I am indebted to Professor Charity Canon Willard for the idea for this study. Several years ago after a slide talk I had given on the violence, especially violence toward women, which dominates the programs of illustration in many manuscripts of the *Roman de la Rose*, she remarked with her accustomed candor, “Now I understand what Christine was objecting to.” It is true that I had perhaps loaded my argument by selecting the most visually shocking scenes of mutilation, suicide, murder and execution in *Rose* illustrations from fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth century manuscripts. However, the remark inspired me to try to discover, if possible, which specific manuscript had so revolted Christine de Pizan that she conducted an epistolary debate with some of the leading scholars and theologians of her day. Was her reaction due, at least in part, to experiencing the *Roman de la Rose* in an illustrated text?

In a letter to Pierre Col, secretary to the King, dated 2 October 1402, Christine wrote “la compilacion du dit *de la Rose* puet avoir empoissonny plusieurs cuers humaines” (“the work of the *Rose* has poisoned many human hearts”). In the present study I will not propose that Christine, like the monks in Umberto Eco’s *The Name of the Rose*, was a victim of a codex impregnated with a toxic substance. Instead, I have examined the surviving *Rose* manuscripts owned by Christine’s friends and patrons to determine whether one of the illustrated copies may have influenced her notoriously
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1 “Mothers and Daughters: The Other Women in the *Roman de la Rose*,” presented at the CEMERS Conference, Binghamton University, October 21, 1995.

negative reaction to the poem, especially Jean de Meun’s continuation, and if so, which one?

Charity Canon Willard rightly points to the importance to Christine de Pizan of the royal library formed by Charles V, king of France, and from Christine’s biography of Charles V she quotes a description of the palace library in the Louvre as containing “all the most notable volumes that had been compiled by sovereign authors, either of Holy Scriptures, or theology, philosophy, and all the sciences, very well written and richly decorated, always by the best scribes.”³ Professor Willard goes on to describe King Charles V’s love of books and learning, and his influence on his younger brothers, Philippe le Hardi and Jean duc de Berry. As we shall see, all three men come into our story.⁴

Christine’s decision to attack the morality of the Rose was an assault on a contemporary cultural icon, though the debate took place nearly a century after the death of Jean de Meun. To judge by the number of extant manuscripts, the Roman de la Rose was one of the most popular and influential secular poems of the Middle Ages, known to its readers as a love poem, an allegorized seduction set in a dream vision in which “l’art d’Amors est tote enclose.”⁵ Guillaume de Lorris, the first of its two authors, intended his poem on the art of love as a gift for his beloved. Some years after


⁴ Willard, Life and Works, identifies Christine’s more prominent friends and patrons, with references to the scholarship on their libraries and book collecting. Patrick De Winter, La Bibliothèque de Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne (1364-1404) (Paris: CNRS, 1985) is a particularly detailed and thorough examination on the collection and inventories one of them, with a full bibliography of pertinent scholarship through the early 1980’s.

Guillaume’s premature death, Jean de Meun completed the work, which he labeled a mirror for lovers, in a continuation famous for its irony and breadth of scope.

The *Roman de la Rose* Manuscripts

Although the subject of both parts of the poem is human sexuality, my analysis of the programs of illustration in *Roman de la Rose* manuscripts demonstrates a paradoxical preponderance of scenes of violence, often directed against women. In the central allegory, the seduction of the girl is depicted in both the text and the manuscript paintings as a military conquest in which the army of the God of Love lays siege to the Castle of Jealousy, ultimately overcoming it in a fiery assault. Other violent and misogynistic episodes drawn from Ovidian material contain deceptions, mutilations, and deaths. Sometimes these are chosen for illustration by the artists as well. A reaction to the graphic depiction of the shocking scenes would certainly have been consistent with Christine’s objections to the text, including its misogyny, and it would not be surprising if such pictures had influenced her response to the poem in its manuscript context. But can we prove it?

