

Enchanted by Miniatures of Goddess Fortune in the *Roman de la Rose* Manuscripts: Part 3*

TODOROKI Yoshiaki**

IV. Discussion

The four findings in Chapter 3, which were left to Discussion in Chapter 4, will be considered here.

1. Why was Fortune depicted in the text description where there was no mention of “Fortune”?

This is a theme given in the Findings of Chapter 3, section 2, that is, a study of the relationship between the miniature and the text description.

(1) Spain, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España MS Vit. 23-11, folio 23

Biaux amis folie est enfance

Tout mis en peine et e[n] esmai.¹(lines 2982-2983)²

This is a passage in which Reason advised the young man (Lover) over the rosebud. Lover was in suffering and confusion because of his folly and childishness. Therefore, Reason urged him to abandon Love. If you continued reading the story, you would see that the young man did not want to listen to Reason’s advice at all, so Reason walked away from the scene (line 3082).

This scene was decorated with a miniature. What on earth is the role of miniatures in a manuscript? As R. Wittkower (1977) points out³, it could be said that the miniature played a role as a visual language that suggested the subsequent development of the story. Then, what about the miniature in line 2982? The fact that the wheel of Fortune was depicted in it tells us that the illuminator attributed the young man’s predicament to the work of Fortune. In other words, the illuminator must have imagined the young man plunged into suffering and confusion, as if he were at the bottom of the wheel of Fortune. Otherwise, such an image would not have been painted in the space⁴ provided for this scene. However, there wasn’t even the slightest mention of Fortune in the scene (lines 2955-3082) of the subheading “Persuasion of Reason”

* This paper is a sequel to the *Annual Report of Regional Research Institute* (Kagoshima Prefectural College), No. 53 (2021), 45-62.

** Professor at Kagoshima Prefectural College.

1 See <http://bdh-rd.bne.es/viewer.vm?id=0000012648&page=1> (Accessed on August 18, 2022). This is the text description transcribed and revised by the author. The English translation is as follows: “Fair friend, because of your folly and childishness, you have been thrown into suffering and dismay.” As the *Roman de la Rose* is the poem written in Old French, hereafter English translations are provided in the footnotes for easy understanding.

2 The line numbers are based on the Lecoy edition. Hereafter, all the line numbers used in this paper are based on this edition. Félix Lecoy, *Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun: Le Roman de la Rose*, Tome I-III (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1982-1985).

3 R. Wittkower, *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1977), p.86: “Being accustomed to the visual language of exemplars fixed by long tradition, the medieval reader on his side did not expect a literal text illustration, but rather visual clarification in terms familiar to him.”

4 The idea of “the space provided for this scene” can be understood by browsing BnF MSS Fr. 799 or Fr. 1665. The spaces that had been originally prepared for the miniatures were left unpainted.

by Shinoda (2007)⁵. Indeed, it was in line 3953 that the word “Fortune” appeared for the first time in the first part (lines 1-4028) written by Guillaume de Lorris. Given the fact, anyone would come to the conclusion that the miniature in line 2982 was probably a product of the illuminator’s imagination.

I will discuss MS Vitr. 23-11 itself from a different perspective. It included twenty-eight miniatures⁶, but only two of them was seen in the second part (lines 4029-21750) written by Jean de Meun. One was in folio 31, where a scribe at work on the *Rose* manuscript was depicted. The other was in folio 37^{vo}, where the wheel of Fortune was depicted. The former corresponds to line 4029, and is placed as a bridge between the first and second parts of the story, as often seen in the *Rose* manuscripts⁷, but seems to have nothing to do with the plot. On the other hand, the latter seems to serve as a visual clarification for line 4819 and below. This discussion will make it clear that there was no room for the miniature in folio 23 to replace the two in the second part. To put it another way, even if the miniature of Fortune was supposed to be placed in the space provided in folio 37^{vo}, there would be no room for a similar miniature in that space. Then, what about the twenty-six miniatures in the first part? I mentioned earlier that the word “fortune” appeared for the first time in line 3953 “C[e] e[st] ausi q[ue] de fortune,” which was found in folio 29^{vo} of this manuscript. The twenty-sixth one was seen in line 3517, which corresponded to folio 28 in this manuscript. Considering this fact, it is unlikely that Fortune was ever depicted as a motif in these miniatures.

The discussion above shows that the twenty-seven miniatures were depicted appropriately in the spaces provided in the manuscript, with the exception of the one in folio 23. Would it be really all right to state firmly that the miniature in folio 23 was a product of the illuminator’s imagination? This conclusion raises somewhat of a question. It is because Fortune’s miniature does serve neither as a literal text illustration nor as a visual clarification for the subsequent development of the story. In that case, what miniature would serve as an appropriate visual clarification for this scene? If we focused on miniatures depicted in MS Vitr. 23-11, the answer would come out naturally. The miniature in folio 21, which explained line 2781 and below, shows “Bel Accueil” (Fair Welcome) and the young man facing each other and conversing with hand gestures. The same is true for all the following four miniatures in terms of composition: the miniature in folio 22 explaining line 2910 and below and depicting “Dangier” (Rebuff) & “Bel Accueil” ; the miniature in folio 23^{vo} explaining line 3107 and below and depicting “Ami” (Friend) & the young man; the miniature in folio 26 explaining line 3423 and below and depicting “Venus” & “Bel Accueil” ; the miniature in folio 28 explaining line 3517 and below and depicting “Mal Bouche” (Evil Tongue) & “Bel Accueil”. Considering such form and substance as these, the best composition for the miniature in folio 23 would be something like “Reson” (Reason) & the young man facing each other and conversing with hand

5 K. Shinoda, *Le Roman de la Rose*, Vol. 1-2, trans. into Japanese (Tokyo: Chikuma Bunko, 2007).

6 f. 1, f. 2^a, f. 2^b, f. 2^a, f. 2^b, f. 3, f. 3^a, f. 3^b, f. 6^{vo}, f. 10^{vo}, f. 11^{vo}, f. 12, f. 13, f. 13^{vo}, f. 15, f. 15^{vo}, f. 21, f. 22^a, f. 22^b, f. 23, f. 23^{vo}, f. 24, f. 25, f. 26, f. 27, f. 28, f. 31, and f. 37^{vo}.

