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Introduction

The essays that make up this volume were originally delivered as lectures at the twentieth annual Medieval Studies Conference at Fordham University, held in March 2000, on “Education in the Middle Ages.” Like the conference, this book is dedicated to Father Louis B. Pascoe, S.J., for many years a professor of medieval history (now professor emeritus) at Fordham and long an inspiration to those who work in this field.

The contributions of Father Pascoe to our understanding of medieval education are well known to generations of students at Fordham. The author of books and articles on Jean Gerson and Pierre d’Ailly, Father Pascoe served on the faculty of history from 1973 and even beyond his retirement from full-time teaching in May 2000. From 1987 to 1990 he was the Chair of the History Department, and he also served as the Acting Dean of Fordham College for a year. He received his Ph.D. in History from the University of California at Los Angeles and has regularly offered graduate courses and seminars on such subjects as Medieval Church History, Medieval Universities, Medieval Monastic and Cathedral Schools, and Medieval Church and University.

In the spirit of his own wide-ranging sense of the varied aspects of education in any age but especially in the medieval period, this volume offers a number of original studies in medieval education, not only in the formal academic sense typical of schools and universities but also in a broader cultural sense that includes law, liturgy, and the new religious orders of the High Middle Ages. Curiously, the field of
medieval education, except for university education, has not been as lively a locus of publication in recent decades as the related field of medieval literacy.\(^2\)

The essays in this book are grouped under three headings: (I) The Transmission of Knowledge, (II) Town and Gown, and (III) Mendicant Education. In the “Call for Papers” the organizers of the conference encouraged contributors to explore the “transmission of knowledge in the Middle Ages” in various kinds of educational communities, including “schools, scriptoria, universities, ateliers, and workshops” and to “conceptualize other types of educational communities” besides those associated with the cathedral schools and the universities.

* * *

The first part of this volume consists of five responses to these two directives. Ralph Mathisen focuses on the transmission of knowledge by looking at rhetorical education in Gaul in the early Middle Ages. Evelyn Birge Vitz responds to the second directive by providing a conceptual basis for understanding the medieval Catholic liturgy as a crucial source of medieval education and formation for a learning community often ignored in discussions of education, for even the illiterate can become quite learned in some important ways.

Conventional wisdom holds that the barbarian incursions into Gaul in the early fifth century brought a rapid end to the traditional school system and to the public subventions funding it. Mathisen argues convincingly that proponents of this thesis tend to explain away evidence that contradicts it by appealing to ad hoc hypotheses. As counter-evidence, he examines references to more than twenty individuals who taught secular subjects in southern Gaul from the fifth to the seventh centuries and discusses the implications of these references for the conventional thesis. Much in the spirit of the work of such scholars as Nicholas Orme and Joanne Moran Cruz, his essay will add evidence about the availability of possibilities for learning secular subjects in late antique Gaul to the outstanding work of these scholars on this topic in England.\(^3\)

By attending both to the variety of medieval liturgical practices and to the physical structures of church buildings, Vitz shows that medieval religious practices addressed the minds and hearts of believ-
ers through the corporeal and constituted an indispensable part of their education. Genuflections and blessings and song in consecrated spaces on feast days and ferial days all helped to form their worldview and shape their characters. Stained glass and pilgrimages and fast days provided an education for the illiterate and the literate alike. In short, the liturgy and all the material signs and symbols around and within that liturgy were the school in which most medieval Catholics learned their faith, especially through the way in which the services and the material structures associated with those services cultivated a sense of the presence of God and of the saints, shaped certain spiritual and moral sensibilities, and evoked responses, whether of contrition, love, or some other appropriate feeling or action. Vitz offers the striking examples of Joan of Arc and of Chaucer’s “little clergeon” as interesting case studies of the way the process of learning and absorbing what the liturgy was teaching worked. By her concentration on the affective side of education, Vitz adds an important complementary dimension to the current literature, which often focuses on the forms of education that were more formal and academic (see Boynton 2000; Zieman 2003).

By their consideration of grammatical study, apprenticeship, and legal training, the essays by Ivanova-Sullivan, Bellitto, and Taylor bring other perspectives to the section of this volume devoted to the transmission of knowledge. By guiding the reader through a range of Eastern European sources relatively understudied by Western scholars, including the Cyrillic alphabet, alphabetical acrostics, grammatical treatises, scholia, and monastic Typika, Tania Ivanova-Sullivan examines conceptions of learning in Slavia Orthodoxa (Bulgaria) and distinguishes between the ethos of the Slavic Orthodox community of the Balkans and that of its Byzantine counterpart. In addition to describing some of the technical features of these fundamental aspects of the learning process at the elementary level, this essay raises some tantalizing questions about the attitudes toward learning on the part of the pupil. The forceful truth contained in the medieval adage “quidquid recipitur, recipitur secundum modum recipientis” applies to every level of education, and even to the basic level of grammatical study (Black 1996; 1987).

Since the Council of Trent, priests have normally received their
education at seminaries. The reforms mandated by that council and implemented by such figures as Carlo Borromeo were intended to correct deficiencies in the system of training by apprenticeship that was the main alternative to formal education at a university. Investigating the question of the education of parish priests during the Middle Ages, Christopher Bellitto argues that some scholars have exaggerated the extent to which parish priests were educated at the universities and that in a number of cases medieval practice followed the late ancient practice of apprenticeships by which a bishop or his representative prepared candidates for the priesthood. Relatively little has thus far been published on the pre-university education of clerics, and this makes Bellitto’s research particularly valuable, especially in light of the recent research on the investments in clerical education made by cathedral and collegiate churches during the medieval period (Dykema 1998).

Apprenticeship and training by the accumulation of hands-on experience was also typical of the legal profession, and yet scholarly access to the way this sort of education took place often needs to proceed obliquely, in comparison to the more direct approach possible when what we want to know is what books or legal collections they studied formally. Scott Taylor examines, as a case in point, the Processus Sathanis infernalis contra genus humanum, a fourteenth-century work depicting the Virgin Mary and a demon arguing whether Christ has jurisdiction to be the judge of the world. Taylor shows that the theme of the Devil’s rights persists well into the High Middle Ages and that this old theme receives a new twist in this work, for the author, under the influence of the Clementine decrees, emphasizes minimal due process and dramatizes courtroom practice for Italian students of law. From Taylor’s analysis we learn not only about some of the practical sides of legal education but also about the roles of reason and rhetoric in an extremely imaginative text.

* * *

The organizers of this conference also solicited papers that would comment on “the impact of education on social networks, political structures, and religious movements.” In this second part of our volume, Phyllis Roberts and Adam Davis explore the relationship be-
tween “town and gown,” between the university and the wider medieval world. In doing so, they are much in the spirit of contemporary research on this ageless tension; as Davis observes, scholars have placed greater stress in recent years upon “the university’s impact outside university walls.”

Phyllis Roberts examines the medieval sermon and thereby contributes significantly to our understanding of the complex role that preaching played in the university curriculum and environment. Drawing upon the sermons themselves and the provisions about preaching in the statutes of a number of medieval universities, she shows convincingly that preaching was a very important way in which the medieval university was linked with the larger world. She looks at preaching within the university and at the university’s contribution to preaching both through its own practice of lectio, disputatio, and praedicatio and through the development of preaching aids and new types of preaching. In this essay we find the higher education equivalent of some of the themes that Evelyn Vitz sounded earlier with respect to the world outside of academe. The analysis provided here of the preaching done to clerics within the confines of the university immediately raises fascinating questions about the preaching aimed at laypeople, the extent to which non-clerics would have understood Latin, the extent to which sermons were translated or even delivered in the vernacular, and related questions of importance for our understanding of the way sermons contributed to the education of clerics and laity in the Middle Ages.

We gain another perspective on the town-and-gown issues in medieval education from the essay by Adam Davis on the life of an educational and ecclesiastical administrator. By resisting the compartmentalization between social and intellectual history and by bringing to bear both disciplines, Davis allows us to see the life of Eudes Rigaud as a unity. Rigaud was a Franciscan Parisian master who later became a distinguished reforming archbishop, and Davis shows how Rigaud’s career as a university theologian prepared him for a career as an ecclesiastical administrator. This essay asks us to think about medieval education both inside and outside the framework of institutional schools and it contextualizes the thoughts of a significant medieval writer.

* * *
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In the third section of this volume, four scholars examine what Andreas Rüther describes as “the most developed and advanced” educational network of the Middle Ages: that of the new mendicant orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. There have been a number of important new studies on medieval university education, but the role of the mendicant orders in relation to these universities remains a fertile field for new research. The essays by Mark Johnson, M. Michèle Mulchahey, and Charles Briggs illustrate the distinctive contribution of the mendicants to medieval education by concentrating on a number of texts that reveal interesting aspects of the structure, the style, and the substance of their pedagogy.

Through an examination of rules, constitutions, and enactments of general chapters, Andreas Rüther presents an overview of the educational system of Franciscans and Dominicans, with special emphasis on the system in Germany. He discusses the Dominican system both at the provincial level and at its “spiritual center,” Saint-Jacques in Paris. He also distinguishes among studia solemnia, studia generalia, and studia artium and examines the ties between Franciscan and Dominican studia and the universities. His analysis of these documents contributes to our growing understanding of that part of the evolution of the universities that occurred under the influence of the new type of educational centers that the mendicant orders established in the urban (rather than monastic) setting provided by the universities.

Thomists have long debated the question of the audience for whom Aquinas intended his massive Summae, the Summa theologiae and the Summa contra gentiles. Investigating St. Thomas’s motive for writing the Summa theologiae and the audience for which he intended it, Mark Johnson calls into question the tendency to associate the Summa largely with the University of Paris. He shows that the work came into being within a Dominican provincial context and that St. Thomas wrote it not for the Dominican rank and file (fratres communes), but for those who would become conventual lectors in the order’s Roman province.

Examining several texts by Remigio de’ Girolami preserved in a Florentine codex Mulchahey shows that these prologues to Scripture and the works of Aristotle and Lombard correspond to what is known
from Dominican legislation and other sources about the syllabus of the Dominican studium generale in the early fourteenth century. She goes on to show that these texts provide a record of inaugural lectures that Remigio gave at the recently established Dominican studium generale in Florence and that they offer us glimpses of his practice as a teacher. Her careful analysis and extensive reflection on the significance of this individual teacher provide important lessons for the general theme of the mendicant contribution to medieval university education, especially on the much-discussed question of the ordering of topics within theological education.

Charles Briggs examines Bartolomeo da San Concordio’s Compendium moralis philosophiae, a fourteenth-century compilation of Giles of Rome’s thirteenth-century work De regimine principum. Briggs argues on circumstantial grounds that Bartolomeo compiled his Compendium for use in the classroom after a Dominican general chapter decided (1314) to integrate moral philosophy into the curriculum of its provincial schools of theology. In Briggs’s view, Bartolomeo intended thereby to make better sense of the new Aristotelian moral philosophy by combining it with the classical and patristic authorities traditionally used to teach moral philosophy. Like Mulchahey’s contribution, this essay enters into the intriguing question of the ongoing assimilation of Aristotle’s thought once the novelty of the material had worn off. Many histories of philosophy accentuate the thirteenth-century struggles of Dominicans like Aquinas to take a middle position between the radical Aristotelian views of the Latin Averroists and the anti-Aristotelian suspicions of the Augustinian camp. These histories then often turn to the quarrels between nominalism and realism on the question of universals in the domain of logic, mindful of the eventual degeneration of scholastic thought prior to the Renaissance. This essay contributes to the less-well-known area of fourteenth-century Dominican efforts to deepen appreciation for Aristotelian moral philosophy while seeking harmony with the still lively currents of patristic theology.

* * *

The essays in this volume thus intend to honor a great historian of medieval education, Father Louis B. Pascoe, S.J., by offering original
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research into an area of his own intellectual interest. They attempt to expand our grasp of the history of education by the research they present into such traditional areas of educational history as the mendicant orders and the university, as well as certain venues not always associated with the topic of education: sermons, the liturgy, and the law courts. Some of these essays raise significant questions about the chronological assumptions we tend to make about the period, whether it be the weakening of secular avenues of education in late antiquity or the pace of reform within medieval clerical education prior to the Council of Trent. Besides what we learn from these essays about various writers of significance in the medieval period and the institutions that sponsored their work, there is much to learn here about the history of education that comes from an interdisciplinary forum.

RONALD BEGLEY
JOSEPH W. KOTERSKI, S.J.

NOTES

1. See the list of these publications in the Appendix.
2. One might cite, for instance, the Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy, published by Brepols, and the journal History of Universities published annually by Oxford University Press, as well as the monograph series “Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance” published since 1992 by E. J. Brill.
3. Nicholas Orme’s numerous works on this subject run from such early studies as English Schools in the Middle Ages (1973) through his recent Medieval Children (2001–2003). See also Moran Cruz’s “Education, Economics, and Clerical Mobility in Late Medieval Northern England” (2000).
4. Two major studies about the schooling provided by the mendicant orders have appeared in recent years, one by one of our own contributors, M. Michèle Mulchahey, See Mulchahey 1998 and Roest 2000.
5. Two of the finest new contributions to this general area are books that focus on the University of Paris and on universities in Italy. See Grendler 2002 and Courtenay 1999.
6. One can obtain an overview of the main schools of thought on this question from Hibbs 1995.


PART I

The Transmission of Knowledge
CHAPTER I

Bishops, Barbarians, and the “Dark Ages”: The Fate of Late Roman Educational Institutions in Late Antique Gaul

RALPH W. MATHISEN*

During the late Roman period public schools enjoyed imperial patronage resulting to a great degree from a need for educated persons to fill posts in the expanding imperial bureaucracy (MacMullen 1962; Jones 1964; Pedersen 1970; Nellen 1977; Kaster 1988). In 376, for example, the emperor Gratian issued legislation providing for the establishment of grammarians and rhetors “throughout each diocese in the most populated cities” (Codex Theodosianus 13.3.11). Gaul was one of the primary beneficiaries of such policies (Haarhoff 1920; van Sickle 1934). In cities that did not enjoy this imperial largess, other public schools operated that were dependent on municipal support and student tuitions (Jones 1964, 999; Kaster 1988, 106–107). Even professors who received public stipends obtained a good deal of income from student fees (Jones 1964, 1002). In addition, only schools of grammar and rhetoric received state support; elementary education was left to “private enterprise” (Jones 1964, 997–98). Moreover, the public schools functioned alongside the long-standing tradition of “home schooling,” carried out either by private tutors or by the students’ own parents (Kaster 1988, 67–68).

As of the early fifth century A.D., Gaul had a reputation as a center of education. For example, St. Jerome wrote to Rusticus, a young man of Marseilles, noting that his mother “sent you to Rome, sparing no expense . . . so that Roman solemnity would restrain the sumptuousness and elegance of Gallic speech” (Epist. 125.6; cf. Chron.

*This study is dedicated to the memory of Fannie J. LeMoine.
s. a. 358). The poet Claudian spoke of the “learned citizens” of Gaul, and the Roman senator Symmachus referred to “Gallic eloquence” (Claud. De quart. cons. Hon. 582–83; Symm. Epist. 6.34, 9.88). Gallic education also bore fruit, for a number of the late Roman writers had their origin in Gaul, and the rhetor Ausonius of Bordeaux not only rose to high imperial office, but also authored a poem on “The Professors of Bordeaux.”

This comfortable situation was interrupted in the early fifth century, when various barbarian peoples began to arrive in Gaul to stay. The Visigoths were settled in Aquitania in 418, and the Burgundians in Sapaudia in 442. In the north, the Franks intruded across the Rhine, and the Alamanni occupied the east. The imperial government collapsed, and Gaul was partitioned among various barbarian kingdoms. The barbarian settlement, coupled with the process of Christianization that had accelerated during the fourth century, brought great political, social, and cultural changes.

The barbarian incursions generally are assumed to have had a disastrous effect upon secular educational institutions. It has been presumed that they of necessity meant the end of the secular, publicly supported school system (Cameron 1967, 662; Marrou 1956, 344; Boyd 1972, 95). Indeed, the image of the uncouth and unlettered barbarian who destroyed classical culture and was the direct cause of the “Dark Ages” (Goffart 1988, 12; Cameron 1999, 118) still is common in modern historiography (Dill 1889, 438; Stevens 1933, 81; Chadwick 1955, 302; Riché 1976, 36; Mathiesen 1988, 45–52). Many scholars portray the barbarians as having no interest in classical culture: Riché, for example, asserted, “We find no trace of any interest in Latin letters among the Visigoths, the Burgundians, or even the Ostrogoths . . .” (1976, 62).

Modern writers, generally presenting arguments from silence, suppose that all or nearly all the secular schools teaching the classical subjects of grammar and rhetoric in Gaul were closed by ca. 420–430 (Roger 1905, 56, 82, 87; Haarhoff 1920, 162; Stroheker 1948, 66; Marrou 1956, 299–313, 453; Cameron 1967, 653–73; Boyd 1972, 97; Matthews 1975, 348) and were succeeded by ecclesiastical schools that often taught little more than basic literacy (Haarhoff 1920, 178; Marrou 1956, 334; Matthews 1975). This scenario has the advantage of simplicity: the barbarians came, the secular schools disappeared, and rudi-
mentary ecclesiastical schools picked up and continued on into the Middle Ages.

But this reconstruction has a problem. Some modern writers cite several secular teachers of grammar and rhetoric—six or seven of them—in Gaul after the 430s. What is one to do with them? Some dismiss them as isolated anomalies or postpone the date of the “last known public rhetor” until the late fifth or very early sixth century (Dill 1926, 474; Raby 1934, 66; Riché 1957, 422–25, and 1976, 31–35; Lot 1961, 166; Kaster 1988, 467–68). Secular teachers who seem to be attested at even later dates (Pirenne 1934, 173–74; Thompson 1963, 1, 7) are explained away by some as representing various kinds of “home schooling” (Boyd 1972, 97), such as private tutoring (Roger 1905, 87; Marrou 1936, 344; Riché 1957, 422) or parental instruction (Sid. Apoll. Epist. 4.12.1–2; Vita Boniti 2; Vita Desiderii 1). Others propose that teachers of secular material after ca. 500 were in fact clerics and consequently do not count as “secular” (Pirenne 1934, 175–76; Riché 1957).

If one accepts these views, the fate of secular educational institutions after the barbarian invasions looks grim. But one might wish, first of all, to consider the possibility that any alterations in the secular educational institutions were neither as traumatic nor as swift as has been thought, and, secondly, to rethink the common assumption that the teaching of secular subjects declined as a consequence of barbarian interference or neglect.

To determine the extent to which secular subjects continued to be taught in early medieval Gaul, one might look comprehensively at the evidence by drawing up a catalogue of attested teachers of secular material. This also seems like a useful thing to do because, hitherto, no one has ever done it. Modern writers cite only a few examples. For example, Kaster lists, for the late fifth century, Domitius, Johannes, and Hesperius of Clermont, and Julianus Pomerius of Arles (1988, 467–68). Riché adds Lampridius of Bordeaux, Sapaudus of Vienne, and Viventiolus of Lyon (1957, 422–25; 1976, 31–35). But this is as far as it goes. So let us see if we can do a little better, making particular use of the poems and letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, prefect of Rome in 468 and then bishop of Clermont.

One might begin in Provence, which, with its ready communications with Italy and the Mediterranean world, always had been the
most heavily urbanized and most economically developed part of Gaul. The cities of Marseilles, Arles, and Narbonne continued to be important centers of administration, commerce, and culture. Arles was an educational center in the fifth century (contra: Riché 1976, 32 n. 102). In the late 440s, Sidonius Apollinaris, and several of his friends, studied dialectic and poetry there “intra lares Eusebianos” (“in the rooms of Eusebius”).2 Another teacher was Aedesius, described as a “rhetoricae facundiae et metricae artis peritissimus vir” (“a man most learned in rhetorical knowledge and metrical art”).3

In the early sixth century, Arles still had a resident rhetor, the African refugee and priest Julianus Pomerius. One of his pupils was Caesarius of Arles, whose Vita describes Pomerius as “a rhetor by training . . . whom learning in the art of grammar rendered singular and famous there.”4 Subsequently, the presence of unnamed scholastici (“scholars”) at Arles is attested in the 540s: the authors of the life of Caesarius feared that their work would be found wanting “if, by chance, we as simple storytellers should come into contact with the ears and judgment of learned men.”5

Evidence is less abundant for Marseilles and Narbonne. In the latter city, ca. 420 the grammarian Consentius authored an extant De barbarismis et metaplasmis (On barbarisms and transformations), and Sidonius recalled the education of Consentius’s son, also named Consentius, in grammar and rhetoric (Carm. 23.210–13). Ca. 460, Sidonius visited his friend Leo of Narbonne, a teacher of the Twelve Tables of Roman law.6

At Marseilles the only direct evidence for secular teaching comes ca. 560. Regarding the parvenu Andarchius, Gregory of Tours (Historiae 4.46) reported, “He, they say, was the slave of the senator Felix, and having been assigned to care for his master, and sent with him to literary studies, he shined forth as one who was well educated. For he was thoroughly learned in the works of Vergil, in the books of the Theodosian law, and in the art of calculation.” A broad range of secular subjects, therefore, including poetry, law, and mathematics, continued to be available at Marseilles.

From Provence one might turn to Visigothic Aquitania, where in the fourth century Bordeaux had served as one of the centers of Gallic education. There, in the 470s, one finds Lampridius, whom Sidonius
described as “declaming in the presence of his pupils at Bordeaux.”7

Another who taught there at the same time, and at Périgueux as well, was Anthedius, described as the *vir praefectus* (“leading man”) of a *collegium* (“association”) of Phoebus Apollo, and a teacher of music, geometry, arithmetic, and astrology, that is, the quadrivium (Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 22. *epist.* 2; cf. *Epist.* 8.11.2; *Carm.* 9.312).

Indeed, Périgueux seems to have been something of an educational center in its own right (Labroue 1905). During the 470s, the rhetor Lupus taught there and at Agen; he was a specialist in arithmetic and astrology (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 8.11.2; Ruricius of Limoges, *Epist.* 1.10). Ca. 480, the rhetor Paulinus of Périgueux was the author of extant letters and poems addressed to bishop Perpetuus of Tours (CSEL 16.1–190; Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 8.11.2). And to the northwest, Sidonius attests that as of ca. 470 there had been holders of “chairs of literature,” that is, municipal rhetors, at Bourges in the not too distant past (*Epist.* 7.9.24 [tr. Dalton 1915, 2:122]).

Just to the south, at Clermont, there likewise is evidence for secular schools. Sidonius’s friend Aper was schooled there in grammar and rhetoric in the 450s (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 4.21.4). Ecdicius, the son of the emperor Eparchius Avitus (455–456), was taught there at the same time and subsequently sponsored the teaching of Roman oratory in preference to “the slough of Celtic speech” (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 3.3.2 [tr. Dalton 1915, 1:67]). During the 470s, Hesperius, a young protégé of Sidonius’s, undertook the study of rhetoric in Clermont. Sidonius praised his *oratoria* (“oratory”) and described him as one *studs discedi* (“zealous for learning”) (*Epist.* 2.10.6 [tr. Dalton 1915, 1:56]; also 2.10.1). Hesperius subsequently became a teacher in his own right; ca. 485 he taught the sons of Ruricius, bishop of Limoges (*Epist.* 1.3–4).8

As late as the mid–seventh century the young aristocrat Bonitus received a traditional education at Clermont: “He was imbued with the elements of grammar and trained in the Theodosian decrees, and excelling the others of his age, he was examined by the *sophistae* [“sophists’] and advanced” (*Vita Boniti* 2: MGH SRM 6.387). Bonitus went on to serve as *referendarius* (“referendary”) of King Sigisbert (634–656) before becoming bishop of Clermont. One of the “others” at school was Bonitus’s brother Avitus, who was described as a “man learned in wider studies and in sacred literature.”9 The presence of
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Sophists, schoolmates, and examinations, not to mention the teaching of grammar and law, suggests the existence of a secular school even in the seventh century. Indeed, another who received legal training at the same time was Desiderius, a native of Alii, of whom it was said, "fully educated in literary studies, he then continued his study with attention to Roman law." Desiderius went on to become "thesaurarius" ("treasurer") of King Dagobert I before becoming bishop of Cahors (Vita Desiderii). One now can return to the Rhone valley. At Lyon, there is strong evidence for secular schooling throughout the fifth century. Sidonius recalled how he and his friend Rusticus attended school in their youth at Lyon in the 440s under a "magister," an apparent reference to a "magister ludi," or elementary school teacher (Epist. 5.9.3; also 3.1.1), who perhaps is to be identified with the "magister" Hoenius who taught Sidonius (Carm. 9.32-43). It also would have been at this time that the rhetor Agroecius, later bishop of Toul, dedicated his De orthographia (On orthography) to Eucherius, bishop of Lyon. Teachers attested at Lyon in the 460s include Dominus, holder of a municipal chair of grammar, to whom Sidonius wrote, "you yawningly commence expounding to your students, 'A Samian was my mother'; ... That the Lyon schools continued to prosper is suggested by Sidonius' tale of playing ball with a "caterva scholasticorum" ("crowd of students") there ca. 469 (Epist. 5.17.6 [tr. Dalton 1915, 277]). Sidonius also provides some insight into the internal functioning of the rhetorical school at Lyon. He wrote to his friend Pythagoras about the latter's schooling in the 450s, which included the study of Vergil and Cicero: "I remember your youth, suitably educated in the liberal schools, and I recall fully that you declaimed often, vehemently, and eloquently in the presence of the thetor" (Epist. 5.52 [tr. Dalton 1915, 272]).

Sidonius also provides some insight into the internal functioning of the rhetorical school at Lyon. He wrote to his friend Pythagoras about the latter's schooling in the 450s, which included the study of Vergil and Cicero: "I remember your youth, suitably educated in the liberal schools, and I recall fully that you declaimed often, vehemently, and eloquently in the presence of the thetor" (Epist. 5.52 [tr. Dalton 1915, 272]).

Once again, one seems to have a functioning public school, complete with
public exams, and a curriculum that included standard Latin authors such as Terence, Cicero, and Vergil.

A rather later teacher of Lyon is attested in a letter of Bishop Avitus of Vienne (ca. 490–518) addressed “to the rhetor Viventiolus” of Lyon. He apparently is to be identified with the Viventiolus who was bishop of Lyon at the same time and also a correspondent of Avitus’s. Viventiolus’s teaching activities are attested by Avitus’s comment, “I hope that you will submit something carefully sought out and unearthed in the ancient orators whom you rightly pass on to your students” (Epist. 57).

This circle tour of Gaul ends just to the south, at Vienne, where the rhetor Sapaudus continued to teach at least into the 470s. Mamer-tus Claudianus, a priest of Vienne, referred to the “abundance of his students,” and spoke of him as a “civis et doctor” (“citizen and professor”) of Vienne (Epistula ad Sapaudum. CSEL 11.205ff.). Claudianus himself also conducted classes in secular philosophy. Sidonius, recalling “how often we used to come to him solely for the sake of consultation” (Epist. 4.11.2 [tr. Dalton 1915, 2:21]), reminisced about Claudianus’s teaching methods, saying,

If there were many of us, he expected us all, of course, to listen, but nominated a single spokesman, probably the one whom we ourselves should have chosen; then, in his methodical way, now addressing one, now another, and giving each his turn, he would bring forth all the treasures of his learning, not without the accom-
paniment of trained and appropriate gesture. When he had fin-
ished, we would put our adverse criticisms in syllogistic form. . . .

Most of all we respected him for his tolerance of some men’s per-
sistent dullness of apprehension. . . . We could admire his pa-
tience, but it was beyond our imitation. Who could shrink from consulting on any recondite point a man who would gladly suffer in argument the stupid questions of the ignorant and the simple? (Epist. 4.11.2–3 [tr. Dalton 1915, 2:21]).

This certainly sounds like a graduate seminar being conducted by a professor.

This catalogue concludes with some teachers whose places of resi-
dence are uncertain. Severianus, for example, a rhetor teaching ca.
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460, has been identified with the Julius Severianus who wrote an extant *Ars rhetorica* (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 9.15.1 *carm.* 37; see Martindale 1980, 999–1000). And Johannes, who taught ca. 470, attracted a “crowd of readers” to his school (Sid. Apoll., *Epist.* 8.2.1).

All these examples suggest that the teaching of secular subjects by no means ended in the early or even the late fifth century, but rather continued, and flourished, in at least some Gallic cities. Rather than the stray anomalies cited in previous studies, one finds no fewer than twenty named teachers, not to mention other kinds of citations, demonstrating that the evidence for secular education in Gaul in the fifth century is not only strong, but in fact more extensive than that for nearly any earlier period. Moreover, it appears that what came to an end in the late fifth century was perhaps not secular education, but our most important source for it, Sidonius Apollinaris. Other sources, not as considerable as Sidonius, indicate that the teaching of secular subjects continued during the sixth century and even into the seventh.

One now can turn to the question of what conclusions can be drawn regarding the commonly held perceptions cited at the beginning of this study. This is a very complex issue, of course, and some potential consequences can only be suggested. One might begin with the settlement of the barbarians, which was thought to have had several deleterious effects on secular education. The collapse of the imperial administration is assumed to have resulted in (1) a lack of need for the educational institutions that produced imperial bureaucrats and (2) a disappearance of the revenues that funded public schools. The barbarians’ destructiveness on one hand and unintellectual attitude on the other are thought to have resulted in speedy decline in the availability and utility of educational services.

But it just has been seen that the teaching of secular subjects in what certainly look like schools continued long after the barbarian arrival. This alone might lead one to reconsider some of the past assumptions about employment opportunities, funding, and barbarian impact. Now, it was seen above that the need for large numbers of educated civil servants was a characteristic phenomenon of the late empire. The imperial subsidization that was designed to satisfy the needs of the bureaucracy was based on the special needs and circumstances of the times. It created a system of education much more ex-
tensive then anything in the past. When circumstances changed, and the bureaucracy and the means to support it collapsed, it should be no surprise that this artificially inflated educational system shrank to a level more suited to the needs of its times.

But the teaching of secular subjects certainly did not disappear, for barbarian Europe continued to have a need for educated persons to fill secular positions. Nor can blame for a large-scale decline in secular education be laid at the feet of the barbarians, for their administrations were every bit as much document-based as the Romans’ had been, and their need for educated, or at least literate, officials was just as great. As a few examples among many for the continued value of education in barbarian administrations in the sixth century, one might note the reference of a Burgundian king to “one of my counselors, who is thought to excel the others in learning”; or the Frankish courtiers Asteriolus and Secundinus, who “were highly esteemed by the king, for each was wise and imbued with rhetorical learning.”

As for funding, recent scholarship indicates that the extent of imperial or even municipal support for schools in the late empire has been overstated. Nearly all governmental salaries not only were granted on an ad hoc basis, but also did not constitute even half the income of the few who received them (Jones 1964, 1002). Most teachers received not a governmental salarium (“salary”), but mercedes, or “fees,” from their students (Kaster 1988, 114–18). One might suppose that in barbarian Europe, as before, secular teachers received intermittent municipal support, but were primarily funded by the tuition paid by their students.

One might rightly question, therefore, whether factors such as lack of employment opportunities, or decline in government funding, or barbarian ignorance resulted in a disastrous decline in the teaching of secular subjects. The preceding discussion suggests not only that the teaching of secular subjects continued into the seventh century, but also that it continued to fill much the same role as it had under the Romans, albeit at a reduced level.

The identification of the exact nature and role of this teaching, moreover, is complicated by a new educational institution that appeared at the same time as the barbarian kingdoms: the Christian Church. The character of the relationship, in the fifth century and
later, between secular and ecclesiastical education remains a very
thorny question, and it is very difficult to disentangle one from the
other. Indeed, in the context of the times this probably would not
even be a sensible thing to try to do. But in the context of this discus-
sion it is important to acknowledge the secular elements that re-
ained, and not to presume that they were completely submerged in
Church-based curricula and institutions, as has been done by those
who question the “secularness” of some post-Roman teachers on the
grounds that they were clerics (Pirenne 1934, 176). In this view, it is
implied that the teaching of a secular topic by a cleric somehow di-
luted the secularness of the topic.

But some clerical teachers seem to have been quite engaged in
their secular topics. It already has been seen that even in the fifth
century the priest Mamertus Claudianus of Vienne did so. He effort-
lessly combined the two roles. Sidonius said of him, “He ceaselessly
acted as a philosopher without harm to his religion” (Epist. 4.11.1 [tr.
Dalton 1915, 2:20]). His dual role was also emphasized in his epitaph:
“In three fields of learning he was a master [magister] and a shining
light, the Roman, the Greek, and the Christian; all of them as a monk
in his prime he made his own by secret discipline; he as orator, logi-
cian, poet, commentator, geometer, musician, skilled also to loose the
bonds of disputation . . .” (Epist. 4.11.6 [tr. Dalton 1915, 2:22–23]).
Sidonius elsewhere praised his expertise in grammar, oratory, arithme-
tic, geometry, music, dialectic, astronomy, architecture, and poetry
(Epist. 5.2.1). This enumeration of the liberal arts establishes Claudia-
nus’s credentials as an educator; indeed, his career before taking eccle-
siastical orders may well have been as rhetor of Vienne.

In other instances, too, the line between secular and ecclesiastical
teachers was a fine one. Not only did many clerics receive a classical
education, but some of them had been secular teachers themselves.
The examples of Julianus Pomerius of Arles and Viventiolus of Lyon
have been mentioned. To this list can be added the “orator magnus”
(“great orator”) Pantagathus, who became bishop of Vienne in the
530s (MGH AA 6.2.187 no. 9), not to mention Desiderius, another
bishop of Vienne, who in the late sixth century was rebuked by Greg-
ory the Great for teaching grammar and secular literature (Reg. 11.340).
In such cases, one might ask whether it matters what the “professional
status” was of those who were teaching secular subjects. It may be that we are looking for distinctions that were not significant in the context of the times, any more than Julian’s law of 362 forbidding Christians to teach the classics (Codex Theodosianus 13.3.5; Julian, Epist. 36 [Loeb]) indicates that Christian teachers were any less qualified to teach secular subjects than their pagan counterparts—all this is not to say, of course, that the way that Christian teachers taught their secular subjects would not have been informed by their Christian beliefs; but bringing one’s personal preferences to bear on one’s teaching is hardly a phenomenon limited to Christians.

The preceding study has endeavored to quantify some of the previous impressionistic views of what happened to the teaching of secular subjects in post-barbarian Gaul. The view that such teaching came to a screeching halt by the end of the fifth century has been shown to be simply incorrect; other views call for a more nuanced exposition. The teaching of secular subjects continues to be well attested until the early seventh century. By that time, of course, the barbarian arrival was two centuries in the past and a lot had happened. There were different educational and cultural needs to be met, and it probably is a mistake to expect too much continuity over such a long interval. With regard to educational institutions, one might suggest that there was a long process of transformation from a system with purely secular subjects taught by secular teachers to one with some secular subjects being taught by primarily clerical teachers. Rather than disappearing, degenerating, or being submerged, the late Roman secular schools were transformed into institutions that reflected the social, religious, and political realities of their times.

NOTES

1. To mention just a few, note from the late fourth and early fifth centuries Consentius of Narbonne, Marcellus of Bordeaux, Rutilius Namatianus, Paulinus of Pella, Julianus Severianus, and the anonymous author of the Querolus. Ecclesiastical writers are far too numerous to mention.

2. Épist. 4.1.3 (tr. Dalton 1915, 2:4); see also Sid. Apoll. Carm. 9.330–33, “ipsi isdem temporibus nati magistris uti” (“born in the same times...
we used the same teachers’); for discussion, see Stevens 1933, 10–11. Sidonius’s phraseology has been used to suggest that Eusebius’s school met in his home, and therefore was not publicly supported (see Roger 1905, 87). This may be, but one knows little of where publicly funded teaching would have occurred at this time, when many secular public buildings were no longer being maintained.

3. *Vita Hilarii* ii (14). There also existed in Arles a literary circle that included Eusebius, Aedesius, Hilary, the poet Rusticus Helpidius Domnulus, and the Gallic prefect Auxiliaris (12 [15]). It also has been suggested (Riché 1976, 73–74) that law was taught there because of the presence of several eminent lawyers, including Petronius, and Athenius, a “homo iuridicum temporumque varietatibus exercitatus” (“a man experienced in varieties of lawsuits and politics”) (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 1.11).

4. “Scientia rhetor . . . quem ibi singularem et clarum grammaticae artis doctrina reddebat” (*Vita Caesarii* i.i). Gennadius of Marseilles (*Vir. ill.* 99) described Pomerius as, “dialecticorum more respondens arte dialectica” (“responding with dialectic art in the manner of dialecticians”); Ennodius of Pavia (*Epist.* 2.6), referred to the “studiorum suorum palaestra” (“the exercise ground of his studies”), to his “studia liberalia” (“liberal studies”), and to his expertise in Greek and Latin. Pomerius is dismissed by Riché (1957, 428 n. 27) because he came from Africa and hence did not “count” as a Gaul.

5. “Ut si casu scholasticorum aures atque iudicia nos simplices contingit relatores attingere” (*Vita Caesarii* 2.5).

6. A visit “ad doctiloqui Leonis aedes, quo bis sex tabulas docente iuris . . .” (“to the house of the learned Leo, when he was teaching the twice-six tables of law”) (*Carm.* 23.446–49). A Narbonese literary circle of the 460s attests to secular learning there (Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 23.436ff.). See Loyen 1943, 86 (but denied by Riché 1976, 35 n. 125).


8. Ruricius’s wife, Hiberia, came from Clermont, where the eldest sons, at least, seem to have lived; see Mathisen 1999, 22–25.

9. “Vir exterioribus studiis eruditus sacrisque litteris” (*Epist.* 1.3–4). Riché 1976, 192, drops the last two words, and consequently masks the distinction between the two kinds of learning.
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11. “Exponere oscitabundus ordiris, ‘Samia mihi mater fuit’” (Sid. Epist. 2.2.2 [tr. Dalton 1915, 1:36]), reading from Terence’s Eunuchus. Riché (1976, 14) asserts that this occurred “sans doute à Clermont,” repeating a common mistake of associating Sidonius, a native of Lyon, with Clermont before 469, when he became bishop there through the influence of his wife’s family.

12. Riché (1957, 425) has Viventiolus as a rhetor, not a bishop, but Coville (1928, 225, 309) has him only as “the bishop who bore the same name.” The letter addressed to Viventiolus as “rhetor” concerned a point of grammar, and Avitus, it seems, was being humorous.

13. The literature on this topic is vast. Note, for example, just the use of barbarian law codes; and the use of documents in barbarian chanceries. See, among others, Galbraith 1935; Riché 1976, 71–78; Cavallo 1984; Petrucci and Romeo 1992; Heather 1994; and Everett 2000.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Floruit</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palladii</td>
<td>400s</td>
<td>rhetors</td>
<td>rhetoric</td>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consentius</td>
<td>420s</td>
<td>grammarian</td>
<td>grammar rhetoric</td>
<td>Narbonne</td>
<td>Sidonius, Consentius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoenius</td>
<td>430s</td>
<td>magister ludi</td>
<td>elementary</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>440s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>poetry dialectic</td>
<td>Arles</td>
<td>Sidonius, <em>Vita Hilarii</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aedesius</td>
<td>440s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>poetry rhetoric</td>
<td>Arles</td>
<td>Sidonius, <em>Vita Hilarii</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agroecius</td>
<td>440s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyon?</td>
<td><em>De orthographia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>450s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>rhetoric</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>450s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>grammar, rhetoric</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severianus</td>
<td>ca. 460</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyon?</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>460s</td>
<td></td>
<td>law</td>
<td>Narbonne</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitius</td>
<td>460s</td>
<td>grammarian</td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudianus</td>
<td>460s</td>
<td>priest</td>
<td>dialectic</td>
<td>Vienne</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamertus</td>
<td>460s</td>
<td></td>
<td>poetry philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td>ca. 470</td>
<td>magister</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>Lyon?</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampridius</td>
<td>470s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>oratory</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthedius</td>
<td>470s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>music, geometry, arithmetic, astrology</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>Sidonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulinus</td>
<td>480s</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>rhetoric</td>
<td>Périgueux</td>
<td>Sidonius, Paulinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperius</td>
<td>480s</td>
<td>doctor</td>
<td>rhetoric</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>Sidonius, Ruricius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>470–485</td>
<td>rhetor</td>
<td>arithmetic, astrology</td>
<td>Périgueux</td>
<td>Sidonius, Ruricius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapaudus</td>
<td>460s–490s</td>
<td>doctor</td>
<td>rhetoric</td>
<td>Agen</td>
<td>Sidonius, Avitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vienne</td>
<td>Claudianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamertus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianus</td>
<td>490–510</td>
<td>rhetor, priest</td>
<td>grammar, rhetoric, dialectic</td>
<td>Arles</td>
<td>Vita Caesarii, Gennadius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomerius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viventiolus???</td>
<td>ca. 510</td>
<td>bishop</td>
<td>rhetoric?</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Avitus of Vienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantagathus</td>
<td>520s</td>
<td>orator, bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vienne</td>
<td>Epitaph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“scholastici”</td>
<td>540s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arles</td>
<td>Vita Caesarii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anonomi</td>
<td>ca. 560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marseilles</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderius</td>
<td>590s</td>
<td>bishop</td>
<td>grammar, calculus</td>
<td>Vienne</td>
<td>Greg. Mag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“sophistae”</td>
<td>ca. 630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>Vita Boniti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This volume is devoted to the theme of education in the Middle Ages. Here, for the most part, the term education is taken in the modern English sense of the word: education consists of learning things in a school-type setting. The practice of reading and the contents of books are central to what is learned in schools and thus to what is discussed under the topic of education.

