

**APOCALYPTIC ASCETICISM: COMPLETING THE  
EDITION OF ALEXANDER MINORITA'S EXPOSITIO IN  
APOCALYPSIM AS IT IS FOUND IN CAMBRIDGE,  
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, MM.5.31**

BY MAGDA HAYTON AND ROBERT L. J. SHAW

*The Expositio in Apocalypsim by Alexander Minorita (also known as Alexander of Bremen, d. 1271) is the earliest complete mendicant Apocalypse commentary. It has been noted for its highly chronological interpretation of the path toward the end times and its witness to the early spread of Joachimite texts into central Europe. Our knowledge of the transmission and, crucially, the use of this text has thus far not taken into account thirty-five folios of instruction on spiritual warfare found in one of the Expositio's eight manuscript witnesses: Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.31 (c. 1270). The edition presented here of this unique addition, which was excluded from the modern critical edition of the Expositio, makes the complete Cambridge version of the Expositio available for the first time. While there has been some debate over the editorship of this version of the commentary — the Benedictine-turned-Franciscan Albert of Stade (d. c. 1260) and Alexander himself have both been suggested — we argue that a further possibility must be considered. Its author may have been a highly educated Benedictine writer, who adapted the commentary with his coreligionists (at least partly) in mind. His goal was not only to extol the importance within the apocalyptic timeline of Benedictine history, but also to promote ascetic values among his readers. Overall, the Cambridge Expositio provides further evidence of the intellectual conversations and cross-pollination of both practices of learning and structures of thought between mendicant, university, and cenobitic cultures in this period. Within this context, apocalyptic thought could find unexpected uses, including galvanizing monks in day-to-day religious practice and progress.*

The *Expositio in Apocalypsim* by Alexander Minorita (d. 1271) is the earliest complete mendicant Apocalypse commentary and one of the earliest witnesses

---

The following abbreviation is used in this article: *Expositio* = Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, ed. Alois Wachtel, MGH, *Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* 1 (Weimar, 1955) (with reference to page and line numbers). All internal citations to the addition to Alexander's *Expositio* edited in this article refer to the folio numbers of Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.31, the unique witness to this text. All English quotations from the Bible are taken from the Douay-Rheims translation of the Vulgate.

*Traditio* 78 (2023), 263–372

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Fordham University. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is unaltered and is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained for commercial re-use or in order to create a derivative work.

doi:10.1017/tdo.2023.2

to the spread of Joachimite texts in Germany.<sup>1</sup> Alexander began his commentary in 1235 when he was still a layman (*laicus*) and revised it in stages after his conversion to the Franciscan order around 1242.<sup>2</sup> In 1955 Alois Wachtel published the first and only critical edition of the work based on the eight known surviving witnesses.<sup>3</sup> Among these witnesses, Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.31 is unique; it contains a number of additions not found in any other manuscript.<sup>4</sup> Wachtel included most of these additions in his critical edition, but he chose not to reproduce the lengthiest one: a thirty-five folio addition (fols. 145v–179v, approximately 26,000 words) added to the commentary at Apocalypse 20:2–3 that offers instruction on spiritual warfare, specifically the individual ascetic’s fight against the assaults of the Devil and his demons. The addition stands in stark contrast to the annalistic exegesis of the *Expositio*, which seems to be why Wachtel chose to omit it and why it has been overlooked in subsequent scholarship. In Wachtel’s edition, he has a note indicating where the addition is located in the Cambridge manuscript and there he writes: “35 leaves of moral-theological content follow that are not related to the Apocalypse and therefore are not printed.”<sup>5</sup> Yet whoever was responsible for this addition clearly thought it was related to the Apocalypse. The Cambridge manuscript is not a work-

<sup>1</sup> Studies of the *Expositio* include Alois Wachtel, “Einleitung,” in Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, ed. Alois Wachtel, MGH, *Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* 1 (Weimar, 1955), vii–lix; Sabine Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar des Alexander Minorita: Zur frühen rezeption Joachims von Fiore in Deutschland*, MGH, *Studien und Texte* 3 (Hanover, 1991); Sabine Schmolinsky, “Merkmale der Exegese bei Alexander Minorita,” in *Neue Richtungen in der hoch- und spätmittelalterlichen Bibelexegese*, ed. R. Lerner (Berlin, 1996), 139–48; Sabine Schmolinsky, “Wer wird das Himmlische Jerusalem gebaut? Interpretationen in der Apokalypsenexegese des Alexander Minorita,” in *Geschichte vom Ende her denken: Endzeitentwürfe und ihre Historisierung im Mittelalter*, ed. S. Ehrich and A. Worm (Regensburg, 2019), 147–57; and Felicitas Schmieder, “Die Joahannesoffenbarung als Schlusssel zur Zeitgeschichte: Alexander Minoritas ‘Expositio in Apocalypsim’ als Chronik,” in *Geschichte vom Ende her denken*, 127–45. For an overview of the *Expositio* with translations of selections in English, see David Burr, *The Book of Revelation: The Bible in Medieval Tradition* (Grand Rapids MI, 2019), 146–179. See also David Burr, “Mendicant Readings of the Apocalypse,” in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. R. K. Emmerston and B. McGinn (Ithaca, NY, 1992), 89–102; Bert Roest, “Franciscan Commentaries on the Apocalypse,” *Studies in Church History, Subsidia* 10 (1994): 29–37; and Morton Bloomfield and Marjorie Reeves, “The Penetration of Joachimism into Northern Europe,” *Speculum* 29 (1954): 772–93.

<sup>2</sup> Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar*, 44.

<sup>3</sup> See n. 1, above. A more recent discussion of the witnesses can be found in Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar*, 15–23.

<sup>4</sup> A digital reproduction and manuscript description can be viewed at the University of Cambridge website. For further bibliography on Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.31, see Richard Emmerston and Suzanne Lewis, “Census and Bibliography of Medieval Manuscripts Containing Apocalypse Illustrations, ca. 800–1500, III,” *Traditio* 42 (1986): 443–72, at 443–44.

<sup>5</sup> *Expositio*, 415.18, n. m.

in-progress; it is a lavishly illuminated copy of the *Expositio* and the product of careful planning and execution.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, this addition represents between 13 and 17 percent of the entire work as it is found in the Cambridge manuscript. When it is considered alongside other additions unique to the Cambridge text, it is clearly an integral part of this version of the *Expositio*.<sup>7</sup> Wachtel's omission and the subsequent lack of scholarly attention to the complete text of the *Expositio* as it is found in the Cambridge manuscript has left us with an incomplete understanding of the work's textual history and the narrative uniqueness of the Cambridge text.

The edition of the previously omitted addition offered here makes the full Cambridge *Expositio* available to modern scholarship for the first time. A commentary on the text highlighting its organization, central themes, and sources is provided below. The following introduction aims to shed new light both on the authorship of the Cambridge *Expositio* and, most crucially, the conversation between established ascetic values and the emergent mendicant apocalypticism to which this version bears witness.

#### THE CAMBRIDGE VERSION OF THE *EXPOSITIO* AND THEORIES OF AUTHORSHIP

Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.31 has been dated to around 1270. The manuscript is of German provenance, perhaps from the Rhineland.<sup>8</sup> It contains the only known copy of the longest extant version of the *Expositio*, a reworking and expansion of Alexander's post-1242 commentary. There is no datable historical material in the Cambridge text that pertains to later than 1248.<sup>9</sup>

Alexander's text uses a historical interpretive method.<sup>10</sup> He reads the polyvalent images and symbols of the Apocalypse as prophecies that have been fulfilled in ecclesiastical history, pairing his own interpretations, which draw heavily from chronicles, with the exegesis offered in twelfth-century *Glossa* compilations.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, the central insight he claims for his interpretation is that "the greater part of [the Apocalypse] . . . was fulfilled according to the order of the histories"

<sup>6</sup> Further evidence that the addition was intentionally included in this version of the *Expositio* is seen in the numerous references to the Apocalypse throughout the text, for example, *Unde in hoc libro, sicut in hoc libro*, etc. See the edition below at fols. 146r, 149r, 155r, and 177r.

<sup>7</sup> The entire *Expositio* runs 205 folios in the Cambridge manuscript. There are at least 41 folios now missing.

<sup>8</sup> Emmerson and Lewis, "Census and Bibliography," 443. For other descriptions, see the publications by Wachtel and Schmolinsky in n. 1, above.

<sup>9</sup> Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above), 47–48.

<sup>10</sup> On Alexander's historical exegesis, see Schmolinsky, "Merkmale der Exegese" (n. 1 above); Roest, "Franciscan Commentaries" (n. 1 above); and Schmieder, "Die Joahannesoffenbarung" (n. 1 above).

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed list of Alexander's sources, see Wachtel, "Einleitung" (n. 1 above), xxxiv–xli; and Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above).

(*secundum ordinem historiarum*).<sup>12</sup> Thus, the commentary moves chronologically through ecclesiastical history from the early church in the first chapters through to Alexander's own day in chapter 20. In fact, Alexander only comes to the rule of Emperor Henry V (r. 1111–1125) at verse 2 of chapter 20 and his interpretation of Apocalypse 20:4 encompasses the entirety of the 1130s through the 1240s, from the pontificate of Innocent II and the rule of Emperor Lothar II through to Frederick II (Innocent IV appears at Apoc. 20:6).

The post-1242 *Expositio*, moreover, reveals the historical significance that Alexander placed on the Franciscan and Dominican orders. They are identified as the "beloved city" (*ciuitatem dilectam*) at Apocalypse 20:8 and the New Jerusalem described in Apocalypse 21: "By this city the Friars Minor, who according to history are imitators of the apostles, and the Preachers, who follow the apostle Paul in preaching, are indicated. All of these are called Jerusalem because they already tend toward the vision of eternal peace."<sup>13</sup> Here we see how the work is grounded in the early mendicant culture of Alexander's time. Alexander uses Thomas of Celano's *Vita prima Francisci* and Peter Ferandi's *Vita sancti Dominici*, calling them "histories" (*historiae*) as he does world chronicles, to demonstrate how Francis, Dominic, and the orders they founded fulfill all aspects of John's vision of the New Jerusalem, building it spiritually in the present prior to the Last Judgment.<sup>14</sup>

We also see the redeployment of long-standing monastic teachings within an emerging mendicant context. For while Alexander was novel in his interpretation of the New Jerusalem as embodied by these specific mendicant orders, the identification of monastic groups with the city was a well-established theme by his time.<sup>15</sup> It is also of note that, while Alexander was one of the first authors

<sup>12</sup> *Expositio*, 6.19–20: "partem maximam libri intelligeremus impletam secundum ordinem historiarum."

<sup>13</sup> *Expositio*, 454.5–8 (on Apoc. 20.8) and 469.11–16, at Apoc. 21:10: "Per istam civitatem designantur fratres Minores, qui secundum historiam vitam apostolorum imitantur, et Praedicatores, qui apostolum Paulum in praedicatione sequuntur. Isti omnes Jherusalem vocantur, quia ad visionem pacis aeternae iam tendunt." Alexander also includes a second interpretation of the New Jerusalem as all of the faithful (*Expositio*, 462.15–464.16; compare *Expositio*, 241.14–19). On Alexander's interpretation of the New Jerusalem, see Schmolinsky, "Wer wird das Himmlische" (n. 1 above); and Schmolinsky, "Merkmale der Exegese" (n. 1 above).

<sup>14</sup> Other mendicant documents employed by Alexander include the *Regula secunda fratrum Minorum* (*Expositio*, 473) and the letters of Pope Gregory IX pertaining to the mendicant orders (for example, *Expositio*, 475).

<sup>15</sup> Cenobitic monks were considered to be "living stones" building the New Jerusalem prior to the end times. See, for example, Conrad, *Exordium magnum Cisterciense sive narratio de initio Cisterciensis ordinis* 1.3 and 1.16 ed. Bruno Griesser, CCCM 138 (Turnhout, 1994), 9 and 69. For Bernard of Clairvaux's identification of cenobitic monks as the New Jerusalem, see for example Peter Raedts, "St. Bernard and Jerusalem," *Studies in Church History, Subsidia* 10 (1994): 169–82.

north of the Alps to cite the teachings of Joachim of Fiore, it was in this context of demonstrating that the Franciscans and Dominicans fulfilled the prophecy of the New Jerusalem that he did so. Rather than following more controversial Joachimite interpretations then taking root in certain Franciscan quarters — above all that the mendicant orders ushered in a new age of salvation history, Joachim's *status* of the Holy Spirit — Alexander cites Joachim solely in support of a comparison with long monastic roots, one to which he also adds the authority of the Benedictine abbess Hildegard of Bingen.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, Alexander can perhaps be seen as a moderating voice in Franciscan apocalyptic discourse at a time where Joachim's influence loomed large, aligning quite closely with the *Symbolismus* school that had developed within reformist monastic circles beginning in the twelfth century.<sup>17</sup>

Alexander's interpretation of the New Jerusalem as the Franciscans and Dominicans is extant in the Cambridge text along with further material added to the interpretation of Apocalypse 20:6, in which Francis and Dominic are presented as “two great luminaries of God's mercy” raised up by God in order to dispel the shadows (*tenebrae*) of the times.<sup>18</sup> While this supplemental material is in keeping with Alexander's promotion of the mendicant orders, the introduction of material of a different thematic vein into the Cambridge text highlights the dialogue between established monastic asceticism and emergent mendicant discourse in this unique version. Three major additions are of particular relevance here. The first and second were included in Wachtel's edition of the *Expositio*: a twenty-five folio addition at chapter 10 of the commentary interpreting the angel that John

<sup>16</sup> There is a large bibliography on Joachim and his *status* of the Holy Spirit. As a starting place, see Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Notre Dame, 1993); and for a more recent survey of the literature, see E. Randolph Daniel, *Abbot Joachim of Fiore and Joachimism: Selected Articles* (Farnham, 2011). For Alexander's use of Hildegard, see *Expositio*, 493.2–495.23. The source of Hildegard's prophecies used by Alexander was the *Speculum Futurorum Temporum sive Pentachronon Sancte Hildegardis* compiled by Gebeno of Eberbach. See Gebenón de Eberbach, *La Obra de Gebenón*, ed. José Carlos Santos Paz (Firenze, 2004); and Magda Hayton, “Prophets, Prophecy, and Cistercians: A Study of the Most Popular Version of the Hildegardian Pentachronon,” *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 29 (2019): 123–62.

<sup>17</sup> For further discussion see Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above). On the Symbolismus school, see H. D. Rauh, *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: Vom Tycho-nius zum deutschen Symbolismus* (Munich, 1973); and for a brief introduction in English, see Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, “Prophet and Reformer: Smoke in the Vineyard,” in *Voice of the Living Light: Hildegard of Bingen and Her World*, ed. Barbara Newman (Berkeley, 1998), 70–90, at 76–78.

<sup>18</sup> *Expositio*, 436.18–24: “His et aliis criminum densitatibus coepit illo tempore mundus tenebrescere et in tantum, ut nemo valeat perdicere, quantis et quot erroribus mundus a lucida deviaverit veritate. Sed Deus scientiarum Dominus, qui omnia novit, antequam fiant, ut has fugaret tenebras, coepit in mundo duo luminaria magna misericordiae suae manibus accendere, Dominicum videlicet et Franciscum . . .” The discussion of Francis and Dominic continues through *Expositio*, 438.25.

sees descending from heaven (Apoc. 10:1) as Benedict of Nursia and a five and a half folio addition at chapter 11 that presents Gregory the Great as the historical manifestation of the seventh angel who blows a trumpet (Apoc. 11:15).<sup>19</sup> The third addition is that presented in this article: the discourse on spiritual warfare introduced in chapter 20. These three additions are significant not only for the substantial volume of new text they represent, but also for the ways in which they depart from Alexander's narrative. All three diverge significantly from the historical treatment of the core Apocalypse commentary and, especially the additions at chapters 10 and 20, deliver lengthy and detailed spiritual and moral counsel for readers in the present, something not seen elsewhere in Alexander's commentary. They present arguments, spiritual *exempla*, and allegorical exegesis in the manner of a well-trained and intellectually-capable preacher of the time. As will be seen, preaching is itself celebrated within their content (see the commentary on fols. 172v–173v, below). Their underlying discourse, however, is more timeless, eulogizing and advising the path of ascetic struggle. The grounding in the thought of Gregory the Great that emerges in all three of the additions is critical here, but so too is monastic heritage, and particularly the Benedictine tradition as expressed in the *vita* of St. Benedict in Gregory's *Liber dialogorum* (composed around 593). The chapter 20 addition also represents the apex of an image that runs through the other two and that can be seen as a natural extension of this ascetic discourse: the *miles Christi*. As Katherine Allen Smith has elucidated, by the dawn of the thirteenth century this metaphor had become deeply entwined with monastic identity and was promoted through a well-established canon of texts and teachings which served the formation of monks.<sup>20</sup> The previously overlooked thematic continuity across these three major additions raises questions about the authorship of the Cambridge text.

There are two current theories about the authorship and date of the Cambridge version of the *Expositio*. The first is put forward by Wachtel in the introduction to

<sup>19</sup> The Benedict narrative is accompanied by an illumination at fol. 54. The addition to chapter 11 may have originally been longer; one folio is missing at the end of the section on Gregory.

<sup>20</sup> Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge, UK, 2011), 114–21. Franciscan writings on spiritual warfare in the thirteenth century include the *Von der Versuchung des Teufels*, ed. G. Steer, “David von Augsburg und Berthold von Regensburg: Schöpfer der volkssprachigen franziskanischen Traktat- und Predigtliteratur,” in *Handbuch der Literatur in Bayern vom Frühmittelalter bis zum Gegenwart*, ed. A. Weber (Regensburg, 1987), 99–118, likely produced by Franciscans in Augsburg belonging to the circle of David of Augsburg (ca. 1200–1272); and Peter John Olivi, *Miles Armatus*, ed. R. Manselli, in *Spirituali e Beghini in Provenza* (Rome, 1959), 287–291, from the later thirteenth century. While a thorough study of thirteenth-century Franciscan teachings on this topic is lacking, there is no indication at this time that the author of the text edited here was using Franciscan sources. We thank Bert Roest for pointing us to these texts and sharing his expertise to guide us in this matter.

his edition, while the second is proposed by Sabine Schmolinsky, who has produced the most significant scholarship on the *Expositio* since Wachtel.<sup>21</sup> Wachtel argued that the Cambridge version of the *Expositio* was the work of Albert of Stade and dated the text to sometime after 1249, when Alexander had completed his revisions.<sup>22</sup> An early convert to the Franciscans, Albert had previously been abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St. Mary's in Stade, but he resigned in 1240 after his attempt to reform his monastery according to the Cistercian model failed. Albert's chronicle, the *Annales Stadenses*, which he began shortly after professing as a Franciscan and completed in 1256, was used extensively in the Cambridge edition of the *Expositio* to add further historical material, but not in any of the other versions. Albert, in turn, was an early reader of Alexander's work, referencing it and mentioning Alexander by name in the *Annales*.<sup>23</sup> Wachtel argued that all known versions of the *Expositio* except for that found in the Cambridge manuscript were the work of Alexander himself. His argument for Albert as author of the Cambridge version rests on a number of observations, including: (1) the extensive use of the *Annales Stadenses* in this expanded version; (2) the depth of personal admiration expressed for the Rule of Benedict and the Benedictine family tree, including the Cistercians, and the promotion of their historical importance; and (3) the fact that the edition nevertheless retains all of Alexander's passages promoting the importance of the Franciscans, the order which Albert left the Benedictines to join.<sup>24</sup> More tentatively, Wachtel cites certain similarities in language between the text and Albert's other writings. For instance, in describing Benedictine observance, the addition to chapter 10 quotes particularly extensively from chapter 58 of the Rule of Benedict (on the reception of brothers) to underline the steadfastness required under vow. Albert had also cited one of the quoted injunctions — that the monk must fulfill what he had promised or be “damned by the One whom he mocks” — when commenting on his departure from the order in the *Annales Stadenses*: he felt that he was at risk of such damnation in the laxer community which he attempted to govern.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Wachtel, “Einleitung” (n. 1 above); and Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalysenkommentar* (n. 1 above).

<sup>22</sup> Wachtel, “Einleitung” (n. 1 above), xxvii–xxx.

<sup>23</sup> Albert of Stade, *Annales Stadenses* (–1256), ed. J. M. Lappenberg, MGH, *Scriptores* 16 (Hanover, 1859), 283–378. On the use of the *Annales Stadenses* as a source in the Cambridge *Expositio*, see Wachtel, “Einleitung” (n. 1 above), x; and Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalysenkommentar* (n. 1 above), 48. For Albert's reference to Alexander and the *Expositio*, see Albert of Stade, *Annales Stadenses*, ed. Lappenberg, 372: “Sed frater Alexander in expositione apokalypsis . . .”

<sup>24</sup> Wachtel, “Einleitung” (n. 1 above), xxvii–xxx. The Cistercians are discussed in the Cambridge text at chapter 16 (*Expositio*, 346).

<sup>25</sup> *Expositio*, 201; Benedict of Nursia, *Regula monachorum* 58.18: “ab eo se damnandum sciat quem inridit,” ed. and trans. Bruce L. Venarde, in *The Rule of Saint Benedict* (Cambridge, MA, 2011), 188–89; and Wachtel, “Einleitung” (n. 1 above), xxix.

Elsewhere, while noting that stylistic comparison is very difficult due to the genres of Albert's other works, Wachtel points to a similar style of explication in the short prose sections of his Latin epic poem *Troilus*.<sup>26</sup>

Contrary to Wachtel, Schmolinsky argues that the Cambridge *Expositio* dates to between 1242 and 1248 and that Alexander Minorita himself was ultimately responsible for all of the additions to the Cambridge text, including the material about Benedict and Benedictine monasticism at chapter 10, which draws heavily, as she acknowledges, from monastic literature.<sup>27</sup> Despite this nod toward the revisionist's use of such material, Schmolinsky does not fully account for the depth of engagement with Benedictine monasticism seen in the chapter 10 addition, nor does she discuss the text of ascetical theology edited here.<sup>28</sup> In her refutation of Wachtel's argument, Schmolinsky notes that Albert of Stade remained in contact with Benedictines after his conversion to the Franciscan order in 1240 and that Albert and Alexander could have exchanged books or had access to the same library, but she ultimately concludes that Alexander was the author of the Cambridge text including, it is implied, the addition edited here.<sup>29</sup> Setting aside the chapter 20 addition on spiritual warfare, Schmolinsky categorizes the material added by the Cambridge revisionist as historical expansions. These either take the form of allegorical interpretations of exemplary people (such as the additions on Benedict and Gregory at chapters 10 and 11, respectively) or of further details of ecclesiastical history which were added throughout the commentary and taken predominantly from Albert's *Annales Stadenses*.<sup>30</sup> As discussed below, however, the chapter 10 addition moves far beyond a presentation of Benedict as *exemplum* to engage with Benedictine monasticism more broadly.

Neither of these authors discusses the meaning of the longest, previously unedited section, nor its thematic continuity with other material unique to the Cambridge *Expositio*. When the additions at chapters 10 and 11 on Benedict and Gregory are read together with that at chapter 20, a clear arc and purpose emerges that builds on the commonalities of their discourse. The spiritual battle waged throughout ecclesiastical history and especially the role of the monk as *miles Christi* is brought from the past into the present, imbuing the commentary with a new didactic weight surely designed to serve in the ascetic and moral formation of monks. When this material is fully considered, Wachtel's

<sup>26</sup> Wachtel, "Einleitung" (n. 1 above), xxx.

<sup>27</sup> Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above), 51 suggests that Alexander may have had help finding sources or doing clerical work, but that he would have overseen the production of the Cambridge text.

<sup>28</sup> Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above), 50 argues that the genre of texts drawn on in the chapter 10 addition, that is, *vitae* and *explanationes regulae*, make it difficult to pinpoint an exact author.

<sup>29</sup> Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above), 48–49 and 50.

<sup>30</sup> Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above), 47–48.



suggestion of the former Benedictine Albert of Stade as the author of the Cambridge additions remains plausible (if open to doubt), while Schmolinsky's identification of Alexander appears unlikely. The shape of the additions, however, presents a further possibility that deserves at least equal consideration: that we are dealing with the compilation of an editor who was still firmly within the Benedictine tradition and purposefully writing (at least in part) for others of this background.

The education and intellectual culture of the editor deserves greater reflection beyond this. If the additions appear to tell us something about the monastic background of the writer, the author also intermingled analytical approaches to theological questions and reflections on the importance of preaching of a sort that suggest that he was highly conversant with the learning and culture of schools. The period during which the Cambridge *Expositio* was produced (around 1248–1270) saw significant developments in the educational systems of not only the mendicant orders, but also the older cenobitic religious orders, as the recruitment of graduates and the subsequent establishment of monastic *studia* closely tied to emerging universities gathered pace.<sup>31</sup> While this process was not always without tension — especially for enclosed religious, as the controversy within the Cistercian Order that accompanied the founding of their first *studium* in Paris attests — approaches to education (from the teaching of grammar up to and including advanced theological formation) and preaching (a key goal of scholastic theological training) derived from the schools were rapidly becoming more common within all manner of cloisters in this period.<sup>32</sup> The Cambridge *Expositio* bears witness to the fluid interweaving of scholastic learning and structures of thought with monastic discourse at this time, underlining the intellectual creativity that could also accompany this process.

<sup>31</sup> By 1248, *studia* at Paris had been established not only by the Franciscans and Dominicans, but also by the Benedictines of Saint-Denis (ca. 1229–30) and the Cistercians (1246), with the Cluniac Benedictines following suit soon thereafter (1258–60). On the Franciscan house of study in Paris, see Bert Roest, *A History of Franciscan Education (c. 1217–1517)* (Brill, 2000), 11–14. On the Dominican house, see M. Michèle Mulchahey, “*First the Bow is Bent in Study*”: *Dominican Education Before 1350* (Toronto, 2000), 351–78. On the Benedictines (including Cistercians and Cluniacs), see Thomas Sullivan, “The *Quodlibeta* of the Canons Regular and the Monks” in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages*, ed. Christopher Schabel (Brill, 2006), 359–400; and Thomas Sullivan, *Benedictine Monks at the University of Paris, A.D. 1229–1500: A Biographical Register* (Brill, 1995). For the emergence of continental Franciscan *studia* beyond Paris, see Bert Roest, *Franciscan Learning, Preaching and Mission c. 1220–1650* (Leiden, 2014), 28–30. On the impact of scholastic education within the Benedictine order and the rise of *studia*, see James G. Clark, *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2011), 206 and 230–231.

<sup>32</sup> On Cistercian debates over the place of the new learning, see C. H. Lawrence, “Stephen of Lexington and Cistercian University Studies in the Thirteenth Century,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 11 (1960): 164–78.

The edition presented below is only a first step toward a better understanding of the authorship of the Cambridge *Expositio*. It remains beyond our purpose here to make any definitive claims as to who the revisionist was or with which religious and intellectual tradition they were affiliated. Nevertheless, the content of the additions discussed below is noteworthy in and of itself. It presents a tightly woven fabric of modifications that not only enhanced Alexander's narrative, but also tied apocalyptic history and foresight to monastic moral and spiritual perfection in a way that was at once intellectually up-to-date and timeless.<sup>33</sup>

#### APOCALYPTIC ASCETICISM

The chapter 20 addition edited below includes no historical information, only instruction for the reader on the art of spiritual warfare. As outlined briefly above, however, it is not a stand-alone interpolation, but rather sits within a didactic arc, which also includes elements that pertain to historical interpretation: the chapter 10 addition on Benedict of Nursia and the chapter 11 addition on Gregory the Great.

The addition appended to the commentary on Apocalypse 10:1–10 in the Cambridge text draws extensively on Gregory's *Liber dialogorum* to eulogize Saint Benedict. In Alexander's original commentary and, indeed, in all other versions of the *Expositio* there is only brief mention of Benedict and the monks who follow his rule. This is found in the commentary to chapter 14, where Alexander also discusses Augustinian canons and other *virgines*.<sup>34</sup> In stark contrast to this brief mention, the Cambridge author presents Benedict as the mighty angel of Apocalypse 10, who descends from heaven with a little scroll, interpreted as his Rule, and stands over the sea and land.<sup>35</sup> Wachtel has already noted the author's extensive knowledge of Benedictine monasticism and the Rule of Benedict, describing how "his statements read like an explanation of the Rule that an abbot could have addressed to the monks of his monastery," but there is also a thematic continuity between this addition and that at chapter 20.<sup>36</sup> Citing Gregory's *Liber dialogorum*, in which Benedict is described as an ideal spiritual

<sup>33</sup> This kind of reading of historically oriented apocalyptic texts was not uncommon, as Anke Holdenried demonstrates in *The Sibyl and Her Scribes: Manuscripts and Interpretation of the Latin 'Sibylla Tiburtina' c. 1050–1500* (Aldershot, 2006). Holdenried shows how prophecies of the sibylline tradition were frequently found in monastic libraries where they were often read as sources of spiritual edification.

<sup>34</sup> *Expositio*, 294.1–295.8.

<sup>35</sup> *Expositio*, 162 (Benedict as angel) and 174 (scroll as Rule). It is likely that the author of this addition covered all of chapter 10, that is, also the final verse (Apoc. 10:11). There is one folio missing at the end of the addition. See *Expositio*, 224.

<sup>36</sup> Wachtel, "Einleitung" (n. 1 above), xxviii..

warrior, the author is able to present Benedict as exactly the sort of spiritual combatant eulogized in the chapter 20 addition:

Blessed Gregory said of him: “The fearless warrior refused to be held back inside the walls and sought the open field of battle.” Indeed, “he girded his loins with strength” (Prov. 31:17), when he strengthened his arm against himself through continence, against the world through abstinence, against the Devil through obedience; and “he put out his hand to strong things” (compare Prov. 31:19), when he began to put into action and to teach all the instruments of good works.<sup>37</sup>

By incorporating Benedict as spiritual warrior into the commentary here, the Cambridge editor was able to mirror the chronological concordance that was the hallmark of Alexander Minorita’s treatment of the Apocalypse. If the latter found Emperors Justin I (d. 527) and Justinian I (d. 565) to be the angels referenced in Apocalypse 10:1 and 10:8, the addition suggested that they could also be identified with their monastic contemporary Benedict.<sup>38</sup> But the commentary offered by the Cambridge revisionist goes beyond presenting Benedict as an example of the ideal Christian warrior-ascetic. The new commentary on the second angel of Apocalypse 10, that is, the one described in verses 8–10, is not about Benedict at all, but about the call to the way of monastic life he founded.

The discourse on conversion to the monastic life found in chapter 10 is written as spiritual instruction for the reader in a similar manner to the chapter 20 addition, and not as a historical description of Benedictine monasticism. This section begins at Apocalypse 10:8: *And again I heard a voice from heaven*. Here, John of Patmos becomes “the figure of any faithful person whom prevenient grace calls to the state of religion.”<sup>39</sup> After describing the various responses one can have to this call of grace (the “voice from heaven” in verse 8), the text culminates in the exegesis of verses 9 and 10, which provides an *exemplum* of one who answered the call: Constantinus, a follower of Benedict. The author interprets verse 9, “So I went to the angel and asked him to give me the little scroll,” in the voice of Constantinus: “So, because I did not want to neglect prevenient grace, at once *I went*

<sup>37</sup> *Expositio*, 165.7–13: “Beatus Gregorius de eo dicit: *Fortis proliator teneri inter claustra nouit, certaminis campum quaesivit*. (Gregory the Great, *Liber dialogorum* 2.3) *Accinxit enim fortitudine lumbos suos* (Prov. 31:17), dum contra seipsum per continentiam, contra mundum per abstinentiam, contra diabolum per obedientiam *roboravit brachium suum; manumque suam misit ad fortia* (compare Prov. 31:19), dum facere et docere coepit omnia bonorum operum instrumenta (Benedict, *Regula monachorum*, 4).” See Gregory the Great, *Liber dialogorum* 2.3.11, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé and Paul Antin, in *Dialogues, livres I–III*, SC 260 (Paris, 1979), 148; and Benedict, *Regula monachorum* 4, ed. Venarde (n. 25 above), 32–33. On Gregory’s presentation of Benedict as a spiritual warrior, see Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 87–89 and 93–94.

<sup>38</sup> For Alexander’s treatment of Justin I and Justinian I, see *Expositio*, 158–62.

<sup>39</sup> *Expositio*, 211.7–8: “Hic Johannes figuram tenet alicuius fidelis, quem gratia praeueniens vocat ad statum religionis.”

to the angel, namely Benedict . . . asking . . . that he give me the book, that is, that he offer me his Rule to read and receive me into the monastic order.”<sup>40</sup> Constantinus describes how he devoured the Rule, just as John devoured the scroll (Apoc. 10:10), and commended it to memory. At this point, the author shifts from the voice of Constantinus back to his usual first person, again addressing the reader directly: “And indeed we chew on holy Scripture through reading, we taste it, so to speak, through understanding.”<sup>41</sup> What follows is a lengthy discussion of the *lectio divina* that at times refers back to the example of Constantinus. The author has strayed quite far beyond Alexander’s stated purpose of demonstrating how the prophecy of the Apocalypse has been fulfilled in ecclesiastical history.

In the chapter 11 addition on Gregory the Great, the Cambridge revisionist develops his theme of spiritual warfare and here aligns with the long-standing use of the writings of Gregory as a foundational source for the instruction of monks in their role as spiritual warriors.<sup>42</sup> Alexander originally interpreted the seventh angel blowing a trumpet (Apoc. 11.15) as Narses (d. c. 566), a general who served under Justinian I. As in the chapter 10 addition, the revisionist left the original interpretation intact while offering his own alternative: that Gregory the Great was the seventh angel because he was a messenger of God who blew a trumpet when “he announced the catholic faith and the praise of the virtues sometimes in the course of his writings, sometimes in the dignity of his conduct, sometimes in the war-cry of his preaching.”<sup>43</sup> Moreover, Gregory was himself a warrior who left instructions on how to engage in spiritual warfare in his writings, which, according to the author, are to be understood as encompassing a sixty-five part trumpet blast: “Starting with the battle weapons of the aforesaid war, he [that is, Gregory] sounded as much the danger of war as the method of waging war, and with the spiritual soldier prudently armed, namely the pastor, and stoutly trained to do battle, he brought the sounding of the same trumpet to completion in sixty-five parts.”<sup>44</sup> The author then lists Gregory’s writings, articulating the sixty-five parts and noting the chief example

<sup>40</sup> *Expositio*, 216.2–7: “*Et, quia praevenientem me nolui negligere gratiam, statim abii ad angelum, videlicet Benedictum . . . ut daret mihi librum, id est, ut porrigeret mihi regulam suam ad legendum et reciperet me ad ordinem monasticum.*”

<sup>41</sup> *Expositio*, 216.23–25: “*Nos etenim, Scripturam sanctam per lectionem masticamus, per intellectum eam, ut ita dicam, sapimus . . .*” Compare the edition below at fol. 154r.

<sup>42</sup> Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 93.

<sup>43</sup> *Expositio*, 247.11–14: “. . . fidem catholicam et praeconia virtutum nunc scripti tenore, nunc conversationis decore, nunc praedicationis clamore . . . nuntiavit . . .”

<sup>44</sup> *Expositio*, 249.6–11: “*Ab armis autem bellicis dicti belli sumens initium tam belli periculum quam bellandi sonuit modum, armatoque prudenter milite spirituali, scilicet pastore, et ad bellandum fortiter informato eiusdem tubae sonum perduxit sexaginta quinque concisionibus ad perfectum.*”

of Benedict of Nursia among the patristic *exempla* offered by Gregory.<sup>45</sup> The addition continues with an exposition of the second half of verse 15: “and there were loud voices in heaven” (*et factae sunt voces magnae in caelo*), in which a number of stories from Gregory’s life are used to demonstrate how he resounded with a *magna vox* throughout the church in his day.

The importance that the revisionist places in the chapter 11 addition on the writings of Gregory for the teachings they offer to one engaged in spiritual warfare provides a vantage point from which we can also comprehend the additions at chapter 10 and chapter 20. In the former, the revisionist drew from Gregory’s *vita* of Benedict to provide an *exemplum* of an ideal monastic spiritual warrior from the past, which, in turn, provided an opportunity to include more expansive teachings from Benedictine practice. In the latter, the chapter 20 addition, he continued to provide spiritual instruction that likewise drew heavily from the writings of Gregory, but with a shift in focus toward the spiritual battle fought by the religious reader in the present. Here he incorporated a broader palette of influences, including more contemporary sources, and his own exegetical flair to achieve this end.

The thirty-five folio addition presented with this article takes its immediate cue from Alexander’s discussion of the binding of Satan at Apocalypse 20:2–3, a verse that runs as follows:

And he laid hold of the dragon, the old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years. And he cast him into the bottomless pit and shut him up and set a seal upon him, that he should no more seduce the nations till the thousand years be finished. And after that, he must be loosed for a little time.

Alexander related these verses to the Investiture Controversy, as well as the loosing of the Devil at the time of the future Antichrist: “*After that, he must be loosed for a little time*, that is to say in the Antichrist, who, at the instigation of the Devil, will cause overt blasphemies and persecutions and rage with all his might against the elect.”<sup>46</sup> As ominous as this might sound, however, the words of Augustine concerning the same passage, quoted by Alexander immediately

<sup>45</sup> *Expositio*, 249.11–250.1. The author arrives at the number 65 by breaking down Gregory’s writings in this way: the 22 chapters in the *Homiliae in Ezechielem* plus the 4 books of the *Liber dialogorum* plus the 35 volumes of the *Moralia in Job* and the 4 expositions on the Gospels. When discussing the *Liber dialogorum*, the author writes: “Dialogum tam eleganter quam breviter quatuor concissionibus tetigit, et per illustra multorum patrum exempla, et praecipue Benedicti, quem tota concisione secunda sonuit, aures audientium voce dulcissima oblectavit” (*Expositio* 249.11–17).

<sup>46</sup> On Alexander’s presentation of the Investiture Controversy, see Burr, “Mendicant Readings of the Apocalypse” (n. 1 above), 99. On the loosing of the Devil, see *Expositio*, 415.6–11: “*Post haec oportet eum solvi modico tempore*, id est in Antichristo, qui instinctu diaboli exhibit ad manifestas blasphemias et persecutiones et tota virtute saeviet contra electos.”

before the long excursus of the Cambridge text begins, remind the reader that humanity is not entirely helpless in God's dispensation. For God binds the Devil, limiting if not entirely suppressing his power, and only lets him loose beyond this for a short time, so that he cannot simply "seduce people to his side by violent compulsion or fraudulent delusion."<sup>47</sup> Humanity was thus powerfully tested by the Devil with the permission of God. As Augustine himself expanded upon in the same passage of the *De civitate Dei* that Alexander drew from, even at the coming of the Antichrist the strongest could and would, thanks to God's grace, fight back:

there is no doubt that even during this period of time there have been, and there are today, some soldiers of Christ so wise and brave that even if they were living in this mortal condition at the time when the Devil is to be unloosed, they would take the most prudent precautions against his stratagems, and withstand his assaults with the utmost steadfastness.<sup>48</sup>

As discussed in more detail in the commentary below, the revisionist immediately expanded on these themes through extended paraphrases of Gregory the Great. He drew from the *Moralia in Job*, reassuring the reader of God's ongoing supervision of such demonic activities and his support for the angels and the elect, as well as an *exemplum* drawn from the *Liber dialogorum* concerning the demonic assaults on Andrew, bishop of Fondi, that led him to sexual temptation.<sup>49</sup> One can thus see the revisionist as segueing not only from Alexander and the words of the Apocalypse, but also from the chapter 11 material on Gregory. The latter *exemplum* indeed allows the revisionist to refocus on the theme of spiritual warfare central to that addition by personifying the enemy and to frame it in terms of the struggle of the individual Christian, prefiguring the direction of the rest of the chapter 20 addition. Overall, the content of this latter addition can be divided into four essential sections:

1. An overview of the main players in the ascetic's apocalyptic battle: God, the Devil, demons, angels, and saintly souls.<sup>50</sup>
2. The three kinds of snares demons and the Devil use to trap Christians.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> *Expositio*, 415.12–18: "Alligatio diaboli est non permitti exercere totam temptationem, quam potest vel vi vel dolo ad seducendos homines in partem suam cogendo violenter fraudulenterve fallendo. Quod si permetteretur in tam longo tempore ac tanta infirmitate multorum, plurimos tales, quales Deus id perpeti non vult, fideles deiceret et, ne crederent, impediret. Quod ne faceret, alligatus est." Compare Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei* 20.8, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, 2 vols. (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1993), 2:424.

<sup>48</sup> Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 20.8, ed. Dombart and Kalb, 2:425; trans. Henry Bettinson, in Augustine of Hippo, *The City of God* (London, 1984), 912.

<sup>49</sup> See the edition below at fols. 146v–147r.

<sup>50</sup> See the edition below at fols. 145v–150v.

<sup>51</sup> See the edition below at fols. 150v–155r.

3. The weapons used by the Devil and demons.<sup>52</sup>
4. The Christian soldier and the three things necessary to fight in this battle (food, arms and armor, and vigilance).<sup>53</sup>

As the introductory bridging by way of Gregory the Great (whose thought re-emerges on multiple occasions) might suggest, the addition is, at its heart, a conservative treatment of temptation, sin, and countervailing virtues, and, fitting with the preceding veneration of the most ascetically-minded of the Church Fathers, fundamentally an ascetic text.<sup>54</sup> The framing of the good Christian's struggle against temptations as a conflict not only with the Devil, but also against particular demons had a particularly long monastic heritage, often representing both a strong challenge and an important rite of passage.<sup>55</sup> The addition is also directly related to a monastic context in an early passage (fols. 149v–150r). Comparing the demons (*satellites*) to the Philistines (compare 1 Sam. 17:1), this passage describes how they set up strong camps between Sohot, identified as “the place of the one who has already erected tents of satisfaction,” and Azeca, the place of “the one whose hands and mind were enclosed in the cell of monastic religion (*in cubili monastice religionis*) some time ago,” and who “put the bolt of profession between himself and the world, praying to his Father with the door locked.”<sup>56</sup> Cloistered religious seem here to be at the forefront of the writer's mind and affections.

In monastic tradition, demons often seem to allegorize the interior struggle of the monk against his own concupiscence, but it can hardly be doubted that to many they represented a powerful external presence as well.<sup>57</sup> In this text, both registers are thoroughly mixed and intertwined. As seen from the introductory section, they had a very real existence for the author, but eventual victory over

<sup>52</sup> See the edition below at fols. 155r–166r.

<sup>53</sup> See the edition below at fols. 164r–179v. Six kinds of spiritual food are discussed, but most of the discussion is devoted to spiritual armor, with little mention of vigilance (*custodia ad cautionem*).

<sup>54</sup> On Gregory's asceticism, see George E. Demacopoulos, *Gregory the Great: Ascetic, Pastor, and First Man of Rome* (South Bend IN, 2015), 13–52. Gregory's “participationist” view of the mystical relationship between grace and human initiative placed particular soteriological value on the cultivation of asceticism and humility.

<sup>55</sup> Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above).

<sup>56</sup> See the edition below at fols. 149v–150r.