Unfortunately, Christine does not tell us which manuscript or manuscripts of the *Rose* she actually read, so my investigation began with the manuscripts to which Christine might have had access in collections of her friends and patrons. As any student of ownership history quickly discovers, the early owners of the vast majority of medieval manuscripts are unknown and probably unknowable. Even when we learn from estate inventories, letters, and other documents that a particular individual owned a copy of a work, it may be impossible to connect that knowledge with a
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particular extant manuscript. A relatively small number of manuscripts have dedicatory inscriptions which identify patrons, sometimes with armorial devices or mottoes. These features could be, and often were, added by later owners. A few owners, even at the earliest period, were in the habit of writing their names in their books, just as we do today, and secretaries, librarians, preparers of estate inventories, and later owners sometimes wrote notes naming early owners of the manuscripts. But even setting aside the sometimes difficult task of identifying the armorial signs and authenticating the *ex-libris* inscriptions, it is accurate to say that most medieval and Renaissance owners of *Rose* manuscripts remain unknown.

My study of the ownership histories of over three hundred *Rose* manuscripts has taught me that the situation is not much better for more recent periods. Beginning in the sixteenth century, many individual manuscripts support the construction of fascinating and tantalizing partial histories, which connect *Rose* manuscripts with the evolution of book collecting, the rise of scholarship, and the foundation of great private, academic, and national libraries. A large proportion of the *Rose* manuscripts, especially the more elegant and expensive ones, must have been in libraries belonging to French aristocrats until the time of the French Revolution, but in many instances that upheaval destroyed whatever contextual information might have linked particular manuscripts to their early owners. The dispersal of *Rose* manuscripts during the Revolution and in the decades immediately following is reflected in the fact that many manuscripts have no known ownership history before their appearance in municipal libraries all over France, and in private collections all over Europe, during the first half of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, rebinding of manuscripts has sometimes resulted in the loss of ownership information such as coats of arms, bookplates, and inscriptions on guard leaves which were discarded.

The easiest manuscripts to trace are those which entered royal and public institutions, such as national and university libraries, at an early date. Many others remained in private collections until quite recently, and a number still remain in private hands today. For these, the tracing of ownership history requires considerable scholarly detective work, and often yields only a discontinuous
story with long periods of unknown ownership. Thus, it is very possible that some of the extant manuscripts whose early history is unknown, including those now in widely scattered locations around the world — from the United Kingdom to the United States and from Spain to South Africa — might have been in the right collections at the right time to have influenced Christine. The search, then, must include all the Rose manuscripts which existed early enough for Christine to have used them, ruling out only those which were demonstrably in collections to which she could not have had access during the period when she formed her opinion of the Roman de la Rose. The results of the present study are preliminary, but I have discovered six extant manuscripts which were in collections probably accessible to Christine: four datable to the fourteenth century and two marginal cases made near the turn of the fifteenth century, which could have existed in time to have shaped the views which Christine presented in the debate. Although there is no basis for identifying any particular one of these as the copy that Christine read, we can draw some inferences from them about possible manuscript influences on Christine’s opinions.

The data for this paper were collected in my research to prepare a catalogue of the illustrated manuscripts of the Rose. This catalogue will include descriptions of all known illustrated copies, as well as manuscripts with blank spaces whose illustrations were never executed and those whose illustrations have been removed. So far, I have identified three hundred fifteen Rose manuscripts and fragments from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, two hundred forty-three of which are illustrated. Two hundred thirty-one manuscripts are complete or nearly complete. Forty-six complete manuscripts have one or more blanks for illustrations which were planned but not executed. Only thirty-one complete manuscripts have no illustrations at all.

In general, the illustrated Rose manuscripts are notable for the absence of a shared program of illustrations derived from an early prototype or model. The number of extant illustrations ranges from
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7 It is also possible that unillustrated fragments of the Rose may come from illustrated manuscripts.
one to one hundred sixty-one per copy; eighteen manuscripts each have one hundred illustrations or more. One fragment containing less than half of the poem may have been the most extensively illustrated copy, originally produced with more than two hundred miniatures. The majority of *Rose* manuscripts have between twenty and fifty illustrations, but every number of illustrations from seven to forty-seven is represented by at least one and no more than seven manuscripts, and this evenly distributed pattern continues from forty-nine to one hundred eighteen illustrations with only a few gaps. The lack of clusters around one or even a few numbers of illustrations is a strong argument against any theory which would derive the programs of illustrations in *Rose* manuscripts from one or a small number of influential archetypes.

