

# “The Foot on Which He Limpes”

## JEAN GERSON AND THE REHABILITATION OF JEAN DE MEUN IN ARSENAL 3339

► In this paper I study the portrayal of Jean de Meun in Arsenal 3339, an early fifteenth-century manuscript collection in which the *Rose* precedes Jean’s *Testament*, *Codicille*, and *Tresor ou Sept articles de la foi*. I marshal manuscript evidence to show how the person who masterminded the production of Arsenal 3339 refuted certain of the reproaches leveled against Jean de Meun in the 1401–1403 Debate about the *Roman de la Rose*. They were, in effect, that he had erred on key theological points and had moreover employed questionable instructional methods. Although the Arsenal mastermind, whom I provisionally identify as its compiler, objects to the way that Jean as *Rose* author had portrayed himself by means of a negative persona, Jean “Clopinel,” which can be roughly translated as “Jean who limps,” he nevertheless declines to join with Jean Gerson and Christine de Pizan to consign the book to the flames. I make the case that the compiler was an early fifteenth-century reader exceptionally well versed in the *Rose*, the Debate documents, and Gerson’s sermons, who, by expertly designing the collection, seeks to rehabilitate Jean’s professional reputation in response to criticisms lodged by his detractors in the Debate.

### I. Jean de Meun’s enduring image

Only three miniatures—but each of high quality—illustrate the 193 folios of Arsenal 3339, an early fifteenth-century manuscript collection in which the *Rose* precedes Jean’s *Testament*, *Codicille*, and *Tresor ou Sept articles de la foi*.<sup>1</sup> Most striking of the three is the second image, which has no direct precedent in other manuscripts of the author’s texts.<sup>2</sup> In this miniature, which heads the *Testament*, Jean lies on his deathbed encircled by an admiring group of clerical and lay figures. His blue robes stand out in sharp contrast to the surrounding strawberry red coverlets and curtains. In his left hand Jean holds a green book, to which he points

with his right. The text of the depicted book, presumably his *Testament*, opens with an affirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity, as does the last text in Arsenal 3339, the *Sept articles*. I will argue here that the image of Jean on his deathbed is a vivid summary of what this manuscript is all about.<sup>3</sup> It “says” that, as *Testament* author, Jean was more authoritative than he was as author of the *Rose*. His pointing finger brings to mind the “Nota” signs often encountered on parchment folios,<sup>4</sup> signaling to the reader that the teaching contained in his *Testament* is what should be gleaned from the book as a whole. The impression given by Arsenal 3339 in its entirety is that it is Jean’s “last will and testament,” representing him for all times as he would have wished to be remembered.

My aim in this paper is to show how the producer of Arsenal 3339 set about to “rehabilitate” the second *Rose* author, Jean de Meun, and that he did so in reaction to the short but spirited public debate about the *Rose* roughly spanning the years 1401–1403. While the royal secretary Pierre Col and his University-trained friends defended Jean, the theologian Jean Gerson joined forces with the court poet Christine de Pizan to censure him on moral and literary grounds. The idea that Arsenal 3339 could have been produced in response to the Debate is justified historically. François Avril dates the manuscript to the period between 1410 and 1415 and locates its production to circles close to Jean de Berry (288), one of Christine’s major patrons and a frequent presence at Gerson’s sermons. I will investigate how Arsenal 3339 can be seen to reflect upon a question considered at length in the original Debate. Whereas the rhodophobes (*Rose* detractors) Gerson and Christine on the one hand held that Jean de Meun repented of having composed the *Rose*, Pierre Col and other rhodophiles (*Rose* supporters) on the other claimed that he had no need to repent, because his text was doctrinally correct.

The present study marshals manuscript evidence to show how the person who masterminded the execution of Arsenal 3339, who, for the sake of my argument I will refer to as the compiler, refuted certain of the reproaches leveled against Jean in the Debate.<sup>5</sup> Not only were the charges that Jean in his *Rose* had erred on key theological points, but he had also employed questionable instructional methods. The Arsenal compiler, like Gerson and Christine, objects to the way Jean had portrayed himself in the *Rose* by means of a negative persona, Jean “Clopinel,” which can be roughly translated as “Jean who limps,” and as a corrective depicts him as an author well-versed in official Church doctrine. Although the compiler may side with the rhodophobes in thinking that Jean subsequently composed more doctrinally sound texts

to make up for what he had written in the *Rose*, he nevertheless declines to join with Gerson and Christine to consign the book to the flames. As a corrective the compiler seeks to rehabilitate Jean's "moral limp" in the public's mind by "republishing" the *Rose* alongside Jean's devotional texts. He further reinforces the reader's perception of the author's piety through his use of rubrics and miniatures. In so doing, he attempts to restore to Jean some of the status as wise theologian and eloquent poet that he had enjoyed prior to the Debate.

While the Debate has been well studied on the basis of the documents Christine assembled about it, scant attention has been paid to the way that certain *Rose* manuscripts returned to issues raised by the controversy.<sup>6</sup> A step in this direction was the attribution of Français 1563, dating, like Arsenal 3339 from the beginning of the fifteenth century (Langlois 20–22, 78), to a supporter of Jean de Meun (Hult 20; Hicks lxiii). These findings and my own reaffirm Sylvia Huot's conclusions about the *Rose*'s protean quality, its ability to be modified by subsequent readers (323–37).<sup>7</sup> Also crucial to my approach are the insights of the "material" or "new" philology, in particular the idea that a text acquires new meanings within the physical context of the codex. The manuscript's illustrations, rubrics, and other paratextual features, as well as any other texts that are transmitted along with it, influence the reception of a text by its readers.<sup>8</sup> Rather than being a neutral signifier, the codex is a potent matrix for the production of a text's meaning.<sup>9</sup>

Manuscript illuminations took on an especially significant role in conveying meaning during the reign of Charles VI (1380–1422), the king of France during the Debate years. The 2004 Louvre exhibition, *Paris 1400: Les arts sous Charles VI*, celebrated the extraordinary flowering of the arts during his reign. This blossoming of artistic production was all the more remarkable because Charles VI was subject to intermittent bouts of madness that led to civil conflict and ultimately to invasion by the English. If the arts in general became, as it were, bulwarks against political instability, the editors of the catalogue find that certain fifteenth-century manuscripts were illuminated in response to the bewildering multiplicity of interpretations offered by Jean's continuation of the *Rose* (Tesnière 236). I place Arsenal 3339 in this group.

The beauty of the collection's three miniatures, the ones placed at the beginning of the *Rose*, *Testament*, and *Sept articles*, is tied up with the didactic value that Jacques Legrand accords to images. In his *Archilogue Sophie* of 1404 the prominent Parisian preacher says:

Pour avoir souvenance d’aucune chose, et singulièrement pour impectorer par cuer, prouffitable est de mectre en son cuer et en son ymaginacion la figure et la fourme d’ycelle chose que l’on veut impectorer; et pourtant est ce que l’en estudie mieulz es livres enluminez pour ce que la difference des couleurs donne souvenance de la difference des lignes. (Beltran 145; Tesnière 236)<sup>10</sup>

In order to remember something, and especially for incorporating it by heart, it is helpful to put into the heart and the imagination the figure and the form of the thing to be remembered. Wherefore, *one learns best from illuminated books*, for the difference between the colors bestows remembrance of the different line [and therefore of the thing itself]. (emphasis added)

Legrand expected a book’s pictures to inscribe its lessons upon the memory of its readers, permanently orienting their moral choices.

In this paper I deal with a subject left untreated in earlier criticism: how in a more general way the theological take on images of Legrand’s colleague Gerson forms the crux of the Debate. Gerson preached a sermon about images for the feast of the Holy Trinity,<sup>11</sup> to which Pierre Col refers in one of the Debate epistles (McWebb 310; Hult 130, n. 74). Whereas scholars generally acknowledge the relationship between the sermons in Gerson’s *Poenitemini* series and the Debate,<sup>12</sup> few have noticed the importance of his Trinity sermon for the issues raised therein.<sup>13</sup> My understanding of the subject is based upon careful examination of Arsenal 3339 and of related manuscripts created in circles around it, many figuring in the *Paris 1400* catalogue.<sup>14</sup> That survey has led me to believe that Gerson’s ideas regarding images, particularly as he expressed them in this sermon preached at the height of the Debate, lie behind the Arsenal compiler’s choice of three carefully crafted images to suggest Jean’s thorough and complete rehabilitation.

