Re-contextualising the *Romaunt of the Rose*: Glasgow, University Library MS Hunter 409 and the *Roman de la rose*.

ABSTRACT

This article examines in detail certain aspects of the *mise-en-page* of Glasgow, University Library MS Hunter 409, the most complete surviving manuscript copy of the Middle English *Romaunt of the Rose*, a translation of the *Roman de la rose*. It explores the way in which, since the nineteenth-century work of Skeat and his contemporaries, critical focus has been directed overwhelmingly towards splitting the text into discrete 'fragments', with the principal purpose of discerning which was by Chaucer. It then argues that the Glasgow manuscript's presentation of the *Romaunt* does not support these readings of the text, and suggests that this manuscript in fact provides evidence of engagement with much broader scribal and decorative traditions of transmitting the *Roman de la rose* through its layout and decoration. The article concludes by arguing for a more integrated and less divisive approach to the *Romaunt*, and a move away from a scholarly model which focuses on its supposed 'fragmentary' state and its relationship to Chaucer, in favour of an exploration of its relationship to the *Rose* itself.

--

This article presents one part of a much larger study, which investigates Middle English translation from French, focusing on translation as broad cultural and bibliographical transfer as well as precise linguistic exercise, and discussing the contribution of Middle English translations both to important debates surrounding their French 'sources', and to critical formations of an English Chaucer canon. One of the central texts within this study is the thirteenth-century medieval 'bestseller' *Le Roman de la rose*, and its Middle English translation *The Romaunt of the Rose*.[1] As is well known, the *Romaunt* has, traditionally, been critically situated within the canon of Chaucer's early or marginal works. Almost all critical debate about the text has centred on the vexed question of Chaucer attribution, and has (both implicitly and explicitly) situated the *Romaunt* in a category of largely derivative, early works by a writer whose mature genius far outstrips these rather uncomfortable beginnings, once it has fully come into its own.[2]

The fact that the *Romaunt* has been shown to be by more than one translator has complicated the situation further as regards attribution. Since the late nineteenth century, the *Romaunt* has been divided into three so-called 'fragments'(A, B and C), according to these

apparent changes in translator – a term which has been universally employed, as far as I am aware, by all critics and editors dealing with the poem. 'Fragment A' comprises the first 1705 lines of the *Romaunt*, 'Fragment B' comprises ll. 1706 to 5810, while 'Fragment C' runs from l. 5811 to l. 7692, the end of the Middle English text as we have it. As a translation of the *Rose*, however, A + B + C does not simply translate the material which comprises the first 7690-odd lines of the French text. A begins at the opening of the poem, and B follows directly from A. Thus A and B together give a translation of *Rose* ll. 1-c. 5154. C, however, does not follow from B, but picks up the translation of the *Rose* after a roughly five-thousand line break, at *Rose* c. l. 10680. A is now the only one of these 'fragments' to be attributed to Chaucer.[3]

In summary, textual evidence for changes in translator exists in three main areas: lexis, dialect and source text. The change from A to B is marked by a shift in the Middle English word used consistently to translate a frequently-used piece of vocabulary, and by a move to Northern dialectal forms. The shift from B to C is again marked by a change in a repeated item of vocabulary, and by fewer Northern forms.[4] Furthermore, Sutherland has argued that different manuscript families of the *Rose* were used to provide the source text of the *Romaunt* in different parts of the translation. Sutherland's evidence suggests that at least two *Rose*-manuscript families, H and R, provide the core sources of the *Romaunt*, with an H manuscript being used as a source for Section A, and an R manuscript for sections B and C.[5] The evidence, then, is both contradictory and complicated. Many critics have linked A and C on the grounds that they do not exhibit the Northern forms found in B, and have suggested that they could potentially be by the same translator. However, the evidence outlined by Sutherland suggests that it is *B* and C, rather than *A* and C, which might be linked: both appear to derive from the R manuscript family of the *Rose*, while A derives from a different

family. Yet B and C are separated by dialect, by certain vocabulary choices and a by a large narrative break.

It seems to be awareness of this narrative break which initially led to the use of the term 'fragment' to posit the three different translators' work on the *Romaunt*. Dahlberg describes how 'the scholarship of the 1870s and 1880s comes to refer to two fragments, the one before the large gap and the one after',[6] and the use of the term 'fragment' arose from a sense that two incomplete *manuscript* fragments must have been pulled together to give the text as it survives in the Glasgow manuscript. Lindner argued explicitly in 1887 that the manuscript was copied from two, different manuscript fragments, one which transmitted A + B (which had not yet been differentiated from one another), and one C.[7] Skeat developed this theory further, hypothesising that A and C both originally existed and circulated in independent manuscript 'fragments', and that C in fact, existed as a poem in its own right before being incorporated into an already-incomplete *Rose*-translation.[8]

