2-2010

Versions of Pygmalion in the Illuminated Roman de la Rose (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Douce 195): The Artist and the Work of Art

Marian Bleeke
Cleveland State University, m.bleeke@csuohio.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clart_facpub

Part of the [Art and Design Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)
How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Publisher's Statement

This is the accepted version of the following article: 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, no. 1 (February 2010): 28-53., which has been published in final form at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8365.2009.00721.x/abstract>

Recommended Citation

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, no. 1 (February 2010): 28-53.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Art and Design at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Art and Design Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

Versions of Pygmalion in the Illuminated *Roman de la Rose* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Douce 195): The Artist and the Work of Art

Marian Bleeker

The *Roman de la Rose* is an acknowledged medieval best seller, its former popularity amongst patrons and readers being indexed by the number of surviving manuscript copies of the poem, over three hundred, in libraries around the world today. Many of these manuscripts are illuminated and this provides a second sign of the poem's popularity in the resources that medieval patrons and producers were willing to lavish on its physical form.¹ Among the most elaborately illuminated copies of the *Roman de la Rose* is the late fifteenth-century manuscript known as Ms. Douce 195, which is one of a number of luxurious books produced by the illuminator Robert (or Robinet) Testard for Charles d'Orléans, Comte d'Angoulême, and his wife Louise de Savoy.² This manuscript's rich programme of imagery includes an unusual sequence of miniatures illustrating the so-called 'Pygmalion digression' that appears near the end of the poem. Where most *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts include one or two miniatures for this portion of the text, Ms. Douce 195 contains a sequence of nine images that covers the complete story of Pygmalion, from the creation of his sculpture through to his giving thanks for its animation.³ This article focuses on differences between the story of Pygmalion as told in the text of the *Roman de la Rose* and in Testard's miniatures in Ms. Douce 195, differences that I see as deliberate and meaningful.

The modern scholarly study of *Roman de la Rose* miniatures has its origins in the work of John Fleming. For Fleming, *Rose* illuminations acted as a 'gloss' on the poem's text: they were dependent on that text and they revealed its deeper meaning.⁴ In recent years this approach to the miniatures has come under criticism from two opposite and contradictory directions. On the one hand, some scholars have questioned Fleming's approach as attributing too much significance to the images and too much interpretive agency to their makers. Alcuin Blamires and Gail Holian, for example, argue that the illuminators were not literary critics but professional craftspeople, who were engaged not in advanced textual analysis but in workshop practices designed to speed and ease the production of images for economic reasons.⁵ However, I would question the relevance of these concerns for Ms. Douce 195 in particular. Robert Testard after all produced this manuscript while working as a court artist for Charles d'Orléans and Louise de Savoy, which would have placed him outside of the typical economic pressures on manuscript production. Furthermore, his employers were both noted bibliophiles who may have allowed him to lavish time and thought on the book's illuminations.⁶

On the other hand, a second group of scholars has criticized Fleming's approach as actually attributing too little significance to the images and too little agency to

Detail of Robert Testard, *Lover approaches the Fountain of Narcissus*, late fifteenth century (plate 12).

1 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion working on his sculpture*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 149r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

their artists. As Suzanne Lewis has written, using the Rose miniatures as a means to understand its text renders them redundant to that text and finally superfluous to it.⁷ For Sylvia Huot, the illuminators of Rose manuscripts stand alongside their scribes and the authors of various textual interpolations as active readers and re-writers of the poem.⁸ This approach to the miniatures is a good fit for Ms. Douce 195 for, as Deborah McGrady and Stephen Nichols have both demonstrated, Testard's miniatures in this manuscript frequently depart from the text of the Rose in ways that appear to be deliberate and therefore

meaningful.⁹ The best evidence of Testard's agency as an artist, however, comes from his use of prints as sources for his illuminations in another manuscript, the Hours of Charles d'Angoulême. As Kathrin Giogoli and John Friedman argue in an extensive article on Testard's work, his adaptations and modifications of his sources demonstrate his freedom as an artist and his ability to make new meanings in his miniatures.¹⁰

Scholarship on the Pygmalion sequence in Ms. Douce 195 has a history similar to that on the *Roman de la Rose* miniatures in general. Charles Dahlberg included the entire sequence as illustrations to his influential translation of the poem. In his introduction to the volume, Dahlberg explains that he, like Fleming, understands the miniatures as a gloss on the text and that he sees the Pygmalion sequence in particular as illustrating its ironies.¹¹ More recently, Michael Camille has set the Pygmalion miniatures within a broader context of medieval attitudes towards love and desire, writing that the Pygmalion's creation of his own object of desire exemplifies the objectification of the female body by the male gaze.¹² Camille's reading of the sequence has the advantage of recognizing the gendered power dynamics at work in its depiction of the relationship between the artist and the work of art, the relationship that is the focus of my argument in this paper.

This essay follows on from Huot, McGrady, and Nichols' analyses in focusing on differences between the Pygmalion story as told in the text of the *Rose* and in Testard's miniatures. To understand these differences, I turn to the text of the poem and to its modern scholarly exegesis, in particular scholarship that reads the Pygmalion digression along with the Narcissus episode in the first part of the poem as the Rose poets' reflections on poetry itself. Here I reverse Fleming's original critical priorities

by using the text to advance my understanding of Testard's illuminations, for my interest in his Pygmalion sequence is in what it reveals of late Medieval/early Renaissance attitudes towards art and artists, rather than what it may contribute to the meaning of the poem. I will argue that Testard's Pygmalion sequence represents his reflection on the changing status of both the artist and the work of art as it narrates an increase in status for the artist at the cost of a reduced stature for the sculpture as work of art. The final section of this article extends this argument by examining Testard's images of images and his use of frames in miniatures throughout Ms. Douce 195.

Living, Lifelike, and Lively

The first miniature in the Pygmalion sequence in Ms. Douce 195, which shows Pygmalion working on his sculpture, is one of Testard's more conventional images (plate 1). In the group of over two hundred illuminated *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts, this scene is shown in three guises that differ primarily in how the sculpture itself is represented: vertically, horizontally, or horizontally in the form of a medieval effigy tomb.¹³ The sculpting scene in Ms. Douce 195 belongs to the third type, for the sculpture as an object appears as a block of stone that lies directly on the floor with the image emerging in relief from the block's top surface. Previously scholars have understood this resemblance between the sculpture and an effigy tomb as emphasizing its original status as a 'dead' or inanimate object. For Fleming, the representation of the sculpture as a dead thing reinforced his interpretation of the poem as an allegory of idolatry; the pursuit of mere things, whether the sculpture or the rose, as a form of false religion.¹⁴ For Michael Camille as well, the dead quality of the sculpture contributed to the overall meaning of the poem as a contest between art and nature in which nature triumphs because it alone is able to produce life.¹⁵

However, in his general consideration of the idea of a 'moving' statue, Kenneth Gross questions what it means for a sculpture to be conceived as dead: is a dead thing simply a lifeless thing? Or, if something is now dead, does that not suggest that it once lived? Does death not thus contain within itself the promise and possibility of life? Furthermore, what does it mean for a dead body to be presented as a sculpture? Does sculpture not work to deny death by fixing the body against decomposition?¹⁶ Gross' suggested reading of the sculpture itself as 'dead' is a good fit for the type of tomb effigy referenced by Testard's sculpture in Ms. Douce 195. As a range of scholars from Erwin Panofsky to Paul Binski have written, this type of tomb sculpture does not represent a dead body but instead combines the deathly connotations of a low and horizontal posture with striking signs of life, including open eyes and active gestures.¹⁷

This combination of signs for both death and life served to locate the tomb effigy on the borderline between the two states.¹⁸ According to Phillippe Ariès, it suggests that the medieval patrons and producers of such images conceived of death as a life-like state of sleep: asleep the dead would wait for the end of time and for their eventual return to life in the resurrection of the body, a return anticipated by the liveliness of their sculpted forms.¹⁹ This liveliness was further reinforced by the tombs' ongoing active role in the process of salvation. As both Binski and Rachel Dressler have observed, effigy tombs frequently included inscriptions that directly addressed their viewers, soliciting prayers for the deceased and promising in return a reduction in the viewers' own time in Purgatory.²⁰ In sum, both visually and in practice, tomb effigies were not dead images but were surprisingly lively. Therefore the resemblance between Pygmalion's sculpture and such a tomb does not reinforce the sculpture's status as dead but instead suggests its life.