## II. The debate before the Debate

In Arsenal 3339 the *Rose* forms the nucleus of a collection of texts authored by Jean de Meun. This phenomenon was not new for its time. Of the manuscripts dating from the second half of the fourteenth century catalogued by Langlois, a total of twenty-five, or about one-fifth, include the *Testament*, and ten of these also include the *Codicille* and/or the *Sept articles*. Huot sees this as part of the growing interest in single author manuscripts during this period, and suggests that the coupling of Jean’s devotional texts with the *Rose* shows that the latter was increasingly appreciated for its didactic value (33).

The debaters trace the origins of the Debate back to Jean himself via the manuscript tradition. Gontier Col, Pierre's brother, sends Christine bits of the *Sept articles* for her consideration, saying that Jean had compiled it himself to be read by his detractors after his death (McWebb 116). And in his *Traicté d'une vision faite contre le Ronmant de la rose* (hereafter *Vision*) of 18 May 1402, Gerson rather surprisingly charges Jean with having explicitly designed the images in his manuscripts in order to attract people to his perverse teachings. According to Gerson, Jean was not content to expound his shameful doctrines orally, "he also had them written down and illustrated insofar as he was able, lavishly and with care, in order better to attract all people to look at them, hear them, and embrace them" (Hult 110).<sup>15</sup> Although nothing has been found to corroborate Gerson's assertion, it should not be rejected out of hand. The statements made by Gontier and Gerson show the extent to which the debaters' view of Jean was colored by what they found in manuscripts of his texts.

These statements also suggest that there was a debate before the official Debate. By distinguishing between the Debate with a capital "D," which spanned the years between 1401 and 1403, and the Debate's unofficial extension both before and after this period, I ally myself with Christine McWebb's attempts to broaden the framework of the Debate. One of the ways she does so is by citing Petrarch's reservations to the *Rose* dating from 1340, when his reputation in France had already become firmly established (Richards xxvii). When we consider Petrarch's criticism of the *Rose* alongside Huot's figures regarding the large number of Jean's single-author compilations appearing around the middle of the fourteenth century, it appears that by that time a large-scale debate about Jean was already underway.

That polemic had been triggered by comments made by Jean in the second quatrain of his *Testament*:

J'ay fait en ma jeunesse mains dits par vanité  
 Ou maintes gens se sont pluseurs fois delité  
 Or m'en doint Dieux un faire par vraie charité  
 Pour *amender* les autres qui peu m'ont proufité.  
 (Ars 3339, fol. 156r; emphasis added)

In my youth I made many poems of vanity  
 In which many people took much delight  
 Now may God let me make one of true charity  
 To *make up* for the others which gave me little benefit.

Whereas Christine interprets Jean’s statement to mean that he repented of having composed the *Rose* (McWebb 148), Pierre believes that it instead referred to *ballades*, *rondels*, and *virelais* that he would have written during his youth. She counters that no such poems have survived, citing to this effect that Jean does not mention any lyric poems in the list of his texts he includes in the prologue to his translation of Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy* (McWebb 148).<sup>16</sup> Christine’s reasoning is that in his mature years Jean repented of having written the *Rose*, because he knew that it was a flawed work. Gerson makes a similar claim in his *Vision* when he has his alter ego Theological Eloquence say that if Jean de Meun were still alive today, he would ask for forgiveness for his sins. And, he adds, as a matter of fact Jean had already repented during his own lifetime and thereafter composed texts “of true faith and holy doctrine” (McWebb 281). These comments show that Gerson, like Christine, believed that Jean de Meun composed pious texts at the end of his life in order to atone for having composed his shameless youthful *Rose*.

Pierre could have gotten his idea that Jean in his *Testament* was repenting for having written racy lyric poems by looking at a manuscript like Arsenal 5209, which Langlois dates from the second third of the fourteenth century (79). Like Arsenal 3339, Arsenal 5209 contains the *Rose*, the *Codicille*, and the *Testament*, but it lacks the *Sept articles*, a copy of which Gontier sent separately to Christine, as noted above. In Arsenal 5209 the *Rose* is illustrated by a cycle of 70 miniatures, beginning with a four-compartment miniature that is typical of mid-fourteenth-century Parisian manuscripts belonging to Alfred Kuhn’s Group VI (Walters, “Parisian Manuscript” 33). The only other miniature in the codex, which heads the *Testament*, depicts Jean praying before an impressive image of the Trinity, an image inspired by the opening lines of the text. The *Rose* is followed by the edifying poem on the virtue of repentance that here and elsewhere goes under the title of the *Codicille*. The latter tellingly ends on fol. 145v with an inscription rendered in brown letters larger than the rest of the transcription: “Explicit le derrain testament / Maistre Johan de Meun / Prions pour l’ame de luy” (“Explicit the last testament / Of Master Johan de Meun / Let us pray for his soul”).

The *Testament* does not begin with a rubric identifying it as such. A reader like Pierre Col could easily think that Jean had offered his devotional *Codicille* to make up for having written objectionable lyric poems rather than for having composed the abundantly illuminated *Rose*, which in Arsenal 5209 contains a higher than usual number of minia-

tures for manuscripts of its group (see Walters, “Parisian Manuscript” 38–40).

Thus it appears that there had been an ongoing discussion about the merits of Jean’s *Rose*, which may have even stretched back to the later years of the author’s own lifetime (although, as I have said, we have no independent evidence of Jean’s participation in manuscript production to back up Gerson’s assertion). The ongoing polemic was undoubtedly inspired by Jean’s statement, quoted above, in which he says that with his *Testament* he makes amends for his earlier work. It may have also been influenced by two passages in the *Rose* (Huot 17). In the first, Jean calls upon his readers to justify the text to his detractors.<sup>17</sup> In the second, he acknowledges that he is ready to amend the text in response to criticism by the Church: “presz sui qu’a son vouloir l’amende” ‘I am ready to amend it according to its [the Church’s] wishes’ (v. 15271). In the *Testament* he “amends” (*amender*) many of the points for which Gerson and Christine will censure him in the Debate. I will discuss below how the Arsenal compiler, through his layout and decoration, foregrounds three of Jean’s devotional texts in order to make the case that these texts make up for a good deal of the mistaken or ambiguous positions Jean had voiced in the *Rose*. I make the case that the compiler was an early fifteenth-century reader exceptionally well versed in the *Rose*, the Debate documents, and Gerson’s sermons, who, by expertly designing the collection, seeks to rehabilitate Jean’s professional reputation in response to criticisms lodged by his detractors in the Debate.

### III. Jean’s “limping foot” and his image as a teacher of Christian doctrine.

It is not surprising that the *Rose* spawned an early fifteenth-century debate that pitted three University-trained clerics, Jean de Montreuil and the brothers Gontier and Pierre Col, against Gerson and Christine. In the words of Eric Hicks (xix; Hult 16), “If the *Romance* [of the *Rose*] fit so easily into the debate, it is because the debate was already in the romance.” A debate about proper “doctrine” or teaching was implicit in the *Rose*. A cognate of the term “doctrine” appears in the famous authorship passage in which the God of Love predicts the birth of “Johans Clopinel” or “Chopinel” (Lecoy v. 10535). The first name likens him to a person with a limp (*clopinier*, a synonym of *clocher*), the second to a drinker (*la chopine*). On the face of it, the names identifying Jean in manuscripts of the *Rose*, that is, “Clopinel” or “Chopinel,” assimilate the author to his character the Foolish Lover (Lefèvre, “Jean de Meun”

818). Gerson and Christine would seem to object to the contradiction between Jean’s apparent self-portrayal as a Foolish Lover and the high calling he ascribes to himself through his mouthpiece, the God of Love. The deity describes how he will teach Jean to be a poet by “indoctrinating” him with his own learning and by having him sing out his verses to the entire realm (vv. 10607–10613). For Gerson and Christine, the “doctrine” that Jean de Meun places in the mouth of his character is not the kind of teaching that should be offered by the true “God of Love.” Although they come to the *Rose* from different positions, Gerson as a theologian and preacher and Christine as a court poet and head of her own scriptorium,<sup>18</sup> they both view the *Rose* as a threat to the public good and Jean as a poor teacher of Church doctrine, as we will see from their own statements, quoted below.<sup>19</sup>

In his functions as chancellor of the University of Paris and chief canon of Notre Dame cathedral, Gerson was seen as the supreme arbiter of Church doctrine.<sup>20</sup> The chancellor of the Church of Paris or of Notre-Dame was:

. . . une charge d’essence *doctrinale* [qui] donne à son titulaire le droit de conférer la licence d’enseigner et l’obligation de surveiller *la doctrine* de tout ce qui se dit ou s’écrit dans le monde universitaire. (emphasis added)

. . . in essence a *doctrinal* charge, [which] gives to the title holder the right to confer the teaching certificate and the obligation to supervise the *doctrine* of all that is said or written in the university world.