In all, there are more than seven thousand extant *Rose* miniatures, about fourteen hundred uncompleted blank spaces for miniatures, and about three hundred fifty historiated initials, cut out miniatures, and illustrations in the margins, not counting unrelated *bas-de-page* illustrations and doodles.

*Rose* manuscripts often begin with a large illustration, sometimes occupying a large portion of a page. It may be in multiple sections and there may also be marginal illustrations such as heads in medallions or the rabbit hunt, whose erotic iconography has been discussed by John Fleming. Subsequent illustrations are most frequently one column wide, though some are two and a few are three columns in width. Historiated initials such as those in copies now in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Chalon-sur-Saône and the Berlin Staatsbibliothek are infrequent, and only one late manuscript, signed with the scribal pseudonym *Jacobus plenus amoris*, has a substantial number of them: eighty-two.

Practical salesmanship, which led to putting most illustrations toward the beginning of each manuscript to make it appear fuller, may have biased the selections in favor of a greater emphasis on the scenes in Guillaume de Lorris’s poem, such as portrayals of the
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vices on the wall and the frolicking dancers in the Garden of Deduit. Nevertheless, the Ovidian material and the final seduction sequence in Jean de Meun’s poem captured the imagination of numerous illustrators, who produced many interesting variations on the intertwined themes of eroticism and violence which so dominate Jean’s learned continuation.

The quality of *Rose* manuscripts varies widely from elegant expensive copies such as those produced for Louise of Savoy, Englebert of Nassau, and Francis I, to pedestrian bookshop copies. At the end of the scale are the sometimes crude but often lively versions produced by individuals for their own use. Based on the available evidence, I believe that Christine may have had access to one of the more elegant illustrated manuscripts, in the library of a noble or royal friend or patron.

**Manuscripts that Christine Could Have Seen**

Christine de Pizan was born around 1364, married aged fifteen in 1380, and widowed in 1390 with three young children, a niece, and her widowed mother to support when she seems to have begun her literary career. She appears to have formed her negative opinion of Jean de Meun’s part of the *Roman de la Rose* by the time she composed her first long poem, the *Epistre au Dieu d’Amours*, which she dated “le jour de May la solemnée feste” 1399. Thus it is unlikely that any manuscript of the *Rose* produced after 1399 significantly shaped her prejudices against the work, and it is more probable that the copy or copies which she read existed in 1398 or before. Christine might have seen *Rose* manuscripts in the collections of Charles V and his two sons Charles VI and Louis I, duc d’Orléans. Charles V’s younger brothers Louis I, duc d’Anjou, Jean, duc de Berry, and Philippe le Hardi, duc de Bourgogne, also
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had important libraries where Christine might have seen illustrated *Rose* manuscripts. Clues to the contents of these collections may be found in inventories and in the later records of collections owned by descendants who may have inherited their manuscripts, such as Jean sans Peur, son of Philippe le Hardi, and Philippe le Bel, son of Jean sans Peur and grandson of Philippe le Hardi. It is also possible that some of the manuscripts in the collections of royal and noble French families may have come from the collections of earlier owners who had made them available to Christine. However, many of the surviving manuscripts which we can associate with Christine de Pizan’s patrons and friends date from the fifteenth century, and so are too late to have influenced what she wrote in the *querelle*.

If we restrict our investigation to manuscripts made before 1400, we find an extant corpus of 184 manuscripts, of which 148 (80%) are illustrated. Given this preponderance of illustrated *Rose* manuscripts, it seems very likely that Christine read an illustrated copy of the text.

Although it is possible that Christine owned a copy of the *Rose*, this seems rather unlikely, especially in view of her financial situation. None of the extant *Rose* manuscripts have *ex-libris* inscriptions or even anecdotal connections to Christine. If we were to suppose, based on the discoveries of Professor Willard and the joint work of Christine Reno, Gilbert Ouy, and James Laidlaw, that Christine de Pizan, herself an accomplished scribe and later the director of her own book production workshop, would have made herself a copy of the *Rose*, this only pushes our problem back to the question of where she obtained the exemplar from which she copied the poem.\(^\text{10}\)

All of this leads to the conclusion that her knowledge of the *Rose*

was probably gained from a copy owned by one of her friends or patrons.