2 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion and his sculpture*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 149r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

The suggestion of liveliness that is somewhat paradoxically produced by the sculpture's resemblance to a tomb effigy is reinforced in the subsequent miniatures in Testard's Pygmalion sequence. In the second miniature the sculpture shifts from a horizontal to a vertical position, it stands up, and this shift accompanies an overall transformation in its bodily form (plate 2). The sculpture's form is somewhat hazy in the first miniature, but it seems to be flat on its back with its arms and legs extended in long straight lines. In the second miniature, however, it appears to have its weight shifted onto its right leg, its left leg relaxed with its knee slightly bent and its toes turned out, its right hip extended, and its right shoulder lowered. This new posture approximates to a classical contrapposto pose and suggests a mobility and flexibility to the sculpture's body. It also now holds a piece of cloth that drapes over its body and conceals its genitals, which suggests a reaction of modesty on its part as it appears nude in front of Pygmalion. Likewise, it seems to have ducked its head and lowered its eyes. Finally, the sculpture's right arm is now bent and its right hand extends out towards Pygmalion in a gesture that breaks the frame of stone surrounding it.²¹ The stone surrounding and the stony grey colour of the sculpture itself reinforce the fact that it is still a stone sculpture even though it twists and bends, acts and reacts.

3 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion kneels in front of his sculpture*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 149v, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

The sculpture retains this bodily shape in the third miniature in Testard's sequence but Pygmalion's posture changes, suggesting his reaction to its actions (plate 3). In the second miniature, he stands facing away from the sculpture but looks back over his shoulder towards it and raises one hand towards its face. It appears as if he had been ignoring the sculpture while working at the table behind him, but then it reached out to him, perhaps even spoke to him (if its gesture can be read as a speech gesture) and he responded by turning to look at it. His gesture to his face connotes confusion even as it resembles a traditional gesture representing regret or despair. In the third miniature Pygmalion is again turned away from the sculpture and looks back over his shoulder at it, which again suggests that it has taken the initiative in calling for his attention and further suggests that he is reluctant to engage with it. He has now sunk to his knees and so is lower than the sculpture within the frame of the image, which indicates its power over him. Because of his kneeling position, furthermore, his eyes are on a level with its outstretched hand, which further suggests that his look is a response to its call. Finally he has drawn his hands together in a

prayer gesture but his position facing away from the sculpture makes the significance of this gesture ambiguous: is he praying to the sculpture? Or is he praying to get away from it?

The rubric that accompanies this miniature suggests an answer to that question as it states that 'Pygmalion asks for mercy/grace from his image.'²² Reading the rubric and the image together, his prayer or supplication would be directed at the image. Reading the rubric likewise reinforces Pygmalion's subordination to the sculpture through his supplication of it and its power over him as the potential dispenser of mercy or grace. The rubric for the preceding miniature also reinforces this reading as it states that 'Pygmalion is surprised/overcome by the beauty of the image.'²³ The passive construction of this piece of text positions Pygmalion as responding to the sculpture, which is attributed with initiative and power, in the form of its beauty. However, reading the rubrics in this way opens the question of the relationship between text and image in this particular manuscript: should we expect to find such a close match between them? In fact, reading the text of the *Roman de la Rose* reveals significance differences in the story of Pygmalion as it is told in the poem and in Testard's miniatures.

Up to this point in the story, the poem admits some ambiguity in the status of the sculpture. On the one hand, it describes the newly created image as 'so pleasing, so exquisite, that it seemed as live as the most beautiful living creature.'²⁴ Pygmalion is confused by it: 'He did not know whether she was alive or dead' for when he touched the sculpture he thought that 'she was like putty, that the flesh gave way under his touch.'²⁵ These points in the text of the poem can be traced back to its Ovidian source: in the *Metamorphoses*, the newly created sculpture is described as having 'all the appearance of a real girl, so that it seemed to be alive, to want to move' and when Pygmalion first kisses and touches it he imagines that it kisses him back and that his fingers sink into its soft flesh.'²⁶ The *Roman de la Rose*, however, clarifies that Pygmalion

is actually feeling his own flesh yielding beneath the pressure of his touch and thus emphasizes the sculpture's lack of life. Pygmalion goes on to despair of loving something that is 'deaf and mute, that neither stirs nor moves nor will ever show me grace'.²⁷ He complains that when he embraces and kisses the sculpture it remains 'as rigid as a post and so very cold that my mouth is chilled when I touch her to kiss her'.²⁸ The sculpture as it appears in the first three miniatures in the Ms. Douce 195 sequence may be cold as indicated by its grey colour, but it is not at all rigid as it seems to move and perhaps even speak. Testard's miniatures thus contradict the text of the *Roman de la Rose* by emphasizing instead the signs of the sculpture's life.

If the sculpture as represented in Testard's miniatures does not closely correspond to its description in the text of the poem, it does seem to register broader ideas in later medieval culture about the potential liveliness of images. First, its transformation in bodily form from the initial creation scene to the second and third miniatures seems to picture the growing naturalism of Gothic sculptural style. As Michael Camille describes in terms of images of the Virgin, Gothic sculptures seem to 'come to life' as they twist and bend their bodies into 'great Gothic S curves', medieval versions of the contrapposto pose that Testard's sculpture adopts as well.²⁹ The liveliness of such sculptures did not depend solely on their visual lifelikeness or naturalistic style, however, but also on their animation through miraculous action. In collections of miracle stories, images of the Virgin in particular break out of the realm of representation to act in the real world; grabbing hold of an artist to rescue him as the devil pushes him off a ladder, striking a nun overtaken by desire for a clerk, reproving a clerk who has criticized the image's form, and wiping the sweat from the brow of a jongleur who performs in front of it, for example.³⁰ Testard's sculpture acts similarly as its gesture breaks out of its frame of grey stone and into the real world of the miniature beyond.

Mediating between the poles of visual lifelikeness and miraculous liveliness were medieval image practices that treated sculptures as if they were alive and so deliberately drew them over the borderline between representation and reality. Such practices included dressing images in real clothes and adorning them with real jewellery.³¹ Pygmalion takes this next step in both the images in Ms. Douce 195 and the text of the *Roman de la Rose*. In the fourth of Testard's miniatures, Pygmalion sews the sculpture into its clothes (plate 4). The setting for this image has changed from a workshop to a domestic environment and Pygmalion's appearance has likewise changed; he has lost his workman's apron and gained a red hat and green sleeves along with a distinctly dopey facial expression. He has apparently taken the sculpture home with him and integrated it into his daily life, although judging by his expression that does not seem to have been a good idea. Finally, the sculpture too has transformed once again. Its stone background has disappeared so that it now shares real space with Pygmalion. Likewise, it has lost the overall grey tone that blended it in with that stone background and reinforced its status as an image. Now its skin is a pale white, its lips are red, and its clothing adds colour to its body. The sculpture's colour in this miniature serves as a reminder that medieval sculptures were commonly painted, a practice that added to their visual lifelikeness.³²

This fourth miniature corresponds much more closely to the text of the *Roman de la Rose*. At this point in the poem Pygmalion delights in dressing, undressing, and redressing the sculpture. He even adds ribbons and garlands to its hair and accessorizes its outfits with earrings, golden pins, a girdle and a purse, and stockings and shoes.³³ Some of these accessories appear in the background of Testard's miniature. If this image is a much closer match for the text of the poem than the text at this

4 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion dresses his sculpture*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 150r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

point diverges from its Ovidian source as it expands upon Pygmalion's treatment of the sculpture as if it were already alive.³⁴ As the text departs from its ancient source it too seems to register medieval image practices, as images were dressed and re-dressed for different feasts and festivals, as well as repainted to renew their colouring and to mark special occasions. As Michael Camille observes, if the addition of colour and clothing made medieval sculptures more visually lifelike, such changes to their appearances added to their overall liveliness.³⁵

Agency, Initiative, and Desire

In the text of the *Roman de la Rose*, Pygmalion's dressing and adorning of the sculpture culminates as he places rings upon its finger and declares himself married to it.