“My profession,” Gerson writes to Pierre Col, requires me “to struggle as vigorously as can be against errors and vices” (McWebb 353). It was evident from Christine’s practice in the Debate that she applies Church-taught “doctrine” to the problems of everyday life. She moreover implicitly proposes herself as a model for the way that people without the benefit of a Latin-based university education should receive the teachings disseminated orally from the pulpit by people like Gerson and Legrand.

The debaters on both sides evaluate Jean according to both what he taught—his “doctrine”<sup>21</sup>—and on how he taught it. The rhodophiles considered Jean to be an excellent theologian and a good Catholic. In his letter to Christine of September 13, 1401, Gontier calls him a:

. . . vray catholique, sollempnel maistre et docteur en son temps en sainte theologie, philosophe tres parfont et excellent sachant tout



ce qui a entendement humain est sciable, duquel la gloire et renommee vit et vivraes aages avenir entre les entendemens par ses merites levéz, par grace de Dieu et oeuvre de nature. (McWebb 114)<sup>22</sup>

. . . true Catholic, worthy master and doctor of holy theology in his time, very profound and excellent philosopher, knowing all that is knowable by human understanding, whose glory and reputation lives on and will continue to live on in the ages to come due to the recognition of his high merits, by the grace of God and the work of nature.

In his late summer 1402 letter to Christine, Pierre refers to Jean de Meun as “. . . ce tres devolt catholique et tres eslevey theologien, ce tres divin orateur et poete et tres parfait philozophe” ‘. . . that very devout Catholic and most exalted theologian, that very divine orator, poet, and highly accomplished philosopher’ (McWebb 306). Since eloquence was seen to be a necessary complement to wisdom, the good teacher was supposed to employ the rhetorical skills of the orator and poet. Gerson drily remarks that when he associates eloquence and theology, he is only following the *De doctrina christiana*, as well as Saint Augustine’s own practice of reinforcing his precepts with all the force of his eloquence (McWebb 363). He thus implies to Pierre, and not very subtly so, that these are things that a person with his background in theology should not have to be told.

The rhodophobes Gerson and Christine considered Jean de Meun to be a teacher of poisonous “doctrine.” In the epistle of June/July 1401 that Christine sent to Jean de Montreuil, she sums up her opinion of the *Rose*. For her, the text expounds:

. . . doctrine plaine de decevance, voye de dampnacion, diffameur publique, cause de souspeçon et mescreantise et honte de plusieurs personnes, et peut estre d’erreur et tres dehonneste lecture en plusieurs pars. (McWebb 138)

. . . doctrine full of deception, the way to damnation, a public defamer, a cause of suspicion and incorrect belief and shame for many people, and providing an erroneous and very dishonorable reading in several sections.

Although Christine concedes that the *Rose* does contain much that is good, this actually makes it more dangerous, an opinion shared by Gerson (McWebb 130, 290).

Despite their different approaches and emphases, Gerson and Christine are alike in censuring Jean not only for what he teaches, but

also for the way he teaches it. He instructs the readers of his *Rose* by means of a negative example, that of the Foolish Lover, a character with a pronounced “moral limp.”<sup>23</sup> One of the debaters’ favorite images for humanity’s moral failings was the “limping foot.” It appears first in Christine’s letter to Jean de Montreuil of June/July 1401, where she reproaches him, saying

Si vous puis souldre par meilleur raison que nature humaine, qui de soy est encline a mal, n’a nul besoing que on lui ramentoive *le pié dont elle cloche* pour plus droit aler. (McWebb 132; emphasis added)

If only I could persuade you that human nature, which is in itself inclined toward sinfulness, has no need to be reminded of *the foot on which it limps* in order to walk straight.

Pierre Col takes up the metaphor in his letter to Christine of late summer, 1402:

Quant tu vas au sermon, n’ois tu pas aux prescheurs respondre les vices que tous les jours font homes et fames, affin qu’ilz aillent le droit chemin? En bone foy, damoiselle, si fait: on doit ramentevoir *le pié de quoy on cloche* pour plus droit aler! (McWebb 326; emphasis added)

When you go to a sermon, do you not hear preachers attack the vices committed every day by men and women, in order that they follow the right path? In good faith, young lady, the answer is yes: one must be reminded of *the foot on which one limps* in order to walk straight!

Christine returns twice to the image in her response to Pierre of 2 October 1402. The first time her tone is mild (McWebb 154), the second time, scathing:

Et le prescheur dont tu m’as escript qu’il ramentoit *le pié dont on cloche* en son sermon (ce as tu dit pour ce que je dis que on ne le devoit ramentevoir a nature pour plus droit aler). Comment le ramentoit il? . . . Ains ramentoit ce pié de telle maniere que il fait grant orreur aux oyans . . . (McWebb 166; emphasis added)

And as for that preacher you wrote me about, saying that in his sermon he did indeed call to mind *the foot on which one limps* (you said this because I had said that human nature did not need to be reminded of it to walk straight), how did he call it to mind?

. . . he called this foot to mind in such a way as to horrify those listening to him . . .

Just two months later, in his December 1402 *Poenitemini* sermon on lust, Gerson employs the “limping foot” as Christine had said it should be employed, to impress listeners of their responsibility to redeem their sins. We know that Gerson had the Debate in mind when he pronounced this sermon because he makes several explicit references to the *Rose* (7.2.829, 7.2.839). Gerson makes abundant use of the metaphor of the moral limp, as in the following passage:

Luxure aveugle, fait clochier . . . empesche bonne doctrine, donne escande contre Jhesucrist . . . Luxure fait *clochier et boiter* ou chemin des vertus car elle a le pie senestre trop grant, qui passe sur les affections charnels, et le pie dextre trop court. (7.2.824; emphasis added)

Lust blinds, it makes one lame . . . it obstructs good teaching, leads to moral lapses contrary to Jesus Christ. . . . Lust makes one *limp and stumble* on the path to virtues, for her left foot, which speaks to the carnal feelings, is too large, and her right foot too short.

Christine and Gerson allude to humanity’s “limping foot” to make the point that preachers or writers are mistaken when they depict characters with “moral limps” who fail to repent of their sins. Humanity stumbled at the Fall, and it has a tendency to continue to stumble instead of walking a straight and steady path. Since human beings are more inclined to sin than to be virtuous, there is always the danger that they will imitate Jean’s protagonist instead of refraining from committing the sinful acts in which he engages. With their similar use of the metaphor of the “limping foot,” Gerson and Christine implicitly lodge a witty criticism of Jean’s Foolish Lover, the character with a pronounced “moral limp,” whose failings, they imply, rebound onto Jean himself. As we have seen in Gerson’s sermon, quoted above, a “stumbler” is typically a sinner, with a nod to the original sin committed by Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. By identifying himself as “Johans Clopinel” or “Chopinell,” the author appears to be encouraging his readers to repeat the sins of Adam and Eve instead of imitating the redemptive example set by Christ, the Virgin, and the saints.

#### IV. Images in illuminated manuscripts: dangerous or exemplary?

In his *Vision* Gerson warns against the dangers posed by illustrated manuscripts of the *Rose*. He has his spokesperson Theological Eloquence rant against persons who plant “sinful doctrine in others’ hearts” by means of words or images (McWebb 282–85). This harangue about the responsibility of speeches, images, and writings to foster piety echoes Legrand’s thoughts on the didactic use of images. The tirade concludes with these words:

... je fais ou non de Chasteté et de Conscience une telle requeste et conclusion contre toute peintures ou escriptures ou dis qui esmeuvent a Lubricité; car trop y est encline de soy nostre fragilité sans la pis enflammer et trebuchier ou parfont des vices, loing des vertus et de Dieu,—qui est nostre gloire, nostre amour, nostre salut, joye et felicité. (McWebb 302)

I am drafting a petition and conclusion in the name of Chastity and Conscience against all paintings or writings or poems that promote lubricity; because our fragility is already inclined enough in that direction without inflaming it further and making it stumble into the fount of vices, far from the virtues and from God—who is our glory, our love, our salvation, joy, and happiness.