It is difficult to determine which extant manuscripts were owned by Christine’s friends and patrons because, as I have noted, very little is known about the early ownership of most *Rose* manuscripts. For example, from his inventories, we know that Jean duc de Berry owned four *Rose* manuscripts, but which ones? Only two extant manuscripts have been linked to his collection, and the inventory descriptions are too vague to be very helpful in identifying the others. It is also possible that the manuscript which Christine read no longer exists or was owned by someone who has not been identified as her acquaintance or patron. We do know that several of her patrons and friends, such as Louis d’Orléans, owned *Rose* manuscripts which have not been identified among the existing manuscripts.

Two manuscripts which have been assigned dates in the early years of the fifteenth century have been included in this study in order to

**11** Léopold Delisle, “Inventaire général des livres ayant appartenu à Jean de France, duc de Berry,” *Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V, Partie II* (Paris: H. Champion, 1907) 247 item 146 (present location unknown) and 267 item 275 (probably Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France fr. 12595), item 276 (BnF fr. 380), and item 277 (present location unknown). We can disregard item 146 because the duc de Berry did not acquire it until May 1404, so it was not in the duc de Berry’s library early enough for our purpose. Item 277, which has not been identified with any extant manuscript, is described in the inventory as “bien historié et enluminé de blanc et de noir” and by a later observer as “sans pris pour la beauté des figures de miniatures,” Le Laboureur, *Histoire de Charles VI* (Paris, 1663) 82, quoted by Delisle, 315.

Later *Rose* manuscript owners with similar names complicate our search. For example, we know that BnF fr. 12588 was in the Bibliothèque Rosny of Marie-Caroline de Bourbon-Sicile, duchesse de Berry (1798-1870), and was acquired in 1837 by the BnF. Despite its having been owned by a nineteenth-century duchesse de Berry, there is no evidence to connect MS fr. 12588 with the fifteenth-century collection of Jean, duc de Berry, or to identify it as one of his two unidentified manuscripts in the inventories.
allow for marginal cases and errors in dating. In addition to manuscripts known to have been in the collections of Charles V and Charles VI, Philippe le Hardi and his heirs, and Jean, duc de Berry, I have included two manuscripts, which have sometimes been assigned to French royal or court patronage on stylistic and iconographic evidence: New York, The Pierpont Morgan Library M.48 and M.245.

One important *Rose* manuscript deserves special comment. According to François Avril, the present Valencia, Biblioteca universitaria 387 (= MS 1327 in the Gutiérrez del Cano catalogue) was illustrated during the first decade of the fifteenth century by the painter who also illustrated two important manuscripts of *The Livre du Chemin de Long Estude*, one of which was presented by Christine to the duc de Berry in 1403.¹² Despite this association of the Valencia *Rose* illustrations with manuscripts of Christine's works, I have excluded the Valencia manuscript from this study because there is no reason to believe that it was made until several years after Christine had formed her opinion of the *Rose*. Moreover, its iconography, certainly notable for eroticism and violence, is unique among existing *Rose* manuscripts. Before including its illustrations in the discussion of the influences which shaped Christine's opinion of the *Rose*, I would want to be able to demonstrate the strong possibility of her access to this very distinctive manuscript.

Another *Rose* manuscript that must be mentioned only to be excluded is Paris, BnF fr. 380, which was in the collection of Jean, duc de Berry. As recorded in his inventory, Berry acquired this manuscript from Martin Gouge, Bishop of Chartres, in 1403, too late for the debate.¹³


¹³ Léopold Delisle, "Inventaire générale" 267 item 276.
Manuscript Descriptions

At least six extant manuscripts can be identified which might have been available to Christine de Pizan before she wrote her polemics against the *Rose*. They are Brussels, Bibliothèque royale Albert Ier 4782 and 9576; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 1522; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 12595; and New York, The Pierpont Morgan Library M.48 and M.245. Four of these are clearly early enough for our purpose here, and two others are marginal.

BR 4782, is an early fourteenth-century northern French manuscript, which was in the collection of Jean sans Peur, duc de Bourgogne, at the time of his estate inventory in 1420. Although we cannot prove that it was in his or his father Philippe le Hardi’s collection when Christine de Pizan must have read the *Rose*, it seems probable that it was. The manuscript is in a smaller format than the other manuscripts considered here (250 x 190 mm), and it contains twenty-one miniatures. The subjects and iconography of these illustrations are unremarkable, and it includes none of the violent Ovidian scenes.