At this point the text again diverges from its Ovidian source as, in the *Metamorphoses*, Pygmalion and the sculpture do not marry until after its transformation into a living woman. Likewise, the gift of rings to a sculpture again corresponds with medieval image practices and image lore. Rings were commonly given as gifts to images and even the gift of a ring to a sculpture as a marriage token was not unknown.³⁶ Pygmalion's gift of rings to the sculpture recalls a group of medieval tales in which a man places a ring on the finger of a sculpture, either an antique image of Venus or an image of the Virgin, and that act has serious unintended consequences for his future.³⁷ This group of tales provides an important intertext for both the *Roman de la Rose* and Testard's miniatures, even though the Pygmalion sequence in Ms. Douce 195 does not include the gift of the rings.

The earliest identified version of this tale-type appears in William of Malmesbury's twelfth-century *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*. In this version, a recently married young man places his wedding ring on the finger of a sculpture of Venus for safekeeping while he plays ball with his friends. After the ball game, he returns to retrieve his ring but finds that the sculpture has bent its finger so that the ring cannot be removed. Later that night, as he gets into bed with his wife, he feels something come in between the two of them and then the something speaks, saying 'Lie with me who you married tonight. I am Venus on whose finger you placed your ring and I will not give it back.'³⁸ It continues to come in between him and his wife until he tells the whole story to his parents. They take him to see a priest skilled in necromancy, who is finally able to retrieve his ring.

Such medieval tales differ from the Pygmalion story as told in the *Metamorphoses* and taken into the text of the *Roman de la Rose* on two crucial points. First, Pygmalion is both the sculpture's maker and its lover. These two roles are closely associated in Ovid's text in particular because his version of Pygmalion is largely a story about the power of artistic creation; the artist's ability to make something lifelike becoming his power to make something live, albeit with divine assistance.³⁹ In the medieval ring tales, however, the man is not the maker of the sculpture but simply a viewer. Indeed the tales make no mention of the makers of these images. Secondly, in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Roman de la Rose*, agency, initiative, and desire clearly belong to Pygmalion. His desire for the sculpture begins as soon as he sees it and he immediately begins to treat it like a human being, while it remains entirely unresponsive. Its eventual animation rests on his initiative as he prays to Venus. Only after his appeal to the goddess does the sculpture-turned-woman begin to act, in reaction to his advances. In the ring tales, however, initiative, agency, perhaps even desire, are all attributed to the sculpture. In William of Malmesbury's version of the tale, the man has no intentions towards the sculpture when he places his ring on its finger; he is simply using it as a convenient ring-holder. In Gautier de Coincy's version of the Marian miracle, the man does pledge his love to the sculpture and place his ring on its finger as a love token, but then he forgets all about it.⁴⁰ If the placing of the ring thus means little or nothing to the men in these tales, the sculptures take that act very seriously as establishing a marital bond between them.⁴¹ The sculptures then actively pursue the men; appearing in their beds, coming between them and their human wives, reproaching them for inconstancy, and insisting upon prior claims to their affections.⁴² For the men, this relationship with the sculpture is undesired and rather undesirable.

As agency, initiative, even desire are given to the sculptures in the ring tales so these tales provide an intertext for the first few images in Testard's Pygmalion sequence in Ms. Douce 195. As Testard departs from the text of the Pygmalion

5 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion makes music for his sculpture*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 150v, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

digression, he too attributes agency and initiative to the sculpture. It appears to act well before Pygmalion asks for its animation. It seems to actively solicit his attentions while he only responds to its call. He even seems reluctant to engage with it and when he does so, it is to his detriment, as that dopey smile spreads over his face. Testard thus appears to have incorporated medieval image lore, in the form of the ring tales, along with medieval image types and medieval image practices into his miniatures for the *Pygmalion* digression. Each of these medieval

aspects of Testard's miniatures, furthermore, works to emphasize the animation and the agency of the sculpture at the expense of its sculptor. If Ovid's version of *Pygmalion* was a story of artistic prowess, of the human power to shape matter into art, these medieval aspects of Testard's miniatures emphasize instead the power of images to shape human lives.

The sculpture's ascendancy in Testard's *Pygmalion* miniatures climaxes in the fifth miniature, at the midpoint of the sequence (plate 5). Here, *Pygmalion* seeks to please the sculpture by making music for it. This miniature corresponds to a long passage in the text of the poem in which he sings, plays on a variety of musical instruments, and dances; he even takes the sculpture by the hand to try and bring it into the dance with him.⁴³ Like the dressing up of the sculpture, this passage represents an expansion on Ovid's version of the *Pygmalion* story. Coming after the long passage on *Pygmalion*'s dressing of the sculpture, his music making reinforces the sense of excessiveness in his regard for it.⁴⁴ However, unlike his image of *Pygmalion* dressing the sculpture, Testard's miniature of *Pygmalion*'s music making departs once again from the text of the *Roman de la Rose*. The sculpture now appears seated under a cloth of honour. The shift in its position reinforces the sense of its mobility and activity, while the cloth of honour emphasizes its power and authority. *Pygmalion* is once again lower than the sculpture within the frame of the miniature, as he sits on a low stool at its feet. The position of his body mirrors the shape of the musical instruments that appear in front of him, which suggests that he is little more than an instrument himself, something that is for the amusement and entertainment of sculpture.

This music-making scene represents the apex of the sculpture's power in Testard's *Pygmalion* sequence, for the story takes a decisive turn in the subsequent miniatures. The next two scenes seem to constitute a new beginning for *Pygmalion*'s story as the two appear together on a single page of the manuscript in an arrangement that

6 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion takes his sculpture to bed*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 151r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

7 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion prays to Venus*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 151r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

8 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion and his transformed sculpture*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 151v, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

duplicates the positioning of the first two miniatures in the sequence (the other miniatures appear one per page) and as these two miniatures recall and rework aspects of the sequence's initial images. Beginning with these two scenes and continuing through the rest of Testard's sequence, the power in their relationship shifts from the sculpture to Pygmalion.

In the first of these miniatures, Pygmalion lays the sculpture on a bright red bed (plate 6). The bed's colour emphasizes one of the transformations the sculpture has undergone in this miniature; it has lost its colour, along with its clothing, and so has returned to the pale and monochromatic appearance it had at the beginning of the sequence. It is not entirely naked here, however, but appears wrapped in a white cloth that suggests a shroud, recalling the deathly connotations of its initial tomb-effigy form.⁴⁵ But if that form paradoxically suggested the sculpture's life, this shroud-

like cloth works to identify the sculpture as a dead form as it contains the sculpture's limbs and so brings their activity (and its agency) to an end.⁴⁶ Pygmalion is ascendant within this miniature as he stands over the sculpture, reversing the visual hierarchy of the preceding images. As he stands over the sculpture, furthermore, Pygmalion's face is closely juxtaposed with its prominent breasts, which are revealed, even framed, by the shroud. As the sculpture has been deprived of activity and agency, it has simultaneously been sexualized with its breasts now displayed for Pygmalion's desirous gaze.⁴⁷ His new power within the miniature is likewise sexualized as a large tool protrudes from the waistband of his apron and suggests a phallic penetrating force directed at the sculpture's newly prone and passive form.⁴⁸

The adjoining miniature completes Pygmalion's ascendancy as he appears without the sculpture (plate 7). He has come alone to pray to Venus for its (re)animation: if it lives (again), it will be at Pygmalion's request and so on Pygmalion's terms. His new power is emphasized by his costume change as he now wears a bright red coat with an elaborate hood and a fringe. The garment's colour repeats that of the bed in the previous miniature and so associates the site of the sculpture's sexualized death with his body. He also now sports a full head of hair, in contrast to his bald pate in the previous miniatures, which suggests an increase in his vigour and virility. He wears the same red garment in the next miniature which now serves to emphasize his activity in contrast to the female figure – presumably the sculpture now transformed into a living woman – who stands passively on the opposite side of the image (plate 8). This miniature's cusped frame cuts off the top of her head and so holds her in place as the object of Pygmalion's advance. She occupies the same position in the miniature as the sculpture in the second and third miniatures in the sequence, but in contrast to the sculpture's gesture to Pygmalion in those images, this woman folds her arms over her midsection. It is Pygmalion who gestures here, holding both arms up and reaching one hand out towards her.