This essay is concerned with a different concept of education, a different kind of learning environment, and a different purpose to the educational endeavor. These pages take the term education in its etymological sense, one that is still common in French and several other languages: upbringing, the manner in which persons are raised and their character formed.

My argument is that the Catholic liturgy was the major source of education about their faith for laymen and -women of the Middle Ages. It was in church, and through church services, that people learned what it meant to be a Christian; that was their most important religious “school.”

The topic to be examined here is similar in important respects to the phenomenon of chivalric education (on the latter, see, for example, McDonald 1988). Although there are significant differences between these two kinds of non-school-based education, in both cases we are dealing with kinds of upbringing and training that were highly impor-

*This work is part of a project supported by an NEH Summer Stipend; I wish to express my deep gratitude for this support.
tant to medieval culture but rarely text-based. In both cases, the les-
sions transmitted were strongly interpersonal in nature and concerned
with attitude and behavior more than with the mastery of abstract
knowledge. In both cases, the purpose of the education was the forma-
tion of a certain type of person.

The study of books is not part of the topic to be addressed, for
two reasons. First, and primarily, my concern is with laymen and
-women, most of whom could not read. Second, for those members
of the laity who could and did read, the part of their religious knowl-
edge that was transmitted to them in written form—for example,
through written lives of the saints and translations from the Bible—
was its non-liturgical part.

What the faithful learned from the liturgy came in essentially by
osmosis: by the mere fact of being in church and attending services
through the different seasons, over many years. It is useful to note the
differences between going to school and learning through the liturgy.
In the former, students had to make a considerable effort to learn;
they were taught by masters; poor students were punished. In the
latter, most of what was mastered was presumably learned without
conscious effort (though not, one assumes, without boredom on occa-

Some private religious reading by the laity did occur, especially
toward the end of the Middle Ages. The argument being made here—
that the liturgy constituted the medieval religious school—is, then,
relatively speaking, somewhat less true of the later medieval period
than of earlier centuries. But, despite some measure of historical
change, the primacy of the liturgy for religious education should be
insisted on for the entire medieval period: the number of readers re-
mained a minority of the Catholic laity.

These pages will deal very little with book learning. Rather, they
will be concerned with basic education in the Christian faith. Such an
approach surely has strong authority (the medievals would surely have
appreciated this argument). Book learning has never been thought of
as necessary to salvation or, indeed, to sanctity. The Catholic and Or-
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thodox traditions contain many saints who could not read or write; some of these figures positively, actively, refrained from acquiring such learning. It is instructive in this regard to recall the highly influential account of the early youth of St. Anthony the Great, the first great hermit, as narrated by St. Athanasius (1952, 134–35):

. . . [H]e refused to attend school because he wished to avoid the companionship of other children. His whole desire was, as is written of Jacob, to dwell a plain man in his house.

He used to frequent the church with his parents and was very attentive as a child; . . . by paying close attention to passages read aloud, he carefully preserved for himself what was profitable in them. . . .

Scarcely six months had passed since his parents’ death, when, going to the church, as was his custom, he thoughtfully reflected as he walked along how the Apostles, leaving all things, followed the Savior. . . . Pondering on these things, he entered the church.

It happened that the Gospel was then being read, and he heard the Lord saying to the rich man: “If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.” As though God had inspired his thought of the saints and the passage had been read aloud on his account, Anthony left the church at once and gave to the villagers the property he had received from his parents. . . .

We see here a saintly figure who refused to learn letters and whose relationship to the scriptures was essentially liturgical and mnemonic. He heard passages read aloud in church, preserved them in his memory, and pondered over what was especially valuable, and was finally moved to act by hearing repeated in the Mass a particular Gospel pericope. Salvation comes through hearing. The case of St. Benedict, as recounted by Pope St. Gregory the Great, is similar in many regards (see Gregory 1959, esp. 55–56).

It is important to recognize how different St. Anthony, a major figure in the early Christian tradition (his story was important to Augustine’s conversion), is from those figures who have embodied Protestant ideals. In Protestantism, literacy and Bible reading have been, from the very start, highly important for all believers. (This is one
reason why the Bible has immediately been translated into the language of any new group to which missionaries have been sent.) The Catholic and Orthodox traditions have had mixed feelings about the importance and value of book learning; they have been concerned by the dangers presented by the world of the school and students and indeed of learning itself. This is not, of course, to deny that there have been great scholars among Catholic and Orthodox saints and respected figures, but ambivalence toward the value of learning is unquestionably present; the holy fool is just one manifestation of it.4

Before proceeding, I want to make the implications of my argument as clear as possible. The point is not simply that most of the laity did not read and had no religious school other than the liturgy, but also that the liturgy was indeed a school. The thrust of the argument is thus positive rather than negative: the liturgy taught important lessons. Members of the laity, and others whose experience of religion was primarily or originally liturgical (and this was true to some degree of most monks and nuns as well5), were not ignorant about their faith. The fact that most of the laity did not read the Bible or other religious writings for themselves (nor indeed were they normally read to from these books outside of the liturgy) does not mean that they knew nothing about their religion.

This argument may perhaps seem self-evident. But there are two reasons why the point must be emphasized and developed. First, the great importance of the liturgy to lay piety has been very much underemphasized; it has typically received short shrift in studies of medieval religion.6

Second, twentieth-century historians of the liturgy—many of them in fact writing in the decades leading up to or in the period immediately following the Second Vatican Council (for example, Klauser 1969; Jungmann 1986; Martimort 1961)—tended to present quite a negative image of the medieval liturgy, at least with regard to its impact on the laity. Such scholars often presented laymen and -women as disconnected from a liturgy that to them was inaudible, invisible, and incomprehensible. For such historians, to the extent that the medieval liturgy taught the laity anything, it taught “bad” (or, at best, dubious) lessons: lessons of passivity and incomprehension; hence, the repeated calls for reform. Some corrective of this unfavor-
able view of the medieval liturgy and its influence upon the laity is, I believe, in order.\textsuperscript{7}

In the context of this volume, a definition of liturgy is hardly necessary.\textsuperscript{8} But it is worth noting that while our primary concerns will be with the Mass and the Offices, the concept of liturgy used here is latitudinarian. Para- and semi-liturgical phenomena will not be excluded from consideration, for they are important gauges of the impact of the liturgy on the laity, as evidenced, for example, in vernacular literature.

The two large questions to be addressed are: How did the liturgy teach, and what did Catholics learn from it?

The essential point to be made with regard to the first question is that the liturgy trained not just minds but also bodies—or, more accurately, minds within bodies. Through the liturgy the person as a whole came to be centrally involved in the practice of religion. The faithful stood, they bowed, they knelt and genuflected, they crossed themselves, and so on (Schmitt 1990, passim; Jungmann 1986, 2:210–13; Klauser 1969, 113–16). They may well have been awake all night in vigil before Mass; during Lent, and at certain other times, they came fasting or having abstained from sexual intercourse. Thus, they received, and transmitted, important religious messages through the participation of their bodies. Their knowledge of the liturgy was in their bodies as much as in their brains; it was, one might say, incorporated into them. They learned a body language.

More specifically, men and women received a substantial amount of religious information through their senses. They heard the music of the liturgy; they smelled the incense; they saw the candles. They watched the clergy process through the church to the altar, or from altar to altar; they heard the music that accompanied such processions. They watched the priest repeatedly kiss the altar. Starting in the thirteenth century, they saw—and apparently hung quite literally upon—the gesture of the elevation of the host (Jungmann 1986, 2:207ff.). One could multiply such details. But people did not just receive abstract cognitive, dogmatic, moral information through reading or from purely catechetical instruction (though there was, to be sure, some cognitive, dogmatic material in the preaching of the sermon). The medieval liturgy was powerfully and intensely sensorial—and, through
the senses, deeply emotional. One is reminded of Augustine’s account of how he wept as he listened to the liturgical music in Ambrose’s church in Milan, and he says that finally his tears of emotion were good (Augustine 1991, 164).

Medieval men and women experienced the liturgy in community. It is with other people that they attended the Mass and Offices such as Vespers. For most people religion was rarely a private experience, such as one has in solitary reading or meditation (though auricular confession, which came in largely after the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, did promote the private examination of conscience).

Liturgical scholars of the twentieth century tended to emphasize what they saw as a lack of community in medieval liturgy: the priest had his back to the congregation, the canon was read in silence, the congregation spoke few responses, and so on. But it must be said that the energy and sense of liturgical community that went into the building of the cathedrals hardly proves their point about a “lack of community.” Nor can such phenomena as the rise and popularity of religious confraternities or the putting on of vast cyclical religious plays in late medieval Europe (England in particular) be said to argue for loss of the sense of religious community.

Laymen and -women knew their religion not as a set of more or less abstract beliefs to which they assented, or as texts that they read and believed to be historically true. Rather, their faith was almost entirely something transmitted to their minds and their emotions through their bodies and their senses, in community with other believers.

The other large question is this: What did medieval Catholics learn in the school of the liturgy? But the “what” is very much related to the “how” which has just been addressed. Medieval men and women took three fundamental lessons away from the liturgy: they learned religion as presence, as affect, and as calling for response. These are not, to be sure, the only things they learned, but they are matters that are of the very highest importance. In the course of the discussion, I will provide examples drawn from vernacular literature and from historical accounts; these texts, songs, and stories are presented as constituting evidence for the points being made in that they
express fundamental understandings of medieval religious belief in works for, and often by, the laity.

(1) From the liturgy men and women learned religion as presence. That is, the liturgy taught the living, physical presence of God—especially of Christ—and of the Virgin and the saints. It taught as well the presence of the believer to these sacred persons.

To begin with the saints: they were understood to be physically present in the church, for not just their bones but they themselves lay in the altar; many churches contained other important relics that ensured the living presence of the saints. When the faithful made pilgrimages to the churches that contained such relics, they came to see the saint himself, herself.

The Virgin’s presence in churches was certainly understood to be strong as well. In one sense it was, interestingly enough, less obvious than that of the saints: relatively few relics could be associated with her. Her widely felt presence was guaranteed perhaps primarily by her patronage of increasing numbers of churches, by the many statues and other images of her, by her appearances, and by the miracle stories told and songs sung about her.

Christ was understood as made present in the Mass, and from an early period the Blessed Sacrament had been kept reserved in churches (Martimort 1961, 451ff.). Moreover, as in the case of St. Anthony, Christ could be experienced as speaking to the faithful directly in the Gospel readings. The presence of Christ—of God—could take very physical expression, and could extend to the Mass as a whole. In Canto XII of Dante’s Inferno, a centaur points out Guy de Montfort (avoided by other sinners), who killed a man “on God’s bosom”—that is, in church, apparently during the Mass (Dante 1975, 66).

The impact on medieval culture of this belief in the presence of God, the Virgin, and the saints is considerable. It is clear, for example, in the extraordinary emergence of liturgical and semi-liturgical drama from the Mass and Offices, first in Latin and then in the vernaculars—in the “Quem quaeritis” tropes and their subsequent developments. The faithful are drawn into the dramatic narrative. Christ is risen today, and you are eyewitnesses! The empty grave cloths are shown to you! Alleluia! (Bevington 1975, esp. 21–44).

Many medieval narratives and dramas emphasize the presence of
Christ in church, generally in a liturgical context; this presence is often experienced directly by the believer. In the famous account of the conversion of St. Francis of Assisi, the young man, while kneeling in the San Damiano Chapel, heard Christ speak powerfully and insistently to him from the crucifix above the altar: “Francis, go, repair my house . . .” (Thomas of Celano 1972, 370).

The literary theme of the divine presence can take complex and theologically engaged forms. In some cases, the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist are clearly at issue. In the romance La Queste del saint graal (The quest of the Holy Grail, ca. 1220), at one point the entire Trinity is shown as present in the Mass. Above the outstretched hands of the priest, Lancelot sees “three men, two of whom were placing the youngest in the hands of the priest who raised him aloft as though he were showing him to the people” (Matarasso 1969, 262; Pauphilet 1965, 255). In another passage, the crucified Christ rises, naked and bleeding, from the Holy Grail and, eclipsing the priest, speaks directly to the knights (Matarasso 1969, 262; Pauphilet 1965, 255).

Stories and miracle plays emphasize not only the presence of Christ and the Trinity but also that of the Virgin and the saints to the faithful in church or chapel. In a story by Gautier de Coinci, a young knight is passionately in love with a woman who rejects him. In a desperate attempt to win her love, he consults an old abbot who persuades him to say 150 “Ave Maria’s” every day for a year, on the assurance that Mary will reward him by granting him his heart’s desire. Toward the end of the year, while the knight is praying to the Virgin in a chapel, she appears before him in person and says, in essence, “Is the woman you love really more beautiful than I? Would you not rather have my love?” (Gautier de Coinci 1955, 109–10). Overwhelmed by her incomparable loveliness, the knight renounces his earlier, now clearly unworthy, love object and becomes a devotee of the Virgin. In a word, he is converted by his experience of the presence of the Virgin as he recites his semi-liturgical “Ave’s” in the chapel. One could easily adduce many more such examples of the appearance, the physical presence, of Christ, the Virgin, or the saints, to the faithful.

In short, in medieval, liturgically centered Christianity, the laity experienced, and expected to experience, real closeness to God, the
Virgin, and the saints. Such experiences were, to be sure, miraculous; but, as we know, miracles were understood to be anything but uncommon.

(2) The second point follows from the first. From the liturgy men and women learned religion as involving affect. That is, liturgically grounded Christianity strongly promoted feelings and emotions—of love, trust, fear, sorrow, and the like—toward the members of the Trinity, the Virgin, and the saints, far more than intellectual assent to doctrine or articles of belief. Here again, one could provide dozens of examples.

If we look again briefly at the Easter dramas, their main purpose was to move spectators and auditors from the sorrow and uncertainty surrounding the death of Christ to the joy and confidence of the Resurrection. Two emotions in particular deserve emphasis: love and gratitude.

Of liturgical religion as an expression of love, there are a great many examples from which to choose. One will suffice: Chaucer’s “Prioress’s Tale” (Chaucer 1987, 211–12). In this story, a little student—a “clergeon”—in a “great city of Asia” loves the Virgin and in her honor learns to sing the famous and beautiful Marian antiphon “Alma redemptoris mater.” (It is interesting to note that the child does not fully understand the words; intellectual comprehension is not what this is about, love is.) The child loves the Virgin and the antiphon in her honor so much that he cannot stop singing it. Certain Jews are offended by his constant singing and, as he is going through the town, they kill him (this is a strongly, and disturbingly, anti-Jewish story). When his mother at last finds his dead body, he resumes his singing of the antiphon—though his throat has been cut. Before he finally gives up the ghost and stops singing at the end of the funeral Mass, he explains that the Virgin had promised to come back for him and take his soul to Heaven.

As to gratitude, many medieval songs in the vernacular are apparently expansions, tropes, of the concluding versicle at the end of Offices (and of Mass at certain seasons): “Benedicamus domino.” And this “versus” tradition leads to the medieval carol, most notably of the English tradition.

Dozens of the medieval lyrics edited by Carleton Brown (1924;
1932; 1939) in his volumes of medieval religious lyrics are in fact translations and expansions of liturgical texts (or themes) bearing on love or praise of God, the Trinity, Christ, the Virgin, or the saints; or on gratitude and other emotions such as sorrow for sin, compassion with Christ’s suffering on the cross, fear of judgment, and many more. The other vernaculars present a similar picture. One thinks immediately of the Italian “laude,” such as Francis’s famous “Canticle.”

(3) The third point combines what has been implicit in the first two: if liturgical religion was about presence and affect, it also called for active response on the part of the believer. This is to say that such feelings as compunction, contrition, love, and so on were linked to the will and to behavior. Men and women understood their faith, and specifically the liturgy, as calling for something on their part: this action could be imitative, as of the life of Christ, the Virgin, or the saints; or it might involve initiatives of a moral, physical, or esthetic nature, understood as done for Christ, the Virgin, or a saint. In the Crusades men went to the Holy Land to help Christ himself. They fed the hungry and clothed the naked for the same reason. In pilgrimage, men and women went to visit the Virgin, or St. James, or St. Thomas, or another saint.

Travel and large-scale endeavors were not the only forms that such response could take; we also see very private manifestations of this desire. In the famous tale “Del Tumbeor Nostre Dame” (Our Lady’s tumbler), a pious minstrel has left his profession and entered a monastery. But he does not know how to read or to sing the liturgy; he feels guilty that he has nothing to offer to God; he is useless. One day, while the monks are singing Mass, he decides to offer to God, through the Virgin, the only art he knows: that of tumbling. He leaps and tumbles so perfectly, and with such great effort and such love, that the Virgin comes down in person to mop his brow. His tumbling is his “liturgy,” performed out of love of God and of the Virgin and from a need to serve God. This unusual liturgy is accepted, and honored, by the Queen of Heaven and—what is a good deal more remarkable!—by the monks as well (Kunstmann 1981, 143–77).

In a vast and famous work of the Middle Ages, the thirteenth-century Cantigas de Santa Maria, Alfonso the Wise presents himself as the Virgin’s troubadour (Alfonso 1986, 1:55) and his collection of songs
and miracle stories as his gift of thanks to the Virgin for her great kindnesses. Many of the stories included express gratitude to the Virgin for her mercy to men and women and, in particular, to sinners.

These examples have tended to be literary in nature; it would have been easy to adduce still others. But evidence does not come just from songs and stories, and we end on an example from history. This figure comes at the end of the medieval period, but the very fact that this fifteenth-century person was so fundamentally formed by the liturgy further strengthens the point about earlier centuries.

The person in question is Joan of Arc (1412–31). Joan’s religious experience is perhaps a bit unusual in that she claimed to have heard the voices of an archangel and two saints: Sts. Michael, Catherine, and Margaret. What she was told to do by these voices is, however, much more striking than the mere fact that she thought she heard them (in fact, many people have believed that saints spoke to them). What do we know of Joan’s experience of her religion, aside from the voices she heard? This peasant girl was illiterate. She owned and read no books. She knew by heart a small number of prayers—the “Our Father,” the “Credo,” and the “Hail Mary”—all of which are public liturgical prayers that were (and are) also part of private use. As to the form her religious experience took, this is quite simple: she attended the liturgy with great frequency. As a child, she is said to have greatly loved Compline and the Angelus, and would offer the bell-ringer sweets to ensure that the bells were rung well and promptly. She frequently attended Mass, and during her travels with the army she often went off to nearby chapels to pray. She repeatedly urged her men to pray, to go to Mass, and to go to confession. She would not fight on holy days (for example, Ascension Thursday). On April 27, 1429, she left for Orléans with her army of four thousand men, all singing the great liturgical hymn to the Holy Spirit, Veni Creator. In short, this is a woman whose religious life, to the extent that it was natural (as distinct from supernatural or miraculous), was liturgical in nature. Joan of Arc was educated by the liturgy (see, for example, Nash-Marshall 1999, 36–38, 51, 65, 67, 75, 153, 163).

Joan’s story provides a late medieval example of the phenomenon that we have been examining. We can safely assume that men and
women of the eleventh through the fourteenth centuries were no less formed in their religious life by the liturgy than she.

It is often said that Christianity, like Judaism and Islam, is a “religion of the book” ; in some respects, this is certainly true. But emphasis on the Bible as the Book for medieval students of Christianity needs to be strongly qualified and to some degree revised. Catholics in the Middle Ages were educated in their religion primarily by the liturgy; to a substantial degree, they still are today.

NOTES

1. The liturgy was indeed intended to teach the faithful about their faith as well as to praise God. This is perhaps particularly clear in the first part of the Mass (originally called the Mass of the Catechumens) and in the recitation of the Creed. After the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) the laity began to receive somewhat more systematic catechesis, but the liturgy remained their primary source of information about their faith.

2. For example, chivalric education concerned only men, and only those of a single social stratum, whereas liturgical education affected both sexes and all who attended church.

3. Therefore I set aside, as outside my purview, the many valuable studies that have been done on monastic education, the education of the non-monastic clergy, education in the university world, and the like.

4. In some Protestant denominations there has been a de-emphasizing of literacy and learning. But the fundamental Protestant emphasis on the individual’s ability to read Scripture has made it very difficult for full illiteracy to be condoned or even embraced, as it sometimes has been in Catholicism. For example, in his “Later Rule,” St. Francis states in chapter 10, “On the Admonition and Correction of the Brothers,” in the context of the avoidance of pride, vainglory, envy, and the like: “And those who are illiterate should not be eager to learn” (Armstrong and Brady 1982, 144).

5. Abbot Suger was surely homo liturgicus.

6. For example, even in André Vauchez’s excellent Les laïcs au moyen âge: Pratiques et expériences religieuses (1987), there is very little discussion of the liturgy or its basic importance to lay piety. In part three, “Religion prescrite et religion vécue,” one of the five chapters takes up “Liturgie et culture folklorique: les rogations dans la ‘Légende dorée’ de Jacques de Voragine.” One of five chapters in part five addresses the topic of “Dévo-
tion eucharistique et union mystique chez les saintes de la fin du moyen âge.” Thus, only two of twenty-four chapters deal with the liturgy, and with arguably somewhat marginal issues. Similarly, Rosalind and Peter Brooke’s useful Popular Religion in the Middle Ages (Brooke and Brooke 1984) has chapters on the saints, the Bible, and so on, but little treatment of the importance of the liturgy. One of the most valuable and useful pieces on these issues is McCue 1987.

7. Fortunately, Duffy 1992 has provided a valuable new appreciation of the importance of the liturgy to the late medieval and early Reformation period in England.

8. As to the distinction between liturgy and sacrament: it is in and through the services of the liturgy that the faithful experienced the sacraments of Baptism, the Eucharist, and Matrimony. Extreme unction normally included the household of the dying person—thus, a small congregation with a priest. Ordination is a special case as it did not directly concern the laity. Confession was increasingly a private sacrament (before 1215, warriors often confessed together on the battlefield); it is the least liturgically embedded of the sacraments.

9. See, for example, Klauser 1969, chap. 3: “Dissolution, elaboration, reinterpretation and misinterpretation: From Gregory VII to the Council of Trent.”

10. One might contrast the liturgy as a mode of religious learning with two other common modes: private reading, on one hand, and direct catechesis—a teacher with a pupil or pupils—on the other. Both these latter modes are obviously markedly more cognitive, and less sensorial and affective, than the liturgy.

11. Some of the literary texts discussed here I have treated in greater depth in Vitz 2001, 503–618.

12. The original reads: “‘Cele qui te fait soupirer / Et en si grant erreur t’a mis,’/ Fait Nostre Dame, ‘bix amen, / Est ele plus bele de moi?’” The knight is terrified. “Mais cele en cui pitiez est toute / Li dist: ‘Amis, or n’aiies doue. / Je suis cele, n’en doue mie, / Qui te doit faire avoir t’ame. / Or pren garde que tu feras: / Celi que tu mieuz enmeras / De nos deux aras a amie’” (lines 200–203; 209–15).

13. When there was no Gloria, as particularly in the season of Lent.

14. My thanks to my colleague Edwards Roesner for his help on this issue.

15. For example, in his Crusade Song (Pax in nomine Domini), Marcabru says that “We must go avenge God for the wrong / they are doing to Him here [in Spain], and over there near Damascus” (Goldin 1983, 79).
16. Another historical character whose relationship to the liturgy was extremely strong is St. Louis, though he was literate (see Joinville 1963).
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The Council of Trent is frequently criticized for entrenching the Church in response to Protestant challenges, but even its critics acknowledge that Trent’s creation of seminaries was innovative. Is this conventional wisdom true, however? In his close study of Trent’s plans for clerical education and their immediate influences, James O’Donohoe pointed to a more plausible and medieval answer. The seminary legislation of Trent’s twenty-third session “was fundamentally a return to the ancient practice of grouping candidates for the priesthood around their bishop and having them thus formed morally and intellectually under his supervision” (O’Donohoe 1957, 171). Pursuing this “ancient practice” through the very long Middle Ages from Nicaea to Trent is marked by many difficulties, but it reveals a medieval legacy of clerical education that is sometimes dwarfed by Trent’s famous seminary legislation.

This essay aims to reconsider the story of how clerical educational institutions (informal domi episcoporum, more formal cathedral schools) were set apart from other structures of learning (Roman pagan schools, monastic scholae, and universities) in the Middle Ages. It will also consider late medieval reforms proposed at the University of Paris and the Council of Constance. This investigation of the question does not deny Trent’s innovative aspects: if seminaries as an idea were not new, certainly their detailed plans were pioneering. The goal is to identify Trent’s plan for clerical formation in dialogue with a medieval educational legacy, although the evidence does not support a deterministic or Whiggish conclusion on the matter. Trent was not
destined to establish seminaries in the form and manner it did. However, that general council’s program of seminary education was more closely allied with the Church’s medieval heritage than is typically imagined.

The question “How were parish priests educated in the Middle Ages?” has largely been answered with vague responses, a necessary evil because of a dearth of information—in stark contrast to the helpful contemporary paper trail and modern studies we have for the mendicants (Mulchahey 1998, 184–203, 400–552). The process is largely one of teasing out signals about clerical training from bishops’ and/or saints’ *vitae*, Carolingian capitularies, canonical legislation, and, increasingly as we proceed in the first few centuries of the second millennium, manuals for parish priests and quodlibets. Episcopal documents can also be helpful, but *florilegia*, allocutions, sacramentaries, pontificals, and ordinals pertained largely to listing the responsibilities of *ordinandi*, describing the progress of the clerical grades with their respective duties, providing rubrics for ordination rites, and occasionally explaining the *examinatio* of candidates. These sources rarely tell us about the education that led to ordination day (Reynolds 1999a, 1999b).

In the Church’s earliest local synods, such as one in Carthage in the late fourth century, we find calls for *ordinandi* who know Scripture, can preach, understand Church laws, and are upright in their personal behavior. Self-evident as these qualifications may appear, apparently they were frequently honored in the breach. So great was the need for clerics in Gaul that bishops often ordained the illiterate or were satisfied if the *ordinandi* could stumble through reading the Bible and/or reciting the Psalter. It was clear, however, that this would not do: the clergy needed to read and preach. Caesarius of Arles said men to be ordained deacons had to have first read the Bible through four times.

In terms of the basic education in literacy and comprehension that this low-level learning entailed, the Roman schools left a legacy of *trivium et quadrivium* with which Christian thinkers struggled. Could the pagan *artes liberales* be used as a sufficient foundation for Christian study, like reading the Bible once or four times, or would their inappropriate content overshadow their praiseworthy form? Augustine
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tried to cut the proverbial Gordian knot in *De doctrina christiana*, but there he is concerned more with methods of interpreting Scripture in general than with the priest’s practical training, although Bible study was of course involved with the latter. These calls tell us what particular skills priests are to possess, but they do not delineate how or where prospective *ordinandi* are to learn them. In the main, we presume that a sort of apprenticeship arrangement under a bishop or his designated priest was the norm, as evidenced by references to a bishop’s questioning candidates as he traveled about, not unlike a circuit judge.

Among the earliest pieces of evidence of O’Donohoe’s “ancient practice” is the *domus episcopi*. Eusebius of Vercelli, Augustine of Hippo, and Isidore of Seville each set up small communities of young men who lived and studied with their bishop. Perhaps building on his experience of intellectual leisure at Cassiciacum and using the community of apostles after Pentecost as a model, Augustine’s “monastery for clerics” in Hippo resembled a circle of friendship, stimulating conversation, and both formal and informal education. Apparently, his efforts were successful: not only did he ordain priests from this community, but as many as ten bishops for Numidia came from Augustine’s household (Brown 1967, 143, 198–200, 224, 409; Holder 1991, 23–26). Augustine set up “what was really the first seminary for priests” (Van der Meer 1961, 234).

Local councils at Vaison (529) and Toledo (531) continued Augustine’s tradition by mentioning the bishop’s house as a place of training, with the bishop acting as *paterfamilias*. Vaison recognized that not all could travel, so it placed would-be priests living outside “cities” under the direction of rural pastor-trainers. Toledo specified a *domus ecclesiae* with a bishop’s delegate, the *praepositus*, under whom young men would live and study starting about the age of ten; at eighteen, they could choose marriage or a Church career. According to one influential historian of educational institutions, these schools—which at this point existed alongside profane schools—“were essentially ‘seminaries’” (Riché 1976, 95–99, 122–35). More formal monastic schools were another option, but their mandate was not to train secular clergy, although some students in their exterior *scholae* presumably went on to orders since they possessed a measure of literacy. From their start, monasteries were schools for souls and so could provide the additional
spiritual and moral training profane schools did not, even during the Roman Empire’s heyday.

The model of the domus ecclesiae or episcopi providing practical training and moral formation began to catch on. Gregory the Great instructed Augustine of Canterbury to set up separate places where men could study, live, and pray together. By the seventh century, perhaps twenty such episcopal schools existed in cities in Gaul and Spain. There was no standard curriculum, but religious topics outdistanced the liberal arts. The emphasis was practical more than properly theological in any academic sense. We know that clerical students learned to read, chant, and administer the sacraments; we are less informed about their systematic study of dogma. The Fourth Council of Toledo (633) specified that a new priest must receive a small ritual manual, something like a lower-level version of the episcopal ordo, with which he was eventually buried (Riché 1976, 282–90). Under popes Eugene II and Leo IV, we find ninth-century Roman examples of these earlier models (Hernandez 1963, 377–80).

Chrodegang of Metz provides further evidence for the predominance of pastoral training under a bishop’s tutelage. In 754, he tried to establish a more systematic vita canonica reminiscent of Augustine’s household. Although Chrodegang did not mention or provide for a school, one followed in 816 under the Carolingian renewal, which included palace schools that trained youths for clerical and “civil” positions (Riché 1976, 445). These schools, like Augustine’s, combined the monastic conversatio morum with apostolic goals. A series of Roman synods in the second half of the eleventh century, which Peter Damian especially supported, revived the vita canonica once more. But most Carolingian—and then Ottonian—monastic, cathedral, and palace schools probably trained few parish priests, especially for the countryside; they produced elite ministers for high society, and not all of their students proceeded to orders anyway. So however impressive (or idealistic) they may appear, they still do not bring us much closer to how the average parish pastor learned to be a priest in the Middle Ages.

When the investiture controversies and then Gregory VII’s papal revolution worked to distinguish the clergy as a caste, schools that trained young men with ecclesiastical ambitions side by side with those
aspiring to serve the nobility and crown were less tenable than they had been before the eleventh century. Now more in opposition than partnership, the Church and the civil structures could not always train in the same location. This is an important reason why cathedral schools reemerged as places dedicated exclusively to practical clerical training and therefore set apart from other educational settings (Jaeger 1994, 36–75, 199–236).

The Third and Fourth Lateran Councils aimed to describe the type of institution the papacy wanted bishops to employ to train parish priests. Canon 18 of Lateran III (1179) specified that “in every cathedral church a master is to be assigned some proper benefice so that he may teach the clerics of that church and the poor scholars,” although that master’s field and the course of study were not specified. Canon 11 of Lateran IV (1215) noted that Lateran III’s decree was not being implemented, so the council reaffirmed and added to it. First, centers of learning were expanded and specified: “not only in every cathedral church but also in other churches with sufficient resources,” one master was to teach “grammar and other branches of study.” Second, practical spiritual matters were addressed in the larger centers: the metropolitan church must pay “a theologian to teach scripture to priests and others and especially to instruct them in matters which are recognized as pertaining to the cure of souls.” In more general terms, Lateran IV required bishops to prepare and instruct ordinandi, either personally or through a delegate, “in the divine services and the sacraments of the church.” They were not to ordain any candidates who were “ignorant and unformed” (ignaros et rudes) (Tanner 1990, 1:220, 240, 248).

Universities are also frequently accepted as an option for priestly training in the Middle Ages, but this idea should be carefully reconsidered. Reinhold Kiermayr, in his study of the well-educated urban clergy of Duderstadt, contends that to satisfy the considerable need for Mass priests, a “large ecclesiastical proletariat” emerged, at least in central Germany. He speculates that high numbers of priests trained at universities in the late Middle Ages and that very few members of the lower clergy had only a rudimentary education. He also cites Bernd Moeller’s estimate that as many as half the late medieval German priests had some university studies (Kiermayr 1984, 8–11). But a
conflicting interpretation comes from contemporary figures at Con-
stance. Though as many as forty percent of late fifteenth-century Con-
stance priests spent some time at a university, few would have received
pastoral training in the classroom (Dykema 2000, 146 n. 12). Certainly
Luther’s early sixteenth-century complaints about the uninformed and
unformed clergy he encountered contribute to the picture of a late
medieval German clergy with a less-than-desirable degree of educa-
despite Kiermayr’s and Moeller’s findings from university rolls.
Moreover, being a clericus at a medieval university was not necessarily
the path to the priesthood. The appellation clericus indicated one who
was literate; the link between being a clericus and being a priest-in-
training may be a false presumption based on the early Middle Ages
when clergy represented most of those with even a measure of literacy
(Schwinges 1992, 200–202). Given the cost, effort, and distance in-
volved in urban education, it simply must be assumed that most parish
priests, certainly rural priests, did not receive their theological educa-
dation and practical instruction in cities, either at cathedral schools or at
universities (Chadwick 1989, 2; Jedin 1963, 398–99).

Universities were not disconnected from the care of souls, of
course. Popes like Innocent III, Honorius III, and Gregory IX in im-
mediate succession took great interest in overseeing dominant univer-
sities, but this was because a place like the University of Paris solved
major theological questions and trained elite students who were poten-
tial bishops or members of their curias. A papal decree like Honorius
III’s Super specula in 1219 was designed to improve the training of
professional theologians, not rural pastors. Some local-level impact was
intended by Boniface VIII’s 1298 decree Cum ex eo, which permitted
priests charged with cura animarum to leave their posts for universities,
but there they pursued a general education, onto which they added
practical clerical training once they returned home (Boyle 1962; 1977).

R. W. Southern has uncovered the practical concerns of the earliest
scholastic humanists who sought to codify moral Christian behavior
in handbooks, florilegia, penitentials, and pastoralia. These materials
give us a portrait of high medieval scholastic theology that was more
pragmatic than the tainted reputation it received because of late
medieval sophismata (Southern 1995). We have many quodlibets extant
from Paris and Oxford in the later Middle Ages treating the cura an-
imarum. Thomas Aquinas gave a backhanded view of the matter when he valued university professors higher than parish priests because “skilled workers” demonstrated their required tasks to “manual laborers” (Boyle 1974, 251).

So it appears that a university is not the place where most medieval pastors typically learned to be priests, though they may have had access to materials drawn from a university setting. It is time, then, to put the textbook cut-out that they studied at universities to rest, as William Courtenay most recently tried to do: “. . . [M]edieval university theological training . . . was never a required way of training priests, and it was viewed as the desired way to train parish rectors only by the most optimistic and visionary university-trained bishops. The vast majority of parish priests throughout the late medieval period had no university training in theology” (Courtenay 2000, 254).

As we return to the question “How were parish priests educated in the Middle Ages?” a trail of evidence from England and Germany points us once more to apprentices, both before and after ordination. In the middle of the thirteenth century, for example, the bishop of Lincoln Robert Grosseteste produced very practical manuals for his priests, presumably to shore up holes in their preparation (Boyle 1979, 8–11). Archbishop Pecham’s 1281 decree Ignorantia sacerdotum required parish priests to teach and preach four times each year on the Creed, decalogue, works of mercy, deadly sins, virtues, and sacraments—but, as Leonard Boyle has observed, “it presumes rather than imparts knowledge. . . . Unaided, it could have done little to relieve clerical ignorance.” Therefore, the decree cannot tell us where or how the archbishop’s men had attained their knowledge. The aid Boyle says the Ignorantia sacerdotum required was soon to follow: about 1320, a priest named William of Pagula expanded upon Pecham’s requirements in the instructional Oculus sacerdotis (Boyle 1955, 81–92). In turn, another parish priest named John Mirk built on the Oculus sacerdotis in his own very pragmatic—and vernacular—Instructions for Parish Priests, ca. 1400 (Foss 1989). We find similar pastoral manuals, especially focused on how to celebrate the liturgy and administer the sacraments, in fifteenth-century Germany, as well (Dykema 2000, 144–47). It seems safe to presume yet again that we are dealing with experienced pastor-mentors and inexperienced protégés who used
these manuals, and that this practice, over time, helped episcopal directives trickle down to the parishes where they would succeed or fail.

To complement practical efforts like these in England and Germany, the late Middle Ages witnessed discussions of the reform of parochial clerical education at the University of Paris. The fact that two chancellors at Paris, one of the institutions that allegedly trained priests, would suggest alternatives to university education for pastoral study indicates universities were not meeting the specific need for the pragmatic training of most parish priests, especially outside urban areas. The proposals of these two late medieval chancellors, Pierre d’Ailly and Jean Gerson, renew the earlier model of independent, practical school settings where the focus would be not on advancing theological scholarship, but on imparting enough down-to-earth knowledge so a pastor could minister his flock through the everyday aspects of their faith. Both d’Ailly and Gerson knew well that the University of Paris may have been the parens scientiarum, but she was not necessarily training the local parish priest to say Mass, hear confessions, and preach an effective sermon.

Pierre d’Ailly, chancellor at Paris from 1389 to 1395, addressed clerical education in his treatise Tractatus de materia concilii generalis in 1402–1403, the third part of which he reworked as the Tractatus de reformatione ecclesiae and submitted to the Council of Constance in 1416. D’Ailly anticipated Trent’s plans, especially concerning the training and duties of the clergy, although his modern editor Francis Oakley, who traced the intersection of d’Ailly’s and Trent’s ideas, believes this foreshadowing “is indicative less of d’Ailly’s prescience than of the persistent nature of the problems plaguing the late-medieval church” (Oakley 1979, 309). Nevertheless, this document does mark another instance of the persistence of this educational type.

D’Ailly’s concern was with the educational and personal qualities of those in pastoral care: if they do not know or live by their faith, neither will those they serve. D’Ailly explicitly called for an overhaul of clerical education and examination, especially where rhetoric was concerned. He wanted provision made for instruction in Scripture and preaching; a mandate was to be given to the successful candidate to preach and teach. He also recommended that libraries, especially in metropolitan churches, be stocked with appropriate books in canon

About the same time as d’Ailly produced his reworked *Tractatus de reformatione ecclesiae*, delegates at the Council of Constance proposed in committee that clergy with responsibilities for pastoral care be well educated, with a license in canon or civil law or a bachelor’s degree in theology; be sufficiently paid; and maintain celibacy. This proposal is rather grandiose, to be sure, but there were other, less vaunted suggestions at this council. Reiterating Lateran IV, the committee at Constance also wanted cathedral schools to fund one benefice for a theology *magister*, adding that another should provide for a doctor in civil or canon law (Stump 1994, 139–45, 149–52, 345–49, 358–67, 370). This latter reform effort was directed toward the free-standing cathedral schools, which were supposed to be operating, and not toward purely academic theological study in a university setting.

