, hence the Dreamers in *Rose* incipits, presentation scenes, or reflect the authoritative nature of the text by including an author portrait. This latter tradition was established in Antiquity and was especially prevalent in medieval medicinal text illuminations, such as in Harley 3140, a Parisian copy of the *Articella* which features both depictions of freestanding teachers, and a figure lecturing to assembled students (Figures 10 and 11).

The example of the Harley 3140 *Articella* contains a number of instances wherein an authority figure stands atop each new medical or discursive text either demonstrating, lecturing or reading. Additionally, the figurative motifs akin to these were adopted by *Rose* illuminators when depicting characters in discussion with one another, particularly when one figure was deemed to be more influential than the other, as with depictions of the discussions between Reason and the Lover. Their positions in the *Articella* do however indicate the authoritative status of their depicted figures, suggesting that these texts may be used as sources of true or useful material.

The authorial portrait was also a common subject in *Rose* illumination and indeed did appear as an incipit scene, suggesting some recognition of its 'authority', despite its rather ambiguous dream-based message.²⁶⁹ However, such images did *not* form the majority of *Rose* incipits; instead, depictions of the Dreamer usurped this traditional seat of authorial power at the head of the poem. While there is not enough room to discuss all the variations of *Rose* incipits, the following section will point to a few salient examples from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, contextualising them among their related formal partners present in other manuscripts. Furthermore, it will also seek to examine how exactly these *Rose* images disrupt the formal order of manuscripts' visual presentation of authority.

The most important factor to note is the position of these incipits, which include an image of the Dreamer directly above Guillaume de Lorris' comments regarding the veracity of dreams (Figure 12).²⁷⁰ They adhere to established tropes for illustrating a dream episode with the depiction of a reclining Dreamer figure, often alongside the depiction of aspects from a dream, as outlined in Chapter One in relation to Arthurian and Biblical examples. The Dreamers appear in a number of forms, and do allow some

²⁶⁹ This replacement of the 'traditional' authorial figure will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter.'

²⁷⁰ Discussed in Chapter One.

loose categorisation of manuscripts on the basis of the incipits. Kuhn's study attempted such a categorisation along these lines, although he used this primarily in order to form a chronology of perceived artistic development.²⁷¹ However, many of the incipits do not correspond to only one moment in the development of *Rose* iconography: older forms sporadically recurred in later eras at the same time new visual tropes were being incorporated.

Nevertheless, some incipits do provide clues as to their production in a particular period of time, such as the related scenes in the BnF fr. 378, Urb. Lat. 376 and BnF fr. 1559 manuscripts, or the quadripartites of the mid fourteenth century. As such, the discussion here is more in relation to the specific interpretations such incipits offered for the poem, not solely their placement in a strict line of visual 'evolution'. Additionally, incipits are not always an indication of homogenous image cycles throughout the rest of the manuscript, and must be used with caution when considering which manuscripts are stylistically or iconographically linked. However, they may still provide useful information about developments and changes in the understanding of the *Rose* in different periods, and even in varied media, as shown by the migration of manuscript motifs into printed editions in the later fifteenth century.²⁷²

A: The First Dreamers: Urb. Lat. 376 and the development of the Dream *topos*

Illustrations of Dreamers at the head of *Rose* texts appeared in some of the earliest illuminated copies, and at first glance seem to follow the dream *topos* established in prior dream representations. The depiction in Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 [Cat. 116] (Figure 9), convincingly dated by König to the late thirteenth century, may possibly represent the first *Rose* incipit illumination, and inaugurated a format that recurred in varying ways through the fourteenth century, before being adapted out of recognisable existence.²⁷³ As noted in Chapter One, König related the depiction of the Dreamer at the head of the poem to representations of religious dreamers, specifically the *Tree of Jesse* in the Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica MS 21, fol. 391v, which takes a vertical form much like that of the BnF fr. 16747 example discussed in the prior chapter (Figure 5).²⁷⁴ However, while König's example does show a reclining figure posed in a similar manner

²⁷¹ Kuhn, *Die Illustration des Rosenromans*.

²⁷² See Chapter Five.

²⁷³ König, *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose*, 63.

²⁷⁴ König, *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose*, 22.

to the Urb. Lat. 376 Dreamer, this nonetheless does not show a simple transplanting of motifs with no regard for context.

The primary distinction between the Urb. Lat. 376 *Rose* Dreamer and the *Tree of Jesse* depictions is the placement; while the *Jesse* figures are awkwardly spliced in around passages of Biblical text, Urb. Lat. 376 depicts a prominent form of incipit that would go on to dominate the frontispieces to *Rose* texts in the majority of copies. The image sits at the head of the poem, in prime position (Figure 12), as noted above a space typically occupied by summative or authorial imagery, or simply decorated initials, in earlier or contemporary manuscripts. The striking depiction of a Dreamer in this authoritative space – not pushed to one side, or simply appearing as part of a long sequence of images as with the *Grail* manuscripts, has major repercussions.²⁷⁵ Placing the Dreamer in this position firmly announces that the tale relates to a dream, and must be read with this in mind. This underscores Guillaume's own textual assurances regarding the dream, but nonetheless contrasts with it, through the representation of two additional elements.

Perhaps the most notable feature of this representation is the nakedness of the Dreamer. Both naked and clothed Dreamers feature in the *Rose* illustrations from the outset - a contemporaneous manuscript, Dijon 526 [Cat. 26] (Figure 13), for example, features a clothed Dreamer reclining on his bed.²⁷⁶ There is no clear developmental emphasis or de-emphasis on the element; naked and clothed Dreamers appear on and off in *Roses* throughout the period in question. The presence of naked Dreamers may reflect a naturalistic approach to imagery, as people often undress to go to bed. These clothed and unclothed figures may also represent different levels of prudishness on the part of *libraires* or artists, some of whom may have been unwilling to show partially naked figures at the head of a manuscript or text. However, these undressed Dreamers must be considered in context - they are in fact some of the least erotic images of figures in the manuscripts of the *Rose* corpus. This after all was a group in which the image of *Nature's Forge* was commonly illustrated by a depiction of two people having sex. Sexual scenes such as *Venus, Mars and Vulcan*, or the violent *Castration of Saturn* and *Castration of Abelard* motifs were also included in miniatures, and marginalia sometimes featured additional risqué or sexual imagery, such as the explicit sexual

²⁷⁵ Discussed in Chapter One.

²⁷⁶ Discussed in Langlois, *Les Manuscrits du Roman de la Rose*, 125-126; Stones, *A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in France*, 183.

affair of a monk and a nun in BnF fr. 25526. With this background, 'prudishness' on the part of *Rose* planners or illuminators would have been unlikely to censure these relatively tame naked Dreamers and leave the group of more erotic scenes alone.²⁷⁷

In terms of proportion, roughly one-fifth of *Rose* Dreamer incipits feature clothed Dreamers, with the other third occupied by undressed figures.²⁷⁸ However, it is more common to see a dressed Dreamer when he sleeps on top of the bedclothes instead of under the sheets (cf. Dijon 526 vs Vatican Urb. Lat. 376). In the former instances, the suggestion seems to be a more impromptu nap, rather than the tucked-in Dreamer of the Vatican copy, who seems to match Guillaume's statement on how he went to bed one evening. While there appear to be few other such rules guiding the presence of naked or dressed dreamers, it is clear that they cropped up proportionately at different times, and thus do not seem to have been linked to major developmental changes during the period of *Rose* production, but rather were the result of more local fluctuations in the attitudes of producers and *libraires*.

Dream theory offers a chance to understand the interrelation of sleep, dreams, and nakedness; principally the ideas of Augustine regarding impure dreams which, given the ending to the *Rose*, does correlate with the dream presented in the *Rose*. In *De Genesi ad Litteram*, Augustine stated that people were not guilty even if they dreamt of sex - even 'unnatural' sex - as this could have a natural cause. The only damage occurred if one were to act on these impulses when awake; those who preserved their chastity would not suffer harm on account of their dreams.²⁷⁹ This sort of apology for

²⁷⁷ This is not to say that all imagery of these scenes was erotic; the image of a couple is alternated fairly evenly with an innocuous image of Nature before a literal forge, while others simply omit the offending scenes from the iconographic cycle. The determination of naked vs non-naked Dreamers is one instance where further investigation into the overall erotic content may be required. While McMunn's "Notes on Representations of the Erotic" study contains some short remarks on the subject, it is evident that more research is still required into the whole group of erotic scenes in comparison to the majority of non-erotic images and motifs across the whole corpus.

²⁷⁸ Several incipits make it impossible to tell whether the Dreamer is clothed or unclothed, often due to the sheets being pulled up to their chin (again, a somewhat naturalistic variation). As unclothed Dreamers may or may not wear caps, the presence of these in non-differentiable imagery is insufficient evidence to prove the state of undress in those manuscripts. Unidentifiable Dreamers appear in 15 manuscripts: Arras 897, Meaux MS 52, BnF fr. 12588, BnF fr. 797, BnF fr. 801, BnF fr. 798, BnF fr. 12595, BnF fr. 19153, Bibl. Ste-Geneviève 1126, Berlin Ham. 577, Munich Cod. Gall. 17, Rome Corsini 1275, Madrid Vitr. 24-11, BL Add. 12042, and Bodleian Add. I.A.22. These manuscripts spread from the early fourteenth to late fifteenth centuries, and appear to have been largely independently produced, as they share few characteristics of text, imagery or visual style.

²⁷⁹ Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, Book 12, 196-204.

impure dreams - which the *Rose* arguably becomes, though not so much in Guillaume's section - may provide the reason such semi-naked Dreamers were accepted. However, the relation of one's character to the content of dreams was also considered relevant, leading John of Salisbury to declare that troubling dreams would more often afflict those who were drunk or in emotional turmoil.²⁸⁰ It may thus be that the image of a naked Dreamer would incite the reader to consider them as more morally loose in terms of sex and romance, and perceive both the Dreamer and the dream in a negative light. The immediate context of the *Rose* also offers some chance for comparison, as when Friend discusses the *Golden Age*, he notes the casual attitude of those people towards dress, food, and sleeping outdoors. While it is not mentioned that these people were naked, the illustrations of the *Golden Age* occasionally also portrayed these figures in varying stages of undress.²⁸¹ However, given that these nearly naked *Golden Age* inhabitants were not often illustrated in manuscripts, it is difficult to surmise that this allusion was specifically intended by the designers incorporating naked Dreamers at the head of the poem.

It is notable that many preceding images of Dreamers did *not* show their subjects in a state of undress, but as a large proportion of these were religious subjects, this could also have been the result of perceived propriety regarding Biblical narratives. It may also have performed a practical function, preventing the viewer's conception of the images from being clouded by suspicions that they were doing anything else in bed other than sleeping. However, it could also have been due to the prevalence of unnatural sleeping positions for many Biblical dreamers, such as outdoors (i.e. Jacob), or in prison, as with the dreams of the Butler and Baker (see discussion of the *St Louis Psalter* in Chapter One). The presence of newly naked Dreamers in *Rose* manuscripts may then have been the result of different attitudes to nakedness in secular as opposed to religious manuscripts, in addition to the incorporation of a more naturalistic representation of sleepers.

While lone Dreamers did exist in the *Rose* illumination tradition, the tendency was for multi-part images depicting objects or figures from the dream, which again is in line with prior dream-representation traditions. Returning to the Vatican 376 incipit, the

²⁸⁰ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 76

²⁸¹ Interestingly, however, I have yet to come across an image of scantily clad *Golden Age* inhabitants sleeping outside - merely images of such people performing waking actions when partially undressed.

Dreamer has been paired with the rosebush wherein he discovers his beloved, and a depiction of a figure grasping a club. Taking the Roses first, this aspect has again been related to prior image conventions, including the *Tree of Jesse*.²⁸² Nevertheless, as König's own comparative example reveals, the representation of the Rosebush in the *Rose* manuscript differs from typical *Tree of Jesse* depictions, not least because in the latter, the tree is populated by figures. Additionally, Martin Meuwese identified an image of flowers growing from the mouth of a dead monk in manuscripts of Gautier de Coinci's *Miracles de Notre Dame* as a potential model for such scenes.²⁸³ However, this also would have required the reworking of both content and context, as with the *Miracles* scene, the flowers extend from the mouth, not the central point of the figure's body. As such, one must consider the assumed 'migration' of rosebush imagery from external sources against the fact that here, the presence of the rosebush fits with its context, as the Roses form an integral part of the narrative. Furthermore, once the general iconography had been established – Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 representing a starting point in this tradition, from which it appears a number of other manuscripts developed – it is more likely that artists and *libraires* would use extant *Roses*, not an external visual subject for their model when producing new copies. Indeed, internal development from other *Roses* is far more probable, and is indicated in the manuscript production methods of groups such as the Brussels-Lyon family, discussed later in this chapter and in Chapter 4. Therefore, the influence of such external subjects is limited in the grand scheme of *Rose* visual development.

The rosebush serves a number of functions. It relates the image directly to a central element of the dream quest, and through this back to general dream imagery traditions, which almost never isolated the Dreamer from the symbolic or actual content of their dream. Blamires and Holian also related the depiction of the Dreamer with Roses – specifically those wherein the roses seem to stem from the Dreamer's midriff – to the *Tree of Jesse* depictions, stating that it could have been adapted consciously to assert the themes of growth and procreation in the *Rose*.²⁸⁴ While this is an attractive theory, it is not supported by additional imagery in *Roses*, certainly not those of the fourteenth century.

²⁸² König, *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose*, 22; Kuhn, *Die Illustration des Rosenromans*, 15.

²⁸³ Martin Meuwese, "Roses, Ruse and Romance. Iconographic Relationships Between the *Roman de la Rose* and Arthurian Literature" in *De la Rose*, eds. Bel and Braet, 93-116.

²⁸⁴ Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, 33.

The topic of growth comes up strongly during the discussion of Nature and Genius, as well as in the Sermon of Genius, where sowing and reaping are explicitly referred to. Yet these episodes were only typically illustrated during the fifteenth century, which is of little relevance to the Vatican manuscript under discussion. Indeed, the transplantation of motifs from one context into another – such as the use of the *Tree of Jesse* for *Rose* incipits – by no means guarantees a similar transference of meaning, as Blamires and Holian’s own dismissal of ‘glossing’ images seems to suggest.²⁸⁵ A more plausible understanding of this scene is available when one considers it against the background of typical dream illustrations: incorporation of the primary content of a dream in conjunction with a Dreamer was after all the traditional schema for such scenes. Therefore, the inclusion of roses at the head of a text which details a dream about a rose, was titled the *Roman de la Rose* by its first author, and ends with the successful plucking of said Rose is therefore to be expected.

In this sense, we are returning to the forms of dream imagery common to prior manuscript depictions, and even appropriated in the depiction of Ezekiel’s Vision in BnF Arsenal 590 (Figure 1), which presents the reclining ‘visionary’, there presented as a dreamer in a bed, alongside his ‘vision’ of the symbolic heavenly creatures. This example is revealing, as it shows how the dreamer trope was recognisable or indeed powerful enough to aid artists seeking to depict a more ambiguous vision. While contemporary scholars may not have appreciated the elision of visions with their less exalted night-time counterparts, the Ezekiel example may have served as a more familiar exemplar to typical audiences of this imagery.²⁸⁶ Furthermore, even if the *Jesse* motif was consciously adopted because it was a prior dream featuring a prominent plant, reworking still occurred to make it specific to the *Rose* – i.e. the removal of the figures populating Jesse trees in other miniatures. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest this was a spatial arrangement, as it allows for the presence of the figure at the foot of the bed.²⁸⁷ This again is unlike *Jesse* representations, wherein the miniatures were often extended vertically to allow for the height of the tree rising above the sleeping figure,

²⁸⁵ Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxviii.

²⁸⁶ It is possible Hildegard of Bingen, for example, would not have appreciated her visions being recast as dreams in later collections of her writings, given her negative position on the subject (see Chapter One).

²⁸⁷ Variants of this scene without a second figure sometimes moved the rosebush to the end of the bed, suggesting developments in iconography and practical composition were perhaps more responsible for the final nature of these incipits, rather than allusions to the ‘generative’ associations of a plant growing from someone’s loins.

and may explain why that subject was so popular in the stained glass imagery of the time, as it slotted easily into the long narrow frameworks of that material.

In terms of dream associations, the motif of the rosebush, present in a variety of incipits after the Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 copy, obliquely relates to Macrobius' hierarchy of dreams, which Guillaume so cleverly manipulated. While Guillaume would have the reader believe this was a *somnium*, an enigmatic dream that came true, this incipit form closely relates to Macrobius' category of *insomnium*, the false nightmare, typified by his example of lovers dreaming of their sweethearts when they are absent.²⁸⁸ As a representation of the Dreamer and the allegorical Rose-female he covets, the presence of the rosebush undermines Guillaume's reinterpretation of the Macrobian hierarchy by alluding to the real category the *Rose* dream inhabits; a category he attempts to disregard in his own discussion of dreams a few lines down.

The final element of this scene might at first glance appear to fall into the category of 'outcome' depiction, as it suggests some threatening or dangerous conclusion to the Dream. However, this character is identifiable as Danger, who is described as and depicted brandishing a club (as well as other weapons) elsewhere in the manuscript, and does not represent the 'outcome' of the poem. This character is represented in a variety of ways, as while this Vatican copy indicates a tidy capped figure, others altered his appearance by including a wild hairstyle, which McMunn interpreted as an allusion to Danger's savage nature, stating that it was a conscious allusion to the iconography of 'wild men' or 'fools'.²⁸⁹ However, as the character fluctuates in appearance, this relationship cannot be confirmed in all *Rose* manuscripts and indeed does not fully apply here.²⁹⁰ Danger acts as one of the principal antagonists in the story, blocking the Dreamer's path to the *Rose*; and yet there are some problems with his inclusion here.

While the introductory verses by Guillaume make the incorporation of the *Roses* understandable, the presence of Danger takes the reader right into the *Rose* narrative, jumping past a number of passages. Indeed, the identification of this figure – in lieu of explanatory rubrics – is only possible once the reader reaches the section in which Danger is described, some folios later. Additionally, Danger's role seems to have been

²⁸⁸ Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, III, 89.

²⁸⁹ McMunn, "The Iconography of Dangier", 3-4.

²⁹⁰ McMunn in "The Iconography of Dangier" notes, but does not investigate, these alterations in the appearance of Danger.

somewhat overlaid here.²⁹¹ Initially, Danger only poses a minimal threat and is easily cajoled by Venus and the Dreamer's friends. Even on his return, Danger is only one of several guardians, suggesting he is unable to block the Dreamer's advances alone. As he is ultimately defeated, his presence at the head of the poem is somewhat questionable. Rather than pointing to the actual outcome of the dream, this depiction seems to point to an erroneous conclusion, especially if we follow the logic of earlier dream images where the true ending or meaning was often alluded to in the composition.

Danger's relegation to the foot of the bed, i.e. not technically blocking the Dreamer's visual or physical access to the Roses, may have been one means of alluding to his rather impotent performance in the poem. His gesture to the Roses even when holding his stick in some miniatures also complicates our understanding of this figure, as if he is describing the Roses rather than protecting them. This may relate to a secondary tradition in incipits for gesticulating or explanatory dream-companions. The transformation of the Danger figure into an approximation of the Dreamer or Author – a process that occurred not long after the appearance of the original trope – hints that such scenes were received poorly by the next group of designers and cycle planners.

In terms of meaning, the figure suggests an inherent danger within the Dreamer's venture – but only once the character reappears in the visual cycle chastising or chasing the Dreamer away. This deferred significance is reliant on visual memory of the characteristics of the figure, but considering the scene's prominence at the head of the poem (in this instance at the head of a manuscript, meaning it would be easy to flick back to refresh one's memory) it is likely the identification of the figure as Danger was at least partly understood.

In this sense, these incipits reflect one of the many arguments regarding the perils of the dream state made by philosophers and theologians in the centuries preceding the *Rose*. While Augustine did not believe dreams could be dangerous, the anecdotal tales of Gregory the Great emphasised the problems caused by their capacity to distort truth. In Book Four, Gregory notes that dreams could come from the Devil, as expounded in

²⁹¹ Kuhn's suggestion in *Die Illustration des Rosenromans* that these scenes in fact derived from images of the Nativity, with Danger replacing Joseph, and the Dreamer and Roses replacing Mary may explain the compositional inclusion of a figure, but does not explain why Danger was selected for the position of prominence, nor why he stayed there, or what he signified to readers.

the books of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) and Leviticus, the latter of which he paraphrases as: 'For dreams have led many astray, and those who believed in them have perished'.²⁹² Gregory enhances his point by incorporating the example of a man who, on having a dream that he would live a long time amassed a great deal of money, only to die suddenly, and without having performed any meritorious works.²⁹³ While these 'dangers' may not seem to be in the same category as the physical violence posed by Danger in the *Rose*, it is clear authors did worry about the spiritual threat of dreams.

Danger's presence raises other questions too. Does he exclusively refer to any obstacle involved in dreams? Present-day experience of dreams grants many instances wherein the dream protagonist comes up against impediments to their progress - walls that cannot be scaled, doors that cannot be opened. So too there are cases where we struggle to escape threats, perhaps by some restraint placed on our movements. While it is unclear how many of today's nightmares applied in the past, the comments of theologians on the ability of dreams to excite and even forewarn us do suggest similar dreams occurred in the medieval period. Or is Danger's presence more specific - alluding solely to the dangers of romantic pursuits? From this, can one infer that his appearance in the incipit is attempting to make a wider point about the applicability of this 'danger' both in dreams and waking life? His appearance here is thus an additional indication of the evaluative failure inherent in this dream, when the author(s) wake abruptly, without further explanation.

All these factors reveal a primary difference between this incipit - which might appear to follow the established tropes of dream depictions - and the status quo. Instead of pointing to a conclusion, these dream images raise a number of questions, even contradictions, with the authorial presentation of the dream state, linking to contemporary and prior theoretical understanding of dreams, but also denying the visual summary format of earlier dream depictions. The dream does not end with a violent encounter, but rather with the successful seduction of the Rose by the Dreamer, and a peaceful reawakening.

The visual characteristics of this depiction were retained in several manuscripts, some of which may have originated from the same workshops. BnF fr. 378 appears to be the most direct relation, sharing peculiarities in the form of the tree, Danger's costume, and

²⁹² Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 261.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 262.

the pose and form of the naked, tonsured Dreamer (Figure 14).²⁹⁴ However, the visual forms of the Vatican and BnF fr. 378 copies were also disseminated in an artistic style that was more varied than its predecessors. The visual tropes of the Dreamer, Roses and Danger were also repeated in BnF fr. 1559 [Cat. 43], (Figure 15) which at first glance has little in common with the aforementioned copies; however, on closer inspection, not only does the upright, reclining pose and stylised rosebush match its predecessors, but other compositional elements are repeated between the three copies.²⁹⁵ A further two copies, BnF fr. 12589 and BnF fr. 9345 [Cats. 44 and 45] also share compositional elements with the group, although the variable number and subjects of the images further complicate comparisons between all these manuscripts.²⁹⁶ While these matters will be dealt with during the discussion on manuscript production and variation in Chapter 4, it is important to say here that even in the early stages, compositional tropes established in the earliest *Roses* were quickly adopted by artists working in quite different visual styles, or even subcontracted in by workshops to inflate the number of available *Roses*.

This incipit and its related companions have been dwelt upon at length as an example of the distinctions that characterised even the earliest *Rose* depictions and distinguished them from their predecessors. While it does not represent the full variety of *Rose* incipits, certain elements of this depiction – even in some cases its full reproduction in the quadripartite scenes of the later fourteenth century – were retained by generations of *Rose* illuminators, and reveals both the ways in which the incipit Dreamers, present in an overwhelming proportion of the manuscripts toyed with earlier conventions and offer insight into the issues posed by the *Rose* itself.

B: Replacing ‘Author with ‘Dreamer’

The overwhelming popularity of the Dreamer figure appearing at the head of incipits suggests that artists and planners found this subject appealing as a summative or simply eye-catching opening scene. However, its incorporation is problematic, as the replacement of an authoritative writer or lecturing figure with the more ambiguous dreamer introduces a whole host of associations, as outlined in the previous section.

²⁹⁴ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 3-5; Coilly and Tesnière, *Le Roman de la Rose*, 146.

²⁹⁵ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 16; Rouse and Rouse, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 185.

²⁹⁶ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 44 (fr. 12589) and 40 (fr. 9345); Rouse and Rouse, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 185.

This following section will consider this authorial conundrum in more detail, with reference to some meaningful variations on the idea of 'authorship' in the *Rose*.

As noted in Chapter One, the authorial integrity of the *Rose* does not follow modern-day patterns of single authorship, but rather indicates the presence of at least two, possibly more writers as ascertained from in-text allusions and manuscript comparisons. The issue of authorship is also addressed in the opening lines of the poem, where Guillaume reflects on the truthfulness of dreams. He also explicitly refers to the poem's potential usefulness, declaring:

Et mie dormoie mout forment
et vi un songe en mon dormant
qui mout fu biaux et mout me plot;
mes en ce songe onques riens n'ot
qui tretot avenu ne soit
si con li songes recensoit
Or veil ce songe rimeer
por vos cuers plus feire agueer,
qu'Amors le me prie et comande.²⁹⁷

These lines indicate not only the truth of the dream, but its potential benefit for others listening or reading it. However, as is evident once one finishes the poem, Guillaume does *not* in fact stick to his authorial premise of usefulness, despite promising further explanatory passages, such as when he discusses the arrows of the God of Love:

Bien vos en ert la verité
contee et la senefiance,
nou metrai pas en obliance,
ainz vos dirai que tot ce monte
ainçois que define mon conte.²⁹⁸

This constitutes a promise that, while he cannot fulfil it now, he will later explain the true significance of the arrows. This is echoed by an even stronger pledge somewhat later in the narrative:

Qui dou songe la fin ora,
je vos di bien que il porra
des jeux d'Amors assez apprendre
puis que il veille tant atendre
que je die et que j'encomance

²⁹⁷ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.25-33. Guillaume here suggests that not only did the dream he recounts come true afterwards, but that he would like to retell it in verse to delight the hearts of his audience, and because the God of Love instructed him to do so.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, ll.980-984.

dou songe la senefiance.
 La verité, qui est coverte,
 vos sera lores toute overte
quant espondre m'oroiz le songe,
car il n'i a mot de mençonge.²⁹⁹

Here Guillaume states that those who listen to the whole dream will learn a great deal about the ways of Love, so long as they await his explanation. He then again asserts that while the truth is hidden, it will be explained later, as his dream contains 'not a word of a lie'. Additional reflections on authorship appear during the section by Jean de Meun, who declares his own presence as second author in a bizarrely timed post-Guillaume but pre-Jean prophetic speech by the God of Love. In this context, with a recurrent theme on the importance and relevance of authorship to the overall poem, the replacement of the authorial figure with a dreamer figure cannot be viewed as a neutral action. Instead of the clear authority both Guillaume and Jean attempt to present, we have the ambiguous dreamer, alluding to a whole collection of positive, negative and unknown qualities established since antiquity. At the outset, then, artists and planners seem to be alluding to the fact that the authority of this account lies in the dream - not with the (now absent) author figure.

One early manuscript, BnF fr. 1569 [Cat. 42], (Figure 16) seems to address this complex authorial relationship by the inclusion of a pairing of the Dreamer and Danger with a depiction of an author-poet reading from a book on a lectern to an assembled group.³⁰⁰ Rather than considering the immediate boundaries of the poem as other depictions do, this pairing represents the world in which the poem existed, and how the poem may have been used as entertainment or a teaching device. Guillaume's assertion of the truthfulness of his dream through these lines, as well as his aim of pleasing his master, the God of Love, and delighting the hearts of his audience, offer a good starting point for the analysis of this image. The relationship is clear here, as a figure, presumably the poet, addresses himself to an audience. The poet is larger than the rest, suggesting his prominence, and reads down to his audience sitting on the floor from a lectern. The pairing of this scene with the gesticulating Danger at the end of the Dreamer's bed, amplified by the reversal of the usual order (the Dreamer appears on the right, i.e. as the second scene, rather than in his more typical first position) and the omission of the

²⁹⁹ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.2,065-2,074.

³⁰⁰ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 25-56; Walters, "A Parisian Manuscript of the Romance of the Rose", 53.

roses, reflects the idea of the poem's instructive purpose, taken from the author's own hints.

While this was clearly an important element of the text noted in Guillaume's prologue and relates strongly to the scattered references to meaning and clarification promised by both authors, it is interesting that few such images exist, given that the Dreamer seems to have largely replaced the trend for authorial incipits. A few scattered examples of direct authorial imagery coexisting with Dreamer incipits do appear in the *Rose* corpus, although these were often relegated, as with the historiated initial author appearing in Tournai MS 101 [Cat. 12] (Figure 17) or the marginal scene of a writer at a lectern in Copenhagen GKS 2061-4^o [Cat. 13].³⁰¹ The Tournai representation of the poet – and indeed the dominant accompanying double-column-width miniature above it are arguably relegated doubly by the fact that these are not the opening images in this manuscript. Instead, Tournai MS 101 opens with a miniature in the left-hand column of fol. 1r depicting two devotees kneeling to Mary – a clear indication of the supreme authoritative figure, rightly placed at the head of the manuscript. However, given that this copy of the *Rose* transmits the moralisation of the *Rose* undertaken by Gui de Mori, the alternative cycle of imagery also naturally reflects the new priorities of Gui as author of a *Remainement* of the poem, rather than the more accepted iconographies transmitted at this time in more 'standard' editions of the *Rose* text.³⁰²

Some comparisons with other authorial imagery at the head of manuscripts reveals the shocking nature of these dreamers when they replace the authorial image. In addition to the prominent images of evangelist figures depicted writing at the head of gospel texts, more contemporaneous depictions of authors undertaking translations of the sacred texts also tied into this exalted tradition, such as the image of a writer at his desk underneath a brief title of the text and description of how it was rendered into French (Figure 18) in BnF fr. 155, a *Bible Historiale* dated c.1310-20. The prayer in the

³⁰¹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 173 (Tournai MS 101) and 175-77 (Copenhagen GKS 2061-4^o); Walters (with reference to Avril) "Marian Devotion in the Tournai Rose: From the Monastery to the Household", in *De la Rose: Texte, Image, Fortune*, eds. Catherine Bel and Herman Braet (Louvain: Peeters, 2006), 207-70; Valentini, *Le remainement du Roman de la Rose*, 12;

³⁰² Interestingly, Copenhagen GKS 2061-4^o has also been related to the manuscript at Tournai, as it contains some lines from Gui's *Remainement*, and may be the work of the same artist, Pierart dou Tielt - perhaps explaining why another authorial portrait appears again on the first folio of the poem (cf. Walters, "Marian Devotion in the Tournai Rose", 208. Nevertheless, the visual prominence of the author is redirected once more, with the author pushed to the lower right-hand corner, apparently seated on the golden scrollwork marginalia decoration.

top margin, its rubric, and the context – at the head of a Biblical translation – all grant this image of the writer a particular authority, and emphasises the strength of the text by partaking in an activity linked with saints and esteemed prior authorities. A second image on fol. 1v strengthens the association with authority by depicting Pierre Comestor giving his book to Guillaume, the Archbishop of Sens, wherein the writer now kneels and offers his book to the higher religious authority embodied in the seated archbishop (Figure 19).

While the association with authority is not lost in BnF fr. 1569, as the seated figures look up to a seated authority figure, the writer/author is not subjugated to another, but is respected in his own right as an authority figure. Nevertheless, as the image pairing makes clear, this authority is also tied to something ambiguous – the dream – not the solid religious foundation indicated in the Guiard des Moulins example.

A similar contrast is indicated when considering another representation of a *Bible Historiale* frontispiece in BnF fr. 8 (Figure 20), wherein Guiard des Moulins is depicted in a historiated initial below a primary miniature, akin to the Tournai or Copenhagen *Roses* with miniaturised authors appearing underneath a major incipit.³⁰³ Yet the authority of the authorial figure is once more related to being(s) of undisputed importance – this time the deities themselves, featured prominently in a double-column incipit. Whereas this is only implied through the presence of an opening miniature of the Virgin in Tournai 101 – and the possibly pre-eminent status of the intended recipients of the manuscript, kneeling by her side – in the *Bible Historiale* the scaling serves to demonstrate a far greater insignificance of the author when compared with the heavenly beings depicted above.

With an example such as this, the presumption of the BnF fr. 1569 incipit and its even more striking compatriots *not* incorporating any reference to a visual authority other than the dream is particularly audacious. While these scenes relate to their predecessors – and in some instances, contemporaries – in religious contexts, with clear religious authority on their side, they also turn against this tradition by their recourse to an ambiguous source of information in the form of the dream.

So are these scenes implying that the dream is the only authority that can be referenced in this *Rose*? The placement of prominent dreamer incipits would appear to suggest

³⁰³ Rouse and Rouse, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, Vol. II, 198.

this, although images such as BnF fr. 1569, where the prominent supplanting of authority by the dreamer occurs in the opening miniature, were certainly rare. Bodleian Douce 195 [Cat. 163] (Figure 21) takes a similar approach, though it shows the author alone in his room with his 'audience' spying through the window.³⁰⁴ However, the example of Douce 195 is more complicated than its predecessor. While alluding to themes of authorship and commentary, the audience is instead addressed indirectly, peering at the author through a window as he writes at his desk. The miniature thus appears to suggest the inaccessibility of the poetic 'truth', as our poet no longer 'explains' the dream to his audience directly, but guards its meaning himself, with the audience reduced to the side-lines. This may be a reflection of the changing reception of the poem in the fifteenth century, 200 years after it was written.³⁰⁵ It may also evidence the degree to which the poem was becoming less familiar to its new audiences, made clear in the trend during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries for *Rose* clarifications, moralisations and rewrites.³⁰⁶ This certainly echoes the explanatory figure of BnF fr. 1569, but emphasise the extent to which Guillaume actually fails his readers. Guillaume does not explain his dream, and neither does the poem's continuator, Jean. The Douce copy then approximates the reality of the poem more clearly, with the author depicted examining his manuscript, concealing the truth from the eavesdropping audience.

In this way these incipits express an idea that ultimately contradicts the status of the finished poem. While expounding the perceived explicatory function of the *Rose*, they in fact draw attention to its absence from the outset. The pairing of this with the Dreamer also extends the meaning of these incipits. Rather than depicting the dream events, or conforming to particular *topoi* for dream representations, it now becomes a site for the analysis of the explanatory concepts alluded to by the Author-Dreamer pairing. Here, the dream is superficially tied to the traditional representation of dreams that came true, or acted as lessons for others – as with the imagery of the Arthurian manuscripts – but in the *Rose*, this function is never fulfilled. By turning the tradition on its head, depicting an explanation that does not textually exist, these manuscripts manage to

³⁰⁴ Hunt, *A Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895-1953), Vol. 4, 550; Deborah McGrady, "Reinventing the *Roman de la Rose* for a Woman Reader: The Case of MS Douce 195," *Journal of the Early Book Society for the Study of Manuscripts and Printing History*, 4 (2001): 202-27.

³⁰⁵ Huot's *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers* also gives a useful insight into the changing ways the poem was received by its audience in the period after it was composed.

³⁰⁶ Further information on these moralisations is provided in Chapter Five.

fully stress the ambiguity of dreams, and are important clues as to how we should read the poem through the lens of the dream.³⁰⁷ In these images, we see a literal fulfilment of the prior arguments about the uncertainty of dreams, voiced from Aristotle to Aquinas, wherein the true meaning of this slippery realm may in fact be inaccessible - or even absent entirely.

There is one final issue to note regarding the presence of authorial imagery in the *Roses*. While only two copies featured the author prominently as part of the incipit to the poem, numerous *Roses* did incorporate imagery of one or both writers later on in the poem. Portraits of an author appeared typically at the end of Guillaume's section (Figure 22) where they would sometimes be accompanied by an inserted rubric declaring that here Guillaume stops, and Jean commences the narrative. Others would defer the portrait until Jean's interpolation during the speech of the God of Love. Indeed, some even draw attention to the co-authorship of the poem through a representation of both authors together underneath an explanatory rubric (Figure 23). The interesting factor here is that, when one considers Guillaume's unfulfilled promises of meaning, the actual writing of the poem may be the only solid 'consequence' of the *Rose*, as he declares he recounts it for 'Rose', the God of Love, and his listeners. In this sense, these fulfil the absent 'consequence' imagery so prevalent in prior depictions of dreams, by providing an image of the concluding moment – the events that occur after the dream ends. This does not come without some complexity, given the presence of two authors, and the fact that Jean actually sets his section of the dream before his own birth, but after Guillaume's initial dream. Additionally, the number of author portraits is only half as popular as the Dreamer incipits: 81 copies include a portrait of an author, either Guillaume or Jean, at the end of the first author's section, while a further 24 (9 of which occur in those already featuring an authorial portrait) feature an image of Jean during the speech of the God of Love, where Jean proclaims his authorship. Discounting overlaps, this amounts to 96 manuscripts featuring author portraits in the 190 considered here – a significant rate of recurrence that may suggest the continuity of dream image conventions *was* somewhat satisfied by these scenes.

³⁰⁷ Interestingly, authorial incipits did make a major appearance in the later printed *Roses*. For more information on these, see Chapter Five.

However, not all manuscripts with an author portrait feature them at the end of the visual cycle in the chronological sequence dictated by earlier dream images (though some early copies do feature this as the terminal image at the end of Guillaume' section).³⁰⁸ Furthermore, the inherited visual tradition of author portraits, appearing in manuscripts dating to the early middle ages, may also be sufficient reason for the insertion of this common subject into the popular *Rose*, one which spends some time on the circumstances of its authorship in Jean's convoluted passage.

Such scenes may - like the *Personifications* - have only been successful due to their relation to earlier subjects, although not all of the most popular subjects have clear-cut analogies in other visual media. A more fruitful line of enquiry could be the displacement of these author images, which more often feature at the head of texts, rather than at the middle or end positions in manuscripts, though it would be unfeasible to consider this in more detail in this thesis. While I propose the author as dream-consequence as a hypothesis, it is uncertain whether the author portraits were indeed considered as an adequate 'conclusion' to the visualisation of this dream according to the norms of earlier representations, particularly as their placement away from the Dreamer incipits disrupts the visual continuity prevalent in earlier dream imagery.

Above all, the complexities of these incipits - particularly the 'replacement' of a traditional authority with a dream one - shifts the focus of the reader, to an understanding of the dream as something to be recounted and analysed. As the *Rose* never fulfils this promise, it leaves both Dreamer and reader to dwell on the prospects of this unexplained dream. As a visual summary of the poem, the incipits of this category reflect the multi-layered figure of Dreamer and Author, but also the idea that meaning must be extracted through interpretation of the dream, in reader interpretation and analysis. As such, these aspects are pushed to the forefront, so meaning and interpretation must be factored in to subsequent reading of the narrative.

C: Quadripartite Incipits and *Croesus and Phanie*

An additional expression of the Dream topos was obliquely linked to the development of a particular form of incipit - the quadripartite form - and depictions of a secondary dream subject, *Croesus and Phanie*. Quadripartite incipits appear in 30 of the

³⁰⁸ BnF fr. 378 is one such example.

manuscripts considered in this study, and typically include mild variations on a 2x2 square or rectangular format, some sharing models or subject matter. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Dreamer – occasionally following the prototype of Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 and others – always appears in the first quadrant. These incipits appear in multiple manuscripts datable to the 1350s (Figure 24), and fit with a chronological line of development from the *Rose* incipits of the earlier fourteenth century.³⁰⁹ However, these were in fact short-lived, later apparently dropped in favour of multiscenic representations.

However, there is evidence that the quadripartite miniatures also relate to external traditions. BnF fr. 10135, a French rendering of the *Grandes Chroniques de France*, features a quadripartite frontispiece on fol. 3r (Figure 25), depicting the *Departure of the Greeks to Troy*, the *Siege of Troy*, the *Building of Sicambria*, and the *Battle of the Franks and Romans*. This later fourteenth-century example introduces a wider range of subject material into the frame than is usually found in *Rose* quadripartite incipits, which typically stick to the initial moments of the story.³¹⁰ However, it does share the same effects of visual summary found in *Rose* incipits, and also features the quadrilobed internal framing that was a feature of some quadripartite *Rose* illuminations and late-century single miniatures. Although the subjects vary, this is an example of the sporadic use of established visual frameworks for new visual purposes in *Rose* manuscript imagery. However, its use in *Roses* does pose problems for the flow of the visual narrative.

The direction of the images works much like reading – left to right and top to bottom, typically focusing on single moments with the Dreamer dressing, washing, and moving into the landscape of the narrative. Some even suggest movement around single coherent spaces, alluding to the idea that we are looking at the same room from different angles, and while naturalistic perspective is not applied, it does at least infer a single room these events occur in. This is much like the shared backgrounds of modern-day comic-books, which assist in rendering continuity of action in space. This reflects the increasing application of perspective and depth in later fourteenth century

³⁰⁹ Two of the manuscripts with a quadripartite incipit are explicitly dated to the 1350s; this therefore allows for the relative dating of other copies to a similar period.

³¹⁰ According to the BnF's *Archives et Manuscrits*, <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000041771> (accessed 27 Aug 2016), this chronicle stops at the year 1333, while the visual characteristics of the incipit relate to manuscripts, including *Roses*, datable to the second half of the century.

miniatures, though it does not perhaps attain the same visually coherent effect the fifteenth-century illuminations eventually did.

In an interpretive sense, these incipits pose certain problems for the interpretation of the *Rose*. They can cause conflict with the visual narrative, much in the way the transposition of Danger or Idleness alludes to alternative interpretations of other incipits.³¹¹ When the Dreamer has already entered the garden in the fourth quadrant one must then jump back visually on turning the page to view the standard *Personifications*, and ignore the fact that one has already seen what will happen next. However, they are also somewhat simpler, by focusing entirely on plot and not focusing on significant figures or actions like Danger, or Idleness. These incipits in some way then presage the appearance of strictly chronological image cycles, stripped of additional interpretive or abstract imagery, during the fifteenth century.

These images also have another function, that of granting additional visual space to the enumeration of the initial stages of the dream. While the Dreamer retains prominence in the first quadrant, the incorporation of additional scenes from his entry into the dream space also provides further focus on his transition; a mode that was also emphasised by fifteenth-century multiscenic imagery, discussed in the following chapter. It is for this reason, perhaps, that the *Roses* with quadripartite incipits also partly correlate with the appearance of imagery of *Croesus and Phanie*, one of the most revealing dream-episodes recounted by Jean during his section of the poem. Just over a third of the manuscripts featuring a quadripartite incipit, including the dated BnF fr. 1565, also include this scene.³¹²

One might presume that this was an instance of coinciding fashions: manuscripts produced with quadripartite incipits, proving popular, spawned similar copies, and whether by chance or design promulgated the retention of a *Croesus and Phanie* image. However, when one considers that additional variations appeared in these copies with quadripartite incipits, it is interesting that the Croesus scene was retained in over a third of these, despite evidently ample opportunity to change the circumstances of the commission between copies. This raises the possibility that the imagery was retained

³¹¹ A number of manuscripts feature Idleness juxtaposed with the sleeping Dreamer.

³¹² 30 manuscripts of the 190 considered in this study feature a quadripartite incipit. 11 of those feature a *Croesus and Phanie* image. For BnF fr. 1565, see also Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 22-23; Walters, "A Parisian Manuscript of the Romance of the Rose"; Coilly and Tesnière, *Le Roman de la Rose* (multiple citations).

purposefully in those manuscripts, perhaps due to their relevance to a manuscript already focusing more on the dream element in the incipit.³¹³

Forty depictions of *Croesus and Phanie* overall appear within the manuscripts considered in this study, and relate directly to the central *Rose* dream subject, as this small narrative interlude stresses the importance of correct dream interpretation.³¹⁴ It also represents the major dream episode described within Jean's section, and occurs during the reprised discourse of Reason.

The exemplar of Croesus and Phanie is invoked by Reason when she attempts to dissuade the Dreamer from loving Fortune. She declares that even a king (in this case, Croesus) could not be protected from the vicissitudes of fortune and fate.³¹⁵ According to her version, Croesus was captured and sentenced to death by fire, but was saved by a shower of rain that extinguished the flames.³¹⁶ On his return to power, he began warmongering once more, and was recaptured and hanged.

