

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Volume 101

Fall, 2004

Number 4

Faux Semblants: Antifraternalism Reconsidered in Jean de Meun and Chaucer

by G. Geltner

FAUSTUS was hardly pleased. Having sealed his pact with the Devil, and having waited long hours for his promised assistant and guide, he was left thoroughly unimpressed by the external appearance of Mephistopheles once the latter finally arrived:

[*Faustus*.] I Charge thee to return and change thy shape;
Thou art too ugly to attend me.
Go, and return an old Franciscan friar;
That holy shape becomes a devil best.¹

Faustus's ingenious solution seems to invoke a celebrated tradition. From Rutebeuf to Rabelais, from Cecco Angiolieri to Boccaccio, from Chaucer to Marlowe, the apparent perseverance of antifraternal sentiment from medieval to early modern literature has helped perpetuate the notion of a Devil-serving friar as a popular, if disturbing, representation of medieval mendicants. Although the presence of mendicants, or friars, in fiction has won a certain amount of scholarly attention, so far the few attempts to deal comprehensively with the topic have yielded questionable generic statements which define such fiction as one form or another of "antifraternal literature." This branding, how-

¹ *Doctor Faustus* 1.3.25–28, in *The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Irving Ribner (New York: Odyssey Press, 1963), 364–65.

ever, obscures the true diversity of friar-characters and their functions within their respective fictional contexts.

Chaucer's Friar John in the *Summoner's Tale* is a case in point, as is Jean de Meun's Faus Semblant in the *Roman de la Rose*. Both authors have been dubbed antifraternal largely on the basis of these characters which, scholars have traditionally argued, illustrate the fallen state of mendicancy that their authors wished to bemoan. Yet not only are these characters multivalent rather than partisan, manuscript evidence for the reception of Faus Semblant's speech reveals that his allegedly antifraternal confession was ambivalent enough in the eyes of contemporaries to prompt the interpolation of a sizable chapter articulating objections to the mendicants' privileges in unambiguous terms. Chaucer, in turn, familiar with an amended version of the *Roman*, also created a multi-faceted friar-character, whose actions and interactions do not convey a strictly negative appraisal of mendicancy.

In 1923, Joseph Spencer Kennard published a series of studies about key depictions of friars in medieval and early modern fiction in England, Germany, and Italy.² One striking feature of his essays is an explicit insistence on the correlation between fiction and reality inherent in these characters; the friar's image as deceitful and immoral, Kennard is "obliged to conclude," "represent[s] *the typical friar* as found in *real life* during those centuries."³ This is one instance in which antifraternal literature is cast as an authentic response to the friars' ubiquitous moral plummet.

Were it not for its continuing legacy in modern scholarship, Kennard's Coultonian approach could have been dismissed as simply old-fashioned, perhaps eccentric, and certainly impaired methodologically. A fairly recent account of medieval antifraternal literature, however, has no qualms about firmly placing Chaucer (and others) in the tradition of English antifraternalism: "Chaucer, Langland, Gower, Dunbar, Henryson all wrote *against* the friars, mainly in longer poems that depict, sometimes comically, sometimes somberly, the decay of human

² Kennard, *The Friar in Fiction, Sincerity in Art and Other Essays* (New York: Brentano's, 1923).

³ "Some Friars in English Fiction," in *The Friar in Fiction*, 6 (italics mine). In Germany antimendicant writers conveyed a picture of "virulence and truth . . . but the great body of friary was gangrened to the core and no physician could avail, no medicine work a cure" ("The Friar in German Fiction," in *The Friar in Fiction*, 25–27). Friars who reached Dante's *Paradiso* did so on their personal merits, rather than due to any mendicant affiliation. See Kennard, "The Friars of Dante, Boccaccio and Machiavelli," in *The Friar in Fiction*, 86.

society near the end of an era."⁴ Yet branding Chaucer with a brazen antifraternalism, one, moreover, that offers a direct representation of reality, is an inappropriate evaluation; it reduces the art of Chaucer's verisimilitudes to simple partisanship, quite in contrast to a growing appreciation among Chaucerians of his refusal to commit to any particular point of view.⁵

The mislabeling of Chaucer also rests on a similar and prevalent misapprehension regarding the work of Jean de Meun, whom Szittyá identifies as Chaucer's antifraternal forerunner in the French tradition.⁶ While their affinities cannot be mistaken, it is not the case that the tradition itself is relentlessly antifraternal. Even Jean de Meun's borrowing from the work of Guillaume de Saint Amour—long considered the ecclesiological fountain of antifraternal literature—and from Rutebeuf's poetry was not carried out with an eye towards targeting the friars exclusively.⁷ I wish to argue, on the contrary, that Faus Semblant, the *Roman de la Rose's* hypocrite friar, is a personification of hypocrisy, not a direct depiction or a caricature of a real (or aggregate) friar. Its allegorical power rests on a binary of corruption and saintliness, not on an appeal to a common appreciation of religious mendicancy's fallen state. And it was this ambivalence, rather than one-sidedness, that was taken up by Geoffrey Chaucer in the century that followed.

* * *

Who is Faus Semblant, and how, if at all, is he a representative of fraternal hypocrisy? Clad in unspecified monastic garb,⁸ Faus Semblant

⁴ Penn R. Szittyá, *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 183, italics mine. Chapter six ("Chaucer and Antifraternal Exegesis") is an exposition of "Chaucer's most antifraternal tale" (231). Even an acute study of antifraternal theology in fourteenth-century England (Jean L. Copeland, "The Relations between the Secular Clergy and the Mendicant Friars in England during the Century after the Issue of the Bull *Super cathedram* [1300]," M.A. thesis, University of London, 1937, esp. 148–81) uncritically links Chaucer with "the popular lampoon [that] was used as a vehicle for anti-Mendicant propaganda" (182).

⁵ Cf. Jill Mann, *Chaucer and Medieval Estates Satire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

⁶ Szittyá, *The Antifraternal Tradition*, 200.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 11–61, 183–90.

⁸ Though later identified in the text as a mendicant, in over two hundred MS illustrations of Faus Semblant surveyed by Meradith McMunn (personal correspondence, September 2002), he appears most frequently in Benedictine garb (black cloak over white habit). Other depictions feature Franciscan (brown habit with rope belt), Dominican (black), and even pink garb. Professor McMunn is completing a comprehensive catalogue

issues forth the chief "antifraternal" exhortation in the *Roman*, stretching, with few interruptions, for over one thousand lines. Hypocrisy characterizes his behavior from the outset:

Je mains avec les orgueilleus,
 Les veziez, les artilleus,
 Qui mondaines eneurs couveitent
 E les granz besoignes espleient,
 E vont traçant les granz pittances
 E pourchaçant les acointances
 Des poissanz omes e les sivent;
 E se font povre, e il se vivent
 Des bons morseaus delicieus
 E beivent les vins precieus;
 E la povreté vous preeschent,
 E les granz richeces peeschent
 Aus saïmes e aus tramaus.