Another manuscript in the “Albertine” in Brussels is BR 9576, which also appears in the 1420 inventory of Jean sans Peur. BR 9576 dates from the first third of the fourteenth century, and its place of production has been ascribed by scholars to either Flanders,
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or northern France, probably Paris. Somewhat larger in format than the first manuscript, MS 9576 measures 310 x 225 mm and has twenty-three miniatures. Here again, it is possible that Christine could have seen this manuscript in the collections of Philippe le Hardi and his son, Jean sans Peur. Two Ovidian scenes are represented: the death of Nero and Pygmalion's discovery that his statue has come to life.

A third Rose manuscript that Christine de Pizan might have seen is now MS Reg. lat. 1522 in the Vatican library. It is ascribed by a fifteenth or sixteenth century marginal note to the collection of Philippe le Bel, son of Jean sans Peur. Because the manuscript dates from the early fourteenth century, it is possible that it had also belonged to Philippe’s father or grandfather, and therefore, that it might have been accessible to Christine in their collections. In the sixteenth century it belonged to Claude Fauchet, the famous scholar and collector, who may have written the note on Philippe le Bon. The Vatican manuscript is in a small format (239 x 202 mm), and it contains twenty-two Rose miniatures. In addition to the Rose, it has two other works: eleven leaves with jeux partis, and thirteen leaves presenting Tournoiments aus Dames de Paris.

The manuscripts of the French royal library were acquired by the Duke of Bedford in 1425, and subsequently they were widely dispersed. The royal inventories record four Roman de la Rose manuscripts in the collection of Charles V and Charles VI, but the briefly described manuscripts cannot be identified among the extant Rose corpus. Two manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York have been attributed on the basis of armorial decorations and general stylistic considerations to the French royal court.

15 Kuhn 24; Doutrepont, Inventaire, no. 181; Doutrepont, Littérature, 281; Gaspar and Lyna, no. 91; Dogaer & Debae 68-69.

16 Ernest Langlois, Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques, 33 (1889) 186-188.

17 Léopold Delisle, Partie I, pp. 138-141 and 192-193 items 1183-1186.
Morgan M.48, made in northern France or Paris in the second half of the fourteenth century, is a small-to-medium sized book (280 x 207 mm) with thirty-two miniatures and nine blank spaces for which miniatures were never completed. The presence of fleur-de-lis background design, the emblem of the kings of France, has been interpreted as evidence for ownership by Charles V or a member of his court, though this attribution remains conjectural.¹⁸

Morgan M.245, also made in northern France, is a borderline case usually dated at the beginning of the fifteenth century. It is a medium sized manuscript (294 x 221 mm) containing thirty-five miniatures, one blank space for a miniature, and one historiated initial. The illustrations were executed by two different artists. On the ivy-bordered first folio are seven shields from which the arms have been erased. The shield of Franchise on fol. 111v⁰ bears the arms of France. A marginal note signed by Jean Boivin and dated 20 January 1720, claims that the manuscript was made by Nicolas Flamel, secretary to Jean, duc de Berry, for his employer. Some scholars, including Paul Meyer, have doubted this attribution.¹⁹

BnF fr. 12595 has the inscription “Ce livre est au duc de Berry. Jehan”.²⁰ Like Morgan M.245 made at the turn of the fifteenth century in northern France, possibly Paris, this is a large, luxurious manuscript (341 x 245 mm), richly illustrated. Originally there were eighty-one Rose miniatures plus frontispiece miniatures for Jean de Meun’s Testament and Codicil. One Rose miniature on folio 30 was lost when that leaf was cut out of the codex. Ovidian scenes include the deaths of Virginia, Seneca, Nero, Manfred, Lucretia, and Empedocles.


²⁰ Ernest Langlois, Les Manuscrits du Roman de la Rose (Lille: Tallandier, 1910) 48, transcribes this inscription and tentatively identifies this manuscript as item 275 in Delisle’s edition of the inventories of the duc de Berry.
Generalizations

Although we cannot be sure which, if any, of these six manuscripts she read, it is probable that each of them was in a library accessible to Christine de Pizan at the time when she first read the *Roman de la Rose*. They are fairly typical of the corpus of fourteenth and early fifteenth century *Rose* manuscripts in the quantity, subject, and tone of their illustrations. Thus, it would seem likely that whatever manuscript she read, it would have had many of the characteristics which the six manuscripts share in common. On the other hand, any unique traits would only have influenced her interpretation if she happened to read the specific manuscript containing them.