<sup>57</sup> On the internality and externality of demons, see David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge MA, 2006), who emphasizes their external quality; and Nienke Vos, “Demons Without and Within: The Representation of Demons, the Saint, and the Soul in Early Christian Lives, Letters, and Sayings,” in *Demons and the Devil in Ancient and Medieval Christianity*, ed. Nienke Vos and Willemein Otten (Leiden, 2011), 159–82, who argues that early ascetics often moved between the internal and external registers when speaking of demons.

them was primarily a matter of inner struggle and involved wrestling against one's own inclinations. The second section, for instance, handles the three "snares" (*laquei*) employed by the spiritual enemy to drag even the seemingly well-intentioned into sin. The first came in the corruption of good intentions before action; the second, by falling into vices after beginning good work; and the third, by leaving the work incomplete.<sup>58</sup> This duality of struggle against demons and struggle against oneself was foundational to the *miles Christi* tradition from which the revisionist drew. Other well-worn monastic images that influenced this discourse are also brought forth in this context. Perhaps harking back to the chapter 10 addition, one of the most obvious references is from Benedictine tradition. The Rule of Benedict, which called on its followers "to fight for the Lord Christ, the true King" armed with the "brilliant and mighty weapons of obedience" is clearly referenced when Christ is described as "our King, under whose banner we fight."<sup>59</sup>

The extensive discussion of spiritual armor and weapons expands on the cuirass, shield, helmet, and sword mentioned by Paul in Ephesians 6 in a manner that likewise recalled numerous twelfth-century models that adapted the image to medieval developments in warfare. Further arms are added alongside these (boots, a belt, a lance, a quiver, a bow, and arrows), as is the knight's equestrian equipment (spurs, stirrups, a saddle, a cinch, and a bridle), and, before all of this, a description of the demonic armaments (snares, a bow and arrows, and swords).<sup>60</sup> As described in the commentary below, however, it is worth noting that the exact combination of metaphors deployed appears original to the author, as does the supporting exegesis. Overall, it is clear that we are dealing with an author who was an experienced preacher and one with abundant intellectual training.<sup>61</sup> His frame of reference includes not only monastic touchpoints like Saint Bernard, but also authors associated with the schools.<sup>62</sup> We find, for instance, John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, and more prominently, and explicitly, the thought of Alan of Lille, whose moral poem *Anticlaudianus* is quoted in the descriptions of (1) the demonic snare by which good intentions are corrupted; (2) the necessity of studiousness represented by the Christian warrior's bow; and (3) the final scattering of the spiritual enemy.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>58</sup> See edition and commentary below at fols. 150v–155r.

<sup>59</sup> Benedict, *Regula monachorum*, prol., ed. Venarde (n. 25 above), 2–3. See the edition and commentary below at fol. 166v.

<sup>60</sup> See edition and commentary below at fols. 167v–174v, 175r–177v, and 150v–164r, respectively.

<sup>61</sup> See the edition and commentary below at fols. 172v–173v.

<sup>62</sup> See the edition below at fol. 147v.

<sup>63</sup> For John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, see the edition below at fol. 154r. For the *Anticlaudianus*, see the edition below at fols. 152v, 170v, and 178v–179r. The *Anticlaudianus* is also cited in the addition to chapter 10. See *Expositio*, 224.12.



A key passage, found amid the description of the stratagems of the serpent archer, discusses at what exact point sin is incurred in *delectatio naturalis* and shows that the revisionist was in fact deeply embedded within scholastic intellectual culture. There is a marked shift in style, addressing the matter through the sort of distinctions and phraseology (*in quantum talis; nec sic . . . nec sic*) that would have been more common in a *Sentences* commentary or a *quaestio disputata*:

Certainly, regarding the dart of suggestion, the wound of delectation and the dangers they bring in this battle, distinctions are made. Natural delectation is either solely in nature or from nature with the tinder [of sin]. If it is the first, it is neither good or bad (*indifferens*), since every natural act, in so far as it is such (*in quantum talis*), is neither good nor bad; for as the Scripture says “The sons of Israel could not destroy the Jebusite and he has lived among them until the present day” (compare Josh. 15.63). If it is the second way, a distinction is made, since the tinder is thought of in two ways. If indeed the tinder is considered as if the penalty of original sin, then sensual delectation considered this way will not be sin, but the penalty of sin. If, however, the tinder is considered as if it is a disposition, then you must next distinguish what is mortal [sin], since sensual delectation considered this way either occurs with the perception of reason or before this. If before, then the sin is of the lightest kind. If it occurs with perception [of reason], you must make a distinction since perceiving reason either consents, dissents, or otherwise dissembles (*aut nec sic, nec sic, sed dissimulat*). If [it occurs] the first way, either in delectation or in the act, whether the deed is done or not, [it is] always mortal [sin]. If he dissents, he either conquers or is conquered. If he conquers, not only is it not sin, it is a source of merit, according to the saying of Gregory: “Temptation which is not consented to is not sin, but rather a cause for the exercise of virtue.” If he is conquered, it is because he could not tear it out, and the temptation then becomes rooted. The cause of this rooting is either his fault or not. If not his [fault], it is thus a penalty and a cause of merit. If his [fault], it is either removed, and then it is a penalty, or it is not removed, and this in two ways, since it is either from a venal [fault], and then it is venal sin, or from a mortal [fault], and then it is mortal [sin]. If, however, reason should dissemble, [it does so] either without delay (*sine mora*) or with delay (*cum mora*). If without delay, the sin is venal; if with delay, then it is mortal, since reason ought not to dissemble.<sup>64</sup>

As Wachtel observed, “the sentence structure [of the additions in the Cambridge text] betrays mastery of the school’s stylistic devices,” but the familiarity with scholastic arguments runs deeper than style and basic method.<sup>65</sup> Here we find a sustained engagement with the complex debate over the so-called “first movements” of the soul and their relation to sensation on the one hand and sin on the other. There are, of course, clear echoes of Peter Lombard, who first used

<sup>64</sup> See the edition below at fols. 157r–157v. The saying attributed to Gregory here is found in the *Glossa ordinaria* (2 Cor. 12), in *Glossae Scripturae Sacrae electronicae (Gloss-e)*, ed. Martin Morard, IRHT-CNRS, 2016–2018. Its source is unknown.

<sup>65</sup> Wachtel, “Einleitung” (n. 1 above), xxvii.

the phrase “tinder of sin” (*fomes peccati*), itself effectively a scholastic expansion on the Augustinian doctrine of concupiscence. The “tinder” was the “penalty” (*pena*) resulting from original sin, not in and of itself sinful, but highly conducive to the dispositions of the will that created actual sin, as described here.<sup>66</sup> Crucially, however, the subtle modifications made to Peter’s doctrine on the first movements also suggest the influence of early thirteenth-century authorities such as William of Auxerre and Stephen Langton.<sup>67</sup>

The debate over the “first movements” had its origins in the controversy between Peter Abelard and Saint Bernard that had culminated at the Council of Sens (1140/41).<sup>68</sup> The former’s strict emphasis on the necessity of conscious consent for the incursion of sin represented a seemingly disturbing shift from the more traditional patristic and monastic view that even momentary titillations might fall within the will’s domain and thus be sinful.<sup>69</sup> While that controversy had long since faded, in part because Lombard and others at the schools had found ways to express what was essentially the more classical view with increased precision, we can see here that the finely crafted argumentation of the early to mid-thirteenth century around this issue had not solely become an esoteric matter for debate within the university.<sup>70</sup> Rather, it could truly matter within an ascetic didactic context too. Expressing these details in his own wording — it is no simple paraphrase — and comfortably interweaving a citation (albeit probably misattributed) to Gregory amid the discussion, the revisionist was able to put relatively cutting-edge thought to work in service of ascetic education, just as he had done on a broader level with the apocalyptic work of Alexander Minorita.<sup>71</sup>

What does all this suggest concerning the authorship of the Cambridge *Expositio*’s additions? As Wachtel has already noted, there is significant erudition on display here. Alongside the knowledge of the Bible and monastic and patristic classics, the profusion of references to classical authors, Ovid in particular,

<sup>66</sup> Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford, 2004), 113–15; and Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1993), 2:743.

<sup>67</sup> See edition and commentary on fols. 157r and 157v.

<sup>68</sup> On the Council of Sens, see Constant J. Mews, “The Council of Sens (1141): Abelard, Bernard, and the Fear of Social Upheaval,” *Speculum* 77 (2002): 342–82; and Wim Verbaal, “The Council of Sens Reconsidered: Masters, Monks, or Judges?” *Church History* 74 (2005): 460–93.

<sup>69</sup> Damien Boquet and Piroska Nagy, “Medieval Sciences of Emotions during the Eleventh to Thirteenth Centuries: An Intellectual History,” *Osiris* 31 (2016): 21–45, at 26–27; and Damien Boquet and Piroska Nagy, *Medieval Sensibilities*, trans. Robert L. J. Shaw (Cambridge, 2018), 132–35.

<sup>70</sup> On Lombard and the schools, see Boquet and Nagy, “Medieval Sciences of Emotions,” 27–28. On the ongoing debates, see Odon Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1948), 2:493–589.

<sup>71</sup> For the citation attributed to Gregory, see the edition below at fol. 157v.

should also be noted.<sup>72</sup> Most tellingly, a familiarity with recent developments in preaching practice and, crucially, a deep engagement with scholastic thought and intellectual practice are entwined with more time-honored influences. This is not to say that we are dealing with a secular scholar. The intellectual formation on display here is quite consonant with the thirteenth-century educational developments within both mendicant and cenobitic orders that have been previously mentioned, driven by the recruitment of graduates and establishment of *studia*.

There is also good reason to think that someone from a German religious and intellectual background was at work here, allying with the manuscript's provenance. As discussed in the commentary, this addition repeatedly draws from distinctive material also found in the writing of Albert of Stade — Wachtel's suggested author.<sup>73</sup> For instance, the text cites a German vernacular proverb translated into Latin by Caesarius of Heisterbach in the prologue to his *Dialogus miraculorum* and a poetic version of the classic fable of the "Ass in the Lion's Skin" found in the *Anti-Avianus* collection, known only from one extant thirteenth-century manuscript (Cambridge, University Library, Dd.11.78), both of which Albert also cited.<sup>74</sup> Albert was also fond of citing other poems found in the *Anti-Avianus* collection, which one can assume had some currency in the learned circles of his region.<sup>75</sup> It may be notable, however, that in the only apparent citation of Albert's own words ("Battles should be borne with a magnanimous heart," found in the section on the "stirrup of magnanimity" and drawn from his Latin epic poem on the Trojan War, *Troilus*), the quoted author is in fact referred to in the third person as *alius*.<sup>76</sup>

It is also important to observe that there are no clear references in this addition to any Franciscan or mendicant authors other than Alexander and Albert, a

<sup>72</sup> Wachtel, "Einleitung" (n. 1 above), xxvi–xxvii. As Wachtel notes, there are very few traces of classical poetry in Alexander's original commentary (xxvii). Schmolinsky suggests that Alexander had access to *florilegia* of classical authors when writing the additions to the Cambridge text. See Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar* (n. 1 above), 50. On the reception of Ovid in the Middle Ages, see *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, ed. James G. Clark, Kathryn L. McKinley, and Frank Thomas Coulson (Cambridge, 2011); Alessandro Schiesaro, "Ovid and the Professional Discourses of Scholarship, Religion, and Rhetoric," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, ed. Philip R Hardie (Cambridge, 2002), 62–78; Ralph Hexter, "Ovid in the Middle Ages: Exile, Mythographer, and Lover" in *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, ed. Barbara Weiden Boyd (Lieden, 2002), 413–42; and Peter Allen, *The Art of Love: Amatory Fiction from Ovid to the Romance of the Rose* (Philadelphia, 1992), esp. the appendix "Medieval Reception and Transmission of Ovid's Amatory Works: An Overview," 111–118.

<sup>73</sup> See edition and commentary below at fols. 153v, 155v, 171v, 176v, and 179r.

<sup>74</sup> See edition and commentary below at fols. 153v (*Anti-Avianus*) and 171v (*Dialogus miraculorum*).

<sup>75</sup> Thomas Gärtner, *Klassische Vorbilder mittelalterlicher Trojaepen* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1999), 447.

<sup>76</sup> See the edition below at fol. 176v.

striking contrast with the references and allusions to patristic and Benedictine writers. It is a pattern which is also found in the major additions in chapters 10 and 11, with one exception. It is certainly difficult to imagine Alexander Minorita incorporating the lengthy and detailed teachings from the Benedictine tradition seen in those additions, which include teachings aimed specifically toward followers of the Rule of Benedict, into his Apocalypse commentary. The single Franciscan source cited in the chapter 10 addition only makes the possibility of a Franciscan author — even one with a Benedictine past, such as Albert of Stade — seem less likely, since it appears as little more than an aside. In the commentary on verse 8, the author describes how through the call (*uoce*) of prevenient grace (*gratia preveniens*) and the hearing or lesson (*auditione*) given by subsequent grace (*gratia subsequens*) the church of the perfect is gathered together (*perfectorum ecclesia colligitur*), and then turns to examples of those who reached such perfection.<sup>77</sup> After indicating Abraham and Noah, the author mentions Francis and cites an antiphon from Julian of Speyer's *Officium rhythmicum sancti Francisci*. The citation reads in full: "And the Church sings of blessed Francis: 'He began under Innocent and completed (*perfecit*) his glorious journey under Honorius.'"<sup>78</sup> This brief mention of Francis suggests a general knowledge of contemporary liturgy and basic respect for the saint, but feels casual in comparison to the handling of material derived from the Benedictine tradition, a heritage which the author clearly held in high regard. Moreover, the contrast between this slim, single-source reference and Alexander's verbose presentation of the Franciscans and Dominicans as the New Jerusalem, including the numerous mendicant sources he uses there, suggests an author with significantly less personal devotion to mendicant religious life and culture.

Taking the chapter 20 addition together with those of chapter 10 (on Benedict and Benedictine monasticism) and chapter 11 (on Gregory's example and teaching), we are presented with an arc that emphasizes long-standing ascetic values above all else and that feels, at the very least, directed towards an audience that included cenobites, those who, as we have read in the chapter 20 addition, were to be found "praying to [their] Father with the door locked." This is true despite the revisionist's interest in thirteenth-century intellectual conversations, reflected in their discussions of preaching and scholastic pursuits. Seen in total, that arc also helps us to understand the chronological importance of the addition we have edited here, that is to say, the reason it was added to the Alexander's commentary: the ascetic and monastic values represented in the additions are situated

<sup>77</sup> *Expositio*, 212.21–23: "Hac itaque voce, quam dat gratia praeveniens, et auditione, quam dat subsequens, perfectorum ecclesia colligitur . . ."

<sup>78</sup> *Expositio*, 212.31–213.2: "Et de beato Franciscus cantat Ecclesia: *Copeit sub Innocentio cursumque sub Honorio perfecit gloriosum*." See *Expositio*, 213 for the reference to Julian of Speyer's *Office*.

for readers in the prophetic present and future. At the very end of the chapter 20 discussion, we find a writer reflecting on their work, acknowledging that they had seemingly traveled far from prophecy, before bringing it back to center-stage:

By this long digression — but necessary discussion — we have instructed [you] in this battle of humans and demons: no one digresses badly if they return better. Accordingly, the triumphant ones and the friends of God should gain as much knowledge of fighting and experience of overcoming as possible . . . Still we have all heard it from the words of this book, that while “the dragon, the old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan,” [currently] performs many wicked deeds through his minions, the angel has bound [ . . . ] *and cast him in a bottomless pit and shut him up and put a seal upon him [ . . . ] till the thousand years be finished* (Apoc. 20:2–3), that is, at the end times of the world.<sup>79</sup>

In just a few lines, the editor thus reminded the *Expositio*'s readers of the necessity of the time-honored message contained within the chapter 20 addition and ended with what seems like both a reassurance in their current task, against a restricted foe, and a warning for the future. The hardest battle might not be far off; the now victorious ascetic soldiers would do well to perfect their training.

Overall, the content of the unique material presented here suggests that the Cambridge version of the *Expositio* was prepared with the expectation of an audience that included Benedictine monks, placing this audience in conversation with intellectual currents derived from the mendicant orders and scholastic learning in a way that was fine-tuned to their interests. Drawing together provenance with content, it also seems likely that we are dealing with a particularly well-educated writer or compiler working sometime between 1248 (the date Alexander finished the revisions attributable to him that are found in the Cambridge text) and 1270 (the date of the manuscript) and probably in Germany. The author's connection with mendicant religious culture was, if clearly far from absent given the ultimate origin of the *Expositio*, at very least somewhat muted within the additions. We cannot rule out that Alexander Minorita or (more plausibly, given his Benedictine connection) Albert of Stade had some hand in these additions. Both were clearly important intellectual influences on the compilation, but a third possibility — that the directing hand was an unknown author within the Benedictine tradition writing for co-religionists — must now be strongly considered given the ultimate shape of the Cambridge version.

That shape, as we have already seen, is marked by a strong ascetic outlook. Despite a significant knowledge of intellectual and religious currents of multiple origins, these elements remained essentially governed by this outlook and in its service. The way in which the chapter 10 and 20 additions segue from prophecy to the instruction of inner asceticism is in keeping with this. But we should not

<sup>79</sup> See the edition below at fols. 179r–179v.

assume that the editorial interest in Alexander Minorita's novel reading of the Apocalypse was simply opportunistic or superficial. Rather, it is arguably a product of serious engagement with Alexander's historical reading of prophecy. Here indeed we have further evidence of intellectual conversations — the movement of texts, ideas, and intellectual practices — between mendicant and cenobitic milieux, and of the overlapping influence of the schools that affected both. Nevertheless, we also have a reminder that the confluence of these environments engendered a measure of competition and rivalry. On the one hand, the Cambridge *Expositio* does not diminish the importance that Alexander granted the rise of the Franciscan and Dominican orders within his apocalyptic history; its compiler or compilers similarly felt no concern in placing scholastic argumentation in front of a monastic audience. On the other hand, it was clearly aimed at fortifying the purpose of long-standing forms of monastic life and learning within the same context. In a world of new orders and new intellectual touchpoints, the ascetic tradition that included followers of the Rule of Benedict also remained critical, proven by an apocalyptic outlook on history and the current dispensation.

It is this connection between time-honored ascetic morality and apocalyptic thought that makes the Cambridge *Expositio*, and above all the long addition to chapter 20 edited here, of particular significance. That even a somewhat tendentious historical treatment of apocalyptic time such as the *Expositio* could be used to support the most basic aspects of the day-to-day spiritual practice of monks should serve as a reminder of how these texts were commonly read and used.

*Independent Scholar*  
[magdahayton@gmail.com](mailto:magdahayton@gmail.com)

*Masaryk University*  
[robert.shaw@mail.muni.cz](mailto:robert.shaw@mail.muni.cz)

**Keywords:** Apocalypse, apocalypticism, Alexander Minorita, Albert of Stade, mendicants, monasticism, asceticism, spiritual warfare

## COMMENTARY

*Section I: Overview of the Main Players in the Ascetic's Apocalyptic Battle: God, the Devil, Demons, Angels, and Saintly Souls (fols. 145v–150v)*

The opening of the addition expands upon Alexander Minorita's citation of Augustine concerning God's power over the binding and loosing of the Devil to include a lower level of the celestial and demonic hierarchies. It is the angels

that have power over the binding and loosing of demons.<sup>80</sup> The bad will of these evil spirits and the Devil, however, is their own and always within them. Even if their leader, the Devil, is not always permitted by divine grace to fulfil his intentions, he does not cease his efforts; rather he “goes about” (1 Pet. 5:8; compare Job 1:7) continually looking for opportunities to strike (fol. 145v).

The author asks, “What, truly, should be the voice of the Devil to God, or of God to the Devil?” (fol. 145v). He answers this with an extended paraphrase of Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job*.<sup>81</sup> God speaks to the Devil by “challenging his perverse ways,” by “displaying the justice of his elect against him,” by sometimes “mercifully permitting him to tempt his elect,” and, conversely, at other times “restraining him, so that he should not dare to tempt his elect” (fol. 145v). The Devil meanwhile speaks to God by “insinuating his ways to him,” by “accusing the innocence of the elect with fictitious crimes,” and by “demanding the elect’s innocence be tested” (fol. 145v). The same paraphrase also describes how God and an angel converse (God by “showing [the angel] his will” and by “inspiring his wonders more clearly than light,” and the angel by “admiring [God’s] glory,” “considering his own grace,” and “intimately praising God on account of this blessing”) and the way “saintly souls” speak to the divine (“the voice of the saintly souls in the ear of God is their desire”) (fols. 145v–146v). Finally, the author describes how the demons speak to each other. They make “a racket” when they make their evil suggestions, provoking each other to greater attacks and exalting the craftiest among them “with a great clamour of praise.” Another paraphrase of Gregory the Great, again cited explicitly and this time from the *Liber dialogorum*, is deployed as an example of such noisy demons: the tale of how a Jew had heard “a crowd of evil spirits” while sleeping in a temple of Apollo, with one of their number boasting of how he had provoked Andrew, bishop of Fondi, to lust after a woman (fols. 146v–147r).<sup>82</sup>

The author then turns to the main focus of the addition: facing the challenge of this demonic foe. The reader is first reminded of the necessity of God’s sure support in the struggle:

And how can we — we who are dust and ashes (compare Gen. 18.27), who dwell in houses of clay, who have an earthly foundation (compare Job 4:19) — hold out in the face of them, whose prince *strews gold under himself like mire* (Job 41:21), unless he helps us: he who threw Pharaoh *with his chariots and horsemen into the sea* (Exod. 15:19) and sunk them *as lead in mighty waters* (Exod. 15:10)? (fol. 147r)

Here also begins the text’s engagement with the language of spiritual warfare against an evil host, frequently clothed in Old Testament comparisons: the

<sup>80</sup> See nn. 47–48, above.

<sup>81</sup> Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 2.7, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 1979), 1:64–68.

<sup>82</sup> Gregory the Great, *Liber dialogorum* 3.7.2–5, ed. de Vogüé and Antin (n. 37 above), 278–82.

Egyptians, the Philistines, the Assyrians, and the Seleucids. The reader in turn is given succor in preparing for this combat through the images of Israelite leaders — Moses, David, Hezekiah, Mattathias, and Judas Maccabeus — reinforced by God (fols. 147r–147v and *passim*). The battle is joined whenever “the spirit of the Lord, by his unction, teaches someone to repent from evil deeds or to grow stronger in good ones, just as it is read concerning David that when he was anointed by Samuel, *the Spirit of the Lord came upon him* (1 Sam. 16:13)” (fol. 147r). Foreshadowing a later section, the text exhorts that “we should take up the arms of justice” against this enemy, but immediately reminds the reader that the threat is not simply external, citing Bernard’s *Sermo super Cantica canticorum* on the difficulty of discerning “between the sickness of the mind and the bite of serpent” (fol. 147v).<sup>83</sup> Humanity’s post-Fall concupiscence indeed left the door open for the Devil, who “adds his machinations to our pleasures” (fol. 147v).

Beyond the explicit quotations of the authorities we have already seen, the text has obvious high medieval models in its focus on inner battle. This was a very popular theme for spiritual authors in this period with even longer patristic and monastic roots. The use of the military battles of the Hebrew Bible as examples for spiritual warfare was a very well-established exegetical tradition that fed into many descriptions of the ascetic *miles Christi*.<sup>84</sup> That said, it is from this point in the text that the author becomes more original in the specific images deployed. While the introductory matter leans heavily on paraphrases of existing material, especially that of Gregory, here the author begins to weave a more independent allegorical and exegetical text, albeit with some well-worn elements and citations (which this commentary will highlight wherever they occur). It is a skill that suggests a strong grounding in preaching, at least to religious and learned audiences. Indeed, while the overall structure of the addition does not follow the sort of *forma praedicandi* described in contemporary manuals, the techniques employed — for example, the occasional division of biblical quotations into shorter phrases for analysis, the use of vivid *exempla*, and the construction of clever allegory — suggest a familiarity with the rapidly developing *ars praedicandi* of the period.<sup>85</sup> For instance, the words of Rabshakeh, the messenger of the Assyrian king Sennacherib (Isa. 36.4–16), are broken down and then expanded upon to

<sup>83</sup> Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo super Cantica canticorum* 32.6, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. Jean Leclercq et al., 8 vols. (Rome, 1957–77), 3:229. See also Wendy Love Anderson, *The Discernment of Spirits: Assessing Visions and Visionaries in the Late Middle Ages* (Tübingen, 2011), 39–41.

<sup>84</sup> Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 10–16.

<sup>85</sup> On these developments and the structural and rhetorical devices of thirteenth-century sermons, see Siegfried Wenzel, *Medieval Artes Praedicandi: A Synthesis of Scholastic Sermon Structure* (Toronto, 2015); and Phyllis B. Roberts, “The *Ars Praedicandi* and the Medieval Sermon,” in *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages*, ed. Carolyn Muessig (Leiden, 2002), 41–62.



serve an extended allegorical exegesis, without obvious models, on how demons (*maligni hostes*) play on one's inner desires. Why give everything for a master, God, who demands sacrifice, rather than one, the Devil, who would give earthly rewards ("two thousand horses") in return for allegiance (fols. 148r–148v)?

Such vivid biblical exegesis allows the author to conjure a spiritual battlefield. Returning briefly to the Apocalypse, the reader is reminded of God's promise to the faithful: "Be faithful until death; and I will give you the crown of life" (Apoc. 2:10). Opposing this was the path of death, the denial of eternal life: "they [the demonic enemy] seek not only to capture or leave destitute, but also to kill" (fols. 148v–149r). The demons place humanity under "siege" with their "machinations." As in Psalm 87:18 ("They have come round about me like water all the day: they have compassed me about together"), they are strong (like water), ceaseless (all the day), and united (together) in their efforts to make one turn to worldly desires (fol. 149r). The author expands on these three themes (fols. 149r–149v). The first — the comparison to water — allows the author to return to the words of Apocalypse: "And the serpent cast out of his mouth, after the woman, water . . . that he might cause her to be carried away by the river" (Apoc. 12:15) (fol. 149r).

Having raised the example of Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem (Jer. 52:4) at the conclusion of a section on the "unity" of the foe, the text then turns to the "most strong camps" (fol. 149r), from which the besieging forces operate. Such imagery of demons surrounding the defences of the *milites Christi* had likewise found popularity among monastic writers like Peter Damian and Bernard of Clairvaux in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but the particular presentation found here appears original.<sup>86</sup> The author imagines the besieging forces as the Philistines "camped between Socho and Azeca" (1 Sam. 17:1), where the opposing forces of good lie waiting. Socho represents the "the place of the one who has already erected tents of satisfaction," seemingly a reference to those Christians in the world who repent and perform penances (fol. 149v). Building on the exegetical association of Azeca with strength (*fortitudo*) also found in the *Glossa ordinaria*, this latter is imagined as the monastic estate:

[the place] of the one who already *has girded his loins with strength* (Prov. 31:17) and, made strong by this, is ruled by the discipline of God's commands; likewise, of the one whose hands and mind were enclosed in the cell of monastic religion some time ago, who put the bolt of profession between himself and the world, praying to his Father with the door locked (fols. 149v–150r).<sup>87</sup>

<sup>86</sup> On the imagery of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, see Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 148–53.

<sup>87</sup> On Azeca and *fortitudo*, see *Glossa ordinaria* (1 Rg. 17), in *Glossae Scripturae Sacrae electronicae* (*Gloss-e*), ed. Morard (n. 64 above).

While not explicitly cited as a higher priority target for the demonic host, the singling out of these monastic defenders is reminiscent of Anthony's claim (in the *Vita Antonii*) that demons particularly hated monks for their resistance and triumphs.<sup>88</sup> In keeping with the same verse of 1 Samuel (1 Sam. 17:1), the location of the demonic camps is said also to be "within the borders of Dommim." The author follows Jerome's etymology of this place name as "the ascent or shadow of the red (*ascensus ruforum vel umbra*)," an image that is related back to the Apocalypse:

in this the final intention of the demons is pitched: that *that red dragon* (Apoc. 12:3) — [red] from the blood of many, as much from that poured out, just as from martyrs, as from that poured in, just as from sins — . . . should ascend over the besieged, trampling them, . . . and with his tail drag them with him (compare Apoc. 12:4) damnably to the place of the shadow of death (fol. 150r).<sup>89</sup>

Surveying this bloody scene are the camps of the demonic host. These are defined metaphorically as the "subtlety of [their] nature" (*nature subtilitas*), that is, the demons' ability, supported by "angelic knowledge," to investigate and exploit the "most secret paths of our ways"; their "antiquity of time" (*temporis antiquitas*), that is, their long practice in the "school of malice"; and, building on these, their "assiduity in deceiving" (*fallendi assiduitas*) (fols. 150r–150v).

*Section II: The Three Kinds of Snares Demons and the Devil Use to Trap Christians (fols. 150v–155r)*

A long exegesis on the "snares" (*laquei*) of the Devil and demons then begins, the first part of the author's analysis of the Devil's war materiel: "Thus the demons place snares for our feet with deceitful scheming when they strive to entangle the steps of the good path within us, whether at the beginning, in the middle, or even at the end, with the goals of their malice" (fol. 150v). This image of "snares" had been favored by the apostle Paul (compare 1 Tim. 3:7; and 2 Tim. 2:26) and used frequently by Augustine, but it is rooted in the Old Testament, as the author makes clear: *They prepared a snare for my feet* (Ps. 56:7). And, *In this way wherein I walked, they have hidden a snare for me* (Ps. 141:4).<sup>90</sup> At the beginning of a good deed, the demonic snare is one of "corrupt intention;" in the middle, of "polluted action;" and at the end, of leaving the matter "unfinished" (fol. 150v).

The first snare, that concerning intention, could be found where one acted under false pretences. The author gives the example of those who, during Paul's

<sup>88</sup> Evagrius of Pontus, *Vita Antonii* 23, in *Vitae Antonii versiones Latinae*, ed. P. H. E. Bertrand, CCSL 170 (Turnhout, 2018), 29; cited in Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 81.

<sup>89</sup> Compare Jerome, *Liber de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum*, PL 23, col. 870.

<sup>90</sup> On Augustine's presentation of "snares" see, for example, *Confessiones* 3.6.10–11 and 10.34.51, ed. James J. O'Donnell, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1992), 1:26–27 and 139.

imprisonment in Rome, preached Christ falsely, *supposing that they raise affliction to my bands* (Phil. 1:17). By extension, this snare entangles “every hypocrite,” who “falsely feigning an outward image of sanctity, on the inside retains a corrupt desire for their own glory” (fol. 151r). Those who sit in judgment over others receive attention in several examples here. The snare of corrupt intention traps those who “under the pretext of justice are cruel in correction.” The victim may not even be aware that they are ensnared in this way; such cruel people may “believe themselves to furnish great service to God” (fol. 151r). There were indeed “vices presenting the shape of virtues” (fols. 151r–151v), an image found in a very similar context (concerning the cruelty of judges) in the sermons of the Cistercian Garnerius of Rochefort, but also, for instance, in the *Moralium dogma philisophorum* and the work of Alain of Lille, works drawn on elsewhere in the addition.<sup>91</sup> The author also cites an example from the *Liber dialogorum* of Gregory the Great of a certain church overseer named Peter, who was harshly punished for his own cruelty in handing out punishments (fol. 151v).<sup>92</sup> Outwardly upright judges privately corrupted by greed also fall under this banner (fol. 151v). Another example is provided by those who sing out above the harmony of the choir, in which the author draws on a liturgical image: “when around him ‘the angels praise the majesty of God, the dominions adore [him],’ he celebrates with them not in shared exultation but conscious of flattery, and the voice which ought to be brought to the praise of God in suppliant confession, he breaks in a subtle quest for his own glory and throws out on high” (fol. 151v).<sup>93</sup> This brings the first of many (often negative) citations of Ovid, albeit he is never mentioned by name. Such people, in the view of the author, would rather follow the “pagan” who taught (in the *Ars amatoria*), “If you have a good voice, sing; if you have graceful limbs, dance; with whatever gifts of pleasing you possess, be pleasing” (fol. 151v).<sup>94</sup> Similarly, someone “who feigns in words but at heart is not a faithful friend” falls into this category, as well as those who “stroke the minds of men in crafty voice and rub the ears of princes with false praise” in order to achieve their own goals (fols. 151v–152r).

<sup>91</sup> See Garnerius of Rochefort, *Sermones* 9, PL 205, col. 630A; *Moralium Dogma Philisophorum* 1.A, ed. John Holmberg, in *Das Moraliū dogma philisoporū des Guilelmus de Conches* (Uppsala, 1929), 10; and Alain of Lille, *Ars predicandi*, PL 210, col. 159B.

<sup>92</sup> Gregory the Great, *Liber dialogorum* 4.37:10–11, ed. de Vogüé and Antin (n. 37 above), 130–32.

<sup>93</sup> “The angels praise the majesty of God, the dominions adore [him]” (*maiestatem Dei laudant angeli, adorant dominationes*) is a common image in the prefaces of the Mass. For one of the earliest witnesses, see Pseudo-Gelasius I, *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae* 3.16, ed. H. A. Wilson (Oxford, 1894), 234.

<sup>94</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.595–96; ed. and trans. J. H. Mozley and G. P. Goold, in *Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems*, Loeb Classical Library 232 (Cambridge, MA, 1985), 140.

The author's longest rebuke concerning "corrupt intention," however, is aimed at a certain brand of intellectual, those "who compose and write books, however useful, and do so to show the strength of their talent, so that when such a work is read, their knowledge is commended; who do not desire the utility of the Church as much as their own praise" (fol. 152r). Here the author takes part in a well-known medieval discourse concerning the right and wrong sorts of intellectual culture. If fomented in part by monastic reaction to the growing influence of secular learning — for example, Bernard and William of Saint-Thierry's criticism of Abelard and his followers — such critiques could soon be found espoused by university scholars of all stripes seeking to elevate their emergent culture. As will be seen further on, the author of the addition was no stranger to scholastic argumentation and clearly understood its utility.<sup>95</sup>

Moreover, despite the essential familiarity of the author's arguments, his own treatment of the issue is founded on an interweaving of materials that is not beholden to any single source. The divine rebukes to the priests in Hosea (Hos. 5:1 and 9:8) are expanded upon to show how such men ultimately obscured reflection on Scripture (fols. 152r–152v). Again, the "pagan" Ovid is cited negatively, and this time repeatedly (once from *Ex Ponto*, *Tristia*, and *Ars amatoria*, and twice from *Remedia amoris*), as representing a culture that took no issue with egotistical intellectual endeavours (fol. 152v). The grammarian Priscian, commonly cited as an apostate in high medieval critiques of his work, is raised as an example of how fruitless such activities really were.<sup>96</sup> He had fallen into apostasy, the author says, in his desire to write the most famous work on grammar. The author also cited Alain of Lille's apparent critique of the same person in the *Anticlaudianus* and how apostasy had ultimately led him to err in his work (fol. 152v).<sup>97</sup> This same citation from the *Anticlaudianus* is also found in the main body of Alexander Minorita's work with a shared spelling variation (*priscus*, instead of *pigrus*) enhancing an association with Priscian that is in fact far from explicit in Alain's original text.<sup>98</sup> Pontius Pilate is also presented as a negative example of a writer of useful things whose intentions had been corrupted. While it was good that he had written the "triumphant title" of Christ beneath his cross, he had written "King of the Jews" ironically and in a literal sense, rather than truthfully and in broader figurative sense (that is, as king of all the devout), and, "desiring human glory," he had indeed killed him (fols. 152v–153r). Bringing these critiques into more contemporary recommendations for

<sup>95</sup> On this discourse, see Ian P. Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris* (Cambridge, 2012), esp. 72–168.

<sup>96</sup> On Priscian, see John A. Albert, "The Grammatical Metaphor: A Survey of Its Use in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 57 (1982): 728–60, at 741.

<sup>97</sup> Alain of Lille, *Anticlaudianus* 2.499–502, ed. R. Bousset (Paris, 1955), 87.

<sup>98</sup> *Expositio*, 229.2–7.

those who preach and teach, the author recommends that writers pursue “utility” over “subtlety,” “humility” over “grandeur,” the “glory of Christ” over “their own dignity” (fol. 153r). The well-known fable of the “Ass in the Lion’s Skin,” in the same version found in the thirteenth-century *Anti-Avianus* collection, is deployed to pillory those of grand appearance but little substance; the same quotation is also used in Albert of Stade’s *Troilus*, a work quoted elsewhere in this addition (fol. 153v).<sup>99</sup>

The final two snares are dealt with in more summary fashion. The first of these, concerning those “who indeed begin good works in right intention, but afterwards mix in certain things by which the same deed is spoiled,” is demonstrated through the example of those who marry in “sincerity,” but who “give in to lust” (fol. 153v). It is compared to the biblical image of mixing bile with wine (Matt. 27:14). The author also draws on Haggai to demonstrate the necessity of lasting resolve in good deeds — “Set your heart upon your ways” (Hag. 1:5 and 1.7) — and the inner pallor of those who conceive acts in charity, but then stray: “You have clothed yourselves, but have not been warmed” (Hag. 1.6) (fol. 154r). The remuneration for whatever good acts such people nevertheless perform in the process is compared to the transactional rewards granted by God to faithless kings like Jehu and the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar (fol. 154v). Regarding the latter, the author employs a paraphrase of Ezekiel (Ezk. 29:18–19) seemingly derived from John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus*: “Because he has served me well at Tyre, I will give him Egypt” (fol. 154v). The subject matter briefly turns to a theological discussion concerning what benefit is wrought by good works performed by someone who has fallen into mortal sin (*sub mortalibus*). While such works “have their remuneration, they do not build to the crown” (fol. 154v). Notably, a verse is quoted which appears to have circulated in compilations intended for educating scholars in the cathedral schools: “Good deeds under mortal [sin] enrich in earthly gifts, render the heart apt, and lessen the torments of Pluto” (fols. 154v–155r).<sup>100</sup> It is the first of several affirmations which make clear that the author was influenced by scholastic intellectual currents and culture.

The final snare — “when someone begins a good work with good intention and does not thereafter taint it by combining it with evil, but nevertheless does not persevere in it to its due end” — returns to martial imagery: “No one indeed, as the apostle said, will be crowned *unless he will have strived legitimately*

<sup>99</sup> *Anti-Avianus* 5.5–6 and 5.11–12, ed. Léopold Hervieux, in *Les fabulistes latins depuis le siècle d’Auguste jusqu’à la fin du moyen âge*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1893–99), 3:470; and Albert of Stade, *Troilus* 2.701–702, ed. Theodor Merzdorf (Leipzig, 1875), 63.

<sup>100</sup> Greti Dinkova-Bruun, “Notes on Poetic Composition in the Theological Schools ca. 1200 and the Latin Poetic Anthology from Ms. Harley 956: A Critical Edition,” *Sacris Erudiri* 43 (2004): 299–391, at 336.

(2 Tim. 2:5); that is, he who does not conclude his fight at its proper end loses the crown” (fol. 155r). The author draws from the well-known legend of the forty martyrs of Sebaste, in which one of the legionaries, condemned to freeze to death for their Christian faith, yielded to his persecutors and died from shock in a warm bath (fol. 155r).

*Section III: The Weapons Used by the Devil and Demons (fols. 155r–166r)*

The military imagery intensifies as the text moves to the discussion of the more direct weapons deployed by the Devil and his minions: “Now let us examine his arrows and swords, and then his ambushes and open assaults, so that we should come to know, as much from his arms as from his names, how we might overcome him, his efforts shattered” (fol. 155r). The names, referencing the nomenclatures of Apocalypse 12:9 — “the dragon, that old serpent, who is the Devil and Satan” — are indeed related to his tools (including the previously discussed snares) and stratagems: “Since indeed he is the dragon, he is accustomed to laying snares of cunning; since he is the serpent, to dipping arrows in poison; since old, to drawing swords skillfully; since he is the Devil, to setting ambushes; since he is Satan, to attacking through open challenges” (fols. 155r).

Quoting a saying, originally of Boethius but here uncredited, that “evil cannot be avoided unless understood,” the narrative turns first to the arrows: “Arrows strike without warning, and often when an untroubled man has no fear at all, the serpent sends arrows dipped in awful poison” (fol. 155v).<sup>101</sup> The author builds upon the words of Psalm 10:3: “For, lo, the wicked have bent their bow: they have prepared their arrows in the quiver, to shoot in the dark the upright of heart.” The serpent prepares arrows by confecting “venomous harms” in the “secret part of his heart” and he shoots “in the dark” when he draws those arrows from “the quiver of wicked intention” and places them on his “bow of cunning” (fol. 155v).

That cunning displayed in the stratagems of the archer becomes an extended focus. The author notes four reasons why the archer might delay his bolt. Sometimes he might seem to stop shooting only to fire his next shot at a more opportune moment, when even the normally God-fearing and determined eventually let their guard down. At that moment the serpent aims for a weak spot, “his thigh or that other bare, more loosely guarded body part,” leaving a wound which causes the victim to sully themselves further (fol. 155v). The author compares this blow to the “arrow fixed in the thigh of the dog” (fol. 156r), an apparent mis-recollection of Ecclesiasticus 19:12 (*femori canis* instead of *femori carnis*),

<sup>101</sup> Boethius, *De differentiis topicis* 2, PL 64, col. 1184B. It may have been drawn more proximately from Albert of Stade’s *Troilus*, which the author evidently had access to and where it is attributed to Aristotle. See Albert of Stade, “Accessus in Troilum,” ed. Merzdorf, 5.

since according to the Scriptures, “The dog is returned to his vomit” (2 Pet. 2.22; compare Prov. 26:11). The author notes how many initially strong and well-meaning people waver in their commitment and let their guard down over time, a reflection that prompts the author to make reference to Ovid again in a somewhat negative light, albeit this time with a certain recognition of his wisdom: “It often happens that she who fears to commit herself to an honest man degrades herself to the embraces of a mean one” (fols. 156r–156v).<sup>102</sup> Similarly, sometimes the serpent archer delays “in order, afterwards, to bend his bow tauter” and thereby produce a more serious blow. Such an arrow could pierce the heart of even a stout and well-defended target “if, amid the weight of virtues, they have neglected to blow away the light dust of pride” (fol. 156v). This lingering but fatal vulnerability of the strong is demonstrated through the scriptural example of Amasias, whose one failing was that “he took not away the high places” (2 Kings 14:4), and by two common proverbs: “When you have fought well, when you believe all things overcome, pride, which vexes more, remains unconquered” and “If wealth, wisdom, and beauty should be given to you, pride, if it comes along too, alone destroys everything” (fol. 156v).

Sometimes, the pause is taken so that the serpent archer “might be sought more eagerly” by its quarry, that is, if the wounded falls to the suggestion of the archer and wilfully delights in it, then there is no need to fire again (fols. 156v–157r). It is here (fols. 157r–157v) that the text engages most deeply in the logical disputation style of the schools in breaking down at what point sin is incurred in “natural delectation” (*delectatio naturalis*). The view taken by the author is certainly informed by the discussions of Peter Lombard and his followers concerning the “first movements” of the sensitive appetite of the soul.<sup>103</sup> In contrast to the less influential Abelardian school of thought (which insisted more firmly on the necessity of clear consent for the incursion of sin), here the effects of post-Fall concupiscence, which laid the “tinder of sin” (*fomes peccati*), meant that humanity’s sensual appetites could provoke fresh sin even in their initial operation and without reasoned thought (albeit that the latter would only be the “most light” variety of sin, as both Lombard and our author maintained).<sup>104</sup> The author was, moreover, deeply embedded in the subtleties of debate that had continued to nuance Lombard’s guiding view into the thirteenth century. The division between a sensitivity that was “natural” and another which was “natural with the tinder [of sin]” (fol. 157r) is reminiscent of the insistence of William of Auxerre and some of the early Dominican masters that one’s simplest animal

<sup>102</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.769–70; trans. Mozley and Goold (n. 94 above), 64.

<sup>103</sup> Lottin, *Psychologie et morale* (n. 70 above), 2:493–589. More recently, see Boquet and Nagy, “Medieval Sciences of Emotions” (n. 69 above), 26–27; and Boquet and Nagy, *Medieval Sensibilities* (n. 69 above), 132–35.