7 See, for example, Albi MS Rochegeude 103, f. 27^{vo}, Arsenal MS 3338, f. 29^{vo}, BnF MSS Fr. 1561, f. 26^{vo}, Fr. 1569, f. 28, Fr. 12588, f. 27, Fr. 19153, f. 31, Fr. 19156, f. 27^{vo}, Fr. 19157, f. 26^{vo} and Fr. 24389, f. 27^{vo}, Princeton MS Garrett 126, f. 29^{vo}.

gestures. Such specific examples were seen in the following five manuscripts at least: BnF MSS Fr. 1576, f. 15^{vo}; Fr. 19153, f. 22^{vo}; Fr. 19156, f. 20^{vo}; Châlon-en-Champagne MS 270, f. 22^{vo}; Valencia MS 387, f. 23.

From the above, those who are unwilling to accept the idea that the miniature in folio 23 was a figment of the illuminator's imagination will have to settle for the conclusion that the illuminator did not depict a miniature appropriate to the subsequent development of the story.

(2) Switzerland, Lausanne, Bibliothèque cantonale et universitaire de Lausanne, MS M 454, folio 17^{vo}

Si ont trouue le peisant

Deisoubs [a] aubeipin gisant.⁸ (lines 3653-3654)

"Peisant" (Peasant) lying under a hawthorn is "Dangier" (Rebuff). This is the beginning of the scene where "Honte" (Shame) and "Peur" (Fear) reprimanded "Dangier" (Rebuff) because Rebuff was dozing off when they came to him (lines 3651-3778).

For this scene, the illuminator depicted the wheel of Fortune in the space provided in the manuscript. As mentioned earlier, line 3953 was the first example of the word "Fortune⁹," so Fortune could not have been involved in this scene. Then, how could the wheel of Fortune be painted? If this miniature was also a product of some illuminator's imagination, he was probably inspired by the phrase "he was lying under a hawthorn." To put it simply, the person who was lying under a hawthorn might have been the image of the figure that represented "*sum sine regno*" lying under the wheel of Fortune. Such an idea would be unavoidable if the decorative painting in the space provided for folio 17^{vo} was analyzed in terms of the relationship between the miniature and the text description. When this scene is analyzed from the perspective of a miniature that would provide a visual clarification, however, a certain question may be raised about the miniature in the folio 17^{vo}. It is an unforgivable mistake caused by the illuminator. More specifically, it is a strong possibility that the illuminator may have mistakenly painted the miniature in a different space than it should have been. The optimal composition would essentially be something like Rebuff lying in front of Shame and Fear, both of whom seemed to be trying to wake him up from his nap, provided that it was considered from the contents of lines 3651-3778. Such specific examples could be found in the twenty-five manuscripts at least, all in line 3651.

Arsenal MSS 5209, f. 27 and 5226, f. 28; BL MSS Royal 19 B XIII, f. 29, Royal 20 A XVII, f. 32^{vo}, Stow 947, f. 27^{vo} and Yates Thompson 21, f. 26^{vo}; BNE MS Vit. 23-11, f. 27; BnF MSS Fr. 378, f. 23^{vc}, Fr. 1558, f. 29, Fr. 1559, f. 31, Fr. 1563, f. 26^{vo}, Fr. 1575, f. 27^{vo}, Fr. 12588, f. 24^{vo}, Fr. 12589, f. 28^{vo}, Fr. 12593, f. 27^{vo}, Fr. 12595, f. 29^{vo} and Fr. 19156, f. 25; BSG MS 1126, f. 26; Paris assemblée nationale MS 1230, f. 28; Lyon MSS 763, f. 24^{vo} and PA 25, f. 24^{vo}; Montpellier MS H 245, f. 22^{vo}; Oxford MSS Douce 195, f. 27^{vo} and Douce 332, f. 39; Princeton MS Garrett 126, f. 27.

8 See <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/searchresult/list/one/bcul/M0454> (Accessed on August 18, 2022). This is the text description transcribed and revised by the author. The English translation is as follows: "And they have found a peasant lying under a hawthorn."

9 Line 3953 "Ce est ausi q[ue] de fortune" in Lausanne MS 454 can be found in folio 19^{vo}.

Upon re-examining the whole of Lausanne manuscript under these circumstances, I found out that it had seven miniatures¹⁰ in it. Most interesting is that the miniature in folio 31^{vo} was similar to the above composition. Just below the miniature followed the text: “Toujours se uest de forme est[r]a[n]ge/ Car qu[an]t ainsinc apere p[ar] air...”¹¹ Referring to the Lecoy edition would inform us that the text description corresponded to lines 5906-5907, which was the scene of the residence of Fortune, beginning at line 5891.

As mentioned above, if the miniature in folio 17^{vo} was considered only in the Lausanne manuscript, it would lead us to the conclusion that it was the product of some illuminator’s imagination. However, a certain question would probably be raised about the conclusion. If further comparative research among the *Rose* manuscripts was carried out, an interesting fact would be revealed, and a satisfactory interpretation would be obtained.

(3) France, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS Fr. 1567, f. 135

Et plus pugni deuront il estre
 Deuant lempe[r]eur celestre
 Clerc qui sabandonne[n]t aus vices
 Que les gens lays simples et nices.¹² (lines 18633-18636)

Nature began to confess to Genius at great length after line 16695, and she herself admitted later that she had conferred nobility equally on all people, just as God had given reason to them all (18839-18845). The above is a passage about nobility (lines 18577-18884) in Nature’s Confession. Nature developed her own theory about clerks: clerks who abandoned themselves to vices should be more punished before the celestial emperor than the simple and ignorant lay.