In this miniature Testard has departed once again from the text of the *Roman de la Rose*. In the text, Pygmalion on returning from his prayer first strips the sculpture of its clothing to feel life in its limbs and then, doubting himself, draws back from the sculpture, questioning if it is not a dream or a phantom or demon that has come into his image. The sculpture-turned-woman then replies, reassuring him that

9 Robert Testard, *Pygmalion and the transformed sculpture pray before an altar*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 152r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

she is no demon or phantom but instead 'your sweetheart, ready to receive your companionship and to offer you my love.'⁴⁹ Kevin Brownlee has remarked on the newly enlivened woman's speech, which grants her remarkable agency, and on the subsequent description of her and Pygmalion's love, which stresses its mutuality: 'There was no pleasure they did not make for each other; they embraced one another in their great love and kissed one another as if they were two doves. Each loved and gave wholeheartedly to the other.'⁵⁰ Testard's miniatures do not picture such a mutual and reciprocal relationship between Pygmalion and the sculpture-turned-woman

but instead narrate his ascendancy and her loss of power. Their hierarchical, rather than reciprocal, relationship is further emphasized in the last miniature in Testard's sequence (plate 9). Here Pygmalion and the woman both kneel before the altar and a priest, but the woman kneels behind Pygmalion and her eyes and her prayer gesture are directed towards him.

Pygmalion, Jean de Meun, and Robert Testard

Robert Testard's Pygmalion sequence in Ms. Douce 195 thus tells a story in two parts: the first five miniatures emphasize the sculpture's activity and agency at the expense of its creator, but in the final four scenes Pygmalion asserts himself and the sculpture is reduced to the status of a submissive wife. This two-part structure resembles that of the *Roman de la Rose* itself for the poem has two different parts, the work of two very different poets, working at two distinct historical moments; Guillaume de Lorris, who wrote the poem's first 4,058 lines in the 1230s, and Jean de Meun, who wrote the remaining 17,721 lines – including the Pygmalion digression – in the 1270s. Jean de Meun offers an explanation for the two-part structure of the poem in his portion of the text, claiming that Guillaume de Lorris died before completing the *Roman de la Rose* and that he was born to complete it.⁵¹ However, recent scholarship on the poem has contested Jean de Meun's claim, seeing Guillaume de Lorris' text as complete in itself and Jean de Meun's work as not a continuation but an appropriation of the earlier text. According to contemporary scholars, Jean de Meun's portion of the poem responds to, rewrites, reverses, even deconstructs or subverts, Guillaume de Lorris.⁵²

The Pygmalion digression is central to readings of Jean de Meun's portion of the *Roman de la Rose* as a response to Guillaume de Lorris' text because it seems to specifically address the appearance of Narcissus in the first part of the poem. Pygmalion himself makes that connection as he contrasts his love to Narcissus' as less foolish since he can at least embrace his beloved.⁵³ Within existing scholarship, their respective love stories are commonly contrasted as a sterile self-love that leads only to death and a fruitful love of another that creates new life, as the statue-turned-woman finally becomes pregnant with Pygmalion's child.⁵⁴ This contrast, furthermore, has been read as commenting on the process of artistic creation with the two characters understood as figuring the two poets in their relationships to their respective texts.⁵⁵ According to Sylvia Huot, Narcissus represents Guillaume de Lorris as the lyrical singer of love who, as both narrator and protagonist, disappears into his own text. Pygmalion, on the other hand, represents Jean de Meun as the writer of a text and the lover of that text, but not the lover in the text, so that the text externalizes his desire as the sculpture externalizes Pygmalion's. For Huot, the transition from Guillaume de Lorris to Jean de Meun within the *Roman de la Rose* demonstrates a process of historical change in the conception of poetic activity, moving to quote her phrase 'from song to book.'⁵⁶

If Pygmalion thus provided a figure for the poet within his own text and so allowed that text to become a site for the poet's reflection on poetic production, so the sequence of Pygmalion miniatures in Ms. Douce 195 would have provided an analogous site for Testard to consider and comment upon his own act of artistic production. Likewise, the two-part structure of Testard's Pygmalion sequence also seems to make meaning as a representation of historical change. The first miniature in the sequence, the sculpting scene, is the most conventional of Testard's images for this portion of the poem and resembles miniatures that date back to the fourteenth century.⁵⁷ Likewise, the image types, practices, and lore that Testard references in this portion of the sequence, from the effigy tomb to the ring tales, date back to the

thirteenth and even the twelfth century. These more medieval image types, practices, and lore all work to subordinate the creator to his creation. However, the assertion of the figure of artist in the second part of the Pygmalion sequence suggests a more renaissance set of art ideas.⁵⁸ Testard's work is commonly classified as medieval and yet he worked at the very end of the fifteenth century and into the beginning of the sixteenth. Ms. Douce 195 was made for Charles d'Orléans and/or Louise de Savoy but Testard also worked for their son, François I, after his accession to the throne in 1515 and it was François' art policy and patronage that marked the beginning of the Renaissance in France.⁵⁹ Indeed, Hans Belting argues that the new art ideas commonly associated with the renaissance, and with renaissance Italy in particular, had a second point of origin in French courts like that of Charles d'Orléans and Louise de Savoy, where artistic production was increasingly valued in terms of technical virtuosity, aesthetic quality, and iconographic innovation – in other words, as the product of the artist.⁶⁰

10 Robert Testard, *Lover approaches the garden*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 2r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

11 Robert Testard, *Portrait of Covoitise*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 2v, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

Artist, Image, and Frame

Seeing Testard's Pygmalion sequence as the artist's reflection on his own practice calls attention to the representation of images that appear in miniatures throughout Ms. Douce 195. These miniatures establish an ambiguity in the status of images, as they appear both as inanimate objects and as living presences. The first example of this ambiguity appears within the first few pages of the manuscript in the miniatures representing a series of images that appear on the outside of the garden wall. As Guillaume de Lorris' Lover approaches the garden, its walls support elevated niches

that contain small sculpted figures (plate 10). These sculptures represent negative personifications that the text describes individually and that Testard proceeds to represent in a series of separate miniatures. In these miniatures, however, the status of the personifications as sculptures becomes blurred (plate 11). Although they do appear in front of niches, the garden wall disappears from behind them and is replaced by an open landscape. Furthermore, the personifications break out of the frames of their niches, moving through space with contrapposto postures and active gestures that anticipate the sculpture's movements in the Pygmalion miniatures.⁶¹

A second example of this ambiguity in the status of images appears in a series of representations of fountains. The first is the Fountain of Narcissus, which Testard represents in two miniatures.⁶² In the first of these miniatures, which shows the Lover approaching the fountain, its corner columns support small sculptures in elevated niches, recalling the initial view of the sculptures on the garden's exterior wall (plate 12). These sculptures are armed with swords and spears as if they were

intended to guard the fountain's interior. Indeed, the sculpture closest to the Lover raises its sword as if to ward him off from approaching any closer. The sculpture's warning appears to be ineffective, however, for the next miniature shows a figure leaning over the fountain's edge with his head within its interior space (plate 13). The rubric for this image identifies this figure as Narcissus, rather than the Lover, and in this miniature the sculpted guards have disappeared. The only image of an image in this miniature is an implied one; Narcissus' reflection in the surface of the fountain. The contrast between the sculpted guards in the first miniature and this implied image in the second create the ambiguity in the status of images; as ineffective little figures or as living beings and potential love objects.