Jean Gerson, like d’Ailly a University of Paris chancellor and leader at Constance, was in line with these efforts. In a sermon he delivered at a diocesan synod in 1408, a few years before Constance, Gerson recommended a separate theological school in each diocese to train parish priests. D’Ailly, Henry of Langenstein, and Dietrich of Niem, although university *magistri* and administrators, had made similar proposals (Glorieux 1960–73, 6:112, 8:131; Brown 1987, 275). Elsewhere Gerson called for the implementation of a decretal from Gregory IX that a theological school be established in every metropolitan church; this decretal had simply restated Lateran IV’s requirement. Gerson went further than Lateran IV, which required only a grammarian in non-metropolitan churches, and therefore Gregory IX’s decretal, as well. The Parisian chancellor sought theology study not only in metropolitan churches, but in every cathedral and in the larger collegiate churches as well. While he believed his own University of Paris should continue to train the most able candidates, especially those capable of becoming professional theologians, Gerson acknowledged that not all candidates would have the resources to attend. Moreover, he had faith that most parish priests could learn what was required via the traditional apprentice system (Pascoe 1973, 123–24, 170; Friedberg 1879–81, 2:770; Glorieux 1960–73, 5:131). The Council of Basel apparently agreed when, in 1433, it required that, at the annual episcopal
synod mandated for each diocese, someone must read out “a comprehensive treatise on how the sacraments should be administered and other useful points for the instruction of priests” (Tanner 1990, 1:473).

These reforms for clerical education proposed during the late Middle Ages stalled in their own time, but they were heard again shortly after Luther and right before Trent. The report of Paul III’s reform committee, the Consilium de emendanda ecclesia (1537), repeated the need for a place in each diocese dedicated to clerical education. The committee identified as the first abuse that was harming the Church the ordination of poorly trained, immoral men to the priesthood. The members recommended the pope name two or three prelates to oversee ordinations and be sure that bishops knew they must attend to this matter at home. While these statements refer more to the episcopal examinatio of candidates than to their training, the committee continued: “Moreover, we think that each bishop should have a teacher in his diocese to instruct clerics in minor orders both in letters and in morals, as the laws prescribe” (Olin 1990, 682–69). The reference “as the laws prescribe” must refer to Lateran III and IV on cathedral magistri, since their canons pertained to diocesan education. So, once more, reformers looked to separate cathedral schools, not universities, to improve clerical education at the diocesan, and therefore parochial, level.

Following in the tradition of revitalizing diocesan schools, Trent first renewed clerical education in 1546 when the council echoed and went beyond the canons of Lateran III and IV, which apparently were still not being observed and yet again needed to be reaffirmed. In line with Gerson’s recommendation of more than a century earlier, Trent in 1546 amended the Lateran conciliar requirements by mandating that a theologian must teach Scripture in the cathedral and collegiate churches, not just in metropolitan churches; a grammar teacher was to prepare students in smaller churches for Scripture study elsewhere (Tanner 1990, 2:667–68; Pascoe 1966, 24–25; O’Donohoe 1957, 33–48).

Clerical education took the form of seminaries as we think of them at Trent in 1563. It had been Claude Jay, one of the first Jesuits, who in the 1546 discussions concerning scriptural preparation had given voice to the many complaints about the inadequacies of clerical educa-
tion in a university setting. It was Jay’s proposal, first raised in 1546 and then taken up after his death by the delegates at Trent in 1563, that colleges be established solely for priestly training. Although we have seen this idea in flawed practice for over a millennium, the proximate suggestion was based largely on Jay’s own experience in Germany and the example of the Jesuit college in Rome (Pascoe 1966, 37; O’Donohoe 1957, 36–37, 64–70). In substance, the plan renewed an ancient precedent: separate, practical places—in essence, trade or technical schools or colleges—for priestly training. These schools would not necessarily be as academically rigorous as a university and would emphasize a candidate’s spiritual life and enough learning to permit his practice as a pastor (Comerford 1998, 1009; Jedin 1975, 50–79).

We know from a representative micro-study tracing the creation of the diocesan seminary in Treviso that some seminaries were built upon existing cathedral schools that predated Trent and reached back to an earlier medieval tradition. Despite this tradition, however, a recent synthesis of the Tridentine seminary legislation records very slow progress in its implementation. But the process of clerical education had proceeded very slowly, non-systematically, and with many interruptions and varying levels of success before Trent, too (Liberali 1971, 23–53; Comerford 1998, 1002, 1007, 1010). In the years just before Trent, examples of such schools following in this ancient, albeit hesitant, tradition could be found around Europe. Cardinal Reginald Pole had worked toward a free-standing institution for clerical education in his 1555–56 English synod, even using the word *seminarium*; Trent drew on this legislation as a template for its own seminary decrees (O’Donohoe 1957, 98–120, 134–45). Fifteenth-century colleges existed in Germany, Spain, and Italy, though not all were under a bishop or used exclusively for priestly training. In Granada and Verona, however, bishops had definitely made a place in their homes—latter-day *domi episcopi* like those of Eusebius of Vercelli, Augustine of Hippo, and Isidore of Seville—to train men for the *cura animarum* outside a university setting. In sixteenth-century Spain, disciples of Juan de Avila founded a “sacerdotal school.” While the Theatines and other early sixteenth-century groups of reformed priests did not establish seminaries properly speaking, their model for priestly living and learn-
ing was Augustine’s common life (Jedin 1963, 400–401; Coleman 1995, 19; Hudon 1996, 21, 27–28; Lewis 1996, 115–22).

Trent’s 1563 decree on seminaries gives evidence of relying on precedent, but the history of these institutions was not necessarily predestined. As it turned out, canon 18 of Trent’s twenty-third session mirrored Gerson’s extension of the conciliar regulations from Lateran IV, with which Trent in 1546 had already agreed. The final seminary legislation directed bishops to establish colleges in “every cathedral, metropolitan and greater church” while making provision for prospective priests in smaller, poorer places to study at regional schools. These places, wherever they may be located, were to be run “so that the college becomes a perpetual seminary [seminarium] of ministers of God” (Tanner 1990, 2:750–53). At Trent, the archbishop of Segovia, probably with some pride, noted that the council’s decree on seminaries was close to the regulation of the 531 council at Toledo (Chadwick 1989, 5). Two hundred years after Trent, one scholar suggested it was Isidore of Seville who, at the Toledo council in 633, had laid down the model for Tridentine seminaries by mandating that priestly candidates should live together under supervision near a cathedral, an idea that could have come from Isidore’s own cathedral school at Seville (O’Donohoe 1957, 6–7).

The late antique and medieval heritage of episcopal schools for pastors had often faltered; it was by no means a certainty that it would survive, let alone thrive. But these prior strands and attempts at clerical education from the long Middle Ages eventually bore fruit at Trent, especially in terms of securing the level of education needed not for high-end theological speculation, but for preaching and teaching in membris. There was indeed a fons of “ancient practices” and medieval clerical education from which Trent’s bishops drew as they married both conservation and innovation at this critical moment in Church history.
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Chapter 4

Interpreting Medieval Literacy:
Learning and Education in *Slavia Orthodoxa*
(Bulgaria) and Byzantium in the Ninth to
the Twelfth Centuries

Tania D. Ivanova-Sullivan

One important way to study the role of learning in medieval society is to focus on the “learning mind,” that is, the person engaged in the process of learning. This essay will use that perspective to examine attitudes toward learning in Bulgaria during the ninth to the twelfth centuries. Usually an educational process is examined through such components of literacy as learning, writing, and reading; scholarship on Western medieval literacy draws on a wealth of extant sources for monastic educational activities of the time—Benedict’s Rule, for instance. But it is more difficult to determine attitudes toward learning in the Orthodox Slavic country of Bulgaria because of a variety of factors, including, for example, the scarcity of sources about educational activity or the existence of these sources only in later copies. As a result, data regarding literacy and learning in medieval Bulgaria must be inferred from extant sources such as *abecedaria*, *Typika*, *florilegia*, quasi-grammatical treatises, apocryphal works, and *graffito*-inscriptions, all of which may be used to reveal the image of the learning mind occupied with reading, writing, translating, and teaching. In this essay I shall analyze several examples of the learning practices and ideas among the Bulgarian Slavic Orthodox community in order to discover the nature of learning in the newly Christianized Bulgarian state and the consequent developments in the sphere of literacy.

For the most part, the Slavic Orthodox community in the Balkans did not draw on the classical Greek educational tradition, which was predominantly secular. For Bulgarians it was the contemporary Byzantine state, not pagan Greece, that had great geographical, political,
and cultural importance, particularly its achievements in the area of educational activity and literacy for liturgical purposes. The first major body of texts to be translated for the Slavs (in the second half of the ninth century), for example, was taken from Byzantine liturgical works. The Bulgarians thus had the option of either following Byzantine (not classical Greek) educational models or modifying them according to the challenges their own situation offered. It is appropriate, then, to look as well at such Byzantine texts as Typika, grammatical treatises, and scholia as sources for additional information on literacy and learning activities in medieval Bulgaria.

Initially, the Bulgarians concentrated on acquiring the basic skills of reading and writing. Numerous translations as well as some original works survive from the tenth century, and these allow us to talk about learned individuals and their methods of instructing others. Such individuals most likely had a solid education, which at this time could be acquired primarily in Constantinople and in certain large monastic scriptoria located throughout the Byzantine Empire.

Taking all these considerations into account, I shall examine not only Slavic sources but also Greek texts that cast light upon the medieval Slavic learning process. For an undertaking of this sort, it is allowable, even necessary, to speculate on some points.

**THE LEARNING MIND: MONASTIC LEARNING**

The Byzantine emperor Michael III (842–867) commissioned the Slavic alphabet in 862 A.D. to facilitate the spread of Christianity among the Slavs and, therefore, help to strengthen Byzantine influence over them in the empire’s central European territories. The newly invented Slavic alphabet became the main device for acquiring literacy. Eventually the creators of the alphabet, Cyril and Methodius, were canonized for their efforts to spread the word of God in Slavic, something that bestowed a kind of sacredness on the alphabet and the Slavic written word, a feature the Greek alphabet did not have. Slavs viewed the very act of reading and writing differently from the Greeks because of the sacredness of their written word.

Alphabetical acrostics and abecedaria illustrate well the twofold nature of the Slavic alphabet. Evidence of learning how to read and
write the alphabet is found in textual sources such as alphabetical acrostics and in the archeological remains of *abecedaria* graffiti-inscriptions uncovered on the walls of the Ravna monastery and the Round Church in Preslav in northeastern Bulgaria.

Alphabetical acrostics in both the Glagolitic and the Cyrillic alphabets appear to have had a liturgical use in the medieval Slavic milieu, for they provide structural integrity for certain hymnographic works. The initial letters of each *troparion* in the canon are the letters of the alphabet in order. Each subsequent copy of the canon, then, followed the original order of the *troparia* without omitting any verses, since the alphabetical order of the letters provided a reliable structure. When translating a canon from Greek into Slavic, the order of the appearance of the letters was violated, and this suggests that we are dealing not with an original text but with a translation.

The alphabetical acrostics may also have served as a mnemonic device for learning the alphabet on the basis of memorizing the *elementa* (the graphemes and the sound values) of the alphabet in its specific order along the vertical dimension of the acrostic (Marti 1997, 129): a, b, v, g, d, e, and so on. Non-alphabetical acrostics spelled out in vertical order a message that was formed by joining together the first letter of each verse. In the most frequent example of this, the author of a canon hides his name and a message in a letter-acrostic. Acrostics tested the ability of the reader to find sequences of letters or words in a given text. The use of acrostics as a teaching aid for copying letters, syllables, or words (Marti 1997, 136) corresponds to a certain extent to the function of *schedographia* for the purposes of memorizing words and forms alphabetically. Although there is no direct evidence that Slavic learning used the method of *schedographia*, the function of acrostics implies such activity.

The Slavic alphabet itself offers a unique feature in its horizontal dimension. Each letter of the alphabet has a name that has its own meaning: ‘a’ is ‘az’ (‘I’), ‘b’ is ‘buki’ (‘letters’), ‘v’ is ‘vedja’ (‘know’), and so on, so that if strung together they convey a message: “I know the letters.” A Paris *abecedarium*, for example, not merely presents the alphabet as letters (a, b, v, etc.) but also gives their full names: *az, bouki, vede*, “I know the letters.” The Greek alphabet lacked this semantic function because its letters have phonetic values, but no mean-
ings in their names, *alpha*, *beta*, *gamma*, and so on. One such example is a Greek *abecedarium* from the Ravna monastery in which the order of letters has a simple sequence but does not create a message (Popkonstantinov 1984, 45). Thus, the potential semantic function of their alphabet provided the Slavs with an additional way of using it for salvific purposes.

Evidence from Ravna monastery and the Round Church in Preslav suggests that some, besides being instructed in how to draw letters and words, learned to write by participating in the liturgy (Petrov and Kodov 1976, 27; Popkonstantinov 1992, 113–14). Western sources also indicate that many wrote verses from the Psalter on tablets and memorized them. This practice probably evolved in the monastic milieu and later found its way into schools and private teaching (Riché 1978, 463). It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the inscriptions of psalms and *prokeimena* at Ravna and Preslav helped teach not only the liturgy but writing as well.

But as a set of basic technical skills, the ability to read and to write is only the first stage of learning. Gribiore maintains that *scriptio continua* placed additional demands on the reader. There are some indications from Byzantine schools (such as the copying of manuscripts) that many learned to write before they learned to read (1994, 72). However, other considerations suggest that it was more common for monks to read than to write. We should distinguish the ability to draw letters from the ability to copy more complex texts skillfully. Well-trained copyists were relatively fewer than well-trained readers.

**READING BOOKS AS SPIRITUAL LEARNING**

It is certain that in monasteries some monks read aloud as a significant part of everyday life. The basic source for the reading schedule and habits of Eastern Orthodox monks is the *Typikon*, the rule that regulates the monks’ routines. It provides information about reading during the Divine Liturgy and also during meals in the refectory. Chapter 28 of the *Typikon* of Stoudios monastery near Constantinople, for example, requires that “when the brothers come over for the midday meal, they should carry their verse [of the psalm] on their lips. They are to sit nine to a dining table. . . . a reading then takes place.”
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Chapter 9 of the *Typikon* of Evergetis monastery near Constantinople confirms the testimony of the Stoudios *Typikon*. When sitting at the table, monks had to “say the customary psalm and the short prayer that accompanies it. . . . moreover, the traditional reading must take place during the sitting in the customary way.” The Orthodox monks read such books as the *Synaxarion*, the *Triodion* homiliary, and the Reading *Menologion* (Nikol’skii 1902, 5–7). We find exactly the same reference in the *Typikon* of St. Sabbas the Serbian for the monks of Hilandar monastery. The list of books from Bachkovo monastery in Bulgaria also gives us a clue about the types of books monks read: besides the Gospels and the Psalter, the list includes works of various Church Fathers (the *Moralia* of St. Basil the Great, the works of St. Gregory the Theologian), liturgical books for the yearly, monthly, and daily cycles, as well as “purely” monastic readings such as *The Heavenly Ladder* by John Climacus and works by St. Isaac.

The approved exegesis of the texts read during communal reading was based on the works of the Church Fathers and on tradition, and was transmitted by the reader to the monks (Romanchuk 1999, 34). A more specific form of such transmission was found in early desert monastic communities, and this form was preserved in Byzantine and probably in Slavic monasteries within the framework of “a textual community” (Romanchuk 1999, 57–60). The form of learning in such communities was characterized as a “pedagogy of spiritual direction” (Burton-Christie 1993, 77–78), for it involved an exchange of words between an elder and his disciple.

Private reading also made use of the pedagogy of spiritual direction, modeling it after the communal interpretative experience. The monk reading in private had to practice interpretive skills that went beyond those required to listen to texts read during the liturgy or at the refectory table (Romanchuk 1999, 34). I would suggest that when the monk read in his cell, he ought to have recalled the communal experience and, thus, tried to apply to his private reading the interpretative strategies he was familiar with from the communal readings. In general I agree with Romanchuk’s remark that the text itself holds the key to the understanding of individual experience as well as the interpretative norms in a monastic foundation.

It is obvious that the monastic community needed books to func-
tion; nevertheless, the *Typikon* rarely refers to specific books (other than liturgical ones) used for private edification. In fact, in some listings of books from monastic libraries (as in the library of Bachkovo monastery in Bulgaria, for example) we find different types of books mentioned, but it is hard to say which of them the monks used for their private reading. Certainly, they were not the books read during the Divine Liturgy, but perhaps some of them were used for communal reading in the refectory and also for private reading. Among these works were perhaps *apophthegmata patrum*, various edificatory compilations of sayings (*florilegia*), excerpts from Scripture, homilies, and so on. It is important to note the form of these works: most of them were short sayings or excerpts that were easy to read and memorize. A famous example is the Slavic translation of the Greek compilation called *Melissa*, which contains short sentences from the Church Fathers and ancient authors.

The exact timing for private reading can be found in the description of Sundays in chapter 26 of the *Typikon* of the Stoudios monastery: “And the brothers assemble at the book station; each one takes a book and reads it until the evening. Before the signal for the office of lamp lighting, the man in charge of the books sounds the sounding-board [sematron] again, and all the brothers come to return their books.”

The *Typikon* is less clear on how the Psalter was learned. “The signal sounds again three times when the canon is about to be sung and at the third doxology of the kathisma11 so that those who are still learning the Psalter can be assembled, for they go out after the Six Psalms and study until this time” (chapter 36). What we see here is that liturgical time regulates the monks’ reading. During the liturgy, monks listen to the Psalter, which is being read, and in the middle of it, they leave to study it by themselves, so by the time they come back to the church for the rest of the liturgy, they could have gone completely through the psalms an additional time.

It is not clear, however, what this text means by “study.” Is it a matter of reciting and memorizing or just reading? In chapter 12 of the *Typikon* of Bachkovo monastery, we find a reference to the “reciting of psalms” together with “all night hymn-singing.” Chapter 14 points also to the act of “singing psalms during work.” Unsurprisingly, the
Psalter was the favorite book of the monks and they used it both in their liturgical practice and in their daily routines.

All in all, the rules of the Stoudios Typikon provide information about what the brothers were reading, how much time they were engaged in reading activities, and where this reading could take place. Although no Bulgarian translation of the Stoudios and Evergetis rules are known to have been used, it is nevertheless probable that the monks used these Typika on Bulgarian soil since, as we have seen, the extant Typikon of the Serbian Hilander was a translation, with few modifications, of the Greek Evergetis rule. Life in the early Slavic monastic foundations required the carrying out of certain rules that Slavs simply did not have at hand immediately after their Christianization; they probably made use of the available Byzantine models and adapted them to their specific needs.

However, there is a Typikon that was found on Bulgarian territory, but it is of Georgian rather than Bulgarian origin, the Typikon of Bachkovo monastery, to which I have already referred several times in discussing the reading of the Psalter, the nature of the books found in this library, and their use in personal and communal readings. I would like now to focus on one particular excerpt from the text of this Typikon and its relevance as a source of educational activity.

The monastery of Bachkovo is located near present-day Plovdiv in southeastern Bulgaria. The Byzantine military commander Georgios Pakourianos, who was of Georgian origin, founded it in 1083. The Typikon itself was written in the same year and to a great extent follows the model of the Typikon of the Constantinopolitan Panagios. Copies in Greek, Armenian, and Georgian exist today. Although Georgian monks inhabited the monastery until the thirteenth century, an analysis of the text of the Typikon nonetheless contributes to our knowledge of the level of monastic literacy in Bulgarian territory at this time and to the attitude there toward Greek literati: it explicitly mentions that Greeks can never be appointed as priests or monks but only as notaries.

The Typikon provides evidence for the training of priests in a school near the monastic walls. This information is confirmed by a reference in the Greek Vita of St. Nicholas the Stoudite about a similar school in the Stoudios monastery. In such schools the curriculum in-
cluded grammar (learning how to write correctly and how to read well), philosophical exercises, and memorizing the sayings of the Church Fathers in order to argue with heretics (Samodurova 1995, 208). It is clear that inexperienced and experienced learners alike regarded the works of the Church Fathers as models.

The education of young boys in the St. Nicholas monastery near Bachkovo followed, in general, the model of the Greek Stoudios Typikon. Chapter 31 of the Bachkovo Typikon requires that groups of young boys (always six in number) be brought up and instructed in the wisdom of Holy Scripture by an older man, usually one of the priests. Those who prove adept in learning are to be ordained when they have reached the appropriate age; those who are not worthy of the priesthood are to be expelled. However, the passage does not reveal anything about the particular curriculum used in the educational process or about the way this process was carried out. Perhaps the books for instruction were well known and there was no need to refer to them specifically. Or it may simply have been the case that most of the books in a monastic library were used in the process of education.

The sources we have examined thus far shed light mainly on monastic learning. I now propose to examine the view of learning implicit in two tenth-century works written by two individuals from the court of Symeon, the Bulgarian ruler: Chernorizets Khrabr and John the Exarch. They both profited in their writings from the fact that a new writing system, the Slavic alphabet, had been created, and that a new language, Old Church Slavonic, functioned as the liturgical and sacred language for the Slavs.

The Learned Mind: Instructing the Faithful

The translation practice of the Slavs that was based on the new sacred writing system implied a linguistic and cultural shift from one model and its Greek traditions to an entirely new one that was Slavic in character. These models were motivated by different social and spiritual dimensions. The decision of the Preslav Council of 893 to replace Greek with Slavonic liturgical books and to elevate Old Church Slavonic to the position of the principal liturgical language in the state presents something unique in the Orthodox world, the act of impos-
ing a new writing system. The spirituality of this system was guaranteed by the sanctity of its creators, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, who were renowned for their efforts throughout the Orthodox Slavic world.

The form of the relationship between the Greek and the Slavic alphabets and languages can be presented in the following way:

1. *digraphia*—use of the Greek graphic system by the Slavs in the process of creating the Cyrillic alphabet. It is very likely that Slavic scribes who knew the Greek alphabet may not have known the Greek language to any great extent. In other words, they had not reached the next level of literacy: using the Greek language to create texts;

2. *diglossia*—the use of Greek and Old Church Slavonic together; later there was a shift from one grammatical and graphic model to the other (from Greek to Slavic);

3. “*dignitas*”\(^\text{15}\)—recognition of the prestige of the new Slavonic literary language, Old Church Slavonic, based on the use of a completely new writing system and the acceptance of the translated Slavic liturgical books by the pope in Rome in the ninth century. Some think that the Council held in Preslav in 893 was the event that precipitated the shift away from Greek; but others hold that the shift was a more gradual process resulting from the increasing role of Old Church Slavonic in the church practice, namely, as something more comprehensible for the Slavs and more functional in their liturgical practice. Greek never totally disappeared, but in time it became the prerogative of a relatively small number of learned Slavs.

In reference to this last situation, the writer known as Chernorizets Khrabr\(^\text{16}\) in a polemical-apologetic treatise “*On the Letters*” maintains that the Slavonic alphabet was superior to its Greek counterpart. He further maintains that the Slavic alphabet benefited the newly converted Slavic people. His essay dwells on two main topics: the creation of the alphabet and the translation of the Holy Scripture.\(^\text{17}\) Pursuing this strategy, he constructs his ideas by placing them in a certain historical and biblical paradigm, in this way structuring the treatise to support his intentions. The origin of the Greek alphabet and the names of its creators, the different translations of the Old Testament from Hebrew to Greek, the question of the oldest language and the origin of different arts are some of the issues he touches upon in his
discussion on the prestige and the spiritual value of the new Slavonic alphabet and the translations from Greek to Slavic. He proceeds by comparing Greek and Slavic achievements in the spheres of literacy and translation. While the creators of the Greek alphabet are unknown, the creators of the Slavic alphabet are well known (Cyril and Methodius) and viewed as spiritual leaders and apostles by the Slavic people. The time needed for the Greek alphabet to be created was much longer than the time required for the creation of the Slavic alphabet.

Khрабр’s data are drawn mostly from *scholia* (commentaries) on the grammars of Dionysius Thrax and Pseudo-Theodosius, the work of Theodoret of Cyr’s *Graecorum affectionum curatio* and his commentary on the Bible, the Περὶ μέτρου καὶ σταθμῶν of Epiphanius of Cyprus, Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Historia ecclesiastica*, Clement of Rome’s *Recognitiones*, and George the Monk’s *Chronica* (Jagic 1896; Kuev 1967, 56). The structure of the Slavic treatise resembles some of the formal aspects of the Greek scholia it uses, namely, hermeneutic strategies, edificatory goals, and the dialectical form of thesis and antithesis that to a certain degree parallels the question-and-answer teaching discourse used in classical education. The use of the polemical genre in the Latin and Byzantine Greek teaching traditions facilitated the learning process through easy-to-follow and easy-to-memorize questions and answers. The efficacy of this genre for the educational process is confirmed by Alekseev, who refers to the presence of questions and answers in various scholia and glossaries on Christian theology, as well as in the act of catechesis (1999, 39). Tzetzes suggests that this particular method of teaching was practiced in Byzantium for grammatical instruction at the same time as school catechisms (quoted in Krumbacher 1897, 581). Chernorizets Khрабр may have chosen the scholia format to facilitate greater understanding among his readers/listeners; yet it is also possible that he retained the format of the works that he used as sources for his treatise.

Another Slavic work, one that lacks such a polemical spirit but nevertheless significantly influences the way Slavs perceived language and translations in particular, is the Prologue of John the Exarch to the translation of John of Damascus’s *De fide orthodoxa*. This short text reflects upon the creation of a translation technique based not on
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literal translation, but on razoum (John the Exarch 1967, 19–20).18 The focal point of this theory is the assertion that each word carries certain connotations depending on the context; therefore, the translators could not rely primarily on its literal meaning. Among the first to deal explicitly with such notions were two fourth-century Anthiochian scholars, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus, who argued that “a word has a semantic field, difficult to be reproduced by a single word in another language” (Wilson 1996, 30). This theory was later taken over by Byzantine grammarians. For our purposes, however, we will cite a passage from Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, a fourth-century Neoplatonist who influenced Slavic theological thinking from the time of John the Exarch in the tenth century until the fall of the Bulgarian Empire to the Turks at the beginning of the fifteenth century: “For it is, as it seems to me, unreasonable and mischievous not to give heed to the meaning of the marks [i.e., the words], but to the phrases” (John the Exarch 1967, 21).19

The fact that such a theory of translation was used on Slavonic soil in this early period indicates a certain level of trained (qualified) clergy or laymen willing to discuss problems of a non-theological nature. Thus, the appearance of a model of translation on Slavic soil at that time can be perceived as a continuation of the first stage of Slavonic literacy, the invention of the alphabet. The existence of an alphabet provided the basic tool for translations, but the Slavic translators realized that this was not enough. What they needed was to specify how the Greek text should be properly translated into Slavic. For this, they had to develop certain strategies for handling complex Greek theological terms, and their subsequent translation practice shows great familiarity with patristic works and Christian theology in general. Certainly, not all the translators had this knowledge but mostly those who were probably educated in Byzantium or in monasteries around the capital Preslav and in the Oxrid area.

The appearance of such an explicit translation theory in the written discourse tells us something of its purpose, namely, the establishment of a body of writings for the newly enlightened people, the Slavs, which included various genres and such works as monastic, historical, pseudo-scientific, and legal texts as well as compilations or florilegia.

The word razoum is at the heart of both the polemical theory of
Khrabr and the translation theory of John the Exarch. In the latter it refers to the “enlightenment” of the newly Christianized people, the Slavs; in the former, to the “meaning” of a word. Both uses of this word fall within the semantic domain of the word “understanding,” a concept that was a characteristic feature of medieval learning in general. Yet, in the Slavic universe at that time, this concept implies reading and interpreting the Holy Writ in their own Slavic language, without the medium of a foreign language (Greek).

Indisputably, the narratives of Khrabr and John the Exarch about the function of the Slavonic language and the means it provides for understanding Scripture did not share the characteristics of Greek and Latin treatises about language, which were purely grammatical and, to a greater extent, secular. These treatises exhibit enumeration of paradigms, description of the parts of the speech, certain translation techniques, and so on, and view the language not as a spiritual tool but as a means for communication. The difference between them and the Slavic works is obvious. The absence of grammatical descriptions is typical of the early stage of Slavonic literacy when no need for a purely grammatical description of the language was recorded; thus, the language-oriented treatises of Slavia Orthodoxa from the period up to the fourteenth century can tentatively be defined as “quasi-grammatical” treatises if the Greek and Latin grammatical tradition is taken as a reference point. With this definition, I would like to emphasize the point that what inspired the earliest Slavonic writers and translators was the desire to discuss the advantages and to defend the new literary language, Old Church Slavonic and its vehicle, the alphabet. They did this by comparing it to Greek and by establishing it as a language, fully capable of revealing God’s knowledge. Thus, specific political and cultural circumstances motivated the Slavs to write their narratives about language.

THE APOCRYPHA AND THEIR “WAYS” OF LEARNING

We have already discussed how structured literary sources such as acrostics, abecedaria, Typika, and quasi-grammatical treatises illustrate methods of learning in medieval times. Images of learning are conveyed by yet another genre, that of apocryphal literature. Apocrypha
are of a lower stylistic register than liturgical, theological, and historical texts and represent a “deviation” from the way the canonical body of Christian works speaks about Jesus, the Virgin Mary, apostles, saints, etc. The apocrypha, then, would describe certain biblical events but substantially deviate from the way the Bible presents them. For example, the Slavic apocryphal narrative “Jesus’s Childhood” narrates the early years of the child Jesus by portraying him as an ordinary and even naughty child, a description completely at odds with his image in the New Testament writings.

These characteristics of the apocrypha, however, make them very interesting and unique sources for the topic of learning. One such source is the apocryphal incantation found in a Slavic miscellany that not only addresses the difficult process of learning (the alphabet) but also suggests a solution embedded in the context of the Holy Eucharist, which certainly underscores the sacredness of the learning process:

Take cinnabar and draw a cross on the holy vessel and write “Jesus Christ” and write all the words in a circle and celebrate the Liturgy. In the first week [or “Sunday”] of Lent, wash [it] out and drink [it]. If it does not have any effect, write again on a red apple all the words and put [it] on the holy table and celebrate the Liturgy for three Saturdays and on Sunday eat to see (what will happen) (When one is learning letters and has difficulties, in Miltenova 1986, 121).

The text offers an alternate way of learning through eating an object, an apple. A similar motif can also be found in a Greek description of a Byzantine ritual that is magic in nature (Averintsev 1977, 149). But where the Greek text says the learner should “drink” the twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet, the Slavic text deals with words and combines the pragmatic aspect of the ritual with the sacredness of the liturgy. The words should literally enter the human body, for its inner parts have to be purified. In addition to the allusion to the Eucharist, this motif has explicit biblical parallels in the Revelation of John (10:8–11) where it is connected with the idea of the gift of prophecy, and in Ezekiel (2:8–10, 3:1–3), the Psalms (119:103), and Jeremiah (15:16).

The text is important for the present study because it elucidates a
perception of learning that combines magic and (Christian) ritual in the very act of eating. This is a rare case in the Slavic written tradition. There are only a few other sources that combine liturgical and non-canonical imagery to provide such an insight into the Slavic perception of learning. Remnants of the Slavic pagan rituals and animal sacrifices in the text blend together with the Christian ritual of receiving communion and focus on the act of learning as nourishment.

An eleventh-century apocryphal narrative describing how Cyril the Philosopher baptized the Bulgarians views the process of learning from another angle, namely, purging one type of knowledge (the Greek alphabet) in order to gain another (the Slavic):

And I saw a pigeon which was carrying a bundle of fig sticks, bound twice. And it threw them into my lap and I counted them and found out that they were thirty-two in number. I slipped them into my bosom and brought them to the metropolitan. Then they hid themselves in my body and I purged Greek (Ivanov 1931, 282–83).

Here the image of the individual purging one type of knowledge and replacing it with another invokes the imagery of the Pentecost and the descent of the Holy Spirit. But again, as in the apocryphal incantation above, learning has been achieved not by reading or writing, but through miraculous intervention.

Both apocryphal texts illustrate the medieval Slavic Orthodox fascination with the magical facets of learning. Moreover, by stressing the physiological aspects (devouring and consuming) that nevertheless underline the spirituality of the act, these curious minds unveil the fascinating duality of physical and spiritual in the medieval culture. This is another large topic yet to be explored by medievalists who work in the field of medieval Slavic culture.

By and large, available Slavic sources do not represent early Slavia Orthodoxa’s learning practices in terms of the classical Latin or Greek educational tradition. The short period the Slavs had for creating their social, political, and cultural institutions, the absence of traditional classical (secular) education, as well as the complex political and ethnic situation in Bulgaria in the ninth to twelfth centuries are all factors that contributed to the emergence and development of the specific
model of Slavonic learning. The monastery was a place where a variety of reading and writing skills could be achieved, and monks had the opportunity to improve their learning skills under the spiritual guidance of the elders.

The picture of early Slavic learning is less developed than that in Byzantium at that time. The sources indicate the existence of a relatively limited number of people—probably at the court or in the monasteries near the capital—who compiled, translated, and wrote works clearly of a high literary quality. Among these works were the quasi-grammatical treatises, although there was no stage in the early Slavic literary tradition comparable to the contemporary Byzantine preoccupation with the systematic learning of grammar. Thus, in the absence of grammars and manuals for learning, the Slavic learning practice must have been subordinated mainly to the preparation for understanding Scripture.

NOTES

1. The verses of the canon are called troparia. The first stanza of each ode of the canon is called a hiermos. It is the rhythmical, melodic, and thematic basis for the rest of the ode. The number of troparia in an ode can vary from three to five.

2. Darchevska (1979, 63) suggests that the main purpose of these acrostics was as a written exercise.


4. Krumbacher (1897, 590–93) cites, as the main texts that were used when practicing this method, prayers and hymns, as well as some works from profane authors such as Philostratos and Agapatos.

5. Prokeimenon are particular verses from the psalms, which were read or sung before the readings from the Gospel or the Old Testament.

6. This text in translation, along with commentaries, can be found on the website of Dumbarton Oaks, www.doaks.org.

7. This text is also posted on the website of Dumbarton Oaks.

8. It has been proven that the Hilandar Typikon is a mere translation, with few changes, of the Evergetis, so this similarity is not surprising.
9. This is confirmed by the Great Catecheses of Theodore the Studite 2.89. Generally, Sunday was dedicated to reading. See Stoudios Typikon on the Net, p. 118.


11. The Psalter is divided into twenty kathismas: the first kathisma comprises Psalms 1–8; the second one, Psalms 9–16, etc.

12. I do not agree with Waring (1997, 415) that the Church Fathers’ commentaries were used only by monastic readers “not filled with the Holy Spirit and who probably misinterpret the texts if not guided.” Church Fathers were invaluable sources of knowledge not only for all those who lived in monasteries but also for the clergy living outside the walls.

13. In the West, the abbot of a monastery had the same function (Baldwin 1971, 35).


15. This is a term used by the Italian Slavist Riccardo Picchio in an article on the question of the relationship among written, spoken, and literary language in the pre-modern European countries. See Picchio 1972. He interprets the “dignitas” of a language as its ability to fulfill certain religious, social, and literary functions.

16. Literally, “the brave monk.”

17. This theory and the fact that this treatise can be found in about one hundred copies (Bulgarian, Serbian and Russian) from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century speaks about its relationship to the needs of the Slavs for historical and cultural self-understanding and for modeling the image of the people saved through the Divine Word.

18. “Therefore, brothers, don’t be disdainful if you find somewhere not the same word, because the same meaning [razoum] has been put in it.”

19. ῾Εστι µὲν γάρ ᾄλογον, ὡς οἶµαι, καὶ σκωιόν τῷ μὴ τῇ δυνάµει τοῦ χιόνιον προσέχειν; ἥναλά ταῖς λέξεωι.
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CHAPTER 5

Reason, Rhetoric, and Redemption: The Teaching of Law and the Planctus Mariae in the Late Middle Ages

SCOTT L. TAYLOR

In The Making of the Middle Ages R. W. Southern contended that, following Anselm’s repudiation of Satanic prerogatives in Cur Deus Homo, the issue of the Devil’s rights was universally rejected (1953, 234–37). According to this view, Anselm shifted the focus of the pretium redemptionis from ransom owed the Devil to the satisfaction owed God. Satan’s due was nothing other than punishment for his crimes, and therefore there was no need to defeat his claims justly. But recent scholarship, most notably that of C. W. Marx (1995) and Brian Patrick McGuire (1970), has demonstrated that earlier theories of the redemption endured and that the High Middle Ages manifested the same eclecticism as prevailed even among the Church Fathers. The Devil’s rights remained a popular motif well into the late Middle Ages. Indeed, the scenario of Satan pleading his rights to humankind in the heavenly court emerges dramatically, first as a topos in theological literature as early as the mid-twelfth century (Marx 1990), then as a genre of legal literature beginning in the mid-thirteenth century. Elaborated and translated into the vernacular tongues, the genre underwent a renaissance by the late Middle Ages.

The renewed interest in Satan’s rights was undoubtedly occasioned by the contemporaneous palingenesis of canon and civil law. Whereas prior literature concerning the harrowing of Hell and the Devil’s rights had been annotated with scriptural and patristic references, the processus genre teemed with citations to the developing corpus juris. The latest phase of this literature generally portrayed the Virgin Mary as the advocate for humanity, no longer in the role of
Bernard of Clairvaux’s intercessor de facto, but as the attorney de jure in a courtroom drama brought to vindicate Satan’s due.

Clement V’s constitutions Pastoralis cura and Saepe contigit established certain standards of minimal due process which easily could be interpreted as providing even Satan with procedural rights, regardless of the tenability of his substantive claims, that earlier theological treatment tended to obviate. The trial as drama provided heuristic exercise for students assimilating these legal innovations by reviving the pre-Anselmic notion that the Devil must be defeated justly. Justice now consists, however, in according Satan a fair hearing. This essay will deal with the pedagogical elements of one genus of the processus genre, the fourteenth-century treatise entitled Processus Sathane infernalis contra genus humanum. This tract portrays the Virgin Mary as advocate before the court of Christ exhibiting the legal and rhetorical skills of the trained lawyer against a demon procurator. Although it was fairly widely distributed in manuscript (Kamp 1936, 72; Jacquin 1962, 271), no attribution was made until 1472 or 1473, when one or more publishers ascribed the work to the Italian jurist Bartolo of Sassoferrato, professor of law at Pisa in 1339 and at Perugia from 1343 until his death; he was a pupil of Cino of Pistoia, who has been credited with introducing the scholastic techniques of the commentators from France into Italy.

Thereafter, the treatise was published in a number of editions and versions that can be categorized into at least three distinct genera (Stintzing 1867, 262–71). However, with the exception of the editor of the 1611 Processus joco-serius, the authorship of the text does not appear to have been seriously questioned until the late nineteenth century when Franz Roediger repeated the objections of the 1611 edition (Roe-diger 1887, 20–25). Gaston Raynaud was drawn to the issue by his interest in the low Norman poem L’Advocacie Nostre-Dame, much of which is nothing other than a translation of the Processus, devoid of citations and legal subtleties but with the addition of lengthy encomia to the Virgin Mary. Raynaud noted that a manuscript of that poem exists accompanied by another, La Chapelerie Nostre-Dame de Baiex, detailing the disputes between the bishop of Bayeux, William of Trier, and the viscount of Constance, Adam of Orleans. Since it speaks of William as living and reigning in Bayeux, it must have been composed
between 1321, the date in which the litigation ended, and 1324, the date William quit the see of Bayeux for that of Rheims. Since the versification of these poems indicates common authorship (presupposing that the manuscript transmits them in the order they were written), it would suggest that the Processus itself must have been composed prior to 1324 and thus could not have been authored by Bartolo, as precocious as he may have been (Raynaud 1896, iii–v). Raynaud’s argument, however, is less than decisive, for if the attribution of the Norman verse by Alphonse Chassant (1855, ix–xii) to Jean Justice, cantor and canon at Bayeux during the period of the chronicled dispute and subsequently counselor to the Parliament of Paris, is correct, his death in 1353 well overlapped the life of Bartolo, and Raynaud’s argument rests exclusively on the accuracy of the order of transcription of these poems in his manuscript. Robert Jacquin (1962, 276) likewise refuted Roediger’s arguments.

Furthermore, Roediger’s arguments stem in large part from reliance on two of the earliest incunable editions attributing authorship to Bartolo, the texts of which resemble that of the 1611 Processus jocosus. For example, these editions contain a date of 1354 in the procuratation but a date of 1311 in the jurat, raising the issues of which date indicates the year of composition and how an author of Bartolo’s status could make such an error. But while some have argued that these editions represent the most developed text (Jacquin 1962, 278), it is the additional detail, probably the product of subsequent accretions, which engenders many such textual problems noted by critics. The text used here, however, is that of the Conrad of Zurich edition of 1505 and that of Jehan Petit of 1510, which, like the Basel editions of 1513 and 1515 identified by Roderich Stintzing, accompany the text with one or more other short tracts generally attributed to Bartolo. This genus of the Processus avoids many of Roediger’s objections and accords with the version used by the fourteenth-century Norman translator, as well as resembles more closely manuscripts Lat. 10,770 of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris and Vat. Lat. 2625.