(11037-49)⁹

[I dwell among the proud, / the devious, the cunning, / who covet worldly honors and pursue great enterprises / and seek great rewards, / and strive for the acquaintance / of powerful men and follow them. / And they are poor, and they nourish themselves / with luxurious foods / and drink precious wines. / And they preach poverty to you, / and they gather great wealth / with their nets and trammels.]

The coexistence of want and sumptuousness and of the preaching of poverty and lavish living are not conveyed through concessive conjunctures. It is simultaneous and as such constitutes a state of affairs that, though perfectly coherent to Faus Semblant, seems paradoxical to his audience: instead of empowering the poor, he flatters the rich; his compulsory poverty gives way to lavish feasting among the worldly. These initial verses signal what is to come: a narrative elaborating on a basic theme of action contrasted with declared intent, interior corruption with exterior piety, verbal expression with intended will. Faus Semblant argues against himself, in confession form, in an attempt to persuade the God of Love and his baronial entourage to admit him into

and study of the illustrated manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose* (cf. n. 38). As a form of gloss to the text, such depictions attempt to further negotiate the character's "true" identity, lending visual support to the argument that there seems to have been no immediate and comprehensive identification of Faus Semblant as a friar.

⁹ All line numbers correspond to *Le Roman de la Rose par Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun*, ed. Ernest Langlois, vol. 3 (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1921).

their company, then on the verge of storming Jealousy's castle. (The confessional itself is also paradoxical: a friar, master of all confessors—a theme that will later become crucial to our understanding of the matter—utters a public confession to, of all allegorical figures, the God of Love!) In any case, the history of his treachery and deceit wins him the desired trust of the barons. After marveling at his enduring corruption, they welcome him into the host.

That these verses are not a concerted attack on friars (or on ascetic religion in general)¹⁰ is indicated by several facets of Faus Semblant's character, not least of which is his dress. Faus Semblant's ultimate choice of a friar's garb can perhaps be viewed as tactical, considering his lay audience of "confessors." Yet at base it is the paradox of the incorruptible-and-deceptive-in-one that offers the greatest momentum to the character's speech. Indeed, there are no limits to Faus Semblant's capacity to adapt, cutting across borders of social class, clerical status, religion, geography, age, gender, and language:

Or sui chevaliers, or sui moines,
Or sui prelaz, or sui chanoines,
Or sui clers, autre eure sui prestres,
Or sui deciples, or sui maistres,
Or chastelains, or forestiers.

(11189–93)

[Now I'm a knight, now a monk; / now a prelate, now a canon; / now a cleric, at another time a priest; / now a disciple, now a master; / now a castellan, now a forester.]

Or resui princes, or sui pages,
E sai par cueur trestouz langages,
Autre eure sui veauz e chenuz,

¹⁰ Such interpretations aim at excluding the confession from the poem's "main" theme. See, for example, Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), 91. This view was radically challenged by Alan M. F. Gunn, *The Mirror of Love* (Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech Press, 1952), 158–63, 270–73; D. W. Robertson, Jr., *A Preface to Chaucer* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), 195–204; John V. Fleming, *The Romance of the Rose: A Study in Allegory and Iconography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 161–71; and more recently by Susan Stakel, *False Roses: Structures of Duality and Deceit in Jean de Meun's "Roman de la Rose"* (Stanford: ANMA Libri, 1991), who offers an innovative interpretation of Faus Semblant's role as linchpin for the theme of truth and falsity in the *Roman*. Pierre-Yves Badel's examination of the speech's literary reception (*Le Roman de la Rose au XIV^e siècle* [Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980], 207–62) concludes that contemporaries did not question the unity of the text on stylistic and thematic grounds.

Or resui jennes devenuz;
 Or sui Roberz, or sui Robins,
 Or cordeliers, or jacobins.

(11195–200)

[Now I am a prince, now a page — / I know by heart many languages. /
 At one time I'm old and white, / then I become young again; / now I am
 Robert, now Robin, / now a Cordelier, now a Jacobin.]

Autre eure vest robe de fame:
 Or sui dameisele, or sui dame,
 Autre eure sui religieuse,
 Or sui rendue, or sui prieuse,
 Or sui none, or sui abaesse.

(11207–11)

[At other times I wear a woman's garb: / now I am a maiden, now a
 lady; / at another time I'm religious: / now a devotee, now a prioress, /
 now a nun, now an abbess.]

Through rhythmic repetition these verses reinforce the notion that Faus Semblant's extraordinary talent of disguise is surpassed only by the diversity of his costumes, from prince to dame, from monk to forester, from prioress to mendicant. Once the choice of disguise is made, the warning that "S'est la celee plus seüre / Souz la plus umble vesteüre [it is the safest disguise, / under the humblest guise]" (11013–14) does not detract from his exposure of hypocrisy in the Church (11035–162), society at large (10976–83, 11177–78), the Capetian court,¹¹ and of course, the mendicant orders themselves (11007–10).

This explicit appeal to vast and various segments of society underscores a penetrating social critique that can hardly be said to target the mendicants exclusively. It is exemplified once again through the depiction of a universal attitude towards the poor:

Trestuit seur les povres genz cueurent,
 N'est nus qui despoillier nes vueille,
 Tuit s'afublent de leur despueille,
 Trestuit de leur sustance humant,
 Senz eschauder touz vis les plument.
 Li plus forz le plus feible robe.

(11544–49)

¹¹ Popular and baronial resentment of Louis IX's mendicant affiliations, which included a rather skimpy wardrobe, was high. See William C. Jordan, "The Case of Saint Louis," *Viator* 19 (1988): 209–17.

[All men want to trample over the poor, / there is no one who does not wish to despoil them; / everyone covers themselves with their spoil / trampling over their human substance. / Without scalding everyone plucks them. / The more powerful rob the feeblest.]

"But I," continues Faus Semblant, "who wear my simple robe, dupe the dupers and the duped, rob the robbers and the robbed" (11550–52). There is no exclusivity, only a general partaking in the universal disgrace.