<sup>104</sup> Lottin, *Psychologie et morale* (n. 70 above), 2:494–96 and 515.

appetites born from natural necessity might still be free from sin. This position was denied by contemporary Franciscan scholars like Philip the Chancellor, whose thought was later upheld by Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas.<sup>105</sup>

There is perhaps also an echo of Stephen Langton in the recognition that such first movements had a duration within which the will could intervene.<sup>106</sup> The author of the addition emphasizes that the willful blocking of incomplete “natural delectation” would be a cause of merit rather than sin (fol. 157r), and that, where “reason should dissemble,” the venal or mortal nature of the sin depended on the length of the dissimulation (fol. 157v). The overall synthesis, however, remains skilfully constructed and unique in its precise phrasing, providing a strong indication of the author’s academic training, calibre, and adaptability. Overall, material derived from scholastic disputation was reframed elegantly as spiritual counsel and tied to broader scriptural exegesis, so that the watchful Christian would show the utmost caution and be on guard against the “dart of suggestion.” Given the sinful traps of human sensitivity, it was little wonder, the author wrote, that the Assyrians “glory in their pikes, and in their arrows, and in their spears” (Jth. 9:9) (fol. 157v).

Finally, the archer might cease temporarily in order that he might ultimately wound in a more lasting fashion:

The serpent often fires his dart of suggestion at a person and when the dart has been withdrawn he allows the wound to heal, and for a second time, he makes the soul bleed from the opened wound with an arrow; and once more, when the arrow has been removed, he conceals the battle until the wound attains complete health. And thus, many times refiring the dart, many times he allows the inflicted wound to heal, so that the one [who is] many times wounded and healed, healed and wounded, relapses many times. Finally, from the frequency of relapsing, the soul, healed and relapsed so many times, falls obstinate into a pit of despair (fol. 157v).

This type of at first innocuous but ultimately decisive wounding is compared to the arrow which hit Jehoram “between the shoulders” and “which came out through the heart” (2 Kings. 9:22). The serpent aims a final arrow during the “continual misery of the wounded,” which strikes “between the neck and shoulder” (2 Chron. 18:33) and turns him against God entirely, a wound which is almost impossible to heal (fols. 157v–158r).

The extensive exegesis on the “arrows” segues into a discussion of the parts from which they are made. The author begins with the “wings” that allow them to fly, in the hope that “we can meanwhile break these wings with God’s aid, so that the dart does not reach that place which its shooter aimed to strike” (fol. 158r). Three wings are listed: the “charm of praises” (*laudum*

<sup>105</sup> Lottin, *Psychologie et morale* (n. 70 above), 2:520–21 and 537.

<sup>106</sup> Lottin, *Psychologie et morale* (n. 70 above), 2:507.



*suauitas*), the “esteem of riches” (*opum dignitas*), and the “vanity of hearts” (*cordium uanitas*) (fol. 158r). The first aids the arrow when the *serpens antiquus* “impresses a fraudulent sanctity upon someone by the dart of his suggestion” (fols. 158r–158v); false impressions are indeed key to its understanding. The wing is disguised as that of another bird; here the author reminds the reader of the words of Job: “The wing of the ostrich is like the wings of the heron, and of the hawk” (Job 39:13). Someone who seeks praise rather than virtue can be said to have “the wings of an ostrich,” carrying “the form of good deeds in appearance, not in performance” (fol. 158v). A hypocrite is likened to an ostrich: “they bury all their eggs — that is, every increment of good deeds — in the sand — that is, in the covering of earthly glory” (fol. 158v). The same comparison can be made of Lucifer himself, who “left his eggs in the earth, when he buried the nobility of [his] nature, the wisdom God bestowed upon him, and [his] decency in the sand of pride” (fol. 158v). “Pride” begat by “human praise” is the nature of this wing (fols. 158v–159r). The second wing is the not unrelated “secular dignity and desire for riches,” and can thus be seen as the “wing of greed.” It is likened to that of an eagle, in line with the saying of Proverbs 23:5: “Lift not up your eyes to riches which you cannot have: because they shall make themselves wings like those of an eagle, and shall fly towards heaven” (fol. 159r). The author briefly cites the example of “Theophilus,” almost certainly Theophilus of Alexandria, who had been decried for his thirst for power and greed in the well-known ecclesiastical histories of Sozomen and Socrates Scholasticus (fol. 159r).<sup>107</sup> The third wing — the “vanity of hearts” — is described as being of particularly widespread effectiveness, “since we hardly find anyone who would remove vanity of heart entirely from within himself; and if anyone has already removed it, it will again return and press upon him” (fol. 159r). Those affected by it proceed not “from virtue to virtue, but from vanity into the same” (fols. 159r–159v). The wing of vanity is described as insatiable: it “is not only gluttonous, but also lustful, as if productive of every levity, since just as envy is the handmaiden of pride, thus lust is the handmaiden of gluttony” (fol. 159v). Jeremiah’s lament that “I have fed them to the full, and they committed adultery” (Jer. 5:7) and the description of Ezekiel (cited as Hosea) of the iniquities of Sodom (Ezek. 16:49) are cited in support of this, but so too (again as a negative moral example) is Ovid’s *Ars amatoria*: “Wine prepares minds and makes them apt for passions” (fol. 159v).<sup>108</sup> Unrestrained lust is indeed its final result. The author

<sup>107</sup> Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.7, PG 67, col. 684; and Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 8.12, PG 67, cols. 1545 and 1547; both cited in Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, 1992), 46 and 48.

<sup>108</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.237, trans. Mozley and Goold (n. 94 above), 29.

raises the example of Ammon, who raped the sister of Absalon, as one who failed to avoid an arrow with this wing (fol. 159v).

The “rod” (*uirga*) of the arrow is defined as the “rigid will of [the Devil’s] intention” which he chooses for someone. The author finds this definition prefigured in Ezekiel: “the rod has blossomed, pride has budded; iniquity is risen up into a rod of impiety” (Ezek. 7:11–12) (fols. 159v–160r). “Pitch” (*bitumen*) then joins the aforementioned three wings to the rod. This is defined as *naturalis scientia*, “natural knowledge which he [the Devil] possesses from angelic virtue, indeed which God imparted to him, but which by the fire of sins, which eradicates the fruits of all virtues, has boiled and blackened over a long time” (fol. 160r). Now a sticky substance, this knowledge allows him to bind sins together and the sinner to the sins, “so that the sinner cannot be extracted from this infirm firmness except with utmost difficulty” (fol. 160r). It serves as a metaphor for how pride, the “beginning of all sin,” produces its offspring in a daisy chain: “pride . . . binds itself to anger, anger to envy, envy to sadness, sadness to greed, and gluttony likewise to lust” (fols. 160r–160v). It also joins the wicked together: “the robbers, the thieves, the illicit lovers, the conspirators and other unwholesome people, who are the body of Lucifer, since he is their head, inasmuch as he is *the king over all the sons of pride*” (Job 41:25) (fol. 160v). The author here returns to the issue of false pretences, stating that this pitch also binds “those who in the field of their fetid heart pretend to do things for the love of God or their neighbor while actually being preoccupied with worldly gains or human favors” (fol. 160v). As an example of “putting forth a good in bad intention,” the author offers Herod saying to the three magi, “Go and diligently inquire after the child, and when you have found him, bring me word again, that I also may come and adore him” (Matt. 2:8), but subsequently ordering the massacre of innocents (fol. 160v). Saul’s attempt to trick David through apparent praise and generosity (1 Sam. 18:22) also allows the author to expand on this theme (fol. 161r). Horace, whom he here cites by name (which he never does with Ovid), provides another instance: “Eutrapeleus, if he wished to injure someone, would give him costly clothes” (fol. 161r).<sup>109</sup>

The iron tip of the arrow (*ferrum*) follows next and naturally represents the Devil’s “obstinate hardness with which he attacks people unremittingly; with this urging him on, he is never diverted from war against the faithful once begun, unless he has conquered or been conquered” (fol. 161r). The association of the Devil with the hardness of metal is reinforced by a reflection on Job: “His bones are like pipes of brass, his gristle like plates of iron” (Job 40:13)

<sup>109</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 1.18.31–2; ed. and trans. H. R. Fairclough, in *Horace: Satires, Epistles, Art of Poetry*, Loeb Classical Library 194 (Cambridge, MA, 1926), 371.

(fol. 161r). This section then turns to David's fight against Goliath, the head of whose spear "weighed six hundred *sicles* [shekels] of iron" (1 Sam. 17:7):

If anyone indeed should guard themselves against the iron tip of this dart with a shield of defence, whether through the fruit of innocence, marked as six, or through the grief of penance, marked as 100, the archer regards this as an obol [gerah], namely, as a small amount — for a *sicle* [shekel] has twenty obols [gerahs] (Exod. 30:13) — because he [the archer] should just the same pierce his [the defender's] shield with his iron tip, namely, his obstinate hardness (fol. 161v).

Those struck by this "hardness" might become hard themselves, a reflection that draws on a citation of Gregory's *Regula pastoralis* on how to treat the obstinate (fol. 161v).

The preceding mention of biblical weights and measures then prompts an extended numerological discussion. The author finds it fitting that this 600 weight of iron is measured in *sicles* (shekels), since these have twenty *obols* (gerahs), and twenty is a "superfluous number" (*numerus superfluus*) (fol. 161v). Superfluous numbers are those whose divisible parts add to a higher integer, a principle that the author would have readily drawn from Boethius's *De institutione arithmetica* or works derived from it.<sup>110</sup> In this case, the parts of twenty (1, 2, 4, 5, and 10) add up to twenty-two, two more than twenty. Two, the author says "is held as infamous in sacred scripture" (fol. 161v). This idea concerning the number two can be found, for instance, in Petrus Comestor's twelfth-century *Historia scholastica's* exegesis of the second day in Genesis. It is related both there and by this author to disunity (fols. 161v–162r).<sup>111</sup> Twenty is also two tens, representing two ways of reading the Ten Commandments in accordance with 1 Corinthians 10:11, literally and allegorically; the addition of the excess two to this twenty signifies, moreover, that the Law emerged because of transgressions, in line with Galatians 3:19 (fols. 161v–162r). While these two ways of reading align with the opposition of flesh (literal) and spirit (allegorical), the mediating sacrifice of Christ, "resolving the enmity between God and man," brought these interpretations together "so that between the Ten Commandments and the Gospel there should now be no otherness, but one and the same concord and inseparable unity, as the one Lord has gathered both into the indivisible unity of solid faith" (fol. 162r). The "old serpent," however, is the "rival of unity and bearer of alterity," for the weight of his iron tip aims to bring discord (fol. 162r). The division of twenty-two — the sum of the parts of twenty — into two evens is also found to be significant, since it denotes the transgression of the Ten Commandments, a connotation with roots as far back as Bede, and fails

<sup>110</sup> Boethius, *De institutione arithmetica* 1.19, PL 63, col. 1097B.

<sup>111</sup> Petrus Comestor, *Scholastica Historia: Liber Genesis* 4, ed. A. Sylwan, CCCM 191 (Turnhout, 2005), 13.

to match the number of the apostles.<sup>112</sup> The 600 *sicles* of the iron tip should thus be considered by the reader as a multiplication of twenty, and thus of the Devil, and the excess of two that the sum of its parts produces, the transgression that he brings (fol. 162r).

Given that the discussion of the iron tip referred primarily to Goliath's spear, rather than part of an arrow, the author moves on to discuss briefly the "spear of the enemy," which is his "arrogance, by which he raises himself up obstinate against God and with which he also sets himself against a person so that he might pierce them" (fol. 162v). The spear is "tall, rigid and sharp. It is tall through audacity, rigid through stubbornness, sharp through deceit" (fol. 162v). Its effect on a person is as much to intimidate as to pierce. The enemy thus "moves against a person brandishing and shaking the spear when he terrifies someone fearful either by the height of his audacity, the rigidity of his stubbornness, or the sharpness of his deceit, so that [the victim] turns their back on God during the battle" (fol. 162v). The biblical comparison of Goliath's spear to "a weaver's beam" (1 Chron. 20:5) allows further reflection, since those who follow in the wake of the spear "have woven a spider's web" (Isa. 59:5), leaving them defenceless in the battle (fol. 163r).

With the discussion fixed on handheld weapons, the author now moves onto "the swords" of the enemy. The swords differ from the snares (which act as "hidden ambushes"), and arrows (which cause "unexpected wounds"), in that they concern "openly malicious deeds": "the sword of Satan is the insult of his malice, by which he openly assails humanity," an image founded on the "malicious sword" of Psalm 143:10 (fol. 163r). Despite this openness, the theme of sly and subtle tactics, seen in the discussion of the serpent's archery, is present here too. The sword's sheath is "deceitful suspense, by which the enemy administers himself covertly, until, when the moment is right for him, he unsheathes his sword," an action compared to Joab's unsheathing of his sword in 2 Samuel 20:8 (fol. 163r). As the author returns to the openness of Satan's attacks on the faithful, the Assyrian Holofernes again provides a parallel: "the sword of my soldiers shall pass through your sides, and you shall be stabbed and fall among the wounded of Israel, and you shall breathe no more until you are destroyed with them" (Jud. 6:4) (fols. 163r–163v). The audacity of the Devil is underlined by the example of Christ's temptation in the desert — "Who, moreover, can believe himself secure when the same one [Satan] should have drawn his sword against the very Creator of heaven and earth?" (fol. 163v) — but the author

---

<sup>112</sup> Bede, *De Tabernaculo*, ed. David Hurst, in *Beda Venerabilis Opera, Pars II: Opera Exegetica, 2A: De Tabernaculo, De Templo, In Eram et Neemiam*, CCSL 119A (Turnhout, 1969), 51; and Conrad Haderlein, "Two, Three, and Eleven: Disharmony, Disorder, and Disarray," in *Medieval Numerology: A Book of Essays*, ed. Robert L. Surles (New York, 1993), 123–33, at 131.

notes in this context that he is a skilled and tactical swordsman too, even when attacking more openly:

By turns, one following the other, he drew his sword audaciously, brandished it arrogantly, wheeled it around precisely, when, in one way suggesting, in another arguing, and another promising, he dared to attack his maker, thinking that with the sword of gluttony, which he drew first since [Christ] was hungry, or with the sword of greed, which came second since he saw that he was poor, or at last with the sword of pride [since] he envied his humility, he could overpower him with the utmost reckless daring (fol. 163v).

Horace, quoted for a second time and here described simply as “the philosopher” is invoked to show that a person would be rather more susceptible to the second threat of greed than Christ: “Ardent trader that you are, you rush to the furthest Indies, fleeing poverty through sea, through rocks, through flame” (fol. 163v).<sup>113</sup> The third sword, pride, allows the author to finish his exegesis on demonic weaponry with the “beginning of all sin” (Ecclus. 10:15), before drawing the reader back to the scene of the siege through the example of Antiochus offering seemingly generous terms for Jerusalem’s surrender to Mathathias (1. Macc. 2:17–18) (fols. 163v–164r).

*Section IV: The Christian Soldier and the Three Things Necessary to Fight in the Battle (Food, Arms and Armor, and Vigilance) (fols. 164r–179v)*

At this point, the text turns toward the Christian soldier and the defences of the besieged faithful. The besieged are not without hope, for with the aid of him “who girds his soldiers for war with virtue . . . not only will they be able to evade the dangers we have just mentioned, indeed they will be able to trample the enemy himself under their victorious feet” (fol. 164r). While the foes of the Israelites featured heavily as metaphors for the Devil and his demonic minions, the Old Testament patriarchs, David above all, provide the key models for the faithful warrior: “On the warrior, strong of hand, we indeed read: *David ran and stood over the Philistine* (1 Sam. 17:51)” (fol. 164r). The enemy is described as a “lion against the fearful, an ant against the vigorous,” who “cannot overthrow any of the faithful, unless they should want, from their own will, to bow to his machinations” (fols. 164r–164v). Humanity, as Isaiah exhorted, can choose not to bend before the host: “But Isaiah admonished us, saying: *Do not bow down under the bond and fall with the slain* (Isa. 10:4)” (fol. 164v). The cause of any defeat thus ultimately lay within. A person cannot fight the enemy without uprightness in their own affairs, as the extended quotation and exegesis of Deuteronomy 20:5–7 makes clear: anyone who lacks this must, as the verses repeatedly state, “go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle” (fols. 164v–

<sup>113</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 1.1.45–6; trans. Fairclough, 254.

165r). Reflecting on the following verse — “What man is there that is fearful, and faint hearted? Let him go, and return to his house, lest he make the hearts of his brethren to fear, as he himself is possessed with fear” (Deut. 20:8) — the need for strong hearts and courage is underlined (fol. 165r). God’s help for the courageous who rely on his aid is reinforced with reference to Jahaziel’s speech to the defenders of Jerusalem against the Ammonites, Moabites, and Syrians: “Fear not, and be not dismayed at this multitude: for the battle is not yours, but God’s. . . It shall not be you that shall fight, but only stand with confidence, and you shall see the help of the Lord over you” (2 Chron. 20:15–17) (fols. 165r–165v).

One can indeed “devour the Devil just like bread,” a reference to Joshua and Caleb’s words concerning the inhabitants of the Promised Land at that time (Num. 14:9) (fol. 165v). Another example, explained carefully through the division of phrases in the manner of a preacher, is provided by Tobias (Tob. 6:2–6), who, when attacked by a “monstrous fish” — by which, the author states, “the Devil is denoted” — grasped it by its “gills” (“the opening of suggestion”), threw it on “dry land” (“the dry shore of solid faith”), and disemboweled it (removing the enemy’s “hidden cunning”) (fol. 165v). The latter interpretation concerning the removal of the Devil’s cunning is in line with that of the *Glossa ordinaria*, and ultimately, of Bede’s commentary.<sup>114</sup> Following Tobias’s example, the faithful Christian “whose travelling companion is the Lord” is exhorted to catch and kill such a “fish,” “roast its flesh in the fire of charity, totally parching its strength,” and take this same “victory” with them as “traveling provisions” (fol. 165v). These themes continue with a verse from the Psalms, “You have broken the heads of the dragon: you have given him to be meat for the people of the Ethiopians” (Ps. 73:14). The repentant person could dine on “former nuisances” in a “banquet of the soul” (fols. 165v–166r). But as the Psalmist also warned — “whilst the wicked draw near against me, to eat my flesh” (Ps. 26:2) — one’s soul could also be consumed by the demons through “carnal desires” and “[a]ccordingly, in a human, the pruning of virtues and the refection of sins provides a certain nourishment to the Devil in his proposition” (fol. 166r). The author once again returns to underlining the strength of the foe, this time compared to the mighty host that Antiochus sent against Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc. 3:27). The reader is reminded of the absolute necessity of God’s aid, in which they could be confident even though the battles would often be long (fol. 166r).

The author outlines three things which the Christian soul will need to overcome a lengthy siege: “food for sustenance, arms for defence, vigilance for precaution” (fol. 166r). The remainder of the text is focused on these matters, but with a predominant focus on arms and armor. The food is “royal,” divine in origin, just as

<sup>114</sup> Bede, *Allegorica interpretatio in Tobiam*, PL 91, col. 929a; and *Glossa ordinaria* (Tb. 6), in *Glossae Scripturae Sacrae electronicae (Gloss-e)*, ed. Morard (n. 64 above).

Jesus is the “living bread” (John 6:51), and comparable to the manna that fed the Israelites, even if, as the author notes, it no longer falls from heaven (fols. 166r–166v). It is the “flour” that the Lord assured would “not waste . . . until the day wherein the Lord will give rain on the face of the earth” (1 Kings 17:14). It should not be fermented with “any bitterness of infidelity,” but sprinkled with the “water of credulity,” and carried away “on both shoulders, one of a favorable will, the other of good action” towards the reader’s own “promised land” (fol. 166v).

The food “fills through faith, refreshes through hope, nourishes through charity, heals through confession, strengthens through good activity, and conserves through consummation” (fol. 166v). Faith is essential for the good Christian to “overcome the world” (1 John 5:5), and thus, “as a consequence, the Devil” (fol. 166v). On hope, which the author relates to Ecclesiastes 10:17 (“Blessed is the land, whose king is noble, and whose princes eat in due season for refreshment”), the author makes a clear, if unstated, reference to the Rule of Benedict (fol. 166v).<sup>115</sup> Charity builds on hope, since to put one’s trust in a nourishing Lord is to put one’s trust in charity, as “God is love” (1 John 4:8 and 4:16) (fol. 166v). With the words “it is necessary to not fall silent, so that while many fall wounded in battle . . . the wounded [soldier] knows where to find a doctor, lest he meet his death from the wound he has received,” confession is linked more deeply to food by what it opens the way for: the ingestion of the sacraments of the altar, which is the “medicine” offered by the divine doctor (fols. 166v–167r). The food brings strength in a way that is related to robustness in action: “In war, this food strengthens lax hands and reinforces weak knees” (fol. 167r). The final “consummation” of all these things brings wisdom that protects and conserves the just to fight on until the end, an idea that allows the author to return to the Apocalypse: “He that shall overcome shall not be hurt by the second death” (Apoc. 2:11) (fol. 167r). With the essences of this food fully consumed, there will be no further need for it in eternal life: “with the end of this year of battle, which is transitory, there follows the year of reward, which is eternal” (fol. 167r).

The text moves on to its final long exegetical theme concerning the arms of the just. In part, this mirrors the long section of the Devil’s weaponry. The arms “are the instruments of justice with which the spiritual knight (*miles*), if he should attack or be attacked, ought to rush boldly against the enemy, if he wants to triumph in battle through him who teaches his hands to fight (compare Ps. 143:1)” (fol. 167v). The arms of the “good warrior” are influenced by the list in Ephesians 6:10–18, but somewhat modified and expanded: a helmet (“the

<sup>115</sup> Compare “our King, under whose banner we fight” (*Rex noster sub cuius uexillo militamus*) in the addition with “fight for the Lord Christ, the true King” (*Domino Christo vero regi militaturus*) in Benedict of Nursia, *Regula monachorum*, prol., ed. Venarde (n. 25 above), 2–3. See also Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 92–96.

integrity of faith”), a coat of mail (“the continuity of virtues”), boots or greaves (“the contempt of worldly things”), a belt (“the girding [*succintibilitas*] of the loins”), a lance (“the height of steadfastness”), a quiver (“the shrewdness of good meditation”), a bow (“the eagerness of participation”), an arrow (“the authority of Scripture”), a sword (“the insight of preaching”), and a buckler or shield (“the stability of perseverance”) (fol. 167v). Such expanded lists of the Pauline arms were not uncommon in monastic literature on spiritual combat, but the author’s exact descriptions and comparisons again appear largely original.<sup>116</sup>

The “helmet” of the “integrity of faith” is there to protect the head, with the author reminding the reader how the angry crowd had beaten Christ’s head while he carried the cross (Mark 15:19) (fol. 167v). The head looks after the “beginning of a deed,” and accordingly, “we put on the helmet of salvation when we place the faith of Christ at the beginning of every good deed” (fol. 167v). A helmet on its own, however, does not provide much protection; faith must be supported by the “continuity of virtues,” the chainmail of the knight. Just as the links of mail are joined to each other, “virtue joins to virtue by binding, so that one impenetrable garment of virtuous perfection should arise from them” (fol. 168r).

The association of the “greaves” and “boots” that ground the warrior with the ascetic objective of “the contempt of worldly things” prompts a far longer exegesis than those concerning the helmet and mail (fols. 168r–169v). It is introduced with reference to Ephesians 6:15: “Your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.” Since Jesus demanded that the apostles cast aside possessions (Lk. 9:3), the footwear of the “preparation of the gospel” could be equated with the same (fol. 168r). The enemy have their own greaves made of brass like those of Goliath (1 Sam. 17:4), which make a “loud, yet shameful racket” as they rush to meet the faithful, underlining their “firm and unwavering intent to harm” (fols. 168r–168v). A lengthy reflection on David’s battle with Goliath reminds the reader that the heavily armored Philistine was defeated by an “unencumbered” warrior, “that is, by a contemptor of worldly things” (fol. 168v). The example of Peter, who was told by the angel to “gird yourself and put on your boots” (Acts 12:8) to escape the clutches of Herod, is used to underline the ability of the ascetic to escape a seemingly more powerful foe (fols. 168v–169r). Abraham’s interaction with the king of Sodom (Gen. 14:21–23), where the former refused the latter’s goods “from the very woof thread unto the shoe latchet” (Gen. 14:23), is expanded as an example of how to dismiss the temptations of the enemy in this regard. Within this discussion, the reader is told to remind their tempter in line with the words of the Apocalypse that they are in

<sup>116</sup> Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 119–21.



fact “miserable and poor and blind and naked” (Apoc. 3:17) despite their apparent riches (fol. 169r).

A further reflection on how to meet such temptations with a faith grounded in unworldly simplicity returns to the example of the interaction between Pontius Pilate and the high priests of the Jews, who told the former not to write “King of the Jews,” but “he who said, ‘I am king of the Jews’” (John 19:21) next to the name of “Jesus of Nazareth” beneath his cross. The priests are compared to the Devil seeking to drag someone to damnation at the end of their life through the “doubting of faith,” “the negligent examination of their sins,” or “despair” (fol. 169v). The target of the temptation is counseled to respond, like Pilate, “What I have written, I have written” (John 19:22), and to keep the name “Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews” in their heart (fol. 169v).

Following this long discussion of the contempt of the world, two other pieces of equipment are treated in a more summary fashion. The “warrior’s belt, that is, the girding of the loins” is cited as a necessary support to the contempt of worldly things (fols. 169v–170r). The “spear or lance,” quickly taken to hand against the enemy just as the Lord had asked of Jeremiah (Jer. 46:4), represents the “good practice of steadfastness,” its length figuring its continuity. Brandishing it, just as the horseman had done before the army of Judas Maccabeus, brings strength and resolve (fol. 170r).

As with the weapons of the enemy, archery equipment also receives significant attention. Every part — the quiver, the bow, and not only the arrow but also its individual parts — is here too broken down. The overall theme is that of putting good Christian learning into action, as a counterpoint to the image of vain scholarship found in the section on the snares. The quiver of the Christian soldier — “the shrewdness of good meditation” — concerns preparation for battle through heartfelt and diligent reflection on the “paths of God’s commands,” which provide the “arrows” that they will need in battle: “Sharpen the arrows, fill the quivers” (Jer. 51:11), as the Lord had told Jeremiah (fols. 170r–170v). The bow, previously described as figuring “the eagerness of participation,” is here more precisely defined as the “eagerness to instruct others” (fol. 170v). The idea is supported by a quotation from an unnamed “philosopher” (in fact, Boethius), an uncited quotation from Alain of Lille’s *Anticlaudianus*, as well as Old Testament matter, above all Moses’s wish that “all the people might prophesy, and that the Lord would give them his spirit!” (Num. 11:29) (fol. 170v).<sup>117</sup> Those who do not share the fruits of their good meditation, that is, their arrows, come in for harsh critique, perhaps an echo of the author’s earlier attack on academic arrogance. The words of a “pagan,” Horace in this instance, are used to attack the vain

<sup>117</sup> Boethius, *De syllogismis hypotheticis* 1, PL 64, col. 131B; and Alain of Lille, *Anticlaudianus* 1.8.345–46, ed. Boussat (n. 97 above), 67.

who hoard knowledge (which perhaps they do not even have) under the excuse of “honoring dead geniuses” and avoiding novelty (fol. 170v).

The arrows represent “the authority of sacred Scripture or of any of the saints,” and are indispensable to the Christian soldier whether “the Devil is to be attacked, a heretic confounded, or a neighbor informed” (fols. 170v–171r). The iron of this arrow (and of the aforesaid spear) is “the invincible truth which is contained in the testimonies of sacred Scripture,” which cannot be tainted or doubted (fol. 171r). Drawing on 1 Samuel 13:19 — “there was no smith (*faber ferrarius*) to be found in all the land of Israel, for the Philistines had taken this precaution, lest the Hebrews should make them swords or spears” — the author laments the effectiveness of contemporary preaching:

Truly it was distressing that when there was need of arms and to march to war, *a smith could not be found in all the land of Israel* (1 Sam. 13:19). But it is more distressing that while there are many smiths (*fabri ferrarii*) to be found in the church of God today, who by the hammer of preaching forge the iron of truth in spiritual matters and sharpen weapons, this same iron begins to dull in the hands of those who forge it. Thus, the same iron either does not penetrate people’s hearts, or if it penetrates, does not long retain its power. For people regard themselves during preaching as if in a mirror, go away, and forget how they should have looked. And most distressing of all is that, as a result — just as God reproached the Hebrews at the time — since we have cast aside our Lord, who alone saves us from all our evils and tribulations (compare 1 Sam. 10:19), our Philistine enemies are permitted to take precautions amongst us, lest we should make a sword or a spear (compare 1 Sam. 13:19) (fol. 171v).

In lamenting this state of affairs, the author draws on the words of Cato reported by Lucan and a Latin rendering of a German vernacular saying (“Such was the woman, such were the greens she cooked”) first seen in Caesarius of Heisterbach’s *Dialogus miraculorum*, but also found in Albert of Stade’s *Troilus* (fol. 171v).<sup>118</sup> Just as in 1 Samuel 13:20–21, the author feared that the only sharpening to be found would be among the Philistines, to whom people would flock (fols. 171v–172r). Pure truth, however, could only be sharpened against itself, just as “iron sharpens iron” (Prov. 27:17) (fol. 172r).

The wings of the arrow represent “faith, hope, and charity” (compare 1 Cor. 13:13), for arrows go astray “when truth is said, but neither faith, hope, nor charity is observed by the speaker” (fol. 172v). If the demonic arrows had wings compared to those of the ostrich and eagle, the feathers here are likened to those of a dove, “of simple substance,” drawing on Psalm 54:7 (fol. 172v).

<sup>118</sup> Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, prol., ed. Alfons Hilka, in *Die Wundergeschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach*, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1933–37), 3:15. This is Caesarius’s rendering of a vernacular German proverb: “Wie der Koch, so der Brei.” See Albert of Stade, *Troilus* 2.280, ed. Merzdorf (n. 99 above), 48.

The pitch that attaches these wings is “the gift of the Holy Spirit, by which he works all these things in us” (fol. 172v).

If the exegesis on the archery equipment had segued into discussions of both academic culture and preaching — both subjects of clear importance to the writer — the latter now takes the fore. The sword, “the insight of preaching,” is first and foremost the property of those who preach: “Whoever accepts the office of preaching equips himself with this sword” (fol. 172v). The discussion here builds on the concern of the author for sharing divine truth seen previously, which reaches new rhetorical heights. The art of preaching is here elevated and celebrated openly. The sword, derived from the practice of preaching, is described as something that fortified the practitioner as well as the audience. In line with Psalm 44:4, “He straps the sword to his thigh, he who resists the pleasures of the flesh due to preaching” (fols. 172v–173r). Just as the Devil has his brand of sword-play, so does the preacher, girded in this fashion. Describing these techniques, the author intermingles structural devices favored by “thematic” sermons promoted by contemporary *artes praedicandi* manuals — the clear establishment of a scriptural theme, breaking it down through distinctions and divisions — with emotive rhetorical strategies designed to cut through to the moral core of the listener:

The preacher unsheathes his sword when he proposes his theme. He brandishes it when he intimidates by putting forth threats. He wheels it around when he lays down distinctions from here and there. He cuts when he directs himself to the pruning of vices. He amputates when he separates the faithful from the unfaithful, the unfaithful from the faithful, true from false, sin from the sinful. He penetrates when, due to the sharpness of [his] word, the listener obeys him eagerly. He kills entirely when he mortifies all the evils of vices in the listeners (fol. 173r).<sup>119</sup>

Each of these techniques is given example in the deeds and words of the apostle Peter (fol. 173r). The sword indeed had been given to the apostles by the risen Christ himself, when he had said “teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 28:19) (fol. 173v). Its sheath is thus “divine dispensation” (fol. 173v).

The author segues from the image of the sword to discuss the importance of prior steadfastness for the coming battle. If several previous armaments, that is, the greaves and the belts, had emphasized traditional ascetic objectives, here the meaning of asceticism as continuous training takes the fore: “this warrior must take up arms before the fight, lest he should become fearful in trepidation of the conflict, lest he should be greedy of the spoils without the enemy entirely defeated” (fol. 174r). He could be sure that God would help him overcome his foe (Deut. 20:3–4), but he should not seek victory for his own praise, in line with the author’s interpretation of 1 Maccabees 4:17 (“Do not be greedy of the

<sup>119</sup> Wenzel, *Medieval Artes Praedicationi* (n. 85 above), 47–86; and Roberts, “The *Ars Praedicationi*” (n. 85 above), 50–51 and 57–59.

spoils, for there is war before us”) (fols. 174r–174v). This segues neatly into the discussion of the shield representing the “stability of perseverance” (fol. 174v): “Arms without a shield provide little to the armed, and virtues produce little for the virtuous without the good of perseverance” (fol. 174v).

With the Christian soldier armed and well prepared, the text now proceeds to the “duel”: the single combat that occurs between a person and a demon whenever the latter suggests a sin and it is resisted (fol. 174v). The soldier is depicted riding in on a horse, his feet in two spurs, those of confession and thanksgiving (fol. 175r). Just as each spur has three components — a prick (*punctorium*), a leather strap (*corium*), and a fastener (*astrictorium*) — so too do confession (“compunction,” “laying out [one’s] sins,” and “satisfaction”) and thanksgiving (“innermost conscience,” “assiduous rejoicing,” and “virtuous life”) (fols. 175r–176r). In both, the prick of the spur represents inner impetus, the strap its deployment in action, and the fastener its full fruition. They serve to keep the mount (“our flesh”) in line, “so that it does not become listless, but rather keeps itself to a good course” (fol. 176r). The *punctorium* can also be understood as “the fear of the Lord,” the *corium* as the “human condition,” and the *astrictorium* as “vigilance in holding these things together.” They are joined together “if, conscious of our frailty, we never separate our heart from the fear of the Lord” (fol. 176r).

The mention of “vigilance” signals that the reader has, perhaps, strayed into the final section on the requirements of a Christian soldier the author mentioned previously, “vigilance for precaution,” although this is not clearly signaled. In another sense, we are still in the realm of military equipment, albeit those elements associated with horses. The text continues in this direction, while also borrowing structure and some wording from the description of the components of “fortitude” found in the widely read *Moralium dogma philisophorum* (which in turn drew its structure from Macrobius), though neither “fortitude” itself nor the actual source used are mentioned.<sup>120</sup> The warrior raises himself up on the “stirrups” of “magnanimity” — “the reasoned and spontaneous undertaking of difficult things,” just as in the *Moralium*’s definition, there drawn ultimately from Abelard’s *Collationes* — and “confidence,” and onto the “saddle of security” (fol. 176v).<sup>121</sup> The exposition of “magnanimity” gains further support through quotations from Lucan (“prepare your minds for a high feat of valor”)

<sup>120</sup> Macrobius, *In somnium Scipionis* 1.8; and *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* 1.C, ed. Holmberg (n. 91 above), 30–41.

<sup>121</sup> The equation of the first stirrup with *magnanimitas* is obvious from the discussion that follows, but not quite explicit in the text, due to the apparent elision of some words concerning the first foot prior to “et alio pede strepam fiducie constanter posito” (see the edition below at fol. 176v). See *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* 1.C, ed. Holmberg (n. 91 above), 30; and Peter Abelard, *Collationes* 2.136, ed. John Marebon and Giovanni Orlandi (Oxford, 2001), 146; with John Marebon, “Magnanimity, Christian Ethics and Paganism in the Latin Middle

and Albert of Stade (“Battles should be borne with a magnanimous heart”) (fol. 176v).<sup>122</sup> The saddle is tied tightly to the mount by the final component, gained by the completion of magnanimous aims: “the cinch of magnificence which is,” again, just as in the *Moralium*, “the consummation of difficult and remarkable things” (fol. 177r).<sup>123</sup> The “constancy” and “patience” that also form part of fortitude in the analysis of the *Moralium dogma philisophorum* are absent; the author had already dealt with the former in his description of the warrior’s lance. Instead, the revisionist moves on to the “bridle” representing “temperance,” the virtue that follows directly after the analysis of “fortitude” in the *Moralium* (fol. 177r).<sup>124</sup> Unlike in that possible source, however, the author does not break “temperance” down into parts, but treats it as a whole, building on scriptural sources concerning bridles: for example, the five horsemen with “golden bridles” who appeared before the enemy in 2 Maccabees 10:29, representing the five senses bridled by temperance (fols. 177r). The author again displays a knowledge of Roman literature, although he is here unable to name Horace correctly (once unnamed, once cited as Seneca) as the origin of two of his supporting quotations. Claudian is also quoted, but not identified (fol. 177v). The attachment of the bridle to the head of the animal is also significant, since it signals that “we ought to curb all illicit movements of the will at the beginning of their motion” (fol. 177v). Ovid (“a poet,” unnamed) is cited more positively than on previous occasions, since the matter here, drawn from the *Remedia amoris*, relates to the quick restraint of insidious desires: “Resist beginnings; too late is the medicine prepared, when the disease has gained strength by long delay” (fol. 177v).<sup>125</sup>

The charge to battle can thence be undertaken with confidence, the Lord acting as “standard bearer” and guaranteeing the warrior the “crown of eternal glory” as a reward for victories in line with the words of Isaiah: “And you shall be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord” (Isa. 62:3) (fol. 177v). The warrior should aim his blows to the head of the demon “so that he should strike back against the beginning of [the enemy’s] intention, by which he wants to strike” (fol. 178r). Grasping this head by the hair, he could lay hold of all the “subtleties” and “circumstances” attached to that intention, and more easily behead his foe (fol. 178r). The extended example of Judith’s decapitation of Holofernes (Jth. 13) builds upon this image, with the reader reminded that just prior to striking this unexpected blow against a powerful foe, she had called upon God’s aid: “Strengthen me, O

---

Ages,” in *The Measure of Greatness: Philosophers on Magnanimity*, ed. Sophia Vasalou (Oxford, 2019), 88–116, at 93.

<sup>122</sup> Lucan, *Pharsalia* 9.380–81, ed. and trans. J. D. Duff, in *Lucan, The Civil War (Pharsalia)*, Loeb Classical Library 220 (Cambridge, MA, 1928), 533; and Albert of Stade, *Troilus* 4.240, ed. Merzdorf (n. 99 above), 109.

<sup>123</sup> *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* 1.C, ed. Holmberg (n. 91 above), 30.

<sup>124</sup> *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* 1.D, ed. Holmberg (n. 91 above), 41.

<sup>125</sup> Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 91–92; trans. Mozley and Goold (n. 94 above), 184.

Lord God of Israel, and in this hour look on the works of my hands” (Jth. 13.7) (fols. 178r–178v). With this “head,” that is, the enemy’s wicked intention, removed, even the Devil himself “falls to the ground powerless” (fol. 178v). The demon “should depart confounded,” a possible reference to a common prayer used in exorcisms (fol. 178v). Alain of Lille is cited by name for a second time, albeit without a quotation attached. The reference would appear, somewhat obliquely, to relate to the long narrative concerning the victory of the virtues over vices in the concluding “psychomachia” of *Anticlaudianus*, although it is not precisely stated (fols. 178v–179r).<sup>126</sup>

The battle presented here does not follow the pattern of that text nor Prudentius’s *Psychomachia* which influenced it.<sup>127</sup> Rather than personified virtues and vices in direct combat, the fight is between a person and a demonic enemy, respectively deploying their virtuous and wicked weapons. The earlier paralleling of the weapons of the demons and the warrior is brought to a sort of corollary conclusion — that through repeated resistance, one can turn the Devil’s own weapons against him — by means of a proverb also deployed in Albert of Stade’s *Troilus* (and elsewhere): “Often the arrow learns to strike the archer” (fol. 179r).<sup>128</sup> Comparing the situation to David’s slaying and decapitation of Goliath (1 Sam. 17:50–51), the warrior who detects the intention of his enemy is able to take the latter’s own sword and strike him, removing the head “when he does not permit the beginning of his suggestion to grow” (fol. 179r). He effectively kills the enemy “when crushing all the strength of his will, he assents to none of his temptations” (fol. 179r). Just as David brought Goliath’s head to Jerusalem and placed his armor in his tent (1 Sam. 17:54), the warrior could do the same:

Indeed, we carry the head of the defeated enemy into Jerusalem when we convey the thanksgivings due to the Heavenly One *who lives in Jerusalem* for the victory (Ps. 134:21) . . . We place his armor in our tent when we also no longer permit him to harm us and never remove from our conscience how strong he would have grown if allowed (fol. 179r).

The text concludes by noting the length of the digression, which the author hopes will be worth reflecting on repeatedly. The final peroration on this theme is built from four quotations from Ovid (*Ex Ponto* and *Tristia*), here cited as a certain “philosopher” and more positively than on most previous occasions: “oft adown the stream the oars hasten the voyage over the flowing waters;” “The mettlesome

<sup>126</sup> Alain of Lille, *Anticlaudianus* 9.380–409, ed. Boussat (n. 97 above), 196–97.

<sup>127</sup> On the influence of Prudentius on monastic thought, see Smith, *War and the Making* (n. 20 above), 75 and 123–24.

<sup>128</sup> *Proverbia sententiaeque latinitatis mediæ aevi: Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung*, ed. Hans Walthert, 6 vols. (Göttingen, 1963–69), 4:678 (no. 27267); and Albert of Stade, *Troilus* 4.121, ed. Merzdorf (n. 99 above), 105. See also *Polythecon* 3.452, ed. A. P. Orbán, CCCM 93 (Turnhout, 1990), 112.

steed who will of his own accord race for the honour of the palm will nevertheless, if you urge him, run with greater spirit;” “It does no harm to spur on the galloping steed;” and “I am but giving sails to a ship that is already using the oars” (fol. 179v).<sup>129</sup> The addition ends by returning to the words of Apocalypse 20:2–3. As quoted above, the final line reminds the reader that the binding of the Devil will be loosed at the “end of the world” (fol. 179v).

#### THE EDITION

The text as it is found in the Cambridge manuscript is relatively error-free and most of the scribal errors were corrected by another scribe (indicated in the edition with *p. c.*). The few instances where editorial intervention was necessary are indicated in the notes, or when a word was added to the text with [ ]. Lacunae are indicated with \*. All abbreviations have been expanded silently and the orthography of the manuscript has been preserved except to standardize V/v to U/u, the more common forms in this manuscript, and for instances where the scribe’s spelling could lead to confusion; for example, *sautius . . . saucius* is changed to *saucius . . . saucius* (fol. 157v). Biblical quotations are in italics and quotations from other sources are in quotation marks. The division of the text into paragraphs, its punctuation, and its capitalization are the work of the editors. The following abbreviations are used in the critical apparatus: *add.* = *addidit*; *add. sed exp.* = *addidit sed expungit*; *exp.* = *expungit*; *in marg.* = *in margine*; *om.* = *omissit*; and *p. c.* = *post correctionem*.

#### Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.31, fols. 149v–179v

**/fol. 145v/** *Demonum alligatio uel solutio, uidelicet nocendi hominibus inhibitio uel permissio, in bonis est angelis. Semper autem in eisdem est ad nocendum praue nequicia uoluntatis. Unde legitur: Inuasit spiritus Dei malus Saul (1 Sam. 18:10), Dei quoad permissionem, malus quoad propriam uoluntatem.*<sup>130</sup> *Nec semper dyabolum diuina gratia sue uoluntatis propositum implere permittit; numquam autem in eo mali desiderii, qua nocendi licentiam postulat, requiescit. Circuit enim, ut ait apostolus, querens quem deuoret (1 Pet. 5:8). Et ipse: Circuiui terram et perambulauit eam (Job 1:7). Circulus non finitur et dyabolus circumferentia nocendi semper in se reuertitur. Que uero sit dyaboli uox ad Deum uel Dei ad dyabolum? Beatus Gregorius luculentissime in *Moralibus* aperit, ubi*

<sup>129</sup> Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 4.15.27–28, 2.11.21, and 2.6.38; and *Tristia* 5.14.44; ed. and trans. A. L. Wheeler and G. P. Goold, in *Ovid: Tristia, Ex Ponto*, Loeb Classical Library 151 (Cambridge, MA, 1988), 485, 371, 348, and 261, respectively.