The term 'hypothesising' is important here: the very influential nineteenth-century use of the term 'fragment', which we have carried over to our own twenty-first century critical discourses about the *Romaunt*, originally derived from conjectures about the kind of *codicological* situation which could have given rise to its text as we now have it. Indeed, the word 'fragment' is most usually employed in medieval studies as a codicological term: that is to say, it refers to physical fragments of now-dismembered or otherwise incomplete medieval books.[9] Using this term about the *Romaunt* to refer to potential differences in translator, however, is not, I would argue, without its problems. At a purely practical level, it can lead to misconceptions about the nature of the principle manuscript witness to the text, the Glasgow manuscript. On at least one occasion a colleague, on hearing me refer to 'Fragment

A', assumed that this manuscript was itself made up of several, disparate 'fragments' of *different* manuscripts retrospectively bound together – a situation which is emphatically not the case. More importantly, at an ideological level, it embodies and perpetuates a way of approaching the *Romaunt* which lays stress on its incompleteness and inadequacy as full or whole translation of *Rose*, and which allows critical attention to be focused almost entirely on the 'fragment' of the text assumed to be by Chaucer.[10] For these reasons, it may be time to put the term 'fragment' – or at least, unthinking *use* of that term – behind us.[11] In what follows, then, I prefer the more neutral terms 'section' or 'part' to the traditional 'fragment' when referring to the changes in translator: while I do not mean to contest the evidence that more than one translator contributed to the production of the *Romaunt*, it does seem to me to be useful to attempt to return our critical focus to the text that we have in its entirety, rather than foregrounding a sense of Chaucer-centred incompleteness.

The three-fold division of the *Romaunt* into different sections, and the critical assessment of those sections has, historically, been deeply intertwined with the business of establishing and critically assessing the Chaucer canon. These preoccupations, however, have perhaps led us to forget that the text as it survives in its principal manuscript witness is certainly *not* presented to us in such a way as to foreground any such concerns. The *Romaunt* as it actually survives in its principal manuscript witness is anything *but* fragmented, in the usual sense of the term: codicologcially speaking, the Glasgow manuscript is actually largely complete. It is made up of a sequential series of quires, it features catchwords to ensure quire binding in the correct order, and it displays a well-designed, regular and well-executed decorative scheme involving collaboration between scribe and limner. It is now missing eleven folios, although it is likely that some of these at least have been removed from the manuscript because of their decorative quality. There is also evidence of some loss of text at

the close of the translation (although how much has been lost is unclear)[12] and of some misplaced leaves in quires 19 and 20, as several chunks of text have been transcribed out of order. However, as the resultant breaks in sense are sometimes found in the middle of folios, the disordering must have occurred in the Glasgow manuscript's exemplar or an ancestor.[13] There is, then, no compelling reason to describe this manuscript as particularly *codicologically* 'fragmented'.[14] Crucially, there is also no reason at all to assume that the scribe of the Glasgow manuscript knew about, or was interested in differences in translator or narrative gaps between sections: the *Romaunt* is laid out as one, continuous piece, with absolutely no attention whatsoever paid to the divisions between what we now see as different translators' parts of the text. Rubrication and other forms of textual division through *mise-en-page* are certainly employed in the manuscript – but these features are *not* used to highlight the same divisions as those which we habitually foreground.

It is time, I would argue, to return to the Glasgow manuscript with a view to asking what its codicological features *do* articulate about the *Romaunt*. James-Maddocks has provided us with one important new framework through which to re-read the presentation and circulation of this text: that of the artisan limner who decorated Hunter 409, and his or her scribal associates, professional networks and surviving border-work.[15] Here, I suggest a second framework through which to approach the manuscript: its relationships with French traditions of *Rose*-transmission. My aim in doing so is to explore some new avenues of critical exploration in relation to the *Romaunt*: if we remove Chaucer from the equation, and we pay attention to some of the design features and layout of the Glasgow manuscript, in what different ways can the *Romaunt* be conceptualised? Instead of categorising the *Romaunt* as an early and fragmentary Chaucer production situated on the fringes of the Chaucer canon, we can read this translation and its presentation as a creative and

interpretative response to the *Roman de la Rose*, a contribution to a much larger and more wide-ranging discussion.

One way of undertaking this reading is to focus on the decorative detail with which the *Romaunt* is presented visually in the manuscript. Stephen Partridge has recently highlighted the extent to which scribes often copy layout while copying text, showing how a particular *mise-en-page* can be transmitted from exemplar to copy.[16] Manuscript *mise-en-page* of a text can also form an important way to articulate – indeed, construct – intertextual connections within and between established literary traditions. Aditi Nafde, for example, has recently discussed the ways in which Hoccleve, in his autograph manuscripts 'demonstrates his Chaucerian lineage' through his page layout, particularly the layout of his stanzas. Hoccleve, she writes, 'seems to be concerned with engaging with his literary predecessor through his manuscript page': manuscripts construct intertextual engagement both in the words they transmit *and* in the *mise-en-page* which they use.[17] Ardis Butterfield, examining the scribal presentation of *Troilus and Criseyde* in extant manuscripts, has emphasised the importance of 'setting the *Troilus* manuscripts within a broad scribal practice' by 'situating them within a larger context: the manuscript culture of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century French secular writing.'[18] In what follows, then, I want to consider the *Romaunt of the Rose* in similar terms, investigating the ways in which the Glasgow manuscript might engage codicologically with *Le Roman de la Rose*, and with the interpretative traditions which surround it.