The miniature in folio 135 was an illustration of such a text description as this. What is the implication of the miniature, if so? What I am trying to bring up here is the fact that the iconographical image of the wheel of Fortune was selected as a visual clarification in the text description where the word “pugni” (< past participle of “punir”) was used. This means that God apparently punished clerks who abandoned themselves to vices on the wheel of Fortune, and also gives us the impression that the fickle pagan goddess Fortune took on a Christianized aspect, just like Fortune in the seventh canto of Dante’s *Inferno*. If we follow the view¹³ of Patch (1927), however, that old material from Boethius may have helped the development of “philosophy of Fortune” in the *Roman de la Rose*, it is somewhat questionable to apply a new conception of Christian Fortune to the miniature here.

Then, is it possible to consider this miniature from a different perspective? If we focus on the manuscript

10 Lausanne MS 454, f. 1, f. 6, f. 7^{vo}, f. 13, f. 17^{vo}, f. 31^{vo}, and f. 64.

11 See <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/searchresult/list/one/bcul/M0454> (Accessed on August 18, 2022). This is the text description transcribed and revised by the author. The English translation is as follows: “It is always clothed in a different manner, for when it appears thus in the air...”

12 See <https://dlmm.library.jhu.edu/viewer/#rose/Francais1567/135r/image> (Accessed on August 18, 2022). This is the text description transcribed and revised by the author. The English translation is as follows: “And clerks who abandon themselves to vices should be more punished before the celestial emperor than the simple and ignorant lay.”

13 H.R. Patch, *The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature* (1927; New York, rpt. 1967), p. 28.

itself, the answer will naturally emerge. The clue is the word “Fortune”. Luckily, the word with the initial F pen-flourished was used in line 18571. This was the last example of its use in the second part written by Jean de Meun.

Fortune met le remanent
Qui ne scet estre p[er]manent
Ne se prent garde a quel p[er]sonne
Et tout retolt et tout redonne
Et tout retolt et retoldra
Toutes les foiz quelle uoldra.¹⁴ (lines 18571-18576)

This is the text description in folio 134^{vo}, transcribed and revised by the author. If we looked at folio 135 and folio 134^{vo} side by side, we would realize that the text description beginning with Fortune is just one leaf before the miniature, that is, almost in the same position. Given the situation, it would be more appropriate to place the miniature depicting the wheel of Fortune just over the text description beginning with “Fortune” in folio 134^{vo} than the one beginning with “Et plus pugni deuront il estre” in folio 135. I think this miniature was completely misplaced. Such an error might have been caused by a failure in the allocation of space for the miniature (here folio 135) in the process of determining the layout of each leaf in the manuscript.

(4) United States, New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS M. 948, f. 167

Qui les fait a ceste fin traire
Par la matiere obeissant
qui leur cueur si va flechissant.¹⁵ (lines 17044-17046)

Nature began to develop the issues of the heavens, humors and fortune after stating that the heavens affect all the “accidenz” (accidents) and the “sustances” (substance) that exist beneath the moon (16925-17070). The above is a passage where Nature stressed the possibility that the heavens also led men to death through obedient matter that affected their minds.

This scene was decorated with a miniature. In the left compartment are depicted a tonsured priest and a woman. It seems as if they were seated and in conversation face to face with hand gestures. Considering that this is part of the scene where Nature confessed herself to Genius, it can be easily imagined that a tonsured priest represents Genius and a woman Nature. Therefore, the left composition does indeed serve as a visual clarification for the scene. The problem we should discuss was in the composition of the right

14 The English translation is as follows: “Fortune works on the rest, but she is never permanent. She doesn’t care about what person she gives her gifts to. She takes them all back, and then gives them all again. She takes them all back, and then will take them back as often as she pleases.”

15 See <https://dlmm.library.jhu.edu/viewer/#rose/Morgan948/binding.frontcover/image> (Accessed on August 18, 2022). This is the text description transcribed and revised by the author. The English translation is as follows: “It is true that the heavens will lead them to this end through obedient matter that proceeds to shake their hearts in this way.”

compartment: Fortune was depicted on the upper part, and the Fates¹⁶ on the lower part. After line 17070, Nature further developed the issues of “fortune and free will” (17071-17236) or “fate and free will” (17697-17762), with the help of Boethius’ views. At this time, words representing abstract concepts such as “destinees” (destiny or fate), “fortune” and “cas” (chance) were often used. Should we assume that the illuminator imagined Goddess Fortune and the Fates (the fatal sisters) from such contents and words? I don’t want to think so.

I mentioned a while ago that a miniature played a role as a visual language that suggested the subsequent development of the story. However, this illuminator seems to have ignored the rule in deciding the composition. More specifically, knowing that the word “Fortune” (line 18571), the last example of its use in the second part, was described approximately 1500 lines ahead, the illuminator could possibly have adopted the motif in his composition. Then, what about the Fates? No mention of the Fates, that is, “Clotho,” “Lachesis,” and “Atropos” could be found in Chapter 9. Finally, in Chapter 10, “The Sermon of Genius,” the Fates were described.

Sacihez que moult me reconforte
 Cloto Qui la quenouille porte
 Et Atheesis qui les fils file
 Mais Atropos qui les deffile
 Ce que ces deux peuent filer.¹⁷ (lines 19737-19741)

It says here that Clotho held the distaff, Lachesis spun the thread and Atropos tore to pieces anything these two could spin. The illuminator must have been aware of the description of the Fates, which was approximately 2700 lines ahead. Otherwise, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos would not have been incorporated so beautifully into the miniature.

I have tried to make a possible interpretation of the right compartment in the miniature based on the text. Nevertheless, would it be labeled as somewhat of a high-handed and far-fetched interpretation? I believe that this idea, if taken in a broader sense, would be somehow acceptable. Therefore, some will think that this miniature including the right compartment served as a so-called “loose” visual clarification, reluctantly accepting my idea. Others will think that it was a product of the illuminator’s imagination, adhering to the concept of a “visual clarification”.

(5) United States, New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS M. 948, f. 170^{vo}

Quant il les voit a bien entendre

16 The Fates are defined in the *Oxford Dictionary of English* (2nd edition revised) as follows: the three goddesses who preside over the birth and life of humans. Each person was thought of as a spindle, around which the three Fates (Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos) would spin the thread of human destiny.