In any event, it is certain that the Processus could not have been written much before the early 1320s since the ordo detailed in the treatise follows the expedited summary procedures that were authorized in the Clementine constitution Saepe contingit, appended to those of
the Council of Vienne (1311–12) but not issued by John XXII until 1317. At minimum, then, the Processus would postdate the tenure of Cino of Pistoia as assessor for Henry VII (1310), his academic activity at Bologna, and probably his subsequent entry into teaching at Siena (1321).

Indeed, the entire Processus is credible only from the standpoint of the recurrent theme of minimal due process, a topic of timely concern as a result of Henry VII’s Ad reprimendum, justifying the trial in absentia of Robert of Naples, and the Clementine responses, Pastoralis cura and Saepe contigit. Bartolo, one of the few civilians to write a commentary on the Ad reprimendum, squarely aligned himself with the Clementine constitutions (Pennington 1993, 196–200). Conceding that certain procedural niceties could be eliminated, as authorized by the phrase “sine strepitu et figura iudicii,” he nonetheless maintained that any judge was bound to fulfill the minimum requirements of the law of nations and natural reason. While particular forms of action were of legislative creation, the right to petition was fundamental to natural equity, as were notice, opportunity to be heard, exceptions, delays, and proofs.

In short, there is no chronological reason to doubt the characterization placed on the Processus by both publishers and nineteenth-century French scholars as a heuristic device illustrating current courtroom practice for the edification of law students in North Italy (Aubertin 1876–78, 2:476; Delachenal 1885, 315–16). Paul Vinogradoff reached the same conclusion, although he confused the Processus Satthane and the Processus Belial (1929, 128–30). Moreover, the Processus manifests a pedagogical concern to create a “true philosophy,” which for the fourteenth-century jurist meant one that is sui generis in its accommodation of theory to praxis, unbounded by the formalities of logic or grammar. Glimmers of all four of the traits Donald Kelley once ascribed to the mos italicus—that is, the Italian school or style of jurisprudence—are evident in this tableau: a methodological concern for history and first causes; a formalism, centered on legal subjectivity, emphasizing the status or condicio hominum; a systematic attempt to comprehend and order human nature and experience through equity and interpretation; and a general deference to Romanist tradition and authority (1979, 784).
In form, the Processus Sathane constitutes a quaestio de facto or disputata, which was the medieval equivalent of moot court. As such, it was designed not primarily to discuss the intricacies of legal texts but to reproduce the aura of litigation so that the student could be initiated into the practice of law, not merely its academic discussion. Accordingly, this essay will suggest how the vignette not only serves the classroom as a sample of courtroom technique by introducing various legal topics and communicating certain positions on issues of contemporary concern, but also imbues the student with certain quasi-professional values, including the relationship among truth, reason, and rhetorical gesture. In this sense, the Processus is both exemplar, or model, and exemplum, or parable, a monument of both education and socialization. On one hand, it acquaints the novice with rules of procedure and forms of pleading; on the other, it exalts the lawyer’s role, providing a moral basis for courtroom antics.

This emphasis on procedure should not be understood to obviate the formulation and communication of substantive legal principles. But what we see at work in this vignette is part of the larger landscape of late thirteenth-century and fourteenth-century legal scholarship, which emphasized procedure in all aspects of teaching and writing. This tendency has been particularly noted with regard to the development of English practice and attributed to a certain ossification of the common law in the reign of Edward I, visible not only in the larger treatises of Fleta and Britton but in the vast literature of shorter tracts such as the Hengham Summae. However, the continent manifests similar development in the emphasis of both legists and canonists (Hazel-tine 1932, xii–xiii) as doctrine takes a secondary position to practice and, more and more, to use Henry Sumner Maine’s famous phrase, the substantive law is “gradually secreted in the interstices of procedure” (Maine 1883, 389). The Processus Sathane, as a device of legal education, should be read within this pan-European context.

Read within this larger context, then, the Processus must accomplish its goals in a manner not totally dissatisfying from a rhetorical perspective. In this I would argue that the unadorned text I allege to approximate the Urtext succeeds, whereas the several later editions, although perhaps more delightful from a literary standpoint, fail. To illuminate this point, a brief synopsis of the 1505 edition is essential.
Following a brief recounting of humanity’s fall, the tableau joins in progress Satan’s ongoing efforts to lead the human race back into its allegedly pristine estate of servitude to him. In council, the denizens of Hell determine that the best course for asserting their alleged “rights” is to appoint one particularly astute demon as procurator in order to bring a petition before the judgment seat of Christ. Armed with his letters, the infernal lawyer proceeds to the court of Christ, where, having submitted his briefs, he seeks issuance of a citation commanding humankind to respond on a date certain and requesting that the process be returnable on the day after the morrow. Christ rejects this maneuver, reminding the lawyer from Hell that where there is no agreement on a date for appearance and the defendant is a long way from the court where he is to appear, it rests with the discretion of the court to set a date giving the party summoned adequate time to appear and defend. He therefore sets the date for Good Friday following, to which the demon objects that business transacted on such a day would not be recognized as lawful. Christ, however, reminds him that this is legislative enactment and, since he made the law, he may depart from or dispense with it (quire [B8v]).

The attorney for Satan appears on the day set and, despite his best efforts to have his matter called, is kept waiting until sundown. With the case at bar and no one appearing on behalf of defendant humanity, the demon maintains that humankind has been proven contumacious. When Christ reminds him that judgments of excommunication should not be hastily issued, the procurator demands that the defendant’s default be perpetuated in writing (quire Ctr). Despite the demon’s laments on the decline of justice, Christ determines that it is within his equitable jurisdiction to continue the matter. Meanwhile, a great lament goes up throughout Heaven as to the fate of humanity if no representation be found.

These occurrences reach the ears of the Virgin Mary, and at the hearing the next day, when the demon lawyer seeks his default, Mary asserts herself as advocate for humankind. The plaintiff’s attorney strenuously objects, first, because of Mary’s relationship to the judge and, second, because women are barred from the office of advocacy (quire C2r). But Mary cites the plenitude of exceptions contained within the Decrees, the Decretals, and the Pandects, alleging that her
maternal relationship to humanity as well as her own human lineage justifies her representation of the class (quire C2v).

Be that as it may, responds the demon, he is entitled to immediate interdictory relief in the form of a return to peaceful and quiet possession of his spoliated property, namely, humankind, pursuant to the decretales on restitution, which exclude the defendant’s right to be heard (quire C3r). Nonsense, says Mary, for restitution ought not be made to those in possession by force, fraud (stealth), or precaria, but rather where good faith and clear title are demonstrated; and Satan never possessed humanity, nor did he ever have good faith or prescriptive right. His claim derives from the Devil’s wrongfully detaining humankind in death’s dark prison, whence restitution will not arise.

Not true, says the demon. He alleges a prior decree entitling him to possession and proceeds to read from Genesis and the story of the Fall (quire C3v). Retorts Mary: “Now he has raised head and tail contrary to law.” She proceeds to allege Satan’s complicity in the Fall by telling Adam and Eve not that they “would surely die,” but only that they, “like God, would have knowledge of good and evil.” On account of that fraud, he should bear the loss. But the demon counters that, according to legal principle, humankind must be punished officio judicis, on account of justice and equity, lest crime go unpunished.

Mary immediately notes that the demon had his choice of remedies and was now attempting to change his cause of action (quire C4r). Furthermore, where there is recourse to ordinary procedures, a party is not entitled to rely on extraordinary relief. Satan seeks restitution, an ordinary remedy, based on a private interlocutory order from which there was no appeal. Thus, the demon’s demands transcend the res judicata, necessitating the dismissal of his entire case.

At this point, to emphasize her argument further, Mary resorts to pathos, falling on her knees and tearing open her robes to expose her breasts so as to remind Christ of his filial obligations. But Satan suggests that flesh and blood cannot reveal the truth of his claim. He points the judge to those passages of Scripture that denominate Satan the lord of this world and demands that Christ not nullify the scriptures (quire C4v). He then proposes that an accord be entered, dividing humanity into the good and the evil, and that Christ be lord of the good, and he, lord of the wicked. Christ is about to assent when
the Virgin interjects that this distribution had already been considered when her son was on the cross, descended into Hell, and led out its captives, from which no appeal had been taken then (quire C5r). The demon, however, insists that his proposed scrutiny of the human race is justified, first, by the example of the fallen angels who, though having no precept, were condemned \textit{ad infinitum} and, second, by God’s own commandment to Adam and Eve.

Mary responds, however, that the angels required no precept, for their knowledge was inherent and therefore they sinned knowingly. Humanity, however, is infirm, and infirmity, rather than malice, was the cause of its sin. Thus humankind requires definite precepts. Besides lacking the certainty inherent in the angels, humans are weighed down in nature by the body. Hence, in the person of Eve, humankind responded to Satan in the garden only by saying “perhaps we shall die” (quire C5v). Besides, why did Satan not seek an interlocutory order at the outset? The fact remains, however, according to Satan, that mankind has sinned. But, insists Mary, the demon reasons from false premises. He has distorted his version of the origins of the dispute, and therefore all his conclusions are necessarily to be rejected. He should not even be heard in the courts of Heaven. To this, the demon offers to leave and let it be seen what type justice Heaven offers (quire C6r). The judge, concerned with preserving the natural rights even of Satan, cautions his mother to allow the demon his say, even though the two attorneys continue their personal attacks and countercharges.

Finally, Mary advances the irrefutable argument that, whereas God created humankind to be the heir to life eternal, as promised to Abraham and Sarah, if humanity were to be condemned entirely, it would mean that God had created the genus in vain (1505, quire C7r). But, says the demon, either all things were wisely created or the demons themselves were unjustly condemned. Not so, according to Mary, for if an entire chorus of angels were to be condemned, nine more would remain, whereas humanity itself could not logically be condemned without offense to the omniscience of God. With this final point, judgment is entered that dismisses the complaint; the demon is sent packing his papers back to Hell.

Several characteristics of this text deserve special emphasis. The
first is the manifest concern for the requisites of minimal due process discussed in the Clementine decrees. So tied are these to natural reason that their precepts implicitly bind Christ himself to their standards. Thus, Satan must be afforded his right of petition and humanity must be afforded notice, but at the nod of Christ the Magistrate, this business may be transacted on a Good Friday. Similarly, at the end of the Processus, we see the parties arguing that God cannot judge twice, for this would offend what the Italian jurists also considered a fundamental canon of natural reason: that no one be judged twice for the same offense.

The second critical argument of the text is that the intent of the legislator must be effectuated. In fact, the entire substance of the vignette rises and falls on this point. While Mary’s arguments are not infrequently bettered by the demon procurator, the coup de grace is that God could not have intended the entire human race to perish or he would never have created it in the first place. If I may phrase it in terms that, I hope, are not too Arian, Christ the Judge must afford deference to the intent of God the Legislator.

The third noteworthy aspect of the text is a characteristic concern with human free will, which for the mos italicus was not merely central to jurisprudence but its very sine qua non. Here we see an early formulation of the notion of law as civil science, a theme of the mos italicus and expressed most clearly by Baldo, the renowned student of Bartolo’s, who portrayed positive law as the bridge between nature and free will, limiting the latter, lest it descend to the former, for the sake of equity and justice (Kelley 1979, 783). This principle is illustrated by our text. On one hand, humanity, unlike nature itself which is governed by the heavens, is possessed of free will and at liberty to obey or disobey God; on the other, dispossessed of certainty and by nature burdened with corporeity, the race inevitably devolves to its baser instincts, absent intervening limitation. Accordingly, preceptual laws, that is, positive dictates, alone can prohibit or limit human will from descending to the bounds of its corporeal appetites.

Unlike most processus literature, these texts do not oppose Satan and Christ. Rather, the demon proceeds against humankind directly, implying that humanity is sui juris rather than a possession of either God or the Devil. In this specific genus of texts, the disposition of the
trial itself does not resolve the ultimate status of any person but only determines that Satan has no pre-existing claim to possess humankind by reason of the Fall and that ultimately some of humanity must be saved since God does not exercise his creative powers in vain. The neo-Pelagian implication is that, loosed from the bonds of original sin, humankind is truly free to determine its own fate, not only collectively in the here and now but also personally in the hereafter.

Of equal import with the topics themselves, however, are the differences in style and substance of argumentation between the two attorneys within the dialectic of the courtroom. While Satan sophistically, even scholastically, resorts to valid arguments (*bene sequitur*), Mary pursues the various topics from the standpoint of antecedents and consequences, addressing not merely *quid* but *quare* in the pursuit of the sort of “deeper” truth that is engendered not by syllogistic proof but by moral persuasion and that is espoused by Bartolo and the *mos italicus*. It is with regard to the relationship between a full knowledge of the dispute and Mary’s overwhelming sincerity that we see developed the implicit correspondence between reason and rhetoric that transcends mere persuasion. True, when Mary tears open her robe, it is to emphasize the filial relationship, but it also reveals her state of mind, without which pathos is meaningless. Truth is not *scientia* alone; it must be coupled with *sinceritas*. Justice requires *sinceritas* not only in the sense of honesty but also in the original sense of integrity or wholeness. Therein we can anticipate the emerging form of what Charles Trinkaus once labeled a humanist “counter-nominalism” (1970, 1:152) that is reflected in the famous and rather lengthy statement of Lorenzo Valla in his *Repastinatio dialecticae et philosophiae*.

There is no investigation of truth before a controversy concerning the matter is born. Hence, truth is the knowledge of the matter of controversy, falsity indeed a lack of knowledge of the same, truth or falsity being a kind of prudence or imprudence, wisdom or folly. Or we say truth is, on the one hand, knowledge of the mind concerning some matter, on the other, the signification of speech derived from knowledge of the mind. For I wish speech to be judged in two ways: first, whether one speaks factually when he speaks as he feels; in the other, whether one declares what he feels
or whether something different by simulation or dissimulation. And thus there will be a double kind of falsehood in speaking, the one out of ignorance, the other out of malice, the one imprudence, the other injustice.

Thus gestures, acting, and emotions may convey either truth or dissimulation. Here, then, is the common ground of reason and rhetoric, so dear to the hearts of humanists like Bruni, who were more concerned with the ends for which one speaks than with formal validity.

This last point brings us in conclusion to Mary and, by implication, to the good advocate, not merely as “procurator” but as “propugnator,” as the “legal knight” of the glossa ordinaria, the “champion” in the lists of justice. Here the Virgin appears in her full glory as co-redemptrix, and even as the advocate who seeks to redeem or deliver humankind on trial and set the race back on the path of righteousness. The advocate fulfills this function by bringing forward all that touches upon a cause. For the mos italicus, however, “relevance” is conceived in the broader sense of everything touching upon the subject matter, physically or metaphysically, a panoply of antecedents and consequences, from humanity’s innate weakness that, despite its lack of malice, would debase the race to the nethermost limits of nature, to humankind’s teleological role as heir to eternal life that, despite its corporeality, would exalt the genus above all creatures. Mary, having borne Christ, who is divine justice itself, and yet being human herself, qualifies uniquely to fulfill this function in the court of Christ. Likewise, the mos italicus requires the professional jurist to assure humanity of its patrimony, civitas or the body politic, by mediating between its nature and its will and by justifying its acceptability for civilitas, or citizenship, just as Mary justifies humankind for its place in the celestial kingdom. Bartolo would remind the student that, although humanity is vested with a certain dignity while still in its infirmity, this dignity is realized in the world only when the lawyer is its guarantor.
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PART 2

Town and Gown
Sermons and preaching had long and well-established ties with medieval schools and universities. There were institutional ties wherein preaching within the university was governed by statute. Ties between town and gown were created by university masters who also preached in the surrounding community. Moreover, there were the essential ties between sermon-making and the study of Scripture. Although masters in the schools did not devote much time in their lectures to *instruction* on preaching per se, they were teachers by example and in the composition of a variety of preaching aids that came to be identified with the *ars praedicandi*. Sermons and preaching were, therefore, essential to the religious, intellectual, and institutional life of the medieval university.

From their earliest days, medieval schools emphasized the intimate relationship between teaching and preaching. The twelfth-century master Peter the Chanter identified the threefold requirement of the master of theology:

> The practice of Bible study consists in three things: reading [*lectio*], disputation, preaching. . . . Reading is, as it were, the foundation and basement for what follows, for through it the rest is achieved. Disputation is the wall in the building of study, for nothing is fully understood or faithfully preached, if it is not first chewed by the tooth of disputation. Preaching, which is supported by the former, is the roof, sheltering the faithful from the heat and wind of temptation. We should preach after, not before, the read-
ing of Holy Scripture and the investigation of doubtful matters by
disputation (Verbum abbreviatum, PL 205, 25, trans. Smalley 1984,
208).

Practices in the schools came to be formalized later in university
statutes which identified two kinds of preaching. First were those
sermons that all members of the university were required to attend on
Sundays and feast days. These were official sermons given coram uni-
versitate, which from the fourteenth century were called sermones mag-
istrales at Paris and sermo publicus or sermo generalis in Oxford statutes.
The second usage applied to the sermon as an academic exercise in the
faculty of theology, the sermones examinatorii in Oxford and Cam-
bridge statutes. Bulaeus, in his history of the University of Paris, men-
tions the early custom of preaching sermons to masters and scholars
in the schools of twelfth-century Paris on all major feast days, during
Advent and Lent, and on the feast days of the patrons of the saints of
the nations (Bulaeus 1665–73, 2:374). Newly admitted students in the
faculty of theology, for example, were required to preach. Students in
theology had to preach at least once a year, and preaching competence
was required for the granting of the license (doctorate) in theology
(Denifle and Chatelain 1889–97, vol. 2, nos. 1188, 1189). Masters and
students in the theology faculty were also expected to attend university
sermons (Denifle and Chatelain 1889–97, vol. 2, 1188). After 1231,
morning sermons at Paris were followed in the evening by the collatio,
a sermon in which the preacher often took the theme of the morning
sermon and expanded on it. Paris statutes of 1335 were even more
precise in calling for sermons to be given in the presence of masters
and students in the church of the Dominicans or Franciscans, the
College of Navarre, or some other church, such as Saint-Germain-des-
Prés (Denifle and Chatelain 1889–97, vol. 3, 1246). Various college
statutes at Paris specifically directed students of grammar and arts to
hear sermons on Sundays and feast days.

Paris university statutes became the model for theological studies
throughout medieval Europe and included provisions that governed
preaching within the university. In fact, much of what we know about
instruction and practices in the theological faculty at Paris is supple-
mented by references in the later statutes of Italian, French, and Ger-
man universities. Statutes of Bologna (1364), Toulouse (1366), Heidelberg (1386), Vienna (1389), and Cologne (1393) followed the Paris model and frequently provide a more systematic elaboration of practices only briefly mentioned in the Paris documents (Asztalos 1992, 417).

Oxford also followed the Paris model for the most part, certainly insofar as preaching was concerned. An important difference was that at Oxford the students lectured on the Sentences before lecturing on the Bible. The statutes of Oxford University in 1253 further called for preaching in public before the university as a requirement for incepting in theology. Later statutes elaborated on this public preaching: “Those who are about to incept in theology, before they are admitted to inception, must throughout all theology schools oppose in public, preach in public, and read in public some book from the biblical canon or the Sentences” (Wenzel 1995, 305). At Oxford, where university sermons appear as early as 1170, candidates for the license in theology were required to preach in Latin at the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, which housed the first university library. Such preaching, by a bachelor or doctor of theology, occurred every Sunday during fall term except for certain festivals. Two collators prepared a list of preachers for the whole year and notified each preacher two months before his turn. Fines were exacted for non-performance of the provisions of the statute governing preaching. There were also provisions for a Bidding Prayer when preachers commended the names of special benefactors to the university. A careful register of university sermons was kept in the university library for the use of students in theology and other graduates intending to preach. A penalty of two shillings was exacted for failure to give the proctors a copy of the sermon within a week of its having been preached (Jackson 1897, 16–17). An additional sermon was added by statute in the fifteenth century, and there is evidence that candidates sometimes wanted to preach in English at St. Peter’s in the East, instead of in Latin at St. Mary’s. Oxford students, like their Paris counterparts, were required to attend university sermons, as were students at Cambridge where St. Benets Church was probably used for the preaching of university sermons.

General university sermons were distinguished from examinatory sermons, which were required of all bachelors before their inception.
By the late fifteenth century, a copy of the *sermo examinatorius* had to be deposited in an official register (Wenzel 1995, 306). These examinatory sermons, according to a statute of 1311, also had to be preached at St. Mary’s, which provoked some opposition by the Friars, whose periodic conflicts with the university revolved around Oxford’s insistence that no one could proceed to the degree in theology unless first graduating in arts. The Dominicans objected to the 1311 statute that required that examinatory sermons be preached in St. Mary’s Church and insisted that such sermons be preached in their own church. There were appeals to the king and to the pope. The dispute was finally settled in 1314 when the university conceded “that incepting Bachelors should at some time preach one sermon, not an examinatory one, in the Dominican Church” (Jackson 1897, 17–21). In addition to “public” and “examinatory” sermons, there were also the *principia*, which were speeches or sermons in praise of theology given some years later at the master’s inception and were intended to demonstrate his ability to dispute, to teach, and to preach.

Great friar-scholars also came to medieval Cambridge to study and teach in the theology faculty, the statutes of which required experience in the three traditionally cited areas, widely acknowledged and practiced since the days of Peter the Chanter: *lectio, disputatio, and praedicatione*. Cambridge followed a program similar to that at Oxford, with the same essential components of lectures and disputations, as well as preaching. Once a candidate became a full bachelor of theology, he was then required to lecture on the *Sentences* for two years, followed by a course of lectures on the Bible. By the fifteenth century, the candidate was required “to preach publicly (in English) at St. Paul’s Cross in London to whomsoever came to listen at that outdoor site.” Following upon another series of disputations and depositions concerning the state of his learning, he then delivered a Latin sermon “to the clergy” in Great Saint Mary’s (Leader 1988, 174).

Theological instruction arrived later in Italian universities. It was not until the fourteenth century that a faculty of theology was introduced at Bologna and statutes relating to preaching drafted. Bologna in turn became the model for the universities of Padua, Perugia, Florence, and Parma (Maierù 1994, 39). References to the *sermo* also appear in the statutes of medicine and arts at Bologna. The oldest doctor of
medicine marked the inauguration of the academic year by delivering a *sermo universalis* or *generalis*. The other masters, elected by their disciplines in the arts faculty, could not conflict in their own schedule of sermons at the beginning of the academic year with the day and hour of the doctors of medicine. Another opportunity for preaching at Bologna occurred when the title of doctor was conferred (public examinations, called *publica* or *conventus*). In a related ceremony, the presenting master generally preached a sermon commending the new master, who pronounced the *petitio* for the conferral of the insignia of the doctorate (Maierù 1994, 69–70). The statutes of the University of Bologna of 1364, furthermore, contain a rather full account of the academic exercises relating to the *principia*, which included sermons preached in praise of Sacred Scripture (Wenzel 1995, 307–308).

Elsewhere in Europe, universities followed these earlier examples as they developed their own theological faculties. The statutes of the University of Salamanca, where a chair of theology was endowed in 1355, included provisions for the regular preaching of university sermons. The Salamanca statutes of 1411 followed the Bologna model. The year 1411 also marked the founding of a faculty of theology at the University of Coimbra (Rashdall 1936, 2:82–83, 112). The regulations of the universities of Prague, Vienna, and Heidelberg also required such preaching. Established by royal charter of Charles IV in 1348, Prague had been granted a theological faculty from the outset and generally held the monopoly of theological teaching in the German lands until the Hussite troubles in the fifteenth century, when Vienna (founded in 1365) came to dominate the German universities. Heidelberg, founded in 1386, followed the Paris model for sermons and preaching in its faculty of theology (Rashdall 1936, 2:214–15, 236–38, 244, 251). University statutes thus defined the place of preaching in medieval university life and spelled out the preaching requirements in the faculties of theology. In short, the statutes furnish the institutional evidence in the story of the medieval university sermon.

The medieval university also had its own “outreach” program. Masters who were also preachers participated in the direct instruction of the surrounding community and created an important link between town and gown. University of Paris regulations, for example, explicitly directed that theological masters preach on certain days and in speci-
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Medieval churches in the capital. It was clearly recognized that those who taught in the schools were also those who preached to the people. Leading preachers of the high Middle Ages, such as Stephen Langton, Jacques de Vitry, Peter the Chanter, Robert of Courson, Thomas Cobham, and numerous others, had ties to the schools and universities.

The career of one of the most remarkable preachers of the twelfth century, Master Foulques, formerly the priest of Neuilly, is instructive. During the early years in his parish, Foulques, like many of his contemporaries, was hindered by immoral habits and poor training. According to Jacques de Vitry, Foulques was encouraged to pursue theological studies at Paris and was inspired chiefly by the teaching of Master Peter the Chanter, whose lectures Foulques transcribed on wax tablets. What Foulques learned at Paris on weekdays he preached to his parish on Sundays and his fame as a preacher spread in the countryside. The Chanter also encouraged Foulques to preach before a learned audience of students in Paris to improve his style. It was, however, the fervor of his popular preaching that caught the notice of chroniclers and won the admiration of his contemporaries, who regarded him as a moving preacher whose sermons wrought wonders and miracles and were especially effective in converting usurers, prostitutes, and incontinent clergy from their evil and immoral ways (Baldwin 1970, 1:36–37).

The close ties between university and community can also be seen in the life and career of Ranulphe de la Houblonnière. His sermons to the clergy and the people of Paris in the thirteenth century have recently been studied by Nicole Bériou (1987), who has also edited a complete series of twenty-seven sermons that were actually preached by this secular cleric. Ranulphe (ca. 1225–88) studied arts at Paris before moving on to the faculty of theology. He appears in 1267, at least, as a priest of a large Parisian parish, at the church of Saint-Gervais, and then in 1274 he became one of the fifty-two canons of the cathedral church of Paris. During this period, Ranulphe had occasion to preach to a variety of audiences, as he continued to do when he became bishop after 1280. Ranulphe’s audiences included university scholars, female religious (Cistercian nuns, beguines), and the laity in the parish. We have insights in these sermons into the society of
medieval Paris, Ranulphe’s recognition of the traditional orders of society, and the importance of the urban setting of the university.

Ranulphe’s message was also in accord with the papal program of the thirteenth century, attacking heresy, confirming and strengthening the Catholic faith, extirpating vice, and promoting virtue. The Fourth Lateran Council, which had been called by Pope Innocent III in 1213, specifically addressed these issues and enacted a broad program of disciplinary reform that was to guide the leadership of the Church for many years to come. The seventy canons that were decreed at the council represent the effort of a papacy that was intent on reform of the Church and the implementation of a religious renewal that had been gaining ground in the Church since the Gregorian era of the mid-eleventh century. Not least among these reforms was an emphasis on preaching and on raising the level of the clergy (Schroeder 1937, 237; Hefele and Leclercq 1913, 1316–98).

Many masters who were trained in theology and were themselves notable preachers allied themselves with this reform program. They were interested in the reinvigoration of Christian teaching and therefore attached great significance to popular preaching. The careers of these masters add another dimension to the phrase “town and gown,” which generally refers to the tensions and conflicts that frequently erupted between universities and townspeople. In the case of preaching and preachers, however, we find an extraordinary level of involvement and commitment between the university and the medieval city.

Into the milieu of the medieval city, the preacher brought a message of social morality as well as denunciations of ill-gotten gain, usury, and fraud. Stephen Langton, master of theology in late twelfth-century Paris and preacher of numerous sermons addressed to the people, criticized bourgeois merchant and worker alike. Workers were frequently condemned for fraudulence in the products of their industry. Langton also denounced shady business practices and usury. Usury was likened to theft and its practitioners to the creations of the devil. All things acquired unjustly by robbery or by usury, or by some other illicit means, are evidence in judgment against the usurer. Langton identified usury with mortal sin; in still another sermon he called it “dung and filth.” Usurers, he said, are condemned to eternal damnation.
tion, for the usurer will see cash rather than God. The moneylender, like a wolf, devours the poor of Christ (Roberts 1968, 114–15).

Langton also exposed and denounced crafty and deceitful businessmen who are unwilling to unfold their bolts of cloth, but sell them folded and thus deceive their customers. Not all merchants, however, are bad. Some ply their trade with skill, as we notice in this remark of Langton’s on supply and demand in the market place: “If a merchant brought to the market something that was in great supply, he would be unwise to sell it. Good merchants, therefore, are those who bring those items to market that are not so plentiful, and sell them well because of their scarcity” (Roberts 1968, 115).

The medieval university’s role in providing preachers to the community at large is also evident in the history of Cambridge University. Cambridge had, by the fifteenth century, established a tradition of popular preaching at St. Paul’s Cross in London. When Oxford, in 1489–90, requested permission for the chancellor and doctors of theology to grant preaching licenses, nothing much resulted from the request. Not so for Cambridge, which was more successful in getting permission to grant preaching licenses. A bull by Alexander VI on May 2, 1503, “empowered the chancellor annually to appoint twelve doctors, masters, or graduates in priestly orders to preach throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland to the people and clergy, except in places where the bishops themselves preached, or in any church without the consent of the rector.” These papal licenses were initially for life, but in 1511 a Cambridge statute, intending to curtail possible abuse, restricted the license “to two years if the candidate had not publicly preached in the university before; however, if he did so (in either English or Latin) during the two years, the licence would be extended for life. If not, the licence would expire” (Leader 1988, 278–79).

The preaching masters of the medieval schools and universities, in their development of the *ars praedicandi*, represented a further step in the growth of the preaching art. The distinguishing mark of most early medieval preaching was that it was essentially preaching by clerics for audiences of clerics, the language being Latin. The monastic sermon of this period, which was typical of the style of preaching into the first part of the twelfth century, was rather simple in structure and style.
Preachers expounded on a theme drawn from Scripture and concentrated on theological motifs such as grace, the sacraments, and redemption (Lebreton 1956, 6, 8). By the last part of the twelfth century, sermons entered into yet another distinctive phase influenced by the increasing importance given to popular preaching in the growing cities of Western Europe (Smalley 1984, 244). Sermons and preaching by masters in the schools (such as we have described earlier) were valuable weapons in the effort to educate and persuade urban audiences.

By the early decades of the thirteenth century, however, there emerged a whole new rhetoric of preaching with close ties to the schools and universities where preaching, sermon-making, and the study of Scripture had long been linked. From these elements emerged the thematic sermon, a creation of the medieval university and often called the university-style sermon. Consider, for example, Thomas Chabham or Chobham (d. between 1233 and 1236, also known as Thomas of Salisbury, master at Paris) whose Summa de arte praedicandi, written between 1210 and 1215, set the art of preaching solidly within the intellectual framework of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Thomas Chabham demonstrated the value of the art of rhetoric to the office of the preacher by showing how the parts of a sermon compared with Roman rhetorical doctrine. His outline for the sermon included the opening prayer for divine aid, the protheme (or antetheme) or introduction of the theme, the theme or statement of a scriptural quotation, division or statement of parts of the theme, the development or prosecutio of the members named in the division, and conclusion (Murphy 1974, 311–26).

By the fourteenth century, when Robert of Basevorn wrote his Forma praedicandi, the thematic sermon had become the favored form of preaching. Thematic preaching took its name from the way preachers treated scriptural texts or themes as a basis for amplification and division. The fourteenth-century English Dominican and Oxford master Thomas Waleys (d. after 1349), in his De modo componendi, set forth the conditions for the selection of the theme: “‘The theme should suit the material about which the preacher principally wishes to speak . . . it should be taken from Scripture. . . . it should be to the point. . . . and it should be accurately quoted’” (quoted in Charland 1936, 341–49). Thematic preaching was a preaching of instruction in
the meaning of Scripture and was closely linked to exegesis. Preaching manuals thus reflected the influence of a variety of disciplines such as biblical exegesis, scholastic logic, and rhetoric (Kennedy 1980, 191–92). Grammar and other liberal arts also made their mark in the amplification of the divisions of the theme. In its fully developed form, thematic preaching was a systematic, logical form of preaching in sharp contrast with the relative informality and lack of structure of earlier medieval homilies. The scholastic or university sermon became increasingly complex. Preachers divided the theme to facilitate the organization and presentation of the sermon. Division of the theme was accompanied by a declaration and confirmation of its parts. Declaration furnished a rational justification, that is, that the division was well grounded according to reason; confirmation, that such division was well grounded according to Scripture. Similar procedures were followed by medieval theologians in their exegesis and scriptural commentary, and it is probably no accident that many of the best preachers were also distinguished biblical scholars.

The means by which sermons could be developed were rather elaborate by the later Middle Ages. Thomas Waleys indicated three: citation of authorities, arguments, and example. Robert of Basevorn added digressio, that is, the marginal development of the principal subject, and correspondentia, the comparison of various parts (Charland 1936, 195, 213–14). A late medieval tractate on preaching lists these nine methods of expanding a sermon: through concordance of authorities, through discussion of words, through explanation of the properties of things, through a multiplication of senses, through analogies and natural truths, through marking of an opposite, through comparisons, through interpretation of a name, and through multiplication of synonyms (Caplan 1970, 94).

The manuals of the artes praedicandi were one of several resources available to preachers. University masters also led the way in the development of a wide variety of preaching aids: Scripture with its glosses; collections of exempla, florilegia, distinctiones, and similitudines; concordances; alphabetical lists and topic charts to locate materials as well as collections of model sermons. The subject is a vast one, but I shall, in the final pages of this essay, offer some examples of the way these
contributions were linked to the role of sermons and preaching in the medieval university.

While collections of *exempla, florilegia, and similitudines* contained biblical materials and served as useful reference works for the university-trained preacher, books of distinctions were most directly linked to utilizing and organizing the senses of Scripture. Medieval preachers drew on a long tradition of expounding Scripture according to its multiple senses: historical or literal, tropological, allegorical, and anagogical. Medieval treatises on preaching also commented on the importance of the use of the senses of Scripture. Guibert de Nogent (d. 1124), in his handbook on sermon-making, urged preachers to use any or all of the four senses of scriptural interpretation and offered as an example this interpretation of Jerusalem in its multiple senses: in the literal sense, Jerusalem represents the city of that name; in the allegorical sense, it represents Holy Church; in the tropological sense, it signifies the faithful soul of one who aspires to the vision of eternal peace; and in the anagogical sense, it refers to the life of the dwellers in Heaven who see God revealed in Zion. Senses of Scripture were tabulated and formulated in the *distinctio*, a scheme or table of meanings for each word, according to three or four senses, each meaning frequently illustrated by a text. The earliest examples of biblical distinctions appear to have been the work of Paris masters of the last quarter of the twelfth century and became an increasingly frequent feature in sermons to clergy and people throughout the Middle Ages (Roberts 1968, 103–106).

A prominent feature of these reference works was their alphabetical arrangement, which, though taken for granted in modern reference works, was not an obvious medieval usage. As Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse observed in their splendid study of the *Manipulus florum* (1306) of Thomas of Ireland, “to discuss *Filius* before *Pater*, or *Angelus* before *Deus*, simply because the alphabet required it, would have seemed absurd” (1979, 35). Alphabetization first gained acceptance in collections of distinctions, concordances, and subject indexes and then was applied to the organization of materials in encyclopedias, *exempla*, collections, and *florilegia*. By the 1270s, there was wide acceptance of a subject index and of general reference tools by masters and scholars in Paris. In the 1280s, an effective biblical concordance be-
came available, so that fourteenth-century *artes praedicandi* take for granted preachers’ access to a concordance (Rouse and Rouse 1979, 21, 11). A number of important techniques had been developed to make these tools useful and accessible: (1) the development of layouts for both book and page; (2) the emergence of reference systems, including the adoption of Arabic numerals; and (3) the acceptance of alphabetical order as a means of arranging words and ideas (Rouse and Rouse 1979, 26–27).

Finally, there is the essential tie between preaching and the study of Scripture. The medieval sermon took its fundamental inspiration from Scripture. Preachers drew widely on biblical texts and examples that they perceived as especially relevant to the teaching of both clergy and lay folk. The Bible, with its glosses and commentaries, was central to the medieval *ars praedicandi*. Stephen Langton, the greatest biblical scholar of the later twelfth century, commented on the whole of the Bible. Biblical glosses were read as lectures in the Paris schools, circulated and transmitted by *reportatio*. Langton’s commentaries contain a considerable amount of homiletic material. Marginal and/or interlinear glosses call attention to portions of the text that suited a particular occasion for preaching. Whether these notes were in the original *reportationes* of Langton’s lectures or were added by a later copyist does not diminish their usefulness as an aid for preachers (Roberts 1968, 97). The lecture-commentary itself thus became a source book for sermon-making. While the commentary itself was clearly too bulky for the purpose, various methods of annotation appear in the manuscripts to facilitate their use: (1) marginal notes or headings that indicated the suitability of certain passages as themes for particular sermons and occasions; (2) indexes by subject, which sometimes appear in the manuscripts to aid the preacher; and (3) the most drastic method, which was to break up the commentary and then retranscribe it as subject matter for sermons arranged according to the liturgical year (Smalley 1960, 34–36). A brief example from Langton’s commentaries must suffice here. Peterhouse College (Cambridge) MS 112, which contains texts of Langton’s biblical commentaries, is full of glosses, some of which highlight the relevance of certain passages to sermons. The Book of Genesis, chapters 6–9, gives an account of the Flood. On fol. 10rb of the manuscript, the following is added: *Sermo in si-
nodo, and a gloss in which the ark is compared to the Church: “for just as the ark was tossed about by the waves of the sea and was not submerged, so is the Church beset everywhere by the persecution of evildoers, nor is it submerged” (“quia sicut archa tundebatur fluctibus maris et non submergebatur, ita ecclesia tunditur undique persecutione malorum nec submergitur”). The archa suggested the Church; the archus (rainbow) that appeared after the waters of the Flood receded designated Sacred Scripture (“per archum designatur sacra scriptura, iste archus positus in nubibus celi, i.e., in doctrina apostolorum et prophetarum . . . ,” fol.11rb). In most cases, these glosses refer to a scriptural passage that is commented on in the text. These are not necessarily themes of sermons. Yet there are instances when such themes might be identified, as we find in a passage on 3 Kings 8 in Peterhouse MS 112, fol. 142rb. To the passage “Siquis cognoverit plagam cordis sui” (= 1 Kings 8:38: “if every man shall know the plague of his own heart . . .”) is added the gloss: *Sermo in dedicatione ecclesie.* Langton himself preached on this theme on the occasion of a church dedication (Roberts 1968, 98–99).

Sermons and preaching had thus become integral to university life over the course of the Middle Ages. Their provision in university statutes did not necessarily ensure their popularity for their university audiences. Students at Paris were criticized for caring nothing for sermons and making holy days an occasion for idleness. “They remain outside during mass, and like their masses short and their lectures and disputations long,” the thirteenth-century preacher Gautier de Château-Thierry observed (Haskins 1929, 57). Perhaps another issue lay in their length. “Medieval university sermons were not wont to err on the side of brevity,” Hastings Rashdall reminds us. A statute of Ingolstadt, *de quantitate Sermonum*, provided that sermons should be limited to an hour and a quarter. At Vienna, sermons might last for an hour and a half or, at the most, two hours (Rashdall 1936, 1:479).

Student criticism notwithstanding, what is of interest here is how sermons and preaching came to be provided for institutionally in the statutes of the medieval university. They were also the means by which the schools interacted with the surrounding community by providing masters who were preachers to the local populace. Finally, master-preachers were in the forefront of the development of the thematic
sermon and a wide variety of preaching aids that made Scripture more accessible to audiences of clergy and laity. The role of sermons and preaching in the schools and universities of the Middle Ages must also be seen in the context of the major reform program embodied in the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council, which emphasized the central importance of preaching and the need to exercise some control or licensing constraints over preachers. The canons concerning preaching and other decrees affecting the reform of the clergy were eventually incorporated in the law and practice of the various local churches throughout Western Christendom (Paul 1993, 246–52; Roberts 1989, 277–97). They can be seen in the efforts to implement the reform decrees, to raise the standards of the local clergy, and to furnish the outlines of catechetical instruction. Synodal statutes required preaching by bishops, by friars, and by parish priests and mirrored the overall reformist aims of the Lateran program. The medieval university as an institution gave academic structure, direction, and leadership to this pastoral program, and as universities were founded and developed in the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, preaching counted among the theological requirements. Sermons and preaching were thus very important to education in the Middle Ages and formed a significant part of the institutional fabric of the medieval university, whose masters were often notable preachers who taught by their writings and their own example.