His eventual death was the fulfilment of a dream he had, and which he described to his daughter Phanie:

Puis refu sires de sa terre,
et puis resmut novele guerre,
puis refu pris et puis penduz,
quant li songes li fu renduz
des .II. dex qui li apparoient,
qui seur l'arbre en haut le servoient:³¹⁷

In the dream, he was served by two gods as he sat high in a tree – Jupiter, who washed him, and Phoebus who dried him with a towel – which he reads as divine sanction for his actions:

Mar se vost ou songe apuier,
don si grant fiance acueilli
qu'il comme fols s'en orgueilli.³¹⁸

³¹³ Interestingly, the quadripartite incipits also often coincided with an additional text regarding the truthfulness of dreams (as found in Gray's Inn 10). The recurrence of *Croesus and Phanie* in this context thus suggests a parallel transmission of visual and theoretical dream elements in that group of manuscripts.

³¹⁴ A quarter of these in manuscripts with a quadripartite incipit.

³¹⁵ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.6,459-6,460.

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, l.6,464.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, ll.6,471-6,476.

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, ll.6,480-6,482.

In these lines, Reason interjects that it was unfortunate for him to have such faith in his dream, as it led him to become foolishly proud. However, his wise daughter Phanie, who was able to interpret dreams, had a different understanding of his vision. She stated that the dream was Fortune mocking Croesus, declaring her intent to have him hanged on a gibbet, and while hanging the rain will fall on him and the sun will dry him out.³¹⁹ Fortune will use his death as an opportunity to take back his crown and power, which she originally loaned to him. Phanie then explains that the tree allegorically stands for the gallows, Jupiter is the rain, and Phoebus is the sun.³²⁰ She summarises by saying this consequence will be Fortune's means of avenging the people for Croesus' pride, and thus begs her father to avoid conceit and instead set an example to his people in kindness and courtesy.³²¹

Croesus refuses to heed her warnings, remaining proud and arrogant, and chastises his daughter for her 'false' reading of his dream.

Et quant par vostre fol respons
 m'avez mon songe ainsinc espons,
 servi m'avez de granz mençonges ;
 car sachiez que cist nobles songes,
 ou fause glose volez metre
 doit estre entenduz a la letre,
 et je meïsmes l'i entens,
 si con nos le verrons en tens.
 Onc aussi noble vision
 n'ot si vils exposicion.
 Li dieu, sachiez, a moi vendront
 et le servise me rendront
 qu'il m'ont par ceste songe tramis
 tant est chascuns d'els mes amis
 car bien l'ai piece a deservi.³²²

A number of elements in this speech are interesting. Firstly, Croesus calls the dream noble, implying that Phanie's interpretation of it does not do enough justice to it, and that she has provided a false gloss. He states that it ought to be understood literally, as he interpreted it, and that it will come true as he says. Croesus says never was such a noble vision given such a bad explanation. He summarises by stating that the gods are his friends, and will give him the service he deserves, as shown in the dream. Obviously,

³¹⁹ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.6,487-6,497.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, ll.6,498-6,518.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, ll.6,549-6,562.

³²² *Ibid.*, ll.6,575-6,589.

as intimated at the start of the tale, Croesus' interpretation was incorrect, and he was in fact hanged in accordance with Phanie's reading of the dream.

This exemplar is incorporated in Reason's admonishment of the Dreamer for a number of his actions, including his folly in love – and is therefore part of the advice he chooses to reject. The episode raises a number of points relevant to the dream scenario in the *Rose*, as will be considered in this section. It presents another example of a foolish Dreamer, who refuses to heed the explanation provided by a wise figure and comes to harm, though the extent to which the Dreamer commits a 'fatal' mistake in the *Rose* is up to the reader to decide. Yet it also reiterates faith in the prophetic power of dreams, exemplified by the sage Phanie, who interprets it correctly. In the context of the *Rose*, then, Croesus' dream is both a warning and an admission regarding the nature of true and false dreams, with an emphasis on the necessity of correct interpretation. In contrast to the allusive statements regarding dreams and sleep up to this point, this is the first direct note of caution against unbridled faith in dreams, and as such opens a fresh debate on the degree of truthfulness in this dream poem.

Given Jean's propensity for altering the model of his predecessor, it is perhaps unsurprising that he offers a more cautious, moralistic representation of dream sequences. The *Croesus and Phanie* tale, one of a selection of historical tales Jean inserts as exemplum, directly promotes the dangerous outcomes of dream misinterpretation, and more clearly reflects the concerns of past and present commentators on the subject.³²³ However, it also draws attention to the uncertainty of dream interpretation, as discussed in prior texts. While handbooks for dream divination were present in popular medieval culture, their use seems to have been condemned by both Biblical precedent and contemporary commentators.³²⁴ Leviticus 19:26 explicitly states 'You shall not divine nor observe dreams', while the twelfth-century John of Salisbury, in addition to criticising the dreambooks circulating under the name of Daniel, firmly

³²³ See the aforementioned exemplar of Gregory the Great's avaricious monk, described in his *Dialogues*. Although in that case the dream was not the cause of the monk's demise, it was a factor in his turning away from virtue, and which it is implied gave him a disadvantage in the afterlife.

³²⁴ The extent to which such books were used by those who owned them is naturally difficult to quantify without explicit accounts stating this. One may perhaps take the aforementioned 'Dream dictionaries' as a comparative example; given their existence, it is also plausible that some people believe(d) the information held within them.

disparaged the practice and implied that all those believing in dreams are not just potentially heretical, but insane.³²⁵

Images of this scene thus had to tackle a tricky subject that could have major consequences for the reading of the *Rose* as a dream narrative. While the lower rate of *Croesus and Phanie* depictions means we cannot say its relevance appealed to every planner and reader of the *Rose*, nevertheless it offered a highly complementary dream episode in those manuscripts featuring it. With 40 appearances, it is neither ubiquitous nor especially rare, though its presence - often in important manuscripts evidencing many competing interpretations of the narrative - provides a relevant reinterpretation of the dream subject expounded in the majority of *Rose* incipits. In contrast to the Dreamer opening scenes, this less prominent scene reveals the way in which less typical dream scenes represented this subject. It also enhances the representation of the dream in the manuscripts they appear in, augmenting the positive, negative, or ambiguous messages provided in the incipits.

It also provides a necessary contextualisation for some of the major hypotheses of this thesis - that dreams are integral to the understanding of the *Rose*, and that dream imagery underwent a major change with the representations accompanying this poem, as it reveals that the focus on the dream subject indicated in the incipits was not always retained throughout by *libraires* and artists, or was dependent on transmission methods. Furthermore, this subject mingled with a whole host of other subjects, all of which formed the visual context for readers of the *Rose*. While the prominent position of dreamers at the head of the vast majority of manuscripts belies their authority and importance to the medieval understanding of the poem, the *Croesus and Phanie* representations both assert and modify these perspectives as they mix with other non-dream themes. Indeed, one further subject - Nature's consideration of dreams - was completely overlooked visually.³²⁶

Interestingly, aside from a group of manuscripts with a quadripartite incipit, there does not appear to be a clear logic to the inclusion of *Croesus and Phanie* scenes in the extant manuscripts. Given its lower rate of appearance, one might expect it to be found primarily in copies with many illuminations. While some manuscripts featuring the

³²⁵ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 84. See Chapter One for a specific quotation regarding those who he believes foolishly believe in dreams.

³²⁶ The 'missing' depiction of Nature's theory on dreams is discussed near the end of this chapter.

scene do contain over 100 miniatures, others like the more modest Mazarine 3874 [Cat. 38] (only 17 images) incorporate this scene too.³²⁷ This again suggests that designers were not simply picking restricted cycles from fuller model versions to fit the specifics of a commission, as evident with the Brussels-Lyon family, which is discussed below. Rather, manuscripts were produced with more in mind than size and economy, subject to the more fluid concepts of individual workshop practices, and interest in particular subjects perhaps at the request of patrons or *libraires*.

Furthermore, *Croesus and Phanie* illuminations do not always reflect a manuscript-wide interest in the visualisation of dreams, though the aforementioned relationship between quadripartite incipits and the *Croesus and Phanie* subjects does reveal that additional emphasis on dreams sometimes may have been responsible for the inclusion of this scene. However, it was not always the case that *Croesus and Phanie* scenes tallied with additional focus on dream subjects. Two unusual fifteenth-century manuscripts featuring additional dreamers outside the usual subjects – King Scipio in Los Angeles Ludwig XV 7 and Socrates in Valencia 387 (both discussed in Chapter Three) – also incorporate *Croesus and Phanie*, but this must be considered against these individual copies' interest in visualising many of Guillaume and Jean's textual allusions to classical antiquity and history.³²⁸ The different intellectual context that inspired the iconographic cycles of these manuscripts must therefore be considered ahead of aims to incorporate additional dream scenes in the Valencia and Los Angeles copies, though the *Croesus* narrative does contribute significantly to the visual ideas present in these manuscripts.

This evidence points to the fact that the *Croesus and Phanie* subject, even more so than the incipits, occupies an unusual position in *Rose* iconography: visually and theoretically significant from a dream sense, but nonetheless a secondary subject that mingled with competing interpretations and image cycles in the manuscripts it appeared in. Yet while they appear somewhat sporadically in the corpus, the extant *Croesus* scenes, by merit of their inclusion in a healthy number of copies (small in contrast to the overall *Rose* corpus, but not insignificant in the context of most images accompanying other contemporary poems, which only appeared in a handful of

³²⁷ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 84-85.

³²⁸ For the Los Angeles manuscript, also see Timothy L. Stinson, notice on [www.romandelarose.org](http://romandelarose.org), <http://romandelarose.org/#book;LudwigXV7> (accessed 27 Aug 2016); for the Valencia copy, see Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 180-81; Ost, "The Mythographical Images", 141-91; Ost, "Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose*", 405-35.

manuscripts) deserve consideration, especially when one is considering the dream topic as represented in the *Rose*. While the importance placed on the dream was clearly present in the incipits of *Roses*, its visual emphasis waxed and waned in additional imagery, suggesting that the focus on dreams was actually tied more so to the *specific* dream recounted in the *Rose* rather than more general treatments of the dream subject – after all, the *Croesus and Phanie* episode does not advance the plot. However, this does not negate the ability of this scene to reflect on contemporary attitudes to dreams, their interpretation, and the experience of them during the Middle Ages.

Images of the *Croesus and Phanie* episode featured in some of the earliest illuminated copies, such as the early and irregularly formatted Florence Laurenziana Acq e Doni 153 [Cat. 114], or the more typical Milan Ambrosiana I 78 Sup [Cat. 115].³²⁹ In the Milan manuscript (Figure 26), Phanie is shown seated on a bench beside her father, finger raised in a gesture of explanation or admonishment. Though the miniature is damaged, the major elements of the composition and colouring remain clear, and align with other depictions of characters conversing in this manuscript, such as the Dreamer with Idleness on fol. 3v (Figure 27).³³⁰ Although Phanie is the only figure to raise her hand and point, this gesture is easily recognisable as one of instruction or admonishment, and perhaps the fact that only she utilises this gesture could be in recognition of her authoritative status. This association with advice-givers – themselves depicted in prior and contemporary manuscripts of the *Rose*, as noted earlier - over and above the conventions of conversational characters in this manuscript may explain the rubric, which reads: 'How Phanie chastised and taught the king Croesus, her father.'

A similar tone of admonishment appears in the allusive, narrative-based image cycle of Chalons-en-Champagne MS 270, fol. 47r, when Phanie stands before her father with her arms spread as he speaks and gesticulates (Figure 28).³³¹ However, in this instance,

³²⁹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 184-87 and Peruzzi, *Il Codice* (Florence Acq e Doni 153); Luisa Sacchi, *Codex: I tesori della biblioteca Ambrosiana* (Milan: Rizzoli, 2000), 98 (Milan Ambrosiana I 78 Sup).

³³⁰ Though neither character points in this latter scene, the Dreamer raises his hands in the same manner as Croesus, indicating he is responding to the figure before him. While these gestures are slightly unclear in that episode, the gestures in the *Croesus and Phanie* scene can be more easily understood if one considers that Phanie is admonishing (literally pointing the truth out to her father) and Croesus is gesturing with both hands, a somewhat defensive pose that lines up with his rejection of her interpretation in the narrative.

³³¹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 121-22; Cécile Ribot, "La représentation iconographique d'un roman allégorique: Le Roman de la Rose de Guillaume de Lorris et de Jean de Meun(g) dans trois manuscrits enluminés du XIVe siècle: Bodmer 79, Châlons-en-Champagne 270 et Lyon 763" (PhD diss., 2011).

Croesus' dream and its outcome are also shown, as a tree appears on the right with the rain and sun bearing down on it. This visualisation actually conflates the imagery of the dream with its eventual outcome - the tree is a dream metaphor for the gibbet, but the sun and rain are the real substitutes for the godly figures in her father's dream. Here, the rubric is even clearer about Phanie's purpose. Rather than describing her just teaching or telling off her father, it reads: 'How Phanie exposed the dream to King Croesus her father', placing the exposition of the dream as the substantial element in both rubric and accompanying image.

In this case, the miniature appears in a manuscript notable for the unusual form of several scenes, most notably the incipit, which incorporates a composition not adapted in any other copies before or after (Figure 29). This imagery also gives a fresh prominence to different aspects of the opening stages of the Dream, with a summative *Dreamer and Roses* vignette to the left, an irregular T-shaped structure in the middle featuring the vices the Dreamer encounters on the garden wall above, and Idleness standing guard below, and finally the Dreamer exploring either the countryside or, more likely, the garden itself. The composition is engineered to suggest transition, with the Dreamer passing through the gateway dominated by Idleness – with all of the negative connotations she might suggest, particularly after the reader sees her labelled depiction on fol. 5v, where she also stands guard at the gate. Both Idleness and the negative busts on the garden wall appeared in other incipits of the *Rose*; indeed, there was a brief period wherein these negative personifications actually took on concrete form beside the inquisitive dreamer (as in BnF Arsenal 3338, or Mazarine 3873). However, in no other manuscript does the composition so directly indicate a form of transition between states, from the comfortable Dreamer seated in his bed to the wandering, idle Dreamer who has obviously passed the vices on the garden wall – vices that are apparently rejected from the garden by Guillaume, but which appear prominently in Jean's narrative, such as Old Age, Religious Hypocrisy (via Fraud and Constrained Abstinence), and Poverty.

In this context, the visual elaboration of the *Croesus and Phanie* narrative becomes more clear – instead of simply relating the tried and tested incipit formulas of the early fourteenth century, these planners appear to have stretched the available models to indicate additional themes and content consistently throughout the visual cycle.

A further example from the first decades of *Rose* manuscript production appears in the now-fragmented Charlottesville 6765 [Cat. 187], which reveals a third way this episode was illuminated (Figure 30).³³² Croesus is here shown on the gallows, crowned, with the tree of his prophetic dream appearing behind him, as if mocking his misinterpretation. The tragic outcome of Croesus' failure to heed his dream - and his daughter's correct interpretation - has been brought to the fore, though it is here blended with the imagery of the dream that foretold it. Phanie has been removed from this visual narrative, although its content justifies her reading as it is described in the text.

These images reveal the depth of variation present in the *Croesus and Phanie* imagery, and reflects the means by which ambiguity of message or text may result in flexible imagery. While the textual version provides a fairly clear moral - that dreams can be interpreted in multiple ways, not all of which are 'true' - the exploration of two such distinct comprehensions points back to the unclear understanding of the *Rose* itself. Additionally, the presence of several instances in the plot, each of which suggest different aspects of the principal characters and the flow of events, seems to have compelled varying artistic representations of the narrative. Some focused on the tragic outcome, others on the explanation of the dream, and still others on the enigmatic imagery of the dream itself. Though not as common as the *Dreamer* incipits, or the stable *Danger Sleeping*, this subject appears to have been capable of engaging planners and artists in many ways.

Rather than exemplifying a benign dream episode, or continuing the plot of the dream Guillaume commenced, the visual presentations of this tale focus on the potentially deadly nature of dreams, or the importance of interpretation within or outside the context of the actual outcome of the apparition. Surprisingly, these images did not feature a central dreamer or sleeping figure motif, with only a handful of the surviving manuscripts focusing on this element. This in itself is a novel development in the history of dream representations; as described in Chapter One, representations of dreams in earlier centuries almost never omitted the Dreamer figure. Its removal in the *Croesus and Phanie* scenes of *Roses* represents a significant break with tradition,

³³² Information of this manuscript gained through personal correspondence with Anne Causey at the Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library – basic curatorial information was included with a scan of the manuscript.

allowing one to focus more on the episode and its consequences without relying on an old, formulaic device.

In contrast to the main dream of the *Rose*, the example presented in the *Croesus* renderings offers a different type of dream, one that indicates the dreamer is in mortal danger. As such, these alternative sequences offer a complementary dreamer vision that could alter the reader's response to the dream-poem of the *Rose*. In manuscripts where the emphasis lies on Phanie and Croesus in conversation, an analogy is drawn visually between the Dreamer's liaisons with other characters or advice-givers, such as Idleness, Reason, or Friend. The contradictory nature of such figures is refracted through the *Croesus* narrative which also incorporates two contrasting interpretations, the choice of which has fatal ramifications for that dreamer. In the light of Jean's alterations to Guillaume's courtly narrative, with its surprising exhortation of procreation as a means of salvation, these images draw further attention to the difficulty of extracting meaning from the central dream of the *Rose*, and the advisors who appear within it.

In images of this narrative where the dream element is incorporated, the *Croesus* scenes reflect prior dream illustrations, including those of the *Rose* incipits, though they incorporated it without much recourse to the more traditional reclining dreamer and dream object formula. Additionally, those scenes that feature the dramatic consequences figuratively, with imagery from the dream, or literally in the representation of the hanging scene, put additional focus on the consequences of ignoring one's dreams, or of following an incorrect interpretation.

Until the mid-fourteenth century, representations of this episode remained fairly stable. Of the three forms of representation outlined above (*Croesus* and Phanie discoursing, *Croesus* and/or Phanie with the imagery of the dream, and *Croesus* Hanging) the first and last groups were the most popular, with visualisations of the actual dream content occurring less often. Perhaps unsurprisingly, artists seem to have favoured the more striking representation of the gallows, or the talking figures that relate to typical imagery for the rest of the poem, instead of more ambiguous dream imagery. The clear prominence of two *Croesus and Phanie* compositions in the early years of production provides an interesting contrast with the consistently variable *Rose* incipits, even from the early stages, though during the mid-1300s some changes were gradually introduced.

Berlin Cod. Gall. Qu. 80 [Cat. 107] features this scene inserted into an established decorative structure, the historiated initial (Figure 31).³³³ In this manuscript, *Croesus and Phanie* appears in an 'F' initial of *filie*, responding to the dictations of space and manuscript design. This image is thus dependent on the visual programme, something that would be planned long before the artist inserted the *Croesus* scene. This may explain its basic composition, depicting only two figures in dialogue, and omitting any reference to the dream motif or its consequences, as it was restricted by the space it has to fit within.

The version of Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 1126 [Cat. 100], on the other hand, features an unprecedented scene, showing the manner in which *Croesus and Phanie* was reformulated in the mid-fourteenth century.³³⁴ A female figure, presumably Phanie, is depicted untying her father from the gallows (Figure 32). This may relate to the unusual rendering of the scene in Brussels KBR 18017 [Cat. 9], which features the humorous scene of Phanie chastising her father as he hangs from the scaffold.³³⁵ Both of these scenes recast Phanie in a more active role during her father's punishment. While in the text Croesus casts her off in distaste for her interpretation of events, not to be heard from again, in these she comes back to chastise him even once he is dead, a futile if comic visual 'I-told-you-so'. The Sainte-Geneviève's manuscript is however a difficult exemplar as a whole. While it features several less popular scenes that expand upon the text, such as the depictions of the narratives of Dido, Phyllis and Medea (whether singly or as a trio, these subject(s) only appear in 25 copies of the *Rose*), or the *Battle of Charles and Manfred* (found in only 14 copies) among its 107 miniatures, there are some atypical, possibly even erroneous images present in the manuscript.³³⁶ For example, while the manuscript features a quadripartite incipit, akin to other copies containing *Croesus and Phanie* imagery, the first quadrant of this incipit appears to feature a case of mistaken identity (Figure 33). While at first glance these appear to conform to the Dreamer and Danger layout, in fact the reclining figure appears to have

³³³ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 162-63; Dominique Stutzmann and Piotr Tylus, *Les manuscrits médiévaux français et occitans de la Preussische Staatsbibliothek et de la Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz*. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 102-6.

³³⁴ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 85.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, 172.

³³⁶ These numbers refer to the proportion of the 190 illuminated *Rose* manuscripts considered in preparation for this study.

a headdress more commonly sported by females, at least in this manuscript, suggesting the Dreamer has changed gender.

This appears to make the narrative appear much more like a typical 'Nativity' scene, with Mary and Joseph, rather than a Dreamer and Danger motif. As noted in Chapter One, Kuhn believed that the Nativity motif formed the basis for the Dreamer and Danger formula, and I concede that this incipit does certainly provide some justification for his point of view.³³⁷ However, this is the only copy in some 190 manuscripts I have seen that comes close to mixing up the Nativity and *Rose* Dreamer formula in a manner that could result in confusion; and indeed, given the date of this manuscript – c.1345-55, around seventy years after the establishment of the Dreamer-Danger formula in other incipits, Kuhn's idea that it provided the foundation for this motif is untenable. It appears more likely that, in this particular instance, the artists in a rush to produce another *Rose* manuscript utilised a pre-existing Nativity model for their composition, and forgot to de-feminise the principal character.³³⁸

Nevertheless, this exemplar does mean we must be rather careful when considering how this *Croesus and Phanie* image builds upon the narrative, as given that the artists seem to have reused models from external sources in producing this visual cycle, it is possible this unusual gallows scene was not a direct expansion from the text, but simply the result of a specific external model being incorporated. It must be said, however, that this does not appear to reflect the majority of manuscript production methods, wherein ill-fitting scenes end up reused in copies of the *Rose* – this will be addressed more clearly in Chapter Four of this thesis.

Other copies, such as The Hague Meermanno MS 10 B 29 [Cat. 124] split the action up into sequential imagery, with this version featuring two images of *Croesus and Phanie*.³³⁹ In the first, a crowned Phanie gestures to her father who holds up one hand and tugs at his robes with the other. The depiction of Phanie as a dominant, active tutor is reinforced through visual continuity with the other explanatory figures in the

³³⁷ Kuhn, *Die Illustration des Rosenromans*, 14-15.

³³⁸ Further discussion of workshop practices and model use will be covered in Chapter Four.

³³⁹ Meuwese, "Roses, Ruse and Romance", fig. 6; Edith Brayer and A.S. Korteweg, *Catalogue of French-Language Medieval Manuscripts in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (Royal Library) and Meermanno-Westreenianum Museum, The Hague*. (Amsterdam: Royal Library, Moran Micropublications, 2003).

manuscript. After this, the second image summarises her correct prophecy by showing Croesus hanging.

This sequential technique is employed in the heavily illustrated BnF fr. 25526 [Cat. 71], a copy loosely related to the Meermanno manuscript in the use of a quadripartite incipit - again, a sequential technique.³⁴⁰ However, while Meermanno features a correct representation of the male Croesus and female Phanie, the image in the Paris copy was again evidently confused with another scene. Croesus appears to have once had wings, now partly erased, and Phanie is male, suggesting that the artist simply reused an image of the Dreamer speaking to Love (Figure 34). Whether this was an artistic mistake, forgetting to omit these from the figure when copying the model, or due to misinformation in the guiding notes, this scene reveals that even established scenes with fully accompanying rubrics could be subject to error. This is perhaps not unusual in a manuscript that features a huge variety of imagery unrelated to the *Rose* itself, and which has been discussed at length by a variety of scholars.³⁴¹ However, unlike the BSG 1126 copy referred to above, at least some steps have been taken to correct the error, as the mistaken wings of the figure on the right have been erased from the scene, although one must bear in mind that this may not have been contemporaneous with the original production of the copy, particularly as the gold background has not been replaced.

After this mid-century flourishing of the scene, there appears to have been an abrupt halt in the popularity of Croesus scenes. None of the later fourteenth-century manuscripts incorporating new fashions in design and iconography feature this episode, and one must wait for the early years of the fifteenth century to see the return of the subject, as with BnF fr. 380.³⁴² Here, the stock image of *Croesus Hanging*

³⁴⁰ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 71; Sylvia Huot, "Sacred and Erotic Love: The Visual Gloss of MS Bibl. Nat. fr. 25526", in *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 273-322; Richard Rouse and Mary Rouse, "A 'Rose' by Any Other Name: Richard and Jeanne de Montbaston as Illuminators of Vernacular Texts" in *Illiterati et Uxorati: Manuscripts and their Makers. Commercial Book Producers in Medieval Paris, 1200-1500*, Belgium: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2000), Volume 1, 253-60.

³⁴¹ See for example Huot's aforementioned chapter in *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers* or the discussion of the manuscript by the Rouses in *Illiterati et Uxorati* as part of a section on the 'Montbaston' workshop.

³⁴² Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 5-6; Coilly and Tesnière, *Le Roman de la Rose*, multiple citations; Beatrice Radden Keefe, notice on www.romandelarose.org, <http://romandelarose.org/#book;Francais380> (accessed 27 Aug 2016).

reappears, though excepting changes in format and design, the image is little different to the exemplars of this scene some fifty years earlier.

This brief overview of the treatment of a less popular dream subject in fourteenth-century *Rose* manuscripts reveals a number of aspects relevant to the poem, and other dream imagery as a whole. Firstly, that when the *Croesus and Phanie* subject was applied, a variety of image types were used. Some resurrected the typical dreamer-dream-outcome formula, while others incorporated an element of dramatic foreshadowing, or reinserted the figures into the format of discursive characters present elsewhere in the *Rose* manuscript tradition. The appearance of this scene coincided with some trends, such as the quadripartite incipits with an additional focus on the dream's first moments, but it was not limited to manuscripts with a specific number of scenes, subjects or visual foci.

In many instances, the images place an additional emphasis on the dream context, with a focus on the interpretation and potential danger of dreams that are misunderstood by those who dream them. This was not present in all the copies, some of which skirted these potential references by shifting attention to the favouring of Croesus prior to his dream. However, in the majority which do deal with the dreamer, dream content, interpretation or outcome, these scenes amplify the visual focus on a subject of clear relevance to the poem itself, one defined as truthful but also beneficial in the retelling. In the context of Jean's section, they draw attention to the negative views on dreams expressed by other characters, as well as Jean's ultimate denial of interpretive summary at the end of the poem. Also of note is the fact that they appear in visual cycles that often do not feature any other particular interest in the topic beyond the ubiquitous Dreamer imagery that formed the first image in most copies, but by their very nature elaborate upon it with the depiction of a highly relevant subject. Additionally, over a third appear in manuscripts with extended visual prominence for a dreamer in the incipit, and often with an accompanying extension to the text of the poem appearing at the end, referencing the truthfulness of dreams – an epilogue that was not written by Jean.

Ultimately, the Croesus and Phanie scenes occupy an unusual position in the context of dream illumination in the *Rose*. While they represent a more secondary subject in terms of popularity, able to be used or not depending on the context of the commission, the incarnations of this scene across the entire period considered here reveal that when it

was present, these depictions offered a representation of dream and dream interpretation that diverged from the promises of Guillaume, assimilated some of the warnings of Jean, and granted a stern caution to those who would interpret their dreams – or even the dream of the *Rose* – without careful consideration. Images could vary greatly, taking their cue from a variety of textual features, and resulted in scenes that attest to the engagement of artists and planners with these scenes in a variety of contexts. The scene appeared in luxurious manuscripts produced for elite members of society with historical or classical interests, but also mingled with others in mass-produced versions or in unusual or remarkable copies. Each recurrence allowed for greater reflection on the dream of the *Rose* for contemporary readers, and resulted in generally effective imagery that underscores the importance of dreams and dreaming to comprehension of the poem overall.

D: Nature's Discussion of Dreams

The final section of this chapter is both related to and independent from the imagery of the incipits and *Croesus and Phanie*, in that its subject directly contends with the contemporary understanding of dreams, as well as its historical context, as well as reflecting back on the entire *Rose* narrative. However, it is distinct in that it never received any form of visual expansion, at least not in any of the 190 copies covered here – something shared by other subjects discussed by both Guillaume and Jean, though given its direct relation to the central dream theme, this may be viewed as rather unusual.

During Jean de Meun's cosmic sojourn to the realm of Nature and Genius, a startling admission on dreams is incorporated, one which offers a further interpretation of the *Rose* dream from the mouths of another key character. While it cannot be considered in a visual representation, it is necessary to discuss it as a dream subject that was rejected from the visual cycles, despite its appearance in a passage that often saw some illumination. It occurs during the speech of Nature as she toils away at her forge creating new members of the species in an attempt to overcome Death. In Nature's long speech (part rambling tirade, part confession to her priest, Genius) she covers a multitude of subjects ranging from the organisation of the cosmos to sexual deviations. At one point, she pauses over optical illusions and apparitions caused by devotions, and it is here that she first speaks of dreams:

Et ce n'est for truffe et mançonge,
ainsinc con de l'ome qui songe,
qui voit, ce cuide, en leur presances,
les espiuex sustances,
si con fist Scipion jadis ;
et voit anfer et paradys³⁴³

This first passage is notable for its treatment of a subject close to the heart of the first author, Guillaume. In it, Nature compares the apparitions seen by those who practice devout meditation and the visions seen by dreamers, both of whom believe the things they see are really before them. She uses, as her example, the case of Scipio, mentioned right at the start of the poem by Guillaume as a justification for the truth of dreams. The authorial divergence from the first author is, after the Croesus and Phanie exemplar, a second indication that Jean is not apparently as trustful of dreams as his predecessor, and sets up the rest of Nature's speech.

Ou voit Jalousie venant,
un petail a son col tenant,
qui prouvez ensamble les treuve
par Male Bouche, qui contreuve
les choses ainz que fetes saient,
don tuit amant par jour s'esmaient,
car cil qui fins amanz se claiment,
quant d'amors ardanmant s'antraiment,
don mout ont travauz et enuiz,
quant se sunt endormi de nuiz
en leur liz ou mout ont pansé
(car les proprietéz an sé),
si songent les choses amees
que tant on par jour reclamees ;
ou songent de leur adversaires
qui leur font annuiz et contraires.³⁴⁴

Here, Jean's Nature describes how dreamers may even see Jealousy coming to catch them with their sweetheart by the help of Slander, who makes things up before they happen and of whom lovers are always wary. She also says those who burn with desire go to bed, thinking of their lover, and therefore dream of them, or their enemies who trouble them.

Finally, Nature states that similarly those in prison may dream of being free, or of punishment by hanging, and summarises by saying that these things are not in fact true,

³⁴³ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.18,333-18,338.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, ll.18,359-18,374.

or external to the dreamer, but made up in their heads, and able to deceive the five senses.

Si recuident il por voir lores
que ces choses saient defores,
et font de tout ou deul ou feste,
et tout portent dedanz leur teste,
qui les .v. sans ainsinc deceit
par les fantosmes qu'el receit.³⁴⁵

These remarks on dreams are comparatively short in the context of Nature's huge speech, but represents another significant passage on the folly or danger of dreams, dwarfing the short promises made by Guillaume at the head of the poem. They differ from the passage on Croesus and Phanie as the association with optics and the short summary emphasise the otherworldly status of these phantoms or apparitions, whereas that exemplar used by Reason was on a dream that did come to fruition, albeit differently from its Dreamer's intention.

While buried among a mass of other information, this passage is soaked in irony within the context of the dream poem of the *Rose*. Firstly, these pronouncements on the false impressions of dreams are apparently given from within a dream, setting up a paradox wherein supposedly true information on the falsity of dreams is given *within* the inherently false medium of the dream. Furthermore, the section proclaims its intended relevance to the events of the poem that came before it, with direct references to both Jealousy and Slander, and the actions they committed in Guillaume's section - acting as an obstacle to the Dreamer's quest for the *Rose*. Furthermore, the remark on hanging also draws clear comparison with Jean's own exemplar of *Croesus and Phanie*. On a subtler level, they both detract from and support a suspiciously Macrobian scheme for dreams: the dismissive remarks on Scipio contradict that Classical author's faith in that vision, but the recollection of sweethearts dreaming of their lovers very closely relates to Macrobius' definition of the *insomnium*.³⁴⁶

In theoretical terms, Nature's section on dreams provokes a witty reconsideration of the dream plot by Jean's predecessor, but also throws the purpose of this dream into jeopardy. If dreams are only false illusions, then any reader invested in the poem thus far is wasting their time on an untrue apparition that was merely the result of a lover

³⁴⁵ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.18.389-18,394.

³⁴⁶ Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, 88-89.

meditating on his sweetheart before bedtime. It recalls a number of theoretical pronouncements on the dream as being the consequence of physical or mental situations, as well as the single source used by Guillaume to support his rendering of the dream in poetry. Most notably, it relates back to a position first adopted by Aristotle, wherein dreams were explicitly linked to apparitions, visions and hallucinations, and could not be trusted.³⁴⁷ This relationship was noted by scholars throughout the medieval period, including Augustine, who also included within his implied hierarchy dreams that related to hallucinatory visual disturbances.³⁴⁸ Finally, in addition to dispelling Guillaume's spurious claim that this dream relates to the higher fields of Macrobian dream theory, such as *somnium*, Jean also appears to implicate Macrobius' arguments on the merits of dreams as a suitable vessel for the transmission of narrative content, and John of Salisbury's rather damning comparison between dreams and artistic modes as dishonest. Regarding Macrobius, as stated in Chapter One, this author opened his *Commentarii* by justifying the dream as a means of presenting truths, related to the appropriate models of allegory or fiction, which were also capable of transmitting revelatory material.³⁴⁹ This provides a convenient link to Guillaume's stated aims, to inform and entertain his reader, featured at the head of the poem, but also contrasts with both author's avoidance of final pronouncements of meaning; an act that in fact comes full circle when one considers the difficulty of extracting meaning from dreams in the first place. With John of Salisbury, however, there is possibly a clearer link to Jean's ultimate aims for the discussion of dreams and how he ends the *Rose*. During John's discourse on dreams, he makes an interesting analogy between dreams and 'art', stating:

...as the work of artists who imitate nature is surpassed by the works of nature herself, so the significance of events, which is much more intricate than meaning conveyed by words, requires much shrewdness for the interpretation of dreams and the elucidation of riddles and signs.³⁵⁰

In this passage, John delivers a double blow to both dream interpretation and artistry, which are both deemed inferior to the things they aim to mimic – i.e. reality and nature. However, when one considers the self-aware status of Jean throughout the poem, such as his asides to the reader, or his promises for greater meaning that remain unfulfilled, it is possible Jean was playing up to the idea of both dreams and artistry being a

³⁴⁷ Aristotle, *On Dreams*, 87.

³⁴⁸ Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 209.

³⁴⁹ Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, 81-83.

³⁵⁰ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 81.

mediocre version of their respective predecessors, consciously averting the 'meaning' his predecessor implied was present. While the relationship between Jean and the works of John of Salisbury cannot be directly drawn, it is possible that the theoretician's ideas were accessible to Jean, in the same way Macrobius' comments on allegorical fiction appear to be reflected in Guillaume's prologue. As such, it is clear that Nature's digression into the dream sphere provokes a number of evaluations on the status of this dream, its later continuation by another author, and its poetic merit, and is a wholly problematic interjection in terms of the poem's chronology and linear plot.

Its complexity may partly explain the distinct lack of any attempt to visualise this section of the poem, despite its many references to subjects such as dreaming, love, imprisonment, and Scipio. However, in the context of understanding the representation of the dream in the *Rose*, this passage should not be overlooked. While it never received concrete visual form, it casts as much doubt on the prior images of dreams as it does the rest of the poem, and given its textual status, it was present in the majority of poems - even more common than the dreamer incipit. Considering the structures of manuscript production in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries, it is unlikely any artist read this passage with specific relevance to their depictions of dreams in the *Rose*, but it is possible that planners and indeed readers would have spotted some of its wry significance in the context of the extant copies. By providing a textual caveat that throws all of the dream into doubt, this passage is an antagonistic force against the representation of the dream in both text and image, playing with the expectations of the readership who have started the poem believing this was a 'true' dream - and once more relating to the historical mistrust of dreams discussed in the preceding chapters of this thesis.

Representations of dreams within the *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts clearly differed from their predecessors, not only in the compositional sense but also in terms of how much they reveal contemporary attitudes to dreams in a more nuanced manner. While prior dream depictions were overwhelmingly positive, the *Rose* dreamers introduced ambiguity and negativity into the portrayal of dreams, a position far more in line with their theoretical treatment over the prior centuries. The dreamer incipits broke new ground by replacing the typical authoritative image of the writer, a tradition established in antiquity. Additionally, they reversed the prototype for dreamer imagery

by rejecting the prior formula of dreamer, dream and consequence, necessitated by the fact that no clear 'meaning' can be derived from the poem, despite the authors' claims to the contrary. This revolutionary trend was embodied in the very first illuminated manuscripts of the *Rose*, and continued throughout the transmission of the poem even into the printed copies of the late fifteenth century.

Furthermore, the visual cycles enhanced the sense of ambiguity and danger – features almost entirely absent from the earlier field of dream illumination – through the depictions of the *Croesus and Phanie* narrative, a tale that underscores the potentially lethal consequences of misinterpreting one's dreams. This lies in stark contrast to the depictions of the *St Louis Psalter*, for example, wherein the dreams of Jacob or Joseph are correctly interpreted and acted upon in a manner that benefits their dreamers.

These equivocal or even hazardous dream depictions also coexisted with a text that emphasised the uncertainty of dreams, as shown by the extended discussion by Nature on the subject. Her position summarises the arguments of those opposed to dreams, and their interpretation by everyday people, and has the effect of contrasting with Guillaume's own stated position at the head of the poem. Although Nature's dream discussion was never apparently illuminated, it aligns with the undercurrent of suspicion attending dreams during the prior centuries.

As such, it is not only in a visual sense that the *Rose* illuminations dispensed with previous traditions for the representation of dreams, but also in their accompanying a text that indicated a far more balanced approach to the topic, by covering the negative attitudes of contemporary theoreticians and readers. By dispensing with the one-sided positivity of prior dream representations and replacing authority with ambiguity, the depictions of dreams within the *Rose* herald an innovative new era in the history of visual dreams, the ramifications of which can still be witnessed in depictions of this subject today.

Chapter Three: Representing Dreams in the *Roman de la Rose* and its Contemporaries in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

While the manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose* produced in the fifteenth century have certain levels of continuity with thirteenth and fourteenth century exemplars, a number of new visual traditions also forced alterations to the status quo. While the presence of a prominent incipit Dreamer continued, the visual characteristics of these images, and the rest of the images in the manuscripts, was significantly changed.

This chapter will consider some of the new variations in the subject matter of the dream and visual characteristics in fifteenth and sixteenth-century manuscripts, which at times was boosted by atmospheric visual cues, or downplayed by more literal conceptions of the poem's narrative. The appearance of several dream scenes of variable style in the Valencia 387 manuscript will be discussed at length, as this early fifteenth-century manuscript exhibits almost all the visual tropes – past and present – used for the depiction of dreams at the time. Secondly, the visualisation of the dream in a new, more surrealistic manner in a series of unrelated manuscripts during the fifteenth century will also be discussed, as these indicate the significant alteration in the visual conception of the dream at the time, signposting the direction in which dream imagery would move in later centuries. Throughout, the depictions of dreams will be compared to contemporaneous depictions of this subject, and others, to further contextualise the development of the dream motif in *Roses* of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

I: Continuity and Development of the Dream

As noted, visual representations of Dreamers continued to have an important position at the head of *Rose* texts, whether alone in one manuscript, or part of a multi-text codex. The transitional Bodleian e mus. 65 manuscript [Cat. 160] reveals the developing tradition for *grisaille* imagery in *Rose* illuminations, wherein the figures are depicted in shades of grey set off by coloured backgrounds (Figure 35).³⁵¹ This tradition would continue to develop into the fifteenth century, with manuscripts featuring an even more minimal approach to colouration, by illuminating the entire manuscript solely with sketch-like, linear illuminations, as with the early fifteenth-century BnF fr. 805

³⁵¹ Hunt, *A Summary Catalogue*, Vol. 2, Part 2, 728.

[Cat. 87] or the mid-century BnF fr. 798 [Cat. 96].³⁵² These visual elements are found in other, non-*Rose* manuscripts, and reveal not only that the artistic fashions migrated into *Rose* production, but also that artists would work on a variety of manuscripts within their workshops, applying similar visual styles to each according to the prevailing trends.

The incipit of the *Rose* on fol. 120v of BnF fr. 812 [Cat. 88], an early fifteenth-century manuscript, retains the reclining Dreamer motif, although this time the room appears to have been updated to incorporate changes to the visual presentation of space common to the time period (Figure 36). This depiction deepens the visual illusion of space through the inclusion of a perspectival canopy over the bed, a diagonal clothes pole, and an attempt at perspective in the angled curved chair depicted at the foot of the bed. This image is also notable in the way it brings in a rather playful indication of the *Roses*, also often featured in prior incipits, by including them on the bedclothes as a decorative motif. Such humorous additions, building upon the traditions of earlier manuscripts, are not uncommon in late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century copies of the *Rose*, although these are of course related to the systematic playfulness and originality present in earlier fourteenth-century copies.

Some incipit representations also provided alternative models for the structure of meaning in the *Rose*. Getty Ludwig XV 7 [Cat. 164], an early fifteenth-century manuscript, features two Dreamer images, compounding our awareness of this element and its importance to the text (Figure 37).³⁵³ Despite its irregularities - most notably in the fact that it appears halfway down the page, not at the head of the text - it represents an interesting departure from the norms of bipartite incipits of the period.³⁵⁴ On the

³⁵² For BnF fr. 798, Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 6-7; for BnF fr. 805, Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 12; Coilly and Tesnière, *Le Roman de la Rose*, 29; Notice on www.romandelarose.org, <http://romandelarose.org/#book;Francais805> (accessed 27 Aug 2016). BnF fr. 805 is also discussed in greater detail during the chapter on production methods of illuminated *Roses* (Chapter Four).

³⁵³ According to Timothy Stinson on www.romandelarose.org, <http://romandelarose.org/#book;LudwigXV7> (accessed 26 July 2016) this manuscript has been linked by Eberhard König and François Avril to artists working in the first decades of the fifteenth century, such as the Master of Marguerite d'Orleans, and those associated with the Bedford Trend. However, despite its evident relation to contemporary trends in manuscripts illumination, its bipartite incipit is wholly unique in the context of the *Rose* corpus, and is not found in any other manuscript.

³⁵⁴ Rarely, some manuscripts chose to depart from the tradition of including images at the head of the *Rose* text. One example is Berlin Gall. Qu. 80 [Cat. 107], where the first image (a historiated initial) occurs at the moment where Guillaume begins his dream narrative. A similar rationale may have been at play here - the images of Macrobius and the Dreamer lie just two

left, we have a depiction of 'roi Scypion', Guillaume's citation from the Late-Antique philosopher Macrobius.³⁵⁵ The scene relies on an understanding of the story of Scipio that is not fully explained in the *Rose*. Macrobius' tale was adapted from Cicero's *De re publica*, and describes how the statesman Scipio was granted knowledge of the divine realm through dream encounters with his deceased kinsmen.³⁵⁶

This is paired with a depiction of the *Rose* Dreamer, sleeping in bed in a landscape. While one would expect to find him also indoors, his bed is incongruously sited within the Garden of Delight, the geographical and temporal location of his dream. The Fountain of Narcissus is present in the background, while the trees are full of birds, alluding to Guillaume's later description of these creatures. The siting of the Dreamer within the Garden is unusual in *Rose* incipits; mostly the Dreamers remained in their bedchamber, with the exception of the irregular BnF fr. 1576, mentioned above.

The two images are visually alike, with the canopied style of the bed, grisaille rendering of the figures versus coloured backgrounds and the organisation of perspective appearing very similar. One major difference is that on the left with the crowned Scipio the artist has added a framing architectural element – something popular in other bipartite incipits of *Rose* manuscripts – as well as four figures in the clouds above him. These represent the authorities Scipio consults in his dream, who each offer him advice on matters such as good government and cosmology. It is interesting that these appear, as they are not referred to in the text; the planner has therefore combined Guillaume's rendering of the tale (i.e. that Scipio is a king) with knowledge of the actual events of the tale as Macrobius and Cicero recounted it.