Gerson returns to these points in his winter 1402–1403 letter to Pierre:

I consider that I have sufficiently argued therein [in his *Vision*] that writings, words, and pictures that provoke libidinous and lascivious thoughts are to be condemned and banned from the republic of the Christian religion—and this, in truth, is valid for every mind that has been illuminated by the Catholic faith and not at all corrupted by a vicious passion. (Hult 223; Latin original McWebb 352)

In both cases Gerson implies that “books of the Rose” should be free of paintings that could reinforce Jean’s licentious reading of the *Rose* quest.

The Arsenal compiler’s inclusion of the *Sept articles* with its image of the Trinity, which he connects to the collection’s preceding two images through his use of line and color, suggests that he, the compiler, was responding to doctrinal ideas on the Trinity expressed during the time of the Debate. In his *Vision* Gerson makes it clear that he was working on a sermon on the Trinity (7.2.1123–1137; McWebb 302),<sup>24</sup>

which he preached in French to a mixed audience three days later, on 21 May 1402. Pierre refers to it in the following way:

Car par ma foy je tiens qu'ainsy come il meismes, quant il prescha en Greve le jour de la Trinité, dist que icelle Trinité nous veons et cognoissons en umbre et come par ung mirouer. . . . (McWebb 310)

For, by my faith, I agree with what he preached in Grève [at the church of Saint-Jean-en-Grève] on the day of the Trinity, when he said that we see and know this Trinity as a shadow, and as if by a mirror. . . .

Pierre here paraphrases the Pauline text that Gerson had taken as his theme, and which he cited twice at the opening of the sermon (151–52; 7.2.1123): 1 Cor. 13:12, “Videmus nunc per speculum in enigmate” ‘We see now through a glass in a dark manner.’<sup>25</sup> Pierre speaks about the sermon as if he had heard it in person. Christine may have also attended the same Trinity service. She would seem to refer indirectly to Gerson’s sermon when she opens her letter to Pierre with an allusion to the obscurity that clouds all human understanding, and when she returns to the Trinity in the prayer with which she concludes her letter to him (McWebb 140, 188).<sup>26</sup> Since Gerson’s sermons were widely attended, and frequently copied verbatim and circulated afterwards (Hobbins 18–50), it is likely that Pierre and Christine were well acquainted with the Trinity sermon in one way or another.

What Gerson preaches to his Parisian audience in that sermon goes to the heart of the issues in the Debate. Early on he makes implicit jabs at the *Rose*, saying that some people are unable to see clearly in the mirror of thought “par accoustumance de ouyr mauvaïse doctrine” ‘because they are used to hearing bad teaching’ (153, l. 55; 7.2.1124). He repeats Legrand’s idea that good teaching requires the correct use of images, and goes on to connect the misuse of images to sexual depravity. Gerson’s critique of current mores addresses both the content of the park of the lamb episode, in which Jean has his preacher Genius encourage indiscriminate sexual coupling as the way to achieve paradise (Hult 137, 158), and Jean’s dishonorable use of images, whether these be negative textual personae or lascivious manuscript illuminations. In the sermon Gerson develops the idea, originally stated by Paul, and developed by Augustine, that humans are guilty of “loving the creature more than the creator.” Paul castigates those who do not look beyond their love objects to worship the divine love of which all earthly things are only the “semblances,” or appearances. The worship of earthly things

leads to all manner of crimes, including sexual depravity. All of this happened because, according to Paul, “. . . they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeness and image of a corruptible man . . .” (Rom 1:23).

Gerson’s sermon on the Trinity is essentially about the way images should be used in order to reestablish contact with the *imago Dei* that was not entirely obscured by original sin. It is easy to see how his critique of the misuse of images applies to the *Rose*. In his sermon Gerson even takes up the *Rose*’s fable of Narcissus, who drowned because he mistook his mirror image reflected in a stream for a real person. The lesson Gerson draws from the fable is “ainsy font les folz mondains qui aiment l’image de Dieu en lieu de Dieu” ‘so do the crazy worldly people who love God’s image rather than God’ (169, l. 517–18; 7.2.1135). Although Gerson does not mention Jean’s Pygmalion episode, it is another good illustration of the mistake of falling in love with an image rather than loving the divine exemplar that lies behind it. The sculptor Pygmalion falls in love with his statue of Galatea, brings it to life, and enters into a union with the lady. But their union dies out with Adonis, because, according to the logic of the fable, he is the result of an “incestuous” coupling. The reasoning underlying Gerson’s sermon is that figures like Narcissus, Pygmalion, the Foolish Lover, and by extension, Jean himself, are guilty of fixing their attention on love of what God has created, which is represented by Narcissus’s mirror image, Pygmalion’s statue, and the Lover’s lady, rather than understanding that these objects are only manifestations of the exemplar that lies behind all worldly appearances, the *imago Dei* that was not entirely obscured by original sin. One of the forms taken by the *imago Dei* was that of the Trinity.

Gerson’s lesson is not particularly easy to grasp, and for good reason, because the Trinity was one of the greatest mysteries of the Christian faith. Gerson goes on to assert his authority in all things doctrinal when he reproaches Pierre for having supported the heretical notion that children are born free of original sin (“Hec est heresis Pelagii” ‘This is Pelagian heresy,’ he tells him; McWebb 354). This too is related to what he had said in his sermon on the Trinity.<sup>27</sup> Since even newborns are marked by guilt, preachers and lay pedagogues alike have a great responsibility to dispense correct doctrine in an unambiguous way. Otherwise, given their natural propensity to sin, people would be more inclined to imitate Jean Clopinel’s “moral limp” than to use his negative image to correct their own behavior.

## V. Arsenal 3339 as a cure for a “limping foot”

Arsenal 3339's illuminations, rubrics, and other decoration all contribute to the view of Jean de Meun as a respected theologian and poet. Stylistic uniformity is conveyed by its three miniatures, which were all executed by the “Josephus Master” (Avril 288; Meiss), an associate of the Master of the *Cité des Dames*, who owes his name to his long collaboration with Christine. The collection exhibits an impressive sense of unity that is evident down to the details of its transcription and minor decoration. The *Rose* (ff. 1r–155v) is transcribed in a Gothic script, written in two columns of 36 lines each. The alexandrines of the *Testament* (ff. 156r–185v) are written in a single column of 36 lines; the *Codicille* (ff. 186r–186v) and *Sept articles* (ff. 187r–193r) are transcribed in two columns of 36 lines each, like the *Rose*. From an examination it appears that the entire manuscript is in the same, or two very similar, hands.<sup>28</sup> A slight difference is noticeable beginning on fol. 56, which may attributed either to a change of copyist or to a change of ink or pen.

The entire manuscript has a sober appearance. As opposed to the presentation of the *Rose* in Arsenal 5209, in Arsenal 3339 its sole illustration is its five-scene frontispiece. The *Rose* does not call attention to itself in any other way. Its rubrics are uniformly short and to the point, most typically introducing episodes or characters. Small blue initials flourished in red and red initials flourished in blue are found throughout the entire manuscript. A similar decorative pattern unites the *Rose*, the *Testament*, and the *Sept articles*. Each has a miniature, similar borders, and similar large and small initials. The *Codicille*, which is a short devotional poem whose theme of repentance recalls the *Testament*, lacks a miniature of its own, but is connected to the *Testament* by similar small initials placed at the beginning of each quatrain.<sup>29</sup> A possible explanation is that the poem is seen as part of the *Testament*, a “codicil” being an addendum to a will. Although lacking a miniature, the *Codicille* does have a border and large and small initials similar to those found in the other three texts. The entire collection appears to be of one piece, the *Rose* being followed by a series of devotional texts whose layout and decoration contribute to an overall view of Jean as a pious author and an eloquent poet.

The compiler diminishes the notion that the *Rose* was Jean's masterpiece, and he does so in two ways. First, he gives the entire text only one miniature. Although this is not unusual in and of itself,<sup>30</sup> it helps to foreground Jean's later productions. Second, he downplays the importance of the *Rose* in the compilation by placing only one rubric on

its opening folio. Rather than introducing the text in its entirety, it only introduces the author (“L’auteur”). The first of two rubrics found at the conclusion of the transcription on fol. 155v is the same one that frequently appears in the *Rose*. It reads: “Ci fine le rommant de la Rose / Ou l’art d’amours est toute enclose” ‘Here ends the *Roman de la Rose* / In which the art of love is completely enclosed.’ But it is more typically placed at the opening of the text. The fact that this rubric comes at the end rather than at the beginning of the text closely links the *Rose* to the *Testament* that follows it, especially since the second rubric introduces the *Testament*: “Et après commence le Testament maistre Jehan de Meun” ‘And afterwards begins the *Testament* of Master Jean de Meun.’ In addition, the *Testament* author is identified using the honorific, “Maistre,” whereas the *Rose* author merely merits the designation of “L’auteur.”