<sup>130</sup> Compare Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 2.10.17, ed. Adriaen (n. 81 above), 1:70.

dicit,<sup>131</sup> loquitur Deus ad dyabolum uno modo, scilicet, peruersas eius uias arguendo, ut ibi: *Unde uenis?* (Job 1:7 and 2:2). Quasi dicat: “Sine me ambulas et nescio uias tuas.” Alio loquitur ad eum modo, scilicet electorum suorum contra eum iusticiam proponendo, ut ibi: *Numquid considerasti seruum meum Iob, quod non sit ei similis super terram, uir simplex et rectus ac timens Deum et recedens a malo?* (Job 1:8). Tercio, ut electos suos temptet misericorditer permittendo, ut ibi: *Ecce uniuersa que habet in manu tua sunt* (Job 1:12). Quarto, ne electos suos temptare audeat inhibendo, ut ibi: *In eum ne extendas manum tuam* (Job 1:12). Loquitur autem dyabolus ad Deum uno modo, uidelicet uias suas ei insinuando, ut ibi *Circuiui terram* (Job 1:7). Item alio, scilicet electorum innocentiam fictis criminibus accusando,<sup>132</sup> ut ibi: *Numquid frustra Iob timet Deum?* (Job 1:9). Tercio, temptandam electorum innocentiam postulando, ut ibi: *Extende manum tuam et tange cuncta que possidet* (Job 1:11), et amplius: *Tange os eius et carnem et uidebis quod in facie benedicat tibi* (Job 2:5).

Sed longe aliter, testante etiam Beato Gregorio, loquitur Deus angelo et angelus Deo. Deus loquitur angelo uoluntatem suam ostendendo ei in ipso sue contemplationis speculo, et mirabilia sua luce clarius inspirando.<sup>133</sup> Unde Dominus in ewangelio: *angeli eorum semper uident faciem Patris mei qui in celis est* (Matt. 18:10). Si uident, immo quia uident faciem, sciunt utique uoluntatem, facies enim eius sicut sol lucens in uirtute sua, omnia cognita faciens et aperta. Angelus loquitur Deo intima contemplatione,<sup>134</sup> ipsius ammirando gloriam et sui-/fol. 146r/-metipsius respiciendo gratiam, et ex hoc beneficio Deum intime collaudando.<sup>135</sup> Unde in hoc libro Iohanni ostenditur quod *omnes angeli stabant in circuitu throni, et seniorum, et quatuor animalium, et ceciderunt in conspectu throni in facies suas, et adorauerunt Deum dicentes, “Amen. Benedictio,”* qua scilicet conseruasti nos aliis cadentibus, *et claritas,* qua glorificasti nos in celestibus, *et sapientia,* qua te et tua mirabilia cognoscimus, *et gratiarum actio,* qua in tua laude non deficimus, [et] *honor* quem habemus a nostris laudatoribus, *uirtus* quam operamur in tuis mirabilibus, *et fortitudo,* qua eterna confirmatione subsistimus, sint attributa tibi soli *Deo nostro,* non per spacia temporum, sed *in secula seculorum* (Apoc. 7:11–12).

Sancta quoque anima loquitur Deo cum se totam effundit eius desiderio, et quasi loquitur cum Deum intimo contemplatur desiderio, ut in hoc libro ibi: *Usque quo Domine non iudicas et uindicas sanguinem nostrum de hiis qui habitant in terra?* (Apoc. 6:10). Quasi dicant: “Diem desideramus iudicii et mortuorum

<sup>131</sup> “Loquitur Deus ad dyabolum . . . in facie benedicat tibi” is based on Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 2.7.12, ed. Adriaen (n. 81 above), 1:67.

<sup>132</sup> accusando] accusandam

<sup>133</sup> “Sed longer aliter . . . luce clarius inspirando” is based on Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 2.7.9, ed. Adriaen (n. 81 above), 1:65.

<sup>134</sup> contemplatione] complatione

<sup>135</sup> “Angelus loquitur . . . Deum intime collaudando” is based on Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 2.7.10, ed. Adriaen (n. 81 above), 1:65–66.



resurrectionem et premii plenitudinem.” Sed Deus sanctis loquitur animabus inter ardorem desiderii eis ex ipsa prescientia consolationis solatium inspirando. Ideo *date sunt illis*, ut liber iste dicit, *singule stole albe*, id est in longa dilatione data est unicuique earum consolatio prestolationis placite, *et dictum est*, id est plena certitudine expressum est illis, *ut requiescerent tempus adhuc modicum donec impleatur numerus conseruorum et fratrum eorum* (Apoc. 6:11). Hoc aliud non est nisi ut cum collectionem fratrum expectare debeant, eorum mentibus expectandi libenter moras infundere, et licet carnis resurrectionem appetant gratulabunde, tamen pro colligendorum fratrum adhuc auementando numero tempus ultimum expectare. Si enim aliquod subesset tedium, nequaquam tante dilationis tempus diceretur modicum. Secundum nostri temporis usum, non est tempus modicum ex quo Petrus est crucifixus, Paulus decollatus, Stephanus lapidatus. Et nisi septem Machabei uel martyres alii in lege ueteri, immo ipse Abel filius prothoplasti cum Christo surrexerint, inter multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierant adhuc usque quo *Deus non iudicas et uindicas sanguinem nostram* (Apoc. 6:10) clamant. Sed hoc tempus longissimum ob predictam causam est eis modicum, cum nullius omnino tedii sentiant detrimentum. Uox itaque sanctorum animarum in aure Dei desiderium est earum. Unde Psalmista: *Desideri—fol. 146v—um eorum audiuit auris tua* (Ps. 9:38).<sup>136</sup>

Demonum autem lingue, scilicet eorum intentiones peruerse, tunc sue uocis inuicem emittunt strepitum, dum per iniquum consensum conspirant malarum desiderio uoluntatum, ita ut perdendas hominum animas et res suscitandas legi diuine contrarias conatu se prouocent alterutro, et ut hoc non uno modo, sed omni nequicie peragant instrumento. Hiis cohortationibus pessime uocis,<sup>137</sup> plerumque conuenticula conflantes iniqua quid ille profecerit, uel ille<sup>138</sup> magis offererit, non segniter discuciant, et magnis laudum clamoribus illum attollunt, qui in deceptione hominum rem promouit notabilem, iactis in eum contumeliis quem deprehenderint negligentem. Testatur hec Psalmista qui ait: *Super populum tuum malignauerunt consilium, et cogitauerunt aduersus sanctos tuos. Dixerunt: Uenite, disperdamus eos de gente et non memoretur nomen Israel ultra* (Ps. 82:4–5). Et iterum: *In eo dum conuenirent simul aduersum me, accipere animam meam consiliati sunt* (Ps. 30:14). Beatus Gregorius exemplum huius rei porrit in libro *Dyalogorum*, dicens: Iudeus ex campanie partibus Romam tendens carpebat iter, et ad Fundanum cliuum ueniens, et in templo Apollinis quiescens cruce se muniuit. Media nocte uidit malignorum spirituum turbam, unum uero qui ceteris preerat in eiusdem loci gremio consedere. Cepit ille discutere quantum unusquisque nequicie peregisset. Tandem unus quanta temptatione carnis

<sup>136</sup> “Sancta quoque anima loquitur . . . audivit auris tua” is based in part on Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 2.7.11, ed. Adriaen (n. 81 above), 1:66.

<sup>137</sup> uocis] *p. c. ex uocibus*

<sup>138</sup> ille] uel *add.*

commouisset Andream Fundane ciuitatis episcopum enarrauit. Et hoc ille spiritus qui preerat diligenter audiuit, uidelicet quod episcopus in terga cuiusdam femine blandiens alapam dedisset,<sup>139</sup> blande exhortans eum ut perficeret quod cepisset.<sup>140</sup> Uides qualiter exultant cum nostri pedes a recti itinere se obliquant. Nouerat hoc qui dicebat: *Qui tribulant me exultabunt si motus fuero* (Ps. 12:5). Nec solum exultant, sed etiam glorianter sue dant fortitudini quod triumphant, secundum illud: “Congregati sunt inimici nostri et gloriantur in uirtute sua”<sup>141</sup> (compare 1 Macc. 3:52). Et quid mirum quod se continuis ictibus experiuntur in nobis, qui etiam temeritatis sue iacula miserunt in faciem creatoris? Audi ewangelium: *Tunc assumpsit eum dyabolus in montem excelsum ualde et ostendit ei omnia regna mundi, et gloriam eorum, et ait illi: “Hec omnia tibi dico, si cadens adoraueris me”* (Matt. 4:8–9). Si in uiridi hec faciunt, in arido quid fiet? Si po–/fol. 147r/suerunt in celum os suum, lingua eorum non transibit in terram? Uti que. Nam Deus dixit: *Si me persecuti sunt, et uos persequentur* (John 15:20). Etiam ad Iob loquens de nimia Luciferi superbia, nos premunit tamquam qui nullum intactum permittit: *Non est super terram potestas que comparetur ei, qui factus est ut nullum timeret* (Job 41:24). Ipse enim in corporatione socie dampnationis absorbebit fluuium, populum scilicet incredulum absque statione fidei fluidum, et non mirabitur, id est non multum quia modica sibi uidetur acquisitio letabitur. Et prenimia<sup>142</sup> superbia habet magne presumptionis fiduciam quod uel fide relicta uel fidei operibus largo impetu adhuc imfluat Iordanis, id est populus fidelis, locus nude<sup>143</sup> baptismatis, in os auiditatis eius ut degluciat. Et sic adnichilet omnem preteritam iusticiam illius: *Reputabit enim quasi paleas ferrum et quasi lignum putridum es* (Job 41:18).<sup>144</sup>

Et quomodo poterimus subsistere ante faciem illorum, qui puluis sumus et cinis (compare Gen. 18:27), qui domos habitamus luteas, qui terrenum habemus fundamentum (compare Job 4:19), quorum princeps *sternit sibi aurum quasi lutum* (Job 41:21), nisi ille adiuuet nos, qui Pharaonem *cum curribus et equitibus*<sup>145</sup> (Exod. 15:19) eius proiecit in mare et submersit eos *in aquis uehementibus quasi plumbum?* (Exod. 15:10). Cum itaque spiritus Domini unctione sua docet aliquem ut de malis peniteat, uel in bonis conualescat, sicut de Dauid legitur quod cum unctus esset a Samuele, *directus est in eum spiritus Domini* (1 Sam. 16:13), *a die illa et deinceps* statim maligni spiritus *non rectis* in eum

<sup>139</sup> dedisset] dediffet

<sup>140</sup> “Iudeus ex companie . . . ut perficeret quod cepisset” is a paraphrase of Gregory the Great, *Liber dialogorum* 3.7.2–5, ed. de Vogüé and Antin (n. 37 above), 278–82.

<sup>141</sup> *Corpus antiphonarium officii*, ed. René-Jean Hesbert, 6 vols. (Rome, 1963–79), 4:83 (no. 6326).

<sup>142</sup> prenimia] prenimi

<sup>143</sup> nude] nuda

<sup>144</sup> es = aes

<sup>145</sup> equitibus] eq\u/uitibus

*oculis* aspicientes (1 Sam. 18:9), armati nequicia et animati seuitia — a uia principe dicente eis, “Egredimini contra eos qui contempserunt imperium meum. Non parcat oculus noster ulli regno. Omnem urbem Christianorum licet munitam subiugabitis michi. *Confortamini et bellate!*” (1 Sam. 4:9; compare Jth. 2:5–6) — circumdant eum, secundum uocem Psalmiste, *sicut apes* (Ps. 117:12), modo ipsum melle delectationis, modo tribulationum aculeis inuadentes. Nam legitur, *Audientes Phylistiim quod unctus esset Dauid in regem super Israel uniuersum ascenderunt omnes* (1 Chron. 14:8), ut quererent eum. Phylistiim interpretantur “cadentes” et significant demones, quorum dicitur principi: *quomodo cecidisti* (Isa. 14:12). Hii intelligentes aliquem fidelem in bonis operibus manu fortem, in consortio Deum pre oculis habentium, oleo diuine gratie super terrenis cupiditatibus factum regem, ascendunt per tumorem superbie, secundum quod dicitur: *Superbia eorum qui te oderunt ascendit semper.* (Ps. 73:23). Et querunt eum, id est omnibus modis /fol. 147v/ attemptant eum, uidelicet ut uel capiant, destinant, uel occidant. Querunt ut capiant obsistendo ei ne quid proficiat; hinc Pharaon loquitur ad Moysen et primo sic: *Ite, sacrificate Deo uestro in terra hac* (Exod. 8:25). Quasi diceret: “Ite, et quadam exteriori superficie Deo uestro sacrificium facite, sed interiori intentione in terra hac, id est in terrenis huius Egypti moribus, remanete.” Secundo sic loquitur: *Ego dimittam uos ut sacrificetis Domino Deo uestro in deserto, uerumptamen longius ne abeat* (Exod. 8:28). Quasi dicat: “Dimittam quidem uos ut Deo uestro sacrificetis, et eum non me Dominum appellatis me penitus deserentes, uerumptamen ut iterum, cum uoluero, possum uos meis mancipare seruitiis, uolo ne longius a meis finibus abeat.” Unde temptato Domino bene subicitur a Luca: *Et consumata omni temptatione dyabolus recessit ab eo usque ad tempus* (Luke 4:13). Non enim legitur quod Sathanas temptandi causa ad Dominum redierit amplius, sed nos, ut semper cauti simus, sermo monet ewangelicus, asserens quod ab angelorum Domino Sathanas uictus recesserit, non simpliciter, sed *ad tempus*. Semper enim reuertitur, siue lubricitate nostra siue malignitate propria reuocetur. Siquidem labimur in uicia miseria uel innata uel illata. Innata, scilicet illecti et abstracti concupiscentia nostra, sensus enim et cogitatio hominis in malum prona sunt ab adolescentia sua; illata, scilicet machinatione dyabolica. De qua apostolus: *Non est nobis tantum conluctatio aduersus carnem et sanguinem, sed aduersus principes et potestates, aduersus mundi rectores tenebrarum harum, aduersus spiritalia nequitiie in celestibus* (Eph. 6:12).

Etiam statim armat nos armis iusticie, dicens ut possitis *omnia tela nequissimi ignea extinguere* (Eph. 6:16). *Incensa igni et suffossa*, hec duo Psalmista nominat, (Ps. 79:17) et contra hec etiam sic Deum orat: *Ab occultis meis munda me et ab alienis parce seruo tuo* (Ps. 18:13–14).<sup>146</sup> Beatus Bernardus dicit esse difcillimum

<sup>146</sup> Also a common responsory: *Corpus antiphonarium officii*, ed. Hesbert, 4:478 (no. 7928).

discernere “inter morbum mentis et morsum serpentis.”<sup>147</sup> Unde: *Delicta quis intelligit?* Statim subiungit: *Ab occultis meis*, etc. (Ps. 18:13). Primum est contra partum cordis aut contra seminarium mentis. Cum itaque nos innata concupiscentia deicit, statim temptator appropriat ut suas machinationes nostris uoluptatibus superaddat, ut de eo similiter dici possit:<sup>148</sup> *Ubicumque cadauer fuerit, ibi adest* (Job 39:30). Quandoque ergo dimittit nos dyabolus ut Domino sacrificemus, sed non uult ut longius abeamus, et hoc secundo locutus /fol. 148r/ est Pharao. Tercio ait: *Ite tantum uiri, et sacrificate Domino* (Exod. 10:11); et quarto: *Ite et sacrificate, oues tantum uestre et armenta remaneant* (Exod. 10:24) — quasi dicat Pharao, id est ipse diabolus qui nudauit, scilicet, prothoplastum uirtutibus, quibus uestierat eum Deus: “Ite, sed tantum uiri, scilicet ut non crescatis neque multiplicamini, sed maneatis quasi arbores autumpnales, infructuose, bis mortue. Eradicat non curantes illum qui dixit, *eatis et fructum afferatis* (John 15:16). Oues quoque et armenta nobiscum hic maneant, ut coram Deo uestro manus tantum appareat in sacrificiis, animus autem in Egypto sit, et hereat in ouibus et armentis.” Ecce quanto molimine maligni spiritus aduersus hominem ascendentes querunt ipsum ut capiant in hoc, scilicet ut contra profectum uirtutum iamdictis retinaculis eum claudant.

Querunt etiam ut destituant, id est regno priuent, cogendo eum si ualuerunt ut in honorum operum proposito non persistat, ut dum seruire ei cui seruire negare est, desierit, regnum perdat. Unde legitur in Ysaya Rapsacen clamasse uoce magna: *Dicite Ezechie: “Hec dicit rex magnus, rex Assyriorum: Que est ista fiducia qua confidis? Aut quo consilio aut fortitudine rebellare disponis? Super quem habes fiduciam, quia recessisti a me?”* (Isa. 36:4–5). Et impropersans super aliis hec subiunxit: *“Et nunc trade te domino meo regi Assyriorum, et dabo tibi duo milia equorum, nec poteris rex te prebere ascensores eorum”* (Isa. 36:8). Quasi dicat Rabsaces, scilicet princeps deosculatus a mundi delectationibus secundum quod in Prouerbiis dicitur, *Mulier apprehensum deosculatur iuuenem, et procaci uultu blanditur* (Prov. 7:13), et nuntius Sennacherib, uidelicet alleuiantis desertionem, qui suadet hominibus leuipendere quod suum deserant creatorem (compare 2 Chron. 32), sic enim clamauit, et hodie clamat, et hoc uoce magna quasi desiderans audiri in tota ecclesia: “Dicite Ezechie,” id est ei qui in auxilio Domini confidens loquitur *Confortauit me Dominus* (2 Tim. 4:17), “Tu credis quia rex sis, qui nec es regulus, cum sub dominio sis alterius et tibi imperet quidam deus, cuius seruitium tu dicis esse magnum regnum. Sed audi me, hec que nunc loquor ad te. Dicit tibi non regulus tamquam alicui subiectus, sed rex in toto terrarum orbe magnus, qui quasi stipulam estimabit predicationis malleum, etiam si petram sic conterens, et deridebit contra se ui-/fol. 148v/-brantem illius in qua confiditis crucis hastam

<sup>147</sup> Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo super Cantica canticorum* 32.6, ed. Leclercq et al. (n. 83 above), 3:229.

<sup>148</sup> [ut de eo similiter dici possit] p. c.

(compare Job 41:20), *de cuius ore lampades procedunt, sicut tede ignis accense* (Job 41:9–10), rex inquam Assyriorum, uidelicet recte uiuentium, non indirecte sicut est consuetudinis Iudeorum. Cum aperte uideas quod recedentes a me inueniunt mala multa et quod sunt *obprobrium hominum et abiectio plebis* (Ps. 21:7), *subsannatio et illusio hiis qui in circuitu eorum sunt* (Ps. 78:4), mortificantur enim tota die, estimati merito sicut oues misere occisionis, propter eum (compare Ps. 43:22; and Rom. 8:36) quem eo tempore quo *cum hominibus conuersatus est* (Bar. 3:38) *diripuerunt omnes transeuntes uiam et factus est obprobrium uicinis suis* (Ps. 88:42), que est ista inanis fiducia qua stulte confidis tu sicut illi (compare 2 Kings 18:19), aut quo predicatorum uel confessorum tuorum deceptus consilio, aut qua taliter morientium fortitudine prouocatus rebellare michi qui sum inuictissimus temere disponis? Dic michi: super quem regum aut deorum hanc friulam habes in decepto corde fiduciam? Quia cum hec omnia scires, tamen fecisti quod tibi non expedit, et recessisti a me, qui ad satellites meos non dico: *‘Ite! Ecce, ego mitto uos sicut agnos inter lupos’* (Luke 10:3), et *‘morte afficient ex uobis’* (Luke 21:16), sed sic: *‘egredimini ad me et comedite unusquisque in pace et securitate uineam suam et unusquisque ficum suam et bibite unusquisque aquam cisterne sue donec ueniam et tollam uos et transferam uos in terram que est similis terre uestre’* (Isa. 36:16), et *‘uiuetis, et non moriemini’* (2 Kings 18:32). Et cum hec omnia scias, audi consilium meum et salutem tuam ne differas, sed nunc incontinenti trade te corpore et mente domino meo iam prenominato regi Assyriorum. Et ut per eum locuples fias, dabo tibi ex parte eius decem milia equorum pro explendis innumerabilibus deliciis gaudiorum. Et considera quam pauper est domini tui familia, quia nec poteris propter paucitatem milicie tue ex te tantum nisi adiutorio nostro prebere ascensores eorum.”

Hiis nequam insultibus, maligni hostes<sup>149</sup> in bello anime premunt hominem, qui bene uiuendo suscepit a Domino sancti Spiritus unctionem, palpando querentes et querendo palpantes. Si forte per ipsos et ipsorum persuasus uilissimos aliquando deceptus in uera fide, uel eius opere, uel simul utroque dampnabiliter et tepescat et torpeat, et eterni regni coronam promissam et dandam perseuerantibus miserabiliter sic deponat. In hoc enim libro precipitur, *Esto fidelis usque ad mortem*, deinde promit—**fol. 149r**—titur: *Et dabo tibi coronam uite* (Apoc. 2:10). *State in fide*, ait apostolus, *uiriliter agite* contra deceptores istos, *et confortamini* (1 Cor. 16:13) in armis iusticie contra eos, quia non solum querunt ut capiant aut destituant, uerum etiam ut occidant. Unde Psalmista: *Inimici mei dixerunt mala michi: quando morietur et peribit nomen eius?* (Ps. 40:6). Apostolus ait: *Si secundum carnem uixeritis, moriemini* (Rom. 8:13). Et iterum Psalmista: *Mors peccatorum pessima* (Ps. 33:22). Susanna uiso quod non esset medium, quin ageret adulterium uel falsum non effugeret iudicium, et premissis, *angustie michi sunt*

<sup>149</sup> maligni hostes] p. c.

*undique* (Dan. 13.22), *et quid eligam ignoro* (Phil 1:22),<sup>150</sup> et quod tutius erat electo subiecit, si enim hoc, id est adulterium, egero, mors michi est mortem innoxiam, non estimans mortem sed potius criminis uoluptatem. Maligni ergo spiritus hunc occidunt quem immortalia deiciunt. Illi itaque qui *multiplicati sunt super capillos capitis mei* (Ps. 68:5) querunt animam meam ut auferant eam; in multitudine graui circumdant hominem, ualidam firmantes aduersus cum prenotatis machinationibus obsidionem. Sic enim habes Saul et uiri eius in modum corone cingebant Dauid et uiros eius ut caperent eos. Modum obsidionis istius Psalmista exprimit, ubi dicit: *Circumdederunt me sicut aqua: tota die circumdederunt me simul* (Ps. 87:18). Sicut aqua ecce impressio multa. Tota die ecce remissio nulla. Simul ecce intentio una. Aqua labitur et deprimit, et dyabolus hominem ut labentem et lubricum mundum diligat semper premit. Unde in hoc libro legitur: *Serpens misit ex ore suo aquam post mulierem ut eam faceret trahi a flumine* (Apoc. 12:15). In Ezechiele legimus: *Inundatione equorum eius scilicet dyaboli operiet te puluis eorum* (Ezek. 26:10). Et in Trenis: *Inundauerunt aque super capud meum, dixi perii* (Lam. 3:54). Et Psalmista orat Dominum pro deprimenti obsidione aquarum istarum dicens: *Saluum me fac Deus quoniam intrauerunt aque ad animam meam* (Ps. 68:2). *Tota die*, Psalmista dicit, exprimens quod ab hac obsidione dyabolus pertinaci herens proposito non recedit. Unde in Ieremia legitur, *Nolite decipere animas uestras dicentes euntes abibunt et recedent a nobis Chaldei*, crudeles scilicet dyaboli, *quia non abibunt* (Jer. 37:8).

Simul dicitur ut una esse ipsorum intentio demonstretur. Hinc statim in Ieremia subiecitur: *singuli de tentorio suo consurgent et incendunt ciuitatem* (Jer. 37:9). Etiam Psalmista, *Aduersum me susurrabant omnes inimici mei aduersum me cogitabant ma-/fol. 149v/-la michi* (Ps. 40:8); hoc male unitatis priuilegium emanauit ab illo qui primum se opposuit uni Deo. Nam legitur, *Scriptis rex Antiochus*, scilicet<sup>151</sup> Lucifer, Deo contrarius, *omni regno suo ut esset omnis populus unus* (1 Macc. 1:41). Hoc unitatis priuilegium immo prauilegium prohibet holocausta et sacrificia et placationes fieri in templo Dei; iubet animas in omnibus inmundicis et abominationibus inquinari. Sic reges terre et principes conuenerunt in unum aduersus Dominum et aduersus Christum eius cum cohors et tribunus et ministri Iudeorum comprehenderunt Iesum et ligauerunt eum. Bene Moyses scripturus superborum mentes in malum unitas in edificatione turris Babel premisit quod *erat terra*, id est quod mens terrenis dedita, *labii unius, et sermonum eorumdem* (Gen. 11:1), quia certe ipsi erectis in se cornibus superbie, *ciuitatem et turrim, cuius cacumen pertingeret ad celum* (Gen. 11:4), pro celebrando proprio nomine,

<sup>150</sup> The combination of these two verses is liturgical, with origins that reach as far back as the *Liber responsalis* attributed to Gregory the Great. See *Corpus antiphonarium officii*, ed. Hesbert (n. 141 above), 4:24 (no. 6099).

<sup>151</sup> scilicet] silicet

una proponebant<sup>152</sup> facere uoluntate. Tunc quoque Babylonice confusionis ciues animo uno cornua superbie in nos pertinatiter eleuant, dum animam in pace uirtutum cum Christo uiuentem obsident et impugnant, hoc in eam uentilantes propositum ut cum ipsis os suum ponat in celum, et celebret etiam ipse per ascensum terreni cacuminis nomen suum. Unde legitur in Daniele [sic], *Uenit Nabugodonosor* (Jer. 52:4), dyabolus scilicet sedens in eterne dampnationis angustia, ab omnibus sane sapientibus agnita, ipse inquam rex confuse Babylonis uenit Ierusalem, id est ad mentem infra muros fidei cum Christo pacifico quiescentem, et coadunatis satellitum suorum cornibus obsedit eam. Contra hec superbe unitatis cornua orat Psalmista: *De ore leonis libera me Domine, et a cornibus unicornium humilitatem meam* (Ps. 21:22). Sequaces talium compescit hiis uerbis: *Dixi iniquis, nolite inique agere, et delinquentibus nolite exaltare cornu* (Ps. 74:5). Dominus enim omnia cornua peccatorum confringet.

Isti autem satellites hominem obsident e castris firmissimis, utentes laqueis, sagittis et gladiis et aliis diuersorum generum armis, nunc iacentes in insidiis, nunc instantes insultibus manifestis. De hiis castris dicitur, *Congregantes Phylisium agmina sua in prelium conuenerunt in Sohot Iude*, quasi uersus tentoria confessionis et penitentie, *et castrametati sunt*<sup>153</sup> *inter Sohot*, id est locum illius qui iam erexit satisfactionis tentoria, *et Azecha* (1 Sam. 17:1), illius uidelicet qui iam *accinxit fortitudine lumbos suos* (Prov. 31:17) et ex hoc robustus effectus mandatorum Dei regitur disciplina, illius quoque cuius manus et mens in cubili monastice religionis iam dudum clausa, inter mundum et se professionis po-/fol. 150r/-suit pesulum orans clauso hostio patrem suum. Et locus castrorum illorum erat *in finibus Dommim*<sup>154</sup> (1 Sam. 17:1), quod sonat ascensus ruforum uel umbra, quia demonum finalis intentio in hoc est posita, ut *draco ille rufus* (Apoc. 12:3) ex multorum sanguine tam effuso uelud martyrum quam infuso uelud criminum, de quo superius est narratum, cum  *suis septem capitibus* (Apoc. 12:3), id est omnibus peccatis mortalibus, et decem cornibus (compare Apoc. 12:3), uidelicet cunctis decalogi transgressionibus, super obsessum hominem conculcando ipsum ascendat, sicut in Iob legitur, *uadant et reuertantur super eum horribiles* (Job 20:25), et sic eum ad regionem umbre mortis cauda sua dampnabiliter secum trahat (compare Apoc. 12:4).

Castrum est eis firmum et altum nature subtilitas,<sup>155</sup> dum angelica suffragante scientia secretissimas uiarum nostrarum semitas considerando inuestigant, et inuestigando considerant, et eo facilius armis suis nos uulnerant, quo perspicatius sagaci profunde cognitionis oculo nos perlustrant. Unde Ysaias: *Tu signaculum similitudinis Dei plenus sapientia et decore in paradyso Dei fuisti* (Ezek. 28:12).

<sup>152</sup> proponebant] proponebat

<sup>153</sup> sunt] suunt

<sup>154</sup> Dommim] Domim

<sup>155</sup> subtilitas] subtilitatis

Etiam Ezechiel: *Cedri non fuerunt altiores illo in paradyso Dei [ . . . ] Omne lignum paradyssi non assimilatum est ei et pulchritudini eius, quoniam speciosum feci eum* (Ezek. 31:8). Numquid ergo angelice subtilitatis sit, illudes ei quasi aui que leuiter in decipula capitur, aut ligabis eum ut contra te non surgat in prelium? Non.

Castrum firmum est et longum temporis antiquitas, quia cum ab initio seculi fuerunt toto animo semper actibus intererant nefariis et omni negotio prauitatis, et dum hec tria, scilicet<sup>156</sup> peruicacitas, studii continuitas, temporis longinquitas conueniunt, nescio in quo mali articulo dubitent qui tam diu in scola malicie<sup>157</sup> se exercent. Unde iterum Ysaias: *Quomodo cecidisti de celo Lucifer qui mane oriebaris?* (Isa. 14:12). Per hoc quod dicit *quomodo cecidisti de celo* malum eius studium arguitur; per hoc quod *Lucifer* ingenii claritas innuitur; *qui mane oriebaris* ibi longitudo temporis indicatur. Ipse enim est, ut Dominus ait ad Iob, *principium uiarum Dei* (Job 40:14).

Castrum quoque firmum est et latum fallendi assiduitas, quia si usus et ingenium semper fecere magistrum, solus et artifices qui facit usus adest, cum ipsi sint, ut dictum est, ingenio prediti, usu continui, tempore antiqui et multos multociens et multipliciter<sup>158</sup> fefellerint precipue cum quilibet eorum mille artifex uero uocetur nomine, tamquam in omni sua peritissimus actione. Nescio quid dicere possimus aliud, /fol. 150v/ nisi quod omnes sillogismos fallacie plane norint. Dicit apostolus: *Aduersarius uester Dyabolus tamquam leo rugiens circuit querens quem deuoret* (1 Pet. 5:8). Item: *Non enim ignoramus astucias eius*<sup>159</sup> (2 Cor. 2:11). Inde dicuntur demones quasi scientes. Dicuntur autem sic a iamdicto sensus acumine, uel etiam aliquando a spirituum supernorum reuelatione, dicuntur etiam sic irrisorie, dicuntur et yronice “Irrisorie,” quia Eue promisit dyabolus scientiam et eam ipsa credulitas fecit stultam. Dixit enim *Eritis sicut dii scientes bonum et malum* (Gen. 3:5) yronice cum ea que de ipso dicuntur contrarium habent intellectum. Ut in Ieremia: *Perdix fouet que non peperit* (Jer. 17:11). Dyabolus, scilicet, qui bene *perdix* dicitur, quia locum suum perdidit cum dicatur *impium de terra perdentur* (Prov. 2:22), *fouet* bona uidelicet *qui non peperit*. Yronia est. Nam sicut numquam bonum sponte facit, sic nec bonum fouet, sed potius a fomento amouet, ideoque sequitur: *et in nouissimo suo erit insipiens* (Jer. 17:11). Etiam sacra pagina uocat *eum senem fatuum insensatum* (Eccles. 25:4). *Senem* propter temporis uetustatem, *fatuum* propter operis prauitatem, *insensatum* propter obstinatam sensus duriciem. Estimabit enim abyssum senescentem, tamquam omnipotens in eternum ignem nutrire non ualeat infernulem, et tunc sine sponte creatoris perueniat ad quietem. Certe in scolis Ysaie prophete non fuit et

<sup>156</sup> scilicet] silicet

<sup>157</sup> malicie] malcie

<sup>158</sup> multipliciter] multiplciter

<sup>159</sup> astucias eius] p. c.



si fuit lectionem que dicit, *uermis eorum non morietur et ignis eorum non extinguetur* (Mark 9:43; 9:45; and 9:47), non audiuit, et si audiuit non intellexit, et si intellexit tamquam obstinatissimus non curauit. De eo namque dicit Deus: *Cor eius indurabitur quasi lapis et stringetur quasi malleatoris meus* (Job 41:15).

Demones itaque laqueos pedibus nostris fraudulentamente ponunt molimine, dum gressus boni itineris student in nobis uel in principio uel in medio uel saltem in fine malicie sue finibus irretire. Unde Psalmista: *Laqueum parauerunt pedibus meis* (Ps. 56:7). Et: *In uia hac qua ambulabam asconderunt laqueum michi* (Ps. 141:4). Et: *Funes peccatorum circumplexi sunt me* (Ps. 118:61). Teste enim Salomone: *Iniquitates sue capiunt impium et finibus peccatorum suorum constringitur* (Prov. 5:22). In principio boni operis nos sepe demones illaqueant intentione corrupta, in medio actione maculata, in fine re inconsumata. Intentione corrupta cum, scilicet in inchoatione boni operis, suasionem illorum aliud intendimus, et aliud pretendimus male radici et sterili, ramos inserentes fertiles et inimicorum laqueos in ipso uirtutis introitu non cauentes. Unde legimus in Trenis: *Facti /fol. 151r/ sunt hostes eius in capite* (Lam. 1:5). Actione maculata quando intentione bona bonum quidem opus incipimus, sed postmodum inimico seminante pestifere actionis herbas frugibus boni operis immiscemus. Unde legimus in Matheo: *Uenit inimicus et super seminauit et zizania in medio tritici, et abiit* (Matt. 13:25). Re inconsumata cum quis bonum opus intentione sincera concipit, immo incipit, et in utero bone conseruantie non addito fermento malicie pulchre gerit, sed tandem illaqueatus ab hiis qui in castris eum obsident germen uirtutum ad finem debitum non perducit. Unde habes in quarto Regum, Manaen *interfecit omnes pregnantes in Thersa et scidit eas* (2 Kings 15:16). Manaen interpretatur castra, Thersa pulchra, et ille qui nos in castris obsidet, impregnatum pulchra uirtutum specie scindit fraudulentamente bone mentis uterum, ne per finem debitum eadem uirtutis ymago perueniat ad effectum. Hinc etiam Amos, *filiis Ammon*<sup>160</sup> [...] *dissecuerunt pregnantes Galaad* (Amos 1:13), animis scilicet que aceruum testimonii contra se peccata sua confitendo iam posuerant, Amonite, scilicet demones iniqui et inutiles sicut fraudulentie secant per medium, ut illa confessio sine satisfactiois puerperio faciat abortiuum.

Primo laqueo capiti erant, qui eo tempore quo Paulus apostolus propter fidem uinculatus iacebat in Roma, uerbo predicationis instabat uoce clara sed intentione obscura, non ut fidem auditoribus infunderent, sed ut pressuram uinculis apostoli suscitant. De quibus scribens ad Phillippenses de carcere per Epafroditum ait: *Quidam ex contentione Christum annuntiant non sincere, existimantes se pressuram suscitare uinculis meis* (Phil. 1:17). Unde dicitur: *Peccantem uirum iniquum inuoluet laqueus* (Prov. 29:6). In hoc laqueo tenetur omnis ypocrita, qui fecte sanctitatis externis pretendens ymaginem, corruptam continet interius laudis proprie

<sup>160</sup> Ammon] Amos

uoluntatem. Unde dicitur in Iob: *Tenebitur planta illius laqueo* (Job 18:9). Hoc etiam laqueo sunt detenti, qui ad regimen assumpti sub pretexto iusticie crudeles sunt in correctione; magne uirtutis precium estimantes si in criminibus uerberandis, non uirgam caritatiue dulcedinis, sed potius baculum arripiant liuide feritatis. Hunc laqueum demones ponunt tam abscondite ut tales magnum Deo putent etiam obsequium se prestare. Unde Psalmista: *Qui cogitauerunt supplantare gressus meos, absconderunt superbi laqueum michi, et funes extenderunt in laqueum iuxta iter scandalum posuerunt michi* (Ps. 139:5–6). Sunt enim quedam uitia uirtutum /fol. 151v/ speciem<sup>161</sup> preferentia que tanto pernitiosius sectatores suos decipiunt quanto se sub uirtutis uelamine male tegunt. Nam, sicut dictum est, sub pretexto iusticie credulitas agitur et remissa segnicies mansuetudo uocatur. Beatus Gregorius in libro *Dyalogorum* dicit quod “Petrus ecclesiastice familie maior [. . .] in locis teterrimis magno ferri pondere” tenebatur, “quia si quid ei pro facienda ultione iubebatur, ad inferendas plagas plus ex crudelitatis desiderio quam obedientie ministerio seruiebat.”<sup>162</sup><sup>163</sup> Hoc etiam laqueo sunt morum iudices innodati, qui cum iuditio president, tamquam pro exsequenda iusticia solliciti, statuta legum proponunt et canonum in publico, sed pro consequenda pecunia consiliis inhiant in occulto, in ultione criminum magis intendentes nummos colligere quam medicinam criminibus adhibere; et tanto periculosius hoc negotium peragitur si tales ad hec ecclesie clauibus abutuntur. Ieremias: *Inuenti sunt in populo meo impii insidiantes quasi aucupes laqueos ponentes et pedicas ad capiendos uiros* (Jer. 5:26). Audi consequentiam. Dicit sapiens: *Qui laqueum ponit alii, peribit in illo* (Ecclus. 27:29). De hiis et de superioribus ait Psalmista: *Prodiit quasi ex adipe, id est boni operis pinguedine, iniquitas eorum, quia dextera eorum dextera iniquitatis* (Ps. 72:7). Etiam hoc laqueo tenentur astricti, qui super bene consono uocis sue gaudentes organo in choralis conlegio iactant in aures astantium eiusdem soni claredinem, ut sibi terrene laudis exinde suscitent claritatem. Et tunc precipue cum circa ipsum maiestatem Dei laudant angeli, adorant dominationes, ipse cum eis, non socia exultatione sed conscia adulatione celebrat, et uocem quam ad Dei laudem supplici confessione deberet extollere subtili uenatione laudis proprie frangit et proicit in sublime. De hoc laqueo Psalmista ait: *Fiat mensa eorum coram ipsis in laqueum et in ret ributiones et in scandalum* (Ps. 68:23). Dicit philosophus: “Multis uox sua lena fuit.”<sup>164</sup> Audi quid dicat alius: “Non ego uentose plebis suffragia uenor.”<sup>165</sup> Audi quid dicat dei filius:

<sup>161</sup> Compare Garnerius of Rochefort, *Sermones* 9, PL 205, col. 630A; *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* 1.A, ed. Holmberg (n. 91 above), 10; and Alain of Lille, *Ars predicandi*, PL 210, col. 159B.

<sup>162</sup> seruiebat] seuiebat

<sup>163</sup> Gregory the Great, *Liber dialogorum* 4.37.10–11, ed. de Vogüé and Antin (n. 37 above), 130–32.

<sup>164</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.316.

<sup>165</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 1.19.37.

*Claritatem ab hominibus non accipio* (John 5:41). Sed isti non audiunt catholicum loquentem, “Frangere uocem inimicum est,”<sup>166</sup> sed magis ethnicum sic docentem, “Si uox est, canta; si brachia mollia, salta; et quacumque potes arte placere, place,”<sup>167</sup> nolentes utiliter reminisci, *Quoniam Deus dissipauit ossa eorum qui hominibus placent, confusi sunt, quoniam Deus sperauit eos* (Ps. 52:7). Et apostolus ait: *Si hominibus placerem Christi seruus non essem* (Gal. 1:10).

In hoc quoque laqueo iacet captus qui simulat uerbis nec corde est /fol. 152r/ fidus amicus alicuius, qui tempestatem quam concitat in mente quadam serenitate obducit in facie et cum tempus oportunitatis sibi uidet accedere, non differt illum abscondite tempestatem improviso grandine uerberare. Cui sic inprecatur Psalmista: *Captio quam abscondit apprehendat eum, et in laqueum cadat in ipsum* (Ps. 34:8). Accidit Ioab principi milicie exercitus Dauid, qui occurrenti sibi Amase dixit, *Salue mi frater, et tenuit manu dextera mentum Amase, quasi osculans eum*. Porro Amasa, qui de nulla presumebat inimicitia, *non obseruabat gladium quem habebat Ioab, qui, etiam fabrefactus leui motu egredi poterat et percutere quo percussit eum, Ioab, in latere et effudit intestina eius* (2 Sam. 20:9–10). Sed captio quam abscondit apprehendit<sup>168</sup> eum, et in ipsum laqueum cecidit quando ascendit Banayas filius Ioiade et aggressus eum interfecit, quia interfecerat uiros duos iustos meliores se, Abner et Amasam.

In hoc laqueo sunt etiam compediti, qui uoce callida palpant mentes hominum et laude perfida fricant aures principum, ut ex una parte propositum alicuius fictis eliciant prouerbiis et ex altera uerbis adulatoriis cor decipiant auditoris, cum non in hoc eorum uersetur intentio ut patrie consulant aut domino, sed per mendacia propriis emolumentis prouideant blandiendo. Unde Salomon in Prouerbiis: *Qui congregat thesauros lingua mendacii, uanus et excors est, et impingetur ad laqueos mortis* (Prov. 21:6). Hinc non incongrue adulator et laudator eisdem litterarum apicibus figurantur. Adulator enim quid est aliud quam laudator? Quam palpauit dyabolus quando dixit, *Cur precepit uobis Deus ut non comederetis de omni ligno paradysi?* (Gen. 3:1) ut ex responsione colligeret, qualiter mentem eius ad suum propositum inclinaret.

Hoc laqueo se implicant qui libros quamuis utiles dictant et scriptitant, et ideo ut ingenii sui uires ostendant, ut dum tale opus legitur, ipsorum scientia commendetur, qui quam proprie laudi non ecclesie student utilitati. Licet et tunc et in posterum ex hoc edificentur plurimi, non poterunt tamen apud inspectorem cordium de merito gratulari, immo presumitur quod magis de tali. Hii enim secundum Psalmistam *posuerunt signa, sed sua signa* (Ps. 73.4) et *uocauerunt nomina sua in terris suis* (Ps. 48.12). Legitur in Osee, *Propheta*<sup>169</sup> *laqueus ruine factus est*

<sup>166</sup> Source unknown.

<sup>167</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.595–96.

<sup>168</sup> apprehendit] *p. c.* ex apprehendit

<sup>169</sup> Propheta] prepheta

*super omnes vias eius* (Hos. 9:8). Item: *Laqueus facti estis speculationi et rece expansum subter Tabor* (Hos. 5:1). Tabor interpretatur aduentus luminis, diuina pagina speculatio est nostra, quia dum uul-/fol. 152v/-tum natiuitatis nostre consideramus in hoc speculo, eius ostensione mentis faciem a notamine detergimus uicioso. Et digne debet sacra scriptura speculatio uel speculum appellari, que puritate sui prouocato in nobis directe speculationis oculo. Docet nos claritatem regni celestis, immo ipsum, qui *splendor est lucis eterne et speculum sine macula Dei maiestatis* (Wis. 7:26), quodammodo contemplari. Nunc enim uidemus per speculum scripturarum in enigmate autoritatum, tunc autem facie ad faciem, transeuntes de fide ad speciem, de spe ad rem, de caritate ad dilectionem, de perfecta in perfectiorem,<sup>170</sup> de prauis temporis in perhennem. Sed heu, rete tunc expansum est subter Tabor, cum quis sub luminosi operis studio ducitur, sed per proprie laudis desiderium iactantie ligaminibus irretitur, sic ut id quod aliis fit aduentus luminis, ei fiat reciaculum peccatoris.