17 See <https://dlmm.library.jhu.edu/viewer/#rose/Morgan948/binding.frontcover/image> (Accessed on August 18, 2022). I started an investigation in September 2020, but could not identify this website at that stage. This is the text description in folio 190^{vo}, transcribed and revised by the author, and the English translation is as follows: “You should know that Clotho, who holds the distaff, and Lachesis, who spins the thread, will comfort you greatly. But Atropos rends and tears to pieces whatever these two can spin.”

Ne n'a pas pource subplante.

Pouvoir de franche volente.¹⁸ (lines 17458-17460)

Nature developed the issues of free will and divine foreknowledge (17237-17468) after those of “destinees” and free will (17071-17236), with the help of Boethius’ *De consolacione philosophiae*. The above is a passage in which Nature stated that God’s foreknowledge did not have the power to supersede free will.

This scene was decorated with a miniature. In the upper part of the composition God, seated on a chair with a mirror in his right hand, was depicted. No such text description could be found after line 17458, but the word “mirouer,”¹⁹ possessed by God, was used in line 17438. From the perspective of the placement of the miniature, it was certainly misplaced by 20 lines or so. Misplacement may have been due to good use of a large-sized miniature, but misalignment of the miniature embedded in the text description, according to a use for miniatures, is slightly less than favorable.

Then, what about the composition of the lower part of the miniature? Fortune and Nature, supporting a large mirror or a large disk together, were depicted there. Such a text description was not seen in the scene of “free will and divine foreknowledge”. It was the phrase²⁰ in line 18571, however, that caught my attention: “fortune y met le remanant.” It showed that the roles of Fortune and Nature were different, although they were both involved in human affairs. To put it simply, Nature led all humans to be born naked, and made them all equally the same, whereas Fortune did the rest. If the miniature was created, based on such a text description, then the most likely composition would be the one in which Fortune and Nature were present together, that is, the juxtaposition of both. As for a mirror, it was described in lines 18123 to 18256. In the mirror was depicted natural scenery, which might be merely a representation of the visible world, in the words of the text description, all the accidents and substance that existed under the moon.

Thus, this illuminator must have been working on the image of the miniature, considering the text description up to approximately 1000 lines ahead. It could be said in this sense that the miniature in folio 170^{vo} was the result of his painstaking efforts and an illustration of such a text description.

2. How was Fortune depicted as a nude female figure in Morgan MS M. 948?

This is a theme given in the Findings of Chapter 3, section 3, that is, a study of a certain illuminator’s creative ideas in the process of producing miniatures. As far as Morgan MS M. 948 is concerned, all

18 The English translation is as follows: “when predestination sees them striving to do good, but that doesn’t mean that it has supplanted the power of free will.”

19 Et des devant la il veue/ Par demonstration veritable/ En son mirouer pardurable/ Que nul fors luy ne scet polir/ Sans Reins a franc vouloir tollir (lines 17436-17440). This is the text description in folio 170, transcribed and revised by the author, and the English translation is as follows: “And God has always seen it in true demonstration, in his eternal mirror, which no one, except Him, can polish without detracting from free will.”

20 See Morgan MS M. 948, folio 179^{vo}.

the images from the text descriptions were depicted in large-sized miniatures with solemn and majestic architectural frames. Anyone who saw them would not only be struck by the powerful visual impacts, but probably would feel amazed by some of them. Specifically, Fortune was completely nude in folio 61; Fortune wore only a loin cloth in folio 69^{vo}, folio 167 and folio 170^{vo}. How did Fortune become a nude female figure with wings on her back? Such an explicit image of hers astounded even me, for I had never come across Fortune in the nude among the manuscripts produced around the same period²¹ as Morgan M. 948 or prior to it. Then, were the nude figures of Fortune the creative idea of a certain illuminator (Master of Girard Acarie)?

The first thing to investigate is whether there were any nudes of Fortune besides those in Morgan MS M. 948. Checking Kurose (1977)²² and Todoroki (2000)²³ led to confirmation of two miniatures of Fortune, almost nude, in the former.

(a) Paris, BnF MS Fr. 14765, folio 349.

(b) Oxford, MS Ashmole 1, folio 133.

(a) was an eighteenth-century work *Livre d'astrologie* put in Plate 69. In folio 349 was depicted Fortune, a nude figure who stood on a winged globe, holding a balance in her right hand, with her breasts and pubic area covered only by fabric cloth. (b) was a manuscript produced in Germany, dated 1618-27, put in Plate 73. The title of the work was unknown. In folio 133 was depicted Fortune, a nude figure who stood on a winged sphere, holding the sail end with her left hand, and covering her pubic area with the sail part folded up small and held in her right hand.

Noteworthy here is that two miniatures of Fortune almost nude were created in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A look at the Emblem books reveals to us that Fortune in the form of a nude figure was indeed present in the seventeenth-century works. For example, in 1635, George Wither produced an engraving of Fortune, a nude female figure with her forelock fluttering in the wind, who stood on a winged sphere, holding a crescent moon in her left hand and grasping the edge of the wind-swollen sail with her right hand.²⁴ In 1603, Cesare Ripa produced an engraving of Fortune, a nude female figure with wings on her back, blindfolded with cloth, who stood balancing herself on her left foot on a large globe, with crowns, scepters, and money scattered from one cornucopia held in her right hand, and with pens, scrolls, and paintbrushes scattered from the other cornucopia held in her left hand.²⁵ In 1610, Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco made an engraving of Fortune, a nude female figure under the influence of the wind, holding the sail end with her right hand and the sail part folded up small with her left hand.²⁶ In 1655,

21 As for the date of production, refer to <https://www.themorgan.org/manuscript/145641> (Accessed on August 18, 2022).

22 T. Kurose, *Miniatures of Goddess Fortune in Mediaeval Manuscripts* (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1977).