Jean de Meun's antifraternal partisanship may, however, rest on the narrator's valorizing allusions to Guillaume de St. Amour and his struggle against the mendicant masters in Paris (ca. 1253–57). Furthermore, the very name of the character invokes the memory of St. Amour's Parisian partisan, the popular poet Rutebeuf, who developed his figure of Hypocrisy in the *Du Pharisien* and gave it the name of Faus Semblant in *De Maître Guillaume de Saint Amour*.¹² It is possible that the association of de Meun and St. Amour was strong enough in certain circles to have led some scribes to attribute parts of the *Roman* to St. Amour, occasionally at the expense of Jean de Meun himself. On the other hand, it is possible that the very attribution was intended to eliminate ambiguity in favor of partisanship, by replacing a poet with a theologian.¹³

¹² See *Œuvres Complètes de Rutebeuf*, ed. Edmond Faral and Julia Bastin, 2 vols. (Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1959–60), 1:251–55, 258–66. By this stage in his career Rutebeuf had developed authentic antifraternal sentiments, contrary to his earlier support for the mendicant cause. Yet even in Rutebeuf's case, scholars unnecessarily perceived certain instances of a wider critique as limited to mere antifraternalism. See Edward B. Ham, *Rutebeuf and Louis IX* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962). Modern appreciation of Guillaume de St. Amour rests more on fame than on scholarship. There is still no full critical edition of his works, most recently printed in 1632. (Sporadic treatises, mostly misidentified and/or wrongly dated, were published in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.) A careful reading of the infamous *De periculis novissimorum temporum* (1255), for instance, yields a richer crop of allegations than against the usual mendicant suspects, including the secular clergy, lay society, and even St. Louis. I am preparing a translation and critical edition of this important apocalyptic treatise. The trope of an external garb concealing inner corruption is already tossed around during the monastic debates of the twelfth century. See Giles Constable, "The Ceremonies and Symbolism of Entering Religious Life and Taking the Monastic Habit, From the Fourth to the Twelfth Century," *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale* (Spoleto: Presso La Sede del Centro, 1987), 822–31. As a personification, Religious Hypocrisy's genealogy can be traced to Prudentius (*Psychomachia*, ed. H. J. Thomson [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949], vv. 557–71) and Jerome (*Letter to Eustochium*, trans. F. A. Wright [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954], 16 and passim).

¹³ MSS that attribute the first part of the *Roman* to Guillaume de St. Amour are: (1–2) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS fr. 804 and 1569 (Jo); (3) Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 3873 (Ki); (4) Falaise, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 37. Two MSS identify him as the author of the work's second part: (5) Turin, Biblioteca de l'Università MS L. III

What is continuously overlooked in indicating this association is that the theological debates over poverty in Paris had a much wider context than religious mendicancy. For social historians the controversy is an illuminating moment of contemporary attitudes towards poverty, far beyond any in-house debate.¹⁴ The most comprehensive modern study of the university quarrels (which did not end with St. Amour's exile in 1257, but continued into the late 1260s) concludes that St. Amour "attaque à la fois une règle d'une excessive sévérité et contraire au droit commun traditionnel, d'une part, et d'autre part les pratiques inverses des frères."¹⁵ Thus, even if de Meun were simply siding with St. Amour, in the context of the quarrels of the 1250s this would have been indicative of concerns quite beyond the university halls and any anti-mendicant faction therein.

The lamentable social conditions underscored by Jean de Meun through prevalent attitudes toward poverty assume eschatological significance by being interpreted as tokens of the approach of Judgment Day. Through the image of Faus Semblant *all* religious hypocrites, not merely friars, are numbered among the children of the Antichrist,

Des larrons don il est escrit
Qu'il ont abit de sainteé
E vivent en tel fainteé.
(11714–17)

[About whom it is written / that they dress in a habit of sanctity / and live in such pretence.]

This proliferation of allegations must not detract from an even more basic fact about Faus Semblant, namely that he is the living image of the Cretan liar's dilemma, a moving field of deceit. His frankness is compromised by his very name, allowing for the existence of two diametrically opposed narratives at every step. This tension only increases towards the moment in which he invokes the fond memory of Guillaume de St. Amour, his celebrated historical and literary antagonist,

28 (Ka) and (6) Lyon, Palais des Arts MS 23. See Ernest Langlois, *Les Manuscrits du Roman de la Rose: description et classement* (Paris: H. Champion, 1910), 11, 25, 83, 127, 190, and 131, respectively. All MSS mentioned are fourteenth-century works. Parenthetical letters denote Langlois's classification.

¹⁴ Cf. Sharon A. Farmer, *Surviving Poverty in Medieval Paris* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002).

¹⁵ M[ichel]-M[arie] Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la Polémique Universitaire Parisienne 1250–1259* (Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1972), 12.

and vows to carry his message forward even at the cost of his own life (11501–8). It is the second time that Faus Semblant vows to surrender his life for the sake of a “nobler” cause. The first instance was prompted by his desire to satisfy the God of Love’s command to hear the truth about hypocrisy (10999–11002). At his insistence Faus Semblant swiftly changes his position from explicit opposition to total surrender. With such self-service acting as the dominant guideline, it is impossible and indeed futile to identify Faus Semblant’s affinities beyond himself.

In sum, this ambiguous environment prohibits us from identifying a partisan authorial voice at one side or the other of a defined political border. The very attempt, I believe, is inherently wrong if we wish to understand the *Roman* in terms of its allegorical art rather than its alleged historical veracity. Faus Semblant does not *depict* anyone; he *typifies* hypocrisy. The character is a personification and an allegory, created by Jean de Meun to represent the nature of all liars, not all friars. Jean de Meun crafted a protagonist who turns against himself, in defiance of any particular perspective. If doubts still linger, the narrator’s insistence in a major satellite of the confession that “ne fu m’entencion / De paler contre ome vivant / Sainte religion sivant . . . Mais pour quenoistre . . . Les desleiaus genz, les maudites, / Que Jesus apele ypocrites” [it was not my intention / to rebuke a person living / according to holy religion . . . but to identify . . . the debased people, the evildoers / whom Jesus calls hypocrites] (15252–64) again undermines any categorizing of the attack as simply antifraternial.

Manuscript evidence (surveyed fully in the appendix) reveals that contemporaries did not overlook the ambivalence of Faus Semblant’s confession. I have suggested that the occasional attribution of parts of the work to Guillaume de St. Amour might have been an attempt to secure a partisan reading of the speech in lieu of a clear antifraternial statement. A more prevalent method, however, was resorting to fabrication. A later interpolation containing a vehement attack on mendicant privileges is widely found in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century *Roman* manuscripts.¹⁶ Usually inserted between lines 11222 and 11223, but occasionally affixed to the end of the poem, it has come to be known as “the apocryphal chapter on the friars’ privileges” and frequently consists of some one hundred and fifty lines.¹⁷

¹⁶ As the appendix reveals, over 30% of all extant pre-1400 *Roman* MSS contain some version of this text.

¹⁷ See Langlois, *Manuscripts*, 426–30, which also contains the collated text. Beyond the

One thing is quite clear about this interpolation: it is hardly ambiguous. These verses offer a brazen attack on the fraternal orders' rights of confession, secured in 1282 by the pope's intervention after long years of struggle with the secular clergy. The text diverges from its contiguous narrative in tone and content by its lucid political targeting. Faus Semblant, now "really" a friar, boasts his privileged authority to confess and absolve

Toutes genz ou que je les truisse.
Ne sai prelat nul qui ce puisse,
Fors l'apostoile seulement,
Qui fist cest establissement
Tout en la faveur de nostre ordre.
(v–viii)¹⁸

[All men or those whom I deceive. / No prelate may have such power, / save only the Apostle, / who established these [privileges] / entirely in favor of our order.]