De se ipsos predicantibus et docentibus idem dicimus. Nam et hoc reprobatur apostolus. Ait enim: *Non predicamus nosmetipsos, sed Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Nos autem seruos uestros per Iesum* (2 Cor. 4:5). Salomon ait: *Aues comprehenduntur laqueo* (Eccles. 9:12). Aues sunt uiri litterati pennis scientie et eloquentie preediti. Et hii comprehenduntur laqueo, si quando studendo, dictando, scribendo, legendo, docendo, predicando, expandunt alas sue peritie uolantes in alto scripture sancte fastigio, teneantur proposito arrogantie funibus innodato. Inter ethnicos inuenitur consuetudo ista, uel potius corruptela, testante uno eorum qui dixit tenet in sanabile multos scribendi cacethes, id est malus mos, et ideo malus quia ut ait alius: “Artibus ingenuis<sup>171</sup> quesita est gloria multis.”<sup>172</sup> Quod aliud non quererent ostendit cum dixit: “Nil non mortale tenemus, pectoris exceptis ingeniique bonis.”<sup>173</sup> “Nam iuuat et studium fame michi crescit honore.”<sup>174</sup> “Hoc tantum nostri summa laboris erit.”<sup>175</sup> “Dum modo sic placeam dum toto canter in orbe, quod uolet impugnet unus et alter opus.”<sup>176</sup> Sed Priscianus nimium erat delirus qui pedes suos in apostasie laqueum sponte posuit ut per mundum eius ferret scientie preconium liber grammaticae quem parauit. Cuius stulticie Alanus in Anticlaudianis meminit ita dicens: “Grammaticae tractus percurrat apostata noster priscus in dictis torporis sompnia passus in scriptis errans propriis aut ebrius esse aut magis insanus aut dormire uidetur.”<sup>177</sup> Claudicat ille fide ne fama claudicet eius tractatus, uenditque fidem ne premia libri depereant, erratque fides ne rumor oberretur.

<sup>170</sup> perfectiorem] ducitur sed *add. sed exp.*

<sup>171</sup> ingenuis] ingeniis

<sup>172</sup> Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 2.7.47.

<sup>173</sup> Ovid, *Tristia* 3.7.43–44.

<sup>174</sup> Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 393.

<sup>175</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.404.

<sup>176</sup> Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 363–64.

<sup>177</sup> Alain of Lille, *Anticlaudianus* 2.499–502, ed. Boussat (n. 97 above), 87.

Triumphalis tituli scriptor ille magnus, uidelicet Pylatus, de gloriosa scriptura /fol. 153r/ uera et utili, et per totum mundum celebri, nichil leuauit, nec leuabit premii, quia conclamantibus contra Christum Iudeis, *Si hunc dimittis non es amicus Caesaris* (John 19:12), *Crucifige crucifige eum* (Luke 23:21; and John 19:6) adiudicauit fieri petitionem eorum, condemnare malens innocuum quam per inimiciam Caesaris amittere potestatis iudiciare dominatum. Bene quidem quod scripsit scripsit, quia quod scripsit, nobis scripsit (compare John 19:22). Sed sibi deleuit cum regem angelorum, quem ipse regem Iudeorum tantum yronice scripsit ad litteram (compare John 19:19), qui non yronico sed intellectu uero rex est Iudeorum, id est pie confitentium, immo rex omnium seculorum, regem Romanorum metuens, quia humane glorie cupidus extitit, interfecit. Sed fideles mundane glorie contemptores stili sui tenorem ad Dei laudem et proximorum edificationem, sepe subtiliter, semper utiliter, tamen humiliter solent dirigere, ne illi qui nos in circuitu obsident plantas eorum ualeant laqueis sue fraudis aliquialiter implicare. Suadet hoc apostolus dicens: *Omne quodcumque facitis in uerbo aut opere omnia in nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi facite, gratias agentes Deo patri* (Col. 3:17).

Magis ergo studendum est utilitati quam subtilitati, magis humilitati quam sublimitati, magis glorie Christi quam proprie dignitati, docente iterum apostolo et dicente: *Ego, cum uenissem ad uos, fratres, ueni non in sublimitate sermonis aut sapiente, annuntians uobis testimonium Christi* (1 Cor. 2:1). Dominus per prophetiam: *Gloriam meam alteri non dabo* (Isa. 42:8). Hec est uxor eius legitima, preter quam donauit omnia. Qui enim, ut ait apostolus, *proprio filio suo non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum: quomodo*<sup>178</sup> *non etiam cum illo omnia nobis donauit?* (Rom. 8:32). Sed hanc uxorem suam Deus omnipotens nulli dedit, sed sibi soli retinuit, ut nulli hominum nulli prorsus angelorum hanc procari, sed tantummodo liceat uisu et non nisi purissimo intueri. Legimus in Genesi Ioseph dicentem: *Dominus meus omnia michi tradidit, nec quicquam est quod non sit in mea potestate, uel non tradiderit michi, preter te que uxor eius es* (Gen. 39:8–9). Hanc uxorem Domini sabaoth oportet ut nemo sibi uendicet, quia quicumque eam sibi quomodo-cumque uendicat, ipsa presumptionis temeritate in predictos demonum laqueos statim calcet.

Et breuiter omnes qui sunt in apparentia lucidi, in existentia mucidi, ueluti penne columbe, per simulationem deargentate non per ueritatem argenteae, et posteriora dorsi in pallore non in ualore auri, scilicet pretendentes exterius quod interius non intendunt, sunt huius primi laquei funibus innodati. Quibus omnibus scriptura improperat dicens: *Uox qui—/fol. 153v/—dem uox Iacob est, manus autem manus sunt Esau* (Gen. 27:22). Et Psalmista: *Iniquitatem si aspexi in corde meo non exaudiet Dominus* (Ps. 65:18). Quilibet istorum est fici arbor stans secus uiam, ad quam cum uenit Iesus nichil inuenit in ea nisi folia tantum. Et

<sup>178</sup> quomodo] quomo

de hiis ait: *Omnis plantatio quam non plantauit pater meus celestis eradicabitur* (Matt. 15:13). Et talis non dissimilis est asino de quo pro informatione morum legitur puerulis in libellulo fabularum, qui se pelle leonis induit, “indutam gestat, et inde tumet,” quam quando “sumit, presumit et induit extra grande supercilium qui nichil habet intus.”<sup>179</sup> “Rusticus hunc deprendit longa ab aure, ligatur, uapulat, exuitur quod male gessit onus.”<sup>180</sup> Hoc erit in consumatione seculi. Nam sicut in Iob legitur: *Diuicias, scilicet scientie, quas deuorauit euomet* (Job 20:15). Dicitur enim a iudice: *Auferte ab eo mnam* (Luke 19:24). Quod ei non contingeret, si mortalitatem que sequitur attendisset. Nemo suas uires debet transcendere, nemo laudes alterius appropriare sibi, immo auctoritatem que dicitur ad tales: *Nolite multiplicare loqui sublimia gloriantes* (1 Sam. 2:3).

In secundum corruunt laqueum qui recto quidem proposito inchoant opus bonum, sed postmodum immiscent aliqua quibus fit eadem operatio uiciata. Pluribus contingit et pluries quod intentione debita tam fidei quam prolis in matrimonio conueniunt et multos in sinceritate coniugii dies ducunt, et tandem cedentes libidini, frequentem dant operam uoluptati, exercentes inter se plurima incontinentie ludicra, que in coniugali federe non admittit pudicia, que specialis est omnium lubricis uiuentium inimica; et quamuis adulterio se non polluant, fedo tamen lubricitatis genere suum matrimonium<sup>181</sup> inhonestant, luxurie irretiti laqueis, contortis fune tam maliuole quam multiuole uanitatis. Legimus in Ecclesiastico: *Ne respicias mulierem multiuolam ne incidas in laqueos illius* (Ecclus. 9:3). Hos laqueos euitari docet apostolus, scribens ad Hebreos: *Honorabile connubium sit omnibus et thorus immaculatus* (Heb. 13:4). Multi etiam artes mechanicas<sup>182</sup> intentione discunt laudabili, ne uel mendicare uel aliena cogantur rapere, sed ut se suosque ualeant tali manuum exercicio sustentare et postea cum habuerint res uenales, diuersas immiscent suis actibus falsitates, dativam asserentes rem aliquam, quam de certa scientia nouerint indatiam, et cum intendunt fallere proximum hoc mercimonio, obducunt etiam suas fallacias iuramento. De mercatoribus idem sentimus, qui similem cadunt in laqueum cum diuites fieri uolunt, per simile iuramentum, et si dece-/fol. 154r/-perint estimant gloriosum. Unde Salomon in Prouerbiis: *Malum est, malum est, dicit omnis emptor et cum recesserit tunc gloriabitur* (Prov. 20:14). De hoc laqueo ait apostolus: *Qui uolunt diuites fieri incidunt in temptationem et in laqueum dyaboli* (1 Tim. 6:9). Audi qualem *Uir qui*

<sup>179</sup> *Anti-Avianus* 5.5–6 and 5.11–12, ed. Hervieux (n. 99 above), 3:470. This is the fable of the Ass and the Lion, first recorded in Aesop’s fables and circulated in various Latin versions, including the verse version quoted here known only from so-called *Anti-Avianus* collection, which is found in a single thirteenth-century manuscript: Cambridge MS Dd.11.78, fols. 149v–151r.

<sup>180</sup> *Anti-Avianus* 5.11–12, ed. Hervieux (n. 99 above), 470.

<sup>181</sup> matrimonium] *add. in marg.*

<sup>182</sup> mechanicas] *machanicas*

*festinat ditari, ait Salomon, et aliis inuidet, ignorat quod egestas superueniet ei* (Prov. 28:22).

Etiam quicumque bono operi peccatum adicit, tamquam fel misceatur uino, iam dicto tenetur laqueo et ad uitam intrare gressu non poterit expedito; insuper opus quod tali felle corrumpitur oblatum Domino nullatenus acceptatur. Nam dicitur: *Et dabant ei uinum bibere cum felle mixtum. Et cum*<sup>183</sup> *gustasset noluit bibere* (Matt. 27:14). Talibus loquitur Aggeus: *Ponite corda uestra super uias uestras* (Hag. 1:5 and 1:7). Quasi dicat: “Non animaduertitis quam grauiter in uia morum erretis.” Per magni laboris operam seminastis multum, sed per parui ualoris paleam intulistis parum. Comedistis, quia uirtutis cibum bone operationis dentibus quodammodo masticastis, et de tali commestione non estis satiati, quia terrenorum ammixtione operum mansistis inanes et uacui tamquam Spiritus sancti gratia non repleti. Nam legitur: *Terra autem erat inanis et uacua* (Gen. 1:2). Bibistis, quia potum salutis de uase boni hausistis operis, et non estis inebriati, dum uis huius poculi propter mixturam mali non recte penetrat uenas intimas sensus uestri, ne demulcendo cerebrum possit idem haustus sani potus officium operari. Sic secundum Ysaie uerbum: *Somniat esuriens et comedit cum autem fuerit expergefactus uacua est anima eius, et sic somniat sitiens et bibit, et postquam fuerit expergefactus, lassus adhuc sitit et anima eius uacua est* (Isa. 29:8). Ille non in ueritate, sed in sompno esurit, comedit, et bibit, qui saporis boni operis desideranter inuigilat, sed tamen interea in sopore permixti criminis dormitat. Cum autem expergefactus a presentis uite sompno fuerit, et se in nocte huius temporis non cum iustis uigilasse, sed cum interfectis dormiuisse compererit, sentiet quia uacua est anima tamquam ab illo qui suorum replet in bonis desiderium superne sacietatis dulcedine non implenda.

Et Aggeus subicit ad eosdem, *Operuistis uos, scilicet contra frigus mentis* quadam bone operationis uestra, *et non estis calefacti* (Hag. 1:6), quia per mixturam mali ignem caritatis, qui uos posset calefacere, nouistis sub eodem tegmine custodire, idem operimento sociantes talia que non caloris sed sunt frigoris effectiua. In quorum enim cordibus rex Christus<sup>184</sup> senex est et frigidus, quamuis in tali lecto multis tamquam bone sollicitudinis operiatur /**fol. 154v**/ uestibus, non calefit, quia amoris sui calorem ad facta talium non conuertit. Unde legitur: *Etiam rex Dauid senuerat, habebatque etatis plurimos dies* (1 Kings 1:1). Cumque operiretur uestibus non calefiebat. *Iesus nazarenus rex Iudeorum* (John 19:19) apud illos senex est et frigidus, habetque etatis plurimos dies, quos in se frigidus esse permittit et debiles, nec fomentum sui caloris, nec firmamentum eis exhibens sue fortitudinis, quia multiplicatis seruitii eius diebus tedere incipit eos itineris et laboris, clamantes sepius cum hiis qui simili tedio laborabant:

<sup>183</sup> cum] \*\*\* add.

<sup>184</sup> rex Christus] p. c. ex Christus rex

*Anima nostra arida est*, scilicet propter frequens ieiunium, *nihil aliud respiciunt oculi nostri nisi man* (Num. 11:6). Et hec idemptitas nobis generat tedium et hoc idem dies diei eructat uerbum, ut nullum penitus respirandi ueniat interual- lum. Hec cogitauerunt et errauerunt. Unde si Christus ab istis aliquorum bonorum operum operitur uestibus, fit minime calefactus, et eo non calescente a quo possent calefieri, manent omnino frigidi, licet in spuercie sint operti, quia quamuis habeant aliquando operis boni laborem, intermiserunt ea quibus elidunt omnem eiusdem operis bonitatem. Et hiis accidit sicut propheta dicit: *Qui mercedes congregauit, misit eas in sacculum*<sup>185</sup> *percusum* (Hag. 1:6). Sic Iheu studiose fecit quod rectum erat, et placebat in oculis Domini, uerumptamen a peccatis Ieroboam non recessit (compare 2 Kings 10:29–31). Sed quia nullum bonum irremuneratum manet, sicut nullum malum impunitum, pro remuneratione eiusdem facti dixit Dominus ad eum: *Filii tui usque ad quartam generationem sedebunt super thronum Israel* (2 Kings 10:30). Etiam habes: “Quia Nabugodonosor seruiuit in Tyro, dabo ei Egyptum”<sup>186</sup> (compare Ezek. 29:18–19). Et in Ezechiele: *Dedi eis terram Egypti pro eo quod laborauerunt michi* (Exod. 29:20).

Bona siquidem opera sub mortalibus facta habent remunerationem suam, sed non edificant ad coronam. Sic enim dicit scriptura, *Dona iniquorum non probat altissimus, nec respicit in orationibus impiorum, nec in multitudine sacrificiorum suorum propitiabitur peccatis* (Ecclus. 34:23), sed *Oblatio iusti inpinguat altare et odor suauitatis est in conspectu altissimi* (Ecclus. 35:8). Aliquid tamen in peccatore bona proficiunt opera, nec tamquam a desperato sunt aliquatenus omittenda. Aliquando enim bona terrena tribuunt, sicut iam de Iheu et Nabugodonosor diximus, aliquando cor habile ad exercitium boni faciunt, aliquando tormenta Gehenne minuunt. Semper autem, ne Sathanas hominem ad uotum suum plene possideat, impediunt plerumque etiam per cooperantem gratiam peccatorem penitus respiscere faciunt. Unde hii uersus: “Ditant terrenis sub mortali bona donis, cor /fol. 155r/ reduunt habile, minuunt tormenta plutonis.”<sup>187</sup> Sepius hec hominem faciunt respiscere tandem, nec mentem Sathanas ad uotum prendit eandem. Uiuere qui uultis laqueis ex omnibus ite mortis perpetue, uia non est altera uite. Hic enim est secundus demonum hominem obsidentium laqueus, scilicet cum quis bonum bene operans, tandem malum intermiscens funibus eiusdem malicie fit ligatus.

Tercius [laqueus] est cum bonum opus intentione bona quis inchoat nec postmodum illud copulatione mali coinquinat, non tamen in illo ad finem debitum perseuerat. De hoc laqueo legimus in Trenis: *Ceperunt me quasi auem inimici mei gratis* (Lam. 3:52). Quicumque enim non perseuerauerit in finem, quasi auis incidit in huius laquei captionem. Nemo enim, ut ait apostolus, coronabitur,

<sup>185</sup> sacculum] saculum

<sup>186</sup> John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 8.18, ed. C. C. J. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1909), 2:359.

<sup>187</sup> Source unknown.



*nisi qui legitime certauerit* (2 Tim. 2:5), id est coronam perdit, qui pugnam suam fine legitimo non concludit. Sic unus de quadraginta militibus sub Maximiano passis, quorum etiam septimo nonas Marcii celebratur triumphus, cum iam esset in continenti coronam martyrii delatam ab angelis accepturus, socios et eorum constantiam deseruit et statim in balneo quod pro uitando frigoris supplicio uiteque procelando termino miser intrauerat expirauit, et custos eorum et tortor, qui quadraginta coronas de celo descendere et non nisi triginta nouem personas stare uidit in glacie, factus credulus, ad martyres est ingressus, coronam glorie quam ille perditus perdidit consecutus.<sup>188</sup> Unde bene in hoc libro cui libet fidei consulitur, *Tene quod habes, ut nemo alius accipiat coronam tuam* (Apoc. 3:11).

Uidimus qualiter et quando *draco, ille serpens antiquus, qui est dyabolus et Sathanas* (Apoc. 12:9; compare Apoc. 20:2) hominem obsideat et illaqueet, uidelicet opere circa principium male cepto, uel bene cepto, sed postmodum corrupto, uel certe bene cepto, et postmodum non corrupto,<sup>189</sup> sed minime consumato. Nunc uideamus de sagittis eius et gladiis, et tunc de insidiis et insultibus manifestis, ut discamus, tam ex eius armis quam nominibus, qualiter cum eliso ipsius molimine superemus. Quia enim draco est, solet hastutiae laqueos abscondere, quia serpens ueneno sagittas inficere, quia antiquus gladios scienter eximere, quia dyabolus insidias ponere, quia Sathanas manifestis aduersitatibus impugnare. Ideo audito hoc nomine draco, monemur a Iohanne ut eius caueamus laqueos, hoc *serpens antiquus* (Apoc. 12:9 and 20:2) ut sagittas et gladios, hoc dyabolus ut insidias, hoc Sathanas ut malicias manifestas. Positis itaque tractatu longo, sed non superfluo, draconis istius la-/fol. 155v/-queis, subiciamus de sagittis antiqui serpentis et gladiis ut, quia secundum sapientis uerbum “malum non potest uitari, nisi cognitum,”<sup>190</sup> habeamus de armis hiis nocuis pro nostro munimine documentum.

Sagitta ex improuiso percutit, et sepe cum homo securus minime metuit sagittas diro litas<sup>191</sup> toxico serpens mittit. De hiis sagittis Psalmista dicit: *Ecce peccatores intenderunt arcum parauerunt sagittas suas in pharetra, ut sagittent in obscuro rectos corde* (Ps. 10:3). Serpens iste sagittam parat in pharetra, cum in abscondito cordis sui, modo quo non creditur, et hora qua non presumitur, uenenosa conficit nocumenta. Sagittat in obscuro cum eadem spicula sumpta ex prae intentionis pharetra, et super arcum hastutiae posita, non in patulo, sed olam mittit tempore penitus improuiso. De hac pharetra dicit Ieremias: *Pharetra eius quasi*

<sup>188</sup> This is the well-known legend of the forty martyrs of Sebaste.

<sup>189</sup> non corrupto] rem in consumato *add.*

<sup>190</sup> A proverb that possibly originated with Boethius (*De differentiis topicis* 2, PL 64, col. 1184B). It appears in this exact wording (attributed to Aristotle) in Albert of Stade, “Accessus in Troilum,” ed. Merzdorf (n. 99 above), 5. The author makes several subsequent references to Albert’s *Trolius*, so this seems to be the most likely proximate source.

<sup>191</sup> litas] litos

*sepulchrum patens* (Jer 5:16). Et de arcu Psalmista: *Dedisti metuentibus te significationem, ut fugiant a facie areus* (Ps. 59:6). Et iterum: *Arcum suum tetendit, et parauit illum, et in eo parauit uasa* (Ps. 7:13), id est arma mortis. Uerum cum idem serpens sagittas suas frequentius mittat, aliquando tamen mittere cessat, et quando cessat, ideo cessat ut postea intentionis eius iaculum amplius inualescat. Cessat enim ut redeat oportunius, cessat ut impugnet grauius, cessat ut queratur auidius, cessat ut teneatur obstinatus.

Dyabolus sagittare cessat et sagittam remittit in pharetram, ut postmodum oportunius mittat eam. Quod fit cum aliquis accedens ad seruitutem Dei stat primitus in timore, et fortiter preparat cor suum ad temptationem, omnique custodia munit illud, stans super speculam suam uigiter et contra sagittas serpentis noxias sumens ante se scutum in expugnabile equitatem. Sed tandem incipit negligentius agere, custodiam remittere, et depositis prioris cautele uigiliis, tamquam hostem uiderit, dormire, cum illico serpens, uacta oportunitate quam expectabat, sagittam ueneno luxurie uel alterius malicie toxicatam in ipsum dirigit, et in femur eius uel aliam nudam corporis partem custoditam remissiuam illam figit, ut hoc saucius uulnere, priori sordere reincipiat feditate. *Quam uilis*, ait Ieremias, *facta es iterans uias tuas* (Jer. 2:21). Hec iuxta uerbum sapientis est *sagitta infixata femori canis* (compare Ecclus. 19:12), quia et hic est *canis reuersus ad uomitum* (2 Pet. 2:22; compare Prov. 26:11), habens femur sagitta ueneni noxii sauciatum. Eadem sagitta dyabolus quendam iuuenem, quem scriptor huius libri Iohannes conuerterat in Asya, perforauit, qui inter pluri-/fol. 156r/-mos uirtutum labores, quia se tandem in custodia negligentius habuit, episcopum cui a Iohanne commendatus erat fugiens, ad mala priora rediit, et princeps factus latronum (compare 1 Kings 11:24). Multis ferocium eximinum enormitatibus se inmersit, licet iterum per apostolum Iohannem reductus fuerit efficaciter ad salutem.<sup>192</sup>

Plurimi quoque uiam uirtutis ardentem arripiunt et letanter currunt, incipiunt tamen processu temporis paulatim subsistere, et licet ex uia per maliciam non exorbitent, nichilominus intendunt amplius in ipso itinere non letis, sed lentis passibus ambulare. Qui etiam de tarditatis sue pigritia seipsos in cubili cordis sepius increpant, sed gressus bonos secundum dies pristinos ideo non maturant, donec tali dissuetudine uel corporis inualitudine, etiam si uelint, non ualeant tam alatis quam armatis pedibus contra hostes sicut ceperant properare. Et dubium non est quod membra<sup>193</sup> que incipiunt lentescere non possunt contra fortes arma fortia fortiter intentare. Sed teste Domino: *Cum fortis armatus custodit atrium suum, in pace sunt ea que possidet* (Luke 11:21). Si autem fortior illo, scilicet forte quantomagis pigritante, superueniens uicerit eum, cum inopinabile sit quod pigritans ueniat ad triumphum, uniuersa arma eius auferat, id est ad

<sup>192</sup> Compare Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.23, ed. and trans. Kirsopp Lake, Loeb Classical Library 153 (Cambridge, MA, 1926), 242–49.

<sup>193</sup> membra] membra

repugnandum impotentem reddet, in quibus confidebat tunc cum agilis et circumspectus erat, et spolia eius distribuet, quia talem uictoriam cunctis suis complicitibus innotescet. Hic casus ex hoc accidit, quod cum scriptura dicat, *Confortentur manus uestre et estote filii fortitudinis* (2 Sam. 2:7); tamen desidiose torpescimus et uiam mandatorum Dei, quam contra serpentem antiquum pugnaturi feruenter intrauimus, et positis armis debita fortitudine non seruamus. Aliter de Ionatha, id est columba, scilicet cauta simpliciter anima canitur: *Sagitta Ionathe numquam rediit retrorsum* (2 Sam. 1:22). Sed tepentium personam Iob in se suscipit, quando dicit: *Quis michi tribuat ut sim iuxta menses pristinos, secundum dies quibus Deus custodiebat me, quando splendebat lucerna eius super capud meum, et ad lumen eius ambulabam in tenebris,*<sup>194</sup> *sicut fui in diebus adolescentie mee, quando secreto Deus erat in tabernaculo meo, quando erat omnipotens mecum* (Job 29:2–5). Ecce quomodo dyabolus hominem spernit et abicit, et in pharetra sagittam abscondit, quam postea cum oportunitatem uiderit, ad sagittandum uelociter apprehendit et crudeliter mittit. Et si forte domum scopis penitentie mundatam et bonorum operum floribus ornatam inuenit, *uadit et assumit alios septem spiritus nequiores se, et expugnata domo fol. 156v/ ingressi habitant ibi. Et fiunt nouissima hominis illius peiora prioribus* (Matt. 12:45; compare Luke 11:26), quod utique non fieret, si homo ille maneret in sua custodia circumspectus. Sic Dalila quem in sinu fouerat abiecit Sampsonem (compare Judg. 16:19), que tamen decipiendi eum ad uotum oportunam postea reperit facultatem. Sepius etiam adulter aliquis penitentia ductus adulteram formosam adhuc et iuuenem abiecit, quam postea huius sagitte ueneno tactus, deformem et uetulam adamauit. Simile huic legitur in quodam loco: “Sepe fit ut que se timuit committere honesto uilis ad amplexus deterioris eat.”<sup>195</sup>

Serpens etiam iaculum uirulentie sue aliquando de pharetra non extrahit, sed ad tempus sagittare desistit, ut et arcum postea strictius tendat et sagittam grauius mittat. Et hoc ideo ut si eo feriente res munita concutitur et concussa prosternitur, ipse de maiori uictoria gloriatur.<sup>196</sup> Dicitur enim: *Gloriati sunt qui oderunt te* (Ps. 73:4). Hic siquidem sepe uidet et subsannando deridet quod *quis obturat aures suas ne audiat sanguinem et claudit oculos ne uideat malum* (Isa. 33:15). Immo cunctis sensibus suis statuit firmum contra tela noxia munimentum, sic ut de die in diem proficiat et de uirtute in uirtutem eat, cum ecce sagittarius iste, arcum callida expectatione diu remissum fortius intendens missile ualidum contra illum dirigit, et donec sagitta transfigat cor eius ictum, sepius iterans non quiescit. Et hoc iaculum ille non potest euadere, si inter uirtutum pondera, leuem paleam superbie neglexerit exsufflare. Sic percutimur a sagitta uolante in die, si tam nociuum quam excelsum arrogantie uolatum non abigimus

<sup>194</sup> tenebris] tebris

<sup>195</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.769–70.

<sup>196</sup> uictoria gloriatur] corr. ex gloriatur uictoria

in lucis operatione. Unde legitur in Regum: *Fecit Amasias quod erat rectum coram Domino* [. . .] *nisi hoc tantum quod excelsa non abstulit* (2 Kings 14: 3–4). Bene ergo docet qui dicit: “Cum bene pugnaris cum cuncta subacta putaris, que magis infestat, uincenda superbia restat.”<sup>197</sup> Et alius: “Si tibi copia, si sapientia formaque detur, destruit omnia sola superbia, si comitetur.”<sup>198</sup> Ecce qualiter balistarius iste facta bonorum subsannat et diu tamquam non aduertens balistam intendere dissimulat, permittens eos sine pugna proficere, ut postmodum si moti ceciderint, possit de casu ipsorum arrogantius exultare. Nam Psalmista dicit: *Qui tribulant me exultabunt si motus fuero* (Ps. 12:5). Et in Abacuc legimus: *Ipse super omnem munitionem ridebit* (Hab. 1:10).

Iterum iste sagittarius non iuuenis sed antiquus sagittare cessat, ut queratur auidius, quia plerumque cum sagit–/fol. 157r/–tauerit incautum, astat eminus et prospicit sauciatum. Quia teste Deo, *oculi*<sup>199</sup> *eius sunt ut palpebre diluculi* (Job 41:9), alto intellectu uolentes et ualentes singula tenebrarum opera subtilius intueri, prospicit autem et expectat utrum suggestionis spiculum quod misit in mentem inhereat per dilectionem, et si uiderit accedere consensum, sperat quod peruenerit ad triumphum. Et cum intellexerit tali tactum iaculo rationis armis se non defendere, sed nec medelam post uulnus acceptum querere, immo suggestionem delectatione infectam ad effectum perducere, telis suis de magna calliditate in pharetram repositis, nullum uulnerat qui fiat ei socius propositae uoluptatis, ut, cum non inuenerit, quamuis sollicitus quesierit sue uoluntatis socium, anima eius seipsam magis prouocet<sup>200</sup> ad peccatum. Testatur hoc Ezechiel dicens, *Factum est contra consuetudinem aliarum mulierum* (Ezek. 16:34); aliis dantur munera, tu autem dona dabis, ut intrarent ad te (compare Ezek. 16:33).

Uerum de telo suggestionis et uulnere delectationis et eorum in hoc bello nocuentis, ita distinguitur. Delectatio naturalis aut est in natura tantum aut a natura cum fomite. Si primo, indifferens<sup>201</sup> est, cum omnis actus naturalis in quantum talis sit indifferens quia scriptura dicit: *Non poterant filii Israel expugnare Iebriseum sed habitauit inter illos usque in hodiernum diem* (compare Josh. 15:63). Si secundo modo distinguitur, quia fomes consideratur duppliciter. Si enim consideratur fomes prout est pena originalis peccati, delectatio sensilis in hac consideratione non erit peccatum sed pena peccati. Si autem consideratur fomes prout est dispositio ad sequens “mortale” distingue, quia delectatio sensilis sub hac consideratione aut est cum perceptione rationis aut citra. Si citra

<sup>197</sup> *Proverbia sententiaeque latinitatis medii aevi*, ed. Walther (n. 128 above), 1:476 (no. 4031).

<sup>198</sup> *Initia carminum ac versuum medii aevi posterioris latinorum: Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der Versanfänge mittellateinischer Dichtungen*, ed. Hans Walther and Alfons Hilka (Goettingen, 1959), 943 (no. 17998).

<sup>199</sup> oculi] p. c.

<sup>200</sup> prouocet] prouocet

<sup>201</sup> indifferens] ndifferens

leuissimum est peccatum. Si cum perceptione, distingue quia ratio percipiens aut consentit aut dissentit, aut nec sic, nec sic, sed dissimulat. Si primo modo, aut in delectationem aut in actum, siue fiat siue non, semper mortale. Si dissentit, aut uincit aut uincitur. Si uincit, non solum non est peccatum, sed causa meriti, secundum Gregorium dicentem: “Temptatio cui non consentitur<sup>202</sup> non est peccatum, sed causa exercende uirtutis.”<sup>203</sup> Si uincitur, hoc est quia non potest euellere, et tunc temptatio radicata est. Causa tamen huius radicationis aut est ex sua culpa aut non. Si non ex sua, sic est pena et causa meriti. Si ex sua, aut deleta, et sic est pena, aut non deleta, et hoc duppliciter /fol. 157v/ quia aut de ueniali, et sic est ueniale, aut de mortali et sic est mortale. Si autem ratio dissimulat, aut cum mora aut sine mora. Si sine mora peccatum est ueniale. Si autem cum mora, mortale, quia ratio non debet dissimulare. Quanta autem debeat esse mora, non est a sanctis patribus diffinitum. Itaque bellator iste, ex eo quod figmentum nostrum per frequentem nouit experientiam, tantam in suis armis habet fiduciam, quod cum telum persuasionis miserit in aliquem, non dubitet, quin ille delectatione concepta, tam actu quam consensu, omnem suam expleat uoluntatem. Etiam quid mirum cum, sicut superius diximus, *habet fiduciam quod influat*<sup>204</sup> *Iordanis in os eius?* (Job 40:18). Legimus in Iudith,<sup>205</sup> *Assirii in contis suis et in sagittis, et in lanceis gloriantur* (Jth. 9:9). Assyrii sunt demones, qui contra nos sagittas suas dirigunt, quia Assyrii interpretantur dirigentes.

Diximus quomodo pugnare cessat aliquando *serpens antiquus* (Apoc. 12:9 and 20:2) ut redeat oportunius, aliquando ut sagittet grauius, aliquando ut queratur auidius; restat ut dicamus qualiter impetere cessat ut postmodum teneatur obstinatius. Telum suggestionis serpens in hominem plerumque dirigit et telo retracto uulnus sanari permittit, et iterum per sagittam aperto uulnere animam cruentat, et iterum sagitta reposita bellum dissimulat, donec sanitatem integram uulnus sumat. Et ita sepius telum iterans, sepius sanari permittit uulnus illatum, ut ille multotiens saucius et sanatus, sanatus et saucius, multis uicibus faciat reciduum, ut tandem ex recidiuandi frequentia, anima sanata tociens et relapsa in desperationis cadat<sup>206</sup> foueam obstinata. Ad hoc enim nititur, ut sicut eius, ita quoque quasi lapis cor hominis induretur, ut cum amplius nec recuperationem nec ueniam sperat, cum desperato desperatus dicat: *Maior est iniquitas mea quam ut ueniam merear* (Gen. 4:13). Hec est sagitta qua percussus est Ioram<sup>207</sup> *inter scapulas* et *que egressa est per cor eius* (2 Kings 9:22). Sauciati sunt inter

<sup>202</sup> consentitur] sentitur

<sup>203</sup> *Glossa ordinaria* (2 Cor. 12), in *Glossae Scripturae Sacrae electronicae (Gloss-e)*, ed. Morard (n. 64 above). The source is unknown.

<sup>204</sup> influat] imfluat

<sup>205</sup> in Iudith] p. c.

<sup>206</sup> cadat] p. c.

<sup>207</sup> Ioram] p. c. ex roram

scapulas, et inimici sagitta transiuit cor<sup>208</sup> eorum, qui corde peruerso, ab humeris suis abiciunt iugum Domini, nec redire proponunt ad penitentiam dampnabiliter obstinati. Legimus in Zacharia: *Noluerunt attendere et auerterunt scapulam recedentes* (Zach. 7:11). Et statim serpens in miseram sic uulnerati perniciem, sagittam illam dirigit que transiuit Achab *inter scapulas et ceruicem*, sicut legitur in Paralipomenon (2 Chron. 18:33), quia talis aliquando non solum iugum /**fol. 158r**/ Domini de suis humeris abicit, immo *pingui ceruice armatus, erecto collo* (Ps. 15:26) contra Deum currit, dum mala perpetrata non deserit, sed despicit et defendit. Unde dicitur: *Peccator cum in profundum peccatorum uenerit, contempnit* (Prov. 18:3). Contra<sup>209</sup> hanc contemptionis sagittam scutum petiuit qui ait: *Non declines cor meum in uerba malicie ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis* (Ps. 140:3). Dicit Dominus per Ezechielem: *Ideo nolunt audire te quia*<sup>210</sup> *nolunt audire me* (Ezek. 3:7). Et quare nolunt audire, aperit qui dicit Ieremias: *Cor suum leuauerunt contra me* (Jer. 51:1). Et: *Indurauerunt faciem suam supra petram et noluerunt reuerti* (Jer. 5:3). De hiis in fine Paralipomenon legitur: *Illudebant angelis Dei et despiciebant sermones eius et diripiebant prophetas eius, donec ascendit indignatio Domini, essetque nulla curatio* (2 Chron. 36:16). Nichil [est] hac sagitta indurationis nociuius, cuius toxicum raro uel numquam permittit sanari uulnus.

Sagittas antiqui serpentis quibus in hac obsidione contra obsessum hominem utitur aliquantisper expressimus. Non erit inutile, si quibus pennis ducentibus uolatum dirigat etiam exprimamus. Sagitta enim ut locum directe tangat qui intenditur, per pennas superpositas magistratur. Et cognitis sagittis, si noticiam quoque pennarum sagittas dirigentium habuerimus, Dei adiutorio possumus interim ipsas pennas confringere, ne telum ualeat illi loco quem mittens tangere cogitat propriare. Penne autem sunt hee: laudum suauitas, opum dignitas, cordium uanitas. Hiis trium leuitatum pennis telo serpentis antiqui suppositis, idem telum facile dirigitur ut in errato tramite et agili uolatu uersus<sup>211</sup> hominem cum defertur, id quod desiderat citius operetur. Cum enim dyabulo tamquam in pluribus experto constet, quod homo bibulis auribus aut laudem humanam appetat, et ex hoc sepe fictam sanctitatem ostendat, uel quod opum cum sit cupidus diuitiarum suadeatur ei leuiter appetitus, uel quod etiam cum mores habeat leues et ad malum ductibiles, leui quoque suggestionem ad seculares possit pertrahi uanitates, dicente Deo *sensus et cogitatio hominis in malum prona sunt ab adolescentia sua* (Gen. 8:21). Hiis tribus pennis sagittarius iste contra uos in sagittis suis utitur, ut non obliquo sed directo uolatu et celeri, per humana precordia deferatur, maxime cum primam pennam, scilicet laudis

<sup>208</sup> cor] eor

<sup>209</sup> Contra] p. c.

<sup>210</sup> quia] que

<sup>211</sup> uersus] p. c. ex reuersus

fauorem, superbia, alteram, id est opum honorem, auaricia, terciam uero, uidelicet cordium uanitatem, luxuria comitetur.

Penna laudis *serpens antiquus* (Apoc. 12:9 and 20:2) sagittam suam leuem facit et uolatilem, cum alicui /fol. 158v/ suggestionis sue iaculo perfectam imprimit sanctitatem, similitudinem ei faciens penne alterius uolueris, non pretendens in se speciem aliquam falsitatis. De hac simulatorie laudis penna Dominus ait ad Iob: *Penna strutionis similis est penne herodii et accipitris* (Job 39:13), qui ouis suis in nido non in arena positus diligenter incubant et eis incrementa uiuendi fomentis debitis amministrant. Sic simulator laudis utique non uirtutis amator, pennas strucionis habet, quia eorum qui facta sua digno fomento nutriunt similitudinem tantum tenet et formam bonorum operum in apparitione gerit, non in operatione, bonis similis facie non uirtute, spem ponens non in germine sed colore, in cortice non uigore. Et quid est ypocrita nisi strutio, qui omnia oua sua, id est singula bonorum operum incrementa, sepelit in sabulo, uidelicet terrene glorie tegumento? Non sic boni, non sic, quia spei sue oua, concepta de spiritualis illius galli copula, qui Petrum negantem statim cantando redarguit, eumque uerba<sup>212</sup> Iesu recordare fecit, in nidum fidei ponunt et caritatis ea calore nutriunt, nec negligenter sicut strucio in humane laudis puluere derelinquunt. Et hoc ideo, quia pennas non habent pennis prouidarum auium in superficie tantum similes, sed prorsus ipsas easdem ueras et ad oua fouendum habiles, nichil aliud quam extra pretendunt intrinsecus intendentes. Quod autem ouum spei nostre fomentum in figura sit, ostendit Dominus cum sic negatiue intulit. Aut si petierit ouum numquid porriget illi scorpionem? Et ipse Lucifer, immo etiam Luctifer, quia luctum fert omnibus se sequentibus euidenter, uero sermone strucio dici poterit, quia oua sua in terra reliquit, cum nature nobilitatem, a Deo sibi traditam sapientiam, et decorem in superbie puluere sepeliuit. De hoc strutione habes in Trenis: *Filia populi mei crudelis quasi strucio in deserto* (Lam. 4:3). *Strucio in deserto* est Lucifer derelictus a Deo. Ipse quoque pennas similes pennis auium oua sua cum diligentia fouentem sibi uendicat, dum *se in lucis angelum transfiguratur* (2 Cor. 11:14). Ueritas enim dicit: *Uidebam Sathanam sicut fulgur de celo cadentem* (Luke 10:18). Sicut fulgur de celo cadit, qui ut decipiat fulgidum se ostendit. Quanti hodie ante oculos hominum lucide fulgurant, qui ante Dei faciem modicum lucis portant. Hec est una penna superbie, uidelicet laudis humane, quam *serpens antiquus*<sup>213</sup> (Apoc. 12:9 and 20:2) suggestionis sue sagittis solet /fol. 159r/ apponere ut possit eas tanto certius in locum quem desiderat destinare.

Alter a penna secularis est dignitas, uel opum cupiditas, cuius uolatu dyabolus penetrat mentes multas. Sagitta enim eius facili uolatu in pectus alicuius dirigitur,

<sup>212</sup> uerba] uerbi

<sup>213</sup> antiquus] antiquus

cum penna opum uel dignitatum secularium instauratur. Pomposa siquidem dignitas, uel deliciosa cupiditas, aquile more se semper eleuat, et in quantum potest penna auaricie se dilatat. De hac penna Salomon ait: *Ne erigas oculos tuos ad opes quas habere non potes, quia faciant sibi pennas quasi aquile, et uolabunt in celum* (Prov. 23:5). Penna leuis est, in uolatu facilis, in sono delectabilis, affluam deliciis et fruar bonis. Hanc pennam iste sagittarius, noster inimicus, sagitte suggestionis superposuit cum Theophilum sagittauit, qui quoniam opum erat cupidus, auaricie penna telum ducente ruit crudeliter uulneratus. Hanc pennam angelus claritate sibi tradita non contentus arroganter arripuit, cum se similem altissimo per totam curie celestis amplitudinem proclamauit, et hanc pro uulnerandis mortalibus persuasionis sue telo solet apponere, ut eos simili lesos uulnere contingat, sicut ipse dignitatis auariis interiit, interire. Hec erga est altera penna quam serpens in hominem mittendo supponit telo, ut nocendi propositum uolatu perficiat expedito.

Tertia penna cordium est uanitas, qua serpens idem mentes percellit innumeras, cum uix inueniamus aliquem qui penitus a se totam cordis remoueat<sup>214</sup> uanitatem, et si iam remouerit, iterum reuertitur et incumbit. Et si telo locutionis male et operationis inique cautionis scutum aliquomodo possumus obicere, pennam cogitationis uane habitaculo nostri cordis sepius aduolantem nequaquam plene ualemus abigere, maxime si uolatum eius non uiolenter sed uolenter aliquando consueti fuimus acceptare. *Uanitas enim uanitatum dixit Ecclesiastes uanitas uanitatum et omnia uanitas* (Eccles. 1:2). Et: *Dominus scit cogitationes hominum quoniam uane sunt* (Ps. 93:11). Et uere: *Uani sunt omnes homines teste libro sapientie, in quibus non sub est Dei scientia* (Wis. 13:1). Hec uanitatis penna de alis est uolatilium pennatorum que *cecidere in medio castrorum circa tabernacula eorum* (Ps. 77:28), qui *concupierunt concupiscentiam in deserto* (Ps. 105:14), sicut legitur in Psalmo: *Et pluit super eos sicut puluerem carnes et sicut harenam*<sup>215</sup> *maris uolatilia pennata* (Ps. 77:27). Hac penna uolante, ibant non de uirtute in uirtutem, sed de uanitate in idipsum, quia *ortum est murmur eorum* /fol. 159v/ *quasi dolentium pro labore contra Dominum* (Num. 11:1), cum propter uanitatem cordis magis delitiosum sequi uolebant ocium quam per laborem itineris consequi Dei promissum. Unde defecerunt in uanitate dies eorum et anni eorum cum festinatione. Nam sequitur: *Ad huc carnes*<sup>216</sup> *erant in dentibus eorum nec defecerat huiusmodi cibus et ecce furor Domini concitatus in populum percussit eum plaga magna nimis* (Num. 11:33).

Hec penna uanitatum non solum est gulosa, sed etiam lubrica, tamquam leuitatum omnium effectiua, quia sicut inuidia superbie, sic luxuria pedissequa est gule. Unde Ieremias: *Saturauit eos et mechati sunt* (Jer. 5:7). Et Osee [sic]: *Hec*

<sup>214</sup> remoueat] p. c. ex remouet

<sup>215</sup> harenam] p. c. ex arenam

<sup>216</sup> carnes] eorum add. sed exp.