Sylvia Huot's comprehensive 1993 study of manuscripts of the *Rose* has demonstrated the extent to which the codicological presentation of the text materially articulates the ways in which it was interpreted by its scribes and readers.[19] This takes place in terms of large-scale reworkings, abridgements and interpolations within the text – the means by which many medieval readers, of whom Gui de Mori is perhaps the best-known,

reshaped the poem in line with their own readings, producing often very different manuscript recensions of the poem.[20] It also takes place through more local 'annotations, or […] programs of illustration [...and] rubrication.'[21] Considering detailed codicological presentation of the *Rose* in all of these areas across different manuscript witnesses allows Huot to 'discern the outlines of different medieval readings of the poem', and to show the ways in which readers' varied responses to it were articulated through the manuscript page.[22] *The Romaunt* is, I would like to suggest, one such 'reading of', or response to the *Rose*. Investigating its particular manuscript presentation in the Glasgow manuscript in the context of the broader evidence of the many manuscripts which transmit different forms of the French text allows it to be situated alongside – or, indeed, *within* – wider *Rose*-transmission patterns.[23] My aim here is emphatically *not* to reconstruct or identify a single *Rose*-manuscript source for the *Romaunt*; rather, it is to give a sense of the broadly-ranging 'larger context' of *Rose*-transmission, and of ways in which the Glasgow manuscript's presentation of the *Romaunt* could engage with 'broad scribal practice[s]' employed to structure and interpret the *Rose*.[24] The particular feature of the Glasgow manuscript which I want to focus on to do this is its champ initials and border decoration,[25] the most obvious, and most obviously consistent form of decoration employed by its designer(s).

Decorated initials of some kind feature in every manuscript of the *Rose* which I have seen: indeed, it is almost impossible to imagine a text so long being copied entirely without some organisational structure which divides it into parts. At the most simple level, initials take the form of pen and ink capital letters, usually using red and/or blue ink and usually two to three lines high. At a more elaborate level, there can be flourished initials,[26] painted, or historiated initials, sometimes with decorated borders. Very often, a hierarchy of differently-sized initials is used, with larger letters and/or borders used to signal major narrative divisions, and smaller ones sub-divisions. BnF MS fr. 1573, for example, uses a selection of

initials from ten lines tall to two lines tall.[27] Chalon-sur-Saône, Bib. mun. MS 33 contains an extremely careful and consistent decorative system which surrounds and shapes its *Rose*-text, with running headers on each folio (recto and verso) in red ink with blue paraphs, summarising the content of that folio; regular vernacular rubrication; a hierarchy of flourished initials in blue and red between three and seven lines tall, and Latin marginal glosses and notae, written in the same brown ink as the text, but boxed on three sides in red and each signalled with a red and blue paraph.

Tantalizing evidence remains that the Glasgow manuscript also may have employed this sort of hierarchy or range in its initial and border design. Currently, one border in the manuscript is considerably larger and more detailed than any of the others. This border appears on f. 57v of the manuscript, and it marks the moment at which Amours leaves l'Amant having given him his commandments: 'The god of loue whanne al the day | had taught me as ye haue herd say [...] he vanyshide awey al sodeynly' (f. 57v). Usually, this manuscript's champ initials are two lines tall; however, the 'T' from 'The' to which this border is attached is four lines high, and instead of being a champ initial in the usual style for the manuscript it is illuminated, containing images of foliage matching the foliage found in the border. The foliage in the initial has been arranged so that it forms a face with its tongue sticking out, and the appendage that forms the tongue is also found several times in the border, this time unmistakably as a penis also forming a spadix protruding from a stylised aroid flower.[28] The artist has included an erect and a non-erect version, and the flaccid penis appears in the border directly next to the lines in which l'Amant bemoans his love-wounds, which can only be cured by access to the Rose. While I would not wish to overstate the significance of this moment, it is worth noting that concerted and humorous engagement with the content or themes of a text on the part of a border artist it is not an unknown phenomenon.