A visual contrast for the guardian sculptures in the first of these miniatures appears in the form of a second fountain, the Fountain of Life (plate 14). This fountain resembles a large-scale version of the architectural niches that contain the sculptures on the first Narcissus fountain and it contains a large sculpture of a nude female figure. Like the individual images of the garden wall personifications, this sculpture anticipates Pygmalion's as it appears in the first part of the sequence, as a large-scale relief sculpture that is nevertheless animated by its active gestures – here reaching to its breasts and to its genitals. The streams of water that arc away from its body at these sexualized sites further animate the fountain sculpture. In the text of the poem, Genius describes the Fountain of Life as part of his sermon in which he advocates for reproductive sexuality as necessary

13 Robert Testard, *Narcissus at his fountain*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 12r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

14 Robert Testard, *The Fountain of Life*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 146r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

Puis aduise com bone archiere.
 Par une petite archiere.
 Quelle voit en la tour reposte.
 Par deuât non pas par decoste.
 Que nature ot par maistrise.
 Entre deux pillieres assise.
 Et ilz priieres d'arget estoient.

Et restent als q' la regardoient.
 Par nul eun ne len gardoient.
 Fors perleus le filz iouis.
 Qui par l'estai la voit ou vis.
 Que la leur palas lui iura.
 Par cel esai le delinra.
 Par l'estai le chief li toly.

15 Robert Testard, *Venus attacks the castle and figures before a statue*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 148v, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

for the continuation of life. He directly contrasts this fountain to Narcissus' as life to death.⁶³ Testard's miniatures seem to build on that contrast to again present an ambiguity in the status of images; the sculpted guards on the first fountain as dead images, powerless little forms, as opposed to the sculpture from the second fountain, which seems to be bursting with life.

Two additional images of a single image appear immediately prior to the beginning of the Pygmalion sequence (plate 15). In the first of two adjacent miniatures, Venus begins the assault on the tower by aiming an arrow at a sculpture that appears on its outer wall. According to Jean de Meun's text, the sculpture's legs frame a window into which Venus aims her arrow, which strongly sexualizes the assault on the tower.⁶⁴ In Testard's miniature, however, the tower sculpture instead appears elevated on a platform and, although damaged and so difficult to see, it appears to hold a shield in front of its body along with a spear or a staff. Rather than presenting a sexualized opening into the tower, this sculpture recalls the sculpted guards that appeared on the exterior of Narcissus' fountain to warn the lover away.⁶⁵ The adjacent miniature shows a very similar sculpture, now set up on a covered table or altar, along with three figures. This miniature is difficult to understand in terms of the text of the poem, although it probably bears some relationship to a textual variant known as the Medusa interpolation that in Ms. Douce 195 is situated in-between Venus's arrow shot and the beginning of the Pygmalion digression. The Medusa interpolation uses her petrifying power to elaborate on the virtues of the tower sculpture, for it has the power to heal the petrified and to raise the dead.⁶⁶ The Pygmalion digression is likewise introduced as a contrast to the tower sculpture because, according to the text, that sculpture's beauty compares to Pygmalion's sculpture's as a lion compares to a mouse.⁶⁷

The inclusion of the Medusa interpolation in the manuscript's text thus doubles its attention to the tower sculpture and turns this portion of the poem into a discussion of images – of their potential powers and of their proximity to human life, whether as men turned into stone in the Medusa story or as stone becomes flesh in Pygmalion's. The second of these two miniatures likewise heightens the attention that Testard's miniatures give to images of images; it is as if the tower sculpture has been taken off the castle wall and set up here to become a focus for discussion among the figures in the miniature. The tower sculpture, furthermore, provides a visual contrast for Pygmalion's sculpture as it develops over the following miniatures. It is small in scale, separated from its viewers on a platform, and static, stiff, or still as it remains the same from the first miniature to the second. It highlights by contrast the Pygmalion sculpture's life size, its occupation of real space alongside its viewer, and its animation as it changes from one miniature to the next. This contrast recapitulates that seen earlier in the manuscript between the different views of the garden wall personifications and between the fountain statues and thus brings the ambiguity over the status of images that appears throughout Testard's miniatures in Ms. Douce 195 to bear on his Pygmalion sequence.

A final image of an image appears in the second half of Testard's Pygmalion sequence in the form of a sculpted retable that he introduces into the seventh and ninth miniatures. Appearing above an altar, the retable's elevated position and its small size recall the tower sculpture and that resemblance brings the ambiguity in the status of images inside of the Pygmalion sequence itself. At the same time, the retable also resembles Pygmalion's sculpture as it appears in the first few miniatures in the sequence, in the following ways: it is a relief sculpture, it is monochromatic, and its figures assume contrapposto poses that attribute activity and mobility to their bodies. These similarities, in addition to the retable's appearance after the sculpture's sexualized death, in the only miniature in the sequence that does not include either the sculpture or the woman it becomes, suggest that the retable represents a replacement for the sculpture. Taken together, the sculpture and the retable offer a resolution to the ambiguity over the status of images that appears earlier in the manuscript, in the form of a narrative of change from one position, the sculpture as an animated presence, to the other, the retable as an object. As that narrative is also the narrative of historical change from medieval to renaissance so the new renaissance art ideas presented in the second part of Testard's Pygmalion sequence extend beyond the emergence of the artist to a changed role and status for the image itself. Indeed, the sequence narrates a relationship between the increased status of the artist and a reduced status for the image as a work of art.

The retable's reduced status in comparison to Pygmalion's sculpture is made visible in differences in their interactions with their viewers. The contrapposto poses that activate the retable's figures' bodies motivate gestures that connect them to their viewers. In the seventh miniature, the left figure gestures in towards the one in the centre and that figure reaches out to lift up her skirts, creating a long line in her body that extends down to where Pygmalion kneels before the altar. It appears as if this figure is acknowledging his prayer by extending its hand. Likewise, in the final miniature, this same central figure shifts its weight to one side and reaches its arm across its body to that side, as if in response to the priest's gesture towards the altar and its images. This central figure seems to be mobile and active, like Pygmalion's sculpture; however, its actions and gestures differ from the sculpture's in that they are responses to Pygmalion's and the priest's prayers, in contrast to the sculpture's autonomous activity. The rubric for the seventh image specifies that Pygmalion is

16 Robert Testard, *The author and the dreamer*, from Ms. Douce 195, f. 1r, late fifteenth century. Manuscript illumination. Oxford: The Bodleian Library. Photo: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

here making his request to Venus that his sculpture will come to life.⁶⁸ If Pygmalion here is addressing himself to Venus, and is using the retable to do so, then its central figure must be a representation of Venus. Its response to Pygmalion is thus Venus' favourable response to his prayer, rather than the image's own response to his actions. Pygmalion's sculpture was not a representation of anyone and so its actions were autonomous acts.⁶⁹ Finally, the retable figures' movements and gestures do not break the frame of the retable itself, unlike the Pygmalion sculpture's reach into real space. These figures may act and even interact with their viewers, but their actions remain confined within the separated space of the retable, a space created by its intact frame.

Frames become important in the last three miniatures in Testard's Pygmalion sequence not only as the frame around the retable sets its figures apart from the rest of the miniature, and so from Pygmalion's sculpture, but also as these final miniatures each sport an elaborate architectural frame that is not present earlier on in the sequence. Frames appear on miniatures intermittently throughout Ms. Douce 195, beginning with its first illumination; a two-column image that contains two separate scenes, the author at his desk and the dreamer in his bed, each enclosed within an architectural frame (plate 16). This image establishes two patterns for the use of frames in the miniatures throughout the manuscript, patterns that seem deliberate on Testard's part. The first pattern is an association of frames with bed scenes including a second image of a dreamer, a couple, Mars and Venus, the castration of Saturn, and the rape of Lucretia.⁷⁰ Other than the dreamer images, these bed scenes present images of sexuality, of violence, and of the two joined together. The framing of these

Et ravaislēt tant com ilz vuvrōt.
 Il a nature naconsimuront.