23 Y. Todoroki, *An Addition to Miniatures of Goddess Fortune in Mediaeval Manuscripts* (Tokyo: Seibido, 2000).

24 George Wither, *A Collection of Emblemes, 1635* (A Scholar Press Facsimile, 1973 rpt.), Book 3, Illustration XL, p. 174.

25 Cesare Ripa, *Baroque and Rococo Pictorial Imagery* with introduction, translations and 200 commentaries by Edward A. Maser (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971), Pl. CLII.

26 Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco, *Emblemas Morales, 1610* (The Scholar Press, 1973), Emblema 34, p. 134.

Diego López made an engraving of Fortune, a nude female figure who stood with her left foot on a sphere in front of Hermes seated on a square pedestal, holding the wind-swollen sail with both hands.²⁷

Then, can't we see a nude female figure Fortune in the sixteenth-century emblems? It could definitely be seen. In 1539, Guillaume de la Perriere made an engraving of Fortune, a nude female figure with wings on her back, blindfolded with cloth, holding a wind-swollen sail in her right hand and guiding a blind man with her left hand.²⁸ In 1540, Gilles Corrozet produced an engraving of Fortune, a nude female figure who stood at sea with her left foot on a sphere and her right foot on a dolphin, holding a snapped mast in her right hand and a folded sail in her left hand under the influence of the wind.²⁹ In 1568, Jean Cousin made an engraving of Fortune, a nude female figure who stood at sea with her right foot on a sphere and her left foot on a dolphin, holding the sail end with her left hand and the sail part folded up small with her right hand to catch the favorable wind, while concealing her pubic area with it.³⁰

Thus, Fortune in the nude began to be used in the mid-sixteenth century emblems, and seemed to have been firmly established in the seventeenth century.³¹ The manuscript in question here, Morgan MS M. 948, was created in Rouen, France around 1525, so the illuminator Master of Girard Acarie is unlikely to have been influenced by the engravers mentioned above. Even though there were some differences between miniatures in the manuscripts and engravings in the emblem books, the illuminator of the Morgan MS M. 948 seems to have played a pioneering role in the trend of trying to create Fortune in the nude. Then, were the nude figures of Fortune in Morgan MS M. 948 a figment of some illuminator's imagination? What I would like to focus on here is an engraving of Nemesis made by Albrecht Dürer in 1503, which was a nude female figure with wings on her back who stood on a sphere, holding horse bridles in her left hand and a goblet in her right hand. A dictionary has it that Nemesis was "a Greek goddess who saw to it that justice and luck were evenly distributed in human life and who meted out due punishment for misdeeds and arrogance (*hubris*)."³² Pickering (1970) points out, however, that his contemporaries had no qualms about referring to his Nemesis as Fortune.

I touch now upon the case of more wilful re-interpretation. This can perhaps better be illustrated by reference to a well-known picture of later date. For instance the copper-engraving of about 1503 in

27 Diego López, *Declaración Magistral Sobre las Emblemas de Andrés Alciato, 1655* edited by John Horden (Scholar Press, 1973), Emblema 98, p. 377.

28 Guillaume de la Perriere, *Le Theatre des Bons Engins, 1539* with an introduction by Greta Dexter (Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1964), p. 50.

29 Gilles Corrozet, *Hecatographie, 1540* edited by John Horden (The Scholar Press, 1974), p. F7v. cf. <https://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/french/emblem.php?id=FCCGa040> (Accessed on August 18, 2022).

30 Jean Cousin, *The Book of Fortune* with introduction and notes by Ludovic Lalanne (Paris: Bibliothèque internationale de l'art, 1883), Plate 1.

31 cf. Rosemary Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1948; 2nd imp. 1967), p. 1: "Emblem books were first introduced into England from the Continent during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. They quickly became popular, and translations of foreign collections together with some original works were published in the vernacular. They continued to flourish in the seventeenth century and..."

32 Manfred Lurker, *Dictionary of Gods and Goddesses, Devils and Demons* (London and New York, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), p. 250.

which Albrecht Dürer offered his image of Nemesis: he himself called it 'Nemesis'. He had copies with him on the Netherlands journey, and his diary refers to gifts he made of 'Nemesis'. This did not prevent his contemporaries from seeing in this picture a 'Fortune'. The picture *was* thereafter, to all intents and purposes, Fortune – a familiar concept.³³

Whether or not Dürer's Nemesis was regarded as Fortune by his contemporaries in the first half of the sixteenth century, there was a strong possibility that the illuminator of Morgan MS M. 948 was aware of his engraving. It was because there were some similarities between Dürer's Nemesis and his Fortune, not only in the elements such as "a nude female figure," "with wings on her back" and "standing on a sphere", but also in the way they have voluptuous bodies with protruding bellies. Focusing on these similarities led me to come up with the idea that the illuminator in Morgan MS M. 948 took advantage of Dürer's Nemesis to create the image of Fortune such as a nude female figure.

Four miniatures of Fortune in the nude in Morgan M. 948 produced around 1525 were quite different from others and attracted much attention because of their novelty. I believed that Fortune in Morgan M. 948 was created under the influence of Dürer's Nemesis, but new discoveries would naturally lead to a different conclusion.

3. What miniatures could be considered creative or original?

This is a theme given in the Findings of Chapter 3, section 3, that is, a study of iconographical features of the wheel of Fortune in the *Rose* manuscripts. The discussion here covers the sixty-two miniatures on "the wheel of Fortune" from among motifs shown in 'Appendix 4'³⁴ and will reveal what aspects are similar and what aspects are original.

3.1 First impression on the wheel of Fortune

Upon looking at the composition of Fortune and her wheel in these miniatures, the first thing I noticed was the following six points.

- (i) Figure(s) were placed on the wheel or none.
- (ii) The wheel was equipped with a crank or without a crank.
- (iii) The number of spokes was uneven, ranging from zero to twenty.
- (iv) Fortune was sometimes standing behind the wheel or sometimes standing beside it. Of course, there were a few exceptions.³⁵
- (v) When Fortune was standing behind the wheel, the placement of the spokes was sometimes adjusted so that her face could be seen perfectly.
- (vi) The wheel was sometimes colored.