Instead of being the manuscript’s liberally illustrated focal point, as collections of Jean’s texts more typically feature it, here the *Rose* functions as a frame for an essentially didactic collection. Its elaborate frontispiece comprises five scenes, which is a frequently seen early fifteenth-century variation on the earlier four-scene model that was exhibited by Arsenal 5209, as discussed above. The first scene depicts the Author/Narrator in bed, followed by four others in which he dreams he wakes up and embarks on his journey as the Foolish Lover.<sup>31</sup> When in the third of these four scenes the Lover washes his face in the water of the stream, he symbolically realizes that he must clean up his “moral physiognomy.” In the last of these four scenes he stands before personifications of the vices, significantly also four in number, which are sculpted on the rose garden wall. The vice dressed in blue, the most striking of the four, does the most to inspire his self-correction, since it mirrors the blue robes he wears while depicted as the Foolish Lover. Acknowledging his faults, the protagonist submits himself to the educative value offered by the images sculpted on the garden wall.

Since the *Rose*’s frontispiece is not followed by any other miniatures, the next time the reader sees the author, he is lying on his deathbed, dressed again in the blue robes of his penitential self, and holding his *Testament*. More than anything else in Arsenal 3339, the manuscript’s second miniature fosters the idea that Jean repented of having composed the *Rose*. Observing him are thirteen ecclesiastical and royal figures. A cardinal stands in the upper middle of the picture, dominating the scene. Several other ecclesiastical figures flank him to our right. Among the other onlookers we notice a courtly lady smartly dressed in a green gown and headdress. Another cleric and several male and female



crowned heads are seated in front of the bed. The miniature reinforces Jean de Meun's authority by picturing him as a poet honored by both ecclesiastical dignitaries and lay figures. The image implies that his death will be followed by a dignified burial. Arsenal 3339's second miniature portrays Jean dying, as the French say, in "odeur de sainteté," departing the world in an aura of saintliness.

Taken along with the honorific title of "maistre" given to Jean in the *Codicille* and the *Sept articles*, the *Testament* miniature and the rubrics connecting the three devotional texts imply that Jean only attains his true and correct identity at the end of his life when he writes his *Testament*, adds a codicil to it, and pronounces the seven articles of the faith. By setting off and linking the three devotional texts, the rubrics, which are all transcribed in the same hand, play a key role in promoting the portrait of a repentant Jean. Those found on fol. 185v at the end of the *Testament* connect that text to the *Codicil* to follow: "Ci fine le testament maistre Jehan de Meun. / Et cy après commence son Codicille" 'Here ends the *Testament* of Master Jean de Meun. And here afterwards begins his *Codicil*.' The rubrics of the *Codicille*, located on fol. 186v, link it to the next and final text in the compilation, the *Sept articles*: "Ci fine le codicille maistre Jehan / de Meun. // Et après s'ensuit son tresor qui fait / mention des sept articles de la foy." 'Here ends the *Codicil* of Master Jean de Meun. And afterwards follows his *Tresor* that makes mention of the seven articles of the faith.' The rubric that closes the *Sept articles*, found on fol. 193r, reads: "Ci fine le Tresor maistre Jehan de / Meun, lequel il fist et compila au / lit de sa mort, et fait mention des sept articles de la foy." 'Here ends Master Jean de Meun's *Tresor*, which he composed and compiled on his deathbed, and makes mentions of the seven articles of the faith.' It is noteworthy that the manuscript's concluding rubric is longer and rendered in slightly larger script than the preceding rubrics, as if to doubly emphasize the pious character of the author's last actions, in which he pronounces the seven articles of the faith.

The *Sept articles* opens with a miniature of the Trinity that occupies about 1/3 of the left column of text.<sup>32</sup> The dove symbolic of the Holy Spirit precedes from the seated double figure of God the Father and Son and points, with open wings, to a book open on the chests of the first two persons of the Trinity; God the Father raises his right hand in instruction, while Christ in his left hand holds a cross. The iconography works with the text and rubrics to reinforce the impression that the author died an exemplary death, which is tied to his espousal of the doctrine of the Trinity. The *Testament* begins with a prayer to the

Trinity, “Le peres et li fils et li sains esperit” ‘the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.’ A similar prayer is recited at the beginning of the final text, the *Sept articles*, headed by the beautiful miniature of the Trinity that I have described above. The *Testament*, *Codicille*, and *Sept articles* act as testimonials to the piety expressed by Jean on his deathbed. The miniatures heading the *Testament* and the *Sept articles* make the texts they illustrate appear to be as important as the *Rose*. Furthermore, since these two pious texts each have their own illustration, taken together they “outweigh” the *Rose*.

The Arsenal compiler would seem to have a close knowledge of Gerson’s sermons and an understanding of their pervasive *Rose* subtext. The frontispiece shows the Foolish Lover learning to correct his ways and thus becoming the repentant author of the *Testament*. The Lover benefits, so to speak, from the lessons of Gerson’s sermon on the Trinity. Realizing that he should not “love God’s image in place of God,” he renounces his narcissism to embark on a search for the divine exemplar underlying all of God’s creation. The new Jean moreover exchanges the “limping feet” of lust, mentioned by Gerson in the *Poenitemini* sermon quoted above, for the “two holy feet” of his Trinity sermon (see Mourin 125, 146). Only when the feet tread the right path, says Gerson, can the soul take on the Trinity’s “emprainte spirituelle” ‘spiritual imprint’ (171, l. 568; 7.2.1136).

The three miniatures in the Arsenal manuscript trace, as it were, Jean’s spiritual ascent in terms set forth by Gerson in the Trinity sermon. Citing the three mirrors of nature, scripture, and the human creature, the preacher concentrates on the way the human creature should reflect the Trinity. Correspondingly, in Arsenal 3339 the rehabilitation of Jean de Meun is a three-part process, with each miniature marking a step in the author’s moral progress. The manuscript’s frontispiece becomes a frame for the entire collection, in which the author’s penitential practices lead him towards the vision of the Trinity that awaits the just.

The Arsenal compiler further implies that Jean’s rehabilitated figure becomes a model for the reader’s own path to self-improvement. He does this by having the author point to his book, his *Testament*, the text in which he repents of having written youthful texts and turns to composing devotional works. Jean’s “his last will and testament,” the *Testament*, and by extension the entire collection, becomes a model for the reader’s own path to virtue. The blank pages of the book in the *Sept articles* miniature encourage readers to write their own “book of the heart” to take to the final judgment (note the resemblance to the image reproduced by Jager 118, fig. 8). The ideas on dying a proper death,

which are expressed visually in the Arsenal manuscript, may have been influenced by Gerson's widely circulated writings on the *ars moriendi*, which, when illuminated, typically include a miniature of a dying man lying in bed, making his final confession to a priest.

The image of the rehabilitated Jean fits the mold of the preacher of official Christine doctrine, as taught by Gerson. With his finger Jean points to his *Testament*, indicating it to be a summary of his final teachings, which he develops further in the *Codicille* and *Sept articles*. As we have seen, the rubrics of these last two texts connect them closely to the *Testament*, and more closely so than is customary in compilations formed around Jean de Meun. The *Testament*'s abiding message is the conventional wisdom that everyone should repent before death takes them unawares. The Arsenal 3339 compiler thus not only "corrects" Jean de Meun in function of Gerson's criticisms of him, but he does so in the terms set forth by the immensely respected preacher at a critical juncture in the Debate.