Et de nature fait lon deul.
Nature q̄ tant est loutnue.
 Et obien q̄lle fust etentnue.
 A les oeuvres q̄ moult amoit.
 Et alle et doulate le clamoit.
 Et li parfondemāt plourait.
 Q̄ nul n'est cūē q̄ poit damō ait.
 Ne de pitie qui se gardast.
 Q̄ ne de plorer se engardast.
 Et ar tel doule au cuer lenoit.
 D'ung fait dōt el se repentait.
 Q̄ ne les oeuvres vouloit lessier.

miniatures creates a connection between their scenes of sexualized violence and the Pygmalion sequence, wherein the frame appears for the first time immediately after the sculpture's sexualized death in Pygmalion's bed. The second pattern established by the initial miniature is the use of frames in images of authorship and of authority including the sermon of Genius, the image of a ruler that appears as part of his sermon, Nature making her confession to Genius (where Genius appears as an authority figure), and Nature with the artist Zeuxis (plate 17).⁷¹

Many of these framed miniatures appear within the section of the poem dedicated to Nature, her interaction with Genius, and Genius' sermon on her behalf. Indeed, the images of Nature with the artist Zeuxis, Nature confessing to Genius, the couple, and the second dreamer, make up a series of four sequential framed illuminations; the only comparable concentration of framed miniatures in the manuscript is the final three images in Pygmalion sequence. This close concentration of frames, in contrast to their scattered appearance in the rest of the manuscript, creates a connection between these two sequences. This connection appears to be meaningful as the two also share a concern for the role and status of the artist and the work of art, a concern exemplified by the appearance of Zeuxis in the first framed miniature in the Nature/Genius sequence. The visual connection between these two sequences may have been motivated by the text of the poem which includes a brief mention of Pygmalion in its initial presentation of Nature, along with Parrhasius, Apelles, Miro, Polykleitos, and Zeuxis, all as examples of the inadequacy of art and artists.⁷²

The sequence of images dedicated to Nature in Ms. Douce 195 begins with two unframed illuminations, the first showing Nature at her forge hammering out living beings and the second a female personification of Art on her knees before Nature, who appears in the clouds still hammering on an animal's head.⁷³ These images follow the text of the poem in celebrating Nature at the expense of Art. However, here as in the Pygmalion sequence, the first framed miniature marks a significant shift as Testard once again diverges from the text of the poem by showing Nature and the artist Zeuxis in direct confrontation. This scene does not exist in the text, where Zeuxis is mentioned only in an aside, as part of the poet's commentary on his own inadequacy: Nature is so beautiful that she cannot be adequately described by the poet nor represented by visual artists.⁷⁴ In this third miniature, Nature's posture has changed dramatically as she now kneels in a corner of the image with her head held in her hand. According to the rubric, this miniature represents Nature mourning and if one reads far enough along in the text it becomes clear that she is upset because man is neglecting to perpetuate his species through reproductive sexuality.⁷⁵ In Testard's miniature, however, it appears as if her despondency is instead the result of her confrontation with the artist and his art.

In the poem, Zeuxis is remembered as using five nude models to try to create an image beautiful enough to represent Nature and as failing in that attempt. In the miniature, however, five sculptures appear instead of five models and these sculptures are the most active and dynamic figures within the frame; this despite the text's depreciation of art as lifeless imitations of real forms.⁷⁶ The sculptures anticipate both the retable, in their position on an elevated altar, and Pygmalion's sculpture, in their active postures and gestures, and so embody the ambiguity in the status of images that appears throughout the manuscript until it is resolved in the Pygmalion sequence. The miniature's frame helps to diagram the relationship between Nature, the sculptures, and the artist. Nature alone occupies one of the frame's two compartments, but she has retreated to its outside edge. The sculptures dominate the other compartment. One reaches her hand out towards Nature, to just underneath

the point that divides the frame into its two cusps, in a gesture that anticipates Pygmalion's sculpture's gesture towards him and that suggests the images' activity and agency within the miniature. The artist, finally, appears trapped between the altar that supports his sculptures and the outside edge of the frame. One of the sculptures looks down over her shoulder at him and his tool hangs passively at his side. The artist here appears dominated by his sculptures, the same relationship between artist and work of art that exists at the beginning of the Pygmalion sequence, but that is reversed by its end.

In the seventh miniature in the Pygmalion sequence the cusped frame likewise works to diagram the relationship between Pygmalion and the retable. It is as if Pygmalion and the retable have traded places with Zeuxius' sculptures and Nature and so reversed the dynamics of their relationship. The retable now recedes within the left cusp of the frame while Pygmalion kneels within the right cusp, looking up to the retable and leaning in towards it but without crossing over the central line of the frame. The initiative here clearly belongs to Pygmalion but it is not sufficient to break the boundary between him and the image, reality and representation – the boundary that his sculpture broke. As the retable recedes, furthermore, it intersects with the frame for the miniature, so that the frame actually completes the framing of the retable. This intersection creates a close association between the retable and the frame, which is heightened by their shared warm colour tone.

In both the seventh and ninth miniatures, the intersection of the frame with the retable creates a spatial dilemma inside the image. On the one hand, as the frame cuts off a portion of the retable it ought to work to press the retable back into the depths of the image space. However, the identical colouring of the frame and the retable blurs the boundary between the two and so works to relocate the retable alongside the frame on the front surface of the image space. One of the more 'medieval' visual aspects of Testard's work is his apparent lack of interest in strict perspectival/spatial constructions.⁷⁷ In these miniatures, however, this spatial dilemma serves a productive end by allowing the retable to play two roles simultaneously, as both a figure within each miniature and a figure for the miniatures. Located on the picture plane, the retable is identified with Testard's miniatures, so that its appearance within those miniatures can stand as Testard's visual commentary on his own art.

The close relationship between the retable and the frame suggests that the framed miniatures be seen like the retable as bounded forms, separated off from their viewers, like Pygmalion is separated from the retable by the cusping of the frame on the seventh miniature. In the ninth miniature, it seems as if the spatial construction of the seventh illumination has swung around by ninety degrees; the frame is now a single arch that joins everything within the image while the viewers of the miniature take up what was Pygmalion's place inside of the previous miniature. The retable now steps back and away from the miniature's viewers and, as it is identified with the miniature through its coincidence with the frame, it pulls the entire miniature away with it.

As Derrida writes in *The Truth in Painting*, the cut of the frame changes the status of the image, identifying it as a mere representation rather than a presence – the retable rather than Pygmalion's sculpture. However, the frame redresses the loss of status for the image by attaching the image to the discourse on art and in particular to the person of the artist.⁷⁸ Hans Belting establishes a historical home for the development of this detach- and reattachment in the sixteenth century and so associates it with the rise of linear perspective as a means of organizing pictorial space. The idea of the images as the product of the artist's imagination is thus associated with the

construction of the image as if seen through a window onto another world so that the viewer is expected to seek the artist's idea within that other world.⁷⁹ On the verge of the sixteenth century, in the final miniature in the Pygmalion sequence, Robert Testard places the artist on the verge of the image space. Pygmalion kneels at the front edge of the image, with his toes touching its bottom border. The priest who occupies the miniature's opposite edge is placed just slightly further back into its space, standing on a bottom step in front of which Pygmalion seems to float. Their poses and gestures lead the viewers' eyes over the frame and into the space of the image, to the retable as it recedes into the background. Viewers thus gain access to the image, now set apart by the frame, either through the priest (a figure perhaps for authority) or through Pygmalion, the figure for the artist.

Notes

My work on this project would not have been possible without the virtual access to MS Douce 195 provided by the Roman de la Rose Digital Library (<http://romandelarose.org/#project>), a joint project of Sheridan Libraries at Johns Hopkins University and the Bibliothèque nationale de France established with support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Portions of the paper were presented at the 40th International Congress on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan State University and at the 2008 annual meeting of the Medieval Academy of America and this final version benefited from the comments and questions from the audience members at both presentations. Anne F. Harris generously shared her work on MS Douce 195 with me and commented on a draft of this paper. The anonymous readers for *Art History* were instrumental in the development of the last section of the paper as they encouraged me to take into account miniatures from the whole of the manuscript. Finally, this project owes a large debt to my former professor, Michael Camille, whose work continues to inspire my own.