33 F.P. Pickering, *Literature and Art in the Middle Ages* (Florida: University of Miami Press, 1970), pp. 83-84.

34 See the *Bulletin of Kagoshima Prefectural College*, No. 72 (2021), 100-102.

35 In Ambrosiana MS I 78 sup., f.35^{vo} Fortune is not present, in Harley MS 4425, folio 57 Fortune sits in the hub of the wheel, and in Morgan MS M.185, folio 45 Fortune stands in the wheel.

Enchanted by Miniatures of Goddess Fortune in the *Roman de la Rose* Manuscripts: Part 3

It was in Table 5 that the above items were taken account of and summarized. The manuscripts in which Fortune's face was beautifully placed between the spokes are indicated in boldface (thirty-five examples). In this case, it does not matter how many spokes were in the wheel, or how much taller Fortune was than the large wheel, both of which make us feel good devices of the illuminators in composition. On the other hand, the manuscripts in which Fortune's face was partially hidden by the spokes are indicated in lightface

Table 5

the number of spokes	Manuscript			
	Fortune stands behind/ in the wheel or sit in the hub of the wheel		Fortune stands beside the wheel	
	with figure(s)	with no figure	with figure(s)	with no figure
	0	Genève Fr. 178, [f. 38] & [f. 47^{vo}]		
4	BnF Fr. 1565, f. 42^{vo}, Fr. 1567, f. 135; Morgan G. 32, f. 59^{vo}	Montpellier H 246, [f. 38] & [f. 46]		
5	Chicago UC 1380, f. 31^{vo}			
6	BnF Fr. 380, f. 36^{vo}, Fr. 12593, f. 37; Oxford Douce 188, [f. 45], Douce 332, f. 58; Astor A. 12, f. 50^{vo} Gray's Inn 10, f. 30 ^{vo}	BNE Vit. 23-11, f. 23; ÖNB 2592, f. 36; Smith-Lesouëf 62, f. 34^{vo}; Selden Supra 57, f. 34; [Morgan M.185, [f. 45]]		
7	BnF Fr. 25523, [f. 35]; Arsenal 5209, f. 36; BLAdd. 42133, f. 42^{vo}; Baltimore W. 143, f. 34	BNE Vit. 23-11, f. 37^{vo}; BnF Fr. 798, f. 45 BnF Fr. 802, f. 42	Ludwig XV 7, f. 38 ^{vo}	Grenoble 608 Rés, f. 59 ^{vo}
8	Arras 897, [f. 34^{vo}]; Montpellier H 245, f. 30^{vo}; BnF Fr. 1565, f. 34; Warsaw 52 (III 3760), f. 58; Lausanne M 454, f. 17^{vo}; BL Add. 42133, f. 34 BSG 1126, [f. 34]; Fr. 1564, [f. 20 ^{vo}], Fr. 24388, [f. 36]; BNE 10032, f. 39 ^{vo} ; Morgan M. 48, [f. 37], M. 324, f. 34 ^{vo} ; Princeton Garrett 126, f. 36; The Jersey MS, f. 35	Morgan M. 132, f. 48, M. 503, f. 34; BnF Fr. 1575, f. 45^{vo}; BSG 1126, [f. 43^{vo}]; (BL Harley 4425, f. 57) Chantilly 481, f. 32 ^{vo} , 482, [f. 35]; BnF Fr. 1560, f. 44 ^{vo} , Fr. 25526, f. 48; The Jersey MS, f. 26	BnF Fr. 24392, f. 39 ^{vo} & f. 49 ^{vo} ; Morgan M. 948, f. 61	Lyon P. A. 25, f. 42 ^{vo}
10	BL Add. 31840, f. 40^{vo}; BnF Fr. 24388, [f. 44^{vo}]; Vatican Reg. lat. 1492, f. 35			
11	(Ambrosiana I 78 sup., [f. 35 ^{vo}])			
12	Philadelphia Collins 1945-65-3, f. 38			
20			Collins 1945-65-3, f. 47	

(twenty examples). The seven miniatures in the right column consist of almost the same composition in which Fortune was standing beside the wheel, all supported by the posts firmly anchored to the ground, and turning the wheel with the crank. Sixteen folio numbers are surrounded by a square. This indicates that the wheel or spokes were brilliantly colored.³⁶ It was definitely thanks to this survey that I was able to focus on the characteristics of the colorful wheel. In particular, the wheel in MS Douce 188, folio 45 was coated with gold leaf, which would have enchanted the viewers for certain.

3.2 Similarities in composition

Then, what similarities can be seen in the fifty-five miniatures (except for the seven miniatures in the right column) shown in Table 5, aside from the number of spokes? If we focused on Fortune's hands, especially the angle of her hands holding the outer ring or spokes tightly, we would be able to see the similarities in composition. Pattern (a) shows the composition where both hands were spread wide to grasp the rim of the wheel. The following fifteen miniatures were identified:

ÖNB 2592, f. 36; Chantilly 481, f. 32^{vo}; Chantilly 482, f. 35; Montpellier H 246, f. 38 & f. 46; BnF Fr. 1560, f. 44^{vo}, Fr. 1565, f. 42^{vo}, Smith-Lesouëf 62, f. 34^{vo}; Arsenal 5209, f. 36; Genève Fr. 178, f. 38 & f. 47^{vo}; Collins 1945-63-5, f. 38; Chicago UC 1380, f. 31^{vo}; Morgan G. 32, f. 59^{vo}, M. 185, f. 45

Pattern (b) shows the composition where both hands were extended to grip the spokes in a straight line. The following twelve miniatures were identified:

BnF Fr. 380, f. 36^{vo}, Fr. 1567, f. 135, Fr. 1575, f. 45^{vo}, Fr. 24388, f. 36 & f. 44^{vo}; BL Add. 31840, f. 40^{vo}; Gray's Inn 10, f. 30^{vo}; Oxford Douce 332, f. 58; Morgan M. 48, f. 37, M. 132, f. 48; Astor A. 12, f. 50^{vo}; The Jersey MS, f. 35