The direct mention of the ecclesiastical forces at play—the prelate, a mendicant order, and the pope—offers for the first time a skewed political picture.

As noted above, the text was in all probability added in the aftermath of Pope Martin IV's bull *Ad fructus uberes* which, among other provisions, stripped local parish priests of their exclusive monopoly over hearing confessions. Canon 21 of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), which obliged every Christian to make at least one annual confession to his or her parish priest, resonates from "chascuns chascuns an a son prestre / Une foiz [each person to his own priest / once]" (x–xi). Yet thanks to Martin IV, the probable referent of the interpolation's "l'apostoile," the decree could be suspended by the friars: "Car nous avons un privilege / Qui de pluseurs fais les aliege" [we have a privilege / which relieves us from many burdens] (xiii–xiv). The local clergy were desolated by the threatening implications of the privilege, as the token speech given by a parishioner reveals. He is no longer dependent on his priest for his salvation, since

internal evidence for a different author, the later dating of the interpolation relies on an allusion in lines xi–xii¹ to Pope Martin IV's bull *Ad fructus uberes* (13 December 1281). Full discussion on the legal peculiarities of this stage in the conflict over mendicant preaching and burial privileges is in P. Glorieux, "Prélats français contre religieux mendiants," *Revue de l'Histoire de l'Eglise de France* 11 (1925): 309–31, 471–95.

¹⁸ Line numbers correspond to Langlois, *Manuscrits*, 426–30.

... cil a cui je fui confès
 M'a deschargié de tout mon fais;
 Absolu m'a de mes pechiez.
 (xvii–xix)

[he to whom I have confessed / discharged me from all my deeds, /
 absolved me from all my sins.]

Consequently, he asserts, "Ne je n'ai pas entencion / De faire autre confession" [I have no intention / to make another confession] (xxi–xxii). Prelate and curate have lost their hold on their flocks, which no longer seek double absolution since that would require a double confession. The parishioner continues:

Je ne dout prelat ne curé
 Qui de confessier me contraigne
 Autrement que je ne m'en plaigne;
 Car je m'en ai bien a cui plaindre.
 Vous ne me pouez pas contraindre
 Ne faire force ne troubler
 Pour ma confession doubler,
 Ne si n'ai pas affeccion
 D'avoir double assolucion.
 (xxviii–xxxvi)

[I fear no prelate or curate, / who will constrain me to confess / beyond
 my will; / for I have one to whom I can very well complain about this. /
 You can oblige me no more, / neither force me nor trouble, / to make my
 confession double; / nor am I inclined / to receive double absolution.]

From the clergy's perspective, the loss of confessional monopoly meant a significant reduction in their ability to monitor the morality of their parish members and posed a serious threat to the social and religious cohesiveness of their communities. It also meant a serious reduction in income for any parish church, whose role as the basic local religious unit was, in a sense, no longer guaranteed.

The privileges were protected by papal authority and supported by the French monarchy, thus rendering futile any attempt to curb the friars' reinforced powers. The parishioner clarifies this point by assuring his priest:

Je voir juges imperiaus,
 Rois, prelaz ne officiaus
 Pour moi ne tendra jugement.
 (xlv–xlvii)

[I shall be safe from imperial judges, / kings, prelates, and officials, / [for] no judgment will be held for me.]

The tone and message are straightforward. As all relevant contemporary institutions are named and aligned, from pope to king, the underscored theme becomes one of power and its abuse, not hypocrisy. Moreover, Faus Semblant is no longer the focus of the narrative. After relinquishing his place to the parishioner, he is distanced from the scene even further by the introduction of the ruthless and power-thirsty

. . . frere Leus,¹⁹ qui tout deveure,
 Combien que devant le gent eure.
 Et cil, jurer l'os et plevir,
 Se savroit bien de vous chevir;
 Car si vous savra atraper
 Que ne li pourrez eschaper
 Senz honte et senz diffamement,
 S'il n'a dou vostre largement;
 Qu'il n'est si fous ne si entules
 Qu'il n'ait bien de Rome des bules,
 S'il li plaist, a vous touz semondre,
 Pour vous travaillier et confondre
 Assez plus loin de deus journees.
 (lvi¹–lviii⁹)

[. . . Friar Wolf, who devours all, / however lucky men were before. / These [men] he dares to judge and swear. / He knows well how to protect himself from you. / For he could trap you / so that you could not escape / without shame and dishonor / if he does not receive from you generously; / for he is not so mad nor such a fool / not to obtain from Rome some bulls / (if it so pleases him) to summon you all / in order to exert and confound you, / in a little more than a two days' journey.]

The secular clergy's ultimate danger lies within two days' journey from Paris, but Friar Wolf is everywhere, posing a threat to each and every individual's dignity and purse. He shames and dishonors; he takes, "devours," "traps," "exerts," and "confounds" all. The presence of this friar is necessary to polemicize an otherwise ambiguous text.

Finally, even Faus Semblant's confession of partiality towards the rich (lxxx–xc) leads not, as we would expect, to furthering his image as a hypocrite, but rather reinforces the theme of his political dominance

¹⁹ Probably a character borrowed from Rutebeuf's *La Discorde de L'Université et des Jacobins*, in *Œuvres Complètes*, 1:240.

over the prelates. This time he threatens direct violence on prelates who dare grumble at the loss of their confessional privileges:

Teus cos leur dorrai seur les testes
 Que lever i ferai teus boces
 Qu'il en perdront mitre et croces.
 (xciv–xcvi)

[For this I shall beat them over the head / and cause them such bruises, / that they will lose their miters and crosses.]

"Thus I deceive them all," he concludes, "so formidable are my privileges" (xcvii–xcviii).

In sum, the interpolation offers a direct, partisan harangue about the friars' abuse of power. It stands well apart from the deep ambiguity of the uninterpolated speech, yet in preceding it, the interpolation efficiently sets the tone of the entire confession; it seems to bring out of the confession an antifraternal voice that had no central place in it to begin with. But does the interpolation's presence in dozens of *Roman* MSS, or the occasional attributions of parts of the *Roman* to Guillaume de St. Amour, indicate an enduring consensus over the speech's original ambivalence? The evidence surveyed in the appendix lays itself open to many possible interpretations: was the speech not antifraternal, or not antifraternal *enough*? What can one make, for instance, of Chantilly, Museum Condeé MS 686, which originally omitted nearly the entire speech, but where later, and on separate occasions, both the speech and the interpolation were added? Can this be said to have been motivated by antifraternalism, or merely by a desire to obtain what was believed to be the authentic text? These questions and others, however, can and should only be answered in terms of particular cases. One such recorded case is the interpretation and appropriation of Faus Semblant in the works of Geoffrey Chaucer.