Indeed, instances of it have been discussed specifically in relation to certain *Rose* manuscripts, particularly BnF MS fr. 25526.[29]

The large border at f. 57v of the Glasgow manuscript certainly highlights a key narrative transition in the *Rose*; it signals the moment at which Amours leaves l'Amant. L'Amant's first introduction to the important character Bel Acueil will follow in a few lines. However, it is one among many such moments, and it does now appear discordant that it should be given this high decorative status in the Glasgow manuscript when nowhere else at all in the narrative has apparently been marked in this way. In manuscripts of the *Rose*, the corresponding line to the *Romaunt*'s 'The god of loue whanne al the day | had taught me as ye haue herd say […]', 'Tout maintenant qu'amors m'ot | Son plesir dit...' (*Rose,* v. 2765) very often contains some decoration.[30] However, its degree is *always* consistent with a wider system of decorative features used throughout the manuscript in question: out of all the *Rose*-manuscripts I have examined, none places decoration here that is more extensive than, or otherwise different to that found at any other point, as the Glasgow manuscript now does. However, this manuscript is now missing eleven folios: could some or all of these have had similar heavy decoration to that which now appears out of place on f. 57v?[31] The border and illuminated initial would then have been part of a planned hierarchy or sequence of textual divisions within the *Romaunt*. One way of exploring this question is to consider further the patterns of decoration and textual division which can be discerned across a variety of *Rose*-manuscripts. Does the Glasgow manuscript participate in known and repeated systems of organising and decorating the text of the *Rose*? Can awareness of these systems shed light on the folios which have been removed from the manuscript?

The opening folio of the Glasgow manuscript is now missing, and comparison with the *Rose* would strongly suggest that the *Romaunt* contained a particularly elaborate border at its start, perhaps including a historiated intial. F. 1 apparently contained two lines of text

fewer than regular folios of the manuscript: this is not enough space into which to fit an opening miniature (unless it were placed largely in the upper margin of the manuscript, above the writing area). Historiated initials, however, sometimes do extend beyond the writing area into margins. More importantly, they usually occupy only half of the writing column in which they are found, meaning that the other half can still be used to contain text. The opening folio of the Chalon-sur-Saône manuscript, for example, opens with a historiated initial (with an attached border) depicting a dreamer in bed, dreaming of roses which only removes three full lines of writing space, because the initial is six lines tall (and extending taller into the upper margin), but only half a line wide. Decoration of opening folios on a more lavish scale than the rest of the manuscript, often including opening miniatures or historiated initials and borders, is a very common feature of *Rose*-manuscripts.[32] Of the sixteen containing only one miniature which have to date been digitized by the *Roman de la Rose* digital library, in twelve cases, that miniature occurs at the opening of the text.[33] Of the remaining four listed manuscripts, in each case the opening folio is now missing, rather than un-decorated.[34] The digitized *Rose* manuscripts containing more than one illumination similarly suggest that an opening miniature was an overwhelmingly popular choice; so far I have only found a single manuscript which, while containing illuminations, does *not* illuminate the opening page of the poem.[35] Viewed this context, it is likely that the Glasgow manuscript possessed a large amount of decoration on its opening folio.

In terms of the manuscript's other missing folios, it is possible to find decorative patterns in other *Rose* manuscripts which suggest that they could have contained points in the text which were singled out for decoration. For example, two consecutive folios are missing after what is now f. 27. These folios would have contained the narrator's description of Amours stalking him through the garden, his arrival beside Narcissus's fountain, in which he will first glimpse the Rose, along with the opening of the narrator's exposition of the story of

Narcissus. This exposition is the first of what Braet has called the 'récits intérieurs' which embed particular Classical narratives within the *Rose* (*Romaunt*, ll. 1361-1482).[36] Guilluame de Lorris's introduction of Narcissus at this moment in the poem was clearly recognized by readers, scribes and illuminators of the *Rose* as an extremely significant moment. The line 'Narcissus fu .i. damoisiaus' (*Rose*, v. 1436), corresponding to *Romaunt* l. 1469, 'Narcissus was a bachelere', is almost universally marked by an important degree of decoration (specific features are again dependent on the decorative scale of the manuscript in question). So, for example, in Paris, BnF MS fr. 24389, this moment is marked with a nine-line high illumination showing Narcissus looking into the fountain, at f. 11r. This manuscript only contains 21 illuminated images across the whole text of the *Rose*, so that the Narcissus moment is, here, one of relatively few to be singled out for a miniature.[37] In manuscripts without illuminations, too, this moment is often presented with an important degree of decoration. BnF MS fr. 19154, for example, uses two-line pen-flourished initials throughout in alternating red and blue to form its decorative scheme. Ff. 9r-10v of this manuscript contain the material corresponding to the missing two folios of the *Romaunt*, and several sections of the narrative clustered together are highlighted in this way on these folios – including 'Narcissus fu .i. demoisaus' (f. 10r). Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS Peniarth 5015D contains an extremely unusual marginal gloss, given in red ink alongside the decorated capital which begins the word 'Narcisus'. This gloss reads: 'la description narcis*us* et la cause de sa fortune' (f. 16r), a comment which specifically highlights the introduction of an intertextual 'récit intérieur'; *i.e.* the temporary move from the narrative of the *dreamer* to that of Narcissus. Habitually, this manuscript only employs marginal glosses sporadically, and only then to give one-word reminders of particular characters' names: such a long, interpretative gloss for this manuscript renders the moment particularly noteworthy. The Chalon-sur-Saône manuscript gives its line 'Narcisus fu uns damoisiaus' an enormous six-