This image clearly alludes to the idea of truth and untruth in the *Rose*. The depiction of Scipio, Guillaume's primary authoritative exemplar, appears parallel to the Dreamer, suggesting not only visual but actual comparison between the figures. However, the lack of advice-giving figures in the Dreamer scene, as well as the fact that Macrobius

lines above the description of the dream proper, as opposed to the preamble. The Scipio image thus appears just before the lines: 'Because many dream during the night / of many covered things / which then become clear.' However, it is also possible that the scribe simply forgot that an image was required at the head of the text, and rather than erase work already undertaken, simply inserted the gaps for the images after he had written several lines of text.

³⁵⁵ Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Lecoy, ll.7-10. As noted in Chapter One, Guillaume erroneously describes Scipio as a king, when in fact he was a general. This is reflected in the Getty manuscript, which portrays the sleeping figure with a crown, suggesting elements of the image were lifted directly from the *Rose* text, without recourse to the original source material.

³⁵⁶ Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*. Discussed in detail during Chapter One.

does offer a satisfactory explanation of Scipio's Dream, means we must question this pairing. While Guillaume and these images may allude to the similarities between these dreams, no unambiguous meaning is expounded in the *Rose*. The visual focus on Scipio also alludes to further problems: Macrobius' hierarchical division of dreams into distinct categories maintained a separate field of *insomnium*, which included dreams of 'lovers', and which were not to be trusted.³⁵⁷ The reference to this learned text then, clearly available to the artist or planner of the manuscript, as they have added visual embellishments not present in Guillaume's retelling, is double-edged, and may even have resulted in the recalling of Macrobius' negative comments on the false dreams of lovers by educated readers.

The bipartite image also however alludes to some of the problems of transcribing the narrative and dream space in visual form, and seems to promote a perspective on the poem that stems from its being understood from within the dream itself. It also coincides with an awareness of the poem's poetic element, as Guillaume's error regarding Scipio is repeated visually, but coincides with aspects that originate in Macrobius' tale. As such, this scene provides yet another example of the myriad of elements that coincided in *Rose* incipits, featuring the conflation of immediate and external source material, practical planning considerations, and expressive visual juxtaposition for meaningful effect.

Interestingly, the Dreamer representations did have ramifications in manuscripts other than the *Rose*; Guillaume de Deguilleville's *Pèlerinages*, for example, reveal the migration of a Dreamer incipit into other literature. As noted in Chapter One, Guillaume de Deguilleville was certainly enamoured with the *Rose* during his first version of the *Pèlerinage* (1330), which is also structured around the dream theme, and which is inspired by a reading of the *Rose*.³⁵⁸ Although Guillaume withdrew his open admiration for the poem in later versions of the *Pèlerinages*, the visual dream motif survived in illuminated manuscripts of the poem. As shown in BnF fr. 829, an early fifteenth-century copy, the illuminators appear to have taken cues not only from the author's indication that it was a dream, but also perhaps illustrated *Roses* (Figure 38). The *grisaille* dreaming figure is depicted alongside a lectern, perhaps a nod to the authoritative incipits and his own desire to be read, as well as a depiction of the heavenly city featuring prominently in his dream. Despite the fact that Guillaume

³⁵⁷ Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*, 89.

³⁵⁸ Outlined in Hill, *The Medieval Debate on Jean de Meung's Roman de la Rose*, 5-6.

attempted to remove the links to the *Rose* in this edition of the poem (the copy contains the second redaction of *Pèlerinage de vie humaine* of 1355, and the long version of the *Pèlerinage de l'âme* c.1355-58), this copy retains a strong visual link to copies of the *Rose* by the inclusion of a prominent Dreamer figure right at the head of the poem.³⁵⁹ This manuscript appears in the 1402-1413 inventory of Jean de Berry and Robinet d'Estampes' 1413-1416 inventory of Jean's collection. As Jean also owned numerous copies of the *Rose*, it is not unfeasible to suggest that Jean and those with access to his manuscripts would have been able to recognise the visual similarities between the illustration of this narrative, with a prominent Dreamer, and the incipits of *Roses*. To some extent, this would undermine the attempts of Guillaume to distance himself from the *Rose* – and also reveals the lack of control authors had over their texts in the centuries after their composition, a factor which would also affect fifteenth- and sixteenth-century *Roses*.

II: Dreams in the Valencia Manuscript

This manuscript is a particularly intriguing example of an illuminated *Rose*, and is worthwhile considering in this study not only for its wide range of dream depictions, but also its status as the most lavishly illuminated copy within the entire *Rose* corpus.³⁶⁰ Finally, its date – roughly contemporaneous with the public *Querelle de la Rose* – also means this may provide evidence of how the at-times vicious and in-depth debate on the *Rose's* character and merits was received by artists and planners of the time. Indeed, the range of subject material incorporated into the image cycle does suggest we are dealing here with an educated, erudite planner who may have had some knowledge of the contemporary debate on the *Rose*.

The Valencia manuscript is often noted as remarkable for the sheer amount of classical illustrative material within its pages.³⁶¹ The elaboration of alternative narratives, often in multiscenic depictions, is the main factor that contributes to its being the most illustrated *Rose* extant today, with 160 separate scenes. As the studies by Ost revealed, many of these scenes were elaborations of classical, historical and mythological

³⁵⁹ Information on the manuscript sourced from the BnF Gallica site, www.gallica.bnf.fr, last updated 2011 (accessed 20 July 2016).

³⁶⁰ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 180-81; Ost, "The Mythographical Images", 141-81; Ost, "Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose*", 405-35.

³⁶¹ Ost's two major studies focus on this classicising aspect in great detail.

references made by Jean, and reliant on a wide range of French and Latin sources.³⁶² It is evident that such elaborations would have to be made at the instigation of a keenly interested (and wealthy) party; Ost suggests that it was likely commissioned by Philip the Bold of Burgundy, and perhaps retained after his death in 1404 by Jean de Berry, his brother, due to a personal interest in the manuscript.³⁶³ Given the documented antiquarian interests of Jean, it is even possible he commissioned the manuscript, and his inventories attest to his having collected at least four copies of the *Rose*.³⁶⁴ While Jean de Berry's tastes for illuminated manuscripts may simply reflect his acquisitive nature - he was also an avid collector of various material and valuable objects - his interests may have drawn him to the Valencia manuscript on account of its containing so many images of historical, mythological and Biblical subjects.³⁶⁵

The Valencia *Rose* offers up a wide range of dream-related subjects for consideration, and presents these in a number of ways - multiscentic, innovative, traditional, and classically inspired. The following section will dissect these separate dream scenes, investigating why such a range of approaches to the dream were incorporated, and in what context we should consider the appearance of such scenes in this copy. After all, the lavish nature of this manuscripts marks it out as something of an anomaly in a market at this point still relatively dominated by closely linked manuscripts produced by a close-knit group of illuminators and scribes, such as the related copies Madrid Vitr. 23-11 and Rouen 1056, or BnF fr. 12595 and Arsenal 3339, featuring far less images per manuscript. Indeed, the presence of so many images may have simply reflected a desire to produce a *Rose* saturated with images; while several copies cross the threshold of 100 images, the next most illuminated copy surviving today is Reg. Lat. 1858 which has 139 scenes, and dates from the fourteenth century. Indeed, the multiscentic approach prevalent throughout this manuscript slightly conceals the true

³⁶² While Heidrun Ost in "Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose* in the Time of the Debate" and "The 'Mythographical Images' in the Roman de la Rose of Valencia" does not cover all the sources of imagery in this manuscript, his examples do make it clear that the sources for the image cycle are to be found outside the *Rose* in a variety of external sources.

³⁶³ Ost, "Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose* in the Time of the Debate", 406.

³⁶⁴ Jean-Bernard de Vaivre, "Notes d'héraldique et d'emblématique à propos de la tapisserie de l'Apocalypse d'Angers." in *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Vol. 127, no. 54 (1983) : 102-3, 113. The *Nine Heroes Tapestries*, identified as belonging to Jean de Berry due to the repeated presence of his coat of arms, also demonstrate the interest Jean had in collecting imagery of classical and historical personages in different media, and his willingness to lay out significant sums of money to procure them.

³⁶⁵ Michael Camille's essay "For Our Devotion and Pleasure: The Sexual Objects of Jean, Duc de Berry", *Art History*, Vol. 24 (2001): 169-94 goes into some detail regarding the acquisitive nature of Jean de Berry.

density of this copy's imagery. Events that typically occupy two or three separate vignettes are often crammed into one, such as the *Crimes of Nero* depiction on fol. 45v, and yet still this *Rose* outstrips all other copies in terms of image numbers. As each image would have to be allotted its own space and design - the several large-scale, double-column-width images requiring even larger spaces than are usually found in the body of the text - this density of imagery was clearly planned from the outset, and must have played a major part in the design process. Nevertheless, the variable representations of dreams do have ramifications for how the reader-viewers would have encountered and understood the narrative of the *Rose*.

A: The Multiscenic Incipit

Valencia 387 features a multiscenic depiction of the first instances of the poem. This appears to be a development from the bipartite and quadripartite scenes of the fourteenth century, wherein separate scenes were depicted in a form of staged layout akin to a modern-day comic strip. Indeed, manuscripts produced by the same artisanal group, such as the Lyon-Brussels family discussed in the prior chapter, show the development from more simplistic incipits to multiscenic opening scenes. However, in the Valencia scene (Figure 39), the action is condensed into a couple of demarcated spaces, with multiple depictions of the Dreamer; he is shown in bed, pulling on clothes, washing, sewing up his sleeves, and reaching the stream he encounters just prior to the garden wall. One must be careful when discussing the Valencia manuscript, as indeed, there appear to have been alterations made to the images on the first few folios later in the fifteenth century, given the presence of gold highlighting or additional elaboration that does not appear after fol. 13v. However, these appear to have been applied over the top of these scenes, hence not negating the implications or significance of the compositional aspects of this incipit.³⁶⁶

While the architectural framework creates an impression of distinct spaces, the addition of multiple figures destroys this sensation, as the sleeping, rising and walking Dreamers occupy the same fluid landscape, moving effortlessly between inside and out. This manuscript also employed multiscenic elements in other miniatures, as with the histories of Narcissus and Nero, which allowed the designers to force many extra

³⁶⁶ See the Appendix Catalogue for discussion of the alterations made to this manuscript in the later fifteenth century.

scenes into the allotted spaces within the manuscript, with the result that it is the most densely illustrated *Rose* that survives today.

The multiscenic incipit was adapted in other manuscripts of the period, and in other depictions of 'dreams', including copies of the aforementioned *Pèlerinages* by Guillaume de Deguilleville. The incipit for BnF fr. 376, an early fifteenth-century copy of the text, again undermines Guillaume's own efforts to distance himself from the *Rose* by incorporating a prominent Dreamer figure in the incipit, akin to the multiscenic opening miniatures for *Roses* of the period, as well as a rubric that references the *Rose* by name (Figure 40). In this miniature, the action flows clearly from the left to the right, with the central pulpit serving as a compositional link between the carpeted area underneath Guillaume's bed and the grassy area where the nobles are congregated on the right.

According to Fleming, Kuhn saw the multiscenic *Rose* incipits as the most successful type, emphasising the movement and action of the poem.³⁶⁷ However, the organisation of space conflicts with the text's linear chronology, at least in Guillaume's section. These *Rose* scenes, much like quadripartite or even bipartite incipits, jump ahead of the text, as Guillaume will not have reached the stream within the text until the following folio. In the Valencia copy, the visual disjunction is not overly pronounced, as the next scene is chronologically correct (featuring Guillaume at the garden wall on fol. 2r), although it has still jumped beyond the textual narrative. Additionally, while the multiscenic aspect is a useful device for representing multiple stages in a narrative sequence within one semi-logical space, it is visually surreal, as such events occur sequentially, not simultaneously with multiple dreamers, as the image suggests.

This multiscenic image and others like it therefore follow their own visual timeline, rather than being tied to the text. What this suggests is that the desire to show several scenes at once overrode the desire for a clear visual 'sequence' of images, and implies that these incipits are somehow 'outside' the temporality of the rest of the visual cycle. This may be a reflection of the unrealistic idea of time presented in the *Rose* poem, which switches between authorial interjections, dream action, and static conversational periods. These images may then be seen as reflecting the curious dream-reality of the poem – something strengthened by the near-continuous inclusion of the Dreamer in

³⁶⁷ Fleming, *The Roman de la Rose*, 40-41.

multiscenic incipits.³⁶⁸ However, unlike other manuscripts featuring multiscenic opening scenes, wherein the following images return to single-scene depictions from the rest of the narrative, the Valencia manuscript reuses the multiscenic motif consistently throughout the illustrated cycle, for both dream and non-dream scenes.³⁶⁹

B: The *Dream of Socrates*

The next dream subject represented in the Valencia manuscript is the *Dream of Socrates*, which relates to the future success of Plato (Figure 41). This is extrapolated from a rather obscure conflation of ideal love and the so-called ‘swan of Socrates’, which was able to soar in the heavens.³⁷⁰ While the Dreamer’s reference is swiftly forgotten as Reason moves on to a description of an attainable love – friendship – the instance has been singled out and expanded upon in the Valencia manuscript. The ‘swan of Socrates’ refers to a legendary dream Socrates had the day before meeting Plato.³⁷¹ In this dream, Socrates saw a cygnet on his knees, which then flew off singing beautifully; the following day, Socrates met Plato and recognised him as the swan from his dream. The implication in the tale is that Socrates helped nurture Plato’s talent and allow him to soar –the *Rose* passage also briefly suggests the success Plato had on his own, as the swan flies above the clouds.

The visual presence of this subject is not entirely straightforward. It does not illustrate a plot point, just a narrative allusion made by one of the characters, and even then the ‘moral’ point it makes is not a positive one. The Dreamer uses the Socrates episode as a

³⁶⁸ Emmanuèle Baumgartner’s “The Play of Temporalities: or, The Reported Dream of Guillaume de Lorris” in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose*, eds. Brownlee and Huot, 22, considered Guillaume’s positioning of the narrative within a dream as an act which denies it temporality, as the event does not exist in historical time, but only in the mind of the dreamer. Such visual simultaneity accords with this idea of a non-existent temporality, as the events shown deny sequential reality and instead suggest a static moment where everything happens at the same time.

³⁶⁹ BnF fr. 12595, for example, features no additional multiscenic images despite a prominent multiscenic incipit.

³⁷⁰ The Dreamer brings in this reference during a passage on Cicero’s search for ideal love, starting at line 5,375. He states that even the wise Cicero was unable to find perfect love on earth, and suggests that the only way one might find it would be to fly in the heavens or go beyond the clouds, as the swan of Socrates did.

³⁷¹ This mythical dream is recounted in the works of Apuleius, Diogenes Laërtius and John of Salisbury, among others. The account of the dream here refers to Laërtius’ version, trans. Robert Hicks, in *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, (London: W. Heinemann, Loeb Classical Library, 1925), Book III, 4; Jean de Meun does not specify his exact source.

reason *not* to seek perfect love on earth, as one will be unable to attain it.³⁷² As such, he emphasises the heights Plato was able to achieve – but also that these are largely unavailable to people such as the Dreamer. Yet the illustration of this textual point has been achieved by reference to a wider pool of resources than the text itself, focusing on the largely apocryphal legend of Socrates’ dream of the swanlike Plato.

Interestingly, this scene comes closer to representing a traditional dream illustration than any other scenes in the Valencia manuscript, or indeed the entire *Rose* corpus. Socrates is shown reclining in a typical fifteenth-century version of the Dreamer position, comfortably swaddled in bed leaning slightly to one side. On his body, the swan Plato is shown emerging from a cracked egg, craning its neck upwards, while above a fully-grown swan flies in the air, hovering over Socrates’ bed. If the egg represents Plato before his meeting with Socrates, the adult swan represents the achievements he may accomplish after it. Heidrun Ost, in a study of the Valencia manuscript, suggests that this rendition of a dream that came true is analogous to the central dream of the *Rose*, and yet Ost does not account for the fact that no other such unambiguous, true dreams appear in the narrative – nor indeed that many accompanying dream scenes are of a negative or unclear nature.³⁷³ This latter point is indeed important to investigation of the *Socrates Dreaming* episode, as it marks it out as distinct from the other representations of dreams in the Valencia copy, not just in terms of visualisation but interpretation and meaning.

The trend for continuing the typical mode of dream representation (i.e. dreamer, dream and consequence) was certainly retained in non-*Rose* manuscripts. Depictions of biblical dreams certainly retained their typical composition, though combined these with indications of the multiscentic trends on occasion. A miniature of *Jacob’s Dream* in BnF fr. 2810 (Figure 42), a copy of Jean de Mandeville’s *Voyages* (the *Livre des Merveilles*) follows the usual formula, with the reclining Jacob, the vision of the angels and ladder from his dream, as well as the consequence, the shrine he places on the holy site the following day. This image collapses time in a manner familiar to the multiscentic

³⁷² Ost in “Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose*”, 416, describes this as indicative of the Dreamer’s scepticism concerning Reason, and that Socrates’ swan is “a metaphor of the arrogance of Reason’s vision of an ideal and spiritual love.”

³⁷³ Ost, “Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose* in the Time of the Debate”. Unfortunately, Ost’s dissection of the Socrates image also fails to take account of the wide traditions for Dream representation prior to this manuscript’s completion – elements that must be considered in relation to this image.

Socrates image, where present and future collide in one miniature, providing a visual summary of the major events surrounding the particular dream.

The Socrates image is also remarkable for its presentation of a narrative not contained within the text; the details of the swan and Socrates' dream are only found in external passages, not the *Rose* rendering of it. Nevertheless, like the majority of scenes in the Valencia manuscript, the action appears to take place within the Garden central to the *Rose*, exemplified by the small wall that stands in the background. In some respects, this recalls some of the compositional devices appearing in the *St Louis Psalter*, which incorporated walls or other background elements to indicate that events were occurring in a similar space. The Valencia manuscript's amalgamation of external dream narrative and the internal *Rose* dream setting however additionally complicates the interpretations this element offers, explanation of which may only be found when considering the rest of the cycle.

C: *Croesus and Phanie*

A third dream scene present in the Valencia *Rose* depicts that of Croesus and Phanie, the allusive exemplar described by Jean in his section of the poem (Figure 43). This returns to the multiscenic format of the Valencia incipit, featuring the commencement, middle and ending of the fateful narrative in one scene. In fact, the prelude to Croesus, not covered in depth by Jean, wherein he is saved from a flaming pyre by a shower of rain, is also depicted in the prior scene, offering a visual justification for Croesus' rosy interpretation of his dream. Interestingly, it was this alternative scene, wherein Croesus is 'saved' that became more popular in the later fifteenth century depictions of this moment in Jean's narrative. Indeed, several manuscripts began to omit references to Croesus' dream from the 1450s onwards, rejecting the negative and allusive ideas incorporated in preceding depictions of the narrative.

Croesus sleeping is also distinguished clearly from the incipit Dreamer and the preceding Socrates, as he is clearly crowned in all his incarnations in the single scene. Additionally, there is differentiation in terms of the bed style, as well as the scene-specific elements. Somewhat an exception to the earlier rules of *Croesus and Phanie* depictions, both Croesus' false interpretation of the dream and its true outcome are shown side by side, whereas earlier visualisations tended to focus in on one or other. Phanie also appears, pleading at the foot of her father's bed. This cramped composition therefore covers the key aspects of Jean's retelling of the event, including the prefatory

incidence of the flaming pyre extinguished by rain in a previous image. This is therefore one of the most in-depth examples of a Croesus and Phanie depiction, underscoring the importance of the dream element through a prominent dreamer, but also intertwining the dream, dreamer and consequence aspect of earlier visual traditions into the overall composition. Unlike the Socrates depiction, it does not expand upon Jean's narrative, though it does offer an extended treatment of it not found in other manuscripts or depictions of *Croesus and Phanie*.

D: The Waking Dreamer

The final depiction of a Dreamer accompanying the *Rose* in the Valencia manuscript is one that is wholly irregular within the overall *Rose* corpus. On fol. 148v of the Valencia manuscript, below an explicit that echoes the rubrication provided at the head of some *Roses*, the Dreamer is shown being roused from his sleep by the morning light coming in through his window (Figure 44). This is a literal rendering of the poem's last line, though with more direct relevance to Jean's specification that it was morning when he awoke. Contrasted with its corresponding image at the head of the manuscript, the *Dreamer Sleeping* on fol. 2r, it is a far less elaborate scene, with none of the multiscentic aspects characteristic of this manuscript's imagery. There is also no continuity with the Dreamer's bedroom on fol. 2r, with different architectural features and angles of perspective. Even when one removes the elements added in the later fifteenth century to the incipit, such as the costume and background details, there is a distinct difference between the compositions of these scenes.

This points to the low priority of visual continuities in this manuscript, and likely the practicalities of *Rose* production when work was done by multiple artists; even though an image of the *Dreamer Waking* was planned for the copy, it seems it was not necessary for this to occur in the same room as the *Dreamer Sleeping*, and may reflect the distinct artistic approach of two different illuminators. Such a state of discontinuity of setting is not uncommon in manuscripts of this period and earlier, as shown in the flexibility of characterisations, costume colour and details between images in earlier *Roses* and other contemporaneous illuminations. However, even the question of how well this image was planned is problematic. While it partakes of the visual style of the rest of the images, it in fact sits half outside the text block, as if it were added as an afterthought by a planner who desired its inclusion. It contrasts with the tightly organised layout of the majority of images in the manuscript which reside in the central

framework, with only the occasional ivy leaf decoration straying this low into the margins. This seems to me to suggest that this was not part of the original planning sequence, and was instead inserted by someone, perhaps the artist, to bring closure to the visual exemplification of the poem.

For a tradition shaped by the immense reconfiguration of dream imagery to suit the *Rose* in the incipits of the manuscripts, a striking fact appears when collating the imagery of the extant copies. In the 190 manuscripts accessed for this study, only three contain a representation of the Dreamer waking. The vast majority of earlier dream images, as discussed in Chapter One, utilised the typical formula of dreamer, dream, and dream consequence – the final aspect of which typically implies the waking of the Dreamer, and an aspect often included in the imagery. The omission of an awakening Dreamer from such a large majority of *Roses*, especially in contrast to the popularity of the incipit Dreamers, is an intriguing element, and must therefore form a part of any consideration of the visual presentation of the dream in the *Rose* manuscripts.

Jean's final lines are a striking conclusion to a poem that throughout promised an explanation, and which was presumably expected to occur in the closing lines after the dreamer woke. His blunt conclusion had a clear effect on many scribes and copyists, as the large number of manuscripts with interpolations and extracts attest to. As noted in Chapter One, Gray's Inn 10 [Cat. 143], features an extra 24-line conclusion expounding the truth of dreams after Jean's 'atant fu jourz et je mesveille', an addition which was inserted into multiple copies of different eras. That such additions were deemed necessary by the scribes of later years is significant, suggesting that not all were as keen as Jean to leave the ultimate meaning up to the reader to decide. However, despite these *explicit*s, summaries, and the historical tradition of imaging dream consequences as a means of supporting their accuracy, depictions of the dream's end are surprisingly scarce.³⁷⁴

Depictions of the *Dreamer Waking* appear in Tournai MS 101, a fourteenth-century copy of Gui de Mori's *Recension* of the *Rose*, Valencia 387, and Morgan M.948, produced for King François I in the early sixteenth century. Of these, both the Tournai and Valencia copies somewhat place the scene out of the typical page construction – Tournai's *Dreamer Waking* occurs in a *bas-de-page* scene (Figure 45). Below the final

³⁷⁴ As outlined in Chapter Two, however, it is possible that the authorial depictions did perform the role of a 'concluding' image in *Roses*, given that the writing of the narrative is the only concrete outcome of the poem the authors offer us.

textual section when the Dreamer takes the Rose and thanks his supporters for their assistance, two figures are shown embracing on the lower left, potentially a re-rendering of the above miniature's depiction of the Dreamer entering the enclosure and taking the Rose. This redrawing of the climactic scene as a human interaction and not a figurative one is intriguing in itself, as the majority of manuscripts depicting this scene retained Jean's abstract pretence in the final scenes, as in the early Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 finale, which shows the Dreamer plucking Roses. On the right, partitioned off by a small archway, the Dreamer is shown sitting up in bed, posed as if listening to a man playing an instrument and perched on the ivy leaf stem that stretches out from underneath the Dreamer's mattress.

Several aspects of this *bas-de-page* are interesting. First, the representation of the Dreamer waking is not present in a typical *Rose*, but an edition that focused on moralising the text, and featured extensive additions by Gui de Mori to this end. As noted in the earlier discussion of the Tournai copy, this revised text had an effect on the image cycle, too, as with the inserted image of *Pride* on the garden wall in one of the earliest scenes, as well as other iconographical deviations from the norms established in the late thirteenth century. Furthermore, the image only appears in the marginalia, not as a framed miniature in a space allotted by the scribe. While the relation of marginalia to miniature is a fraught one, the fact that no space within the body of the text block was left for this image suggests that this representation was planned in an alternative way to the others, and that it may also have been received differently by readers.³⁷⁵

Reading these images in the context of the Tournai *Rose*, it is evident that the *bas-de-page* illustrations function in two major ways. First, they add to the external circumstances of the poem, as on fol. 5r with the representation of the God of Love with two figures, one accompanied by a coat of arms, suggesting that this was a portrait of the patron or intended recipient of the manuscript. Secondly, the scenes support the

³⁷⁵ The arguments of authors such as Michael Camille on general marginalia in *Image on the Edge: The Margins of Medieval Art* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd., 1992), and, regarding *Rose* marginalia, both the Rouses in *Illiterati et Uxorati* and Sylvia Huot in *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers* deviate in terms of what they view the ultimate response to such images to be. Though marginal imagery appears in only a handful of *Rose* manuscripts (the most notable being BnF fr. 12592, BnF fr. 25526, and the Tournai *Rose*), each takes a different approach to subject matter and representation. In this respect, it is necessary to treat each in their own context, not just in contrast to the marginalia of other *Roses*, particularly as the group featuring marginal imagery is so small.

miniature cycle by providing extra scenes for representation, which on occasion were of more dubious moral standing. One such scene is the *Murder of Slander*, shown at the bottom of fol. 111r, accompanied by a visual joke on the part of the artist. After the murder, Fraud and Constrained Abstinence pitch Slander's body into the 'ditch', in this case the empty space beneath the border decoration. A similar example of this is the copious nudes on fol. 156v, which appear to conflate the Pygmalion and Zeuxis myths discussed in the *Rose*. The margins may then have been the preferred position for violent or sexual content. However, more innocuous scenes appear alongside these, such as conversing figures, suggesting the marginalia was not solely a place for 'undesirable' subjects.

Overall, the margins of the Tournai *Rose* are filled largely with plot-moments left out of the major sequence, less so as a means of slyly incorporating unsavoury subjects or even apparently supporting Gui de Mori's moralisation. It is therefore in this context – as expanding visualisations of the plot – that the marginalia of the Tournai *Rose* is here understood. In this sense, the scene of the *Dreamer Waking* fits into the scheme of providing extra images of scenes not accounted for in the set rectangular miniatures.

There are also strong implications in the composition of the *Dreamer Waking* image, with the suggestion that the Dreamer has been woken by an external sound – suggested by the fact that the waking figure looks at a man playing an instrument. This is not implied during the poem or by Jean's final lines; the only prominent 'noises' described being Guillaume's description of birdsong in the garden. External waking stimuli did appear in other fourteenth century dream poems, but nothing in the *Rose* appears to have inspired this depiction.³⁷⁶ Lastly, Tournai 101 is highly unusual as its manuscript places less emphasis on the dream or sleep aspect, by relegating the Dreamer to folio 6r, after a Virgin and Child miniature (reflecting Gui de Mori's alterations to the poem, as well as images of the Garden of Delight, the God of Love and an author. A Dreamer does not then open this poem, a very atypical move for a manuscript produced in the early fourteenth century.

³⁷⁶ An example of external stimuli waking a Dreamer appears in Guillaume de Machaut's *Dit dou Vergier*, where the Dreamer is wakened by dew dripping on him from the tree above him. See A.C. Spearing, *Medieval Dream-Poetry*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 42. Such tropes may have stemmed from the theoretical link between waking life and dreams made by authors such as Aristotle and his medieval proponents, wherein physical experiences (i.e. overeating, illness) could affect the nature of one's dreams.

The presence of the *Dreamer Waking* scene is then a little puzzling, as although it incorporates an element of a prior tradition, in showing the dream's conclusion, it is not balanced by a similarly prominent Dreamer scene at the head of the poem.

Furthermore, by suggesting an external stimuli woke our Dreamer, it augments the circumstances of the end of the poem described in the text. This may partly explain its presence in the marginalia, as an additional subject designed to represent the final line of Jean's poem, though its deviation from the run of events is confusing.

Nonetheless, this episode's placement in a version of Gui de Mori's *Recension* may offer assistance regarding the purpose of this scene. Gui was an author who expanded the *Rose*, substantially fleshing out some of the more common ambiguities of Jean's meaning, and adding additional characters and explanation to the text.³⁷⁷

Furthermore, Valencia like its predecessor also makes reference to a potential external cause for the rousing of the principal figure. Additionally, however, neither example refers to the events after the tale that proved its truth to the first author, Guillaume, and consequently ends the visual narrative as abruptly as Jean does textually. Despite its apparent fulfilment of earlier dream image conventions, by alluding to the actions of the Dreamer after the dream ends (a factor commonly ignored in *Rose* visual cycles), these scenes also sidestep the traditional representation of dream consequence, or meaning. Indeed, it is arguable that the authorial portraits at the head of the poem actually do a better job of depicting the 'outcome' of the poem than an image of the waking Dreamer.

The images both in miniatures and marginalia therefore have a relationship both to the original text of Guillaume and Jean and its reinterpretation by Gui, and in some instances the image cycle was indeed altered to fit the new reading (i.e. the insertion of *Pride* in the first *Rose* miniature).

The inclusion of the *Dreamer Waking* then functions within the context of Gui de Mori's interpretation of the poem, perhaps in reference to the new light Gui casts on the poem in the form of his *Remainement*. It is notable however that this Dreamer Waking scene

³⁷⁷ Andrea Valentini's "Le Remainement de Gui de Mori et sa tradition manuscrite", in *De la Rose*, eds. Bel and Braet, and *Le remainement du Roman de la Rose par Gui de Mori: Étude et édition des interpolations d'après le manuscrit Tournai, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 101* (Brussels: Academie Royale de Belgique, 2007) offers an in-depth reading of the types of editing Gui performed on the text, summarised largely as the suppression of some classical sources, eliminating more salacious sources, and removing some larger digressions.

was *not* added to other versions of Gui's *Rose*, many of which only featured a shortened version of the moralisations.³⁷⁸ Consequently, it appears that any interpretive association between the inclusion of a *Dreamer Waking* and the presence of Gui's interpolations was limited to this manuscript, and may have depended on its rather unique use of marginalia as an extension of the visual imagery.

The Tournai manuscript therefore represents the only potential predecessor for the Valencia manuscript's *Waking Dreamer*, although it is dubious whether it acted as a direct model, given the textual variations and its production almost one hundred years earlier. Nevertheless, while it is less divergent than the Tournai *Waking Dreamer*, who responds to sound, it again divulges nothing of the events after the tale that seemingly proved its truth to Guillaume, and consequently ends the visual narrative as abruptly as Jean does textually.

Another hundred years after the Valencia manuscript was produced, the third image of the *Dreamer Waking* appeared in a new and important manuscript, treating the subject far more dramatically than either of its predecessors (Figure 46). In Morgan M.948, the famed copy produced for King François I [Cat. 185], the Dreamer – having just plucked the Rose with the aid of Love, depicted on the opposite folio – has risen from his bed and rushed to the window, suggested by the dishevelled state of his bedding.³⁷⁹ He peers out of the shutters at the landscape before him, looking to the left as if staring back into the final moments of his dream.

This is an entirely fictional rendering of the Dreamer's movements on waking, lies in stark contrast to the textual ending, and is the first and sole example to suggest the actions taken by the Dreamer after he rises. As discussed above, the only other possible representation of post-dream actions is in the variable tradition of author portraits, and these are in the vast majority of cases divorced from any reference to the bedroom of the Poet-Dreamer. The representation of the Dreamer hurrying from his bed to the window is further complicated when one compares it with the incipit scenes at the head of this manuscript, discussed in more detail at the end of this chapter. The opening miniatures are notable in the extent to which they deviate from the traditional forms of incipits, including a presentation scene, the poet appearing sequentially before

³⁷⁸ See Valentini, "Le Remainement de Gui de Mori".

³⁷⁹ Braet, "Der Roman der Rose: Raum im Blick" in *Träume im Mittelalter: Ikonologische Studien*, eds. Agostino Paravicini Bagliani and Giorgio Stabile (Stuttgart: Belsar, 1989), 191; McMunn, "Notes on Representations of the Erotic", 129.

the dream depiction, and no representation of a sleeping dreamer. The presence of this *Waking Dreamer* then in a manuscript dating from a late stage in the chronology of *Rose* production, and in a copy meriting additional interest due to its royal connection, may provide some insight into the later medieval attitudes to the *Rose* poem prior to its fall from popularity in the mid sixteenth century.

Ultimately, the *Dreamer Waking* scene's in Morgan M.948 seems to serve a similar function to the other two examples in Valencia and Tournai, functioning as an illustration of the final lines of the poem, but not offering much in the way of interpretive meaning. It also seems to have been dictated by its specific context, guided by two primary factors: that the text comes from the printed edition by Michel Le Noir of 1519, and it was produced for the King of France. The first factor does not appear to have affected the representation of the *Dreamer Waking*, as the scene does not occur in the printed edition the text is taken from.³⁸⁰ Indeed, ignorance of or even removal of the imagery present in printed editions used as the basis for text in other handwritten *Roses* appears to have been fairly common, as with the British Library's Harley 4425 [Cat. 155]. That manuscript used the text of a Lyon edition from c.1487 as its basis, but also omitted the typical representations present in those printed copies.³⁸¹

However, the patron likely did have a major role in determining the images of François I's manuscript. As will be discussed in Section IV within this chapter, large images appeared on each page of this lavish commission, revealing the considerable resources available to the artists, while several scenes at the beginning relate to the conditions of its royal patronage, including a presentation scene and a large coat of arms. Furthermore, the imagery relates far more to the classicising style of sixteenth-century painting than any other *Rose* manuscript, suggesting contemporary tastes and ideas played a dominant role in dictating the style of the images in this copy, as well as the copious amount of illuminations. Yet while those aspects affected the external representation of the subject material, it has not altered the abruptness of the waking scene, nor attempted to incorporate interpretation into the *Dreamer Waking*, much like its predecessors.

³⁸⁰ Interestingly, Michel Le Noir's 1515 edition of Molinet's *Roman de la Rose Moralisé* incorporated an image of the poet at his writing-desk as the first scene. This factor may have influenced the decision to place a poet before the Dreamer in the edition for François I.

³⁸¹ Thomas Kren and Scot McKendrick identified this edition as the likely source in *Illuminating the Renaissance: The Triumph of Flemish Manuscript Painting in Europe* (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2003).

The three manuscripts including depictions of the *Dreamer Waking* reveal both continuity and divergences in the representation of this atypical subject across the whole breadth of medieval *Rose* manuscript production. Despite the different circumstances of each – one in the marginalia of Gui de Mori’s moralised *Rose*, another in a classicising fifteenth-century manuscript, and the last a fictional rendering in a lavish royal commission – all three present a similar representation of the waking moment, one that denies additional interpretation and merely shows the ‘literal’ end of the dream. While these loop back to incipit or near-opening scenes of the *Dreamer Asleep*, they are not necessarily presented in coherent single spaces, nor do they always reflect a manuscript-wide interest in the visual exploration of the dream subject. Nevertheless, their presence, even in such small quantities, in important manuscripts does shed further light on the representation of the dream theme in the *Rose* corpus. Due to their having been produced in such different contexts and times, the revival of this subject in each copy discussed is of interest for revealing ways in which particular themes could be revisited in completely divergent circumstances. Although this insistence on the end point of the poem would not have been visually accessible to every *Rose* owner, they stand as another reiteration of the flexibility of *Rose* representation and interpretation across the whole period of manuscript production.

Despite their apparent fulfilment of earlier dream image conventions, by alluding to the actions of the Dreamer after the dream ends (a factor commonly ignored in *Rose* manuscripts), these scenes also sidestep the traditional representation of dream consequence, or meaning. In some instances, these even perform a less efficient role at depicting the ‘outcome’ than the author portraits present in some copies, as from the evidence of the manuscripts and authors, our only provable conclusion is that this poem was the sole outcome of the dream of Guillaume. While that adds further complexity given the presence of two authors, and the fact that Jean sets his section of the dream before his own birth but after the dream of Guillaume, the author scenes placed variably at the head, middle or end of visual cycles offer the only real ‘consequence’ scenes in the *Rose* dream image convention.

These scenes in the Valencia copy reveal a wide variety of dream subjects – and visual approaches to the dream – present in one lavish fifteenth-century copy of the *Rose*. Whoever the patron was, it is clear that the planners had a strict plan for this

manuscript, as well as access to additional materials with which to flesh out the design plan. The aforementioned dream images must therefore also be considered in the context of the overall intention, to either produce a manuscript saturated with images, or one that expands on most classical and historical references made in the text. As shown with the *Socrates* episode, the planners were not shy of referencing external sources to provide subject matter for the extended sequence of images, or extending visual scenes through multiscenic, saturated scenes. Aside from the *Socrates* scene, the copy features at least 15 other interpolated scenes not present in other *Rose* manuscripts, as well as multiple versions of subjects only represented once or twice in other copies.

In terms of motivation, this manuscript was produced at a rather fortuitous period in the history of *Rose* reception and readership. As noted in Chapter One, the fifteenth century saw an outpouring of discussion on the *Roman de la Rose*, with series of notable supporters and detractors engaging in a public debate on its perceived morality. Although this largely took the form of a textual discourse, it is not unfeasible that the increased attention on the narrative of the *Rose* might have been paralleled by renewed attempts to *visually* explore the various facets of the poem.³⁸² Additionally, the very nature of these debates may have influenced the planner(s) intention to offer prominence to the dream aspect. As discussed in Chapter One, Jean Gerson's diatribe against the *Rose* actually took the form of a dream narrative, a framework that reversed the *Rose's* own structure in order to use it against the poem.³⁸³ Given the visual cycle's references to both internal and external elements of historical and *Rose* literature, it is likely the original planner of the visual scheme was aware of some of the contemporaneous debates on its merits.

The patrons and planners therefore evidently desired a classicised, elaborate version of the narrative, one that expanded on the *Rose* by referencing external sources in the visual imagery. However, arguably the atypical scope of this commission makes the representations of the dream moments in this copy worthier of consideration. As the other examples of dream imagery in the Valencia manuscript reveal, a number of

³⁸² McMunn's "Was Christine Poisoned by an Illustrated Rose?" considered whether or not Christine's position may have been soured by the at-times risqué imagery in illuminated *Roses*, though she finds no conclusive evidence that this would have been the case. This suggests that the *Querelle* was largely due to disagreements over the textual, not visual nature of contemporary *Roses*.

³⁸³ Gerson, "Traite contre le Roman de la Rose".

attitudes to dreams were incorporated into this single copy. Yet the scale of this manuscript's imagery also reflects another aspect of the poem - the wide-ranging subject matter covered by Guillaume and Jean, something that would have been hard to incorporate were the narrative not entirely set in the enveloping, ambiguous realm of dreams.

III: Erroneous Perspective

There is one other visual trope that also amplifies the dreamlike status of the poem: imagery that is warped or 'erroneous' in perspectival terms. Working in a similar manner to the multiscenic depictions which play with time and place, collapsing chronological moments into single snapshots, alterations of physical space also break down the largely naturalistic illusions of many *Rose* cycles. While fourteenth-century copies naturally reflect contemporary means of visual expression and may seem visually 'incorrect' to the modern viewer, the fifteenth-century witnessed new trends for understanding illusionistic visual space - and consequently offered up new opportunities to subvert it.³⁸⁴ Studies of fifteenth-century visual trends do mention possible reasons for the increase of naturalism, such as the influence of Italian artists (Avril), or the effects of panel painters moving into manuscript illumination (Sterling). Interestingly, this trend had the added effect of moving the representations of the *Rose* away from what modern audiences might consider an abstract, 'dreamlike' appearance, towards one that overlaps more so with representations of waking life. However, as noted in Chapter Two, distinguishing between these two spheres was not the concern of fourteenth-century artists or their predecessors. It is possible, however, that the approximation of perspectival illusionism in representations of the *Rose* provided some impetus for artists, such as those discussed in this section, to subvert the new norms of naturalistic representation in favour of something 'dreamlike'. Whereas in the fourteenth century the Dreamer may have been shown squeezing through the garden gate due to spatial restrictions and representational traditions in visual art, fifteenth-century imagery occasionally exploited the newly naturalistic visualisation of space in a manner that recalls the landscape of dreams.

A prime example of the subversion of fresh modes of perspectival illusionism appears in Egerton 1069 [Cat. 151], which features an elaborate multiscenic incipit that

³⁸⁴ Avril, *Manuscript Painting at the Court of France*, 10; Sterling, *La Peinture Médiévale à Paris, 1300-1500*, 238.

contrasts with the various images present in the following folios (Figure 47).³⁸⁵ The incipit displays the skills of the artist at rendering illusionistic, recessive spaces, with a wall that stands much higher than the Dreamer and Idleness, reflecting the truly imposing nature of this as described in the text. Yet in the following images, the visualisation of the garden is far more haphazard, with the Dreamer shown approaching a garden wall that stands at only half his height. This atmospheric representation of a mismatched world continues in the following images, one of which shows the Dreamer kneeling down to try a small door in the wall, or bending down beneath trees that dwarf the Garden's perimeter. The most obvious rendering of this is on fol. 5v, where Idleness kneels to turn the key in a door that could never admit herself or the Dreamer into the Garden (Figure 48). This Alice-in-Wonderland style of depiction recedes when the figures enter the Garden proper, apparently due to the omission of buildings and walls. One example is the largely coherent space of the aforementioned *Slander Waking Jealousy*, though in that instance the bed is perhaps a little too close to the fire to be viewed as totally naturalistic. However, the irregular perspective makes a striking reappearance when the Castle is breached by the Host of the God of Love, and is particularly haphazard and comedic on fol. 100r, when the Old Woman greets the Dreamer (Figure 49).

While the distinctions in visual style between the first and following images point to a change in working approach, if not a different artist, the formal properties of the characters do not vary enough to suggest they were designed or completed in different periods or places. The figure costumes, landscape details and characterisation of major figures suggests a contemporaneous working process, revealing that the largely mismatched world of the dream space was designed at the same time as its naturalistically planned incipit. Furthermore, the 'second' artist, if indeed there was one, proved themselves on occasion able to produce more naturalistic perspective. As such, the disjunction of these scenes, to evidently comedic and unusual visual effect, alters our perception of the dream, producing a place where people and objects are not always aligned with their surroundings. These characters struggle to fit through doorways, squeeze within castles, or have to stoop beneath the upper branches of trees – situations impossible in everyday life but possible in the unusual sphere of dreams.

³⁸⁵ Ward, H. L. D. *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, Vol. I (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1883), 890; Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 143-44, Camille, *The Medieval Art of Love*, 73-74.