Pattern (c) shows the composition where both hands were outstretched to hold the spokes at a 10:10 angle. The following six miniatures were identified:

BSG 1126, f. 34 & f. 43^{vo}; Arras 897, f. 34^{va}; BnF 1564, f. 20^{vo}; Walsaw 53 (III 3760), f. 58; BNE Vit. 23-11, f. 23

Pattern (d) shows the composition where the left hand was bent to grasp the spoke at about forty-five degrees while the right hand was extended to grasp the spoke in a straight line. The following nine miniatures were identified:

Montpellier MS H 245, f. 30^{vo}; BnF Fr. 798, f. 45, Fr. 1565, f. 34, Fr. 12593, f. 37; BL Add. 42133, f. 34 & f. 42^{vo}; Oxford, Selden Supra 57, f. 34; Princeton Garrett 126, f. 36; The Jersey MS, f. 26

Pattern (e) shows the composition where the right hand was bent to grasp the spoke at about forty-five degrees while the left hand was extended to grasp the spoke in a straight line. The following six miniatures were identified:

³⁶ As for the color of the outer wheel and spokes, there are red (897, f. 34^{va}; H 246, f. 38; H 246, f. 46; 1126, f. 43^{vo}; Fr. 24388, f. 36; Fr. 24388, f. 44^{vo}; M. 185, f. 45; I 78 sup., f. 35^{vo}), orange (482, f. 35; 1126, f. 34), green (Fr. 1564, f. 20^{vo}), white (M. 48, f. 37) and gold leaf (Douce 188, f. 45). As for the color of spokes, there is red (Fr. 25523, f. 35). As for the color of the outer wheel, there are white (Fr. 178, f. 38; Fr. 178, f. 47^{vo}) and blue (Fr. 25523, f. 35).

BnF Fr. 802, f. 42, Fr. 25526, f. 48; BNE 10032, f. 39^{vo}, Vitr. 23-11, f. 37^{vo}; Baltimore W. 143, f. 34; Morgan M. 503, f. 34

Pattern (f) shows the remainder that could not be classified into categories (a) to (e) in composition. The following seven miniatures belonged here.

Lausanne M 454, f. 17^{vo}; BnF Fr. 25523, f. 35; Morgan M. 324, f. 34^{vo}; Vatican Reg. lat. 1942, f. 35; BL Harley 4425, f. 57; Milan I 78 sup., f. 35^{vo}; Oxford Douce 188, f. 45

Focusing on the placement of Fortune's hands and the wheel led to the classification into six different patterns at least. These patterns are similarly seen in Kurose (1977) and Todoroki (2000)³⁷, and may not be uncommon. However, abundant examples of the wheel itself make the *Rose* manuscripts impossible to ignore in considering Fortune's allegory.

3.3 Peculiarity of Fortune's wheel

Then, what kind of miniatures could be considered creative or original? Patch (1927) called the activities of Fortune, definitely described by Boethius, the classical or traditional allegory.³⁸ If asked what is the classical allegory of Fortune's wheel in miniatures, it could easily be defined as follows, relying on the manuscripts related to Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* from among Kurose (1977) and Todoroki (2000):

- (a) As shown in the previous six patterns, Fortune stands behind the wheel and controls its rotation by holding the outer ring or spokes, or stands beside the wheel, supported by the posts firmly anchored to the ground, and controls its rotation by means of the crank.
- (b) The wheel of Fortune sometimes has four figures on the rim, sometimes no figure at all.
- (c) In addition, the number of spokes is basically five to twelve.

Therefore, the miniatures of Fortune depicted in the composition that deviated considerably from these features and characteristics, to be brief, something different from the traditional wheel of Fortune have the potential to be described as "original" or "creative".

The miniature in Morgan MS M. 185, folio 45

Fortune stood in the wheel, with her hands outstretched to grasp the rim of the wheel. There was no similar composition among the sixty-two miniatures in the *Rose* manuscripts. Noteworthy is that Fortune herself was turning with the wheel. Given this composition, it is hard to imagine that Fortune herself had any control over the wheel operated by her, which means that the goddess Fortune also had to undergo tribulation and hardship caused by the rotation of the wheel. This is different from the way "Boethian" Fortune was drawn. Moreover, it seemed that the illuminator had not relied on the text description in determining the composition of the miniature.

When all is said and done, it may be said that the illuminator newly created the allegory of Fortune by

³⁷ For example, see Kurose (1977), Plates 34, 112, 118, 119, 126 and Todoroki (2000), Figs 35, 43, 45, 46, 95, 125, 130, 141.

³⁸ H.R. Patch (1927), p. 153.

his own casual ingenuity or his ignorant idea of the wheel that would make Fortune herself suffer. The composition in which Fortune herself was turning with the wheel is rare and extremely valuable in terms of the allegory of Fortune. My research has only revealed the existence of one more miniature³⁹ with such composition in a different manuscript than the *Rose* manuscripts, and so I am certain that the miniature in M.185 was original, that is, it was a product of the illuminator's imagination.

The miniature in BL MS Harley 4425, folio 57

Fortune was seated in the hub of the wheel, which is a novel idea. No similar composition could be found among the sixty-two miniatures in the *Rose* manuscripts. The hub also rotates, though not as fast as the outer wheel. Thus, the text description “siet ou milieu com[m]e aueugle”⁴⁰ means that as the wheel rotates, her head moves to where the feet should be and then back again. This is another composition in the new tradition, where Fortune herself turns with the wheel, unlike “Boethian” Fortune. Three miniatures⁴¹ with similar composition could be confirmed in the different manuscripts than the *Rose* manuscripts, so it would not be possible to determine whether the miniature was a product of the illuminator's original imagination, although it should be worthy of attention.