NOTES

1. See the indispensable bibliography of medieval sermon studies in Hall 1995; see also the International Medieval Bibliography, which, since 1986, has identified a separate section on Sermons and Preaching. On the study of medieval sermons, see L.-J. Bataillon 1980 and Kienzle and D’Avray 1996, 659–69.

2. On preaching and the medieval university, see the articles in Hamesse et al. 1998.

3. For excellent summaries of material relating to preaching aids (sermon collections, florilegia, exempla, and artes), see Mulchahey, 1998, 400–79; and on the tools for biblical exegesis, see 480–526.


In his 1957 book *Les intellectuels au moyen âge*, the medieval historian Jacques Le Goff, then a young man, suggested that the thirteenth-century intellectual was in danger of completely removing himself from the larger medieval society. According to Le Goff, the scholastic’s language—Latin—and his abstract and technical ideas distanced him from the masses of laymen and -women, their problems, and their psychology. “Attached to abstract and eternal truths, the scholastic risked losing contact with history, with what was contingent, moving, and evolving. One of the great risks of the scholastic intellectuals was forming an intellectual technocracy” (Le Goff 1957, 132). That Le Goff’s critique of medieval intellectuals is jarring to us today is testimony to how much our knowledge of the medieval university has expanded during the past forty years, in part because of the work of social and cultural historians like Le Goff himself. We know much more today about the way the medieval university functioned as a society and culture in its own right. The experience of studying and teaching at a medieval university involved much more than the production of technical commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. There is also increased scholarly interest in exchanges between

*A different version of this essay appeared in the *Revue Mabillon*, n.s., 12 (2001): 45–63. I would like to express a special debt of gratitude to Professors Nicole Bériou, Marielle Lamy, William Chester Jordan, Peter Brown, Giles Constable, Anthony Grafton, and my colleague, Emily Kadens, for their help in the preparation of this essay.
the medieval university and the larger society. David d’Avray (1985) has studied how model sermon collections, produced by friars at the studia in Paris, were disseminated to friars around Europe and then preached (albeit in somewhat different form) to laymen and -women. In her recent book on Dominican education, M. Michèle Mulchahey (1998) has shown that the primary responsibility of Dominican university masters was in training teachers for the order’s provincial scholae, where most Dominican preachers and confessors received their education and training. We are beginning to learn more, in short, about the university’s impact outside the university walls.

There is still much more work to be done, however, particularly in exploring how the university served as a training ground for talented ecclesiastical and secular administrators. During the thirteenth century, members of the new, mendicant, evangelical orders—the Franciscans and Dominicans—entered universities in large numbers. The mendicant studia attached to a university like Paris trained students, most of whom, after graduating, dispersed into the provinces and growing urban centers as preachers and confessors, as well as teachers in provincial studia. A few student friars remained at the university, rising through the ranks to become distinguished university masters. Of these masters, roughly twenty-five percent left the university for high ecclesiastical position, such as bishop, archbishop, cardinal, or pope (Avi-Yonah 1987).

This was the case with Eudes Rigaud, the Franciscan regent master of the University of Paris, who was elected archbishop of Rouen in March 1248. During his tenure as archbishop, Eudes became a close friend and councilor to the king of France, Louis IX. He held a seat in the Parlement of Paris, served as a master or judge at the royal court of the exchequer in Normandy, and was instrumental in negotiating a peace treaty in 1259 between the kings of England and France, ending more than fifty years of war. From the detailed episcopal register he kept over a twenty-one–year period, we know that Eudes was an extraordinarily hard-working and meticulous episcopal administrator and reformer (Bonnin 1852; Brown and O’Sullivan 1964). He conducted more than one thousand visitations of more than two hundred Norman monastic houses, hospitals, cathedral chapters, and collegiate and parish churches. He presided over at least nine provincial councils and
more than two dozen diocesan synods. Before being elected archbishop, however, Eudes had a distinguished career in theology at the Franciscan studium in Paris. The scholarly attention that has been paid to Eudes’s career has focused either on his university career or on his administrative career, reflecting the modern divide between intellectual and social historians. Yet one must ask whether teaching theology in a university and working as an ecclesiastical administrator were absolutely distinct careers. How did a career as a university theologian prepare someone for a career as an ecclesiastical administrator?

It hardly needs to be said that a university career was not a prerequisite for becoming an ecclesiastical administrator in the Middle Ages. Some of the finest medieval bishops and archbishops did not have university backgrounds, while some mediocre ones did. Nor should one infer that Eudes’s interest in moral theology while at Paris made him destined to become an administrator. Some of the most distinguished university theologians who displayed an interest in moral theology never became administrators. Nonetheless, it seems worthwhile to explore some of the continuities and discontinuities between a university and an episcopal career, particularly since it was not uncommon for university masters to become ecclesiastical administrators. (One need only think of some of the better-known thirteenth-century episcopal reformers, such as Robert Grosseteste, John Pecham, Stephen Langton, Guillaume d’Auvergne, and Boniface of Savoy, all of whom had university backgrounds.)

Not much is known about Eudes Rigaud’s university career. There is no critical edition of his commentary on Lombard’s Sentences, and few of his other theological works have been published (Glorieux 1934; Doucet 1934; Henquinet 1939). There have been some recent studies of Eudes’s philosophy and more speculative theology based on his “disputed questions” (quaestiones disputatae) and unpublished Sentences commentary (Sileo 1984; Fresneda 1988, 1995; Lottin 1942–60). Until now, however, there has been no effort to study the Franciscan’s career as a whole, with all the insights it provides into ecclesiastical reform and the interplay among the university, the Church, and the state in thirteenth-century France.

Several unpublished manuscripts of sermons Eudes preached at the University of Paris in the mid-1240s, shortly before he was elected
archbishop, present a fuller picture of his university career (Schneyer 1969–90, 6:93–107 and 9:210–25). In the sermons, we hear not only Eudes the teacher, but also Eudes the rhetorician, using various strategies to persuade his students of the value of leading an evangelical, mendicant life. Rather than invoking Aristotelian philosophy, as he did in his lectures on theology, he invokes biblical-moral themes, applying them to practical problems. In short, the sermons are less about theological and philosophical speculation than about the moral values and simple wisdom with which a friar was expected to live. As archbishop, Eudes would largely devote himself to the task of reforming the practices and lives of the Norman clergy. Already as a master at the university, however, he fulfilled a pastoral role, preaching the religious life to students.

Some of Eudes’s formal theological writings, particularly his “disputed questions,” also call for serious examination, especially in light of their relevance to his later administrative career. Here Eudes displays a deep interest in human free will, the relationship between divine grace and human merit, and the degree to which ignorance lessens a person’s culpability. As a university master of theology, what did the Franciscan think was possible in terms of humans’ capacity for reform? Eudes’s theological writings are different in tone and purpose from his university sermons. The lectures tend to be philosophical and abstract, and the language is technical. Yet beneath the Aristotelian terminology and the dialectic method of his theological writings, Eudes addresses many of the same questions involving moral philosophy and psychology as he raises in his sermons.

THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM

Before beginning his specialized studies in theology, Eudes probably spent about seven years during the 1230s in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Paris. It is likely that during these years he received his training in philosophy and was first exposed to Aristotle and Islamic and Jewish philosophic texts. Increasing numbers of Aristotelian texts were translated into Latin during the 1240s, including direct translations from the Greek. Yet, as it happened, there was little in the way of Aristotelian controversy during Eudes’s time at the university.
He arrived there after the bans on Aristotle’s *libri naturales*, which had occurred in 1210 and 1215, but which went largely unheeded during the 1230s and 1240s, even in the more conservative Faculty of Theology. And by the time the Aristotelian debates re-ignited during the 1250s, Eudes had left the university.

Even so, during his years at the university there was ambivalence about the “new” Greco-Arab philosophy and the blurring of lines between theology and the secular sciences. Although Eudes showed a willingness to use the “new” logic, psychology, ontology, and metaphysics, he viewed himself as doing so in the service of theology. He did not hesitate to cite Aristotle, if only to argue against “the Philosopher’s” position. Above all, Eudes was representative of a second generation of Franciscan theologians, fascinated by questions surrounding human morals, but willing to go beyond their mendicant teachers’ use of the Bible and Augustine. Eudes and his generation of theologians were eager to draw from a growing treasure chest of intellectual traditions—what one historian has termed, for lack of a more descriptive characterization, “eclectic Aristotelianism,” a mix of Aristotle, Neoplatonism, and Augustinianism (van Steenberghen 1955, 38–55).

We do not know precisely when Eudes took the Franciscan habit, but it is likely that he did so after having arrived at the university. The *Chronicle of the Twenty-Four Generals* refers to him as a member of the order at the time Elias was minister general, from 1232 until 1239 (Ménindès 1931, 166–67). In taking the Franciscan vows, he may have been following the example of his teacher, Alexander of Hales, who had entered the Franciscan order in 1236 (Doucet 1948, 784–87). At that time, Alexander was approximately fifty years old and had already established himself as one of the most distinguished secular masters of theology at the university. His decision to take the Franciscan habit not only gave new intellectual credibility to the Franciscan order, but also came as a blow to the secular masters who were upset at losing one of their chairs. As more secular masters followed Alexander’s example in taking the religious habit, the Franciscan convent in Paris, previously only loosely affiliated with the university, became a central player in the intellectual life of the university (Verger 1997, 76–77).

Upon entering the Faculty of Theology, Eudes would have spent two years as a “biblical bachelor,” lecturing on the complete Bible and
biblical glosses. Beginning in about 1240, he started his tenure as a “sententiary bachelor,” lecturing on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. He would have been one of the first students to lecture on the Sentences as part of his theological training. The only Parisian university masters before him to write commentaries on the Sentences were his teacher Alexander of Hales, who had written a commentary as a secular master in the 1220s, and Hugues de Saint-Cher, who had written one in the 1230s. It was only in the early 1240s, however, when Eudes was lecturing, that the Sentences was becoming the standard university theological textbook. To lecture on the Sentences meant synthesizing the entire university theological curriculum into an organized and coherent form; finding creative ways to reconcile the hundreds of scriptural, patristic, and medieval auctoritates’ conflicting positions on the major points of theology; and raising new questions of one’s own by building on preexisting theological foundations (Colish 1994, 9–12).

Eudes’s commentary on the first three books of the Sentences seems to have met with success. There are more than twenty extant manuscripts, showing that it was widely diffused (Doucet 1934, 541–42; Glorieux 1934). Although the commentary reflects the influence of his teachers Alexander of Hales and Jean de la Rochelle, it also manifests a certain intellectual independence. Odon Lottin, an historian of medieval theology, has argued that three of the greatest thirteenth-century theologians—Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas—not only read Eudes’s commentary on the Sentences, but drew heavily from it in their own work, particularly with regard to the nature of free will (Lottin 1942–60, 1:173–74, 2:592–94, 684–735).

In 1241, when Eudes had not yet lectured much beyond book two of the Sentences, a Franciscan chapter of diffinitors requested that each province appoint a committee of learned brethren to draft a report on the Franciscan Rule of 1223 (Pergamo 1935, 444). Eudes was chosen to represent France, along with his older mentors Alexander of Hales, Jean de la Rochelle, and Robert de la Bassée. Thus, while still a sententiary bachelor, Eudes had already emerged as a promising leader among the second generation of Franciscan theologians. In submitting an expositio or commentary on the Rule, the four Parisian masters acted contrary to St. Francis’s desire that the Rule never be glossed. In their preface to the expositio, however, the four masters made clear that
they did not view themselves as in any way revising the Rule. They felt that there was a need, however, to make some clarifications about the constitution of the order in the aftermath of the damaging generalate of Brother Elias (1232–39) (Brooke 1959, 205–22). In addition to addressing constitutional issues, the *expositio* confronted some of the unsettled questions raised by the Rule of 1223. Even Pope Gregory IX, who claimed to have helped Francis with the composition of the Rule and reminded the brethren of Francis’s wish that the Rule never be glossed, admitted in the bull *Quo elongati*, published on September 28, 1230, that the Rule contained “certain things doubtful and obscure and certain things difficult to understand” (Lambert 1998, 83). The four masters clarified, for instance, the Rule’s precept that all brothers were to wear “poor clothes” (*vestimentis vilibus*), arguing that, by “poor,” the Rule meant the “value” (*pretium*) and “appearance” (*color* ) of clothes according to the judgment of the people of a particular region (Olinger 1950, 136). In other words, the same tunic might be permissible for friars to wear in one place, if the inhabitants of that region considered the tunic poor, but impermissible for friars in another region, where the tunic conveyed no such meaning. The four masters also supported Pope Gregory IX’s judgment in *Quo elongati* that there was a necessary distinction between the possession and the use of property. The brethren were permitted to make use of houses, furniture, and books, but these remained the possessions of the donors who lent them for the brethren’s use. Eudes’s contribution to the *expositio* demonstrates that, as early as 1242, he was confronting the problem of maintaining the “perfect” poverty of his order by translating Franciscan ideals from theory into practice.

On February 3, 1245, Jean de la Rochelle died, and Eudes Rigaud was elected to replace him as regent master. Only six months later, Alexander of Hales died. Until his death, Alexander had continued to occupy a second Franciscan regent-master chair. However, the provincial-general of the order, John of Parma, renounced the second Franciscan chair, wishing to conciliate the secular masters who were increasingly distressed by what they viewed as the mendicants’ encroachment upon their rights. Eudes was suddenly thrust into the position of being at the head of the Franciscan *studium* in Paris. His ascendancy was so rapid that he appears not even to have had time to
finish his formal theological training. As far as we know, he never commented on book four of the Sentences and did not quite finish the commentary to book three (Lynch 1949). As regent master, Eudes continued his theological work. He authored a number of publicly “disputed questions” (which initially were public performances, later copied down in an expanded form), and contributed to Alexander of Hales’s Summa, a cooperative venture, begun while Alexander was still alive and carried on posthumously by Alexander’s disciples. Yet above all, as the contemporary Franciscan chronicler Salimbene de Adam, reported, Eudes became known as “one of the finest scholars in the world . . . exceedingly adept in disputation and a very pleasing preacher” (Baird, Baglivi, and Kane 1986, 441).

As his “disputed questions” and sermons demonstrate, the Franciscan master held a pragmatic view of the theological enterprise. He argued that theological knowledge is virtuous only to the extent to which it leads humans to morally virtuous action. This understanding of the purpose of theology, and education more generally, corresponded with the way the Franciscan studium viewed its own mission. For mendicants in the studium, the study of theology was not just an academic exercise, but also part of their spiritual and pastoral training. The great majority of them left the university after receiving their license to teach, returning to the provinces as preachers, confessors, and teachers. Even among those few who stayed on as university masters, many eventually left the university for high ecclesiastical positions. Thus the Franciscan studium not only played its part in defining Church doctrine, but also educated many prelates who would be the programmatic vanguard of the Church. Eudes Rigaud’s own career reflects how a university master could reach the highest ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, thereby having a direct impact on hundreds of individual parish churches and monasteries.

PREACHING THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

The university sermon played a central role in the religious formation of students (Bougerol 1976). Sermons were normally preached on Sundays and feast days, and the audience included both secular and religious masters and students. The Franciscans and Dominicans often
appear to have convened to hear sermons together. Although the sermons were often scholastic in their organization and drew heavily on biblical and patristic sources, they tended to appeal to their listeners’ emotions as much as their reason. In this way, the sermons, often concerned with practical moral lessons, were quite different from formal theological lectures or publicly disputed *quaestiones*. University preachers were eager to show off various rhetorical devices in their sermons, which they had learned from ancient texts on rhetoric by Aristotle and Cicero, as well as contemporary manuals on rhetoric being produced in the universities. Not only were university sermons intended to persuade listeners; they also served to teach student audiences *how* to persuade. Most theology students ultimately became preachers themselves, whether as mendicant preachers, bishops, or teachers in a *studium* or university. And before they left the university, not only would the students hear masters preach dozens of sermons, but they themselves would preach as part of their education. Sermons served to ensure that graduates left the university not only with wisdom, but also with eloquence.

As Jacques-Guy Bougerol has shown, the primary function of the mendicant university sermon was to instill students with good judgment and steep them in the culture of the religious life, exemplified most dramatically in the lives of Christ and the apostles (1976, 261). Eudes Rigaud’s university sermons addressed the contemporary social preoccupation with material wealth, pride, and sex, all central concerns to members of the Franciscan order. But like other mendicant preachers of his time, Eudes translated these contemporary problems into the theological language and topos of the three major vices: *luxuria*, *avaritia*, and *superbia* (Bériou, 1998). In the unusually long *prothema* or introductory prayer of a sermon he preached on the feast of St. Nicholas sometime in the mid-1240s, Eudes appears to have been recruiting either a group of novices who had yet to profess, or secular students wavering about whether to enter one of the mendicant orders. The Franciscan master acknowledged that he was surely not the first preacher to appeal to the students to enter the religious life: “It has often been preached to you,” he says, “that you should make penance, abandon the vanity of the world, and enter religion.”

He reassured his audience that Christians of all ages could enter the religious
orders, with some entering during their youthful years and others, such as his own teacher Alexander of Hales, not entering until their later years of life. Moreover, it was never too late or too early to enter the religious life. Eudes acknowledged that one of the principal tactics he and his fellow mendicant preachers were using in recruiting new mendicants was to convey the "miseries, troubles, and worries of the world which harass lovers and possessors [of worldly things], which ought to recall us from the love of those things, rather even provoking us to condemn them." Yet if describing the destructive symptoms associated with a love of worldly things did not suffice, Eudes invoked the constructive examples of "Sts. Jerome, Augustine, Nicholas, and Martin, the holy hermits and monks, all of whom preach to us a contempt of worldly things and recommend, in words, deeds, and examples, a life of religion which all of them confessed."

Anticipating an objection that perhaps some seculars had already made, Eudes raised the question of the status of celebrated figures from the Hebrew Bible, such as Abraham, Moses, and Job: "We are not better [than they were]," he admits, "and yet they were rich in the world and they did not enter religion. Why therefore do we preach all day an order and poverty and such?" As he explained it, the biblical patriarchs were excused from living a religious life of poverty because they lived before the life of Christ. They had not worshipped Christ, nor had they read the Gospels; they had not heard of "the blessed poor" (Matt. 5:3), nor heard the Lord say, "If you wish to be perfect, go and sell all of your things" (Matt. 19:21). Eudes believed that if Abraham, Moses and Job had heard Christ’s words, they would have willingly agreed with His counsel, and entered a religious life of voluntary poverty, celibacy, and humility. The Franciscan preacher ended the protheme of his sermon with a prayer to the Son of God that he and his university audience be helped to resist carnal pleasures and endure the tribulations of the present life.

Eudes could not apply his argument about the biblical patriarchs who lived before the time of Christ to St. Nicholas, who was the patron saint of clerics, and whose feast day was then being celebrated. Yet as Eudes pointed out in his sermon, Nicholas "never was a monk, nor made a vow of religion, and was called upon by the Lord to remain as such for the preserving and governing of his people." It was
not simply that Nicholas had never entered a religious order; he was also of noble birth, as Eudes noted, and had inherited enormous riches from his parents. Nonetheless, the Franciscan preacher celebrated Nicholas as a paragon of the “blessed rich,” maintaining that although the saint possessed temporal wealth, he “was more noble in his sanctity and in his conduct, which truly is nobility; nor did he put a stain upon his honor.” Eudes thus broadened the meaning of “rich” (dives), arguing that Nicholas was rich not only in life, but also in reputation and miracles. Most impressively, the saint had lived unstained by the spiritual sins of avarice, pride, and carnal lust. And although Nicholas had never formally taken the vows of the religious life, “nonetheless he led a sufficiently religious life at the appropriate time, for it is read of him that during two days of the week, he used to abstain from the breasts of his mother, namely, on Friday, Wednesday, and feast days. The south wind—love and delights of temporal things—did not pull him back from the love of God as those things drew many away.” Eudes went on to contrast the saintly life of Nicholas with the disgraced biblical figure of King Solomon, who stained his honor and defiled his posterity with reckless temporal greed and carnal lust.

What is most surprising about Eudes’s sermon on St. Nicholas was his admission that temporal wealth is not an inherently evil and corrupting force. The life of Nicholas proved that material wealth does not preclude someone from living a religious life, “rich” and “noble” in conduct. Eudes appealed to his audience, “Dearest ones, if we do not wish to be the blessed poor, at least let us be just as that blessed one who was rich, such that we may be without stain, just as he was.” In part, this may have been a rhetorical device used to appeal to an audience that included students not committed to living lives of voluntary poverty. But Eudes was also not the only Franciscan theologian to draw a distinction between having riches and loving riches. Alexander of Hales suggested that it was permissible for a layman to adorn his clothing according to the nobility of his person, the customs of his country, and the dignity of his profession, as long as his motivations were acceptable (Hanska 1997, 79). In other words, it was the pride and ambition so often associated with luxurious clothing that was sinful, not the clothes themselves. Bonaventure, echoing what his former
master Eudes Rigaud had said about the Old Testament patriarchs, cited these Old Testament patriarchs as illustrations of the possibility that the rich could also be virtuous (Hanska 1997, 30–31). These conciliatory tones on the issue of wealth may have reflected the mid-thirteenth century Franciscans’ increasingly ambiguous relationship with the saeculum or world. On one hand, Franciscans were committed to working in the world: traveling, preaching, hearing confessions, and interacting daily with ordinary laypeople. On the other hand, Franciscans lived according to an ascetic rule that required them to renounce all property, live celibate lives, and show total obedience to the leaders of their order. Eudes may well have identified with Nicholas’s sense of a divinely assigned role working in the world and governing his people, while also living a religious life. Later, Eudes would have to harmonize his role as a Franciscan with his temporal and spiritual responsibilities as archbishop of Rouen.

Yet, while he was still at the university, Eudes displayed a particular interest in the nexus between ideas and actions, preaching and practice. In a sermon preached on Good Friday, he used the commemoration of the crucifixion to exhort his audience to a life of service and action. Pointing to the life of Christ, the Franciscan preacher argued that for preaching to have any value, it must be accompanied by the preacher’s own virtuous example. In the case of Christ, the crucifixion represented the consummate moment, echoed by Christ’s final words, “It is finished” (consummatum est, John 19:30), when all words were perfected and fulfilled.

Eudes discussed in concrete terms both the process by which someone commits a sin and the practical ways the temptation to sin can be thwarted. Sinful action, he explained, begins with a mere idea or suggestion; it then moves on to a dangerously delightful tickling sensation from the idea of the sin; then the decision to sin; and finally we come to the committing of the sin itself. Yet the temptation to sin can be overcome, he argued, by surrounding oneself with wise and good men, around whom there is less chance of sinful ideas arising in the first place; achieving a sense that one has enough (consummatio sufficiencie) and is not in need of anything more; and always persevering. The problem of sinful temptations was particularly acute in a group of predominantly young male mendicants, who, while having
taken a vow of voluntary poverty, obedience, humility, and chastity, were at the same time committed to living and preaching in cities and towns, where they would be surrounded by the temptations of sex, bustling commercial districts, drinking, and gambling. Living in Paris, the students had already faced these kinds of temptations, but they had been under the protective and watchful eyes of their mendicant masters.

What would happen, however, to a student friar when he left the university and served as a preacher and confessor in a province? Who would watch over him? As Eudes solemnly informed a group of students still at the university, “Dearest ones, those who are an example in evil to others are their parents in evil. Thus it is said in the Book of Wisdom: ‘All who are born of iniquity are therefore witnesses of evil against their parents at their [parents’] interrogation.’” What Eudes wished to stress above all was the responsibility that the student friars would bear when they left the university to fulfill pastoral functions. They would be the new representatives of the religious life. Yet whether they were preaching the Gospel, disseminating doctrine, hearing laypeople’s confessions, or merely walking down a city street, the friars would always be in the public eye. Thus, if the Franciscans wished to guard the public’s trust, they would have to remind themselves that the laypeople they were serving were not only listening to their preached words, but also scrutinizing their daily conduct. As Eudes told a group of friars, quoting St. Bernard, “A good conscience is necessary before God, and a good example necessary before man.”

In his sermon discussions of how to live well, Eudes relied heavily on simple maxims from the wisdom literature of the Bible, frequently citing the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, and Proverbs. But he also made frequent references to Leviticus and showed great respect for the Mosaic law. In his sermon on the feast of St. Nicholas, for instance, Eudes affirmed the contempt expressed in Jewish law for a stain in a house (domus), which Eudes took to mean one’s family; one’s dress (vestimento), which he understood as outward behavior; one’s oblations (oblationes), which he said were the deeds one offers to God; and one’s offering (offerens), which he understood to be what one offers to God in the way of will or intention. Eudes identified with the ancient Israelite temple, its liturgy, and the priestly
office. Perhaps he viewed his own Order of Friars Minor as the natural successor to Aaron the high priest and his sons. When, as archbishop, Eudes addressed the Norman clergy in a synodal sermon, he was explicit in saying that he and his clergy belonged to an elite class of priests, much like the high priests of the Israelite temple, chosen by God as His ministers. And as elite priests, the Franciscan would argue, they were expected to live according to special criteria, particularly with regard to their moral and bodily purity. As his university sermons demonstrate, however, Eudes was already deeply engaged while at the university, on the most practical level, with the question of what it means to live a religious life.

Eudes’s deep-rooted interest in moral theology is reflected not only in his preaching but also in his more formal theological writings, where he first began working out a systematic philosophy of human nature and the possibility for human reform. Although he had had the opportunity to confront some of the philosophical problems related to moral theology in his commentary on the *Sentences*, the commentary had limited him to the curricular outline laid out by Peter Lombard in the twelfth century. In Eudes’s own “disputed questions,” however, which were composed in the period after his *Sentences* commentary, he found greater freedom to explore the questions that interested him most. Again and again, he returned to the nature of human free will, the relationship between human merit and divine grace, and human ignorance as an avoidable cause of sin. Eudes was certainly not alone in displaying an interest in moral theology. Earlier theologians, such as Peter the Chanter and Stephen Langton, and contemporary ones, such as the Dominican Hugues de Saint-Cher, took a pragmatic approach to moral questions. Eudes’s interest in moral theology was thus part of an ongoing inquiry among university theologians into the ethical problems arising in everyday life.

But Eudes was one of the first medieval theologians to ask probing questions about the nature of the theological enterprise itself. He devoted an entire “disputed question” to “whether theology is a science” (Sileo 1984). Although he believed that philosophy, metaphysics, and physics could be useful to theology, and drew on profane philosophic and scientific works in his own theological work, he also upheld theology’s distinctiveness. Eudes’s basic position was that theology is a sci-
ence, but a special kind of science, more powerful in its end (God), its
method (invoking *auctoritas*), and its subject (God) than any of the
profane sciences (Sileo 1984, 2:24–28). Theology is a unique science
not only in producing faith in addition to understanding, but also in
requiring the grace of faith in the first place (Sileo 1984, 2:11). Perhaps
what is most important, theology is unlike the purely speculative sci-
ences in having *practical* ends. Not content to stop with the mere
recognition of truth, theology leads to good and virtuous works. Eudes
disagreed with Aristotle, who in the *Nicomachean Ethics* had said that
“the receipt of knowledge has little or no value for one’s health” (“ac-
ceptio scientiae parum vel nihil valet ad salutem”) (Sileo 1984, 2:7–8).
On the contrary, Eudes argued that “as much as anyone is a good
theologian and preacher, unless he wishes that which he knows to be
realized in actions, it profits him little or nothing” (Sileo 1984, 2:18).
In short, theological knowledge is virtuous only to the extent to which
it leads humans to morally virtuous action.

Yet how does theological knowledge actually find expression in
virtuous action? Do theologians, according to Eudes, necessarily lead
more perfect lives because of their theological knowledge? Eudes al-
ways insisted that divine grace is necessary for humans to achieve
merit. In a disputed question “On Grace,” he skillfully navigated him-
self clear of the treacherous shoals of the Pelagian and Manichaean
positions (Pergamo 1935; 1936). When Eudes was not dealing with the
issue of grace directly, however, he asserted the necessity of grace for
merit as a kind of required refrain, while carrying on the genuine
business of distinguishing the merits of various human actions. In a
“disputed question” on psalm singing (*de eo quod est psallere*), for in-
stance, he asked: Is it good to say the hours out loud or better only to
think them in one’s mind? Is it permitted to sing to God with the
accompaniment of an organ and instruments? Does someone receive
merit even when he chants without understanding? Is it a sin to sing
for one’s own pleasure rather than in praise of God (van Dijk 1942, 7,
26)? Eudes’s discussion of psalm singing is again significant in showing
that while he was at the university, he was concerned with the practical
problems of chant, liturgy, and Church life more generally. It is note-
worthy that as archbishop, he repeatedly showed a special interest in
chant and modulation, in one case even attempting to move the loca-
tion of an episcopal consecration ceremony from the cathedral in Evreux to Lisieux, where he greatly preferred the canons’ chant (Bon- nin 1852, 106–107). But in addition to displaying an interest in chant per se, Eudes also conveyed the importance of knowledge and education. If one knew how to chant properly, one would have a better chance of chanting meritoriously.

The nexus between knowing and doing also arose in Eudes’s work on free will, where he drew particular attention to the role of reason in human action. By “reason” (ratio), he seems to have meant “human judgment” or “moral conscience.” Reason’s judgment is always morally correct, he argued, if it is properly instructed and is not mistaken for the will’s sometimes overpowering passions. He defined free will as the will penetrated by reason. Reason and understanding allow humans to will deliberatively. Animals (and infant humans), in contrast, do not have the capacity to reason, and therefore have wills more like instincts, governed by sensitive appetites. Eudes assumed that animals have no moral sense and no sense of the past or the future. As beings endowed with reason, however, humans are able not only to make judgments, but also to make judgments about their judgments; they are able to give into their desires or to will not to follow their desires; they are able to think about the implications of their actions, with respect to the past, present, and future.

Although Eudes emphasized the role of reason in humans’ free will, he did not go so far as to equate reason with will. In short, he disagreed with the Socratic position, which held that it is impossible to knowingly do wrong (Plato 1991, 46–47). A bad act, Eudes argued, is not necessarily a reflection of an error or ignorance on the part of the intellect, since there are times when reason is shut down or overpowered by the passions of the will. By definition, free will gives a person the freedom to act contrary to his rational judgment. The will, while penetrated by reason, always retains its autonomy (assuming there is no external coercion) in being able to move toward what it wants (Lottin 1942–60, 1:163). As archbishop, Eudes would often confront situations in which Christians knowingly sinned. That a monastery had a copy of its monastic rule and that its monks knew the rule well did not mean that the rule would be heeded. That a religious house kept careful financial records did not always prevent reckless spending.
Nonetheless, Eudes viewed knowing what is morally right as the first step in doing what is morally right. Unlike most of his university contemporaries, he argued that unwilled, intellectual ignorance diminishes the voluntary nature of a sinful act and, therefore, the sinner’s culpability (Lottin 1942–60, 1:87). There was no reason not to prevent this kind of unwilled ignorance through moral instruction. As archbishop, he insisted that every religious house have a copy of its financial records, its rule, and the statutes of Pope Gregory IX. And the archbishop’s own visitations, which usually included a sermon and an inspection of the spiritual and temporal state of the community (along with appropriate admonitions), served as a kind of instruction and moral monitoring of the community’s conduct.

CONCLUSION

Although it was not unusual for thirteenth-century university graduates and masters to become prelates, there were also significant differences in the job descriptions and skills required. A newly elected archbishop, like Eudes, who had come from the university, would have had to do a certain amount of on-the-job learning. As a university master, Eudes rarely left Paris. Governing the large Norman province, on the other hand, required almost daily travel, more reminiscent of the life of an itinerant apostle. As archbishop, Eudes faced a constant barrage of decisions to make, responsibilities to delegate, sermons to preach, ceremonies to hold, correspondence to write, and charters to seal. An archbishop wielded power and authority (whether or not he chose to express it through his clothing and the symbolic objects he carried), which no university master did.

Yet the medieval intellectual did not live in an ethereal world of abstract scholastic commentaries, removed from the practical realities of the day. The thirteenth century witnessed a growing number of university masters who became bishops, archdeacons, canons, councilors, and ministers. In the case of English royal administration, one historian has suggested a correlation between the employment of former university masters and an improvement in political administration (Baldwin 1976).

Furthermore, an examination of Eudes’s university career reveals
that he was not even at that stage merely engaged in abstract scholastic commentaries. He viewed the theological enterprise as serving a pragmatic and redemptive purpose. His sermons addressed the challenges of living a religious life and thus conveyed a tone of activism. Eudes appears to have taken his responsibility as a teacher seriously, showing concern not only with his students’ theological knowledge but also with their moral conduct, both while they were at the university and once they were serving the larger Church society. Eudes’s interest in moral theology extended to his more speculative theology, where he assessed humans’ capacity for reform. In his capacity as theologian and Franciscan, he stressed the important connection between thought and action, word and deed. This connection would be dramatized most vividly in his episcopal career. Yet already in his career at the university, he displayed a dual commitment to the moral and spiritual as well as the philosophical and intellectual.

NOTES

1. All the following sermons bear the rubric “fratris rigaldi” or “frater rigaudus”: Bibliothèque Municipale d’Arras, MS. Lat 759 (691) f. 112rb (vol. 6, no. 77), 120va (ibid., no. 82), 228vb (ibid., no. 178); Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS Lat. 16502, f. 157ra (vol. 9, no. 267). Schneyer attributes several other sermons in the Arras collection to Eudes Rigaud (vol. 6, nos. 175, 180, 183, 190, 197, 198), but these appear to be misattributions. Four of the sermons bear the rubric “collatio prioris provincialis,” making it likely that they were preached by Humbert de Romans, the Dominican provincial of France.

2. “Novam autem expositionem vel glosaturam contra regulam non astruimus, sicut a quibusdam intentionis purae damnatoribus et zelum suum in animarum suarum periculum et fratrum scandalum pervertenti-bus praedicatur” (Olinger 1950, 124).


4. Ibid.: “Quidam enim ab oriente, id est in principio iuventutis, veniunt ad deum et intrant religionem, alii ab occidente, sic ut illi qui iam cum sunt in decrepta etate et occasu vite veniunt tunc ad religi-onem.”
5. Ibid.: “Ostense sunt etiam vobis miserie et cure et angustie seculi que artant suos amatores et possessores, que debent satis revocare nos ab amore ipsorum, immo etiam ad contemptum eorum provocare.”

6. Ibid.: “Et si hec non sufficiant ad commendationem religionis et contemptum terrenorum, proponimus vobis in exemplum beatos confessores Augustinum, Ieronimum, beatum Nicholaum et beatum Martinum, sanctos heremitas et monachos. Omnes isti contemptum seculi nobis predicant et commendant verbis, operibus et exemplis, vitam religionis quam omnes isti confessi sunt.”

7. Ibid.: “Ipsi e contrario nobis proponunt antiquos patres Abraham, Moyses, et Job, et alios qui divites fuerunt in secolo, quibus tamen meliores non sumus et tamen ipsi religionem non intraverunt. ad quid ergo tota die predicamus ordinem et paupertatem et huiusmodi?”

8. Ibid.: “Karissimi nondum venerat Christum, nec erat adhuc evangelium, nec tunc adhuc audierant ‘beati pauperes’ etc. nec dum adhuc audierant verbum illud de ore Domino: ‘si vis perfectus esse vade et vende omnia etc. . . .’”

9. Ibid.: “Credo quod si hoc audissent, libenter aquievissent huic consilio.”

10. Ibid.: “Karissimi, rogemus ipsum filium Dei qui paupertatem eligit, ut ea que nos retrahunt ab ipso ipse amoneat, et dicat aquiloni: ‘Da.’ Et austero: ‘Noli prohibere.’ Et dicat quiliber ‘Pater noster.’” Eudes has the aquilo or northern wind signify the tribulations of the present life through which God recalls us from loving temporal things. The auster or southern wind signifies the carnal pleasures that take many people away from God and His service. Eudes’s protheme is based on Is. 43:5–6.

11. Ibid.: “Omnes isti contemptum seculi nobis predicant et commendant verbis, operibus et exemplis, vitam religionis quam omnes isti confessi sunt, preter quamque [cancel] beatum Nicholaum de quo non legitur scriptum quod ipse fuerit monacus, nec votum religionis fecisse, et hunc vocavit dominus ad populi sui conservationem et gubernationem sic manere qui nihilominus religionis vitam satis tempestive duxit.”


13. Ibid.: “Qui nihilominus religionis vitam satis tempestive duxit. Nam de ipso legitur quod bino die in ebdomada, abstinebat a mamillis matris, sexta videlicet feria et quarta. Ipsum non retraxit auster, amor et delicie temporalium, ab amore dei, sicut multos retrahunt. . . .”

15. Arras, Bibl. Mun., MS Lat. 759 (691), fol. 112: “Unde Dominus illam predicationem audiri fecit verbo, postea fecit exemplo, ut insufficiens predicacio per verbum redderetur sufficiens per examplum.”

16. Ibid., fol. 113v: “Primo est suggestio, postea titillacio in delectacione, deinde est consensus ad peccatum, postea peccati perpetracio et egressio in opus.” Eudes is drawing here on a long tradition that went back to Augustine of Hippo, who, in his commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, suggested that there were three ways in which a sin was committed: “suggestione, delectatione, et consensione.” See PL, 34: 1246.

17. Ibid., fols. 113v–114: “Prima consummacio est excellencie et hec est in consilio, item est consummacio sufficiencie, et perseverancie et hec due sunt in precepto, set quarta consummacio est glorie.”

18. Ibid., fol. 122r: “Karissimi illi qui dant aliis exemplum in malum patres sunt eorum in malum et ideo dicitur in libro Sapientie: ex iniquis enim omnes filii qui nascuntur etc. . . . [testes sunt nequitiae adversus parentes in interrogatione sua]” (Wisdom of Solomon 4:6).

19. Ibid.: “Et Bernardus dicit quod bona conscientia est necessaria coram Deo et bonum exemplum coram homine.” I have not been able to locate the citation Eudes attributes to St. Bernard in the Patrologia Latina database.

20. Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS Lat. 16502, fol. 157v: “Quadruplicem maculam legimus quam lex detestabatur, sicut patet in Levitico, scilicet maculam in domo, maculam in vestimento, maculam in oblatione, et [maculam] in offerente, quia nullus maculam habens debet offere sacrificia Domino. Per maculam domus intelligitur macula familie proprie, per maculam in vestimento intelligitur macula in conversatione, macula in oblatione dicitur macula in opere, nam per oblationem intelligitur opus quod Deo offeretur. Persona offerens dicitur voluntas hominis que dicitur offere Domino.” Eudes is referring to a passage in Leviticus dealing with laws regarding leprosy, which was viewed as a form of impurity.


22. Ibid., fol. 235v: “Deinde queritur si omnibus hominibus in hac vita est usus liberi arbitrii quia videtur quod non sit in pueris quia nec videntur habere usum rationis nec voluntatis.”


Hanska, Jussi. 1997. “And the Rich Man also died; and He was buried in hell”: The social ethos in mendicant sermons. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.


PART 3

Mendicant Education
CHAPTER 8

Educational Communities in German
Convents of the Franciscan and Dominican
Provinces before 1350

ANDREAS RÜTHER*

This essay will treat, first of all, the mendicant orders at the universities of Europe in the thirteenth century and then turn to some specific examples from Germany in the fourteenth (Rüegg 1996; Patschovsky and Rabe 1994; Cobban 1975). Additionally, rather than treating the intellectual history of mendicant learning, I will be focusing primarily on the history of the mendicant movements in medieval society and academic life (Maierù 1994; Hoenen, Schneider, and Wierland 1995). I am looking at the schools not as institutions but as organized groups of individuals who formed, inhabited, and constituted the convents as educational communities. I will not concentrate on individual scholars or their thinking and writings (Courtenay 1994, 325–50; Brunner and Wolf 1993). I will discuss the characteristics of the system of higher education and illustrate them by reference to certain specific studia in German lands. Therefore, I will cite evidence and statements about the development of regular schools from the rules, constitutions, and decisions of the general chapters; I will also present a short overview of ordinances for studies and curricula of preaching friars and Minorites. Subsequently, I will sketch the origins of colleges of the mendicant orders at the universities and offer a panorama of the provincial and local convent studies.