These visual aspects are unusual when one considers the prevailing approach to manuscript illumination by the time of the early fifteenth century. As indicated in the Egerton incipit, the general direction of fashion was towards more perspectival coherence, not less. British Library Burney 257, a collection of texts by Publius Papinius Statius and Laurent de Premierfait and produced in Paris in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, possibly c.1405, contains several scenes produced with the collaboration of numerous artists revealing this trend in action.³⁸⁶ While the depiction of a cramped internal and external multiscentic image on fol. 8r (Figure 50) may not appear to reflect a movement towards more spatially coherent miniatures, there is some indication that this instance was only due to the desire to cram multiple instances into one scene. In a miniature like that appearing just a few folios later, on fol. 13v (Figure 51), the artist(s) reveal what they can do when a less complex scene is attempted. In the second example, the action takes place before a perspectively sensitive depiction of a large building, against which the figures appear to be if not perfectly sized, at least more appropriately scaled than that of the image on fol. 8r. These suggest that the complexity of a given scene could impact upon the ability of artists to scale their images in order to produce a naturalistic effect. However, with the examples outlined from the Egerton manuscript, the issue of ‘complexity’ does not perform in the expected way. Rather than being less perspectively naturalistic when the images become more complex, the busy scene of the incipit is in fact more naturalistically organised than the simpler, less crowded imagery appearing in the rest of the manuscript.

The popularity of the Bedford and Boucicaut Masters and their related workshops in the first decades of the century, with their spaces constructed around largely cohesive spatial relationships was also clear through the sheer number of surviving manuscripts in these styles (Figure 52).³⁸⁷ The depiction of the *Nativity* in the Salisbury Breviary, produced for the Duke of Bedford c.1430-40 and attributable to the milieu of the so-called Bedford Master is just one of many examples where the space has been organised around a cramped, but largely naturalistic perspectival arrangement.³⁸⁸

³⁸⁶ Information sourced from the British Library, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/welcome.htm> (last updated 2005, accessed 20 July 2016).

³⁸⁷ Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 129-130; Albert Châtelet, *L'âge d'Or du Manuscrit à Peintures: en France au temps de Charles VI et Les Heures du Maréchal Boucicaut* (Dijon: Institut de France, Editions Faton, 2000), 37.

³⁸⁸ Sterling, *La Peinture Médiévale à Paris, 1300-1500*, 435.

Joseph and Mary are smaller than the large barn that contains them, and while there is some indication that a religious form of perspective has been used (the halo-bearing Mary is larger than Joseph, who is not marked out as saintly), the figures in the background – i.e. further away – are smaller, in line with true visual perspective. Such perspectival cohesion also came to dominate the later tradition of *Rose* manuscripts too, with the exception of a handful of experimental manuscripts scattered throughout the early to mid-fifteenth centuries. The contrast with these contemporaneous exemplars, and indeed the evidence of its own incipit, marks out the example of Egerton 1069 as an interesting divergence from the norm, one that should be considered in more detail – and may have some answers in the nature of dreams themselves.

This perspectival disruption verges on the ‘common’ in fifteenth-century *Rose* manuscripts, though it was evidently less widespread in other types of illuminated manuscript. BL Additional 12042, for example, contains scenes that reflect many contemporary trends in illumination.³⁸⁹ The incipit on fol. 1r featuring the Dreamer has a flat patterned background, potentially a throwback to fourteenth-century decorative trends. However, on fol. 166v, when the Dreamer plucks the Rose from a large plant in a spacious background, the effect is more open, relating to contemporary fifteenth-century copies with plain vellum backgrounds to the images. In stark contrast to these, *Venus Torching the Castle* on fol. 162v features a miniscule castle besieged by the freakishly large host of the God of Love. While the evidence elsewhere suggests the artist was able to produce both naturalistic and retrograde renderings of space, the appearance of this mismatched perspective lends a humorous quality to the scene, and simultaneously presents a dreamlike warping of size and place.

A starker example of the propensity for irregular perspective in fifteenth-century manuscripts appears in Stockholm MS Vu 39, which contrasts the perspectively sophisticated incipit scene of the Dreamer, asleep in a spacious room, with the assault of several characters on the castle that looks barely large enough to hold one standing figure, never mind four guardians, the Old Woman, Responsiveness, and the Roses. In the Stockholm manuscript, there is no indication of different artists working across the pages. Instead, naturalistic representations in the repertoire of the artists coincide with mismatched perspectives in other scenes, clearly designed at the same time, suggesting

³⁸⁹ Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, 887-88; Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 145.

a world where the regular rules do not always apply. However, while popular in the first half of the fifteenth century, such representations largely appear to have gone out of fashion in the later 1400s. By the late 1450s, more efforts were made to simply render the dream space according to the rules of perspective, and in a naturalistic manner. By the time we reach François I's manuscript, unnaturalistic elements have been all but eliminated from the tradition.

This brief tradition runs counter to the prior artistic tradition of representing all states – waking or dreaming – in the same visual manner. It certainly contradicts the statements of Guillaume at the start of the poem, who would have us believe that all this happened in real life exactly as described, after his dream. Yet it coincides with Jean's remarks on optical illusions and dreams inserted during Nature's speech at ll. 18,333-18,394. While Guillaume attempts to relate dreams to historical and authoritative precedent, stressing the correlation between dreams and waking life, Jean instead relates dreams to optical illusions, and apparitions caused by devotions. While, as noted, no depictions of Nature's speech appear in any manuscript found in preparation for this study, it is possible that the general attitude of Jean, after so long lying dormant, found some expression in the altered visual relationships depicted in these fifteenth-century manuscripts.

A peculiar set of circumstances may provide the reasons for the irregular perspective trend. Akin to the Valencia manuscript's circumstances, the turn of the fifteenth century, when several of these manuscripts were produced, witnessed close interpretation and re-reading of the text, particularly in the wake of the *Querelle de la Rose* in Parisian circles.³⁹⁰ I would suggest it is not too large a leap to suppose that such a period of re-evaluation by readers may have coincided with visual experimentation; indeed, the luxury early fifteenth-century manuscripts Valencia 387 and BnF fr. 12595 reveal that new image cycles were researched and produced in the period after the *Querelle*, though they do not respond directly to the questions of propriety - or rather impropriety - raised by the authors of the debate. Instead, those copies appear to reflect a more general interest in the *Rose* inspired by the public debate on its merits, one which had the benefit of new insight in philosophical, historical and educational teachings that were established by the fifteenth century.

³⁹⁰ See also Chapter One for further comments on the *Querelle*.

A secondary reason may also be the changes to artistic conventions. As demonstrated in Chapter One, traditions dominant in thirteenth and fourteenth-century art guided the representations of dreams as visually equal to images of waking life. However, during the later fourteenth century, styles altered, with additional emphasis being placed on the representation of proportion and perspective in visual art, including in manuscripts.³⁹¹ Comparison of *Rose* manuscripts from these different periods undertaken for this study reveals this line of development, with an increasing preference for naturalistically rendered space, although this unusually coincided with the non-naturalistic appearance of multiscenic incipits and other imagery. It is possible that once artists had the means to represent dreams as distinct from the visual tropes of waking life, they introduced it into their illuminations of the *Rose*, recognising its dream state (as was always the case), but now emphasising it indirectly through visual style rather than through dreamer, dream and consequence visual formula.

The appearance of deliberately retrograde styles of illumination in these *Roses*, with enforced irregular perspective and warping of time (as appeared in multiscenic images) during a period where more naturalistic images became the norm is, I would argue, not coincidental. Previous visual styles representing dreams and waking life in the same mode may be viewed as being linked to the prevailing theoretical understanding of dreams as sharing parity of consequence or meaning with the events of everyday life.³⁹² Yet the representation of dreams in the *Rose* already undermined this correlation, and as artistic conventions crept towards more naturalistic imagery, it is possible artists and planners no longer saw fit to visually align these two distinct spheres of experience - a situation likely supported by the evidence of their own dreams. Visual experiences in dreams and in waking life are *not* always similar, with changes in space and time possible in one sphere but not the other. It is possible that with the urge to achieve more naturalistic representations, artists believed it necessary to warp time and space in their images in order to capture the 'true' visual effect of dreams.

These manuscripts reveal an element of conscious visual difference, one that originated in the planning stages of the manuscript, with either *libraires* or artists being

³⁹¹ The studies of Avril and Reynaud, *Les manuscrits à peintures en France, 1440-1520* and Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis* among others provide more information on the types of alterations occurring at this time.

³⁹² See for example the previously cited arguments of Augustine and Gregory the Great.

responsible. While isolated examples like the Valencia manuscript may point to patron interests, the more widespread nature of these mismatched perspective scenes suggest a larger-scale movement and attitude change within the producing community. The approach is also external to theoretical trends, which rarely touched upon the visual nature of the dream space. These manuscripts instead adopt a conception of dreams more familiar to modern audiences, as spaces which do not always follow the regular rules of perspective or naturalism, but are instead dependent on whim, and characterised by confusion and disorder.

Without the benefit of personal dream accounts, unaffected by the tropes of religious or theoretical literary conventions, it is difficult to reconstruct how and which dreams were experienced by people of the time. I believe it is however likely that this new approach, with mismatched and unnaturalistic representations of the dream space, was guided by such personal experience, rather than one specific theory. The evidence of artists' own dreams, I would argue, is the most likely source of this 'modern' approach to dream representation as a sphere visually distinct from everyday life.

The reasons for the disappearance of this approach are less clear, but most likely were due to stylistic conventions and changes. As artistic expression attained increasing naturalism as the century wore on, it is possible that potential buyers no longer wanted to see scenes with cluttered perspective and representations, even if this was an intentional device to render the dream representations 'dreamlike'. It also could relate to the appearance of printed *Roses* in the 1480s, which incorporated in the first instance representations of a strikingly retrograde nature.³⁹³ As these images circulated, patrons of increasingly 'luxury' manuscript one-offs may have wanted to differentiate their copies from the prevailing fourteenth-century trends in printed editions, leading to the naturalistic characteristics of late-fifteenth-century productions.

IV: Resurgence of Authority? Rejection of the Dream *Topos*

The picture of medieval *Roses* painted thus far reveals a number of elements that accord with the prevalence of the dream theme in both narrative and imagery. However, it is also evident that this emphasis on dream elements was not necessarily continued through to the end of the period of *Rose* manuscript production, and was in fact reduced significantly by the time we reach the final handwritten copies. Certainly,

³⁹³ See Chapter Five for a focused discussion of the printed editions.

by the 1480s, machine-made copies of the *Rose* did account for a significant proportion of 'new' *Roses* available to readers – these will be discussed in greater detail during Chapter Five. Additionally, the production and reception of handmade manuscripts increasingly seems to have been restricted to the elite sectors of society, as evidenced by the luxury nature of most of the surviving copies from the 1450s onwards. In terms of the visual elements these copies incorporated, it is clear that the dream subject had somewhat fallen out of favour; in addition to the removal of the aspects of erroneous perspective suggestive of a dream space, in some cases the prominent Dreamer, who had occupied a position at the head of the poem in most copies from the last 150 years, was entirely rejected.

A copy of Jean Molinet's prose moralisation, produced for Philip of Cleves c.1500 reveals one manner in which the Dreamer motif was supplanted by more important visual aspects.³⁹⁴ In the miniature on fol. 1r (Figure 53), the scribe presents the completed book to a seated Philip of Cleves, clearly assigning the prominence not to a poet or dreamer, but a revered political figure. While this is a copy of a moralised *Rose*, a text first issued in print by the publisher Vérard in 1500, and therefore not containing the same text shared by the copies featuring dreamer incipits, it is important to note that Molinet did not strip all the dream references from the text. In fact, the purpose of the moralisation was simply to help guide the reader through the poem and make its meaning clearer.³⁹⁵ As such, the removal of the dreamer, and indeed the poet, who in fact featured prominently in the imagery of the printed edition of Molinet's *Rose*, suggests that by the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, these internal elements were being supplanted by external circumstances of patronage or reception.

A similar approach to the visual narrative appears in the famed manuscript produced for François I, c.1519-47.³⁹⁶ Once more based on an edition of the *Rose* that appeared in print, though this time not a moralisation, this copy was produced by Girard Acarie based on the printed edition overseen by Michel Le Noir at Paris in 1519. Once more, the opening scene is no longer dedicated to a dream or even authorship aspect, but a double-page-spread dedicated to the king's coat of arms, and a presentation of the manuscript to the king himself (Figures 54 and 55). This is followed up by a miniature

³⁹⁴ Brayer and Korteweg, *Catalogue of French-Language Medieval Manuscripts*, 35.

³⁹⁵ More information on the copies of Molinet's Moralisation and its accompanying imagery in the printed editions appears in Chapter Five.

³⁹⁶ Braet, "Der Roman der Rose", 191; McMunn, "Notes on Representations of the Erotic", 129.

of the poet at his writing desk within a bedroom, but the next scene, on fol. 6r, jumps directly past the traditional dreamer-in-bed scene to depict a fully-clothed dreamer standing within the landscape of his dream, next to his empty four-poster bed. The manuscript is also notable for the extent to which it borrows from the classicising aspects of contemporary imagery being produced in Italy, such as coherent perspectival arrangement or prominent semi-clad heroic figures, and the depiction of up-to-date clothing fashions and courtly life, particularly in the presentation scene on fol. 4r. Once more, this manuscript reveals that the once common depiction of a dreamer, or indeed an emphasis on atypical imagery indicative of a dream state has now been eradicated in favour of one that strongly relates to contemporary courtly trends and the veneration of political figures. Interestingly, the manuscript copy diverges rather strongly from its printed origins, as that copy of 1519 featured a prominent bipartite depiction of the *Dreamer and Danger*, and *Dreamer with Idleness*, hearkening back to the imagery used in several mid-fourteenth-century manuscripts. While more details of the printed editions' relationship with manuscript copies will be given in Chapter Five, it is simply necessary here to consider the way in which the authoritative Dreamer figure, so daring in its replacement of the typical authorial portrait particularly considering the ambiguous nature of the *Rose*, has finally been supplanted by changing tastes.

A comparable presentation scene featuring numerous similarities with the image in François I's *Rose* appears in a copy of Guillaume Crétin's *Chroniques Françaises*, BnF fr. 2817, produced in the region of Rouen after 1515 (attested to by an inscription on the first folio, and stylistic analysis).³⁹⁷ This was also produced for François I, and again features as the first image a depiction of a presentation scene (Figure 56) which once more stresses the powerful, preeminent nature of the recipient over and above the content of the manuscript being offered. The fact that an additional manuscript in a book produced for the King of France also incorporates an incipit including a presentation scene provides some context for the *Rose's* reworking in the Morgan M.948 copy, as it points to the personal tastes of the commissioner coming through in the selection of images for the manuscript. Nevertheless, it also reveals that in the later years of the *Rose's* circulation in manuscript form, the image cycles of the *Rose* were becoming ever more subject to the whims and fancies of their patrons and producers,

³⁹⁷ BnF Archives et Manuscrits, www.archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr (accessed 20 July 2016); Gallica, www.gallica.bnf.fr, last updated 2011 (accessed 20 July 2016).

often leading to the suppression or even rejection of dreamlike elements from the visual subject material.

This latter point is particularly important, as it reveals that while the dream aspect did remain consistently popular for over 150 years in *Rose* iconography, it was subject to changing tastes, workshop production practices, and the evolving comprehension of its narrative and significance. These *Roses*, after all, were not always accompanied by 'correct' or 'appropriate' imagery, as the later printed exemplars reveal, with haphazard scenes borrowed from other prints appearing out of place in *Rose* editions. While it is evident that dream subject material had a prominent place, this must be tempered by the changing attitudes to the poem that appear throughout the fourteenth, fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

The previous two chapters have discussed some of the myriad depictions of dream subjects in *Rose* manuscripts and other texts from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. However, the assertions present in these chapters also rely on one specific conviction about the nature of manuscript production and planning: namely that artists and planners were consciously considering their representations, and the meaning that these images could transmit to readers of the manuscripts. While this chimes harmoniously with contemporary notions of artistic 'intent', it would be naïve to claim that these ideas were automatically shared by manuscript producers working in the period of the *Rose*. Indeed, such ideas have come in for a great deal of criticism by manuscript scholars, and even those discussing the *Rose* in particular. However, as I will go on to discuss in the following chapter, I firmly believe that this revision of attitudes towards medieval workshop production has swung too far in the opposite direction, and in fact poorly reflects the variety of artistic innovation and originality built in to workshop practices and manuscript illumination.

As such, Chapter Four serves as both a backup to the contentions regarding dream imagery expounded in this thesis, as well as a call for scholars of medieval manuscript practices to re-open their minds to the ideas of artistic impetus and - dare I say - 'intention'. In my opinion, there is also no better corpus for the investigation of workshop production and development practices, considering the vast numbers of surviving copies, the *Rose's* status as a secular text (i.e. less subject to the religious

concerns attending biblical manuscripts and the like) as well as the great wealth of diversity and uniqueness present in the group as a whole.

Chapter Four: Production Methods from Complete and Incomplete *Rose* Manuscripts

As noted above, any study of *Rose* manuscripts requires not only an understanding of the poem and its relation to prior literature (arguably, especially dream theory and attitudes) but also its temporal context in relation to the practicalities of manuscript production. In 1993, Sylvia Huot considered an element of the *Rose* relevant to this study: how a series of miniatures and marginalia in a *Rose* manuscript could affect contemporary readings of the poem.³⁹⁸ However, that study considered the topic from the side of the reader, not the maker. In order to consider how *Roses* conveyed the dream visually, we must not focus only on the reception of meaning, but also the processes of making, as production methods offer the most promising means of deciphering the level of intentional interpretation in the image cycles.

If the meaning expressed by dream images was *not* the result of artistic or planner intention, then the images discussed in the prior chapters are all but useless for the recreation of medieval attitudes towards dreams, and indeed the ideas represented by the dream images of the *Rose*. If, however, these dream images were intentionally produced, they may offer insight into the dream experience of everyday men and women during the Middle Ages, as the production process would require extended contemplation of the dream state, and how it was understood at the time. In order to investigate the level of 'intentional' input in the artistic process, it seems sensible to return to the copies that provide the best means of ascertaining how the process of *Rose* production was undertaken - the incomplete ones, and those that retain the trace of these methods. As the following chapter will reveal, dream scenes (and many others) were made according to a process that left ample scope for the insertion of interpretive visual content, ultimately resulting in large variations in the visual expression of the poem, and the meanings they offered. I believe that, based on the evidence of these copies, the expression of meaningful visual content was not accidental, but an important part of the production process. This therefore allows for the use of such images for the reconstruction of medieval attitudes to visual and textual dreams, as the intentional aspect would be conditioned by a contemporary understanding of the subject material. My point is addressed specifically to the claims of Blamires and Holian

³⁹⁸ Huot, "Sacred and Erotic Love", 273-322.

that: 'In our view their procedures do not characteristically enable them to be deeply in touch with complexities in the text for which they are furnishing miniatures'.³⁹⁹ While this study does not claim that artists were those responsible for the alteration of miniatures for interpretive function, it does posit that someone in the production cycle was, and that this variation was a conscious and consistent part of *Rose* production.

At present, there appear to be no studies of the inferred or actual specifics of *Rose* production based on the evidence of the manuscripts themselves. Studies of medieval manuscript production have flourished in the last fifty years, particularly concerning France and, specifically, Paris.⁴⁰⁰ It is perhaps no accident that this was a region where many *Roses* were made and illuminated - most manuscripts reveal links to Paris, if not documentary evidence of their production there. This city was well-equipped to deal with the popularity and demand for copies of the *Rose*, especially in the fourteenth century. Jean de Meun's relation to the University of Paris also provided the poem with a concrete link to the capital from the period of its completion. However, while studies have touched upon *Rose* production as part of the fabric of Parisian manuscript production practices, the creation process of specific *Rose* manuscripts is woefully understudied.⁴⁰¹ Returning to the manuscripts themselves, as advocated by Keith Busby, seems to be the best means of solving the topical scholarly dispute on the intentionality of *Rose* (and other) manuscript imagery.⁴⁰² Many studies have in the past incorporated visual analysis alongside textual analysis, implicitly promoting the idea that expressive imagery was planned from the outset -as with Huot's dissection of BnF fr. 25526, or Fleming's less convincing deconstruction of BnF fr. 1576.⁴⁰³ However, this

³⁹⁹ Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, p.xxvii.

⁴⁰⁰ Scholarly studies of Parisian manuscript illumination include the still-authoritative study by Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis*, Alexander's *Medieval Illuminators*, an analysis of illuminators and work processes, Avril *L'enluminure à l'époque gothique: 1200-1420*, the documentary analyses of Richard and Mary Rouse in *Illiterati et Uxorati*, which does contain some reference to *Rose* producers in the mid fourteenth century, and finally Ainsworth and Croenen's *Patrons, Authors and Workshops*. In addition to this, several studies have commented on practical or theoretical issues of productions, as with Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers*, Stones' "Sacred and Profane Art", "Indications écrites et modèles picturaux", or the Blamires and Holian discussion in a specific *Rose* context. Though this study does not concur with the latter's conclusions on artistic intentionality, the authors nonetheless raise important points regarding production methods.

⁴⁰¹ Huot in "Sacred and Erotic Love" does touch upon the issues of manuscript production in her analysis of BnF fr. 25526, though this focuses on the compositional structure of the copy and how this produces meaning through a symmetrical patterning of motifs.

⁴⁰² Busby, *Codex and Context*, 1-2.

⁴⁰³ Huot, "Sacred and Erotic Love"; Fleming, *The Roman de la Rose*, 23-25.

chapter aims to evidence this more directly, in an effort to specifically counter the arguments of Blamires, Holian, and the Rouses.

The extent of the misconception of illumination and artistic agency in present scholarship is exemplified through the Rouses' discussion of the purported output of the Montbaston workshop (see the Catalogue for refutations of some of their assigned manuscripts), in which they suggested that the practicalities of workshop production – specifically regarding Jeanne de Montbaston – meant the artists likely had little understanding of the texts they illuminated.⁴⁰⁴ However, their assertion that Jeanne was an artist with poor literacy seems to conflict with the fact that she took the libraire's oath in 1353 after the death of her husband, as overseeing multiple vernacular productions seems to me to preclude a necessary level of literacy in order to draw up contracts, organise producers, and coordinate production, scribal and artistic efforts.⁴⁰⁵

Blamires and Holian do however correctly point out that present *Rose* manuscript scholarship is often narrow in focus, either concentrated on a small number of copies, thematic strands, or iconographical elements, caused by the vastness of the corpus scholars are faced with.⁴⁰⁶ While this thesis incorporates one such 'narrow' thematic approach, the discussion of production methods for *Roses* is designed to engage with the wider issues around intentionality, primarily to reveal the relevant ratio of interpretive imagery in order to provide further evidence for the conclusions presented here regarding the meaning of dream illuminations. The section stands as a counter-argument to those who would remove intentionality from the process of manuscript illumination – though I do not intend to ascribe it solely to artists – but it is also designed to provide a starting point for further investigation in this area.

Although this was discovered in the context of a study of *Rose* manuscripts, the issue of intentionality in artistic production is pervasive in historical studies of illumination and painting in the Western tradition, setting up an implied chronology wherein subsequent manuscripts reusing a motif or style become mere copies or shadows of what was produced before. Such practices have been going on for at least the last 100 years, and expresses itself most obviously in the attribution of particular works to the 'workshops' or 'circles' of known or anonymous artists, and the tracking of particular

⁴⁰⁴ Rouse and Rouse, "A 'Rose' by Any Other Name".

⁴⁰⁵ Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 22.

⁴⁰⁶ Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xix.

motifs or compositions to an origin point or manuscript. While the desire to know who was responsible for any given work or motif is satisfied by these conclusions, they also have the effect of implicitly relegating any future user of a style or motif to a mere copyist, unable to produce 'original' works for themselves, and ignoring the insights that can be provided by a reworking of such motifs in new contexts. Though some scholars have attempted to consider the converse possibility that variation was as important as tradition and copying (see for example J.J.G. Alexander's 1989 essay "Facsimiles, copies and variations"), the default position still seems to be one that emphasises basic 'reproduction' over intentional variation.⁴⁰⁷ As the incomplete *Roses* reveal, mindless copying and incorporation was in fact *not* the major factor in manuscript production, but instead this was a space in which reworking and reinterpretation could occur. It is thus proposed that similar reinvestigation of other grouped manuscripts, focusing as much on their drift away from exemplars as their adherence to them, will reveal many more facets of the interrelation between visual production methods, modes of expression, reception and meaning in medieval codices, allowing us to present a more nuanced picture of the actual practices of illumination in the Middle Ages.

This section will consider several *Roses* which were left unfinished between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, containing gaps for image cycles that were not undertaken, or featuring only a minimal amount of preparatory work. It will also consider a family of finished manuscripts that evidence the artistic involvement of one recurrent 'master' of *Rose* illumination, and those that worked from models provided by them, or their workshop. Several complete copies featuring remnants of the design stage will also serve to illuminate working practices, allowing for the extrapolation of methodology to the vast majority of copies lacking surviving indications of the planning stages. Finally, it will consider some copies of the poem with atypical image cycles, attesting to the irregular but complementary spirit of ad-hoc *Rose* illumination. Certainly, there is some difficulty in ascribing the terms typical or atypical to *Roses*, as so many manuscripts feature fluctuations in the number, composition or iconography of images, even when based on similar prototypes. However, in this sense, the term

⁴⁰⁷ J.J.G. Alexander, "Facsimiles, Copies and Variations". The study does open with promising statements on the duality of copying and variation inherent in manuscripts, but Alexander also spends much of his study emphasising the latter and not the former.

'atypical' refers to manuscripts featuring image cycles largely undertaken in the margins, or with scenes added in the centuries after the original production stage, rather than in contemporary full-framed miniatures set within the columns. 'Atypical' therefore designates manuscripts that bend the typical rules of thirteenth to sixteenth-century production and illumination practices otherwise featured in the majority of manuscripts. All these manuscripts provide a basis for the arguments centred on the degree of intentionality in visual designs for *Rose* manuscripts, and back up the findings concerning the meaning of dream images discussed in the following chapters. This section takes as a starting point the methodology of Robert Calkins' studies of the processes of illumination demonstrated in unfinished manuscripts, though here it has been applied exclusively to *Roses*.⁴⁰⁸

The *Rose* manuscripts span a period in which the style of miniatures and other artistic productions changed dramatically. The term 'style' here refers to the formal qualities circumscribing the representation of particular artistic subjects in different periods and regions of the primary country of *Rose* production - in this case, France. As shown in Chapters Two and Three, many *Roses* of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries incorporated imagery with a degree of flatness, abstraction and a bright but limited palette, later fourteenth century copies increasingly utilised *grisaille* colouring, increased shading, and reduction of the abstract or symbolic elements in favour of depicting naturalistic or everyday figures and objects. In the fifteenth century, *Rose* imagery incorporated the developments of contemporary French, Italian and Netherlandish painting, including perspectival illusionism (or in some cases, an emphasis on non-illusionism), sketch-like or informal miniatures, and even archaic features from *Roses* of the past centuries. This latter aspect is particularly evident in the trend for historiated initials in later fifteenth and sixteenth century *Roses*. An even more radical change occurred in the latter half of the 1400s, with the innovation of the printed book featuring woodcut illustrations.⁴⁰⁹ In order to place these wide-ranging developments in an appropriate context, and allow for the analysis of the dream element that forms a part in these image cycles, it is necessary to first consider the changes in form and production methods, and their ramifications for the image cycles.

⁴⁰⁸ Robert Calkins, "Stages of Execution: Procedures of Illumination as Revealed in an Unfinished Book of Hours", *Gesta*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1978): 61-79; *Programs of Medieval Illumination* (Lawrence, Kansas: Helen Foresman Spencer Museum of Art and the University of Kansas, 1984).

⁴⁰⁹ Discussed in Chapter Five.

Rose copies often varied according to inconsistent circumstances of production and patronage. While the aristocratic readership comprised figures such as the artistically inquisitive and acquisitive Jean de Berry (whose documents attest to multiple copies of the *Rose*), to King François I who owned a copy with hundreds of images, workshops also produced many copies in advance of expected purchasers.⁴¹⁰ Other copies attest to limited resources, as with the short and irregular image cycle of BnF fr. 12592 [Cat. 82]. Furthermore, the fact that a number of manuscripts remained unfinished could suggest a reversal in patrons' fortunes; while there are many possible reasons for the incomplete *Roses* that survive today, it is probable that a break in funding was a primary cause of the cessation of work.

Issues of location also had a bearing on the nature of *Rose* imagery. While a majority of the surviving copies appear to have originated in Paris, or were produced by artists trained there, others were produced by those of regional location or training. These manuscripts often adapted Parisian motifs, but assimilated them through more local traditions, as was likely the case with Rennes 243 [Cat. 102]. This strong Parisian link evidently facilitated the production of a relatively large number of copies as the burgeoning book trade allowed patrons and *libraires* to harness a large workforce.⁴¹¹ However, in later years this connection may have had its pitfalls: the city of Paris, home to French aristocratic and economic power was subject to attack and occupation throughout the 1400s. This may help to explain why comparably few *Rose* manuscripts were produced during the middle of the fifteenth century. As Paris was occupied by the English from 1420-36, who perhaps had little interest in commissioning copies of a French vernacular poem, this lacuna is understandable.

However, even when peace was restored, the connection of Paris to *Rose* commissions seems to have suffered a long-term blow. Despite the return of French nobles to the city after 1436, it was outlying artists and even those of a different nationality that supplanted Parisian *Rose* producers in the latter half of the century.⁴¹² By the time we reach François I's copy, Parisian illuminators had been rejected in favour of Rouennais producers, although this may simply reflect the more international tastes of the patron.

⁴¹⁰ Jean de Berry certainly owned BnF fr. 380 [Cat. 86], and likely also BnF fr. 12595 [Cat. 90], in addition to two other unidentified copies mentioned in his inventories. King François' copy is now held in New York, Morgan M.948 [Cat. 185].

⁴¹¹ Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 22.

⁴¹² François Avril, "L'éclatement des ateliers parisiens" in *L'enluminure à l'époque gothique: 1200-1420* (Paris: Bibliothèque de l'image, 1995), 118-25.

This avoidance of Paris appears to have been shared by the first publishers of printed editions. While the exact provenances of several of the earliest editions is unclear, the first few, including those incorporating an oft-repeated image cycle, originated at Lyon and Geneva rather than Paris, likely reflecting the growing printing trade in these outlying regions. While the production of printed *Roses* did migrate back into the city during the early sixteenth century, this was long after the popular and prodigious era of Parisian *Rose* manuscripts had ended. While BL Egerton 2022 [Cat. 154] seems to attest to the continuation of manuscript production in the capital during the closing years of the century, there is a clear contrast between the numbers of *Roses* produced around this time, and those of the *Rose*'s heyday in the mid fourteenth century.⁴¹³ While a number of luxury manuscripts, often featuring many images and produced on highly refined vellum, were produced in the early 1500s, the rarity of these manuscripts suggests that the nature of the popularity of *Roses* had changed. In previous eras, these expensive manuscripts coincided with the production of less labour-intensive copies destined for poorer owners, and attest to a multitude of different tastes in the scope, style and form of the image cycles. In the later fifteenth century, it appears the 'mass produced' *Rose* manuscripts had given way to the printed editions, who could monopolise production of copies of the poem far easier than the manuscript workshops.⁴¹⁴

Beyond these changes, there was also an internal evolution in *Rose* image cycles. What was viewed as 'typical' in the late thirteenth century was not the same as that of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when new topics were introduced, or familiar aspects revitalised. The later artists of the *Roses* also had the additional benefit of being able to draw on traditions instigated by their predecessors. Such changes add an additional element to the comparison of earlier and later *Roses*, and must be considered when looking at the production of copies and the developments of image cycles. *Rose* imagery – specifically its dream content – was not produced in a vacuum, and thus the evidence of the finished and unfinished copies, revealing the modes of their creation, provide a vital clue as to how visual interpretation and completion was undertaken in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries.

⁴¹³ Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, 891-92; Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 144.

⁴¹⁴ Discussed in Chapter Five.

I: The Initial Stage: Scribes, Rubricators and the Implications of Gaps in Manuscripts in the First Decades of *Rose* Production

BnF fr. 12786

One of the earliest incomplete copies of the *Rose* is BnF fr. 12786 [Cat. xxvii], dating c.1310-40 (Figures 57-58). In order to date the manuscript, one must rely on the layout and script, although one may also draw conclusions from other *Roses* by comparing their intended image cycles. Its planned open-bipartite form of imagery, with one image heading up each column of text is a rare but not unknown layout, with its earliest proponents dating from the first half of the fourteenth century, as with Mazarine 3874 [Cat. 38]. This form was contemporaneous with the closed-bipartite incipit form, which developed during the second quarter of the 1300s, evident in manuscripts such as Paris Assemblée Nationale 1230 [Cat. 37]. While BnF fr. 12786 only contains Guillaume's section of the poem, it features gaps for imagery that correlate with illuminations for his segment in other completed *Roses*.

This copy is the sole exemplar containing only Guillaume's text; several authors suggest that this is proof that Guillaume's text had low popularity on its own, and was only transmitted on a large scale after Jean produced his ending.⁴¹⁵ However, the dating of this manuscript, from the late thirteenth century (i.e. a time when Jean had most likely completed his work) begs the question why Jean's section was not included. BnF fr. 1573, a contemporary manuscript, may shed some light on the issue. Despite containing both Guillaume and Jean's sections, these are written in different hands – suggesting that, at least in the late thirteenth century, copying of the *Rose* was sometimes undertaken separately by those with access to only one section of the poem at a time, not the whole work. As such, it is therefore possible that we have simply lost the copy of Jean's section intended to be reunited with Guillaume's in BnF fr. 12786. This is even more plausible given the unfinished state of the manuscript.

Spaces have been left for scenes such as the *Personifications on the Garden Wall*, the *Companions of Pleasure*, the *Dreamer's Encounter with Love*, the meetings with Responsiveness, Danger and Reason, and the *Imprisonment of Responsiveness*. These images were present in some of the oldest *Roses*, such as the pre-1300 BnF fr. 378 [Cat. 41] and were retained in image cycles of early fourteenth century copies. One notable

⁴¹⁵ Hill, *The Medieval Debate on Jean de Meung's Roman de la Rose*, 36; Badel, *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe Siècle*, 55.

element is the restricted size of the intended incipit, which differs from the larger introductory images present in many mid to late fourteenth century *Roses*, further supporting the early date assigned to this copy.

In its unfinished state, it is difficult to draw too many conclusions about the proposed imagery, although BnF fr. 12786 reveals several things about the process of *Rose* manuscript production. As with other manuscripts produced in the fourteenth century, copying the text came first. The scribe(s) responsible would leave gaps for initials and/or miniatures to be completed by themselves or other artists, as the presence of instructional marks suggests. This points to an organised process wherein one figure, possibly the scribe (but more likely the *libraire*) was responsible for coordination.⁴¹⁶ Well-documented in tax rolls of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the *libraire* oversaw the making and selling of books and was the means of bringing together the various artists required for the production of illuminated manuscripts.⁴¹⁷ As the initial at the head of the poem was likely intended to contain an image, and neither initials nor illuminations have been completed throughout the *Rose*, it is possible that the decorator and illuminator were the same person. However, given the variation of illuminator styles visible in *Rose* manuscripts, and the evidence for individual specialists working solely on decoration, it is more likely that this was a collaborative effort involving multiple figures, and was simply interrupted at a very early stage in the process.⁴¹⁸

The first gap sheds further light on the dating for this manuscript and its production methods. Just below the red rubric 'Ci qmence li romanz de la rose' there is a large space for an initial, as the first word 'maintes' lacks its capital M.⁴¹⁹ From the current

⁴¹⁶ Avril, *L'enluminure à l'époque gothique: 1200-1420*, 8-13 and the Rouses, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 14-15 both stress the growing importance of this figure to manuscript production in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries.

⁴¹⁷ Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 22-23; the Rouses, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 25-48.

⁴¹⁸ Allen Farber's "Considering a Marginal Master: The Work of an Early Fifteenth Century Parisian Manuscript Decorator", *Gesta*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (1993): 21-39 revealed the extent to which such figures could be famed in their own specialist fields. Variations between decoration in *Rose* manuscripts that share similar models for the miniatures, and even the same artists, similarly suggest that specialisation in the field of marginal decoration was also a part of thirteenth and fourteenth century practices.

⁴¹⁹ The term 'rubric' as used here refers to the short explanations or headings inserted in red ink above new sections of text (which they commonly summarise) or images. These contrasted with the typical brown and black hues of the inks used for the majority of text, making them a useful eye-catching means of indicating new sections or changes of place and subject. For more information on the practical production of manuscripts, including scripts, see Christopher de Hamel's *Medieval Craftsmen: Scribes and Illuminators* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press,

state of the page, we can surmise that the person responsible for leaving the gaps differed from that assigned the as-yet incomplete initials. Three vertical marks appear in the upper left of the gap, designating the three vertical bars of the intended M initial. Such marks, or similar miniscule versions of the initial letters recur in many complete and incomplete *Roses*, suggesting that this was the most common means of designating which letter was to be filled in after the scribe completed his work. Often, these minor marks were obscured during the production process, though at times these are still visible beneath the paint of the majuscule letters, as in Milan Ambrosiana MS I 78 Sup, fol. 1r (Figure 59) [Cat. 115]. It is possible that the scribe was also responsible for these letters, though these marks (and incomplete manuscripts) suggest that the completion of the initials was considered to be a separate stage in the production process, one that occurred after the main text was completed. The practice continued even into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as with the printed *Roses* that incorporated hand finishing of letters or imagery, and which still used these markings (see Chapter Five).

The page offers no other clues as to the intended design of the initial, nor whether it was to be historiated, as it lacks further annotation and no sketches are present on the vellum, as found in other fourteenth century *Roses*.⁴²⁰ However, when viewed against the number of gaps left in the rest of the manuscript, comparable in size to the miniatures in completed illuminated copies, it is probable that an image was intended for this initial. Such a combination of imaged initials and regular rectangular miniatures was rare, but it was present in a copy of Gui de Mori's recension of the poem, Tournai 101 [Cat. 12]. Judging by the proportionate numbers of incipit imagery, this M was most likely intended to feature an image of the *Dreamer in Bed*.⁴²¹ This scene appeared in the vast majority of *Rose* incipit scenes, and featured in historiated initials 'A' and 'M' at the head of some manuscripts, as with fol. 1r of Chalon-sur-Saône BM 33 [Cat. 19] (Figure 60).

As to who was responsible, the theory of multiple artisans is strengthened by the nature of the instructions left by the scribal planner. While small initials appear in or around the gaps for the decorative initials, no such marks appear around the

1992), while Otto Pächt's *Book Illumination in the Middle Ages: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986) provides useful insight into some of the consequences of the use of rubrics, initials, and so forth.

⁴²⁰ Alexander discusses the use of rubrics and titles as methods of instructing the illuminator in *Medieval Illuminators*, 54; 60-71.

⁴²¹ See Chapter Two.

rectangular gaps for miniatures. While several gaps have red rubrics nearby that could relate to the appropriate images designated to appear, these are largely short, uninformative and do not appear in every instance. This suggests that if more detailed instructions were made available to the miniaturists, these existed beyond the manuscript and were provided directly to the illuminator and perhaps visual in nature.⁴²² Even if one assumed that the artists were independently responsible for their own visual interpretations of the narrative for each vignette, the evidence of preparatory sketches and notations in other *Roses* suggests the work of miniaturists was rarely completely spontaneous. The more likely scenario, wherein visual planning was the result of an educated planner familiar with the story, also corresponds with the appearance of visual or textual designs in other manuscripts with completed images.

The presence of different forms of instruction – one in notations on the vellum, the other merely implied by the absence of sketches or written plans – suggests different types of workers were employed, each following guidelines appropriate to their task. Initial decorators would just require the letter, presumably free to create the internal patterns or external calligraphic decoration themselves, based on prior workshop training and experience. Miniaturists – whose domain could occasionally overlap with decorators in the instances of historiated initials – would require more detail than this, allowing them to draw on their knowledge of visual motifs and forms. That the process occasionally broke down is attested to by the humorous examples of inappropriate images appearing in some manuscripts, as the Rouses and other *Rose* scholars have noted.⁴²³ Another example found during the course of this study appears in Vienna Cod. 2592 [Cat. 1], where in the depiction of *Charles and Manfred* on fol. 48r, the artist has forgotten to paint in the back end of one of the horses, leaving one fighter attacking from a two-legged pony. But the more overwhelming picture is one of success, with the vast majority of manuscripts featuring largely appropriate images, well suited to their contexts and appearing in the correct place.

This *Rose* then evidences a highly organised, professionalised workforce, each member of which had a specific role to play in its production. It appears to have been a product of a specialised book-producing region, possibly Paris, though whether BnF fr. 12786 is

⁴²² Alison Stones considered the probability of external guides for illumination in “Indications écrites et modèles picturaux”, 327.

⁴²³ See the ‘erroneous’ insertions the Rouses mention in *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 254-56 regarding the output of the so-called Montbaston workshop, with mistakes they ascribe to Jeanne.

Parisian or not is unclear, as there are few obvious textual or formatting clues to its origin. Additionally, the well-documented production processes of the city of Paris were likely exported to other regions of manuscript creation. What is clear is that at some stage this process broke down, resulting in its present unfinished state. Nevertheless, it serves as a guide to processes involved in *Rose* production in the first half-century of the poem's circulation; one that chimes with the manufacturing methods used for other vernacular or religious texts.⁴²⁴

II: Scribes, Rubricators and the Implications of Gaps in Manuscripts During the Later Fourteenth Century

Besançon 553

Besançon 553 [Cat. vi], dating from the later fourteenth century, offers further perspective on *Rose* production at a time when the poem's popularity had been established for many years.⁴²⁵ In contrast to BnF fr. 12786, it reveals the clear presence of a decorator figure distinct from the scribe or illuminator. Unusually, despite featuring large gaps for images throughout, there is no such space left at the head of the poem for the typical image of the Dreamer (Figures 61-62), and instead the text opens directly with a large decorated initial, but no other illumination. Such an absence casts doubt upon the purposes of similar gaps in other manuscripts, like BnF fr. 12786. However, while it is possible that this copy represents an atypical approach to *Roses*, without incorporating any incipit image, it is more probable – given their prevalence in other fourteenth century *Roses*, and the practicalities of workshop labour – that this was the result of miscommunication. Besançon 553's decorator performed only a minimal role in this manuscript, on the incipit folio bordering and scattered two-line-high initials up to fol. 30r, where they end. From 30v onwards, there is no decoration other than alternating blue and red initials, with no calligraphic detailing, suggesting that the decorator only managed to work on a few folios before work ceased.

The decorator was clearly separate to the scribe, who has completed all of the writing, both for the *Rose* and the other texts in the manuscript. This figure was also distinct from the illuminator, who had not yet begun their work. One might expect if these were

⁴²⁴ See the aforementioned studies by Alexander, "Preliminary Marginal Drawings" and *Medieval Illuminators*, Calkins' "Stages of Execution" and Stones, "Indications écrites et modèles picturaux", for further studies on production methods in the medieval period.

⁴²⁵ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 117-20.

the same person that some aspects of the imagery would have been started when completing the decorative elements, as is evident with another manuscript, Lyon 764 [Cat. 32] whose initials and images have both begun, but are incomplete. The similar status of both initials and images in that copy could suggest that the decorator was also in charge of some aspects of the miniatures, as neither element has been wholly finished, suggesting that it was not undertaken in two separate stages.

The contrasting division of labour suggested in the unfinished manuscript Besançon 553 could adequately explain why here we have a decorated initial rather than a historiated one, if the decorator misunderstood that the interior of the letter they designed was to remain blank. Instead, following the protocols for other initials, they filled in the interior of the letter with the types of detail evident in the marginal decoration, with thin calligraphic swirls that also accompany the smaller initials in red and blue. I believe this is a more satisfactory explanation than the converse possibility that no image was intended for the head of the poem, only to accompany the rest of the text, as this would go against the evidence of almost all the other illuminated *Roses* produced in the fourteenth century, especially as it features so many other gaps for images throughout.

In all other respects, Besançon 553 is a typical fourteenth century *Rose*. It contains both sections of the poem, and has left gaps for scenes typically present in *Roses* at the time, a reminder that even unfinished manuscripts reflect a tradition of illumination where particular scenes were intended to be included in many copies. In addition to several of the scenes noted as being planned for in BnF fr. 12786, this manuscript also features spaces for *False Seeming and Constrained Abstinence encountering Slander*, the final battles between Love's Host and the Guardians of the *Roses*, and *Pygmalion*. This last scene was a common concluding image for fourteenth-century *Roses*.