- For a foundational catalogue of 200 manuscripts see Ernst Langlois, *Les Manuscrits du Roman de la Rose: Description et Classement*, Paris, 1910; for a list of surviving manuscripts see John Fleming, *The Roman de la Rose and its Manuscript Illustrations*, PhD Dissertation, Princeton University, 1963. Meredith McMunn is currently working on a full catalogue of Rose manuscripts and counts 315 surviving manuscripts, of which 243 are illuminated; see Meredith McMunn, 'Was Christine poisoned by an illustrated Rose', *The Profane Arts of the Middle Ages / Les arts profanes du moyen-âge*, 7: 2, Autumn 1998, 140.
- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Douce 195: on the manuscript see Otto Pacht and J. J. G. Alexander, *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, London, 1966, vol. 1, 61; Deborah McGrady, 'Reinventing the Roman de la Rose for a woman reader: the case of Ms. Douce 195', *Journal of the Early Book Society for the Study of Manuscripts and Printing History*, 4, 2001, 202–27; and Stephen Nichols, 'Philology and its discontents', in *The Future of the Middle Ages: Medieval Literature in the 1990s*, Gainesville, FL, 1994, 131–5. A facsimile of the manuscript is available on-line through the site Roman de la Rose Digital Library, <http://romandelarose.org/#home>.
- On patterns in Pygmalion illustrations in Rose manuscripts see Lori Walters, 'A Parisian manuscript of the Roman de la Rose', *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 51, 1989, 40–1.
- John Fleming, *The Roman de la Rose: A Study in Allegory and Iconography*, Princeton, NJ, 1969, viii–ix, 8–13.
- Alcuin Blamires and Gail C. Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated: Manuscripts at the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, Tempe, AZ, 2002*, xxvii, xxxii, xxxvi. For similar concerns see Lesley Lawton, 'The illustration of late medieval secular texts, with special reference to Lydgate's *Troy Book*', in *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth-Century England: The Literary Implications of Manuscript Study*, Cambridge, 1983, 41–69.
- On Charles d'Orléans and Louise de Savoy's bibliomania see Dorothy Moulton Mayer, *The Great Regent: Louise of Savoy, 1476–1531*, New York, 1966, 12–15.
- Suzanne Lewis, 'Images of opening, penetration, and closure in the

Roman de la Rose', *Word and Image*, 8: 3, July–September 1992, 215.

- Sylvia Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, and Manuscript Transmission*, Cambridge, 1993.
- McGrady's focus is on miniatures from the jealous husband section of the poem and Nichols' on those representing the portraits of vices from the garden walls and the castrations of Saturn and Origen. See McGrady, 'Reinventing the Roman de la Rose', 204, 208, 211–14; and Nichols, 'Philology and its discontents', 132–4.
- Kathrin Giogoli and John Block Friedman, 'Robinet Testard, court illuminator: his manuscripts and his debt to the graphic arts', *Journal of the Early Book Society*, 8, 2005, 154, 160.
- Charles Dahlberg, 'Introduction', in *The Romance of the Rose*, Princeton, NJ, 1971, 23.
- Michael Camille, *The Medieval Art of Love*, New York, 1998, 149–50. On the Pygmalion sequence see also Anne F. Harris, 'Pygmalion reconfigures Narcissus: questions of rewriting and rereading in images of the Roman de la Rose (Ms. Douce 195)', forthcoming in *Proceedings of the International Courtly Literature Society*.
- Michael Camille, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art*, Cambridge, 1989, 325–7. Virginia Egbert counts only two types of this scene, in which the sculpture is shown either as a figure in the round or as a relief: Virginia Egbert, 'Pygmalion as sculptor', *Princeton University Library Journal*, 28: 1, 1966, 21.
- Fleming, *The Roman de la Rose*, 219, 226–36.
- Camille, *The Gothic Idol*, 317, 327, 332.
- Kenneth Gross, *The Dream of the Moving Statue*, Ithaca, NY, 1992, 7, 13–15, 21.
- Erwin Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture: Four Lectures on its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini*, New York, n.d., 47, 51–6; Phillippe Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, New York, 1981, 238–43; Paul Binski, *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation*, Ithaca, NY, 1996, 93, 99; Rachel Dressler, *Of Armor and Men in Medieval England: The Chivalric Rhetoric of Three English Knights Tombs*, Burlington, VT, 2004, 1–2, 24, 68–9. For a similar reading of Roman de la Rose Pygmalion sculptures, including the sculpture in Ms. Douce 195, as tomb-like yet alive see Victor I. Stoichita, *The Pygmalion Effect: From Ovid to Hitchcock*, trans. Alison Anderson, Chicago, IL, 2008, 37–9.
- Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture*, 56; Binski, *Medieval Death*, 93.
- Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, 24, 241–3, 604–6. On the resurrection of the body in medieval theology and its impact on medieval culture see Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*, New York, 1995.
- Binski, *Medieval Death*, 71, 93; Dressler, *Of Armor and Men*, 60–4, 72.
- On the effect of frame-breaks in Testard's Pygmalion miniatures as blurring the boundaries between representation and reality see Stoichita, *The Pygmalion Effect*, 32.
- 'Come Pymalion requiert mercy a son ymage'. See the text of this manuscript as reproduced in the on-line facsimile, <http://romandelarose.org/#read;Douce195,f.149v>.
- 'Come Pymalion est surpris de la beaulte de l'ymage'. Again see the on-line facsimile, <http://romandelarose.org/#read;Douce195,f.149r>.
- 'Si fist une ymage d'ivreire et mist en fere tele antente qu'el fu si plesant et si gente qu'el sambloit ester autresint vive con la plus bele riens