* * *

The *Roman de la Rose* was hardly Chaucer's sole encounter with literary, theological, or social antifraternal sentiment. One can find such expressions, whether in polemical treatises, poems, or real events, in Chaucer's more immediate surroundings.²⁰ Even if the original context of the struggle at the University of Paris was entirely lost to Chau-

²⁰ Cf. D. W. Robertson, Jr., *Chaucer's London* (New York: Wiley, 1968), 184–94; Arnold Williams, "Chaucer and the Friars," *Speculum* 28 (1953): 499–513; Szittyá, *The Antifraternal Tradition*, 190–230.

cer's contemporary audience, it was supplanted by distinctly similar circumstances in fourteenth-century England: although there were fewer friars in mid-fourteenth-century England than in mid-thirteenth-century France, English friars were never as numerous as in the 1350s, and their popular appeal was never stronger, as evidence from local wills continues to inform us.²¹ However, London and other urban centers witnessed a swell of antimendicant sentiment generated by lay and clerical responses to the friars' growing privileges and material wealth.²² In the first decades of the fourteenth century, quarrels resembling those in Paris between secular masters and friars were waged at both Oxford and Cambridge,²³ and the high mortality rate among mendicant convents during the Black Death, a calamity commonly interpreted as divine retribution, could have easily validated a perception of the friars' fall from grace.²⁴ All this can be augmented by the often-violent suppression of the so-called Spiritualist wing of the Franciscan Order by Pope John XXII, an event that, for many, underscored the order's actual departure from its original path.²⁵ In this context an allusion to the events of the 1250s would have been a powerful and bitter reminder of the friars' perceived threat.

²¹ By 1350 the friars peaked in England and Wales, numbering between 165 and 200 houses and between 3722 and 5016 members. See David Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales* (London: Longman, 1971), 363. Sizable bequests to mendicant convents feature, for instance, in virtually all pre-1400 documents in *Wills and Inventories Illustrative of the History, Manners, Language, Statistics, &c. of the Northern Counties of England* (London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1835), 6–42. Cf. also M. G. A. Vale, *Piety, Charity and Literacy among the Yorkshire Gentry, 1370–1480*, Borthwick Papers, no. 50 (York: St. Anthony's Press, 1976), 20.

²² Cf. Robertson, *Chaucer's London*, 24, 32, 61–62, 86, 107. Copeland, "The Relations between the Secular Clergy and the Mendicant Friars," esp. 97–122, gives a more nuanced but ultimately similar view of these strained relations.

²³ Cf. H. Rashdall, "The Friars Preachers v. The University," *Oxford Historical Society Publications*, 2d series, no. 2, ed. Montagu Burrows (Oxford, 1890), 193–273; A. G. Little, "The Friars v. The University of Cambridge," *English Historical Review* 50 (1935): 686–96; W. Gumbley, *The Cambridge Dominicans* (Oxford: Blackfriars, 1938), 12–14.

²⁴ To be sure, the argument could have equally applied to all monastic houses. Cf. Philip Ziegler, *The Black Death*, rep. ed. (1969; repr., New York: Penguin Books, 1982), 274–75; Peter George Mode, *The Influence of the Black Death on the English Monasteries* (Menasha, WI: George Banta, 1916).

²⁵ Cf. Duncan Nimmo, *Reform and Division in the Medieval Franciscan Order: From Saint Francis to the Foundation of the Capuchins* (Rome: Capuchin Historical Institute, 1987); John R. H. Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order from Its Origins to the Year 1517* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); Malcolm D. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty* (London: S.P.C.K., 1961); David Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty: The Origins of the Usus Pauper Controversy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989).

How does Chaucer utilize this seemingly convenient context? A consistency in certain objections to friars—their ubiquitous presence (“serchen every lond and every streem, / As thikke as motes in the sonne-beem”),²⁶ especially at universities—can be gleaned from Chaucer’s character of the humble friar who “had in scole that honour” of being called “maister” (*Summoner’s Tale* [hereafter *ST*], 2185–86). The words can serve as a sharp reminder of ensuing dissatisfaction with the friars’ settlement in academic centers, quite in contrast (at least in the Franciscans’ case) to their ethos of a life of preaching and begging by the wayside. The *Canterbury Tales’* (*CT*) “antifraternal” tale is told by the friars’ bitter ecclesiastical enemy, the summoner—a contemporary political tension that is further reflected by the dramatic juxtaposition of friar Huberd and the summoner as outspoken antagonists within the *CT*’s economy. In this antagonistic equation the summoner seems to have won a privileged position. Scholars’ appreciation of Chaucer’s deep familiarity with mendicant theology and practice only transformed the summoner’s critique from antifraternalism to Chaucer’s antifraternalism, earning him a secure place in the antifraternal Hall of Fame, alongside St. Amour, Rutebeuf, and Jean de Meun.²⁷ But what should be the market value for a censure of a drunk, lecherous summoner, who “speke and crie as he were wood” (*General Prologue* [*GP*], 636)? Can an identifiable authorial voice be ascribed to “a gentil harlot and a kynde [. . . who] wolde suffre for a quart of wyn / a good felawe to have his concubyn” (*GP*, 647–50)?

The validity of the summoner’s statements is questionable at best. Rather than in antifraternal partisanship, the affinities between the *CT* and the *Roman* can be located in the realm of ambiguity. Both works emphasize the tension between the form and the content of a pilgrimage. For Amant, the *Roman*’s chief protagonist, a journey with a defined emotional, if not spiritual end unfolds in remarkably different terms, climaxing in a ridiculous penetration, the “plucking” of the Rose. As for the English pilgrims, their joint travels, as well as their individual verbal wanderings, that is, their *errores*, recapitulate those of Amant and his cohort. While Amant is driven by his cupidity, the pilgrims’ stories originate in the merry innkeeper’s suggestion of a tale-telling contest.

²⁶ *The Wife of Bath’s Tale*, 867–68. All citations of Chaucer are from *The Riverside Chaucer*, gen. ed. Larry D. Benson, 3d ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).

²⁷ Cf. John V. Fleming, “The Antifraternalism of the *Summoner’s Tale*,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 65 (1966): 688–700.

Yet the ascent in either cases bears little resemblance to that delineated, for instance, in St. Bonaventure's *Itinerarium*.

To be sure, these affinities cannot be reduced to a simple set of mirror images. An intricate web connects many of the characters of the *Roman* and the *CT* without positing a single complementary image for Faus Semblant. Rather, through Chaucer's brilliant appropriation emerges a variegated resonance of the character's two distinct voices—the partisan and the ambiguous.