However, in this manuscript it is possible that the scribal rubrics were also designed to guide the intended illuminator.⁴²⁶ The final gap is preceded by the rubric, 'Comet pymalion se mist a genoux', which corresponds with a typical composition used for *Pygmalion* images in the later fourteenth century where Pygmalion kneels before his statue. While the phrase makes no reference to the statue, the mention of Pygmalion on his knees could have provided a hint to the illuminator. It is also possible such phrases,

⁴²⁶ This runs contrary to Stones' assumption in "Indications écrites et modèles picturaux", 330, that some rubrics may have been more for readers than producers.

like the catchwords used by binders, were simply a means of alerting the illuminator to a specific image to copy from a model. So too, such rubrics do not negate the possibility that a separate, fuller set of instructions once existed, though none such survive. Yet in the absence of other instructions, these rubrics represent a concrete example of something that could have been used by the illuminators, a parallel to the miniscule letters left by scribes for the decorators of the initials. If the rubrics were designed with this purpose in mind, this would suggest the rubricator knew they could rely on the illuminator to 'interpret' these lines visually, based on their prior training. Such a process was ultimately reliant on a repeated translation of text into summary and then image, requiring the input of a literate designer figure who shaped the final appearance of these scenes by appealing to the training, tradition and workmanship of the artists employed.

Besançon 553 thus attests to a more compartmentalised labour force than BnF fr. 12786, suggesting some development of production methods in the intervening years, but perhaps also the problems that could result from the division of works, in the case of the non-historiated initial on fol. 1r. It also reveals a level of reciprocity between scribes, rubricators and illuminators, as in the absence of other material relating to the commission, or concrete instructions, they may have had to – and been expected to – rely on the signals left by the preceding worker. This incomplete manuscript provides a hint as to the processes in other manuscripts featuring short informative red-ink rubrics above the imagery, suggesting again that these were intended as much as an aid to the illumination as well as a guide for the reader.⁴²⁷ These leading phrases would be filtered through the artist's knowledge of subjects and compositions, perhaps even a specific model, resulting in the images that feature in completed *Roses*: a process which leaves room for visual flux and development between copies.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁷ Red rubrics have been posited as a means of breaking up text (Stones, "Indications écrites et modèles picturaux", 322); guides to image programmes (Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 85); and even as an expansion of the text (Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers*, 285). Their red colouring quickly allows them to stand out from the text, and unlike the marginal notations or instructions discussed below, these were intended to be a permanent feature of the text - perhaps one reason why they were put to the additional purpose of guiding artists.

⁴²⁸ Several writers, including Stones, "Sacred and Profane Art", 100-1 and the Rouses, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 242, have stressed that makers of vernacular manuscripts like the *Rose* would not have been limited to the production of copies of this text alone, but responsible for a variety of manuscripts, both secular and religious. While an understanding of this has factored in to assessments on the origins of *Rose* iconography, e.g. Kuhn and König's emphasis on the similarities of *Dreamer and Roses* incipits and *Tree of Jesse* imagery, it is important to remember

III: The Second Stage: The Illuminator's Tasks During the First Decades of Rose Production

Lyon 764 and BnF fr. 12593

Two further manuscripts provide insight into the next stage of the process, revealing the methodology of the illuminator: Lyon 764 [Cat. 32] which contains sketches and underdrawings, as well as some minimal underpainting, and BnF fr. 12593 [Cat. 72], a complete but occasionally smudged copy.⁴²⁹ The former manuscript was only partly completed, with finished rubrics, text, and almost all of the decorated initials, but it lacks full illuminations. The first gap in Lyon 764 was written over at a later stage in its history, but likely was intended for a double-column miniature, akin to other fourteenth-century manuscripts with bipartite or multiscenic incipits.⁴³⁰

However, some of the following pages have been worked on by an illuminator, suggesting that the person responsible for the first quire was at least able to begin before production ceased. It is also probable that the scribe was separate from the decorator of the initials; while the text is complete, the calligraphic flourishes are not. However, it is also likely that this decorator was not the person responsible for the images, as the calligraphic flourishes have been completed on many of the pages where work on the illuminations has not commenced.

On fols. 2r, 2v, 3r and 3v, preparatory work has begun on a number of *Personification* images. This could suggest that, excepting the first scene, our designer-illuminator was working through the manuscript from start to finish, as the *Personifications* directly follow the incipit. It is possible that the initial scene was left intentionally for another to finish, or even to be outsourced. This latter practice is evident in other *Roses*, such as Rennes 243 [Cat. 102] where the first miniature was undertaken by an artist known to have worked on other *Roses* (discussed in Chapter Three), though the rest of the illumination was delegated to others. However, it may also have been the case with Lyon 764 that the incipit was simply left to last, perhaps due to its prominent status as the first image in the manuscript.

that such scenes, when imported, are rarely ever facsimiles of the preceding imagery. *Rose* illuminations are generally well-suited to the text, with only rare instances of visual misinterpretations and irrelevant images.

⁴²⁹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 46 (BnF fr. 12593) and 130-31 (Lyon 764).

⁴³⁰ See Chapter Three.

The first preparatory sketch portrays *Avarice*, the fourth personification described in the text after *Hate*, *Felony* and *Covetousness*, though no designs for the three preceding figures have been inserted (Figures 63-64). As the incipit was untouched, we may discount the first folio, which may not have been part of this designer's workload at the time the sketch was added. To explain the two gaps on fol. 2r before *Avarice* is more difficult, but could be explained by working method. The scene has been sketched and also partly painted, with white and pink hues added. If our artist was left-handed, such a starting position could allow work to progress without the risk of smudging the paint. However, the absence of any designs for *Felony* and *Covetousness* is at odds with the preparatory work that follows on fols. 2v and 3r, leaving us forced to conclude that the artist was not working front-to-back. Without hands-on access to the manuscript it is difficult to ascertain the foliation, though the present visual evidence in the bound manuscript could suggest they were working backwards on the folios of this quire, as fol. 3 contains more complete designs than fol. 2.

It is also possible that further work was not completed on fol. 2v in an attempt to avoid damage to the partly designed and painted image of *Avarice* on the recto. Yet the pale and partly effaced nature of the white and red tones of this scene, as well as the fact that *Envy* is less detailed and shaded than *Avarice*, could suggest that the artist simply returned to *Avarice* after designing *Envy*, somewhat to the detriment of the underpainted sketch on the verso. This again suggests an *ad-hoc* method of working, where the artist moves between a series of images, completing them to an arbitrary level, before moving back across the folios to add more detail.

Fol. 3r also implies this tactic, with the contrasting states of finish accorded to *Old Age* and *Sorrow* (Figure 65). In this instance, we may more easily ascertain the direction of work, as the image of *Old Age* on the right has been worked up to a higher degree than its left-hand counterpart. However, while *Sorrow* is less 'finished', the artist appears to have used up the paints after adding colour to *Old Age*, as light colour appears in the background to *Sorrow*, the same colour as the robes of *Old Age*. On fol. 3v, we have the last scene incorporating design or preparatory work, with the thickly-drawn and smudged figure of *Religious Hypocrisy*, though again some white tinting has been added to the frame.

These images reveal particular emphases in the underdrawing stages. The human figure is the principal element of each scene, receiving most attention, followed by the

delineation of background or framing elements. Light red paint has been used to pick out decorative details in this early stage, while white paint has been used to lift particular elements such as robes, or the frame. Some basic shading has been added as part of the initial grey-toned sketches (presumably in metalpoint) though on the whole the images are quite linear.⁴³¹

One further image appears in this manuscript on fol. 20v, however its ink-sketch form, depicting presumably the *Castle of Jealousy* and the Roses, does not accord with the sketch and underpainting methods of the preparatory designer on fols. 2r-3v. This last image was likely added at a later date by an owner or reader; the addition of personalised images to unfinished manuscripts was a fairly regular occurrence for *Roses* retained in private collections.⁴³²

Lyon 764 thus presents us with a small but interesting series of folios where the designer and/or illuminator has begun work on the imagery. It suggests a segmented approach to the design and production of manuscript illumination, backing up the assertions of art historians that artists worked on specific folios at a time, rather than the whole bound manuscript.⁴³³ It also however implies that the stages of planning and execution blended together during production, and that manuscript illumination was not linear, but the result of movement back and forward across folios. These images suggest a simultaneous course of work on a few folios, each scene being loosely sketched, then variably worked up. Some, like *Old Age*, have had all of the details of frame, figure and background included as well as underpainting; others like *Religious Hypocrisy* received only minimal sketching and application of paint. This repetitive movement across the pages may have its origin in practicality; using up quantities of red and white pigment, or allowing time for images to dry before attending to the versos. Nonetheless, the process appears rather erratic. While the figures were added

⁴³¹ Christopher De Hamel, in *Medieval Craftsmen: Scribes and Illuminators* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 51, and Calkins, "Stages of Execution", 61, both reference metalpoint and silverpoint as the most likely tools for underdrawing, which from the visual evidence could have produced the effects shown in this manuscript.

⁴³² Such *Roses* are discussed below under manuscripts with alternative image cycles.

⁴³³ De Hamel in *Medieval Craftsmen*, 18, notes that artists and scribes appear to have worked only on single gatherings, as changes in writing and imagery tend to adhere to such sectional divisions. Lyon 764 supports this as the preparatory work only appears on a few folios. Alexander in *Medieval Illuminators*, 26, provided another piece of evidence for segmented labour practices based on documentation: some thirteenth and fourteenth century manuscripts refer to payments per quire, implying that this was the standard unit of work, and as such would be divided up among workers in this way.

first, secondary details were added in a less orderly fashion, sometimes framing or background patterns first, or major compositional furniture, as with the clothes rod accompanying *Avarice*.

The manuscript also suggests the division of labour, exemplified by the missing image at the head of the manuscript – perhaps assigned to another – and the restricted number of folios on which designs have been sketched. It may help to explain the processes behind the completed manuscript Rennes 243, which features the incipit painted by one artist, and the rest by a different group of workers. The producers of the Rennes *Rose*, perhaps like the designer of fols. 2 and 3 in Lyon 764, may only have had access to these pages, and may never have been intended to work on the incipit folio.

Lyon 764 provides insight into general working practices, and may be usefully compared with – or used to decipher – the oft-cited marginal image present in *Rose* BnF fr. 25526 [Cat. 71], where the artists appear to have depicted themselves working on manuscripts (Figure 66). Alexander cited this image as an example of the playful attitudes of thirteenth-century illuminators to marginalia.⁴³⁴ Huot devoted an entire chapter to the marginalia of BnF fr. 25526, and proposed that this marginal image of the illuminators is emphasised by the structure of the manuscript.⁴³⁵ The Rouses also highlighted the ‘self-referential’ nature of this bas-de-page, while Blamires and Holian use this exemplar as further evidence for the bifolia as unit of production – and to back up their assertion that artists could not be invested in the texts they illuminated under such circumstances.⁴³⁶ However, these floating figures in the margins by their very nature cannot offer us a complete picture of workshop practices, suspended without full context among the bar-borders and ivy-leaf decoration beneath the text. These instead must be contextualised within the largely sporadic, commonly ad-hoc and often erotic marginalia present throughout BnF fr. 25526, a context which I believe undermines the ability of these random scenes to provide insight into ‘actual’ working methods in the mid-fourteenth century.

These two figures work on single pages while bifolia hang on rods behind them, presumably drying. One may easily extrapolate from this the relevance to the Lyon 764 pages, with the artist(s) applying paint to several folios, working on others while the

⁴³⁴ Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 118.

⁴³⁵ Huot, “Sacred and Erotic Love”, 273-322.

⁴³⁶ Rouse and Rouse, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 240; Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxxi.

first dried. Nonetheless, for all BnF fr. 25526 suggests an organised production cycle, the evidence of Lyon 764 is that in some instances, *Rose* illumination was not a formulaic march from one folio to another, especially when it came to deciding which order to complete the images in. The implications of this are important, if only for revealing that manuscript production may not always be summarised as a rigid and codified sequence of events with artists mindlessly following instructions from folio to folio, but a more nuanced or even erratic process.

The second manuscript considered here is BnF fr. 12593 [Cat. 72], from the mid years of the fourteenth century. The copy was eventually completed with full text, red rubrics above images and new sections of text, gilding and painted miniatures and initials. However, at some point in its history, several of the manuscript images were partially damaged, causing smudging to the layers of paint, framing and decoration. One of the most deteriorated examples is on fol.112r, with the *Battle of Love's Army and the Doorkeepers* (Figure 67). Here, the paint has been so smudged as to reveal the hard outlines of the figures design – one that strikingly contrasts with the intricate design of the Lyon 764 copy. The bodies of the figures are loosely drawn in sinuous lines, with no indication of facial features, nor the intricate patterns present on the painted shields of the fighters.

Elsewhere in the manuscript, facial features have been carefully delineated to suggest characteristics of the figures, such as on fol. 27v when *Shame and Fear Approach Danger* who has his eyes closed and a downturned, relaxed mouth. When applied to the rest of the manuscript, the loose designs visible on fol. 112r and elsewhere, such as the representation of Pygmalion later in the manuscript offer little support for the highly worked detail that appears in the finished miniatures.

As a complementary partner to the Lyon 764 copy, this manuscript reveals that not all programmes for design that occurred in the spaces left for the miniatures were so in-depth as to allow no variation. The BnF fr. 12593 manuscript instead reveals a process wherein the final state of the miniature was determined by the paintbrush – and not the all-circumscribing hand of a master designer. This implies that the importance of the design was in adding the correct number of figures or compositional aspects, and not the minutiae of finished details. As such, this shows a considerable freedom granted to artists partaking in this design process, and proving that much of the allusive or interpretive detail that appears in *Rose* manuscripts was as much at the mercy of actual

artists as in the hands of *libraires* or skilled designers. This runs contrary to most assumptions regarding the input of artists on finished images, and thus it is proposed here that one reinstate the persona of the artist as an agent of image design, rather than positioning them solely as the mechanical means of illumination.

IV: Alternative Planning Methods in the First Decade of *Rose* Production

Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 and BnF fr. 802

Two other manuscripts, this time fully illuminated, provide insight into alternative manuscript production methods and planning: Vatican Urb Lat. 376 [Cat. 116] and BnF fr. 802 [Cat. 58], dating from c.1280-90 and c.1325-50 respectively.⁴³⁷ It is important to note that the marginal planning notes in these manuscripts are rare survivors; most producers appear to have either erased indications of these elements or cut them off in the binding process, while many others have also likely been lost over time.⁴³⁸ The Vatican manuscript is one of the earliest extant *Roses*, and contains a series of marginal indications for the imagery in the form of sketches for principal elements. The full extent of the marginal notations and sketches is difficult to ascertain, as some appear to have been rubbed or cut off. However, on a number of pages, a series of instructions both visual and textual in nature appear alongside the miniatures. One of the first appears on fol. 1v, which contains two scenes - the first of the Dreamer in a landscape sewing up his sleeves, and the second a two-part miniature of *Hate*. In the margins, there are small notations stating what was to be included. These were evidently not designed for a rubricator, as there are no red titles or headings appearing on the page, nor do they fulfil the functions of rubrics, as they are removed from the textual context that rubrics and images typically explain or appear alongside.

The instructions are direct in tone, with statements such as 'Ci doit avoir haine' for the image of *Hate*. The folio also contains the instruction for the Dreamer image beginning 'Ci doit', but this has been partially cut off. The directness of these instructions is perhaps unsurprising given the manuscript's early date in the chronology of *Rose*

⁴³⁷ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 183; König, *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose*, multiple citations (Vatican Urb. Lat. 376); Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 9-10; Rouse and Rouse, *Illiterati et Uxorati*, 253-60; Coilly and Tesnière, *Le Roman de la Rose*, 153.

⁴³⁸ The notations referred to in this section take the form of brown or black instructions in the margins; these differ from the completed red rubrics appearing in the text discussed in the two sections at the head of this chapter. While red rubrics were intended as a permanent feature of the *mise-en-page*, the brown or black notations discussed here, often written in shorthand, were only required temporarily.

production and illumination. However, the phrase is quite open, and relies on the artistic translation of this concept. Reference to *Hate* necessitates the linkage of this representation to the more common 'vice' imagery that preceded this image, and was likely Guillaume's inspiration for the description. The message on the folio does not specify what is to be depicted in full detail, and therefore is here depicted as two figures back to back. This differs from the more typical representation of *Hate* in later eras - a generic, often scowling figure - and the related vice 'Ire', who in some manuscripts was shown tugging her hair, as shown in a *Tree of Vices* on fol. 6r of a *Speculum theologiae* manuscript, BnF fr. 9220. The Vatican instructions thus point to a planning figure, aware of what miniatures would fit the poem, but one reliant on the artist's ability to relate this notation to traditional representations of *Hate* - a chain of events that did not always result in facsimile images, as demonstrated with the atypical *Hate* in Urb. Lat. 376. As will be demonstrated, this correlation with preceding imagery was not always possible in the early years of *Rose* production, and presents a further difficulty with assuming readers and viewers would recognise the 'prototypes' for images appearing in *Roses*. When such images deviated from their models, identification of their original form and context could arguably have been impossible.

Fol. 2v features the first of a group of more specific instructions, with the partial notation for the first miniature reading: 'Ci doit avoir avarice q tendra une...' which is again cut off by the page. This reference probably ended with a phrase referring to *Avarice's* money-bag, which is depicted in the finished miniature. This differs from the aforementioned *Tree of Vices* representation of *Avarice* in BnF fr. 9220, who was shown there at a counting desk, which was a form often used in other *Roses* for depictions of both *Avarice* and *Covetousness*. The specification of *Avarice* holding a bag of money was therefore a direct request that reflected a variant representation of this character. The depiction of *Avarice* with a money bag may reflect the materialistic nature of the Old Woman, who regales Responsiveness with tales of her youth. She advises women to take what they can from their lovers before they abandon them; a characteristic not unlike the vices of *Avarice* or *Covetousness* depicted on Guillaume's garden wall. The alternatives, with *Avarice* or *Covetousness* seated at formal counting-desks, may have been intended to imply these behaviours in people who dealt with money professionally, such as money-lenders.

However, text was not the only means of guiding the illuminators of this manuscript. On other pages, such as fol. 12r, visual instruction appears in the margin alongside or in

place of textual notes. The image of the God of Love firing his arrow at the Dreamer is indicated by a small sketch on the far left showing the Dreamer shot in the side or hip, a fairly common reinterpretation that varies from the poetic statement that the first arrow entered through his eye. This has been included in the final image, with the Dreamer's pose suggesting he is shying away from the arrow.

Lest one suspect that these doodles were not preparatory sketches, one may usefully contrast these marginal vignettes with other imitative doodles. Bodleian e. mus. 65 [Cat. 160] features sketches by a later owner (or more likely, as I believe, a later owner's child) on folio 5v beneath the scene of *Love Shooting the Dreamer* (Figure 68).⁴³⁹ The principal element of the sketch is indicative of the falling Dreamer, with arms outstretched to either side, though it reduces the primary elements to simple shapes and sticks, dissimilar to the volumetric bodies it copies from. The addition of a floating figure above the head of the falling Dreamer also has no parallels in the image above - suggesting this is more an imaginative re-envisioning of the miniature, not a preparatory sketch for it. Instructive sketches such as those found in Urb. Lat. 376 were certainly simplistic in nature, but typically included the major elements to be included in the miniatures above; additional figures in a sketch would almost certainly reappear in the final illumination. The creative adaptation of the miniature in the sketch of the Bodleian copy is more in tune with the spirit of secondary programmes of illustration in *Roses*, such as the additions to BnF fr. 12592 [Cat. 82] or Baltimore Walters W.143 [Cat. 169] (both discussed below). Contrastingly, Urb. Lat. 376's marginalia is far closer to the miniatures they appear beneath or alongside, focusing on important elements of the composition as if abbreviating the scenes, and therefore most likely served as visual guides for the illuminators during the preparatory stage.

That no imagery appears in the margins before fol. 12r in the Vatican copy could suggest that this was the first scene deemed to require additional visual guidance, although they may also have been specifically removed.⁴⁴⁰ However, the survival of the

⁴³⁹ Hunt, *A Summary Catalogue*, Volume 2, Part 2, 728; Braet, "Der Roman der Rose", 191-92; Camille, *The Medieval Art of Love*, multiple citations.

⁴⁴⁰ Alexander, in "Preliminary Marginal Drawings", suggested that marginal drawings were not meant to be retained, and were cut off during the binding process or erased with a sharp tool. This was evidently a factor in Urb. Lat. 376, as the instructions are often cut off by the bottom edge of the page. Alexander's assumption that these were not meant to be seen aligns too with the earlier examples of this chapter where drawings were placed in the borders of the miniatures themselves; these would be naturally obscured by layers of paint, negating the need for specific erasure at a later date.

guiding instructions on earlier pages may mean sketches were not present in the first instance, and could mean textual notes were viewed by the planners as sufficient for the opening images.

Throughout the rest of the manuscript, both textual and visual notations crop up around pages featuring imagery, interspersed with the more common textual annotations by someone correcting the text (as on fol. 7r) or a later reader following the text. Such notations were present in many *Roses*, including unillustrated versions. However, the majority of visual sketches are now difficult to make out, and in some instances one can only speculate what aspect of the finished miniatures they specified.

On the whole, the Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 manuscript provides a clear indication of a specific planned process for the illumination of *Roses* in the first years of its production. As is to be expected with the decoration of a text which was only finished off in the prior decade, it was a carefully planned exercise, pointing to the existence of a designated designer who wanted a specific number of images, with certain characteristics present in each. While this was probably not the artist, who was expected to relate generic instructions to prior traditions of imagery and 'copy' the intended iconography of some sketches, this does show that the visual interpretation of the *Rose* was deliberately planned by someone, most likely the *libraire*, but perhaps also the lead artist.

As exemplified by another manuscript of later date, this carefully designed approach to the visual aspect of *Roses* continued into later eras, as demonstrated by BnF fr. 802. Its image cycle is also complete, but like the Vatican manuscript it also features a glimpse of its production process. In many of the margins below the images and the text blocks, there are small sketches of the primary elements of the scenes depicted above, like the Vatican copy, but without any written counterparts. On fol. 3v, for example, the lower-right margin contains a sketch of two crutches - the principal attributive element in the miniature of *Old Age* which appears on this page (Figures 69-70). Such small and fairly unobtrusive sketches appear on many pages in this manuscript, but vary in the level of specificity in delineating elements of the composition. On fol. 5v, below the miniature of *Idleness Greeting the Dreamer*, the now-faded sketch depicts not only the relative positions of the two standing figures, but also the outline of the garden gate and trees that comprise the background. Contrastingly, on fol. 11r, the sketch artist has only depicted the head of the Dreamer and the outline of the fountain he kneels beside,

omitting the background elements of birds and trees. And in what may prove the most minimal of all the sketches, on fol. 12v, below a complex figure scene of the *God of Love Attacking the Dreamer*, our marginal planner has only included a bow and arrow as the miniaturist's guide (Figures 71-72).

Like the Vatican manuscript, these marginal scenes clearly relate to the images, but they betray a more specific reduction of the imagery to major compositional elements, as well as varying levels of design between the pictures. These are also clearly planning elements, preparatory studies rather than sketches deriving from the miniatures as found in some other manuscripts; were it the other way round, it is more probable a greater level of detail would have been retained in the marginal copy produced after the miniature. However, while the planner suggested the key elements of each scene - in the same way the rubrics of Besançon 553 proposed that Pygmalion be shown kneeling before Galatea - other aspects were less fixed, and subject to variation or addition. The inclusion of extra details not present in the miniatures suggests that artists were able to insert visual material on top of that suggested by the planner, leaving scope for the provision of iconographical details that served interpretive functions - whether those were intentional or not. On fol. 11r with the scene of the *Dreamer by the Fountain*, the trees and birds in the background contribute to our understanding that this scene takes place in the Garden of Delight, which Guillaume describes as full of birds and plants (Figures 73-74). These were not indicated in the sketch, raising the question of whether the artist knew of their textual significance when including them, or if it was a mere coincidence of their design, or model.

However, it is clear our artist in BnF fr. 802 did know something of the *Rose* text, and reflected this in the imagery. If one compares the *Dreamer by the Fountain* and its respective sketch with its counterpart image, the *Dreamer Reflected in the Fountain* (Figures 75-76), it is clear the illuminator has added to the basic details of the model for the purposes of identification. Though the sketches allude to a similar composition - a figure leaning over a river - the finished images specifically contrast a Dreamer looking into an empty fountain with a figure looking at his own reflection. The contrasting hairstyles do introduce some ambiguity into these representations; the Dreamer is tonsured in the first (a hairstyle often used to differentiate the poet-Dreamer in fourteenth-century manuscripts), and fully coiffed in the second, suggesting

some overlap with the figure of Narcissus.⁴⁴¹ However, the scene on 12r and its rubric refer to a brief detail in the text when Guillaume looks at his own reflection in the fountain's mirrored surface – despite his prior warning that glancing in the fountain will make you fall in love. The addition of a reflection thus points to a specific detail in the text, showing that the artist likely relied both on textual and sketched guides for the final illumination, and results in a more accurate visual interpretation of the narrative.

Interestingly, this focus on the *Dreamer by the Fountain* is less common in the rest of the manuscript corpus, which typically paired one image of the Dreamer with an empty fountain and his tragic parallel, Narcissus, seeing his own reflection in the water. Some, including MS Egerton 881 [Cat. 146] differentiate clearly between the two visitors to the fountain, showing one standing and approaching it (suggesting the Dreamer discovering it) while Narcissus sits contemplating his reflection. Lyon PA 23 [Cat. 29], a manuscript likely produced by the same workshop as BnF fr. 802, omits any reference to the Dreamer, and instead features only an image of Narcissus. A slightly later manuscript, BnF Arsenal 5209 [Cat. 66] however takes the opposite approach, featuring almost identical images of Narcissus (fol. 11v) and the Dreamer (fol. 12v) looking at their reflections in the fountain.

Returning to BnF fr. 802, it is clear that those at work on the manuscript were not restricted by the designs circumscribed in the marginal sketches. Indeed, given the brief nature of these drawings, it is understandable that the artists had to develop these minimal compositional guides with additions of their own making. This evidences a rather different state of affairs to the process visible in Lyon 764 and BnF fr. 12593. Rather than drawing the details within the frames of the miniatures, they are featured in truncated form within the margins. This change in methodology may simply be the result of different working styles, or due to a desire to retain the visual model throughout the production process. The aforementioned in-frame planning process has one considerable drawback if one requires significant underpainting before applying detail: the paint will easily obscure the sketched design, which is a major problem if one needs to refer to the model at a later stage. The introduction of marginal sketches also further suggests a division of labour; while the careful designs of Lyon 764 were by a

⁴⁴¹ Lori Walters in “Illuminating the *Rose*: Gui de Mori and the Illustrations of MS 101 of the Municipal Library, Tournai”, in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose*, eds. Brownlee and Huot, 81 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992) refers to the frequently tonsured appearance of the Dreamer.

skilled visual designer, the brief sketches in BnF fr. 802 could have been undertaken by a *libraire* with only a minimal grasp of visual forms but aware of the required compositions, and need not have been the work of an experienced illuminator. *Libraires* often worked originally in a section of the book trade, either as scribe, parchment-maker, illuminator or binder, and thus may not have had artistic training; marginal sketches would allow those with knowledge of the text to provide their instructions in a basic visual form, which would then be elaborated on by a more skilled illuminator. Tax lists and judicial documents show that those holding the title *libraire* were also often taxed or known as a member of another profession.⁴⁴²

The marginal sketches reveal a reciprocal relationship, as they are less restrictive than the in-frame designs. While the artists were expected to incorporate particular elements, the final nature of the completed images was left to the artist to decide. This aligns with the evidence of other incomplete *Roses* where the artist was trusted to follow the directions of a planner, *libraire*, designer, or scribe, as with the instructive rubrics in Besançon 553. While the methodology points to an internal hierarchy, with a designer or planner responsible for the transmission of key elements to their artists and subordinates, it does not negate the prospect of individual visual interpretation in the final worked-up scenes.

That the additions to the second scene on fol. 12r relate to a minor detail in Guillaume's narrative reveals that the artists were more sensitive to the narrative than they are often given credit for. These developments from simple sketches into fully-formed, differentiated images reveal that the workers did have awareness of some nuances in the narrative - namely the fact that Guillaume's experiences at the Fountain took different visual forms as he first discovers, then interacts with it. While one might suppose that these additions were solely due to the artists' prior experience illuminating the poem, 'remembering' the details included before, the evidence of another family group (the Lyon-Brussels family, discussed below) suggests that even this assumption is unreliable. Consistent variation in manuscripts produced by the same workshops and artists reveal that even if artists were aware of how the image looked before, they did not make any extraordinary efforts to repeat them - rather new elements or omissions appear in each fresh example.

⁴⁴² For examples of this, see Marie-Thérèse Gousset, "Parcheminiers et Libraires Rouennais à la fin du quatorzième siècle d'après un document judiciaire", *Viator*, 24 (1993): 233-46, a study of a judicial document from Rouen containing details of parchment-makers and *libraires*.

The nature of these sketches in BnF fr. 802 and Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 reveal that the artists had skills not only in elaborating upon given designs, but also the ability to translate narrative textual difference into a visual form. The variations from the simplistic guide sketch prototypes reveal interpretive additions and omissions that were only inserted at the moment of the miniature's completion - not during the planning stage. As such, they must have originated with the final illuminator, as the sketches show no sign of these changes. This does not apply to all manuscripts - indeed, the detailed designs of Lyon 764 suggest a rather different approach - but it is important to bear in mind the existence of the BnF fr. 802 and the Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 manuscripts as part of the whole picture of *Rose* production. Although these sketches and their development may have had different motivations to the principles of artistic 'design' as it is considered today, it is clear that, at least in some manuscripts, visual variation, elaboration of basic designs and the development of traditional motifs was built in to the production process for medieval *Roses*. These manuscripts provide a useful counterargument to the idea that artists had no control over the images they produced; in fact, miniatures were produced in an environment that required the push and pull of conflicting factors, such as tradition, workshop training, and 'interpretation' of textual or visual guides.

Although it is clear that artists belonged to an organised workforce in which they performed a specific role, this was also a responsive, receptive working space, where visual models were interpreted through the lens of inherited traditions and contemporary understandings of the poem. While workshop and collaborative structures are evident in the *Roses* discussed here, it is important to remember that these did not wholly circumscribe the nature of *Rose* imagery, which is overwhelmingly variable. Such manuscripts attest to the fact that artists were intentionally engaged in the expressivity of their representations in a manner that produced not only visual distinctions, but also meaning and significance for the observant reader.

V: Multiple Methodologies, and an Unfinished Copy: The Late Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries

BnF fr. 805 and Arras 897

BnF fr. 805 [Cat. 87] exemplifies another unusual trend in *Roses*: the state of having a distinct incipit scene, often finished in full colour, alongside a majority of images

worked up to different degrees.⁴⁴³ This copy is datable to the transitional years at the end of the fourteenth century due to its incorporation of *grisaille* features, plain backgrounds, and the compression of several personifications into one scene, all of which were more popular in the latter half of the 1300s. Unlike the other manuscripts mentioned so far, which evidence a homogenous approach even when produced by multiple hands, the imagery in this manuscript draws a strong contrast between the first and following images, apparently as a conscious design effort (Figures 77-79).

The bipartite incipit (Figure 77) features two of the scenes commonly found in later incarnations of this type, the *Dreamer in Bed* with roses in the background, and the *Dreamer Rising and Washing*. The details are fully worked up, with tessellated backgrounds of gold and colour. The only elements approximating a *grisaille* form are the Dreamer's pillow on the left and the towel hanging on the right, which are even then naturalistic colours for these items.

The following scenes are however finished in two different visual style (here identified as Variations 1 and 2). Variation 1 (Figure 78) contains plain vellum backgrounds without embellishment, light washed-in colours for the lower landscapes or features such as trees and select details like hair, while the main bodies and faces are coloured in *grisaille*. At other times the figures barely even seem to have been filled in beyond the drawing stage, as with the figures on fol. 25v (Variation 2, Figure 79).

The styles in this manuscript resemble other late fourteenth and early fifteenth-century manuscripts featuring lightly coloured images. Variation 1, visible in the *Carole*, is similar to the worked-up *grisaille* figures of the contemporary Oxford Bodleian Douce 332 [Cat. 159], though the latter's backgrounds were filled in with intricate gold and coloured patterns often arranged in plant-like spirals. The images of Variation 2, with a lesser degree of paint application, are similar to BnF fr. 1570 [Cat. 93] which features numerous images characterised by plain vellum backgrounds, landscapes and objects in light colour, and figures in shades of grey. This latter comparison is revealing, as BnF fr. 1570 also features an incipit miniature fully worked-up in thick multi-coloured paint. BnF fr. 801 [Cat. 94], also from the early fifteenth century, featured a variation of this style, with figures and backgrounds worked up with thick bold lines of colour over

⁴⁴³ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 12; Coilly and Tesnière, *Le Roman de la Rose*, 29.

the top of a sketched design, but allowing the vellum to shine through both in the foreground and background.

The presence of these three different styles in BnF fr. 805 point to a few possible scenarios. The manuscript may have been worked on by three separate artists, each using an alternative visual style for their respective folios. It may have been the product of two or even three stages of work, with the codex left unfinished after the incipit was completed, then worked on respectively by the artists of Variations 1 and 2. However, the sketchy form of Variation 2 may correspond to simply an earlier stage in production, before the application of the white paint that characterises Variation 1 imagery. The visual difference between these two latter forms may then simply have been due to abandonment before more work could be done on the figures and landscapes.

Whichever scenario applies - one we will likely never trace with complete certainty - the manuscript was still bound together, despite these variable images. The lack of cross-page smudging on folios facing the Variation 1 miniatures suggests that the copy was unbound while work was undertaken, unlike other manuscripts where work was undertaken while bound or compiled too quickly (see Douce 188 [Cat. lxxix] for example, or the ghostly imprint of the incipit of Gray's Inn 10 [Cat. 143] onto the left-facing flyleaf), though the Variation 2 miniatures could have been undertaken after binding, as the light wash approach could have dried quickly, resulting in low risk to the facing folios.⁴⁴⁴ If the miniatures were undertaken in different periods, it attests to the willingness of the patron or buyer to have variable imagery, with the artists not being required to approximate the visual style of the incipit. Whatever the causes of these variable first and following images, evidently these were still accepted by the patron(s) or owner, as no steps appear to have been taken to alter or 'complete' the imagery. There are a number of manuscripts featuring a similarly distinct incipit, or even select miniatures by artists with quite different training. This suggests that the

⁴⁴⁴ Several manuscripts akin to Douce 188, featuring interventions to the miniatures while bound, reveal characteristic smudging, transference or other deterioration of images on facing folios. Douce 188 is a particularly extreme example, as the images were coloured with oil paint. This medium is particularly unsuitable for manuscripts as the long drying time increases the likelihood of smudging when the pages are closed - further suggesting the intervening artist had little understanding of original manuscript painting methods and materials. However, the case of the Gray's Inn manuscript reveals that smudging and contamination also occurred in the medieval period - the now-lost fourteenth-century quadripartite, quadrilobed incipit partly printed onto the facing flyleaf, suggesting it was hastily compiled and bound after completion.

practice of accepting variable styles was commonplace during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Another manuscript, Arras 897 [Cat. 17] also features a similar juxtaposition of images finished to greater or lesser degrees.⁴⁴⁵ The imagery of the manuscript also complicates matters, as several images allude to meaningful aspects of the text or attitudes towards it. The incipit (Figure 80) is particularly notable for its atypical iconography, depicting a long curling frond of Roses stemming almost from the Dreamer's mouth outside into the countryside, where a secondary Dreamer, this time wandering through the countryside towards a castle-shaped edifice, looks up at the Roses. While this image may relate to the example Meuwese highlighted, of the dead monk with roses growing from his mouth, its incorporation here raises problems.⁴⁴⁶ Even if borrowed ostensibly from the legend recounted by Gautier de Coinci, it is being reused in a context that has almost nothing to do with that original tale. The Roses in the *Rose*, above all else, have romantic or sexual connotations, depending on your reading of the eventual 'coupling' at the end of the narrative.

Within the *Rose* tradition, the presence of these Roses stemming from the Dreamer's mouth and spreading outside to interact with a secondary representation of the Dreamer may refer to something entirely different. Related to, but reversing the trend of incipits featuring the Roses as part of the background, where external circumstance is suggested as a cause for the dream, here the Dreamer is shown as the origin of his own dream and love object. The Roses stem from his mouth, perhaps reflecting oral poetry, but also the idea that they grow from within the body of the poet himself, subsequently inflecting upon the rest of his dream. This may therefore be an abstraction of poetic creativity, with the idea of the Roses originating in the Dreamer then shaped into a 'real' object – the text of the *Rose*. It may also come full circle to the theories of theologians and authors regarding dreams, wherein physical causes - digestion, love-sickness and illness - could cause the onset of particular types of dreams.

Visually, this incipit has all the details of background, frame, and internal objects painted in thick paint with no plain vellum visible. Those from fol. 2r appear less

⁴⁴⁵ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 110-16.

⁴⁴⁶ Discussed in Chapter Two, fn. 283.

complete in comparison, blocked in with flat colour, and the scenes are typically bereft of background details or landscapes, with the vellum showing through (Figures 81-82).

While this appears to be a relation of the BnF fr. 805 manuscript, with an intentional distinction between first and following images, the scenario is actually more complex. Other miniatures in the copy feature a higher degree of paint application on the faces, such as that on fol. 18r, or the castle on fol. 23v (Figure 82), suggesting that work was continued further on some folios, and that a greater degree of finish was intended throughout the manuscript image cycle. While the colours in several other miniatures appear quite jarring, as with the green and orange colouring in the images of Fortune on 34v, the evidence of the multiple painting levels throughout suggest that this was an intermediary, underpainting stage that would be worked up to a more neutral level, like that suggested in the incipit.

Once more, this manuscript attests to the variable working processes in later fourteenth century *Roses*, wherein illumination was added across several folios at once. That the manuscript was completed to the degree where paint is applied to all the miniatures in the copy suggests that production was continued for some time before being called off, however evidently the artists still ran out of time to finish it. Indeed, it is possible that, knowing the work was to be curtailed, they returned to the incipit to complete it before production ceased. This manuscript is therefore an example of a copy wherein artistic production methods resulted in the visual difference between first and following images. However, the copy also reveals the extent to which this incomplete cycle was viewed as 'complete' by its later owners and readers.

The fact that the manuscript was bound and preserved is one strong indication that reveals it was accepted by at least one patron after production ceased. Furthermore, the image cycle was evidently explicit enough to cause offense to at least one later reader. On fols. 119r and 120v, two scenes from the climax of the poem have been erased, likely due to their risqué content. An image beneath an archway and pillars, likely the *Dreamer Approaching the Sanctuary*, has been almost entirely obliterated. The scene on fol. 120v retains its architectural frame and rosebush, but the cylindrical shape beneath – likely a bed due to the presence of what appears to be striped sheets – has been all but erased (Figure 83). Coming so near to the end of the poem, this image may have represented the *Dreamer Bedding the Rose*, a literal rendering of Jean de

Meun's allegorical textual ending that exists in only a handful of copies, and which would certainly be capable of offending more prudish viewers.

VI: Artists for Hire, c.1325-50: The Lyon-Brussels Group and their Extended Family

Lyon 763, Brussels 9574-5, Rennes 243, Draguignan 17, Lyon PA 24, BnF fr. 24388, Augsburg I.4.2.3.

The group of manuscripts discussed in this section each share peculiarities of incipit or general decoration, illuminating further aspects of fourteenth-century *Rose* production: multiple copies produced by one workshop, and the outsourcing of particular artists for external work. I have designated this grouping 'Lyon-Brussels' due to the striking similarities in the incipit miniatures of Lyon 763 and Brussels 9574-5, and the fact that the copies clearly shared models for the rest of their images, despite variations of individual handiwork (Figures 84-89).⁴⁴⁷

The incipits of Lyon and Brussels appear at first glance to be the most closely connected of the group, with strong correlation in composition and colouring that suggests the presence of a shared model, or could imply that one was copied from the other, a fact borne out by the proximity of other scenes in the manuscripts. The major variations in these two incipits is largely due to artistic handiwork, and the additional trellis-like grid placed over the top of the Lyon version. While the model for the Dreamer, Roses, and details of the bedding appears to be exactly the same, there is a distinct difference in the treatment of faces and colour application, though the lighter tones of the Lyon copy could partially be down to preservation. However, even the seemingly minor addition of the trellis and removal of the bird have effects on the incipit in these cases. While the bird on top of the rosebush in the Brussels copy points to the description of the Garden of Delight some pages on, populated with birds and flowers, its omission in the Lyon copy reduces the rosebush to a more generic representation of the Roses as a signifier of the dream content, not their status as object within the garden.

The trellis is a trickier alteration, and was evidently placed at the last minute over the composition - the red hues of the Dreamer's robe and spirals of the rosebush leave

⁴⁴⁷ Lyon 763 - Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 130. Brussels 9574-5 - Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 167-68; Gaspar and Lyna, *Les Principaux Manuscrits à Peintures de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique*. (Bruxelles: Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1er, 1984), 166-67; Bernard Bousmanne and Céline van Hoorebeeck, eds., *La librairie des ducs de Bourgogne* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000, CD-Rom).

ghostly imprints beneath the white lines. This suggests that it was not simply a drawing aid, akin to those used for the scaling up of small images.⁴⁴⁸ The addition must then be viewed as an alteration to the iconography of the scene, one with potentially meaningful associations, evident elsewhere in the Lyon copy which tends towards a more elaborate visual and iconographic cycle than the Brussels manuscript. While it bears some relation to the trellises present in some fifteenth-century copies, as with the aforementioned Stuttgart manuscript, its presence almost a century prior to these incipits is hard to comprehend, and the Roses do not appear to grow around it. It could be a representation of the Rose enclosure, akin to the wicker fences present in later *Rose* manuscripts, but here it encircles both the Dreamer in bed (by definition, outside his dream) and the Roses that feature within his dream. Such an alteration, though seemingly minimal, therefore has complex repercussions for the representation of the dream, and reveal again how productions by one workshop could incorporate variations that posed interpretive questions into their output.

The Rennes copy on the other hand takes the formula used in these manuscripts and develops it (Figure 86).⁴⁴⁹ Here, the Dreamer and Roses of the Lyon 763 copy have been reproduced, but without the irregular trellis over the composition. The second half of this double-column incipit features the Dreamer with Idleness at the garden gate, the model for which comes from a freestanding miniature in Lyon 763 on fol. 5r. The artisanal handiwork of the Rennes incipit is shared with Lyon 763, featuring the same slightly irregular features and generally pale styling, though as noted before this artisan only made one miniature for the manuscript. This reconfiguration of two traditionally separate miniatures into one multiscenic composition is a clear example of the borrowing and reworking that led to such compressed action incipits, and provides a model for the other types of multiscene incipits discussed in relation to Valencia 387.

Beyond the incipits of the Lyon and Brussels copies, the compositions up to folio 10 are almost identical, with only minor tweaks to the characterisation of heads and the colouring of buildings and garments. The differences are slight enough as to suggest two artists trained in the same environment, with access to similar figure models but varying in the personal application of paint. The fact that the Brussels copy was clearly

⁴⁴⁸ If the grid was designed to help the artist scale up the image of Brussels or another intermediate copy, it is unlikely it would have been preserved in the final illumination. Furthermore, this trellis does not extend to either the bottom or top edges, nor are the gaps of equal size, again demonstrating its unsuitability as a practical scaling tool.