## VI. The enduring "aura" of the rehabilitated author

The compiler uses the color blue to make a didactic statement. Just as he had done in the frontispiece and in the deathbed miniature, the compiler gives the color blue a commanding place in the collection's concluding miniature, in which the color forms the backdrop of the Trinity's red and green of royal majesty. In *The Color Blue*, Michel Pastoureau notes that Louis IX—a "penitential" monarch if there ever was one, was the first French king to be depicted invariably in blue robes, and that after his reign blue became the monarchical color *par excellence* (52). Paired with gold, blue was the color of choice for the *fleur-de-lis*, emblem of the monarchy's unswerving support of the doctrine of the Trinity (Gousset 112).<sup>33</sup> It thus does not seem to be by accident that in the collection's final miniature the compiler employs the color blue to highlight the article declaring faith in this doctrine. The effect of its inclusion is to help demonstrate Jean's strict adherence to principles concerning proper doctrine preached by the charismatic Gerson during the time of the Debate, sermons which were closely followed by some (if not all) of the other debaters.

It appears, then, that the Arsenal 3339 compiler consciously employed images to establish Jean de Meun as an authoritative Catholic poet. The quotation from Legrand reveals the extent to which images, and even their colors, were invested with meaning in early fifteenth-century Paris during the time when Arsenal 3339 was produced. Although I

do not have space to embark here on a full-fledged study of the way the Arsenal manuscript reflects color symbolism popular at the royal court, Pastoureau’s findings about the color blue nonetheless suggest that the compiler, by employing that color as he does, wants Jean to be remembered as an author who in his old age repented of having composed the *Rose*. The impression created by the miniatures is that Jean, reading himself into the *Rose* protagonist, realizes that he is condemned for his youthful foolishness, repents of it, goes on to compose other devotional texts, and dies pronouncing the seven articles of the faith. In this way he can be seen to conform himself to the ideas of Gerson and Legrand concerning the correct use of images as moral guides for the viewer.<sup>34</sup>

What is nonetheless odd about Arsenal 3339 is that what more than anything else makes the case for Jean’s rehabilitation is the miniature of Jean on his deathbed. The closest the *Testament* comes to actually referring to the *Rose* is in the passage in which Jean admits that authors have to guard themselves against promoting erroneous teachings. He accordingly “amends” (*amender*; see above) several of the teachings he expressed in the *Rose*. For example, Jean moderates his stance toward the mendicants by acknowledging the crucial role they play as counselors to kings and queens. He considers marriage in its religious sense as figuring the conjoining of God and the Church, and devotes much space to the duties of husbands and wives to each other. However, scholars such as Demarolle point out Jean’s persistent criticism of the mendicants and his lingering antifeminism. It is the Arsenal depiction of Jean that carries the argument of the collection, “speaking” more eloquently for the author’s complete rehabilitation than does his *Testament*, even when the piety of that text is bolstered by passages in the *Codicille* and *Sept articles*.

Avril provides one explanation for the convincing “aura” of Jean’s deathbed scene. He finds it reminiscent of a fresco made by Ambrogio Lorenzetti for the church of San Francesco in Sienna figuring the reception of Saint Louis d’Anjou in the Franciscan order. The Siennese painting shows the haloed Louis d’Anjou, tonsured and dressed as a Franciscan, kneeling before Pope Benedict VIII, while a large number of clerical and lay figures look on. Avril moreover believes the scene to have been known in the Parisian circles around Jean de Berry, because he finds an even closer echo of the Italian painting in a miniature done by the Mazarine Master, a close associate of the Boucicaut Master (288; Meiss, figs. 428 and 430). The Franciscan overtones of Jean’s deathbed scene would soften the criticism of the mendicants still present in his *Testament*. But most of all they would situate this image of Jean in a long line of exemplary models.<sup>35</sup>

The image of Jean de Meun as a repentant author held iconic value during the first decade of the fifteenth century and long afterwards. People of the time were supposed to imitate iconic models that they saw all around them, those of Christ, the Virgin, and their patron saints, who presented them with *patrons* ‘patterns’ with which to fashion their own higher selves (Alford 1–21).<sup>36</sup> As projected by the Arsenal compiler, Jean’s iconic image groups him with figures such as Saint Louis d’Anjou and his uncle, the only sainted king of recent history. The two saints Louis were so popular at the time that the Queen of France hung a picture of the two of them over the bed of her son Louis de Guyenne, undoubtedly hoping that the image of their piety would leave its imprint on the heart of the dauphin who bore their name (Taburet-Delahaye 115). The iconic value of Jean’s deathbed scene was so powerful that it exerted its force about a half century later, when the Parisian compiler of Français 24392 copied it for his own collection,<sup>37</sup> which comprises the same four texts as does Arsenal 3339.<sup>38</sup>

The Arsenal compiler’s logic seems to have been that since Jean had erred through his use of images, and most grievously so when he portrayed himself as an author with a pronounced “moral limp,” his full and complete rehabilitation necessitated his association with an equally arresting persona that contrasted markedly with his former self-depiction. It was thus not totally unexpected that when the compiler composed what he manifestly considered to be the final chapter in Jean de Meun’s long career, he had him figured in both text and image as an indefatigable supporter of the Trinity.

## VII. Afterthoughts

In this study I have argued that the Arsenal 3339 compiler set out to rehabilitate Jean de Meun’s professional reputation, and that he, the compiler, did so by taking to heart Gerson’s criticisms of the author.<sup>39</sup> Jean’s new penitent stance is reflected in the images of Arsenal 3339. The compiler counts on all three of the miniatures he includes in the compilation, the ones illustrating the *Rose*, the *Testament*, and the *Sept articles*, to help define the reformed Jean de Meun. The effect obviously desired by the compiler was to allow Jean de Meun to regain some of the status as a foremost theologian and good Catholic that the rhodophiles had claimed for him in the Debate.

Despite the efforts of Gerson and his ally Christine, neither manuscript production of the *Rose* nor the polemic surrounding Jean came to an end after the Debate. About a century later Jean Molinet (c.

1435–1507) reiterated the point of view of Jean’s defenders. Attributing Gerson’s condemnation of the *Rose* to the preacher’s failure to understand the deeper meaning of the text (Blumenfeld-Kosinski 355), Molinet insisted that Jean’s continuation was the work of a great theologian. The thoroughgoing moralization of the *Rose* done by Molinet takes its place alongside Douce 195, the copy of the *Rose* owned by Charles d’Alençon and Louise de Savoie, parents of King François I and Marguerite de Navarre (Bleeke; McGrady; Nichols, “Philology”). With its magnificent cycle of 125 miniatures executed by Robinet Testard, Douce 195 gives eloquent testimony to the *Rose*’s enduring appeal for members of the French royal family.

This study of Arsenal 3339 reveals just how important it was to preserve Jean de Meun’s position in the vernacular canon. We do not know the identity of the person for whom it was produced (Avril 288), nor if the manuscript was well known. But we can wonder if in the long term it did not have a part in restoring to Jean much of the authority that had been contested in the Debate.

## Notes

1. Although the *Tresor* is now believed to be by Jean Chapuis, many manuscripts, including this one, identify its author as Jean de Meun (Hasenohr 761).
2. I checked this point out with Meradith McMunn, who is doing a study of all the surviving copies. In an e-mail message of 15 June 2011 she said that she found “nothing comparable (or even close)” in earlier manuscripts. I thank her for her advice.
3. Jean de Meun on his deathbed at Arsenal 3339, fol. 156r, <<http://roman-delarose.org/#read:Arsenal3339.156r.tif>>
4. On the “Nota” signs, see Huot 36–37.
5. The collection’s “mastermind” might well have been a theologian who gave advice or directions to the compiler and the illuminator. The portrait of the mastermind that can be inferred from this study is someone who knew Gerson’s work inside out, respected his authority, but was intent on maintaining Jean’s place in the vernacular canon. He could have even been a rhodophile who, although swayed by Gerson’s arguments (or by his authority), was determined to rehabilitate Jean. For examples in which a theologian collaborated on the making of an illuminated manuscript, see Ouy for Gerson, and Sherman 23–33 for Nicole Oresme, in particular 31–33, “Oresme’s Role in Designing the Programs of Illustration.” For the classic study of the role of the conceptualizer/mastermind (“le concepteur”) in manuscript production, see Brent.
6. An exception is Huot 16–46.

7. Huot's study is a perfect illustration of the essential *mouvance* of the medieval text, a concept first set forth by Paul Zumthor and developed by Bernard Cerquiglini.

8. Huot discusses how the illuminations and marginal images can constitute the text's "visual gloss" (273–285).

9. Important in this regard are the principle of the "whole book" (Nichols and Wentzel) and the idea that "no text exists outside of the support that enables it to be read" (Chartier 161).

10. Legrand dedicated his *Archiloge* to Louis d'Orléans and his recast version of the original text, known as the *Livre de bonnes meurs*, to Jean de Berry (Lefèvre, "Jacques Legrand" 734).