I would like to start with the Dominican position on the pursuit

*I am grateful to Dr. Susan R. Boettcher, of the University of Texas at Austin, and David C. Mengel, of the University of Notre Dame, for help in translating and discussing this essay.
of knowledge and the evaluation of education (Mulchahey 1998; Re- 
nard 1977; Boyle 1978). The Dominican order had created absolutely 
new and independent institutions for teaching and study, for which 
Dominic himself had laid the foundation and which were developed 
further by the general chapters of 1259, 1305, and 1405. At the most 
basic level within a convent, a lector instructed all his brothers in 
theology and was supported by a director of students (the magister 
studentium). In addition to this, each province possessed one or two 
studia solemnia, which educated the convent lectors; among them the 
most significant had the title studia generalia—these individuals had 
the obligation to take two or three advanced students from each prov-
ince for further education.

After the reform of studies in 1259 in Valenciennes, a differen-
tiation of the system emerged with the creation of a studium solemn as a 
studium directed particularly at theology and a studium artium in 
which younger members would receive direction in grammar and dia-
lectic as well as an introduction to philosophy. The lector prepared 
the younger brothers for the examination that was appropriate to the 
friars who sought permission to preach outside the convent. Such fri-
ars were required to be at least twenty-five years of age (constitution 
2, chap. 10, 11–12; constitution 2, chap. 33, 5–6). A prerequisite for the 
attainment of permission to preach publicly was at least four years of 
theological studies, and these studies only the most qualified of the 
brothers were allowed to undertake.

The leadership of the order limited the number of students sent 
to the studia to three per province; each home province was to equip 
its scholars with money as well as three theological books that corre-
responded to the objects of study at the order’s studia (constitution 2, 
chap. 28, 22–23). The increasing numbers of young students who 
sought to complete their insufficient education through study of the 
arts within the order caused the general chapter to set a minimum age 
of eighteen for acceptance into the cloister; in addition to this, each 
cloister was supposed to set up a board of three qualified brothers who 
were to check prospective novices in morals and knowledge (constitu-
ction 1, chap. 14, 19–22).

Further prescriptions regarding studies found their way into the 
constitution later; each public preacher was required to study for three
years but might study theology for another four years (constitution 2, chap. 30). The total time of study comprised eight years: the first two were devoted to philosophy; the second two were focused on history of the Church, basic theology, and canon law, and only then did actual theology make its entrance. The spiritual center of this system was Saint-Jacques in Paris, which had two chairs of theology at hand and exclusively educated those masters who had received the licentia ubique docendi (Verger 1995; 1997).

Now I will turn to a brief examination of the educational system and the Franciscan organization of studies (Roest 2000; Società internazionale 1990). The constitutions of Narbonne in 1260 included a separate chapter on the vows of poverty but no provision for access to books for education or rules about the paths of study; nor did the constitution of the order worked out by Bonaventure offer any selection criteria for scholars or urge an obligation to study. In this case as well, entrance to the convent was not to occur before the novice’s eighteenth year, for these beginning clerics had to be educated sufficiently in grammar and logic. Before the year-long novitiate, in which contemplation and the praying of the offices and theological studies stood at the center, an examination as to the content of the faith and knowledge of the sacraments took place. No academic degrees were awarded. After two to three years of attendance at a provincial institution, a study of four years could constitute a finished degree. The provincial chapters appointed the lectorships of the studia particularia.

For the central part of this essay, I will concern myself with the relationship between mendicant studia and the universities. The University of Paris was a union and congregation of magistri and scholars into a corporate education body; the University of Bologna, on the other hand, had an autonomous corporation of students who had charged a collegium doctorum with the task of instruction. The association of teachers and students together constituted the studium generale. Attendance at the studium generale meant at first nothing more than connection to a house in which the masters and students lived and were provided with food and in which academic exercises were conducted under the direction of a regent. In the colleges of masters, on the other hand, a circle of masters of arts lived in a collegial society similar to an endowment; these magistri studied at the superior facul-
ties and gave instruction in philosophy. This principle of structure corresponds to that of the system of schools of the mendicant orders (Elm 1983; Berg 1977). The mendicant studies in these old university cities were created in the context of the universities and borrowed or copied their organization from them (Courtenay 1988; Wagner 1999). The erection of these order-specific schools of lectors in Paris was the framework for later successes in scholarly activities. In Bologna, for example, only the *studia generalia* of the mendicans offered the opportunity to study theology until the creation of the theological faculty in 1360, which was equipped with three Franciscan, two Augustinian (Gutiérrez 1970; Cendoya 1966), two Carmelite, one Dominican, and one Cluniac Benedictine professorships.

In contrast to the early Dominican *studia* in Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, the fourth in Cologne became a center of scholasticism long before the city could boast of a university like those other famous ones (Berg 1986; Duchardt 1993). In the biggest city of medieval Germany, Albertus Magnus, the first lector of the Dominican *studium generale*, had in 1248 an international audience, including the person who shortly afterward became the order’s central theologian (Thomas Aquinas) one hundred fifty years before there was a university there (Frank 1992, 1988). In 1307, as the mystic Meister Eckhart instructed the preachers of Cologne, Duns Scotus established the scholarly tradition of his own order’s schools at the Franciscan *studium* there. Eighty years later, at the founding of the University of Cologne, mendicant orders controlled five of the seven professorships and were freed from the obligation of enrollment through the statutes of 1392. University activities in Cologne took place in the convents of the orders, and for academic actions the members of the university assembled themselves in the rooms of the mendicant orders.

In Erfurt as well we find quite early on a structure similar to that of the later university. Emperor Charles IV set up a *studium generale* as early as 1360 because of the presence of the four higher schools of the mendicant orders and the great number of independent masters and scholars, although until then a privileged university had not existed (Schwinges 1996; Keck, Wiersing, and Wittstadt 1996; Fuchs 1995). At the founding of the university, the two great chapter churches and the three mendicant orders had to provide the resources
for masters and establish chairs of theology. The three professors of
the religious orders were also the leaders of the mendicant *studia generali*a and took part simultaneously in public disputations. The regent
of the Augustinian *studium*, Angelus von Döbeln, who had received
his doctorate in Paris, was the first dean of the university’s theological
faculty. Among the colleges of Erfurt were found eight masters from
Prague, and each college had a Licencius, a Baccalaureus formatus, a
Sententiarius, and a Biblicus. Its most famous student and scholar
would be the Augustinian friar Martin Luther.

Yet, their *studium generale* lagged behind the excellence of that of
Magdeburg for a long time, but the elevation to the status of a univer-
sity was denied to Magdeburg. This relationship could be compared
to that between the cathedral school of Chartres and the early universi-
ties in the late twelfth century (Boockmann 1999). Before the first
university in Central Europe was even established, there existed at
twenty-eight places in the Holy Roman Empire such *studia*, in com-
parison to three hundred in the whole of Europe, a phenomenon *sui generis*. In the second half of the fourteenth century this flourishing
development stopped, yet was continued in part in the numerous
newly founded universities. In Prague, Vienna, Erfurt, and Cologne
the former Dominican, Franciscan, Augustinian, and Carmelite
schools (Flood 1988; Lickteig 1981; Lansink 1967) were incorporated
into the theological faculties, a phenomenon see in Padua and Sala-
manca. In Heidelberg, Leipzig, Freiburg, Mainz, and Tübingen these
*studia* did not serve as chairs in the later university; in Magdeburg and
Strasbourg, despite the massive concentration of higher schools of each
mendicant order, universities were not established there during the
Middle Ages (Lorenz 1999; Schmidt 1998).

In Germany, mendicant schools provided in many cases the founda-
tions of the later universities (Elm 1999; Barone 1993). The efficient
systems of *studia* were highly developed and rationally organized. They
became a fundamental part of the later medieval educational world. A
centralized administration selected students and distributed teachers.
Twenty-two regional schools with separate disciplines were founded in
the Strasbourg Franciscan province, eight in the Cologne Augustinian
province, and even four in the Lower German Carmelite province
(Andermann and Andermann 2000; Kintzinger, Lorenz, and Walter,
In general it has been estimated that there were nearly 700 to 800 mendicant schools of varying levels in the early fourteenth century altogether (Barone 1997; Le scuole 1978). The hierarchical system of education provided for cloister schools on the local level, whose task it was to equip the brothers with theological and pastoral knowledge, as well as familiarity with the scriptures. This was a temporary arrangement: regional groups were assembled for the organization of schools of arts and natural philosophy, within which an educational community moved at intervals on a principle of rotation. The studia particularia were intended to impart deeper, more comprehensive knowledge. Prerequisites for admission to these colleges for theology were attendance at all three types of particular studies—arts, logic, natural philosophy.

In this distributed and specialized system, which was similar—in structure, not in geographical unity—to that of the university, each master had a bachelor at his side who read under him. Smaller schools were directed by a principal lector; larger schools, by a qualified instructing body under the supervision of the provincial chapter, which controlled the distribution of the advanced students and teachers. This system was neither monolithic nor restricted to theological pursuits. For example, the Dominican commission of studies decided to add, alongside the system of purely theological schools, institutions for the exclusive instruction of secular knowledge: studia artium and studia philosophiae naturalis. In the vertical direction, studia solemnia were arranged that were attended by those members of the order of each province who did not aspire to any higher theological degrees. The backbone of this system of education remained the flexible exchange of people and ideas throughout Europe, making this network the most developed and advanced of its age.
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The Summa theologiae of Thomas Aquinas suffers from the fact that it is his best-known work. Scholars and students, graduate and undergraduate, usually first learn of Thomas's doctrine on a subject by reading texts from this masterwork—texts often thought to be Thomas's “definitive treatment” simply because they are found in the Summa. Readers get little contextualizing information about the book—its pedagogical goals, its intended audience, or its literary genre—because little is deemed necessary. The Summa is, after all, his most translated, most read, most commented-upon work. True, during his twenty-one-year writing career, Thomas wrote all sorts of other works, in genres ranging from the philosophical to the polemical, and even the liturgical. And true, he spent only six of those years as a regent master at the University of Paris, from 1256 to 1259, and from 1269 to 1272 (Torrell 1996, 330–59); the rest were spent teaching in a non-university setting. But when Thomas makes his appearance on the stage of medieval education, when he gets “face time,” it is as a university master. So Paris, we have come to think, was his intellectual and pedagogical base of operation (Mulchahey 1994; 1998). Not surprisingly, the Summa theologiae, his most important contribution to medieval theological education, had to be destined for the university.

Or so the story goes. The late Leonard Boyle strove to wake us from that dogmatic slumber in his 1982 Gilson lecture, The Setting of the “Summa theologiae” of Saint Thomas” (Boyle 1982). Boyle had traced through Thomas’s historical itinerary within his Dominican order and found that Thomas’s educational career fell well within the
outlines of a typical Dominican teacher, even if, as a theologian, Thomas proved to be anything but typical. Upon his entry into the order, being exceedingly bright, Thomas was sent for studies with Albert the Great when Albert opened his Dominican studium generale in Cologne in the late 1240s. Thereafter he was sent to Paris to undertake the course of studies and activities that would result in his being made a regent master, which came to pass in 1256. According to custom, once he incepted as a master, Thomas taught at Paris for three years (1256–59) and then returned home to Italy, to his Roman province. Having returned to Italy, he was immediately pressed into service of his province’s educational needs in the way it knew best, perhaps the only way it knew how at the time: the province assigned Thomas to be a lector conventus, the Dominican convent’s in-house teacher, its “staff theologian,” in the town of Orvieto, a position he held from 1262 to 1265.

In 1265 Thomas’s Roman province tried something new, Boyle claimed (see Mulchahey 1998, 279). It commanded him to set up a studium in Rome at the convent of Santa Sabina, to which were sent students from individual Dominican convents from all over the Roman province. Thomas was given complete say over the students. If they failed to live up to his expectations, he could even send them packing back to their home convents.

As to the curriculum at Santa Sabina, Boyle saw Thomas breaking new ground. Because of the Dominican order’s pastoral commission to preach the true Christian faith and hear confessions, education at the convent level had always had something of a pastoral, practical bent, depending upon received texts such as Raymond of Peñafort’s Summa de casibus, which, though a work of canon law from stem to stern, passed for moral theology in the order. Thomas attempted to fill out that partial view of the theological enterprise, if only because the moral life cannot be understood in isolation from the other key signposts of Christianity, such as the doctrines concerning God, the Trinity, creation, and certainly the Incarnation. For his teaching text at Santa Sabina, therefore, Thomas turned to Peter Lombard’s Libri sententiarum, perhaps out of habit, for he had lectured on it during his time at the University of Paris and likely used it for instruction purposes in the more intimate setting of his earlier lectureship in Or-
Aquinas’s Summa theologiae as Pedagogy

But his familiarity with the Sentences need not be the only reason he chose it, for Lombard excelled in the dogmatic areas that traditional Dominican education had lacked, while the Dominicans had plenty in the way of moral texts (for example, Raymond, Peraldus), which is just where Lombard was soft (Lombard 1971–81).

But the curriculum did not work. For some reason, Thomas simply gave up using Lombard’s mainstay, having worked only about halfway through book 1 of its four books (after book 1, distinction 23, having already skipped distinctions 18 to 22). And it is precisely at this moment that Thomas begins to write his Summa theologiae, a work whose title is truly descriptive, for the book provides comprehensive coverage of all theological matter (God, creation, the human being’s constitution, human morality, Christ and his sacraments, and the last things), a set of topics that Thomas might earlier have had to use many different texts in order to cover. In fact, one early catalogue of Thomas’s works lists it not as the “Summa theologiae,” but as the “Summa totius theologiae.” And so the work sought to provide complete coverage of Christianity’s sacred teaching. But to whom did it intend to provide this?

Boyle noted that Thomas’s transparent prologue to the work indicates that he had beginners in mind, not unlike the iuniores and the simplices to which so much Dominican pastoral literature was addressed. Thomas’s audience were novitii and incipientes, so he invokes the almost maternal image authored by St. Paul, who in 1 Cor. 3 tells his Corinthian charges that he treated them like “infants in Christ, giving them milk to drink, not meat to eat.” In sum, Boyle argued that the Summa was written for the run-of-the-mill Dominican who was not likely to get the chance to obtain advanced study within the order but would instead be bound to the current literature available in the convent in which he lived. This standard-issue Dominican, this frater communis, would therefore be prevented from making headway in his mandated studies, not because of his own lack of intellectual brilliance or by being subject to poor teaching by his convent’s lector (lector conventus), but rather by the very books he was to read. The Summa, Boyle urged, sought to change that.

But there has been instructive dissent that may help to clarify some of Boyle’s key claims. In a book devoted to the scientific and
logical character of the *Summa*, a Thomist philosopher, John Jenkins, balks at the idea that the *Summa* could have been intended for beginners or *incipientes* (1997, 78–98). While Boyle’s arguments centered on external historical data, Jenkins focused instead on the intrinsic intellectual dynamics of the work. He noted that the texts the articles in the *Summa theologiae* comprise, with the legion of philosophical and theological sources they cite—many standard, many others esoteric—seem frankly too complicated to be the texts by which one would actually teach these *parvuli in Christo* the very substance of their Christian faith, which is what Thomas seems to be promising to do in the prologue to the work (81–82). Would a run-of-the-mill *frater communis* be prepared to grapple with the discussion of the identity of God’s essence and existence but three questions into the *Summa* (*Summa theologiae*, I, q. 3, a. 4)? And where in the *Summa* is the student given the metaphysical foundation necessary to address the presentation of the subsistent relations in the Trinity (*Summa theologiae*, I, qqs. 27–28)? The ironic upshot of Jenkins’s concern is that, if the *Summa* is intended to be a teaching text that succeeds where other texts have failed, it itself fails badly if it intends to teach the beginners whom Thomas supposedly addresses in the second person in the work’s prologue. For this reason Jenkins suggests, rather, that the work was intended for a university readership from the outset and that Thomas is employing a level of pedagogy in the work that is based upon full-blooded application of Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics*, which is best understood in a university setting.

There is, in my judgment, a *via media* between these two views, even though at the end of the day I believe that it lends strength to Boyle’s overall concern to situate Thomas’s efforts primarily within the Dominican educational context. To begin with, Jenkins’s concern about the intellectual sophistication of the questions and articles in the *Summa* does tend to ring true if the *novitii* and *incipientes* addressed in the work’s prologue are the same sort as addressed by other Dominican literature at the time. If one looks at contemporary works of his confreres destined for beginners, such as Simon of Hinton’s *Summa iuniorum*, written around 1260–62 (Carroll-Clark 1999; Dondaine 1937; Kaeppeli 1970–93, 3:346) and Aag of Denmark’s *Rotulus pugilarius*, written at nearly the same time, between 1261 and 1266 (Kaeppeli
1970–93, 1:135; Walz 1954 and 1955; cf. Mulchahey 1998, 204–207), one is struck by how elemental, even catechetical, those works are in comparison with Thomas’s *Summa*. By my count Thomas provides about four times as much material on any given subject as Simon of Hinton does, and with much greater depth and citation of both philosophical and theological authorities.

On the other hand, from the historical perspective it does seem clear that Thomas, when he began writing the *Summa*, had no expectation whatsoever of ever breathing again the rarified air of the universities; his teaching and writing during his first Italian sojourn (1261–68) really should be seen as ordered to the teaching of other Dominicans in his provincial context. That Thomas returned a second time to Paris as a master of theology in 1268 was simply an ad hoc decision made by the order’s master general at the time, for reasons frankly having to do with university politics of the Averroist and mendicant controversies (Torrell 1996, 179–84). There is every reason to think that Thomas would otherwise have spent the rest of his days teaching in his Roman province, perhaps circulating as a *lector conventus* through time, something we know happened with other *lectores*. The key question, then, to understanding why and for whom the *Summa* was written becomes this: Who were these selected Dominicans whom Thomas taught at Santa Sabina beginning in 1265, whose experience there prompted Thomas to put Lombard down to pick up his own pen?

Dearth of detailed evidence leaves us to make reasonable conjectures from the few scraps we possess. We can be confident that this *studium’s* function was not to be a clearinghouse for Dominicans who were destined to be sent to Paris or the order’s other *studia generalia*, for the Roman province had been doing this successfully for quite some time anyway (Mulchahey 1998, 278ff.). The students sent to Thomas at Santa Sabina were selected from convents in his Roman province, so the *studium* was a *studium provinciale* in at least that literal sense. But if the student that issued forth from this *studium* was not automatically earmarked for attendance at Paris or elsewhere, where was he to be sent upon completion of his studies with Thomas? My answer: to a Dominican convent somewhere in the Roman province, to become its *lector*.
I did not tell the whole story earlier when I described Thomas’s short attempt to teach Lombard’s *Libri sententiarum* to his students at his Roman *studium*, after which time we see the beginning of the *Summa*. Our historical source for the knowledge that Thomas taught Lombard at Santa Sabina at all comes from Tolomeo of Lucca, a student and confidant whom Thomas came to know in the last two years of his life, from 1272 to 1274, in Naples. In a work he wrote in the early fourteenth century, Tolomeo recalls with some surprise that Thomas wrote on book 1 of the *Sentences*, even though he was already a master in theology—the idea being that once Thomas had done this for acceptance in the faculty of theology at Paris in the middle 1250s, there was no need to do it again. Tolomeo claimed further that he had seen this text, this second commentary, on book 1 of the *Sentences*, at the Dominican convent of Lucca, but after he left Lucca, he never saw it again.3

As is often the case with Tolomeo’s testimony about Thomas’s life, he is right about the important things but fuzzy on the details. For what he saw at Lucca was probably not a text that Thomas wrote out himself but rather the report (*reportatio*) from a student who had attended Thomas’s lectures at Santa Sabina. Eventually this report gets copied into the margins of a manuscript containing Thomas’s earlier Parisian commentary on book 1 (Boyle 1982, 12; 1983). In investigating this manuscript (now at Lincoln College, Oxford, MS Lat. 95), Boyle did more than explain what its references to the “other lectures of Brother Thomas” might mean; with the aid of an ultraviolet light he was able to detect on a guard leaf the name of the one who had owned the manuscript: Iacopo di Ranuccio, a Dominican from Perugia who ended his days as the bishop of Florence in 1286. The historian Emilio Panella (1988) has provided us with an excellent *curriculum vitae* of this little-known Dominican from Thomas’s Roman province who interests us not because of his eventual episcopal office but rather because of the offices that he exercised within his order. Simply put: Iacopo spent the early part of his career as a *lector* at Dominican convents in the cities of Arezzo, Orvieto, Perugia, Città di Castello, and Lucca, the very place where Tolomeo claims to have seen the text. One would dearly love to have hard evidence that places Iacopo in Thomas’s retinue at Rome when he taught at Santa Sabina in 1265.4 But we
have to make do with the fact that Iacopo, if he is the copyist of this Lincoln manuscript, knew of Thomas’s changing opinions on matters just before they were written in the *Summa*, and that the doctrinal content of these ninety or so scholastic articles in the manuscript not only is Thomistic but also fits neatly into the period that postdates his *Summa contra gentiles* (1259–64) and predates the *Summa theologiae* (1266).

But there is more to it than that. Recalling the concern voiced by John Jenkins—namely, that the doctrinal sophistication of the *Summa theologiae* seems too advanced for an outright beginner—one notices immediately that the texts from this Roman Commentary on the *Sentences* are strikingly like the articles on the same topics that one will see in the *Summa*. Whatever difference there is between the two—the texts from the *Summa* tend to be ever-so-slightly longer and to quote authorities more fully—can be explained by the fact that in writing more than in lecturing Thomas’s texts would be clearer, tighter, and more detailed.

The picture I see emerging is this. The texts of the *Summa* are not so long and detailed as the disputed questions that we know came from the University of Paris. But its texts do place demands that a beginner, a run-of-the-mill Dominican, could not meet. Its massive completeness in terms of doctrinal extension, coupled with the careful argumentation found in each article, where even objections appear in a logical sequence, suggest strongly that Thomas was covering sacred doctrine in such a way that nothing of importance was left out, no stone unturned. I therefore have come to wonder whether Boyle’s claim, that the audience for the *Summa* was the general-issue *frater communis*, might have been overstated. But if, on the other hand, the *Summa* were written to meet the long-term needs of the students Thomas had before him in Santa Sabina, students who would someday be the staff theologians in Dominican convents all over the Roman province, functioning as theological one-man bands who teach the general-issue *frater communis*, then the *Summa’s* depth and breadth fit the bill perfectly. If our young *lector* Iacopo di Ranuccio of Perugia found himself stumped by a tricky question arising out of the Lombard upon whom he was lecturing, or Raymond’s canon law, or some biblical passage, or even some quodlibetal question he was di-
recting, it would be some relief to him to have at hand a *summa* that covered all that ground in a way that either let him answer the tricky question and be done with it or follow the work’s intricate analysis of the subject so as to increase his own theological mastery.

In short, the *Summa theologiae* is not a text for beginners in Christian doctrine but a text for the teachers of beginners in Christian doctrine: the precise job description of a *lector conventus* in the Dominican educational system that defined Thomas, the Dominican master of theology. And the eventual publication of the *Summa* by Parisian stationers—with Thomas willing, we presume—simply meant that Dominicans who copied the work, and carried it back from Paris to their home provinces and convents, would have ready to hand an extensive and intensive account of the Christian faith, the study of which would produce an individual capable of instructing others in the faith and safeguarding them from error. And there is no more “Dominican” goal than that (see *Summa theologiae*, I, prologus).

The Dominican master general Humbert of Romans insisted that each Dominican convent’s library should have pulpits reserved for a slew of standard texts used by the brethren: the Bible, the *Sentences*, Raymond of Peñafort, William of Peraldus, Gratian, glosses, distinctions, and many, many other texts (Humbert of Romans 1956, 2:265). Maybe Thomas was secretly hoping that there was still a pulpit available for his little *Summa*.

**Notes**

1. There is no real moral treatise in the *Libri sententiarum*, so theologians’ moral speculations in their *scripta* centered upon Lombard’s *litterae* concerning original sin (Bk. 2, dd. 25–44) and the presence of the theological virtues in Christ (Bk. 3, dd. 23–40).

2. Jenkins does admit, however, that Thomas’s treatment of certain topics in the *Summa* is simpler than in other works, such as the *De veritate* and the *Summa contra gentiles*, which somewhat militates against his own view that the *Summa theologiae* was designed for very advanced students.

Aquinas’s *Summa theologiae* as Pedagogy

4. Humbert of Romans (1956, 2:254) stresses that the lector himself needs to keep on studying: “Ut autem melius et fructuosius officium suum exequatur, debet studere diligenter, et praecipue in scriptis quae communi judicio meliora reputantur.”

5. In Johnson (1990, 61) I wondered whether there might be paleographical evidence in the Oxford, Lincoln College MS. Lat. 95 that so linked its author to Thomas. Louis-Jacques Batallion, upon closer examination, tells me that the Lincoln College manuscript does not contain the evidence.

6. Humbert’s text is worth quoting in its entirety: “Item, ad ipsum [that is, the convent’s librarian] pertinet providere quod in aliquo loco silentii et apto, sit aliquis pulpitus magnus, vel plures, in quibus legentur aliqui libri bene legibles, quibus frequentius fratres indigent cum habetur, ut est Biblia glossata in toto, vel in parte, Biblia sine glossis, Summae de casibus, et Gaufredi, et De vitiis et virtutibus, et De quaestionibus, Concordantiae, Interpretationes, Decreta, Decretales, Distinctiones morales, Sermones varii de festis et dominicis per totum annum, Historiae, Sententiae, Chronica, Passiones, et Legenda sanctorum, Historial ecclesiastica, et similia multa, ut communitas fratrum in promptu possit illa habere.”

**Works Cited**


Many years ago, in an effort to trace possible schoolroom influences upon the great poet Dante Alighieri, Charles T. Davis examined the schools of Florence as they existed at the turn of the fourteenth century (Davis 1965). Dante himself, in a familiar passage in the *Convivio*, claimed that there was a period, which scholars place in the 1290s, during which he frequented “the schools of the religious” as well as the “disputations of the philosophers” in Florence.¹ This directed Davis’s attention to the important Franciscan community at Santa Croce and to the Dominicans of Santa Maria Novella. He pointed out that various passages in the *Commedia* show the importance to Dante of the Spiritual Franciscans’ doctrine of poverty and of the reform preached at Santa Croce; that Dante’s view of ecclesiastical history was very close to that of the Franciscan Peter John Olivi; that in his portrait of Francis in the *Paradiso* Dante quotes directly from Ubertino da Casale’s *Arbor vitae crucifixae Jesu*. As for Santa Maria Novella, Davis thought it fair to say that the Aristotelianism of Paris had reached Dante through the Dominicans, the order of Thomas Aquinas. He also noted strong resemblances between Dante’s political theories and those of one particular Dominican friar, fra Remigio di ser Chiaro dei Girolami, who taught for many years at the *studium* at Santa Maria Novella (Davis 1960; and updated 1965).

¹This article is a prelude to my Dominican teaching in *Dante’s Florence: Remigio de’ Girolami and the schools of Santa Maria Novella* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, forthcoming), which includes a full edition and study of the lectures of fra Remigio discussed here.
My purpose here is not so much to reconsider Dante’s intellectual heritage per se, nor, indeed, to revisit the putative Dominican connection—and the claim that Dante could have had direct experience of Remigio de’ Girolami’s teaching at Santa Maria Novella has in any case been very much undermined.² But the mystique that Charles Davis first created for Remigio de’ Girolami, the schoolmaster, continues to surround him. Latter-day explorers of Remigio’s Thomism have attempted to make of him a material figure in the educational history of the Dominican order (Grabmann 1924; 1925; 1926). And Remigio’s long service in the lectorate does seem to mitigate the hyperbole of those who would view him as a towering presence in the schools of Santa Maria Novella at the beginning of the fourteenth century. My intention is to add some precision to our understanding of the day-to-day work of Remigio de’ Girolami as a teacher at Santa Maria Novella by adducing some unpublished manuscript sources that illustrate his actual classroom activities, as opposed to his better-known work as polemicist, preacher, and pamphleteer. From these sources much of the syllabus of the studium at Santa Maria Novella can be reconstructed, especially for the critical years between about 1305 and 1311 that saw the transformation of Santa Maria Novella’s upper school from a provincial school of theology into the Dominicans’ studium generale in central Italy. Thus, while the purported personal connection between Remigio de’ Girolami and Dante may have been comprehensively severed, fra Remigio can nonetheless teach us something about the operations of the Dominican schools in Dante’s Florence.

* * *

Before turning to the manuscripts themselves, however, we would do well to locate fra Remigio’s work in its institutional context by looking first at the most important milestones in the history of the schools at Santa Maria Novella. One crucial preliminary observation needs to be made, especially in the face of the longstanding belief that Dante studied philosophy at Santa Maria Novella, and that is that over the course of the thirteenth century Santa Maria Novella’s educational role within the Roman Province of the Dominican order became identified almost exclusively with providing instruction in theology. Like all Dominican priories, Santa Maria Novella was re-
quired to operate a conventual schola in which the friars of the local community were taught the basics of theology through daily lectures and weekly disputationns on the Bible and on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Such a school existed in Florence, at Santa Maria Novella, throughout the medieval period. During the second half of the thirteenth century, however, the Dominican order also began experimenting with specialist studia, that is, intermediate schools that functioned at the provincial level between the basic scholae found in every convent and the great studia generalia, such as Saint-Jacques at Paris. These new provincial studia were dedicated to the teaching of logic (the studia artium, which started appearing in the 1240s), natural philosophy (the studia naturarum, which emerged in the 1260s), and intermediate theology (the so-called studia particularis theologiae, which were developed in the 1280s).

Santa Maria Novella became one of the first priories in the order to host a studium particularis theologiae when the Roman Province asked the chapter to organize one in 1281. The studium was, in fact, one of the first to appear since the death of Thomas Aquinas, who had pioneered the model of intermediate theology at a school he ran at Santa Sabina in Rome between 1265 and 1268, and there penned the Summa theologiae for the purpose. Santa Maria Novella could thus lay legitimate claim to a seminal role in the Roman Province’s theology program. Over the next two decades Florence was increasingly singled out by Dominican educators in Tuscany as a center for theological studies. A studium particularis theologiae was assigned to Santa Maria Novella in 1288, in 1291 and 1293, and in 1299 (Kaeppli and Dondaine 1941, 85, 100, 112, 131–32). No other type of studium was ever assigned to Florence, not an arts school, not a philosophy school. Not even the priories in Rome, Santa Maria sopra Minerva and Santa Sabina, where Thomas’s idea had originated, were reserved exclusively for theology in the way Santa Maria Novella seems to have been. Santa Maria Novella was also consistently among those convents chosen to receive a cursor Sententiarum, the Dominicans’ more modest local equivalent of the universities’ bachelor of the Sentences, to work alongside the lector in its priory school—something only a very few convents merited. All this points to a growing tradition of specialization in theology at Florence, and made Santa Maria Novella an exceedingly likely
choice for the site of a new *studium generale* for Italy when the Dominican general chapter commanded the Roman Province to establish one in 1290.

The history of the implementation of the command to erect a *studium generale* was neither smooth nor immediate, complicated in part by the division of the Roman Province in two in 1296. This meant that a *studium generale* that had been created at San Domenico in Naples in the meantime no longer fulfilled its function as general house of studies for the Roman Province, being now the *studium* for the Province of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Evidence that the new, smaller Roman Province was working to create its own *studium generale* becomes tangible only around 1305. In that year the Roman chapter made a special assignment of four *studentes in theologia* to Florence and appointed a master of theology “as *doctor* in the Florentine *studium*.”10 That the chapter would assign theology students simply “to Florence,” and in a statute separate from any indication that a new, temporary provincial school was being organized at Santa Maria Novella, seems to imply that the Florentine *studium* had acquired a degree of permanence by 1305.11 That the Roman chapter was placing a master of theology in Florence seems at first blush to be equally significant.

As it happens, however, what is important about the assignment is not so much that Santa Maria Novella was now to have a master of theology as the manner in which the assignment was made. The mere fact that a *studium* was presided over by a credentialed master did not in or of itself make that school a *studium generale*. Newly licensed Parisian master Thomas Aquinas spent his first years back in Italy in a variety of postings as lector—as conventual lector at San Domenico in Orvieto, as head of the experimental Santa Sabina theology *studium*, and, later, as head of his last *studium* at Naples—but none of these schools was recognized as a general house of studies because of his presence. The crucial point about the Roman Province’s assignment of a master of theology to the *studium* in Florence in 1305 is the Roman chapter’s recorded testimony that it had been empowered to make the appointment “through a *commission made to us by the master of the order*.”12 The only reason the master general’s permission would have been necessary before a provincial prior and his chapter could
make personnel arrangements for a school within their province’s borders would be if the school in question were a *studium generale*. Provision for the lectorate in all the order’s general houses and assignment of all bachelors, as well as the selection of students, were reserved to the master of the order together with the general chapter, unless they chose to delegate that authority. This is exactly the kind of authority the Roman chapter appears to have been granted in 1305 by master general Emerico da Piacenza with respect to a new *studium generale* at Santa Maria Novella, and special note was made of it.

In 1308, 1309, and 1310 Tuscan students were deputed to “the *studium Florentinum*,” “to Florence,” “to the Florentine convent” — descriptions that all seem to allude to a permanent educational fixture that could be referred to simply by its locale. Then in 1311 the status of the *studium* at Santa Maria Novella is put beyond doubt. The general chapter that met in late May entrusted that year’s selection of lectors and bachelors for all the order’s studia generalia to the provincial priors and chapters of the provinces in which the *studia* were located. At its meeting a few months later the Roman provincial chapter duly recorded the decisions it had taken concerning the staff in their *studium generale* for 1311–12. Filippo of Pistoia was to be the principal lector “in the *studium generale* in the Florentine convent” and Pietro Nero would “read the *Sentences* in the *studium generale*” there. Santa Maria Novella had arrived. But there remains more than a hint that the truly significant date in the maturation of the *studium* in Florence was actually a few years earlier, around 1305, when that master of theology was assigned to Santa Maria Novella.

The master in question was Remigio de’ Girolami. He had been a teacher in his order for many years by the time he took up his post at the new *studium generale*. Remigio was himself a Florentine, and most of his early career was spent in a number of different teaching assignments at Santa Maria Novella. In 1273 we find him there as lector in the convent school; by 1289 he had been promoted to the lectorate in the provincial *studium theologiae* currently sited in Florence (Kaeppli 1963, 247; Kaeppli 1970–93, 3:297). Remigio left Italy to read the *Sentences* as a bachelor at Saint-Jacques some time in the late 1290s and was ultimately licensed as a master in theology by the command of the Dominican pope Benedict XI between late 1303 and
mid-1304. When the call came in 1305 to return to Florence as doctor for the Santa Maria Novella studium, fra Remigio was currently serving as conventual lector at San Domenico in Perugia, where the curia of a new pope, Clement V, resided before its move to France. Fra Remigio’s two surviving quodlibetal disputations may be the witnesses to his assumption of the magisterium in Rome and to this span of teaching apud curiam in Perugia that followed (Panella 1983; cf. Glorieux 1935, 352–53).

Remigio’s obligations to the pope may have made it difficult for him to come to Florence immediately, and the Roman chapter appears to have made allowance for this when it assigned him to the lectorate at Santa Maria Novella. Arrangements were made for fra Giordano da Pisa, the current lector at Santa Maria Novella to stay on and continue teaching in the event Remigio could not come straightaway. Giordano da Pisa did, in fact, act as lector in Remigio’s stead at the new studium generale throughout 1305 and perhaps the next year as well. Fra Remigio apparently remained in Perugia until the curia departed for the north and seems to have made his way to Florence only in the summer of 1307 (Panella 1983, 30–31; 1979, 222–23).

Much to the delight of those who would reconstruct his preaching and teaching, Remigio de Girolami collected his works in four large codices, which survive today in Florence’s Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale. A scribe was entrusted with the job of writing out the nearly 2,700 folios of text, but Remigio himself carefully edited the volumes, supplying his own marginal notes and corrections, as well as numerous cross-references between works and among the four codices. The first of the manuscripts, MS. Conv. soppr. C.4.940, contains a number of short treatises on a wide variety of subjects, including the De bono communi, which has attracted attention as a locus of fra Remigio’s political theories (Minio-Paluello 1956; Davis 1960; Sarubbi 1971; De Matteis 1977; Briacca 1978), and the De uno esse in Christo, published early in the last century because of its doctrinal similarities with the Christological writings of Remigio’s teacher at Paris, Thomas Aquinas (Grabmann 1924; 1925; 1926). Here, too, are the quodlibets that Remigio disputed at the papal curia in Perugia. The second manuscript, MS. Conv. soppr. D.1.937, is devoted to a lengthy, if incomplete, cycle of saints’-day sermons. The third, MS. Conv. soppr. G.3.465, contains
a series of disputed questions, organized alphabetically by subject, begin-
ing with “De angeli compositione” (Cavigioli and Imbach 1979). The fourth manuscript, MS. Conv. soppr. G.4.936, has traditionally been inventoried as another collection of sermon materials “de diversis materiis.” It also carries a few folios of poetry and another few that record Remigio’s thoughts on the legal force of the “admonitions” issued by Dominican general chapters.

What has garnered the most attention for this last manuscript, particularly among historians of Florence, is a series of special-occasion sermons that Remigio delivered at various public ceremonies. These sermons mark such moments as the handing over of the Florentine Signoria to Charles of Valois in 1301 and the welcome of various ecclesiastical and secular dignitaries to the city over the years. They show Remigio de’ Girolami at his rhetorical best and have done much to secure his reputation as a fiery declaimer about war and peace, papacy and empire, and good government in Florence (Salvadori and Frederici, 1901). But MS. G.4.936 also contains the text of the two principia of Thomas Aquinas, the lectures he delivered when he incepted as master of theology in Paris in 1256. Indeed, this is the only copy of Thomas’s principia that survives anywhere, and the manuscript has thereby assumed a different sort of significance for those interested in the career and teaching of the great Aquinas himself. Within the biography of Remigio de’ Girolami, however, MS. G.4.936 is a witness to Remigio’s access to texts from the Parisian inception ceremonies that marked the beginning of Thomas’s initial tenure as regent master at Saint-Jacques; it also points tantalizingly to the possibility that he studied directly under Aquinas in Paris, most likely during the man’s second regency, 1269–72. Remigio entered the Dominican order in Paris as a result of his encounter with the Preachers, and would himself be teaching theology at Saint-Jacques twenty-five years later, when he returned to Paris to serve as bachelor of the Sentences.

Less often remarked is a series of short works that fills folios 268va–345ra of MS. G.4.936 that Remigio identifies in an index he appended to the volume as “sermones prologales: super totam bibliam seu sacram scripturam seu super librum Sententiarum” (“introductory sermons on the whole Bible or Sacred Scripture, or on the book of the Sentences”). The most ancient descriptions of the manuscript com-
pletely obscure the existence of these “prologal sermons” in summary descriptions of the manuscript’s contents simply as “sermones de tem-
pore.” Later cataloguers, who were attempting to reconstruct the holdings of Santa Maria Novella after their dispersal following the Napoleonic suppression, identified the contents with more care, and noted the slightly different nature of these pieces compared to the other sermons in the codex. In some instances they even gave heed to Remigio’s own terminology, calling them “Prologi super Bibliam” (Taurisano 1924, 28 n. 1), simply “Prologi” (Grabmann 1924, 353–6228), or, in one instance, “opere scritturali” (Orlandi 1952, ad indicem; 1955, 285–307). But the most recent catalogue of Santa Maria Novella’s former holdings once again subsumes the “prologues” under a general rubric: “sermones de diversis materiis.” And few indeed have ever re-
marked that there are, as Remigio himself indicates, prologues in the group devoted to subjects other than the Bible.30

The sequence opens with sixteen “sermons” on the subject of theological science (fols. 268va–309rb). These include several commendations of Scripture; divisions of the sciences intended to show how sacred doctrine both embraces and transcends all other disciplines; a division of the text of the Bible itself; and a comparison of the work of the theologian and the philosopher. Lastly, there appears one piece that is perhaps best interpreted as a commendation of Peter Lombard and the Libri quattuor Sententiarum to complement the pre-
ceeding commendations of sacred Scripture. Of the sixteen, eleven appear to be Remigio’s own compositions,31 while the remaining five, the first five prologues in the series, carry rubrics indicating authorship by other friars. Thomas Aquinas’s two principia are here, given pride of place at the beginning of the sequence.32 These are followed by two sermons, one attributed to a friar Annibaldo (presumably the well-
known Thomist preacher Annibaldo Annibaldi),33 the other to an anonymous “Frater cuiusdam nomine.” Generally speaking, these introductions to theology are the longest pieces in the collection, ranging up to twenty-two manuscript columns in length.