⁴⁴⁹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 139.

a more luxury edition also modifies our appreciation of the visual style, as the copious amount of gold in that copy makes it appear more refined, adding a certain crispness to outlines wherever the gold leaf appears. The Brussels copy specifically relates to the poorly-preserved Augsburg manuscript [Cat. 105], whose few surviving miniatures share a similar approach to light and dark colour contrasts and form, as is evident when one compares the Jean de Meun miniatures in each copy (Figures 87-89).⁴⁵⁰

The other related copies are more complex in their relation to the Brussels-Lyon-Augsburg manuscripts. BnF fr. 12588 [Cat. 53] shows proximity to the models of the Brussels example in many compositions, though this appears to have been filtered through the style of an artist with a different approach to figural and background modelling, and it features a retrograde incipit based around a different composition.⁴⁵¹ Its most striking similarity is in the variant God of Love in a tree motif (Figures 90-91) which appears in the Brussels manuscript and another relation, Rennes 243 [Cat. 102].⁴⁵² This particular vignette is striking as it adds a touch of humour to the God of Love's pursuit of the Dreamer, and is not present in the text. The few surviving images of Lyon PA 24 [Cat. 30] are close to the style of BnF fr. 12588, and while the loss of the opening folios prevents the comparison of more images between the two, there is a strong similarity in the conception of figures and backgrounds.⁴⁵³

Rennes 243 is a more hybrid manuscript. The first scene is almost certainly the work of an artist working in the same circle as those responsible for the Lyon 763 and Brussels copies, but from fol. 2r the imagery is of a quite different nature. The scenes share compositional features, including the God-in-a-tree motif from the Brussels manuscript, suggesting it was based on it or a similar copy, but presented in a different visual style (Figure 92). The figures of Brussels and several of the other copies tend to be elongated, thin, and feature intense shading; those of the Rennes manuscript are stockier, flatter in form and painted with thicker brushstrokes and wider planes of colour. It has something in common with manuscripts deriving from northern and eastern France, which share some of those characteristics. The contrast in first and following images thus points to a scenario where the *Rose* painter(s) of Brussels and

⁴⁵⁰ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 163-66.

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 43-44.

⁴⁵² This motif is almost unknown in *Rose* manuscripts prior to this date; however, it does appear in a variable form in the margin of the incipit folio of Tournai 101 [Cat. 12], where the armed God of Love, seated in a tree, points arrows at two kneeling figures.

⁴⁵³ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 131-32.

Lyon were hired for the design and production of the first folio, but no further work. Instead, their models – perhaps even the Brussels manuscript itself – were used by workers with a different training background to complete the image cycle.

This state of affairs was likely economic, as the established – and perhaps more costly – artists with experience working on *Roses* were only contracted for a single image in *Rennes*. That would appear to back up McMunn’s assertion on the commercial status of these manuscripts, and her assumption that the image-heavy nature of Guillaume’s section in many *Roses* was the result of market factors, to make the copies more attractive to buyers skimming through.⁴⁵⁴ McMunn suggests that by placing images at the head of the manuscript, they may have appeared fuller to prospective buyers. However, such an illusion could only ever trick the most half-hearted of buyers – given the high value of manuscripts attested to in documents, it is highly unlikely that buyers of ready-made or second-hand books did not take a careful look at the manuscript before handing over their money. While such variations between incipit and majority images in manuscripts like *Rennes 243* attest to concepts of ‘saleability’, it is nonetheless interesting that this was deemed acceptable. After all, one turn of the page would reveal to any prospective buyer that the incipit was not representative of the workers responsible for the rest of the images. While such scenes could add to the value of a manuscript, they comfortably lie alongside imagery of a quite different style.

However, the *Rennes* manuscript was also not just a poor companion copy of the Brussels-Lyon-Augsburg copies, but one that freely incorporated different scenes as well as different finishing styles. The image of *Fraud Murdering Slander* on fol. 77v appears only in this copy, and none of the other related manuscripts, which instead opt for the more innocuous scene of *Fraud and Constrained Abstinence Meeting Slander* outside the Castle of Jealousy. Instead, the *Rennes* copy inserts a more extreme violent episode, offering the viewer a ring-side view of Fraud strangling the unfortunate Slander as he kneels before him in confession. The scene has the additional effect of emphasising the deceptive nature of this figure dressed in clerical robes – a theme that sometimes saw backlash against the *Rose* from its readers.

The evidence of the completed cycle in the *Rennes* copy thus underlines that it was not therefore designed solely as a lesser-quality copy of the Lyon or Brussels family manuscripts. While such variations could attest to the presence of model copies that

⁴⁵⁴ McMunn, “Was Christine Poisoned by an Illustrated Rose?”, 141.

have since been lost, the scenes in Rennes reveal that fluctuation was as important as tradition in the workshop production of *Roses*. Variety rather than static 'copying' has a strong place in these manuscripts, and will be explored further in the discussion of the Brussels, Lyon and Rennes copies in Chapter Three.

In turn, the cycle of the Rennes manuscript is also similar to the images of MS Draguignan 17 [Cat. 27], as while the iconography varies, there is close proximity in facial features, general detailing and colouration (Figure 93).⁴⁵⁵ Here, however, the terms of its completion did not involve the commission of an established *Rose* painter for one incipit, but a homogenous sequence of scenes by the same artists as the rest of the manuscript. Interestingly, it also incorporates variation as standard, borrowing the God of Love composition from the Lyon 763 manuscript, but editing the traditional image of *Sorrow* to show a woman clutching her breast while tugging her hair, which has no relation in the other Brussels-Lyon copies. Its most variant scene is in fact the incipit, which regresses to the symmetrical rosebush and Dreamer with no indication of the asymmetrical compositions featured in the Brussels, Lyon and Rennes copies, and may be an inflection of a secondary tradition for incipits present in the workshop's wider context.

These grouped manuscripts, each featuring different numbers of images, visual techniques and artists reveal a complex picture of interrelations in *Rose* illumination. Manuscripts that may have shared artists did so only partially, or with variations in image cycles that emphasise different parts of the narrative. Models were also filtered through alternative visual styles, with shared compositions appearing in manuscripts by differently trained artists. Of this group, no two manuscripts are identical, and scenes or iconography present in one disappear in others. Variations were a constant factor in the manuscripts produced by this atelier and its wide-reaching workforce, and meant that motifs and models were rarely ever replicated, suggesting a state of affairs that again challenges the mechanical work ethic suggested by authors such as Blamires and Holian.⁴⁵⁶

Extrapolated further, these variable manuscripts point to a spirit recognisable not just in the Lyon-Brussels group, but the *Rose* corpus as a whole – repetition, but not exact duplication. A similar case occurred in the mid fourteenth century, with the large

⁴⁵⁵ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 126.

⁴⁵⁶ Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, xxvii.

numbers of *Roses* featuring a quadripartite incipit, many of which shared a basic framework, but varied the compositions or figures of the internal subdivisions, or changed the image cycle that accompanied them.

VII: Atypical Illumination Cycles of the Fourteenth Century and Beyond

BnF fr. 12592, Baltimore Walters W.143, BnF fr. 1574, Harvard Houghton Fr 39, Bodleian Douce 188, Madrid Rés. 41 and BL Additional 31840

While the previous manuscripts featured more common production methodologies, a significant number attest to quite different approaches to illumination, several of which exemplify the way later ownership of manuscripts resulted in irregular image cycles. The first to be discussed, BnF fr. 12592 [Cat. 82], is perhaps the earliest extant copy revealing a very unorthodox approach to visualising the *Rose*.⁴⁵⁷ The images in this manuscript were inserted, perhaps contemporaneously, in a manner quite unlike traditional *Rose* imagery where miniatures and historiated initials are present within the text block. Instead, the image cycle in BnF fr. 12592 runs almost exclusively in the margins.⁴⁵⁸ The copy appears to date from the later fourteenth or early fifteenth century, and is written in the rarer three-column text block, suggesting a shortage of vellum, a lack of funds, or both. It therefore only takes up 64 folios, rather than the typical 125 or more found in most other copies, and only contains the *Rose*. It contains one image justified in the body of the text, that of Jean de Meun on fol. 45r, while the rest appear in the margins.

Yet the imagery in these margins is quite extensive, with ink-sketched vignettes often related to the text appearing consistently from folio 16 (Figure 94). On fol. 16v, beneath a column of text where Reason discusses the tale of *Virginius and Virginia*, our ad-hoc artist has added two sketches (Figure 95). The scene on the right depicts *Virginius Beheading His Daughter*, while that on the left shows him presenting Virginia's head to the judge. The exact date of the addition of these images is difficult to ascertain, but the figures do relate to late fourteenth and early fifteenth century forms, and are in colours similar to the script and initials that comprise the text. While it is possible they were

⁴⁵⁷ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 45; Huot, "Sacred and Erotic Love", 280-85.

⁴⁵⁸ Due to their irregular appearance, it is difficult to date these scenes with certainty, as they do not fit with the typical stylistic movements in *Rose* and other manuscript illumination. However, certain characteristics of the script, and the proximity of text inks and image colours do suggest they were produced at the same time as the writing, in the later fourteenth or fifteenth century.

added at a later date, this proximity in the colours used for the initials and the highlights added to the sketches suggest they were undertaken at the same time, by the same person. Whenever they were added, they remain interesting examples of 'alternative' imagery, added around a text block that largely omitted spaces for images. Such an intervention speaks to an impulse to visualise the major moments of the *Rose*, even in manuscripts not produced within the typical planner-workshop dynamic.

A spirit of visualisation appears to have been the motivation for other marginal imagery, which provides a parallel visual response to the scenes typically represented in miniatures. While one of the most famous examples of this tradition, the marginalia in BnF fr. 25526, has already been discussed at length by Huot, other *Roses* also contain marginal scenes that provoke questions about the accompanying miniatures.⁴⁵⁹ Baltimore Walters W.143 [Cat. 169] features two marginal interventions that suggest a visual commentary on the miniatures elsewhere on the page.⁴⁶⁰ On fol. 69v, beneath the traditional scene of Fraud, Constrained Abstinence and an unidentified third figure meeting the God of Love, we have a marginal representation of a female kneeling before a hooded seated character, reminiscent of the manuscript's later image of *Nature and Genius*. Some pages later, below the scene of the Love accepting Fraud into his service, the marginal image depicts a wolf or fox dressed in a monk's habit, being chased by three dogs (Figures 96-97). This scene sheds light on the preceding marginalia, relating to the textual idea that Fraud accomplishes his acts through disguise. It leads us to reconsider the image, and understand that the kneeling figure is not being comforted, but misled by the seemingly innocuous Fraud. In both scenes, our secondary visual narrator has commented on the acceptance of Fraud into Love's company, backing up the narrator's description of such men as deceptive and dangerous.

Interestingly, both marginal interventions coincide with changes to the figure of Fraud in the main miniatures on each page. On both 69v and 72v (Figure 98) the face of Fraud has been smudged and later redrawn with ink that does not match the original nature of this figure's face, which survives in its original form on fol. 81v. That the changes appear on the same pages as the marginal additions suggests that some of the alterations may have occurred at the same time – either a later reader mutilating the

⁴⁵⁹ Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers*.

⁴⁶⁰ Lilian Randall, *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Walters Art Gallery, Vol. 1, France, 875-1420* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press in association with the Walters Art Gallery, 1989), 173-76 and 330.

faces at the same time they added the visual commentaries, or a restorer adding to the margins as he repaired the faces of Fraud on both folios. It is unlikely that mutilation, redrawing and marginalia all occurred together, as the apparently deliberate removal of Fraud's face seems unlikely to have been followed by the careful redrawing of his features.

Other manuscripts reveal their histories regarding additions and attempts to revisit the imagery. BnF fr. 1574 [Cat. 54] was originally designed and written in the fourteenth century, shown by the script and layout, although the sketched images are arguably of later date.⁴⁶¹ The image of *Old Age* in particular has been conceived in a manner quite unlike the preparatory sketches of the fourteenth century (Figure 99). The body of the figure is drawn across and beneath the lines of the text around it, a wholly atypical approach for fourteenth-century *Roses*, which always kept the images framed and separate from the space occupied by text. The iconography is also irregular, as the image incorporates a small dog companion for the figure. While fifteenth-century illuminators did elaborate upon the iconography of this figure, it was most commonly by the addition of a fire as indicated in Guillaume's text. The visualisation of Old Age with a dog companion is not present in any of the late thirteenth to early sixteenth century *Roses* considered in this study, and while *Roses* do vary in their representation of events, the fact that this appears alongside an irregular design that spreads beneath the text suggests this was added after the mid sixteenth century.

The other sporadic sketches in the manuscript point to a conception of the *Rose* distinct from that of the fourteenth century, suggesting that the interventions were by a later reader keen to visualise some of the scenes within the gaps in an old copy, and based on their own understanding of the poem rather than fourteenth-century visual traditions. This being said, they have taken the time to reproduce some of the missing initials in a manner that relates to those of fourteenth-century manuscripts, suggesting they had some knowledge of manuscript decoration traditions in earlier periods. This however could be the result of connoisseurship, and as the reader clearly knew the poem (suggested by the inscription in modern script added to a gap on fol. 31v regarding Guillaume's concluding lines) it is possible they were working with some knowledge of another fourteenth or fifteenth-century copy of the poem. Ultimately, this sequence of events attests to the continued interest in the visualisation of the poem by later owners

⁴⁶¹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 32-33; Coilly and Tesnière, *Le Roman de la Rose*, 151.

of early manuscripts, although this did not reflect a wider desire to re-publish the *Rose* until the eighteenth century. The reworking of *Rose* manuscripts was not uncommon, and in addition to the destructive actions of some later owners - see for example the mutilated Dijon 525 [Cat. viii] and Princeton MS 132.43 [Cat. lxxxvi] manuscripts, where almost all the images have been cut out - some were carefully preserved or even touched-up in later periods.

Some copies clearly attest to more thorough intervention in the image cycles of *Roses*. Harvard Houghton MS Fr 39 [Cat. lxxxv] may have originally contained one miniature but this was painted over after the sixteenth century, which has completely obliterated any intended design for the miniature.⁴⁶² Bodleian Douce 188 was similarly altered long after its original date of production, as while the script suggests a late-fourteenth-century dating, the images have been partially painted in oils which have smudged onto the opposite pages - a technique totally alien to fourteenth century manuscript production.⁴⁶³ Furthermore, the iconography has been erased or misinterpreted, as with the humorous image of the God of Love with a bow floating in front of his hand (Figure 100).

Madrid Rés. 41 [Cat. lxiv] offers another example of later alteration, in this case due to the removal of images.⁴⁶⁴ At some point after its completion, someone cut out all the images in this *Rose*, destroying large chunks of the vellum and in some cases causing the loss of entire folios. At some stage, a later owner attempted to repair the manuscript, inserting folios to cover the losses and adding patches to several others. While the repairer has reintroduced imagery into the *Rose*, the nature of these vignettes points to a later dating, given the interest in Antique dress styles. The attempts to recover the script also suggest that the repairer had access to a model copy of the *Rose*. Given that interest in the *Rose* seems to have become a much more private affair after the mid sixteenth century, with no new manuscript copies or printed editions commissioned, this may be the result of two different situations. It could have been one owner's personal interest in the poem, who desired the restoration of his own copy in the centuries between the 1500s and the date of its acquisition by the National Library in Madrid, or more specifically inspired by the eighteenth-century 'resurrection' of the

⁴⁶² R.L. Hawkins, "The Manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose* in the Libraries of Harvard and Yale Universities", *Romanic Review*, 19 (1928), 3-17; McMunn, "Programs of Illustration", 746.

⁴⁶³ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 154-55; Hunt, *A Summary Catalogue*, Vol. 4, 548.

⁴⁶⁴ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 179-80.

poem, evidenced by the printing of new editions, the first of which was Lenglet du Fresnoy's version in 1735.

A similar - if more subtle - restoration occurred with BL Additional MS 31840 [Cat. 147] which was repaired by a Horatio W. Lonsdale, employed by the manuscript's owner William Burges who bought the manuscript in 1874.⁴⁶⁵ In this copy, a detailed list of all the alterations to the manuscript images is included on the first folio, detailing the extent to which they were repaired. These alterations are very restrained, as Lonsdale only touched up areas that had seen particular wear and undertook his work sensitive to the original outlines and visual style of this fourteenth-century manuscript.

While the interventions in these manuscripts are of variable date, they provide an interesting picture of the reception of the *Rose* in the centuries of its production and beyond, when some extant copies were revisited by later owners under different circumstances to those of their original production. These copies complement the *Roses* produced in traditional workshops, revealing that not all imagery of the *Rose* corpus was circumscribed by standard practices. Although such changes represent a minority of the extant manuscripts, they reveal a continued tendency for variation, visual intervention and development during the long period after *Roses* ceased to be made in manuscript, and offer an important historical context for the more 'traditional' visual iconographies discussed here.

VIII: Continuity of Process in the Fifteenth Century

BnF fr. 1665, BnF fr. 12591, BnF fr. 1462

While the fourteenth century offered a range of incomplete manuscripts from which one can extrapolate the means of their production, the fifteenth-century selection is more limited. This is likely related to the general reduction in *Rose* manuscript production during the 1400s, possibly due to the periods of political volatility, but also due to changes in the way people encountered the poem. In the early years of the century, *Roses* were still produced for a variety of patrons, from short, minimally illuminated copies to elaborate luxury versions. But by the late 1400s, manuscript *Roses* had all but become the preserve of the rich elite who sought out the best quality versions, even at times outsourcing to foreign workshops. At the end of the century,

⁴⁶⁵ Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, 884-85; Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 146. A full description of the circumstances of these repairs appears at the head of the manuscript.

manuscripts also had to compete with paper copies, and though these occasionally were printed on vellum and touched up with painted additions to satisfy the taste of patrons, eventually these came to usurp the position of manuscripts as the popular means of transmitting the poem.⁴⁶⁶

Still, there are a few copies that attest to production methods, and which largely display continuity with their thirteenth and fourteenth century counterparts. One of the earliest dating from this century is BnF fr. 1665 [Cat. 83], which straddles the turn of the 1400s.⁴⁶⁷ This copy features three images, and a number of gaps for further scenes that were never completed. However, the work on these unfinished pages is uneven. While the script of the poem has been finished, several folios feature elaborate initial decoration and completed frames for the miniatures, as on fol. 2r. The completed frames then cease, shortly followed by the elaborate initials, as found on fol. 89v-90r, with the following folios only featuring text and gaps. The incomplete state of this manuscript thus provides us with a relation between the framing artist and that of the decorated initials that appear on each page with an image. They seem to have been separate from the miniature artists, who have only completed three images between them.⁴⁶⁸ Here again is a manuscript attesting to a subdivision of labour in *Rose* production, one that extended to multiple figures of decorators and illuminators, each of which ceased their work at different times in this incomplete manuscript.

A slightly later manuscript, BnF fr. 12591 [Cat. xxxix] also seems to follow the pattern of incomplete *Roses* from the fourteenth century.⁴⁶⁹ While the first folio of the manuscript was replaced after 1526 (as the text is copied from Clément Marot's Recension of the poem, completed in that year), it has imitated the 'unfinished' state of the rest of the manuscript by leaving space for imagery. Moving to the first original surviving page, we have evidence of the different steps of production; script, rubrication and illumination, all designed as clear-cut steps. This last task can be surmised by the faint brown ink marks that appear alongside the red rubrics, as shown on fol. 1r with 'hayne'. This unnecessary duplication suggests that its presence here

⁴⁶⁶ One interesting study of the transitional stage is Diane Booton's *Manuscripts, Market and the Transition to Print in Late Medieval Brittany*, (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010) which raises some of the important aspects of this period in relation to one region, though the *Rose* does not greatly feature in her discussion.

⁴⁶⁷ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 36-37.

⁴⁶⁸ That there was more than one artist at work is evident in the comparison of the incipit and the two scenes on folio 7r, as their approaches to figures and landscape are vastly different.

⁴⁶⁹ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 45.

was a guide, not a permanent feature. Whether this was a reminder to the same scribe going back over his work, or for a second rubricator skilled in display script, it suggests again the divided structure of *Rose* illumination in the fifteenth century. However, this methodology is not consistently present, as on fol. 12r among others, the scribe appears to have completed it without prefatory guidance. It is possible that they left the instructions in a now-absent marginal space, but this would represent an unusual deviation from typical working methods shown elsewhere – suggesting that more than one scribe was at work on the text.

Somewhat later, Arsenal 3336 [Cat. xlv] dating c.1450-1500 features gaps for images and initials throughout.⁴⁷⁰ Once more, the scribe's work has been completed, leaving space for images and indications for decorators and illuminators. The gaps for initials feature small letters written inside them as a guide, while the image spaces are largely accompanied by rubrics that could have acted as instructions for illuminators.⁴⁷¹

Later still, another incomplete *Rose*, this time in prose, reveals further continuation of production methods. BnF fr. 1462 [Cat. xlvi] was clearly designed to be a luxury copy, with elaborate display script headings and large spaces for imagery. The poem takes up 285 folios, suggesting resources were not an issue, though the production was ultimately halted. It reveals that, even in the later fifteenth century when artists had more scope for large-scale decoration in *Roses*, the divided roles of producers persisted. Such a manuscript thus relates to the contemporary production, BL Harley 4425 [Cat. 155], and may explain how it was completed.

Although many of the manuscripts discussed in this chapter represent *Roses* that were abandoned during production, or altered at a later date, they offer considerable insight into the many methods of *Rose* manuscript creation and illumination. These manuscripts were vulnerable to changes of taste and fashion, as well as external factors like new technology (i.e. printing), or even war in the case of Paris. These circumstances form the context for all the *Roses* considered in this study, and while this thesis focuses on dreams as represented in the *Rose*, the interactions between imagery, production, and external factors also played an extensive role in shaping the final

⁴⁷⁰ Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 75-76.

⁴⁷¹ Such small letters indicating which initial is to be inserted interestingly appeared in the contemporaneous wave of printed *Roses* (discussed in Chapter Five).

character of finished manuscripts. The representation of dreams was not merely a theoretical process, but one in which attitudes and interpretation mingled with the practicalities of production in France between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Right from the outset, *Roses* were assimilated into the output of workshops, products of a system that divided work between various professionals. This could simply be a matter of employing different workers for script, decoration, and figural illumination, or extend to the use of multiple artists, such as with the outsourcing evident in the Lyon-Brussels group. This division could lead to issues of misunderstanding, as with the Besançon 553 copy, or at the other extreme carefully circumscribed image cycles, such as the one intended for Lyon 764.

However, in a large number of cases, the manuscripts occupy a middle ground between the absence of instruction and an abundance of it. From the earliest surviving manuscripts, such as Vatican Urb. Lat. 376, a number of copies incorporated minimal instructive rubrics, or simplistic marginal sketches which the artists were free to incorporate into the finished piece alongside their own visual interpretations. Marginal planning by its very nature does not force the artist into following the outlines of the 'experienced' *libraire* or lead artist, but rather requires the combination of open-ended planning and artistic training - a method that provided considerable scope for reinterpretation of subjects, and resulted in variable imagery and iconography.

Visual styles, particularly during the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, also exhibited a large amount of variation even in single copies ostensibly by the same group of artists. While this was sometimes due to the manuscripts being left incomplete, this may also have been consciously done by the artists. The fact that these were later bound also attests to the willingness of the public to accept copies with variegated imagery. This trend is datable to the first multi-artist manuscripts, such as those produced by the Lyon-Brussels group, wherein artists with different visual styles coexisted in single manuscripts, a fashion evidently accepted by their final owners.

The Lyon-Brussels group also provides an important lesson regarding *Rose* manuscripts; even when produced in the same environment, copies could incorporate a large variety of subjects, or even different renderings of the same moment in each new incarnation. While the variation of artists may explain the additional scenes of Rennes 243, the evolution of the incipits between Lyon 763, Brussels 9574-5 and Rennes reveals that *Rose* illumination was not a static process.

The alternative cycles of several manuscripts further show the flexibility that is inherent in *Rose* imagery, with innovative formal properties and iconographies between copies. While these represent something of a minority in the context of the whole corpus, they are present in significant enough numbers to yield comparative benefit, and still form part of the overall picture of *Rose* illumination. Furthermore, they reveal that even once a manuscript was finished, it continued to undergo alteration; *Roses* were not just made, purchased and preserved, but altered, mutilated and read, sometimes by many owners, over the course of their post-production history.

Rose manuscripts seem to attest to a spirit of visual imperative, wherein artists - both amateur and professional - would intervene in the text blocks or margins to provide the poem with visual accompaniments, even when these were not present in the traditional form of miniatures. The statistics enforce this fact, as the majority of *Roses* - two-thirds - feature figurative imagery.

While several of the image sequences described here are somewhat atypical in the sense that they are 'incomplete', they above all evidence the fact that *Rose* imagery was not just a strict process of duplication. Images could be - and clearly were - the result of personal responses to the poem both in the sphere of workshop production and outside it. The variations present in manuscripts deriving from similar models, and the flexibility in artistic styles even in single copies suggest that production was not simply the result of an introspective group of workers churning out multiple identical facsimiles.

McMunn noted that 'no two *Rose* manuscripts with more than a single illustration share the same program of illustrations'.⁴⁷² I would go further than this and state that until the appearance of the printed editions, no two *Roses* with *any* illuminations share a programme of illustrations, nor were they intended to do so.⁴⁷³ While the attribution of artistic 'intent' is difficult to ascertain in the medieval period, the consistency of variation points to a general approach that invited visual and interpretive difference, even in copies made under similar circumstances. The complete and incomplete manuscripts discussed here all imply the presence of a driving force behind the imagery, whether one can ascribe that role to a planner, *libraire*, or illuminator. This is of the utmost importance when considering the degrees of interpretation present in the

⁴⁷² McMunn, "A Fragment of an Unknown MS", 283.

⁴⁷³ I have yet to discover any *Rose* which shares illustration type and text layout or decoration with another.

images that were discussed in the prior chapter, the subject of which - dreams - were exposed to some of the most variable interpretations of all. When representing dreams, as with the whole gamut of other imagery present in *Roses*, production methods left considerable scope for artists to incorporate meaningful elements into their depictions. Rather than a series of images devoid of meaning, or only featuring 'accidental' significance, *Rose* illumination was circumscribed as much by variation as it was tradition. When one considers the availability of multiple meanings in the *Rose*, a by-product of its status as a dream as much as it was due to the incorporation of alternative viewpoints, this state of affairs is perhaps unsurprising. Indeed, this ability of dreams - and the *Rose* - to mean different things to different people is an important feature; one that goes a long way to explaining the visual diversity evident in the *Rose* manuscripts.

Chapter Five: Dreams in the Printed Editions, c.1481-1530

The printed editions of the *Roman de la Rose* represent something of an epilogue to the entire tradition of *Rose* iconography. Unlike the variable productions of the Lyon-Brussels group, or the divergent traditions of iconography throughout the whole *Rose* manuscript corpus, *Rose* incunabula represented an entirely new trend: large-scale accessibility to multiple, identical editions. The adaptation of the *Rose* into print not only codified the text to an extent unseen in the diverging copies of the past two hundred years, but also its imagery. By merit of the mechanical processes of their creation, these editions allowed for the dissemination of highly proximate image cycles on a far larger scale than was possible with handmade copies. While fewer printed editions survive than hand-copied manuscripts – a natural consequence of using paper instead of the more durable vellum – it is clear that for the last fifty years of medieval *Rose* production, it was printed cycles that dictated *Rose* iconography for the majority of the readership.⁴⁷⁴

Despite their significance for those studying the visual representation of the poem, studies on these printed editions remain limited. The primary source in fact remains Bourdillon's *Early Editions of the Roman de la Rose*, written over 100 years ago.⁴⁷⁵ As such, this chapter will seek to redress the lacuna in discussions of printed *Roses* by examining their representation of this poetic dream, what they reveal about dissemination of dream iconography in the later middle ages, and how they interacted with contemporary hand-painted and written editions. This last point is necessary to emphasise, as the printed editions did not exist in a vacuum. Production of manuscripts on vellum, copied by scribes and illuminated by artists continued during the period of *Rose* incunabular printing, and the two methods sometimes accompanied each other, as they did for other texts at the time.⁴⁷⁶ While printed *Roses* could reach far larger audiences, there is evidence that patrons either ignored or adapted the new technology

⁴⁷⁴ Interestingly, a number of editions were printed on vellum and embellished by traditional illuminators. These however constitute a minority of the surviving prints, most of which were on paper.

⁴⁷⁵ F.W. Bourdillon, *The Early Editions of the Roman de la Rose* (London: Chiswick Press and The Bibliographical Society, 1906).

⁴⁷⁶ See for example the aforementioned Booton study, *Manuscripts, Market and the Transition to Print*, on the interrelation of manuscript and print.

to produce one-offs based on printed editions. Additionally, the printed editions did not appear out of the blue, but relied on manuscripts for their source text and image cycles.

The earliest edition, printed c.1481 by Jean Croquet at Geneva, marks an important moment in the history of *Rose* book production and reception.⁴⁷⁷ It also evidences the clear dependency on preceding manuscript trends, particularly in the image cycle, but also in the modes of production.⁴⁷⁸ This edition featured 82 original woodcut images, 6 of which were repeated several times, resulting in a total of 92 images throughout. This in itself is a remarkable change: while many *Rose* manuscripts featured repeated or 'stock' images of characters in conversation, or in battle, these scenes were never fully identical. Often, as expressed in the prior chapters, the differentiation from basic motifs was intentional, designed to inject visual difference into the visual cycle. However, even when motifs were directly copied, as with the multiple productions of some mid-century quadripartite incipits, these were never truly identical, as they relied on the reproduction by hand of a pre-extant model, not the direct transplanting of one image into multiple copies, as was made possible by printing.

Yet it was not only the presence of repeated images that make this edition unusual; according to David McKitterick, the addition of *any* imagery is also unusual in the first decades of printing. McKitterick states that like most manuscript productions, printed books were often devoid of elaborate ornament or decoration in order to make the most of the page dimensions.⁴⁷⁹ There is then an interesting question as to why additional resources were spent on producing a larger, illustrated edition of the poem, as not only would a designer and woodcutter have to be hired to produce the images, but more paper would then be required to print the full poem with spaces for illustrations. The answer to this may be found in the preceding *Rose* tradition: as noted in the Introduction, around two-thirds of *Rose* manuscripts contain some form of

⁴⁷⁷ While common consensus now holds that Jean Croquet was responsible for this edition - each library holding copies of this edition regards it as Croquet's - Bourdillon in *The Early Editions*, 20, assigned it to Ortuin and Schenck, at Lyon, on the basis of watermarks and the ownership of one copy. The analysis of the edition in this study is based on the St Omer copy (Inc. 77-2223), ENSBA Est Mas 995 and BnF Rés. Ye. 13 [Cats. a-c].

⁴⁷⁸ The production of this copy at Geneva reflects the varying production centres of incunables in the first years of *Rose* printed editions. Rather than being based like the manuscript tradition in Paris and its environs, printed *Roses* first appeared at Lyon and Geneva, before returning to the Parisian region in the late fifteenth century.

⁴⁷⁹ David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 43-45.

figurative imagery. In order to attract a public used to seeing *Rose* images, then, a natural solution may have been to also provide images in printed copies too. However, the printers were not totally immune to the forces of production and economy, which explains the combination of a sequence of images with the internal repetition of some scenes at appropriate moments.

The literal repetition of some images in *Rose* printed editions would have had a striking effect on both new and seasoned readers, able to access copies with seemingly identical image cycles and texts. As noted by Elizabeth Eisenstein, in a practical sense these were not as exact as modern-day prints can be: the process was still mechanical, worked by hand, and required the inking up of woodcuts and the arrangement of letters that could result in errors and distinctions between separate copies in an edition.⁴⁸⁰ However, the overall effect would be far more homogenous than in the earlier handwritten copies by different teams - and also far faster.

Regarding Croquet's edition, Bourdillon correctly suggested that the cycle was produced specially for the edition, as the images remain close to the textual indications throughout, unlike later editions that reused compositions from other print runs and texts, and consequently were often ill-matched.⁴⁸¹ Beyond these practicalities of production, however, there are also major differences regarding the imaging of dream subjects, especially when compared to contemporary manuscript illuminations.

The incipit dream scene is bipartite, maintaining the tradition present in earlier manuscripts for representing the Dreamer at the head of the poem. On the left, the Dreamer lies in bed accompanied by Danger holding a stick, while on the right the Dreamer kneels before Idleness at the Garden Gate, who holds a key in her hand (Figure 101).

The most notable aspect of the incipit is the degree to which its cycle is outmoded. Rather than referencing the multiscenic trend that dominated fifteenth-century manuscript incipits (see the contemporary *Ferrell Rose*, [Cat. 189] or even the popular quadripartite scenes of the mid-to-late 1300s), this image recalls an early fourteenth century pairing of *Idleness, the Dreamer and Danger*, first seen in the 1320s. As discussed in Chapter Three, this bipartite pairing alludes to the negative connotations

⁴⁸⁰ Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 51.

⁴⁸¹ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 16.

of sleep; a site of danger, temptation or idle desires. However, this scene also modifies the traditional format by representing the Dreamer kneeling before Idleness, as if in supplication to her with his hands clasped. This representation of Idleness emphasises her control over the situation, as if dominating the vulnerable figure of the Dreamer who sleeps to the left.

This 'return' to a traditional, much older image convention ironically suggests a new approach to the visualisation of the *Rose* incipit. Rather than seeing the shift to woodcut and print as an opportunity for a brand new cycle of images, this incipit refers to a historical period of peak production, reproducing a visual interpretation not seen in new handwritten copies for 150 years. Further reference to older traditions is evident in the page layout, which leaves spaces for handwritten initials to be inserted, as with the missing M of 'Maintes' at the head of the poem below the incipit. This division of labour is certainly minimal, leaving only decoration – not even images – for the copyist. However, this does reveal that printers were apparently reticent to remove all traces of manual workmanship from their productions, reliant on these workmen to put the finishing touches on editions. Indeed, this may also relate to flexible expenses: the hand-copied initials could be of greater or lesser complexity, and as the St-Omer version shows, not all editions even received these initials. BnF Rés. Ye. 13 did have some hand-painted initials, though as the erroneous 'S' at the head of the poem reveals, this recourse to manual workmanship could have its downfalls. Furthermore, ENSBA Est Mas 995 features ink washes applied over the images, suggesting again the varied levels of personalisation applied to these copies. This individualisation of printed copies occurred with other editions, as noted by McKitterick.⁴⁸²

Such nostalgia continues throughout the edition, with the *Personifications* retaining a fourteenth-century appearance, presented in empty spaces performing allusive, generic or characteristic actions. This contrasts with the trends prevalent in the fifteenth century, where these figures were depicted on pedestals on the wall, or perched incongruously before three-dimensional interior scenes. Some iconography does relate to the later dating of this edition, as with Narcissus leaning over the half-height fountain instead of by a stream on the ground. The overall conception of space is also more proportionate to the figures, less like the cluttered compositions of the early fourteenth-century *Rose* manuscripts it appears to mimic.

⁴⁸² McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order*, 55-66.

However, while based on old traditions, there are some notable alterations to the visual iconography. The use of repeated scenes fully exploits the benefits of the new media, with some generic scenes appearing more than once. Unlike hand-painted manuscripts, this edition could utilise the facsimile properties of the printing process to create more images from fewer woodcuts. Only two dream scenes appear in Croquet's edition. The incipit Dreamer and the *Croesus and Phanie* (Figure 102) follow fourteenth- and fifteenth-century iconographical traditions. The later image of Croesus and his daughter shows Phanie kneeling at her father's feet and pointing to the gallows she interpreted from his dream account. In this instance, the literal dream imagery has been omitted, much like earlier fourteenth-century editions, and is replaced by the ultimate outcome of the dream. More notable perhaps is the lack of a dreaming Croesus, though again this was occasionally not featured in earlier representations of the subject in manuscripts.

One other aspect that is notable with this printed edition is the new prominence granted to previously neglected or less common scenes. While no new dream scenes were brought in to the corpus, a depiction of three reclining figures was added, referring to the speech of Friend regarding the Golden Age, wherein when the people of this period wished to sleep, they would use leaves and bundles of grass for bedding. While the textual image does not refer to dreaming, it does represent sleep in rather novel terms for the *Rose* as a site of innocence. It contrasts with the incipit of the Dreamer who, despite his comfortable bed, remains threatened by the ominous figure of Danger.

The representation of this aspect of the Golden Age was not popular prior to Croquet's edition, and is present in only 13 illuminated manuscripts. Furthermore, while other copies depicting this subject incorporated representations of these humble people prior to the eras of kingship and hierarchical societies, this largely constituted depictions of those figures relaxing or cavorting in the countryside. This sleep-based imagery, while directly alluded to in the text, draws a natural comparison with the incipit, the only other scene to feature sleeping figures. While the scenes are not side-by-side, nor even close in relative terms, the images share the unique characteristic of representing sleeping or dreaming figures. Indirectly, these interact with the incipit in the same way other dream interpolations functioned in manuscripts, as a potential point of reference with regards to one topic. Indeed, their prospective allusions are even strengthened by the fact that multiple identical editions could be printed. Though

no records survive of how many editions Croquet printed of his *Rose*, Bourdillon declares that he viewed five copies in preparation for his study, and knew of a further four, three of which I have viewed.⁴⁸³ Even if the overall aim of manuscript artists was to produce an exact facsimile of an illustrated *Rose* (something they clearly were not, as demonstrated in Chapter Four), they would find it difficult to achieve as proximate a copy as the printed incunables. Reflective imagery, such as that of the Golden Age, was therefore not only for those with the means to fund luxury copies, but was now also available to those picking up a cheaper printed edition.⁴⁸⁴

Croquet's edition reveals a number of characteristics of the formative years of printed *Roses*. Firstly, the name of the producer or printer is not stated, nor is the date or origin of the edition present. This relates clearly to the largely anonymous corpus of *Rose* manuscripts, which also omit precise information regarding origin, maker or date. Secondly, the imagery suggests that the model used for the image cycle was an old one, likely produced in the first half of the fourteenth century. The translation of these images into woodcuts has also affected the styling of the scenes, as they are largely linear, without shading or suppleness to the figures or backgrounds. The process of cutting into wood explains this flat linearity, as the method of producing shades or gradations in woodcuts requires the building up of lines and cross-hatching, something this cutter evidently had little experience with. This could suggest that the artist was not trained in woodcuts, and may even have been a manuscript illuminator or other image-maker called in to produce this series. Yet the lack of similarity to extant fifteenth century *Roses* prevents us from further exploring this hypothesis; however this person was trained, they left no extant illuminated *Roses*.

⁴⁸³ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 35-36.

⁴⁸⁴ Booton's *Manuscripts, Market and the Transition to Print*, a study of the transitional phase in Brittany discusses how a desire to cheapen the costs of book production pervaded later fourteenth and fifteenth-century book production. She notes in "The Economics of Manuscript Making", 11-37, based on a reading of Carla Bozzolo and Ezio Ornato's *Pour une histoire du livre manuscrit au moyen age* (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1980), that by the 1480s manuscript production costs were going down, perhaps in response to the competition with printed books selling at 'attractive' prices. In Chapter Three, "Printing and the Market", 97-133, she notes the high setup costs of printing presses in Brittany, but also refers to the established print runs of some early incunables being between 400-500 copies; even if Croquet's edition only managed a small percentage of this figure, it is likely low costs could still be maintained and allow a profit for the printer, especially if they also produced other texts at the same time. McKitterick in *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order*, 298 also refers to the lower unit costs for printed editions, which could then be produced in hundreds of copies.

The use of a fourteenth-century model may also point to the practical appropriation of resources; it could have been the only copy the printers were able to access first-hand. However, it is unusual that the scenes make almost no reference to later fifteenth-century trends in manuscript illumination, especially if the artist was previously trained in painting. This may have in turn been a consequence of the increasingly private, luxury nature of *Rose* manuscript production in the 1480s, as well as the trend for commissions spread across a wider geographical area. Late manuscripts such as BL Harley 4425 were produced in the Netherlands, and given that this edition was printed in Geneva, a place few *Rose* manuscripts have links to, it is possible that there were simply no manuscripts available to the printers.⁴⁸⁵

However, the processes necessary for producing the woodcuts to accompany this *Rose* were also vitally different from the manuscript methods that had gone before. Whether or not an artist with experience in *Rose* illumination (a fact that seems unlikely given its divergence from contemporary trends), they would not necessarily be responsible for undertaking the actual cutting of the wood for the illustration. Furthermore, the woodcuts would have been produced in isolation from the textual narrative, unlike the inherent proximity that occurs between image and text production in manuscript illumination. As such, the designer or woodcutter would work away from the printing presses, only providing their image at the layout stage before printing. While this does not appear to have affected the proximity of the dream images to the dream subjects they refer to, it likely influenced the choice of an older model for the new woodcuts - and may have had a great effect on the later printed editions featuring inappropriate or unrelated imagery, discussed below.

The following edition, c.1485, is generally assigned to the printer Jean Syber, of Lyon.⁴⁸⁶ It also features a large number of images, printed from 85 woodcuts closely based on - but not identical to - the previous edition. While the edition is difficult to access either in facsimile or in person, the third *Rose* edition, by Guillaume Le Roy at Lyon, c.1487 uses the same woodcuts.⁴⁸⁷ This version allows for comparison and analysis of Syber's cuts from the 1485 edition. Syber's 85 woodcuts were reused in Le Roy's edition to

⁴⁸⁵ Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, 892-94; Langlois, *Les Manuscrits*, 144-45; Braet, "Der Roman der Rose", 183-91; Camille, *The Medieval Art of Love*, 80-81 and 91-92; Kren and McKendrick, *Illuminating the Renaissance*, multiple citations.

⁴⁸⁶ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 37-38.

⁴⁸⁷ Discussion is based on the Library of Congress copy, Inc. Rosenwald 396 [Cat. d].

produce 92 images throughout the text, and clearly bear an uncanny resemblance to the imagery of Croquet's *Rose*.⁴⁸⁸

The first image, for example, copies the incipit layout almost exactly, with the major differences only in detailing, not composition (Figure 103). Additional elements have been added to the dress and buildings, but these are clearly based on Croquet's earlier prints. The major distinction is in the level of shading applied to the image; through the placement of extra lines, a greater sense of shadow and light projects from these scenes, far more than the earlier Croquet cuts. The similarities continue into the representations of other moments from the poem, again using the Croquet cuts as a base before building on these with extra details. The scenes correlate almost exactly throughout the editions, suggesting that the visual forms were not only emulated, but imitated.

Only in a few instances are the models alternated. Unusually, the *Croesus and Phanie* image has been reversed, implying that the means of 'copying' differed, resulting in reversal. As Croquet's cuts only appeared in one edition, it is possible that in the process of being lent to the producers Jean Syber and Guillaume le Roy, the Croesus scene was lost, and had to be copied from the Croquet print rather than the wood block. Additionally, with this scene, Croesus and Phanie are proportionately larger than in Croquet's edition, shifting emphasis away from the small gallows on the hill. In the older version, the speaking figures also drew attention to the larger gallows, Phanie by pointing to it and Croesus by tilting his head upwards.

This reproduction of a visual sequence, recreating compositions and iconographies from the fourteenth century had strong consequences for the representation of dream plot of the *Rose*. Instead of the animated, continually changing visualisations of manuscript editions, these scenes introduce a form of stasis, where perceived conventions prevailed and alterations were introduced by degrees, not by overhauls. This was further concretised by the process, which by its very nature led to the fixing of specific visual and textual forms. That this second series of images went on to be the most commonly reproduced visual sequence in late fifteenth century printed *Roses* is further evidence of the new rigidity of the image cycle, diverging from its earlier roots

⁴⁸⁸ Bourdillon's *The Early Editions*, 15-19, discussed this proximity, and using an argument based on the perceived accuracy of the 1485 edition, contrasted to the occasional visual slips in the Syber/Le Roy version, proposed that the more correct but less detailed edition (Croquet's) was chronologically first.

in flexible imagery. Even the related manuscripts of the Lyon-Brussels family, or the copies featuring similar bipartite or quadripartite incipits during the mid-fourteenth century did not exhibit the same inertia of visual development.

Jean du Pré's Parisian edition of c.1494 also featured the Syber/Le Roy woodcuts, although two blocks were absent from the cycle.⁴⁸⁹ This was one of the first to allude to the printer responsible, as it featured the device and initials of the printer that appear in other editions printed by du Pré. Although it repeats the woodcuts of an earlier edition, this suggests a growing desire for printers to identify their editions – likely a consequence of the sharp increase in *Roses* printed in the 1490s, and the fact that they often reused the same imagery as their competitors. Nevertheless, it is interesting that this coincides with the increased personalisation of *Roses*, such as those for François I (Morgan M.948) or Philip of Cleves (Hague MS 128 C 5), as discussed in Chapter Three. Du Pré also appears to have expressed awareness of the personalisation trend in another manner, by leaving blank spaces in the frontispiece to the edition, as shown in BnF Rés. Ye-166, potentially allowing owners to fill in their coat of arms in line with blank spaces in earlier manuscripts. Once more, this exposes the means by which printed *Roses* were not entirely 'complete' when they rolled off the presses, but could be altered by or on behalf of prospective buyers, potentially a means of making them more appealing to publics trained in the reception of manuscript editions. One final salient point revealed by this edition is not only the popularity of the image cycle, but its availability. The different printers and locations attributable to the 1485 (Lyon), 1487 (Lyon) and 1494 (Paris) editions reveal an element of mobility and also collaboration between those producing printed *Roses*.