- qui vive'; Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Felix Lecoy, Paris, 1970, vv. 20796–20800. For the English translation see Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, trans. Charles Dahlberg, Princeton, NJ, 1971, 340.
- 25 'Ne set s'ele est ou vive ou morte; soavet au mains la detaste, et crait, ausinc con ce fust paste, que ce soit sa char qui li fuie, mes c'est sa main qu'il i apuie'; Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, vv. 20896–20900. For the English translation see Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 342.
- 26 'Uirginis est uerae facies, quam uiuere credas et, si non obset reuerentia, uelle moueri'; P. Ovidi Nasonis, *Metamorphoses*, ed. R. J. Tarrant, Oxford, 2004, vv. 250–251. For the English translation see Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Mary M. Innes, New York, 1955, 231.
- 27 'J'aime une ymage soured et mue, qui ne se crole ne se mue ne ja de moi merci n'avra'; Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, vv. 20820–20823. For the English translation see Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 341.
- 28 'Car quant je me veull easier et d'acoler et de besier, je truis m'aime autresinc roide comme est uns pex, et si tres froide que, quant por lui besier i touché, toute me refredist la bouche'; Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, vv. 20871–20876. For the English translation see Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 342.
- 29 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 212–14, 222.
- 30 These tales appear in collections assembled by Gautier de Coincy, Cesarius of Heisterbach, and others. See Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 223–4; David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*, Chicago, IL, 1989, 301–9; and Kathleen Kamerick, *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry in England 1350–1500*, New York, 2002, 58–9.
- 31 Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 285–8; Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 227; Kamerick, *Popular Piety and Art*, 102.
- 32 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 225–6; Kamerick, *Popular Piety and Art*, 78–84.
- 33 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 323–4.
- 34 Compare Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 342–3, to Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 231–2; Gross, *Dream of the Moving Statue*, 82.
- 35 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 227.
- 36 For example, as a young man Edmund Rich (Archbishop of Canterbury 1170–1240 and a future saint) placed a ring on the finger of an image of the Virgin, and a similar ring on his own finger, and then considered himself to be married – although to the Virgin herself rather than to the sculpture. Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 239; Paul Binski, *Becket's Crown: Art and Imagination in Gothic England 1170–1300*, New Haven and London 2004, 135.
- 37 For a collection of medieval ring tales along with similar tales from other cultural contexts see Paul Franklin Baum, 'The young man betrothed to a statue', *PMLA* n.s. 28: 4, 1919, 523–79. On these tales see Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 320–45; and Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 83–5, 237–9.
- 38 Baum, 'The young man betrothed to a statue', 525–6.
- 39 Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 342–4; Gross, *Dream of the Moving Statue*, 74–5; Deborah Tarn Steiner, *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, Princeton, NJ, 2001, 250.
- 40 Baum, 'The young man betrothed to a statue', 548–9.
- 41 Here I disagree with Freedberg who sees the placing of the ring as the enlivening action and the mark of the man's desire for the image. See Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 320, 332–3, 338.
- 42 Baum, 'The young man betrothed to a statue', 526, 549, 555, 557–8.
- 43 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 343–4.
- 44 Roger Dragonetti compares the long lists of different garments Pygmalion provides for the statue to the list of musical instruments he plays for it, see 'Pygmalion ou les pièges de la fiction dans le Roman de la Rose', in *Orbis Medievalis: Mélanges de langue et de littérature médiévales offerts à Reto Raduolf Bezzola*, Bern, 1978, 104–5.
- 45 Camille, *The Medieval Art of Love*, 150.
- 46 For the sculpture as dead in Pygmalion's bed see Stoichita, *The Pygmalion Effect*, 39.
- 47 On Pygmalion's sculpture in other *Rose* manuscripts as both dead and sexualized see Marilyn Desmond and Pamela Sheingorn, *Myth, Montage, and Visuality in Late Medieval Manuscript Culture: Christine de Pizan's Epistre Othea*, Ann Arbor, MI, 2003, 77–81.
- 48 Camille, *The Medieval Art of Love*, 150.
- 49 'Ce n'est anemis ne fantosme, douz amis, ainz sui vostre amie, preste de vostre compaignie recevoir, et m'amour vos offer, s'il vos plect recevoir tele offre'; Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, vv. 21124–21128. For the English translation see Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 345.
- 50 'A ces paroles s'antr'ailent, de leur amour s'antremercient, n'est joie qu'il ne s'antrefacent; par granz amours lors s'antr'ambracent, con .ii. colonbeaus s'antrebisent, mout s'antr'eiment, mout s'antrepresent'; Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, vv. 21135–21140. For the English translation see Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 345–6; Kevin Brownlee, 'Pygmalion, mimesis, and the multiple endings of the Roman de la Rose', *Yale French Studies*, 95, 1999, 196–8.
- 51 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 187–8.
- 52 Scholarship on the poem has generally shifted from emphasizing differences between the two portions (in the nineteenth century), to emphasizing continuity between them (in the mid-twentieth century), and back again (in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries). See Dahlberg, 'Introduction', 1–27; Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot, 'Introduction', in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, Philadelphia, PA, 1992, 2–4; Sylvia Huot, 'From Roman de la Rose to Roman de la Poire: the Ovidian tradition and the poetics of courtly literature', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 13, 1985, 95; Eric Steinle, 'Versions of authority in the Roman de la Rose: remarks on the use of Ovid's Metamorphoses by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun', *Mediaevalia*, 13, 1987, 192; Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, 'Overt and covert: amorous and interpretive strategies in the Roman de la Rose', *Romania*, 1990, 436–7; and Suzanne Conklin Akbari, *Seeing Through the Veil: Optical Theory and Medieval Allegory*, Toronto, 2004, 78.
- 53 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 341.
- 54 Steinle, 'Versions of authority in the Roman de la Rose', 202–3; Akbari, *Seeing Through the Veil*, 80–8; Sylvia Huot, 'The Medusa interpolation in the Romance of the Rose: mythographic program and Ovidian intertext', *Speculum*, 62: 4, October 1987, 871–3; Jean Dornbush, *Pygmalion's Figure: Reading Old French Romance*, Lexington, KY, 1990, 50–4.
- 55 On Pygmalion in particular as a figure for the poet see Dornbush, *Pygmalion's Figure*, 50–7, 78–9, 95–7; J. Hillis Miller, *Versions of Pygmalion*, Cambridge, 1990, vii.
- 56 Sylvia Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry*, Ithaca, NY, 1987, 88–98, 105–6, 141, 144, 190, 208.
- 57 See, for example, the sculpting scene in the Princeton manuscript of the Roman de la Rose, Princeton Garrett 126, f. 146v.
- 58 Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 337.
- 59 On the chronology of Testard's career see Giogoli and Friedman, 'Robinet Testard, court illuminator', 144–5; on the French Renaissance and on François' patronage in particular see Rebecca Zorach, *Blood, Milk, Ink, and Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance*, Chicago, IL, 2005, 33–81. Victor Stoichita sees Testard's miniatures in Ms. Douce 195 as renaissance images, as 'little paintings' comparable to Flemish painting; see Stoichita, *The Pygmalion Effect*, 41.
- 60 Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, Chicago, IL, 1994, 422–4.
- 61 On the garden wall personifications in Ms. Douce 195 see Nichols, 'Philology and its discontents', 132; on this portion of the poem see Stephen G. Nichols, 'Ekphrasis, iconoclasm, and desire', in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, ed. Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot, Philadelphia, PA, 1992, 150–3; on miniatures for this portion of the poem in a number of manuscripts see Phillipe Menard, 'Les Représentations des vices sur les murs du verger du Roman de la Rose; la texte et les enluminures', in *Texte et Image: Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly*, Paris, 1984, 177–90.
- 62 On images of Narcissus and the fountain in other manuscripts see Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, 72–4.
- 63 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 334–7.
- 64 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 340. On illuminations of this portion of the poem see Lewis, 'Images of opening, penetration, and closure', 237–9; and Blamires and Holian, *The Romance of the Rose Illuminated*, 93–7.
- 65 According to Victor Stoichita, the Tower statue in Ms. Douce 195 represents Shame or Modesty; Stoichita, *The Pygmalion Effect*, 22.

- 66 On the Medusa interpolation see Sylvia Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers*, 175–7, 264; Huot, 'The Medusa interpolation in the Romance of the Rose', 870–3; and Camille, *The Gothic Idol*, 324.
- 67 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 340.
- 68 Again see the on-line facsimile, <http://romandelarose.org/#read;Douce195>, f. 151r.
- 69 In Victor Stoichita's terms, the fact that Pygmalion's sculpture does not represent anyone makes it the prototype of the 'simulacrum'. See Stoichita, *The Pygmalion Effect*, 1–3.
- 70 The dreamer, f. 131v; the couple, f. 118r; Mars and Venus, f. 99r; castration of Saturn, f. 67v; rape of Lucretia, f. 61v. These images are available in the on-line facsimile, <http://romandelarose.org/#read;Douce195>.
- 71 The sermon of Genius, f. 139v; the ruler, also tentatively identified as Noble Speech, f. 134r; Nature's confession to Genius, f. 117v. Again these images are available in the on-line facsimile, <http://romandelarose.org/#read;Douce195>.
- 72 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 274. On Art and Nature in the Roman de la Rose see Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 316–9; and Roger Dragonetti, 'Le "Singe de Nature" dans le Roman de la Rose', *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 16, 1978, 149–60. On visual connections between Pygmalion and Zeuxis in *Roman de la Rose* miniatures see Stoichita, *The Pygmalion Effect*, 84; and Lori Walters, 'Illuminating the Rose: Gui de Mori and the illustrations of MS 101 of the Municipal Library, Tournai', in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, Philadelphia, PA, 1992, 185–6.
- 73 Nature at her forge, f. 114v; Art kneels before Nature, f. 115v. Both are available in the on-line facsimile, <http://romandelarose.org/#read;Douce195>.
- 74 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 274.
- 75 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 317–19.
- 76 Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, 271–4.
- 77 Giogoli and Friedman, 'Robinet Testard, Court Illuminator', 144, 147.
- 78 Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*, Chicago, IL, 1978, 11–12, 21–23, 31–2, 38–41, 71, 282–3, 303–4, 312–14, 365–9.
- 79 Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, 471–2, 484.