11. Henceforth in the body of my text I refer to two editions of the Trinity sermon; first, to the one by Mourin (151–74), then to the one by Glorieux (7.2.1123–1137). For the Mourin edition, I first indicate the page number, then the line number. For the Glorieux edition, I first indicate the volume number, then the page number(s). Note that volume 7 appears in two parts.

12. The title of the sermon series means "Do penance" or "Repent and be saved."

13. An exception is Mourin 92–93.

14. I thank Nathalie Coilly, conservatrice chargée des manuscrits médiévaux et saint-simoniens at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, for having examined this manuscript with me and for having advised me on Arsenal 5209 and Français 24392.

15. Hult 110, n. 24: "This is an interesting reference to the manuscript format of the *Rose* text, which was frequently transcribed in lavishly illustrated volumes."

16. These are the French versions of Vegetius's *Book of Chivalry*, the Letters of Eloise and Abelard, Giraud de Barri's *Topographia hibernica* and Aelred de Rievaulx's *De amicitia spirituali*. The last two texts have been lost.

17. Here is the text, cited by Huot, together with her translation (17): "prie vous que le me pardonnez,/et de par moi leur respoignez/que ce requeroit la matiere," 'I pray you to forgive me [for any excesses], and to reply to them, on my behalf, that the material required it' (vv. 15141–43).

18. As head of her own scriptorium Christine produced over one-third of the surviving manuscripts of her texts, which number 50 out of the current total of more than 252 copies. For a list of the 252 manuscripts containing at least one item by Christine, see Angus J. Kennedy, *Christine de Pizan: A Bibliographical Guide* (121–23), and the first supplement to Kennedy's guide. Several other manuscripts have been found since Kennedy made the list.

19. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski sums up their respective positions: "Put succinctly, Christine de Pizan objected to the *Rose*'s misogyny, while Jean Gerson considered the text and its author immoral" (323). For further discussion of the differing positions and emphases of the two figures, see, among others, Nabert; Huot 22–27; Brown-Grant 7–51; Cayley 52–86; McGuire 150–54.

20. Combes, *Jean Montreuil et le chancelier Gerson* 285–286, qtd. by Greene, *Le Débat* 161, n. 1.

21. For an extended discussion of Christine’s use of this term, see Walters, “Anthoine Vérard’s Reframing” 47, 53–4.

22. I cite the text from McWebb’s edition, which she bases on London, British Library, Harley 4431, which represents Christine’s final version of the text. All of my statements about this compilation and about Christine’s role as head of her own scriptorium are based on the information on the Harley 4431 website and from discussions with McWebb, who is spearheading a project to digitize all of Christine’s presentation copies in conjunction with the Johns Hopkins University’s Sheridan Library. Although all of the translations in this paper are my own, I have benefitted from the translations of McWebb and Hult.

23. See Huot’s discussion of Gerson’s distaste for the use of negative examples (23).

24. Pace McWebb 378 n. 85. This sermon was not part of the *Poenitemini* series that Gerson preached in December 1402. See Hicks 179–85. McGuire defines the *Poenitemini* series of Advent 1402–Lent 1403 as “twelve sermons preached in parish churches on seven capital sins (7.2.793–934)” (357). See also McGuire 71–72, 78, 140–45.

25. All biblical citations are from the Douay-Rheims translation of the Vulgate.

26. Christine returns to the Trinity in several post-Debate texts (Green 227).

27. Gerson echoes the vocabulary he had used in the Trinity sermon when in the next paragraph he repeats a key phrase from it, Paul’s “in speculo et enigmate” ‘in a glass darkly’ (McWebb 354).

28. No systematic study has been made of the classification into families of fifteenth-century *Rose* manuscripts. In an e-mail message dated 14 June 2011, Huot notes that many manuscripts of the time are composite texts, “to which bits and pieces of different families have been added.” Based upon my examination, Arsenal 3339 appears to be a composite text.

29. Significantly, Gerson opens his *Ave Maria* and *Ad Deum vadit* with quatrains, probably of his own invention, and Christine begins exempla 6–100 of her sermonizing *Epistre Othéa* with quatrains (Walters, “Christine and Gerson, Poets” 76).

30. McMunn 149 identifies 30 *Rose* manuscripts having only one miniature.

31. See the beginning of Jean’s dream at Arsenal 3339, fol. 1r, <<http://romanmandelaware.org/#read: Arsenal3339.001r.tif>>

32. See the Trinity illumination at Arsenal 3339, fol. 187r. <<http://romanmandelaware.org/#read: Arsenal3339.187r.tif>>

33. This is a theme to which the *Grandes Chroniques de France* repeatedly returns. According to Hedeman, Christine and Gerson are alike in expressing two themes that emerge with special power in this official history of the French



royal house: the French king is a *rex christianissimus*, and the *fleur-de-lis* symbolizes divine favor of the monarchy (138–40, 143, 168, 174).

34. Another preacher and colleague of Gerson and Legrand, Pierre d'Ailly, refers to the educative function of the images painted on the garden wall that he depicts in his *Devout Soul's Garden of Love* (Hult 75).

35. It is worth noting that by 1500 these models would have included Gerson himself, who had become known during his own lifetime as the *doctor christianissimus et consolatorius* (Brown 252–56). Hobbins notes that Gerson's fame only increased after his death. "In the German-speaking world, his name was linked to a tradition that included the greatest names in the history of Christian theology: Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory the Great, Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas. Fifteenth-century readers copied his works in quantity, and by the year 1500 he commanded authority rivaling the greatest names in the Christian tradition" (5–6).

36. Alford dubs the Bible the original pattern book and traces this conception of it to Paul, who, besides advising his audience to be imitators of Christ, also suggests that they can imitate Paul himself as an imitator of Christ, thus presenting a pattern of imitation that can be passed from one person to another.

37. See Jean de Meun on his deathbed at Français 24392, fol. 177r, <http://romandelarose.org/#read:Francais24392.177r.tif>. The manuscript displays densely rubricated and illuminated folios treating passages on Nature's speech to Genius about the Trinity, one of which is illustrated by an uncharacteristic image of the Trinity, located on folio 154r. As in Arsenal 3339, the illuminations help the reader remember the official doctrine of the Trinity, thus filling the function that Legrand had charted out for them. Nature admits that she had no part in creating the Trinity, a divine mystery that she is moreover unable to understand, vv. 19123–26. The illuminations of Français 24392, like those of the Arsenal manuscript, were probably designed by someone trained in official Church doctrine. It appears that the Français 24392 compiler set out to help the reader understand the workings of the natural universe and their relation to divine mysteries like the Trinity.

38. Two art historians who are preparing a catalogue of Flemish manuscripts held in Parisian collections, Pascal Schandel and Ilona Hans-Collas, exclude Français 24392 from their corpus of study. They believe it to have been produced in France, most probably in Paris. Schandel confirms Marie-Thérèse Gousset's earlier dating of the manuscript to the third quarter of the fourteenth century (93). Two art historians who are preparing a catalogue of Flemish manuscripts held in Parisian collections, Pascal Schandel and Ilona Hans-Collas, exclude Français 24392 from their corpus of study. They believe it to have been produced in France, most probably in Paris. Schandel confirms Marie-Thérèse Gousset's earlier dating of the manuscript to the third quarter of the fourteenth century (93).