line flourished initial, a size usually used in this codex only for major narrative shifts or extremely important moments; the most regular size is three lines (f. 7r). It is also introduced with a rubric: 'Co*mmen*t narcisus morut sus la fontaine de dessus le biau pyn'. Comparison with examples of decorating and organising the text of the *Rose*, then, suggests that the missing 'Narcissus' folios from the Glasgow manuscript may well have contained a much higher than normal level of decoration, perhaps similar to that now found on f. 57v of the manuscript.

The same is true of the four folios missing from between ff. 147 and 148 of the Glasgow manuscript. These would have contained most of the narrator's description of the characters Fauls Semblant and Abstinence Contrainte as they encounter Malebouche, and the beginning of their discussion with him. These episodes, once again, are very often distinguished by decoration in manuscripts of the *Rose*, particularly miniatures depicting the couple dressed as pilgrims, or as a nun and a monk or friar,[38] and/or in conversation with Malebouche. These images are often found at *Rose*, v. 12148, 'Quant li pelerin venu furent', which would correspond to *Romaunt*, l. 7473, 'Whan the pylgrymes co*m*men were', on a folio now missing from the Glasgow manuscript. Ten manuscripts listed on the *Roman de la Rose* digital library insert an illumination at this moment.[39] Furthermore, as with the introduction of Narcissus discussed above, many more manuscripts without illuminations, or with illuminations at other points, still choose to mark this moment prominently in different ways, following their own systems of decoration and textual organisation. BnF MS fr. 802, for example, inserts an illumination of Fauls Semblant and Abstinence Contrainte before *Rose*, v. 12033, 'Or vouz diroi la co*n*tenance | De fa*u*x s*emblant et* dabstine*n*ce' (f. 80v), a moment whose translation in the corresponding line in the Glasgow MS is also decorated with a champ and border (f. 147r: 'Nowe wol I sayne the contynaunce | Of falssemblant and abstynaunce'). The decorator of fr. 802 next inserts an illumination of the two speaking to

Malebouche at *Rose*, v. 12155, ‘Sire dist constraint abstinence | Por faire nostre penitence’ (f. 81v), a line whose translation would be found in the missing folios of the Glasgow manuscript. Between these two illuminations in fr. 802, four more lines are decorated with two-line flourished initials (in blue and red, or gold and dark blue), marking them as further subdivisions in the narrative; one of these four is the line ‘Q*ua*nt li pelerin venu fure*n*t’ (f. 81v). The other three all fall on lines which would also appear translated in the missing folios of the Glasgow manuscript. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden Supra 57, similarly, illuminates ‘Or vous dirai la contenance | De faux semblant et dabstina*n*ce’ (f. 86r-v), and thereafter uses repeated two-line decorated capitals to mark other divisions in the narrative; there are ten which would decorate the corresponding material in the missing folios of the *Romaunt* in the Glasgow manuscript (cf. Selden Supra 57, ff. 86v-87v), including one at ‘Quant li pelerins venuz furent’ (f. 87r).

The situation and patterning of champ initials and attached borders within the text of the *Romaunt* in the Glasgow manuscript in fact appears to correspond in a sustained way with patterns of textual divisions as they are created in different ways by scribes and decorators across many *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts. For example, of the first forty champs and borders in the Glasgow manuscript, twenty-two are found marking the same lines as two-line decorated initials with penwork in the corresponding section of the *Rose* in BnF MS fr. 24389. A further nine champs and borders are found within a few lines of their placement in this manuscript, and are clearly highlighting the same narrative moments. In BnF MS fr. 2195, twenty-three penwork initials match precisely with the first forty in the Glasgow manuscript and six more match within a few lines; in BnF MS fr. 25524, twenty-two match exactly and seven approximately; while in Arsenal, MS 2988, there are twenty-four exact matches and a further six approximate matches. When compared to one another, these *Rose*-manuscripts show similar kinds of overlap: while their placement of decorative features is

certainly not exactly identical at all points, there are nonetheless a lot of moments which are repeatedly marked across several or all of them, suggesting that placement of particular decorative features, such as decorated initials, in *Rose* manuscripts was not entirely subject to the choices of individual scribes, but due also to common and shared patterns of layout, decoration and textual division which were transmitted between manuscript copies.[40] The patterns of decorative correspondence between the *Rose*-manuscript examples and the presentation of the *Romaunt* in the Glasgow manuscript would suggest that the scribe or the overall designer of this manuscript (or its exemplar(s)) may well have been basing the arrangement and placement of their decorated initials on common layouts of *Rose*-manuscripts which he or she had seen.