*fuit iniquitas Sodome, superbia et habundantia*<sup>217</sup> *panis* (Ezek. 16:49). Dicit philosophus: “Uina parant animos faciuntque caloribus aptos.”<sup>218</sup> Hanc uane leuitatis pennam Lucifer adinuenit, cum libere potestatis esse decreuit, et in ueritate non stetit, unde adhuc terram circuit (compare Job 1:7) et in pluribus locis mala superbe uanitatis uestigia derelinquit, ut congruenter dici possit de eo quod dicitur de suo membro: *Uir uanus in superbiam erigitur et tamquam pullum onagri liberum se natum*<sup>219</sup> *putat* (Job 11:12). Sed in uerticem ipsius iniquitas eius descendet, quia secundum uerbum sapientis, *In uanitate*<sup>220</sup> *sua peccator iste comprehenditur* (Eccles. 23:8), cum *uidentibus cunctis precipitabitur* (Job 40:28). Et quos hac penna tetigerit, in precipitium secum ducit. Stantes ergo in precipitio dicunt: *Uenite fruamur bonis* (Wis. 2:6) et *non pretereat nos flos temporis* (Wis. 2:7); *Nemo nostrum sit exsors luxurie nostre ubique relinquamus signa leticie* (Wis. 2:9). Hanc instabilitatis pennam serpens uirosus impudicie telo superposuit, quod mulier inuerecunda de arcu petulantie sue contra iuuenem misit, cum ei *Dormi mecum* (Gen. 39:7 and 39:12) dixit et ille opposito pudicie clipeo telum omnino se tangere non permisit, dum nequaquam operi nefario acquieuit, et ideo non solum tocius Egypti dominium, uerum etiam celestis patrie promeruit incolatum. Non sic Amon, qui quoniam huic telo penna lubricitatis directo, clipeum continentie neglexit opponere. Contigit eum ab Absalon cuius sororem uiolauerat interire (compare 2 Sam. 13). Hec sunt tres penne super sagittas posite, que mittuntur a serpente.

Uirga huius teli est ipsa intentio qua dyabolus, omni alio circum circa, contra, erga remoto negotio, unum sue prauitatis negocium, huc illucque uertendo, sepe diligentius intuendo, non necessaria precipiendo, subtiliare non cessat, donec eandem intentionem in eam que ad hominem feriendum sibi sit utilis formam ducat, ut cum *fol. 160r*/ hanc uirgam, scilicet intentionis sue uoluntatem rigidam, in missile formauerit, pennas agglutinauerit, ferro immiserit iniquo, surgat conamine aliquem e fidelibus eodem spiculo uulnerare. De hac uirga dicit Ezechiel: *Floruit uirga germinauit superbia, iniquitas surrexit in uia impietatis* (Ezek. 7:11–12). Numquid non floret hec uirga cum hii qui sauciati sunt ea dicunt id quod paulo ante diximus, *Uenite fruamur bonis* (Wis. 2:6), et *non pretereat nos flos temporis?* (Wis. 2:7). Non germinat superbia cum ad suos complices clamant: *Coronemus nos rosis antequam marcescant?* (Wis. 2:8). Iniquitas surgit, per uiam impietatis currit, cum dicunt inter huius teli uulnera: *Nullum pratum*<sup>221</sup> *sit quod non pertranseat luxuria nostra* (Wis. 2:8). Uides quod huius

<sup>217</sup> habundantia] *p. c. ex habuntia*

<sup>218</sup> Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.237.

<sup>219</sup> se natum] *p. c.*

<sup>220</sup> uanitate] *p. c. ex uanite*

<sup>221</sup> pratum] *corr. ex paratum*

teli uirga serpentis, qui callidior<sup>222</sup> est cunctis animantibus (compare Gen. 3:1), sit intentio, quam specialiter figit super alicuius hominis detrimento.

Bitumen uero quo tres pennas ad uirgam agglutinat est naturalis scientia, quam ex uirtute possidet angelica, a Deo quidem sibi indita, sed ab eo criminum igne, qui omnium uirtutum genimina eradicat, excocta et temporum diuturnitate atrita, de ualde bona in uiscosam et totius mali conglutinatiuam permutata substantiam, qua scit crimen crimini facinus facinori subtiliter apponere, appositum apprimere, appressum<sup>223</sup> coniungere, coniunctum connectere, connexum continuare<sup>224</sup> inseparabilis accidentis duritie, ut non nisi maxima difficultate criminosis ab hac infirma possit abstrahi firmitate. De hoc glutine Psalmista conqueritur quando dicit: *Conglutinatus est in terra uenter noster* (Ps. 43:25). Cum angelus apostata, qui per subtile ingenium sternit sibi aurum sapientie hominum quasi lutum, sicut est superius prenotatum, mentis nostre memoriam terrenis adherere facit affectibus, utique per hoc eius bitumen uenter noster est in terra conglutinatus. Istius efficitia bituminis ipse facit, quod inter squamas criminum una uni coniungitur, et nec spiraculum quidem incedit per eas. Una alteri adhaerent et tenentes se nequaquam separabuntur, dum facinora sic sibi coherere facit inuicem, ut semper una alteram sibi conglutinet uanitatem. Sic superbia, que initium omnis peccati est, iram, ira inuidiam, inuidia tristitiam, tristitia auariciam, gula quoque luxuriam sibi conglutinat, ut nec spiraculum uite quod Deus inspirauit in faciem hominis, nec pacis quod Deus suis in-/fol. 160v/-sufflauit apostolis, per has uiscosas uiciorum squamas incedat, sed in coherentia sui bituminis derelinquat. Uallis enim siluestris scilicet mundus floridus et labilis, qui tamquam paradisu Domini irrigari uidetur a stultis, multos habet puteos bituminis, quia plurimos in perditionis foueam mittit sue retinentia uanitatis. Hoc bitumine raptores, fures, illiciti amatores, conspiratores, et alii pestilentes, qui corpus sunt Luciferi, quia eorum caput est utpote rex<sup>225</sup> *super uniuersos filios superbie* (Job 41:25), impie se conglutinant, ut in sue prauitatis molimine semel compacti tamquam squama squame ab inuicem non discedant. Unde Dominus ad Iob: *Corpus eius quasi senta fusilia compactum squamis se prementibus* (Job 41:6). Etiam paulo post: *Membra carniuum eius coherentia sibi* (Job 41:14).

Hoc bitumen pro cemento habent illi qui in campo cordis fetidi simulant ea se facere pro dilectione Dei et proximi in quibus sunt uel pro emolumentis temporalibus uel humanis fauoribus occupati. Herodes hoc bitumen pro cemento<sup>226</sup> habuit, cum ad reges dixit: *Ite et interrogate diligenter de puero* (Matt. 2:8).

<sup>222</sup> callidior] *p. c. ex calidior*

<sup>223</sup> appressum] \*\*\*\*\* *add.*

<sup>224</sup> continuare] \*\*\*\*\* *add.*

<sup>225</sup> est upote rex] *p. c.*

<sup>226</sup> cemento] *p. c. ex procemento*

Audite lupum balantem, et uulpem<sup>227</sup> mugientem, bonum intentione pessima proferentem. Sicut ovis uoce lupus iste balauit, et gutture bouis uulpes mugitum dedit, ab omnibus de uirtute in uirtutem ire uolentibus, puer iste Iesus est summa diligencia requirendus. Ad huc balauit cum superaddidit: *Et cum inueneritis renuntiate michi ut et ego ueniens adorem eum* (Matt. 2:8), ut omnes simul adorando puerum ualeamus proficere, quilibet alii tenetur inuentionem pueri nuntiare. Audiuius sophisticam ovis uocem, uideamus freneticam lupi mentem. Audiuius formosum bonis sonitum, uideamus dolosum uulpis propositum. Audiuius quod pretendit, uideamus quid intenderit. Herodes uidens quia *illusus esset a magis*, misit in Bethlehem et *occidit omnes pueros qui erant in Bethlehem et in omnibus finibus eius* (Matt. 2:16). Ite! Discite uulpi illi et cuilibet illi simili! O ypocrita! Ad instar puncti non esset gloria tui operis, si intenderes quod pretendis (compare Job 20:5). Pretendis iustitiam, incendis nequiciam, idcirco tua facta non ad coronam sed edificant ad gehennam. Et quanti huius bituminis irretiti uinculo creduntur obsequium prestare Deo, quorum actio tota uertitur in peccato. Unde Salomon: *Est uia que uidetur homini iusta, nouissima autem eius ducunt ad mortem* (Prov. 14:12). Et Miche-/fol. 161r/-as: *Malum manuum suarum dicunt bonum* (Mic. 7:3).

Quanta multitudo in pulchre Rachelis amplexibus se dormire credit, ad quam Laban, qui in superficie album se ostendit, Liam que *lippis est oculis* (Gen. 29:17), introduxit, dum se quidam contemplatiuos estimant et terrenis actionibus tamquam in hoc utiles semper uacant? Quanti super muros Ierusalem *stercora sua comedunt et urinam pedum suorum bibunt* (Isa. 36:12; compare 2 Kings 18:27), dum abominationibus quas occulte faciunt uiciosissime se corrumpunt? Unde dictum est Ezechieli: *Ingredere et uide abominationes pessimas quas isti faciunt hic* (Ezek. 8:9). Quid ualeat simulatores illos in medium ducere, qui signa magne pretendunt amicicie, ut possint inimiciarum<sup>228</sup> aculeos quos si cariorum more deferunt, statim cum oportunitas aduenerit, liberius exercere? Sic Saul mandauit seruis suis de Dauid, cuius *inimicus erat cunctis diebus* (1 Sam. 18:29), immo *non rectis oculis cum aspiciebat* (1 Sam. 18:9), dicens ad eos: *Loquimini ad Dauid clam me dicentes, "Ecce places regi et omnes serui eius diligunt te"* (1 Sam. 18:22). Porro *Dauid psallebat post hec manu sua, nisusque est Saul configere lancea Dauid in parietem* (1 Sam. 19:9–10). Audi quid de tali dicat ethnicus Horatius: "Eutrapelus cuicumque nocere uolebat, uestimenta dabat preciosa."<sup>229</sup> Tales dente rident, mente strident, et dum cor ab ore diffibulant, seipsos uitii conglutinant.

Liquet aperte quod bituminis istius retentiuua uiscositas et pennas telo serpentis adherere faciat, et multas abominationum compagine multorum mentibus introducat; at quia superius ferrum huius teli tetigimus, quid ipsum ferrum sit

<sup>227</sup> lupum balantem et uulpem] *p. c.*

<sup>228</sup> inimiciarum] inimiciarium

<sup>229</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 1.18.31–32.

uideamus. Ferrum teli, uidelicet suggestionis dyaboli, est ipsa eius pertinax duricies, qua irremissibiliter impetit homines et qua incitante numquam a bello contra fideles into auertitur, nisi aut uicerit<sup>230</sup> aut uincatur. De eo a Domino dicitur: *Cartilago eius tamquam laminae ferris*<sup>231</sup> (Job 40:13). Si cartilago eius, pars scilicet corporis inter carnes et ossa que ad duriciem media, dicitur esse ferrea, cui comperabimus eius ossa? Audi rursus Dominum: *Ossa eius quasi fistule eris* (Job 40:13). Propter pertinacem eius duriciem dicit eum Deus durum sicut lapidem, ut supra diximus, et sicut malleatoris incudem<sup>232</sup> (compare Job:41:15); et Ysaïas eum nominat *Leuiathan serpentem uectem* (Isa. 27:1). Et sicut ferrum ferro acuitur sic inuicem pertinacia eius per duriciem et rursus duricies per pertinaciam, tamquam ad summam incidendi periciam et plenam percellendi potentiam acuatur. Ab hoc stimulo Ieremias nos premonet /fol. 161v/ et premunit quando dicit: *Stimulator ab Egypto*<sup>233</sup> *uenit tibi* (compare Jer. 46:20). De hoc ferro legitur in primo Regum: *Ipsum ferrum haste eius sexcentos cyclos habebat ferri* (1 Sam. 17:7). Siue enim quis per innocentie fructum signate per senarium, siue per penitentie luctum signate per centenarium, contra ferrum huius teli clipeo defensionis se muniat, sagittarius iste tamquam pro obulo, scilicet pro modico nam *scyclus uiginti habet obulos*<sup>234</sup> (Exod. 30:13), reputat, quia quod ipsum eius clipeum acumine ferri sui, uidelicet duricia pertinaci, nichilominus perfodiat. Semper sperat, immo etiam aliquos hac ipsa sua pertinacia inconuertibiliter indurando sic uulnerat, ut ulla numquam persuasione mens illorum a ferreo proposito se auertat, qui ad peruersitatis cumulum seipsos decipiunt tam misere, ut eandem pertinaciam audeant etiam constantiam nominare. Quorum beatus Gregorius in *Cura pastoralis* sic meminit, “Pertinaces [. . .] quia plus de se quam sunt sentiunt, idcirco alienis consiliis non acquiescunt,” et “nisi<sup>235</sup> meliores se aliis estimarent, nequaquam cunctorum consilia sue deliberationi postponerent.”<sup>236</sup> Quidam sic ait: “Casibus et causis qui se putat omnia nosse non minus est fatuus quam qui putat omnia posse.”<sup>237</sup> Quod quando sumis presumis sumere noli, utere consilio pateant licet omnia soli. Inter pertinacem autem et obstinatum modica aut nulla est differentia, cum neuter eorum a uoluntate flecti ualeat indurata.

Non incongrue autem ferrum haste serpentis uel sagitte sub pondere cycli, qui uiginti obulos habet (compare Exod. 30:13), ponitur, quia hic numerus superfluus, qui a perfecto longe discrepat, computatur: excedit eum seipsum binario, qui in

<sup>230</sup> uicerit] uincerit

<sup>231</sup> ferris] eris

<sup>232</sup> incudem] incidere

<sup>233</sup> Egypto] aquilone *Vulgate*

<sup>234</sup> obulos] oculos

<sup>235</sup> nisi] *p. c.*

<sup>236</sup> Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis* 3.18, ed. Bruno Judic, Floribert Rommel, and Charles Morel, SC 381–82, 2 vols. (Paris, 1992), 2:368.

<sup>237</sup> Source unknown.

sacra scriptura infamis habetur. Verbi gratia: Media pars de uiginti decem sunt, quarta quinque, quinta quatuor, decima duo, uicesima unum. Hec partes compositae binario probantur ipsum excedere. Preterea numerus uiginti duobus denariis conficitur, decalogus autem per denarium designatur. In lege quoque Moysi sub syclorum pondere numerantur uasa sanctuarii (compare Exod. 30:23–24) et quod syclus, qui de duobus denariis conficitur, uiginti habet obulos legenti sepius inculcatur, ut manifeste detur intelligi decalogum duobus modis, scilicet in littera et in allegoria debere seruari, dicente apostolo: *Hec omnia in figura continebat illis* (1 Cor. 10:11). Lex namque propter transgressionem posita est notata per binarium, quia sicut binarius infamis est<sup>238</sup> /fol. 162r/ definitur: *Lex, ergo, propter transgressionem, binarii ab uno Deo uiuo, et uero posita est<sup>239</sup> donec ueniret semen, sine quo quasi Sodoma fuisset et quasi Gomorra similes essemus, cui repromiserat ordinata per angelos in manu mediatoris* (Gal. 3:19). Mediator autem unius non est (compare Gal. 3:20), sed duorum et sibi aduersantium, sicut medius duorum sibi non aduersantium, etiam caro et spiritus sibi contraria sunt. Hec enim sibi inuicem aduersantur teste apostolo, immo magis teste experientie<sup>240</sup> libro, in quo cottidie legitur quod *caro concupiscit aduersus spiritum et spiritus aduersus carnem* (Gal. 5:17). Intellectus autem hystoricus carnalis est, allegoricus spiritualis. Ille uero qui *fecit utraque unum* (Eph. 2:14), soluens inimicicias inter Deum et hominem, mediatorem se unitatis et binarii, id est Dei et hominis perditum, in cruce constituit, quia tunc binarium ad unitatem reduxit, quando carnalem intellectum ad spirituales profectum paritate fidei reuocauit, ut inter decalogum et ewangelium iam nullam alteritas habeat uicem, cum unus Dominus utrumque in in-scissibilem solide fidei collegerit unitatem. Iam enim unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus et pater omnium, uno ore ab omnibus declamatur, ut iam inter decalogum et ewangelium nulla sit alteritas, sed una eademque concors et inseperabilis unitas, cum ambo in unum simul conueniant parietem per eum qui se medio lapidem posuit angularem.

Sed quia serpens antiquus, unitatis emulus et alteritatis baiulus, decalogum tam in littera quam in spiritu nititur elidere, ferrum teli sui sub sexcenteno numero pro tam innocentia quam penitentia extinguenta posuit. Et pondus eius sub syclorum nomine fabricauit, ut ab unitate perfecta binarium per peccati infamiam recedere et ab immutabilitate eterna faciat per alteritatis uitium discordare. Nam sicut iam diximus, uiginti numerus per partes suas collectus binario se excedit, et in uiginti duos excessit. Hic quoque numerus ex binis constat undenariis. Et undenarius primus excedit a denario et per hoc etiam ipse infamis efficitur, quia per eum decalogi transgressio denotatur. Unde Lucas Spiritu sancto edoctus contionem iustorum in actibus per ipsum exprimere

<sup>238</sup> posita . . . est] *p. c.*

<sup>239</sup> definitur . . . est] *p. c.*

<sup>240</sup> experientie] *p. c. ex experiente*

noluit, quando dixit: *Erant omnes uiri fere duodecim*<sup>241</sup> (Acts 19:7). Hec itaque uiginti, syclos, sunt dyaboli, ex cuius membris binarius, scilicet infamia transgressionis, nascitur, ideoque sexcentos syclos habere ferri sagitta uel etiam ipsa hasta dyaboli<sup>242</sup> memoratur.

Et quia de hasta eius mentionem fecimus et inter ferrum sagitte ipsius et ferrum haste, nulla est distantia, cum /fol. 162v/ similia operentur uulnera, hec hasta quid sit etiam uideamus. Istius hostis hasta est eius arrogantia, qua se contra Deum ceruicosus eleuat et qua etiam contra hominem, ut ipsum perforet, se obiectat. Hac lancea configere nos nititur ad parietem, qua uitiorum compaginibus nos inherere desiderat usque ad mortem. Hec hasta, uidelicet contra celum arrogantia, procera, rigida est et acuta. Procera per audaciam, rigida per contumaciam, acuta per fallaciam. Procera est eius arrogantia, quia sicut in Daniele legimus, *altitudo eius*, scilicet contra Deum se leuantis, *nimia* (Dan. 4:7), quia abutitur potestate sibi tradita et proceritas eius contingens celum, per audacie se iugiter contra Deum erigentis insultum. De audacia eius dicitur: *Factus est ut nullum timeret* (Job 41:24). Non erat audax nimium qui proterue locutus est ad creatorem suum, *mitte te deorsum?* (Matt. 4:6). Rigida est eius arrogantia, quia a praua uoluntate numquam flectitur, sed in ipsa semper fortius intentatur. Nam de eo dictum diximus:<sup>243</sup> *Ossa eius sicut fistule eris* (Job 40:13). De contumacia eius habes quod non multiplicabit ad aliquem<sup>244</sup> preces nec loquetur ei mollia (compare Job 40:22). Acuta quoque eius est arrogantia, cum de eo dicat Psalmista: *Sicut nouacula acuta fecisti dolum* (Ps. 51:4). Quid de dolo et fallacia eius testimonium querimus, cum uersutias ipsius omni modis intricatas nunc uerisimilibus coniecturis, nunc probabilibus argumentis cotidie lectitemus? Quamuis omnes uersipellitantes suas in tantum acuat, subtiliet et inuoluat, et tanta perplexitate circumtrahat, ut intentionis sue finem non facile quis perpendat nisi in genere hoc solum, quod in<sup>245</sup> singulis actibus suis deceptio latitat animarum. *Constringit enim caudam suam quasi cedrum, nerui testicularum eius perplexi sunt* (Job 40:12). Ideoque inuolute sunt seruite gressuum eorum, qui secuntur ipsum. Et ipsa ueritas de eo ait: *Mendax est et pater eius* (John 8:44), scilicet mendacii.

Uidetis quam procera sit hec hasta per audaciam, quam rigida per contumaciam, quam acuta per fallaciam. Hanc hastam uibrando et quatiendo tunc contra hominem hostis mouet, cum uel proceritate audacie, uel rigiditate contumacie, seu acumine fallacie formidolosum aliquem terret, ut in bello Deum terga uertat (compare Jer. 2:27). Plures siquidem fugat. De quibus ait Ieremias: *Uidi ipsos pauidos et terga uertentes fortes eorum cesos fugerunt conciti et non*

<sup>241</sup> fere duodecim] p. c.

<sup>242</sup> dyaboli] p. c.

<sup>243</sup> de eo dictum diximus] p. c.

<sup>244</sup> ad aliquem] aliquem ad

<sup>245</sup> in] p. c. ex sine

*respexerunt* (Jer. 46:5). Sed et hoc uigilantius intuendum, quod *hastile haste eius est quasi liciatorium texentium* (1 Chron. 20:5). Liciatorium forte est, magnum est, et planum est. /fol. 163r/ Et hostis humani generis arroganter hec tria pretendit, scilicet, fortitudinem, magnitudinem, planitudinem. Primum in permissione potestatis. Nam de eo dicitur: *Non est super terram potes que comparetur ei* (Job 41:24). Secundum in promissione sublimitatis. Dixit enim ad primos parentes: *Eritis sicut dii* (Gen. 3:5). Et ad ipsum Dominum: *Hec omnia tibi dabo* (Matt. 4:9). Holofernes ad Iudith: *Tu in domo Nabugodonosor magna eris et nomen tuum nominabitur in uniuersa terra* (Jth. 11:21). Tercium autem pretendit in immissione impunitatis.<sup>246</sup> Nam ait: *Nequaquam moriemini* (Gen 3:4). Eo que suadente, *Dicit insipiens in corde suo non est Deus* (Ps. 13:1 and Ps. 52:1), et *Non uidebit Dominus nec intelliget Deus Iacob* (Ps. 93:7). Ecce qualiter *hastile haste dyaboli est quasi liciatorium texentium* (1 Chron. 20:5), quia superbia eius fortis est in permissa sibi potestate, magna in ea quam promittit sublimitate, plana in ea quam immittit impunitate. Et bene liciatoria hec comperantur texentium, quia omnes qui usque hodie secuti sunt ipsum *telas arame texuerunt* (Isa. 59:5), et tales ad defendendum se contra hostem sunt inutiles, quia in hoc prelio penitus sunt inermes. Laqueos hostium et sagittas, hastam quoque transiuimus. Restat ut ad gladios ueniamus.

Laqueos, ut audistis, [ponunt] per occultas insidias.<sup>247</sup> Sagittas mittunt per lesiones inopinatas. Sed gladios contra nos eximunt per operas malicie manifestas. Itaque *serpens antiquus* (Apoc. 12:9 and 20:2) inimicus humani generis, teste Deo qui dixit, *Inimicicias ponam inter te et mulierem et semen tuum et semen eius* (Gen. 3:15), apertas in nos exercet inimicicias; cum euaginato malicie sue gladio, patenter nobis occupat uias bonas. Dicit enim:<sup>248</sup> *Euaginabo gladium meum et interficiet eos manus mea* (Exod. 15:9). Est enim secundum uerbum sapientis quasi *romphea acuta omnis iniquitas* (Ecclus. 21:4). Gladius Sathane insultus est eius malicie, qua hominem impetit manifeste. Unde Psalmista: *De gladio maligno eripe me* (Ps. 143:10–11). Huius gladii uagina est expectatio subdola, qua se dissimulanter inimicus exercet, donec oportuno sibi tempore, gladium euaginet. *Me*, et enim teste Psalmista, *expectauerunt peccatores ut perderent me* (Ps. 118:95) et sic gladium euaginauerunt. De hac uagina legitur: *Ioab erat [. . .] desuper accinctus gladio dependente usque ad ylia in uagina* (2 Sam. 20:8). Ioab enim dolose gladium in uagina abscondit, et donec securum percuteret expectauit. Gladium ergo suum Sathanas qui non solum oc-/fol. 163v/-cultus, sed manifestus etiam aduersarius est, contra fidelem populum patenter eximit; eoque cum superbia sursum sepe uibrato, hunc sonum per os Holofernis satellitis sui facit: *Gladiis milicie mee transiet per latera tua et confixus cades inter uulneratos Israhel et non respirabis ultra donec extermineris cum illis* (Jud. 6:4).

<sup>246</sup> impunitatis] p. c.

<sup>247</sup> per occultas insidias] p. c.

<sup>248</sup> enim] p. c.

Quis autem se poterit estimare securum cum in ipsum creatorem celi et terre idem exemerit gladium suum? Gladium quippe suum et uicissim unum post alium exemit audacter, uibrauit iactanter, circumduxit subtiliter, cum modo suggerendo, modo argumentando, modo promittendo factorem suum presumpsit impetere, putans eum gladio gule quem primo exemit, quia esuriit, uel gladio auaricie quem secundo, quia pauperem uidit, aut certe gladio superbie [quia humilitati cuius inuidit, ausu nimium temerario superare. Suggestendo gladium mouit quando dixit: *Si filius Dei es dic ut lapides isti panes fiant* (Matt. 4:3; compare Luke 4:3). Argumentando, cum inquit: *Si filius Dei es mitte te dorsum* (Matt. 4:6; compare Luke 4:9). Et intulit. Scriptum est enim: *Quam angelis suis mandiuuit de te et in manibus tollent te ne unquam offendas ad lapidem pedem tuum* (Ps. 90:10–11). Ecce qualiter fulgidum sacre scripture splendorem gladio suo continuans, ipsum glorianter uibrauit ad solem, estimans ut cum splendor<sup>249</sup> intuentem alliceret; allectus ab ictu gladi non caueret. Promittendo tertium exemit gladium, quem circumduxit subtiliter et uibrauit arroganter cum *ostendit illi omnia regna mundi et gloriam eorum et ait: “Hec omnia tibi dabo si cadens adoraueris me”* (Matt. 4:8–9; compare Luke 4:5–6). Christi capud gladio suo ferire et sic euincere proposuit, dum ipsum in questione panis gule suggestionibus attemptauit, arma enim gule uersantur in capite, gustu palatum per cibos delectabiliter oblectante. Hoc gladio per uerbum Dei, quo uiuit homo et non in solo pane (compare Matt. 4:4), pulchre confracto, alium Sathanas exemit et per auaricie suggestionem contra Christi pedes ictum fecit, exhortans ut se deorsum mitteret, cum offensam pedum<sup>250</sup> per angelorum custodiam non timeret. Auariciam namque pedibus hominum Sathanas gladio suggestionis sue manifeste consueuit infigere, quia cum pro<sup>251</sup> lucris temporalibus sollicite curritur, magis quam cetera membra pedes auaricie famulantur. Unde philosophus: “Impiger extremos currit mercator ad indos per mare pauperiem fugiens, per saxa per ignes.”<sup>252</sup>

Hoc quoque gladio de manu hostis scripture armis nobiliter /**fol. 164r**/ excusso, idem hostis tercio uelociter euaginato gladio, cor Christi quem tunc assumpsit in montem excelsum ualde molitus est perfodere, putans illi dignitatum superbiam insufflare. Experimento enim didicerat Sathanas quod in cordis humani solio regnat superbia et quod de ipso crimina prodeunt uniuersa: *Omne enim sublime uidet* (Job 41:25). Et idem testatur ueritas dicens, *De corde exeunt cogitationes male, homicidia, adulteria, furta, falsa testimonia, blasphemie* (Matt. 15:19), que omnia sunt causatum superbie: *Inicium, enim, omnis peccati superbia* (Ecclus. 10:15). Hoc etiam gladio uirtute saluatoris potenter eliso, Sathanas confusus abscessit, sed tamen adhuc hodie licet a capite superatus manifestos

<sup>249</sup> splendor] *p. c.*

<sup>250</sup> pedum] *p. c. ex pedem*

<sup>251</sup> pro] *p. c.*

<sup>252</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 1.1.45–6.



machinationis sue gladios in membra ipsius capitis eximere non desistit, uibrans in eos tam procaciter quam frequenter gladium gule per uoluptates, auaricie per opes, superbie per honores; uerte librum Machabeorum et inuenies quomodo Sathanas manifeste coram Matathia<sup>253</sup> istum uibrauerit gladium. Dixit enim ad eum: *Princeps et clarissimus es in ciuitate hac et ornatus filiis et fratribus* (1 Macc. 2:17). Ecce quam eleganter circumduxit gladium<sup>254</sup> et uibrauit ipsum. Et statim attemptauit ictum in cute dicens: *Ergo accede prior et fac iussum regis sicut fecerunt omnes gentes* (1 Macc. 2:18). Et ictum in carne, subinferens: *Et uiri Iuda et qui remanserunt in Ierusalem* (1 Macc. 2:18). Iterumque pugionem leuatum<sup>255</sup> uibrando circumduxit et circumducendo splendescere fecit, ut cum Matathias<sup>256</sup> splendorem inhianter aspiceret, ictum gladii nullatenus obseruaret. Nam sic concludit: *Et eris tu et filii tui inter amicos regis amplificatus argento et auro et muneribus multis* (1 Macc. 2:18).

Et de singulis huius obsidionis articulis exempla ponere, non est aliud quam auditores ad tedium prouocare. Sed draco *iste serpens antiquus qui uocatur dyabolus et Sathanas* (Apoc. 12:9; compare Apoc. 20:2), siue laqueos abscondat ad decipiendum, siue ponat insidias ad capiendum, uel lanceam erigat ad percellendum, aut gladios eximat ad feriendum, si cauti fuerint et strennui, hii qui sunt eius obsidione uallati, auxilium prebente eo, qui suos milites uirtute precingit ad bellum, non solum poterunt pericula que prediximus euadere, immo ipsum inimicum uictoriosus pedibus conculcare. De bellatore enim manuforti legimus: *Cucurrit Dauid et stetit super Phylisteum*. (1 Sam. 17:51). Inimicus iste leo est contra pauidos et formica contra strennuos, nec aliquem poterit fidelium deicere, quin se sponte uoluerit eius /fol. 164v/ machinationibus incuruare. Dicunt ad hominem isti hostes ad uoluntatis sue propositum illum flectere cupientes: *Incuruare ut transeamus* (Isa. 51:23). Sed Ysayas nos ammonet, dicens: *Ne incuruemini sub uinculo ne cum interfectis cadatis* (Isa. 10:4). Et ipse Deus: *Ego confregi cathenas ceruicium uestrarum, ut incederetis erecti* (Lev. 26:13). Incuruatur qui pro rerum temporalium collectione, uel commessionum continuatione, uel certe uoluptatum carnalium expletione, demissis ad terram delectationum mundanarum manibus inclinatur. Et demones tunc transeunt, cum iter cordis illius pernium sibi faciunt, in quo prius ne transire possent uirtutum obstaculum habuerunt. Ezechiel dicit: *Pestilentia et sanguis transibunt per te* (Ezek. 5:17). Et in Iob: *Uadant et reuertantur super eum, scilicet impium, horribiles, id est demones* (Job 20:25); horribiles enim sunt nimium, quia *facies combuste uultus eorum* (Isa. 13:8). Et inclinatum sibi non solum transeunt, immo conculcant, et

<sup>253</sup> Matathia] p. c. ex mathias

<sup>254</sup> gladium] add. in marg.

<sup>255</sup> leuatum] p. c. ex leuatam

<sup>256</sup> Matathias] p. c. ex mathias

sanguinolentum uulneribus uiciorum reddunt. Hinc Ieremias [*sic*]: *Uidi te conculcari in sanguine tuo* (Ezek. 16:6).

Tales accedere prohibentur ad prelium, quia nisi depositis huiusmodi uanitatibus et armis uirtutum assumptis non peruenient ad triumphum. Unde in Deuteronomio ad bellum accedentibus proclamatur: *Quis est homo qui edificauit domum nouam et non dedicauit eam? Uadat et reuertatur in domum suam, ne forte moriatur in bello et alius dedicet eam. Quis est homo qui plantauit uineam et necdum fecit eam esse communem et de qua uesci omnibus liceat*<sup>257</sup> *Uadat et reuertatur in domum suam, ne forte moriatur in bello et alius homo eius fungatur officiis. Quis est homo qui desponsauit uxorem et non accepit eam? Uadat et reuertatur in domum suam, ne forte moriatur in bello et alius homo accipiat eam* (Deut. 20:5–7). Domum edificat, qui ut temporales res sibi ampliet elaborat. *Nouam* dicit, quia rerum ampliatur mundalium uix una consumata, aliam incipit. Edificat sed non dedicat, qui studens auaricie Dominum de sua substantia non honorat. Talibus loquitur Ysayas: *Ue qui coniungitis domum domui et agrum agro copulatis usque ad terminum loci* (Isa. 5:8). Uineam plantat, qui commessionibus et ebrietatibus semper uacat. De qua omnibus nesci non licet, et nec dum eam communem efficit, quia gastrimargie deditus, id quo multi possent refici, solus ingutturat et consumit. Quibus iterum Ysayas: *Ue qui consurgitis mane ad ebrietatem /fol. 165r/ sectandam, ad potandum usque ad uesperam, ut uino estuetis* (Isa. 5:11). Uxorem desponsat, qui non in uirginali mundicia, sed in carnali copula uitam ducere cogitat. Sed eam non accipit, qui inuendo lubrica, statim a Deo concessum in huiusmodi proposito non custodit. De hiis ait apostolus: *Fornicatores et adulteres iudicabit Deus* (Heb. 13:4). Hii omnes ut dictum<sup>258</sup> est procedere prohibentur ad prelium, propter mortis periculum, quia nisi rebus hiis domi melius ordinatis, non reportabunt triumphum. Unde quidam: “Quem gula, quem mulier, et quem tenet ardor habendi, ad bellum Domini fas non habet egrediendi.”<sup>259</sup>

Tales igitur iubentur in domum suam reuerti ne contingat alios in eorum laboribus iocundari. Nam Dominus discipulis suis dixit: *Alii laborauerunt et uos in labores eorum introistis* (John 4:38). Sed ille in domum suam reuertitur, qui causa in morandi conscientie sue habitaculum quod peccando exierat diligentius peruagatur. Longe a se exierat de quo Saluator narrat: *Adolescentior filius peregre profectus est in regionem longinquam, et ibi dissipauit substanciam suam uinendo luxoriose* (Luke 15:13). Iter domum uertit, eum in se reuersus dixit: *Quanti mercennarii in domo patris mei habundant panibus, ego autem hic fame pereor; surgam et ibo ad patrem meum* (Luke 15:17–18). Unde ne quis a semetipso exeat, sed semper in domo bone conscientie se includat, precipitur in Exodo: *Maneat unusquisque apud semetipsum, nullus egrediatur de loco suo* (Exod.

<sup>257</sup> liceat] *p. c.* ex liceatur

<sup>258</sup> dictum] *p. c.*

<sup>259</sup> Source unknown.

16:29). Item ante belli principium declamari iubetur: *Quis est homo formidolosus et corde pauido? Uadat et reuertatur in domum suam ne panere faciat corda ciuium*<sup>260</sup> *suorum, sicut ipse rimore perterritus est* (Deut. 20:9). Ecce *formidolosus* etiam in *domum suam*, id est in conscientiam propriam, reuertere precipitur, quia si pauidus cum audace congregitur de facili superatur. Qui enim pauet hesitat. Et *qui hesitat*, teste beato Iacobo, *similis est fluctui maris qui a uento mouetur et circumfertur* (James 1:6). Et qui in pugna mouetur et circumfertur, impossibile est ut uictoria perfruatur. In libro Machabeorum legimus: *Dixit, Iudas, hiis qui edificabant domos et sponsabant uxores et plantabant uineas et formidolosus, ut unusquisque rediret in domum suam secundum legem* (1 Macc. 3:56). Strenuis autem apostolus ait: *Induite uos armatura Dei ut possitis stare aduersus insidias diaboli* (Eph. 6:11). Hic datur intelligi, quod stare debemus in prelio non moueri. Tobias omnem temptationem euicit, quia *immobilis in timore Dei permansit* (Tob. 2:14).

Itaque bellum hoc aggredientes Scripture bucina ad superandi fiduciam prouocat, /fol. 165v/ et ne multitudinem hostium timeat clangorem ualidum sic exultat: *Nolite timere, nec paueatis hanc multitudinem, non est uestra pugna sed Dei* [ . . . ] *Non eritis uos qui dimieabitis sed tantummodo confidenter state et uidebitis auxilium Domini super uos* (2 Chron. 20:15–17). Non ergo debemus auxiliante Deo proceritatem hostium istorum metuere, quia si steterimus in fide et digna eius operatione, non solum uincere, sed teste Caleph et Iosue, *sicut panem eos possumus deuorare* (Num. 14:9). Ille more panis diabolum deuorat, qui machinationem eius subtilem et fecte candidam quasi farinam, et aquis que decurrunt in preces conspersam et intritam, et in ardenti fornace uoluntatis impie diu coctam, duro contradictionis dente fortiter mordet, et sedulo orationis ore auide masticat, et tam mordendo quam masticando ipsum diaboli propositum sicut panem deuorat, consumit, et annihilat. Et quicquid meriti de diabolo sic deuorato, id est hac strennitate consumpto, deuoranti accrescit, ipse membris aliarum uirtutum incorporando transmittit. Hinc in Deutronomio populo Dei precipitur: *Deuorabis*, id est consumes, *omnes populos quos Dominus Deus tuus daturus est tibi* (Deut. 7:16). Nonne cum *piscis inmanis*, quo denotatur diabolus, *exiuit ad deuorandum* Tobyam (Tob. 6:2), idem Tobyas qui quemlibet fidelem designat, dum clamaret ad angelum *Domine inuadat me* (Tob. 6:3), iubente angelo apprehendit *branciam eius* et *traxit eum in siccum*, exenterauit et *carnes eius assauit* et *in uia* comedit? (Tob. 6:4–6). Insinuans quod ille cui Dominus socius est itineris, debet piscis istius quamcumque sit inmanis branciam, id est suggestionis aperituram, ori quo nos inuadere uult prope positam, manu ualide defensionis apprehendere, et ex aqua ubi sue tempestatis est abyssus, in siccum solide fidei litus, ubi impos sui factus, iam non feriendo palpat, sed moriendo palpat, trahere et

<sup>260</sup> ciuium] p. c.

latentem eius astuciam, diu in uentre callide meditationis absconditam, exenterando eicere, carnes eius igne caritatis assare, uires scilicet eius totaliter excoquere, et in hoc peregrinationis itinere, uictoriam eandem secum pro uiatico deportare.

Et quid dicit Psalmista ad Dominum? *Tu confregisti capita draconis; dedisti eum escam populis Ethyopum* (Ps. 73:14). Tunc Deus draconis capita confregit, cum quis eius adiutus gratia in ipso machinandi<sup>261</sup> principio conterit omnia machinationis diabolice temptamenta. Dat *eum escam populis Ethyopum* cum aliquibus uiciorum nigredine tetris,<sup>262</sup> sed postmodum per penitentiam dealbatis concedit /fol. 166r/ priora ipsius nocumenta usque ad interruptionem<sup>263</sup> deicere, faciens eos per fomenta uirtutum ex ipsa pugna prouenientium hac eadem uictoria in anime conuiuio se cibare; sicut econuerso, *dum appropiant super me nocentes*, scilicet demones, *edunt carnes meas* (Ps. 26:2), si, quod Deus auertat, animam meam per carnales occiderint uoluptates. Siquidem in homine resectio uirtutum et refectio criminum est dyabolo quoddam in suo proposito nutrimentum. Unde in Ysaya legimus: *Puluus panis eius* (Isa. 65:25). Et Dominus ad serpentem: *Terram*, id est terrena diligentes, *comedes* (Gen. 3:14).

Quia itaque castra demonum sunt fortia, arma fortiora, pugna fortissima, dicente scriptura, *misit Antiochus et congregauit exercitum uniuersi regni sui castra fortia ualde* (1 Macc. 3:27), nec in aliquo nisi in Christo pugnantium sint auxilia, animam<sup>264</sup> ab eis obsessam que in ipso<sup>265</sup> plenam habet fiduciam, loqui expedit cum Psalmista: *Si consistant aduersus<sup>266</sup> me castra non timebit cor meum* (Ps. 26:3). Legimus in Paralypomenon: *Deum inuocauerunt cum proliarentur et exaudiuit<sup>267</sup> eos eo quod credidissent<sup>268</sup> [in eum]* (1 Chron. 5:20). Unde sicut est dictum non debet pauere fidelis anima obsidione demonum uallata, sed in nomine Iesu Christi Nazareni se eis ualenter obiciat, et donec eos potenter euicerit non desistat, cum contingat sepiissime quod pro maiori exercicio pugne uirtuose hostes istos longo tempore non poterimus superare. Habes enim: *Facta est longa concertatio inter domum Saul et inter domum Dauid* (2 Sam. 3:1). Item: *Multo tempore pugnauit Iosue contra reges istos* (Jos. 11:18). Ysayas ait: *Numquid parturiet terra in die una, aut parietur gens simul?* (Isa. 66:8). Etiam audire possumus illum qui dixit, “Nemo repente fit summus,”<sup>269</sup> et paulatim longius itur. Tu autem in pugna ista secundum Psalmiste consilium, *Expecta Dominum uiriliter age, et*

<sup>261</sup> machinandi] *p. c.*

<sup>262</sup> tetris] *p. c.*

<sup>263</sup> interruptionem] interrutionem

<sup>264</sup> nec . . . animam] *p. c.*

<sup>265</sup> que in ipso] *p. c.*

<sup>266</sup> aduersus] aduersam

<sup>267</sup> et exaudiuit] et exau\*\*\*\*

<sup>268</sup> Legimus . . . credidissent] *add. in marg.*

<sup>269</sup> Compare *Proverbia sententiaeque latinitatis medii aevi*, ed. Walther (n. 128 above), 3:95 (no. 16429).

*confortetur cor tuum et sustine Dominum* (Ps. 26:14), et, *Si moram fecerit expecta eum, quia ueniet* (Hab. 2:3), Psalmista confirmante<sup>270</sup> iterum et dicente: *Expectans expectaui Dominum et intendit mihi* (Ps. 39:2).

Longam autem obsidionem opinantibus tria sunt necessaria, quibus etiam numquam carere debet anima Christiana, que sunt hec: cibus ad sustentationem, arma ad defensionem, custodia ad cautionem. Cibus iste regius est, quia a regalibus sedibus uenit, uidelicet Iesus Christus, qui ait: *Ego sum panis uiuus qui de celo descendi* (John 6:51). Hoc cibo per figuram aliti sunt filii Israhel<sup>271</sup> donec terram promissionis attingerent, tunc enim defecit eis ille cibus, postquam comederunt de frugibus terre illius. Nobis quoque peccatoribus in huius mundi solitudine per multa pericula uagantibus, idem cibus habens omne delectamentum et omnem saporem /fol. 166v/ suauitatis non deficiet, sed ad huius uie terminum, immo ad patrie introitum, nos perducet, ubi in lactis et mellis affluentia, tanta nos Deus perfundet sue benignitatis pluuiam, quod Dei filium non per speculum et in enigmate (compare 1 Cor. 13:12), uidelicet in panis et uini specie, sed regem in decore suo sicuti est lucida et manifesta uidebimus ueritate.

Dicit enim propheta: *Hydria farine non deficiet*,<sup>272</sup> *et lechitus olei non minuetur, usque in diem qua daturus est Dominus pluuiam super terram* (1 Kings 17:14). Hec farina in ollam nostre mortalitatis erat mittenda, ut non sit amplius quicquam<sup>273</sup> amaritudinis in ea. Hanc farinam non debemus aliqua infidelitatis amaritudine fermentare, sed aqua credulitatis conspergere et sic eam ex hac in Egypto utrisque humeris, tam uoluntatis prone quam actionis bone, uersus promissionis patriam deportare. Iste cibus nos implet per fidem, reficit per spem, nutrit per caritatem, sanat per confessionem, confortat per bonam operationem, conseruat per consummationem.