A series of twenty introductions to individual books of the Bible follows (fols. 309rb–337ra). The coverage is selective. Remigio offers prologues to about half a dozen key books of the Old Testament—Job, Proverbs (two prologues), the Psalms, the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes,
and Ecclesiasticus. Two of the four Gospels are introduced—Luke and John (with two prologues apiece). And there is a sampling of other New Testament texts: the Pauline epistles are introduced as a group (in two different ways), as are the other canonical epistles (also in two different ways), with individual sermons for Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Hebrews. At half a dozen points in this series, Remigio has inserted sermons that adopt the same scriptural text as has just been used to introduce a book of the Bible to introduce in analogous fashion one of the four books of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*. In one instance, Remigio first constructs a prologue to Proverbs around the theme “Cum consumauerit homo tunc incipiet,” from Eccli. 18:6, “Once a man has finished, then he will begin.” This he develops into a conceit about how to have finished reading Proverbs, the third and final of the books of Solomon’s wisdom, means one begins to understand the nature of wisdom. There then follows a piece that shows how the same quotation can also serve as a springboard for introducing book 2 of the *Sentences*, after one has finished book 1.

This text was proposed the other day at the beginning of our lectures *de textu* and it can be not inappropriately taken up again at the beginning of our lectures on the *Sentences*. For last year we read the first book of the *Sentences*, but now we intend to read the second book; so it seems that “Cum consumauerit homo tunc incipiet” can truly be said about us. For, indeed, in the first book the Master of the *Sentences* offered a discourse about God, in it examining the unity of the divine essence in God, and the trinity of the divine persons, the proper nature of the notions regarding their relations, and the multiplicity of the divine attributes. “He is the consummation of our words,” as is said in Eccli. 43; and in Sap. 6 it is said that “To reflect upon this (that is, uncreated Wisdom or the deity) is the consummation of our understanding.” It is the same with the perfections of all genera, as the Commentator, in fact, says on *Metaphysics*, 5. Reading the first book of the *Sentences*, therefore, we are now familiar with a finished discussion, and, in a certain way, can be said to have finished. But now, being about to read the second book, we are about to become familiar with the discussion now beginning, and, in a certain way, we shall
begin. In the second book, in fact, the Master offers a discourse and a tract on creatures, and begins from the active principle of all creation, for “He who lives forever created all things together,” as is said in Eccli. 18. . . 35

Interspersed throughout the biblical prologues in this fashion are parallel prologues for each of the four books of the Sentences individually (fol. 311vb–312rb [book 2], fol. 312vb [book 3], fols. 314va–vb [book 1], fol, 318va [book 4]), as well as two prologues that introduce the Lombard and his text as a whole (fol. 322ra–rb and fols. 327va–328ra). These last are both divisiones textus, and both suggest a division of the text based on a consideration in Aristotelian terms of the fourfold causation of the Libri quattuor Sententiarum.

Fra Remigio is not finished with the Sentences, however. After he concludes his series of biblical prologues, with these insertions, he provides a sequence of prologues dedicated solely to the Lombard, with their own themata and a strictly independent content. Here can be found an additional introduction to book 2 (fols. 338rb–340ra) and another to book 3 (fol. 340ra–341rb), two further introductions to the material on the sacraments so important to the Dominican ministry found in book 4 (fols. 337ra–vb, 337vb–338rb), and a unique piece that is not so much an introduction at all as a concluding reflection “in fine Sententiarum” (fol. 341rb–vb).

Two more pieces bring the collection of sermones prologales to a close. Unheralded in Remigio’s index, but present in the codex is a pair of sermons on neither Scripture nor theological science, nor indeed on the Sentences. They carry the rubrics “Prologus super scientiam in generali” (fols. 341vb–344va) and “Prologus super librum Ethicorum” (fols. 344va–345ra). Both take as their themata quotations assumed from the writings of Aristotle rather than from Scripture, used in both cases as a way into a discourse on man’s pursuit of knowledge. As their titles imply, one is a more general exploration, while the other is designed to show the advantages of studying moral philosophy in particular.

A line from the Topics, “Omnia appetunt bona,” affords Remigio an opportunity to begin his more wide-ranging discussion “on science in general” with a tidy syllogism. All things seek their own good:
major premise. And minor premise: knowledge is universally recognized as a good, *simpliciter*, worth seeking in its own right. Therefore, it makes perfect sense to conclude, as Aristotle does in the *Metaphysics*, that all men naturally desire to know. If one looks more closely, there are three reasons this is so, Remigio explains. First, each thing naturally seeks its own perfection, and everything that is in potency is perfected only when it is reduced to act. Man, because he is a rational soul, is in act properly speaking only when he exercises his reason, and therefore he naturally seeks to understand. Second, each thing is naturally inclined toward its proper function, and the proper function of the human intellect, clearly, is to know. And, third, each thing naturally desires to be united with its source, with its own beginning, because in this will lie its perfection. The source of all our understanding—understanding being that through which man is truly man—is God, and we are united with God, and thereby perfected, through cognition and knowledge. Why is it then, Remigio asks, if it is such a natural proclivity to desire knowledge, that so many men make no effort to acquire it? He answers his own question by noting the many things—pleasure, riches—that men rightly perceive as goods to be desired, but mistakenly prefer to the greater good of pursuing knowledge, which alone will bring them to God. This said, Remigio outlines the remainder of his discourse, which, he says, will unfold in three sections. First, he intends to show that knowledge is, in fact, the greater good he claims it to be, by demonstrating that only through knowledge will one be able to possess the highest good of all, Uncreated Good, God himself. Next, he intends to show how one goes about actually acquiring knowledge. In Prov. 2:3–6, “For if you call upon wisdom and incline your heart toward discretion, if you seek it like wealth and dig for it like treasure, then you will understand fear of the Lord, and you will find knowledge of God,” Remigio finds implicit reference to the seven things necessary for successful study: prayer, faith, humility, desire, zeal, serious inquiry, and a willingness to communicate what one has learned. As a conclusion to his lecture, Remigio promises to offer a division of the sciences as an outline for the content of man’s study. This he does not do, however. All that is to be found of such an outline is a brief mention earlier to the effect that, within the realms of knowledge, theology is the most desirable
of the sciences because it allows immediate rather than mediated access to God—although Remigio grants that logic is a useful tool.

The Prologus super librum Ethicorum, a sort of encomium in praise of philosophy, then follows in the manuscript. Here Remigio assumes his thema from the Ethics itself, the text he proposes to introduce: “Videtur philosophia admirabile delectationes habere puritate, certitute” (“It seems that philosophy has amazing delights, with purity and sureness”). In a sermon on moral science that draws the majority of its auctoritates from the Philosopher himself, there then unfolds a short excursus on the delights that philosophy has in store for the student, and how those delights qualify as being amazing, pure, and secure.

This is the end of the “sermones prologales: super totam biblia seu sacram scripturam seu super librum Sententiarum.” Given that the collection closes with what seems to be an introduction in two parts to the discipline of moral philosophy, we are justified in inquiring as to the exact nature and purpose of these “prologal sermons.” To what are they prologues and where were they delivered?

I would suggest that what we have here is a record of the lectures with which Remigio de’ Girolami opened each school year at Santa Maria Novella. They show him beginning, first, with a general meditation on the theologian’s craft and then turning his attention, in a second lecture, to the specific texts he had chosen as the year’s subject. These “sermones prologales” are the annual introductions to the courses taught in a Dominican studium generale, modeled on the principium and resumptio lectures of the university.

A brief look at the syllabus of the Dominican studium generale in this period lends support to the proposition. Theology instruction in the order’s general houses of study assumed a more or less tripartite form. The principal lector in each studium presented the central lecture cycle, the ordinary lectures de textu on the Bible, focusing upon the most important issues in contemporary exegesis. The order required its lectors to cover the Bible at the rate of one book per year, although shorter books could be paired. Conversely, central texts such as the Gospels were sometimes stretched over two years. The men who led studia generalia were also required to lecture on one of the four books of Peter Lombard’s Sentences each year, as a framework within which the theological implications of Scripture could be examined,
albeit through a lens provided by Thomas Aquinas. Each lector also presided over regularly scheduled *quaestiones disputatae*, weekly it was hoped, on issues that arose directly from the lectures, and occasionally mounted as well the more wide-ranging quodlibetal disputations in which the order’s Thomism was put on very public display. Most Dominican *studia generalia* also had a *cursor Sententiarum* working under the lector. He was expected to cover the four books of Lombard’s work over a single academic year, in a series of simple and straightforward expositions of the text, known as “cursory” or running lectures. These ensured that students who were normally assigned to the *studium* only for a year or two would nonetheless hear all of the *Sentences*. In all this, clearly, Dominican *studia generalia* closely imitated the course that had evolved at the University of Paris. There was one big difference, however: where the Parisian schools and Oxford tended to have a *cursor biblicus* who worked alongside the *cursor Sententiarum* and offered cursory lectures on the Bible, Dominican *studia generalia* substituted a course in moral philosophy taught by the *studium*’s master of students, that is, the brother who functioned as tutor within the *studium*. The reason for the substitution is that Dominican *fratres studentes*, by the time they found themselves in a *studium generale*, would already have been exposed to several years’ worth of cursory lectures on the Bible—for that is what the classes in their conventual *schola* consisted of—and were therefore not seen to be in need of more of the same. Instead, from the beginning in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, their master of students was made responsible for presenting a cycle of lectures drawn either directly from the works of Aristotle or from Thomas Aquinas’s commentaries on Aristotelian ethics. Bible, *Sentences*, *Ethics*—that, in short, is the curriculum of a Dominican general house of studies.\(^{37}\) It is also precisely the coverage of Remigio de’ Girolami’s *sermones prologales*.

Other evidence that Remigio’s *sermones prologales* are actually schoolroom lectures survives in the form of numerous anecdotal references within the prologues themselves to Remigio’s habits as a teacher, to a previous year’s material giving way to a new cycle of lectures on a new text, to classroom practices and medieval pedagogical traditions. If we look again at the passage cited above to illustrate Remigio’s use of a single *thema* to introduce in parallel the book of Proverbs and
book 2 of the *Sentences*, for example, unmistakable allusions to the *studium*’s parallel cycles of ordinary lectures and *lectiones Sententiarum* are soon recognized: “This text was proposed the other day at the beginning of our lectures *de textu* and it can be not inappropriately taken up again at the beginning of our lectures on the *Sentences.*”

The meaning, furthermore, of “last year we read the first book of the *Sentences*, but now we intend to read the second book . . .” is unambiguous. Examples could certainly be multiplied where Remigio opens a “sermon” by reminding his listeners of the road traveled in the preceding year’s coursework. His prologue to 1 Corinthians begins with fra Remigio noting how his own year-by-year coverage of the Pauline epistles is following the order in which Paul himself wrote them: “Among the letters of the blessed apostle Paul the twofold letter to the Corinthians, to the exposition of which we propose to devote ourselves this year starting with the First Letter and continuing on in the same measure as it pleases the Lord to offer grace and courage, is placed immediately after the letter to the Romans, which, with the help of God’s grace, we finished reading last year.”

The Lord apparently offered a full measure of grace and courage, for the next prologue in Remigio’s collection finds him turning his attention to 2 Corinthians after the successful completion of his exposition of 1 Corinthians. “Last year, as you know, we brought to a close our exegesis of the First Letter of blessed Paul to the Corinthians; this year, however, with God’s grace aiding us, we are about to embark upon his Second Letter to the Corinthians.”

At the start of another prologue is found some indication of what happened when a particularly close reading of a text caused one year’s teaching to overflow into the next. In a second prologue to the Gospel of Luke, Remigio explains that he will lecture only briefly, since he is merely picking up where he left off with the Gospel of Luke the year before, and an introduction to a new cycle *de textu* is not called for. He takes as his theme the advice found in Eccli. 3:19, “Perfect your works,” “*Opera tua perice*,” finish the job. He also uses the schools’ terminology to distinguish his “ordinary” lectures, that is, the lectures scheduled for regular class hours as part of the curriculum, from the teaching offered *extraordinarie* or outside of class.
It is not my intention at present to offer a *sermo ordinarius* such as it is sometimes customary to offer at the beginnings of lectures, since I have already done this repeatedly, starting outside of class [*extra scolas*]. Nor indeed will I offer the extended lecture that is appropriate at the beginning of a book, since we are not really taking up a new book. But let this suffice for us at present, that we adapt the text proposed from Ecclesiasticus after a fashion to the continuation of the Gospel of blessed Luke, of which we read fifteen chapters last year.41

This also happens to be one of those points in the manuscript where Remigio records using the same theme to introduce his year’s work on the *Sentences* as well: “*Opera tua perfice, Eccli. 3*. This text was proposed the other day upon the continuation of our lectures on the Gospel of blessed Luke, which indeed can be not inappropriately taken up again in the continuation of our lectures on the *Sentences*. For at present it is incumbent upon us to read the fourth book, in which book the *Sentences* is completed and perfected. . . .”42

Some of the personal asides Remigio interjects tell the same tale of a man hard at work as a Dominican lector. Fra Remigio, in fact, refers to himself explicitly as a lector in his prologue to the Letter to the Romans, when he apologizes that temporary duties as prior of the Santa Maria Novella community had kept him from fulfilling his primary assignment as lector.43 He apparently functioned in both capacities at the beginning of the school year, until he gave in to the pressure, and another friar was found to assume his teaching duties. But Remigio, it seems, was not pleased that his replacement did not continue the cycle of lectures he had started, but shifted the students’ attention instead to another book of the Bible.

> “*Septimus angelus tuba cecinit et facte sunt uoces magne in celo dicentes factum est regnum huius mundi Domini nostri et Christi eius et regnabit in secula seculorum*” [*‘The seventh angel sounded his trumpet and there were great voices heard in heaven saying, ‘The kingdom of this world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever’’*], Apoc. 11.

Last year, as those who were then present know, I lectured upon only six chapters of the Letter to the Romans, because I was
occupied simultaneously in another office, being prior and lector at the same time until another lector could be provided; after which six chapters were read the other lector arrived, reading another book in a different way. Not wishing, as is my habit, to leave what I have begun unfinished, I have therefore proposed to begin our lectures this year from the seventh chapter of the aforesaid Letter. And hence I wanted to propose the above text, speaking as it does about a seventh thing that happened, which seems to be appropriate to our beginning.44

Whether Remigio meant to imply that the return of leadership of the school to him after the temporary ministrations of another lector is to be likened to the passing away of this world and the dawn of the kingdom of heaven is perhaps best left for others to decide. There is also one very interesting comment on the manner in which the Sentences was actually taught in Europe’s schools in this period, a comment on the order in which the books were normally taken up. In a prologue to book 4 of the Sentences, fra Remigio explains why it is standard procedure to read the fourth book immediately after the first book, and only then to backtrack to pick up the second and the third. The interrupted order, he explains, results from both pedagogical and pastoral considerations. The fourth book is easier than the second and third and thus can be approached more readily. The material it contains, about the sacraments, is of critical importance to both the laity and the practicing priest and should be especially emphasized. And—a reason probably not often adduced by secular masters of theology—by taking up the fourth book after the first, the Dominican teacher and his students will arrive at this material just in time for Lent, when it is particularly relevant and when the demands of the order’s ministry leave student-priests less time to attend lectures: teachers do well in this season to mark time in more familiar, less taxing, material.

“Quartus angelus tuba cecinit” [“The fourth angel sounded his horn”], Apoc. 8.

This [fourth] book of the Sentences, which, according to ancient custom should be expounded by us after the first book, is described for us in a threefold manner in the verse quoted. First,
it is described by numeric reckoning, hence “Quartus”; second, by its general condition, hence “angelus”; third, by the material of which its substance is formed, hence “tuba cecinit.”

Regarding the first it should be noted that just as it sometimes happens that there are certain things prior in the order of nature which are nevertheless posterior in the order of writing, so it happens that there are some things prior in the order of writing which are posterior in the order of lecturing, and vice versa. That certain things prior in the order of nature are sometimes written about later happens either because of a failing on the part of the writer, who for some reason or accident writes in reverse order (whether it is the one writer of various works or a different writer of another work) or because of a failing on the part of the listener, for whom there are things better known that are less well known in nature, as is clear in the first book of the Physics. It always behooves one to begin from things better known, because all doctrine and every discipline builds upon preexisting knowledge, as is said in the first book of the Posterior Analytics. And similarly that certain prior writings are sometimes lectured upon after others in the school-room can happen either because of the greater necessity of the posterior writing, or because of its greater usefulness, or because of the greater ease with which it can be understood, or because of the greater receptivity of one’s listeners. And for this reason the reading of the fourth book of the Sentences is placed before the reading of the second and third book: because it is more necessary to the faithful owing to the obligation to receive the sacraments; because it is more profitable owing to the administration of the sacraments; because it is clearer owing to the lesser difficulty of its questions; and because it is more opportune owing to the fact that clerics have less time for study at this time of the year. For clerics cannot attend classes so easily during Lent because they are occupied in administering the sacraments. And thus the first member is plain, namely, the numeric reckoning, hence “Quartus” . . .

It will be noted that, while in some of his prologues to individual books of the Sentences Remigio describes taking up a new book with each new school year, the pace implied here is the quicker one set by
the cursory lectures of a bachelor of the *Sentences* in a Dominican *studium generale*. Remigio is describing the *Sentences* being read “*integraliter*” in one academic year and a *cursor*’s reaching his midway point in the text by early spring. Clearly, then, we need to be a bit more exacting in our analysis of the manuscript. Remigio seems to have collected in his notebook lectures he delivered over the course of many, many years and while teaching in a variety of capacities. The prologue just quoted, for example, almost certainly dates to his span of teaching in Paris as *cursor Sententiarum*, the only time in his life that we know for certain he lectured cursorily. Others, which reflect the slower rhythm of magisterial lectures on both Bible and *Sentences*, probably belong instead to his years as principal lector in Florence’s *studium generale*. Just to complicate matters, however, some of the *sermones prologales* seem to record Remigio’s even earlier work as lector in the *schola* at Santa Maria Novella, or possibly in the provincial *studium theologiae* that operated there for a number of years. Remigio’s service as prior, to which he refers in his second prologue to the Gospel of Luke, for example, can be dated to 1293–94, a point in his career, before he had trained as *cursor* at Saint-Jacques, when he would have been considered qualified to run a conventual school or a regional *studium* (as he had, in fact, been assigned to do in 1289), but would not yet have been allowed to teach as a principal lector in a general house of studies. It was also a point in time when Santa Maria Novella did not yet house the province’s *studium generale* for Remigio to teach in. Indeed, the Florentine friars had that very year been asked to host another provincial *studium theologiae*, and it might well be there that Remigio offered his 1293–94 lectures. The argument remains, however, that Remigio de’ Girolami’s *sermones prologales* are indisputably a product of the lector’s *cathedra*, not the pulpit.

There are yet other marks of these *sermones* being schoolroom lectures. Persuasive without Remigio’s anecdotal evidence would have been the fact that many of the prologues offer an initial *divisio textus*, a division or general outline of the work about to be examined, such as was standard university practice when opening a commentary on a text. One favorite technique was to work outward from a consideration of the four Aristotelian causes that lie behind the work to be
examined. Remigio says as much in his prologue to the Pauline epistles:

As you have often heard when books are first taken up, it is customary to inquire concerning the four causes of the book about to be read, so that through them some general understanding of the book to be read may be had. I have therefore proposed a passage in which we can easily discover the four causes of the letters of blessed Paul and especially of the Letter to the Romans, which indeed falls first in the order of his letters to be expounded by us. I say four causes, namely, the efficient cause, the formal cause, the material cause, and the final cause. . . .49

Just how successful Remigio is at combining the two opening gambits, a reference to Aristotelian causation and a division of the text, can best be seen in his general introductions to the Sentences—a textbook that lent itself quite well to the exercise owing to its systematic organization. The final prologue super librum Sententiarum in generali in Remigio’s collection is a particularly good example. After making the requisite observation that God is the text’s principal efficient cause, as the source of its inspiration, while the Lombard, as its human author, is its instrumental efficient cause, Remigio finds his divisio textus resident within a consideration of the material cause, or subject matter, of the Sentences.

“Fundamentum . . . secundus saphirus” (“The second foundation was sapphire”).

The four causes of the book of the Sentences, namely the efficient cause, the material cause, the formal cause, and the final cause, are all touched upon in the proposed verse.

The principal efficient cause, the means of the work’s inspiration, is God, who is indeed noted in the word “Fundamentum,” since God has every manner of priority, and sureness, and support of other things. But the instrumental cause, the means of the writing of the work, was master Peter Lombard, bishop of Paris and master in theology. And this is noted in the word “saphirus,” since just as the sapphire is the jewel of all gems, so master Peter Lombard was the jewel of all those writing collections of sentences. For
only his book, in fact, is read ordinarie in the schools, even by masters in theology.

But the work’s material cause is also touched upon in the word “foundation.” In the first book is treated the Uncreated Foundation, that is, God, as regards the unity of essence and the trinity of persons. But in the second book is treated the created foundation, that is, the universe of all creatures, which indeed is understood as heaven and earth. The text in Psalm <88:12> is about this foundation: “Yours are the heavens, and yours is the earth; you have founded the world and its fullness.” . . . This foundation, insofar as its substance is concerned, does indeed have stability, according to that passage in Psalm <118:90>, “You have founded the earth and it endures.” . . . In the third book, however, is treated the Incarnate Foundation, that is, Christ, regarding which foundation is said in 1 Cor. 3 <11>, “For no one can lay any other foundation than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” In the fourth book is treated the renewed foundation and renovation, that is, the sacraments of the New Law, which undoubtedly have stability, since they will never be altered as the sacraments of the Old Law were, and because they confer the grace through which each one of us is made new. . . .

The formal cause is touched upon in the word “second,” since he himself was not among the first teachers, but among the second, who followed the sententiae of the first doctors, as he himself admits in the Prologue to the Sentences, saying “Bringing together in a concise volume the sententiae of the Fathers with their accompanying witnesses. . . .”

The final cause is touched upon in the word “sapphire” not only by reason of its heavenly color, but because by reason of its power against infirmities of all sorts, as was said before. Whence the Master says in his Prologue, “Offering recompense for the Samaritan’s labors. . . .”50

Not to be overlooked in all this is the fact that, in likening the Sentences to a firm foundation, Remigio also manages to mention that the Lombard’s text is the only foundational text lectured upon ordinarie in the schools by masters of theology, a practice in which Remigio was himself engaging even as he spoke.
Final precision can be added to the picture of Remigio de’ Girolami’s *sermones prologales* as opening lectures for the Dominican academic year by bringing our discussion of MS. G.4.936 full circle, or, at least, by turning our attention back to the beginning of the sequence of prologues in Remigio’s notebook, to the two “sermons of brother Thomas” that open the cycle. Although there are a number of different ways in which the prologues could be grouped—those on non-biblical texts being one of the more obvious—the most fundamental distinction to be made is, in fact, between the prologues that introduce individual texts and the prologues that provide more general considerations of the nature of sacred doctrine or the pursuit of philosophy or the glories of the Lombard. The significance of this distinction can be demonstrated by reference to those two *principia* lectures of Thomas Aquinas, delivered, as noted above, when he incepted as master of theology at Paris. The first of Thomas’s two lectures is a commendation of Sacred Scripture, such as university candidates for the *magisterium* were expected to make on these occasions. It is based on a passage from Ps. 103:13, “Rigans montes de superioribus suis, de fructu operum tuorum satiabitur terra,” (“Watering the mountains from their lofty heights, the earth is filled with the fruit of your works’”). In it, Thomas praises God for the gift of revelation that is Scripture, and likens the work of the teacher of theology, in mediating God’s spiritual wisdom to his students, to rivers that direct the course of the rains from above to enrich the soil. The second lecture should technically be called not a *principium*, a first lecture, but Thomas’s *resumptio*, the lecture he gave on the first day when regular classes resumed after the festivities of the inception ceremony. It takes as its theme “*Hic est liber mandatorum Dei et lex que est eternum; omnes qui tenent eam peruenient ad uitam*” (“This is the book of God’s commandments and the law that endures forever; all who hold fast to it will come to life everlasting”) from Bar. 4:1, which sets the stage for Thomas’s division of the text, the second showpiece required of new university masters on that first day of classes. Here Thomas formally introduces all the books of the Bible, grouping them according to the manner in which each instructs man about God’s law.

The primacy of place Remigio de’ Girolami gives to these two inaugural lectures in his notebook, positioning them before his own
introductions to the individual books of the Bible, suggests two things. First, it reveals a respect for Thomas Aquinas’s organization of material, certainly, respect for his understanding of the theologian’s work. But it also reveals the overall scheme behind Remigio’s prologues. The sixteen longer, more general commendations in his collection, among which Thomas’s sermons are located, were pieces he used as his own annual principia, as it were, to greet the term at Santa Maria Novella, while the individual introductions, with their clear commitment to providing divisiones textus, were Remigio’s equivalent to resumptio lectures, when he began lecturing in earnest on the year’s chosen text. In fact, we can see all three cycles that formed the syllabus in a Dominican studium generale represented in Remigio’s prologues, even if they hail from different periods in his own teaching. Principal lectures on the Bible are here, represented by commendations of sacred science and prologues to a number of separate books from both Old and New Testaments. Both cursory and magisterial lectures on the Sentences are here, represented by commendations of the Lombard and prologues to each of the four books of the Libri quattuor Sententiarum in turn. And here, too, are lectures on moral philosophy, represented by commendations of the capacities of human science and an introduction to Aristotle’s Ethico in particular. Remigio de’ Girolami’s sermones prolo-gales are a collection of lectiones de principio and lectiones de resumptione intended for the Dominican classroom. 

The full substance of fra Remigio’s lecture cycles does not appear in MS. G.4.936; these are only the annual openers. But such material is preserved in another pair of manuscripts, today in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence. Both MS. Conv. soppr. 362 and MS. 516 contain a copy of Remigio’s postillae on the Song of Songs. One, that in MS. 516, carries textual interventions and marginal corrections recognizable as being in Remigio’s own hand.52 “Postillae,” a term coined from the phrase “post illa verba,” “after those words . . . ,” were running commentaries, particularly on the Bible, which took up the text being considered virtually word by word and explicated it sequentially. After quoting a passage, a line, a few words, the commentator would provide an interpretative gloss, and then move on to the next few words, until the entire work had been explained. Many of the biblical commentaries that survive to us from
the Middle Ages in this form are actually the written, edited versions of classroom lectures. Remigio de’ Girolami’s postills on the Song of Songs, arguably, are just this, his only surviving full commentary, bearing all the hallmarks of original classroom presentation. But is that enough to connect it to Santa Maria Novella and the *sermones prologales*? As it happens, one of the prologues in BNCF, MS. Conv. soppr. G.4.936 is on the Song of Songs. And one way of proving that Remigio’s *postilla* are equally a witness to his teaching would be if there were some sort of family resemblance between prologue and commentary that might indicate a common context of production. Such a resemblance might also provide reflexive confirmation that the *sermones prologales* are indeed the first lectures in ongoing cycles of lectures *de textu*. In the event, the evidence is not far to seek, and there is much more than a similarity between the two texts. In fact, roughly the first three and a half columns in Remigio’s surviving commentary on the Song of Songs repeat his *Prologus super Cantica*. The prologue records the first lecture; the year’s *lectiones ordinariae* formed the rest of the commentary.

And if we look at the transition point between where the prologue ends and the commentary picks up and continues, we can perhaps detect a teacher’s awareness of the clock when his introductory analysis of authorial causation had run a bit long, and forced him to stop and leave his division of the text for next time. The Song of Songs is unique among the books of the Bible as an erotic poem whose burden of meaning resides not in the literal description of bride and groom but in its mystical reference to Christ and his Spouse, the Church. Remigio’s initial discussion of the formal cause of the Song of Songs therefore required him to spend quite a bit of time defining the four senses of Scripture, as well as the nature of metaphorical language. Then, when attempting to enumerate the many different ways in which the Church is described metaphorically through Solomon’s praises of his bride, Remigio got rather sidetracked by trying to identify who the wife of Solomon actually was—the Queen of Sheba? Abishag the Shunammite? Mandragora? Pharaoh’s daughter?—not to mention that there are various references in the Old Testament to Solomon’s having 60 or even 70 queens and up to 300 concubines. It is all very confusing, admits Remigio. But at the end of his prologue,
which is equally the end of the first section of the full commentary, he ultimately opts for the evidence in favor of Pharaoh’s daughter, with, it seems, only enough time left to refer ahead to the complexities a division of the text of the Song of Songs will entail and to dismiss his students.

And thus perhaps it would seem to suffice at present to say that Solomon speaks of Christ and his spiritual bride, and principally of the Church Militant, through the metaphor of himself and his fleshly bride, Pharaoh’s daughter—although for a metaphorical saying to be true it is not required that it was so, but only that it could be so. And this is seen more when pursuing a division of the text or the literal significance than when pursuing a division of the sense or the meaning, because the meanings may be almost counter-intuitive, as will become clear in our exposition of the book.54

Those are the last words of Remigio’s prologue super Canticum canticorum. But his Postillae super Cantica canticorum carry on with the prorogued diuisio textus, describing it as the real beginning of the exercise of expounding the Song of Songs. It probably represents Remigio’s first lectio ordinaria for the year.

At the start we can say that the book is divided into six parts, according to the six ways in which the bride describes herself in relation to her groom. For in the first part is introduced a bride who most ardently desires the arrival of her groom. In the second part, starting where it says “Dum esset rex” in the same chapter, she most assuredly affirms his presence. In the third part, starting where it says “Surge, aquilo, et ueni” at the end of the third chapter, she demands gifts from him with might and main. In the fourth part, starting where it says “Dilectus meus misit manum” in the fifth chapter, she remembers the favors bestowed upon her by him. In the fifth part, starting where it says “Dilectus meus candidus” in the fifth chapter near the end, she extols their mutual passion again and again, even though she has extolled it before. In the sixth part, starting where it says “Dignum dilectum meum ad potandum” in the sixth chapter, she delights herself completely
with him whom she had praised. Since it is true that those three
women were not the wives of Solomon, it makes for a metaphorical
congruence with those particular churches about which we will
speak in due course, and because of many other reasons that will
be adduced further on, in their places.

Yet, it may seem better to divide the whole book in four parts,
according to what was first suggested to us. . . .

* * *

There is much that could still be said about Remigio de’ Girolami
and the notebooks that recapitulate a lifetime’s work, much about the
actual chronology of his lectures, and much about the operations of
the schools of Santa Maria Novella at the turn of the fourteenth cen-
tury. But the basic significance of fra Remigio’s “sermones prolo-gales
super totam bibliam seu sacram scripturam seu super librum Sententi-
arum” should be clear. They are a record of the teaching of one Dom-
inican lector as he followed the demands of the syllabus his order had
devised for training its men in theology. Remigio de’ Girolami may
not have been Dante’s teacher, but he helped to prepare a generation
of Dominican friars for their work as preachers and confessors, and
teaches us about how he did it.

NOTES

1. Dante Alighieri, Convivio 2.12.7: “E da questo imaginare cominciai
ad andare là dov’ella [filosofia] si dimostrava veracemente, cioè ne le
scuole de li religiosi e a le disputazioni de li filosofanti. Si che in picciol
tempo, forse di trenta mesi, cominciai tanto a sentire de la sua dolcezza,
che lo suo amore cacciava e distruggeva ogni altro pensiero.”

2. See most particularly Emilio Panella’s latest conclusions in
“Nuova cronologia remigiana” (1990, 180–82), which demonstrate the
historical unlikelihood that Dante could ever have attended Remigio’s
lectures or disputations in person, as well as the fact that most of the
similarities between Remigio’s writings and Dante’s own are more appar-
tent than real, representing “indipendente rielaborazione da fonti com-
mini.” And as for the “disputations of the philosophers” Dante claims
to have attended being at Santa Maria Novella, one has to note that, first,
no philosophy studium ever operated out of Santa Maria Novella (see
above, pp. 144–145, and that, secondly, as Panella also observes, any lectures and disputations presented in Dominican schools, save those in theology, were closed to the public. Even the postulate that Dante may have read rather than heard Remigio falls to the ground: there is no evidence that Remigio’s writings circulated during his lifetime or Dante’s. Dante could certainly have absorbed the Christian Aristotelianism that figured in the Dominican sermons preached from the pulpit at Santa Maria Novella, however, and this more obvious channel of diffusion should not be overlooked.

3. This requirement was virtually as old as the order itself: the Dominican Constitutions in 1220 defined a canonical priory within the order as one that had a minimum of twelve friars, including a prior, and a lector to run the conventual school. See Constitutiones antiquae 2.23 (Thomas 1965, 358). That the course of the schola came to consist primarily in lectures and disputations on the Bible and the Sentences can be surmised from the order’s legislative prescriptions relative to conventual education, as well as from such things as Humbert of Romans’s description of the duties of the various officers within Dominican life, which include the conventual lector. The Dominican conventual curriculum has been reconstructed in detail in Mulchahey 1998, 130–218.

4. These provincial schools, their development, and curricula are the subject in Mulchahey 1998, chap. 4. See esp. pp. 336–37 for a discussion of the significance of the phrase “studium particularis theologiae,” in which the Dominicans introduced a new usage of the term “particularis” to connote not a regional school (the studium particulare of secular parlance), but a partial or specialized theology course that focused only upon the Sentences of Peter Lombard and the issues it raised, in contrast to the “general” theology curriculum of the order’s studia generalia, which covered both the Bible and the Sentences, that is, both exegesis and theology. See also see Mulchahey 1999, esp. 106–10; 1994, esp. 278–313.

5. See Kaeppeli and Dondaine 1941, 56 for the notice of the creation of four studia theologiae in 1281; and see the discussion of the early years of the Roman theology program in Mulchahey 1998, 348–50.

6. See Boyle 1982, who first drew attention to the connection between Thomas’s teaching at Santa Sabina and the genesis of the Summa theologiae. And see too my own elaboration of the thesis, in Mulchahey 1998, 278–336, which builds on Boyle’s work to suggest that the real project Thomas’s province set for him at Santa Sabina was to experiment with a course in theology that would be intermediate between that of the con-
ventual scholae and that of the order’s studia generalia. See, as well, Mark Johnson’s thoughts on the matter in this volume (chap. 9).

7. The Neapolitan convent San Domenico could claim a similar record of housing theology studia to the exclusion of other types of studia but as this priory passed from Roman jurisdiction in 1296 it was not meant to be included in the generalization made here about centers for theological studies in the Roman Province.

8. Five lists of conventual cursor Sententiarum assignments in the Roman Province survive from the thirteenth century, from 1287, 1288, 1292, 1293, and 1295. Florence was named in each of these instances to receive a cursor. See Kaeppeli and Dondaine 1941, 78, 84, 107, 112, 121.

9. The division of the Roman Province was undertaken at the request of Pope Boniface VIII, who was eager that the Dominican order’s administrative units in Italy more closely reflect current political realities. Regarding the division and its implications for the new Italian studium generale, see Mulchahey 1998, 385–86.

10. For the first assignment (Rieti, 1305), see Kaeppeli and Dondaine 1941, p. 155: “Assignamus studentes in theologia Florentie: frater Laurentium Viterbiensem, Iohannem de Petrorio, Egidium Perusinum et Angelum de Tulfis”; for the second, see 154: “... fr. Remigium magistrum in theologia ex commissione nobis a magistro ordinis facita assignamus in doctorem in studio Florentino, si autem ipsum illuc ire non contigerit, ex nunc ex tunc ponimus in eodem studio lectorem fr. Iordanum Pisanum.”

11. A similar indication of permanence had come in 1297 when the chapter committed to the Roman provincial prior the assignment of students to, and, if need be, their removal from, the “studium Florentinum.” See Kaeppeli and Dondaine 1941, 127: “Committimus priori provinciali de assignandis studentibus studio Florentino ac etiam de eodem, si expedientes iudicaverit, removendis.” This remains an ambiguous piece of legislation, however, because any implication it may carry for the unique, permanent status of the studium at Santa Maria Novella was almost immediately vitiated when Florence was once again told to organize a provincial studium particularis theologiae in 1299: no convent was allowed to host a provincial studium if it already housed a general studium, and hence Santa Maria Novella in 1299 apparently had not been rendered ineligible by the presence of a studium generale. The same reasoning applies when interpreting the evidence of the acts of the Spanish provincial chapter of 1299. Here, the province of Spain can be seen making decisions to send students to the “studium Florentinum”; see Hernandez 1983, 46, 65, and
66. But, again, Santa Maria Novella was meant to be running a studium particularis theologiae at the time. Was that the Spanish brothers’ destination?

12. See the wording in note 10 above.

13. These legal realities are explained fully in Mulchaei 1998, 352–78, esp. 372–78.


18. The events surrounding Remigio’s elevation to the magisterium have been reconstructed in Panella 1982a, 11–14. Remigio complains of the delays he encountered in receiving his license in a poem included amongst his Rithmi. See Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale (hereafter BNCF), MS. G.4.936, 406vb: “Ad urbem uocatur Remigium / reprobissum magisterium. / Set dum primum consistorium / sperat quo expediatur, / summus presul infirmatur, / mors succedit tumulatur, / Dictus super sic frustratur. / Fine quo erat uocatus, / qui non est ex hoc turbatus, / generale bonum ratus / et sequentis presulatus, / expectando gratiam. . . .”

20. The most recent and comprehensive catalogue description of these four codices can be found in Gabriella Pomaro’s census of manuscripts of Santa Maria Novella provenance today in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence and in the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana (1980, 366–69, 377–78, 422–23, and 425–27). But cf. Panella’s more detailed work (1979, 19–42) on such questions as identifying Remigio’s autograph and determining the order in which the codices were produced.


22. The principia were edited from this very manuscript. The edition appears in Mandonnet 1927, 481–90. See also the first preliminary study made of the two “sermons” in Salvatore 1912.

23. Remigio also refers to Thomas explicitly as “magister meus” at least once in one of his sermons, “Sermo VI, In octauo de beato Martino”: Conversatio nostra in celis est (in BNCF, MS. Conv. soppr. D.1.937, fol. 354vb): “Et quomodo rustici propter beneficia pretulerunt beatum Martinum beato Petro apostolo, ut lusorie referebat magister meus Thomas de Aquino. . . .” So the connection appears sound. It is Panella who posits that it was Thomas’s second Parisian regency that saw Remigio as his student (1979, 191–92 [Appendix II-b, “Remigio uditore di Tommaso d’Aquino?”], 208; 1990, 156–57). The possibility remains, however, that Remigio studied under Aquinas closer to home in Naples, 1272–73, during Thomas’s last year of active teaching before his death.


25. A reference by Remigio to his successor in the position of lector Sententiarum in one of the pieces in his notebooks, as well as a funeral sermon preached at the death of a French confere that also notes the
presence of a third brother as a novice at Saint-Jacques, all of whom can be identified, originally helped Panella to narrow the likely dates for Remigio’s service as bachelor of the Sentences at Saint-Jacques to 1297–99. See Panella 1979, 93–98 (Appendice II-c: “Quando a Parigi come bacceliere sententiario?”). He modified this slightly to 1298–1300 in his “Nuova cronologia remigiana” (1990, 204–208).


27. The earliest descriptions of the manuscript date from before the Napoleonic suppression and the dispersal of Santa Maria Novella’s library. For the first see Poccianti 1589, 55: “Alterum vero intitulatum est: Sermones temporum per totum annum incipiens a prima Dominica Adventus hoc modo. Induamur arma lucis. Rom. 13.” J. Quétrag J. Echard (1719, 507a) simply adopted Poccianti’s description in their article on Remigio de’ Girolami. Vincenzo Fineschi did no better (Florence 1790, 179–80), when listing the surviving works of Remigio: “[MS.] Num. 26 Sermones de Tempore. Princ. Induamur arma lucis, etc. [. . .] Cod. in foglio membranaceo di pag. 408.”

28. Most subsequent students of Remigio de’ Girolami have assumed their descriptions from Grabmann. See, for example, Castagnoli 1927 and Glorieux 1935, 352–53.