What I hope to have begun to demonstrate in this brief analysis is that close attention to manuscript layout and design can be an important method of uncovering the *Romaunt*'s participation in widespread, cross-channel traditions of discussing, interpreting and responding to *Le Roman de la Rose* – a suggestion which, hopefully, will have some further-reaching consequences for critical approaches to the translation itself. Most particularly, I would argue, we urgently need to move away from 'fragmenting' the *Romaunt* – either because we consider it to be incomplete or unfinished as a translation of the *Rose*, or because we are only interested in pinpointing and discussing what has traditionally been considered Chaucer's contribution. The codicological evidence which the Glasgow manuscript preserves, however, suggests that the *Romaunt* has more to offer in terms of complex engagement with the *Rose* than many of us have hitherto allowed. The *Romaunt* is more than 'fragments': its *mise-en-page* in the Glasgow manuscript presents a coherently-decorated and deliberately-ordered text, which responds visually and organisationally to the *Rose*.

[1] The term 'bestseller' is widely employed about the *Rose*, due to the fact that it survives in more than 300 manuscript copies; see e.g. Alastair Minnis, *Magister Amoris: The Roman de la Rose and Vernacular Hermeneutics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 33. For the *Rose* (edited from two of the possible 300+ manuscripts), see *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Armand Strubel (Paris: Livre de Poche, 1992). For the *Romaunt*, see *The Romaunt of the Rose and Le Roman de la Rose: A Parallel-text Edition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967) and *The Riverside Chaucer*, gen. ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). Sutherland and *Riverside* provide two different texts of the *Romaunt*: Sutherland uses William Thynne's 1532 *Romaunt* (printed as part of *The Werkes of Geffray Chaucer*; STC 5068) as his base text, while *Riverside* uses the most complete surviving manuscript witness, Glasgow, University Library MS Hunter 409. For the recent dating of this manuscript to the 1430s, and the identification of the area in which it was produced, see Holly James-Maddocks, 'Collaborative Manuscript Production: Illuminators and their Scribes in Fifteenth-Century London', 2 volumes (Ph.D Diss., University of York, 2013), vol. 1, pp. 209-13, pp. 227-33. Hunter 409 was, in fact, Thynne's copy-text; however, it has been demonstrated that he corrected and altered its text either with a copy of the *Rose* or with a second copy of the *Romaunt*; see Simon Horobin, 'A New Fragment of the *Romaunt of the Rose*', *SAC* 28 (2006), 205-15. For a full description of the Glasgow MS, see Young and Aitken, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of the Hunterian Museum in the University of Glasgow* (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1908) and Linne Mooney, Simon Horobin, and Estelle Stubbs, *Late Medieval English Scribes* <http://www.medievalscribes.com> [accessed 23 August 2012].

[2] This is a question to which I give much fuller attention in my forthcoming study, *Contest, Translation and the Chaucerian Text* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015). On the *Romaunt*'s usual classification as immature or 'apprentice' Chaucer, see, e.g., Alfred David's comments in *Riverside*, p. 1104, or Jordi Sanchez-Martí, 'Chaucer's 'makyng' of the *Romaunt of the Rose*', *Journal of English Studies* 3 (2001-2002), 217-36. For a critique of long-standing approaches to Chaucer's translations from French which characterise those works as 'early' and 'derivative', see Ardis Butterfield, *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language and Nation in the Hundred Years' War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 269-76, esp. p. 271 on Chaucer's 'early phase'.

[3] Charles Dahlberg gives a comprehensive summary of the long-running nineteenth- and twentieth-century discussions which focus on isolating and interpreting textual and metrical evidence which would suggest more than one translator, and on establishing the identity of one of these putative translators as Chaucer: *The Romaunt of the Rose*, A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, VII (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), pp. 5-24.

[4] See Sutherland, xi, *Riverside*, p. 1103 and esp. Simon Horobin, *The Language of the Chaucer Tradition* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003), pp. 139-40.

[5] Sutherland, p. xvi-xxxiv.

[6] Dahlberg, p. 5.

[7] Lindner, 'Die englische Übersetzung des Romans von der Rose', *Englische Studien* 11 (1887), 163-73.

[8] See W. W. Skeat, 'The Three Fragments of the *Romaunt of the Rose*', *Academy*, August 15th 1891, p. 137 and *The Chaucer Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900), pp. 92-93. I discuss particular ways in which some of the Glasgow manuscript's features might be interpreted in the light of Skeat's hypothesis in my forthcoming study.

[9] See, e.g., the essays in *Interpreting and Collecting Fragments of Medieval Books*, ed. Linda Brownrigg and Margaret Smith (London: The Red Gull Press, 2000).