Around the same period, c.1493-5, Antoine Vérard's edition showed the first signs of some visual development, either due to a lack of access to the Syber cuts, or a willingness to produce a new cycle. However, the cycle was still characterised by copying - out of the 62 woodcuts, Bourdillon intimates that as many as 46 may be borrowed from stock imagery used by Vérard for other texts, with only 16 designed specifically to accompany the *Rose*.⁴⁹⁰ Study of the Bonn copy of this edition [Cat. f] reveals Bourdillon's assumptions may be correct: beyond the incipit scene, which

⁴⁸⁹ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 23 and 41. The analysis of this edition is based on BnF Res. Ye-166 [Cat. e].

⁴⁹⁰ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 27 and 42-43. Bourdillon also suggests that Vérard's reuse of old woodcuts was in order to compete with the new *Rose* edition produced by his rival.

perhaps explains the iconography of the ENSBA *Rose* incipit, and some of the *Personifications*, many of the blocks have little in common with the text they supposedly accompany.

The opening scene is bipartite, like the previous two cycles of imagery, but changes the subject matter dramatically. On the left, a blindfolded God of Love wields two arrows, seated on a throne behind the Dreamer's bed. On the right, a woman with a large key, possibly Idleness, wearing a dress decorated with roses and other flowers kneels before a similarly attributed God of Love (Figure 104). This imagery is entirely novel: while the God of Love's arrows dictate the direction of the Dreamer's quest (making his presence behind the Dreamer clear), the characterisation of Idleness as the God's assistant is a fresh interpretation of her actions during the poem, and is present in no other *Roses*. Given that the incipits of printed *Roses* at this time incorporated a much older pairing of the Dreamer with Idleness, it is possible that Vérard's edition sought to update the bipartite incipit common in his contemporaries' versions, making a subtler comment on the behaviour of Idleness. However, this pairing did not manage to supplant the prevailing incipits of late fifteenth century printed *Roses*, and given that Vérard's edition is also cluttered with less insightful imagery, its interpretive power is easily forgotten as one moves through the poem.

The following figures of *Hate*, *Felony*, *Villainy*, *Covetousness* and *Avarice* are typical representations of the characters, with common attributes such as knives and money. However, from *Envy* onwards, the imagery starts to get repetitive. *Envy* is shown stabbing herself – the same image used for *Felony*, an iconographic approach first used in the fifteenth century for the latter character, and slightly ill-suited to *Envy*. Overleaf, while *Sorrow* is shown tearing her hair out in another traditional representation, *Old Age* is represented by the incongruous cut of a woman riding a donkey through a river. *Hypocrisy* is illustrated by two figures conversing at a table – an allusive, not illustrative example – while *Poverty* is represented by two naked figures in a bed. These atypical and even unfitting images continue throughout the edition, and suggest that the placement of scenes was of less concern than the simple fact of their being present. One image of a figure holding scales is used variously to introduce a section on the *Carole* and the tale of *Narcissus* – repeated from its original instance as an indication of *Avarice*, having little to do with either narrative it later illustrates.⁴⁹¹ A particularly

⁴⁹¹ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 27.

notable example of misuse is the illustration for the battle of *Shame and Fear Assaulting the Dreamer*, prior to the battle of the Personifications: this is a scene of *Cain Killing Abel with a Jawbone*. A number of scenes do appear to have been borrowed from a religious source – an image of Noah appears when Friend describes the voyage of Jason, for example.

These atypical scenes borrowed from other editions and available stock sit uneasily alongside occasionally appropriate images. The scene illustrating the Dreamer with the Roses expresses the melancholy of this figure as it is described in the text, contemplating his beloved. Yet some pages later, the scene of *Croesus and Phanie* – notably traditional in earlier cycles of printed images – has been reduced to a generic scene of two figures conversing in a village, with no indication of the major plot points or foreshadowing of its outcome. The scene used here is in fact a repetition of that used for the depiction of *Danger with Shame*, as well as several other ‘conversational’ points, stressing again the generic, lacklustre approach to visualisation in this edition.

Such imagery suggests that, even in the early 1490s, the desire to have a fitting series of images was not always the priority for *Rose* printers. Instead, imagery could be taken from other sources and repositioned in the text. However, this theory is to ignore the possibility that such scenes were intentionally reused for their allusive value – i.e. the representation of Avarice at the start of the Carole, or the Narcissus narrative both in Guillaume’s section, could have been an attempt to draw a link between these instances. Yet for many of the more unusual images, such the nudes for Poverty or the image of Noah for Jason, would have required recognition of their original content or source in order for such allusions to be understood - something that could only have been achieved in the unlikely event that an owner had both a copy of the exact external source as well as the *Rose*. The idea that Vérard incorporated scenes from other texts with a view to extending the implications of the text depends on his having great faith in his readership to spot these associations, and may not have been a reality for the new print-reading public. By moving so often outside the direct image relation of the *Rose*, there is a great risk of misunderstanding – one that explains why Bourdillon (and to an extent all potential modern-day viewers of Vérard’s edition, myself included) find these images so incongruous. Rather than featuring images that interpret the *Rose* from within, at times these scenes barely even illustrate the *Rose*, appearing only to superficially link images to keywords on the page, even when they have little to do with the narrative context.

David McKitterick's exploration of the 'errata' of early incunables provides some context for these incongruous images in printed *Roses*.⁴⁹² As errors would be transmitted to many copies, not just one or two examples, the potential public for 'mistakes' is far higher than in manuscript transmission. McKitterick takes this as an example of where the reader becomes important, as in some instances they would contact the printer with details of errors, or insert pen corrections in their own copies. However, the issue of images is more complicated. As McKitterick also notes, ambiguous, incomplete or misplaced images also appeared in many printed editions of the later fourteenth century, but that these were less likely to be corrected or altered:

Levels of tolerance remained higher for illustration than for printed text, and it is rare to find apologies for them.⁴⁹³

With the examples of *Roses* here, however, this may not entirely be true. Of the editions of Verard's c.1493-5 printed *Rose*, Bourdillon remarks that both the British Library and BnF contain copies on vellum, with illuminated cuts - suggesting that some audiences were unwilling to accept the haphazard representation of the poem in his edition. Furthermore, V erard went on to produce other *Rose* prints, this time with increasingly appropriate imagery, suggesting some dissatisfaction with his edition of the earlier 1490s.

This edition then presents a complex scenario. For those without the means of repairing or altering the images, the visual experience of this copy would be confusing, particularly when set against the traditions of earlier printed editions and manuscripts. Nonetheless, it would also shape the understanding of the poem for new readers of the *Rose*, coming to the narrative and images through this edition only. Unable to afford luxury manuscript copies, these readers were faced with an iconographical sequence that at its best represented insightful, interpretive images, but at its worst, shows a garbled interpretation of the plot. It is unclear how many readers caught V erard's intended allusions (if indeed they were intended), but it is evident that his approach of borrowing images from elsewhere was not satisfactory for all readers. A copy in the Library of Congress, Washington D.C. (Incun. X. G974) [Cat. g] was printed on vellum, but includes painted scenes over the original prints. While these scenes follow the outlines of the print images, comparison with the original prints reveal these were also doctored to varying degrees in order to present a more accurate visual representation

⁴⁹² McKitterick, "A House of Errors" in *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order*, 97-138.

⁴⁹³ McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order*, 96.

of the poem for the patron who invested money in hiring an illuminator to complete it.⁴⁹⁴

Some years later, the Syber/Le Roy/du Pré cuts surfaced again, this time in the hands of Jean Petit (as with BnF Res. M-Ye-22), but also printed with the devices of Vérard, Le Petit Laurens, or anonymously.⁴⁹⁵ Their recurrent popularity suggests the new tradition formulated by these woodcuts was dominant in the late 1490s for printed *Roses*, while the appearance of an edition funded by Vérard suggests that he was dissatisfied with his previous alternative image cycle – or that he was finally able to access them. Still, the reduced number of woodcuts (only 80 of the Syber’s originals appear) and their increasingly deteriorated state in the final prints, i.e. broken edges, reveal that these were coming to the end of their working life, and indeed these variable editions were the last to feature the Syber cuts. These editions, similarly to Vérard’s 1493 cycle, were also printed in some instances on vellum and overpainted. BnF Velins-578 [Cat. i] features a frontispiece where Vérard’s motif has been painted over, removing the direct link to the printer. While the motto survives, the added motif replaces Vérard’s initials which were the major indication of his involvement in the printed *Roses* – and various other texts - that bear it. This overpainting hints that the increased indication of printers was not always desired by the buyers – but indeed, as Jean du Pré’s earlier edition shows, some printers were shrewd enough to admit the personalisation of later owners of these copies.

At the start of the new century, a fresh series of images appeared in the version attributed to Vérard and Galliot du Pré, with 85 woodcuts (three repeated). While, as Bourdillon suggests, many scenes imitate the Lyon cuts used by Syber et al, there are some important variations in the iconography.⁴⁹⁶ At the head of the text there is a prose prologue, with a large woodcut of a man lecturing from a book to an assembled crowd of scholars (Figure 105). This relates to the variant interpretation of the *Rose*, visualised in some manuscripts, as a book for instruction and edification. While this does not entirely replace the image of the Dreamer, as it does in some manuscripts with

⁴⁹⁴ Comparison of the representations of the personifications reveal the artist was not afraid to add additional details to the scenes in the Library of Congress copy. Bourdillon’s description of the copies of this edition in *The Early Editions* suggest many other scenes were substantially altered during the repainting process.

⁴⁹⁵ The various library holdings of copies of this edition refer to the numerous printer devices appearing at the head of these printed versions.

⁴⁹⁶ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 29-30, 47-49.

overpainting from a later date (i.e. Notre Dame 34), it does cast the poem in a different light, as the Dreamer is not represented at the head of the overall poem, but overleaf after the prologue. Similar alterations occurred in the manuscript cycles where the Dreamer was shifted from position, although as these were largely rarities, the presence of this change in an edition of a few hundred copies means this 'old' imagery was able to reach a far larger audience through the Vérard/du Pré editions.

The *Personifications* in the new edition clearly relate to the Syber cuts and the traditional imagery that informed them, omitting the inconsistent representations of the previous Vérard edition. They do however introduce additional scenes, some of which again relate to a spirit of interpretation. Opposite *Poverty*, for example, a second seated figure writes at a lectern, suggesting that the images on the wall are not only to be viewed, but studied and interpreted. The scenes between the *Carole* and the *Building of the Castle* return to the Syber cuts for inspiration, but later, at the *Lamentation of the Dreamer for the Roses and Responsiveness*, there is another representation of a writing figure, likely relating to the change of author that occurs just before this image. These additional figures referencing the interpretation, reading and writing of the poem chime not only with the incipit at the head of the prologue, but also the prolific explanatory references that appear in the margins of this edition, functioning like expanded versions of manuscript rubrics.

This edition also saw the return of a specific *Croesus and Phanie* image, with the gallows on the hill format evidently based on the standard representation from the Syber cuts. Evidently, however, dreams were not a major topical focus for the imagery, as the exemplars of reading, writing and lecturing outweigh dream-related subjects. Later scenes of the schooling of Responsiveness by the Old Woman reiterate this focus, with these figures twice shown conversing over books.

Interestingly, some pages later, the generic scene of two people talking in a townscape from Vérard's earlier edition is reintroduced (used there to represent *Croesus and Phanie*, and *Danger with Shame*). In the updated edition, it accompanies the *Old Woman Meeting the Dreamer by the Castle*, an episode it more obviously suits. This suggests that, in addition to recreating Syber cuts, this producer-publisher was not against revisiting his older stock and repurposing it for his new edition - a further example of the spirit of practicality and economy visible in early printed *Roses*. This spirit of recombination further suggests Vérard's dissatisfaction with his earlier examples, and

provides a useful prelude to the two most elaborate reinterpretations of the printed *Rose* in the sixteenth century: the editions of Jean Molinet's and Clément Marot's enhancements of the text.

Jean Molinet's *Roman de la Rose Moralisé* first appeared in 1500, released by Vérard, and used a similar cycle to his edition of the poetic text released in the same year. In 1503, however, a second edition appeared, with 67 woodcuts used to produce 139 illustrations to the text, printed by Guillaume Balsarin at Lyon.⁴⁹⁷ Molinet's prose version revised the text and provided large chunks of moralisation, designed to guide the reader through the poem and make its meaning explicit. The incipit image, like the Vérard and Galliot du Pré *Rose*, featured a poet at his writing-desk, though here he is unaccompanied except for an angel that sits above him (Figure 106). The image is followed by Molinet's prologue, but no scene of the Dreamer appears. Instead, a premonitory image of Idleness leading him through the garden gate appears at the head of Molinet's rewriting of Guillaume's section. The morality beneath this prose section is introduced by two other recycled scenes, the *Dreamer Stalked by Love*, and the *Crowning of the First King*. Following this, representations of the *Personifications* are again illustrated with both generic and specific scenes, some of which are based on the compositions or attributions of the Syber series. From this point onwards, the repetitions become more frequent, with potentially confusing effects.

The repetitions at time appear to have little to do with the narrative: the representation of the Dreamer led into the garden by Idleness – i.e. a male/female interaction that appears at the head of the poem – is omitted at the moment of its actual occurrence during the narrative. Instead, an image of two men entering the enclosure indicates the Idleness and Dreamer interaction. As the original image was clearly at the disposal of the printers, the edition raises the question of why these scenes were not reused in their appropriate positions. This suggests that for Balsarin, as with Vérard's haphazard cycle c.1493-5, the priority was not appropriate imagery, but merely the presence of it. It also suggests a rather *ad-hoc* approach, not detailed minutely by *libraires* or planners, but by those with less interest in accurate visualisation, or with little time to ensure the placement of accurate images for each section. That this confusion was not totally intended is evident from the variable nature of these scenes, which betray their origins in different cycles. The *Personifications*, for example, are bordered singly, doubly, or

⁴⁹⁷ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 33-34, 64-66.

within floral frames, suggesting their origin outside a single cycle produced specifically for the *Rose*.

Evidently, this 1503 edition suggests again that production took precedence over accuracy in the printed visual cycle. The timing of this edition may explain why; the first edition of Molinet's moralisation had appeared just three years earlier, suggesting demand for it was high. The 1503 edition may have been inspired by this popularity, as Vérard's hasty first version was in the 1490s, and supports the hypothesis that the urge to publish, rather than the urge to revise the iconography, was more important at this time. Notably, the next edition of Molinet's moralisation did not appear until 1521 (discussed below), and incorporated a new cycle of images; a cycle which may have been facilitated by the longer gap between print runs. However, as the printer responsible also changed – Michel le Noir in place of Balsarin, or Vérard and du Pré – it is possible that the approach was altered due to the involvement of a new printer.

1509 saw the issue of Michel le Noir's first edition, which was accompanied by only one woodcut, borrowed from an earlier printing of *Matheolus*. Le Noir was responsible for a further edition, in 1515, expanding the visual cycle and incorporating a mixture of new and reused woodcuts. The incipit scene (Figure 107) returns to the formula popular in the 1480s and 90s, with the Dreamer and Danger combined with the Dreamer before Idleness, however the framing and internal pillar aspects reproduce elements of the M-shaped incipits popular in late fifteenth-century manuscript copies. The settings have also been updated and reworked with new details, though they still imitate the Croquet/Syber cuts of the late 1400s. As Bourdillon described, Michel le Noir used older woodcut imagery from an edition of *Matheolus* to fill out the images – including *Samson and Delilah*, *Dido*, and *Phyllis*.⁴⁹⁸ While those specific scenes hardly betray that they were first used in an edition other than the *Rose*, they do attest to the cut-and-paste compilation of printed *Rose* cycles in the first two decades of the sixteenth century.

A further edition of Molinet's Prose Moralisation appeared in 1521, and at first glance appears to provide a more homogenous visual accompaniment through the woodcuts than the 1500 or 1503 editions.⁴⁹⁹ The incipit image relates to the 1503 author portrait incipit, though the setting has been reworked, with plants strewn about the author's

⁴⁹⁸ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 31 and 50-51.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 34 and 53.

feet, and an angel holds up a scroll containing the title of the work. That this title has been written in suggests this may have been a template image, used for other editions whose titles would replace the *Roman de la Rose* appearing here (Figure 108). This is further backed up by the worn edges of the woodcut, suggesting it was not its first outing, and undermines the idea of the 'pre-ordained' author motif being specifically designed for this *Rose*. From the first scene of the Dreamer, too, it is clear that second-hand woodcuts have been used to accompany the narrative, as the Dreamer is not alone, but attended to by several figures including a king – a wholly atypical rendering of this moment in the poem (Figure 109). While such a scene might perhaps have been read as an indication of the dream's importance as an exemplary tale, it is more likely that the reused image was simply felt to be an adequate scene for the traditional spot at the head of the poem, with little care for its inherent inappropriateness.

The following representations are variable; from the clustered, generic women representing *Hate* to the semi-nude figure in a garden by a house representing *Love Armed by his Servant*, the scenes show different levels of accuracy and relation to the poem. The visual style of the prints also differs from page to page, with shorter, squatter and less detailed images in double frames present alongside larger, more detailed scenes. The width of these scenes in comparison to the text columns also vary. Such elements create again a messy, haphazard effect, and while some repetitions may incorporate intentional allusions – i.e. the image of a king kneeling before an idol to represent both Love and the 'roy des ribauldz', Fraud – it is difficult to extract these from the random cacophony of images. Such variation and visual confusion suggests little time was spent on the commissioning and placement of the scenes in this edition – an unusual factor when one considers that to achieve a successful printed edition, textual alignment and *mise-en-page* were an important part of the editorial process. If one were not considering the placement of page furniture carefully, one would quickly end up with the kind of missing passages, errors and confusing leaps that McKitterick, Eisenstein et al reveal to be present in early incunabula.⁵⁰⁰

⁵⁰⁰ McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order*, disagrees with Eisenstein's comments in *The Printing Revolution* on the prevalence of errata in manuscripts. While I agree with McKitterick that there was some tolerance for errors (shown in the prevailing attitudes to inappropriate imagery), his assertion that the process involved a necessary search for formalisation, and the ordering of written word and image also makes clear this was a highly organised production method. Although printers may not always have succeeded in their aims for a formally precise edition, the very element of a coherent organisational process should have made it harder for inappropriate images to end up in the copies. As they did end up producing

The final edition to be discussed here is Clement Marot's *Recension*, consulted here in the edition of 1529 by Galliot du Pré held in facsimile by the BnF [Cat. q].⁵⁰¹ While the BnF's facsimile is partly illegible, the selection of images still provides a stark contrast to the series of ill-fitting or nostalgic representations present in the majority of late fifteenth and early sixteenth century printed *Roses*. While again a moralisation, the text has been prepared carefully in a small format style, accompanied by a cycle of images in small rectangular and ovoid frames (Figure 110). The scenes relate well to their textual surroundings, and while again some images are repeated, they seem to be more carefully sited. The 'aims' of the producers are stated clearly on the frontispiece, which states at the head of the edition: 'Le Rommant de la Rose, nouvellement Reveu et corrige oultre les precedentes Impressions', suggesting this was designed to be a better edition, more accurate than previous prints.

The images also represent a major shift in the visualisation of the *Rose*. Rather than repeating mid-fourteenth century visual tropes cast through the filter of the fifteenth-century printing process, these images update costumes and details to the sixteenth century. While the compositions and subjects remain traditional, the frames of the images incorporate up-to-date decorative motifs, such as masks, faux-floral decadent borders, or abstract forms not found in fourteenth-century manuscript illustration. The dress of the figures is also updated, with the men sporting wide capes and feathered caps, while the women wear dresses with wide or puffed sleeves. These costumes have much in common with the early sixteenth century manuscript made for François I, and are the first indication of the updated styles of the contemporary court scene making their way into printed *Roses*.

However, this fresh approach to the visualisation of the poem in printed editions was short-lived, and the few editions that appeared after 1529 in fact reused earlier cuts, those of other texts, or, as with the two further Marot *Recension* editions, simply reproduced the images of their earlier print runs. Bourdillon's study ends in 1538, with the last edition of Marot's *Recension*, and it indeed seems that with this edition, the last push for medieval illustrated printed *Roses* was at an end. That neither manuscripts nor printed editions were produced until the new versions of Méon et al during the eighteenth century shows that the period of *Rose* popularity had indeed come to its

editions with atypical or irrelevant scenes, one must concede that the presentation of appropriate imagery was not a priority in the editorial process.

⁵⁰¹ Bourdillon, *The Early Editions*, 32-33 and 57-62.

(temporary) end by the mid-1500s, and while trade in old manuscripts and printed editions likely continued, the demand for copies was no longer met through new editions. This point is also where this study ceases, as its focus is on medieval *Roses*.

This brief overview is intended to draw attention to a number of factors present in the medieval printed *Roses*. Adherence to a perceived 'tradition' guided the earliest editions, with the popularity of a series of cuts based on fourteenth-century trends – perhaps even inspired by an extant fourteenth-century manuscript – dominating the printed editions in the late fifteenth century, and continuing to inspire those of the sixteenth. Those perceived tropes left little room for the exploration of the dream topic, instead focusing on a series of 'typical' scenes illustrating major plot points or exemplars. Secondary scenes of sleepers and dreamers were rare, replaced briefly by one reference to the innocent sleepers of the Golden Age, but largely lost in a cycle of images that did not focus on them. This coincides with a general replacement of the original incipit format, with Dreamers replaced in several editions by a teacher or poet heading up the modern prologues inserted by those rewriting the text. In some instances, this may have coincided with the appearance of new 'Recensions' and 'Moralisations' by contemporary authors, which naturally place an emphasis on the authorship and explanation of the *Rose*. In others, the return to authorial portraiture may simply reflect a revisiting of earlier, rarer traditions for the incipit imagery of philosophical and literary manuscripts and printed editions.

The editions also reveal a spirit of recombination, with the reuse of woodcuts both related and unrelated to the text. This contrasts overwhelmingly with the original manuscripts of the *Rose* these printed editions appeared to emulate. While scenes naturally migrated from other works into the repertoire of thirteenth and fourteenth century manuscript makers, these were most commonly adapted into their contexts, leaving only rare traces of mistakes or misunderstandings. Conversely, the focus in the printed editions often comes across as speed and superfluity, as if the content of the images is less important than the simple fact of its being present. This only seems to have altered during the second decade of the sixteenth century, tied to the reconstruction of the text by the likes of Marot, but even this was not long-lasting. Just twelve years after Marot's *Recension* seemed to herald a new period of re-evaluation and interest, the *Rose* was all but out of fashion.

Such a stagnant visual tradition is perhaps related to the fact that, time and again, the same printers were responsible for producing multiple editions each year - a natural outcome of being invested in the business of book production and printing. Michel le Noir and Vérard were undoubtedly two of the most prolific, and were also responsible for large print workshops, producing many texts in addition to the *Rose*. From these, they were able to source a number of images – most likely an action guided as much by economy as visual familiarity with the scenes used, as often these were reused in less typical or less fitting positions. The use and reuse of particular models, most notably the Syber cuts, also seems to have been the consequence of the printers' close relationships with one another, as these same woodcuts appeared in editions funded and organised by different people, attaching their separate devices to their own editions.⁵⁰²

The effect of these visual cycles on their contemporary readers is hard to reconstruct. However, given the potential for larger audiences to access the printed copies, it must be recognised that these sequences would quickly overtake the established 'norms' of *Rose* reader experience first outlined in the manuscript editions. Instead of a luxury, tailored visualisation of the poem, many new readers would encounter images occasionally at odds with the text, or compositions recycled from earlier instances, a state of affairs that could easily become confusing, especially as few rubrics appear to have accompanied the images.

Nevertheless, there was an important, continued interaction between manuscript and incunabula editions of the *Rose* in the late 1500s. Not only were printed editions drawn from the manuscript tradition, but also new manuscripts used the print editions as a base for either text or image. As with the overpainted editions of Vérard's *Rose*, or the manuscript for François I that used Michel Le Noir's 1519 textual rendering, these two forms of *Rose* production overlapped in many instances. While the images in François' manuscript have little to do with the short sequence that appeared in his printed copies, there appears to have been a recognition of how these two methodologies could be combined. Although many of the editions discussed here suffered their own version of the modern-day typo, with words omitted between pages, text misaligned during

⁵⁰² That these were not just 'copied' woodcuts, but reuse of the originals, is evident by the wear-and-tear Bourdillon draws attention to in his study. Further, his identification of the loss of several scenes throughout the period of their reuse suggests that they were circulating, and therefore more likely to result in the loss and deterioration evident in subsequent prints.

printing and so forth, the multiplicity inherent in the process of printing created a greater opportunity than ever for 'fixing' the text of the *Rose*, and it seems to have been this aspect that informed manuscript producers during the latter years of *Rose* production. Although several of these editions suggest that at least in terms of images, accuracy and appropriateness was not desired, the numerous editions issued within just three or four decades point to both competition, as well as a desire to produce a more accurate text than that of their predecessors. In some, like Galliot du Pre's edition of the *Recension* in 1529, this desire to outdo earlier attempts was expressed explicitly, drawing a line under the implied errors of past production.

Unfortunately, the same fixity of text possible with the printed *Roses* did not translate well into the image cycles. While familiar, appropriate scenes worked well when used in the first editions of Croquet and Syber, the tradition of use and reuse eventually was applied even if it was not appropriate, and resulted in ultimately ill-fitting sequences that visually confuse the reader. At best, many of these cycles were nostalgic and out-of-date, but at their worst were an ineffectual rendering of major plot points that contrast starkly with the updated, elaborate cycles accompanying contemporary luxury manuscripts.

On the whole, while this section has not discussed the 'dream' topic in depth as it appeared in the printed *Roses* (a side effect of there being very few such scenes to analyse), it does reveal parity with earlier manuscript editions. While the visualisation of the dream circumscribed the poem to a greater or lesser extent in the manuscripts and printed incunabula, it was, like many other subjects, subject to changes of taste and format. While the nostalgia of the early editions preserved the long-standing Dreamer and Danger pairing, it also resurrected a form that related this to Idleness – an interpretation of the poem not present in new visual cycles for over 100 years. And while the manuscript tradition allowed for the reformulations of the visual tradition, resulting in alternative, singular perspectives on the events and narratives, the printed editions were subject to a repetitive formula that only once was really rejected in favour of bringing the poem's visualisation up to date. In many of these editions, the dream aspect was also subjugated to the increased identification of those responsible for its transmission – paralleling the increased focus on patrons in sixteenth century manuscripts. And while these alternative print cycles reduce the expression of the dream element of the poem, they are a necessary counterbalance to the idea of the importance of the visualisation of that point. Such cycles prove that dream imagery was

subject to other concerns, coexisting with other elements that guided manuscript and incunabula production; matters that seem to have eventually called the death knell for such scenes in *Rose* editions.

Conclusion:

In the field of dream literature and the history of its artistic representation, the *Roman de la Rose* occupies a unique position as the preeminent exemplar of both theoretical and visual traditions regarding this elusive and immersive subject. Its visual expression in an astonishing number of surviving manuscripts and printed editions serves only to underline the major contribution it made to the history of dream imagery. Its popularity in France was matched by enthusiasm for the poem elsewhere, resulting in a variety of translations, homages and citations within the 250 years of its presence in medieval French manuscripts and printed editions, and beyond. For those seeking to explore the history of dreams, both textually and visually, no better candidate from the extant dream narrative or theoretical literature presents itself than the ambiguous and exciting *Roman de la Rose*. As the previous chapters have clearly demonstrated, aspects of the surviving *Rose* corpus touch on a variety of areas of interest, from the deliberate ambiguity of the classical and medieval theories on dreams, to the stark distinctions depictions of this dream represent when contrasted with their forebears.

First and foremost, the *Rose* manuscripts and printed editions featuring imagery provide evidence of the psychological experience of dreams, and their narrative retelling, during the Later Middle Ages. The *Rose* is an extraordinary combination of dream-plot, interpretation, classical paraphrase, educational discourse and love story all in one. Understanding this dream poem engrossed and even infuriated some of its medieval readers (and many modern ones), as it incorporated the same illogicality and ambiguity as its dream subject. Both drawing on and rejecting earlier theoretical approaches to dreams - pretending to offer an allegorical representation of 'truth', but in fact providing no unequivocal message - I would stress that the *Rose* represents a substantial leap forward in the fictional representation of dreams. By focusing on the internal narrative, without recourse to an external interpretation of the dream, the *Rose* authors produced a poem with meaning(s) that can only be deconstructed and analysed by the readers, who are not provided with a single 'answer'. In many ways, this reflects the double-edged conception of dreams by the authors' distinguished forebears in the church and philosophical literature, as potentially both true and false.

The reasons for this major shift in the conception of dreams in the *Rose* are difficult to pin down, but were certainly inevitable given the constant stream of non-credulous literature about the subject already present in the historical background. While

Guillaume has been perceived as a less able, less adventurous writer whose verse retains many tropes of secular narrative, with credit for the poem's longevity and appeal often going to the loquacious Jean, the complex string of guarantees on the poem's veracity and subsequent breaking of said promises is in fact commenced within Guillaume's prologue. The resumption of the hide-and-seek approach to overall meaning within Jean – a feature that ensures no one is ever certain regarding what the authors wish to say about the 'dream' is therefore indebted to the stark change in approach within Guillaume's section. While the reasons for Guillaume's reaction to the formalised, positive recounts of dreams in prior literature may never be discovered given the severe lack of information surrounding this author, Jean's position may be more easily discerned. A student at the University of Paris, Jean would have been conscious of the 'rediscovery' of Aristotelian theories, most notably expressed in the works of the eminent Thomas Aquinas, and the backlash embodied in the Condemnations of 1277, both of which incorporated significant ideas concerning dream theory and the prospect of 'truth' within these. While Jean's section of the poem is undoubtedly more indebted to a broader range of theoretical literature, too, this may again be traced to a named source identified in Guillaume's section – the famed Macrobius, who argued for the prospect of couching truths in allegorical fictions, and a hierarchical structure of dreams that admitted both true and false dreams. The ambiguity inherent in Guillaume and Jean's poem – certainly a feature which earned it long-standing admiration from a public who could glean whatever message they wished from it - clearly incorporates these ideas, originating from Late Antiquity but repeated in the prominent dream and literary theoreticians of the Middle Ages that formed the context for the ground-breaking *Rose*.

Yet it was not only in a textual sense that the *Rose* synthesised and advanced 'representations' of dreams. Unlike their theoretical and textual counterparts, visualisations of dreams had been in a form of stasis for many years, focused on the repetition of the same tropes of Dreamer, Dream and Consequence imagery, largely expressed in Biblical, or quasi-Biblical contexts. Furthermore, these images were almost entirely concerned with representations of dreams that came true, not - as the *Rose* was - regarding a dream of ambiguous meaning, or outcome. From the earliest *Rose* manuscripts, a new stage was attained, wherein a dream of uncertain truth was accompanied by vast swathes of imagery that enhanced the ambiguity. While some of these did attempt to 'interpret' the poem, their immense variation was undoubtedly the

result of the openness of the *Rose* dream to different perspectives, suggesting this ambiguity is both the heart of the *Rose's* meaning, and its characteristic legacy.

This thesis demonstrates that the sheer number of *Rose* manuscripts and prints provide an unparalleled opportunity to trace the changing approaches to dream depictions, and how dreams were 'represented' in text and image in this period. While the earliest manuscripts echo the visual tropes for the representation of dreams in previous centuries, the *Rose* quickly produced its own traditions, with models and compositions that stretch the interpretation of the poem far beyond the scope of the narrative plot. These alterations derived not only from external planning considerations, but more personal attitudes and perspectives on the poem, whether these originated in the artist, *libraire*, or patron. Even manuscripts originating in the same workshops, by the same team of artists, could vary wildly in terms of dream imagery, adding to and expanding the potential variations in the visual interpretation of the poem. These factors no doubt additionally enhanced the popularity of this text; while the ability to earn multiple copies may only have been the preserve of the more affluent in society (cf. Jean de Berry, with his many commissions and manuscripts of the *Rose*), the variability in manuscripts not only offered the promise of a unique visual retelling of the poem for those who desired several copies, but even those purchasing 'ready-mades', as these never simply repeated the precise pattern established in other manuscripts. Although the patterns of readership are difficult to discern with such historical distance between then and now, the desire to own your 'own' copy of the popular poem may certainly have been gratified by the fresh renderings of the *Rose* emerging every few years in response to the changing trends of illumination.

It is this point that this thesis principally aims to demonstrate; while a number of aspects, including the fact that this is an atypical narrative produced by two separate authors, contributed to its visual distinctiveness, many illustrated manuscripts experiment when depicting the *Rose* dream. Instead, the visualisation rejects earlier tropes in favour of a varied, fluid and at-times revolutionary new aesthetic treatment of the dream, suggesting that *this* is what the *Rose* actually represents.

In some of the earliest manuscripts, this innovation solely consisted of overthrowing the typical authoritative figure represented at the head of the poem in favour of the ambiguous figure of dreamer. While this might not appear so surprising to modern-day viewers more used to the summative images appearing on the covers of paperbacks or

title-pages, previously no images of dreamers stood dominant at the head of the texts they appeared in. Conversely, with the *Rose*, the dreamers occupy the principal site at the head of the poem in the majority of instances, and provide only a fragmentary insight into the authorial 'intent' or message of the poem, proposing a revolutionary new approach to manuscript imaging and readership: that authority or 'meaning' is not the priority with the *Rose*.

What the *Rose's* 'message' was also differed strongly from prior dream vision exemplars, with their structured narratives embodying cause and effect, often with a positive or meaningful outcome. The prime example of this is the representation of Biblical Dreams, wherein God's elect are able to forewarn their fellows regarding danger as a result of alerts provided in dreams – patterns of behaviour and interpretation that are backed up by the description of such future events, vindicating the heroes and serving moral lessons to their readerships, serving only as a means to an end. This lies in stark contrast to the ambiguous, potentially dangerous experience of the dreamer in the *Rose*, who, with his abrupt awakening, refuses the provision of a meaning or moral – excepting that which can be gleaned by the reader themselves. This aspect has heretofore been neglected in *Rose* scholarship, excepting the handful of authors who have already recognised the falsity or flimsy nature of its 'authority' discussed in the Introduction – though not tying this directly to the dream topic, which arguably dictates the lack of concrete meaning in the narrative.

The complexity of the narrative and the underlying dream theme is reflected within the breadth of incipit images, all of which give varying degrees of attention to the connotations of dreams as positive, negative or a combination of the two. The ever-present *Dreamer* incipit was the most popular single illustration to the *Rose*. Although the extant examples of this scene encompass a widespread number of interpretations for the poem as a whole, as well as the state of dreaming. Rather than simply illustrating the opening lines of the narrative, these scenes reveal contemporaneous perspectives on the *Rose* and dreams, from the stark Single-Dreamer images that reveal very little, to the bipartite pairings with unscrupulous or ambiguous figures like Danger or Idleness, which draw on commonly held theoretical ideas about dreaming that previously had not received any visual representation. Others incorporated oblique references to its interpretation by depicting the author or poet writing, which is a representation of the only concrete consequence of this dream - Guillaume and Jean's poetic account. Incorporation of the symbolic markers from the poem, while drawing

on prior representational traditions also links to the populist Dreambooks, which assigned particular meanings to specific symbols or motifs, and again could result in positive or negative associations for the reader.

Some scenes obliquely reflected the dubious citation of Macrobius by Guillaume in the first lines of the poem by representing the Roses as central to the composition. This was potentially in reference to Macrobius' comments that lovelorn dreamers often dream of their sweethearts, a type of dream that bears no significant meaning. This lay in stark contrast to the status Guillaume attempted to convince his readership this particular dream had, as a bearer of meaning and a vision future events – akin to a much higher category of Macrobius' dream theory, that of the *somnium*. As the *Rose* ostensibly follows one love-quest, the representation of Roses instead links the poem back to a dream trope that was recognised as untrue, subversively undermining Guillaume's own comments on the truth of his dream.

These incipit types were also subject to substantial alteration as they were revisited in later manuscript illuminations, with a gradual withdrawal from abstract significations to more concrete representations of the literal first moments of the poem. However, these also blended into multiscentic images, scenes which undermine the naturalism of these artistic efforts, and which draw further attention to the surreality of the dream space. A number of irregular opening images also dwell on aspects of medieval dream theory, such as the roses being delivered by the hands of an angel to a sleeping dreamer in the incipit of Egerton 881, to the roses stemming from the mouth of the dreamer in Arras 897. In the former, there is a reflection of the medieval theory that true dreams came only from God, while the latter relates to more physical theories on sleep by Aristotle, namely that certain bodily states could result in particular dreams.

While these groups were subject to clear compositional patterns, workshop circumstances, artistic collaborations and exemplar-copy relationships, the variety inherent in these incipits reveal the true complexity of dream representation within the *Rose* corpus – again pointing to the fact that this is the *Rose's* real legacy: its ambiguity. These images do not belong to a static chronological line of development, as subjective interpretations and reinterpretations appeared throughout the period in question. In a general sense, as demonstrated in this thesis, there was a move towards a more literal rendering of the dream narrative, one that omitted some of the more abstract interpretations of the poem, though again these forms of meaningful incipit were

resurrected in the later fifteenth century by the first printed editions. Furthermore, *Rose* imagery expresses the significant rejection by artists and *libraires* of earlier tropes for dream imagery, by largely avoiding the clear-cut consequence aspect present in so many prior scenes. Arguably, this stems from the nature of the *Rose* itself, which lacks a final pronouncement of meaning.

The dream imagery structured reader responses to the poem in a large variety of ways, each of which could work both with and against personal perspectives on the narrative. In the context of this thesis, it is perhaps no wonder enthusiasts like Jean de Berry collected multiple illuminated copies of the *Rose*, saving them in his library, as each incarnation represented different facets of the poem through the visual imagery. Jean provides an interesting case, particularly given his well-documented interests in the collection of not only illuminated manuscripts, but other crafted objects and artworks. Though his special habit of acquisition marks him out as an unusual case, his purchase of multiple *Roses* suggests he was drawn to the variable visual focus in each distinct manuscript, perhaps as some suggest procuring the famed Valencia copy, with its clearly classicising, scholarly approach to the imagery. After all, Jean would hardly need several copies if he was only interested in reading the text which would be nearly identical in each manuscript. The prevalence of the *Rose* at the turn of the fifteenth century – boosted by the very public *Querelle* – was likely also a means of encouraging the market for such manuscripts, though the impending crises in the war with England seems to have had a negative effect on the production of *Roses* after the 1420s, meaning it was unable to regain the popular dominance the poem had in the fourteenth century manuscript market. By the time the illuminators returned to the poem in the mid-to-late fifteenth century, it was to pander to the changed priorities of rich patrons, as the popular dispersal of the *Rose* text fell to the emergent printers.

Perhaps the only defining characteristic of the wide range of *Rose* images is the prevalence of the dream plot within them, and the unwillingness of those planning the visual cycles – like the authors of the poem – to defer to external figures for interpretation of the dream. *Libraires*, artists, and sometimes even owners themselves exploited the internal material of the poem, resulting in dream images that offer intriguing insights into this ambiguous poem. As a structural device, these images push the reader on into the poem in search of meaning, paradoxically, a task they must complete themselves, without guidance from either author.

In this sense, these innocuous dreamers offer their most powerful challenge to the authorities they supplant, by provoking the readers to form their own opinions in lieu of an overarching message or moral. Secondary scenes also revealed further complexities regarding the medieval attitude to dreams, such as the 40 examples of the highly relevant *Croesus and Phanie* episode analysed for this thesis, which demonstrably brought in new reflections on old subject material that could easily relate to prior traditions for dream imagery, as the narrative contains a clear Dreamer, Dream and Consequence construction. However, images of this scene also diverged from prior prototypes, with little or no recourse to a Dreamer image, merely a focus on the variable interpretations of Croesus and his daughter - an episode with fatal consequences for the protagonist. As such, the depictions of this scene further reflect the ambiguity surrounding the meaning of the *Rose* and dreams in general. Additionally, the rare *Waking Dreamer* depictions provides a codicil to these wide-ranging representations of dreams, by relating closely to the earlier dream imagery conventions, but being present in so few manuscripts as to reflect a near-total refusal of those earlier tropes. Even when they are included, the *Dreamer Waking* scenes provide a fictional re-rendering of Jean's abrupt ending, offering up a scene that again delves into personal interpretation rather than textual truth. Yet there was another means by which the artists complicated the image of the dream: through alternative representations that appear to borrow more heavily from individual experiences of the dream state, and their unusual visual and atmospheric nature.

Before the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, dreams were depicted in a manner that shared vital characteristics with imagery of waking life. Despite copious theoretical discourses on the hazy, otherworldly, or ambiguous visual qualities of the dream state, where true or false could intertwine – something Macrobius aligns with the natures of allegories and fables – visual dreams tended to be circumscribed by the rules guiding the representation of waking reality.

As demonstrated in Chapter One, the only indication of 'other worlds' in the St Louis Psalter comes within the sphere of God, when he communes with those on earth, whereas dreams were visually indistinguishable from scenes from waking life – no blurred edges or cloud bubbles appeared to surround the 'visions' of dreamers. However, as the traditions of visual representation evolved throughout the period of

the *Rose's* popularity, the *Rose* corpus provides some indication that this status quo was unfit for purpose. In the plastic arts, the increased proximity to the visual nature of waking life through methods such as perspectival illusionism may have posed a dilemma to artists and *libraires* wishing to represent dreams, particularly as the evidence of their own dreams will have shown how much dreams visually diverged from waking life. Some reaction to the altered visual reality of the dream space is evident in manuscripts from the early fifteenth century, exemplifying the at-times surreal or topsy-turvy nature of the experience of dreams.

In a sense, these variable images align with the complex theoretical background of dream discussion regarding the allegorical, figurative nature of dreams, which often required some form of deconstruction or interpretation before their meaning could become clear. Additionally, they also coincide with a period wherein the text of the *Rose* was also under a great deal of scrutiny, through the public debates known as the *Querelle de la Rose*. The historical field of dream theory also provides some justification for the range of visual depictions of the dream narrative, as theologians and scholars accepted the ability of dreams to be interpreted in various ways. Through the multiplicity of dream representations, including the many different approaches to the dreamer incipits, each new *Rose* re-interpretation is a physical example of the theoretical divergences regarding the dream subject, whether inherited indirectly, or the result of exposure to specific dream theories, the latter likely only a factor when scholars were involved in the planning of image cycles, as with the Valencia *Rose*.

While these novelties did experience a period of popularity, the eradication of the respected authorial figure did not last, and during the later fifteenth century we witness a retreat back to the potentially surer ground of poetic or patronage-based authorities, who began to appear in place of the dreamers in new manuscripts. Nevertheless, these unusual trends in *Rose* illumination did leave a lasting legacy, notably picked up by the producers of late-fifteenth-century printed editions, which borrowed from the traditions of the fourteenth century in their early period, reviving long-forgotten tropes for new audiences.

These final issues do point to another important aspect the study of the dream representations in the *Rose* raises; the idea of external factors shaping and altering the *Rose's* depiction over the centuries, and the artistic agencies responsible for how they ultimately turned out. Research into the extant manuscripts demonstrates that artists

and planners were responsible for producing multiple, variable copies of the poem. Additionally, it is clear that each time, someone was interested in the possibility of altering the status quo, developing the ideas and methods of their predecessors in order to produce novel, meaningful imagery.

Rose visual production was an active, fluid process - much like the mutable *Rose* itself, whose ambiguity likely inspired these imaginative visual responses - and left us with a corpus that is extremely varied, especially when one considers that these were all illuminations concentrating on one single poem. Investigation of the working processes at play behind these manuscripts reveals that these largely followed inferred or evidenced production methods of the time, partaking of traditions that divided up the roles in manuscripts - planner or *libraire*, scribe, illuminator - and farmed them out to multiple artisans. Yet these methodologies also reveal substantial space for the sort of interpretive variation that makes the *Rose* corpus such an engaging and heterogeneous group. Within the context of the *Rose* manuscripts, the ambiguity of the poem likely provided a spur to variable visual reinterpretations. However, it is important to note that the same working processes were used by those producing other texts, and as such, also hints to an interpretive streak that has long been neglected in the delineation of manuscript production practices in the medieval period.