29. This is Pomaro (1980); see her elenchi of the contents of the manuscript as cited above, note 20.

30. Emilio Panella in his exhaustive studies of Remigio de’ Girolami is the one exception.

31. Only one actually carries a rubric identifying it as being Remigio’s own—“Sermo sextus. Fratris Remijii”; inc.: “Flumen dei repletum est aquis. Eximius propheta Daudid qui solius spiritus . . .,” which fills fols. 276va–278va. But the authorship of the first five sermons is consistently noted, something unusual in the manuscript, and it does seem to be the case that the rubric of this sixth sermon signals the return to Remigio’s own material.

liber mandatorum Dei, et lex que est eternum. Omnes qui tenent eam per-
uenient ad uitam, Baruch 4. Secundum Augustinum in 4 De doctrina
christiana, ‘Eruditus eloquens . . . .’

ad me omnes qui concupisicitis me et a generationibus meis implebimini,
Eccli 22. Inter cetera doctrinas christiane . . .’; fol. 276rb–va: ‘Sermo
quintus. Fratris Anidi’; inc: ‘Que uidi annuntiabo in sermonibus domini
opera eius, Eccli 43. Creaturarum consideratio et philosophis et theologi-
est communis. . . .’

Ecce descripsi iam scilicet sapientiam tibi trado in cogitationibus et scientiam
ut ostenderem firmitatem eloquia ueritatis respondens, Prov. 22. Ex ista auct-
oritate potest elici generalis diuisionis totius sapientie. . . . et a generationibus
mei implebimini, Eccli 22. Inter cetera doctrinas christiane . . .’

35. G, fol. 311vb: ‘Istud uerbum proponebatur altera die in principio
nostrarum lectionum de textu et potest non inconuenientur resummi in
principio lectionum nostrarum de Sententias. Nos et enim anno preterito
de Sententias legimus primum librum. modo autem intendimus legere li-
brum secundum, ita ut bene uideatur posse ueri
carri de nobis
Cum consu-
mauerit homo tunc incipiet.
In primo namque libro Sententiarum Magister
facit sermonem de Deo, disserens in ipso de diuine essentie unitate et de
duiinarum personarum trinitate et de relationum proprietatu notionum
et attributorum diuinorun multiplicitate. ‘Consumatio autem sermonum
ipse est,’ ut dicitur Eccli. 43. Et Sap. 6 dicitur quod ‘Cogitare de illa (id
est de sapientia increata uel deitate) sensus est consumatus.’ Ideo enim
 sunt perfectiones omnium generum, ut dicit Commentator super
quintum Metaphyce. Sic ergo legentes primum librum Sententiarum ser-
monem sumus usi consumato, et consumasse dici possimus quodam modo.
Nunc uero secundum librum lecturi sermone sumus usuri inceptiuo, et
quodam modo incipiemus. In secundo enim libro Magister sermonem et
tractatum facit de creaturis et incipit a principio actiuo totius creationis,
‘Qui enim uiuit in eternum creauit omnia simul,’ ut dicitur Eccli. 18. . . .

36. ‘Si enim sapientia inuocaueris et inclinaueris cor tuum prudent-
iae si quesieris eam quasi pecuniam et sicut thesauros effoderis illam tunc
intelleges timorem domini et scientiam dei inuenies.’

37. The Dominican studium generale syllabus has been reconstructed

38. See above, note 35.
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legendo opitulante dei gratia compleuimus anno preterito, inter epistolas beati Pauli apostoli immediate ordinatur duplex epistola ad Corinthios, cuius expositioni nos proponimus hoc anno intendere, incipiendo a prima epistola et prosequendo secundum quod domino placuerit uirtutem et gratiam ministrare. . . .

40. G, fol. 329vb: “Anno preterito, sicut scitis, nos explanando terminauimus primam epistolam beati Pauli ad Corinthios; hoc anno autem dei assistente gratia inchoaturi sumus eiusdem ad Corinthios epistolam secundam.”

41. G, fol. 318ra–rb: “Non est mee intentionis ad presens sermonem ordinarium facere quemadmodum in principiis lectionum interdum fieri consueuit, quia hoc crebro actenus feci, extra scolas incipiens. Nec etiam sermonem extensum faciam, qui libri principio congruat, quia nouum librum minime inchoamus. Set hoc nobis satis sit ad presens ut propositum uerbum Ecclesiastici ad continuationem euangelii beati Luce, de quo anno preterito 15 capitula legitimus, aliquatenus adaptaremus.”

42. G, fol. 318va: “Opera tua perfice, Eccli. 3. Istud uerbum altera die proponebatur in persecutione lectionis nostrarum de euangelio beati Luce, quod quidem non incongrue potest resummi in persecutione lectionum nostrarum de Sententiis. Nam quartum librum legere incumbit ad presens, in quo quidem libro Sententiarum perfectur et completur. . . .”

43. Fra Remigio served as prior pro tempore at Santa Maria Novella from June 1293, when his provincial chapter assigned him the task until election for a new prior could be made. The assignment is recorded in the Roman provincial acts for 1293: “Curam conventus florentini commitimus fratri Remigio lectori” (Kaeppeli and Dondaine 1941, 111 [Anagni, 1293]). Remigio himself mentions his new responsibilities in a sermon entitled “De prioratu, I”, inc. Iacta super Deum curam tuam et ipse te enutriet; non dabit in eternum fluctuationem iusto’ Ps. <54:23>, which also survives in G, fols. 361rb–362ra: “Sicut vos scitis, nos ad presens caremus priore sed ipsum in brevi habebimus, Domino concedente. Placuit autem, illis qui absolverunt priorem, curam huius conventus michi commictere in actis capituli provincialis; michi, dico, de commissione huiusmodi pertinent nichil scienti et omnimode ignoranti. Sed qualitercumque commissio facta sit incumbit profecto et expedit michi de memetipso nullam prorsus confidentiam habenti obedire verbo prophete qui dicit “Iacta etc. curam etiam,” id est tibia commissam. . . .”

44. G, fol. 324va: “Septimus angelus tuba cecinit et facte sunt uoces magne in celo dicentes factum est regnum huius mundi domini nostri et christi
eius et regnabit in secula seculorum,” Apoc. 11. Anno preterito, sicut sciunt illi qui tunc fuerunt presentes, ego, cum essum simul in alio officio occupatus, utpote simul existens prior et lector, quo usque de alio prouideretur lectore, legi sex capitula de capitolia ad Romanos, post que sex lecta capitula superuenit alius alterum alium legens librum. Ego igitur, nolens secundum consuetudinem meam imperfectum dimicere quod incepit, propusui a septimo capitulo predicte epistole nostras hoc anno incipere lectiones. Et ideo uerbum loquentem de septimo quod occurit et uisum est nostro conuenire principio proponere uolui. . . .”


Circa primum notandum est quod sicut interdum contigit aliqua esse priora ordine nature que tamen sunt posteriora ordine scripture, ita contigit aliqua esse priora ordine scripture que tamen sunt posteriora ordine lecture et e contra. Quod enim aliqua priora ordine nature interdum posteriori scribantur contigit uel propter defectum scriptoris qui propter aliquam causam uel occasionem prepostere scripsit, siue sit idem scriptor diuerse scripture siue sit alius et alius, uel contigit propter defectum auditorsi cui sunt magis nota que sunt minus nota nature, ut patet ex primo Phisicorum. A magis autem notis semper oportet incipere quia, omnis doctrina et omnis disciplina ex preexistenti sit cognitione, ut dicitur in primo Posteriorum. Et similiter quod aliqua prius scripta interdum posteriori legatur in scolis potest contingere uel propter maiorem posterioris scripture necessitatem, uel propter maiorem utilitatem, uel propter maiorem facilitatem, uel propter maiorem auditorum opportunitatem. Et propter hoc lectura quarti libri Sententiarum premiecti uidetur lecture secundii et tertii libri, tum quia est magis fidelibus necessaria propter sacramentorum obligationem, tum quia est magis proficua propter sacramentorum exercitationem, tum quia est magis plana propter minorem questionum difficultatem, tum quia est magis oportuna propter minorem clericorum in isto tempore occupationem. Clerici enim in quadagesima non ita possint audire, quia tunc magis circa sacramentorum exercitium occupantur. Et sic patet primum scilicet computatio numeralis, quia “Quartus.”

46. See, for example, the discussion of Remigio’s introduction to the second book of the Sentences, above, p. 151.
47. See above, note 43.
48. See above, p. 147.
49. G, fol. 320rb: ‘Caput eius aurum optimum, Cant. 5. Sicut frequentemer audistis in librornu inchoationibus, consueuit inquiri de quattuor causis libri legendi ut scilicet per earum cognitionem habeatur aliquais cognitio in generali de ipso libro legendo. Proposui igitur uerbum in quo satis possumus inueniire quattuor causas epistolorurn beati Pauli et maxime epistole ad Romanos, que quidem in ordine epistolorum eius primus nobis expondenda occurit. Quattuor inquam causa scilicet efficientem, formalem, materialem, et finalem. . . .”

Efficiens autem principalis et per modum inspirationis est deus, qui quidem notatur in ‘fundamento,’ quia Deus habet omnimodam prioritatem et firmitatem et alienum substantiationem. Causa uero instrumentalis et per modum scriptionis fuit magister Petrus Lombardus episcopus parisiiensis et magister in theologia. Et hoc notatur in ‘saphiro,’ quia sicut saphirus est gemma margaritarum, sic magister Petrus Lombardus fuit gemma sententias conscribentium. Solus enim liber ipsius in scolis ordinario legitur etiam a magistris in theologia.

Causa uero materialis etiam tangitur in ‘fundamento.’ In primo enim libro agitur de fundamento increato id est Deo et quantum ad unitatem essentie et quantum ad trinitatem personarum. In secundo uero libro agitur de fundamento creato id est de uniueritate creaturarum que quidem per celum et terra comprehenditur. De quo fundamento habetur in Psalm <88:12>, ‘Tui sunt celi et tua est terra orbi [ter.] et plenitudinem eius fundasti.’ . . . Quod quidem fundamentum quantum ad suam substantiam habet stabilitatem, iuxta illud Psalm <118:90>, ‘Fundasti terram et permanet.’ . . . In tertio uero libro agitur de fundamento incarnato, id est de Christo, de quo fundamentum habetur Cor. 3, ‘Fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere preter id quod positum est qui est Christus Ihesus.’ In quarto uero libro agitur de fundamento innovato et innovatione id est de sacramentis noue legis que nimimum stabilitatem habent, quia numquam mutabitur sicut sacramenta ueteris legis et quia conferunt gratiam per quam quis spiritualiter innovatur. . . .

Causa uero formalis tangitur in secundo quia non fuit ipse de primis doctoribus set de secundis qui secutus est primorum sententias sicut ipse fatetur in Prologo, dicens, ‘Breui volumine complicans patrum sententias, appositis eorum testimoniis.’
Causa uero finalis tangitur in saphyro non solum ratione coloris celestis set etiam ratione uigoris contra infirmitates omnium generum ut predictum est. Vnde et magister dicit in Prologo, ‘Laboris mercedem in samaritano statuentes. . . .’

51. See above, pp. 149–150 and notes 23 and 32.

52. Both are composite manuscripts of Santa Maria Novella provenance. MS. Conv. soppr. 362 (saec. xii–xiv) contains the following: Peter the Chanter’s Summa Abel, fols. 1r–72v; Bernardus de Papia’s Summa de matrimonio and Summa de electione prelatorum, fols. 79v–82v and fols. 73r–79v; anonymous sermons, fols. 82v–87v; Remigio de’ Girolami’s Postille super Cantica canticorum (rubr: Postille super Cantica Canticorum secundum fratrem Remigium Florentinum ordinis Predicatorum), fols. 88r–123r; and Nicholas of Lyra’s Postilla super Danielem, fols. 124r–160v. MS. Conv. soppr. 516 (saec. xii–saec. xiv) is a collection of three different commentaries on the Song of Songs: those of Egidio de Brago, fols. 1r–148v; Henry of Lexington, fols. 149r–220r; and fra Remigio, fols. 221r–268v. On Remigio’s autograph additions to MS. 516 see Panella 1979, 28–29. Also see the entries for the two manuscripts in Pomaro 1980.

53. A locus classicus for the study of the commentary literature of the Middle Ages is, of course, the work of Beryl Smalley. See her general studies The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (1952), which focuses upon Old Testament commentaries, and the complementary The Gospels in the schools, c. 1100–1280 (1985); but also see her more specific explorations, such as “Stephen Langton and the four senses of Scripture” (1931); “A commentary on Isaias by Guerric of St. Quentin O.P. (m.c. 1245)” (1946); and “Some commentaries on the Sapiential Books of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries” (1950).


55. Ibid.: “Possumus dicere quod liber iste in summa diuiditur in sex partes secundum sex respectus quibus sponsa se habet ad sponsum. In prima namque introducitur sponsa que sponsi aduentum ardentissime
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desiderat. In secunda, ibi *Dum esset rex in accubitu* capitulo eodem, ipsum presentem certissime affirmat. In tertia, ibi *Surge, aquilo, et ueni* in fine tertii capituli, ab ipso dona obnixe expostulat. In quaesta, ibi *Dilectus meus misit manum* infra capitulo quinto, ab ipso esse sibi collata grata commemorat. In quinta, ibi *Dilectus meus candidus* infra capitulo quinto circa finem, conuentement diffuse commendant, licet etiam prius commendauerit. In sexta, ibi *Dignum dilectum meum ad potandum* infra capitulo sexto, cum ipso commendato se plene delectat. Verum quia illas tres non fuissent uxores Salomonis facit ad metaphorice congruentiam secundum illas particulas ecclesias quibus agitur infra in locis preassignatis, necnon et propter plures alias rationes que adducentur infra in locis suis.

Melius uidetur librum totum diuidere in quattuor partes secundum quod primo dicebamus.
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Moral Philosophy and Dominican Education: Bartolomeo da San Concordio’s *Compendium moralis philosophiae*

CHARLES F. BRIGGS

The *Nicomachean Ethics, Politics, Rhetoric, and Economics* were among the last of the works either by or purporting to be by Aristotle to be translated into Latin during the Middle Ages. The *Ethics*, whose first three books were translated from Arabic and achieved some degree of circulation in the latter part of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, did not circulate in its entirety until Robert Grosseteste translated all ten of its books from the Greek in the late 1240s. The *Politics* and *Rhetoric* would have to await the ministrations of William of Moerbeke in the 1260s, while the pseudo-Aristotelian *Economics* began to circulate only at the very end of the thirteenth century, in the translation of Durandus of Auvergne. Taken together (and with the occasional admixture of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Magna moralia, De bona fortuna*, and *Summa Alexandrinorum*), these came by the early fourteenth century to constitute the set texts of the *studia moralia* of the arts curriculum. If, early on, they were the subject of particularly close scrutiny at Paris, where in the decades surrounding 1300 several commentaries and *quaestiones* appeared, similar activity can later be observed at centers of learning on the rest of the continent and in England. The excitement that attended the reception of these texts resulted in part simply from university scholars’ desire to study, compare, and harmonize the entire corpus of the Philosopher’s teachings. But the Aristotelian *philosophia moralis* also propounded stimulating and potentially disturbing positions: for example, that virtue and human happiness can be discussed without recourse to theology, and that life lived in the political community is not only natural but a

Despite such challenging issues, however, these texts were critiqued, absorbed, adapted, and put to work in the service of not only the studia artium but also those of law and theology as well (Gauthier and Jolif 1970, 111–46; Flüeler 1992; Miethke 1992; Bazán, Andújar, and Sbrocchi 1995). The Order of Preachers was no stranger to these efforts; and indeed was at the very forefront, thanks to the early commentaries of Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, as well as Thomas’s incorporation of moral philosophy into the secunda secundae of his Summa theologiae. Thomas, and his younger confère Ptolemy of Lucca, drew heavily on the Ethics and Politics when writing the Mirror of Princes which circulated under the title De regimine principum (Blythe 1997, 293–94). If Albert and Thomas pioneered the study of Aristotelian moral philosophy among the Order of Preachers, however, the Dominicans’ engagement with this aspect of the Aristotelian corpus seems to have increased significantly in the fourteenth century, in the wake of the order’s decision in 1314 to incorporate studia moralia into the curriculum of both its provincial schools of theology, or studia particularis theologiae, and its studia generalia (Mulchahey 1998, 333–36). Thus, in the 1320s two friars who had served as lectors in the studium generale at Bologna, Conrad of Ascoli and Guido Vernani, commented on and prepared compendia of Thomas’s Ethics commentary, while Guido also abridged the Politics commentary of Thomas and Peter of Auvergne and Giles of Rome’s exposition of the Rhetoric. Galvagno della Fiamma, who lectured on moral philosophy in the convent of San Eustorgio, Milan, prepared a brief commentary on the Economics during these years, and Milianus of Spoleto compiled an alphabetical index of extracts from the Ethics, perhaps while he was lector philosophiae at Arezzo in 1338–39 (Lohr 1967, 394, and 1968, 191–92; Kaeppeli 1970–93, 3:137; Mulchahey 1998, 335).

The incorporation of Aristotelian moral philosophical texts into the theology curriculum of the Dominicans, especially after the statute of 1314, no doubt ensured a solid grounding in these texts, and particularly the Ethics, for all Dominican lectors and magistri studentium. And these teachers, in turn, would have passed some of their knowledge on to the fratres communes in the conventual scholae. Given the eminently
practical goal of Dominican education to train preachers and confessors, one cannot help but wonder how Dominican teachers converted the mass of Aristotelian doctrine into some kind of comprehensible and usable form. Certainly, they did so through that combination of lectiones, repetitiones, disputationes, and collationes which Michèle Mulchahey has described in her study of Dominican education before 1350 (1998, 134–78, 194–203). Yet, when it comes to the matter of this teaching, one well may ask both if the Preachers relied on texts other than the Aristotelian originalia and these works’ respective commentaries in their quest to make sense and use of Aristotle’s lore, and to what extent the study of Aristotelian doctrine superceded or merely complemented that of the biblical, patristic, and classical Roman texts that had traditionally served as authorities in the field of moral philosophy.

These questions can be partially answered with recourse to the writings of Bartolomeo da San Concordio, one of the order’s most gifted teachers and preachers during the first half of the fourteenth century. Born in 1262 in San Concordio, Bartolomeo entered the convent of Santa Caterina in Pisa at the age of fifteen. He completed his studies at Bologna and Paris in the 1280s, after which he held several lectorships, at Todi, the Minerva in Rome, Santa Maria Novella in Florence, Arezzo, Pistoia, San Gimignano, and finally Pisa again, where he directed the studium in 1335 and remained until his death twelve years later in 1347. Famed in his own lifetime for his eloquent preaching and effective teaching style, it was said he “voluit semper futuros de utilibus informare” and that “non est apud nos, sive saecularibus sive ecclesiasticis disciplinis, quem non sciverit et . . . esset eius memoria quasi quoddam armarium scripturarum.” In more recent times, he has been praised by Italian scholars as a precocious humanist and volgarrizatore, because of his having written commentaries on Vergil and Seneca and translated Sallust into his native Tuscan dialect. Bartolomeo’s tendencies as a classicizer and vernacularizer are also displayed in his collection of patristic, classical, and biblical extracts, the Documenta antiquorum, a work that he himself translated into Italian as the Ammaestramenti degli antichi. However, he was best known in the later Middle Ages for his alphabetized confessor’s manual, the Summa de casibus conscientiae, a work that circulated widely.

Insofar as they helped “the friars translate the learning of the schools into everyday preaching and into moral instruction for penitents” the *Documenta antiquorum* and *Summa de casibus* can be classified as works of Dominican education (Mulchahey 1998, 398); still, it is fair to say that these were not, strictly speaking, classroom texts, but manuals. However, a much less studied work that is ascribed to Bartolomeo, the *Compendium moralis philosophiae*, may bring us closer to the way moral philosophy was taught in the Dominican *studia* of the early fourteenth century. To date, eleven surviving copies of the *Compendium* have been identified. These are (with their sigla):

- **B** Bologna, Bibl. Universitaria, MS 1512 (759), fols. 1–25v (s. xiv²)
- **E** Escorial, MS d.III.2, fols. 1–71 (s. xviⁿ)
- **F** Florence, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana, MS Ashburnham 103 (176–108), fols. 1–39 (s. xiv¹)
- **M** Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., MS clm 28818, fols. 141–158v (s. xiv²)
- **Po** Palermo, Bibl. Nazionale, MS I.D.1, fols. 111–138 (s. xv)
- **Ps¹** Paris, Bibl. nationale de France, MS lat. 2191, fols. 201–230v (s. xv)
- **Ps²** Paris, Bibl. nationale de France, MS lat. 6466, fols. 1–35 (s. xivmed)
- **S** Szczecin, Wojewódzka i Miejska Bibl., MS 8, fols. 115–145 (s. xiv)
- **T** Troyes, Bibl. municipale, MS 2137, fols. 76v–144v (s. xiv)
- **V** Vatican, Bibl. Apostolica, MS Urb. lat. 1007, fols. 3–76v (s. xiv)
- **W** Wertheim a. M., Evangelische Kirchenbibl., MS 672, n. 5 (s. xv)

The comments that follow are tentative, since thus far I have personally inspected only the three manuscripts in French libraries, while
having had to rely on catalogue descriptions and the word of Kaeppeli
for the remainder. Nevertheless, enough evidence has come to light to
allow some preliminary observations. The eleven known surviving
copies comprise at least three major recensions, one being represented
by \( F, Ps^2, T \), and possibly \( E \) (Recension 1); another by \( B \) and \( V \) (Re-
cension 2); and another by \( Ps^1 \) (Recension 3).\(^2\) Any judgment as to
how \( M, Po, S, \) and \( W \) fit into or modify this schema must await
their examination at first hand.\(^3\) Bartolomeo’s authorship is virtually
certain, as at least three copies (\( F, Po, \) and \( Ps^2 \)), all in Italian hands
and in the cases of \( Po \) and \( Ps^2 \) possibly dating from his lifetime, credit
him with having composed the \( Compendium \). At least two of the other
eyearly manuscripts, \( V \) and \( B \), are in Italian hands as well, while \( B \) is
of certain Dominican provenance, having belonged to the Bolognese
convent of San Domenico Maggiore.\(^4\) The close correspondence of
several of the glosses in the \( Compendium \) with those found in the \( Doc-
umenta antiquorum \) also lends weight to Bartolomeo’s authorship. Sec-
ond, the medieval dissemination of the \( Compendium \) both within Italy
and in France, Germany, and Spain not only witnesses to a relatively
high level of popularity for a text of this kind, but also suggests the
possibility of its having been spread via the agency of a group with
international ties, like one of the mendicant orders. Taken together,
then, the \( Compendium \)’s likely authorship by a Dominican famed for
his commitment to teaching in the schools of his order, its earliest
circulation in the general vicinity of where he lived, and its fairly rapid
movement north into France and Germany provide good circumstan-
tial evidence for its having been originally destined for use in the
Dominican schools.

The \( Compendium \) is not, as its title might lead one to assume, an
abridgment of Aristotle’s \( originalia \); rather, it “contains,” as the pro-
logue of Recension 1 puts it, “some things that are taken, more accord-
ing to sense than word-for-word to avoid prolixity, from a certain
book which is called \( On the rule of princes \).” Nor is this “book on the
rule of princes” the \( De regimine principum \) of the Dominicans Thomas
Aquinas and Ptolemy of Lucca, as Cesare Segre has incorrectly sup-
posed in his entry on Bartolomeo in the \( Dizionario biografica degli
italiani \) (1960–2003, 768–70). Rather, it is the \( De regimine principum \)
that the Augustinian friar Giles of Rome composed around the year
1280 for Philip the Fair of France. Bartolomeo’s decision to employ Giles’s *De regimine* conformed to what was already becoming a common practice, first at Paris and then in other *studia* around Europe: namely, the use of the *De regimine* as one of the chief ancillary texts of the moral philosophy portion of the arts and theology curricula. Already by the early decades of the fourteenth century, the *De regimine* was circulating in several *pecia* versions, all probably of Parisian origin, while as early as 1304 the text is listed among the books of a Parisian university stationer (Briggs 1999, 13–19, 91–107). Although it is possible that Bartolomeo learned of the *De regimine* during his studies at Saint-Jacques in the 1280s, this seems a trifle early, given the *De regimine*’s date of completion. More probably he came to know of it a bit later while teaching in Italy, either by way of his confreres at Paris or through one of the several copies that had been produced in Italy by the 1320s.

Thanks to both its form and its content, the *De regimine* lent itself to the study of moral philosophy. To begin with, it was comprehensive, combining many of the key subjects found in the *Ethics* and the *Politics*, as well as in the *Rhetoric*, a work whose applicability to moral philosophy was well appreciated. It also drew heavily upon the *De re militari* of Vegetius, a text that came to be studied in connection with the *Politics*. Moreover, it reorganized the information of its authorities to conform to Aristotle’s own taxonomy of moral philosophy into the rule of the self (ethics), the household (economics), and the state (politics), while simultaneously redirecting many of their arguments to conform to his and his intended audience’s Christian and aristocratic ideological expectations and practical needs: for example, the rejection of the practice of usury because of its inherent sinfulness, the preference for hereditary and largely unfettered kingship and for territorial states over the mixed constitution of the city-state preferred by Aristotle. In short, not only did the *De regimine* counsel the would-be perfect prince, but it also subjected the doctrine of the prince of pagan philosophers to the service of later medieval Christian morality (Briggs 1999, 9–13).

As useful as the *De regimine* seems to have been, however, its very comprehensiveness, not to mention its author’s exhaustive treatment of subjects (resulting in a work of some 155,000 words), led several of
its readers to modify the text in various ways in order better to suit their particular needs (Briggs 1999, 116–45). This certainly seems to have been the case with Bartolomeo, who radically pared down the original, while further reorganizing its contents and changing the headings of its chapters in order better to reflect the import of their now modified contents. The length of the resulting abridgment amounts to a bit less than one-seventh of its original. As for the Compendium’s structure, Recension 2 respects De regimine’s major divisions into three books—devoted in turn to the rule of the self, of the household, and of the state—as well as the subdivision of these books into parts (four parts, three parts, and three parts respectively), whereas Recension 1 is divided into ten parts; Recension 3 ignores both major levels of division, keeping only the minor division, into chapters, which it numbers consecutively throughout the work. In all three recensions, moreover, considerable modification occurs at the chapter level. Given its shorter length, it comes as no surprise that the Compendium has fewer chapters than its main source. Thus, in comparison to the De regimine’s preface plus 209 chapters, the Compendium totals between 142 chapters (Recensions 1 and 3) and 145 chapters (Recension 2).

Usually, indeed in 109 cases, chapters in the Compendium correspond to those in the De regimine. In eleven instances, however, the Compendium dedicates two or three of its chapters to a single one found in the De regimine. Thus, for example, in the Compendium’s second part, entitled “De viciis et virtutibus,” chapters 5 through 7 cover chapter 13 of De regimine’s book 1, part 2. This rather long chapter in the De regimine, which is headed “What bravery is, and what it is concerned with, and how we can make ourselves brave,” is broken down by Bartolomeo into chapters headed, “Concerning those who are too fearful or too bold,” “That the perils of war are more difficult than others,” and “That it is harder to sustain an attack than to be an attacker.” Here Bartolomeo respects the order of Giles’s narrative, but breaks it down into discrete units. The same strategy is applied to the thirteenth chapter of De regimine’s book 2, part 2, entitled “How youths ought to behave themselves in play, how they ought to control the movements of their bodies, and how they should dress.” Again the Compendium effects a tripartite division, with chapters headed “The necessity of play,” “Discipline regarding activities,” and “Clothing.”
Sometimes, on the other hand, Bartolomeo collapses two or more chapters in the *De regimine* into one of the *Compendium*’s. Usually, this is a fairly simple matter of taking two closely related chapters and combining them in the same narrative sequence as they occur in *De regimine*. In two instances, however, the order of chapters is changed. Both occur in the last part, which is devoted to warfare. In the first, the *Compendium*’s chapter 8, “Precautions that should be taken by an army” is a combination of *De regimine*’s chapters 8, 11, 10, and 9, in that order, whose titles, respectively, are “That it is useful for an army to construct ditches and fortified encampments, and how fortified encampments should be constructed, and which things should be considered when building these encampments”; “Which precautions a general should take so his army is not harmed while on the march”; “That in wars it is useful to bear banners, and to appoint generals and officers”; and “Which and how many things need to be considered in a war, if it has been determined that a public war [that is, *publica pugna*] should be undertaken.” In the second instance, the *Compendium*’s chapter 10, entitled “How to stand and fight,” combines the *De regimine*’s chapter 15 (“How soldiers ought to stand if they desire to strike the enemy, and how they ought to surround them, and how they ought to withdraw from battle if the conditions are not propitious”) and chapter 13 (“That all those who slash with their swords are worthy of derision, and that it is preferable to stab”).

As has already been mentioned, Bartolomeo excised or contracted the matter of his source considerably. Yet in some cases these excisions are much more radical than in others. The most extreme paring has been performed on *De regimine*’s first and third books, especially on book 1, parts 2 and 3, which treat of the virtues and vices, and of the passions, and on book 3, part 2, whose subject is the rule of the state in peacetime. In those same books, however, the fourth part of book one, on the character of youths, old men, rich men, and powerful men, has been preserved in considerable part, while book 3, part 3, on warfare, has also fared pretty well. The second book, on the rule of the household and family, has been given the most generous treatment, especially its second part, on child rearing, and third part, on managing the household. The first part, on marital relations and the character of women, has, however, fared less well, though Bartolomeo has
managed to preserve quite a lot of Giles’s (and Aristotle’s) counsel on how to have healthy male babies, not to mention a fair bit of anti-feminist diatribe. Bartolomeo’s decision to excise so much material on the virtues, vices, and passions is somewhat surprising, not only because this is the matter that seems to conform most closely to our expectations of precisely what is “moral” about moral philosophy, but also because it conflicts with the other evidence of how moral philosophy was studied in the schools. The lion’s share of Aristotle citations in book 1, parts 1 through 3 of the De regimine is taken from the Ethics, which was the most studied of Aristotle’s books of moral philosophy. Moreover, copies of the Ethics tend to have more annotations than those of the other works, while other abridgments of the De regimine, as well as of Aristotle’s moral philosophical works, tend to devote the most space to the Ethics. And yet it is precisely those parts of the De regimine that rely more heavily on the Politics and Rhetoric, as well as on Vegetius, that are accorded the most attention in the Compendium, while those parts derived from the Ethics get considerably less. Perhaps this was because Bartolomeo felt it would be otiose to rehash material that his confreres could find more than adequately treated in Aquinas’s Ethics commentary (and perhaps the Bolognese abridgments thereof by the Dominicans Guido Vernani and Conrad of Ascoli) and the secunda secundae of the Summa theologica.8

Bartolomeo has not only abridged his source, however; he has also amplified it by adding, according to Recension 1, “certain sayings of others, placed to one side, in the manner of glosses.” This is expressed a little differently in Recension 2, which says “Because this book has been produced by abstracting, on account of this Seneca in his 84th letter to Lucilius persuades [us] that in the doing of these things we ought to consider separately whatever we have gathered together from diverse reading, for it is better that individual things be separated.”9 The glosses in the Compendium number just over 150, and are drawn from a wide array of biblical, patristic, classical, and medieval sources, the favorites being Aristotle, Seneca, Jerome, Ecclesiasticus, and Cicero, while citations from Gregory the Great, Augustine, Proverbs, and Horace also appear frequently. He also quotes “frater Thomas” on three occasions: once from Aquinas’s own De regimine principum and twice from the prima secundae of the Summa theologica. The heaviest
glossing occurs in the sections on passions and the rearing of children (especially the sections on education and girls) and wherever the subject of counsel is discussed. Throughout the Compendium, Bartolomeo has also added several citations from Aristotle’s works not found in the De regimine, while in the section on warfare, he has bolstered Giles’s citations of Vegetius with a number of others from the same source. Usually these glosses are included by way of amplification or explanation, especially when it means adding exempla and similitudines, perhaps with an eye to providing matter for sermons.

Occasionally, however, Bartolomeo displays a critical attitude toward his main source. For example, where Giles lists mildness among the six irascible passions at the beginning of book 1, part 3, Bartolomeo counters with a gloss saying “Here Thomas disagrees with Giles on two points: first, because Giles says there are six irascible passions, whereas Thomas says there are only five, not counting among them mildness; second, because Giles says in this chapter that anger and mildness are opposites but Thomas, that nothing of anger properly speaking is contrary.” Again, where Giles in chapter 7 of book 2, part 2 credits philosophers with having invented Latin so that they might have an “idiom so broad [latum] and copious that through it they could sufficiently express everything they thought of,” Bartolomeo glosses the word Latinum (which Giles has quite absurdly etymologized as being derived from latum) as follows: “Rather, Latin derives its name, as it so happens, from the kingdom of the Latins, which takes its name from King Latinus, the son of Faunus, as Augustine says in . . . the City of God; for if Latin was so called because of its breadth, it would follow that Greek would be called Latin, on account of its greater breadth and abundance.” And when at the end of that same book, Giles recommends that his De regimine be read aloud to princes and nobles as they dine, Bartolomeo says that while he agrees with Giles that diners should keep quiet and listen to elevating readings, as Augustine prescribes in his Rule, he cautions his own brethren to avoid imitating Giles, never advertising their own works, presumably because doing so smacks of pride, but rather keeping them secret.

There remains the issue of the Compendium’s probable date of composition. If Bartolomeo compiled the Compendium as a classroom
text, as has been suggested in this essay, then 1314, the year of the
Dominican general chapter’s decision to incorporate moral philosophy
into the curriculum of its provincial schools of theology, or studia
particularis theologiae, seems a likely terminus post quem, and Kaeppeli
assigns it a terminus ad quem of 1323 (though he provides no explana-
tion for this). This seems as apt a dating as any, since Bartolomeo
seems to have been busy with the Documenta antiquorum/Ammaestra-
menti degli antichi and the Sallust translation during the first decade
of the century, while the writing of the Summa de casibus conscientiae
may have occupied much of his free time during the 1330s, given its
completion date of 1338. As for which recension or recensions of the
Compendium Bartolomeo had a hand in compiling, this too is matter
for speculation. From what I now know of the manuscripts and their
texts, I am tempted to think that Recension 1 represents the Compen-
dium’s original form. As already mentioned, two of this recension’s
manuscripts ascribe the work to Bartolomeo and may have been com-
pleted before his death in 1347. Then there is the matter of the glosses.
In this recension they are placed in the margins and give incomplete
citations (names of authorities only, without specifying works or loca-
tions within works), thereby suggesting not only that they were added
after the original composition of the De regimine abridgment but also
that they were quoted from memory. Recension 2 seems instead to be
a revision, with the glosses now incorporated into the text space and
full citations given to authorities and their works. Perhaps Bartolomeo
prepared Recension 1 as a kind of study aid for collationes, the informal
afternoon discussions between teacher and students of topics earlier
treated in lectures on the set texts of the curriculum; then either he or
someone else subsequently spruced this up into the form of Recension
2. Recension 1 clearly made its way to France, since T is in a French
hand and the fifteenth-century inscriptions in Ps² look to be French.
It was this version that served as the exemplar for Recension 3 in Ps¹,
which contains the abridgment of the De regimine shorn of the accom-
panying glosses.

Modern scholarship has tended to represent Bartolomeo in the
guise of a pre-humanist, because of his interest in the classics, and as
an early champion of the Italian vernacular (Segre 1974, 49–78; Mag-
gini 1952, 41–53). Yet the Compendium, like his confessor’s manual, the
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Pisanella, presents a picture of Bartolomeo very much in keeping with the characterization of him, in the Chronica of his home convent of Santa Catarina in Pisa, as a teacher and preacher, forever concerned about the education of his brethren and the future of his order. When Bartolomeo is seen in this light, his use of the classics in the Compendium and the Documenta Ammaestramenti looks less like that of the later humanists and more like that of his English contemporaries, the classicizing friars of Beryl Smalley’s English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century (1960), Thomas Waleys, O.P., and Robert Holcot, O.P., or indeed of the slightly earlier Franciscan, John of Wales, studied by Jenny Swanson (1989). Smalley knew nothing of Bartolomeo, and so assumed that the interests of the English friars were not shared by their Italian contemporaries (1960, 280–98). But I think she would have agreed that Bartolomeo was just such a classicizer, though perhaps one of slightly greater sophistication. As for Bartolomeo’s vernacularizing, I see this less as evidence of a proto-Renaissance humanist trying to break free of the constraints of medievalism than as simply a sign of the lengths to which a Dominican friar was willing to go to educate and care for the souls of his confreres and of a non- or semi-Latinate laity. Indeed, one could argue that Bartolomeo was a conservative, wanting to preserve an earlier form of moral philosophy, based on the Roman auctores, especially Cicero and Seneca, and on the Fathers. And in this, it seems to me, he had much company at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Witness, after all, the classicizing friars, just mentioned, as well as the popularity during these years of various florilegia of classical and patristic authorities, such as, for example, the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland (Rouse and Rouse 1979). Consider also the work of Bartolomeo’s contemporary, the Dominican Luca Mannelli, who, in the 1340s, wrote a treatise on virtue derived from Aristotle, Cicero, and St. Thomas, which he dedicated to his aristocratic patron, Bruzio Visconti, and entitled Compendium moralis philosophiae, perhaps in imitation of Bartolomeo. In hindsight, all these works appear to be harbingers of the Renaissance (and, in a sense, so they were), but when it comes to the chief motivations of their compilers, it may be more appropriate to see these works as attempts to make better sense and use of the new Aristotelian moral philosophy by combining it with the old.
NOTES

1. This characterization is found in the *Chronica antiqua conventus Sanctae Catharinae de Pisis, Archivio Storico Italiano* ser. 1, vol. 6, pt. 2 (Florence, 1845), as quoted in Pellegrini 1999, 129–31.

2. The first and third recensions are entitled *Compendium moralis philosophiae*, whereas the second is entitled *De regimine principum*.

3. There are no printed catalogues of the Szczecin and Wertheim manuscripts, nor are any unprinted descriptions included in Cranz 1987. And although Kristeller (1983, 731) partially describes W, he neglects to mention the *Compendium* among its contents. The available descriptions of M and Po fail to include text incipits.

4. For B and V, see Del Punta and Luna 1993, 49–54, 102–108.

5. “Incipit compendium moralis philosophie. Libellus iste continet quaedam que assumpta sunt de quodam libro qui dicitur de regimine principum, magis quidem secundum sentenciam quam secundum verba, propter prolixitatem vitandam, additis nichilominus quibusdam aliorum dictis, que quasi loco glosarum separati sunt posita. Appellatur autem liber iste compendium moralis philosophie, et dividitur in decem partes ut in processu patebit” (Ps², fol. 1; T, fol. 76v). There is no modern critical edition of the Latin *De regimine*. I have used the 1556 Rome edition.


7. The following discussion of chapters is based on the text in F/Ps²/T.

8. R. A. Gauthier, in his introduction to Aquinas’s *Ethics* commentary, lists 13 surviving and 3 lost copies of Guido Vernani’s abridgment, and 3 lost copies of Conrad of Ascoli’s (1969, 37*–44*).

9. “Quia liber de abstracione [sic] est, ideo ad eas faciendas inducit Seneca, epistola 84 ad Lucillum [sic], dicens: quicumque ex diversa lectione conessimus, separare debemus” (B, fol. 1). V (fol. 3) erroneously cites Seneca’s 64th *Epistula*.

10. “LATINUM: forte verius dicitur latinum a Latinorum regno quod quia sic dictum est a Latino rege Fauni filio, ut Augustinus dicit xxviiij [recte 18] De civitate dei; nam si latinum dicitur quia latum, sequeretur quod grecum magis esset latinum, cum magis latum et habundans sit” (Ps², fol. 13v).

11. “Vel etiam ad mensam legetur liber De regimine principum ut ipsi principantes instruerentur qualiter principari debeant et alii edocer-
entur quomodo est principibus obediendum” (De reg. princ. bk. 2, pt. 3, ch. 20).

12. “De regimine: Hoc verbum dixit auctor illius libri quod potest credi dictumuisse propter eruditionem, sicut et Augustinus regula sua legi mandavit. Forte autem nos hoc imitari non debemus sed opera nostra summo studio celare” (Ps², fol. 21v).

13. See above, note 1.

14. The Latin original survives in a single manuscript, Paris BnF lat. 6467. It was also translated into Italian. On Mannelli, see Kaeppeli 1970–93, 3:89–90; Smalley 1960, 288–89.
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