The miniatures in Genève MS Fr. 178, folio 38 and folio 47^{vo}

Kitzinger (1973)⁴² presented the two miniatures in the eleventh-century manuscript at Monte Cassino as the earliest example on the wheel of Fortune: MS 189, folio 73 and folio 73^{vo}. Noteworthy was that the wheel had no spokes and that Fortune was missing, which at a glance did not make us feel as if they were the wheel of Fortune. Such a wheel was depicted with Fortune in folio 38 and folio 47^{vo} of the Genève MS Fr. 178, produced in 1353. Fortune seemed to control its rotation by turning the outer ring of the wheel floating in the air or by grabbing “*regnabo*” and “*regnavi*” the figures on the outer ring. Reference such as “the wheel with no spokes” was neither in the text description nor in the rubric in the *Rose* manuscripts. Given the fact, the unconventional wheel in the miniatures was doubtless a product of the illuminator's imagination. Such miniatures were neither included in Kurose (1977) nor in Todoroki (2000) nor in the descriptive catalogue⁴³ of Todoroki (2010), which would make them rare and invaluable from the perspective of iconography.

3.4 Some devices by illuminators

The illuminator of Arsenal MS 5209 probably decided that if he painted the figure equivalent to

39 See Todoroki (2000), Fig. 51. The wheel of Fortune is depicted as a decorative ornament at the bottom of the manuscript, and Fortune is in the wheel.

40 The English translation is as follows: “Fortune is sitting in the center like a blind person.”

41 See Todoroki (2000), Fig. 135, Fig. 143 or Dijon MS 562, folio 171^{vo} (*Histoire ancienne*). As for Dijon MS 562, see https://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/resultRecherche/resultRecherche.php?COMPOSITION_ID=1523 (Accessed on August 18, 2022).

42 Ernst Kitzinger, “World Map and Fortune's Wheel: A Medieval Mosaic Floor in Turin,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 117 (1973), 362-363 (Fig. 13 & Fig. 14).

43 Y. Todoroki, “A Descriptive Catalogue of 61 Miniatures of Goddess Fortune in Medieval Manuscripts (Part 2),” *Jinmon of Kagoshima Prefectural College* 34 (2010), 21-35. Fortune depicted in the sixty-one miniatures has been confirmed on web pages.

“*regno*”, it would not fit into the frame provided for a miniature and might cause an overlap with the text. Consequently, the figure was not depicted in folio 36. Lack of one figure on the wheel would not be a target of bitter criticism, considering that it was within the illuminator’s discretion. Then, what about the following four miniatures?

ÖNB MS 2592, folio 36; Arsenal MS 5209, folio 36; BL MS Add. 42133, folio 34; Morgan MS M. 503, folio 34

Thanks to some overly elaborate work by the illuminators, Fortune’s face was not hidden by the spokes of the wheel. All the composition was such that Fortune stood behind the wheel and stuck her head out inside it. This device doesn’t allow us to imagine that the wheel will spin. And moreover, BnF MS Fr. 25526, folio 48 was a miniature that seemed very bizarre and strange, because Fortune’s head was pierced with the spoke of the wheel. Such composition as this may have been a means of showing her face beautifully, but I believe the miniature was a complete failure of the illuminator who overused his technique.

The above were incredible devices by the illuminators that made me tilt my head in total disbelief, while there was also some device by a certain illuminator that captivated me. It was seen in the BSG MS 1126, folio 34 & folio 43^{vo}.

Table 6

	Fortune’s eyes	Color of the wheel	on the wheel
folio 34	open	orange	four figures
folio 43 ^{vo}	blindfolded	red	no figure

Aside from the conventional characteristics of the presence or absence of Fortune’s eyes and the figures on the wheel, the wheel was colored orange in folio 34, and the wheel red in folio 43^{vo}. The wheel colored orange or red is unusual in that it is different from the way the wheel of “Boethian” Fortune was drawn. This could have been one of the new techniques in depicting the wheel of Fortune among the *Rose* manuscripts. More remarkable was the shape of the spokes, which seemed to have been the best device of the illuminator. The spokes, very distinctive and quite different from the ones in the miniatures of other manuscripts, were shaped like the rose windows seen in the Gothic Cathedrals or Churches. It can be said that the illuminator’s unique inspiration and imagination led to the fascinating “wheel of Fortune” which had never been seen before.

3.5 A novel idea or a visual clarification

A close look at the miniature of Morgan MS G. 32, folio 59^{vo}, which could not be dealt with in 3.3 and 3.4, provides us with an interesting moot point; It was only one figure equivalent to “*sum sine regno*” that was placed on the wheel, and Fortune turned it, gripping the edge tightly with both hands. No similar composition could be found among the sixty-two miniatures in the *Rose* manuscripts. Given the fact, we can arrive at the conclusion that the miniature was the result of a novel idea by the illuminator, that is, it was a product of the illuminator’s imagination. Then, what if the miniature was reviewed from a different

perspective than the comparison between Fortune's miniatures? Would the same conclusion also be reached? The miniature of Morgan MS G. 32 was set at the very top of line 8011 in the text, where Friend cited his own experience and gave Lover the following advice.

Et me firent trestous la moe

Quant ilz me virent soulz la roe

De fortune enuers abatu

Tant ma par pourete batu. (lines 8009 - 8012)⁴⁴

This is a passage where, after explaining that his friends had left him when they realized that his fortune was seriously depleted and that he was in a difficult situation, he brought up the allegory of Fortune's wheel to illustrate that he was at the bottom of the wheel. A better knowledge of the text description would have helped us to determine that the miniature in MS G. 32 served only as a visual clarification.

The same was true for the miniature in the Harley 4425, folio 57 (See 3.3). Fortune's miniatures were sometimes interpreted as novel ideas by the illuminators, but sometimes as merely visual clarifications. It is important for us to understand that changing the angle can lead to a completely different conclusion.

4. Why did some illuminators dare to ignore the conditions for composition written in the rubrics and create Fortune's miniatures based on their original ideas?

To be continued.

⁴⁴ See <http://ica.themorgan.org/manuscript/thumbs/76943> (Accessed on August 18, 2022). This is the text description transcribed and revised by the author. The English translation is as follows: "And they gave me a pouty look, when they saw me beneath the wheel of Fortune, cast down by contrary Fortune who had thus struck me down through Poverty."