Although I am not exclusively concerned with the intentionality of artists and *libraires* involved in illuminating manuscripts, especially given the limits in recreating the attitudes of people living between 500 to 700 years ago, it is important to remember that the changes occurring between manuscripts reveal a far more invested workforce than has previously been supposed by art historical scholars. Wide-ranging developments in illumination affected not only the external appearance of *Rose* manuscripts, but also the means of interpreting and expressing ideas about the poem, and must be considered ever-present in the background of the dream representations discussed here. Images were more than mere carbon copies of workshop models or prior illuminations, but living, flexible elements within manuscripts, produced by artists and *libraires* interested in their expressive and interpretive potential. This is ultimately what made them such an engaging, varying accompaniment to the manuscripts of the *Rose* and, given their presence in two-thirds of the manuscript corpus and almost all of the printed editions, cemented their popularity with the book-buying public of France during the Middle Ages.

This is the second principal finding of this thesis, indicated in the subtitle of this study, 'artistic vision'. Many scholars have sought to re-evaluate the presence of artistic agency in the context of medieval workshop practices in a manner that does not apply today's notions of a romanticised, thoughtful artist to a period where labour and trade often dominated manuscript production. However, I believe the *Roses* reveal that the new approach has perhaps gone too far in the other direction, cutting out too much of the notion of 'intent' from the process. Rather, it is clear that even when artists and planners were responsible for producing multiple copies of the poem with standardised images, these 'copies' were not predetermined entities, constantly following a particular pattern. Instead, these additional versions could be altered and expanded through the reference to additional trends or ideas that often related back directly to complex ideas relating to dreams, the meaning of the *Rose* as a whole, or theoretical discourses and disputes occurring in the period they were produced in. One particular example of this is with the Brussels-Lyon family, a group which incorporated new ideas in the incipits of the copies produced by both the workshop and those with access to its models. These manuscripts also reveal the spirit of flexibility in workmanship and production through the hiring of 'experts' in *Rose* decoration for one-off incipit images, or the insertion of novel subject matter in manuscripts ostensibly based around a shared framework.

It is also not just the families of manuscripts that reveal these notions of artistic intention and variation, but the general vibrancy of the overall corpus, as no two copies of the *Rose* are in fact identical, nor were they intended to be. From the novel Vatican Urb. Lat. 376 with its extensive image bank, which spawned a whole host of related but distinct copies in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, to the one-off Valencia copy with its multitude of miniatures, each *Rose* develops, alters, or modifies its predecessors in a manner that defies easy 'categorisation', implying in every instance the existence of an artistic agent – be they miniaturist, scribe, *libraire* or patron – who was invested in the visual content of the poem and its expressive potential. While one cannot assign this role with unequivocal certainty to the artists employed in the illuminator workshops, the evidence of the manuscripts makes it clear it can be assigned to someone, most likely the *libraire* responsible for overseeing the whole operation.

Although this may seem like a rather moot point, in terms of analysing the significant aspects of *Rose* dream imagery it must be addressed. Without this form of artistic

agency desirous of expressing a particular meaning, all analysis of the visual aspects of *Roses* – and indeed other medieval manuscripts – would be pointless, as their ideas would simply be expressed by chance. It is my contention that this was *not* however the case, and that be they artists, patrons or *libraires*, someone involved in the stage of *Rose* production was invested in demonstrating an idea or connotation to the viewer of these images, and the readers of the poem. Although this habit declined with the nostalgic approach of the printed editions of the fifteenth century, abandoning variance in favour of homogeneity and the recapturing of a fourteenth-century aesthetic, the presence of such evident ‘intent’ is a clear aspect of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscript production methodology, and its importance should not be undermined.

This idea is of major import not only within the field of *Rose* research, but also has ramifications for the study of other medieval manuscripts. While there is not enough room here to discuss the entire corpus of manuscripts that reveal their working practices in the same way I examined the *Rose* copies, it is a method I would suggest applying to other groups of manuscripts to reveal the extent to which the variation, novelty and above all playfulness of visual development and manuscript-making was shared across other textual productions. While the ambiguity of the *Rose* acted as an evident spur to the freer approaches of the artists and planners designing its visual cycles, this would not have been possible were it not a potential factor of extant manuscript production practices. It must also be stated that while one must retain awareness of the historical gap between the medieval period and the present day, particularly in terms of how illuminators and manuscript producers would have looked upon their own work, I believe it is misleading to suggest that there was not any vested interest in the connotations readers and viewers could glean from manuscript imagery, given the breadth of variety evident in corpuses like that of the *Rose*.

Not only is the issue of artistic intent an interesting aspect that branches out from the parameters of this study, but we also have the interesting cross-over period wherein *Roses* coexisted in both manuscript and printed formats in the later fifteenth century. While this sphere downplayed visual focus on the dream, it also codified the text - and some of its interpretations - based on nostalgic revisiting of earlier tropes. More work must be done on the issue of nostalgia in the medieval arts, and indeed art history in general, though it seems the presence of a retrograde tradition in *Roses* prefigures the recurrent historical trends for revisiting antiquated motifs or visual elements through pastiche. While in 2006, Andreas Huyssen referred to nostalgia as typically concerned

with the inaccessibility of the past and a concurrent desire for it, the type of visual nostalgia evidenced in the earliest *Rose* printed editions calls this into question.⁵⁰³ After all, illustrated manuscripts were still being produced, and while one could not exactly reproduce a fourteenth-century manuscript in printed form, attempts were made to do so by printing on vellum and having miniatures painted in. This mode of nostalgia thus appears to be a more active model, one which invited the reproduction of visual compositions, but also pursued a form of facsimile in the copycat vellum editions; a practice not unlike the modern-day 'rediscovery' of historical crafts, suggesting some origins of these attitudes to the past can be found in the medieval period.

Reflections of perceived traditions appeared in some of the earliest printed editions, leaving little room for visual interpretation of the dream aspect in primary or secondary scenes, and instead building a tradition that relied more on the emphasis of an author or authority figure. The printing process also resulted in its own pitfalls and shortcuts, as external imagery crept in to woodcut cycles, sometimes completely irrelevant to the text at hand. Interrelations with manuscript products continued, though these do suggest some dissatisfaction with the woodcuts, as artists were sometimes paid to paint over the erroneous imagery with new compositions, shown in some surviving printed editions.

On the whole, the representation of dreams in the *Rose* manuscripts and incunabula is as varied, ambiguous, frustrating and engrossing as the dream-poem itself. They reflect the changes occurring in the approach to dream imagery during the later medieval period, new perspectives that would ultimately lead to the modern conception of dreams as sites of visual difference, irregularity, and surreal imagery. This thesis thereby represents an attempt to plug the gap in scholarship concerning the evolution in the representation and reception of dream that occurred during the Later Middle Ages.

In an insular sense, the dream scenes reveal overlaps with and alterations of long-standing attitudes to dreams in theoretical, biblical and fictional literature, as well as the modulations of these as they passed through individual interpretations. They suggest artistic collaborations and workshop practices, as well as the filtration of ideas through new generations and into different regions of production. Above all, the dream aspect provides the best means of understanding the *Rose*, as it invites the reader to not

⁵⁰³ Andreas Huyssen, "Nostalgia for Ruins", *Grey Room*, No. 23 (2006): 7.

only work out the ultimate meaning of the poem themselves, but also be aware that there may not be one single interpretation after all. The visualisation of the dream in *Roses* reveals a fluid picture of the history of dream representation, and touches on a number of issues regarding art, literature, dreams, interpretation, and visualisation. It also bears relevance today, as it reveals how different visual conceptions of the dream space once were, by existing at the tipping point of new investigations into the imagery and representation of dreams. Today, almost 750 years later, post-Freud, post-Surrealism, in a period where scientific studies of the subject still have no conclusive answers for why and how we dream, the all-encompassing, elusive imagery of the *Rose* still offers salient points on the development of attitudes to the ambiguous realm of dreams, and meaning *per se*.

Bibliography

- Adelard of Bath, "On the Same and the Different" in *Conversations with his Nephew*. Translated by Charles Burnett, 1-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Alain of Lille. *The Plaint of Nature*. Translated by James J. Sheridan. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980.
- Alexander, Jonathan J.G. *Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Alexander, Jonathan J.G. 1990. "Preliminary Marginal Drawings in Medieval Manuscripts", in *Artistes, Artisans et Production Artistique Au Moyen Age, Colloque International. Vol. III, Fabrication et Consommation de L'œuvre*, edited by Xavier Barral I Altet, 307-319. Paris: Picard.
- Alexander, Jonathan J.G. 1989. "Facsimiles, Copies and Variations: The Relationship to Model in Medieval and Renaissance European Illuminated Manuscripts", in *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, edited by Kathleen Preciado, 61-74. Washington: National Gallery of Art.
- Allen, Peter L. *The Art of Love: Amatory Fiction from Ovid to the Romance of the Rose*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*. Translated by Paul T. Durbin (Volume 12) and by Thomas F. O'Meara and Michael J. Duffy (Volume 40). London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1968.
- Arden, Heather M. *The Roman de la Rose: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1993.
- Arden, Heather M. *The Romance of the Rose*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987.
- Areford, David S. *The Viewer and the Printed Image in Late Medieval Europe*. Burlington, Ashgate, 2010.
- Artemidorus. *The Interpretation of Dreams: Oneirocritica*. Translated by Robert J. White. New Jersey: Noyes Classical Studies, Noyes Press, 1975.
- Aserinsky, Eugene and Kleitman, Nathaniel. "Regularly Occurring Periods of Eye Motility, and Concomitant Phenomena, During Sleep", in *Science, New Series*, Vol. 118, No. 3062 (1953): 273-274.
- Augustine. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. Translated by John H. Taylor. New York: Newman Press, 1982.
- Avril, François and Gaborit-Chopin, Danielle, eds. *1300...L'Art au Temps de Philippe le Bel*. Paris, École du Louvre, 1998.
- Avril, François. *L'enluminure à l'époque gothique: 1200-1420*. Paris: Bibliothèque de l'image, 1995.
- Avril, François and Reynaud, Nicole. *Les manuscrits à peintures en France, 1440-1520*. (Paris: Flammarion, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1995.
- Avril, François. *Manuscript Painting at the Court of France: The Fourteenth Century (1310-1380)*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1978.

- Ayer, A.J. 1977. "Professor Malcolm on Dreams", in *Philosophical Essays on Dreaming*, edited by Charles E.M. Dunlop, 127-148. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Bachorski, Hans-Jürgen. 2000. "Dreams that Have Never Been Dreamt at All: Interpreting Dreams in Medieval Literature". Translated by Pamela E. Selwyn in *History Workshop Journal*, No. 49 (2000): 95-127.
- Backhouse, Janet. *The Illuminated Manuscript*. Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1979.
- Badel, Pierre-Yves. *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe Siècle, Etude de la Réception de l'œuvre*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980.
- Baltrušaitis, Jurgis. *Réveils et Prodiges: Le Gothique Fantastique*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1960.
- Baumgartner, Emmanuèle. "The Play of Temporalities; or, The Reported Dream of Guillaume de Lorris", in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, edited by Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot, 21-38. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Bauml, Franz H. 1980. "Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy", *Speculum*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (1980): 237-265.
- Beard, Mary. "Cicero and Divination: The Formation of a Latin Discourse", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 76 (1986): 33-46.
- Beer, Jeanette. *Master Richard's Bestiary of Love and Response*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Benson, Larry D., ed. *The Riverside Chaucer*. [Third Edition]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Berriot, François. *Exposicions et significacions des Songes et les Songes Daniel*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1989.
- Binski, Paul and Zutshi, Patrick, with Panayotova, Stella. *Western Illuminated Manuscripts: A Catalogue of the Collection in Cambridge University Library*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Bischoff, Bernhard. *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Translated by Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and David Ganz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Blamires, Alcuin and Holian, Gail C. *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated: Manuscripts at the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth* [Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, Vol. 223]. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002.
- Bodenham, C.H.L. "The Nature of the Dream in Late Medieval French Literature", *Medium Ævum*, Vol. LIV (The Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature) (1985): 74-86.
- Boethius. *The Theological Tractates, and The Consolation of Philosophy*. Translated by S.J. Tester. London: Loeb Classical Library and William Heinemann Ltd., 1973.
- Booton, Diane E. *Manuscripts, Market and the Transition to Print in Late Medieval Brittany*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2010.

- Bousmanne, Bernard and van Hoorebeeck, Céline, eds., *La librairie des ducs de Bourgogne: manuscrits conservés à la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000, CD-Rom.
- Bourdillon, F.W. *The Early Editions of the Roman de la Rose*. London: Chiswick Press, The Bibliographical Society, 1906.
- Braet, Herman. "Narcisse et Pygmalion: Mythe et intertexte dans le 'Roman de la Rose'", in *Mediaeval Antiquity*, edited by Andries Welkenhuysen, Herman Braet and Werner Verbeke, 237-254. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995.
- Braet, Herman. "Der Roman der Rose: Raum im Blick", in *Träume im Mittelalter: Ikonologische Studien*, edited by Agostino Paravicini Bagliani and Giorgio Stablile, 183-192. Stuttgart: Belser, 1989.
- Branner, Robert. *Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis: A Study of Styles*. London: University of California Press, 1977.
- Braut, Gerard J. *The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition: II: Oxford Text and English Translation*. London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978.
- Brayer, Edith and Korteweg, A.S. *Catalogue of French-Language Medieval Manuscripts in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (Royal Library) and Meermanno-Westreenianum Museum, The Hague*. Amsterdam: Royal Library, Moran Micropublications, 2003.
- Bredhorn, Karin and Powitz, Gerhardt. *Die Mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Gruppe Manuscripta Latina*. Kataloge der Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt am Main. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1979.
- Brown-Grant, Rosalind. "A New Context for Reading the 'Querelle de la Rose': Christine de Pizan and Medieval Literary Theory", in *Au Champ des Écritures: IIIe Colloque International sur Christine de Pizan*, edited by Eric Hicks, Diego Gonzalez and Philippe Simon, 581-595. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2000.
- Brownlee, Kevin and Huot, Sylvia [Eds.] *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Buettner, Brigitte. "Profane Illuminations, Secular Illusions: Manuscripts in Late Medieval Courtly Society", *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 74, No.1 (1992): 75-90.
- Burke, Peter. "L'histoire sociale des rêves", *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 28^e Année, No. 2 (1973): 329-342.
- Busby, Keith. *Codex and Context: Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002.
- Calkins, Robert G. *Programs of Medieval Illumination*. Lawrence, Kansas: Helen Foresman Spencer Museum of Art and the University of Kansas, 1984.
- Calkins, Robert G. *Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1983.
- Calkins, Robert G. "Stages of Execution: Procedures of Illumination as Revealed in an Unfinished Book of Hours", *Gesta*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1978): 61-79.
- Camille, Michael. *The Medieval Art of Love: Objects and Subjects of Desire*. New York: Abrams, 1998.

- Camille, Michael. *Image on the Edge: The Margins of Medieval Art*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd., 1992.
- Camille, Michael. "Visionary Perception and Images of the Apocalypse in the Later Middle Ages", in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, edited by Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 276-289. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Camille, Michael. *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Camille, Michael. "Seeing and Reading: Some Visual Implications of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy", *Art History*, Volume 8, Issue 1 (1985): 26-49.
- Camille, Michael. "The Book of Signs: Writing and Visual Difference in Gothic Manuscript Illumination", *Word and Image*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1985): 133-148.
- Carty, Carolyn M. "The Role of Medieval Dream Images in Authenticating Ecclesiastical Construction", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 62, Bd. H. 1. (1999): 45-90.
- Carty, Carolyn M. *Dreams in Early Medieval Art* [1991 PhD Dissertation]. Ann Arbor: UMI/University Microfilms International, 1993.
- Caviness, M.H. "Patron or Matron? A Capetian Bride and a Vade Mecum for her Marriage Bed", *Speculum*, Vol. 68, No. 2 (1993): 333-362.
- Châtelet, Albert. *L'Âge d'Or du Manuscrit à Peintures: en France au Temps de Charles VI et Les Heures du Maréchal Boucicaut*. Dijon: Institut de France, Editions Faton, 2000.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales*. Translated by David Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cicero. *On the Republic*. Translated by Clinton Walker Keyes. London: William Heinemann, 1953.
- Cicero. *On Divination*. Translated by William Armistead Falconer. London: William Heinemann, 1923.
- Coilly, Nathalie and Tesnière, Marie-Hélène. *Le Roman de la Rose: l'art d'aimer au Moyen Age*. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 2012.
- Crick, Francis and Mitchison, Graeme. "The Function of Dream Sleep", *Nature*, Volume 304 (1983): 111-114.
- Dahlberg, Charles. "Love and the Roman de la Rose", *Speculum*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (1969): 568-584.
- Dahlberg, Charles. "Macrobius and the Unity of the 'Roman de la Rose'", *Studies in Philology*, 58:4 (1961): 573-582.
- De Hamel, Christopher. *A History of Illuminated Manuscripts* [2nd Edition]. London: Phaidon, 1994.
- De Hamel, Christopher. *Medieval Craftsmen: Scribes and Illuminators*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- De Winter, Patrick M. *La bibliothèque de Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne (1364-1404): Etude sur les manuscrits à peintures d'une collection princière à l'époque du « style gothique international »*. Paris: CNRS, 1985.

Demaules, Mireille. *La Corne et l'Ivoire: Etude sur le récit de rêve dans la littérature romanesque des XIIe et XIIIe siècles*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2010.

Domínguez Bordona, Jesús. *Manuscritos con pinturas*. (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1933.

Dornbush, Jean. "'Songes et Senefiance': Macrobius and Guillaume de Lorris' *Roman de la Rose*", in *Translatio Studii: Essays by his students in Honor of Karl D. Uitti for his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Kevin Brownlee, Mary B. Speer and Lori J. Walters, 105-116. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.

Dragonetti, Roger. *Le Mirage des Sources, L'Art du Faux dans le Roman Médiéval*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1987.

Duc d'Aumale. *Le Cabinet des Livres: Manuscrits of the Château de Chantilly*. Introduction by Henri d'Orléans. Paris: Plon, 1900.

Duggan, Lawrence G. 'Was Art Really the "Book of the Illiterate"?', *Word and Image*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (1989): 227-251.

Dunlop, C., ed. *Philosophical Essays on Dreaming*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Egmond, Wolfert S. van. "Saintly Images: Visions of Saints in Hagiographical Texts", in *Reading Images and Texts: Medieval Images and Texts as Forms of Communication: Papers from the Third Utrecht Symposium on Medieval Literacy, Utrecht, 7-9 December 2000*, edited by Mariëlle Hageman and Marco Mostert, 221-237. Turnhout, Brepols, 2005.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Elliott, J.K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Emmerson, Richard K. "Visualising the Visionary: John in His Apocalypse", in *Looking Beyond: Visions, Dreams and Insights in Medieval Art and History*, edited by Colum Hourihane, 148-176. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.

Emmerson, Richard K. "Introduction: The Apocalypse in Medieval Culture", in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, edited by Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 293-332. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Empson, Jacob. *Sleep and Dreaming* [Third Edition]. Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002.

Erickson, Carolly. *The Medieval Vision: Essays in History and Perception*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Eusebius. *Life of Constantine the Great*. Translated by Arthur Cushman McGiffert, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, Vol. I, Chapters 28-29, 490. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.

Farber, Allen S. "Considering a Marginal Master: The Work of an Early Fifteenth Century Parisian Manuscript Decorator", *Gesta*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (1993): 21-39.

Fischer, Steven R. *The Complete Medieval Dreambook: A Multilingual, Alphabetical Somnia Danielis Collation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982.

- Flanagan, Sabina. *Hildegard of Bingen, 1098-1179: A Visionary Life* [2nd Edition] London: Routledge, 1990.
- Fleming, John. *Reason and the Lover*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Fleming, John. *The Roman de la Rose: A Study in Allegory and Iconography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translated by A.A. Brill. [Third Edition]. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.
- Gallop, David. *Aristotle on Sleep and Dreams*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips Ltd, 1996.
- Garnier, François. *Le Langage de l'Image au Moyen Age: Signification et Symbolique*. Paris: Le Leopard d'Or, 1982.
- Gaspar, Camille and Lyna, Frédéric. *Les Principaux Manuscrits à Peintures de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique*. Bruxelles: Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1^{er}, 1984.
- Gaunt, Simon and Kay, Sarah, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval French Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Gaunt, Simon. *Love and Death in Medieval French and Occitan Courtly Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Gaunt, Simon. *Retelling the Tale: An Introduction to Medieval French Literature*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 2001.
- Gaunt, Simon. 1998. "Bel Accueil and the Improper Allegory of the *Romance of the Rose*", in *New Medieval Literatures, Vol. 2*, edited by Rita Copeland, David Lawton and Wendy Scase, 65-93. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Gerson, Jean. "Traite contre le Roman de la Rose", in *Le Débat sur le Roman de la Rose*, edited by Eric Hicks, 59-88. Paris: Éditions Honoré Champion, 1977.
- Glenisson, Jean, ed. *Le Livre au Moyen Age*. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1988.
- Gousset, Marie-Thérèse. "Parcheminiers et Libraires Rouennais à la fin du quatorzième siècle d'après un document judiciaire", *Viator*, 24 (1993): 233-246.
- Grant, Edward, ed. *A Source Book in Medieval Science*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Gregory the Great. *Dialogues*. Translated by Odo John Zimmerman. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press and Consortium Books, 1977.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien. *Le Dictionnaire de l'Ancien Français*. Paris: Editions Larousse, 2012.
- Guiffrey, Jules. *Histoire de la Tapisserie depuis le Moyen Age jusqu'à nos jours*. Tours: Alfred Mame et Fils, Editeurs, 1888.
- Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*. Translated by Frances Horgan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*. Translated by Armand Strubel. Paris: Le Livre de Poche, Lettres Gothiques, 1992.

- Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*. Edited by Félix Lecoy. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1965.
- Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*. Translated by Harry W. Robbins. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1962.
- Gurevich, Aron. *Medieval Popular Culture: Problems of Belief and Perception*. Translated by Janos M. Bak and Paul A. Hollingsworth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Hamilton, William Alexander Louis Stephen Douglas-Hamilton. *Catalogue of the Magnificent Collection of Manuscripts from Hamilton Palace*. Sales Catalogue, 1882.
- Harris, William V. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Hawkins, R.L. "The Manuscripts of the Roman de la Rose in the Libraries of Harvard and Yale Universities", *Romanic Review*, 19 (1928): 1-24.
- Hellinga, Lotte. "Manuscripts in the Hands of Printers", in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at The Warburg Institute on 12-13 March 1982*, edited by J.B. Trapp, 3-11. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983.
- Hermann, H.J. *Die westeuropäischen Handschriften und Inkunabeln der Gotik und Renaissance - mit Ausnahme der niederländischen Handschriften. 2. Englische und französische Handschriften des XIV. Jahrhunderts. 3. Französische und iberische Handschriften der ersten Hälfte des XV. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1936 (Vol. 2); 1938 (Vol. 3).
- Heslop, T.A. "Brief in words but Heavy in the Weight of its Mysteries", *Art History*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1986): 1-11.
- Hicks, Eric. *Le Débat sur le Roman de la Rose*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1977.
- Hieatt, Constance B. *The Realism of Dream Visions: The Poetic Exploitation of the Dream-Experience in Chaucer and his Contemporaries*. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1967.
- Hill, Jillian M.L. *The Medieval Debate on Jean de Meung's Roman de la Rose: Morality Versus Art*. [Studies in Medieval Literature, Volume 4]. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991.
- Hobson, J. Allan, Pace-Schott, Edward F. and Stickgold, Robert. "Dreaming and the Brain: Toward a Cognitive Neuroscience of Conscious States", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23 (2000): 793-842.
- Holdsworth, C.J. "Visions and Visionaires in the Middle Ages", *History: The Journal of the Historical Association*, Vol. 48, June, No.163 (1963): 141-153
- Hourihane, Colum, ed. *Looking Beyond: Visions, Dreams and Insights in Medieval Art History*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State Press, Index of Christian Art, Princeton University, 2010.
- Hult, David F. *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Readership and Authority in the First Roman de la Rose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Hunt, R.W., ed. *A Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895-1953.

- Huot, Sylvia. *Dreams of Lovers and Lies of Poets: Poetry, Knowledge and Desire in the Roman de la Rose*. [Legenda: Research Monographs in French Studies, 31]. London: Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing, 2010.
- Huot, Sylvia. "Women and 'Woman' in Bodley, Douce 332 (c.1400): A Case of Accidental Meaning?" in *De la Rose: Texte, Image, Fortune*, edited by Catherine Bel and Herman Braet, 41-57. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.
- Huot, Sylvia. *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, Manuscript Transmission*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Huot, Sylvia. "'Ci parle l'auteur': The Rubrication of Voice and Authorship in 'Roman de la Rose' Manuscripts", *SubStance*, Vol. 17, No. 2, [Issue 56: Reading In and Around] (1988): 42-48.
- Iamblichus. *On the Mysteries*. Translated by Emma C. Clarke, John M. Dillon and Jackson P. Hershbell. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Isidore of Seville. *Etymologies*. Translated by S.A. Barney, W.D. Lewis, J.A. Beach and O. Berghof. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Jager, Eric. "Reading the *Roman* Inside Out: The Dream of Croesus as a *Caveat Lector*", *Medium Ævum*, Volume LVII (The Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature) (1988): 67-75.
- John of Salisbury. *Policraticus*. Translated by Joseph B. Pike in *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers: Being a Translation of the First, Second, and Third Books, and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the Policraticus of John of Salisbury*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis, 1938.
- Jung, Carl G. *Sur l'interprétation des Rêves*. Translated by A. Tondrat. Paris: Albin Michel, 1998.
- Kelly, Douglas. *Internal Difference and Meanings in the Roman de la Rose*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.
- Kessler, Herbert L. *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Kessler, Herbert L. 1989. "Reading Ancient and Medieval Art", *Word and Image*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1989): 1.
- Kessler, Herbert L. "On the State of Medieval Art History", *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 70, No. 2 (1988): 166-187.
- Klein, Peter K. 2010. "Visionary Experience and Corporeal Seeing in Thirteenth-Century English Apocalypses: John as External Witness and the Rise of Gothic Marginal Images", in *Looking Beyond: Visions, Dreams and Insights in Medieval Art and History*, edited by Colum Hourihane, 177-201. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.
- Klein, Peter K. "Introduction: The Apocalypse in Medieval Art", in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, edited by Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 159-199. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1992.
- Knowles, David. *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* [Second Edition]. Edited by D.E. Luscombe and C.N.L. Brooke. London: Longman, 1988.

- König, Eberhard. *Die Liebe im Zeichen der Rose: Die Handschriften des Rosenromans in der Vatikanischen Bibliothek*. Stuttgart: Belser, 1992.
- König, Eberhard. ">>Atant fu jourz, et je m'esveille<< Zur Darstellung des Traums im Rosenroman" in *Träume et Mitellalter. Ikonologische Studien*, edited by Agostino Paravicini Bagliani and Giorgio Stabile, 171-182. Stuttgart and Zurich: Belser, 1989.
- König, Eberhard. "The Influence of the Invention of Printing on the Development of German Illumination", in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at The Warburg Institute on 12-13 March 1982*, edited by J.B. Trapp, 85-95. London, The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983.
- Kris, Ernst and Kurz, Otto. *Legend, Myth and Magic in the Image of the Artist: A Historical Experiment*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Kruger, Roberta L., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Kruger, Steven F. *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Kuhn, Alfred. *Die Illustration des Rosenromans*. [PhD Dissertation]. Freiburg im Breisgau: C.A. Wagner, 1911.
- Langlois, Ernst. "Quelques œuvres de Richard de Fournival", *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* (1904): 102-15.
- Langlois, Ernst. *Les Manuscrits du Roman de la Rose: Description et Classement*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1910.
- Langlois, Ernst. *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose*. Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1891.
- Lazzi, Giovanna and Gabriele, Mino. *Alambicchi di parole. Il Ricettario fiorentino e dintorni*. Florence: Polistampa, 1999.
- Lecompte, Stéphanie. *La Chaîne d'Or Des Poètes. Présence de Macrobe dans l'Europe humaniste*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2009.
- Le Goff, Jacques. "V: Les Rêves", in *Un Autre Moyen Age, 687-752*. Manchecourt: Maury-Eurolivres, 1999.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *L'imaginaire Medieval*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1985.
- Lerner, Ralph and Mahdi, Muhsin. *Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook*. Canada, The Free Press of Glencoe and Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1963.
- Lewis, C.S. *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. London, Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Lewis, Suzanne. "Exegesis and Illustrations in 13th Century English Apocalypses", in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, edited by Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 259-275. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Lewis, Suzanne. "Images of Opening, Penetration and Closure in the *Roman de la Rose*", *Word and Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry*, 8:3 (1992): 215-242.
- Lincoln, Jackson Steward. *The Dream in Primitive Cultures*. London: The Cresset Press, 1935.

- Locke, Frederick W. *The Quest of the Holy Grail: A Literary Study of a Thirteenth-Century French Romance*. California: Stanford University Press, 1960.
- Lucian. "The Dream, or Lucian's Career", in *Lucian*, translated by A.M. Harmon, 213-233. London: William Heinemann, 1921.
- Lucretius. *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by Martin Ferguson Smith. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2001.
- Luria, Maxwell. *A Reader's Guide to the Roman de la Rose*. Connecticut: Archon Books, 1982.
- Lynch, Kathryn L. *The High Medieval Dream Vision: Poetry, Philosophy and Literary Form*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Macdonald, Margaret. "Sleeping and Waking", in *Philosophical Essays on Dreaming*, edited by Charles E.M. Dunlop, 64-80 (Originally Published in *Mind*, April 1953). Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1953.
- Macrobius. *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*. Translated by William Harris Stahl, 1952. New York, Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Malcolm, Norman. *Dreaming*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.
- Mâle, Emile. *Religious Art from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Mâle, Emile. *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*. Translated by Dora Nussey. London: Icon Editions, Harper and Row Publishers, 1972.
- Martin, Eva. "Away from Self-Authorship: Multiplying the 'Author' in Jean de Meun's 'Roman de la Rose'," *Modern Philology*, Vol. 96, No. 1 (1998): 1-15.
- McKitterick, David. *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- McMunn, Meradith T. "Programs of Illustration in *Roman de la Rose* Manuscripts Owned by Patrons and Friends of Christine de Pizan" in *Au Champ des Escriptions: IIIe Colloque International sur Christine de Pizan*, Eric Hicks, Diego Gonzalez and Philippe Simon, 737-753. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2000.
- McMunn, Meradith T. "Reconstructing a Missing Manuscript of the *Roman de la Rose*: the Jersey Manuscript", *Scriptorium*, 53 (1999): 31-62.
- McMunn, Meradith T. "A Fragment of an Unknown MS of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 60 (1999): 276-303.
- McMunn, Meradith T. "Was Christine Poisoned by an Illustrated Rose?", *The Profane Arts/Les Arts Profane* 7:2 (1998): 136-151.
- McMunn, Meradith. "Animal Imagery in the Text and Illustrations of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Reinardus*, Vol. 9 (1996): 87-108.
- McMunn, Meradith. "The Iconography of Dangier in the Illustrated Manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Romance Languages Annual*, Vol. 5 (1994): 86-91.

- McMunn, Meredith. "Notes on Representations of the Erotic in Some Illustrated Manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose*", *Romance Languages Annual*, Vol. 4 (1993): 125-30. [Accessed online through the RLA Archive].
- McWebb, Christine, ed. *Debating the Roman de la Rose: A Critical Anthology*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Meiss, Millard. *French Painting in the Time of Jean de Berry*. New York: George Braziller, 1974.
- Meuwese, Martin. 2006. "Roses, Ruse and Romance. Iconographic Relationships Between the *Roman de la Rose* and Arthurian Literature", in *De La Rose*, edited by Catherine Bel and Herman Braet, 93-116. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.
- Morgan, Michael L. "Plato and Greek Religion" in *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*, edited by Richard Kraut, 227-247. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Moses, Tyson. "Hand-List of the Collections of French and Italian Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 14 (1930): 586
- Mostert, Marco. 2005. "Reading Images and Texts: Some Preliminary Observations Instead of an Introduction", in *Reading Images and Texts: Medieval Images and Texts as Forms of Communication: Papers from the Third Utrecht Symposium on Medieval Literacy, Utrecht, 7-9 December 2000*, edited by Mariëlle Hageman and Marco Mostert, 1-7. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.
- Muir, Lynette. *Literature and Society in Medieval France: The Mirror and the Image 1100-1500*. London, Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 1985.
- Muntz, Eugène. "L'Iconographie du Roman de la Rose", *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 43^e année, N.I. (1899): 15-16.
- Nichols, Stephen G. "Ekphrasis, Iconoclasm and Desire", in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, edited by Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot, 133-166. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Nolan, Barbara. *The Gothic Visionary Perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Nouvet, Claire. "An Allegorical Mirror: The Pool of Narcissus in Guillaume de Lorris' *Romance of the Rose*", *The Romanic Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (2002): 353-374.
- Nouvet, Claire. 2000. "A Reversing Mirror: Guillaume de Lorris' *Romance of the Rose*", in *Translatio Studii, Essays by his Students in Honor of Karl D. Uitti for his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* edited by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Kevin Brownlee, Mary B. Speer and Lori J. Walters, 189-205. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.
- Olschki, Leonardo. *Manuscrits français à peintures des bibliothèques d'Allemagne*. Geneva: Leo S. Olschki, 1932.
- Ost, Heidrun. "Illuminating the *Roman de la Rose* in the Time of the Debate: The Manuscript of Valencia", in *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400*, edited by Peter Ainsworth and Godfried Croenen, 405-435. Louvain and Dudley: Peeters, 2006.

- Ost, Heidrun. "The 'Mythographical Images' in the Roman de la Rose of Valencia (Biblioteca Historica de la Universitat, MS.387)", in *De La Rose*, edited by Catherine Bel and Herman Braet, 141-181. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by A.D. Melville. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Pächt, Otto. *Book Illumination in the Middle Ages: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Pack, Roger A. "Pascalis Romanus and the Text of Artemidorus", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 96 (1965) 291-295.
- Pare, G. *Le Roman de la Rose et la Scolastique Courtoise*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique, 1941.
- Patch, Howard Rollin. *The Other World According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Payen, Jean-Charles and Leff, Margaret Ann. "A Semiological Study of Guillaume de Lorris", *Yale French Studies*, No. 51 [Approaches to Medieval Romance] (1974): 170-184.
- Peden, Alison. "Macrobius and Mediaeval Dream Literature", *Medium Ævum*, Vol. LIV (The Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature) (1985): 59-73.
- Peruzzi, Simonetta Mazzoni. *Il Codice Laurenziano Acquisti e Doni 153, Del 'Roman de la Rose'*. Firenze: Casa Editrice le Lettere, Libreria Commissionaria, Sansoni, 1986.
- Petersen, Joan M. *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great in their Late Antique Cultural Background*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984.
- Pickens, Rupert T. "Somnium and Interpretation in Guillaume de Lorris", *Symposium*, 28:2 (1974): 175-186.
- Piehler, Paul. *The Visionary Landscape: A Study in Medieval Allegory*. London: Edward Arnold, 1971.
- Plato. *Laws*. Translated by T.L. Pangle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Plato. *Timaeus*. Translated by D.J. Zeyl. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2000.
- Poirion, Daniel. "From Rhyme to Reason: Remarks on the Text of the *Romance of the Rose*", in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, edited by Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot, 65-77. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Ponceau, Jean-Paul, ed. *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1997.
- Randall, Lilian M.C. "Exempla as a Source of Gothic Marginal Illumination", *Art Bulletin*, 39 (1957): 97-107.
- Reeve, M.D. "Manuscripts Copied from Printed Books", in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at The Warburg Institute on 12-13 March 1982*, edited by J.B. Trapp, 12-20. London, The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983.

- Revonsuo, Antti. "The Reinterpretation of Dreams: An Evolutionary Hypothesis on the Function of Dreaming", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23 (2000): 877-901.
- Roques, Mario. "Fragments de Manuscrits du *Roman de la Rose*", *Romania, Recueil Trimestriel*, Tome LV, 58^e Année (1929): 263-265.
- Rouse, Richard H. and Rouse, Mary A. *Illiterati et Uxorati: Manuscripts and Their Makers. Commercial Book Producers in Medieval Paris, 1200-1500*, Vol. I. Belgium: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2000.
- Salter, Elizabeth. "Medieval Poetry and the Visual Arts", *Essays and Studies*, Vol. 22 (1969): 16-32.
- Schapiro, Meyer. *Words and Pictures: On the Literal and the Symbolic in the Illustration of a Text*. [Originally printed in 1973]. Paris: Mouton, 1983.
- Schofield, Malcolm. "Cicero For and Against Divination", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 76 (1986): 47-65.
- Solterer, Helen. "Letter Writing and Picture Reading: Medieval Textuality and the *Bestiaire d'Amour*", *Word and Image*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1989): 131-147.
- Somfai, Anna. "The Eleventh-Century Shift in the Reception of Plato's 'Timaeus' and Calcidius' 'Commentary'" *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 65 (2002): 1-21.
- Southern, R.W. "The Schools of Paris and the Schools of Chartres", in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, edited by R.L. Benson and G. Constable, 113-117. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Spearing, A.C. *Medieval Dream-Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Spencer, Eleanor P. "Antoine Vérard's Illuminated Vellum Incunables", in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at The Warburg Institute on 12-13 March 1982*, edited by J.B. Trapp, 62-65. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983.
- Stakel, Susan. *False Roses: Structures of Duality and Deceit in Jean de Meun's Roman de la Rose*. Saratoga: Anma Libri, 1991.
- Sterling, Charles. *La Peinture Médiévale à Paris, 1300-1500*. Paris: Fondation Wildenstein, Bibliothèque des Arts, 1987.
- Steyn, Carol, ed. *The Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Grey Collection of the National Library of South Africa, Cape Town, 2: Manuscripts 3.d.30-48.b.4-5*, 97-98. Analecta Cartusiana 180, Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 2002.
- Stones, Alison. *A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in France*, Vol. I. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2013.
- Stones, Alison. "The Illustrations of BN, Fr. 95, and Yale 229: Prolegomena to a Comparative Analysis", in *Word and Image in Arthurian Literature*, edited by Keith Busby, 203-234. London: Garland Publishing, 1996.
- Stones, Alison. "Indications écrites et modèles picturaux, guides aux peintres de manuscrits enluminés aux environs de 1300" in *Artistes, Artisans et Production Artistique Au Moyen Age, Colloque International*, edited by Xavier Barral I Altet, Vol. III, Fabrication et Consommation de L'œuvre, 321-49. Paris: Picard, 1990.

Stones, Alison. "Sacred and Profane Art: Secular and Liturgical Book-Illumination in the Thirteenth Century", in *The Epic in Medieval Society: Aesthetic and Moral Values*, edited by Harald Scholler, 100-112, Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 1977.

Strubel, Armand. *Le Roman de la Rose*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984.

Strubel, Armand. "Ecriture du songe et mise en oeuvre de la <<senefiance>> dans le Roman de la Rose de Guillaume de Lorris", in *Etudes sur le Roman de la Rose de Guillaume de Lorris*, edited by Jean Dufournet, 145-179. Geneva: Editions Slatkine, 1984.

Stutzmann, Dominique, and Tylus. Piotr. *Les manuscrits médiévaux français et occitans de la Preussische Staatsbibliothek et de la Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.

Synesius of Cyrene, "De Insomniis", in *The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene*. Translated by A. Fitzgerald, 326-359. London: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Tertullian, "De Anima", in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Vol. XV: The Writings of Tertullian, Vol. II*. Edited by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, 410-541. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869-70.

Thorndike, Lynn. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*. Macmillan and Co Ltd., London, 1923-1934.

Trapp, J.B., ed. *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at The Warburg Institute on 12-13 March 1982*. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983.

Tuve, Rosemond. *Allegorical Imagery: Some Mediaeval Books and their Posterity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Valentini, Andrea. *Le remanement du Roman de la Rose par Gui de Mori : Étude et édition des interpolations d'après le manuscrit Tournai, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 101*. Brussels: Academie royale de Belgique, 2007.

Valentini, Andrea. 2006. "Le Remanement de Gui de Mori et sa tradition manuscrite", in *De la Rose: Texte, Image, Fortune*, edited by Catherine Bel and Herman Braet, 299-320. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.

Vieillard, Françoise. *Manuscrits Français du Moyen Âge*. Cologny-Geneva, Fondation Martin Bodmer, 1975.

Walters, Lori. "Marian Devotion in the Tournai Rose: From the Monastery to the Household", in *De la Rose: Texte, Image, Fortune*, edited by Catherine Bel and Herman Braet, 207-270. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.

Walters, Lori. "Illuminating the Rose: Gui de Mori and the Illustrations of MS 101 of the Municipal Library, Tournai", in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, edited by Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot, 167-200. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

Walters, Lori. "A Parisian Manuscript of the Romance of the Rose", *Princeton University Library Chronicle*, Vol. LI, Number I, (1989): 31-55.

Ward, H. L. D. *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, Vol. I. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1883.

Weyer, Gregor. "The *Roman de la Rose* manuscript in Duesseldorf", in *De la Rose: Texte, Image, Fortune*, edited by Catherine Bel and Herman Braet, 117-140. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.

Weyer, Gregor. "The *Roman de la Rose* in Frankfurt, Lat. Qu. 65" in *Contez me tout: mélanges de langue et littérature médiévales offerts à Herman Braet* edited by Catherine Bel, Pascale Dumont and Frank Willaert, 687-705. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.

Williams, John. *The Illustrated Beatus: A Corpus of the Illustrations of the Commentary on the Apocalypse*. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1994.

Williams, John. "Purpose and Imagery in the Apocalypse Commentary of Beatus of Liebana", in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, edited by Richard Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 217-33. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Winn, Mary Beth. *Anthoine Vérard, Parisian Publisher 1485-1512: Prologues, Poems and Presentations*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1997.

Winn, Mary Beth. 'Anthoine Vérard's Presentation Manuscripts and Printed Books', in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at The Warburg Institute on 12-13 March 1982*, edited by J.B. Trapp, 66-74. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983.

Wolfson, Elliot R. *A Dream Interpreted Within a Dream: Oneiropoiesis and the Prism of Imagination*. New York: Zone Books, 2011.

Websites

www.archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/

Contains descriptions, links to digitisations and bibliography for manuscripts of the BnF and related Parisian libraries.

<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/welcome.htm>

Detailed descriptions and images from medieval and renaissance manuscripts in the British Library.

<http://www.bne.es/es/Catalogos/BibliotecaDigitalHispanica/Inicio/index.html>

Biblioteca Digital Hispánica, offering access to the digitised collection of the National Library of Spain.

<http://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/>

Contains digitisations of manuscripts held in French collections.

<http://www.calames.abes.fr/pub/mazarine.aspx>

Details of manuscripts held in the Bibliothèque Mazarine.

<http://corsair.themorgan.org/>

Contains historical curatorial records and images of manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library.

www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en

Virtual Manuscript Library of Switzerland, featuring many digitisations and catalogue entries of manuscripts in Swiss collections.

<http://www.ensba.fr/ow2/catzarts/index.xsp>

Catz'Arts website, offering information on the holdings of the *Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts*

www.lancelot-project.pitt.edu/lancelot-project.html

This website represents an effort to catalogue and categorise the many manuscripts of the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle. Tables and supplementary information were last updated c.2009.

www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de

Details of manuscripts held in German and other institutions.

<http://www.onb.ac.at/sammlungen/hschrift/bibliographie.htm>

For accessing bibliographies of literature held in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.

<http://orbis.library.yale.edu/vwebv/>

Orbis, the Online Catalogue of the Yale University Library

<https://polona.pl/>

Site offering access to the digital collections of Polish libraries.

www.romandelarose.org

The *Roman de la Rose* Digital Library seeks to provide access to many digitized versions of the *Rose*, and is a useful resource for viewing and exploring well over 100 manuscripts.

<http://trobes.uv.es/>

Homepage of the University of Valencia Library.