De primo legitur: *Post hec Deus in terram prospexit et impleuit illam bonis suis* (Eccles. 16:30), utique fide et uirtutibus. Quem enim fides non implet omnino uacuu permanet, quia nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, saluus esse non poterit. Et hec est uictoria que *uincit mundum* (1 John 5:5): fides nostra. Et si mundum, consequenter dyabolum. Lucas Stephanum plenum fide dixit, ideo in turbine saxorum crepitantum Iesum in celo pro sui adiutorio stantem uidit (compare Acts 7:55). De secundo ait scriptura: *Beata terra cuius rex nobilis est et cuius principes uescuntur in tempore suo ad reficiendum* (Eccles. 10:17). Rex noster sub cuius uexillo militamus nobilis est;<sup>274</sup> de quo dicitur, *generationem eius quis enarrabit* (Acts 8:33), et *beata est terra illa* in qua regnat, quia cor quod possidet beatitudine uirtutum illustrat, *et eius principes*, scilicet in regno eius ne

<sup>270</sup> confirmante] et *add. sed exp.*

<sup>271</sup> Israhel] *p. c. ex sisrahel*

<sup>272</sup> deficiet] *p. c.*

<sup>273</sup> quicquam] *p. c.*

<sup>274</sup> Compare Benedict of Nursia, *Regula monachorum*, prol., ed. Venarde (n. 25 above), 2–3.

dominetur iniquitas principantes, *uescuntur* corpore ipsius et sanguine *in tempore suo*, uidelicet in hoc peregrinationis curriculo, uescuntur autem nunc non ad<sup>275</sup> perfruendum, sed *ad reficiendum*, id est ad spem que sola tribulatos reficit se leuandum (Eccles. 10:17). De tercio dicit Psalmista, *Iacta cogitatum tuum in Domino*, id est in caritate, quia *Deus caritas est* (1 John 4:8 and 4:16), *et ipse te enutriet* (Ps. 54:23), sic ut adipe uirtutum et pinguedine orationum repleatur anima tua et<sup>276</sup> per huius amplitudinis crementa infirmetur acies mimica. De quarto, uidelicet quia per confessionem cibus iste sanat, necessarium est non tacere ut cum in prelio sepe cadant uulnerati multi, uarius est enim euentus prelii, et nunc hunc, nunc illum occidit gladius, uulneratus sciat ubi me—**fol. 167r**—dicum inueniat, ne accepto uulnere mortem incurrat. Quis uerus est medicus nisi ille qui dixit: *Ecce ego obducam eis cicatricem et sanitatem dabo, et curabo eos?* (Jer. 33:6). Que est medicina eius? Audi ipsum: *Nisi manducaueritis carnem filii hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis uitam in uobis* (John 6:53). De quinto, scilicet quod hic cibus non solum sanat, immo etiam confortat, dicitur: *Et cum accepisset cibum confortatus est* (Acts 9:19). Iste cibus in bello confortat manus dissolutas, et genua debilia roborat, et hoc se miles Christi roborat ne succumbat. Bene se armauerat qui dicebat: *Certus sum enim quia neque mors, neque uita, neque angeli, neque principatus, neque potestates, neque uirtutes, neque instantia, neque futura, neque fortitudo, neque altitudo, neque profundum, neque creatura alia poterit nos seperare a caritate Dei* (Rom. 8:38–39). De sexto, quod cibus idem conseruat per consummationem, scriptum est: *Sapientia sciuit iustum et conseruauit sine querela Deo* (Wis. 10:5). Sapientia tunc sine querela iustum Deo conseruat, cum idem iustus per donum eucharistie in uigore iusticie stat, et usque in finem prelii cum de pugne qualitate Deo reddenda est ratio, in eiusdem strennuitate [*sic*] constatie perseuerat. In hoc enim libro non legitur quod qui pugnauerit, sed *qui uicerit non ledetur a morte secunda*. (Apoc. 2:11). Summa uictorie finis uite, nam finis uite finis pugne. Dixit quidam: “Pugna suum finem, cum iacet hostis, habet.”<sup>277</sup> Ad bonum finem pugnauit, qui dixit: *Bonum certamen certauit, cursum consummaui* (2 Tim. 4:7).

Cursu consumato, ultra non utemur cibo isto, sed sicut promittitur nobis in Yosue, *Comedemus*<sup>278</sup> *de*<sup>279</sup> *frugibus presentis anni* (Josh. 5:11), id est eterni; finito enim anno prelii, qui est transitorius, sequitur annus premii, qui est eternis. Qui quam nec preterito nec futuro aliorum annorum more se circinat, sed quodam eternitatis centro presentialiter et intransitorie se solidat, merito

<sup>275</sup> ad] *om.*

<sup>276</sup> tua et] *p. c.*

<sup>277</sup> Ovid, *Tristia* 3.5.34.

<sup>278</sup> Comedemus] comederunt Vulgate

<sup>279</sup> de] *p. c.*

sibi presentis anni nomen aptat. Sed nec<sup>280</sup> improprie idem annus presentis dici potest temporis, cum uere sit interminabilis et prorsus omni mutabilitate careat circumstantie temporalis. Tantummodo enim illius sola solius est eternaliter ibi fruitio, qui temporum ordinator omnium, tempore caret omnino. De hoc anno Ysayas dicit: *Dies ultionis in corde meo, annus retributionis mee uenit* (Isa. 63:4). Cibo igitur isto anno prelii utimur in specie transitoria, et post uictoriam anno premii fruemur eo in ymagine uera et pace eterna. Sic enim promittitur uictoribus: *Populus meus sedebit in pulchritudine pacis* (Isa. 32:18). /fol. 167v/ Tunc accipient regnum decoris et dyadema speciei de manu Domini (Wis. 5:17), qui<sup>281</sup> in bello tali permanserunt inuicti.

De cibo prelii aliquantulum tamquam elingues balbutiuimus, nunc de armis uideamus. Legimus in Exodo: *Armati ascenderunt filii Israel de terra Egypti* (Exod. 13:18), quia tam Egyptiorum in cursum expectabant a tergo, quam Amalechitarum occursum et aliorum hostium in deserto. Hec arma sunt instrumenta iusticie, quibus spiritualis miles, si uel impetat uel impetitur, debet audacter in hostem irruere, si desiderat in bello per ipsum qui docet manus suas ad prelium triumphare (compare Ps. 143:1). De hiis armis ait apostolus: *Exhibete uos Deo tamquam ex mortuis uiuentes [et] membra uestra<sup>282</sup> arma iusticie Deo* (Rom. 6:13). Item: *Arma milicie nostre non sunt carnalia, sed potentia Deo ad destructionem munitioum* (2 Cor. 10:4). Est itaque bellatoris boni galea fidei integritas, lorica uirtutum continuas, calige uel ocree mundialium contemptibilitas, cingulus militaris lumborum succinctibilitas, lancea constantie proceritas, pharetra bone meditationis sagacitas, arcus participandi studiositas, sagitta scripture auctoritas, gladius predicationis acuitas, clipeus uel scutum perseuerantie stabilitas (compare Eph. 6:10–18).

Galea capud tegitur ne ledatur. Capud prima et precipua pars est corporis, et significat principium cuiuslibet actionis. Unde habemus in Trenis: *Hostes eius in capite* (Lam. 1:5). Et in euangelio: *Percuciebant capud eius harundine* (Mark 15:19). Christi capud harundine percuciant, qui causam et inicium boni operis ei non attribuunt, sed potius superbie ictibus hoc elidunt. Sed *tu caput tunc unge<sup>283</sup> oleo* (Matt. 6:17), id est quodcumque facis in uerbo aut opere, semper causam attribue Iesu Christo. Apostolus ait: *Galeam salutis assumite* (Eph. 6:17). Quis inquam salutis exprimitur nomine, nisi ille qui *operatus est salutem in medio terre?* (Ps. 73:12). De quo et dicitur: *Non est in alio aliquo salus, uidelicet Iesus Christus*. Et si non est immo quia, *non est in alio aliquo salus, nec nomen est aliud sub celo* in quo credi oporteat (Acts 4:12). Et apostulus nos *galeam salutis* assumere precipiat (Eph. 6:17), et capud principium operis existat: utique

<sup>280</sup> Sed nec] *p. c.*

<sup>281</sup> qui] *p. c.*

<sup>282</sup> uestra] *nostra*

<sup>283</sup> unge] *p. c. ex unges*

galeam salutis in capud assumimus, cum fidem Christi in omni boni operis principio conlocamus. Ieremias ait: *State in galeis* (Jer. 46:4). Apostolus quasi hoc exponit dicens aperte: *State in fide* (1 Cor. 16:13). Ysayas totum simul exprimit ubi dicit: *Galea salutis in capite eius* (Isa. 59:17), boni scilicet bellatoris. Capud ergo militis galea tegitur, cum bone milicie prin-/fol. 168r/-cipium fidei callide communitur. Sed tempore belli non armando sed armato militi galea primum in caput ponitur, quia habitis uirtutibus fides merito superfertur, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo; et fides in cassum geritur, nisi uirtutibus coarmetur, sicut galeato militi modicum confert galea, si non fuerit armis reliquis et aliis<sup>284</sup> corpori necessariis coadiuta. Hinc Iacobus ait: *Fides cooperatur operibus et ex operibus fides consummata est* (James 2:22).

Sicut per galeam fidei integritas, ita per loricam uirtutum exprimitur continuitas, quia sicut in textura lorice macula maculam sibi connectit et sociat, ut ex hiis ad tuitionem corporis una lorica fiat, sic uirtus uirtutem colligando confederat, ut ex hiis una uirtuose perfectionis impenetrabilis toga surgat. Simili modo Dominus, ut ostenderet coaptanda<sup>285</sup> inter se uirtutes coaptandas, et in inuicem inserendas, in coniunctione cortinarum tabernaculi precepit Moysi, ut ansulas iacinctinas in lateribus ac summitatibus faceret cortinarum, ut possent inuicem copulari, et ut cortina haberet ansulas in utraque parte ita insertas, ut ansa contra ansam ueniret et altera alteri posset aptari, de singulis precipiens, ut essent *coniuncta deorsum usque sursum, et una omnes compago* retineret et *similis iunctura* seruaret (Exod. 26:24). Arma quoque iusticie sicut membra lorice inuicem se coaptant, et ideo uirtutes per loricam non incongrue se figurant; et sicut lorica totum corpus protegit contra nocentium insultum,<sup>286</sup> ita uirtutes totum hominem mutuunt, ne contra eum preualeat inimicus. Nonne uir fortissimus uidas, contra hostes pugnaturus *induit se lorica sicut gygas?* (1 Macc. 3:3). Quis sine lorica pugnat? Quis sine uirtutibus triumphat? Et quod lorica uirtutes signanter exprimat, apostolus aperte innuit ubi narrat: *State induti lorica iusticie* (Eph. 6:14). Audi testimonium Ysaye, qui dicit de bono bellatore: *Indutus est iusticia ut*<sup>287</sup> *lorica* (Isa. 59:17). Uides itaque fidem per galeam et uirtutes exprimi per loricam.

In ocreis aut in caligis spiritualiter bellantium significatur rerum contemptibilitas mundanarum, ait enim apostolus: *Calceati pedes in preparationem euangelii pacis* (Eph. 6:15). Qui pedes in preparationem euangelii calceat, oportet ut ea que sunt mundi contempnat, dictum enim euangelizantibus: *Nichil tuleritis in uia* (Luke 9:3). Sed nostri hostes etiam suas habent ocreas, contra nos in eis modo huic ualde contrario procedentes, maxime cum istum<sup>288</sup> rerum

<sup>284</sup> aliis] alias

<sup>285</sup> coaptanda] p. c.

<sup>286</sup> insultum] insultus

<sup>287</sup> ut] et

<sup>288</sup> istum] iste



contemptum, ut dictum est, typice persuadeant et illic cunctis uanitatibus pede sollicito se im-/fol. 168v/-mittant. Et hostium ocree sunt eree, quia sonoro, probroso tamen, strepitu nobis occurrunt, et firmo et inflexibili nocendi proposito nos inuadunt. Certe *spurius* ille, qui legitur, *in cruribus ocreas ereas habuisse, stans*, id est in pertinacia nocendi perdurans, sonora uoce, *clamabat aduersum phalanges Israel, et dicebat, 'Quare uenistis parati ad prelium? Numquid non ego Philisteus sum et uos serui Saul?'* (1 Sam. 17:4, 17:6, and 17:8). Et post pauca iactantiae uerba subiecit, *Ego exprobraui agminibus Israel hodie* (1 Sam. 17:10), et ad nostrum pugilem contra ipsum *in funda et lapide uenientem* (1 Sam. 17:50), *Numquid ego canis sum quod tu uenis ad me cum baculo?* (1 Sam. 17:43). Ille uero Philisteus cadens, scilicet diabolus, quem Christus uidit sicut fulgur de celo cadentem, qui erat *altitudinis sex cubitorum* (1 Sam. 17:4) ob perfectionem donorum — dicitur enim de eo *perfectus decore in uiis tuis in die condicionis tue* (Ezek. 28:15; compare Ezek. 28:12) — et *palmo* (1 Sam. 17:4), quia precellebat alios dono — *abietes enim, testante propheta, non adequabant summitatem eius* (Ezek. 31:8) — habens in capite callidem eream ad tegendum desiderium intentionis nequam, et lorica<sup>289</sup> hamatam (compare 1 Sam. 17:4) — quia in Adam *totum genus humanum in hamo*, sicut dicit Abacuc, *subleuauit et traxit illud in sagena sua et congregauit in rete suum* (Hab. 1:15) — habens etiam in cruribus ocreas ereas, perduras et inflexibiles pertinatie sue uias, et cuius humeros clipeus ereus tegit (compare 1 Sam. 17:6), tamquam illius qui cedere et humeros suos iugo supponere non proponit.

Ille, inquam, adhuc hodie, mane scilicet et uespere, hoc est et in principio<sup>290</sup> boni operis et in fine, stans quadraginta diebus (compare 1 Sam. 17:16), id est cunctis istius quadragesimalis exilii temporibus, statum despectionis et baculum probrose crucis agminibus Dei uiuentis improperat (compare 1 Sam. 17:43). Et sic contra nos, ut *carnes nostras uolatilibus celi et bestiis terre* (1 Sam. 17:44) det, fortiter appropinquat (compare 1 Sam. 17:48). Et *armiger eius* (1 Sam. 17:41) cotidie antecedit eum, quia quilibet satelles mundi arma gerit diaboli et cum ipso diabolo satellites impetit Crucifixi. Sed Philisteus iste uincitur, si ei non ab onusto, sed magis ab expedito, uidelicet a contemptore rerum mundalium, occurratur. Dauid enim postquam id quo indutus erat deposuit, hostem uicit. Non enim habebat consuetudinem ut secum deferret aliqua superflua contra hostem (compare 1 Sam. 17:39). Et nos inimicum superabimus si pedes nostros et crura contemptus mundi caligis calceamus. Nam Petro, qui reliquerat omnia, dixit angelus: *"Precingere et calcea te caligas tuas."* *Et fecit sic* (Acts 12:8). Illum enim *de manu Herodis et de /fol. 169r/ omni expectatione inimicorum* educit angelus (Acts 12:11), qui contemptibilitatis mundane caligis contra ponderosas hostium

<sup>289</sup> lorica] p. c.

<sup>290</sup> principio] princio

ocreas fuerit calceatus. Si ergo rex Sodomorum, princeps scilicet,<sup>291</sup> qui cecare te uult in amore mundialium uoluptatum (compare Gen. 19:11), dixerit tibi, “*Da michi animas, cetera tolle tibi*” (Gen. 14:21), cum Abram respondebis ei, “*Leuo cum gratiarum actione manum meam, id est omnem quam feci uel faciam operationem bonam, ad Dominum Deum excelsum* (Gen. 14:22), a quo solo est *omne datum optimum, et omne donum perfectum* (James 1:17), quem solum recognosco esse *possessorem celi et terre* (Gen. 14:22). Quia in eius uniuersa sunt posita uoluntate, nichil prorsus in tua, qui dicis presumptione magna, *Da michi animas*, cum scias quod sicut anima Patris ita anima Filii Dei sit, ipse enim *inspirauit in faciem hominis spiraculum uite* (Gen. 2:7). *Cetera tolle tibi*, dicis ad me, tamquam a tua pendeant aliqua potestate et non animaduertis, quod *tu sis miser et miserabilis, pauper, cecus et nudus* (Apoc. 3:17). Scias autem quod *a filo subteminis*, quod<sup>292</sup> fere minima pars est mundane possessionis, in qua tamen plures decipis, id est *usque ad corrigiam calige*, qua te persuadente amatores seculi diligenter ligant et stringunt res transitorias ad se, studio manus utriusque, conquiritent scilicet et retinentie, nitentes<sup>293</sup> eas insolubiliter<sup>294</sup> possidere. *Non accipiam* secundum persuasionem tuam *ex omnibus que tua sunt* (Gen. 14:23), si qua tamen *tua sunt*, et secundum aliquid illa *tua sunt*, que sequaces tui uel uiciose sumunt, uel uoluptuose consumunt, quia tantum in hac re uiris habes, quod talium pro talibus et accusas et torques postmodum uoluptates. Nam ex hoc principem mundi, id est mundialis mali, te uocat auctor seculi. Et ideo *non accipiam de domo tua uitulos, neque de gregibus tuis hyrcos* (Ps. 49:9), *exceptis hiis, que comederunt iuuenes* (Gen. 14:24), hii scilicet, qui sunt in bello Domini agiles uite tantum necessaria et nulla superflua requirentes.”

Hec loquere et Petri calceatus caligis te ipsum frequenter in contemptum rerum mundialium exhortare, ut nec pedes tuos in laqueum incidere, nec de casu tuo contingat aliquando diabolum exultare. Sic, inquam, sic erimus semper *egentes multos autem locupletantes tamquam nichil habentes et omnia possidentes* (2 Cor. 6:10). Hec calige sic tuebuntur finem nostrum, ut ille qui callide nostrum obseruat calca-  
neum (compare Ps. 55:7), dante illo, *in cuius manu sunt omnes fines terre* (Ps. 94:4), nullum possit nobis ingerere nocumentum. Nam ei dictum memini: *Tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius* (Gen. 3:15). In fine siquidem hominis, cum erit denudatio operum illius, hostis eum, si potest, supplantare cogitat, ut iter quo tendit ad patriam impedimento aliquo et precipue uel minimo infidelitatis /**fol. 169v**/ articulo ei precludat, et omnia bona eius opera sic elidat.

Cum Pylatus triumphalem scripserat titulum, scilicet “*Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum*,” et *posuerat super crucem* (John 19:19) et multi legerent eum, dicebant

<sup>291</sup> scilicet] \*\*ilicet

<sup>292</sup> quod] qui

<sup>293</sup> nitentes] niteentes

<sup>294</sup> insolubiliter] insclubiliter

Pylato pontifices Iudeorum: *Noli scribere “Rex Iudeorum,” sed “quia ipse dixit: Rex sum Iudeorum”* (John 19:21). Ecce qualiter posteriorem deleri petebant, partem anteriorem non. Quod scriptum uidebant “Iesus Nazarenus,” non curabant, sed “Rex Iudeorum” mutari petebant. Tamquam dicerent, “Iesus iste de Nazareth natus fuit, sed rex Iudeorum non extitit, immo in hoc quod regem Iudeorum se dixit, et se ipsum et sequenter credentes sibi fefellit,” ita diabolus de recta fide et bona alicuius conuersatione, ut supradictum est, non curat dum modo, in extremo uite eius tempore eum, aut per fidei dubitationem, aut per negligentem criminum discussionem, aut certe per desperationem, in interitum secum trahat. Et hec singula possumus animaduertere in hac Iudeorum persuasione. Causantes etenim pro fine non pro principio tituli, et dicentes, “Scribe ‘quia ipse dixit: Rex sum Iudeorum,’” manifeste hesitationem persuadent fidei, tamquam non secure creditur illi qui se presumit alium qui<sup>295</sup> est clam ne palam profiteri. Petentes scribi “ipse dixit: ‘Rex sum,’” quasi se regem diceret cum non esset, negligentem persuadent discussionem et contricionem criminum per spem nimiam uel contemptum tamquam ad faciendam uindictam ipse non sit rex omnium seculorum. Cum scribi postulant quod rex Iudeorum non sit sed “quia ipse dixit,” aperte desperationem inducunt, quia in hoc uerbo plene peccatorum indulgentie, que uere confitentibus ab ipso promittitur, contradicunt. Sed cuicumque persuadetur hec uecordia semper respondeat, *Quod scripsi, scripsi* (John 19:22), et titulum qui loquitur “Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum,” nec in principio, nec in fine a cordis tabula sua deleri permittat, aliquatenus aut mutari obiciens persuasioni prime, quod non est aliud nomen in quo credi oporteat sub celo (compare Acts 4:12); secunde quod potestas eius potestas eterna est<sup>296</sup> et usque ad *nouissimum quadrantem* (Matt. 5:26) *reddet unicuique secundum opera sua* (Rom. 2:6); tercie quod “latronem sero penitentem suscepit”<sup>297</sup> et supplicanti, *Hodie mecum eris in paradyso* (Luke 23:43) respondit.

Contemptui rerum mundialium per caligas aut ocreas signatarum subicitur cingulus militaris, uidelicet precinctibilitas castitatis. Omnis enim qui in agone contendit, ab omnibus lubricis actibus prudenter abstinet. Alioquin hostibus ludibrium et sibi periculi causa fiet. Sicut enim claustra a claudendo, sic castra dicuntur a castrando. Unde dicitur in Deutronomio: *Sint castra tua munda ut non appareat in eis quiquam feditatis. Deus enim tuus ambulat in medio tui* (Deut. 23:14). Ecce adiutorium Dei tempore belli! Castra /fol. 170r/ munda et absque feditate seruat, qui hora istius prelii castimonie cingulo se circumdat et sic eo precingitur, ut in uitium incontinentie non soluatur. Ait enim dux belli: *Sint lumbi uestri precincti* (Luke 12:35). Lumbos precingimus, ut ait de satellitibus eius: “Non infimus, si carnis uicia coartamus.” Et alius: *State in bello*, scilicet

<sup>295</sup> qui] quem

<sup>296</sup> est] om.

<sup>297</sup> *Corpus antiphonalium officii*, ed. Hesbert (n. 141 above), 4:107 (no. 6417).

contra hostes, *succincti lumbos* (Eph. 6:14). Mulier fortis (compare Prov. 31:10), scilicet ratio uel ecclesia, que et ipsa pariter *accinxit fortitudine* continentie *lumbos suos* (Prov. 31:17). *Hunc cingulum tradidit Cananeo* (Prov. 31:24), id est homini in uirtutes de uitii commutato. Et Spiritus Sanctus per Ezechielem dicit homini uirtute precincto, *Cinxi te bysso* (Ezek. 16:10), cingulo uidelicet filo castimonie candidato. Hunc cingulum illius sola conferre potest gratia, quem Iohannes in capite libri istius *precinctum* uidit *ad mamillas zona aurea* (Apoc. 1:13), concedens suis ministris, ut sint et ipsi cum eo precincti zonis aureis (compare Apoc. 15:6). Nam dicit omni obedienti sibi: *Precinge te et ministra michi* (Luke 17:8). Debet siquidem cingulo castitatis se precingere quicumque illi digne uoluerit ministrare. Nonne Petrus *tunica succinxit se et misit se in mare* (John 21:7), cum relictis mundi retibus Christo uoluit proximare? Incorrputio enim facit esse proximum Deo. Qui erga in hoc anime bello iamdicto militari cingulo precinctus fuerit, contra hostes saluti sue oppositos fortius preualebit.

Et Christi miles sic armatus, hastam uel lanceam in hostes iturus prompta manu non segniter arripit, dum bonum contra hostes uiriliter pugnandi propositum constantie manibus apprehendit; hastam uibrat, dum hosti in cordi suo de habenda uictoria minas dictat; hastam erigit, dum in Christo non in semetipso fiduciam belli ponit. Hasta enim aut lancea, ut diximus ante, est constantie proceritas in milite. De hac hasta legimus in secundo Machabeorum libro: Cum Iudas et sui *pariter prompto animo procederent, Ierosolimis apparuit precedens eos equester in ueste candida, armis aureis hastam uibrans. Tunc omnes simul benedixerunt misericordem Dominum, et conualuerunt animis, non solum homines sed et bestias ferocissimas, et muros ferreos penetrare* (2 Macc. 11:8–9). Ecce qualem constantiam per apportatam sibi acceperunt lanceam. De hac constantie lancea Ieremias ait: *Polite lanceas, induite uos loriceis* (Jer. 46:4). Lanceam polit, qui per constantiam boni exempli splendorem reddit.

Nunc uideamus de pharetra que spiculorum contra hostes mittendorum, specialis est domuncula. Pharetra bellatoris istius est, ut supradiximus, bone meditationis sagacitas, qua debet ali—/fol. 170v/—quis in receptaculo sui cordis abscondere diligentius et scrutari mandatorum Dei uias, ut sagittas necessarias in hoc prelio, de eadem pharetra tempore proferat oportuno. Hinc Ieremias: *Acuite sagittas, implete pharetras* (Jer. 51:11). Pharetras implemus dum bone meditationis studium domicilio nostri pectoris imprimimus, et cor nostrum ut intelligamus legem Domini cum Esdra paramus (compare Ezra 7:10).

Sicut pharetra boni studii est sagacitas, sic arcus est alios informandi studiositas. Nam sicut phylosophus dicit: “Bonum in commune eductum melius elucescit.”<sup>298</sup> “Namque bonum quod sepe latet splendore minori degenerat.”<sup>299</sup> Etiam

<sup>298</sup> Boethius, *De syllogismis hypotheticis* 1, PL 64, col. 131B.

<sup>299</sup> Alain of Lille, *Anticlaudianus* 1.8.345–6, ed. Boussat (n. 97 above), 67.

legimus: *Sapientia abscondita et thesaurus inuisus, que utilitas in utrisque?* (Eccles. 41:17). Et in alio loco: *Sine inuidia communico* (Wis. 7:13). Cum Eldad et Medad prophetarent in castris et Iosue diceret Moysi, *Domine mi Moyses, prohibe eos* (Num. 11:28), ille non ut inuidus, immo qui teste Deo erat in omni domo eius fidelissimus, ilico respondit: *Quid emularis pro me? Quis tribuat ut omnis populus prophetet et det eis Dominus spiritum suum!* (Num. 11:29).

Non<sup>300</sup> sic inuidi, non sic, sed soli ipsi in terra habitare uolunt, dum aliis,<sup>301</sup> ut arcum sue studiositatis intendant et sagittam ex sue meditationis pharetra mittant, prout poterunt, uiam claudunt. Audi ethnicum super eo taliter exprobrantem, “Quod mecum ignorat, solus uult scire uideri. Ingeniis non ille fauet plaudique sepultis, nostra sed impugnat, nos nostraque liuidus odit. Quod si tam Grecis nouitas inuisa fuisset quam nobis, quid nunc esset uetus, aut quid haberet quod legeret tereretque uiritim publicus usus?”<sup>302</sup> Sed dilectus Deo et hominibus arcum suum prudenter intendit et sagittam utiliter dirigit, et aliis arcum tendentibus et sagittam mittentibus humiliter acquiescit. De hoc arcu scriptura dicit: *Tolle arma tua, pharetram et arcum* (Gen. 27:3). Pharetram tollit et arcum, qui inter bonum quo meditatur in lege diuina pectoris exercitium, uel linguam proximis ad docendum, uel pennam posteris preparat ad scribendum. Quo contra de reprobis dicitur: *Extenderunt linguam suam quasi arcum mendacii et non ueritatis* (Jer. 9:3). Hunc etiam arcum ab hostibus obsessi intendimus, dum contra illos bonorum operum nos exercitiis preparamus. Hinc iterum Ieremias ait: *Preparamini contra Babylonem per circuitum, omnes qui intenditis arcum debellare eam* (Jer. 50:14).

Arcum ostendimus, que sit sagitta uideamus. Sagitta sacre scripture uel alicuius sanctorum est autoritas. Hec enim ab exercitati cordis pharetra sumitur et per arcum lingue, nunc in demones, nunc in hereticos, nunc in proximos destinatur. Siue enim impetatur diabolus, siue confutetur hereticus, /fol. 171r/ seu informetur proximus, semper oportet ut omnis his actus diuine scripture testimonio sit munitus. Hinc quidam sapiens ait: *Sapientiam omnium antiquorum exquiret sapiens, et in prophetis uacabit. Narrationem uirorum nominatorum conseruabit, et in uersutias parabolarum simul intriobit* (Eccles. 39:1–2). Diximus ante Ieremiam dixisse: *Acuite sagittas* (Jer. 51:11). Sagittas acuius dum nos uel ad diabolum configendum, uel hereticum confundendum, aut proximum instruendum, cuius auctoritatis testimonium tunc temporis magis sit necessarium, subtiliter indagamus. De eadem sagitta dixit Elyseus ad Yoas regem, id est Deus ad hominem, tam se quam alios a temporalibus seperantem — “Ioas” enim interpretatur “seperans” uel “temporalis” — *Affer arcum et sagittas* (2 Kings 13:15), id est ad hec que intendis pretendere, collige tibi de scriptura sancta auctoritates congruas. Et paulo

<sup>300</sup> Non] Noc

<sup>301</sup> aliis] alii

<sup>302</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 2.1.87–92.

post, *Iace sagittas*, ecce sagittandi preceptum, *et iecit*, ecce obediendi ministerium (2 Kings 13:17). Et statim exprimit Helyseus sagitte huius auxilium dicens, *Sagitta salutis Domini, et sagitta salutis contra Syriam* (2 Kings 13:17). Hec enim sagitta Domini auxilio bis opem operatur salutiferam, dum ad contriendum tam corpus quam animam, uel ad intuendum tam presentem uitam quam aliam, sacre scripture profertur auctoritas contra sublimem mundi superbiam. “Syria” enim interpretatur “sublimitas.” At tu qui sagittans, te sic exerces ad signum semper, ut precipit Helyseus, *Pone manum super arcum* (1 Kings 13:16), uidelicet ipsemet operare id quod prolaturus es in medium, ut quicquid lingua loquitur, etiam moribus uita fateatur.

Huius sagitte, sicut et haste, ferrum est ipsa ueritas inuincibilis, que continetur in sacre scripture testimoniis, quam quia nulla falsitas potest elidere, dubium non est eam omne obuium penetrare. Unde Ysaïas: *Subuertentur condensa saltus ferro* (Isa. 10:34), id est uiciorum adinstar saltus densitates concrete sub iugum fidei uertentur ferree ueritatis eloquio. Et certe *ferrum ferro acuitur* (Prov. 27:17), dum in sacre scripture eulogio ueritas ueritati, una auctoritas alii suffragatur. Immo omnia arma quibus in defensione fidei miles catholicus protegitur et quibus inimicus uincitur ex istius ferri materia fabricantur. Unde legimus in Daniele: *Ferrum comminuit et domat omnia* (Dan. 2:40). Et scio qui dixit, *Ueritas liberabit uos* (John 8:32). *Magna est enim ueritas et preualet omnibus* (1 Esd. 4:41). Uerum, quod sine graui merore<sup>303</sup> dicere non possumus, ueritatis ferrum per ecclesiam Dei sic est hodie in locis pluribus ebetatum, ut acies armorum contra hostes gerendorum per sui hebetudine fere sit inutilis, ita quod uirtutum etiam instrumentis uis incisiua non sit in criminibus extirpandis<sup>304</sup> propter inundationem nimiam /fol. 171v/ que terram operuit per fidei falsitatis. Tangit hec Spiritus sanctus in Osee: *Non est ueritas, et non est misericordia, et non est scientia Dei in terra. Maledictum et mendacium et homicidium et furtum et adulterium inundauerunt* (Hos. 4:1–2). Et ipsa ueritas ait: *Dum uenerit Filius hominis, putas inueniet super terram?* (compare Luke 18:8). Quasi dicat uix aut non. Ferrum enim teste et luto misceri non poterit et numquam falsitati ueritas adhaerebit.

Legimus in libro Regum quod *faber ferrarius non inueniebatur in omni terra Israel*, et quod *cauerent Philistum, ne forte facerent Hebrei gladium et lanceam. Et descendebat omnis Israel ad Philistum, ut acueret unusquisque uomerem suum, et ligonem, et securim et sarculum, quia retuse erant acies uomerum, et ligonum, et tridentium, et securium, usque ad stimulum corrigendum. Cumque uenisset<sup>305</sup> dies prelii, non est inuentus ensis et lancea in manu tocius populi* (1 Sam. 13:19–22). Non ab re Spiritus sanctus, qui omnia prescit, hec scribi et nobis uoluit aperiri,

<sup>303</sup> merore] p. c. ex timore

<sup>304</sup> extirpandis] extirpendis

<sup>305</sup> uenisset] uenissent

ut hiis premunirentur exemplis nam hec omnia in figura contingebant illis. Ualde erat miserum, quod cum usus erat habendus armorum et iam procedendum ad bellum, *faber ferrarius non inueniebatur in uniuersa terra Israel*. Sed miserius est quod cum multi fabri ferrarii hodie in Dei inueniantur ecclesia, qui malleo predicationis ferrum ueritatis in spiritualia fabricant et acuunt arma, inter manus fabricantium ipsum hebetescit ferrum, sic ut idem ferrum aut corda non penetret hominum, aut, si penetrat, non diu uigorem retineat.<sup>306</sup> Considerauit enim se homo in predicatione tamquam in speculo, et abiit, et statim oblitus est qualis fuerit. Et miserrimum est quod ex eo, sicut et Hebreis tunc temporis obiecit Deus, quod proiecimus Dominum nostrum, qui solus saluat nos de uniuersis malis et tribulationibus nostris (compare 1 Sam. 10:19), Philisteis inimicis nostris permittitur ut caueant inter nos, ne a nobis gladius et lancea fabricetur. Et quid sibi uult hoc, quod *descendit omnis Israel ad Philistum, ut exacueret unusquisque* ferramenta sua, quia *retusa* erant *usque ad stimulum corrigendum*? (1 Sam. 13:20–21). Numquid debemus acumen ueritatis a fabris falsitatis querere, et arma iusticie ad incudem iniustorum corrigenda portare? *Que conuentio Christi ad Belial?* (2 Cor. 6:15). “Que seges infecta surgit non decolor herba?”<sup>307</sup> “Qualis erat mulier, tale coquebat olus?”<sup>308</sup> Uel ipsi nobis ea fabricarent arma que de certa scientia postmodum ipsorum transirent colla? Non puto. Sed lucido lucidius innotescit, quod huius soli milites in terram Philistum arma sua quasi frequenter deferunt acuenda, dum miliciam in maliciam, mu-/fol. 172r/–cronem in sicam, et uirtutum exercitium uertunt in exicium uiciorum.

Inter Philisteos acuunt aciem uomerum arantem spoliando rusticum; acuunt aciem ligonum uiolenter auferendo fructus agrorum; acuunt aciem tridentium in armentorum rapina ouium et porcorum, aciem securium in depredatione uel exustione domorum. Acuunt etiam apud Philistum sarculum concuciendo pauperes, opprimendo uiduas, diripiendo singula usque ad olera hortorum. Et quia consilium Iohannis baptiste non seruant docentis, *neminem concuciat, neque calumpniam faciatis, et contenti estote stipendiis uestris* (Luke 3:14), dum in quolibet istorum in contrarium ueniant, non defensant ecclesiam sed impugnant, et hoc faciunt usque ad stimulum corrigendum, quia et hii in propria persona rapine tempore longe extra officium et statum suum minant greges boum, stimulando eos et ad uiam corrigendo consuetudine bubulcorum. Et quia tales non cum stantibus in uirtute sed cum cadentibus in uicia super hiis malis explendis iniquum uersant consilium, arma sua non inproprie dicuntur acuere in terra Philistinorum. Hec de militibus soli, de militibus poli nichil dico. Etatem habent ipsi pro se

<sup>306</sup> retineat] \*\*\*\*\* *add.*

<sup>307</sup> Lucan, *Pharsalia* 7.851.

<sup>308</sup> Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, prol., ed. Hilka (n. 118 above), 3:15. This is Caesarius’s rendering of a vernacular German proverb: “Wie der Koch, so der Brei.” Also found in Albert of Stade, *Troilus* 2.280, ed. Merzdorf (n. 99 above), 48.

loquantur utrum etiam ipsi *acies*<sup>309</sup> *uomerum*,<sup>310</sup> *ligonum*, *tridentium* et *securium* (1 Sam. 13:21) in terra Philistum aliquando acuunt, dum modo indebito, uel se inuicem, uel alios nunc in temporalibus nunc in spiritualibus inquietant. Hoc scio quod quidam non in Iudea, in qua notus est Deus, sed in Philistum terra, in qua est despectus, ferramenta sua acuunt. Nichilominus<sup>311</sup> tamen in bello Domini contra hostes conflare se ostendunt, uidelicet qui operationis sue intentionem quidem habent dampnabilem, sed se in eisdem factis murum opponere pro domo Domini constanter astruunt et defendere fideliter equitatem. Hic populis ait Dominus per Ysaïam: *Labiis me honorat, cor autem eorum longe est a me* (Isa. 29:13). Absalon cum diceret ad Dauid, *Uadam et reddam uota mea que uoui Domino in Hebron* (2 Sam. 15:7), non intendit uota reddere, sed de regno patrem potius expugnare. Ex hac igitur ferri hebetudine et iniusto acumine, mirum non est, si cum uenit dies prelii, non inuenitur *ensis*<sup>312</sup> *et lancea in manu tocuis populi* (1 Sam. 13:22), quia qui ante tempus de armis sibi prouidet tempore belli insultum hostium propter armorum penuriam non euadet. Sed mera ueritas pro acumine sui ferri ad Philisteos non transit, immo apud se ipsam *ferrum ferro*, sicut est dictum, *acuit* (Prov. 27:17). Et ex hoc permanet et inualescit et acie sua inuincibili sic munit sagittam spiritualis sagittarum, ut ante eum nichil impenetrabile ualeat inueniri. Ex hoc itaque ueritatis ferro nobis armatur ipsa sagitta salu-/fol. 172v/-tis in hac uita ut triumphemus ab hostibus, et sagitta salutis Domini in futura ut ea tunc omne periculum propellamus.

Penne autem huius sagitte sunt fides, spes, et caritas (compare 1 Cor. 13:13), quia nisi hiis tribus continuatim agglutinatis et in capite inseparabiliter apposis, sagitta uias non seruat debitas, sed potius per obliquationes deuiat indirectas. Quod tunc fit cum ueritas dicitur, sed a dicente nec fides, nec spes, nec caritas obseruatur. Utique fecerunt hec qui sicut ad Philippenses scribit apostolus: *Christum annuntiabant ut pressuram uinculis apostoli suscitant* (compare Phil. 1:17). Quidam sapiens ait: *Fidei initium agglutinandum est ei* (Ecclus. 25:16). Quia ergo fides, spes, et caritas hanc sacre scripture sagittam ferro ueritatis munitam directo faciunt uolare tramite, et sine hiis, immo sine una earum, sagitta frustato labore dirigitur a mittente, non incongrue, ut reor, penne huius iaculi sunt uocate. Et hec penne de pennis quas uidit Ezechiel (compare Ezek. 1:6 and 17:3) sunt assumpte. Dicit enim: *Et manus hominis sub pennis eorum* (Ezek. 1:8), id est animalium. Oportet etiam pennas istas columbinas esse, id est simplicis substantie, si uis hac sagitta bene hereticum confundere, uel recte proximum instruere, uel pulchre hostem callidum superare. Unde Psalmista: *Quis dabit michi pennas sicut columbe?* (Ps. 54:7).

<sup>309</sup> *acies*] *aciem*

<sup>310</sup> *uomerum*] *p. c.*

<sup>311</sup> *Nichilominus*] *p. c.*

<sup>312</sup> *ensis*] *p. c.*



Bitumen<sup>313</sup> autem uel gluten quo penne iste supponuntur sagitte donum est Sancti Spiritus, quo ipse est in nobis hec omnia operatus. De hoc bitumine legimus in Genesi, *Bitumine linies archam intrinsecus et extrinsecus* (Gen. 6:14), id est Spiritus Sancti ligamine circumdes Mariam intrinsecus per fecundationem, extrinsecus per confirmationem. Ysaïas ad hec: *Glutino*<sup>314</sup> *bonum est* (Isa. 41:7). Sed interim tu, qui sagittarius es in bello Domini, secundum doctrinam Helisei, iace sagittas et tolle eas (compare 2 Kings 13:17–18) ut quod predicas uerum credas et tunc *iaculo percute terram* (2 Kings 13:18), id est secundum pondus uerborum in sagitta missorum terrenam relide concupiscentiam, et hoc *quinquies, uel sexties, uel septies*, id est diebus omnibus quibus uiues, quia tunc *percutes Syriam* (2 Kings 13:19), uidelicet omnem hostium sublimitatem, non tribus uicibus, sed usque ad internitionem (compare 2 Kings 13:19).

Sequitur de gladio. Gladius, ut supradiximus, est predicationis acuitas. Unde Ieremias [sic]: *Posuit os meum quasi gladium acutum* (Isa. 49:2). Bene acutum, quia *uiuus est sermo Dei, et efficax et penetrabiliorum omni gladio ancipiti* (Heb. 4:12). Qui predicationis officium susceperit, hoc gladio se accingit. Cui a Psalmista dicitur: *accingere gladio tuo super femur tuum* (Ps. 44:4). Gladio super femur accingitur, qui ratione<sup>315</sup> predicationis car-/fol. 173r/nis uoluptatibus reluctatur. Predicator gladium eximit cum thema proponit. Uibrat cum minas mouendo teritat. Circumducit cum distinctiones hinc inde diffinit. Secat cum in amputandis uiciis se intentat. Amputat cum fideles ab infidelibus, infideles a fidelibus, uerum a falso, crimen a criminoso seperat. Penetrat cum pro uerbi acumine auditor inhianter auscultat. Omnino necat cum omnia in auditoribus uiciorum mala mortificat. Petrus gladium eximit cum stans in medio plebis os suum ad loquendum aperit (compare Acts 10:34). De eo enim legitur: *Unus ex hiis qui erant cum Iesu, extendens manum, exemit gladium suum et percussit* (Matt. 26:51). Nemo condigne gladium poterit predicationis eximere et pro Iesu percutere, nisi cum Iesu sit pro fidei imitatem, et manum pariter extendat per bonam operationem. Gladium uibrat dum minatur in epistula sua, dicens: *perditio malorum non dormitat* (2 Pet. 2:3). Et hoc in Psalmo legimus: *Nisi conuersi, fueritis gladium suum uibrabit* (Ps. 7:13). Nobiliter gladium circumducit quando dicit: *Ministrate in fide uestra uirtutem, in uirtute scientiam, in scientia autem abstinentiam, in abstinentia autem patientiam, in patientiam autem pietatem, in pietate autem fraternitatis amorem, in amore autem fraternitatis caritatem* (2 Pet. 1:5–7). Secat quando pro uiciis reseccandis sic intonat: *Maledictionis filii dereliquentes rectam uiam errauerunt, secuti uiam Balaam* (2 Pet. 2:14–15). Infidelem a fidelibus amputat cum Symoni sic predicat, *Non est tibi pars neque sors in sermone isto* (Acts 8:21). Et in Esdra dicitur infidelibus edificationem sancte ciuitatis impediens: *Non est uobis pars, et*

<sup>313</sup> Bitumen] *p. c. ex si tamen*

<sup>314</sup> Glutino] Glutio

<sup>315</sup> ratione] *p. c. ex pratione*

*iusticia, et memoria in Ierusalem* (Neh. 2:20). Falsum a uero sperat cum stans cum undecim apostolis prior uocem sic eleuat: *Uiri Iudei [. . .] non sicut uos estimatis, hii ebrii sunt, cum<sup>316</sup> sit hora diei tertia, sed hoc est quod dictum est pro prophetam Iohel* (Acts 2:14–16). Crimen a criminoso amputat cum post predicationem scriptura clamat: *Multi eorum qui audierant uerbum Dei crediderunt* (Acts 4:4). Et quia omne crimen est probrosum nos in Psalmo petimus: *amputa obprobrium meum* (Ps. 118:39). Habemus in Canticis: *Tempus putationis aduenit* (Song 2:12). Et petens, id est predicator firmus, seruo amputat auriculam cum ei qui seruus est peccati uoluntatem demetit amplius audiendi narrationem nociuam. Hanc amputationem Ieremias commendat quando dicit: *Si sepeaueris preciosum a uili, quasi os meum eris* (Jer. 15:16).