[10] For the *Romaunt* as disappointingly 'fragmentary' version of the *Rose*, see e.g. *Riverside*, p. 686 or Skeat, *Chaucer Canon*, pp. 65-66. For overwhelming interest in the 'Chaucer fragment' (i.e. A), to the total exclusion of other parts of the translation, see e.g. Sanchez-Martí, or Caroline D. Eckhardt, 'The Art of Translation in the *Romaunt of the Rose*', *SAC* 6 (1984), 41-63: these studies restrict their discussions of the text to 'Fragment A', precisely *because* of its putative connection to Chaucer, a tendency which has been very marked ever since the first discussions of the *Romaunt* in the nineteenth century.

[11] For a recent argument about the inaccuracy of the term 'fragment' when used to describe the textual division of the *Canterbury Tales* in its surviving manuscript forms, see Robert J. Meyer-Lee, 'Abandon the Fragments', *SAC* 35 (2013), 47-83, esp. pp. 49-50 and p. 76.

[12] Unclear because not all versions of the *Rose* in fact end the text at the same point. We do not know where the translator intended to finish his or her translation, although the abrupt ending mid-climactic-episode (Fauls Semblant and Abstinence Contrainte are murdering Malebouche) points to the loss of some text. I use the French names throughout for these and other *Rose*-characters for ease of comparison.

[13] See Dahlberg, pp. 48-50 on the disordering.

[14] Indeed, the discovery in 2009 of an *actual* codicological fragment, a single leaf which comprises all that is left of a different manuscript of the *Romaunt*, underlines this point forcefully; see Horobin, 'A New Fragment'.

[15] See James-Maddocks on the professional relationships between scribe and limner in Hunter 409.

[16] 'Designing the Page' in ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin, *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 79-103.

[17] Aditi Nafde, 'Hoccleve's Hands: The *Mise-en-Page* of the Autograph and Nonautograph Manuscripts', *JEBS* 16 (2013), 55-83 (p. 62).

[18] Ardis Butterfield, '*Mise-en-page* in the *Troilus* manuscripts: Chaucer and French Manuscript Culture', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 58 (1995), 49-80 (p. 52).

[19] Sylvia Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, Manuscript Transmission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). For *Rose*-manuscripts, see also the seminal *Les Manuscrits du 'Roman de la Rose': description et classement*, by Ernest Langlois (Lille: Tallandier, 1910).

[20] Cf. Ardis Butterfield's comments on Gui de Mori's reworking of the *Rose*: 'Gui's role moves with astonishing fluidity between those of reader, scribe and author [...] Gui positions himself as a third kind of author figure, somewhere between reader and scribe', 'Articulating the Author: Gower and the French Manuscript Codex', *Yearbook of English Studies* 33 (2003), 80-96 (p. 86). On Gui, see also David Hult, *Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Readership and Authority in the First 'Roman de la Rose'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

[21] Huot, p. 11.

[22] Huot, p. 18.

[23] In order to do this, I have made use of the large and fully searchable sample of *Rose* manuscripts reproduced by the Johns Hopkins *Roman de la Rose Digital Library* (which holds full digital reproductions of more than 130 *Rose* manuscripts), supplemented by my own examinations of non-digitized manuscripts. See <<www.romandelarose.org>> [accessed March 2014].

[24] Cf. Butterfield's comments on 'the importance of seeking wider cultural perspectives' rather than focusing on 'the notion of a source' or 'single and definable moments of transference', '*Mise-en-page*', p. 50.

[25] I discuss other features of the manuscript at greater length in my forthcoming study. For champ initials, see Kathleen Scott, 'Limning and Book-Producing Terms and Signs *in situ* in Late Medieval English Manuscripts: A First Listing', *New Science out of Old Books: Studies in Manuscripts and Early Printed Books*, ed. Richard Beadle and A. J. Piper (London: British Library, 1995), pp. 142-88, pp. 145-58, and *Dated and Datable English Manuscript Borders, c. 1395-1499* (London: British Library, 2002), pp.10-11.

[26] I use 'flourished initials' in the sense outlined by Martha Driver and Michael Orr: 'non-illuminated penned initials with pen flourishing extending in to the margin', 'Decorating and Illustrating the Page', in Gillespie and Wakelin, pp. 104-28 (p. 109).

[27] See, e.g., the opening two folios of this manuscript, in which the first letter of the text is given a ten-line decorated initial, and subsequent sections of the narrator's introduction to the dream are given two-line or three-line initials, before the vices on the walls of Déduit's garden are introduced with four-line initials.