This process of appropriation may have been instigated by the translation of the French work into the Middle English *Romaunt*. One does not have to accept the extant Fragment C of the *Romaunt* as Chaucer's in order to claim that its contents, or indeed the poem as a whole, exerted a significant influence on him.²⁸ We can simply assume that Chaucer either (a) translated the work at some point, as he himself testifies,²⁹ or (b) was otherwise well acquainted with it. The widespread recognition that the *Roman* “probably exerted on Chaucer a more lasting and more important influence than any other work in the vernacular literature of either France or England” furnishes a solid *a fortiori* argument for either of these assumptions.³⁰

Still, there is good reason to believe that the *Romaunt*, specifically in its extant (or highly similar) form, was known to Chaucer either as a reader and quite possibly as a translator. Fragment C contains Faus Semblant's speech in its entirety, including a unique version of the apocryphal chapter on the friars' privileges.³¹ The translation of the work provided an opportunity to iron out some stylistic peculiarities in the French interpolation and to render them less obvious. One would like to think that the translator's intimacy with the text enabled

²⁸ The recent work of Xiang Feng reaffirms Max Kaluza's attribution of Fragment C to Chaucer on philological grounds. See the Introduction to *The Romaunt of the Rose*, ed. Charles Dahlberg (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 3–24.

²⁹ *Legend of Good Women*, 329.

³⁰ Preface to the *Romaunt of the Rose*, in *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, 2d ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961), 564.

³¹ Lines 6082–7292 (from a total of 7692). The interpolation comprises lines 6383–472. Its peculiarity lies in its incongruity with the version in *Ri*, the supposed source of Fragment C. *Bu*, the comparative text for the reviser of fragments C and B, could not have been the source for this unique version, since it has omitted the interpolation entirely. But *Bu* contains the warning after 11222, which, according to Langlois, indicates the presence of an interpolation in the immediate source. It is plausible, therefore, that the reviser possessed an earlier MS of the *B* family, with which we no longer are familiar, since all extant *Bs* reviewed by Langlois contain quite dissimilar versions. Another option is to posit the existence of a third text containing the French parallel of the Middle English lines.

him in this case to recognize and address the idiosyncrasy of these lines.

Departing from its French source, the Middle English translation sets up a situation similar to the basic plot of the *ST*. Within the space of six lines in the *Romaunt*, the interpolation's original "Touz li monde" and "Chascuns chascun" (viii¹³, x) are rendered respectively into "husbonde and wyf" and "man and wyf" (*Romaunt*, 6379, 6383). This variation lends a particularist quality to the text, so that a specific couple (rather than all mankind) falls prey to the friar's manipulations. The couple tends to the friar's needs following his sermon and is finally urged to confess. At this point in the interpolation Faus Semblant puts into the parishioner's mouth the argument against double confession to be flung at the priest (6390–440) and then moves to reclaim his own privileged status over that of the secular clergy.³²

It is a small leap to see how the basic plot in the *ST* is an exact inversion of the translated interpolation, the retaliation, as it were, of the *Romaunt*'s deceived couple. Following his sermon at the local church, Friar John jarringly announces himself at the couple's door: "Deus hic!" (1770). It is yet another mission to extort money from the affluent Thomas and food and sexual indulgence from his wife—a plot that dissolves nastily into un-thin air. His attempt to solicit a confession (2093) is swiftly rebutted by Thomas, in words that echo the *Romaunt*: "I have be shryven this day at my curat" (2095). The shamed friar leaves with empty ears, hands, and stomach, and with the unsettling mathematical problem of dividing Thomas's "gift" equally among his brethren (2149). Something of a happy end, especially considering its century-old antithesis.

Yet the plot-driven inversion does not maintain the straightforward partisanship of the interpolation. Despite John's evident immorality—he is a self-indulging glutton: *tipped staf*, marble tables and all, whose straying from his order's path is manifest—both Thomas and his wife (as well as the people who sustain him along lines 1744–60) are held equally responsible for the situation. Behind the wife's gullibility lies a strong desire to manipulate Friar John. Her passiveness at his sexual advances (1802–5), and her uncensored exposés, offering him a bedside view of her conjugal life (1826–31), reveal a character calculated to promote a highly personal agenda. This is also evident from her attempts to exploit the friar as a spiritual medium for news regarding the celestial

³² The *CT*'s friar's claims to political superiority already emerge in *GP*, 218–20.

whereabouts of her recently deceased child. Although these attempts result in Friar John's shameless monologue (1851–68), they at least attest to the scarcely less hypocritical nature of the wife's piety.

Sluggish Thomas, laying "Bedrede upon a couch lowe" (1769), is hardly a more inspiring figure, although it is his wit that ultimately prevails over Friar John's. His routine handouts to the friars do not go unnoticed, nor does a questionable attitude towards charity that emerges from the gambling-like strategy of his offerings (1951). Yet unlike Jean de Meun's barons at the end of Faus Semblant's speech, Thomas, though driven more by economic considerations than by moral righteousness, thwarts John's plan.

The assaulting baronial host had embraced Faus Semblant in order to gain his support for their expedition; likewise the *ST*'s couple appears to have been repeatedly reliant upon the friar's "religious" services as mediator and supernatural intercessor. Complicity and cooperation were necessary in both narratives to perpetuate corruption, and in both cases the authors delegated responsibility over moral decline among all parties involved.

Chaucer's continuous appropriation of Faus Semblant goes beyond the translation of the *Roman* and the composition of the *ST*. It has long been noted, for instance, that in the *Pardoner's Prologue* and in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* he drew on the confessional form and ironic tone of Faus Semblant's confession. The instances explored above, however, illustrate Chaucer's understanding specifically of Faus Semblant's ambiguous character and his employment of its distilled form.³³ The other facet of Faus Semblant's character, its (interpolated) partisan antifraternalism, is isolated in the brief *Summoner's Prologue* (*SP*): in his vision the hell-bound friar breathes a sigh of relief at the sight of a mendicant-free cavern. His accompanying angel soon corrects the picture. As they approach Satan, the angel exclaims:

"Hold up thy tayl, thou Sathanas!" quod he;
 "Shewe forth thyn ers, and lat the frere se
 Where is the nest of freres in this place!"
 And ere that half a furlong wey of space,
 Right so as bees out of a swarmen from a hyve,
 Out of the develed ers ther gone dryve

³³ It is perhaps in recognition of the *Wife of Bath's* similarity to Faus Semblant that Friar Huberd (who is a "false friar"!) commends her tale, for she has "touched . . . / In scole-matere greet difficultee" (*Friar's Prologue*, 1271–72).

Twenty thousand freres on a route,
 And thurghout helle swarmed al aboute,
 And comen again as faste as they may gon,
 And in his ers they crepten everychon.

(1689–98)

The gruesome depiction of numerous friars under Satan's tail in hell appears to be antifraternality in its pristine form. Yet the scene still inherits the stamp of Jean de Meun's ambiguity, for, on one hand, the summoner's antagonist along the pilgrimage is, by the summoner's own reckoning, a "false Frere" (1670) who is "neither a 'typical friar' nor a 'character' of any kind, but . . . the abstraction 'Faus Semblant' as he appears in the habit of a friar";³⁴ on the other hand, the summoner himself, as we have seen, is no less guilty of treachery and greediness. In other words, the two characters and their respective tales are one and the same.³⁵ Together they typify hypocrisy, not real men or their respective affiliate social categories.