39. For a study of how Gerson "corrects" Philippe de Mézières, see Walters, "The *Vieil Solitaire*" 143–44.

## Works Cited

- Arsenal 3339. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris. Roman de la Rose *Digital Library*. Web. 3 January 2012.
- Arsenal 5209. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris. Roman de la Rose *Digital Library*. Web. 3 January 2012.
- Douce 195. Bodleian Library, Oxford. Roman de la Rose *Digital Library*. Web. 3 January 2012.
- Français 1563. Bibliothèque national de France, Paris. Roman de la Rose *Digital Library*. Web. 3 January 2012.
- Français 24392. Bibliothèque national de France, Paris. Roman de la Rose *Digital Library*. Web. 3 January 2012.
- Harley 4431. British Library, London. Roman de la Rose *Digital Library*. Web. 3 January 2012.
- Works Cited
- Alford, John A. “The Scriptural Self.” *The Bible in the Middle Ages: Its Influence on Literature and Art*. Ed. Bernard S. Levy. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992. 1–21. Print.
- Avril, François. “Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Ms. 3339.” *Paris 1400* 288.
- Beltran, Evencio. “Christine de Pizan, Jacques Legrand, et le *Communiloquium* de Jean de Galles.” *Romania* 104 (1983): 208–28. Print.
- Bleeke, Marian. “Versions of Pygmalion in the Illuminated *Roman de la Rose* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Douce 195): The Artist and the Work of Art.” *Art History* 33.1 (February 2010): 28–53. Print.
- Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Renate. “Jean Gerson and the Debate on the *Romance of the Rose*.” *A Companion to Jean Gerson*. Ed. Brian Patrick McGuire. Leiden: Brill, 2006. 317–56. Print.
- Bousmanne, Bernard, and Thierry Delcourt, eds. *Miniatures flamandes, 1404–1482*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France; Bruxelles: Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 2011. Print.
- Brent, Beat. “Le texte et l'image dans la Vie des saints au Moyen Age: rôle du concepteur et rôle du peintre.” *Texte et image: Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly (October 13–15, 1982)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984. 31–40. Print.
- Brown, D. Catherine. *Pastor and Laity in the Theology of Jean Gerson*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.
- Brown-Grant, Rosalind. *Christine de Pizan and the Moral Defence of Women: Reading Beyond Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.
- Cayley, Emma. *Debate and Dialogue: Alain Chartier in His Cultural Context*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2006. Print.
- Cerquiglini, Bernard. *Eloge de la Variante. Histoire critique de la philologie*. Paris: Seuil, 1989. Print.
- Chartier, Rogier. “Texts, Printing, Readings.” *The New Cultural History*. Ed. Lynn Hunt. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989. 154–75. Print.

- Combes, André. *Jean de Montreuil et le chancelier Gerson. Contribution à l'histoire des rapports de l'humanisme et de la théologie en France au début du XVe siècle*. Paris: Vrin, 1942. Print.
- Demarolle, Pierre. "Le *Roman de la Rose* et le *Testament* de Jean de Meun." *Hommage à Jean Séquy*. Vol 1. Toulouse: U de Toulouse-Le Mirail, 1978. 237–51. Print.
- Gerson, Jean. *Oeuvres complètes*. Ed. Palémon Glorieux. 10 vols. Paris: Desclée, 1960–1973. Print.
- Gousset, Marie-Thérèse, and Nicole Fleurier. *Eden: Le Jardin médiéval à travers l'enluminure. XIII–XVI siècle*. Paris: Albin Michel, 2001. Print.
- Green, Karen. "Could Christine de Pizan be the author of the *Advis à Isabelle de Bavière*, BNF MS fr. 1223?" *Cahiers de recherches médiévales* 14 (2007): 211–229. Print.
- Greene, Virginie, ed. *Le Débat sur le Roman de la Rose*. Paris: Nizet, 2002. Print.
- Hasenohr, Geneviève. "Jean Chapis." *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le Moyen Age*. Ed. Geneviève Hasenohr and Michel Zink. Rev. ed. Paris: Fayard, 1964. 761. Print.
- Hedeman, Anne D. *The Royal Image. Illustrations of the Grandes Chroniques de France, 1274–1422*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991. Print.
- Hicks, Eric, ed. *Le Débat sur le Roman de la Rose*. Geneva: Slatkine, 1996. Print.
- Hobbins, Daniel. *Authorship and Publicity Before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2009. Print.
- The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate*. Baltimore, 1899. Rockford, 1971. Print.
- Hult, David, ed. and trans. *The Debate of the Romance of the Rose*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2010. Print.
- Huot, Sylvia. *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, Manuscript Transmission*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
- . Message to the author. 14 June 2011. E-mail.
- Jager, Eric. *The Book of the Heart*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000. Print.
- Kennedy, Angus J. *Christine de Pizan: A Bibliographical Guide*. London: Grant and Cutler, 1984. Print.
- . *Christine de Pizan: A Bibliographical Guide. Supplement 1*. London: Grant and Cutler, 1994. Print.
- Kuhn, Alfred. "Die Illustration des *Rosenromans*." *Jahrbüch des Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen* 31 (1913–1914): 1–66. Print.
- Langlois, Ernest. *Les Manuscrits du "Roman de la rose."* 1910. Geneva: Slatkine, 1974. Print.
- Lecoy, Félix, ed. *Le Roman de la Rose de Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun*. 3 vols. Paris: Champion, 1976–82. Print.

- Lefèvre, Sylvie. "Jean de Meun." *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le Moyen Age*. Ed. Geneviève Hasenohr and Michel Zink. Rev. ed. Paris: Fayard, 1964. 817–818. Print.
- . "Jacques Legrand." *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises*. 733–734. Print.
- McGrady, Deborah. "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. Print.
- McGuire, Brian Patrick. *Jean Gerson and the Last Medieval Reformation*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2005. Print.
- McMunn, Meradith T. "Programs of Illustration in *Roman de la Rose* Manuscripts Owned by Patrons and Friends of Christine de Pizan." *Au champ des escriptures (Actes du IIIe Colloque international sur Christine de Pizan, Lausanne, 18–22 juillet 1998)*. Ed. Eric Hicks, Diego Gonzalez, and Philippe Simon. Paris: Champion, 2000. 737–753. Print.
- . Message to the author. 15 June 2011. E-mail.
- McWebb, Christine. *Debating the Roman de la Rose: A Critical Anthology*. Intro. Earl Jeffrey Richards. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Meiss, Millard. *French Painting in the Time of Jean de Berry. The Boucicaut Master*. New York: Braziller and the Pierpont Morgan Library, 1968. Print.
- Méon, D. Martin, ed. *Le Testament et le Codicille, Le Roman de la Rose*. Vol. 4. Paris, 1814. Print.
- Mourin, Louis. *Six sermons français inédits de Jean Gerson. Etude doctrinale et littéraire suivie de l'édition critique et de remarques linguistiques*. Paris: Vrin, 1916. 151–74. Print.
- Nabert, Nathalie. "Christine de Pizan, Jean Gerson et le gouvernement des âmes." *Au champ des escriptures (Actes du IIIe Colloque international sur Christine de Pizan, Lausanne, 18–22 juillet 1998)*. Ed. Eric Hicks, Diego Gonzalez, and Philippe Simon. Paris: Champion, 2000. Print. 197–218. Print.
- Nichols, Stephen G. "Philology and its Discontents." *The Future of the Middle Ages: Medieval Literature in the 1990s*. Gainesville, FL: U of Florida P, 1994. 131–35. Print.
- Nichols, Stephen G., and Siegfried Wenzel, eds. *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 1996. Print.
- Ouy, Gilbert. "Une maquette de manuscrit à peintures." *Mélanges d'histoire du livre et des bibliothèques offerts à Frantz Calot*. Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1960. 43–51. Print.
- Paris 1400: Les arts sous Charles VI*. Paris, Musée du Louvre, 22 mars–12 juillet 2004. Paris: Fayard, 2004. Print.
- Pastoureau, Michel. *Blue: The History of a Color*. Trans. Markus Cruse. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001. Print.
- Roman de la Rose Digital Library*. The Johns Hopkins University and the Bibliothèque nationale de France. Web. 2 Feb. 2011. <<http://romandelarose.org>>

- Sherman, Claire Richter. *Imaging Aristotle: Verbal and Visual Representation in Fourteenth-Century France*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995. Print.
- Taburet-Delahaye, Elisabeth. "Le couple royal: Charles VI et Isabeau de Bavière." *Paris 1400* 113–15.
- Tesnière, Marie-Hélène. "Livre illustré et renouveau des lettres." *Paris 1400* 236–37.
- Walters, Lori J. "A Parisian Manuscript of the *Romance of the Rose*." *The Princeton University Library Chronicle* 51 (Autumn 1989): 31–55. Print.
- . "Anthoine Vêrard's Reframing of Christine de Pizan's *Doctrine* for Anne de Bretagne." *The Cultural and Political Legacy of Anne de Bretagne: Negotiating Convention in Books and Documents*. Ed. Cynthia J. Brown. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010. 47–63. Print.
- . "Le *Vieil Solitaire* and the *Seulette*: Devotion as Political Theology in the Works of Philippe de Mézières, Christine de Pizan, and Jean Gerson." *Philippe de Mézières and His Age: Piety and Politics in the Fourteenth Century*. Ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Kiril Petkov. Leiden: Brill, 2011. 119–44. Print.
- Zumthor, Paul. *Essai de poétique médiévale*. Paris: Seuil, 1972. Print.