Certe omnem populum penetrauerat acumen huius gladii cum, uerbis apostolicis in intima cordium receptis, *conuenit uniuersa ciuitas audire uerbum Dei* (Acts 13:44). Ysaias ait: *Ad dexteram et ad leuam penetrabis* (Isa. 54:3). Ad dexteram et ad leuam gladius predicatoris /fol. 173v/ penetrat, quia, tam in aduersis quam in prosperis, ipse contra uicia uerbum Dei intentare non cessat. Nam ille qui dixit, *Loquimini ad cor Ierusalem et aduocate eam* (Isa. 40:2), uoluit ut idem gladius usque ad interiora hominis penetraret mentem totam. Nec mirum, cum sit, ut supradiximus, *penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti* (Heb. 4:12). Et iste gladius apostolicus omnia omnino interfecit opposita, dum per predicationem eorum acutam, una die tria, et postea crediderunt quandoque milia per manus apostolorum recipientes fidem et baptisma (compare Acts 2:41–42). Nonne ibi interierunt omnes uiciorum currus et equites,<sup>317</sup> ne unus quidem superfuit ex eis? Hinc Ysaias: *Ego creauit interfectorem ad disperdendum* (Isa. 54:16). Et Ezechiel: *Mucro, mucro, euaginate<sup>318</sup> ad occidendum; limate ut interficias et fulgeas* (Ezek. 21:28). Et Ieremias ait: *Maledictus qui prohibet gladium suum a sanguine* (Jer. 48:10). Gladium prohibet a sanguine qui tacendo dissimulat uiciis obuiare, sicut Hely qui uidit *indigne agere filios suos et non corripuit eos* (1 Sam. 3:13).

Hunc gladium eduxit Dominus de uagina sua et dedit apostolis quando dixit: *Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti* (Matt. 28:19). Unde Dominus per Ezechielem: *Eduxi gladium meum de uagina sua irreuocabilem* (Ezek. 21:5). *Irreuocabilem*, dicit, quia uia salutis altera nunquam erit, teste Salvatore qui ait: *Qui crediderit et baptizatus, fuerit saluus erit; qui uero non crediderit, condemnabitur* (Mark 16:16). Huius gladii uagina dispensatio est diuina, a qua egredietur omne quod salutem hominum operatur. Unde Ezechiel: *Egredietur gladius meus de uagina sua ad omnem carnem* (Ezek. 21:4). Factum est hoc cum Dominus ait apostolis: *Predicate euangelium omni creature* (Mark 16:15). Hic gladius, ut dicit Ezechiel, *exacutus est ut cedat uictimas;*

<sup>316</sup> cum] *p. c. ex tum*

<sup>317</sup> equites] *et add.*

<sup>318</sup> euaginate] *euagino te*

*limatus est ut splendeat* (Ezek. 21:10). *Exacutus est*, uidelicet, e Christo acutus, et hoc pro auctoritate apostolica; *limatus est* etiam ab ipso pro utilitate nostra. Exacuit illum quando apostolus dixit: *Quorum remisieritis peccata,*<sup>319</sup> *remittuntur [eis], et quorum retinueritis, retenta erunt* (John 20:23). Limauit cum in gloria resurrexit. Cecidit gladius uictimas cum, predicantibus apostolis et eorum successoribus, uictimauit turbas martyrum infinitas. Fidem enim predicando in occisione materialis gladii mortui sunt. Gladius iste, crucis lima, uerberum, clauorum, et lancea, passionis uidelicet dominice asperitate limatus durissima, fulgidis Christi misteriis et gloriosis sanctorum miraculis, per uniuersum mundum se exhibet hodie splendidum, lucide declarens qualiter uincamus ip—**fol. 174r**—sum humani generis inimicum. Oremus ergo cum Psalmista: *Sit splendor Domini Dei nostri super nos* (Ps. 89:17). Nec frustra predicationis gladius inter cetera bellantium arma tempore belli proponitur, cum per ipsum quomodo resistendum sit hostibus doceatur. Qui enim predicationis proponit uerbum, quid aliud facit, nisi quod hos quibus constat, quod *milicia est uita hominis super terram* (Job 7:1), euocat, conuocat, prouocat contra hostes bellum. Nonne cum apostolus dixerat, *aduersarius uester diabolus tamquam leo rugiens circuit, querens quem deuoret* (1 Pet. 5:8), statim ad bellum nos prouocat, dicens *cui resiste fortes in fide?* (1 Pet. 5:9). In Deutronomio mandat Moyses: *Aproppinquante prelio stabit sacerdos ante aciem et sic loquatur ad populum: 'Audi Israel, uos hodie contra inimicos uestros pugnam committitis, non pertimescat cor uestrum'* (Deut. 20:2–3).

Idcirco hoc belli nostri tempore, cum hodie tamquam hoc et omni die pugnam contra hostem debeamus committere, necessaria semper nobis est exhortatio ut cotidiano proficiamus aumento, uidelicet, ut pugnator iste ante conflictum armis se induat ne in conflictu trepidando metuat, ne spolia nisi omnino deuictis hostibus concupiscat. *Induite uos armatura Dei* (Eph. 6:11), clamat ad primum apostolus, et *state in galeis* [. . .] *induite uos loricis* (Jer. 46:4), intonat propheta, ut semper hostis paratum inueniat pugilem istum in sua custodia. Alius ad aliud: *Nolite metuere, nolite cedere, nec formidatis, quia Dominus Deus pro uobis contra aduersarios dimicabit* (Deut. 20:3–4). Et Dominus ipse, ut de uictoria nos redderet certissimos, quesitus a Dauid dicente, *Persequar latrunculos hos, an non?* respondebit, *Persequere, absque dubio enim comprehendes eos* (1 Sam. 30:8). Dignatus assertionem suam superaddere hoc confirmationis uerbum *absque dubio*, cum omnino satis esset ei dixisse *comprehendes eos*, tantum simplici uerbo. Et hoc ideo ut omnem diffidentiam tolleret cordi nostro. Ad tertium loquitur tertius, suis uidelicet Iudas Machabeus: *Non concupiscatis spolia, quia bellum contra nos est, et Gorgias et exercitus eius prope nos in monte,*<sup>320</sup> *sed state contra inimicos nostros et expugnat eos, et post hec sumetis spolia* (1 Macc. 4:17–18). *Spolia ante*

<sup>319</sup> peccata] pecca

<sup>320</sup> et Gorgias . . . in monte] om.

tempus arripimus cum, necdum plene uictis hostibus, aliqua tamen habita uictoria propriis laudibus inhiamus. Adhuc enim *Gorgias*, qui interpretatur precisio diabolus scilicet, *et exercitus eius*, uidelicet demonum concursus, est *in monte*, id est in excelsa<sup>321</sup> super nos nature sue,<sup>322</sup> et *prope nos*, quia in communi aere apud nos, contra nos perpetuum intendens prelium, ut precipdat nos de terra uiuentium. /fol. 174v/ Sed nos, hac uita finita, tamdiu enim durat hostium pugna, et tunc Deus *arcum eorum conteret, et confringet arma, et scuta comburet igni* (Ps. 45:10), spolia primum secure ualemus accipere, quia tunc omnem uirtutem in prelio conquisitam debemus ei, qui dedit nobis uictoriam, non sine nostris laudibus resignare. Dicitur enim cuius: *Euge serue bone et fidelis* (Matt. 25:21).

Nunc de clypeo: *Surgite, principes, et arripite clypeum* (Isa. 21:5). Arripere necesse est ipsum, quia nisi arrepto eo et retento, nec bonum belli exitum, nec uictorie possidebitis principatum. Est enim scutum uel clypeus perseuerantie stabilitas. Scutum siquidem rotundum est et omne rotundum fine caret, quia reuertitur in seipsum, et significat perseuerantie donum, *cuius participatio eius in idipsum* (Ps. 121:3). Legimus in Psalmo: *Circuibo et immolabo* (Ps. 26:6). Circuit et immolat, qui nullum bono operi finem prestat. Arma quoque sine clipeo modicum ualent armato, et uirtutes non proderunt uirtuoso sine perseuerantie bono. Clipeus enim tam arma quam armatum solet protegere, ne contra aliquod eorum possit rabies hostica preualere; sic boni operis perseuerantia uirtutum merita defendit in homine, ut numquam hostis de uictoria ualeat exultare. Non ergo durante pugna deponat hunc clipeum quicumque coronari desiderat per triumphum. De hoc clipeo habes: *Iosue non contraxit manum, quam in sublime porrexerat, tenens clipeum donec interficerentur omnes habitatores Hay* (Josh. 8:26). *Hay* interpretatur questio uite. Et preliator inclitus ut Iosue manum operationis bone, quam semel porrigit in sublimi, gratias agens Deo omnipotenti non contrahit, quia accepto<sup>323</sup> opere non desistit, tenens fortiter clipeum perseuerantie donec penitus interficiantur omnes qui contra nos habitant in sui munitione et qui nobis in uite contrarii sunt questione.

Militem armauimus, nunc ad duellum uel ad prelium ueniamus. Duellum est singularis pugna duorum, et dicitur duellum quasi duorum bellum prelium conflictus plurimorum. Diabolus cum Christo duellum iniit, dum ipsum de gula, auaritia, superbia<sup>324</sup> singulari certamine attemptauit (compare Matt. 4). Et Christi pugil contra demonem in duello congreditur cum in aliquo crimine, quod idem demon ei suggerit, ipsi demoni reluctatur. Sed uniuersa ecclesia contra Sathanam et omnes eius satellites continuum et generale trahit prelium, quia communiter eam delere intendunt cunctis generibus uiciorum. Et si succumbere nolumus,

<sup>321</sup> excelsa] eccelsa

<sup>322</sup> sue] \*\*\*\* add.

<sup>323</sup> accepto] a cepto

<sup>324</sup> superbia] exp.

omni tempore ad consilium et auxilium Domini fugiamus. Legimus in libro Iudicum: *Post mortem*<sup>325</sup> *Iosue, consuluerunt filii /fol. 175r/ Israel Dominum, dicentes: "Quis ascendet ante nos contra Chananeum, et erit dux belli?" Dixitque Dominus: "Iudas ascendet"* (Judg. 1:1–2). *Iudas* interpretatur confitens siue glorificans. Et ille qui frequenter suum confitetur defectum, et semper Deum glorificat ob suum quem ei confert profectum, digne dux erit belli dominici, quia hiis duobus poterit contra hostes in prelio prosperari. Unde hec uox gratulationis: *Confitebor tibi, Domine rex, et collandabo te Dominum saluatorem meum, quoniam adiutor et protector factus est michi* (Ecclus. 51:1–2).

Hec sunt duo calcaria quibus equum cuius terga in bellum ituri premimus, scilicet carnales affectus motis instanter bone uoluntatis tibiis sine intermissione pungimus, et ualido impetu nos in medios hostes intrepidi deportamus. Dicit scriptura: *Iudas Machabeus fortis uiribus a iuuentute sua sit uobis princeps milicie, et ipse aget bellum populi* (1 Macc. 2:66). Debet enim in confessione<sup>326</sup> et in laude constare profectuum, si uincere uolumus inimicum. *De preliis*, enim *Iude narrabat omnes gentes* (1 Macc. 3:26) utique *propter crebras eius uictorias* (2 Chron. 26:8). Nam uera confessio et intima gratiarum actio hostibus humani generis formidinem incutit et Christi militum gloriose nomen extollit. Legimus enim: *Cecidit timor Iude ac fratrum eius, et formido super omnes gentes in circuiu eorum, et peruenit ad regem nomen eius* (1 Macc. 3:25–26). *Et ipse Iudas ait, "Absit [. . .] ut fugiamus. Et si appropiauit tempus nostrum, moriamur in uirtute propter fratres nostros, et non inferamus crimen glorie nostre"* (1 Macc. 9:10). Fugit, qui post factam confessionem sicut canis ad uomitum redit (compare Prov. 26:11; and 2 Pet. 2:22). Crimen infert sue glorie, qui pro morte uel pro aliquo tormentorum genere, uisis hostibus incipit in Christiana milicia trepidare. *Iudas, cum corde confractus et dissolutus est* (1 Macc. 9:7), cecidit, et post obitum eius omnis iniquitas emersit (compare 1 Macc. 9:23). Impetum ergo inimicorum ne timueritis, ut in bello anime uictoriam non perdati.

Et quia confessionem et graciaram actionem duo calcaria esse paulo ante iam diximus, quibus iumentum nostrum per medios hostes agitur, uidendum est qualiter hec duo calcaribus adaptentur. Ex tribus calcar consistit, punctorio, corio, astrictorio; sic etiam ex tribus uera constat confessio, scilicet compunctione, criminum prolatione, satisfactione. Significatur ergo per punctorium compunctio, per corium criminum prolatio, per astrictorium satisfactio. Compunctio enim peccatorum sic mentis pungit intuitum, ut compunctus soluat sepius in lamentum. Hinc quidam sapiens: *Pungens oculum deducet lacrimas* (Ecclus. 22:24). Et dum cor de perpetratis compungitur, quicquid mortalis egit infirmitas, labiorum et lingue, ut ita dicam, corio deligatur. Unde statim a sapiente subditur: *Et qui*

<sup>325</sup> mortem] morte

<sup>326</sup> confessione] profectuum *add. sed exp.*

*pungit cor profert sensum* (Ecclus 22:24). Et nos ad preceptum Domini corium /**fol. 175v**/ cum intestinis et fimo extra castra ferimus, dum non solum superficiem criminum, sed et omnium interiora sordium, confessionis gerula exportamus, et hoc in locum criminum, quia intra confessionis locum, se confitens reminiscitur esse puluerem et in puluerem reuersurum (compare Lev. 4:11–12 and 8:17; and Gen. 3:19). Nam cinis in cinerem nature soluet honorem. Astrictorium duo priora, scilicet punctorium et corium, continet et conligat ne a planta ferentis corruant, ita satisfactio duo etiam priora, uidelicet compunctionem et confessionem,<sup>327</sup> confirmat, ut sui uigoris habitudinem non amittant. Nam uera penitentia est male acta deflere, et deflenda non admittere. Stricte itaque tenere debemus penitentiam in satisfactione, si duo precedentia in suo effectu uolumus obseruare. Dicitur enim nobis a Iohanne: *Facite dignos fructus penitentiae* (Luke 3:8).

Habes unum calcar confesisonis, nunc accipe socium ipsius, scilicet calcar laudis. Tria sint laudare commendantia, scilicet mens intima, gratulatio assidua, uita uirtuosa.<sup>328</sup> Ecce prima pars est quasi laudis punctorium, secunda corium, tertia astrictorium. Mens intima, cuius spiritus exultat in Deo, uelud stimulus quidam, frequenter incitat hominem ut ardenti desiderio proferat Dei laudem. Beata uirgo cum laudans dixerat, *Magnificat anima mea Dominum* (Luke 1:46), ilico causam laudandi subuectie, dicens: *Et exultauit spiritus meus in Deo salutari meo* (Luke 1:47). Quod prima causa sit consequens secunda uero antecedens, in hoc ostenditur quod prima sub presenti, secunda uero sub tempore preterito a uirgine decantatur. Ideo namque laudem Domini magnifice cecinit, quia mens eius in Deo ex intimis precordiis exultauit. Ille utique qui tam angelos quam homines ad laudem sui prouocat, et non nisi punctorio sue bonitatis, exultauit in Spiritu Sancto, et dixit, *Confiteor tibi, Domine pater celi et terre* (Matt. 11:25), et nobis exemplum dedit ut et nos ita faciamus (compare Matt. 6:9). Huius gratia mens quasi quoddam punctorium est in laude diuina, cum cogat hominem non tacere Dei beneficia. Legimus in Psalmo: *Confitebitur tibi cum benefeceris ei* (Ps. 48:19). Et in hoc calcar laudis suam corrigiam habet uel corium, cum mortalis homo Christi incarnatione et morte se gratulatur redemptum, cuius incarnatio per corrigiam exprimitur, ut Iohannes testatur. Ait enim: *Ueniet fortior me post me, cuius non sum dignus soluere corrigiam calciamentoe eius* (Mark 1:7). Reuera corrigia hec est insolubilis, que nec intellectu concipi, nec exprimi potest uerbis. Nam generationem eius quis enarrabit? Nemo subaudis. Exsuperat enim omnem sensum. Habet et calcar istud suum astrictorium, /**fol. 176r**/ uirtuosam scilicet uitam, que si non affuerit, uita contraria duo predicta, uidelicet mentem intimam et gratulationem, quamuis assiduam, detrahet in ruinam. Non est laus preciosa in ore peccatoris, sicut conligimus ex

<sup>327</sup> confessionem] *add. in marg.*

<sup>328</sup> uita uirtuosa] *p. c.*

Psalmiste uerbis, ad talem dicentis: *Quare tu enarras iusticiam meam, et assumus testamentum meum per os tuum? Tu uero odisti disciplinam* (Ps. 49:16–17).

Duo calcaria, id est confessionem ueram et gratulationem assiduam, preparaui-mus, quibus iumentum carnis nostre, ne torpeat sed magis in cursu bono se exer-ceat, prouocare debemus. Potest etiam per punctorium intelligi timor Domini, per corium conditio generis humani, per astrictorium cautio hec tenendi. Timor Domini configit mentem, continue pungens eam et suggerens, ne in carnalibus desideriis faciat stationem. Orat Psalmista: *Confige timore tuo carnes* (Ps. 118:120). Apostolus ait: *Qui autem sunt Christi, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum uiciis et concupiscentiis* (Gal. 5:24). Per corium siue corrigiam, quia de pellibus mortuorum animalium accipitur, uire mortalitatis nostre conditio figuratur. Huic sententiae Ysaïas consonat, qui per corrigiam humanitatem Christi notat, dicens: *Neque soluetur cingulum renum eius, nec rumpetur corrigia calciamenti eius* (Isa. 5:27). Et nos punctorio corium apponimus si nostre fragilitatis conscii numquam cor nostrum a timore Domini separamus, meditantes assidue quod oportet nos hanc tunicam Ade pelliceam in puluerem commutare (compare Gen. 3:21). Hinc Iob ait: *Pelli mee consumptis carnibus, adhesit os meum* (Job 19:20). Tunc *pelli mee consumptis carnibus adheret os meum*, cum meditatio cordis mei, uoluptatibus carnis ad consumptionem detritis, mortis debitum quo pellis et omnia interiora eius resoluentur in lutum semper reminiscitur affuturum. Et hec meditatio hominem de limo terre formatum humiliat, sicut pes calcar gerentis corium semper calcat. Sed tam punctorium quam corium de calcaneo labitur, nisi per astrictorium fortiter fibuletur. Unde dixi quod astrictorium in calcari cautio sit tenendi, quia nisi stricta cautio uirtutes apprehensas firmo tenaculo custodiat, id quod apprehensum est necesse est ut in terram cadat. Unde apostolus ei consulit qui uirtutes aliquatenus apprehendit: *Qui tenet, teneat, donec de medio fiat* (2 Thess. 2:7). Et iterum: *Uidete quomodo caute ambulatis* (Eph. 5:15). Et in alio loco: *State et tenete traditiones quas didicistis* (2 Thess. 2:15). Et Iob ait: *Iustificationem meam, quam cepi tenere, non deseram* (Job 27:6). Et sponsa de sponso: *Tenui eum, nec dimittam* (Song 3:4). Immo totum calcar pariter a calcaneo labitur, nisi corium per fibulam ductum lingua fibule perforetur. Et nos omnem gratiam perdimus, nisi tribulationes fragili-/fol. 176v/-tatem nostram cotidie terebrantes per patientiam toleremus, sicut ille de quo dicitur: *In omnibus hiis non peccauit Iob labiis suis, neque stultum quid contra Deum locutus est* (Job 1:22). Qui quamuis diceret, *Nocte os meum perforatur doloribus* (Job 30:17), tamen addidit, *Donec deficiam, non recedam ab innocentia mea* (Job 27:5).

Ecce quam stricte uir iste calcaria sua confibulat, ne per impatientiam incaute admissam sui meriti donum perdat. Hiis, inquam, calcaribus miles probus utrique calcaneo sic adaptatis, super equum strenue se extollit, et alio pede<sup>329</sup> strepam

<sup>329</sup> See n. 121, above.

fiducie constanter posito, in sellam securitatis cinctam<sup>330</sup> fortiter magnificentie cingula, que difficilium et preclarorum est consummatio,<sup>331</sup> apte se recipit, paratus non solum hostibus irruentibus occurrere, uerum etiam in ipsos hostes pugnandi gratia uiriliter se deferre. Magnaminitas autem, que est difficilium rationabilis et spontanea aggressio,<sup>332</sup> bellatori mistico necessaria est, quia nisi animo uoluntario et corde magno iumentum sue carnis ascenderit, et nisi fiduciam, que certa spes est animi rem inchoatam ad finem perdudenda, habuerit, in sella securitatis, que incommoditates imminentes et rei inchoate affines non metuit, diu sedere sine precipitio non ualebit. Ad magnaminitatem nos bellatores inuitant incliti, scilicet Machabei, dicentes, *Faciatis eius*, id est Dei, *uoluntatem corde magno et animo uolente* (2 Macc. 1:3). Et quidam philosophus exclamat: “Componite mentes ad magnum uirtutis opus.”<sup>333</sup> Et alius: “Debent magnamino prelia corde geri.”<sup>334</sup> Ad fiduciam nos inuitat ille ipse, cuius cum fiducia debemus adire thronum gratie, et, ut certum sciamus, eius adiutorium seipsum nobis exhibet in exemplum, dicens: *Habete fiduciam. Ego sum, nolite timere* (Matt. 14:27). Et Salomon ait: *Sit in Domino fiducia tua* (Prov. 22:19). Et nos, secundum apostolum, *fiduciam talem habemus ad eum, non quod sufficientes simus facere aliquid a nobis, quasi ex nobis, sed sufficientia nostra ex eo est* (2 Cor. 3:4–5). Dicat ergo miles inclitus de eo: *Dominus illuminatio mea et salus mea, quem timebo?* (Ps. 26:1). Et adiciat: *Omnia possum in eo qui me*<sup>335</sup> *confortat* (Phil. 4:13). Hec due strepe, scilicet magnaminitatis et fiducie, militem in securitatis sellam pulchre eleuant, bene conlocant, recte continent, dum amore celestis Ierusalem hic bellum aggreditur, ut in illa post uictoriam coronetur. Unde propheta: *Sedebit Ierusalem segura* (Zech. 14:11). Et: *qui uigilauerit ad illam cito erit securus* (Wis. 6:16). Qui uero specietenus hanc sellam ascenderit, et cordetenus in laudem terrenam uel aliam huius mundi concupiscentiam descenderit, ascendendo cadit, quia in corde suo ascensiones debitas uersus celestem Ierusalem non disponit. /fol. 177r/ Audi Psalmistam: *Cadent omnis qui descendunt in terram* (Ps. 21:30). Miles ergo magnaminitas, cuius cor est habens fiduciam in Domino, sic secure sedet in sella, dum modo fuerit magnificentie cingula bene cincta. Sed hec magnificentie cingula et<sup>336</sup> res difficiles et preclaras bene confirmat, nisi ille, cuius *magnificentia*, postquam *omnia quecumque uoluit fecit* (Ps. 134:6), *eleuata est super celos* (Ps. 8:2), concedat. Hinc Daniel ait ad Baltasar: *O rex, Deus altissimus regnum et magnificentiam, gloriam et honorem dedit*

<sup>330</sup> cinctam] p. c. ex cunctam

<sup>331</sup> *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* 1.C, ed. Holmberg (n. 91 above), 30.

<sup>332</sup> Compare *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* 1.C, ed. Holmberg (n. 91 above), 30; and Abelard, *Collationes* 2.136, ed. Marebon and Orlandi (n. 121 above), 146.

<sup>333</sup> Lucan, *Pharsalia* 9.380–81.

<sup>334</sup> Albert of Stade, *Troilus* 4.240, ed. Merzdorf (n. 99 above), 109.

<sup>335</sup> me] p. c.

<sup>336</sup> et] que



*Nabugodonosor patri tuo* (Dan. 5:18). Sic itaque sedens et iumentum sui terga premens ruinam non sustinebit, sicut Hely qui<sup>337</sup> *de sella retrorsum cecidit, et fractis ceruicibus* expirauit (1 Sam. 4:18). Immo si uictor fuerit, cum Rege regum et Domino dominantium in throno suo sedebit, sicut in hoc libro dicit: *Qui uicerit dabo ei sedere mecum in throno meo* (Apoc. 3:21).

Et ne iamdictus equus<sup>338</sup> *tamquam pullum onagri liberum se natum putet* (Job 11:12), uel tamquam *pullus equinus fugetur, et ubi non sperabit apprehendatur* (Eccles. 23:30), aut certe quo uoluerit euagetur, immo ne cadat ascensor eius retro, uel forsitan ab hostibus propter equi bucca duritiam uel petulantiam capiat, antequam miles ascendat super ipsum, os eius est freno temperantiae constringendum. Siquidem recti linea postulat, ne equus<sup>339</sup> pro libito suo stet aut eat, cursitet aut currat, aut sessorem pro uelle suo deferat, sed sessor ipsum pro loco et<sup>340</sup> tempore huc<sup>341</sup> obuoluat et, ut oportuerit, freno retineat et remittat.

De hoc freno temperantiae quidam sapiens ait: *Ori tuo facito stateram, et frenos ori rectos, et attende ne forte labaris in lingua, et cadas in conspectu inimicorum insidiantium tibi, et sit casus tuus insanabilis in mortem*<sup>342</sup> (Eccles. 28:28–30). In libro Machabeorum legitur: *Cum uehemens pugna esset, apparuerunt aduersariis de celo uiri quinque in equis, frenis aureis decori, ducatum Iudeis prestantes, et contra hostes tela et fulmina iacientes* (2 Macc. 10:29–30). Pugna uehemens nobis est in hoc tempore contra aduersarios istos utique qui uim nobis faciunt uehementissime. Et quamuis hec pugna sit uehemens, est tamen auxilio aduenientis spiritus uehementis, cum uicerimus, ue adimens, et quinque uiri in equis frenis aureis sunt decori ducatum presentes, dum quinque sensus freno temperantiae carnem seruant, et ducatum recti itineris administrant. Et tunc uere illi quinque uiri in frenis apparent aureis quando, tam claris exemplis quam nobilibus actis, omnes motus coercent illicite uoluptatis. Tela contra hostes iaciunt et fulmina, dum et in facies eorum acuta uirtutum iactant opera, et terrorem tamquam fulguris eis incuciant per exempla. /fol. 177v/ Non enim possunt non metuere, dum per bona exempla uiderint<sup>343</sup> alios rutilare. Hoc freno carere non debet miles catholicus, quia teste beato Iacobo, *potest eo circumducere totum corpus*, ait enim, *Si frenos equis in ora mittimus, ad consentiendum nobis, omne corpus illorum circumferimus* (James 3:2–3), unde fit ut animal nostrum et rationi consentiat et nociuas sensualitatis illecebras non incurrat. Nocua est enim uoluptas quam necesse est purgari per penas. Scitis quis dixerit: “Sperne uoluptates, nocet empta dolore

---

<sup>337</sup> qui] que

<sup>338</sup> equus] equus

<sup>339</sup> equus] equus

<sup>340</sup> et] p. c.

<sup>341</sup> huc] p. c.

<sup>342</sup> mortem] mori

<sup>343</sup> uiderint] p. c.

uoluptas.”<sup>344</sup> Hoc itaque frenum nostre carnis equo semper debemus imponere, cum constet omnem fere uirtutem sine temperantia non ualere. Seneca: “Nullius uirtutis amore temperantiam relinquendam.”<sup>345</sup> Alius: “Animum rege, qui nisi paret, imperat: hunc frenis, hunc tu conpesce cathenis.”<sup>346</sup> Item alius: “Tu licet extremos late dominere per Indos, te Medus, te mollis Arabs, te Seres adorent, si metius si praua cupis, si duceris ira, seruitii pauere iugum, tolerabis iniquas interius leges, tunc omnia iure tenebis, cum poteris rex esse tui.”<sup>347</sup>

Animal quoque frenatur in capite, scilicet in prima et precipua corporis parte, et nos omnes motus uoluntatis illicite debemus motus<sup>348</sup> sui principio refrenare. Unde dicit poeta: “Principiis obsta, sero medicina paratur, cum mala per longas inualuere moras.”<sup>349</sup> Et quare<sup>350</sup> induco poetam quasi non sit propheta in Israel? Audi prophetam: *Ante languorem adhibe medicinam* (Ecclus. 18:20).

*Dominus quasi uir pugnator, omnipotens nomen eius* (Exod. 15:3), *qui percussit reges magnos, et occidit reges fortes* (Ps. 135:17–18), sui bellatoris est ipsemet uexillifer, precedens et animans aciem, ut tanto confidentius irrumpat in hostem. Ait enim: *Ego ante ibo, et gloriosos terre humiliabo* (Isa. 45:2). Et ipse satellitibus suis confert omne hoc genus armorum cum eos uirtute precingit ad bellum (compare Ps. 17:40), docet manus earum ad prelium (compare Ps. 143:1), continuum prestat auxilium. *Non enim in arcu meo sperabo, et gladius meus non saluabit me* (Ps. 43:7), sed *dextera tua et brachium tuum* (Ps. 43:4), qui omnis *inimicos tuos ponis scabellum pedum tuorum* (Ps. 109:1).

Et tu, Domine, omnia gloriose concludis, qui eterne coronam glorie uictoribus repromittis cum dicis, *Eris corona*<sup>351</sup> *glorie in manu Domini, et diadema regni in manu Dei tui* (Isa. 62:3), daturus eis eandem *coronam pro cinere, oleum gaudii pro luctu, pallium laudis pro spiritu meroris* (Isa. 61:3). Sicut<sup>352</sup> e contrario, [eis] qui non contra hostes in bello, sed cum ipsis potius in ocio pedibus sue uanitatis composito gressu incedunt, coronantes se *rosis antequam marcescant* (Wis. 2:8), *erit pro suauis odore fetor, et pro zona funiculus, et pro crispan—fol. 178r—ti crine caluicium, et pro fascia pectorali cilicium* (Isa. 3:24). Sed nos in te, qui non uenisti pacem mittere, quam repentinus sequitur interitus, sed gladium tui spiritus (compare Matt. 10:34), inimicos nostros uentilabimus cornu salutis, per quod afflante te spiritum caritatis ualide efflamus ex intimo pectoris, ut ex strepitu

<sup>344</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 1.2.55.

<sup>345</sup> Source unknown. Also referenced in the main text of *Expositio*, 4.178.

<sup>346</sup> Horace, *Epistolae* 1.2.62–63.

<sup>347</sup> Claudian, *De IV consulatu Honorii Augusti panegyricus* 8.257–62.

<sup>348</sup> motus] mortus

<sup>349</sup> Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 91.

<sup>350</sup> quare] quid

<sup>351</sup> corona] corone

<sup>352</sup> Sicut] scut

soni talis preliandi feruor domesticis, et terror proueniat inimicis. Et sic in nomine tuo, non in nomine nostro, spernemus insurgentes in nobis.

Fortis ergo bellator procedat in hostem leto bellandi animo, securus et gaudens, quasi iam uictor redierit cum triumpho. De Machabeis dicit scriptura, quod *preliabantur prelium Israel cum leticia* (1 Macc. 3:2). Et quid dicit Psalmista? *Letetur cor querentium Dominum* (Ps. 104:3). Nec hostis letius et leuius uincitur, quam cum in gaudio et cordis iubilo quasi idem hostis nullius sit ponderis, et tamquam ad ludum quis accesserit, impugnatur. Unde Ysaia: *In timpanis et cytharis, et in bellis precipuis, expugnauit eos* (Isa. 30:32). *Tuba quoque cecinerunt hii qui erant cum Iuda*<sup>353</sup> (1 Macc. 4:13). Et uere, secundum quendam philosophum, “letius est quociens magno sibi honestum.”<sup>354</sup> Magnum, certe secundum istius libri uisionem, istud est prelium (compare Apoc. 12:7), quia contra hostem seuissimum, magnum quia in consepctu angelorum, magnum quia spectatorem habet et iudicem ipsum Deum, et magnum, quia uictor eternum meretur gaudium, uictus eternorum incendia tormentorum (compare Apoc. 12). Licet tamen magnum sit prelium, modicum est contra illum, qui nichili est congregari, et cuius *fortitudo quasi fauilla stuppe* (Isa. 1:31) debet a fortibus computari. Nam si aliquid esset, Spiritus sanctus ei non dixisset: *Nichili factus es, et non eris in perpetuum* (Ezek. 28:19). Aliquis est in existentia, nullus in resistentia. Semper enim uincitur, nisi sponte uincere permittatur. Nam dicitur: *Draco pugnat et angeli eius, et non ualuerunt* (Apoc. 12:7–8). Debet etiam bellator inimicum per uim irascibilem aggredi, quia debemus omnibus in uia morum nobis obuian- tibus indignari. Sic Machabei *percusserunt peccatores in ira sua, et impios in indignatione sua* (1 Macc. 2:44). Sic in isto bello, in corde bellatoris ira erit leta, et leticia simul irata, ira uidelicet mentem prouocans et leticia animans, ut leticie serenitas bellandi tedium eliminet, et ire seueritas studium amministret.

Bellator autem si uincere desiderat, semper conetur in caput hostis ictum dirigere, uidelicet, ut principium intentionis eius, qua ferire uult, studeat referire. Et ut hoc facilius agat, hostem per comam capitis audacter arripiat; id est omnes subtilitates huic intentioni adherentes, et circumstantias hinc cause famulantes stricta conditionis manu uiriliter apprehendat, ut in abscissione capitis tanto paratior ictus fiat. Uerbi gratia: Holofernes uisa Iudith hanc concepit intentionem, ut cum ea suam expleret libidinem (compare Jth. 10:17 and 12:16). Ecce capud hostis nocere uolentis, uis audire subtilitates et cir-/fol. 178v/-cumstantias hinc capiti adherentes? Uagao procatur eam ad Holofernis consensum, inuitatur ad conuiuium, iubetur in iocunditate bibere uinum (compare Jth. 12:12), sollicitatur ad libinis incendium, licentiatur ad lectum. Sola cum solo in cubiculo clauso relinquitur (compare Jth. 13:1–3), ut male intentionis desiderium expleatur. Ecce come

<sup>353</sup> Iuda] p. c. ex iucunda

<sup>354</sup> Lucan, *Pharsalia* 9.404.

capitis istius! Sed mentita est iniquitas sibi, quia Iudith *apprehendit comam capitis eius, et percussit bis ceruicem eius, et amputauit caput eius* (Jth. 13:9–10). Ita bellator strenuus<sup>355</sup> hostem per comam capitis arripiat,<sup>356</sup> et bis ceruicem eius percuciens, caput eius abscidat. Et hoc faciet facili molimine, si Iudith, id est confitens uel glorificans esse, et sicut ipsa diuinum auxilium non cessauerit implorare. Ait enim: *Conforta me, Domine Deus Israel, et respice in hac hora ad opera manuum mearum* (Jth. 13:7). Et ille bis ceruicem Holofernis percutit, qui, cum una uice primam hostis ceruicosi maliciam non consentiendo reliserit, alio ictu caput eius plene demetit, cum omni uite sue tempore, cunctis conatibus eius, tanquam uires eius omnino interficiens, uno eodemque proposito contradicit. Hinc Ieremias ait: *Interfucite omnem maliciam eius* (Jer. 51:3). Et Iosue: *Omne quod spirare poterat interfecit* (Josh. 10:40). In hiis itaque duobus ictibus, tota pugna pendet et uictoria.

Ecce hiis bene expletis Holofernes, id est diabolus, iacet in terra sine efficitia, et capud eius non est in eo, quia impotens factus est in suo proposito. Et mirum non est ipsum fieri impotentem, cum sepe contingatur eum non solum spiritualibus armis Dei, uerum etiam armis propriis debellari. Semper autem cum uincitur, uirtus eius minuitur, siue ex parte siue ex toto superetur. Superatur ex parte cum illum, a quo iam uictus est ante, rediens iterum incipit attemptare. Nam teste Domino dicit aliquando: *Reuertar in domum meam unde exiui* (Matt. 12:44). Legimus etiam: *Factum est rursum prelium Philistinorum aduersus Israel* (2 Sam. 21:15). Superatur ex toto cum sic uincitur ab aliquo, ut nec illum nec alium simili audeat impetere, uel ualeat deicere nocumento. Quod fit, si alicui mortale peccatum suggerit et ille eum uicerit, ita quod in nulla umquam parte ei consentiat, immo in omni sue intentionis proposito contradicat. Dicunt<sup>357</sup> quod “confusus abscedat”<sup>358</sup> demon ille, nec alterum in simili crimine possit amplius irretire. Senserat hoc qui ait, *Diuisit Dominus inimicos meos per manum meam sicut diuiduntur aque* (2 Sam. 5:20). Nonne de hostibus Machabeorum uictis legitur, quod *proiecerunt arma sua et fugerunt*?<sup>359</sup> (1 Macc. 7:44). Et Dominus ait per Amos: *Ego exterminauit Amorreum a facie eorum, cuius altitudo, cedrorum altitudo eius, et fortis ipse quasi quercus, et conteram fructum eius desuper et radicem eius subter* (Amos 2:9). Et Alanus in Anticlaudio hoc manifeste asserit ubi **/fol. 179r/** pensauit.<sup>360</sup> Iudeum, enim qui *accessit in oculis omnium sacrificare idolis in ciuitate Modin secundum iussum regis, [. . .] insiliens trucidauit super aram*

<sup>355</sup> strenuus] *sic for* strenuus

<sup>356</sup> arripiat] arpiat

<sup>357</sup> Dicunt] *p. c.*

<sup>358</sup> This phrasing appears in exorcism prayers, the earliest clear example being Pseudo-Gelasius I, *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae* 1.67, ed. Wilson (n. 93 above), 111.

<sup>359</sup> fugerunt] *p. c. ex* fugierunt

<sup>360</sup> Compare Alain of Lille, *Anticlaudianus* 9.380–409, ed. Boussat (n. 97 above), 196–97.

(1 Macc. 2:23–24). Tercium ictum imperterritus dedit, cum *uirum quem miserat rex Anthiochus, qui cogebat immolare* [. . .] *occidit et aram destruxit* (1 Macc. 2:25). Uidete quantam fortitudinem prebet Deus hiis qui perfecto corde credunt in eum. Sic sepiissime diabolus in quo ledere se credit leditur et eodem quem eximit gladio debellatur. Et quocienscumque aliquis per infestationem eius ei resistendo melior efficitur, ipse per instrumenta propria referitur. Ait quidam: “Sepe sagittantem didicit referire sagitta.”<sup>361</sup> Et alius: “Ach quociens telis uulneror ipse meis.”<sup>362</sup>

Nos autem in tanta armorum habundantia, et diuini adiutorii gratia cum castra Dei sint hec, si hostem non inuadimus, Deum suis beneficiis impugnamus. Ait enim: *Ego dedi eis aurum meum et argentum et ipsi edificauerunt Baal* (Hos. 2:8). Et si inimicum in castra hec permittimus irrupere, perditionem corporis et anime non possumus non timere. Sed super hostem stat, qui omnia eius irritamenta conculcat. Gladium de uagina eius extrahit, qui quo intentionem malicie sue dirigat, deprehendit. Gladium uel pugione proprio eum percutit, qui, ut dictum est, suis machinationibus quibus resistendo ei melior sit, eum punit. Caput eius abscidit, cum suggestionis eius inicium inualescere non permittit. Eum interficit, cum omnem uigorem uoluntatis illius elidens, nullis eius temptationibus acquiescit. Audi scripture testimonium: *Preualuit David aduersum*<sup>363</sup> *Philisteum in funda et lapide, percussumque Philisteum interfeci. Cumque gladium non haberet in manu David, cucurrit et stetit super Philisteum, et tulit gladium eius, et eduxit de uagina sua, et interfecit eum, preciditque caput eius* (1 Sam. 17:50–51). Habita uictoria quid faciendum est? Queramus ab uno de uictoribus: *Assumens David capud Philistei attulit illud in Ierusalem. Arma uero eius posuit in tabernaculo suo* (1 Sam. 17:54). Uade et tu fac similiter! Capud enim inimici deuicti post uictoriam in Ierusalem deferimus, cum illi qui *habitat in Ierusalem* (Ps. 134:21) celesti debitas gratiarum actiones pro uictoria deportamus. Sic Machabei, dum uicerant, semper in Ierusalem laudes uictorie celebrabant (compare 1 Macc. 7:48–49 and 13:51–52). Arma uero eius in tabernaculo nostro ponimus, dum et ipsum nobis amplius nocere non permittamus, et quante sint eius uires si inualuerit, numquam a nostra conscientia remouemus.

Hanc hominum et demonum instruximus pugnam digressionem longa, congregatione tamen necessaria, nec enim male quis digreditur, si melior reuertatur. Triumphatores siquidem et amici Dei quamuis bellandi habeant peritiam et superandi frequentiam. Sepe tunc<sup>364</sup> non erit inutile, siquis aliquando materiam notam

<sup>361</sup> *Proverbia sententiaque latinitalis medii aevi*, ed. Walther (n. 128 above), 4:678 (no. 27267); and Albert of Stade, *Troilus* 4.121, ed. Merzdorf (n. 99 above), 105. See also *Polytheon* 3.452, ed. Orbán (n. 128 above), 112.

<sup>362</sup> Source unknown. Compare Ovid, *Amores* 2.9.4.

<sup>363</sup> aduersum] aduersus

<sup>364</sup> tunc] p. c. ex tamen

recolat et consuetam, et sepius in cursu rerum exigitur, ut /fol. 179v/ a minus sapiente sapiens instruat. Salomon ait, *Audiens sapiens, sapientior erit* (Prov. 1:5). Dicit philosophus: “quia flumine sepe secundo augetur remis cursus euntis aque;”<sup>365</sup> “acer et ad palme per se cursurus honores, si tamen hortaris, fortius ibit equus<sup>366</sup>.”<sup>367</sup> “Non nocet admissio subdere calcar equo.”<sup>368</sup> Sic et nos “uela damus, quamuis remige nauis eat.”<sup>369</sup> Et ipsa ueritas ait: *Omnem qui fert fructum, purgabit eum, ut fructum plus afferat* (John 15:2). Uerumptamen hoc ex uerbis illius libri omnes audiimus quod *draconem, serpentem antiquum, qui uocatur diabolus et Sathanas*, quamuis ipse per suos satellites plures exerceat malicias, angelus *ligauit et misit in abyssum et clausit et signauit super illum* [ . . . ] *donec consumentur mille anni* (Apoc. 20:2–3), scilicet usque ad ultima tempora mundi.

---

<sup>365</sup> Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 4.15.26–27.

<sup>366</sup> equus] equus

<sup>367</sup> Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 2.11.21.

<sup>368</sup> Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 2.6.38.

<sup>369</sup> Ovid, *Tristia* 5.14.44.