First, then, let us consider the shared features of this entire group of manuscripts. Their programs of illustrations are in the statistical middle of illustrated *Rose* manuscripts. They range from twenty-one (BR 4782) to eighty-one *Rose* illustrations (BnF fr. 12595), and they tend toward the lower end of that range, with twenty-two, twenty-three, thirty-seven, and forty-one illustrations, respectively. To place these numbers in context, thirty *Rose* manuscripts have only the frontispiece illustration, and seventeen have over one hundred illustrations.

Five of the six manuscripts have more scenes illustrating the work of Guillaume de Lorris than that of Jean de Meun; the sixth, Morgan M.48, has nineteen miniatures illustrating Guillaume’s poem and twenty-two illustrating Jean’s poem, but even here, despite the original plan, the effect favors Guillaume’s poem because only thirteen illustrations in Jean’s part were completed — the other nine remain blank. The predominance of scenes from Guillaume’s poem results in an emphasis in these manuscripts on the more abstract “courtly” allegory with less overt antifeminism and social commentary.

All six of the manuscripts have the following illustrations: the dreamer in bed, the portraits of the vices on the garden wall, the carole, and the God of Love shooting the dreamer with an arrow. Except for BnF fr. 12595, the manuscripts in this group contain relatively few representations of violence, other than the battle for the castle at the end of the poem, and they contain very little
Ovidian material, thus avoiding the scenes of mutilation, castration, suicide, and murder which are prevalent in Jean de Meun's retelling of Ovid's tales. BnF fr. 12595, which has the largest illustrative program in this group, has an expanded selection of illustrations in the garden of Deduit sequence (four illustrations inserted between Amant's meeting Oiseuse and the carole); and five devoted to the sequence in which the God of Love captures and instructs the Lover; other subjects in this manuscript not present in the other five portray the Lover and Dangier, Bel Acueil, and Franchise. Even though this manuscript has more Ovidian illustrations than any of the others, its iconography does not emphasize their violence. As a group, these manuscripts contain fewer scenes of eroticism than many of the other Rose manuscripts, and no scenes in any of the six show lovers in bed, though other Rose manuscripts include such scenes to illustrate several different passages in Jean's text, including Nature at her forge, the conversation between the submissive husband and his unfaithful wife, Vulcan's discovery of Venus's infidelity with Mars, and the Lover's ultimate conquest of the rose.

The final illustrations in these Rose manuscripts are varied. Two represent Pygmalion and Galatea (though at different moments in the narrative), one ends with Faus Semblant and Abstinence Contrainte as false pilgrims, one with the combat of Franchise and Dangier, and one with the defenders fleeing the burning castle. BnF fr. 12595, the most extensively illustrated of the six manuscripts, includes representatives of all these scenes, and ends with Courtoisie talking to Bel Acueil after his release from captivity. This is a very rare scene, which occurs in only five other Rose manuscripts.

Conclusion

If the illustrations in the six manuscripts identified here are representative of those which she may have seen when she first read the Roman de la Rose, Christine de Pizan seems to have been influenced, and incensed, primarily by the words of the text rather than by graphic depictions of violence toward and the defamation of women. In the letters which form the famous "Querelle de la Rose" she refers repeatedly to the "words" both spoken and written:
“If you wish to excuse him [Jean] by saying that it pleases him to make a pretty story of the culmination of love by using such images, I reply that by doing so he neither tells nor explains anything new.” “Read then the Art.” “Dante is one hundred times better written.” Even when she uses terms like “images” and “art” she is clearly referring to verbal descriptions, rather than miniatures.21

Since this is a preliminary study, I must reserve the possibility that more intensive research may yet identify other manuscripts which Christine could have seen, and I must always allow for the possibility that the manuscript which she read cannot be associated now with her friends and patrons, or that it no longer exists. However, based on the present state of my inquiry, it seems clear that, just as her statements in the debate imply, Christine de Pizan, herself a writer, most probably formed her opinions of the Rose from its words rather than its pictures.
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