In contrast to the *SP*'s graphic imagery and brutality, the *ST* offers a nuanced critique, which, very much in the spirit of Faus Semblant's original speech, points fingers in all social directions through an unflattering portrayal of all the characters involved. Chaucer was able to overcome the straightforward partisanship of the interpolation and in this way avoid the constraints of a political or social affiliation.

In fine, Chaucer grasped and emulated the multivalent nature of Faus Semblant. Familiar with an amended textual tradition and perhaps aware of the interpolation that it contained, he allocated for each of its contrasting voices—the partisan and the ambiguous—a distinct place in the *CT*. To each of these he added the touch of his own genius. In the *ST* he managed to maintain a wider sense of social critique despite employing the partisan voice associated with the interpolation, by delegating responsibility not only to Friar John's illicit motives, but also to the calculated hypocrisy of the people he encounters. In the *Pardoner's Prologue* and the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* he retained the superb form of ambiguous confession that characterizes Faus Semblant's original speech. Even in the coarse humor of the *SP* Chaucer avoided categorical antifraternality, stressing a critique of both those who have already fallen and those who are in danger of doing so: hypocrites.

It is not the case then that Chaucer wrote exclusively *against* friars.

³⁴ Robertson, *Preface to Chaucer*, 249.

³⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 266–67, 275.

It was in this respect—and not in his so-called “antifraternalism”—that he may be said to have followed in the footsteps of Jean de Meun. Both authors chose quintessentially hypocritical characters to broaden, rather than limit, their respective social critiques, while exploring the expressive potential inherent in a well-developed character of a Cretan liar.³⁶ That this choice, at least in the case of the *Roman*, discomfited certain contemporaries seeking a more straightforward antifraternal rhetoric is borne out by a careful survey of the reception of Faus Semblant’s confession. By balancing historical context, MS evidence, and a close reading of the various (“original” and interpolated) texts, I hope to have offered a methodologically sound approach to explore the complex and shifting “horizons of expectations” of Jean de Meun’s readers. Chaucer was merely one among many attentive readers, as were, for instance, Dante and Boccaccio. The latter, like the interpolators of Faus Semblant’s confession and the attributors of some *Roman* segments to Guillaume de St. Amour, saw through the false seeming of a friar’s garb.³⁷

Princeton University

Appendix

THE TEXTUAL RECEPTION OF FAUS SEMBLANT’S CONFESSION

Manuscript evidence reveals that Faus Semblant’s speech did not go unnoticed by contemporary and later scribes. Their reactions were diverse. Some rejected it entirely or partially, while others retained the passage but prefaced it with a warning in recognition of its potential disturbance. Many, however, kept it more or less in what they may

³⁶ Boccaccio employs a strikingly similar technique in portraying “Friar” Tedaldo (*Decameron* 3, 7).

³⁷ The generosity of John V. Fleming; the insightfulness of friends and colleagues at two of his seminars; the critical attention given to earlier versions by William C. Jordan and Jeff Schwegman; and the opportunity to share the work at Yale University’s Medieval Studies Graduate Conference (October 2002) are all happily acknowledged. Lia Lynch, a staunch and fruitful critic, was instrumental in banging scattered ideas into coherent shape. Any failure to incorporate all of this good advice is entirely my own. Manuscript research was greatly aided by the staffs of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, and Firestone Library’s Department of Special Collections, Princeton. I have also benefited from the expertise of Meradith T. McMunn on the illuminations of *Roman de la Rose* MSS.

have thought was its original form, although frequently including a sizable interpolation. The following is a comprehensive review of current knowledge regarding the reception of the relevant passages. Following Langlois, I have limited the scope of this survey to late thirteenth- and fourteenth-century MSS.³⁸

Interpolations. Langlois identified a late thirteenth-century interpolation in fifty-seven MSS, most commonly between lines 11222–23. The actual text varies from copy to copy. It ranges in length from a minimum of 82 verses (group 5; 2 MSS) to a maximum of 151 verses (group 7; 29 MSS).³⁹ To these we can now safely add a considerable number of later discoveries. First are Harvard University, Houghton Library MS F. 14 and Yale University, Beinecke Library MS 33.⁴⁰ Next, Princeton University MS Garrett 126 contains a full version of the interpolation.⁴¹ Finally, I have discovered no less than seven such texts in Pierpont Morgan Library's rich collection of *Roman* MSS: G. 32, M. 503, M. 372, M. 324, M. 120, M. 132, M. 48.⁴² There is evidence for at least one more fourteenth-

³⁸ According to Meradith McMunn (personal correspondence, June 2002) there are currently 324 known *Roman* MSS and fragments in public repositories, of which 217 (179 full versions and 38 fragments), or roughly two-thirds, date from before 1400. This figure excludes redacted texts. The division across centuries is as follows: 13th—13, 14th—204, 15th—97, 16th and later or unknown—10. Only one extant fragment (Paris, *Bib. Nat.* MS nouv. acq. fr. 9252) includes lines 11222–23 “with any interpolation that may be located there.”

³⁹ See Langlois, *Manuscripts*, 426–30.

⁴⁰ Both known to but never studied by Langlois (*Roman de la Rose*, 1:49n; *Manuscripts*, 196). The interpolations are of 92 and 152 lines respectively, though the former is a later addition appended to the end of the text (fols. 152r–v). Cf. Richmond L. Hawkins, “The Manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose* in the Libraries of Harvard and Yale Universities,” *Romanic Review* 19 (1928): 1–24.

⁴¹ One hundred fifty-one lines between fols. 79v–80v (in Langlois's numbering: i–viii¹⁷, viii¹⁹–viii²⁰, ix–xii, xii¹–xii⁴, xiii–xiv, xiv¹–xiv⁴, xv–l, lvi¹–lvi², lvii–lviii, lviii¹–lviii³⁰, lix–xcviii). This MS is mentioned by Langlois (*Manuscripts*, 209) in his section on “Manuscripts dont le domicile actuel est inconnu.”