[28] On the terms 'spadix' and 'aroid', see Kathleen Scott, *English Manuscript Borders*, Glossary. Scott defines an aroid flower as 'a fantastic or pseudo flower with a spadix […] in various possible forms… a favourite stylized flower of much fifteenth-century English border decoration' (p. 121). The aroid flowers in the Glasgow manuscript have been identified as exaggerated 'Lords and Ladies' or Cuckoo Pint; cf. Nigel Thorp on the artist's 'exuberant play' with their

'suggestive appearance', *The Glory of the Page: Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts from Glasgow University Library* (London: Harvey Millar, 1987), p. 89, no. 36.

[29] See Michael Camille, *Image on the Edge: The Margins of Medieval Art* (London: Reaktion, 1992) on deliberately-executed 'visual play' in margins (p. 31). For fr. 25526, see Huot, pp. 286-322 and Herman Braet, 'Entre folie et raison: les drôleries du MS. B. N., fr. 25526', *Risus Medievalis: Laughter in Medieval Literature and Art*, ed. Herman Braet, Guido Latré and Werner Verbeke (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), pp. 43-74.

[30] See e.g. BnF MS fr. 2195, f. 18r; BnF MS fr. 22524, f. 45r; BnF MS fr. 24389, f. 19v; BnF MS fr. 1571, f. 17v; BnF MS fr. 380, f. 19v; Arsenal, MS 2988, f. 24r, all of which use a decorated capital of some kind or a rubric to highlight the line beginning 'Tout maintenant'. Fr. 24389 also decorates this moment with a miniature, as do several other manuscripts, including Cologny, Fondation Martin Bodmer MS Bodmer 79; Arsenal, MS 3338 and the privately-owned Ferrell *Rose*.

[31] Graham Caie hypothesises that the eleven missing folios could have contained illuminations, <<www.memmss.arts.gla.ac.uk/html/pilot>> [accessed 8 July 2012]; however, apart from the opening folio, I believe this is unlikely. The number of lines omitted from the *Romaunt* in the case of each missing folio except folio 1 (to which I return) are an exact match with the number of lines appearing in the appropriate places in William Thynne's 1532 printed edition of the *Romaunt* – which, we recall, used the Glasgow manuscript as its copy-text. If there had been illuminations on these folios, the images would have taken up some line space, so that the correspondence between missing folios and number of missing lines would not have been so exact.

[32] On opening miniatures, see Alfred Kuhn, 'Die Illustration der Handschriften des *Rosenromans*', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 31 (1912), 1-66 and Herman Braet, 'Du Portrait de l'Auteur dans *Le Roman de la Rose*', *Medieval Manuscripts in Transition: Tradition and Creative Recycling*, ed. Geert Claassens and Werner Verbeke (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006), pp. 81-99.

[33] These manuscripts are: the privately-owned Cox Macro *Rose*, Versailles, Bib. mun. MS 153, Rouen, Bib. mun. MS 1056, BnF MSS fr. 24391, 22551, 19154, 1572, 804, 803, 800, 797 and MS naf. 28047.

[34] These are BnF MSS fr. 799 and 939, and MSS naf 5094 and 28001.

[35] This is Amiens, Bib. mun. MS 437, in which the *Rose* contains two illuminations, neither of which are at its opening. The first letter of the *Rose* is, however, a historiated initial in this manuscript.

[36] Herman Braet, 'Narcisse et Pygmalion: Mythe et Intertexte dans *Le Roman de la Rose*', *Medieval Antiquity*, ed. Andreis Welkenhuysen (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995), pp. 237-54 (p. 238). On the importance of the Narcissus episode for the *Rose* as a whole, see also Sylvia Huot, *Dreams of Lovers and Lies of Poets; Poetry, Knowledge and Desire in the 'Roman de la Rose'* (London: Legenda, 2010), pp. 16-20.

[37] A search of the *Roman de la Rose* Digital Library's collection returns 24 manuscripts which contain an illumination of Narcissus at the fountain. Most place it at this point in the text. On the iconography of Narcissus within the *Rose* and for further manuscripts which illuminate this moment, see Alcuin Blamires and Gail C. Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated: Manuscripts at the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2002), pp. 72-74.

[38] For a brief discussion of this iconographic trend, see Guy Geltner, 'Faux Semblants: Antifraternalism Reconsidered in Jean de Meun and Chaucer', *Studies in Philology* 101 (2004), 357-80 (pp. 359-60, esp. n. 8).

[39] BnF MSS fr. 380, 1559, 9345, 12588, 12595; Paris, Assemblée nationale MS 1230; Geneva, Fondation Martin Bodmer, MS Bodmer 79; Châlons-en-Champagne, Bib. mun., MS 270; Arras, Bib. mun., MS 897 and the privately-owned Ferrell *Rose*.

[40] Kuhn suggests that repeated iconographic trends – for example, in the layout, composition and framing of opening illuminations – can be perceived within illuminations across very many copies of the *Rose*. Braet, 'Du Portrait d'Auteur' (pp. 82-84), suggests ways in which the common composition of many *Rose* opening illuminations itself often mimics traditional and established iconography used when depicting the Evangelists.