⁴² The interpolations vary in length and are always embedded in the text, not appended to it: (1) 92 lines between fols. 79v–r (i–viii, ix–xii, xiii–xiv, xv–l, lvii–lviii, lxvii–lxxiv, lxxix–lxxvi, lxxv–xcviii); (2) 145 lines between fols. 75r–76r (I–l, lvi¹–xcviii); (3) 145 lines between fols. 74r–75r (I–l, lvi¹–xcviii); (4) 145 lines between fols. 75v–76v (I–l, lvi¹–xcviii); (5) 150 lines between fols. 65r–66r (I–l, lvi¹–lviii²⁷, lviii³⁰–xcviii); (6) 132 lines between fols. 80r–81v (I–l, lvi¹, ?, li–lii, liii–lvi, lvii–lviii, lix–lxx, ?, ?, lxxi–xcviii); (7) MS M. 48 used to have some version of the interpolation before a quire between current fols. 81 and 82 was removed (fol. 81v ends at line 11 of the interpolation, but fol. 82r begins with line 12226). Apart from this MS and MS M. 185, which is missing all of lines 10254–20581, all the texts I have studied contain no significant omissions from Faus Semblant's narrative. MSS M. 48 and M. 132 are unstudied but noted in *Manuscripts*, 210 (then *Bib. Didot*, no. 33) and 197–98 respectively.

century MS that contained the chapter (see next entry). All in all, then, there are at least sixty-eight MSS containing the interpolation; that is just over thirty percent of extant contemporary MSS.⁴³

Modern editions of the *Roman* offer diverse treatments of the interpolation. Unlike earlier editors, Langlois himself (3:310–15) did not incorporate the interpolation in his edition, but placed the full text in his notes and later elaborated on it in his systematic *Manuscripts* (426–30). Earlier editions that include the interpolation are Francisque-Michel (Paris, 1864) and the pseudonymous Pierre Marteau (Paris, 1878–80). Modern translators, such as Karl August Ott (Munich: W. Fink, 1976), Charles Dahlberg (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), and André Mary, 2d ed. (Paris: Gallimard, 1949), in following Langlois, left the interpolation out of their texts but unfortunately also omitted it from their notes (Dahlberg does discuss the interpolation in his notes). Frances Horgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) followed them by translating Felix Lecoy's more recent edition (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1969). Daniel Poirion (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1974), although generally following Lecoy, did insert an interpolation of 134 lines, and Armand Strubel's edition and translation (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1984) contains an (acknowledged) interpolation of ninety-six lines. F. S. Ellis's verse-translation (1928; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1975) accepted the interpolation as an integral part of the text, while Harry W. Robbins (New York: Dutton, 1962) offers a balanced presentation of the translated interpolation, signaling its unoriginality while keeping it in the text.

Caution clauses. Three MSS preface the resuming of Faus Semblant's speech by a warning: "whatever follows [until the end of the speech?] you may pass on to no one": (a) Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale MS 11019 (*Bu*): eleven lines (between lines 11222–23); (b) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS fr. 1576 (anc. 7629⁵) (*Bû*): ten lines (Latin; between lines 11227–28); (c) London, British Library MS Egerton 881(1) ($\chi\omega$): nine lines (Latin; between lines 11222–23, after the interpolation).

In Langlois's opinion, the warning could only have originally come before the aforementioned interpolation, although the interpolation

⁴³ For the interpolation's dissemination beyond the fourteenth century see, for example, Maxwell Luria, "A Sixteenth-Century Gloss on the *Roman de la Rose*," *Medieval Studies* 44 (1982): 333–70. The MS itself dates to the fifteenth century.

does not always follow.⁴⁴ Marteau records another warning combined with a significant omission, though he does not specify the source.⁴⁵

Minor additions. The *B* family and several other MSS contain several additions to the speech, at times adding up to over thirty lines:⁴⁶ (a) seven MSS from the *B* family and $\chi\omega$ contain an interpolation of six lines after line 11316 that augments the claim regarding the mendicants' break from Christian tradition by referring back to St. Augustine's *le livre des oeuvres des moins*;⁴⁷ (b) between lines 11568–69 the same group of *B* MSS add a further ten verses on the confessional rights of the mendicants;⁴⁸ (c) replacing lines 11903–4 in the same group there is a further sixteen-line expansion.⁴⁹

Redactions. The scribe of Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 845, a collation of extracts from the *Roman*, included much of Faus Semblant's confession, followed directly by the narrator's apology. In Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 101 (*Tou*) and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS fr. 797 (*Mor*), containing Gui de Mori's 1290 rendition of the *Roman*, hundreds of lines were added on the subject of mendicancy and monastic corruption, immediately followed by the narrator's apology.⁵⁰ Given that this reworking sought to reshape de Meun's narrative so as to form a coherent continuation of Guillaume de Lorris's part (obviously interpreting Faus Semblant as a non-integral part of the theme of Love), it is actually the fact that the speech was left nearly intact, which makes it significant. Hence it is justly deemed by Sylvia Huot "a rather odd exception, considering that virtually any other portion of Jean's poem has more bearing on love, seduction, or the quest for the Rose than do the words of Faus Semblant."⁵¹

⁴⁴ The texts are given in full in Langlois, *Manuscripts*, 396–97.

⁴⁵ Marteau, *Roman de la Rose*, 3:422 (note to 84–85).

⁴⁶ This augments the information in Sylvia Huot, "Authors, Scribes, Remanieurs: A Note on the Textual History of the *Romance of the Rose*," in *Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception*, ed. Kevin Brownlee and Sylvia Huot (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 216. My debt to Dr. Huot's work goes far beyond what these notes would express.

⁴⁷ *Be, Bi, Bá, Bî, Bê, Bu, Bû*. See Langlois, *Manuscripts*, 381.

⁴⁸ See Langlois, *Le Roman de la Rose*, 3:322.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 326.

⁵⁰ Sylvia Huot, *The Romance of the Rose and Its Medieval Readers: Interpretation, Reception, Manuscript Transmission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 236–39.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 217.

Omissions. Although less common than the various forms of preserving and augmenting the speech, six extant MSS contain texts censured to varying degrees: (a) Chantilly, Museum Condeé MS 686 (*Ac*) initially omitted lines 11223–980, but the omission, and later the interpolation, were separately appended;⁵² (b) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS fr. 25526 (*Bi*) omits lines 10952–11168, 11223–26, 11392–406, 11409–10, 11425–96, 11599–640, 11717–86, 11849–94, and 11953–68 (a total of 483 lines from the speech). It also omits all of lines 12541–14752, which cover “antifraternal” lines 13967–14006 and 14719–752; lines 15153–302, which cover the “antifraternal” verses 15243–302; and lines 15829–20710, which cover “antifraternal” verses 15935–42; (c) Turin, Biblioteca de l’Università MS L. III 22 (*Be*) omits lines 11599–640; (d) Rennes, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 243(1) (*Lm*) omits 674 verses in total (11235–40, 11251–54, 11269–552, 11561–64, 11573–74, 11577–896); (e) P. Morgan Library MS M. 185 is missing all of lines 10254–20581 (probably an entire quire); (f) P. Morgan Library MS M. 48 now lacks lines 11223–12226, though it certainly used to have some version of the aforementioned interpolation, since the extant text breaks off at line 11 of the interpolation.

As far as I could tell, there are no major omissions from the speech recorded in any MS that currently contains the interpolation, with the possible exception of Marteau’s aforementioned (but unspecified) MS.

⁵² Langlois, *Manuscripts*, 357–58.